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Abstract

I present a study of variation, change, and social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis. This study is informed by a year-long ethnographic participant-observation in the Cornish towns on Camborne and Redruth as well as novel lexis-oriented sociolinguistic interviews with 87 participants from the same area. I investigate the inter-speaker variation of semasiological and onomasiological usage by conducting a quantitative analysis of the relationship between lexis and age, gender, socioeconomic class, and strength of Cornish identity. I also analyse onomasiological variation from the perspective of intra-speaker variation by comparing casual and careful speech. Additionally, using the meta-linguistic narratives of participants, I detail the attested social meanings of the investigated words, *crib, croust, maid, stank*, and *emmet*. I propose that variation in usage and perception of Anglo-Cornish lexis can be accounted for by Cornish identity, not only in terms of strength but also by type. I suggest that participants’ identities orient to two types of Cornish identity, namely the *Industrial Celt* and *Lifestyle Cornwall*.

The key findings of this study are that the best predictor of Anglo-Cornish lexical usage is the strength of local identity and that Anglo-Cornish onomasiological forms are most likely to occur in careful speech styles. This is an *inverted* pattern of style-shifting. That is, the style pattern observed in this study is the inverse of the style pattern typically attested in variationist sociolinguistics (see Labov 1972a). I account for this pattern by suggesting that Anglo-Cornish forms accrue value from a specifically Cornish linguistic market (see Bourdieu 1991) and by introducing an
attention-to-self model of style which suggests that when speakers pay greater attention to their speech, they use language to approximate a desired self that they aspire to embody, which, in many cases, is a Cornish self.
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<td>OVC</td>
<td>Onomasiological Variable Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Place of Domicile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pp</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Spot-the-Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SED</td>
<td>Survey of English Dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC</td>
<td>Upper-Working-Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Working-Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

In this thesis I explore the contemporary socio-cultural landscape of Cornwall by conducting a variationist sociolinguistic analysis (see Labov 1972a) of the dialect of English spoken in Cornwall, that is, the Anglo-Cornish dialect. More specifically, I investigate the relationship between language and ideology with a particular focus on the role of local words in the construction of place identity. This investigation focuses on variation, change, and social meaning of lexis in and around the mid-West Cornish towns of Camborne and Redruth (henceforth Camborne-Redruth). I consider Anglo-Cornish words as a conduit through which Cornish identities are managed, (re)constructed, and performed.

Although regional identities are increasingly subject to forces of cultural homogenisation, in a review of census data from 2001 and 2011, Cornwall Council (2013) found a real-time increase in the strength of Cornish identity. Cornwall has a complex and contested history which is reflected in the identity of Cornish people, both historically and contemporaneously. There is even disagreement about what Cornwall is, ‘a Celtic nation’, ‘a county of England’, or ‘a Duchy’ (see Kirkhope 2010, 2013)? While I make no attempt to resolve Cornwall’s constitutional ambiguity, I consider the role of this geo-political vagueness on Cornish identities, as understood by the people of Camborne-Redruth, through the lens of linguistic variation.

Cornish identities are largely shaped by Cornish histories. In the 17th century, Cornwall became renowned for its industrial prowess. Fishing, farming, and,
particularly, mining were major contributors of jobs and economic capital in Cornwall. Many Cornish people remain proud that Cornish copper and tin was exported across the globe. However, in the 18th century, the mining industry began to decline. This demise continued into the 19th and 20th centuries until the last Cornish mine, South-Crofty, closed in 1998.

While its traditional industries have waned, Cornwall has developed into a tourist destination and a tourist industry has ensued. There are two major strands to this tourist industry. The heritage tourism industry relies on the mystique of Cornwall’s Celtic history and the prowess of its industrial past. The leisure aspect of the tourist industry is largely driven by the attractive aesthetics of Cornwall’s seascapes and landscapes as well as its variety of locally sourced and produced food and drink. Despite the tourism and hospitality sector as well as substantial EU subsidies, Cornwall today is largely economically poor, even though it remains socio-culturally rich.

As with the two strands of Cornish tourism, Cornish identities tend to be oriented to one of two periods of Cornish history. Firstly, the ‘traditional’ conceptualisation of Cornwall as Celtic and industrial is a source of pride for many, particularly older Cornish people. Many, particularly younger Cornish people also feel a pride in the lifestyle which is widely associated with Cornwall. For example, a slow-paced lifestyle linked to leisure culture and beaches is perceived to be particular to contemporary Cornwall. Those who align to this latter sense of Cornish identity associate themselves with a type of local identity which is predicated on Cornwall’s perceived natural aesthetic beauty and feel that Cornwall is a ‘cool’ place.
In this thesis, I explore these identities in Camborne-Redruth by conducting a sociolinguistic analysis, focusing on the level of lexis. In order to explore lexical usage, I devised and implemented lexis-oriented elicitation procedures which facilitated the collection of data from a sample of 87 participants. This thesis has three key points of difference from most existing work in variationist sociolinguistics. Specifically, these are an emphasis on the Anglo-Cornish dialect, variation in vocabulary, and identity of place. This thesis serves to redress the dearth of variationist sociolinguistic studies concerned with the Anglo-Cornish dialect. In fact, this is the first study of sociolinguistic variation among adults in mainland Cornwall. Also, this is the first study to consider vocabulary usage from the perspectives of both semasiological and onomasiological variation, as well as social meaning. This thesis adds to the limited number of studies of sociolinguistic variation to consider identity of place quantitatively, as well as the interaction of place identity with other social categories (for review, see Section 2.1.4). Of these gaps in the existing sociolinguistic literature, the focus on lexis is the most challenging to resolve.

The choice to investigate lexical variation has special significance as this level of language has largely been absent from sociolinguistic research (see Beeching 2011; Durkin 2012; Robinson 2012a). Although dialectology has shown that lexis can be a good diagnostic for the geographical space occupied by populations, it has seldom been explored as a diagnostic for the social space within a community. It is often assumed that lexical variation is superficial (e.g. Labov 2001a: 28; Chambers 2003:

---

1 Dann (2016, 2019) studied sociophonetic variation among adolescents in West Cornwall, while Moore & Carter (2015) investigated linguistic variation in the Isles of Scilly, an archipelago approximately 28 miles south-west of mainland Cornwall.
187), and, therefore, a trivial part of the linguistic system, as opposed to other levels of the grammar such as phonology or morpho-syntax. For example, Quine (1953: 47) noted that semanticists ‘are in the situation of not knowing what they are talking about’. Hymes (1972: 325) remarks upon the tradition that ‘proper’ linguists do not study meaning. Although Labov (1972a: 120) called for sociolinguistic studies at the level of semantics, the trivialisation of lexis has extended to the variationist paradigm (e.g. Trudgill 2014; Holmes & Wilson 2017). This point is illustrated by Ruette (2012: 5, see Figure 1.1), who observed the subject matter of articles in the journal *Language Variation and Change* for two years and found very little focus on lexical variation.²

![Table showing the level of language analysed by articles in the journal *Language Variation and Change* from March 2010–March 2012 (from Ruette 2012: 5), with the number of articles in italics.](image)

Lexis has been largely eschewed from the epistemological and methodological considerations of variationist sociolinguistics (Robinson 2012a: 38). As a result, lexical usage has seldom been viewed through a variationist lens (Armstrong 2001: 211). The consensus view is that lexical changes are not socially-conditioned, that ‘words do not behave systematically’ (Adams 2014: 164, see also Trudgill 1986: 24; Lodge 1989: 427).

² For a similar review of seminal, and otherwise influential quantitative studies in language variation, see Macaulay (2005: 4).
Indeed, Heylen & Ruette (2013: 353) refer to ‘[t]he stigma of lexical variation’ in variationist sociolinguistics (see also Johnson 1996). As a result, lexical variation has hitherto been restricted to a ‘footnote status’ in sociolinguistics (Pütz et al. 2014: 8).

Despite limited research from sociolinguists, lexical variation and change incites a lot of attention in the public domain. Smith & Durham (2019: 83) state that lexis is ‘the most salient aspect of language use’ (see also Trudgill 1986: 25). This is reflected in the fact that words are prominent in public-audience books which engage the topic of language variation and change (e.g. Fox 2004; C. Moore 2004; Crystal 2011, 2014; Jones 2018; Murphy 2018). In everyday communication, speakers’ use of words provide fundamental cues pertaining to stances, values, and identities.

There is a seemingly contradictory state of affairs, whereby, on the one hand lexis is the most visible and socially marked level of language to its users, yet it has been neglected by sociolinguists. Durkin (2012: 3) states that lexis is the ‘Cinderella of sociolinguistics’ (see also Beal 2010: 53; Beal et al. 2012: 73), as it is the level of language ‘that has the most salience for the general public and is the focus for most popular observations about language’, yet, is simultaneously ‘a topic that modern sociolinguists tend to steer clear of’. This lack of focus on lexis, which has been largely consistent throughout the history of variationist sociolinguistics, means that the field has provided an abridged account of language variation.

One of the key reasons for the dearth of lexical studies is that the existing methodological apparatus is not compatible with studying vocabulary (see Weiner & Labov 1983: 31). Labov addressed this in 1973 (p. 340):
The reason for this neglect is certainly not a lack of interest, since linguists like any other speakers of a language cannot help focusing their attention on the word, which is the most central element in the social system of communication. It is the difficulty of the problem, and its inaccessibility to the most popular methods of inquiry, which is responsible for this neglect.

This view is echoed by Durkin (2012: 3) who expanded the Cinderella metaphor to suggest that lexis is the Cinderella of sociolinguistics, who could not go to ‘the ball’ because of ‘methodological difficulties’. This suggests that a lexical perspective has the potential to enhance our understanding of the relationship between language and society, if only a suitable method could be developed. Labov (1973: 341) comments that ‘[w]ords as well as the world itself display the ‘orderly heterogeneity’ which characterizes language as a whole (Weinreich et al. 1968)’. Indeed, Labov not only states that words exhibit this socially-stratified distribution, he goes on to suggest that ‘the word seems to be the linguistic unit of greatest social significance’ (Labov 1973: 370). However, this view contrasts with Labov’s later work, in which the lexicon is trivialised. For example, he states that (Labov 2012: 17):

There is of course a great deal of fluctuation in vocabulary. We all find it interesting to learn that what is called soda in one place is called pop in another place, and coke in another. Yet the change of one word does not tell us much about change in another, and the long list of words that differ from one place to another does not form a coherent pattern or give us much insight into the machinery of speaking and listening.

This trivialisation of lexical variation has been challenged in recent years. For example, Nini et al. (2017) have demonstrated that lexical innovation exhibits the S-curve trajectory that is typical of linguistic change (see Chen 1972). Such systematicity in patterns of lexical variation and change can also be seen in the work on lexical lectometry (e.g. Ruette et al. 2016). Variationist sociolinguistic models have proved valid in the study of lexical variation, at the levels of onomasiology and semasiology.
(for definitions and discussion, see Sections 2.2.1 & 2.2.2, respectively). For example, the apparent-time construct (Labov 1972a) has been employed in onomasiological (Boberg 2004a, b) and semasiological (Robinson 2010a) studies.

In this thesis, as well as repurposing methods at the level of semasiology (Robinson 2010a), I present innovative onomasiologically-oriented methodologies which elicit variation of lexis at the intra- as well as inter-speaker dimensions of sociolinguistic variation. Sandow & Robinson (2018) and Sandow (2020) served as a proof-of-concept pilot study from which this thesis developed.3 This pilot study indicated that the relationship between local words and local identity in Cornwall required further exploration.

1.1. Research questions

In this study, I consider the ways that a study of lexical variation and of perception of the social meaning of lexis can enable us to better understand locally-meaningful ideologies, including language ideologies, and identity of place in Cornwall. In order to make this possible, I develop and refine the theoretical, methodological, and analytical approaches to the study lexical variation. I articulate the key aims of this study as research questions:

1) How can the social meaning and usage of lexis inform our understanding of (language) ideologies and identity of place (in Cornwall)?

3 Both Sandow & Robinson (2018) and Sandow (2020) are outputs from the same pilot-study.
2) How can I further develop sociolinguistic approaches to the study of lexical variation?

I answer research questions 1) & 2) by conducting a sociolinguistic analysis of four onomasiological and two semasiological variables in Camborne-Redruth, Cornwall. From an onomasiological perspective, I investigate the concepts LUNCH BOX, WOMAN, WALK, and TOURIST which can be realised by Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants such as crib box/croust tin, maid, stank, and emmet, respectively, along with Standard English alternatives. From a semasiological perspective I investigate the variables maid and emmet. The semasiological variants of maid include the Standard English sense ‘female servant or attendant’ and the Anglo-Cornish sense ‘woman’. Within Cornwall, emmet has the meanings of both ‘ant’ and ‘tourist’.

Following on from studies such as Labov (1963, 1966) and Trudgill (1974), I hypothesise that the traditional sociolinguistic parameters of age, gender, and social class account for much of the variation found within the community. Due to the historical and current relationship between language and place in Cornwall (see Chapter 3), it is reasonable to suspect that the use of language is allied to speakers’ affiliation to the local community and their sense of place. However, it is only when both supra-local social categories, such as socioeconomic class and age, as well as local identities are considered that one can best understand how the local sociolinguistic system works and operates in Camborne-Redruth.
1.2. Overview

In this thesis I argue that that the goal of a descriptive usage-based paradigm, including any broadly sociolinguistic framework, must be to give an holistic account of the linguistic system in use. Without an onomasiological perspective, the resulting account is necessarily abridged. Methodological frameworks for investigating phonological (Labov 1972a), phonetic (Foulkes & Docherty 2006), morpho-syntactic (Wolfram 1969; Cheshire 1982a, b, c) and semasiological (Robinson 2010a) variation all currently exist. An onomasiologically-oriented methodology which elicits a casual speech style is the last part of this jigsaw. In light of this, I introduce an onomasiologically-oriented methodology to sociolinguistics. Additionally, I expand and refine Robinson’s (2010a) semasiological framework.

This thesis is a timely contribution to the growing body of sociolinguistic research on lexical variation (e.g. Kiesling 2004; Robinson 2010a, b, 2014.; Grieve et al. 2018; Snell 2018). I argue that lexical variation can be both systematic in its patterns of variation and a strong index of social identities. Specifically, Anglo-Cornish lexical usage is conditioned by a range of social parameters, including age, socioeconomic class, and strength of local identity. In addition, lexis can be used to stylise Cornish identities, which is evidenced by intra-speaker variation as well as participants’ meta-linguistic commentaries.

While I develop a novel approach to the sociolinguistic study of lexis, I also provide analysis and interpretation which is relevant to sociolinguistic theory more broadly. Together, the social and stylistic distribution of Anglo-Cornish dialect usage, as
well as the social meanings that they index, provide the foundation for a reinterpretation of Labov’s (1972a) attention-to-speech model of style shifting. I suggest that attention-based linguistic variation is a symptom of a broader model of identity construction, namely, attention-to-self, whereby individuals more closely approximate an idealised version of the self when their attention to their identity is elevated. This model accounts for the finding that Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis exhibits an inverted pattern of style-shifting as it is used more frequently in careful speech styles. I interpret this style-pattern as identity performance. In doing so, I argue that Cornish identity is something that one can ‘do’ (see West & Zimmerman 1987) by employing lexical items ‘enregistered’ (Agha 2003) as Cornish (cf. Schilling-Estes 1998). I propose that the stylisation of Cornish identities is validated by an alternative linguistic marketplace (cf. Bourdieu 1991) in Cornwall, which I refer to as the Cornish micro-market.

This thesis consists of nine chapters (including this one), each dealing with a distinct topic which collectively serve to answer the research questions stated in Section 1.1. In Chapter 2, ‘Language variation so far’, I reflect on the development of variationist sociolinguistic theory. I also provide a review of research pertaining to language ideology and language and identity. This is followed by a discussion of the previous findings of sociolinguistic research at the level of lexis. Chapter 3, ‘A socio-historical overview of Cornwall’ serves to situate this research into its local context. Drawing largely on the work of the Institute of Cornish Studies (University of Exeter), I consider how Cornish history and Cornish identity are intertwined. The first three chapters of this thesis provide the background for the study.
In Chapter 4, ‘Theoretical, analytical, and methodological apparatus’, I outline the theoretical foundations which underpin the notions of semasiological and onomasiological variables in this study. I also explain the methodologies that I employ to investigate variation, change, and social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis. I also describe the way in which I conducted ethnographic participant-observation in the Camborne-Redruth community. This chapter provides the link between the background to this study in the first three chapters and the findings of this study which are discussed in the final five chapters.

In the final five chapters of this thesis I present and analyse the data collected in this study. In the fifth chapter, ‘Variation and change of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis’, I present the quantitative lexical data collected from the application of the methodological procedures outlined in Chapter 4. I subject this data to statistical analyses in order to identify socially- and stylistically-conditioned patterns of variation. In Chapter 6, ‘Cornish identities’, I analyse two distinct Cornish identities, the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall. I do this through the lens of Bakhtin’s (1981) chronotopes and suggest that these identities represent the enduring yet dynamic nature of Cornish identity. This is supported by ethnographic participant-observation and participants’ reflections on their own and others’ Cornish identity. In Chapter 7, ‘The social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis’, I use participants’ meta-linguistic commentaries to explore the perceptions of the investigated words and the Anglo-Cornish dialect more broadly. In the eighth, and penultimate, chapter, ‘Discussion of findings’, I synthesise the key findings from the previous chapters and discuss the implications of this thesis. I analyse the social variation of the investigated semasiological variation and consider the cognitive processes which underpin these changes. I also reflect on the observed
patterns of onomasiological variation which leads me develop a new interpretation of style, which I refer to the *attention-to-self* model of stylistic variation. Finally, in Chapter 9, ‘Conclusions’, I summarise this thesis by reflecting on the theoretical, methodological, and analytical contributions that this thesis makes to the fields of (variationist) sociolinguistics and Cornish Studies. I also identify potential areas of future research for a nascent lexis-oriented branch of sociolinguistics.
2. Language variation so far

In this chapter I review the existing research in the context of language variation from which this thesis develops and to which it ultimately contributes. With a particular focus on social meaning, identities and ideologies, and lexis, I discuss and critique some of the key approaches and findings in sociolinguistics. I adopt a broad understanding of sociolinguistics, which includes dialectology, variationist sociolinguistics, interactional sociolinguistics, and linguistic anthropology. Together these perspectives provide the foundation to the study of lexical variation, change, and social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis which I develop in subsequent chapters.

I begin this chapter with an outline of the origins of variationist sociolinguistics. More specifically, I detail key findings from early sociolinguists who explored how linguistic variation could be accounted for by the demographic profile of the speaker and the context of speech. I then trace the development of sociolinguistic theory into the ‘third wave’ (see Eckert 2012) with a focus on how identities can be semiotically constructed, performed, and interpreted. By drawing on the Language Ideology framework (e.g. Silverstein 1979; Lippi-Green 1997; Irvine & Gal 2000), I explore how language is used to construct and reflect ideologies, particularly those pertaining to identity of place. Finally, I review previous sociolinguistic research on the level of lexis, focusing on the findings of previous onomasiological and semasiological studies. By accounting for existing work in sociolinguistics, I situate the novel contribution of this thesis in the context of a wider field of study.
2.1. The sociolinguistics of language variation

In the 1960s, the seminal work of Labov in Martha’s Vineyard (1963) and New York (1966) introduced a research paradigm that is now referred to as ‘variationist sociolinguistics’ (for discussion, see Tagliamonte 2015). The variationist sociolinguistic paradigm afforded researchers a methodological and conceptual framework through which to explore the socially- and stylistically-conditioned structure of linguistic variation. Variationist methods and analytical apparatus were, and remain, objective, and, therefore, replicable. A number of scholars adopted Labov’s framework in a range of diverse localities such as Detroit (Wolfram 1969), Washington D.C. (Fasold 1972), Norwich (Trudgill 1972, 1974), Panama (Cedergren 1973), Belfast (Milroy & Milroy 1977), Glasgow (Macaulay 1977), Tobago in the West Indies (Minderhout 1977), Tehran and Qazvin, Iran (Modaressi 1978), and Alabama (Feagin 1979). These early studies were conducted in different social contexts, yet consistent processes of linguistic variation were observed.

Etically defined, census-type categories such as age, socioeconomic class, gender, and ethnicity were shown to reflect the ‘orderly heterogeneity’ of the social structure of language (see Weinreich et al. 1968). The paradigm championed the use of quantitative methods in order to investigate the relationship between language and society through the notion of ‘variables’, particularly ‘variable rules’ (see Labov 1969; Cedergren 1973; Sankoff 1973; Wolfram 1973; Cedergren & Sankoff 1974; Sankoff & Labov 1979). The notion of a variable enabled sociolinguists to operationalise the abstract way that a feature of a grammar is linguistically realised in a way that was
probabilistic, based on contextual and social factors. For example, the abstract notion, the (ING) variable can be realised in many northern dialects of English by the velar nasal [ɪn], the velar nasal plus [ɪŋ], or the apical [ɪn] variant in words such as *sing*. When applied to language in society, variable rules provided a foundation from which principles of linguistic change (see Section 2.1.1) and style-shifting (see Section 2.1.2) could develop. In recent years, sociolinguistic studies have become increasingly concerned with the social meaning of sociolinguistic variation (see Section 2.1.3)

2.1.1. Inter-speaker variation

Early variationist sociolinguistic research, retrospectively termed the *first-wave* (see Eckert 2012), tended to consist of survey-type studies of a socio-demographically representative sample of speakers. These survey type studies investigated ‘social’ or ‘inter-speaker’ variation, which is the variable use of language between different speakers and groups of speakers. One of the primary interests of early sociolinguistics was language change. While many linguists believed language, particularly sound, change to be not directly observable (e.g. de Saussure 1916/1983; Bloomfield 1933; Hockett 1958), sociolinguists sought to observe such changes in progress. Labov (e.g. 1972a) observed that variation in language use between age-groups was a proxy for change in real-time. The *apparent-time* hypothesis (Labov 1972a) predicts that variation between age groups reflects change in real-time. That is, differences in the usage of a sociolinguistic variant between generations can be indicative of a diachronic change in progress.
The trajectories of linguistic variation and change were found to be mediated by social factors such as gender, socioeconomic class, and age (e.g. Trudgill 1974). Such findings led Labov (1990) to establish some principles of linguistic variation and change, based on a wealth of cohesive evidence of distributions of sociolinguistic variants across social groups. These principles were refined by Labov (2001a) and are as follows:

Principle 1: ‘Linguistic change from below⁴ originates in a central social group, located in the interior of the socioeconomic hierarchy’ (Labov 2001a: 188).

Principle 2: ‘For stable sociolinguistic variables, women show a lower rate of stigmatized variants and a higher rate of prestige variants than men’ (Labov 2001a: 266).

Principle 3: ‘In linguistic change from above, women adopt prestige forms at a higher rate than men’ (Labov 2001a: 274).

Principle 4: ‘In linguistic change from below, women use higher frequencies of innovative forms than men do’ (Labov 2001a: 292).

⁴ Meyerhoff (2011: 180) defines change from ‘below’ as those changes which operate ‘below the level of conscious awareness’, while she defines change from ‘above’ as those changes which are above the ‘level of individuals’ conscious awareness’. Meyerhoff (2011) also states that changes from above are likely to be commented upon by the community, but those from below are not.
Trudgill (1972) attributes the higher use of non-standard forms among men (see Labov’s (2001a) principles 2 & 3) to a ‘covert prestige’. Trudgill (1972:188) observes that:

Privately and subconsciously, a large number of male speakers are more concerned with acquiring prestige of the covert sort and with signalling group solidarity than with obtaining social status, as this is more usually defined [...] for Norwich men, working-class speech is statusful and prestigious.

Alignment to different types of prestige can account for why men tend to over-report, and women under-report, their use of nonstandard forms (see Trudgill 1974). While Labov’s (2001a) principles provide heuristics for the inter-speaker variation and change, between speaker variation is not the only axis along which the distribution of linguistic forms is conditioned.

2.1.2. Intra-speaker variation

In addition to inter-speaker variation, the other dimension of linguistic variation that sociolinguistics have studied language variation is ‘style’. Stylistic, or ‘intra-speaker’, variation emerges in different speech environments in response to contextual and social stimuli. Labov’s (1972a: 208) ‘attention-to-speech’ model dominated first-wave conceptualisations of sociolinguistic style (e.g. Labov 1966; Trudgill 1972, 1974). This model is based on a number of principles which include:

The principle of style shifting: ‘there are no single-style speakers’ (Labov 1972b:112).
The principle of attention: ‘styles can be ordered along a single dimension, measured by the amount of attention paid to speech’ (1972b: 112).

The canonical style pattern in variationist sociolinguistics involves speakers using their highest frequency of the non-standard forms in their linguistic repertoire in casual, that is, unconscious and unmonitored, speech styles and reducing their use of such variants as their attention-to-speech increases (e.g. Labov 1966; 1972a; Trudgill 1972, 1974).

Early sociolinguistic studies (e.g. Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974) reported on a remarkably consistent pattern of style-shifting. Snell (2018: 667) observes that early sociolinguistic work on style assumed that:

ALL speakers follow the same general pattern with regards to stylistic variation: speakers systematically increase their use of ‘standard’ forms (and decrease their use of vernacular forms) as their perception of the formality of the situation increases. [original emphasis]

Indeed, in his study on the Lower East Side of New York, Labov (2001a: 38) reported that ‘each individual followed the same community-wide pattern of style-shifting’. It is the consensus view that this ‘regular and predictable pattern’ (Hernández-Campoy 2016: 90) is ‘almost always in a uniform direction’ (Labov 1972c: 180). When attention-to-speech is elevated, such as from casual speech, to formal speech, to reading passages, to word lists, speakers typically converge on forms typically associated with higher social classes (Romaine 1980: 228; Labov 1990: 223–224; Snell 2018: 667; Bailey 2019: 4). For example, Labov (1972a: 240) observed that the careful speech of a pipefitter may resemble the casual speech of a salesman. Figure 2.1 demonstrates how
social variation remains consistent across speech styles, as all groups move towards the standard as their attention-to-speech increases.

When there is variability in the use of a linguistic feature across generations, this change is more advanced in particular speech styles, particularly when there is prestige or stigma attached to these forms (see Labov 2001b: 86). From a diachronic perspective, the stylistic contexts in which the incoming feature can be found increases over time. Consequently, the stylistic contexts in which a recessive feature is likely to be found decreases (see Macafee 1994). Thus, the stylistic context in which a recessive feature can be found becomes increasingly limited. This process is known as *stylistic shrinkage* (Campbell & Muntzel 1989).

---

5 WLS= Word List Style, RPS= Reading Passage Style, FS= Formal Speech, CS= Casual Speech. LWC- Lower-working-class, MWC- Middle-working-class, UWC- Upper-working-class, LMC- Lower-middle-class, MMC= Middle-middle-class.
Most accounts of stylistic shrinkage have found that recessive language varieties first become increasingly absent in formal speech and then subsequently in casual speech (Bereznak & Campbell 1996: 662; Holloway 1997: 153; Wolfram 2002: 776). This pattern is described as *top-to-bottom* stylistic shrinkage (e.g. Romero 2014: 56), whereby the loss of the recessive variety is most advanced at the ‘top’, that is, formal speech styles. The other conceivable, but seldom attested pattern is *bottom-to-top* stylistic shrinkage, which refers to attrition of the recessive variety in the most informal, casual speech styles, while the variety endures in formal styles (see Campbell & Muntzel 1989; Wolfram 2002; Kasstan 2019). In this pattern, linguistic attrition is resisted in formal speech, particularly in ideologically motivated performative speech styles (see Schilling-Estes 1995; McColl Millar et al. 2014: 8; Macafee 1994).

One issue with the methodology used to investigate intra-speaker variation from a first-wave perspective (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974), particularly read speech, is that it heavily relies on literacy (see Schilling 2013). A participant who is a less able, or infrequent, reader will pay more attention to their speech when reading than a participant who is a highly competent, or regular, reader. Conversely, those who regularly read are going to require a lower degree of cognitive processing when reading than those who do not regularly read. This is because those who have experience with a task exert less cognitive effort than those who do not have experience with the task (Kirschner et al. 2018). Thus, the increase in attention-to-speech between non-read and read tasks is not uniform across a population of speakers.

---

6 This is also known as the ‘Latinate pattern’ (Campbell & Muntzel 1989).
Another weakness of the conclusions drawn from this interpretation of style is that the often-cited studies such as Labov (1966, 1972a) and Trudgill (1972, 1974) were conducted in urban areas, where the majority of the community conformed to a standard language ideology. In order to test the validity of this model further, it should be applied to communities which may evaluate the standard language differently. This would serve to test whether or not the canonical pattern of intra-speaker variation is a symptom of a standard language ideology, or if this pattern occurs irrespective of language attitudes. Labov (2001b: 86) acknowledges that ‘groups who are in contact with the community but are still excluded from its main rights and privileges will often participate in the use of linguistic variables with altered stylistic patterns’. Labov (2001b) did not detail what these altered stylistic patterns may be (cf. Section 8.2.1).

Subsequently developed alternatives to the attention-to-speech interpretation of style tend to focus more on dynamic interactional and psychological factors of intra-speaker variation, as opposed to viewing style as a reactive process. Two of the main alternatives to the attention-to-speech model are speech accommodation theory (Giles 1973; Giles et al. 1973; Giles & Powesland 1975) and audience design (Bell 1984, 1999; Bell & Johnson 1997). Speech accommodation theory suggests that speakers typically converge on the speech of their interlocutor, although divergence is also possible. Audience design suggests that speakers style-shift in response to their audience, which could be their interlocutor but also a range of other listener roles, including overhearers (Bell 1984). Despite these alternative approaches, it is Labov’s (1966, 1972a) attention-to-speech model which has dominated variationist analysis of style (e.g. Trudgill 1974; Watt 1998; McCarthy & Stuart-Smith 2013; Becker 2009; Devlin 2014; Jansen 2018), even if it has attracted criticism (e.g. Milroy & Milroy 1977;
Bell 1984; Macaulay 1999). One of the key themes of this criticism is the lack of ecological validity of traditional sociolinguistic methodologies. For example, it has been claimed that the elicitation procedures used in the studies of intra-speaker variation from the perspective of attention-to-speech are not representative of actual linguistic usage (e.g. Bell 1984; Milroy & Gordon 2003). That is, it is argued that the language produced in a sociolinguistic interview, such as a word-list, is not representative of the language produced in other contexts. More recently, sociolinguists have focused less on patterns of social stratification and more on the social meaning of language variation.

2.1.3. Social meaning

The speaker design model is an alternative interpretation of sociolinguistic style which suggests that speakers can use the social meanings of linguistic variants in order to facilitate the ‘creation, presentation, and re-creation of speaker identity’ (Schilling-Estes 2002: 388). Speaker design attributes a greater degree of agency to the speaker and suggests that they manipulate their linguistic style in order to present a contextually desirable identity (see also, Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). Speaker design is ‘always also audience design’ as one’s identity is constructed in the context of a developing interpersonal discourse (Hernández-Campoy & Cutillas-Espinosa 2010: 298, see also Coupland 2007). This model suggests that individuals are social actors who can, with varying degrees of agency, draw upon particular elements of their sociolinguistic repertoire in order to stylise their identity in light of the social meanings.
of sociolinguistic variants. This focus on the non-entailed meaning of linguistic variation can be considered to be pragmatic in nature (e.g. Silverstein 2003; Reyes 2005; Acton 2019).

Speakers attribute non-denotational meanings to linguistic forms which they use to influence their own use of language and to make social evaluations about others. Indeed, language is an instrument for conveying social information (see Hernández-Campoy 2016). In light of this, speakers can manipulate their sociolinguistic repertoires and a range of other socio-semiotic resources in order to align themselves with or in opposition to other individuals, groups of individuals, or social structures (see Eckert 2000). The way that language is imbued with symbolic power in interactions and the ways in which these can serve to reinforce relations between social groups, such as hierarchical relationships between socioeconomic classes, is a fundamental concern of recent sociolinguistic analysis (Tyler 2015: 23). The social meaning that can be indexed through linguistic variation has steadily become a more central concern of sociolinguistics in recent years.7 This theme of research which is concerned with social meaning has been termed the third-wave of variation studies (see Eckert 2012).8

From the perspective of social meaning, linguistic features ‘index’, that is, ‘construct’ or ‘evoke’ (Johnstone et al. 2006: 81) particular social identities. An
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7 This can be quantitatively demonstrated by using the Journal of Sociolinguistics as a mini-corpus. In the volumes of the journal published 1997–2001, the phrase ‘social meaning’ occurred in 8% of articles, and ‘index/indexicality’ in 18 % (Bell 2016: 401). However, in a more recent sample, 2010–2013, the frequency with which these terms were used increased to 27% and 60%, respectively (Bell 2016).

8 I do not detail the second-wave of variation theory here. In summary, second-wave studies typically employed ethnographic methods and were concerned with the role of social networks in linguistic variation and change (e.g. Cheshire 1982c; Milroy 1987a. For discussion, see Eckert 2012).
association between a linguistic feature, such as velar variants of (ING), and a social feature, such as educatedness (see Figure 2.2), can develop due to a perceived regularity of co-occurrence between the use of the velar variant and educated individuals. However, there is not a straightforward one-to-one meaning mapping between a linguistic feature and a social feature. A single linguistic variant can index a multitude of social characteristics, one or more of which can be accessed at any one time.

The possible social meanings of a linguistic variable are referred to as meaning potentials (e.g. Moore & Carter 2015; Eckert 2016, 2019; Snell 2018). The meaning potentials of a variant constitute an ‘indexical field’ (Eckert 2008; Campbell-Kibler 2009; Moore & Podesva 2009; Walker et al. 2014; Tyler 2015; Jaffe 2016; Vine & Marsden 2016; Sandow & Robinson 2018). Indexical fields visualise a range of social meanings expressed by a linguistic variant(s). They are ‘constellations of ideologically linked meanings’ (Eckert 2012: 94), any of which can be invoked in an interactional context, as social meaning is constructed ‘in the interaction between speaker and hearer’ (Eckert & Labov 2017: 471). These meanings are drawn from a range of indices which have accrued social meaning through perceived behavioural and statistical occurrences between a linguistic form and social characteristics.

A number of visualisation techniques have been useful in illustrating indexical fields. Figure 2.2 illustrates the indexical values for the apical and velar variant of the (ING) variable. Methodologically, Eckert (2008) suggests that indexical fields can be constructed on the basis of match-guise test results as well as inferences of social meaning based on patterns of correlations with social groups.
Figure 2.2 presents the indexical values of two contrasting variants. It shows that the velar variant of (ING) is perceived to be used in formal contexts, when a speaker is being effortful, and by those who are educated and articulate/pretentious. Conversely, apical variants of (ING) are perceived to be used in relaxed contexts, when a speaker is being easygoing/lazy and by those who are uneducated and inarticulate/unpretentious. In light of these social meanings, speakers can stylise their identities. For example, one could use a velar variant of (ING) in order to construct an educated persona.
In contrast to Figure 2.2, visualisations which focus on a single variant are also commonly used. Figure 2.3 provides a detailed representation of the indexical values for /t/ release (Eckert 2008).

Figure 2.3 Indexical field for /t/ release- ‘boxes= social types, black=permanent qualities, gray=stances’ (Eckert 2008: 469)

Figure 2.3 shows that /t/ release can index a wide range of social meanings. For example, /t/ release can index membership to social groups such as ‘British’. It can also index persona types, such as ‘elegant’ and ‘articulate’. Additionally, /t/ release can index stances in the context of an interaction, such as ‘angry’. The indexical field in Figure 2.3 demonstrates that social meanings for a single linguistic form can seem contradictory. For example, Eckert (2008: 469) suggests that /t/ release can index both an angry stance as well as a polite stance. This speaks to the importance of not considering the social meaning of sociolinguistic forms in isolation, but to consider
language as part of a broader socio-semiotic process of meaning making (see also Hebidge 1979).

In light of the social meaning of sociolinguistic variants, speakers can use their sociolinguistic repertoire as a resource to construct identities. Managing and negotiating these potential social meanings is a feature of the competence of speakers as social actors. In order to make themself socially locatable, a speaker can use their stylistic repertoire to index perceived desirable social characteristics about themself, for example, ‘friendly’ and ‘polite’ (see Moore & Podesva 2009: 478). Strategically adapting the available features in one’s sociolinguistic repertoire relies upon the shared understandings of linguistic, stylistic, and social practices between a speaker and hearer(s).

