On Words from Days of Yore:

Attitudes Toward English Word Usage in

American English Speakers of Different Varieties

by

Paris Weslyn Hickman

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved April 2016 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Robert E. Bjork, Chair
Karen L. Adams
Elly van Gelderen

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2016

ABSTRACT

The English language is taught all over the world and changes immensely from place to place. As such, both L1 and L2 English Language Users all utilize English as a tool for creating meaning in their existence and to also form perspectives on how the language ought to be. What is interesting about this is that the language being used to do that is one birthed from a culture that many English speakers across the globe are separated from; that is, Anglo-Saxon culture. Since learning and using language is also learning and participating in culture the question is, then how separated are American English speakers from that of the culture that created the language they speak? Does Anglo-Saxon culture impact how worldviews are formed in contemporary English speakers? I propose that the first step to finding some answers is by investigating the language ideologies that American English speakers have through the inquiry of meanings that they prescribe to English words that derive from Old English and subsequently have Germanic origins. The following work details a study examining the language attitudes of American English speakers in hopes of shedding new light on these questions.

ACKNOWLEDGINGS

First and foremost I must take the time to wholeheartedly give my thanks to all of those who, in their own way, have helped this work come to be.

To Robert E Bjork, your endless knowledge of the English wordhoard, your *gléawscipe*, and your cunning have been like true gifts of gold throughout the making of this work.

To Karen L. Adams, thank you for your words of wisdom, and careful help with birthing, crafting, and writing this work.

To Elly van Gelderen, thank you for being one of the most wonderful women I have ever known. I am a stronger thinker thanks to having you steadfast in my learninghall, both soothfully and in heart, over the years.

Having the luck of growing as a learner under the wisdom of each of you has shaped the way I think about and live in the world. The embers of knowledge that you have all stoked within my mind have given life to a great fire and have left a mark upon my own mindcraftiness.

A hearty thanks must also be given to all those who freely gave answers full and true for the life of this thing. Also thanks to those who took the time to speak to me nose to nose. I am full of wonder at all of your thoughts and feelings that you have shared with me, whether written or spoken.

As a young child I fell in love with the written work of J.R.R. Tolkien and the Brothers Grimm. As such, I would also like to hail all of the work on tales of men and their words

that each of those men did before me, and thank them all for sparking a love of words

deep within me at a young age.

Without all of the folk who are spoken of, none of my work could have been crafted.

 The bits you all have done for me and my work is hallowed.

Thank you forever,

Paris Weslyn Hickman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW GLOSSARY

(.5)	timed pause
(.)	untimed micropause
£talk£	talk produced in a laughing voice
#talk#	talk produced in a "smiley" voice
talk	talk produced in a creaky voice
(( ))	additional explanations or descriptions
-	sharp cut-off of an utterance
:	sound elongation
( )	unclear fragment; best guess
.	a stopping or a fall in tone
,	continuing contour
?	a rising inflection
underline	speaker emphasis
CAPS	noticeably louder speech
=	contiguous utterances
[ ]	overlapping talk
↓ ↑	marked falling or rising intonation
°talk°	noticeably softer or quieter speech
"talk"	talk produced as represented speech; in a way that indicates the speaker is voicing

someone else (or a past or hypothetical self)

>talk<	faster speech
<talk>	slower speech
italics	non-English words

From Prior 2011 lecture on transcription

INTRODUCTION

Modern English is one of the most widely spoken languages in the world next to Mandarin and Spanish. Thumbing through countless pages of history books one can learn role imperialism and colonization play in the current status of English as a world language, which has resulted in a plethora of communities in the modern world being made up of either L1 and/or L2 users of English. These communities, from Chicago to New Delhi, are adding to a lineage of folk who have the English language nestled safely in their tool boxes in order to further create their worlds. Language—like art, religion, and fashion— is a tool that is seamlessly bound to culture. Through *wordwork* communities find ways to collectively prescribe meaning to various realms of existence. *Wordwork* here refers to all of the ways in which a people work to assign meaning to their existences both individually and communally with their languages. The languages these communities speak is a part of the way they create the worlds they live in, just as the worlds they live in are a part of how they speak their language.

"When a language dies, a way of understanding the world dies with it," (Steiner 1975). It is from ruminating on the heuristic above that inspiration to investigate the attitudes of American English speakers towards the use of words native to the English tongue was birthed. That sentiment, which George Steiner states in his work *After Babel*, is particularly interesting for the case of English, as the language of Anglo-Saxons has not died; it is fluid, and it may be ever changing, but it still lives. Exploring the ways in which Anglo-Saxon understandings of the world might be interlaced with that of how American English speakers understand the world is significant, because despite the fact that these speakers are generally separated from what is thought of as Anglo-Saxon

1

culture, they are still ultimately using the language of Anglo-Saxons, and language is riddled with culture. To do this, the work is separated into seven sections. First I will review the literature that was necessary in developing a theoretical background. Then I will detail the research question and hypothesis. After I will discuss and provide justification for the methodological procedures used to generate data. I will discuss the findings of the pilot study, as well as the results of the full-scale study. In the last two sections will be a discussion of the full-scale study's results, and I will provide insight into implications of this study moving forward.

The way American English speakers perceive their language, or the languages of others, has an impact on the ways language is talked about and taught, from those creating legislation in government buildings, to those teaching curricula in the classroom, to those perpetuating prejudice against marginalized communities. The goal of the work is to discover not only how the culture of a people changes as their language changes, but also what remains the same. In examining what impact, if any, Anglo-Saxon culture has on American English speakers I set out to find that American English speakers are not entirely as disconnected from the people who first spoke their language as they initially might seem. It is my greatest hope that by beginning to look into the language perspectives of American English speakers in this way it will provide a framework for unraveling new interdisciplinary ways for teaching the English Language that could in turn lead to the normalization of English variation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The background for this topic of study is extremely interdisciplinary. To build any kind of framework it was necessary for me to pull from many different fields. It is for this reason that it must be acknowledged here that the researcher is not an unbiased party. I, like the researchers I have been inspired by, am a human attempting to decode living language. The very act of choosing a topic to study, and what preceding works upon which the work ought to be founded on, is proof that the primary influence of this work is the researcher herself first and foremost— as it was by her hand that this study was constructed, and that these pages were put together

When I began my research it became apparent that there was a gap between the ways in which 'doing language' in turn, involves 'doing culture,' and how that culture does not exist in a vacuum. Finding work that specifically explores the relationship between language, culture, and the history of both was hard to come by. The culture that surrounds American English, of any variety, is one that does not begin or end with The United States. Therefore, this work attempts to solidify connections between the Dark Age English speaking cultures of the "Old World" with that of the "New." To do so it was necessary for me to forge a framework by laying down a theoretical foundation bit by bit with bricks of knowledge from Sociolinguistics, Applied Linguistics, Linguistic-Anthropology, Historical Linguistics, Psychology, Anglo-Saxon Scholarship, language ideologies, language and identity, Post-Structuralism, and relativism. The following will outline that framework and the theoretical background of this study.

In order to start pulling back the layers research began humbly with Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf. There have been many studies done over the years attempting to prove

3

the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This is something that has shown to be very difficult. Sapir-Whorfian studies done for the purpose of proving linguistic determinism, which is that idea that the language one speaks determines how they understand the world, have not really shown any strong evidence that this is true. There has also not been much work that explicitly proves linguistic relativism one way or the other either. Still, there are countless studies around the globe that have been done in the realm of understanding how the knowledge of various communities is held in their languages. Works that were of the most interest in the development of this study were various readings on linguistic relativism, Indigenous language studies in the US, and also works investigating heritage languages and Identity in language such as: Whorf, 2012; Norton, 1995; Alford, 1980; Alfred, 1999; Van Troyer, 1994. The notion that the cultural identity and knowledge of a people lives inside their language is incredibly intriguing, especially when one takes into consideration the turmoil that many indigenous communities go through to keep their languages alive. Languages have the capability of providing communities with a means to know the world as their ancestors did:

> Our bodies may live without our languages, lands, or freedom, but they will be
> hollow shells. Even if we survive as individuals, we will no longer be what we
> Rotinonhsyonni call Onkwehonwe-the real and original people-because the
> communities that make us true indigenous people will have been lost, (Alfred,
> 1999).

It seems common to find communities at risk of losing their languages holding these beliefs about the important role language plays in creating the worldviews of their community. It is uncertain, though, whether these attitudes are things that are intrinsic to

4

each individual in the community, or if these attitudes are the result of having been taught them. These sentiments are ones that are used in developing the importance of providing an outlet for American English speakers of all varieties to learn where the language they use comes from. This is something that I feel is particularly important for L1 users of English, but also would provide and excellent wealth of knowledge to L2 users that are interested in gaining a deeper understanding of English. Language helps us carve out our own individual identities as much as it is a marker of cultural identities. Both one's individual and communal identity are social constructs that are largely influenced by one's surroundings, as well as ones internal cognitive abilities.

So much of what makes up wordwork—or 'doing language'— and culture is deeply rooted in the mind, because of this another area that greatly influenced this work was psychology—specifically the works of Jacques Lacan and Carl Jung. The unconscious is structured like language, in turn giving language a pivotal role in the construction of our worlds—and subsequently both our cultures and identities. In 'The Direction of the Treatment, and the principles of its power' Jacques Lacan states that,

> [His] doctrine of the signifier is first of all a discipline in which those [he] trains have to familiarize themselves with the different ways in which the signifier effects the advent of the signified, which is the only conceivable way that interpretation can produce anything new.
>
> For interpretation is based on no divine archetypes, but on the fact that that is unconscious is structured in the most radical way like a language, that a material operates in it according to certain laws, which are the same laws as those

discovered in the study of actual languages, languages that are or were actually

spoken,(1977).

Language is considered here like sets of symbols used by the unconscious of speakers in

order to create meaning. These symbols are structured and passed down from generation

to generation, and language change occurs as the interpretations of those symbols change.

For the case of English one must examine how many different cultures currently use

English as a tool to create their realities and how people perceive the role their language

has in the construction of their worldviews.

> Worldview strikes us as a big thought, as well it should, because it includes not
>
> only our own habits, but those of our culture as well, in dealing with the world--
>
> the world as background against which we operate, the world as culturally
>
> modeled habits of doing and being, perceiving and sensing, thinking and
>
> speaking. Language is one of the principal ways in which we experience and
>
> interact with our culture. Thus, the wordworld is the map which a particular
>
> language creates in order to navigate the worldview. The wordworld becomes, in
>
> some sense, most of the worldview, (Alford 2000).

The *wordworld* being explored here is one that is native to English, and subsequently,

one that was used by Anglo-Saxons to aide them in constructing their worldviews as

well. The thought that these worldviews are something that could possibly still be similar

is rooted in Jungian archetypes and the idea of collected consciousness—the connecting

feature here being language. Michael Vannoy Adams' *The Multicultural Imagination* is a

text that was highly influential on this work, and another reason why making sure that a

wide variety of identities, cultures, and Englishes were being represented in the study. In it Vannoy Adams' explores how vital the construction of race is in the unconscious. This is important for my own work, because so many American English varieties are ones that are extremely racialized. This in turn also led me to reading briefly about the concept of race as it relates to Anglo-Saxons.

In addition to exploring racial identities of Anglo-Saxons in Harris (2003), *Race and Ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon Literature,* it was also necessary to read many other texts detailing Anglo-Saxon culture. Text chronicling the history of English were also crucial for the theoretical framework of this study. Works that were used to help gain an understanding of who the Anglo-Saxons were, and how their language began to change were: Bede 1994; Laing and Laing, 1979; Campbell, 1982; Mitchel and Robinson,1992; Neville, 1999; Baugh and Cable, 2002; Amodio and O'Brien O'Keffe, 2003; van Gelderen, 2006; Higham and Ryan 2013; Fulk 2014. What is currently known about Anglo-Saxons and the way they used their language is pivotal to how I went along selecting which words would be utilized in both the pilot and full-scale versions of this study. It is also upon these works that I base the analysis of how different or similar the results of the study were to what we know of how Anglo-Saxon English speakers used the Old English versions of the words selected for research. One of the most astounding similarities I found illuminated on how the concept of 'cultural appropriation—' which is currently a prevalent topic of interest in identity politics becomes more mainstream— is not something that is in anyway novel or new, but has seemingly been an issue for as long as there have been cultures to appropriate. This has led me to think that finding other

similarities in the cultural values of Anglo-Saxons and that of modern day Americans might be less difficult than was previously thought.

The theories upon which the analysis of the work is based on were found through an overview of Sociolinguistic inquiry, Qualitative research, Interview research, the use of questionnaires in linguistic study, language ideologies and also English varieties. Works that were used for this purpose were extremely influential on both the design and content of this study were: Paltridge and Phakti 2015; Hudley and Mallinson, 2011; Balohg, 2011; Mendoza-Denton, 2008; MacNeil and Cran 2005; Kiesling, 2004; Parakrama 1995; Onyeama, 1988; McDavid and Dill, 1980; Laihonen, 2008; Schilling-Estes 1998, Wolfson, 1976; Hall-Lew and Plichta, 2013; Boberg, 2010; Avis, 1954; Cassidy, 1953; Chambers, 2000; Chambers, 1998; Nylvek 1992; Scargil, 1954; Dubois and Horvath, 2002; Labov, 1972; Dillard, 1992; Davies, 2005. Many of these works were studies that involved looking at the language attitudes people held toward different English varieties, specifically though the use of questionnaires. Each taught me how "the measurement techniques with the help of which language attitudes can be investigated may be categorized from different angles. For example, quantitative techniques apply statistics to be able to convey people's attitudes in figures, while qualitative techniques might endeavor to identify the reasons behind figures, i.e. to uncover details behind figures," (Balogh 2011).

Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs by Norma Mendoza-Denton was particularly important when it came to the development of the full-scale study. Mendoza-Denton's book showed how important language is for cultural expression. It was because of this that I wanted to add another element of study

that would provide a more personalized look at how different American English speakers feel about their language as an expression of their culture. Each of the works mentioned above were able to give a full description of what different Englishes in the United States, and Canada, are like. In works that were specifically looking at African American and Chicano Englishes there was a lot of information that provided a historical background for why these varieties developed and the historical and cultural backdrop under which they developed.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESIS

English has undergone immense changes since it was first echoed across the briny deep from the shores of British Isles, marking the end of Roman rule. Still, some 1500 odd years later and many of the most basic words and phrases used for constructing identity, and also the world in which American English speakers live in, have deep roots in Old English language, and Anglo-Saxon culture: from Easter celebrations, to Yule logs, to the names given to the days of the week. The purpose of this work is to explore the ways in which Anglo-Saxon culture continues to live through the wordwork of American English speakers of different varieties; if language holds some of the responsibility for the ways in which speakers understand the world, could American English understandings of the world still be impacted by Anglo-Saxon understandings, despite how removed from Anglo-Saxon culture American culture seems? How do Anglo-Saxon ways of looking at the world still thrive in spite of the many changes that have occurred in English? The first step to answering these questions is to investigate the language ideologies that American English speakers have through the inquiry of meanings that they prescribe to English words that derive from Old English, or have Germanic origins. Analysis of the perceptions that American English speakers have on the utilization of words that derive from Old English will show whether or not Anglo-Saxon understandings of the words are latent in the contemporary understandings of those words.

METHODS

In the field of language attitude research a variety of methodologies has been applied since researchers started investigating the general public's attitudes towards language varieties and their speakers in the 1930s. Regardless of whether they have employed direct or indirect, or quantitative or qualitative methods, or the matched guise or the verbal guise techniques, the common goal of these studies has usually been to measure people's attitudes towards different dialect or accent varieties of particular languages as well as, in the majority of the cases, towards the speakers of specific language varieties, (Balogh 2011).

Language attitudes are the main source of investigation for this work. It is very common that studies examining language attitudes are exploring how speakers feel about different dialects. For example: EFL students discussing how they feel about different English speaker accents. Language attitudes are about much more than just that, though. "Language attitudes represent important communicative phenomena to explore," because they also have the ability to show researchers how people navigate the importance of certain aspects of their language, and looking into the perspectives people have about their languages, or the languages of others, is another way to look into powerful social dynamics that in turn provide a glimpse into what particular things are of what value to certain linguistic communities, (Cargile and Giles 1998).

This language attitude study consisted of a variety of methods. I utilized questionnaires and surveys, interview, and also experimental activities. It was also conducted multiple times. First I issued an initial pilot study, and then I attempted to recreate a full-scale version, implementing changes that I felt were necessary. The pilot

was conducted solely as an online questionnaire. The questionnaire method of data collection was chosen for the pilot, and remained a part of the study during the full-scale run, because it seemed as though this would be the best place to begin finding what ideologies are ones that are commonplace in regards to American English speakers and their usages of words native to English.

The justification of this method rests in the ability of questionnaires to reach a large population of people. Culture and language are expressions of the human experience, allowing for people to discuss openly about the way they interact with the languages and cultures they participate in is crucial in exploring how human language, history, and culture are intertwined. A downside about the use of questionnaires, surveys, and qualitative inquiry in general is that there is no surefire method to measure what is objectively true about the data collected and what is not. I maintain that even in more quantitative research what is ultimately being explored is always one's perception of data that has been collected. In the case of questionnaires and surveys, even if every answer that is provided is not completely true the perception that the participants provided is still valid. This perception, whether true of false, still illuminates what the participants want people to think they believe about themselves and the world they live in.

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part was general demographic information. Originally I was very concerned about the implications of demographic information. I have found that for people who are members of marginalized groups filling out these sections can be an extremely uncomfortable experience. Having to put oneself in a box, when none of the boxes accurately describe one's identity can be troublesome for anyone. The information collected by many demographic questions and answer

section is largely meaningless; it rarely ever seems to take into account how complex and bizarre social constructs like race and gender are. Regardless every participant must check off one box or another, and that is easier for some than it is for others. Because of this I found myself very torn between the choices of either omitting or including demographic information of participants. In the end I decided that it was worth keeping demographic information, as it might possibly add some insight when the evaluation process began, and I needed to have as many ways as possible for making sure that the results of the study were diversified. That being said, I was very particular about how I asked those questions. The next section consisted of 6 questions about the language history, and general perspectives on the English language as a whole. The final portion of the questionnaire asked the participant to explain the frequency with which they used 7 words in American English that derive from Old English. The participants were also asked to explain what those words meant, to explain how they would use those words in a sentence, and then explain whether or not that word had any special significance for them.

The questionnaire was created using Google Forms and was distributed online through the use of social media. I posted frequently in various groups. Some of these groups were very inclusive demographics wise, and others were groups that were specifically for creating exclusive space for people of color. I did this in efforts of getting the most amount of people who speak different varieties of American English, and come from different socio-cultural backgrounds, as possible. I originally set out to have at least 100 participants in the survey. Out of that target number I was able to get responses from 96 participants. This happened in a matter of days. I waited about two weeks to be sure

that I wasn't going to end up getting anymore responses and then I began to look at the type of data that I was collecting.

The full-scale recreation of the pilot was also centered on a questionnaire although, unlike the pilot the full-scale version implemented a mixed method approach. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: general demographic information, language learning history, and language attitudes towards twenty words native to English. Participants of the questionnaire were also able to participate in an interview portion that involved answering questions about their experience with the questionnaire, more questions about their perception of the roles language, culture, and history all play in creating worldviews, and then a short activity.

The questionnaire was also constructed through Google Forms and distributed via social media. Although the basic design of the questionnaire portion of the study stayed the same there were many details that I fine-tuned for the recreation. The largest change is that I greatly reduced the amount of multiple choice questions throughout. I felt as though doing this would allow for participants to provide the most authentic answers. This shows in each section of the recreation. In the demographic portion, places where I once utilized multiple choice questions were replaced with open-ended answer boxes. So, instead of asking what race or gender the participant was, and then providing answers for them, I ask the participant how they would describe their race or gender and allow them to fill-in-the blank. The answers that I received just from this minor change showed a much larger representation of diversity within the overall community of American English speakers.

In addition to that, most of the changes that I made were done out of the interest of making the instructions and purpose of each question clearer to participants. It was extremely difficult to make sure that the questions I was asking were being conveyed in the way I meant them to be for the participants due to the issue of the subjectivity of words and their meanings. I realized that in the pilot I asked a lot of detailed questions about people's gender and ethnic identities out of the interest of maintaining diversity, but I didn't ask very many questions to help frame the content of the survey.

In the full-scale study I added an entire section that was devoted to asking only questions about the language learning history of the participant. This helped me see even more clearly what different varieties were being represented. There was also an addition of questions that specifically ask the participants to unpack the relationships between language, history, and culture. After this section the participants would begin describing the meanings that they personally ascribe to certain words. All of the words chosen were ones that are Germanic in origin, and only two of them are not native to the English language. However, they are also words that have experienced changes in meaning through time, and across varieties. 19 words were chosen for the full-scale version. For the first 10 words the participants were asked to rank how frequently they used these words, and if these words held any special or significant meanings for them. For all 19 words the participants were asked to explain how they would describe what that word means to someone who had never heard of that word before: this also included sharing multiple uses or meanings of the word.

A small number of the participants volunteered to be a part of an interview session and activity in addition to having completed the online survey. This provided a

more intimate look into some of the online survey responses that were provided. The activity of the interview consisted of providing the participant with excerpt from Old English, Middle English, Dutch, Swedish, French, and Latin and asking them to circle the words in each excerpt that look like they might be words they know. After they went through each excerpt we discussed the familiar words, what each of the languages the excerpts were from, and what those languages have to do with the history of English.

The interview itself was as close to naturalistic conversation as possible. It was unstructured. There was no list of questions. There was, however, a list of topics that I did want to try to make sure that we covered. Every interviewee discussed their experience with the online survey—what they thought about it, things they liked, things they didn't like, provided a more in-depth description of their language learning history, gave an explanation of what they fell the relationship between language, history, and culture is, and finally discussed the ways in which History of English is or is not relevant for American English speakers

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF PILOT

Of the 96 people who were participants in the pilot study survey 33.3% of them were between the ages of 18-25, 43.7% fell between the ages of 26-35, 10.4% were ages 36-45, 11.5% were ages 46-65, and 1% were 66 years of age or older. 74.7% of the participants identified as White, 22.1% identified as Non-White, and 3.2% preferred not to answer. Something that was interesting about this was that at the same time 84.9% of people felt as though they are perceived by others as white, while only 14% of the participants felt as though they were also perceived as Non-White, even though they self-identify as Non-white, and only 1% of participants preferred not to answer. Many of the participants provided further explanation on their ethnic background showing that many of the people who identify as White have various types of European or Latino backgrounds, while many of those who identified as Non-White described themselves as mixed, metizo, latino, or of African, Middle Eastern, or East Asian descent.

One of the things I would have liked to do during the pilot would have been to make sure that there was a more balanced number of participants. Even though I tried to spread the questionnaire around to places with a more diverse climate, I still found that a large majority of the participants were not people of color. This is problematic because in looking at the understandings of Americans, that means looking at a very diverse set, and the sample that I collected is far more homogenous than what I was originally intending for the work. The last bit of demographic information shared that 49% of the participants identify as male; 43% of the participants identify as female; 7.3% of the participants do not identify as male or female. American English was the first language of 94.8% of

participants, and 56.3% of all participants identified as monolingual speakers of American English.

To begin generating data beyond that, I did not look into who provided what responses. If I had a sample that was less homogenous I might have decided to examine that aspect more closely, but instead I first examined how frequently the participants felt the used the words selected. The words that were investigated for the pilot study were*: 'weird,' 'thing,' 'dream,' 'earth,' 'craft,' 'midwife,'* and *'freedom.'* I choose these words because I felt like each of these words were common enough that even if people weren't actively using them, the way in which they use them, or the ways in which they would describe their usage would be a good starting place for figuring out what types of words would be most important to look at for the full-scale study.

As I began looking at the frequencies I had in mind which words I thought would be the ones that were more frequently used. Words like '*weird,' 'thing,' 'dream,' 'earth,'* and especially *'freedom.'* Out of all the words chosen for the pilot, I expected that midwife would not be a very commonly used word. Despite how frequent or infrequent the words were used, I wanted to see what meanings the participants prescribed for each of the words, h ow they would use them to create meaning if they had to—even if they are words that they do not feel they use. I then took the responses the participants provided and compared the perspectives the participants shared about those words to the ways in which those words were used for Anglo-Saxon era English speakers.

It was surprising how quickly so many people participated in the pilot study. Out of the target number of 100 participants 96 people participated. About ¾ of the

participants expressed that they enjoyed learning English, 60% said that they had previously studied the history of the English language in some form. And around 60% of the participants felt as though the history of the English language was either "very" relevant, or "somewhat" relevant for American English speakers. The rest of the participants either felt it wasn't important at all, or were neutral about the history of the English languages relevance for American English speakers. About 10% of those surveyed felt like the history of the English language was knowledge that is extremely relevant for American English speakers to have. This is interesting because when it comes to discussions about Old English, much of the information that is circulated about Old English is somewhat misleading. Many are left with the notion that Old English is a vastly different language from the English they are currently speaking, as if that's the end of it all. This is true to an extent: Modern English is different, but fails to be recognized is how much Old English Modern English speakers know and use on a daily basis, despite the changes in key features like inflection, word order, and spelling (Mitchell And Robinson 1992).

The data retrieved from the next section of questions showed that the words which had been selected for their perceived frequent usage were indeed words that participants felt they used often. These are the words *'weird,' 'thing,' 'dream,'* and *'freedom.'* It is important to note that even when participants felt as though they did not use the word often, like in the case of 'earth' or 'craft' the meanings that they prescribed for those words. The used of the word "earth" as the name of our planet is one that is younger than the use of 'earth' as a general word for terrain, or the realm of the living, or

19

as a synonym with 'world' (also a word of Germanic origin deriving from OE). Participants across the board made sure to describe both usages of the word.

There was a similar finding for the responses that were provided for the word "craft" as well. The 'craft' of Modern English was once 'cræft,' which had a meaning similar to that of 'power,' from Latin. Forms of this word are found in many other Germanic languages as '*kraft*', '*kraftur*', '*kracht*', etc. Although in Swedish, Danish, Dutch, German, and other Germanic languages the word has largely retained the meaning of 'force,' or 'power.' In English, the meaning of the word has shifted. It is no longer is a word that represents power intrinsically, but is one that represents having strength in some particular area, or something that has been skillfully made. None of the participants expressed knowledge of the word's former, more inclusive, meaning. Most of them made the shift of meaning very clear by using compound words and collocations such as 'witchcraft,' 'wordcraft,' and 'craft beer,' to help explain what the word means for them. In instances where the participants were asked to create sentences using the word, many of them used the form 'crafty' (OE '*cræftig´*') instead of just 'craft'. Interestingly enough, this usage shows how the meaning of '*cræftig,´* which meant something like 'skill' or 'cleverness,' has taken the role of the '*cræft*' as a whole for many of the participants, as none of them expressed the word having anything to do with power, beyond it being a word used to express artistry, mastery, or skill. In the cases of the words 'weird' and 'dream' (OE '*wyrd*' and '*dréam*') the results of the study showed that the original meanings of the words are not lost completely, but have shifted in ways similar to that of 'craft'.

