

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/67115> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Lukac, M.

Title: Grassroots prescriptivism

Issue Date: 2018-11-22

GRASSROOTS PRESCRIPTIVISM

Published by
LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6111

e-mail: lot@uu.nl
<http://www.lotschool.nl>

ISBN: 978-94-6093-301-1
NUR 616

Copyright © 2018: Morana Lukač. All rights reserved.

Grassroots Prescriptivism

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 22 november 2018
klokke 15.00 uur

door

Morana Lukač

geboren te Osijek, Kroatië
in 1986

Promotores Prof. dr. I.M. Tieken-Boon van Ostade
Prof. dr. C. Mair (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität
Freiburg)

Promotiecommissie Prof. dr. M. Hannay (Vrije Universiteit
Amsterdam)
Prof. dr. H. de Hoop (Radboud Universiteit)
Prof. dr. J.C. de Jong (Universiteit Leiden)
Dr. S. Moody (Universiteit Leiden)

The research for this book was carried out as part of the project
‘Bridging the Unbridgeable: Linguists, Prescriptivists and the General
Public’, financed by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research
(NWO)

For my mother

Table of contents

Acknowledgments	V
Abbreviations	VII
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Grammar vigilantes	1
1.2. The end of prescriptivism?	6
1.3. For how long has the language been in decay?	9
1.4. Thesis outline	19
2. Grassroots prescriptivism: An analysis of individual speakers' efforts at maintaining the standard language ideology	25
2.1. Introduction	25
2.2. Who complains about language use?	27
2.2.1 Letters to newspaper editors.....	29
2.2.2 The survey	34
2.3. Which linguistic features are stigmatised in public discussions on usage?	37
2.3.1. Comparing <i>The Times</i> and <i>The New York Times</i>	37
2.3.2. The survey	41
2.4. Conclusion.....	42
3. Linguistic prescriptivism in letters to the editor	45
3.1. Introduction	45
3.2. The 'misused' possessive apostrophe.....	46
3.3. Data	48
3.4. Semantic analysis	51
3.4.1. Key words and key semantic domains	51
3.4.2. Key word analysis	53
3.4.3. Key semantic domains	55
3.5. Conclusion.....	66
4. From usage guides to language blogs	69
4.1. Introduction	69
4.2. The popularity of grammar blogs	73
4.3. <i>Grammar Girl</i> as a usage guide 2.0.....	75
4.4. Comments on the <i>Grammar Girl</i> website	81
4.4.1. The commenters' identity construction.....	82
4.4.2. Types of comments	87
4.4.3. Arguments presented in metalinguistic debates	91

4.4.4 Repetitive narratives and humour in metalinguistic discourses	96
4.5 Conclusion.....	98
5 From usage guides to Wikipedia: Re-contextualising the discourse on language use	101
5.1 Introduction: Expert discourses on language use	101
5.2 The usage guide as a genre.....	105
5.3 The history of collaboration in knowledge creation: From the <i>OED</i> to Wikis	107
5.4 Wikipedia: The online collaborative encyclopaedia community	109
5.4.1 Related work	111
5.4.2 The structure of Wikipedia entries and Talk pages..	112
5.5 Analysing Wikipedia entries on language use.....	116
5.5.1 The editors.....	118
5.5.2 Wikipedia entries on usage items.....	121
5.5.3 Corpus-based comparison of Wikipedia entries and usage guides	123
5.5.4 Comparing Wikipedia Talk pages and entries on usage items	129
5.6 Conclusion.....	133
6. What is the difference between <i>thus</i> and <i>thusly</i>?	137
6.1. Introduction	137
6.2. The prescriptivists	139
6.3. The general public	143
6.3.1. The survey	143
6.3.2. Acceptability of <i>thusly</i>	145
6.3.3. Differences among demographic groups.....	147
6.4. Actual usage	150
6.4.1. Genre differences in the usage of <i>thus</i> and <i>thusly</i> ...	150
6.4.2. Differences in meaning between <i>thus</i> and <i>thusly</i>	154
6.4.3. Verbs modified by <i>thus</i> and <i>thusly</i>	156
6.5. Conclusion.....	159
7. Conclusion	161
7.1. Revisiting the concept of grassroots prescriptivism	161
7.2. Bridging the gap	163
7.3. Changing prescriptivism.....	166
7.4. Methodological challenges	170