There are multiple types of indexical meanings. Indices can be direct, or indirect. Direct indexicality refers to the most immediate interactional stances, such as ‘subjective orientations to ongoing talk’ (Bucholtz 2009: 148). These can include ‘interpersonal’ and ‘epistemic’ stances, as well as the speakers’ ‘affective’ stance in relation to the stance focus/object, that is, the thing that is being spoken about. Interpersonal stance is defined as ‘a person’s expression of their relationship to their interlocutor’, such as ‘friendly or dominating’ (Kiesling 2009: 172). Epistemic stance can be considered to be ‘a person’s expression of their relationship to their talk’, such as ‘how certain they are about their assertions’ (Kiesling 2009: 172). One can also index their evaluation of the stance object/focus in terms of affect, such as positive or negative (e.g. Eckert 2019). Consistent with these three types of stance, Du Bois (2007: 163) states that the stance act ‘creates three kind of stance consequences at once. In
taking a stance, the stancetaker (1) evaluates an object, (2) positions a subject (usually
the self), and (3) aligns with other subjects’. This is visualised by Du Bois (2007) as a
‘stance triangle’, see Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.4 Du Bois’ (2007: 163) ‘stance triangle’

Stances can ‘accumulate into more durable structures of identity’ (Bucholtz & Hall
2005: 596) through a process known as ‘stance accretion’ (Du Bois 2002; Rauniomaa
2003 cited in Bucholtz & Hall 2005: 596). When linguistic features no longer simply
index a stance in the context of an interaction, but, additionally, come to index more
durable social identities, a linguistic (or other semiotic) form can take on indirect
associations. Indexicality is indirect when ‘linguistic forms become associated with

position myself, and thereby align with you’.
particular social types believed to take such stances’ (Bucholtz 2009: 148). For example, Moore & Podesva (2009) found that those who directly index a ‘conducive’ interpersonal stance indirectly index ‘friendly’ or ‘cool’ personas (see Figure 2.3). Indirect indexicalities can be further unpacked into ‘orders of indexicality’ (see Silverstein 2003; Johnstone et al. 2006).

2.1.3.1. Orders of indexicality

Linguistic and other semiotic features can index indirect social meanings in a variety of different ways. Silverstein’s (2003) ‘orders of indexicality’ provide a theoretical framework for explaining differing indirectly indexed social meanings. Each order of indexicality makes reference to a different level of abstraction with ideological links connecting each order. Indeed, Silverstein (2003: 193) suggests that the indexical order is the concept necessary to map ‘the micro-social to the macro-social frames of analysis of any sociolinguistic phenomenon’. The framework of indexicality proposed by Silverstein (2003) conceives of indexicality as a series of orders, which Johnstone et al. (2006) articulate as ‘first-order’, ‘second-order’, etc.10

When a socio-semiotic variable11 correlates with socio-demographic categories such as gender, socioeconomic strata, or membership to a geographically-defined
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10 I follow Johnstone et al. (2006) in referring to indexical orders as first, second, and third as opposed to the alternative of referring to indexical orders as nth-order, \(n+1\)th, and \((n+1)+1\)th (e.g. Silverstein 2003). I do this primarily as the former is easier to parse when reading. Eckert (2008: 464) suggests that while indexical orders may imply linearity, this is not necessarily the case.

11 Although, here, the discussion is primarily limited to sociolinguistic variables, the framework of indexicality is productive enough to be applied to other semiotic resources which are socially
population, they are said to index social meaning of the first-order (see Johnstone et al. 2006; Eckert 2008). In meta-linguistic discussions, such as conversations regarding language and place, these variables are not likely to be explicitly mentioned by speakers as they exist below the level of mainstream conscious awareness, especially for non-geographically or socially mobile speakers (see Johnstone et al. 2006, cf. Labov’s 1972a ‘indicators’). Although a linguist may observe first-order indices, they are not cognitively accessible to speakers for stylised speech. That is, if a speaker is not aware of an association between a social identity and a linguistic feature, such as younger speakers and GOOSE fronting (see Haddican et al. 2013), they will not be able to use fronted GOOSE vowels in order to construct a youthful persona.

When an apparent pattern of co-occurrence between a linguistic form and social group, such as people from Cornwall, becomes perceptible to a community of speakers, a form can take on new social and stylistic functions. When this happens, linguistic forms come to index social meanings at the second-order. At this point, a linguistic feature is not just associated with a population, but also with qualities associated with that population. For example, Cornish forms could be perceived as ‘local’ or ‘incorrect’ on account of their non-standardness. Second-order indexicalities encode meta-pragmatic meanings which can be negotiated by a speaker in order to create and project novel social meanings. Features which index second-order social meanings can display stylistic variation (Johnstone et al. 2006: 82). At this indexical order, features may or may not be the subject of meta-discursive comment (Johnstone meaningful. For example, Sneller & Roberts (2018: 308) note that ‘the wearing of black and white keffiyeh headscarves was originally a first-order index of being Palestinian that became a second-order index of political orientation and solidarity with Palestinians’.
When a feature or a set of features index social meaning at least at the second-order they become enregistered (Johnstone 2009; Cooper 2013: 35). Enregisterment refers to the process whereby ‘a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a socially recognized register of forms’ (Agha 2003: 231). As a result, a user of an enregistered feature becomes socially locatable as part of a larger population of speakers, such as Cornish.

When a linguistic feature becomes ‘available for self-conscious, performed identity work’ (Johnstone et al. 2006:93), it indexes social meanings at the third-order of indexicality. At this indexical order, a linguistic feature becomes more heavily ‘ideologically laden’ (Snell 2017: 306), whereby it becomes highly codified and can be used to ‘perform local identity, often in ironic, semi-serious ways’ (Johnstone et al. 2006: 83). While second-order indices may be the subject of overt comment (Johnstone & Kiesling 2008: 10), third-order indexicality is characterised by overt metalinguistic discourse (Johnstone & Kiesling 2008: 11).

Social meanings are always available for novel construal as they are ‘fluid and ever-changing’ (Eckert 2008: 464). That is, it is always possible for indexical meanings to change over time as well as to vary across social groups. For example, non-mobile speakers may not recognise the localness of a dialect form as they may assume it to be commonplace, yet for a geographically mobile person, the very same form may be used to perform local identity, which is indicative of third-order indexicality. Thus, while social meanings can vary over time and within and across communities, the framework of ‘orders of indexicality’ provides a lens through which to conceptualise the ideological links between these orders.
The framework of orders of indexicality has been particularly useful in the context of exploring the relationship between language, ideology, and identity. I review the relevant research in this area in Section 2.1.4.

2.1.4. Language, identity, and ideology

Identity is a multidimensional phenomenon which is composed of shared norms, values, and attitudes between an individual and larger social structures involving other individuals. Social identity has been defined as ‘that part of the individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership to a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership’ (Tajfel 1981: 255). Echoing Tajfel’s statement, Risse (2010: 22) observes that ‘[s]ocial identities are not about “I” or “Me”, but about that part of “me” that belongs to a larger “we”, a social group and/or community’. These identities can be constructed linguistically, through linguistic forms with social meanings associated with particular social groups. For example, through ‘acts of identity’ (see Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985), ‘the individual creates for himself the patterns of his linguistic behaviour so as to resemble those of the group or groups with which from time to time he wishes to be distinguished’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 181). Eckert (2008: 463) comments that:

[Acts of identity] are systematically related to the macrosociologist’s categories and embedded in the practices that produce and reproduce them. It is in the links between the individual and macrosociological category that we must seek the social practice in which people fashion their ways of speaking, moving their styles this way or that as they move their persona through situations, from moment to moment, from day to day, and through the life course.
Indeed, Bucholtz & Hall (2005: 592) claim that identities encompass (a) macro-level demographic categories; (b) local, ethnographically specific cultural positions; and (c) temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant roles. From a constructivist perspective, Butler (1990) argues that identity is not something that an individual has or is, but something that they ‘do’ or ‘perform’ (see also West & Zimmerman 1987).

One of the main ways that linguists study identity is by conducting discourse analysis. For example, Meân (2001) found that male football referees do masculinity through their discursive practices when officiating men’s and women’s football matches, with male referees being more likely to dismiss protests relating to controversial on-field decisions, such as a penalty kick that was or was not awarded, when made by women, as opposed to men. The gendered-deployment of such discursive acts, such as males dismissing the legitimacy and competence of female players, are a means of reinforcing gendered stereotypes by performing a gender role in an interactional context. Piazza (2014) found that a group of travellers made use of discursive practices, to construct their identities in relation to their conceptualisation of place, particularly relating to concepts such as HOME and deictic concepts such as HERE. Discourse can also be used to construct regional identities (see Johnstone 2013b).

Identity can also be considered from the perspective of variationist sociolinguistics. In early variationist research, identity was essentially synonymous with membership to fixed social categories, such as socioeconomic class, age, sex, and ethnicity (see Mendoza-Denton 2002; Dyer 2007: 103). However, more recent
research (e.g. Reed 2016; Snell 2017) has argued that cultural values and normative beliefs comprise ideologies\textsuperscript{12} which in turn mediate the evaluation of social meaning potentials indexed by socially- or regionally-marked forms of language. Thus, more complex and agentive models of identity are beginning to inform sociolinguistic studies of identity.

The role of identity in language variation and change is a contested area in variationist sociolinguistics. Labov (1963: 306, see also Labov 1972a: 298–299) states that one’s orientation to Martha’s Vineyard displayed the ‘sharpest example of stratification’ in relation to the centralisation of (ay) and (aw). Young Vineyarders with a positive orientation towards the island were reversing a process of lowering of centralised vowels (ay) and (aw). Although Labov’s (1963) seminal sociolinguistic study on Martha’s Vineyard is routinely cited as evidence for the role of identity and ideology in linguistic variation and change (e.g. Hazen 2002; Schneider 2008, see Labov 2001a: 191), Labov himself is less enthusiastic about this view. Labov (1979: 329) argues that one’s use of language reflects ‘early social experience, almost independent of [an] individual[’s] ideology or self-image’. Moreover, Labov (2001a: 191) observes that ‘we do not often find correlations between degrees of local identification and the progress of sound change’. This scepticism of the role of identity in language change is echoed by Trudgill (2001, 2008). These contrasting perspectives indicate that there is little consensus of the role of identity in variationist sociolinguistics (see Moore 2011: 219).

\textsuperscript{12} I make the distinction here between \textit{ideology}, as a belief system, and \textit{identity}, which refers to alignment with a group. For example, a nationalist ideology could manifest in a strong English identity or a Marxist ideology could manifest in strong identity as a communist.
Nuanced conceptualisations of identity have been demonstrated to not only account for the distribution of linguistic variables, but also provide an explanation of the social motivations for these distributional patterns (e.g. Eckert 2000; Bucholtz & Hall 2005). For example, Eckert (1989) found that there was not a statistically significant association between socioeconomic class and the use of the (uh) variable, but with membership to ‘jock’ or ‘burnout’ communities of practice. Membership in ‘jock’ or ‘burnout’ communities of practice explained the way in which the variants were distributed and shed light on the ways in which these social groups imbued sociolinguistic variants with localised social meaning and their capacity to construct social identities (e.g. Eckert 2000).

In first-wave sociolinguistic studies (e.g. Labov 1966, Trudgill 1974), the jock/burnout distinction would not have been identified due to a focus on etic, census-type, as opposed to emic, locally constructed, sociological categories. Ethnographic approaches have enabled sociolinguists to explore community dynamics in a way that is much more socially meaningful and adaptable than was possible in first-wave sociolinguistic studies (e.g. Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974). Ethnographic analysis enables the researcher to transcend traditional macro-sociological divisions in order to identify and investigate the socially-conditioned distribution of sociolinguistic variants that may have previously gone unnoticed, or ‘under the radar’ (Eckert 2008: 463). While in traditional sociolinguistic analysis, social groups are assumed a priori, through ethnographic methods of observation, they are discovered through the research process.
The ethnographically-informed perspectives employed in many recent sociolinguistic studies have facilitated a level of insight into locally constructed social meaning that was once beyond the scope of variationist theory (e.g. Carmichael 2017). Mendoza-Denton (2002: 475) criticises early sociolinguistics’ focus on correlations as merely ‘a statistically motivated observation-cum-speculative-description’ (see also Cameron 1990). This is not to say that macro-sociological categories are now irrelevant or unimportant. They remain foundational to the identities of individuals and groups. Levon & Holmes-Elliot (2013: 112) highlight the importance of considering the reciprocal influence of emic and etic social categories (see also Bucholtz & Hall 2005; Pappas 2008). It is the blend of quantitative and qualitative orientations that have been seen to best understand the socially motivated manifestation of linguistic style (Coupland 2007). That is, we must consider not only the census-type categories which are attributed to speakers, but also the categories with which they choose to align themselves in constructing their identity. One of the ways in which individuals can construct their identity is to index (non-)alignment to their locale.

2.1.4.1. Language and place

Place has been central to research on language variation. Dialectology has employed a cartographic approach which mapped linguistic variation across geographically defined areas, or ‘isoglosses’ (e.g. Orton & Dieth 1962–71). Much of the early variationist sociolinguistic research (e.g. Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974) considered place as a means of defining the sample universe. Llamas (2007: 582) observes that ‘in most dialectological
and variationist research, place is viewed in objective, physical terms and is largely unexamined’. An example of this is the notion of the ‘speech community’ which has been used to define the geographical scope of a study, such as the Philadelphia speech community (see Labov 1989). Labov (1972a: 120–21, see also Labov 1989) defines the ‘speech community’ as being:

not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms; these norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behaviour, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation.

This definition, specifically the requirement for shared evaluative behaviours, has subsequently been problematised as sociolinguists have recognised the nature of communities largely characterised by conflict as opposed to consensus (see Rickford 1986; Eckert 2000; Snell 2018) and of solidarity-based as opposed to status-based ideologies (e.g. Woolard 1985; Milroy & Milroy 1997).

In addition to the classic variationist sociolinguistic categories of gender, age, and socioeconomic class, another, less frequently considered, category which has been observed to condition language use is place identity. According to Proshansky et al. (1983: 59), place identity is a ‘substructure of the self-identity of a person consisting of, broadly speaking, cognitions about the physical world in which the individual lives’. From a variationist perspective, place identity can be reflected in and constructed by usage patterns of local linguistic variants.

The relationship between language use and the way one feels about a place is exemplified by Knee & Van Herk’s (2013) study in Newfoundland, USA. Knee & Van Herk (2013) investigated, among other speakers, Venus and Aphrodite who
participated in the same social networks and were from similar socioeconomic backgrounds yet had very different rates of (th-) stopping, which is characteristic of Newfoundland English. Knee & Van Herk (2013) attribute this linguistic differentiation to social aspiration. Venus, who aspired to live locally in adulthood, used the stop variant 68% and 19% of the time in voiced and voiceless contexts, respectively, whereas Aphrodite, who aspired to live non-locally, used the stopped variant in 6% and 0% of possible environments. This finding suggests that aspiration, such as planned future mobility or stability, can influence linguistic usage. Knee & Van Herk’s (2013) study demonstrates that a critical perspective on the relationship between language use and place can provide further insight into patterns of sociolinguistic variation.

There have been a very limited number of studies which bring an empirical perspective to place identity and language usage at the level of the community. These include Hazen (2002), who compared differences between local and expanded (that is, non-local) identities in Warren County, North Carolina, and found that these categories provided insights into linguistic patterns of variation. For example, Hazen (2002: 246) found those with a local identity were 24.9 times were likely than those with an expanded identity to produce wont, a negative past be variant associated with Warren County speech. Other studies have also found a relationship between regional identity and language use (e.g. Labov 1963; Fraser 1983; Underwood 1988; Burbano-Elizondo 2008; Miller 2008; Haddican et al. 2013; Reed 2016; Beaman forthcoming; Cole & Evans forthcoming). These studies have found that speakers are more likely to use sociolinguistic variants associated with a particular locality if they have a strong
identity of place in relation to that locality. For example, Labov (1963) found that
speakers with positive orientations towards Martha’s Vineyard were more likely to use
the local, more centralised, variants of (ay) and (aw).

The role of place identity and sociolinguistic variation is not entirely clear. Many
studies have demonstrated relationships between strength of local identity and use of
local dialect forms (e.g. Labov 1963; Frazer 1983; Underwood 1988; Ito & Preston
Alimoradian 2014; Reed 2016; Baranowski 2017; Sandow & Robinson 2018; Beaman
forthcoming). Despite these findings, studies of language and identity do not
consistently find correlations between the usage of linguistic features and the strength
of local identity. For example, other studies have found no clear relationship between
the strength of local identity and linguistic variation (e.g. Asprey 2007; Braber &
Butterfint 2008; Hundt & Staicov 2018). However, rather than dismissing the role of
identity in language use, Asprey (2007) and Braber & Butterfint (2008) identify the
complex nature of identity and call for further research to explain complex patterns of
linguistic variation.

In order to conceptualise local identity as a social parameter which is suitable
for quantitative analysis, it requires systematic categorisation. One method which has
been employed in order to determine strength of local identity is that of an identity
questionnaire (Llamas 1999; Burbano-Elizondo 2008; Levon & Buchstaller 2015; Jensen
2016; Reed 2016; Sandow & Robinson 2018; Dann 2019). Some identity
questionnaires employ open-ended questions and the responses are rated on a
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13 The studies cited here did not all call their method an ‘identity questionnaire’ but they all share a
similar function.
continuum of evaluation, whereby affect, such as positive, neutral, or negative, is allocated a numerical value (see Llamas 1999; Burbano-Elizondo 2008; Haddican et al. 2013; Dann 2016; Baranowski 2017; Hundt & Staicov 2018). In questionnaires which are explicitly quantitative (e.g. Jensen 2016; Reed 2016; Sandow & Robinson 2018; Beaman forthcoming14), participants are asked to rate the extent (such as from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)) to which they agree with a statement, such as ‘I am proud to be from X’. This provides the researcher with a reasonably objective tool with which to categorise the strength of participants’ local identity. Another method which has been used in the context of identifying a speakers’ local orientation is the use of scales, either to determine strength of agreement with a statement (e.g. Llamas & Watt 2014) or to order a range of identities from least to most important (e.g. Watt & Llamas 2017; Dann 2019).

When considering the role of the strength of local identity on language variation, it is important to reflect on the interactions that identity has with other social categories. However, this remains somewhat underexplored. In her Teesside study, Llamas (2001) found young males to have the strongest local identities and young females to have the weakest. Burbano-Elizondo (2008: 123) found that males and middle-aged speakers typically had the strongest Sunderland (Mackem) identity. Neither Llamas (2001) nor Burbano-Elizondo (2008) considered the role of social class on strength of local identity. The lack of critical reflection of the relationship between local identity and social class is a common criticism of studies of language variation and

identity. For example, Haddican et al. (2013) acknowledge that the observed relationship between attitudinal data and usage of local dialect forms in their study may be an artefact of social class, which they did not control for (also Reed 2016). Baranowski (2017) suggests that the effect of attitude, such as identity, on linguistic usage is secondary to the effect of socioeconomic class. These findings further complicate the understanding of local identity in variationist research. As a result, further research that details the precise interactions between language variation, strength of local identity, and other social categories is required.

Another limitation of studies of place identity in variationist sociolinguistics is that the intra-speaker dimension of variation has largely been neglected. An exception to this is Reed’s (2016) study of dialect usage in Appalachia. Reed (2016) found that the local non-standard form, monophthongal /aɪ/, was used most often in the careful speech styles of those with a strong degree of local orientation. Similarly, Sandow & Robinson (2018) found that Anglo-Cornish lexis occurred most often in the careful speech of speakers with a strong local identity. These findings are surprising in the context of the literature of style-shifting (e.g. Labov 1972a) which would predict a shift away from, not towards, the local forms as attention-to-speech increases (see Section 2.1.2). In light of the findings of Reed (2016) and Sandow & Robinson (2018), more studies are needed of stylistic variation in, regionally and/or socially, peripheral communities. Such studies would serve to test the generalisability of the assumptions that have been made regarding the nature of style-shifting from the perspective of attention-to-speech (see Section 2.1.2).
It has also been found that local variants are used when the discourse is focused on local topics. For example, Becker (2009) found that non-rhoticity, which is associated with New York speech, was used more frequently if the topic of discourse was related to the ‘neighbourhood’, such as ‘memories of the block’, as opposed to other topics such as ‘mortality’. Thus, from this quantitative distribution, Becker (2009) concluded that local place identity is indexed by non-rhotic variants. Nycz (2018) found Canadians in New York exhibit a similar topic-shift effect. When a positive affect was expressed regarding New York, more local forms of (oh) were used, while fewer local forms of (oh) were used when a negative affect was expressed. Devlin (2014: 238–239) found that in Durham, the local variants of the FACE and GOAT vowels occurred 10–15% more frequently when the discourse was related to mining, as opposed to non-local discourse topics.

In England, there have been a large number studies of language use and place identity in the Midlands and the North. For example, language and local identity has been investigated in Corby, Northamptonshire (Dyer 2002), Newcastle (Watt 2002), Middlesbrough (Llamas 2007), the English-Scottish border (Llamas et al. 2009), Sunderland (Burbano-Elizondo 2006), Barnsley (Burland 2017), and Northumbria (Maguire 2017). Yet, studies of place identity have seldom explored the South of England. There have been various studies of sociolinguistic variation in the South of England in areas such as Reading (Cheshire 1982a, b), Hastings, Sussex (Holmes-Elliot 2015), Devon (Godfrey & Tagliamonte 1999; Sullivan 1992), Dorset (Piercy 2011), Somerset (Jones 2002; Garnett submitted), Milton Keynes (Kerswill & Williams 1999), The Fens (Britain 1997), London (Cheshire & Fox 2009; Gabrielatos et al. 2010; Cheshire et al. 2011; Levon & Holmes-Elliot 2013; Ibury 2019), Bristol (Blaxter et al.
However, none of these studies have considered the role of regional identity in linguistic variation. As a result, little is known regarding the relationship between language and local identity in the South of England.

Recently, there has been an increase in the consideration of place identity in sociolinguistic studies in the South of England. This is exemplified by Dann’s (2019) study of sociophonetic variation among adolescents in West Cornwall and Cole & Evans’ (forthcoming) study of sociophonetic variation Debden, Essex. Dann (2019) found that strength of Cornish identity correlated with the use of the TRAP vowel, but not the BATH vowel. Cole & Evans (forthcoming) found that speaker’s identities, which typically were either ‘Cockney’ or ‘Essex’, were important factors when considering the sociophonetic levelling observed in their study.

2.1.4.1.1. Language Ideology

While quantitative approaches to the study of language and orientation to place have often been shown to be insightful, the qualitative ‘Language Ideology’ framework provides an alternative, potentially complementary, approach. Place identity can be intertwined with ideologies, including language ideologies. For example, one’s local orientation, or ‘place identity’, can influence one’s thoughts and beliefs about language, or ‘language ideology’.

Language Ideology (LI) has been defined as ‘sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use’ (Silverstein 1979: 193). While LI has often been used in the context of
language planning and policy (e.g. Reagan 1986; Jaffe 2001; Fitzsimmons-Doolan 2017; Zhou 2017), in this section I consider LI from the perspective of linguistic usage and perception as this is the approach I take in this study. LI provides an interpretive framework for examining the relationship between perception and production of language. LI is often studied in the context of (non-)alignment to a standard language ideology. A ‘standard language ideology’ has been defined by Lippi-Green (1997: 64) as:

> a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class.

Under the LI framework, the role of speaker agency is central and the analytical framework, embedded in narrative analysis, provides the tools required to account for the relationship between an individual’s social psychological motivations and the way in which they employ a repertoire of linguistic resources.

Research under the guise of the LI framework challenges the widely held assumption that speakers’ observations about language are of limited use to the sociolinguist. For example, Labov (1972a: 144) stated that ‘there is no vocabulary of socially meaningful terms with which our informants can evaluate speech for us’ (see also Labov 1994: 352). This suggests that not only are speakers unreliable narrators when it comes to their own usage (see Trudgill 1974; Labov 1996) but they do not have the capability to discuss their meta-linguistic beliefs. This view also has the consequence that the researcher does the speaking for the community, as opposed to promoting the voices within the studied community.
In traditional variationist approaches to linguistic variation and change, speakers’ metalinguistic and social commentaries are considered to be ‘unreliable’ or even ‘irrelevant’ (Llamas 2007: 581). In contrast, the LI framework uses informants’ discursive and meta-discursive narratives to provide an insight into their personal socio-psychological reality and their evaluation of social, including linguistic, practices. This enables the researcher to account for patterns of variability by triangulating ‘ideology, language, and agency’ (Remlinger 2009: 121). Llamas (2007: 581) states under an LI framework, speakers’ meta-linguistic commentaries are ‘a means of interpreting and understanding linguistic variation in the community, thus allowing insight into social psychological motivations for sociolinguistic differences that may be otherwise inaccessible to the analyst’ (see also Gal 2006).

Speakers’ meta-linguistic commentaries are central to the interpretation of LI. However, where studies under the umbrella of ‘Language Ideology’ do reproduce verbatim meta-linguistic commentaries from participants these tend to be attitudes which deal with a whole (e.g. regional) variety as opposed to individual sociolinguistic variables and their variants (e.g. Dyer 2002; Llamas 2007; Burbano-Elizondo 2008; Johnstone & Kiesling 2008; Remlinger 2009; Atkinson 2011; Burland 2017, see also citizen sociolinguistics, e.g. Rymes & Leone 2014; Leone-Pizzighella & Rymes 2018 and perceptual dialectology, e.g. Preston 1989; Montgomery 2007). Thus, the focus of LI has largely been on macro-level ideologies as opposed to how such ideologies manifest in terms of perception on a more micro-level such as a single lexical item.15

15 From a cognitive, rather than LI, perspective, Robinson (2010a) did elicit meta-linguistic commentaries relating to single lexical items, such as gay.
In this thesis, I argue that while non-linguists and linguists may use different terminology, speakers can provide an insightful additional lens to our analysis at the level of the variant, particularly for enregistered language features. I further demonstrate how speakers’ evaluative comments are a valuable resource for interpreting quantitative patterns of linguistic variation. In Chapter 7, I employ speakers’ introspection as a resource for analysing the social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis. In doing so, I show that each of the investigated lexical items has evaluations which are distinct yet not independent of broader language ideologies.

2.1.5. Summary

In this section I have outlined some of the key research pertaining to social and stylistic variation as well as the relationship between language, identity, and ideology. For example, I have discussed Labov’s (1990, 2001a) principles for linguistic change and of intra-speaker variation (Labov 1972b). I have also outlined Du Bois’ (2007) stance triangle and Silverstein’s (2003) orders of indexicality. In presenting these key findings and analyses, I have identified key limitations and gaps in the variationist account of language variation. For example, place identity has seldom been conceptualised as a social parameter in studies of language variation, particularly in the South of England and that studies in Language Ideology tend to focus on the level of the variety, without detailing how this manifests on a more granular level, such as a sociolinguistic variant.

Another conspicuous gap in the literature on the relationship between language and place identity is that variation in vocabulary has been understudied. This
lack of attention afforded to lexis is commonplace in sociolinguistics more broadly. In Section 2.2, I present some of the key findings from sociolinguistic approaches to lexical variation.

2.2. Lexical variation

Variationist sociolinguistics remains ‘phonocentric’ (Cornips & Gregerson 2016), and it is widely believed that phonology is the level of language ‘most readily adapted to convey social meaning’ (Eckert & Labov 2017: 467). The vast majority of the sociolinguistic studies cited in Section 2.1. were concerned with phonological, phonetic, and, to a lesser extent, morpho-syntactic variables. Labov (1966: 49) suggested that the application of the variationist paradigm is most informative at the phonological level. Lavandera (1978: 171) argued that variationist analysis, in ‘the current state of sociolinguistic research’, should be confined to phonology. However, Labov himself soon began to explore morpho-syntactic variation (Labov 1969) and active/passive alternation (Weiner & Labov 1983). In this section, I review the findings of studies which are concerned with linguistic variation at the level of lexis. In Section 4.2 I evaluate methods that have hitherto been used in studies of lexical variation and change.

While variationist sociolinguistics developed from traditional dialectology, a key point of difference between the two paradigms is the object of study. The former
seldom engages with lexical variation, while the latter does so heavily.\textsuperscript{16} Traditional (also referred to as ‘geographical’ or ‘rural’) dialectology was primarily concerned with preserving the linguistic variation found in varieties of language which were perceived to be terminally obsolescing. Dialectologists documented regional linguistic boundaries and investigated diatopic variation. The principal unit of analysis used by the dialectological model is lexical variation (Durkin 2012: 7). For example, out of 1322 questions used in the Survey of English Dialects (SED) questionnaire, 387 were concerned with morphology, with 128 and 77 questions pertaining to morphology and syntax, respectively, and the remaining 730 being ‘mainly concerned with the lexicon’ (Orton 1962: 15). Word atlases (e.g. Orton et al. 1978; North & Sharpe 1980), which were the primary output of dialectological studies, show the geographical distribution of a linguistic feature. The categorical nature of lexis lends itself readily to such data visualisations.

The perception of dialectology changed drastically throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. In the mid- to late-20th century, dialectology received not insubstantial criticism, often attracting a pejorative comparison with ‘butterfly-collecting’ (Trudgill 1999: 2). As early as the nineteenth-century, it was observed that ‘collecting country words is looked upon as an amusement’ (Ellis 1875: 1087, cited in Chambers & Trudgill 1998: 15), thus, not as serious scholarship. More recently, Lipski (2008: 211) suggests that dialectology is seen as an ‘anachronism […] a throwback to Neogrammarian pre-enlightenment’. This school of thought argued that dialectology lacked an insightful analytical

\textsuperscript{16} This is true of sociolinguistic studies of spoken language. Sociolinguistic studies of signed languages often deal with the level of lexis (e.g. Lucas 2001; McKee & McKee 2011; Stamp et al. 2016; Schembri et al. 2018).
framework and, thus, was a superficial practice with minimally informative potential or explanatory power. Indeed, dialectology has been criticised as not just being theoretically weak, but as being atheoretical (see Watt 2018) and has been accused of ‘collecting data for sake of collecting data’ (Trudgill 1999: 2). Although, in the short term, dialectology brought lexical variation to prominence, it may have been detrimental to the study of socially-conditioned lexical variation in the long term. The descriptive framework employed by dialectologists, and consequently associated with the study of lexical variation, was perceived to be antithetical to the empirical methodologies employed in the variationist paradigm (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974; Macaulay 1977).

Lexical variation and dialectology are inextricably linked. Ruette (2012: 5) suggests that some variationist sociolinguists work under the assumption that lexical variation is in the domain of dialectology and that it should remain there and not enter into the considerations of Labovian sociolinguistics. As a result, some scholars believe that it should be the intention of variationists to focus on a different unit of linguistic variation (Ruette 2012). However, this assumption is not valid, in light of the success that phonological variation has enjoyed within both dialectology and variationist sociolinguistics (Ruette 2012).

Dialectological maps have shown physical space to be a diagnostic of lexical variation, yet we know much less about the relationship between lexis and social space. That is, within a geographically defined area, such as Cornwall, we do not know how patterns of lexical usage are socially- and stylistically-variable. While serving many purposes, the cartographic approach of dividing physical space into clearly delineated
isoglosses is reductionist. It ignores a lot of intricate inter- and intra-speaker variation, and because of its broad-brush approach, it essentialises the linguistic landscape both within and between speech communities by implying regionally deterministic patterns of variation. Variation within communities is peripheral to the dialectological framework (Chambers & Trudgill 1998: 128). Indeed, with the exception of variation of quotatives (e.g. Romaine & Lange 1991; Tagliamonte & D’Arcy 2004; Buchstaller 2006, 2014; Buchstaller & D’Arcy 2009), variationists have seldom considered lexis to be part of the sociolinguistic system.

While the variationist paradigm has proved fruitful in developing a socially-informed understanding of linguistic change, its application is limited. It has not accommodated variation within the lexicon. Sankoff (1973: 44) suggests that ‘perhaps the very success of (the Labovian) framework in dealing with phonological data and with morphophonemic reduction rules has led many to believe that concepts of variation are applicable only in these domains’. Hasan (1989: 231) suggests that the exclusion of lexical semantic variation from variationist considerations is ‘an artefact of an inadequate theory of language’. Though it is perhaps unfair to describe variationist sociolinguistics as ‘inadequate’, without accounting for the level of lexis, it is fair to describe the framework as limited. There have been a limited number of sociolinguistic studies of lexical variation and change. I review the findings from these studies from onomasiological (see Section 2.2.1) and semasiological (see Section 2.2.2) perspectives.
2.2.1. Onomasiological variation: Findings

Onomasiology takes its starting point as the concept and is concerned with the ways in which that concept is lexicalised. An example of this is the concept \textit{alleyway}\textsuperscript{17} which can be realised by a range of lexical items such as \textit{alleyway} (Standard English), \textit{ginnel} (e.g. Yorkshire), \textit{twitten} (Sussex), and \textit{ope} (Cornwall). The geographical variation exhibited in dialect maps is primarily onomasiological. More recently, computational methods have been applied to lexical variation. For example, by using geo-tagged and time-stamped social media posts, researchers can observe variation and change of a linguistic feature in real-time. An example this is Jack Grieve’s work on onomasiological variation and change on Twitter (e.g. Grieve 2012; Grieve et al. 2016, 2018, see also Eisenstein et al. 2014). This research provides insight into geographical diffusion of innovative lexical forms.

Another, related, area of lexical research which investigates geographical onomasiological variation is ‘lexical lectometry’ (e.g. Ruette 2012), which applies the study of distance, or difference, between language varieties, to the lexicon. By adding a diachronic component to this analysis it is possible to investigate whether two or more language varieties are becoming more similar or more different over time. For example, da Silva (2010) conducted a diachronic lectometric study of European and Brazilian Portuguese lexicons. He found that in the lexical field of clothing, the varieties were diverging, but in the lexical field of football, they were exhibiting a slight pattern

\textsuperscript{17} The concept is typically referred to in small caps. The concept is often written as one of the onomasiological variants but this is in fact an arbitrary decision and is a convention followed in the interest of clarity.
of convergence. These patterns of lexical change reflect contact between the communities which use the linguistic varieties. While there was little contact in the domain of clothing, there was a greater degree of contact in the domain of football. Using a similar approach, Grondelaers & Geeraerts (2003: 87) found increasing uniformity between Belgian and Netherlandic Dutch in the lexical fields of clothing and football, with Belgian Dutch converging on Netherlandic Dutch.

Dialectology demonstrated the regular and predictable relationship between lexical usage and one’s regional provenance. Chambers (2000) also found lexical usage to be correlated with geographical mobility, through the use of a regionality index. A limited number of studies have shown that other social facts about an individual such as their age, gender, or socioeconomic class condition patterns of lexical variation. For example, using the British National Corpus and a variety of previous studies, Baker (2010) demonstrates that lexical usage is conditioned by gender (p.34 & 37), age (p.37), socioeconomic class (p. 37), and exhibits real-time change (p.70). Perhaps the most successful and rigorous example of applying variationist sociolinguistic methods to onomasiological variation is the work of Johnson (1993, 1996). Johnson (1996: 31) found that, overall, for nearly 1,000 words, region was the strongest social correlate in predicting use of lexical variants in data collected by the Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States in 1930. However, in data collected by Johnson herself in 1990, she found that region as a demographic feature yielded a third as many statistically significant results as in 1930. She concluded that this was indicative of diatopic lexical homogenisation. In other words, traditionally regionally distinct varieties of American English are becoming more similar over time as the locus of variation shifts to other demographic features. As the probabilistic relationship
between lexical variant and region faded, race, age, and, to a lesser extent, sex, acquired a stronger probabilistic relationship with lexical variants.

Other studies have found no statistical relationship between social categories and lexical usage. For example, Nagy (2011) conducted a study of 26 lexical borrowings from the Franco Provençal dialect of Featar in two mountaintop villages in South-eastern Italy, Faeto and Celle de St. Vito. Although both Italian and Franco Provençal lexical items were used by participants, Nagy (2011) observed that the lexicon in these communities was stable and did not reveal any consistent patterns of socially-conditioned variation. That is, lexical variation was not statistically significantly associated with the social parameters of age, social class, or gender (see also Meyerhoff 1993).