Wyrd was once understood by English speakers as a cosmic force. All people had their own *wyrd*, which was uncontrollable, this was the fate of each man, woman, and child. This was a word that described what has happened, what is happening, and what will happen, (Borden 1982). For many of the participants the meaning of 'weird' was not explicitly tied to destiny or fate, but it did reflect Anglo-Saxon roots by describing the unexplainable, things being the way they are for no reason beyond being that way. The most common words used to describe the meaning of 'weird' were 'unsettling,' 'strange,' 'unexpected,' and 'unusual.' Some participants discussed 'weirdness' and the ability for 'weird' to become normal, and a few hinted to the word having metaphysical qualities. Overall this word proved to be one of the most frequently used words within the sample, second only to 'thing.'

'Dream' once only described sensations of 'joy' or 'delight.' As time progressed, however, 'dream' came to replace '*swefen*' and now represents not just joys and delights in the conscious world, but also the visions experienced during our sleep. As such, the responses that the participants shared expressed 'dreams' to be things that fill them with hope or desire, like aspirations, and also night time visions which occur during certain stages of the sleep cycle. This word seemed to hold special meanings for participants, as some described having the word resonate with them because they saw themselves as "a dreamer." One thing that I started to notice was whether or not participants used other words of Germanic origin in attempt to further explain the meaning. For words like 'weird' and 'thing,' and 'freedom' most of the participants seemed to rely on Latinate words to help make the meaning of the word more clear,

whereas for words like 'earth,' 'craft,' and 'midwife' the words that would be used to help with clarification were also mainly words that were Germanic in origin.

This study in and of itself is not enough to make any generalizations of how English speakers of different varieties are connected to cultures they are seemingly vastly distant from, by proxy of using the same types of words to create their existence. That being said, there were lot of things that I instantly wished I would have done differently. What I was most interested in was how the participants would describe the meaning of those words to people who had never heard of that concept before—getting to the root of meaning connected to the words. There was also an issue with some participants only answering the multiple choice questions, but skipping all of the questions which required a text answer. This was frustrating because what I felt was most important about the questionnaire was the written portion. Luckily, the amount of participants who did that was small, but I still wish there was some sort of way to get the perspectives of those participants. This is something that also remained a bit of an issue for the full-scale survey as well.

RESULTS OF FULL-SCALE STUDY

When I was putting the full-scale version of this study together I thought long and hard about the types of questions I wanted to ask, and the best way to ask them. Due to this, many of the questions were completely restated. The first sections of questions to undergo changes were the demographic information questions. In this section I allowed for the participants to simply explain how they would describe their ethnic background and gender identities, instead of forcing them to pick and choose.

This change resulted in a much more diverse representation of American English speakers. Not all of the 136 participants completely answered the demographic questions, but from the results that were given 35.6% of the participants were between the ages of 18-25, 31.9% were ages 26-35, 12.6% were 36-45, 17.8% were 46-65, and 2.2% were 66 years of age, or older. 33% of the participants identified as male, 60.9% identified as female, and 6% identified as non-binary or gender-fluid. There was some difficulty when it came to figuring out what to do with the answers that participants gave for their ethnic backgrounds. This is due to so many of the words that are commonly used for describing one's ethnic background not being as meaningful or accurate as initially thought. There were many participants who identified as multiracial. I had to draw lines in the sand as far as whether or not mixed-race participants would be counted as one for each of their 'mix'.

There were also issues between Latino/Hispanic identities. For many Latino and Hispanic both have very different implications. It was also difficult navigating whether or not people who identified as white and Latino ought to be counted among those who are multi-racial, or if these types of identities represent being culturally Latino, but white-

23

passing. An issue still was how to count people who identify as Non-white Caucasians, or Asians who are not East Asian. Racial identities are extremely complex, and the main role they play in this study are that of a way to make sure that a diverse sample is being gathered, because there is no standard American English speaker identity. In the end I tried to put "like identities with like identities," trying to be ever mindful of not perpetuating the erasure of anyone's individual identity as best as I could. That being said, of the participants who answered the demographic information questions 44.7% identified as only white, 12.9% explicitly identified as multiracial, 10.6% identified as either Latino, Hispanic, or both, 9% identified as Black, African Diasporic, or African American, 7.6% identified as Asian, 3.8% identified as Polynesian or Pacific Islander, 2.3% identified as Middle Eastern, and 2.2% of the participants identified as Native American. 84.3% of these participants were L1 American English speakers, while 15.7% of the participants were L2 American English speakers.

In the next section of question I wanted to get an idea of the language learning history of each of the participants. This is something that proved very difficult to do, because the questions I asked did not always result in the types of answer I was looking for. The greatest example of this is the question "Where did you begin learning American English?" as it relates to the question "What Varieties of American English do you speak?" From the latter I was looking for answers that reflected what region of the United States, or where in the world the participant began learning English, and I tried to ask it in a way that was inclusive to both L1 and L2 speakers. Unfortunately, many of the L1 participants provided answers like "at home" or "in the womb." These answers are true, of course, but they do not reflect the nature of how the English people speak changes

from place to place. Some of the participants did accompany their initial "at home" answer with a region. Many of the participants initially learned American English in Arizona, but there were also participants who began learning English in Pennsylvania, Hawaii, Michigan, Missouri, Virginia, California, Wisconsin, Illinois, New York, New Mexico, Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, Florida, South Carolina, Arkansas, Vermont, Colorado, and even Brazil. Some of the participants expressed initially learning in one place, and then moving to another place while they were very young. Experiences like this were especially reflected in participants who showed evidence of commonly code-switching between American English dialects. Code-switching between Standard American English, and non-standard varieties was a commonality among participants who are People of Color.

These participants detailed having to switch between Standard American English at work, or at school, and then Chicano English, Hawai'i English, or African American English with certain family members and with friends. The same is also true for participants who expressed English-based creoles as other languages that they speak, the most common of those being Hawaiian Pidgin and Jamaican Patois. A large number of participants put that they spoke only Standard English, but also made sure to clarify where they are from, or what words they say commonly that they do not think are really "standard English," like "y'all." Many of the participants who spoke non-standard varieties expressed frustration at not being allowed to speak the way that is most comfortable to them, or not being able to learn their heritage languages free of prejudice. There was one participant in particular that expressed a great deal of pride in their linguistic variety as they explicitly detailed that they began learning English in Northern

California and the American English Variety they spoke was "hella Bay Area," "hella" being a term very commonly used in Northern California to mean something similar to "a lot," "much," or "very." Another of the most colorful responses was layered with cultural in-group codes and also expressed the many ways in which how American English speakers speak changes from situation to situation:

> *"[I speak] African American English for my family. Hood ass Trapgod English wit da homies. Straight up mayonnaise voice for strangers. Thoughtocauster life puzzler conundrummer English for my intellectual nignogs."*

Many of the participants who spoke non-standard varieties expressed how the varieties they speak also are things that change from audience to audience. Showing that code-switching is something that goes much deeper than just between the standard and everything else. It was also common to equate the standard variety with whiteness in a majority of the results.

The majority of participants were monolinguals, who expressed only speaking Standard American English, in addition to being L1 American English speakers. Of the participants that were not monolinguals Spanish was the most common language used other than English. They next most common languages were Japanese, Portuguese, French, German, and Hawaiian. In addition to describing the languages they speak, and how they speak them, participants were also asked questions that highlighted certain language attitudes. These questions were ones that asked the participants if they liked learning English, how relevant they felt the History of English was for American English speakers, and what role the language a person speaks plays on how they construct their worldview.

A common response is that The History of English is something that ought to be most important to "native English speakers," because they should know where their language comes from. It was also proposed by a large amount of participants that learning more about English, and about different types of Englishes might help ward off prejudice against different varieties, *"language is part of culture. Studying history is culturally relevant to reveal truths and dispel myths."*

At the same time it was also common for the participants to express that American's do not care about history, or language, or culture. Some said they would like to have learned those things because they simply like learning new things. While there were a few participants who believed that history is not as important as proficiency, there were many that felt that learning more about history would be important for American English speakers, *"almost every piece of slang, euphemism, idiom, connotation, what have you, it all comes from a historical context and I think it's important to understand what we're saying and why we say it."* Whatever the reason over half of the participants felt like the history of the English language is something that American English speakers ought to know about. Many participants also expressed that there is a possibility that knowing more about the history of English could help with both L1 and L2 understanding of English, one of the more eloquently put perspective being:

> *"We generally teach English language learners (native or not) that we have a bunch of 'irregular' verbs in English, and that their conjugations just have to be memorized. It seems to me that a brief introduction to ablaut and the concept of Germanic strong verbs would really be helpful in understanding what's going on with these verbs. Our normal explanation is simply 'yeah, English is just weird'."*

Many of the participants, who could remember what learning English was like for them expressed that they enjoyed learning, but that enjoyment came with stipulations. It was common for there to be a lot of frustration, and difficulty due to grammatical or spelling issues that "didn't make any sense." Some participants expressed "liking" all of the "crazy nonsense" and "goofy idioms" in English, and felt as though English classes provided a space for them to grow as a person. About 85% of the participants said they had previously studied the History of the English language either formally or informally. However, an overwhelming majority of these participants were unsure whether or not English was considered a Germanic language, or what made English similar or different from other languages that it is said to be related to. When asked how language impacts one's worldview very few participants thought language did not impact the construction of worldviews at all. Many expressed feeling as though it did, but were no sure exactly how to articulate why. A majority of the participants wrote lengthy explanations of how people use their languages to create their identities and express how they interact with the world.

After completing this section the participants of the survey then started the final portion which was essentially the list of words native to English. As mentioned previously, 19 words were chosen for the full-scale version. These words were: '*self,*' '*life,*' '*clean,*' '*kind,*' '*troll,*' '*like,*' '*work,*' '*cool,*' '*true,*' '*will,*' '*god,*' '*good,*' '*love,*' '*think,*' '*feel,*' '*world,*' '*be,*' '*hate,*' '*want,*' and '*nightmare.*' Each of these words are small, common, frequently used words. It could be argued that some of them do not carry much semantic meaning and are more syntactic items, necessary for stringing sentences

28

together. However, the participants were still were able to provide their ideas of what these words mean for them, and how they use them.

For the first 10 words each of the participants was asked to gauge how frequently they used the word in question. Roughly 75% of the participants claimed to use each of the listed words either 'sometimes' or 'often.' The words 'like' and 'work' were two words that the largest percentage of participants claimed to use 'all of the time.' The word 'troll' is something that was only commonly used among younger participants, because of its modern usage. This shows that a majority of participants do use the words chosen for the study quote often, across all of the different varieties that are represented, and somewhat across age gaps. After the participants recounted how regularly they used the words, they then began unpacking how they use those words to create meaning. Below is a brief overview of the results from 19 words that were used to provide a look into the perspectives that American English speakers have about Old English words that are more or less still in use.

Self:

130 participants answered how frequently they used the word 'self.' 124 people detailed how they would explain what the word meant. 125 participants answered whether or not the word 'self' held any significant meaning for them personally. When asked how they would explain what 'self' means to someone who had never heard the word before 6 out of 124 participants explicitly stated the grammatical function of 'self' as a reflexive. Some of the participants detailed a scenario in which they would point to their heart or punch the person that they are teaching the meaning of 'self' to—to illicit that *selves* are things that feel, that the speaker is a self, as well as the listener. Another

common scenario was to hold up a mirror in front of the person with "self" written on the mirror, so that when the person looks into the mirror, they see themselves, and can equate that to the meaning of the word. Many of the participants expressed 'self' in a way that is comparable to a soul, or an essence of a person. Some of the participants also discussed the concept of 'the self' as 'ego' in Psychology and Philosophy. Identity was one of the most common words used to explain what 'self' means.

It was also extremely common for participants to provide clarification explaining that 'self' is something that is perceived, whether it is someone's own perception of who they are, or how someone wants others to perceive them. Statements like *'your true you,'* *'self is my being now in this world,'* *'it is who you are,'* and *'that which starts with you,'* etc., were particularly interesting because it showed what seemed like how participants would think to use the 'simplest' way they could think of explaining the word, and also how that 'simplest way' of explaining relied completely on words native to English. Most of the participants did not feel as though 'self' had any special or significant meaning, except for those who mentioned their interests in Jungian psychology, the self as a reflection of their god, existential philosophy, or the importance of individualism and knowing one's 'self.'

Life:

128 people answered the question detailing how frequently they used the word life. 124 people gave a description of how they would explain the meaning of the word to someone. 122 people answered whether or not the word 'life' held any special or significant meaning for them. Life is a word that many of the participants expressed difficulty in explaining. Common responses touched on the idea that 'life' is, *'things that*

aren't dead,' 'what a self does in the world,' 'time on earth,' 'existence,' 'being,' or '*growing*.' Many of the participants also created scenarios in which they point to 'living' things like plants, animals, and themselves. Another common scenario was to first explain with 'dead' or 'death' is and provide and explanation of what 'life' is based on what it is not. Of the 122 people who answered if the word had any special meaning for them personally roughly 42% of the participants said that the word had no significance for them. 1 participant did not understand what was being asked. The rest of the participants either simply said yes, or went into great detail explaining why 'life' is important for them, many of those reasons reflecting spiritual or metaphysical understandings of what 'life' entails.