7.5. Moving forward.....	172
Appendix A: <i>English Today</i> features.....	175
Apostrophe(')s, who needs them?	175
Grammar Advice in the Age of Web 2.0: Introducing the new (and keeping the old) language authorities.....	178
Appendix B: Bridging the Unbridgeable blog entries	183
Jafaican: ‘Ali G would understand it perfectly’	183
Out with <i>whom</i> , in with the split infinitive.....	184
David Crystal and the history of English spelling, or how the Internet is killing off silent letters	187
The history of txt spk and Queen Victoria	188
Who’s to blame for literacy levels in England and Northern Ireland	190
‘Could care less’ or ‘couldn’t care less’	192
Censoring the ‘G-word’	194
Railway station or train station?	196
The future of English.....	198
#Fundilymundily the language of the UK general election 2015	200
Murphy’s Law and other mistakes prescriptivists make	202
Migrants: the language crisis.....	204
Adding the <i>Mx</i> : Gender-neutral titles and pronouns	207
The descriptive backlash	209
Can your local accent hold you back?	210
Appendix C: Flat adverbs survey	213
Appendix D: List of newspaper sources for the Letters corpus	217
References.....	219
Samenvatting.....	241
Curriculum vitae.....	241

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the many people who have helped me write this thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor for providing me with the opportunity to take part in the Bridging the Unbridgeable project, and for her advice and guidance. I would like to thank the members of project for the useful discussions throughout the years. I am indebted to Robin Straaijer, Robert Gutounig, Tony Parr, the members of the committee, and the anonymous reviewers of the studies included in this thesis for reading some or all of its chapters. Each commented in their distinctive way and provided useful feedback. For her editing the Dutch summary of this thesis written by Robin Straaijer, I thank Renée Dekker. Professor Christian Mair gave me valuable advice in crucial stages of the work and helped me make the most of my stay at the University of Freiburg. All of them have my thanks and have helped to make this a better book than would have otherwise been the case.

I would like to thank Bobby Ruijgrok and Chris Engberts for sharing the PhD experience with me. I am also thankful to Mignon Fogarty, survey participants, and journalists for their answers to my questions and for providing me with the data without which this thesis would not have been possible.

I would not be here without the support of my remarkable aunt, Slavica Lukač, who has taught me that kindness and integrity are the highest forms of wisdom.

Abbreviations

AE06	The American English 2006 Corpus
AHD	<i>American Heritage Dictionary</i>
AP	Associated Press
APA	The American Psychological Association
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BE06	The British English 2006 Corpus
BLOB	Before Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus
BNC	British National Corpus
COCA	Corpus of Contemporary American English
COHA	Corpus of Historical American English
CMC	Computer-mediated communication
FLOB	The Freiburg-Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus
GG	<i>Grammar Girl</i>
GloWbE	The corpus of Global Web-based English
HUGE	Hyper Usage Guide of English
LE	Letters to the editor
LL	Log likelihood
LLOCE	<i>Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English</i>
LOB	Lancaster-Oslo/Bergen Corpus
NPOV	Neutral Point of View
NYC	<i>The New York Times</i>
MLA	Modern Language Association
NS	Native speaker of English
NNS	Non-native speaker of English
PMW	(Frequency) per million words
POS	Part of speech
MEU	<i>Modern English Usage</i>
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
ODO	<i>Oxford Dictionaries Online</i>
TED	Technology, Entertainment, Design