In a study of lexical usage in Parisian French, Beeching (2011) observed that younger speakers used familiar forms of lexical doublets significantly more than middle-aged or older speakers. However, Beeching (2011) did not observe significant patterns of variation with respect to the investigated social variables of gender and level of educational attainment. An analysis of corpora of speech from interviews from three diachronic intervals (1969, 1988, 2002) indicate that the generational differences found by Beeching (2011) are occurring in real-time as well as apparent-time (see also Boberg 2004a). However, the French lexical doublets investigated by Beeching (2011, see also Lodge 1989) are not applicable to English as the English lexicon does not have analogous ‘high’ and ‘low’ forms (although, see Ross 1954 ‘U’ and ‘non-U’ words).

In relation to age, there is evidence to suggest incoming lexical variants are used with a higher relative frequency by younger speakers. For example, Johnson
(1993: 296) found that the youngest age-group in her study was the group most likely to use the ‘newer’ terms. Conversely, McColl-Millar et al. (2014) found traditional dialect lexis pertaining to fishing to be more common among older speakers and Smith & Durham (2019) observed higher rates of local lexis being used by adults (caregivers) as opposed to children. Similarly, LaFond & Moffett (2020) found traditional dialect lexis to be used most often by older speakers.

With respect to gender, some rather tentative evidence suggests that females tend to be more advanced in onomasiological change. For example, Cañete Gonzalez (2017) found that female blog writers used nearly twice as many neologisms as men. Johnson (1993) found that women were less likely than men to use recessive lexical variants. For adjectives undergoing change, Tagliamonte & Pabst (2020) found gender to be statistically significant predictor of lexical usage in both Toronto, Canada, and York, England. For example, in Toronto, Canada, *great* is used most often by older speakers and by men. However, in York, where *great* is used most often by younger speakers, this gender effect remains, with men seemingly leading this change (Tagliamonte & Pabst 2020).

While there are examples of studies which do show gender effects in the context of onomasiological change, this gender effect is absent in many other studies. For the incoming variants in Toronto, *cool* and *awesome*, no gender effect was observed (Tagliamonte & Pabst 2020). Despite age-related variation, Jankowski and Tagliamonte (2019) identified no gendered variation in the use of *dinner* and *supper* in Canada. Similarly, Tagliamonte & Brooke (2014) found no gender effect in the usage of the incoming variant *weird* in the semantic domain of *strangeness*. This is consistent
with Beeching (2011) who found no statistically significant gender pattern in an ongoing change towards greater use of familiar forms of French lexical doublets. These rather disparate findings with respect to gender and onomasiological variation evidence the lack of consistency in the role of gender in the context of onomasiological change.

Socioeconomic class has also been found to condition the use of lexical variation. For example, Macaulay (2005: 126) found that middle-class Glaswegians use approximately twice as many evaluative adjectives as their working-class counterparts. Also, Osser & Endler (1970) found that upper-class speakers of Canadian English were more likely to use British words than their lower-class counterparts, who were more likely to use the less prestigious American alternatives. Johnson (1993) found that lexical change is typically led by those of higher social-strata. Beal and Burbano-Elizondo (2012: 14) also found that younger middle-class participants were less likely to use the regional variants *lad/lass* than their working-class peers.

Many sociolinguistic studies at the level of phonetics and phonology have observed correlations between local orientation and use of local variants (see Section 2.1.4.1). There is also a widely attested link between lexis and identity (e.g. Chambers 2003: 187–188; Kiesling 2011a; Durkin 2012, 2015; Bucholtz 2011; Beal & Burbano-Elizondo 2012). In a study of speakers of a non-English-speaking background in Australia, Alimoradian (2014) found a link between the self-reported use of vocative *mate* and lower ethnic orientation. Despite this, no studies have quantitatively investigated the relationship between regional identity and lexical usage.
Collectively, the studies discussed in this section demonstrate that lexical variation is conditioned by social factors. Although we have a limited understanding of quantitative patterns of inter-speaker onomasiological variation, we know even less about how, or even if, this level of language exhibits intra-speaker variation. Very few studies have explored onomasiological style-shifting. An exception to this is Abdel-Jawad (1981) who found that Arabic lexis associated with a colloquial style was more likely to be found in casual speech styles, while Standard Arabic forms were more common in careful speech styles. Additionally, Levin et al. (1994) observe that in English, Latinate, as opposed to Germanic, words are associated with formal styles (see also Levin et al. 1981; Levin & Novak 1991). Lodge (1989) found that speakers’ perceived ‘high’ and ‘low’ French words to be appropriate for different contexts, such as when speaking with intimates or with strangers. Lodge (1993: 256) observes that ‘[i]t is probably in the lexicon that style-shifting in French is indicated most obviously’. Despite these findings, it remains the case that no usage-based experimental studies have explored intra-speaker lexical variation.

Corpus studies have also shown that lexical variation exhibits stylistically- and socially-conditioned patterns of distribution (see Baker 2010: 44–49). McEnery & Xiao (2004) found the use of fuck and its derived forms to exhibit socially- and stylistically-conditioned variation. For example, fuck was more likely to be used by males, rather than females, those of a low socio-economic class, and younger, as opposed to older, speakers, while fuck occurred 12 times more often in spoken as opposed to written

---

18 However, Abdel-Jawad (1981) used existing tape-recorded data, such as from public speeches, in their analysis, which means that confounding variables, such as the audience, as opposed to formality, could have influenced the data.
registers. *Fuck* was also more likely to be found in business domains, as opposed to education, public/institutional, or leisure domains. McEnery & Xiao (2004: 239) conclude that *fuck* may be used as a ‘rhetorical device’ in the business domain, where ‘arguments/disputes are common’. This finding suggests that lexical items can communicate social meanings.

The study of the social meaning of lexical forms is a developing area of research in variationist sociolinguistics. Eckert (2019: 757) states that ‘[a]reas of the lexicon that engage ideology are particularly likely to be socially indexical’. A limited number of studies have explored the way that lexis can be used in order to construct locally-meaningful identities. For example, Wong (2005) discusses the complex indexicalities involved in the reappropriation of *tongzhi* ‘comrade’ among gay rights activists in Hong Kong. Kiesling (2004) found that in an American college fraternity community the vocative *dude* indexed stances such as ‘solidarity’ and more enduring personas such as ‘skater’ and ‘druggie’. Similarly, Bucholtz (2009) found that that *guey* ‘dude’ indexes ‘cool solidarity’ in a Latinx American youth community. Snell (2017, 2018) observed that *howay* can be used to index a complex milieu of interactionally and ideologically relevant identities among schoolchildren on Teesside, such as assertive and authoritative stances. Johnstone (2013a) also explored the ways in which dialect words, such as *yinz*, were used in the construction of Pittsburgh identities. Bakht (2010) observed the role of lexis in constructing identities among U.S. middle-school students, while Alimoradian (2014) observed that the vocative *mate* indexed an Australian identity. These studies have showcased the ways in which onomasiological forms can be used stylistically in order to construct and interpret speaker identities.
The social indices of lexis have been exemplified in oinoglossia ‘wine talk’ (Silverstein 2003) and speciality coffee lexis (Cotter & Valentinsson 2018), whereby lexis was found to be used to index product knowledge and in-group membership. Reyes (2005) noted the role of African American Vernacular English lexis in the construction of urban youth identities by Asian American teenagers. Barbieri (2015) shows that words are used to index stances, including epistemic stance, affect, and interpersonal involvement. These studies demonstrate that lexis not only has referential meaning, but can also index social meaning. Beltrama (2018: 193) comments that ‘semantic and social meaning are not disjointed domains’ but that semantic meanings can bleed into social meanings (see also Lodge 1989: 432; Acton & Potts 2014; Eckert & Labov 2017: 469).

The notion of an indexical field (Eckert 2008, see Section 2.1.3) has been used to visualise the set of social meaning potentials of lexical items. Figure 2.5 illustrates the range social meanings associated with a single lexical item, favelado ‘slum-dweller’ (Beaton & Washington 2015). Many of the alleged indices in the indexical field are in fact variation in the words denotation and are not necessarily relevant to the social attributes associated with the user of favelado. This highlights the complex, often porous, relationship between semantic and social meaning.
Although the studies cited above discuss the social meaning of open-class words, closed-class words, such as *we* and *that*, can also convey social meaning (see Acton & Potts 2014).

While the existing research on onomasiological variation have demonstrated that lexis does exhibit inter- and intra-speaker variation, our understanding of these sociolinguistic patterns remains limited. Similarly, variation and change in semantic meaning is an under-studied, but growing, level of sociolinguistic analysis. In Section 2.2.2 I review the research on sociolinguistic variation at the level of semasiology.

2.2.2. Semasiological variation: Findings

Another perspective from which lexical variation can be observed is that of semasiology. Semasiological variation occurs where a single lexical form has a number
of polysemous senses, such as *sick* ‘evil’ and *sick* ‘cool’. A limited amount of research has been conducted on lexical variation and change from a semasiological perspective.

Semasiological change has been observed from the diachronic perspective of historical linguistics. For example, Molina (2005) found that semasiological change is not random, but systematic. Specifically, she found that conceptual mergers, and their break-ups, can be accounted for by the conceptual relations between terms in a lexical field, with recourse to their prototypical senses (see also Geeraerts et al. 1994).

Semasiological variation has also been used as a lens through which to view conceptual and socio-cultural change. An example of this is Fitzmaurice’s (2017) diachronic and diatopic study of the word *native*. She found that semasiological change could be accounted for by the changing nature of colonialism and understanding of the concept of *nativeness*. Indeed, Fitzmaurice (2017: 34) concludes that ‘the history of meaning can be grounded in social and cultural change in general in a principled way as well as in terms of key historical events’. Similarly, Robinson (2012b) interpreted real-time change of the adjective *skinny* in relation to shifts in cultural salience and evaluative stances to the concept of *skinny*. These studies indicate that meaning change can be interpreted through a much broader social lens of cognitive and socio-cultural realities (see also Li & Lei forthcoming). As the world changes, so too do the meaning of the words that we use to describe the world around us.

Semasiological variation has also been viewed through the prism of variationist sociolinguistics. Hasan (1989) argued that sociolinguistic patterns could be found in semasiological variation. This view is supported by elicited data from speakers has
demonstrated that semasiology exhibits orderly heterogeneity. Robinson (2010a, 2014) demonstrated that clusters of similarly innovative or conservative senses, share similar socio-demographically mediated trajectories of change. More specifically, Robinson (2010a, 2012b, 2014) found semasiological variables to be conditioned by social parameters such as age, gender, and socioeconomic class. For example, the innovative sense *gay* ‘lame’ is most likely to be used by younger males who are in education (Robinson 2012). Bailey & Durham (forthcoming) also found acceptability judgements of the innovative sense *cheeky* ‘mildly illicit’ to conditioned by age, although the gender effect was ‘marginal’.19

Social meaning has also been considered from the perspective of semasiology (see Robinson 2010a, 2012a). In relation to the adjective *gay*, negatively-evaluated social meanings developed which led to speakers stopping using the variable altogether. That is, they didn’t use *gay* in any of its senses because of a negatively evaluated social meaning for particular senses, primarily *gay* ‘homosexual’.

2.3. Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the contributions of key texts pertaining to sociolinguistic variation, with a particular focus on the level of lexis. In doing so, I have situated this thesis into a broader context of sociolinguistic research. I have outlined key texts in the sociolinguistic study of style such as Labov’s (1972a) attention-to-

---

19 Bailey & Durham (forthcoming) did not consider social class as a social parameter in their acceptability judgement study. They did find location to condition acceptability judgements, with speakers of British English more likely to rate the innovative sense as acceptable than their North American counterparts.
speech model and the predictions that it makes regarding intra-speaker variation. I have also discussed key theories relating to social meaning, such as Silverstein’s (2003) ‘orders of indexicality’ and Du Bois’ (2007) ‘stance triangle’. The discussion of sociolinguistic style, particularly attention-to-speech and speaker design, informs the interpretation and discussion of the data that I present in this thesis (see Chapters 5, 7 & 8).

I have also reviewed the growing body of research on sociolinguistic approaches to identity. A key theme in this review was identity of place. Despite the seminal work of Labov (1963), the relationship between language variation and regional identity remains under-researched. This chapter has acknowledged a limited but growing body of work on this area and showed how the extent of one’s orientation to place can condition the use of local sociolinguistic variants. While broadly advocating a Language Ideology framework, I have highlighted the tendency to focus on the level of a variety as opposed to specific dialect features, which a language ideology approach typically, implicitly, assumes to be homogenous. In later chapters, this thesis contributes to the developing area of sociolinguistic research relating to identity and ideology by demonstrating a link between Cornish identity and the use and perception of Anglo-Cornish lexis. In addition, while Milroy (2004) notes that studies of language use and studies of language attitudes are often independent of each other, I redress this imbalance in this thesis by considering the interaction between usage and perception (see also Burbano-Elizondo 2008).

Studies of lexis are peripheral to the variationist sociolinguistic paradigm. Despite sporadic attempts at exploring the socio-lexical variation (e.g. Johnson 1996;
Boberg 2004a, b; Beeching 2011; McColl Millar 2014), little work has been undertaken with a view at marrying sociolinguistic theory with lexical variation and change, particularly from a theoretical perspective (although, see Robinson 2010a). The existing research that has considered social meaning at the level of lexis has demonstrated that this is a fruitful research endeavour. However, no studies have considered lexical variation from an holistic perspective, by considering semasiology, onomasiology, and social meaning. I redress this gap in the research on sociolinguistic approaches to lexical variation in this thesis.

By redressing gaps in the major themes of research explored in this chapter, namely, style, place identity, and language ideology, through the lens of lexical variation, this thesis makes a novel contribution to our understanding of the relationship between language and society. This chapter has situated the thesis in the academic context to which it contributes. However, in order to fully understand this study, further background is required. Specifically, it is necessary to understand the physical context in which this study took place, that is, Camborne-Redruth, Cornwall. Due to the strong and multiple identities of place Cornwall, which are strongly associated with the Anglo-Cornish dialect, particularly its lexis, a complex ideological landscape exists in Cornwall. This makes it in an interesting locality in which to conduct a study variation, change, and perception of the social meaning of lexis.
3. A socio-historical overview of Cornwall

The relationship between language, speakers, and place in Cornwall can only be understood in light of Cornish history and with a thorough grounding in the myriad complexities of the socio-cultural landscape of Cornwall today. Thus, in this chapter, I report key events in Cornish history, which have shaped the ever-evolving relationship between Cornwall and England. I also explore the socio-economic, cultural, and ideological landscape in 21st century Cornwall, with a particular focus on Camborne-Redruth. This chapter serves as a foundation for understanding the quantitative patterns of lexical usage presented in Chapter 5, the Cornish identities outlined in Chapter 6, the social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis attested in Chapter 7, and the overall interpretation of the research findings in Chapter 8.

Until relatively recently, it was the consensus view among historians that, in all principal aspects, the United Kingdom is culturally, politically, and economically homogenous (Payton 1992a: 7). Indeed, it was the assumed that the United Kingdom was a ‘text-book example […] of a ‘civic culture’’ (Payton 1992a: 7). This reflects a view of history, and contemporary society, as Anglocentric with England, and London in particular, not only dominating historical narratives, but the ever evolving socio-cultural and political landscape too. As a result, regions such as Cornwall have become marginalised and peripheral, in contrast to the ‘centre’, specifically, London and other large metropoles, which dominate and are championed by political and cultural discourses.
The wants and needs of territorial appendages are often sacrificed by centralised governments, institutions, and businesses in order to preserve and grow the centre. In particular, England is one of the most centralised countries in Europe (Grayson 2016: 180). Despite clear benefits of centralisation for London and the south-east, many peripheral regions feel that their concerns are not reflected in the policies implemented by those with the majority of power and authority (Willett 2016). Arguably, this manifests in regional economic disparity. London stands alone as the richest area in Northern Europe, whereas 9 out of 10 of Northern Europe’s poorest areas are in the UK. (Inequality Briefing 2014). Cornwall was ranked as the second poorest region in Northern Europe, and the poorest in England (Inequality Briefing 2014).

In light of this situation, many Cornish people feel neglected, even disenfranchised, by what they perceive to be an out-of-touch Westminster and Brussels elite. As a result of such attitudes, Cornwall has been at the vanguard of decentralisation campaigns, alongside areas such as Sheffield, Manchester, and the north-east. This movement is a form of emancipatory politics which endeavours to ameliorate regional inequality by rejecting centralised power and promoting self-governance (Willett 2016). In few places is the marginalisation of peripheral populations resented as strongly as in Cornwall.

The Institute of Cornish Studies at the University of Exeter and its associate/affiliate members have dedicated a great deal of scholarship to exploring Cornwall from various disciplinary perspectives, such as social science, history, archaeology, and literature. Research under the guise of Cornish Studies (e.g. Payton
1989, 1992a; Deacon 2007a, 2013a; R. Harris 2016) has often adopted a ‘centre-periphery’ model of society which is a conceptual framework that accounts for the asymmetric balance of power between the ‘centre’, that is, England, specifically, London, and the ‘periphery’, such as the Celtic ‘fringes’ of the United Kingdom.

Cornwall’s peripherality must first be viewed in the context of its geography. Cornwall is located at the south-west extremity of Great Britain (see Figure 3.1). Situated on the south-west peninsula, Cornwall is both the most southerly (The Lizard) and westerly point (Land’s End) in Great Britain. It is bordered by water on three sides, to the north and west, the Celtic sea, to the south, the English Channel, and the county of Devon to the east. The River Tamar separates Cornwall from the rest of England, with just 3.7 miles of land connecting Cornwall’s eastern border with West Devon (D. Harris 2016). This geographical remoteness has been a central factor in Cornwall’s peripherality. At the heart of its history are a series of geo-political events which have embedded a profound and enduring sense of difference among the people of Cornwall.
3.1. Centre-periphery model

Throughout this thesis when explaining Cornish identity and the usage and perception of the Anglo-Cornish dialect, I make reference to the centre-periphery model. In this section, I explain what this model is and how it facilitates an understanding of Cornwall and the identity of place felt by many Cornish people.

The centre-periphery model (Rokkan & Urwin 1982) is a spatial metaphor that is regularly used in regional studies to explain the structural relationships between the military, ecclesiastical, political, and cultural nexus of a state, and its territorial appendages. This model requires both conflict and closeness between centre(s) and periphery(ies). These geo-political relationships are established through cumulative processes of historical conflict and cohesion which develop, reinforce, and reconstruct
centre-periphery dynamics. This model highlights the role of the centre’s dominance and the periphery’s subordination. According to Rokkan and Urwin (1982: 5), ‘centres’:

can be minimally defined as privileged locations within a territory where key military/administrative, economic and cultural resource-holders most frequently meet; with established arenas for deliberations, negotiations and decision-making; where people convene for ritual ceremonies of affirmation of identity with monuments that symbolize this identity.

By contrast, Rokkan and Urwin (1982: 5) define ‘peripheries’ as:

dependent, controlling at best only its own resources and more exposed to fluctuations in long-distance markets; is isolated from all other regions except the central one; and contributes little to the total flow of communication within the territory, with a marginal culture that is fragmented and parochial, yet not fully dominant across the politically defined territory […] a periphery depends upon one or more centres, and its predicament cannot be understood in separation from the latter.

Often, the points of difference between centre and the periphery become a celebration of a distinct identity for the periphery (see Deacon & Payton 1993). Indeed, some Cornish people react against their marginalised geo-political condition and attempt to negotiate an alternative structural paradigm. Rokkan & Urwin (1982) identify Cornwall as the exemplar peripheral region of the United Kingdom. Indeed, Payton (1992a) argues that Cornwall endures a ‘peripheral condition’.

3.1.1. Cornwall’s peripheral condition

Historically, the relationship between Cornwall and the rest of England has been ‘bitter and sometimes violent’ (Ferdinand 2013: 207). In this relationship, there exists an asymmetric distribution of power which has invariably disfavoured Cornwall. This
situation has impacted upon and shaped the identity of Cornish people. Some Cornish people position themselves in opposition to England and the English. This opposition is manifested at many levels of every-day life and social structure, including eating habits, a *de facto* national anthem (Trelawny/ Song of a Western Man), and iconography, as well as language. These points of difference between Cornwall and England are consequences of and responses to Cornwall’s peripheral condition.

Cornwall has long faced a categorisation problem. That is, Cornwall is seemingly simultaneously and paradoxically a Celtic nation and a county of England. Largely owing to this Cornwall’s duality of place (Kent 2002) as both a county and a nation, the Cornish are both ‘English and not English’ (Vernon 1998). A Cornwall Council guide from 1988 (cited in Deacon & Payton 1993: 75) noted that although Cornwall is ‘in’ England, it is not ‘of’ England. D.H. Lawrence (1916) noted, ‘I like Cornwall very much. It is not England’. At times Cornwall is conceptualised as much more than a county, but not quite a nation, yet at other times it is conceived of as both a Celtic nation and a county of England (Deacon 2007b: 18). This contradictory state of affairs has been termed the ‘Cornish paradox’ (see Deacon et al. 2003). This constitutional ambiguity, of whether Cornwall is a nation or a county, has become a ‘fundamental tension’ among the Cornish population (Deacon 2007a: 2).

In order to understand the tensions that exist in Cornwall today and their linguistic manifestations, it is necessary to recognise how these came to exist. By situating today’s Cornwall in its historical context, the stances, values, and identities of the Cornish people can be much more readily understood. In order to comprehend

---

20 Here, I present a fairly orthodox narrative of Cornish history, for a discussion of Cornish historiography see Deacon (2007a).
the historical motivations for this social situation in Cornwall, it is necessary to understand the history of Cornwall and of the Cornish people, particularly in relation to England.

Although many of the historical events that I discuss in this chapter are unfamiliar to the many of Cornish people, the cultural significance of these events remains to this day. Writing in 1605, John Norden (cited in Dunmore 2011: 97) observed that the Cornish ‘retain a kind of concealed envy against the English, whom they yet affect with a desire for revenge for their fathers’ sakes, by whom their fathers received the repulse’. The sentiments which Norden (cited in Dunmore 2011) observed in the early 17th century have endured to the present day. To a large extent, they are responsible for many Cornish people’s aversion to ‘the English’ and a desire for Cornish autonomy. Cornish identity, and, therefore, the nature of the language spoken within Cornwall, owes a lot to these events.

It would be a mistake to assume that Cornwall’s peripheral condition today is the same as that of the past. As Cornwall and England/London has changed, so too has their relationship. Although Cornwall remains peripheral, the nature of its peripheral condition has not been stable. Building on Tarrow’s (1977) notion of ‘older’ and ‘second’ peripheralism’, Payton (e.g. 1989, 1992a) developed a framework which showcases the ‘enduring nature and dynamic quality’ of Cornwall’s peripheral experience (Payton 1992a: 242).

Payton (1989, 1992a) categorises three historical periods as ‘first’, ‘second’, and ‘third’ peripheralism. Territorial and cultural isolation characterised the first phase of peripheralism in Cornwall until the 17th century. A shifting relationship between
centre and periphery, which was largely a result of the industrial revolution and Cornwall’s successes in various extractive industries, particularly mining, led to a second epoch of peripherality which was defined by economic and social marginalisation. Payton (1992a) then observes that in recent decades, the nature of Cornwall’s peripherality has evolved into a third discrete stage which is distinguished by ‘branch factory’ economics and counter-urban migration.

In this section, I explore the historical events of these stages, focusing in particular on those events which are historically significant in terms of reflecting and reconstructing a distinct sense of Cornishness. These events represent a continuous process of conflict, resolution, and accommodation which explain the relationship between Cornwall and the Cornish’s sense of place, that is, their identity. The historical and current relationship between Cornwall and England is fundamental to understanding the usage and perception of the Anglo-Cornish dialect.

3.1.1.1. First peripheralism

The wants, needs, and desires of the Cornish people are not always consistent with that of the rest of England. As a result, many systems of governance in England have struggled to maintain a stable and peaceful relationship with the Cornish. Cornwall is one of the Celtic regions not entirely conquered by the Roman Empire during their occupation of Britain from the 1st to the 5th century. As Roman culture transformed society in what is now (the rest of) England, Cornwall was left to develop largely autonomously. Little is known about the nature of Roman influence in Cornwall
(although, see Deacon 2016). The landscape that we now call ‘Cornwall’ formed a part of the Roman canton of Dumnonia (modern Cornwall, Devon, and West Somerset) and was largely ‘left to its own devices’ throughout this period (Payton 2002a: 5). During the Roman era, Cornwall possessed neither the rebellious threat of Wales or Scotland, nor the strategic significance of South-East England (Daniell 1989: 13).

Soon after the Romans returned to continental Europe in the early 5th century, Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were established throughout most of modern-day England. This new regime became much more involved affairs in the far South-West of Britain. Under pressure from Æthelstan the Anglo-Saxon king of Wessex, Huwal, the last king of Cornwall abdicated the Cornish crown by recognising the authority of the Anglo-Saxon king (Payton 2002a: 7). In 936, Æthelstan set the border between the Saxons and the Celts at the River Tamar (Payton 2002a: 7), which remains the Cornwall/Devon border. It is only from this time onwards that one can meaningfully talk of a ‘Cornwall’.

The Anglo-Saxons encroached into Cornwall and appointed influential Saxon figures in positions of authority to oversee the region (George 2009: 489). This Anglo-Saxon involvement in Cornish affairs has been cited as seminal to the gradual death of the Cornish language (Ferdinand 2013: 204).

After the instantiation of Normal rule in England during the 11th century, due to mutual connections with Brittany, Cornwall enjoyed a largely amicable relationship and was granted a range of freedoms and privileges. Since then, Cornwall has been something of a constitutional anomaly. In 1201 a charter established mining districts in Cornwall known as ‘The Stannaries’, with their own legislative body, the ‘Stannary
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21 The act of 1201 included stannaries in Devon. In 1305, Cornwall was granted its own Stannary charter.
Parliament’ (Payton 2002a: 15–16). In 1337, the ‘Duchy of Cornwall’ was established (Payton 2002a: 13). The Duke of Cornwall, a hereditary title bestowed on the heir-apparent to the British throne\textsuperscript{22}, was quasi-sovereign ruler over a constitutionally semi-independent region (Payton 2002a: 13). However, throughout history this has done little to prevent anti-English, including anti-royal, sentiments in Cornwall.

During a long period of instability within England, largely as a result of conflicts including the Hundred Years War and the War of the Roses, the peripheries of Britain were largely autonomous (Payton 2002a: 20). As a result, Cornwall became increasingly independent. However, once the House of Tudor assumed power, it began to curtail Cornwall’s autonomy as Henry VII endeavoured to assert control over the peripheries of Britain (Payton 2002a: 20–21). Under the Dukedom of Prince Arthur (son of Henry VII, older brother of Henry VIII), the mining industry began to be much more regulated as many rights granted by the Stannaries were scaled back. Tensions intensified when, in 1497, a tax increase was levied by King Henry VII in order to raise funds for a war with Scotland. The Cornish people largely refused to cooperate. This incensed the King and led to the confiscation of Stannary Charters which effectively suspended the Stannary government (Payton 2002a: 22). These events led to two Cornish rebellions in 1497.

The rebellion of June 1497, sometimes known as the ‘An Gof rebellion’,\textsuperscript{23} involved 15,000 Cornishmen and their allies who marched to London in order to battle with the King Henry VII’s army. However, after a large number of desertions, 10,000

\textsuperscript{22} Charles, Prince of Wales, is the current Duke of Cornwall.

\textsuperscript{23} This is a reference to one of the rebellion’s leaders, Michael Joseph, who was a blacksmith. In the Cornish language, Kernewek, An Gof translates as ‘the blacksmith’ (Porter 2014: 322).
Cornishmen were left to fight the King’s 25,000-strong army at the battle of Blackheath (Fletcher & MacCulloch 2016: 21). The Cornish rebels were swiftly defeated with their leaders killed (Fletcher & MacCulloch 2016: 21) and some other rebels sold into slavery (Mills 2010: 196). A second, much smaller, rebellion followed in September of 1497. In 1508, Henry VII issued the ‘Charter of Pardon’ which exonerated those involved in the rebellions, and, most significantly, granted the Stannary Parliament additional powers, including the right to ‘overturn any law made at Westminster’ (Payton 2002a: 24). However, relations between Cornwall and the Tudors did not remain stable for long.

Henry VIII’s break from the Roman Catholic church led to a further rebellion against the House of Tudor from within Cornwall. In the 16th century, Henry VIII’s dissolved the monasteries. Within Cornwall, the dissolution of Glasney and Crantock monasteries removed the primary source of Cornish language literature (Mills 2010: 197). Following his death in 1547, Henry VIII’s reforms were continued by his successor, the boy-king Edward VI. In 1549, Edward VI passed the ‘Act of Uniformity’, which required all church services to be conducted in English and established the ‘Common Book of Prayer’ as the sole legal conduit of worship and reflected the new King’s Protestant belief system. For monoglot Cornish people, who were mostly Catholic, this meant that they were forced to worship in accordance with a denomination of Christianity in which they did not believe, in a language that they did
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24 In 1974, a group of activists protesting the constitutional status of Cornwall unilaterally attempted to revive the Stannary Parliament (Deacon 2010:49). They claimed that as Cornwall’s veto over the parliament in Westminster had never been rescinded, it remained valid on the grounds that the English legal system does not recognise desuetude (that is, in England, in the context of a long period of non-use, laws remain valid).
not understand. This led to a third, and arguably the most historically significant, Cornish rebellion in just over fifty years, the Prayer Book rebellion of 1549.

Similarly to the previous rebellions, inferiority in terms of both numbers and quality of weaponry ensured that the uprising ended in defeat for the Cornish rebels (Payton 2002a: 26). As punishment for the Prayer Book rebellion, it is estimated that, the King’s soldiers killed half of the adult male Cornish speaking population (Ferdinand 2013: 209). One death had exceptional cultural significance. Payton (2002a: 27) observes that ‘[o]ne of the chief casualties of 1549 was the Cornish language’. Although the Cornish language did not die out immediately in 1549, the Act of Uniformity is generally considered to be a major catalyst for its demise. These events indicate greater engagement with England, which suggests that Cornwall was emerging from the territorial and cultural isolation that defined the era of first-peripheralism (see Payton 1992).

3.1.1.2. Second peripheralism

During the 17th and 18th centuries, Cornwall was at the vanguard of the industrial revolution (Deacon 2007a). As a result, Cornish mining was able to operate on a much larger scale and its economy became much more closely wedded to wider economic systems (Deacon 2007a: 124). Deacon (2007b: 28) notes that ‘Cornwall was a powerhouse of the industrial revolution’ and Payton (1992: 73) states that Cornwall had ‘a near monopoly on world [tin] production’. Cornwall’s role in the system of production, allocation, and distribution of extracted metals, mainly copper and tin, to
the rest of Britain and further afield made Cornwall a key player in a rapidly changing economic landscape. Such was the recipe for Cornwall’s ‘glory days’. Yet, peripherality endured.

The industrial revolution was the catalyst for a sea-change in the nature of Cornwall’s peripheral condition. Cornwall transitioned into a second stage of peripheralism which was characterised by industrialisation and subsequent de-industrialisation which was mirrored by economic prosperity followed by economic adversity. Though Cornwall is most famous for its tin mining, it was ‘the expansion of copper rather than tin which gave the initial impetus to technological advance, the 1680s witnessing the rise of several important copper-producers in the environs of Redruth’ (Payton 1992a: 73). From the mid-18th to the mid-19th century, the extent of Cornwall’s industrialisation was on par with that of the Midlands and the North of England (Holt 2003: 3).

The industrial prowess exhibited by the people of Cornwall became, and remains, a major source of local pride (Deacon 2007b: 15). However, ‘in the latter part of the nineteenth century the relative position of Cornwall in the tin-mining world declined considerably, as first copper then tin were plunged into crisis’ (Payton 1992a: 75) due to the emergence of low-cost competition from overseas. Just as Cornwall was one of the first regions to industrialise, it also become one of the first to deindustrialise (Deacon 2007a: 165). As a result of an over-specialisation and over-reliance on the mining industry, there was little opportunity for alternative work. Contemporaneously with the decline in the mining industry, there was something of a diaspora, as Cornish people left to find work elsewhere in the world (Deacon & Schwartz 2007: 293),
notably in North America and Australia. In the final quarter of the nineteenth-century, approximately 40% of adult males and 25% of adult females from Cornwall emigrated (Baines 1985).

Payton (1992a: 127–8) laments the duality of economic and sociocultural paralysis that engulfed Cornwall in the early 20th century:

[Just as de-industrialisation had led to a certain economic paralysis, so too it had caused parallel and attendant social-cultural paralysis [...] the fabric of Cornish society and the strength of the Cornish identity had in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries been built around mining and its associated industrial activities. Cornwall and mining were inseparable, synonymous almost, every social activity – from religion to education – shot through with myriad influence of mining the assertive characteristics of an almost aggressive Cornish sense of identity centred on Cornwall’s unsurpassed industrial prowess. When, in a comparatively short period of time, Cornwall was stripped of that prowess and her mining industry almost obliterated, the effects upon Cornish society and its culture were inevitably traumatic [...] for the most part, Cornish society sunk into a fatalism and resignation, a certain paralysis, mirroring the economic inertia

Due to a reliance on traditional extractive industries, Cornwall has arguably struggled to adapt to its post-industrial reality of the 20th and 21st centuries. As Roger Bryant (1996) wrote in his song ‘Cornish lads’:

Well Cornish lads are fishermen
And Cornish lads are miners too
But when the fish and tin are gone
What are the Cornish boys to do?
3.1.1.3. Third peripheralism

Payton (1989, 1992a, b) argues that in the years after the Second World War, Cornwall moved into an era of ‘third-peripheralism’, which can be defined by a branch factory economy and large-scale counter-urban migration.

In the 1970s, Cornwall benefitted from the UK government’s macroeconomic policies and a general upturn in the British economy (Payton 1992b). This enabled regional development funds to foster prosperity into the UK’s peripheral, and traditionally less affluent territories. More specifically, the majority of Cornwall was designated ‘Development Area’ status, with Falmouth, Camborne, and Redruth being identified as a ‘Special Development Area’. In light of this, Cornwall, and Camborne-Redruth in particular, received substantial regional aid from the UK government. By 1984 this regional aid had contributed to the development of 49 industrial estates in Cornwall (Payton 1992b: 243). At this time, national and international companies were beginning to expand into Cornwall. This, alongside a developing tourist industry, generated a lot of hope and it appeared to be the case that there had been ‘a genuine long term transformation of the [Cornish] economy’ (Spooner 1974, cited in Payton 1992b: 243). However, Payton (1992b: 245) suggests that this was simply ‘a veneer, an illusion of prosperity’. In reality, the apparent successes of the Cornish economy in the post-war years were due to the ‘branch factory phenomenon’ (Payton 1992a, b). That is, jobs and manufacturing in Cornwall were often dependent on the expansion of non-Cornish companies into Cornish markets.
The influx of national and international business was not matched by endogenous entrepreneurialism. As a result, in the 1970s, around threequarters of Cornish manufacturing was controlled exogenously (Perry 1982, cited in Payton 1992b). This was an unsound foundation for an economy, and by extension, for a society and a culture, too. As Payton (1992b: 244) observes, ‘in times of economic difficulties it was the ‘branch factories’ which were the first to be closed or run-down by their parent companies’. As financial aid from regional development policies was cut throughout the 1980s, there were fewer incentives for companies to continue their expansion into the Cornish market. As the veneer created by (inter)national companies and their branch-factories was removed, it became clear that there had been little progress within Cornwall itself. Systemic issues that had previously thwarted progress within Cornwall’s economy came to fruition once more. Locally based enterprise was all too seldom. By the 1980s, it was evident that a branch-factory economy was not a viable long-term economic model and the spectre of a Cornish paralysis loomed once more (Payton 1992b). Despite this, many perceive the tourism and hospitality sector to mitigate some of the negative effects of the demise of Cornwall’s traditional industries.

3.2. Cornwall today

The negative socioeconomic effect of deindustrialisation has been partially offset by tourism. However, the jobs created by tourism are often ‘seasonal, part-time, low-paid, and female’ (Porter 2014: 320). Much of Cornwall’s post-industrial economy relies on commodifying pre-industrial and industrial culture. Inevitably, due the
historical orientation of much of the tourism sector (see Coupland & Coupland 2014; Kennedy 2016), much of Cornish culture is becoming fossilised. Due to this, Deacon (2013a: 21) is wary that ‘an over-concentration on the rear-view mirror leaves us in danger of failing to spot the scat-up [crash] that is coming right at us over the horizon’. This suggests that although selling Cornwall’s past to visitors in the form of heritage tourism may be economically profitable in the short-term, it is not generally considered to be a long-term solution.