Clean:

128 people answered how frequently they used the word 'clean.' 123 people provided an answer for how they would explain the meaning of the word. 121 participants answered whether or not the word had any special or significant meaning for them personally. The most prevalent explanation of 'clean' was for participants to answer '*not dirty*' or '*free of impurities.*' Some participants provided scenarios in which they showed the listener a sink full of dirty dishes, and then 'cleaned' the dishes. Other expressed that 'clean' has too many layers, that it is synonymous with things that look 'awesome' in certain varieties, and also that it is a reflection of 'bourgeois values.' Roughly 54% of the 121 people who answered whether or not 'clean' had any significant meanings for them said that 'clean' did not have any significant meaning. The other

participants who did feel that 'clean' had significance for them personally talked about the battles with drug addiction, or the affiliation between cleanliness and being 'godlike.' Kind:

116 people answered how frequently they use the word 'kind.' 116 participants answered how they would explain what the word meant to someone. 117 participants answered whether or not the word 'kind' held any significant or special meaning for them personally. Most of the participants expressed 'kind' being a word that describes a quality in others, and that quality being something that is amicable, and friendly. In addition to that a lot of participants added a second interpretation of the word that represents similarity, either in physical traits or in-group values. There were two participants that directly connected the word 'kind' to its Old English usage. Over half of the participants did not feel like the word had any special or significant meaning. Those that did feel as though 'kind' holds some sort of significance for them describe its importance as a crucial way of interacting with their fellow man. They also feel it is imperative to teach their children to treat others 'kindly.' Participants also expressed understanding 'kindness' as a character trait is something that is more important than 'niceness.'

Troll:

126 participants detailed how frequently they felt they used the word 'troll.' 117 participants described how they would explain what the word 'troll' meant to someone who had never heard the word before. 115 people answered whether or not the word 'troll' held any significant or special meaning for the personally. All of the participants described a troll as a mythical beast that is ugly and horrid. Over half of the participants, who were also participants who said they sometimes use this word, also described a troll

as a person that is an unrelenting agitator, specifically someone who posts unruly and inflammatory things on the internet, to upset people on purpose. Some of the participants went a step further and made connections between the mythical beast, and the modern day internet personality. Only 10 of the participants felt as though that word held a significant or special meaning for them personally.

Like:

122 participants detailed how frequently they used the word 'like.' 114 participants described how they would explain what the word 'like' means to someone who had never heard the word before. 114 people answered whether or not the ascribed any significant or special meaning to the word. All of the participants described three usages for the word in explaining what 'like' means. One of the usages is as a filler word, to take up space. The next usage for the word that participants provided was expressing similarity between things. The third usage that was given is one that expresses pleasure, or enjoyment from something. This is most clearly reflected in 'liking' things on social media websites. None of the participants felt that the word was particularly special, but they did express that as much as they are told it is a useless word it ends up feeling necessary. Many of the participants also expressed feeling as though they used the word too much. Some of the participants expressed the importance of its usage as a feature of certain Californian American English varieties.

Work:

Only 120 people described how regularly they use the word 'work.' Despite the apparent attrition rate in participants work provided the second highest percentage of frequent usage. Roughly 33% of participants claimed to use this word 'all of the time.'

The other 66% of participants claimed to either use the word often or sometimes. Many of the participants expressed this word meaning the effort that one puts into completing something. Some specifically talked about 'jobs' and how one 'makes a living,' but many participants left what one 'works' for open ended. Out of all of the words work had the largest amount of participants feel as though 'work' was a word that held significant or special meanings for them. Many participants described the 'work' that they do as a pivotal part of their identity, as well as a necessity in life—claiming that everyone 'does work' some people 'work' with their hand and create 'works' others 'work' with their minds. The way in which people 'work' changes, but all things that require determination and effort to accomplish them are 'work.'

Cool:

117 participants responded describing how frequently they use the word 'cool.' 112 people detailed how they would explain what they word 'cool' means to someone who had never heard it before. 107 participants discussed whether or not the word held any special or significant meanings for themselves. All of the participants gave multiple meanings for this word. The ways that they described 'cool' either have to do with pleasantness, calmness, temperatures, or a way of being. The usage that is a way of being is related to being 'smooth.' Many of the participants felt as though this word had significant meanings because they thought of themselves as 'cool' or strive to be 'cool,' or have nostalgic memories to a time in their life when 'being cool' was important to them.

True:

　　　117 participants answered how frequently they used the word 'true.' 110 participants answered how they would explain what the word 'true' means to someone who had never heard the word before. 109 participants expressed whether or not the word had any special or significant meaning for them. All of the responses given to this question were definitions of the word. The most common responses were '*not false,*' '*not a lie,*' and '*right.*' 36% of the participants felt as though 'true' was a word of particular importance, and as such held significant or special meanings for them. Much of the significance that 'true' held participants was philosophical or spiritual in nature. Loyalty was also a word that was frequently used as a description of why that word 'true' was important to participants.

Will:

　　　115 participants answered how frequently they use the word 'will' in various forms. 108 answered how they would describe what the word 'will' means to someone who had never heard it before. 104 participants answered the question asking whether or not the 'will' held any significant or special meaning for them personally. Two of the most common words used to help explain what the word 'will' means were 'intention' and 'desire.' There was a consensus among most of the participants that 'will,' aside from being a word used to indicate the future, is a word used to reflect ones inner strength or desire. 16 participants felt that this word had a significant meaning. Each of this participants either connected their will to their spirituality, philosophies that hey ascribe to, or discussed their will as a motivational force that gives their life meaning.

God:

113 participants answered frequently they use the word 'god.' 105 participants explained how they would explain what 'god' means to someone who was unfamiliar with the word. 101 participants detailed whether or not the word 'god' held any significant or special meanings for them. The most common words used to explain 'god' were '*holy being.*' A large majority of participants also described 'god' as a mythical being, a higher power, something that was *'larger than life,'* '*the all*,' or someone who is the best at something. A large portion of the participants expressed that as Christians 'god' was a word that was extremely important for them. It was also very common for participants to answer 'not anymore,' when they were asked to answer whether or not the word 'god' was a word that held any significance for them personally.

For the last 9 words the participants were simply asked to explain what the word in question meant for them, and then provide a brief explanation of how they would explain what the word meant to an unfamiliar party. During this portion there was the largest rate of attrition as anywhere from 92-100 participants answered these questions. Some of the participants didn't even answer the question, but instead put 'no comment' or a question mark for their answer. Below is a brief description of the most common responses for each of these words that was provided by the participants who completed the entire online survey.

Good:

Many of the descriptions that were provided to explain what the word 'good' means where '*not bad,*' and *'positive.'* There were many participants who also equating

things that are 'good' to things that are pleasing to 'god.' Other most common definitions provided were 'good' being a word that is similar to '*okay*' or '*satisfactory*.' None of the participants provided an example of how they would explain 'good' to someone who was actually unfamiliar to the word.

Love:

Love was most frequently described as a *'strong feeling,'* a *'strong desire,'* or a '*deep emotion*.' It was also described as the more intense version of '*like*,' and '*extreme goodness*,' '*god*,' a '*family bond*,' '*selflessness*,' and '*caring about another.*' Many of the participants also expressed that love was not something that could be explained; it is something that must be felt in order for anyone to understand what the word means.

Think:

A common phrase used to explain what 'think' means was *'what happens in your mind.'* Many of the participants talked about the inner-workings of the mind, and brain power: *'directing your mind toward something.'* A few participants expressed how saying they 'think' something showed to be a more *'gentle'* way of telling people when they are wrong:

> *"I think X is a better option than Y" than "X is a better option than Y". While people have commented on this an[d] said I should be more confident, or to make things sound more firm, I don't know what the other person is thinking. I guess I tend to "gentle" my language. I would prefer to tread carefully. Recently I also had a short discussion with my friends about how I found the question of "what language do you think in", a little strange, because yes, I do think in English more than I do Mandarin, but when I think, thought doesn't materialize until I write*

something down or open my mouth and say something. My actual thinking feels

more like vague thoughts and urges and visuals rather than words floating up and

me thinking on them. And when I'm writing at least, and am in a good groove, I

shouldn't be thinking at all. Otherwise, I think I'd describe it as "to consider

deeply".

Some even expressed that is it a function that is the background work of the mind and

body together. Some participants also clarified the difference between 'think' and

'know,' claiming that 'knowing' is being more certain about what they believe, and

'thinking' is closer to birthing ideas, imagining, and wondering about things. Many of the

participants wrote that 'think' was too hard for them to explain to someone, while others

wrote that they would simply point to their head, and some felt as though in order for

them to explain what 'think' is to someone it would first be necessary to explain 'mind.'

Feel:

The most common responses for defining and explaining 'feel' were to discuss

senses—like touch, taste, see, hear—and also emotions—like sad, happy, angry, and

scared. Some participants said that 'feeling' is a way of making choices from the heart.

Feeling is experiencing. Another way of describing feeling was that it is the mind and

body thinking together. Also that it is a way *'to listen to your mind and body.'* To explain

what this meant to someone who was unfamiliar with the word some participants said

that they would point to their hearts.

World:

'World' was described by participants to be a word which is in many cases synonymous with 'earth,' but also that is can represent a state or place of being, as well as the things which make up one's own life. The participants describes 'worlds' as '*everything.*'

Be:

The most common responses used to explain 'be' were: '*exist,*' '*a state of existence,*' '*to live,*' '*is,*' '*God's want,*' '*all things be,*' ' *right now,*' and '*what you are.*' One participant explicitly expressed that 'be' is the English copula, and two other participants said that 'be' does not have syntactic meaning anything on its own, but it simply a grammatical tool. The other 89 participants who answered the question did feel as though 'be,' and its forms, are words that have retained semantical purpose.

Hate:

'Hate' was most frequently defined as '*strong dislike,*' '*dislike a lot,*' and '*ill will towards someone or something.*' It was also describe as something that words to give structure to 'love.' Many of the participants hinting to 'hate' being a word that represents something that is 'bad' by writing responses like, '*a short word for an emotional state that rarely gives rise to anything good.*'

Want:

'Want' was most regularly said to mean '*to desire,*' '*to desire but not need,*' and '*a strong yearning.*' It was expressed as something that is very similar to will, but more

of a frivolous feeling, rather than a testament of one's purpose, or a vision into one's own future.

Nightmare:

Over half of the participants who answered this questions said that a Nightmare is a *'bad dream'*. A few discussed that a nightmare does not have to be something that is happening in sleep, but things that happening everyday life that are awful can also be a 'nightmare.' A couple participants said that a 'nightmare' is 'not of God.' The second most common way to define 'nightmare' without saying a '*bad'* dream was to say a *'scary dream'* or *'fear.'*

Interview Portion:

After completing the survey, some participants volunteered to participate in the interview portion of the study, in order to provide more context to their nameless, unidentifiable answers. 6 interview sessions in total. Two of the interviews conducted were group interviews. In total there were 6 participants in the interview portion. All of the interview participants were between the ages of 19 and 45. Three of the participants were women, two of them being a Women of Color. Out of the men who were interviewed two identified as men of color. The interviews took anywhere from 20 minutes to an hour long. The most common finding across the board with each of the interviews was a sense that participating in wordwork, is something that is inseparable from participating in culture. Each of the participants discussed their own language history and how the way the speak is a part of cultural practices they are a part of, or how the way they speak keeps them from feeling connected to cultures they feel they ought to be connected to; this was especially so for interviewees whose parents and families spoke

40

a non-standard variety, and also kept them from learning how to navigate that language variety to keep them from being discriminated against. A majority of the participants expressed that taking the online questionnaire opened their eyes to how they use language, and how they had never actively thought about the way their language is an expression of their culture, and their individual identities. Talking about the implementation of the history of English as a more commonly integrated part of language instruction for both L1 and L2 was something that was brought up during each interview session. Out of the population that wished to be involved in a more in-person version of the online survey they had taken it was unanimous that the best way to ward off prejudice against dialectic differences in English is to teach about how languages change, and specifically how English has changed over time. Each of the participants expressed that this is something that is equally important for L1 speakers as it is or L2 speakers.

During the activity each participant read through 6 excerpts from different languages. All they were told is that these languages in some way have something to do with the development of English as we know it now. The excerpts were taken from poems, psalms, nursery rhymes and encyclopedias in Old English, Middle English, Latin, French, Dutch, and Swedish. The participants were asked to circle the words that looked like words they might know. Out of the participants that were generally monolingual it was shown to be much easier for them to find words that they were confident in knowing from French and Latin than it was for them to find words in Old English or Swedish. However, that was only until while reading the Swedish text they realized the excerpt was a Swedish version of common nursery rhyme "Bah Bah Black Sheep." For all of the participants it was incredibly easy to understand the Middle English excerpt, which was

taken from the beginning of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. Similarly when each of the participants was confronted with the Dutch excerpt they were surprised at being able to read it virtually as easy as reading in English. Participants were completely shocked at how the sentences telling who Dr.Seuss was were put together in a way that was so easy for them to understand, without having any previous knowledge of Dutch language or grammar. It was common for the participants to laugh as they read the first sentence of the excerpt, *"Dr. Seuss was een Amerikaans kinderboekenschrijver."* After reading, it was common for the participants to repeat '*Amerikaans kinderboekenschrijver*,' and retort laughingly 'Dr. Seuss was an American kidbookscriber.' After the activity the participants expressed being more interested in wanting to learn what role each of the languages from the excerpts played in the development of English.

DISCUSSION OF FULL-SCALE STUDY

The Sample:

        Initially the goal for this study was to reach 100 participants for the pilot, and then reach 300 participants for the online survey and conduct 30 interview sessions. Very quickly I discovered that given my means, and ability I had set my goal far too high. Because of this I cannot help but wonder what the findings of the study would have been like had I had a much larger population to examine. Having a larger sample would have added much more weight to any analysis that I provide. Although I am satisfied that the full-scale version of the study was able to reach such an eclectic group of American English speakers. Initially during the pilot phase I was very concerned about the participation mainly coming from young, white men. Of course young white men have something to offer to this discussion, but the identity of American English speakers is so vast, that it is a disservice to all American English Speakers to not provide representation of a decently sized range of varying dialects, experiences, and American cultures. The changes that I made from pilot to full-scale were ones that were necessary for greater inclusion, despite the full-scale not supplying much greater numbers overall.