Even the extent to which Cornwall is economically sustainable in the short-term is questionable. Despite pockets of affluence throughout Cornwall, it is poignant to note that if Cornwall were a country, it would be poorer than Lithuania or Hungary (Wigmore 2016). Indeed, ‘[t]he modern world has not been Cornwall’s friend’ (Wigmore 2016). Cornwall’s is among the ten most deprived areas in Western Europe (The Independent 2015). With GDP at below 75% of the EU average\(^{25}\), in 1999, Cornwall qualified for the highest possible economic grant from the European Union. This funding, known as ‘Objective One’, aims to stop and reverse the economic decline in some of the EU’s poorest regions.\(^{26}\) At the time of the 2016 referendum, on the United Kingdom’s membership to the EU Cornwall was due to receive £2.5 billion from the EU in the 20 years between 2000 and 2020 (Dunt 2016: 49). In Cornwall, Objective One funded projects include the installation of super-fast fibre-optic broadband, a university campus in Penryn, and the Eden Project.\(^{27}\)

\(^{25}\) Cornwall’s GDP was 69% of the EU average (Willet et al. 2019: 1348).

\(^{26}\) More specifically, those regions with a GDP below 75% of the EU average.

\(^{27}\) Note that Objective One funding is only partly responsible for such projects which were also backed by various other sources including National Lottery funds and private investment.
Cornwall was the only region in the UK to qualify for Objective One funding that did not distribute the money internally (Deacon 2007a: 226; Kennedy 2016: 3). The funds were administered from the Government Office for the South West in Plymouth, Devon (Willett 2009: 133). Thus, those who distributed the funds lacked a ‘lived-in’ experience of Cornwall. The handling of Objective One funds for Cornwall exemplifies Willett’s (2009: 5) assertion that ‘Cornwall is poor because policy is based on what some people expect it to be rather than what the overall experience of life in Cornwall is’ (original emphasis). These funding measures have been of limited success as Cornwall is yet to recover from its 20th century economic downturn.

3.2.1. Tourism in Cornwall

One of the key industries in Cornwall today is tourism and hospitality. According to the Cornwall Council website, Cornwall is ‘one of the world’s most iconic destinations’. In 2007, there were 4,850,000 overnight visitors to Cornwall, who contributed around £1 billion to the Cornish economy (Cornwall Council 2011). The vast majority of Cornwall’s tourists are domestic, with overseas visitors only accounting for around 5% of the total number of tourists (Cornwall Council 2011). In 2006, tourism accounted for 22% of Cornwall’s employment (Cornwall Council 2011). Figure 3.2 shows that of NUTS 2 (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics) regions\textsuperscript{28}, Cornwall was, by a large

\textsuperscript{28} Counties of England, (grouped) London districts, unitary authorities in Wales, and council areas in Scotland.
margin, the most reliant on tourism as a percentage of the overall economic output in 2013.

Many holiday-makers are attracted to Cornwall’s leisure tourism industry. Cornwall’s beaches and rugged coastal aesthetic attract visitors each year. Cornwall boasts twelve areas of outstanding natural beauty, five Michelin starred restaurants, and a collection of mining landscapes are designated as a ‘World Heritage Site’ by UNESCO. In addition to such aesthetic and culinary attractions, the lifestyle associated with Cornwall entices many tourists. Specifically, Cornwall’s beach culture and perceived slow-pace of living
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29 The NUTS 2 regions within Scotland are not distinguished in Figure 3.2.
are marketed in opposition to the chaos of everyday life. These themes are summarised by the Cornish blogger and marketer Frankie Thomas, whose uses the tag line ‘Lifestyle. Beaches. Hospitality’ on the landsite page of her blog, meetmebythesea.

Much of the tourism sector in Cornwall is reliant on cultural heritage. An example of this is Poldark mine, which has also become subject of a best-selling series of books (Graham 1945–2002) and BAFTA nominated television series (BBC 2015–2019). Heritage tourism commodifies the past by selling a snapshot of how a place used to be and how people used to live and work. For example, some Cornish mines offer visitors the opportunity to descend the now retired mine shafts. Coupland & Coupland (2014: 496) state that ‘[h]eritage tourism involves metacultural displays designed to represent – typically explain, celebrate, and commemorate – a valued cultural past’. Indeed, Coupland & Coupland (2014) suggest that heritage tourism, and the discourses that surround it, make use of a frame of authenticity. This frame of authenticity of shared by the visitors themselves. This is exemplified by a survey conducted by Arkenford (2012) which found that only 4% of tourists to Cornwall did not think that Cornwall was ‘authentic’ and just 3% thought that Cornwall was not ‘traditional’. The tropes of authenticity and traditionality are utilised by the heritage tourism industry, where holiday-makers can pay for a pseudo-lived-experience of the past by taking part in activities such as descending a mine shaft.

While Cornwall financially benefits from tourism, the Cornish population have a complex relationship with the sector. In areas with high-levels of tourism, residents often exhibit resistance to the sector, particularly pertaining to the density of tourists,
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the behaviour of tourists, and tourist-oriented developments (see Vargas-Sánchez 2011). For example, a 2012 survey conducted by ‘Power Marketing’ on 1100 Cornish residents found that almost nine in ten respondents thought that tourism was ‘good’ for the area. However, the survey also found that over half of the respondents felt tourism to have a ‘bad’ or ‘very bad’ effect on the cost of living, pricing of goods and services, and levels of litter. Moreover, 55% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that ‘traffic fumes and congestion generated by tourists’ are a problem where they live. This illustrates the nuanced relationship that exists between Cornwall’s ‘permanent’ residents and tourists.

Not only does Cornwall’s seasonal population fluctuate due to the summer influx of tourists and second-home owners, the demographic make-up of Cornwall is changing diachronically. This has implications for the Anglo-Cornish dialect as greater mobility and contact with speakers who do not use the regional dialect variety can lead to dialect levelling and diffusion (see Kerswill 2003), as well as greater awareness of linguistic variation (Johnstone et al. 2006).

3.2.2. The demographics of Cornwall

In this section I describe the population changes that have occurred in Cornwall, with a particular focus on the period from the mid-20th century to the present-day. This is important to this study as population changes can provide key insights into language change, from the perspective of both usage and perception.
In the 1951 census, 69% of the residents of Cornwall were born within the county, by 1982, this figure had fallen to 57% (Perry et al. 1982, cited in Deacon 2013a). Despite a lack of official statistics, never mind the sometimes vehement disagreements concerning what is means to be ‘Cornish’, it seems reasonable to assume that the Cornish-born population is now less than half of the Cornish populace (Deacon 2013a: 19). Using a different metric, those who self-identify as Cornish, this figure is much lower, at around 25–33% (Husk 2012; Bewnans Kernow 2014). However, 2011 census data indicate that 9.8% of those living in Cornwall stated that their national identity is ‘Cornish’31, up from 6.8% in the 2001 census (Cornwall Council 2013). Although in real terms the number of ‘Cornish’ individuals is becoming lower as a percentage of the population, the number of people who choose to self-identify as ‘Cornish’ is increasing. This suggests a process of intensification, where there is a quantitative decline, but qualitative increase, in Cornish identity.

The population of Cornwall has been rapidly rising since the end of the Second World War. In 1961, the population of Cornwall was 342,300, by 2011 this rose to 539,900, and is projected to rise to 637,400 by 2031 and nearly 1 million in the early 22nd century (Bewnans Kernow 2014). Rather than due to a rise in birth rates, this increase has largely been a result of in-migration.32 As indicated by Figure 3.3, Cornwall’s population growth is more than three times that of the rest of England, four times that of Wales, and seventy-three times greater than that of Scotland (Bewnans Kernow 2014). This trend seems set to continue. It is estimated that 80% of new-build

31 This is despite ‘Cornish’ not being a selectable option. Those who wished to identify as ‘Cornish’ had to selected ‘other’ and write in ‘Cornish’. Had ‘Cornish’ been a selectable option, this figure would undoubtedly be higher.
32 The natural population growth of Cornwall is actually negative, as the number of deaths exceed the number of births (Cornwall Local Development Framework 2011).
housing, of which nearly 50,000 are planned before 2030, will be occupied by non-Cornish people (Bewnans Kernow 2014).

Figure 3. The population of regions of the UK in 2010, where 100% is the region’s population in 1960 (Bewnans Kernow 2014).

Two-thirds of the population boom can be accounted for by people migrating from South and South-East England (Bewnans Kernow 2014). As a result, Cornwall still remains relatively ethnically homogenous, with 98.4% of the Camborne-Redruth population being White British (Oxford Consultants for Social Inclusion 2016).

The composition of Cornish society is rapidly changing, the effects of which can be seen in changing conceptualisations of Cornish identity, and, therefore, of the Cornish ‘self’.

3.3. Cornish identity

Cornish people are renowned for their perceived strong and sincerely held local pride. However, among the Cornish community, there is a non-homogenous orientation to
English and Celtic norms and values. This is true both legally and socially and is evident both from the top-down and the bottom-up. For example, Cornwall’s status as a Duchy is constitutionally ambiguous (see Kirkhope 2010, 2013). Cornwall’s disputed legal position filters into the mainstream consciousness of the Cornish population to provoke complex and fervent identity politics. This, in turn, puts pressure on local and supra-local authorities to address these concerns.

The ‘Equality Act’ of 2010 recognised the Cornish as a national minority due to the Cornish’s ‘ethnic and national origins’ (Bewnans Kernow 2014: 8). In 2014, Cornwall’s de jure status as an official minority group was recognised by The Council of Europe under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. This officially elevated Cornish identity to be in line with the de facto, self-styled sense of proto-nationhood that has long existed in Cornwall.

In addition to socioeconomic and cultural marginalisation, the Cornish have also been marginalised due to perceived ethnic differences. For example, following a racially motivated purge of the ethnic Cornish from Devon in AD927 by the Anglo-Saxon king Æthelstan, the writer, William of Malmesbry (AD1080-1143) stated that Exeter (Devon) had been ‘cleansed of its defilement by wiping out that filthy race [Celts]’ (cited in Payton 2002a: 7). This disdain for Cornish people is repeatedly evidenced throughout history.

In 1775, one visitor observed that the people of Cornwall were a ‘very strange kind of being, half savages at best [...] as rough as bears, selfish as swine, obstinate as mules’ (cited in Payton 2002a: 35). One need not look far back into history to find evidence of discrimination against those of Celtic heritage. In 1908, W. H. Hudson,
repeatedly compared Cornishmen to apes and concluded that the cognitive faculties of a Cornishmen were nearer to that of a child than an adult. For Hudson (1908/1981: 120), the Cornish people had the ‘natural happiness of the savage’ and ‘marked a lower stage in mental development’ (Hudson 1908/1981: 179). Even more recently, in 1925 C.E. Vulliamy claimed that Cornish ‘peasants’ were ‘untainted aboriginals’ with a ‘depth of ignorance’ and ‘mid-African simplicity’. In 1947 Murray et al. (p.63), observed that in Cornish towns ‘rural decadence, mentally and spiritually is seen at its lowest depths’. Although seldom as extreme nowadays, in popular culture these stereotypes have endured (e.g. The Bad Education Movie 2015). As a result, in the minds of many, the Cornish character and Cornwall’s sociocultural distinctiveness becomes reduced to a set of broadly pejorative stereotypes. Despite such attitudes, Cornwall has maintained a strong sense of local, even national, identity.

The contempt between the ‘English’ and the ‘Cornish’ has not been unidirectional. Similar prejudices existed among the Cornish towards the English. For example, Henry Jenner (1904/2010: 41) wrote that ‘the labouring classes of Devon, Cornwall, Somerset, Wales and the Welsh border are of a type infinitely superior in manners, morals and physique to the same class in the Midlands’. After a period of depression, Cornish identity became revitalised around the turn of the 19th century. Early Cornish nationalists, such as Henry Jenner (see Jenner 1904/2010), reappropriated pejorative views of Cornwall as they ‘drew directly upon the narratives and tropes of English imperial[ists]’ in constructing Cornish identity (Vernon 1998: 154). Henry Jenner was at the vanguard of this movement (see Jenner 1904/2010). Jenner’s views on Cornwall are typified by the following passage (1904/2010: 51):
Cornwall [...] is legally and practically a county of England, with a County Council, a County Police\(^{33}\), and a Lord-Lieutenant all complete, as it were no better than mere Essex or Herts. But every Cornishman knows well enough, proud as he may be of belonging to the British Empire, that he is no more an Englishman than a Caithness man is, that he has as much right to a separate local patriotism to his little Motherland, which rightly understood is no bar, but rather an advantage to the greater British patriotism, as has a Scotsman, an Irishman, a Welshman, or even a Colonial; and that he is as much a Celt and as little of an “Anglo-Saxon” as any Gael, Cymro, Manxman, or Breton. Language is less than ever a final test of race. Most Cornishmen habitually speak English, and few, very few, could have five minutes’ conversation in the old Celtic speech. Yet the memory lingers on, and no one can talk about the county itself, and mention the places in it, without using a wealth of true Cornish words.\(^{34}\)

Although Cornwall has never been completely Anglicised (Haywood 2004: 106), in sociocultural terms it is arguably becoming more ‘English’ than ever before (see Deacon 2013a). At the very least, what it means to be Cornish or to have a Cornish identity is changing. It was once the case that ‘[m]ining was Cornwall and Cornwall was mining’ Payton (2002a: 42). Yet, since the collapse of Cornwall’s mining industry, traditional conceptualisations of Cornish identity, which centred on extractive industries (farming, fishing, and mining), are being replaced by new interpretations of what constitutes ‘Cornishness’ (Deacon & Payton 1993; Deacon 2007a, see Chapter 6).

Among the Cornish population, the social value of Cornish identity has become a highly divisive issue in recent years. For many Cornish people, it provides a genuine sense of belonging, to some, it is a marketing tool that can be exploited for capital gain, whilst to others, it is indicative of ‘navel-gazing parochialism’ which is damaging to Cornwall in the long-term (Willett 2016: 583). Indeed, desires to adopt Anglicised norms wholesale and a desire to reject them equally ubiquitously coexist within the
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\(^{33}\) This is no longer true. Cornwall is now policed by the ‘Devon and Cornwall’ constabulary.

\(^{34}\) Here, Jenner is referring to the use of the Cornish language in Cornish onomastics.
small urban conurbation surrounding Camborne-Redruth. I discuss Cornish identities in detail, using data from this study in Chapter 6.

3.4. Camborne-Redruth

Although the aim of the study is to analyse Anglo-Cornish lexical usage and perception in Cornwall, specifically, I conducted the research in Camborne-Redruth. Diatopically, Cornwall is not socio-economically, culturally, or ideologically homogenous. Thus, it is necessary to consider the specific location of this study in greater detail. An understanding of the local context of Camborne-Redruth is necessary when interpreting the usage and perception of the Anglo-Cornish dialect in this locale.

Located in mid-west Cornwall, Camborne-Redruth is the largest urban area in Cornwall with a population of approximately 60,000 including surrounding parishes (Camborne, Pool & Redruth Place Based Issues Paper 2012). Due to housing and commercial developments between the two towns, they now effectively form a single conurbation. In the 18th century, Camborne was a mere hamlet, while Redruth was a small market town. However, the landscape changed dramatically in the 19th century as the towns saw huge population growth to satisfy the fast-developing mining industry (Clegg 2005: 94).

Camborne-Redruth was at the heart of Cornish mining, which itself was at the vanguard of mining worldwide. Cornish miners with their technical prowess and physical aptitude exported Cornish mining to the ‘New World’ (see James 1994). ‘Cornish mining’ became a hallmark of quality. Even today, the bilingual
(Cornish/English) welcome signs into Redruth proudly assert that it is the ‘World Capital of Cornish Mining’.\(^{35}\) As a result, during its boom years Camborne-Redruth was key to economic prosperity in 18\(^{th}\) and 19\(^{th}\) century industrialised Cornwall, with over 300 mines in the Camborne-Redruth area (Clegg 2005: 94). Between 1820–1840, an area on the periphery of Redruth was known as ‘the richest square mile in the old world’ (Wigmore 2016) and was at the forefront of all things new and modern. However, this industrial success did come to an end and now the story of Camborne-Redruth is somewhat different.

Camborne-Redruth is emblematic of Cornwall’s historical overreliance and overspecialisation on the mining industry, which slowly collapsed throughout the 19\(^{th}\) and 20\(^{th}\) centuries (see Section 3.1.1.2). The demise of the mining industry impacted employment rates in the Camborne-Redruth area. In the post-war years, the average unemployment rate in Redruth was 32.9\% (Murray et al. 1947). This was markedly high, even for Cornwall, where the unemployment rate was high (17.7\%) compared to the rest of England (14.8\%). Even today, the town is ‘characterised by pockets of intense deprivation’, in parts of which up to a third of working-age residents receive out-of-work benefits (Mumford 2014). In December 2015, the food bank in Redruth, a town of 14,000 people, was used 2,095 times (Wigmore 2016). According to Davies (2019), the food banks in Camborne and Redruth supplied 16,000 meals a month in 2019, up from 12,000 a month the previous year. This exemplifies the economic deprivation that remains in Cornwall as a whole and is particularly apparent in Camborne-Redruth.

\(^{35}\) Cornish mining spread world-wide during the Cornish diaspora (see Section 3.1.1.2), thus, Redruth can be considered to be the ‘world capital of Cornish mining’.
Since the collapse of Cornwall’s traditional industries,\textsuperscript{36} the negative financial impact has been, to some extent, offset by the tourism and hospitality sector which has become a vital economic asset for the Cornish economy as a whole. But Camborne-Redruth seldom attracts tourists. ‘If I get tourists in [my pub] then they must be lost’ observed one local publican (quoted in \textit{The Independent} 2008). Consequently, the financial benefits of the tourism industry are largely inaccessible to the town and its people. As a result, Camborne-Redruth typifies the economic hardship which has, in many ways, defined much of post-industrial Cornwall.

Camborne-Redruth today evidences the duality of economic and social fortunes. Clegg (2005: 96) comments that Redruth ‘has a definite ghost town feel in the evenings’ while he describes the nearby village of St. Day as ‘depressed and depressing’ (Clegg 2005: 100).\textsuperscript{37} With the loss of the primary drivers of the Camborne-Redruth economy, social fissures within the community have been exposed. For example, in 2016, the Red Cross commissioned a report on loneliness identified an area within the Camborne-Redruth conurbation to be one of 39 communities throughout the UK in need of intervention to tackle an epidemic of chronic and profound loneliness (Red Cross 2016). Moreover, Redruth has also developed a problem with anti-social behaviour, such as vandalism, underage alcohol consumption, and threatening behaviour. In 2008, Redruth gained attention from international news outlets as it established a temporary voluntary curfew for some young people in order to combat this perceived anti-social behaviour (see BBC 2008).

\textsuperscript{36} Other than mining, Cornwall’s traditional industries include farming and fishing. However, in Camborne-Redruth, mining was the most prominent industry, and the only one of these three to collapse entirely.

\textsuperscript{37} Clegg (2005: 98–99) is somewhat more positive regarding Camborne; ‘[Camborne] also has a pleasant, bustling feeling which is absent in Redruth’.
These historical and contemporary socio-economic contexts have shaped Camborne-Redruth’s people’s thinking about their place in the world and, therefore, their identity. On the level of the community, these feelings can be observed in political polls and voting patterns. For example, in 2014, a Survation poll found that 60% of people from Camborne-Redruth are in favour of devolved power for Cornwall, with 47% going further and agreeing that a Cornish assembly should be established. Moreover, the Camborne-Redruth area voted 63% in favour of Britain’s exit from the EU.\(^{38}\) This indicates that many people from Camborne-Redruth are keen to change the structural paradigm of their peripheral existence, by rejecting the institutions which exert power of Cornwall. One way in which this attitude can manifest in day-to-day interactions is through language. Cornwall has a unique and complex linguistic history, which is inextricably linked to its socio-cultural and political history.

3.5. Language in Cornwall

Cornwall’s Celtic history has had an enduring influence on the language spoken in the Duchy. While the Cornish language is very seldom used in contemporary Cornwall, the Anglo-Cornish dialect is the primary linguistic point of difference between Cornwall and (the rest of) England. In this section, I explore these language varieties from a socio-historical perspective.

Linguistically, it was the Cornish language, or Kernewek, that historically set Cornwall apart from the rest of England (Stoyle 1998: 10). Along with Welsh and

\(^{38}\) For a discussion of the factors that motivated Cornwall’s Brexit vote, see Willett et al. (2019).
Breton, the Cornish language is a part of the Brythonic branch of Celtic languages.\footnote{The other Celtic languages, the Goidelic branch, are Irish Gaelic, Scots Gaelic, and Manx.} The Cornish language is of central importance to Cornish heritage and some Cornish identities as a culturally salient point of difference between Cornwall and England. Many Cornish people have used their linguistic distinctiveness as a manifestation of their autonomy and refusal to succumb to perceived English hegemony. However, for many centuries the usage of Cornish was seemingly undergoing a process of language death. The Anglo-Saxon conquest of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} centuries gave rise to a steady decline in the usage of the Cornish language, a process which was greatly expedited by the Tudor dynasty and the Reformation (Ferdinand 2013: 204). Writing in 1602, Richard Carew (1602/ 1811 :151–2) observed that:

Most of the inhabitants can speak no word of Cornish, but very few are ignorant of the English; and yet some so affect their own, as to a stranger they will not speak it; for if meeting them by chance, you inquire the way, or any such matter, your answer shall be, ‘Meea navidacawzasawzneck,’ ‘I can speak no Saxonage’. \footnote{Carew’s translation is criticised, and it is suggested that ‘I will not speak English’ is a more accurate rendering (Mills 2010: 200).} The English which they speak is good and pure [...] but they disgrace it [...] with a broad and rude accent.

In Cornwall, English has often been seen as the language of hegemony. For example, Whittaker (1804: 37) argues that ‘[t]he English [language] was not desired by the Cornish, but forced upon them by the tyranny of England’. After hundreds of years of the usage of the language steadily becoming further limited, first in the east of Cornwall and later in the west, the last native Cornish speakers died sometime in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century.\footnote{Though widely believed to be Dolly Pentreath, who died in 1777, this is unlikely to be true (see Deacon 2004: 92).} Over the last century, the Cornish language has enjoyed a revivalist
movement. The main achievement of which has been that, in 2010, UNESCO altered its classification of the Cornish language, from ‘extinct’ to ‘critically endangered’.

The Cornish cultural activist and Celtic scholar, Henry Jenner’s (1904/2010) *A Handbook of the Cornish Language* is generally considered to be the start of the Cornish language revivalist movement. Jenner’s (1904/2010) work was a catalyst for the revival not just the Cornish language, but of Cornish identity, too. Following Jenner’s (1904/2010) handbook, Robert Morton Nance’s (1923) *A Glossary of Celtic Words in Cornish Dialect*, and (1955) *Cornish-English Dictionary* served to standardise the revived version of the language, which became known as ‘Unified Cornish’. In 2008, Unified Cornish was superseded by a modern variety known as the ‘Standard Written Form’ of Cornish. This indicates that Cornish is not a linguistic fossil; it is still evolving and undergoing change. However, these changes, such as to orthography, are largely top-down, from the Gorsedh Kernow and Cornish Language Partnership, as opposed to organic, bottom-up linguistic evolution.

The 2011 census was the first to record individuals’ linguistic profiles. 557 respondents cited Cornish as their ‘main’ language. In reality, these responses are likely to be either a statement of identity or a misunderstanding of the difference between the Cornish dialect of English (Anglo-Cornish) and the Cornish language (Kernewek), with the real figure very close to, or exactly, zero. In 1700, a Cornish clerk

---

42 United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation  
43 The Gorsedh Kernow was established in 1928 and exists to maintain a sense of nationhood and Celtic spirit in Cornwall. The Cornish Language Partnership, which was founded in 2005, serves to promote and develop the use of the Cornish language. These groups act as the *de facto* regulatory bodies of the Cornish language.
lamented that the ‘tongueless man […] lost his land’ (cited in Stoyle 1998: 11). However, today the Cornish are not a tongue-less people.

It remains the case that Cornish people have a linguistic outlet through which to index their local identity. The identity associated with the Cornish language lives on in the form of the dialect of English spoken in Cornwall, namely, Anglo-Cornish. Some Cornish people have reappropriated the Anglo-Cornish dialect as a badge of honour, and the dialect served as an ‘emblem of difference’ (Vernon 1998:154). Although it is widely believed that the Anglo-Cornish dialect is strongly influenced by the Cornish language, there is no evidence of influence from a Celtic ‘substratum’ (Wakelin 1984: 195; contra. McWhorter 2009) outside of the lexicon. Anglo-Cornish is one of the most recognisable varieties of English (Montgomery 2007). It is identifiable at the levels of semasiology, onomasiology, morpho-syntax, phonetics, and phonology.

The Anglo-Cornish dialect exhibits a range of structural features which are not present in the Standard variety of English. For example, negative concord is present in the Anglo-Cornish dialect, such as ‘I haven’t done nothing’. Another morpho-syntactic feature found in the Anglo-Cornish dialect is ‘periphrastic do’ (as opposed to ‘emphatic do’) which is found in the habitual aspect, e.g. ‘they do like chocolate’ or ‘they do do dancing’. None of these morpho-syntactic features are unique to the Anglo-Cornish dialect. For example, Nevalainen (2006) suggests that negative concord is a ‘vernacular universal’ and periphrastic do was found in Middle English (Hickey 2012) as well as present-day dialects such as Somerset English (Jones 2002).

---

44 Throughout this thesis I refer to the Cornish dialect of English as ‘Anglo-Cornish’. Elsewhere, it is referred to by a number of labels, including ‘Cornish English’ (Moore & Carter 2015; Dann 2019) and ‘Cornu-English’ (Beal 2006).
Perhaps the two most conspicuous phonological features of the Anglo-Cornish dialect are the presence of rhoticity (Dudman 2000) and that TRAP and BATH lexical sets are distinguished by length only (Wells 1982: 345). Other features include the use of unrounded LOT vowels (Wakelin 1986) and voicing of word-initial voiceless fricatives (Wells 1982). However, much of the structural features of the Anglo-Cornish dialect are not unique to Cornwall. In fact, they are also attested in other areas of the south-west of England, which form a group of dialects which are ‘of basically the same stock’ (Wakelin 1984: 195). However, one level of language which contains features unique to Cornwall is the lexicon. From both semasiological and onomasiological perspectives, Cornwall has a rich and unique stock of local words and meanings.

Cornwall is included in dialectological surveys on a national scale, such as The Survey of English Dialects (Orton & Dieth 1962–1971) and BBC Voices (Wieling et al. 2013). Wakelin (1969, 1975, 1984) provides arguably the most comprehensive description of Anglo-Cornish from an asocial perspective, although he does highlight some east/west divisions within Cornwall. For example, Wakelin (1986: 42) observed that the ‘main area’ of Kernewek loanwords was west Cornwall. Cornwall also has its own unique dialect survey (North & Sharpe 1980). North & Sharpe (1980) mapped regional onomasiological variation, which largely focused on farming vocabulary, throughout Cornwall. In such works, as is typical of the cartographic approach of dialectology framework there is no attempt to consider the socially- or stylistically-conditioned patterns of variation, or the social meanings of Anglo-Cornish dialect features.

45 However, Wells (1982: 343) notes that ‘Initial Voicing’ is ‘sharply recessive’.
46 For a glossary of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis, see Jago (1882) and Phillips (1993).
The perceptions of the Cornish accent have been included in some accent perception studies (e.g. Montgomery 2007; Chambers & Trudgill 1998). It has consistently been found that south-west English accents carry a strong negative stereotype due to associations with farming (Montgomery 2007). A corollary of this association is that those individuals who have a west-country accent sound uneducated and unsophisticated (Kerswill & Williams 1999; Beal 2006). A survey conducted by online dating platform e-harmony found Cornish to be the least attractive of the twenty investigated accents, although it did rate highly for humour (Lowe 2020). Somewhat anomalously, Milroy (2000: 62) suggests that the Anglo-Cornish dialect is ‘generally thought to be attractive’. Although perhaps not consistent with much of the perceptual dialectology literature, this provides an insight into the complex and paradoxically co-present range of seemingly contradictory social indices of the Anglo-Cornish dialect.

Cornwall is widely known to have a distinctive and identifiable regional dialect. For example, Montgomery (2007) found Cornish to be the fourth most recognisable variety of British English.47 Despite this, Cornwall has been almost entirely absent from variationist sociolinguistics and vice-versa. However, limited research does exist. For example, in her BA dissertation, Dudman (2000) found rhoticity to be recessive in St. Ives. Dann (2016, 2019) conducted sociophonetic studies of adolescents in West Cornwall. Also, Moore & Carter (2015, 2017) conducted sociophonetic research on the Isles of Scilly (Moore & Carter 2015, 2017). With the exception of Dudman’s (2000) BA

47 However, Braber (2015) did not find Cornwall to be among the top ten most identifiable dialect areas.
dissertation, the first study to use sociolinguistic methods to explore dialect use among adults in mainland Cornwall was that of Sandow & Robinson (2018).

3.6. Summary

In this chapter I have provided an overview of Cornish socio-cultural history, which has formed the ideological landscape that exists in Cornwall today. Cornwall’s Celtic and industrial heritage are core components of the contemporary Cornish identity. These themes are revisited throughout this thesis and provide the foundation for much of the subsequent analysis. The three eras of peripheralism demonstrate that Cornwall’s peripheral condition is changing, yet constant. Although centre-periphery relations are evolving, Cornwall remains peripheral. However, today, this peripherality is manifested in a way that would be unrecognisable to the people who inhabited Cornwall centuries ago. This understanding of Cornish history is vital in the context of understanding the relationship between Cornish people, their sense of place, and the language spoken within Cornwall. This study contributes to Cornish studies by investigating Cornish identity in modern-day Cornwall, as articulated by a sample of the Camborne-Redruth community (see Chapter 6).

The story of Cornwall presented in this chapter suggests that Cornwall is a prime location in which to conduct sociolinguistic research due to its rich linguistic, social, and ideological heterogeneity. Although dialect surveys such as the Survey of English Dialects (Orton & Dieth 1962–1971) and North & Sharpe (1980) have provided a descriptive understanding of the linguistic features of the Anglo-Cornish dialect, the
frequency and extent to which these features are used in the Cornish community remain unclear. This highlights the suitability of Cornwall and the Anglo-Cornish dialect to a study of language variation, change, and social meaning through the prism of variationist sociolinguistics.

Now that this research has been situated in the context of Cornish studies, and the relevant research in language variation (see Chapter 2), in Chapter 4 I present the methodologies that I used in this study.
4. Theoretical, analytical, and methodological apparatus

In this chapter I describe two complementary methods that I use in this study, namely ethnographic participant-observation and sociolinguistic interviews. Firstly, I describe the ethnographic participant-observation that I conducted in the Camborne-Redruth community (see Section 4.1). The ethnography enables me to develop an understanding of life within the community. This is valuable when interpreting the data collected in the second method, namely, a lexis-oriented realisation of the sociolinguistic interview (see Section 4.4). After defining some theoretical principles for the sociolinguistic study of lexical variables (Section 4.2), I detail the variables selected for analysis in this study, with a particular focus on their Anglo-Cornish variants (Section 4.3). In Section 4.4, I outline the methods used to elicit lexical variants in the sociolinguistic interviews. Firstly, I outline a novel onomasiologically-oriented method which serves to elicit usage on a stylistic continuum, consisting of casual and careful speech styles (see Section 4.4.1 & 4.4.2). I also describe an adaption of Robinson’s (2010a) who/what elicitation technique to investigate semasiological variation (see Section 4.4.3). Additionally, I describe a method that I used to explore participants’ awareness and perception of Anglo-Cornish lexis (see Section 4.4.4). Then, I outline a semi-structured interview schema which serves to engage participants in discussions about Cornwall and Cornish identity (see Section 4.4.1.5).

I detail the socio-demographic profiles of the participants in this study and outline the ways in which individuals are categorised into groups relating to, for example, their socioeconomic status and age, in Section 4.5. The collection of
methodological approaches that I introduce in this chapter enables me to answer the research questions outlined in Section 1.1.

4.1. Ethnography

I conducted ethnographic participant-observation in the Camborne-Redruth community from September 2017 to September 2018. The aim of this ethnographic investigation was to develop a deeper understanding of the lived-experiences of the Camborne-Redruth population. In doing so, I can consider the extent to which data collection through sociolinguistics interviews are consistent with my day-to-day observations of Camborne-Redruth.

The ethnographic method that I used can be described as *participant-observation*. *Participant observation* has been defined as ‘observation carried out when the researcher is playing an established participant role in the scene studied’ (Atkinson & Hammersley 1998: 248). In the context of my ethnography, my role was as a member of the Camborne-Redruth community. Participant-observation is largely accepted to be the most desirable means of sociolinguistic data collection (see Cukor-Avila & Bailey 1995), but it is rarely feasible due to financial and temporal limitations. Cukor-Avila & Bailey (1995: 165) argue that typical sociolinguistic methodologies (such as reading passages, word lists, and interview speech) are ‘surrogates’ for ‘actual linguistic interaction’. Through participant-observation, I was able to observe ‘unsolicited interactions [...] teasing, arguments, jokes, business transactions, and the routing conversations that make up much of the community’s linguistic activity’
(Cukor-Avila & Bailey 1995: 167). My ethnography enabled me to observe and participate in such naturalistic language use within the Camborne-Redruth community.

Ethnographic observation also allows the researcher to develop a thorough understanding of the emic social categories which are locally meaningful. The local knowledge that one can gather from ethnographic field methods ‘expands researchers’ explanatory possibilities’ (Milroy & Gordon 2003: 71). As a result, I am able to present a socially-informed interpretation of the quantitative lexical data in light of the information gained through ethnographic research methods. This enables my analysis to go far beyond observing correlations of linguistic variation within and between social groups. This is particularly relevant in Cornwall as Milroy (1987a, 2004) states that the Labovian paradigm may be problematic when applied to the Celtic fringes of the UK, where notions such as ‘prestige’ may be more complex than is assumed in Labov’s (1966, 1972a) New York study or Trudgill’s (1974) Norwich study. Prestige is a particularly complex notion in the Celtic nations of Britain due to the simultaneous non-standardness and the positive regard in which Celtic varieties of English are held by their speakers. Thus, an ethnographic perspective can augment the analysis where traditional variationist models may struggle (see also Eckert 1989, 2000).

It is a common practice for ethnographically-informed sociolinguistic studies to take place in relatively limited spaces such as schools or youth clubs (e.g. Eckert 2000; E. Moore 2004; Kirkham 2013; Snell 2017; Drummond 2018; Ilbury 2019). However, ethnographic methods can be fruitful on much larger scales (see Hendry 2003). In this study, the arena of ethnography is the level of the community in Camborne-Redruth. In this case, unlike an ethnography of some communities of practice, it is not possible
to observe a high proportion of interactions with the target community. I cannot observe the whole community simultaneously, as an observer cannot be in multiple places at the same time. In order to circumvent this issue, I employed a strategy of network-hopping. That is, I engaged in multiple and diverse social networks in order to gain understanding of the social dynamics of sub-groups within the community. A collective understanding of these networks can provide a more comprehensive account of the social practices and locally meaningful social categories in Camborne-Redruth.

My ethnography included working as an examinations invigilator at a local school, attending local sports fixtures, working in Redruth’s libraries, frequenting various local shops, pubs, and cafes, and community events such as St. Piran’s, Murdoch, and Trevithick days. In addition, I liked and followed a large number of Cornish pages on online social networks Facebook and Twitter. These varied from discussion groups, to comedy pages, to local news outlets. I spent a great deal of time reading posts and comments on the posts from the pages that I followed on social media. This exposed me to a wide range of views on local issues. Thus, I was able to observe the community both offline and online (cf. Ilbury 2019). By integrating myself

---

48 These networks were diverse for Camborne-Redruth. For example, though they were mostly white, this is largely representative of the ethnic profile of the Camborne-Redruth community (see Section 3.2.2).

49 St. Piran is the patron saint of Cornwall

50 A celebration annually held in Redruth in honour of William Murdoch (1754–1839) who is believed to be the first Briton to construct and use a steam-powered road vehicle in 1784.

51 A celebration annually held in Camborne in honour of Richard Trevithick (1771–1833), who build the first steam railway locomotive in 1804.

52 Redruth’s St. Piran’s celebrations were cancelled during the ethnographic research due to adverse weather. However, I did manage to attend celebrations in Truro and at the Institute of Cornish Studies in Penryn.

53 The online mode of the ethnography continued after the offline ethnography finished, until August 2020.
into these social contexts, I was able to participate in social and occupational settings and simultaneously observe Anglo-Cornish dialect usage.

Due to Cornwall’s duality of place as a Celtic nation and as a county of England (see Deacon 2007a), there are aspects of Cornish life that are typical of British culture, and others that are very much unique (see Deacon 2009). Although many researchers may have focused on uniquely Cornish social practices, my ethnography involved immersion in a broad spectrum of life in Cornwall. I explored the social, cultural, and linguistic practices of the Camborne-Redruth community irrespective of whether or not these practices were distinctly ‘Cornish’ practices.

Individually, each of the contexts in which I conducted ethnographic participant-observation represents a minute sub-section of the Camborne-Redruth community. Yet, together, they are the community. Indeed, the meaning and significance of social practice is co-constitutive between micro- and macro-levels of societal structure. Through ethnographic observation, it quickly became apparent that within the Camborne-Redruth community, key emic divisions within society are a result of ideological differences pertaining to Cornish identity (see Chapter 6). I observed the community through an idiosyncratic lens, a lens that is influenced by the fact that I, as opposed to another, conducted this research. As a result, I must reflect on my positionality to this research.
Positionality in any research is important, even more so in ethnographies (see Wilson 2001: 334). Any ethnographer must disclose the biases which may have affected their findings as it is conceivable that if another individual conducted the same ethnographic methodology, they would report different experiences than the ones which I encountered. By accounting for this positionality, I can present a reflexive ethnography, one that is accountable to potential biases, and ultimately, recognise and address the distorting effects that these may have.

It is important to note that I was born and raised by Cornish parents in Cornwall. This fact is fundamental to the extent to which my ethnography can claim to be penetrative, reflective, and accurate. Indeed, Kiesling (2009: 267–8) suggests that narratives are at their most powerful when both speaker and hearer make use of exophoric, that is, language external, context through shared and unspoked discourses. My Cornish status facilitated conversational topics that may not have been elicited from an ‘outsider’, such as when participants framed ‘outsiders’ negatively (see Chapters 6 & 7). This is because ‘positionality is relational [...] the construction of identity acquires meaning in relation to the identities of other people’ (Stamou 2018: 574). Indeed, in my interactions with participants, shared experiences of the local community, shared oral histories, and mutually accepted axioms, facilitated open, unguarded, and candid interactions.

This research is part of a long tradition of sociolinguists returning home to conduct research on the community in which they are from (Trudgill 1974; Britain
1997; Reed 2016; Dann 2019). Such studies do not begin from a standing start but can be dynamic and in-depth from the outset due to the researcher’s existing lived-in experience of the community. Sociolinguistic research that employs the participant-observation approach attempts to acquire a knowledge of the community that can allow them to develop a more insightful interpretation of locally meaningful interpretations of data. Even by employing ethnographic methods, an ‘outsider’ may struggle to fully appreciate the socio-cultural landscape of a community to the same extent as a member of the community.

My awareness of locally-meaningful social divisions is on-par with any other member of the Camborne-Redruth community, *ceteris paribus*. Briggs (1986: 3) suggests that the level of dissimilarity between the linguistic norms of the interviewer and the interviewee is inversely correlated with the success of the interview. As a result of my being Cornish, when compared to ‘outsiders’, I am closer to understanding the community and the role that language plays in negotiating meaning within the community. This is particularly pertinent in Cornwall where some members of the community are suspicious of incomers (see Chapter 6).

Conducting research ‘at home’ is not exclusively advantageous. There are also some disadvantages to such an approach. For example, with such an emotional attachment to one’s locale, objectivity may be compromised. Also, some meta-commentary from participants may be implicit. For example, an informant may not necessarily feel the need to fully articulate something that they believe to be self-evident to a member of the local community. As such, some information may not be explicit in an interview between two Cornish interlocutors, given Horn’s (1984, 2004)
'R principle'. However, the alternative, to be disinterested in the community under observation, is likely to inhibit the elicitation of natural language, as the speakers may be reluctant to use vernacular forms with an ‘outsider’.

Being Cornish allowed me to develop an insider-insider relationship with participants whereby community-specific norms are generally deemed to be appropriate. I grew-up in Redruth and went to the local comprehensive school before leaving for University in 2012. This enabled me to collect data as a participant observer, which greatly benefited the ethnographic analysis by already possessing a knowledge of the emic social divisions present within the community. However, some people may question my credentials as a Cornishman, as my role within the community has been peripheral, particularly in my adulthood. Although I grew up in Redruth and went to the local comprehensive school, I moved away to University at the age of 18 and speak in an approximately Standard Southern British English dialect. According to the social class metric employed in this thesis (see Section 4.5.3), I am middle-class, with one working-class and one middle-class parent.

When I was growing up in Redruth, many of the social networks and communities of practice, such as a rugby team, were of a similar demographic composition to myself, such as young and male. These network ties and associated social practices undoubtedly influenced my experiences of Cornwall. My personal experiences are, at least to some extent, responsible for my perceptions of Cornwall. These idiosyncrasies necessarily make my ethnography of Camborne-Redruth subjective. Although subjectivity is ineradicable in an ethnography (Rampton et al. 54 ‘Say no more than you must, (given Q)’, where the Q-principle states that ‘say as much as you can, (given R)’, where Q stands for ‘quantity’ and R stands for ‘relation’.
2015), I attempted to account for the biases of my personal experiences and took steps to immerse myself in various communities of practice that I would not have otherwise experienced. This involved often being in rooms where I was the youngest person by decades, such as the ‘Redruth Revival’ St. Piran’s day planning committee. This was necessary as such groups are as reflective of Cornish life as the networks with which I habitually engage.

On the one hand, I am a member of the community, which makes me an ‘insider’. On the other hand, I am not so deeply embedded in the community that I am unable to objectively and, at times, disinterestedly observe the community and its social practices and cultural norms. I believe that this enables me to combine the advantages of being an insider with the advantages of being an outsider.

The ethnographic method described in Section 4.1 enabled me to develop an understanding of the rhythm of the community, that is, the day-to-day experiences, ranging from the banal to the more remarkable. Next, I state my definitions for onomasiological (see Section 4.2.1.1) and semasiological (see Section 4.2.2.1) variables and reflect on the methods that have been used to study lexical variation from the perspectives of onomasiology (Section 4.2.1.1) and semasiology (Section 4.2.2.2).

4.2. Approaches to lexical variation

In addition to ethnographic participant-observation, to investigate my research questions (see Section 1.1), I conducted interviews with 87 participants in order to explore the social and stylistic variation, as well as the social meanings, of Anglo-
Cornish dialect lexis (see Section 4.4). However, the extent to which lexical variables can be considered to be sociolinguistic variables is contentious (see Lavandera 1978; Labov 1978; Johnson 1996; Robinson 2010a). The traditional notion of a sociolinguistic variable (see Labov 1972a) cannot be extrapolated to lexical variation without some theoretical refinement. Definitions of a sociolinguistic variable include ‘two or more ways of saying the same thing’ (Tagliamonte 2012: 2) and ‘linguistically equivalent but socially different ways of saying something’ (Coates 1993: 67). While these definitions are suitable for phonetic, phonological, and, to a lesser-extent, morpho-syntactic variables, this definition is problematic for a study of lexis. In this section I outline the way in which I determined the scope of onomasiological (Section 4.2.1.1) and semasiological (Section 4.2.2.1) variation in this study.

Methodologically, the variationist sociolinguistic paradigm has the capacity to investigate a wide range of variable aspects of language, such as morpho-syntax (Wolfram 1969; Sankoff 1973; Cheshire 1982a, b, 2005), discourse (Dines 1980; Coupland 1983; Garner 2007), and the quotative system (Tagliamonte & D’Arcy 2007, 2009; Buchstaller 2006; Buchstaller et al. 2010), as well as sociophonetics (e.g. Foulkes & Docherty 2006; Evans & Iverson 2007; for review, see Foulkes et al. 2010). Yet, there are theoretical and methodological challenges which any sociolinguistic investigation of lexis must overcome (see Labov 1973: 340). I review the methodologies that have hitherto been used in the study of onomasiological (Section 4.2.1.2) and semasiological (Section 4.2.2.2) variation and reflect on their suitability for this project, particularly in light of my research questions (see Section 1.1.) and the definitions of onomasiological and semasiological variables as stated in Sections 4.2.1.1 and 4.2.2.1.
4.2.1. Approaches to onomasiology

In this section I detail two key foundations to the study of onomasiological variation from the perspective of sociolinguistics. Firstly, I define the onomasiological variable in Section 4.2.1.1. In light of this definition, I review the suitability of methodologies which have hitherto been used to study onomasiological (Section 4.2.2.2).

4.2.1.1. Defining the onomasiological variable

Defining the context of a variable is challenging for the study of onomasiological variation. This is because it is not likely that any two words share semantic and social meanings to the extent that they are absolute synonyms. For example, Labov (1978: 13) states that ‘there are no true synonyms, in an absolute sense’ (see also Cruse 1986; Jackson 1988; Murphy 2013; Fellbaum 2015).

A difficulty in determining semantic equivalence between onomasiological forms has inhibited the variationist paradigm’s capacity to account for lexical variation (Grondelaers & Geeraerts 2003: 78; Peirman, Geeraerts & Speelman 2010: 473; Beeching 2011: 30). In naturally occurring speech, semantic and social sources of variability may become difficult to isolate. Beeching (2011: 30) notes that ‘lexical variants, unlike phonological variants and some morphological ones, are frequently said not to be semantically equivalent and thus are not ‘variant forms’ of a given
variable’ (see also Llamas 2001: 71–72, Eckert 2019: 757). Thus, this makes it difficult to satisfy Labov’s (1972a: 72) Principle of Accountability which states that one should not only be concerned with where a variant occurs, one must also investigate where it could have, but did not occur.\footnote{Labov (1972a: 72) defines the principle as ‘we will report values for every case where the variable element occurs in the relevant environment as we have defined them’.} Without semantic equivalence, it is challenging to identify where a variant could have but did not occur. For example, did a speaker use a lexical variant over another due to sociolinguistic or pragmatic reasons, or because one variant does not satisfy the truth conditions of a proposition?

Much of the existing research on the social variation of lexical variables has relied on an intuitive notion of synonymy, without explicit discussion of the degree of semantic similarity required (e.g. Llamas 1999; Boberg 2004a; Beeching 2011; Nagy 2011; Beal & Burbano-Elizondo 2012). Yet, as Grondelaers & Geeraerts (2003: 78) observe:

> An indispensable tool for any linguist [...] who wishes to undertake the hazardous enterprise of studying [...] lexical variation is a theoretical framework in which distinct types of semantic and non-semantic variation are minutely identified, distinguished, and disentangled.

In the pursuit of a theoretical framework of the type called for by Grondelaers & Geeraerts (2003: 78), I propose a semantic relationship between variants which serve as the theoretical basis for onomasiological variables in this study. In order to constrain potential semantic variation, I propose that onomasiological variables should be consistent with the principle of accountability (Labov 1972a) and satisfy two
Onomasiological Variable Constraints (OVCs). The OVCs state that an onomasiological variable consists of two or more lexical items which:

1) Could occur without changing the truth conditions of an utterance when substituted for one another

2) May vary in social or stylistic meaning

I consider lexical items used in constructions to be comparable if they maintain functional equivalence (see also Dines 1980). For example, the OVCs consider tourist and holiday-makers in the constructions ‘those people are tourists’ and ‘they are holiday-makers’ to be comparable due to a functional equivalence in meaning. Both tourist and holiday-maker could occur in either construction, cf. ‘those people are holiday-makers’ and ‘they are tourists’, are both viable alternatives and do not change the truth conditions of the construction when substituted for one another.56 As a result, in the example given, tourist and holiday-maker can be considered to be variants of an onomasiological variable, TOURIST. Complex predicates, such as light verb constructions, and simplex predicates can also be functionally equivalent, and, thus, comparable. For example, the constructions ‘she is taking a walk’ and ‘she is walking’ are comparable under the OVCs and can be considered to contain realisations of the same variable, WALK.

A major point of departure from existing work on lexical variation, particularly ‘onomasiological profiles’ (e.g. Grondelaers & Geeraerts 2003; Zenner, Speelman & Geeraerts 2012), is that OVCs also explicitly license some hyponymic relations (see also

56 Assuming it is true that the referents are tourists and that the referents are holiday-makers.
Johnson 1996). This is not inconsistent with the OVCs as long as the context of use permits the use of the narrower hyponym. In such a context, either the hyponym or the hypernym could occur. For example, the Anglo-Cornish dialect term *emmet* ‘tourist’ requires all of the semantic content of the Standard English label *tourist* with the additional requirement that the referent is, has been, or will be in Cornwall and is not Cornish. Thus, the set of things referred to by the lexical item *emmet* is a subset of the set of things in the *tourist* set. That is, all emmets are tourists but not all tourists are emmets. Consequently, we can conceive of a sentence in which the substitution of the semantically restricted term *emmet* for the superordinate term *tourist* can change the truth conditions of a sentence, but not vice-versa. Thus, there is unilateral entailment between these lexical items. This can be seen by substitution tests in (1) and (2):

1a) The tourists are from Redruth

1b) #The emmets are from Redruth

(2a) The emmets are from London

(2b) The tourists are from London

Free of context, such semantic relationships between lexical items are hyponymous, but in an experimentally controlled environment (see Section 4.5.1 & 4.5.2), we can be sure that such variants are, functionally, if not precisely semantically, equivalent (cf. Dines 1980; Johnson 1996). Similarly, the OVCs conceive of two words with only minimal semantic overlap as being variants of an onomasiological variable as long as it
is evident from the context that both forms could occur. Experimental methodologies can manipulate the target concept to ensure that multiple variants of an onomasiological variable could apply in a given context (cf. Singler 2001).

The variants of onomasiological variables are contextually and temporally specific. The precise and sometimes ephemeral contextual environment in which a variable is elicited determines the composition of variants of an onomasiological variable. For example, if the target concept is CRIMSON then crimson and red are variants of the same onomasiological variable. However, red may be a part of another onomasiological variable that also contains the variant scarlet. In which case, crimson cannot be a variant of that onomasiological variable as the co-hyponyms crimson and scarlet entail mutually exclusive referential targets. Thus, onomasiological variables are defined in reaction to specific contextual environments.

The OVCs require particular semantic relations between variants of an onomasiological variable. By holding the semantic dimension constant, the OVCs requires no theoretical departure from Labov’s (1972a: 271) conceptualisation of a sociolinguistic variable, which requires the option of saying “the same thing” in several different ways: that is, the variants are identical in referential or truth value, but opposed in their social and/or stylistic significance’. The foundations set out in the current section provide the theoretical context within which onomasiologically-oriented methodologies can be developed. I evaluate methods to elicit onomasiological variation in relation to the principle of accountability and the OVCs in Section 4.2.1.2.
Early studies of lexis from the perspective of onomasiology were structuralist in nature (e.g. Lyons 1963; also Trier 1931, cited in Lyons 1963). In light of this, studies of onomasiology tended to focus on the structure of relationships between lexical forms. An example of this is lexical fields. This approach enabled linguistics to determine paradigmatic relationship between lexical items. Methodologically, many lexical fields have been created using linguists’ intuition, based on their knowledge of the investigated language (for discussion, see Clark 2015: 29). Other lexical fields were constructed on the basis of data from dictionary entries (e.g. Sylvester 1994). While this approach enabled structuralist semanticists to map the relations between lexical items, this is not a viable method for this particular study as this approach does not easily lend itself to studying lexical variation and change within a community.

In this section, I consider methodological approaches to onomasiology which can provide insights into onomasiological usage from the perspective of variation and change. These include questioning, interviews, corpora, and conversational speech. In Section 4.4.1.1, I consider an alternative, seldom used approach to the study of onomasiological variation and change, that of task-oriented elicitation procedures.

Many studies have used questioning to elicit lexical data. Often, this takes the form of a questionnaire. Traditional dialectology employed questionnaires as a means to elicit the data from which dialect maps were created. Using a single term, questionnaire, may imply a methodological homogeneity. However, many different
types of questionnaire have been employed to study linguistic variation, including
onomasiological variation. Wenker’s (1881, cited in Chambers & Trudgill 1998)
Sprachatlas employed a ‘postal questionnaire’ which was sent to school masters in
Germany. The postal questionnaire’s consisted of translation tasks. Wenker instructed
the school masters to translate 40 standard German sentences into their local
vernacular. More recently, postal questionnaires have also been used to elicit
onomasiological variation by Chambers (1994), Boberg (2004b), and Dollinger (2012).

Other studies have made use of fieldworkers to collect lexical data from
participants through questionnaires (e.g. Osser & Endler 1970; Labov 1972d; Trudgill
1974; Johnson 1993, 1996; Alimoradian 2014; McColl Millar et al. 2014; LaFond &
Moffett 2020). For example, Trudgill (1974: 195) asked participants ‘[a] few questions
about some Norwich or Norfolk words’ which included, for example:

1. (i) Do you know what a dwile is?
   (ii) Have you ever heard anybody say this word?
   (iii) Do you ever use it yourself?

2. What do you call that stuff you can buy on the fish stalls on the market and
   fry up for your tea – it’s fish eggs really, some of it hard, some of it soft?

3. Do you know any other local words?

Studies which make use of fieldworkers typically involve spoken, as opposed to
written, responses. An early example of this is Gillieron, who employed a fieldworker,
Edmond Edmont, to conduct a survey for the Atlas linguistique de France (Gillieron
rural villages in order to document and preserve dialect variation which was perceived
to be obsolescing. The *Survey of English Dialects* (Orton & Dieth 1962–1971) employed nine fieldworkers to interview participants in 313 locations. A single elicitation technique was not sufficient for the range of variables studied by the SED (see also Simmelbauer 2000). For example, while visualisable concepts can be elicited by naming a picture, this is not suitable for concepts which cannot be visualised. As a result, the SED questionnaire included a variety of prompts, as outlined in Table 4.1. The reverse question format is used to elicit semasiological forms while the other question structures in Table 4.1 are concerned with onomasiology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of technique</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naming</td>
<td>What do you call this (point to/show picture of concept)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>What can you make with milk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse</td>
<td>What do you mean by broth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing</td>
<td>If Jack is not single, he must be ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converting</td>
<td>When I have an apple I ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yesterday I had an apple and I ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whenever I have had an apple, I have ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The task which most directly elicits onomasiological variants in Table 4.3 is the naming task. The naming task can ensure that the target referent is identical for each speaker, thus ensuring that variation in the elicited data is not due to conceptual or semantic differences. This satisfies the OVCs stated in Section 4.2.1.1. However, each of the tasks in Table 4.3 elicit lexical variation in a careful speech style, that is, with a high degree of attention-to-speech. Similarly, more recent dialect surveys which have distributed their questionnaires online (LaFond & Moffett 2020) and through smartphone apps (Leeman et al. 2016) also rely on direct questions. The high-levels of attention-to-speech which is required in the tasks described so far in this section are at
odds with a key methodological goal of variationist sociolinguistics, to access the ‘vernacular’ (Tagliamonte 2006: 8). The vernacular is considered to be the style in which language is thought to be at its most systematic (Labov 1972a: 208).

The need for an onomasiological elicitation procedure to elicit casual speech was recognised by Llamas (1999). In order to fill this methodological gap, Llamas (1999, see also Asprey 2007; Burbano-Elizondo 2008; Clark & Asprey 2013; Braber 2015, 2018) devised an elicitation task known as a Sense Relation Network (SRN, see Figure 4.1).

Building on the notion that the lexicon is structured as a ‘web of words’ (see Aitchison 1997: 61), participants are presented with standard English lexical forms and encouraged to provide ‘dialectal partial synonyms’ (Llamas 1999: 98). As this phrasing suggests, SRNs do not ensure a close degree of semantic equivalence between the

![Figure 4.1 Part of the ‘Outside World’ SRN (Llamas 1999: 101)](image)

...
standard and local dialect words. Thus, the extent to which the responses can be considered to be variant forms of a given variable is problematic. An advantage of SRNs is that the fieldworker can engage in meta-linguistic discussions regarding the local dialect words provide by the participants. However, it is not clear that SRNs make a distinction between the lexical items that the speaker simply knows and the lexical items that the informant actually uses (see also Clark & Asprey 2013: 119). While SRNs can be used to explore regional variation, including variation between mining communities (Braber 2018), it is unclear to what extent SRNs can be claimed to study lexical usage within a community from the perspective of inter-speaker variation.

Relying on self-reported, introspective data is a contentious methodological practice with regard to the extent to which introspective usage is consistent with actual usage (e.g. Trudgill 1974). While introspection is necessary for questionnaires, Labov (1996) and Britain (2014) argue that lexical introspection is not necessarily representative of typical usage. Labov (1996) sought to test this by comparing introspective and elicited data pertaining to ‘last’ or ‘leave-taking’ utterances. Participants were asked which construction they use to signal their leave, such as goodbye, seeya etc. The responses were compared with what the participant said in order to signal taking their leave from the researcher at the end of the interview. Figure 4.2 demonstrates differences between the variants that Labov’s (1996) participants thought that they used and they variants that they actually used.

---

57 It may be possible to clarify this through meta-linguistic discussions, but participants’ perception of their own usage is known to be unreliable (see Trudgill 1984; Labov 1996).
Whereas the majority of speakers in Labov’s (1996) sample believed that see you (later) was their most frequent variant of a leave-taking utterance variable, observed data indicate that bye bye was the most common variant. This suggests that self-reporting of lexical usage may not be reliable. While introspective questioning may be a suitable method to answer a variety of research questions, it is not a substitute for actual usage in the context of answering usage-based research questions. As Geeraerts (2006: 29) states, ‘you cannot have a usage-based linguistics unless you study actual usage’ (for discussion, see Geeraerts 1999, 2006; see also Alimoradian 2014). Similarly, Labov (1972c: 196) states that in self-evaluation tests, speakers tend to report that they use a form that has ‘prestige or is ‘correct’, rather than the form

---

58 However, it is not clear to what extent this finding is influenced by the context of the interactions in which the data were observed. See you (later) may be more likely to be used with people with whom one has plans to see in the future as opposed to a fieldworker.
that they actually use [...] this kind of test data cannot be interpreted without data on the subjects’ actual speech patterns’. Milroy & Gordon (2008: 211) suggest that, if used, self-reporting data should be used judiciously, in conjunction with observed usage.

Another approach that has been used to study onomasiological variation and change is corpus methods. Corpora are seen to be a particularly felicitous data resource to analyse trends in lexical variation and change (e.g. Ito & Tagliamonte 2003; Peirsman, Heylen & Geeraerts 2010; Peirsman, Geeraerts, & Speelman 2010; Szmrecsanyi 2010; Tagliamonte & Brooke 2014; Peirsman et al. 2015 Tagliamonte & Pabst 2020). There are certainly advantages to corpus-based approaches in order to answer large-scale usage-based linguistic research questions. For example, corpora provide a vast amount of linguistic, including lexical data. Thus, it can be argued that ‘big-data’ corpora are as close to a representative sample of language in general as it is possible to get (Heylen et al. 2008: 101–2). Also, it has been argued that the type of linguistic data which constitute spoken corpora are more natural than those which can be obtained by sociolinguistic interviews or elicitation procedures due to the lack of inhibitive effects of the observer’s paradox (Heylen et al. 2008: 101).

Another advantage of corpora is that they allow one to adopt a deeper historical perspective on linguistic change than can be achieved by using the apparent-time construct in variationist sociolinguistics. By using corpora, at least those with a relatively large historical range, one can view linguistic changes in a much broader historical context than is the case in apparent-time studies (see Baker 2010). This has the advantage of providing evidence of linguistic usage from multiple diachronic
intervals (e.g. Beeching 2011), as opposed to making historical inferences from a synchronic data set and using speakers’ age as a surrogate for real-time.

A limitation of the application of corpus methods to variationist sociolinguistic research is that a corpus analyst cannot determine the language external context of an extract of corpus data. While some corpora are able to identify the register or genre of speech (e.g. McEnery & Xiao 2004), it is difficult to identify extralinguistic information. For example, where the word home is used, it may be difficult to determine which other forms could have occurred, such as house, caravan, or log-cabin.59 While collocation can be used to provide insight into semantic similarity of lexical items and the likelihood of particular forms occurring (e.g. Ruette 2012; Ruette et al. 2016), the issue of comparability between synonymous lexical items remains a limitation of corpus-driven studies of onomasiological variation. As such, corpus methods appear to violate Labov’s (1969, 1972a) principle of accountability (for discussion, see Tottie 2015: 44–45; Tagliamonte & Pabst 2020) and the OVCs. Additionally, there is not currently a corpus of linguistic usage in Cornwall. Thus, issues of semantic equivalence notwithstanding, there is no suitable corpus to answer my research questions, as stated in Section 1.1.

Conversational speech has been widely used as a means to collect data in sociolinguistic research (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974; Cheshire 1982a; Milroy & Milroy 1985; Eckert 1989, 2000). While interviews have been shown to be successful to elicit sociolinguistic variables, particularly phonological and morpho-syntactic variables, some studies have also used interviews to investigate lexical variation.

59 An identification of suitable lexical alternatives can be achieved probabilistically, but not definitively.
Interviews have been used to investigate quantitative patterns of onomasiological variation (e.g. Abdel-Jawad 1981; Macaulay 2005; Beal & Burbano-Elizondo 2012; Tagliamonte & Brooke 2014; Jankowski & Tagliamonte 2019; Beaman forthcoming) as well as social meaning (e.g. Bakht 2010).\textsuperscript{60} Vine (1999) used an interview technique to investigate the social perception of American English lexis in a New Zealand community.

A limitation of the use of interviews to investigate lexical variation is the extent to which a sufficient number of tokens of lexical variables can be elicited from a natural conversation (see Llamas 2001: 71; McColl Millar et al. 2014). In natural speech, variants of lexical variables are typically infrequent (Lodge 2004: 228). For example, in a study of words used for meal times using pre-existing interview data from the Ontario Dialects Project, Jankowski & Tagliamonte (2019) found that thirty-two percent of participants did not use a token of the investigated variables. If, in an interview context, a researcher wishes to stimulate the use of particular lexical variables from a participant, they would need to direct the discourse into particular semantic/ thematic domains. When the focus is on the lexicalisation of concepts, as is the case for onomasiologically-oriented studies, there are domains of discourse in which particular concepts are more likely to appear than others. For example, if one is interested in the name for SUBTERRANEAN TRANSPORT, such as subway or underground, it is much more fruitful to direct conversation toward city living and transport as opposed to woodland creatures. In light of this, in order to investigate the

\textsuperscript{60} Some of these studies used conversational data to develop a corpus, hence some of the studies overlap with those cited in the review of corpus methods in studies of onomasiological variation and change.
lexical realisations of pre-selected concepts in the context of an interview, the conversation cannot avoid being somewhat artificial and disjointed due to the fieldworker’s recurrent need to topic-shift in order to attempt to elicit a token for a particular concept. According to Labov’s (1984) guidelines for conducting sociolinguistic interviews, an interview with such a need for interviewer-induced topic shift is not likely to result in a successful sociolinguistic interview.

Another similar methodology that has been used to study the social meaning of lexis is free conversation, typically without the direct involvement of a fieldworker. This method is typically applied to very frequent lexical items, unlike the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants investigated in this study (see Section 4.3). For example, to study the use of *dude*, Kiesling (2004) recorded speech between males in an American college fraternity, Bucholtz (2009) recorded interactions between Mexico and studied their use of *güey* ‘dude’, and Snell (2017) recorded the speech between primary school students in North-East England to investigate the use of *howay*. Similarly, Cotter & Valentínsson (2018) investigated the use of speciality coffee lexis at coffee-tasting events. Acton & Potts (2014) studied Sarah Palin’s use of demonstrative determiners in television interviews. Beaton & Washington (2015) also demonstrated that the social meaning of lexis can be studied by analysing online conversations, such as in discussions, including meta-linguistic discussions, on *YouTube* and blog posts. These studies can all be described as ‘third-wave’ variationist sociolinguistic studies as they were primarily concerned with how lexis was used to establish particular stances and social identities through the indexical meanings of the investigated words. An exception to this is Smith & Durham (2019), who recorded interactions between
parents and caregivers and compared the distribution of local lexical variants and compared the distribution of local forms.

While data from conversational speech may be sufficient to observe the social meaning of lexis, this method is not consistent with the principle of accountability as it is difficult, if not impossible, to identify where a lexical item could have, but did not occur, in natural speech (see Llamas 2001; Bahkt 2010; Beeching 2011). Due to the difficulty in identifying where a variant did not but could have occurred, this method is not consistent with the principle of accountability or the OVCs. Moreover, save for very high frequency words, it is not likely that a sufficient number of tokens of particular onomasiological variables would be observed in free conservation, thus making statistical comparisons challenging.

Questioning, corpora, and conversational data can be used to answer a wide-range of research questions. However, I suggest that none of these methods satisfy the need for an unmonitored, casual speech style while simultaneously controlling for the context in such a way that is consistent with the OVCs and the principle of accountability. Thus, I must consider alternative onomasiological data collection methods. One potential solution is to use a task-oriented methodology.

4.4.1.1.1. Task-oriented methods

Task-oriented methodologies have been employed in attempts to control for utterance targets in a way that also facilitates a casual speech style. These include silent-film narration (Chafe 1980), map-tasks (Brown et al. 1984; Anderson et al. 1991), the
‘holiday tree decorating task’ (Ito & Speer 2006), the ‘time-telling task’ (Bock et al. 2003), picture-book narration (Troiani et al. 2008; Nagy 2011), and partially scripted games (Speer et al. 2011). These methods share the requirement that the participant completes an ostensibly non-linguistic task, yet the completion of that task, requires linguistic data to be produced. For example, in Ito & Speer’s (2006) holiday tree decorating task, participants gave instructions to another participant (a confederate) regarding the decoration of a holiday tree, which they aimed to make identical to a tree that they could see on a computer monitor. In doing so, participants produced linguistic data which were syntactically, pragmatically, and lexically comparable.

Seldom have such studies been used to study onomasiological variation. An exception to this is Nagy (2011) who used picture-book narration to explore lexical borrowings in Italy (for a discussion of findings, see Section 2.2.1). In the picture-book narration task, participants see a series of pictures and are asked to provide an accompanying narrative to describe the events depicted in the images. Stamp et al. (2016) used spot-the-difference tasks (see Figure 4.3) to explore lexical variation in British Sign Language.

Figure 4.3 A spot-the-difference tasks used by Stamp et al. (2016), adapted from Baker & Hazan’s (2011) ‘Diapix’ tasks
From an onomasiological perspective, there are many advantages to using task-oriented elicitation procedures. The conceptual cues, such as a picture, trigger the elicitation of onomasiological variants and ensures a degree of semantic equivalence between different speakers who complete the same task. This is because the underlying conceptual stimulus is identical for all speakers, making the elicited lexical items formally comparable. This ensures that the semantic dimension of meaning is held constant, allowing one to isolate, and, ultimately, investigate, the social and stylistic variation of lexical usage. Another advantage of task-oriented elicitation procedures is that in these tasks, the primary focus of the participants’ attention is on the completion of a task. Thus, the speakers’ attention is not on language, but task-completion. As a result, these methods can be considered to elicit a relatively casual speech style. In light of these reasons, and the successful trial in a pilot-study (Sandow & Robinson 2018; Sandow 2020), in this study, I use spot-the-difference tasks to elicit onomasiological tokens in a casual speech style (see Section 4.4.1).

4.2.2. Approaches to semasiology

In parallel with onomasiology, before any study of semasiological variation can be undertaken, it is first necessary to define the semasiological variable (Section 4.2.2.1) and to consider a range of methodological approaches (Section 4.2.2.2).
Semasiological variation is one level of language in which variation cannot be considered to be ‘different ways of saying the same thing’, as per the traditional definition of the sociolinguistic variable. However, Weiner & Labov (1983: 31) state that ‘[t]here is no reason to confine the study of variation to alternative ways of saying the same thing’. In this study, I follow Robinson’s (2010a: 67–69) definition of a semasiological variable, that is, a semasiological variable ‘is understood as a lexeme which can be realised in different senses’ (p. 69).\footnote{It is important that this is limited to a single lexeme, thus not extending the notion of a variable to homophonous words.} In this framework, the variable is the polysemous word, such as \textit{gay}, and the variants are the word’s senses, such as ‘happy’, ‘homosexual’, and ‘lame’. This definition of the semasiological variable enables one to explore ‘the same way of saying different things’ (Robinson 2010a: 275).

A key point of difference between this definition and traditional sociolinguistic variables is that an increase in frequency in use of one semasiological variant does not entail a decrease in frequency of another. For example, although an increase in h-dropping entails a decrease fully realised /h/, the increase of \textit{wicked} ‘cool’ does not entail a decrease in the use of \textit{wicked} ‘evil’.\footnote{Although it may be the case that an increase in frequency of one semasiological variant does lead to a decrease in another, this is not necessary.} However, under experimental conditions can create such a context where an increase in the usage of one variant does
necessarily lead to the decrease in the usage of an alternative variant (see Section 4.2.2.2).

4.2.2.2. Methods in semasiology

While there is some degree of overlap in relation to onomasiological studies, semasiological studies have typically made use of alternative methodologies. In order to investigate diachronic semasiological change in real-time, corpora and dictionaries have been the most widely used methodological tools. For example, Robinson (2012b: 214–217) used corpus methods to explore real-time semasiological change of the adjective *skinny*. Corpus methods have also been used by Sagi et al. (2012), Grieve et al. (2016), Litty et al. (2016), Shi & Lei (forthcoming) to investigate diachronic semasiological change. Corpus and statistical techniques have also been used to quantify semasiological distance between lexical items (e.g. *Semantic Vector Space Models*, Ruette 2012; Ruette et al. 2016). However, in light of the research questions in this study, corpus methods are not suitable. This is largely because there is no Anglo-Cornish corpus which could be used to study semasiological usage.

Other studies have compared dictionary evidence from diachronic intervals to observe real-time semasiological change (e.g. Menner 1945; Tucker 1972; Allan 2008, 2010; 2012; Robinson 2012a; Fitzmaurice 2017; Litty et al. 2016; cf. Ramson 1966; Labov 1972d; Díaz Vera 2005 who used a similar methodology from an onomasiological perspective). However, these studies seldom take a variationist sociolinguistic approach. Using dictionary data as a primary source of data would
make it difficult to observe the social variation of stable semasiological variants and the socially-conditioned trajectory of semasiological change in progress. Thus, dictionaries are not suitable in order to investigate variation and change of semasiological usage in Cornwall.

Synchronic studies of semasiological variation have typically employed methodologies which involve eliciting senses from participants through direct questioning. For example, the *Survey of Sheffield Usage* (questionnaire reproduced in Robinson 2010a) provided a list of lexical items and instructed informants to ‘define the word as you know it’ (see also Macafee 1994). The SED used the ‘reverse’ elicitation prompt (see Table 4.3) in order to ‘look not for the synonym to one notion, but for a variety of meanings to one word’ (Orton 1962: 45). A limitation of these elicitation procedures is that they are very direct and, consequently, elicit speech in a careful style. Alternatively, Bailey & Durham (forthcoming) used acceptability judgements to track the change in progress of *cheeky*, as it acquires the additional sense of ‘mildly illicit’.

A variationist sociolinguistic framework for investigating variation and change in semasiological usage was developed by Robinson (2010a) who elicited variants through the following method:

Q: Who or what is [ADJ]?
A: [REFERENT]
Q: Why is [REFERENT], [ADJ]?
A: Because it is [RATIONALE].
When this method is applied to a specific semasiological variable, such as *awesome*, this elicitation procedure could take the following form (from Robinson 2010a: 88):

Q: Who or what is *awesome*?
A: The Grand Canyon.
Q: Why is the Grand Canyon *awesome*?
A: Because it takes your breath away.

Using this methodology, Robinson (2010a) found that 85% of variation in meaning of elicited data was conditioned by social factors. However, Robinson (2010a: 279) states that the *who/what* elicitation method ‘cannot be commonly applied to the investigation of all lexical changes […] in order to elicit usage of nouns […] one would have to devise different tasks’. Thus, in light of the semasiological variables that I selected in Section 4.3, which were both nouns, further innovation is required.