The Words:

        Choosing the words, both for the pilot and the full-scale version of the survey was one of the most difficult parts of putting the work together. During the pilot I was very interested in having participants examine words that are currently in use, in some form, which had deep metaphysical or philosophical meaning in their original Old English usage. By the time I started putting the full-scale version together, though, I was thinking about how much weight can be found in some of the most basic words that English

speakers start learning and using. I also thought about how many of the words which derive from Old English that are still in use today functionally are much more syntactic than semantic, but their role as 'glue' for sentences is still necessary for people to create meaning, even if the speaker is using those small words as glue for larger loanwords—as in the case for prepositions.

Due to this I made the choice to use a completely different set of words in the full-scale version than in the pilot. I also felt it was necessary to look at more words than I had initially used for the pilot version of the survey. For the recreation of the survey I chose all words that I felt were important for beginning to construct the identity of an American English speaker, regardless of what variety they spoke. Some of the words I chose specifically because the meaning of the word is seemingly different across varieties, as in the word 'cool.'

The Survey:

Even though the participation goal was not reached, the amount of data that was received was overwhelming initially. Sifting through the data was extremely intimidating, that is, until a pattern began to reveal itself amongst line after line of the responses that had been received. In attempting to explore if remnants of the English language's Anglo-Saxon roots impact contemporary speakers an ocean away from the British Isles, it was astounding how common it was for participants who refrained from utilizing an academic writing voice in their responses answering using little to no loanwords in their explanation of what each of the words meant. I had noticed this on a smaller scale during the pilot study, but was not really seeing enough for it to seem like there was any significance one way or the other. During the analysis of the full-scale study results this

peculiarity provided a new avenue for questioning, as the phenomena bloomed in places where it seemed as though the participant was aiming towards providing an answer that was as simple as possible. Simplifying their language, possibly out of interest of maintaining a quality of clarity, resulted in the retraction of loanwords from their answers. Of course it cannot be confirmed whether or not this was in any way a conscious action. Perhaps what was visible in the responses was not a simplifying of language as much as it was the participants providing answers which came out the most easily, or quickly, for them. Either way it did further spark a flame to the question of when do American English speakers use words that are primarily native or, what English linguistic purists have called, *plain English*.

It is reminiscent of George Orwell's *Politics and the English Language* in which he states, "bad writers—especially scientific, political, and sociological writers—are nearly always haunted by the notion that Latin or Greek words are grander than Saxon ones," (Orwell 1946). Yet another head on this chimera is that of politics and language. The politics behind the status of Latinate and Greek loans in the English language stretch back deep into our past and rest in the quest of both Roman and Greek empires to civilize the world. During those eras Germanic tribes were lowly barbarians. It can be argued that this sentiment within the minds of those with great power throughout the centuries holds a bit of the blame for what has led to the loss of maybe an amount as large as 80% of English lexicon—of course this loss of lexicon did not happen in a vacuum and there are many other events that also are responsible, but prejudices of the elite shape the future. This prejudice—which is classist at its core—is something that still seems to tinge the very heart of how we define what is an acceptable standard of English and what is not.

The language politics latent in how it is commonplace to discuss the role of French, as well as provide countless lessons on Latin and Greek roots in English, but virtually no lesson on Germanic weak and strong verbs, are also intertwined with a fear of celebrating anything Germanic post World Wars. America's role as an Allied power against Nazi Germany, and the atrocities committed by the Third Reich under Adolf Hitler, are circumstances that have subtlety blacklisted anything stemming from Germania in a way that compounds on to the notion of English's inherent barbarism— despite the fact that English is a Germanic language, just the same as its Dutch and Frisian cousins.

Trying to unlock the code to the pattern that I was noticing almost overshadowed my primary analytic goal of inquiring into the ways in which contemporary usages of Old English words have managed to hang on to some of their original meaning. Fortunately, after fully investigating the unexpected gem that had been found in the full-scale version of the study, it was the possible to regroup and continue on the cardinal pursuit. For each of the words I asked for the participants to describe how they would explain what that word meant to someone who was unfamiliar with the word. For whatever reason very few people really answered that question overall. Instead a majority of the participants mostly answered what the word meant, and not really how they would explain that meaning to someone else.

This had an effect on the analysis, because for many of the words I gave examples of how the word is currently being used across different varieties, and provided extra room for analysis by allowing the participant to explain what the forms of the word means, if they happened to use a variant of the word far more often. None of the

46

participants really discussed any of those particularly modern uses. An example of this is found with the word 'self.' Aside from pronouns, using the word 'self' by itself might not be a very common occurrence unless the participant happened to be a psychologist or philosopher, because of this I clarified that in discussing this word 'self' participants are welcome to include forms of the word. The specific examples I provided were 'myself,' 'selfie,' and 'selfish.' 'Selfie' is a usage of 'self' that has become extremely prevalent in the internet culture of young Americans over the past couple of years. A 'selfie' is a picture that one takes of themselves. There are also 'group selfies' that are pictures of a person and their friend. None of the participants explained the usage of this word, despite its new status as an internet subculture term.

Participants all discussed 'self' as an identity, as who they are, themselves. This is an idea that has not changed much at all from the initial meaning of *self (seolf, sielf, silf, sylf)* of Old English. A quick look in the Corpus of Contemporary American English shows that 'self' is more frequently used than 'selfish,' but when one inquires where the corpus entries tare collected from it is very that 'self' alone is not a word that is very commonly used outside of academia. An overwhelming majority of the data used to compile the frequency of the word 'self' come directly from academic journals, whereas when one looks at the word 'selfish' virtually all of those entries are either spoken, or come from fiction writing. Because of this I think it would have been much more useful to explore the usages of the forms of words that were selected for the survey in the case of words that have obtained seemingly unique meanings, and explore what of those new usages are related to the Anglo-Saxon meaning.

47

The pilot study managed to do that better than the recreation, because so many of the words chosen for that are ones where the change apparent change in meaning is a part of its regular usage, as in the case of 'weird' and *'wyrd.'* 'Cool' also provided insight in usage that was more similar to that of 'weird' and 'craft' from the pilot. Cool is shown to be a word where its usage is split between a sensory description of temperature, and that of a slang term. The slang usage of the word 'cool' can be seen to reflect the original usage where instead of describing the actual temperature of a thing, their temperateness, and calmness is exemplary of a state of being. Instead of feeling cool, like a pleasant breezy day, the person in question embodies coolness. The same can also be found in the slang usage of the word 'chill' as well, when one is using 'chill' as an adjective describing another person.

"Troll" is a word that provided particularly interesting insights because of how ambiguous its origins are. It is word that is more or less found across Indo-European languages. However, it should be noted that this word, along with "want," were both words that came into the English language from other Germanic languages. In the case of the Germanic language family 'troll' is both a verb and a noun. In English it has also maintained its usage as both a verb and a noun. This is shown in both what participants expressed in what they felt was the overall meaning of the word, in comparison with the meaning of the word as they use it. Many of the participants discussed the usage of the word troll to describe mythological beasts. In addition to that they also described what a modern day troll and the modern day usage of troll as a verb. Similarly to that of the mythological beast, a troll is still a word used to name a relentless antagonist, and the act of 'trolling' is the antagonistic things that this person does.

48

To gauge the ways in which the meanings of the words chosen for the survey had changed or remained the same over time, I consulted the *Oxford English Dictionary* online database to retrieve etymological information about each of the words. This first stage is also where I made great use of Arthur R Borden's *A Comprehensive Old English Dictionary.* Out of all of the words on the list 'nightmare' is the only word that showed a drastic change in meaning, to the point of no one hinting to a sense of the original meaning in any way. 'Nightmare' has completely lost its context of 'a female spirit or monster supposed to settle on and produce a feeling of suffocation in a sleeping person or animal," (OED) for American English speakers. The closest any participant came to the original sense of the word was to describe night terrors, or *'bad dreams.'* Overall the Anglo-Saxon sense of the words chosen were retained, even in various forms of the words. Similar to that results of the pilot, in places where there were multiple meanings prescribed to the word the root of its semantic meaning would be something that was at the very least hinted at. This shows that even across oceans and the test of time the things in English that are English have remained as such.

The Interview and Activity:

All of the interviews gave insight into the ways in which participants felt history, culture, and language were connected. A common discussion during the interview process revolved around the issue of prejudice and discrimination against non-standard varieties of American English. One interview participant, as he began recounting his experience with the online survey, spoke at great lengths on how he felt like having the History of English would benefit L2 American English users in particular.

Excerpt from Interview Two:

```
01      P:    okay. so:. £from what I <kno:w>£
02      I:    ((subdued chuckling))
03      P:    ((laughter))#you've JUST taken the survey:
04      ((clapping sound))
05            .hh UM(.)since it's super(.) fresh(.) on yer
        mi:nd(.)
06            what are some things that you: ↑THOUGHT ↑a↓bout?
        that
07            you liked(.)that you didn't like? that(.) >went
        through
08            yer mi:nd(.) while you: we:re(.) taking the
        *sur:ve:y*.
09      I:    u:hm the- th—the: the portion abou:t(.) u:hm(.02)
        like
10            ho:w (.02) >how important< we feel like the:
        st↑u↓dy:
11            of like >the history of the english language?<
        i:s to
12            like(.) both to like(.) >the experience of being<
        an
13            english language user and ↑al↓so(.) like(.)
14            understa:nding: like coming to have an
        understanding of
15            the english language(.) ua:hm. ↑like >i ↑like
        that
16            portion <a lo:t> u:m(.) >mostly< 'cause: like(.)
        it
17            gives people the opportunity to like (.02) *soap
        bo:x*
18            about >how important the understanding £the
        history of
19            language< is£
20      P:    ((laughing))
21      I:    a:h(.)but no: i thought it was:- i thought it was
22            interesting to: because like a:h i think that(.)
        it may
23            not be like(.) the first time i've ever talked
        about it
24            (.) but >it's like the first time in a long time
        that
25            that i've talked about ho:w u:hm(.) >how like
        like
26            understa:nding(.) the way that languages develops
        and
```

50

```
27         stuff li:ke(.) kind of reduces the pressure? on
    being
28         like  "standard" english: user? y'know: like it's
    okay:
29         like >understanding< the:(.) like how language
30         ↑develops and how dialects fracture: during the
    course
31         the development and how there's not like(.)
    there's no
32         objective: right "reason" u:h to arrange our-
33         >y'know like< basically that ↑it evolves >like<
34         everything else evolves. and like it doesn't
    evolve to
35         be the best form of whatever(.) it just evolves
    as we
36         use it(.)y'know like(.01)
37   P:    right(.)
38   I:    the fact that like as(.) because it was an
39         insula:r(.01) a:h(.) y'know from the: from: this
40         like(.)proto-germanic language(.)because it was
    so
41         insular a:hm(.) y'know it developed its own weird
42         trajectory and that was li:ke(.)then of course
    like
43         the anglo-saxon:(.)u:h(.) u:h(.) bent on that
    changes
44         even more and(.) uh it continues(.) it continues
    to be
45       modified by different(.)interactions between
    communities
46         like how radically that changes tha:t and how
47         communities grow inside of that once like(.) the
48         la:nguage ↑>continues< to adopt from the outside
    >but
49         then you have large enough population inside that
    starts
50         to like(.) create dialectic differences from
    within the
51         language(.) and um even if like the language that
    you
52         speak doesn't like adhere to a standard or even an
53         existing dialect it doesn't mean yer not a
    competent(.)
54   P:    right(.)
55   I:    english language(.) speaker(.) au:hm and
    how(.)that like
```

```
56        (.) you can be part of a dialect that's
      currently(.)
57         gro:wing(.)and so ↑like >i think it< like reduces
      the
58        pressure on people who are adopting the language to
      kind
59        of adhere to the standard? because even if ye:r a
      really
60        excellent speaker of a particular dialect(.) it
      doesn't
61        meant that you: a:hm na:vigate other dialects very
      well
62        and it doesn't mean yer no:t speaking
      incorrectly(.)
63   P:  right.
64   I:  Yer not(.) wrong(.)like as long as yer using
      english(.)
65        yer using it(.) and that's cool(.)
```

The idea that teaching people about the way that English developed as a means for warding off linguistic prejudice is something that was discussed in every interview session that was conducted. The excerpt above, however was the only to touch on it as a way to make L2 users of American English specifically more comfortable as they are learning. It was particularly interesting that this was the response that was provided as an initial thought about the survey because so many of the participants in the questionnaire who did not think that the history of English was relevant for American English speakers held this claim under the perception that only academic historians really care about those things, and this testament of the importance of learning about English's history came from a man who considers themselves a monolingual English speaker, who is the epitome of an All-American man's man.

Other interviewees discussed how they are pressured into code-switching between varieties because of the way they speak naturally being seen as varieties that are filled

with too much slang for them to be taken seriously. One interviewee who touched on

slang talked about how slang and other features of non-standard varieties of English are

important for creating culture that Standard American English lacks for them.