4.3. Variable selection

With definitions of onomasiological and semasiological variables now stated, I next detail the six lexical variables, consisting of four onomasiological and two semasiological variables, which I analyse in this thesis. I used a relatively bottom-up method to select variables for this study. Building on the work of Llamas (1999, 2001) and Burbano-Elizondo (2008), I repurposed Sense Relation Networks (SRNs, see Section 4.2.1.2) to serve as an exploratory tool. Nine participants, who were excluded from the rest of the study, completed an SRN (see Appendix 1, a filled-in SRN). I
devised a specific SRN in light of lexis attested in Anglo-Cornish dialect dictionaries (e.g. Jago 1882; Phillips 1993) and my knowledge of lexical usage in Camborne-Redruth. Participants also had the opportunity to provide any other Anglo-Cornish dialect words which were not relevant to the specific prompts in the SRN. The SRNs serve to verify that lexical items identified as being Anglo-Cornish in printed sources (e.g. Jago 1882; Phillips 1993; Wakelin 1986) and by my introspection were consistent with contemporary usage in Camborne-Redruth.

Each of the selected variables have at least one Anglo-Cornish variant. The onomasiological variables are the concepts LUNCH BOX, WALK, WOMAN, and TOURIST, while I consider emmet and maid from the perspective of semasiology. I summarise these onomasiological and semasiological variables and their attested variants in Tables 4.2 and 4.3, respectively. I further detail the selected onomasiological variables in Section 4.3.1 and the selected semasiological variables in Section 4.3.2.

Table 4. 2 The investigated onomasiological variables and their attested variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onomasiological Variable</th>
<th>Variants64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH BOX</td>
<td>lunch box, sandwich box, fruit box, crib box, croust, croust box, croust tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALK</td>
<td>walk, hike, ramble, stroll, stank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>woman, girl, lady, female, maid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 These variants are attested by participants in this study when completing the elicitation tasks described in Section 4.4.
64 Note that the spelling conventions for Anglo-Cornish lexis are not standardised, thus many alternative orthographic representations of the investigated variants exist.
Table 4.3 The investigated semasiological variables and their attested variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semasiological Variables</th>
<th>Variants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emmet</td>
<td>‘ant’, ‘tourist’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maid</td>
<td>‘woman’, ‘female servant or attendant’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1. Onomasiological variables

4.3.1.1. LUNCH BOX

In Cornwall, the concept LUNCH BOX can be lexicalised in a variety of supra-local ways such as lunch box, sandwich box, and fruit box as well as the Anglo-Cornish crib, crib box, croust, croust tin, and croust box. Crib ‘food provisions’ derives from Old English crib(b) ‘manger’ (OED online). Croust ‘food provisions’ derives from the Kernewek word croust ‘snack’ (Wakelin 1984:197), from Old French and Latin crusta, possibly via English (Wakelin 1991: 203).
The SED reports an east/west split in the usage of *crib* and *croust*\(^{65}\) within Cornwall, with Camborne-Redruth situated approximately at the isogloss boundary (see Figure 4.4).\(^{66}\) The OED also reports the use of *crib* in the ‘food provisions’ sense in Australia and New Zealand. Butler (2014) reports that Cornish miners brought the word *crib* with them to Australia during their antipodean migration in the 1850s.

I selected this variable for this study because my pilot study (Sandow & Robinson 2018; Sandow 2020) found that the usage and perception of *crib* and *croust* display generational and ideological variation. I wanted to explore this in more detail in this larger study.

---

\(^{65}\) The SED spells *croust* as *crust*.

\(^{66}\) The SED also reports the use of *crib* in West Devon.
4.3.1.2. WOMAN

From the perspective of onomasiology, the attested variants of WOMAN are woman, girl, female, and lady, as well as the Anglo-Cornish, maid. I selected this variable for this study as it was included in multiple SRN responses, Anglo-Cornish dialect dictionaries, and I was aware that its usage was somewhat controversial (see Section 7.1.3). For a discussion of maid, see Section 4.3.2.1.

4.3.1.3. WALK

The attested variants of WALK in this study are walk, hike, stroll, ramble, and the Anglo-Cornish stank. Stank ‘walk’ is derived from the Kernewek word stankya, which means to ‘trample’ or ‘stamp’. This variable was selected for investigation in this study due to the repeated appearance of the variant stank in SRN responses and Anglo-Cornish dialect dictionaries. From my experience in Cornwall, I suspected stank to be almost obsolete, so I was interested to see if this form was used at all, and if so, when and by whom.

67 This variant corresponds to OED senses 2 (‘[a] girl; a young (unmarried woman’) and 4 (‘[a]n unmarried woman, a spinster, esp. one of mature years’) of maid, but is slightly broader as it typically makes no claim with regard to the referent’s age or marital status.
4.3.1.4. TOURIST

From the perspective of onomasiology, TOURIST has a range of attested onomasiological variants in Cornwall, including tourist, visitor, holiday-maker, people-on-holiday, group-holiday, family-on-holiday, foreigner, and the Anglo-Cornish, emmet. I selected this variable because emmet is, in my experience, one of the most frequently used Anglo-Cornish words, particularly by younger speakers. I was interested to explore why and how Cornish people, particularly younger Cornish people, use and perceive this word and how this relates to attitudes towards Cornish identity. Also, emmet was repeatedly included in SRN responses. For a discussion of emmet, see Section 4.3.2.2.

4.3.2. Semasiological variables

In addition to the onomasiological variables, I investigate two of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants as semasiological variables. Specifically, these are maid (see Section 4.3.2.1) and emmet (see Section 4.3.2.2).

4.3.2.1. Maid

In Cornwall, maid has the senses ‘woman’ and ‘female servant or attendant’. The Anglo-Cornish dialect has maintained the sense of maid ‘woman’ which was first attested by the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) in 1275 but is now labelled as ‘archaic’ and ‘regional’ (OED online). Using data from Ellis (1889, cited in Maguire 2012),
Maguire (2012) finds that *maid* ‘girl’ was used throughout south-west England in the late 19th century (see Figure 4.5). More recently, the BBC Voices project recorded the use of *maid* ‘woman’ in Devon (BBC 2005). Although a relic of an older non-local variety of English and then, and perhaps still, a supra-local variety of south-western English English, *maid* ‘woman’ is a feature of the contemporary Anglo-Cornish dialect, as evidenced by SRN responses, dialect dictionaries, and commodified uses of this sense, such as on clothing (see Section 7.1.3). In addition to *maid* ‘woman’, the semantically narrower and supra-local sense ‘female servant or attendant’ (first attested by the OED in 1300) is also used in Cornwall. Thus, both ‘woman’ and ‘female servant or attendant’ are senses of *maid* used in contemporary Cornwall.

![Figure 4.5 The onomasiological variation of girl from Ellis’ (1889) dialect survey (Maguire 2012: 104)](image)

---

68 This sense is a feature of the Anglo-Cornish regardless of whether or not it is also used in other varieties of south-west English English.
In contemporary Cornwall, the word *emmet* has two senses, ‘ant’ and ‘tourist’. *Emmet* is an archaic English word which means ‘ant’, which has been maintained in the Anglo-Cornish dialect. *Emmet* ‘ant’ was used throughout England and is attested as early as 1300 by the OED. Dr. Johnson’s dictionary of 1755 cited *emmet* as ‘An ant; a pismire’. By the time of Joseph Wright’s (1898–1905) *English Dialect Dictionary*, *emmet* ‘ant’ was in ‘gen. dial. use (in general dialect use) in Sc. Irel. and Eng.’. Wright (1898–1905) goes on to cite examples from Kent, Berkshire, and Yorkshire, as well as Cornwall. By the time of the SED (Orton & Dieth 1962–71), the geographic spread of *emmet* was limited to the South of England (see Figure 4.6). The OED cites this sense as ‘poetic’ or ‘archaic’. This sense, *emmet* ‘ant’ forms a part of the Anglo-Cornish dialect (Phillips 1993: 29).
In the Anglo-Cornish dialect, through a process of metaphorical extension and conventionalisation (see Traugott & Dasher 2002) *emmet* has developed the additional sense of ‘tourist’. The conceptual link between the target domain *TOURISTS* and source domain *ANTS* became established due to the somewhat unfavourable observation that in Cornwall tourists are a nuisance, slightly red (sunburnt), and have a propensity to cluster together, like ants.

*Emmet* ‘tourist’ is a relatively recent addition to the Anglo-Cornish dialect. For example, in Phillips’ (1993: 29) *A Glossary of the Cornish Dialect* the entrance for *emmet* reads ‘ants (and, by a recent extension, crowds of tourists)’. The referents of
emmet ‘tourist’ are limited to tourists in Cornwall. Thus, while tourists in Cornwall may be emmets, tourists in, for example, Brighton, are not. The OED’s first citation for emmet in the ‘tourist’ sense was in 1975 in The Times newspaper. In the 2nd edition of the OED, the usage note for emmet ‘tourist’ reads ‘mildly disparaging’, yet the updated online version reads ‘depreciative or humorous’.

Having identified the variables that I investigate in this thesis, reviewed existing methodologies that have been used to elicit lexical variation, and identified the variables that I investigate in this study, in Section 4.4 I describe the methodological approach that I took in order to collect lexical data.

4.4. The sociolinguistic interviews

In this section I refine and develop methodological techniques which are consistent with the research questions stated in Section 1.1, the definition of onomasiological and semasiological variables stated in Sections 4.2.1.1. & 4.2.2.1, the critique of existing methodological approaches in Sections 4.2.1.2 & 4.2.2.2, and the variables selected for investigation in Section 4.3. I outline a lexis-oriented sociolinguistic interview that I developed in order to investigate the production and perception of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis in Camborne-Redruth. I devised and implemented a five-phase procedure. Table 4.4 displays these five stages and the types of variables that each is designed to elicit. Participants were told that the interview was split into three sections; problem-

---

69 Specifically, the attested usage is in reference to attitudes towards tourism in Cornwall, in which it is reported that Cornish people put up stickers which read ‘Emmits go home’.
solving tasks (spot-the-difference tasks), linguistic tasks (naming-tasks, who/what questions, and lexical recognition task), and a conversation about the Cornish dialect Cornwall and Cornwall more broadly (semi-structured interview).

Table 4.4 The methods used in this study and the levels of language that they are designed to elicit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-method</th>
<th>Types of Variables Investigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Spot-the-difference tasks</td>
<td>Onomasiological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Naming task</td>
<td>Onomasiological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Who/what questions</td>
<td>Semasiological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lexical recognition test and meta-linguistic discussion</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I outline these phases in the following sections. More specifically, I discuss the rationale for choosing each of these phases and detail the way in which they were executed. The ordering of the interview is crucial. Some tasks are very direct and incite considerable consequences of the observer’s paradox. For example, before the naming-tasks (phase two), I tell participants that I am interested in the words that they use (see Section 4.4.2). Therefore, it is important that the naming-task is ordered after the stages which are oriented towards eliciting a more casual speech style, such as the spot-the-different tasks. This is because once the participants are aware that I am interested in word-choice in one task, they may be more likely to pay greater attention to their word-choice in subsequent tasks. The explicit discussion of language use in
stage four is completed at the end of all of the production tasks in order not to prime any linguistic feature.

4.4.1. Spot-the-difference tasks

The first task that participants completed is concerned with eliciting onomasiological variants for the selected concepts, LUNCH BOX, WOMAN, WALK, and TOURIST, in a casual speech style. Building on Diapix tasks (see Van Engen et al. 2010; Baker & Hazan 2011; Stamp et al. 2016), I employ spot-the-difference (henceforth SD) tasks. This methodological procedure has been refined from the use of a very similar procedure in a pilot study (see Sandow & Robinson 2018; Sandow 2020).

Although other methodologies are consistent with the OVCs, I have selected SD tasks due to their controlled, yet expressive, scope for visualisation of concepts. The OVCs serve to ensure that the loci of lexical variation are social and not semantic. In order not to violate the OVCs, there must be as little referential ambiguity as possible in the target concept. For example, if the target concept is CUP, it must be the ‘cuppiest’ cup. Labov (1973) demonstrated that the boundary between cup and bowl is a fuzzy one. However, on either side of the ambiguous cases, there were objects that were non-contentiously cups and those that were clearly bowls. In order to avoid such conceptual ambiguity, in the SD tasks I use prototypical examples of each target concept. I used my intuition, along with the help of a graphic designer, in order to determine central category members and to recreate images which reflect these prototypes.
A more practical consideration was identified by Stamp et al. (2016) who reported instances where participants failed to identify some differences between frames, that is, the two near-identical images. When a speaker fails to identify a concept, such as because they are not able to ‘spot the difference’, they do not provide a token for that particular variable. Thus, in constructing the SD scenes, it must be ensured that the key concepts are not so difficult as to risk non-completion in a reasonable timeframe. While not being too difficult, the task must also be cognitively challenging enough to engage the participant’s focus.

The Diapix (Van Engen et al. 2010) and DiapixUK scenes (Baker & Hazan 2011) are not appropriate methods to investigate the four onomasiological variables which are the focus of this study (see Section 4.3). This is because the images used by Van Engen et al. (2010) and Baker & Hazan (2011) did not include the concepts that I identified as being onomasiologically variable in Camborne-Redruth. As a consequence of the shift in research questions and the concepts under investigation, a shift in the composition of SD scenes is also necessary. As a result, I developed five scenes. Each of the investigated concepts appeared in two scenes.

It is reasonable to assume that most people in the UK have experience with SD tasks. In light of this, it was important not to deviate from general schematic templates. That is, the scenes were designed to be prototypical SD games. The SD tasks used in this study were created in order to visualise the particular onomasiological variables investigated in this thesis (see Section 4.3). The scenes are described as ‘table’ (Figure 4.7), ‘living-room’ (Figure 4.8), ‘beach’ (Figure 4.9), ‘bathroom’ (Figure 4.10), and ‘street’ (Figure 4.11).

70 By Tyler Crewes, a graphic designer from Camborne, Cornwall.
Figure 4.7 The ‘table’ spot-the-difference scene

Figure 4.8 The ‘living-room’ spot-the-difference scene

Figure 4.9 The ‘beach’ spot-the-difference scene
I presented the scenes to the participants on a laptop. I placed the laptop displaying the SD scenes on a surface, usually a table, in front of the speaker, so that only one scene, with two frames, was visible at any one time. The order in which the scenes were presented was random.

Each scene comprises of two frames which are exactly identical with the exception of six pre-selected differences.\textsuperscript{71} The differences between frames can manifest in the form of differences pertaining to 1) colour, 2) location, 3) orientation, 4) 

\textsuperscript{71}I chose six as the number of differences because I felt that this presents the participant with a relatively challenging task while not too challenging so that the participant may lose interest in the task.
presence/absence, or 5) replacement. For example, in the ‘table’ scene (Figure 4.7), the LUNCH BOX is a different colour between the frames, the CLOCK is digital in one frame and analogue in the other, a CUP contrasts with a flask, a NAPKIN varies in colour between frames, the PHONE is a landline in one frame and a mobile in the other, and, lastly, the MONEY is a different denomination, £10 in one frame and £5 in another.

I designed the scenes in such a way that the concepts under investigation were conventional in the context. For example, the concept TOURIST is present in the ‘beach’ scene, not the ‘bathroom’ scene. This was done so that each concept can be situated in a relatively natural context, such as with a cluster of other concepts that one may realistically encounter in everyday life.

In order to limit the vernacular inhibiting effects of the observer’s paradox, participants were told that this section of the interview is concerned with ‘problem solving skills’. In my explanation of the task, the problem-solving element was foregrounded and participants were informed that they were being timed. Participants were told that they would be shown five SD tasks, each of which contained six differences. They were then asked to ‘tell me (the researcher) what the differences are’. The justification for asking participants to verbalise their thought-process was in order to allow me to follow their journey from initial exposure to eventual task completion. In order to increase cognitive pressure, participants were told that they were completing the tasks ‘against the clock’. To make this convincing, I used my watch to monitor the time taken to correctly identify the six differences in each frame. This was done in order to foster a sense of urgency, which should lead to less self-regulation, and therefore, a more natural and unmonitored variety of speech.
The instructions with which speakers were provided did not deviate from typical spot-the-difference schematic templates. Upon being presented with the scenes, participants were told that each task is considered complete on the identification of all six differences. This means that in order to complete each task, it is necessary that they identify each of these differences, and in doing so, they lexicalise them. For example, if they observe a TAXI in one frame but not in the other, when identifying this difference they must refer to the concept by using a lexical item, such as taxi, cab, or taxi-cab. Thus, the speakers’ primary cognitive load is concerned with ensuring successful task-completion. Yet, in order to successfully complete the task, they must name the investigated concepts. In order to prevent speakers’ using deictic references such as this, that, these, or those as well as general vagueness, I positioned the laptop at such an angle that participants were aware that I could not see the screen.72

During the SD tasks, my role as interviewer was limited to some simple back-channelling and encouraging paralinguistic communication, such as smiling and nodding. This is a key point of difference between this study and Van Engen et al. (2010) and Baker & Hazan (2011) who instructed pairs of participants to complete the tasks dialogically.73

Upon completion of the SD tasks, I told participants that the next part of the task would be concerned with their use of language. Next, participants completed a

72 There were a very limited number of cases where participants used a pronoun such as it or that when identifying the differences, such as ‘that is a different colour’, in other cases, groups of people as ‘they’ or ‘the people’. In such cases, I simply asked the participants ‘what is?’ or ‘who is?’ in order to elicit an onomasiological variant.

73 Boyd et al. (2015) found minimal differences between data elicited from monologic and dialogic realisations of the spot-the-difference task.
reading passage\textsuperscript{74} and a word-list. The reading passage and word-list were primarily used as a filler task, in order to limit the recency effects between the casual and careful speech styles. Also, I used these tasks as I may wish to conduct phonological analysis on the collected data in the future. These tasks enable this putative future phonological analysis on the collected data to have a stylistic dimension. However, as this thesis is concerned with variation at the level of lexis, I do not discuss these methods here.

4.4.2. Naming tasks

In order to provide a stylistic contrast to the relatively casual style of the onomasiological data elicited from SD tasks, I elicited tokens of onomasiological variants in a careful speech style through ‘naming tasks’ (cf. Orton 1962; Levine & Crockett 1966; Vine 1999). Participants were shown images of prototypical examples of concepts and asked to complete a sentence such as ‘this is a ….’ or ‘these people are ….’ etc. (see Figures 4.12, 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15). In order to maximise the contrast in attention-to-speech between the SD tasks and the naming-tasks, in the latter, I told participants that in this task I am ‘interested in the words that you use’. This was done in order to shift the participants’ attention towards word use. Thus, the participants’ attention to word-usage is greater for the naming-tasks than the SD tasks. In light of this, relative to the SD tasks, I consider the naming task to elicit a careful speech style.

\textsuperscript{74} A story about a dance competition, adapted from Devlin (2014) to include local place-names.
The images used to depict the investigated concepts in the naming task were identical to those that appeared in the SD tasks. This was important as even subtle differences in input could lead to conceptual variation. For example, if the participant was asked to provide a referent for the concept CUP, very small differences in the design of the object could lead to re-classification as a MUG or BOWL (see Labov 1973). Any variation in the target concept would violate the OVCs. In addition to the four investigated onomasiological variables, WALK (see Figure 4.12), WOMAN (see Figure 4.13), LUNCH BOX (see Figure 4.14), and TOURIST (see Figure 4.15), participants also completed naming tasks for the distractor variables MUG, NAPKIN, TAXI, SICK, TOILET, SOFA, CRIMSON, and VIOLET (colour).

These people are going for a...

Figure 4.12 The naming task stimulus for WALK
This person is a...

Figure 4. 13 The naming task stimulus for WOMAN

This is a...

Figure 4. 14 The naming task stimulus for LUNCH BOX
This method was executed using Microsoft PowerPoint, with one image and incomplete sentence presented per slide. This meant that the speaker’s attention was limited to one target concept at a time. By sandwiching the phonological elicitation procedures (reading passage and word list) between the lexical elicitation procedures, recency effects are lower than if the lexical tasks were temporally adjacent. By doing this, it is likely that the speakers cannot recall their answers from the SD tasks which should reduce lexical priming. I present the onomasiological data elicited from the SD tasks and naming tasks in Sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.

4.4.3. *Who/What* questions

In order to investigate lexical variation and change, the level of semantic meaning must be considered too. To address this, I elicited semasiological data by employing a methodology developed and executed by Robinson (2010a). By asking, ‘who/what is x’
(see Section 4.2.2.2), a participant identifies a referent for a chosen lexical item, y. Participants are then asked ‘why is x, y?’ in order to provide a sense for the polysemous word. This is then followed by asking the participant ‘who or what else is X?’ and then ‘why is x, y?’.

While Robinson (2010a) used three who/what elicitation prompts per semasiological variable, I decreased this to two in order to keep the interview dynamic by not spending a great deal of time on each task. By asking the participants the who/what questions twice, participants had the opportunity to provide two senses of the word under investigation. Participants were asked to provide senses for ten words. Eight of these were adjectives and distractor variables, namely sick, wicked, awesome, hot, gay, cool, fit, and hard. I also investigated semasiological variation of two nouns, namely, emmet and maid (see Section 4.3).

A key point of difference between this study and Robinson (2010a) is that I use this method to explore meaning variation and change in nominal categories, whereas Robinson (2010a) exclusively investigated adjectival categories. Robinson (2010a: 279) stated that alternative tasks would need to be devised in order to elicit usage of nouns (see also Section 4.2.2.2). I suggest that the same who/what prompts can serve to elicit polysemous meanings from nominal categories. However, it is important to acknowledge that when applied to nouns, this method asks the participant to provide a sense in a way that is more direct than when applied to adjectives. For example, speakers are more likely to respond to the who/what questions with an answer that is simultaneously a sense and a referent, such as ‘an ant’ for the emmet variable. When this is the case, the follow-up question, ‘why is x, y’, is redundant.
For some answers, particularly when the referent provided was very specific, the rationale question was necessary for nominal polysemous words. For example, when asked ‘who or what is a maid’ if a participant responded, ‘my wife’, it would not be clear which sense was being used. In such cases, I did use the follow up question, ‘why is your wife a maid?’. However, if the participant responded with a more general sense, such as ‘a person who cleans hotel rooms’, then I did not follow up with the second question. This is because asking a participant ‘why is someone who cleans hotel rooms a maid?’ can be interpreted as a question regarding etymology or something to do with gender roles in domestic labour such as cleaning, which is not my intention. Thus, the follow-up question was employed only when it was necessary to disambiguate the sense being used. I present the semasiological data from participants’ responses to this elicitation procedure in Section 5.3.1.

4.4.4. Lexical recognition task

In addition to onomasiological and semasiological usage, I explored participants’ knowledge of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis. In order to investigate awareness of Anglo-Cornish words and senses, I asked participants to identify Anglo-Cornish dialect words in a four-by-eight grid containing 32 words (see Figure 4.16, cf. Payne 1976; Britain 2009).75

---

75 When talking to participants and in the documentation used in the study, I used the label ‘Cornish dialect’ as opposed to ‘Anglo-Cornish dialect’ which I use in this thesis as the former is the most widely used within the community.
Of the 32 words in the lexical recognition task (see Figure 4.16), thirteen are Anglo-Cornish, fifteen are from other regional dialects (e.g. Sussex, Cumbrian, Geordie, Pittsburghese), and four are nonce words (from Lewis Carroll’s *Jabberwocky*). I selected the Anglo-Cornish words from my knowledge of Anglo-Cornish lexical usage, from consulting Anglo-Cornish dialect dictionaries (e.g. Philips 1993), and SRN responses.

Some of the thirteen Anglo-Cornish words are pan-English forms with specifically Anglo-Cornish senses. For example, *crib* ‘food provisions’, ‘*andsome*
(handsome) ‘good’, maid ‘woman’, and scat ‘knock/hit’ are Anglo-Cornish semasiological alternatives to crib ‘child’s bed’, handsome ‘attractive man’, maid ‘female servant or attendant’, and scat ‘treasure/dung’. Stank ‘(past tense) having an unpleasant smell’ is homophonous with the Anglo-Cornish stank ‘walk’. Alternatively, croust ‘food provisions’, dreckly ‘in the future’, teasy ‘bad-tempered’, splann ‘brilliant’, tuss ‘idiot’, and chacking ‘thirsty/desperate’ are distinctly Anglo-Cornish forms. While emmet ‘ant’ is traditionally pan-English but is now obsolete in Standard English and remains in use in the Anglo-Cornish dialect. Emmet ‘tourist’ sense is distinctly Anglo-Cornish. Thus, in contemporary usage both emmet ‘ant’ and emmet ‘tourist’ can be considered to be Anglo-Cornish. Additionally, proper job is an Anglo-Cornish collocation made up of constituent non-specifically Anglo-Cornish lexical items but its non-compositional meaning ‘excellent’ is distinctly Anglo-Cornish.

This task has an additional function. After each participant had finished identifying Anglo-Cornish words from the table, I engaged them in meta-linguistic discussions relating to each word that they correctly identified as being Anglo-Cornish. Participants’ provided metalinguistic observations and, thus, shared their lived experiences and evaluations of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis. Speakers often discussed additional Anglo-Cornish words and phrases that were not included in the lexical recognition task. Words which were not recognised as being Anglo-Cornish were not explored further. This is because if a participant does not recognise a word, they are not be in a position to provide perceptual information regarding its usage.

This section was semi-structured as each lexical item that was correctly identified as Anglo-Cornish was initially explored by employing the same question; ‘If
you were on the phone with someone you didn’t know and they used $X^{76}$, what sort of characteristics would you associate with that person?’ A dialogue then developed with further questions being asked in response to the participants’ initial responses. Subsequent questions included ‘what kind of people are most likely to use $X$’ and ‘do you think that people are more likely to use $X$ when they are in certain moods?’ The answers to such questions are presented and discussed in Chapter 7. The conversation then progressed in a manner that was free and often tangential to the original question. Thus, each meta-linguistic discussion was different, depending on the responses of the participant. I then began to ask questions about the Anglo-Cornish dialect more generally and eventually transitioned into a semi-structured interview (see Section 4.4.5) which broadened the focus even more to the theme of ‘Cornwall’.

4.4.5. Semi-structured conversation

The next stage of the interview served to explore the perceptions of Cornish identity. With each participant, I initiated a conversation regarding Cornwall and Cornish identity. I began this segment of the interview by asking the participants, ‘in the identity questionnaire$^{77}$ you said that you were [response to statement ‘I am proud to be Cornish’], why is that?’ and then followed this up with ‘when people speak about ‘Cornish identity’, what do they mean?’. I asked further questions in light of their responses to the initial question, such as ‘how do you feel about tourism in Cornwall?’

$^{76}$ Where $X$ is the investigated word.
$^{77}$ See Section 4.5.4 for a discussion of the identity questionnaire.
and ‘do you think Cornwall has changed since you were a child?’ This enabled me to elicit information regarding speakers’ ideological orientation and affective stances towards the local community and those who visit it. Some participants responded to my questions with long narratives while others typically responded with short, more direct, answers. The participants’ comments and observations pertaining to Cornwall and Cornish identity are presented and discussed in Chapter 6.

The conversational element established a rapport between myself, as researcher, and the participant. By developing common-ground, it was possible to relax the participant and create an environment in which relatively open and candid interactions were possible. Areas of mutual interest between myself, as fieldworker, and informant were identified by picking up clues from initial interactions. Frequent topics of mutual interest included local sport, particularly rugby, local history/culture, local shops, miscellaneous anecdotes, and mutual friends. Although the informants were encouraged to topic-shift, I initiated some discourse themes throughout each of the interviews. Particularly, I asked questions with a focus on growing up in Cornwall, Cornish identity, and the status of Cornwall in relation to England and the UK. By making Cornwall a central conversational theme, various aspects of identity and stance in relation to the county are foregrounded for the speaker. The rationale for asking the questions that I did are that I identified key themes of Cornish identity from my ethnographic participant-observation and from interviews with participants in the pilot-study (see Sandow & Robinson 2018).

While I did not consciously style shift towards (or away from) that of my interlocutors cannot guarantee that I did not do so, unconsciously (see Trudgill 1986:}
Solidarity with local issues was established on a more macro-level through discourse topic. As a result, speakers became, if they were not already, aware that I am an active participant in the local community and share in the peripheral Cornish experience (see Chapter 3). In order to prevent any ideological accommodation effect, it is important that the researcher is not partisan with respect to politically or culturally contentious issues (Morgan 2017), such as the effect of tourism on Cornwall. It is difficult to strike a compromise between appearing neutral with respect to key issues and being seen to be engaged with one’s interlocutor. I used my intuition and knowledge of community norms to negotiate this trade-off in a way that is ethical (according to both personal judgement and institutional guidelines), honest, and contextually appropriate.

In the previous sections I have identified the selected variables and outlined the theoretical and methodological foundations of this study. In the next section (4.5), I describe the procedures that I used to recruit and categorise participants from Camborne-Redruth.

4.5. Participants

I implemented the methodological process described in Section 4.4 with 87 participants. All participants self-identified as ‘Cornish’ and lived and/or worked in the Camborne-Redruth area. I informed them that the project was concerned with

78 For a discussion of the pros and cons of linguistic accommodation from the fieldworker, see Labov (1984).
people’s perceptions of the local area, Cornish identity, and the language used within the community. I encouraged participants to speak freely and openly assured them that there were no ‘bad’ or ‘wrong’ answers, and that I valued their honest opinions and observations. I told speakers (see Information Sheet, Appendix 2) that the interview would be split into three stages. More specifically, these are verbal reasoning tasks (SD tasks), followed by some tasks focusing on language (reading passage, word-list, naming task, who/what questions, and lexical recognition task), and lastly a conversation regarding Cornwall (semi-structured interview). I also told participants that the interview would last approximately 45-60 minutes. After an overall description of the tasks that they were going to be asked to complete, and a broad explanation of my research aims, I invited participants to sign a consent form (see Appendix 3). Before each stage of the interview participants were given a more detailed explanation of the next task.

I recruited participants by using snowball sampling. My sample began with six participants whom I deemed to be ‘brokers’ (see Eckert 2000), as they have access to a range of diverse social networks. These individuals varied in age, gender, and social class and were able to help me to recruit individuals to whom I may not have otherwise had access. For example, one was the owner of a children’s nursery, which employed some of the younger females who participated in my study, and was involved in organising community events with mainly older individuals who I approached to take part in the study. Another broker was a mechanic, and introduced me to some of his colleagues, including both working-class males (the mechanics) and

---

79 Most interviews did last between 45-60 minutes, while some were as short as 30 minutes and others were as long as 90 minutes.
middle-class males (the management), who participated in the study. These brokers were my ‘ins’ to other groups of speakers with whom I would have otherwise struggled to make contact. Initial contact with much of the rest of the sample was made through these brokers. I instructed them to tell potential participants\footnote{They were explicitly told that I was interested in individuals with a range of opinions regarding Cornwall and Cornish identity. This was necessary so that the recommended participants were not skewed towards those with a strong local identity.} that I was interested in the Cornish dialect and identity and that was looking for participants from Camborne-Redruth.\footnote{Individuals from the surrounding villages of Lanner, St. Day, Portreath, Illogan, Pool, and Carnon Downs were also included in this study.} This allowed me to approach speakers through informal channels which is consistent with the informal atmosphere in which the interviews were conducted. By being introduced as a ‘friend of a friend’ (see Milroy 1987a) and a member of the local community, I was able to engage with the informants as an ‘insider’.

A potential issue with my status as fieldworker stems from the fact that I am male and was 23 years of age at the time of the interviews. Milroy (1987b: 81) suggests that, particularly young, male fieldworkers can feel threatening to some participants. I took all reasonable steps to mediate this disadvantage in order to make the participant feel as comfortable as possible. I endeavoured to achieve this by conducting my research in an empathetic, compassionate, and relaxed manner. In order to be as accommodating as possible, the location of interviews was chosen by the participant. Most interviews were conducted in cafes, while others took place in the participants’ home and offices.

In order to permit an analysis of social variation, I invited participants to complete ‘biographical information’ sheets. The biographical information sheets take
three forms depending on the status of the informant. There were specific biographical sheets which were adjusted for students (see Appendix 4a) and those who have retired (see Appendix 4b). Those who were neither students nor retirees, completed a non-adjusted biographical information sheet (see Appendix 4c). These served to provide information regarding the demographics of the participants.

I conducted interviews with 87 participants. In order to achieve a balanced sample, the quantitative aspects of this study include 80 participants, although the qualitative parts of the analysis in this study include some data, such as quotes (see Chapters 6 & 7), from the additional seven participants. The 80 speakers were numerically balanced according to their membership to the social categories of age, gender, and socioeconomic class.

I distinguished each social characteristic in relation to binary categories. I considered age in relation to older (than 40) and younger (than 30) informants (see Section 4.5.1). Gender (see Section 4.5.2) was not presented to speakers as a binary, as participants were given scope to write-in a non-binary gender identity. However, no participants elected to identify as anything other than ‘male’ or ‘female’. I conceptualised socioeconomic class as a binary, with half the sample identified as ‘middle-class’ and half the sample being identified as ‘working-class’ (see Section 4.5.3). Each cell, that is, the cross-section of these categories, contained 10 speakers.\(^{82}\) For example, there were 10 younger female middle-class participants, 10 younger female working-class participants, etc. Additionally, the biographical information sheets asked participants to state the number of their grandparents who

\(^{82}\) I selected the first ten speakers per cell.
were ‘Cornish’ (0 Cornish grandparents (CGP) n=15, 1 CGP n=7, 2 CGP n=16, 3 CGP n=8, 4 CGP n=34).

4.5.1. Age

A definitive one-size-fits every community approach to categorising the process of ageing fails to account for community specific and individual experiences (see Eckert 1997). As the last mine in Cornwall, South-Crofty, located between Camborne and Redruth, was closed in 1998, the split between younger and older participants is locally meaningful. Older (than 40) participants grew up in a Cornwall in which mining was active, albeit in terminal decline. However, younger (than 30) participants grew up in a very different Cornwall, one without a mining industry. Although most of the younger participants would have been alive in 1998, they would have been too young to be aware of the decline in the mining industry and the economic and cultural impact of Crofty’s closure.83

The overall average age of participants in this study is 40.83. The sample population was equally balanced for age, so that it included forty ‘younger’ participants and the same number of ‘older’ participants. Among the younger participants in the sample, the youngest was 18 and the oldest was 29. On average, younger males were 23.2 years of age and their female counterparts were 22.95, giving the younger participants in this study an average age of 23.07, with a standard

83 The impact of the closure of Cornwall’s mines is a key theme of local oral histories. Thus, all participants are be aware of Crofty’s closure, even if they do lack a lived memory of this event.
deviation of 2.5. In the older sample, the youngest participant was 42 years of age and the oldest was 85 at the time of recording. Older males had an average age of 59.95, with the average older female age slightly lower at 57.25, creating an overall average age for older speakers of 58.6, with a standard deviation of 11.4. With such a large range of ages in the older category, post-data collection, I additionally split the older category into two sub-groups, those aged 40–55 (n=22) and those aged >55 (n=18).

4.5.2. Gender

Similarly to age, the sample was balanced for gender. Although participants were given the option to identify with any gender they wished, all categorised themselves as either ‘male’ (n=40) or ‘female’ (n=40). I am not aware of any participants who identified with a gender which differs from the one that they were assigned at birth.

4.5.3. Socioeconomic class

Socioeconomic class (henceforth SEC) was another demographic feature which was controlled for in the sample. 40 participants were considered to be working-class with another 40 categorised as middle-class. I used three key indicators to determine an individuals’ SEC, namely, place of domicile, education, and occupation. I quantified this information in order to develop social class index which served to determine the socioeconomic profile of each participant in this study. In the following section I
outline each of these key indicators and describe the methodology used in the social class index.