Excerpt from Interview 7

```
01      I    well(.)↑i ↓think- i think(.) honestly right now(.)
        in
02           terms of how we speak the most important(.03)
        thing we
03           have(.) is sl↑a↓ng honestly >i really- i really<
        think
04           that >because i think< <sla:ng> .hh(.02)
05           slang puts people in the position where they have
        a
06           culture and they have(.) some kind of a place in
        history
07           as like(.) cr:eators of s:something that(.)
        contributes
08           to how how people communicate.
09           i think that's ↑su:per important.
10           i think people need to: have a personal:
        connection to
11           how they speak >and what their< *saying*(.) and i
        think
12           slang is how that(.) comes ↑out,
13           and so when people: view slang as some kind of
        like(.04)
14           ↑bastard>ization<(.) of how of like(.)speech? i
        think-
15           i think that's wr:o:ng(.) >i think that's< <not>
        how you
16           should see it(.)i think you should see it as(.03)
17           as people? kind of like(.03) creating their own(.)
18           their own(.02) i guess personality throu:gh >their
19           speech patterns<. like it's so: important(.) like
        i
20           think(.) I THINK what most people hate about
        like(.)
```

```
21          school? for instance is just ho:w(.) how much
      they're
22          taught that everything is one way(.) it has to be
      *that*
23          wa:y(.03)
24          >and i think< when it comes to ↑spea:↓king(.)
      y'know(.)   like(.02) y'need to feel comfortable.
```
After the activity many of the participants were completely aghast at how connected

English is to that of other languages. The perception of an English only America has led

to a large portion of Americans having no idea how similar our language is to that of

other languages. Every participant who was a part of the interview portion professed a

new found interest in the words they use, how they use them, and why they use them that

way— in turn, creating a culture where curiosity in other languages and cultures would

support an America that celebrates universalism and multiculturalism in a more authentic

capacity. The ways in which interviewees discussed their thoughts on the survey, and

what they took away from it showed that providing a full-picture of the language that

Americans speak would be a valuable step in that direction.

MOVING FORWARD

In seeing how American English speakers continue to create their worldviews with the help of words passed down from Anglo-Saxon predecessors it may behoove us to begin paying homage to that part of our English-speaking past. The pilot, and full-scale versions of the study have shown that despite the pre-conceived notion that *"Americans do not care about history or culture,"* as one questionnaire participant stated, there is at least a budding interest in history as it impacts why American English speakers do language the way they do. There is a need to begin creating texts for English Language instruction that incorporates the history of the English language with that of grammar, vocabulary, and more contemporary socialization. In doing so instructors could help to ward off prejudices against non-standard varieties, by teaching people at a very young age that language variation is natural, and it has been a part of English for as long as there has been an English. It would also promote a fuller understanding of why English is the way it is. This understanding may not be necessary for all American English speakers, but it is something that could prove to be a great help to English Language Learners.

In thinking of developing a text that utilizes all of these things I am very inspired by Glencoe and McGraw-Hill's *Trésors du temps*. Within this text students learn French vocabulary, grammar, and contemporary culture while at the same time learning about French history. The text manages to teach the students French while also teaching them about why the French language and French culture is the way that it is, which provides the students with a broader understanding of the language and culture that they were born into or are adopting. Developing a culture of language instruction that bridges the gap

between doing language and doing culture as it relates to the history of that culture is not something that starts and ends with the advent of the American English dictionary. It is important to begin making more in-depth approaches to the way languages develop a more accessible and visible part of English language instruction. Texts like this existing for the instruction of other languages shows that there is already a school of thought universally which supports the idea that the history of a language that is spoken is something that is important for socialization of people who are learning that language. Although I maintain that this should not just be knowledge that is only accessible for L2 learners; the evolution of English ought to be incorporated in the Language Arts classes of L1 American English speakers as well.

Another path that ought to be traveled after completing this work is to continue by embarking on qualitative research which explores the way in which American People of Color navigate creating their identities with the languages of colonizers. During one of my interactions with a participant of this study who revealed themselves to me well after having participated it was brought to my attention how both this participant and myself have at times felt as though there is no language that is truly our own. In the case of this person he recounted how he is originally from Panama. His family moved to the United States when he was very young, and he learned both Spanish and English around the same time. He spoke of not feeling a real connection with English and Spanish, because they are languages he is forced to speak, but also not feeling like he can really learn the language of the indigenous folk of Panama, because he didn't really see himself as "one of them" either.

This was reminiscent of one of the survey participants who described a sensation of anger when it came to English classes in elementary school because they were not allowed to speak Hawaiian. A similar issue was brought to light during one of the interview sessions both with the participant who felt like there is not a real unifying culture that surrounds American English; another participant wishes her mother would have ever talked to her in Hawaiian Pidgin like she did with the rest of her family because now she not only does she feel estranged from American culture because as a woman of color, but she also does not feel connected to her Hawaiian roots because she is not able to speak the same.

There were also participants who expressed feeling the same about learning English as they did about having to learn French back in their native home of Vietnam. The most heart-breaking of these cases are the ones of monolingual English speakers who feel that their language isn't really theirs because of the history of the ancestors who were raped, slaughtered, exploited and were robbed of their own cultural, religious, and linguistic practices because of it. Exploring the ways in which POCs work to make the languages of colonizers their own is also crucial to combating linguistic prejudice as well as racial discrimination.

When I first started this study I did so with the intention of discovering in what ways American English speakers are still connected to the ancient past. This work in no way attempts to make any sweeping generalizations about what Anglo-Saxon and American worldviews are, but it has shown, if nothing else, that English remains much more than just a strange language with heavy Latinate influence. English is a product of the history of the people who have used it, and it will continue to be so even now. I have

found that as much as English has changed, and continues to change, the heart of some of the most quintessential concepts that we more or less still use *Englisc* for have managed to hold on to some of their original feelings in many cases. Across the world English speakers are adding pages to the book of what it means to be an English speaker, but the future of Englishes all over the world is not one that exists as separate from the English that once was. Language, culture, and history are things that are impossibly interconnected. To become who we will be, we ought to know first who we have been.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. V. (1996). *The multicultural imagination: "race", color, and the unconscious*. London: Routledge.

Alfred, G. (1999). *Peace, power and righteousness: an indigenous manifesto.* Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.

Alford D.M., (1980) Manifesting worldviews in language. San Francisco, CA: California Institute of Integral Studies.

Avis, W. S. (1954). Speech Differences along the Ontario-Unites States border I: Vocabulary. *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1(1), 13-18.

Balogh, E. (2011). *Americana (szeged): Attitudes discussed, explained and revealed: Hungarian students' perspectives on language attitudes towards american english accent varieties* Dept. of American Studies, University of Szeged.Baugh, C. (2002). *A History of the English Language* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Bede, t. V., Saint, McClure, J., & Collins, R. (1994). The ecclesiastical history of the english people: The greater chronicle ; bede's letter to egbert. Oxford;New York;: Oxford University Press.

Boberg, C. (2010). *The English Language in Canada: Status, history and comparative analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borden, A.R. (1982) *A Comprehensive Old English Dictionary.* Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Campbell, J. (1982) *The Anglo-Saxons.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

Cargile, A. C., & Giles, H. (1998). Language attitudes toward varieties of english: An american-japanese context. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 26(3), 338-356.

Cassidy, F.G. (1953). *A method for collecting dialect.* Gainesville, FL: American Dialect Society

Chambers, J.K. (1998). Inferring dialect from a postal questionnaire. *Journal of English Linguisics,* 26(3), 222-246.

Chambers, J.K. (2000). Region and language variation. *English World-Wide, 21*(2), 169-199.

Clarke, D. E. (1948). *Culture in the early Anglo-Saxon England: A study with illustrations*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

MacNeil, R & Cran, W. (2005) *Do you Speak American?* New York: Harcourt.

Davies, D. (2005) V*arieties of Modern English: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Pearson.

Dillard, J (1992) *A History of American English*. London: Longman.

Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M.(2002). Sounding Cajun: The Rhetorical Use of Dialect in Speech and Writing. *American Speech* 77(3), 264-287. Duke University Press. Retrieved April 13, 2016, from Project MUSE database.

Fulk, R. D. (2014). *An introductory grammar of Old English with an anthology of readings*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Hall-Lew, L. & Plichta, B. (2013) Technological challenges in sociolinguistic data collection. *Data Collection in Sociolinguistics: Methods and Applications.* New York: Routledge.

Harris, S. J. (2003). *Race and Ethnicity in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. New York: Routledge
Higham, N. J., Ryan, M. J., & MyiLibrary. (2013). The anglo-saxon world. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hudley C. H., & Mallinson, C. (2011). *Understanding English language variation in U.S. schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Klaeber, F., Fulk, R. D., Bjork, R. E., & Niles, J. D. (2008). Klaeber's Beowulf ; and The fight at Finnsburg. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kiesling, S. F. (2004). Dude. A*merica Speech*, 79, 281-395

Lacan, J. (1977). *Écrits: A selection.* New York: Norton.

Laing, L. R., & Laing, J. (1979). Anglo-saxon england. New York: Scribner.

Laihonen, P. (2008). *Language ideologies in interviews: A Conversation Analysis Approach.* Journal of Sociolinguistics. 12/5 Pp668-693.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

McDavid, R. I., & Dil, A. S. (1980). Varieties of american english: Essays. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Mendoza-Denton,N. (2008) *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among latina girl gangs.* Malden, MA: Blackwell

Mitchell, B., & Robinson, F. C. (1992). *A guide to Old English*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Norton, B. P. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 9-31.

Nylvek, J.A. (1992) Is Canadian English in Saskatchewan becoming more American? *American Speech, 67*(3), 268-278.

O'Keeffe, K. O., Irving, E. B., & Amodio, M. (2003). *Unlocking the wordhord: Anglo-Saxon studies in memory of Edward B. Irving, Jr.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Onyeama, D. (1988). Notes of a So-Called Afro-Saxon. Enugu, Anambra State, Nigeria: Delta of Nigeria.

Orwell, G. (1946). Politics and the English Language. *Horizon.* London.

Paltridge, B. & Phakti A. (2015) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Resource.* London: Bloomsbury.

Parakrama, A. (1995). *De-hegemonizing language standards: Learning from (post)colonial Englishes about "English"* Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan Press.

Penn, J. M. (1972). *Linguistic Relativity Versus Innate Ideas: The origins of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis in German Thought.* Paris: The Hague.

Scargil, M.H. (1954) A pilot study of Alberta speech: Vocabulary. *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association, 1*(1), 21-22.

Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). Investigating "self-conscious" speech: the performance register in Ocracoke English. *Language in Society, 27*, 53-83.

van Gelderen, E. (2006). *A History of the English language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Troyer, G. (1994). Linguistic determinism and Mutability: The Sapir-Whorf "Hypothesis" and Intercultural Communication. *JALT Journal*, 16(2).

Whorf, B. L., Carroll, J. B., Levinson, S. C., Lee, P., & MyiLibrary. (2012). Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of benjamin lee whorf (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.'

Yeates, S. J. (2012). *Myth and history: Ethnicity and politics in the first millennium British Isles*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS

Below are the full transcriptions of two interviews referenced in the work.

In these transcriptions utterances from the interviewer are labeled with the letter 'P.'

Interview 1.

```
25     P:   oka:y(.) so:(.) u↑:m(.) you have already ta:ken(.)
26          the:(.) online: questionnaire,
27     J:   [i did(.)yeah]
28     P:   >what did you think of that.
29     J:   a:h(.) it was really interesting tha:t it kinda
       made
30          me: have to th:ink about why i use the words i
       use,
31          um. 'cause i feel like -i feel like most people
       don't
32          Consciously(.) ch:oose their words so much as
       s:peak in
33          patterns that they know. u↑:m(.) >as a result of<
       the
34          people that (.) they spend the most ↑ti:me↓  with,
35          as a result of (.) the places that they're at the
       most,
36          i think- i think especially when you're young(.)
       you
37          know(.) you speak mostly in sla:ng(.) *a:h(.) with
38          certain people tha:t(.) you're with. and you speak
       in
39          c:ertain types of slang with certain types of people
40          and then:(when)you are hanging out with (.02) people
41          tha:t you might not(.)>h:ang out with< normally and
       you
42          speak a little bit mo:re: conventionally I guess.
43     P:   [right]
44     J:        u↑:m(.)because  i   think-   -i   think-   -i
       think(.)speaking(.)
45          to people(.)a:h(.)involves a lot of like(.02)I guess
46          trying to understand like how they communicate and
       trying
47          to(.02) communicate with them(.) in a wa:y that i:s:
       (.03)
48          congruent with how they speak >and um< y↑ea↓h.
49     P:   [right]
50     J:   [((incomprehensible utterance))]
```

64

```
51    P:   do you think that u↑:m(.) similarly to you how speak
      with
52         your friends when you're around your family? >or is
      that
53         like<(.)another layer of like ↑now i'm with my
      grandmother
54         so,
55    J:   [r:ight]
56         i mean(.) i still speak the same way(.)like >okay-
57         like< ↓i swear ↓a ↑lot like(.) just in how I talk,
58         i jus- i swear a lot >and i don't know why< i
59         jus:t(.)it's just one of those things that(.) >i:
      don'
60         even really< like (.)it never really,
61         (.05)
62         r::egisters in my brain that i'm swearing a lot, and
      so(.)
63         like(.03) ↑I was at work uh last week,
64         and i- i- s:omeone told me to stop(.) £s↑wear↓ing
      so much£
65    P:   £[huh huh]£
66    J:   and i didn't realize that it was happening
67         and i was like(.) "oh shit!" and uh: like(.)#>right
      there#
68      u:m .hh so: I kinda forget how i am talking um(.) in
      a
69         certain context.
70         i don't think i- i change how i speak 'very much'
      >which
71         i think is(.) no:t common. bu:t(.) i'm pretty
      comfortable
72         with  how  i  speak.  i  think  i'm  p:retty
      articulate(.)most
73         times, but i also like(.)curse a lot >which i think<
      makes
74         some people kind of uncomfortable(.) um(.) >and i
      think<
75         with my f:amily I tr:y not to as much? but(.) it
      kinda
76      s:lips: out more(.) recently because i'm (.) y'know,
77      (.03)
78       n:ineteen now(.) and i can swear in front of them
      and
79         they really don't care that much(.)
80    P:   [now you're an old man£]
81    J:   [yeah]
```

65

```
82    P:  ((laughter))
83    J:  [i'm an old-] i'm an old(.) wise(.)old man.
84    P:  #old wise old man# um(.) so(.) ah(.) really
      quickl:y:
85        um(.)
86    J:  [sure]
87    P:  <i wanna know a little bit about you:r> um(.)
      like(.)
88        Language learning history.
89    J:  [>okay<]
90    P:  [↑so:] um(.)>y'know< <whe:re you "↑be:g↓an"
      learning>
91        ↑eng↓lish(.) or like(.) what other languages you
92        Speak(.) <any:thing> like that.
93    J:  [UM]
94        a:h(.) well my first language's(.)probably (.02)
95        english(.) for sure. um(.)i starte:d to learn that
      at
96        Home with my mom um(.)she taught m:me to read when
      i was
97        Like tw:o. so(.) i've always kinda had 'like' a
      pretty:
98        (.03) rich history with language(.) I guess(.) in
      that
99        sense(.) BUT um(.) s:she speaks fluent spanish and
      french
100       so(.)that was kind of in my life as well.
101       I don't(.) really speak any french >but i speak(.)
      like,
102       conversational spanish(.) to a point where if i had
      to i
103       could but I chose not to most of the time just
104       'cause(.) like(.)
105   P:  [right]
106   J:  i'm not(.) super comfortable with it
      um(.)especially
107       like(.) with people who speak primarily spanish i
      feel
108       like i <ca:n't> >with them(.)it's just like it's
      just
109       gonna s:sound like(.) terrible.
110   P:  [right]
111   J:  bu:t i mean(.) i- you know (.01) yeah↑ i guess it-
      it all
112       started at home(.) and then school i- always took
      like(.)
```

66

```
113      a:hm(.)in high school i took(.) two(.) A P
      c:courses for:
114      >r:eading and writing< 'which was pretty cool and
      it
115      helped me a lot'(.)um(.)so yeah(.) um(.) mostly
      english.
116  P:  were you um(.) were you in arizona? or were you(.)
      in new
117      york when you were a little person.
118  J:  a:h so(.) i was in new york and n:new jersey from
      the
119      ages of z:ero to eight(.) and i moved here when I
      was
120      eight and i lived here 'til i was sixteen and i
      moved
121      the:re again when i was sixteen and then i moved
      here
122      again when i was eight-teen.
123  P:  okay:
124  J:  [>and i'm nineteen now.<]
125  P:  [do you think(.) that there are um(.) like really
      large
126      differences (.) [i:n:(.)]
127  J:  [absolutely.]£
128  P:  #ye:ah?# do you(.)find yourself like(.) sp- so(.) i
      mean
129      you talked about slang and like cursing ↑but do
      you: find
130      yourself like(.) when you go: back to the east
      coast the
131      way you speak is:,
132  J:  [yeah.]
133      I speak comple:tely different(.)like i've used
      s:slang
134      here t:t:that I was using there (.) like >no one
      knew<
135      >what the hell< i was saying.
136  P:  [wow.]
137  J:  and so i had to like- comple:tely change(.) ↑how ↓i
      spoke
138      when i moved here again because it was like(.) IT
      was
139      almost like i had to like(.) r:re-learn how to
      speak.
140      properly (.) "in quotes" i should y'know £like£(.)
      i
```

```
141        dunno what that means like "properly" but(.) um(.)
142        yeah(.) it was like a wh:ole new world.
143   P:   so(.)did u:m(.) ↑i ↓guess taking the: survey(.)
      since
144        ↑all of the words that were chosen:n the survey
      were
145        words <that were> >that were pretty much< "baby
      words"
146        (.)but i chose them because they were all words
      tha:t
147        h:ave ↑been in english for as long as english has
      existed
148        OR they're words that (.)um(.02)like ↑o:↓ther:
      germanic
149        languages ↑als↓o have,
150   J:   [yeah]
151   P:   the same kind of wo:rd? um: when you: were taking:
      the
152        test did you think about h:ow many of those words
      that
153        you use that ↑are different from place to place(.)
      how
154        many of them m:ight be: words that are like native
      to
155        english?
156   J:   [right]
157   P:   [or that] y'know(.)are loans or whatever have you-
158   J:   well- i mean- .hh i think what's s:o: i guess kinda
159        w:eir:d about this language is that it's- it's-
      (.02)
160        it was created as a result of so many: (.03)
161        ↑o↓ther languages(.) so it's hard ta- it's hard ta-
162        it's hard ta have some kinda of a culture with this
163        language >which i think< in the survey that kinda
      hit
164        me like(.) >pretty hard< was that like(.) >i dunno<
      i
165        think in general this country like(.02) doesn't
      really
166        have much of it's own? culture:? as a result
      of(.02) of
167        our language £i think£(.)
168   P:   [yeah]
169   J:   which i think is- is kinda strange. every word has
      it's
170        roots in ↓some↑thing else.
```

```
171        so(.) that kind of-
172        (.02) brings up this w:eird th:ing about like(.)
173        connotation(.) and i think what that means and like
      how:
174        we use certain words and what they mean for us
      versus
175        >what they mean< for somebody else >'cause there
      are like
176        there .hh i dunno how to explain it but we kinda
      use
177        words very lo:osely here: >where:as(in)most other
178        countries< it's a very spec:ific usage of language.
      >and
179        i think slang is like(.) s:omething that is mostly
180        prominent here m:more so than in other countries(.)
181        ↑which is not totally true but it's like h:eavily
      used
182        here(.)like(.)to the point where(.)some people just
183        ne:ver speak like s:tandard(.) y,know(.)*a:h* *an*
      they
184        just speak entirely in s*lang*- which you- which
      you
185        c↑a:↓n and still(.02)make sense(.) i guess here-
186   P:   [yeah]
187   J:   which is n:o:t the case in most other countries i
      think
188   P:   yeah
189   J:   you can speak here entirely in slang and have like
      a
190        fu:ll(.04) y'know(.) convers:sation with s:someone
      which
191        i think is kind of exclusive(.)>to this country<
      ↑so↓
192        i guess in a way that kind of is our culture(.) is
      that
193        we speak-
194        we kind of like(.03) create our o:w:n(.02) mo:des
      of
195        communication more so i think than other languages.
196        (.02)
197   P:   so do you think(.) u:m(.)because of that(.) it(.)
      would
198        be:(.)um >i dunno<(.)would it even be
      ↓re:↑le↓vant(.)um
199        to learn(.)about(.) you know(.) the history of
      english(.)
```

```
200        and like why it is the way it is?
201   J:   [i think so(.)yeah]
202        i think- i think because at that point you can
      start to
203        kind of comprehend more of the cultural
      s:eperations that
204        (.)happen in this country(.) specifically um as a
      result
205        of how people speak?
206   P:   [right]
207        what do you think about(.)u:m(.)like(.02)f:-
      thinking
208        of (.) um:(.) i'm trying to think of the right word
      for
209        it(.) i guess like(.) prejudices: against(.)
      u:m(.)how
210        other people speak [you know.]
211   J:   [yeah]
212        that's huge(.) that's- that's yeah(.) that's a
      big(.)
213        problem(.) i think. i think .hh(.02) ↑i ↓think
      people
214        who speak (.02) primarily in slang are viewed as
      like
215        s:tupide:r: than people who speak in like standard
216        *<you know>*
217        (.04)
218        i dunno like(.)
219   P:   [right]
220   J:   like- like(.) you know what i mean?
221   P:   so there's (.)um(.)and example i always think about
222        *a lot* *tha:t* what you're saying makes me think
      about
223        is u:m(.)so: u:h(.) >you know how people< get real
      huffy
224        and puffy about like if people "/AKS/" things
      versus
225        "asking" for them?
226   J:   [yeah]
227   P:   so,
228   J:   [↑and ↑like] honestly(.) that makes me angry too£
229        ((laughter))
230   P:   [it makes you angry too:?]
231   J:   [#a] little bit# like(.)
232   P:   so-
```

```
233    J:  not- not- not- to the point where(.) where i'm like
       it's
234        not(.) that word it's ↑THIS word(.) i*:it- it like
       if i
235        hear it in my head i'm like ["ask"(.) just say
       "ask"?]
236        ((laughter))
237    P:  [you don't like it]((laughter))
238    J:  [just]
239    P:  so: one of the first things i ever was learning
       when i
240        started studying old english was tha:t(.) the verb
       for:
241        ↑ask↓ing(.)u:m(.) is as-as-as:(.)
242    J:  ((laughter))
243    P:   #it's hard to say# so there were two forms of it,
244    J:   [yeah]
245    P:   and one was acsian(.) and one was
       as:ci:an(.)that's like
246        r:eally: hard to say and people used to "aks"
       things
247        ((three consecutive clapping sounds)) ALL ((clap))
       of
248        the T↑I↓ME(.)
249    J:  [so: i'm just an #asshole#]
250    P:  [but for:](.)((laughter))
251    J:  for: for doing that(.) i'm just a dick(.)
252    P:  ((laughter))
253    J:  ((laughter))
254        ((clapping and laughter))
255    P:  so do you think(.) if more people like(.) kn:e:w
       things
256        like that like sort of knew(.) you know(.) like
       "↑oh"(.)
257        english has always had these weird little
       [oddities] that
258        maybe it would lead towards people being ↑le:ss(.)
259        [prejudice].
260    J:  [yeah]
261        [absolutely]. yeah(.) £*an(.) ↑i didn't know that
       at
262        ↓all↑£ and i feel ↑re:↓all↑y: *bad*.
263    P:  ((laughter))
264    J:  so you're actually helping me a lot(.) right
       now(.)so(.)
265        thank you(.)>but<-
```

```
266        shit(.) now >i don't even know< what to say.
267   P:   so-
268   J:   'i feel like a #dumb-dumb'#
269   P/J: ((laughter))
270   P:   um(.)so i guess thinking of things like that?(.)
      what
271        r:o:le do you feel like(.) the ↑history of a
      certain
272        language has on:(.)<'*y'know*'> peo:ple in-in
273        >contemporary times<
274   J:   [right]
275   P:   still using it.
276   J:   [right]
277        well(.)↑i ↓think- i think(.) honestly right now(.)
      in
278        terms of how we speak the most important(.03)
      thing we
279        have(.) is sl↑a↓ng honestly >i really- i really<
      think
280        that >because i think< <sla:ng> .hh(.02)
281        slang puts people in the position where they have
      a
282        culture and they have(.) some kind of a place in
      history
283        as like(.) cr:eators of s:something that(.)
      contributes
284        to how how people communicate.
285        i think that's ↑su:per important.
286        i think people need to: have a personal:
      connection to
287        how they speak >and what their< *saying*(.) and i
      think
288        slang is how that(.) comes ↑out,
289        and so when people: view slang as some kind of
      like(.04)
290        ↑bastard>ization<(.) of how of like(.)speech? i
      think-
291        i think that's wr:o:ng(.) >i think that's< <not>
      how you
292        should see it(.)i think you should see it as(.03)
293        as people? kind of like(.03) creating their own(.)
294        their own(.02) i guess personality throu:gh >their
295        speech patterns<. like it's so: important(.) like
      i
296        think(.) I THINK what most people hate about
      like(.)
```

```
297        school? for instance is just ho:w(.) how much
       they're
298        taught that everything is one way(.) it has to be
       *that*
299        wa:y(.03)
300        >and i think< when it comes to ↑spea:↓king(.)
       y'know(.)
301        like(.02) y'need to feel comfortable. ↑Hi(.)
       sup(.)
302        ((speaking to someone else))
303        i think-
304        i think people need to fee:l(.02) comfortable with
       how
305        their-
306        with how they speak(.) and if they're no:t(.) then
307        there's no persona:l: (.02) connection ↑to: their
308        language(.) an-and which pretty much means that(.)
309        there's no: culture(.) in the language.
310    P:  [right]
311    J:  so i think(.02)that's all r:r- super important.
312    P:  so you feel like language(.) culture(.) and(.) >i
       guess
313        by proxy< history(.) are all things that are
       <working
314        together?>
315    J:  [>↑yeah<].
316        absolutely.
317
318    AFTER THE ACTIVITY
319    P:  so ↑this one's middle english
320    J:  i got like(.) a good amount of that one.
321    P:  yeah(.) the-the spelling of things(.) stared
       changing <a
322        lot> fr:o:m ((flipping pages)) this is old english.
323        (.02)
324    J:  really? that's ↑eng↓lish?
325    P:  yeah(.) [so:]
326    J:  [see] i didn't- i didn't get *much* of *tha:t* at
       all.
327    P:  loo:k↑ing at all of these <thi:ngs:> ((each excerpt
       of
328        text for the activity))uh:m(.)n- does it make you
       more or
329        less interested in learning about(.) the history of
330        english.
331    J:  a lot more.

                              73
```

```
332    P:  a *lo:t* more?
333    J:  because it's so: weird how words have changed,
334    P:  [yeah]
335    J:  like(.) even like after seeing this and then
       like(.)
336        hearing myself speak(.) it's like(.) o:dd.
337    P:  [it's weird]
338    J:  it's an odd experience.
339    P:  so this one: this(.) if you: look at this and then
       look
340        at this((pointing to old english excerpt))and if
       you look
341        at old ↑norse? they're so similar,
342    J:  [yeah]
343    P:  they're- >things that are different< are like(.)
       how they
344        "do" verbs and then like(.) .hh old english has lot
       of
345        this ge it's like u:h(.)((snapping sound)) >it's
       like a<
346        ↑pre:↓fix that goes on stuff(.) a:nd makes it(.02)
347        i don't really know how to expla:in
       it(.)(complete)'but'
348        so(.) this is Edward(.) #"her wæ:s ea:dweard"#.
349    J:  ((laughter))
350    P:  AND like(.) everythi:ng sounds just how it looks(.)
       and
351        like(.) it's loo:ks nuts
352    J:  ((lauhghter)) £yeah(.) it does£
353    P:  but that is something that is cool
354    J:  yeah(.) it is(.) it- ↑ya ↓know what is sounds like?
       it
355        sou- have you ever read? a:h ↓tr↑ain↓spotting?
356    P:  ye:a:h >yeah<
357    J:  like have you ever actually read the book.
358    P:  yea:h(.) like(.)
359    J:  that's what it looks like(.) it's very ph:onetic.
360    P:  exactly.
361    J:  i you were to s:peak it outloud it would probably
       make
362        more sense.
363    P:  and that's 'cause every- every sound? you say it.
       you say
364        every sound. so this is(.) < "gehealgod to cyning
       on
```