4.5.3.1. Place of domicile

A key indicator of one’s SEC is their place of domicile (henceforth PoD), that is, where one lives. Although some studies use house-price as a constituent characteristic when determining SEC (e.g. Labov 2001a; Robinson 2010a), here I use the Index of Multiple Deprivation (henceforth IMD), which is produced by the Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government in England. I used the 2015 index which is the most recent available at the time of the data collection. The IMD is ‘multiple’ as it considers levels of deprivation within a locale across a number of domains. The domains have a range of weightings which contribute values to the overall index (see Table 4.5). Using the weighted index shown in Table 4.5, the IMD quantifies relative deprivation, ranking 32,844 in England neighbourhoods from most to least deprived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Deprivation</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, skills, and training</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84 Subsequently, an updated IMD was published in 2019.
85 A limitation with using the IMD alongside occupation as an indicator of SEC is that IMD considers employment (the number of people involuntarily out of work) and income (average earnings for the neighbourhood). This creates a potential confounding effect as employment and income are linked to occupation. However, the IMD considers these factors at the level of the neighbourhood, whereas I consider the occupation of the individual (see Section 4.5.3.3). Though the individual is a constituent part of the neighbourhood, this effect is minimal.
Using the IMD, I allocated each participant a number based on the degree of deprivation in relation to England as a whole (including Cornwall). In this study, if a participants’ PoD was among the 19% most deprived areas in England, I allocated them a value of 3, a value of 2 if their home was between 20-39% of the most deprived locations in England, and a value of if they lived a location which was not in the most deprived 40% in England. Although, intuitively, it may seem logical to categorise deprivation in thirds, the classification system that I used was skewed towards the more deprived end of the continuum. I did this because Camborne-Redruth is largely a deprived area (see Section 3.4). The metric that I used was more reflective of the levels of deprivation experienced in the Camborne-Redruth community. Speakers’ PoD scores, calculated as explained above, exhibit normal distribution. 20 participants were allocated a value of one and 18 had a value of three, with the remaining 42 being allocated a value of two. I made no distinction between whether a participant’s home was rented, mortgaged, or owned (see also Robinson 2010a; cf. Trudgill 1974).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deprivation Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health deprivation and disability</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to housing and services</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living environment deprivation</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5.3.2. Education

I quantified education such that participants could be allocated a value of 1, 2, or 3. I allocated those who left school at the age of 16 or before a value of 3 (20 participants).
I allocated those who completed a Further Education (FE) qualification such as A-levels or a BTEC a value of 2 (30 participants). I gave those who had achieved at least an undergraduate degree a value of 1 (30 participants).

4.5.3.3. Occupation

I used the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NS SEC) to quantify relations between types of employment. The NS SEC classifies occupations into one of nine major groups\textsuperscript{86}, which, for the purposes of this social class index, I condensed into three clusters, with values between one and three (see Table 4.6). In this social class matrix, a value of 1 corresponds to the NS SEC’s ‘major groups’, 1, 2, and 3 (40 participants), a value of 2 corresponded to the NS SEC’s major groups 4, 5, and 6 (22 participants), and a value of 3 reflected the major groups 7, 8, and 9 (18 participants).

Table 4. 6 The NS SEC’s ‘major groups’ and how they were categorised by this study’s social class index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS SEC ‘major group’</th>
<th>Group Title</th>
<th>Social Class Index Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Managers, Directors, and Senior Officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Professional Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Associate Professional and Technical Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrative and Secretarial Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Skilled Trades Occupations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caring, Leisure, and Other Service Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{86} While I only consider the major groups here, the NS SEC further classifies occupations into sub-major groups, minor groups, and unit groups.
PoD, education, and occupation are the three indicators of an individual’s socioeconomic profile which I quantified to form an aggregate score, which I modelled within a social class index (see Tables 4.7 & 4.8). However, it is not the case that each of the three considerations, that is, occupation, education, and PoD, are equally important in the composition of one’s socioeconomic status (see Shuy et al. 1968). Labov (2001a: 85) observed that occupation is the most reliable indicator of SEC and that the effects of different indicators can vary across the lifespan. Trudgill (1974: 34–37 and references therein) argued that, in Britain, occupation was the most important factor in determining one’s socioeconomic profile. He suggested that occupation should have a greater weighting than other contributing factors. He argued that, in de facto terms, he did this by including income and education in his social class matrix, which he suggested are ‘clearly closely correlated with occupation’ (Trudgill 1974: 37). The primacy of occupation is also noted by Williams (2002) who double-weighted occupation in their social-class index (see also Coleman 1983; Poole et al. 1993; Winter et al. 2016). Similarly, Stenström et al. (1998) double-weighted occupation in the
social-class index for The Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT). Shuy et al. (1968) also weighted occupation more heavily than other index of socioeconomic status in their social class index.

In light of the consensus that occupation is the most important factor in determining SEC, which was consistent with my ethnographic observations in Camborne-Redruth, for the older cohort, I double-weighted occupation in the social class index. That is, when calculating the social class of a participant above the age of 40, I doubled the allocated value for occupation. However, my experience with younger participants suggested that this method was not appropriate for those below the age of 30. One reason for this is that person’s occupation in their 20s may not accrue a comparable level of social capital in comparison to the profession in which they build a career later in life. For example, many professors, who would acquire an occupational value of 1, were bar tenders or retail assistants, which would acquire a value of 3, between, before, or immediately after their degrees. Indeed, many graduates who took part in this study were working in bars or in temporary labouring jobs after completing their education and have since found employment in more typically white-collar professions. As a result, for the younger sample population, it was education, not occupation, which I double weighted.

The value for each constituent part of this index were added together to form an aggregate total. Six participants accrued the maximum of 12 points, while 11 participants were allocated the minimum value of 4. Those with an aggregate score of six or below were considered to be middle-class and those with an aggregate total of

---

87 As COLT primarily included teenage speakers, the occupation data was based on the occupation of the parent(s) of the teenage participants.
seven or above were categorised as working-class. The standard deviation for the social-class index is 0.85 for the middle-class participants and 1.68 for the working-class participants. Table 4.7 displays the social information necessary for this social class metric for two hypothetical participants, ‘A’ and ‘B’. In Table 4.8, the social information from Table 4.7 is quantified and added together to form the participants’ aggregate total and their SEC is deduced from this value.

Table 4. 7 Information regarding the age, occupation, place of domicile, and level of education for two hypothetical participants, A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Pension Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS SEC Index (major-group)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation levels in place of domicile</td>
<td>Lowest 10%</td>
<td>Lowest 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>BA Degree</td>
<td>O-levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 8 The social class index used in this study applied to the hypothetical participants, A and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1 (x2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Class</td>
<td>Working-class</td>
<td>Middle-class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Double-weighting one indicator did not change the SEC class categorisation for most speakers. Had I not double-weighted any indicators of SEC, if the SEC boundaries are adjusted for to reflect these changes, only four participants (five percent) would be categorised differently than using the current system.
In addition to the binary social class classification system, in the statistical analysis of the usage data in Chapter 5, I use a tripartite socioeconomic categorisation system. In this system, those with an aggregate total of four or five on the social class index were categorised as ‘middle-class’ (n=21), those with values ranging from six to eight were labelled ‘upper-working-class’ (n=34) and those with aggregate totals above nine were categorised as ‘working-class’ (n=25).

4.5.3.4.1. Students

The metric described above is not an appropriate tool to determine the socioeconomic profile of students. This is because they do not typically have an occupation and, if they are in HE education, are likely to be living in short-term rented accommodation which may not be reflective of the level of deprivation experienced at the place they perceive to be home, such as their parental home.

Six students participated in this study. Two of these students were BTEC students at a local Further Education college and four were in Higher Education. Students were awarded a score for education on the assumption that they would achieve the qualification that they were studying for. For example, two students in FE were awarded a score of two as it was assumed that they would acquire the qualification for which they were studying (they both did so within months of being interviewed). Due to their educational commitments, none of the students had a full-time occupation. In light of this, the students received an occupation score consistent with their highest-earning parent. The four university students were living in short-
term rented accommodation near their university campus. As a result, their parental home was used as the PoD for the purposes of the social class index.

4.5.3.4.2. Retirees

Participants who had retired were asked to provide their occupation before retirement or semi-retirement. For example, one participant had semi-retired at the time of interviewing and was collecting a military pension while working as a groundsman at a school after serving for over twenty years in the Royal Marines, where he earned the rank of Warrant Officer, 1st Class (WO1). In such a situation, his military rank contributed to his socioeconomic class categorisation, as opposed to his current profession as a semi-retired groundsman.

4.5.4. Strength of local identity

As my ethnographic observation suggested that rootedness in Cornwall and orientation to local community norms was a dimension along which linguistic variation is interactionally and socially meaningful, I developed a metric to compare speakers’ identity. Building on Llamas (1999, 2001), Burbano-Elizondo (2008), and specifically adapted from Sandow & Robinson (2018), I used an identity questionnaire (henceforth IdQ) see Appendix 5) to quantify the strength of speakers’ local identity. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with statements, such
as ‘Cornwall is a Celtic nation first, a county of England second’, between 1 and 5, with 5 indicating total agreement and 1 representing total disagreement. Based on my knowledge of Cornish identity when designing the study, I selected the ten statements that I felt best characterised Cornish identity. That is, strong agreement with each statement would indicate a prototypical Cornish identity.

The responses to each of the ten statements were relatively consistent, as evidenced by the Cronbach’s alpha score of .858. This suggests that all ten statements measure the same concept, that is, the strength of Cornish identity. There was also an additional eleventh statement, ‘[t]ourism in Cornwall is a good thing’. However, this statement is not directly concerned with Cornish identity, but with the participants’ stance to tourism. Thus, this statement was not consistent with the other ten in the IdQ. This can be quantitatively demonstrated through the use of Cronbach’s alpha statistic, which decreases to .837 when the eleventh statement is added to the model. Moreover, the eleventh statement, the one pertaining to tourism, is the only statement to display a negative correlation with any of the other statements (see Table 4.9). This shows that statement eleven is measuring something different to the first ten statements. Thus, when considering IdQ data in the rest of the thesis, I only consider the results from the first ten statements.

---

89 Cronbach’s Alpha measures internal consistency, which is ‘the extent to which all the items in a test measure the same concept or construct’ (Tavakol & Dennick 2011: 53). A score between .8 and <.9 indicates a ‘very good’ strength of association (Burns & Burns 2008: 481).
The purpose of the IdQ is to elicit data that allows for quantitative categorisation of speakers’ local identity. This enables me to consider strength of local identity as a social parameter, analogous to socioeconomic class, gender, and age. The participants’ responses (between 1 and 5) for each of the ten statements were added together to form an individual aggregate IdQ value. Two participants scored the maximum possible total of 50. The lowest possible total was ten, but the lowest realised total was 23. Thus the range of IdQ total was 23–50. The mean average total was 38.36 (41.4 for the older participants and 35.33 for younger participants) with a standard deviation of 6.9 (5.95 for the older participants and 6.39 for younger participants).

As with the categories of age, gender, and socioeconomic class, I propose a binary categorisation of identity. I classify those with an IdQ total of ≥40 as having a ‘strong’ sense of local identity and those with an IdQ total of <40 as having a ‘weaker’ sense of local identity. I selected the value of 40 as the IdQ total boundary primarily because if participants, on average, ‘agreed’ with each of the ten questions on the IdQ they would have an aggregate total of 40. This separates those with an ambivalence to
Cornwall from those with a positive orientation. There were 45 participants with IdQ totals above 40 on the IdQ while 35 participants’ totals were below 40.

The sample of participants used in this study was numerically balanced for age, gender, and socioeconomic class (see Sections 4.5.1, 4.5.2, & 4.5.3). However, the sample was not balanced for strength of identity. This is because identity is not evenly spread throughout the population of Camborne. In light of this, when considering strength of identity as a social variable and a potential social psychological driver of linguistic variation and change, it is important to understand how identity interacts with other social categories. The relationships between IdQ and the other independent variables used in this study are displayed in Table 4.10. In Table 4.10, I test the relationship between IdQ total and age and socioeconomic class as both binary (Age and SEC in Table 4.10) and trinary categories (Age_3 and Sec_3), as well as the three indicators of socioeconomic class and the number of CGP.

Table 4.10 The statistical relationships between IdQ total and the other independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Statistical test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Age      | <30: High (n=31) low (n=9)  
>40: High (n=14) low (n=26) | Fisher’s exact test | p=<.001*** |
| SEC      | WC: High (n=26) low (n=14)  
MC: High (n=19) low (n=21) | Fisher’s exact test | p=.176 |
| Gender   | Male: High (n=22) low (n=18)  
Female: High (n=23) low (n=17) | Fisher’s exact test | p=1.00 |

For a discussion of the statistical tests used in this study see Section 5.2.
Table 4.10 shows that there is a statistically significant association, between IdQ total and age, when age is classified as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=<.001) and a
trinary (linear-by-linear association, p<.001) category. Specifically, older speakers are more likely to have high totals on the IdQ. Also, there is an effect of education on IdQ total (linear-by-linear association, p=.029). The educational group who received formal education up to the age 16 are the group most likely to have high IdQ totals. There is also a statistically significant relationship between CGP and IdQ score, with those with higher numbers of CGP being more likely to have high IdQ totals (logistic regression, p=.007). It is important to account for these relationships when using these categories in statistical analysis (see Chapter 5).

4.5.5. Legal and ethical assurances

In order to make this research legally and ethically sound, I ensured that all reasonable steps were taken to protect participants from the perspectives of informed consent, assurance of anonymity, confidentiality, and data protection.

As all participants were adults (18+), they were all able to provide free and voluntary informed consent as to whether or not to participate in this study. The information sheet (see Appendix 2) gave a brief outline of the research aims and a synopsis of what would be required of the participant should they agree to take part. The informed consent form (Appendix 3) outlined what participation in this research project would entail and invited individuals to actively consent to participate in this study. Prospective participants were also given the opportunity to ask any questions about any aspect of the research and were told that they were able to withdraw their
consent and with it their data before, during, or after their participation (none elected to do so).

Participants were assured that the data collected is and will remain strictly confidential. This is important as many participants shared personal or potentially embarrassing information. The number of participants in this study is too great for it to be practical to use pseudonyms. Therefore, throughout the rest of this thesis, when I make specific reference to individual participants they are referred to by a code. Participant codes consist of the participants’ first initial, their gender (M (male) or F (female)), their socioeconomic class (W (working-class) or M (middle-class)) and their age. For example, a 22-year-old middle-class female called Jane would be JMF22. The original names of the participants are stored securely.

Although some sociolinguistic studies have used pseudonyms for the town in which the research was conducted (such as Eckert 1989, 2000; Cukor-Avila & Bailey 1995), I felt that this was not necessary for this study. Indeed, the fact that the research was conducted in Camborne-Redruth is fundamental to this research. In Redruth, a town of 14,000 people, and Camborne, with a population of 20,000, plus many thousands more in nearby satellite villages, the population is big enough such that it is not be possible to identify participants. Even so, I take all reasonable steps to ensure that I do not disclose any information that could, even indirectly, reasonably lead to an individual’s identification.
Although this research project is not concerned with any information that could be considered to be sensitive, participants did divulge some such information.\textsuperscript{91} For example, when discussing Cornish identity, many participants provided accounts of disagreements that they had had with named individuals (I did not ask for such information at any point). A number of participants even unilaterally discussed their involvement in criminal and general nefarious behaviour, which speaks to the level of informality in which the interviews were conducted and the rapport that I was able to develop with the participants.

Reasonable steps were taken such that participants did not divulge any more personal information than was absolutely necessary. For example, although many sociolinguistic surveys use income as a diagnostic of socioeconomic class (such as Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974), many others use social class metrics without using income as an indicator (such as Macaulay 1977; Robinson 2010a). Therefore, it is not essential for the success of this project to ask participants to provide details of their income. As this is not necessary, and the topic of finance can be potentially sensitive, I did not judge it to be ethically responsible to collect such information.

4.6. Summary

The first methodology that I described in this study was ethnographic participant-observation. This involved me integrating with many different social networks within

\textsuperscript{91} The Data Protection Act of 1998 defines sensitive personal data as data pertaining to a person’s race, ethnic origin, political opinion, religious or similar beliefs, trade union membership, physical or mental health, sexual life, commission or alleged commission of an offence, or genetic data.
Camborne-Redruth and endeavouring to develop a diverse understanding of the community, as seen through the eyes of those who live and work there. This has the advantage of enabling me to provide a deeper and more rounded understanding of the community and emic social divisions within it. This is crucial for my description of Cornish identities in Chapter 6 and of the social meaning of Anglo-Cornish lexis in Chapter 7. Also, many of the themes I identified during ethnographic participant-observation became lines of questioning during the sociolinguistic interviews.

In this chapter, I have outlined novel methodologies which can serve lexis-oriented sociolinguistic research. The theoretical foundation of this framework is defined by the OVCs and the operationalisation of the semasiological variable (see also Robinson 2010a). Two elicitation procedures have been outlined which are consistent with the OVCs and the principle of accountability. SD tasks are a task-oriented elicitation procedure, where the participants’ primary cognitive load is focused on task completion. This contrasts with the naming tasks, where participants primary cognitive load is focused on their use of words. I have also explained how a version of Robinson’s (2010a) semasiological elicitation prompts can be applied to nominal categories. The last linguistic methodology outlined in this chapter is the lexical recognition task which serves to quantify the extent of participants’ familiarity with Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis and to engage participants in meta-linguistic discussions. The final section of the interview involved a semi-structured conversation regarding Cornwall and Cornish identity. Together, these methods enable me to develop a comprehensive understanding of the usage and perception of the investigated Anglo-Cornish words as well participants’ attitudes and orientations to Camborne-Redruth and Cornwall more broadly.
In Section 4.5 I also described the processes by which I recruited and classified participants in this study. To summarise, I used snowball sampling methods, which began with six brokers within the Camborne-Redruth community. Although I conducted 87 interviews, I consider the usage data from an 80 participant sample of socio-demographically balanced speakers. The sample is balanced according to age, gender, and SEC. I used a novel social class index, which involved weighted distributions of the indicators of SEC for younger and older speakers. Specifically, for older speakers I double weighted the value for occupation and for younger speakers I double-weighted their value for education. Additionally, I quantified the strength of participants’ Cornish identity by using an IdQ.

The next chapter is concerned with subjecting the data collected using the lexical elicitation methods described in this chapter to statistical analysis in the context of social and stylistic variation.
5. Variation and change of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis

In the current chapter, I present the lexical data collected from 80 participants from Camborne-Redruth using the elicitation techniques that I described in Section 4.4. I first explain the ways in which I coded the collected data (see Section 5.1). Then, I explain the statistical tests that I use in this chapter (Section 5.2). I use both inferential and descriptive statistics in order to describe and account for the quantitative patterns of variation in this study’s data set. I employ a variety of statistical tests in order to assess the relationship between social (independent) and lexical (dependent) variables. These tests are Fisher’s exact tests, independent samples t-tests, one-way ANOVAs, linear-by-linear association, logistic regression, Pearson’s correlation, and Chi-Square Automatic Interaction Detection (CHAID, see Section 5.2).

After explaining the analytical methods that I have employed in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, I apply these methods to the collected data. I begin by analysing inter-speaker variation in Section 5.3. Firstly, I analyse the semasiological data (Section 5.3.1) followed by onomasiological data (Section 5.3.2) and, lastly, the lexical recognition data (Section 5.3.3). Specifically, I explore how patterns of both usage and recognition of Anglo-Cornish words are conditioned by social categories such as age, strength of Cornish identity (IdQ total), number of Cornish grandparents (CGP), socioeconomic class (SEC), and gender. I summarise the patterns of social variation in Section 5.3.4. Then, I consider the intra-speaker variation of the onomasiological usage data (Section 5.4), before summarising the findings of this chapter in Section 5.5.
5.1. Coding of social and lexical data

In this section I explain how I treated the data after they were collected. I begin by presenting the social categories (see also Section 4.5) and the number of participants within each category which are the independent variables used for the statistical analysis in this chapter (Table 5.1). In Table 5.1, I also identify whether each social category is nominal, ordinal, or scalar, which has implications for the statistical tests that I employ in this chapter (see Section 5.2).

Table 5.1 The social categories which serve as the independent variables for the statistical analysis

| Social category (variable type) | Values          |   |   |   |   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| **Gender (nominal)**            |                 |   |   |   |   |
| Male N=40                       | Female N=40     |   |   |   |   |
| **Age (nominal)**               |                 |   |   |   |   |
| >30 N=40                        | >40 N=40        |   |   |   |   |
| **Age_3 (ordinal)**             |                 |   |   |   |   |
| >30 N=40                        | 40-55 N=22      | >55 N=18 |
| **SEC (nominal)**               |                 |   |   |   |   |
| MC (Middle-class) N=40          | WC (Working-class) N=40 |   |   |   |   |
| **SEC_3 (ordinal)**             |                 |   |   |   |   |
| MC N=21                         | UWC (upper-working-class) N=34 | WC N=25 |
| **CGP (scale)**                 |                 |   |   |   |   |
| 0 N=15                          | 1 N=7           | 2 N=16 | 3 N=8 | 4 N=34 |
I entered the participants’ responses to the biographical information sheet, IdQ, SD tasks, naming tasks, who/what questions, and lexical recognition tasks (see Chapter 4) into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. I coded the investigated lexical variables (see Section 4.3) categorically for presence or absence of the Anglo-Cornish dialect variants. Variants were allocated a binary value, that is, 1 or 0, where one= ‘Anglo-Cornish variant’ and zero= ‘non-Anglo-Cornish variant’. With regards to the semasiological data, a Cornish semasiological variant was given the value ‘one’ and a non-Anglo-Cornish sense was given the value ‘zero’ (see Table 5.2). For example, maid ‘woman’ was given the value ‘one’ and other senses, e.g. maid ‘female servant or attendant’, were given the value ‘zero’. With the emmet semasiological variable, both senses, emmet ‘ant’ and emmet ‘tourist’ can be considered to be Anglo-Cornish. In light of this, the earlier sense, emmet ‘ant’, was given the value ‘one’ and the more innovative sense emmet ‘tourist’ was given the value ‘zero’. As well as coding for overall semasiological usage, I also coded for whether or not the participant used the Anglo-Cornish dialect variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POD-Deprivation (ordinal)</th>
<th>Low N=20</th>
<th>Mid N=42</th>
<th>High N=18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation-Prestige (ordinal)</td>
<td>High N=40</td>
<td>Mid N=22</td>
<td>Low N=18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (ordinal)</td>
<td>Degree N=30</td>
<td>A-level/equivalent N=30</td>
<td>Up to 16 N=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ (nominal)</td>
<td>High N=45</td>
<td>Low N=35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 This can be conceptualised as 1= it is true that an Anglo-Cornish variant is present and 0= it is false that an Anglo-Cornish variant is present.
Cornish variant in the first or second iteration of the who/what elicitation prompt.

While in Section 5.3.1, I focus on maid ‘woman’ and emmet ‘ant’, I provide statistical analysis of other attested semasiological variants in Appendix 6.1.

Table 5.2 The coding system for the semasiological variables used in the analysis in the main body of this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emmet</td>
<td>‘ant’</td>
<td>‘tourist’ ‘other’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maid</td>
<td>‘woman’</td>
<td>‘female servant or attendant’ ‘other’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also applied this binary system to the onomasiological data (see Table 5.3). For the purposes of the inter-speaker analysis (Section 5.3.2), Anglo-Cornish variants were coded as being present if a speaker used an Anglo-Cornish lexical item in at least one of the speech styles (casual or careful). For example, if they used a non-Anglo-Cornish variant in one speech style and an Anglo-Cornish variant in the other speech style, the Anglo-Cornish variant was coded as being present for that speaker.

Table 5.3 The coding system for the onomasiological variables used in the analysis in the main body of this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LUNCH BOX</td>
<td>crib box, croust, croust box, croust tin</td>
<td>lunch box, sandwich box, fruit box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMAN</td>
<td>maid</td>
<td>woman, girl, female, lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALK</td>
<td>stank</td>
<td>walk, hike, ramble, stroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURIST</td>
<td>emmet</td>
<td>tourist, visitor, holiday-maker, people-on-holiday, people-on-holiday, family-on-holiday, foreigner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I did not distinguish between which non-Anglo-Cornish variant was used. This was done because in this project I am concerned with variation in the use of Anglo-Cornish forms, and, thus, not concerned with whether a participant used the variants tourist or holiday-maker for the TOURIST variable, but simply whether or not they used emmet.
However, I do display the social variation of all attested non-Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants in Appendix 6.2.

From the perspective of intra-speaker variation, I additionally coded for whether or not the investigated variants were elicited in a casual or careful speech style, that is, from the SD tasks or naming tasks (see Section 5.4). Participants each elicited one lexical item per-variable in the naming-task. That is, they elicited a maximum of four Anglo-Cornish words. However, they elicited multiple tokens per-variable in the SD tasks as each investigated concept appeared in two scenes. In order to ensure quantitative comparability between the two styles, I calculated the usage of each variant as a percentage of overall usage and subsequently converted this to a decimal value. For example, if a speaker used *girl* once and *woman* once in the SD tasks, each variant would be given a value of 0.5 for that speaker as it was used in half of all possible contexts. If a speaker categorically used *woman*, I coded this as 1. Thus, each speaker could use a maximum of four Anglo-Cornish tokens per task, that is, one per variable. For the purposes of statistical analysis, I rounded the sum total of each variant across the cohort of participants to the nearest integer. This enables quantitative comparability between the data collected in the naming tasks and SD tasks. I present the intra-speaker variation of the Anglo-Cornish variants in Section 5.4 and non-Anglo-Cornish variants in Appendix 7.
5.2. Statistical tests

In order to understand how the investigated social parameters (see Section 5.1) condition the usage of lexical variables, I implemented a range of statistical tests using SPSS 25, namely, Fisher’s exact tests (see Section 5.2.1), independent samples t-tests (see Section 5.2.2), ANOVAs (see Section 5.2.3), linear-by-linear association (see Section 5.2.4), logistic regression (see Section 5.2.5), Pearson’s correlation (see Section 5.2.6), and decision tree analysis, using Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detection tests (see Section 5.2.7). In the following sections I outline and justify the use of each of these tests. For each test, the level of significance was set at <.05, as per convention. This means that I report findings as statistically significant if there is a 5% probability that the null hypothesis is true.

5.2.1. Fisher’s exact tests

Where I investigate the interaction between one binary nominal independent variable, such as age, IdQ total, SEC, or gender, and one binary nominal dependent variable, such as use of *emmet* ‘ant’, I employ 2-tailed Fisher’s exact tests. The categorical nature of much of the data in this study means that Chi-square tests are the most appropriate significance tests in the context of seeking to test (null) hypotheses. Indeed, Chi-square tests must be applied to nominal (categorical) variables (Lowie & Seton 2013: 121). Chi-square tests are particularly sensitive to the size of the sample. For example, with a sample size larger than 500 even small differences are considered
to be statistically significant. When sample sizes are small, the non-parametric Fisher’s exact tests give a more accurate p-value than Pearson chi-square tests (Weinberg & Abramowitz 2008: 499). The Fisher’s exact variant of chi-square is recommended when one of the observed values is less than five (Katz 2006: 72). Indeed, in the data sets presented in this chapter, cells often have a value of less than five.

5.2.2. Independent samples t-tests

Fisher’s exact tests are suitable for investigating the relationship between two nominal variables. However, it is not an appropriate test where one of the variables are continuous. In order to determine the statistical significance of relationships between a nominal independent variable and a continuous dependent variable, I employ independent samples t-tests. For example, when I investigate the relationship between age, IdQ total, SEC, and gender (nominal variables) and lexical recognition scores (continuous variable), I use independent samples t-tests. The independent sample t-test is a parametric test which compares the means of two independent groups (Heiman 2010: 262).

5.2.3. ANOVA

While the independent samples t-test was suitable to determine statistical significance between two groups and a continuous variable, it is not an appropriate test to investigate the relationship between an ordinal and a continuous variable. The
purpose of a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is to determine differences in means between three or more groups (Szafran 2012: 340). It can be used with an nominal or ordinal independent variable and continuous (interval or ratio) dependent variables (Szafran 20212). In this study, I use ANOVAs to test the relationship between, for example, age_3 (ordinal, three groups) and lexical recognition task scores (continuous).

ANOVAs tell us only that there is a difference between one or more of the mean values of the investigated groups. It does not tell us what the precise nature of this difference is. As a result, following a statistically significant ANOVA result, post-hoc testing is required. Post-hoc tests tell us exactly which groups the differences are between (Leach 2004: 76). By way of example, if there is a difference between age_3 and lexical recognition scores, a post-hoc test tells us if the statistical difference is due to variation in the means between the youngest group and the middle-aged group, the youngest group and the oldest group, or the middle-aged group and the oldest group. Specifically, in this thesis, I use Scheffé’s post-hoc test as it is the recommended post-hoc ANOVA test for unequal sample sizes (Ramalingam & Kumar 2019: 128), such as in this study (see Section 5.1).

5.2.4. Linear-by-linear association

When testing the relationship between an independent variables and a dependent variable, where at least one variable has three or more ordinal values and the other is
nominal or ordinal, I use linear-by-linear association chi-square. This is a type of chisquare test which is appropriate for data larger than the typical 2X2 chi-square contingency table (e.g. Saukkonen et al. 2015). This test is necessary when I consider lexical usage in the context of ordinal independent variables which have more than two values, such as age_3 and education. Although this test considers all its variables to be ordinal, it can treat nominal categories as ordinal. For example, it can compare the whether a dependent variable rises with values of the independent variable, such as if nominal values such as ‘yes’ and ‘no’ are given numerical values such as ‘one’ and ‘two’. Howell (2007: 290) states that ‘dichotomous variables can always be treated as ordinal without affecting the analysis’. In light of this, this test is appropriate even when the dependent variable, such as use or non-use of stank, is dichotomous.

5.2.5. Logistic regression

In order to test the relationship between a nominal dependent variable and a continuous independent variable, logistic regression can be used to determine significance (Field 2000: 163). Specifically, in this thesis, I use binary logistic regression as when I use logistic regression, the dependent variables are binary. An example of where logistic regression is necessary in this study is where I consider the relationship between the use of stank (dichotomous) and the number of CGP (continuous).

---

93 This is the inverse of the context in which independent samples t-tests are used, that is, when the dependent variable is continuous and the independent variable is dichotomous (see Section 5.2.2).
5.2.6. Pearson’s correlation

In order to test the relationship between two continuous variables, a Pearson correlation, also referred to as Pearson’s $r$, can be used to identify whether or not there is a linear relationship (Evans & Rooney 2008: 313). An example of where this is relevant in this study is when I consider the relationship between CGP (continuous) and lexical recognition scores (continuous).

5.2.7. CHAID decision trees

While Fisher’s exact tests, independent samples t-tests, ANOVAs, linear-by-linear associations, logistic regression, and Pearson correlations can be informative where one is interested between one independent variable and one dependent variable, these tests do not provide insight into the interaction between multiple independent variables on the dependent variable. In variationist sociolinguistics, multivariate analysis using regression models (e.g. Levon & Buchstaller 2015; Nagy 2015; Baranowski 2017) is a common statistical practice. This approach enables interactions between independent variables to be observed, including linguistic and social variables. Multiple regression models enable one to ask questions such as, what is the relationship between socioeconomic class, age, and gender in linguistic change? However, they are not a good fit for the data in this current study. This is because IdQ
totals exhibit statistical associations with age, education, and CGP (see Section 4.5.4). This is known as ‘multicollinearity’ and presents problems for regression analyses as it may lead to misleading interpretations of patterns in the data set (see Allen 1997; Vatcheva et al. 2016), making type 1 errors more likely (Kalnins 2018). However, this does not mean that a statistical multivariate analysis is impossible for such data sets.

A solution to the multicollinearity problem lies in decision trees (see Speybroek 2012; Tagliamonte & Baayen 2012; Kotsiantis 2013; Tomaschek et al. 2018). Decision trees enable one to explore interaction effects between independent variables on the dependent variable. Such analyses can reveal patterns such as those who are introverted and female are likely to have the highest Grade Point Average (GPA), while those who are extroverted, male, and favour group-study have the lowest GPA (see Baran & Kihç 2015).

Specifically, in this thesis I use Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detection (CHAID) in order to test the interaction(s) between independent variables and a dependent variable. CHAID is a ‘non-parametric stepwise regression procedure’ (Robinson 2014: 105), which is appropriate for both categorical and ordinal data (Sridhar & Mallikarjuna Rao 2017: 157) and with minor adjustments, continuous data too (Nisbet et al. 2018: 144). While chi-square tests are used with categorical dependent variables, when the dependent variable is numerical, the CHAID decision

94 Also, under a multivariate regression model, I would not be able to input each of the three indicators of SEC (PoD, occupation, and education) as well as overall SEC due to multicollinearity. This is because the values of each indicator are related to overall SEC classification.
95 Type 1 errors, or ‘false positives’, occur when the null hypothesis is erroneously rejected.
tree computes statistically significant splits by using f-tests (see Hill & Lewicki 2006; Nisbet et al. 2018).

CHAID is a form of multivariate analysis, which, through ‘data dimensionality reduction’ enables the identification of the independent variables which have the strongest interaction with the dependent variable (Milanović & Stamenković 2016: 564). This method not only enables differences between groups, such as socioeconomic class, to be calculated, it also facilitates further differentiation of subgroups, such as socioeconomic class by age. The results of the CHAID are presented in a decision tree, where a ‘parent’ node can be split into statistically significantly distinct categories which form ‘daughter’ nodes (see Figure 5.1).

The decision tree analysis considers all of the data and finds the most significant independent variable according to which data can be split into meaningful groups. When the decision tree ‘splits’, it does so ‘based on the rule of the lowest p-value’ (Robinson 2014: 106). That is, where two splits may be significant, for example, both age and socioeconomic class may exhibit statistically significant effects, the decision tree splits according to the category for which the p-value is lower, that is, more significant. The algorithm then endeavours to find further significant splits in the data until no further statistically significant splits are present. For example, Figure 5.1, which displays the decision tree for the use of gay ‘happy’ from Dr. Justyna Robinson (personal communication), shows that age exhibits the strongest statistical effect with the usage of gay ‘happy’. The 31-60 age-group then split once more on the basis of occupation (NSEC) with those in higher-prestige jobs being most advanced in this change, with the most prestigious group not using gay ‘happy’ at all. Thus, the most
Significant predictor of usage of gay ‘happy’ was age, then occupation (NSEC) for the middle-ages group (see also Robinson 2012a).

As well as visualising quantitative patterns of variation in an intuitive manner, decision trees are also an efficient way of conducting multivariate analysis. This enables one to account for the nuanced interaction between groups and sub-groups in the sample and the dependent variables. An additional function of decision trees is that splits in the data can be ‘forced’ where there is no immediate statistical validation for a split.
This can be insightful where there is no statistical difference between groups, yet there are distinct interaction effects within groups (e.g. see Section 5.3.2.4).

In the CHAID analyses conducted in this study, I include all possible social parameters. Thus, as well as the category of SEC, I add each individual indicator of socioeconomic class, that is, place of domicile, occupation, and education, as independent variables. In the CHAID analyses, I also input trinary categorisations of age (20s, 40–55, <56) and socioeconomic class (working-class, upper-working-class, and middle-class) as independent variables. CGP is also included in the CHAID analyses.

In this study, I set the minimum size of a parent node as ten, and the minimum size of a daughter node as five (see also Chiang et al. 2011; Celik & Yilmaz 2017). These are the recommended minimum specified node sizes for relatively small data sets, such as the one in this study (Onwuegbuzie & Collins 2010: 291). That is, a node containing ten or more participants can split into a daughter node as long as each daughter node consists of five or more participants. All p-values in the CHAID decision trees were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni method.

All of the statistical tests used on the usage data in thesis have been explained in Section 5.2. In the rest of Chapter 5 I use these statistical methods in order to analyse the collected lexical data.
5.3. Inter-speaker variation

5.3.1 Semasiological variation

In this section I present the patterns of inter-speaker variation for the semasiological variables investigated in this study, that is, maid (Section 5.3.1.1) and emmet (Section 5.3.1.2).

5.3.1.1. Maid

The semasiological variants elicited for maid are ‘woman’, and ‘female servant or attendant’.96 The social variation of the non-Anglo-Cornish sense maid ‘female servant or attendant’ is displayed in Appendix 6.1. In the who/what elicitation tasks (see Section 4.4.3), 66 of the 80 speakers used maid ‘woman’ while 56 speakers used maid ‘female servant or attendant’. This difference is not statistically significant (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.094).

Overall, the use of maid ‘woman’ is not conditioned by socio-demographic factors (see Table 5.4). However, maid ‘female servant or attendant’ is most likely to be used by speakers under of 30 years of age (see Appendix 6.1.1).