74

```
365      WINcestra" > so that's Winchester. "EAsterdæig"
      that's
366      <EASTER da:y>. it's a little weird because these
      "g's" at
367      at the ends and the beginning of stuff have a "[j]"
368      sound?
369   J:  o:okay ((nodding))
```

Interview 2

```
66      ((clap, rustling of recorder))
67      P:   okay. so:. £from what I <kno:w>£
68      S:   ((subdued chuckling))
69      P:   ((laughter))#you've JUST taken the survey:
70      ((clapping sound))
71           .hh UM(.)since it's super(.) fresh(.) on yer
        mi:nd(.)
72           what are some things that you: ↑THOUGHT ↑a↓bout?
        that
73           you liked(.)that you didn't like? that(.) >went
        through
74           yer mi:nd(.) while you: we:re(.) taking the
        *sur:ve:y*.
75      S:   u:hm the- th—the: the portion abou:t(.) u:hm(.02)
        like
76           ho:w (.02) >how important< we feel like the:
        st↑u↓dy:
77           of like >the history of the english language?<
        i:s to
78           like(.) both to like(.) >the experience of being<
        an
79           english language user and ↑al↓so(.) like(.)
80           understa:nding: like coming to have an
        understanding of
81           the english language(.) ua:hm. ↑like >i ↑like
        that
82           portion <a lo:t> u:m(.) >mostly< 'cause: like(.)
        it
83           gives people the opportunity to like (.02) *soap
        bo:x*
84           about how important
85
```

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PILOT QUESTIONS

Pilot Survey Questions

What is your Age?: 18-25/ 26-35/36-45/ 46-65/66-100

Gender: I identify as Male/Female/Neither Male or Female accurately describe my

gender/Prefer Not to Answer, [fill-in-the-blank option for further clarification]

Race/Ethnicity: I identify as… White/Non-White/

Prefer Not to Answer People perceive me as… White/Non-White/Prefer Not to Answer

My ethnic background is… [fill-in-the-blank option for further clarification]

Is English your first language?: Yes/No

Do you speak any other languages? Yes/No

Did/do you like learning (about) English? Why or why not? [paragraph text answer box]

Have you ever studied the History of English either formally or on your own? Yes/No

How relevant do you feel the History of English is for American English speakers? Not at

all/ Neutral/Somewhat/ Very/ Extremely

How important do you think the etymology of words is for American English speakers?

Not at all/Neutral/Somewhat/ Very/ Extremely

How often do you use the word [weird; thing; like; think; know; nightmare; kin; craft;

earth; midwife; dream; freedom]*? Not at all, Sometimes, Often, Every day

How many times a day do you think you use the word [weird; thing; like; think; know;

nightmare; kin; craft; earth; midwife; feelings; right; wrong; good; bad; dream;

freedom]*? Once or twice/ at least 5 times/more than 10 times/ more than 20 times

How would you explain what the word [weird; thing; think; know; nightmare; kin; craft; earth; midwife; feelings; right; wrong; good; bad; dream; freedom]* means to someone? [paragraph text answer box]

How do you usually use the word [weird; thing; think; know; nightmare; kin; craft; earth; midwife; feelings; right; wrong; good; bad; dream; freedom] in a sentence? Please give a few examples, if you do not use this word, how would you use it in a sentence if you had to?

Does the word [weird; thing; like; think; know; nightmare; kin; craft; earth; midwife; feelings; right; wrong; good; bad; dream; freedom]* have any special meaning or significance to you beyond using it in a sentence? Please explain. [paragraph text answer box]

*the question will be state separately for each of the words in brackets

APPENDIX C

LIST OF FULL-SCALE QUESTIONS

Survey Questions:

Demographic Information:

 What is your age? *
In order to participate in this study you must state that you are 18 or older.
18-25/26-35/36-45/46-65/66+

How would you describe your ethnic background?
[Short Answer Box]

How would you describe your gender?
non-binary, female, male, etc.
[Short Answer Box]

Language History:

Is American English your first language?
Yes/No

Where did you begin learning American English?
[Short Answer Box]

What varieties of American English do you speak?
Examples of this would be varieties of English that have cultural value and/or are specific to particular regions of the United States like African American English, Appalachian English, Chicano English, Hawaiian Pidgin English, Pittsburghese, and Standard English.
[Paragraph Answer Box]

What other languages do you know?
List any and all languages you know. By "knowing" I mean languages that you understand and/or have at least the ability to engage in a basic exchange. Please indicate if one of these languages is actually your first language and/or if you were raised in a multilingual home.
[Paragraph Answer Box]

General Language Ideologies:

Did you enjoy learning American English? Why or why not?
or "do you like learning American English," if that is more applicable.
[Short answer box]

81

Have you ever studied the History of the English Language, either formally or on your own?
Yes/No

How Relevant do you feel the history of the English Language is for speakers of American English?
Not at all/Somewhat/Neutral/Very/Extremely

Based on the answer you provided above Why do you think the History of the English Language is or is not relevant for American English speakers?
[Paragraph Answer Box]

Do you feel this level of relevancy is the same for all speakers of American English?
For example: would the history of the English language be more or less relevant for First Language American English Users, or Second Language American English Users?
[Paragraph Answer Box]

How could learning this history of the English Language help the understanding of American English users?
[Paragraph Answer Box]

Based on the answer you provided above do you feel it could be just as helpful for First Language Learners and Second Language Learners of English?
[Paragraph Answer Box]

Is English Germanic?
Yes/No

Please use the space below provide further explanation to the answer for the question above if feel it is necessary.
[Paragraph Answer Box]

How is English different from Germanic Languages?
[paragraph answer box]

How does the language one speaks impact their worldview?
[paragraph answer box]

Word Usage:

How often do you use the word "self?"

This can include words that have "self" in them ("myself," "selfie," "selfish")

Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

82

How would you explain what a "self" is to someone who has never heard of a "self" before?

If you feel that there are multiple usages for this word please explain all of them and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

Your answer

Does the word "self" have any special meaning or significance for you?

Your answer

How often do you use the word "life"?
This can include forms of "life" ("living," "alive") or collocations with "life" in it ("love life" or "get a life").
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what a "life" is to someone who has never heard of a "life" before?
Does the word life have a special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "clean"?
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "clean" is to someone who has never heard of "clean" before?
If you feel as if there are multiple usages for this word please explain all of them, and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

Does the word "clean" have any special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "kind"?

This can include collocations ("kind of"/"kinda") or other forms of the word ("kin," "kindred").
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what a "kind" is to someone who has never heard of a "kind" before?
If you feel this word has multiple usages please explain all of them, and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

Does the word "kind" have any special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "troll"?
This can include forms of the word ("trolling," "trolled") or collocations with the word in it ("what a troll").
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what a "troll" is to someone who has never heard of a "troll" before?
If you feel this word has multiple usages please explain all of them, and whether or not you feel there are similarities between those usages.

Does the word "troll" have any special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "like"?
This can include other forms of the word ("LIKE-like," "liking", "liked") or collocations with the word in it ("sweet like")
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "like" is to someone who had never heard of "like" before?
If you feel there are multiple usages for this word please explain all of them and whether or not you feel there are similarities between those usages.

Does the word "like" have any special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "work"?
This can include forms of the word ("worked", "working", "works"), other words that use the word ("network", "homework", "workout"), or collocations that have the word in them ("hard work," "it works," "work of art")
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "work" is to someone who had never heard of "work" before?
If you feel there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all, and whether or not you feel there are similarities between those usages.

Does the word "work" have any special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "cool"?
This can include other forms of the word ("cooling", "coolness") or collocations with the word in it ("way cool," "that is cool")
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "cool" is to someone who has never heard of "cool" before?
If you feel there are multiple usages for this word please explain all of them, and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between the usages.

Does the word "cool" have a special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "true"?
This can include other forms of the word ("truth," "truly", "untrue," "truest") or collocations with the word in it ("so true," "maybe true")
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "true" is to someone who has never heard of "true" before?
If you feel there are multiple usages for this word please explain them all, and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

Does the word "true" have a special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "will"?
This can include other forms of the word ("willingness," "willpower") or collocations with the word in it ("free will," "the will of")
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "will" is to someone who has never heard of "will" before?
If you feel there are multiple usages for this word please explain them all, and whether or not you feel there are similarities between those usages.

Does the word "will" have a special meaning or significance for you?

How often do you use the word "god"?
This can include other forms of the word ("godlike", "godly") or collocations with the word in it ("oh my god", "great god," "god awful")
Not at all/Sometimes/Often/All of the time

How would you explain what "god" is to someone who has never heard of "god" before?
If you feel this word has multiple usages please explain them all, and whether or not you feel there are similarities between those usages.

Does the word "god" have a special meaning or significance for you?

What does the word "good" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple

usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "love" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "think" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "feel" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "world" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "be" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "hate" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "want" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?
This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages.

What does the word "nightmare" mean for you, and how would you explain that to someone who is unfamiliar with this word?

This can include any form of the word or any usage. If you feel that there are multiple usages of this word please explain them all and whether or not you feel there are any similarities between those usages

APPENDIX D

EXCERPTS FOR INTERVIEW ACTIVITY

Excerpts Used in Interview Activity

Old English

From: Teach Yourself Old English

Her wæs Eadward gehalgod to cinge on Wincestra on forman Easterdæig mid myccelum wyrðscype, and ða wæron Eastron .iii. *Nonas Aprelis*. Eadsige arcebishop hine halgade, and toforan eallum þam folce hine wel lærede, and to his agenre neode and ealles folces wel manude. And stignany peost wæs geblestad to bisceope to Eastenglum.

Middle English

From: Cantebury Tales

Whan that Aprill with his shoures soote
The droghte of March hath perced to the roote,
And bathed every veyne in swich licour
Of which vertu engendred is the flour,
Whan Zephirus eek with his sweete breeth
Inspired hath in every holt and heeth
The tendre croppes, and the yonge sonne
Hath in the Ram his halve cours yronne,
And smale foweles maken melodye,
That slepen al the nyght with open ye
(so priketh hem Nature in hir corages),
Thanne longen folk to goon on pilgrimages,
And palmeres for to seken straunge strondes,
To ferne halwes, kowthe in sondry londes;
And specially from every shires ende
Of Engelond to Caunterbury they wende,
The hooly blisful martir for to seke,
That hem hath holpen whan that they were seeke.

Latin:

From: The Holy Bible, book of Psalms

De profundis clamavi ad te, Domine:
Domine, exaudi vocem meam:
Fiant aures tuae intendentes,

in vocem deprecationis meae.
Si iniquitates observaveris, Domine:
Domine, quis sustinebit?
Quia apud te propitiatio est:
et propter legem tuam sustinui te, Domine.
Sustinuit anima mea in verbo eius:

speravit anima mea in Domino.
A custodia matutina usque ad noctem:
speret Israel in Domino.
Quia apud Dominum misericordia:
et copiosa apud eum redemptio.
Et ipse redimet Israel,
ex omnibus iniquitatibus eius.
Gloria Patri, et Filio,
et Spiritui Sancto.
Sicut erat in principio, et nunc, et semper,
et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Swedish:

From: Mama Lisa's World, Swedish Nursurey Rhymes

Bä, bä, vita lamm,
har du någon ull?
Ja, ja, kära barn,
jag har säcken full!
Helgdagsrock åt far
och söndagskjol åt mor,
och två par strumpor
åt lille-, lillebror!

Dutch:

From Dutch Wikepedia entry on Dr. Seuss

Dr. Seuss was een Amerikaans kinderboekenschrijver, dichter, en tekenaar. Hij publiceerde in zijn leven in totaal meer dan 60 boeken. Tot zijn bekendste werken behoren De kat met de hoed (The Cat in the Hat), Horton Hears a Who! en How the Grinch Stole Christmas. Behalve onder de naam Dr. Seuss schreef hij ook onder de pseudoniemen Theo LeSieg en, in een enkel geval, Rosetta Stone. Seuss werkte tevens als tekenaar voor reclamecampagnes van onder andere Flit en Standard Oil. Zijn

kinderboeken zijn tot op de dag van vandaag populair in de Verenigde Staten en andere landen, en zijn meerdere malen bewerkt voor film en televisie. Zijn verjaardag 2 maart is inmiddels de dag voor het jaarlijkse Read Across America-evenement.

French:

From: Alcest

Les sous-bois au printemps
Sont une voûte céleste
Constellée d'émeraudes.
Les feuilles des arbres dansent
Avec la brise légère
Et les rayons du soleil
Pour que sa lumière
Les transforme en joyaux.