Table 5. 4 The overall social variation of the use of maid ‘woman’

96 There were also a small number of miscellaneous responses, such as ‘maid of honour’ and ‘maid Marian’ (a character in the tale of Robin Hood).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>maid</em> ‘woman’ overall</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 35/40&lt;br&gt; &gt;40: 31/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.378&lt;sup&gt;97&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 39/45&lt;br&gt; Low: 27/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 33/40&lt;br&gt; MC: 33/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 32/40&lt;br&gt; Female: 34/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 18/21&lt;br&gt; UWC: 28/34&lt;br&gt; WC: 20/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.252, p=.615&lt;sup&gt;98&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 31/40&lt;br&gt; 40–55: 19/22&lt;br&gt; &gt;55: 16/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.306, p=.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 26/30&lt;br&gt; A-level/equivalent: 23/30&lt;br&gt; Up to 16: 17/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.079, p=.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 16/20&lt;br&gt; Mid-deprivation: 35/42&lt;br&gt; High-deprivation: 15/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.783, p=.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 34/40&lt;br&gt; Mid-prestige: 16/22&lt;br&gt; Low-prestige: 16/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.003, p=.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 12/15&lt;br&gt; 1: 6/7&lt;br&gt; 2: 14/16&lt;br&gt; 3: 7/8&lt;br&gt; 4: 27/34</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Waldχ²(df=1, n=80)=.050, p=.823&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>97</sup> When reporting the results of a Fisher’s exact test, the format I use is ‘p= p. value’.
<sup>98</sup> When reporting the results of a linear-by-linear association, the format I use is ‘Chi-square (χ²) (degrees of freedom, n= sample size)= chi-square statistic, p= p. value’.
<sup>99</sup> When reporting the results of a logistic regression, the format I use is ‘Wald chi-square (degrees of freedom, n=sample size)= chi-square statistic, p= p. value’.
Table 5.4 shows that *maid* ‘woman’ does not exhibit statistically significant social variation based on overall responses to the *who/what* elication questions. However, a closer reading of the data suggests that this initial impression does not tell the full story. By considering the first (see Table 5.5) and second (see Table 5.6) iterations of the *who/what* elication prompts separately, the data do indicate age-related variation.

Table 5.5 The social variation of *maid* ‘woman’ in the responses to the first *who/what* elication prompt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>maid</em> ‘woman’ in first response to <em>who/what</em> questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>15/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>28/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>21/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>22/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.002, p=.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC</td>
<td>19/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>13/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>15/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=5.955, p=.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–55</td>
<td>16/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>12/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>15/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.560, p=.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level/equivalent</td>
<td>14/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 16</td>
<td>14/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-deprivation</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.891, p=.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-deprivation</td>
<td>20/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-deprivation</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.5 shows that older participants are significantly more likely to elicit *maid* ‘woman’ from the first *who/what* question than the younger population, when age is classified a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.007$) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, $p=.015$) category. Also, those with high IdQ totals are more likely to use *maid* ‘woman’ than those with low IdQ totals in the first elicitation procedure (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.042$). However, as IdQ total correlates with age (see Section 4.5.4), it is not clear if these findings are merely a consequence of the distribution of participants with high IdQ across age cohorts or if these findings are meaningful in themselves. In order to test for potential interaction effects, I use CHAID decision-tree analysis.

A CHAID analysis shows that there is an interaction effect between age and IdQ total in the use of *maid* ‘woman’ in response to the first *who/what* elicitation prompt (see Figure 5.2). Specifically, the change from the Anglo-Cornish sense *maid* ‘woman’ to the supra-local sense *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ is most advanced in
younger speakers with a low IdQ total.

From a semasiological perspective, maid 'woman' is undergoing change. However, this change is not obsolescence as overall it is not used significantly less by younger speakers. The change relates to whether or not maid 'woman' is the first sense used (see Figure 5.2). While for most of the older speakers, maid 'woman' is the first sense that they use, maid 'female servant or attendant' is the primary sense for the majority of younger speakers ($\chi^2$ (df=2, n=80) = 10.028, $p=.007$). Although there are no interaction effects within the older population, there is an interaction effect within the
younger population. Younger speakers with high IdQ totals are more likely to use the Anglo-Cornish sense while those with a low IdQ total are more likely to use the supra-local sense in the first elicitation procedure ($\chi^2$ (df=2, n=40)= 6.190, p=.045).

The social variation of maid ‘woman’ in the second who/what elicitation prompt is shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6 The social variation of maid ‘woman’ in the responses to the second who/what elicitation prompt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used maid ‘woman’ in second response to who/what questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age: &lt;30: 16/40 &gt;40: 18/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IdQ: High: 16/45 Low: 16/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEC: WC: 16/40 MC: 18/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender: Male: 21/40 Female: 13/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=1.949, p=.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.033, p=.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age_3: &lt;30: /18/40 40–55: 8/22 &gt;55: 8/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=1.870, p=.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: Degree: 16/30 A-level/ equivalent: 11/30 Up to 16: 7/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.141, p=.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PoD: Low-deprivation: 8/20 Mid-deprivation: 20/42 High-deprivation: 6/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6 displays little social variation. The only social category which a statistically significant relationship with the use of *maid* ‘woman’ in the responses to the second *who/what* elicitation prompt is CGP. Specifically, those with fewer CGP are more likely to use *maid* ‘woman’ in their second response. This complements the near statistically significant finding that those with higher CGP are more likely to use *maid* ‘woman’ in response to the first elicitation procedure (logistic regression, p=.063, see Table 5.5).

Conversely, *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ is more likely to be used by those with fewer CGP in the first elicitation procedure and by those with more CGP in the second (see Appendix 6.1.1) A CHAID analysis of the responses to the second elicitation prompt does not identify any further insight into the social variation of *maid* ‘woman’.

There is not a statistically significant relationship between the use of *maid* in the onomasiological elicitation tasks and *maid* ‘woman’ in the semasiological elicitation tasks, overall (2-tailed Fisher’s exact, p=1.00) as well as in the first (2-tailed Fisher’s exact, p=.275) and second semasiological elicitation procedure (2-tailed Fisher’s exact, p=.456).
5.3.1.2. Emmet

The attested semasiological variants of *emmet* in the who/what elicitation tasks are ‘tourist’, ‘ant’ and two uses of *Emmet* as a personal name. One younger speaker was not familiar with *emmet* (see Section 5.3.3.) in any sense so was not able to provide any variants from this variable.\(^{100}\) In this section, I primarily focus my analysis on *emmet* ‘ant’. I present the social variation of *emmet* ‘tourist’ in Appendix 6.1.2. The inter-speaker variation of *emmet* ‘ant’ reveals socially-distributed usage (see Table 5.7). Overall, eighteen speakers used *emmet* ‘ant’. Six participants used *emmet* ‘ant’ in their first response while twelve did so in their second response.\(^{101}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>emmet</em> ‘ant’ overall</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 1/40&lt;br&gt;40: 17/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 15/45&lt;br&gt;Low: 3/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 6/40&lt;br&gt;MC: 12/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 9/40&lt;br&gt;Female: 9/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 6/21&lt;br&gt;UWC: 7/34&lt;br&gt;WC: 5/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)=.446, p=.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 1/40&lt;br&gt;40–55: 7/22&lt;br&gt;&gt;55: 10/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)=21.214, p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{100}\) Her response was ‘I don’t know’. This is consistent with the results of her lexical recognition task (see Section 5.3.3), where she did not identify *emmet* as being Anglo-Cornish.

\(^{101}\) No speakers used *emmet* ‘ant’ in both their first and second responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Linear-by-linear association</th>
<th>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree:</strong> 8/30  5/30 8/30</td>
<td><strong>A-level/equivalent:</strong> 5/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.065, p=.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Up to 16:</strong> 5/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PoD</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low-deprivation:</strong> 4/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.045, p=.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid-deprivation:</strong> 11/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High-deprivation:</strong> 3/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td><strong>High-prestige:</strong> 12/40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.458, p=.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid-prestige:</strong> 1/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low-prestige:</strong> 5/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CGP</strong></td>
<td><strong>0:</strong> 2/15  1: 1/7  2: 3/16  3: 1/8  4: 11/34</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wald$\chi^2$ (df1, n=80) = .2.442, p=.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 shows that overall the use of *emmet* ‘ant’ is conditioned by age. Older speakers are more likely to use the older sense, both when age is conceived of as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=<.001) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, p=<.001) variable. This change is very advanced as only one of 40 younger participants used the *emmet* ‘ant’ sense, compared to ten of the oldest eighteen participants. As IdQ total interacts with age (see Section 4.5.4), it is not surprising that the use of *emmet* ‘ant’ is also used overall more by those with a high IdQ total (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.014).

Further insight into the overall social variation of *emmet* ‘ant’ can be provided by a CHAID decision tree analysis (see Figure 5.3).
When all of the independent variables are inputted into the model, the 'older' node splits on the basis of education, with those with education 'up to 16' using *emmet* 'ant' more than those in other educational groups ($\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80) = 6.812, p=.018). These nodes did not split further. This first decision tree could account for 83.7% of the observed variation. However, when education was removed from the model, Figure 5.3 accounts for 87.5% of the observed variation.
Figure 5.3 shows that the independent variable with the strongest statistical association with the use of *emmet* ‘ant’ is age ($\chi^2 (df=1, n=80)= 18.351, p=<.001$). Other social categories also emerge as statistically significant which further nuances the description of the social variation of *emmet* ‘ant’. Within the category of older speakers, the next most significant difference in the use of *emmet* ‘ant’ is that of socioeconomic class, with older middle-class participants being statistically significantly more likely to use *emmet* ‘ant’ than their working-class counterparts ($\chi^2 (df=1, n=40)= 5.013, p=.025$). Although there is no socioeconomic class effect in the frequency of *emmet* ‘ant’ in the overall sample (see Table 5.5), there is an interaction effect between age and class for older speakers (see Figure 5.3). This variation can be further unpacked. Within the category of older-middle class participants, those with a high IdQ total are significantly more likely to use the recessive ‘ant’ variant than those with a low IdQ total ($\chi^2 (df=1, n=20)= 6.706, p=.010$). Thus, the speakers most likely to use *emmet* ‘ant’ are older middle-class speakers with a high IdQ total.

*Emmet* ‘ant’ also exhibits social variation when one considers responses to the first (see Table 5.8) and second (see Table 5.9) elicitation procedures independently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>emmet</em> ‘ant’ in first response to <em>who/what</em> questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 0/40 &gt;40: 6/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.026^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 5/45 Low: 1/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.223$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 1/40 MC: 5/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.201$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Number of speakers who used <em>emmet</em> ‘ant’ in second response to <em>who</em>/<em>what</em> questions</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 1/40, &gt;40: 11/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 10/45, Low: 2/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 The social variation of *emmet* ‘ant’ in the responses to the second *who*/*what* elicitation prompt
As with the overall use (Table 5.7), older speakers are more likely to use *emmet* ‘ant’ than younger speakers in the first and second elicitation procedures, when age is classified as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact tests, \( p=0.026 \) and \( p=0.003 \), respectively) and a trinary (linear-by-linear associations, \( p=0.003 \) and \( p=<0.001 \), respectively) category. The social variation of *emmet* ‘tourist’ mirrors this pattern, with younger speakers being more likely to use *emmet* ‘tourist’ (see Appendix 6.1.2). There are also some differences between the overall use of *emmet* ‘ant’ and the results from the first and second responses, when considered independently. For example, unlike the overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male: 6/40</th>
<th>Fisher’s exact test</th>
<th>p=1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female: 6/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SEC_3 | MC: 1/21 | Linear-by-linear association | \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80)=0.974, p=0.324 \) |
| UWC: 7/34 | | |
| WC: 4/25 | | |

| Age_3 | <30: 1/40 | Linear-by-linear association | \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80)=12.895, p=<0.001^{***} \) |
| 40–55: 4/22 | | |
| >55: 7/18 | | |

| Education | Degree: 2/30 | Linear-by-linear association | \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80)=3.217, p=0.073 \) |
| A-level/equivalent: 5/30 | | |
| Up to 16: 5/20 | | |

| PoD | Low-deprivation: 1/20 | Linear-by-linear association | \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80)=1.080, p=0.299 \) |
| Mid-deprivation: 8/42 | | |
| High-deprivation: 3/18 | | |

| Occupation | High-prestige: 7/40 | Linear-by-linear association | \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80)=0.013, p=0.908 \) |
| Mid-prestige: 1/22 | | |
| Low-prestige: 4/18 | | |

| CGP | 0: 2/15 | Logistic regression | Wald\( \chi^2 \) (df1, n=80) 0.693, p=0.405 |
| 1: 1/7 | | |
| 2: 1/16 | | |
| 3: 1/8 | | |
| 4: 7/34 | | |
use, there is no identity effect for either the first or second\textsuperscript{103} set of responses. Another difference is that in the responses to the first \textit{who/what} elicitation prompt, there is a relationship between the use of \textit{emmet} ‘ant’ with educational group and overall socioeconomic class, when classified as a trinary category. Specifically, those with a degree are the educational group most likely to use \textit{emmet} ‘ant’ (linear-by-linear association, $p=.005$), while those classified as MC are more likely to use the variant than their UWC and WC counterparts (linear-by-linear association, $p=.017$). Conversely, in the second elicitation procedure, \textit{emmet} ‘tourist’ is more likely to be used by those with lower socioeconomic status and with less formal education (see Appendix 6.1.2).

There is no statistically significant relationship between the use of \textit{emmet} in the onomasiological elicitation tasks and overall use of \textit{emmet} ‘ant’ in the semasiological elicitation tasks, overall (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=1.00$) as well as in the first (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=1.00$) and second semasiological elicitation procedure (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=1.00$).

5.3.2. Onomasiological variation

In this section I explore sociolinguistic patterns of variation and change in Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis from an onomasiological perspective. I investigate each of the four onomasiological variables, namely LUNCH BOX, WOMAN, WALK, and TOURIST from the

\textsuperscript{103} IdQ total does approach statistical significance in the responses to the second \textit{who/what} elicitation prompt (Fisher’s exact test, $p=.058$).
perspective of inter-speaker variation, that is variation between speakers. I analyse the quantitative patterns of variation and change for each variable individually. I conduct the analysis by considering the realisations of the variables as a binary distinction between Anglo-Cornish variants(s) and non-Anglo-Cornish variants (see Section 5.1). Additionally, owing to the relatively homogenous social distribution and low-token counts of *crib/croust, maid, and stank*, I consider *LUNCH BOX, WALK, and WOMAN* collectively as a *compound variable*, which I explain further in Section 5.3.2.5.

### 5.3.2.1. LUNCH BOX

The variants of the *LUNCH BOX* variable consisted of *lunch box, sandwich box, fruit box, crib box, croust, croust tin, and croust box*. Sixteen participants used either *crib* or *croust*. Specifically, seven participants used only *crib* and seven participants used only *croust*, while two participants provided both forms. Of the speakers who used *crib*, all nine used the form *crib box*. Of the speakers who used *croust*, five used *croust box*, three used just *croust*, and one used *croust tin*. However, in all subsequent analysis I do not differentiate between the Anglo-Cornish variants of the *LUNCH BOX* variable. For the purposes of the subsequent analysis, I make a distinction only between variants which are pan-English, namely, *lunch box, fruit box, and sandwich box* and those which are Anglo-Cornish. That is, I do not differentiate whether or not the participant used *crib box, croust, croust box, croust tin*, or a combination thereof, just whether or not the construction contained *crib* or *croust*. 
The social variation of the use of *crib/croust* is shown in Table 5.10. None of the non-Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants of LUNCH BOX display any statistically significant social variation (see Appendix 6.2.1).

Table 5.10 The social variation of the use *crib/croust* as a variant of LUNCH BOX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 2/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 14/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 15/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 1/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 13/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.010**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 3/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 9/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 7/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 2/21</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=5.180, p=.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWC: 5/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 9/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 2/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=6.506, p=.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40–55: 9/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 5/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 3/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=8.2013, p=.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-level/equivalent: 4/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 16: 9/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 4/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.880, p=.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 5/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-deprivation: 7/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 4/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=3.464, p=.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-prestige: 7/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-prestige: 5/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 2/15</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Waldχ² (df=1, n=80)= 4.380, p=.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: 0/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: 1/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: 2/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4: 11/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 shows that *crib/croust* exhibits age-related variation. Older speakers are significantly more likely to use the Anglo-Cornish variants of LUNCH BOX than their younger counterparts, when age is conceptualised as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact
test, \( p=.001 \) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, \( p=.011 \)) category. As stated in Section 4.5.4, there is an interaction between the categories of age, IdQ total, education, and CGP. Thus, it is not surprising that \textit{crib/croust} is also more likely to be used by those with a high IdQ total (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, \( p=.001 \)), those with lower levels of formal education (linear-by-linear association, \( p=.004 \)), and those with higher numbers of CGP (logistic regression, \( p=.036 \)). SEC also conditions the use of \textit{crib/croust}, when SEC is conceptualised as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, \( p=.010 \)) and trinary (linear-by-linear association, \( p=.023 \)) category, with those in the lowest socioeconomic group being most likely to use the Anglo-Cornish variants.

Table 5.6 tells us nothing about the interaction between these social categories in relation to the use of \textit{crib/croust}. Haddican et al. (2013) and Baranowski (2017) question the role of local identity in language variation due to interactions with other social categories such as socioeconomic class. To investigate how these various social (independent) variables interact with \textit{crib/croust}, I employed a CHAID decision tree analysis (see Figure 5.4).
Figure 5.4 demonstrates that of the social variables investigated in this thesis, IdQ total is the strongest predictor of usage of *crib/croust* ($\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)= 11.429, p=.001).

Within the sub-set of speakers with a high IdQ total, the use of *crib/croust* can be further split as WC speakers were significantly more likely to use the Anglo-Cornish variant than those classified as MC ($\chi^2$ (df=1, n=45)= 4.555, p=.033). Thus, the speakers most likely to use *crib/croust* were working-class speakers with a high IdQ total. No further break-down in the data was deemed to be statistically significant according the
CHAID algorithm.\textsuperscript{104} Age and IdQ are the strongest predictors of the usage of crib/croust (see Table 5.6). However, Figure 5.4 shows no statistically significant interaction between the categories of age and IdQ total. For example, among the older speakers, the difference in usage of *crib/croust* between those with high and low IdQ totals approaches but ultimately falls short of statistical significance ($\chi^2$ (df=1, n=40) = 2.913, $p=.088$).

5.3.2.2. WOMAN

Attested variants of the WOMAN variable include *woman, girl, lady, female,* and *maid.* As with the LUNCH BOX variable described in Section 5.3.2.1, I make a distinction only between *maid,* the Anglo-Cornish variant, and the other pan-English forms. The Anglo-Cornish *maid* was used by eight of the 80 participants in the onomasiological elicitation tasks.\textsuperscript{105} The social variation of this usage can be seen in Table 5.11. The social variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of WOMAN is shown in Appendix 6.2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>$&lt;30$: 0/40, $&gt;40$: 8/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.005^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 8/45, Low: 0/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.008^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 4/40, MC: 4/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=1.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 5/40, Female: 3/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.712$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{104} When the decision tree is ‘forced’ to split on the basis of age, younger speakers also exhibit an SEC effect. Specifically, younger WC speakers are more likely to use *crib/croust* than those who are UWC or MC ($\chi^2$ (df=1, n=40) = 6.316, $p=.024$).

\textsuperscript{105} Of the eight speakers who used *maid,* seven also used *crib/croust.*
Maid exhibits age-related variation (see Table 5.7). Older speaker use maid more than younger speakers, when age is conceptualised as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.005) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, p=.017) category.106 Maid is also significantly associated with high IdQ totals (2-tailed Fisher’s exact tests, p=.008).107 This suggests that the relationship between maid and age is slightly stronger than between maid and identity. However, all speakers who used maid were older and had a high IdQ total. Age exhibits a stronger statistical pattern than strength of local identity than the usage of maid simply because there are more speakers with a high

106 Conversely, woman is used more by younger speakers (see Appendix 6.2.2.1)
107 Conversely, lady is used more by those with low IdQ totals (see Appendix 6.2.2.3).
IdQ total than those who are ‘older’. Specifically, eight of the 40 older participants used the variant, while eight of the 45 participants with a high IdQ total used maid.

The CHAID decision tree for maid split the first node on the basis of age and was unable to split into further sub-groups due a lack of further statistically significant interaction effects. Thus, in this case, it is not possible to disentangle the social categories of age and IdQ total for the WOMAN variable. This was primarily due to the low token count for maid (n=8). Within the older population, the association between the use of maid and strength of local identity approaches, but falls just short of, statistical significance ($\chi^2$ (df=1, n=40)= 2.903, p=.088).

5.3.2.3. WALK

The attested variants of the WALK variable include walk, hike, ramble, stroll, and stank. Throughout the onomasiological elicitation tasks, six speakers used the stank variant.108 The patterns of socially-conditioned variation of stank are presented in Table 5.12. The social variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of WALK is shown in Appendix 6.2.3.

Table 5.12 The social variation of the use of stank as a variant of WALK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 0/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 6/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 6/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 0/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 1/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 5/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108 Of the six speakers who used stank, five also used maid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male: 4/40</th>
<th>Fisher’s exact test</th>
<th>p=.675</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female: 2/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 2/21</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC: 3/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC: 1/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 0/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–55: 4/22</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.525, p=.469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55: 2/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 3/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level/equivalent: 2/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 16: 1/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 2/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 4/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-deprivation: 0/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 4/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-prestige: 1/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-prestige: 1/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 2/15</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 0/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 0/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: 0/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: 4/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stank exhibits age-related variation. Older speakers used the stank variant more frequently than younger speakers (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.026). Stank is also significantly associated with IdQ total. Speakers with a high IdQ total are significantly more likely to use stank than those with a low IdQ total (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.033). As with maid, all speakers who used stank were both older and had a high IdQ total. The CHAID decision tree for stank split in on the basis of age but did not create any further daughter nodes. ¹⁰⁹ Thus, it was not possible to disambiguate the ‘older’

¹⁰⁹ When the older cohort is ‘forced’ to split on the basis of IdQ total, there is no statistically significant difference (χ² (df=1, n=40)= 2.049, p=.152)
and ‘high’ IdQ total groups for this variable. Again, this can largely be attributed to the low token count for *stank* (n=6).

### 5.3.2.4. TOURIST

The variants of the TOURIST variable include the pan-English *tourist, holiday-maker*, *visitor, people-on-holiday, family-on-holiday, group-on-holiday*, and *foreigner*, as well as the Anglo-Cornish, *emmet*. In coding, *emmet* was given a value of ‘one’, while all other variants were allocated a ‘zero’ value. *Emmet* was the most common Anglo-Cornish variant to be elicited from the onomasiologically-oriented methodologies. Specifically, 32 out of 80 participants used *emmet*. The social variation of *emmet* can be seen in Table 5.13. The social variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of TOURIST is shown in Appendix 6.2.4.

#### Table 5.13 The social variation of the use of *emmet* as a variant of TOURIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 14/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td><em>p</em>=.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 18/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 25/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td><strong>p</strong>=.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 7/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 21/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td><em>p</em>=.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 11/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 17/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td><em>p</em>=.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 15/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWC: 10/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 16/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 14/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.003, <em>p</em>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40–55: 13/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 5/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 7/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=5.402, p=.020^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level/equivalent: 14/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 16: 11/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoD</th>
<th>Low-deprivation: 6/20</th>
<th>Linear-by-linear association</th>
<th>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=3.647, p=.056$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 15/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-deprivation: 11/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>High-prestige: 12/40</th>
<th>Linear-by-linear association</th>
<th>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=6.133, p=.013^*$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-prestige: 8/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-prestige: 12/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CGP</th>
<th>0: 5/15</th>
<th>Logistic regression</th>
<th>Wald$\chi^2 (\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=.630, p=.427$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: 1/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 9/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: 2/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: 15/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four onomasiological variables investigated in this study, **TOURIST** is the only one which does not exhibit age-related variation in the overall sample population (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.494$). As with the other three onomasiological variables, **TOURIST** exhibits an identity effect with those with a high IdQ total being more likely to use **emmet** than those with a low IdQ total (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.001$). Also, speakers with lower prestige occupations and lower educational attainment are the most likely to use **emmet** (linear-by-linear association, $p=.013$ and linear-by-linear association, $p=.020$, respectively). The education and occupation effects are consistent with the finding that lower socioeconomic status is associated with the use of **emmet**,

---

110 *People-on-holiday* is also used more by those with high IdQ totals while **tourist** is used more by those with low IdQ totals (see Appendix 11.6.4).
both when SEC is classified as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, \( p=.039 \)) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, \( p=.012 \)) category.

The aggregate pattern of the relationship between socioeconomic class and the use of *emmet* in the overall sample population (see Table 5.9) clouds the nuance of some more fine-grained patterns of variation relating to interaction effects. Although there is no statistically significant age-pattern in the frequency of *emmet*, there is an interesting interaction between age, socioeconomic class, identity, and the *emmet* variant. The overall pattern between SEC and the use of *emmet* can largely be attributed to the younger speakers. This is because there is no significant relationship between *emmet* and socioeconomic class in the older population, but there is in the younger cohort (see Figure 5.5).

Although there is no statistically significant variation in the frequency of usage of *emmet* between younger and older speakers, these groups exhibit distinct patterns of social variation. The differing socially-conditioned patterns of variation between the younger and older age-groups can be seen through a CHAID analysis in which the tree is ‘forced’ to split on the basis of age. That is, even though there is no statistically significant variation between the age cohorts in relation to their use of *emmet* as an onomasiological variant of TOURIST, I manually split the node to reveal further patterns of interaction between the age groups and other social categories (see Figure 5.5).
Figure 5.5 CHAID decision tree analysis of the social variation of *emmet* as a variant of TOURIST, where age is forced as the first variable split.

Figure 5.5 shows that the social parameters which are most strongly associated with the use of *emmet* differ between younger and older age-groups. Within the younger population, when the participants are split into a tripartite socioeconomic class

---

111 This tree, with the ‘forced’ first split, accounts for 75% of the observed variation as opposed to 66.3% in the decision tree for the usage of *emmet* without a forced split, which only split on the basis of IdQ total.
categorisation system, those who are labelled WC are more likely to use *emmet* than those who are UWC and MC \( (\chi^2=(df=1, n=40) 7.179, p=.022) \).\(^{112}\)

Within the older population, IdQ total exhibits the strongest statistical relationship with the use of *emmet*, with those with a high total more likely to use the Anglo-Cornish variant than those with a low total \( (\chi^2 (df=1, n=40)= 5.389, p=.020) \). Older speakers with a high IdQ total aged 40-55 were more likely to use *emmet* than those above the age of 56 \( (\chi^2 (df=1, n=31)= 5.427, p=.020) \). This is consistent with the OED, which attests the first usage of *emmet* ‘tourist’ in 1975. Thus, those who are aged 40-55 would have been exposed to *emmet* ‘tourist’ in their childhood and adolescence, whereas those aged above 56 would have been more likely to have acquired other onomasiological variants of TOURIST. Unlike with the younger speakers, the usage of *emmet* by older speakers does not exhibit an SEC effect.\(^{113}\) If IdQ total is removed from the model, the only category which forces a further split within the older cohort is age_3.

5.3.2.5. Compound variable

In this section I analyse the inter-speaker variation of an Anglo-Cornish *compound variable*.\(^{114}\) I define a *compound variable* as a variable that is composed of multiple

\(^{112}\) Within the younger speaker cohort, when other social variables are removed from the model, IdQ score is also a statistically significant predictor of the usage of *emmet* for younger speakers, with those with a high IdQ total using *emmet* more than those with a low IdQ total \( (\chi^2=(df=1, n=40) 4.642, p=.031) \).

\(^{113}\) This split can be ‘forced’ to show that the SEC effect for the older cohort is not statistically significant\( (\chi^2=(df=1, n=40) 1.616, p=.204) \).

\(^{114}\) This is not to be confused with compound variables in computer programming.
constituent variables. The compound variable is made up of three constituent onomasiological variables, namely, LUNCH BOX, WOMAN, and WALK. These variables all exhibit similar patterns of social variation. Specifically, the usage of each Anglo-Cornish variant, crib/croust, maid, and stank, is conditioned by age and strength of local identity. As emmet does not exhibit a similar pattern of age-related variation, I do not include TOURIST in the compound variable.

Due to the statistical relationship between age and IdQ total (see Section 4.10), when a test of statistical significance identifies identity as being associated with Anglo-Cornish lexical usage but fails to account for the relationship between strength of local identity and age, the explanatory power of one’s analysis is limited. However, by conducting decision tree analysis, interaction effects between age and identity can be considered. In isolation, none of the constituent Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable exhibit an interaction effect between age and IdQ total. The lack of observed interaction between age and identity is largely due to the low number of older participants with a low IdQ total and the general low number of tokens of individual Anglo-Cornish variants. For example, there were only six tokens of stank.

The small number of tokens elicited from lexical studies is typically an issue for studies of lexical variation (see Beeching 2011). Similar approaches of clustering variables have been used for lexical (Osser & Endler 1970; Johnson 1993; Meyerhoff 1993; Robinson 2010a; Beeching 2011; Sousa 2017; Grieve et al. 2018, see also lexical lectometry, e.g. Ruette 2012) and non-lexical variables (e.g. Van Hofwegen & Wolfram 2010; Meyerhoff & Klaere 2017), as well as a combination of lexical and non-lexical variables (e.g. Beaman forthcoming). By agglomerating the Anglo-Cornish
onomasiological variants, the number of tokens available for analysis greatly increases in number. Another advantage of the compound variable is that it enables one to see the bigger picture, that is, what kinds of variation and change are exhibited by Anglo-Cornish lexis, more broadly.

In coding compound variable usage, I assigned each participant a value based on the number of Anglo-Cornish variants of the three constituent variables of the compound variable that they used in the onomasiological elicitation tasks. For example, if a participant used no Anglo-Cornish variants, they were assigned a value of ‘zero’, a value of ‘one’ if they used one Anglo-Cornish variant, ‘two’ if they used two, up to a maximum possible value of ‘three’ if they used all three Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants of the compound variable. By combining multiple variants, this makes investigating more detailed patterns of inter-speaker variation possible, so it is possible to ask questions such as ‘within the older population, is IdQ total a significant predictor of Anglo-Cornish lexical usage?’.

Of the 40 older speakers, 24 used zero Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable, while eight participants used one, and four participants used two and three Anglo-Cornish variants. This means that overall there were 28 tokens of Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants (8 + (4X2) + (4X3) = 28) of the compound variable used by older participants (see Table 5.10). Additionally, two younger participants each used one Anglo-Cornish variant of the compound variable.
Table 5.14 The number of tokens of Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable for older and younger speakers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of A-C variants per speaker</th>
<th>Younger speakers</th>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
<th>Older speakers</th>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usage of Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable as shown in Table 5.10 is considered from the perspective of social variation in Table 5.11.

Table 5.15 The social variation of Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30 (M=115=05, SD=116=.221)</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)=-3.947, p=&lt;.001***117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40 (M=07, SD=1.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>Low (M=03, SD=0.29)</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)=-3.668, p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (M=64, SD=1.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC (M=45, SD=.118)</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)=.835, p=.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC (M=.30, SD=.135)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Males (M=.45, SD=.904)</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)=-.835, p=.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (M=.30, SD=.687)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115 M= Mean (average)
116 SD= Standard Deviation
117 When reporting t-test results, the format I use is ‘t(degrees of freedom)= the t statistic, p= p. value’.
| Age_3 | >30 ($M=.05$, $SD=.221$) | $40–55$ ($M=.82$, $SD=1.00$) | $>55$ ($M=.56$, $SD=1.04$) | One-way ANOVA | $F(2, 77)^{118}=8.449$, $p<.001^{***119}$ |
| SEC_3 | MC ($M=.29$, $SD=.90$) | UWC ($M=.32$, $SD=.72$) | WC ($M=.52$, $SD=.82$) | One-way ANOVA | $F(2, 77)=.603$, $p=.550$ |
| Education | Degree ($M=.30$, $SD=.91$) | A-level/equivalent ($M=.27$, $SD=.58$) | Up to 16 ($M=.65$, $SD=.87$) | One-way ANOVA | $F(2, 77)=1.607$, $p=.207$ |
| Occupation | High-prestige ($M=.27$, $SD=.75$) | Mid-prestige ($M=.50$, $SD=.85$) | Low-prestige ($M=.44$, $SD=.85$) | One-way ANOVA | $F(2, 77)=.144$, $p=.866$ |
| PoD | Low-deprivation ($M=.45$, $SD=.99$) | Mid-deprivation ($M=.33$, $SD=.81$) | High-deprivation ($M=.39$, $SD=.50$) | One-way ANOVA | $F(2, 77)=.641$, $p=.530$ |
| CGP | 0 ($M=.40$, $SD=.73$) | 1 ($M=.00$, $SD=.00$) | 2 ($M=.13$, $SD=.50$) | Pearlson correlation | $r=.156$, $p=.168^{120}$ |

Table 5.11 shows that those with a high IdQ total are more likely to use Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable than those with a low IdQ total (independent

---

118 When f-statistics are used, I report degrees of freedom between groups and within groups. The equation for calculating degrees of freedom between groups is $DF=k-1$, where $k$ is the number of groups. The equation for calculating the degrees of freedom within groups is $DF=N-k$, where $N$ is the total number of subjects.

119 When reporting one-way ANOVAs, the format I use is ‘$F(degrees\ of\ freedom), \ the\ f\ statistic, \ p=value’.

120 When reporting the results of a Pearson correlation, the format I use is ‘$r= Pearson’s\ coefficient, \ p=value’.
samples t-test, $t(78) = -3.668$, $p = <.001$). Also, older participants are more likely to use Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable than younger participants, when age is categorised as a binary (independent samples t-test, $t(78) = -3.947$, $p = <.001$) and a trinary (one-way ANOVA, $F(2, 77) = 8.449$, $p = <.001$) category. Post-hoc testing shows that the significant variation is between those aged <30 and those aged 40–55 (Scheffé’s test, $p = .001$). No other pairwise comparisons yielded statistically significant results.

The interaction between IdQ total, age, and the mean usage of Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable can be explored by a CHAID decision tree121, see Figure 5.6.

---

121 Where the dependent variable is continuous, such as here, the CHAID decision tree employs f-tests as opposed to chi-square tests (see Section 5.2.7).
Figure 5.6 shows that age exhibits the strongest statistical relationship with the usage of the compound variable, with older participants using a mean average of 0.7 Anglo-Cornish tokens of the compound variable, compared with an average of 0.05 for younger speakers ($F(1, 78)=15.58, p<.001$). There are no further splits within the category of younger speakers. For older speakers, IdQ total is the next best predictor of the usage of Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable. Older participants with low IdQ totals used an average of 0.111 Anglo-Cornish tokens of the compound variable while those older participants with high IdQ totals averaged 0.871 tokens ($F$
This finding reinforces the conclusions from the analysis of the individual variables, that age and strength of local identity are the strongest predictors of onomasiological Anglo-Cornish dialect usage. However, Figure 5.6 additionally shows that the categories of age and IdQ interact to condition of the usage of the compound variable. Specifically, Figure 5.6 shows that the group most likely to use Anglo-Cornish variants of the compound variable are older speakers with high IdQ totals.

5.3.3. Lexical recognition

To complement the study of the usage of Anglo-Cornish lexis, I was also interested in how widely known Anglo-Cornish lexis is in the Camborne-Redruth community. In order to investigate this, I employed a lexical recognition task in order to explore whether or not participants could identify Anglo-Cornish lexical items from a table words of mixed provenance (see Section 4.5.4). The highest possible score in the lexical recognition task, that is, if a participant identified all of the Anglo-Cornish dialect words, is thirteen. Four participants identified all of the Anglo-Cornish words in the lexical recognition task. The lowest possible score, that is, if a participant did not identify any Anglo-Cornish words, is zero. No participants scored the lowest possible score of zero. Two participants recognised three Anglo-Cornish words, which was the lowest attested overall score. The mean score was 8.9 with a standard deviation of 2.53. The social variation of overall recognition scores is displayed in Table 5.16.
Table 5.16 The social variation of overall Anglo-Cornish lexical recognition scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 (M=7.65, SD=2.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)= 5.153, p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40 (M=10.15, SD=1.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (M=7.94, SD=2.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)= 3.01, p=.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (M=9.56, SD=2.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC (M=8.88, SD=2.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)= .089, p=.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC (M=8.83, SD=2.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (M=8.95, SD=2.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>t(78)= .356, p=.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (M=8.75, SD=2.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30: (M=7.60, SD=2.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>F(2, 77)= 13.152, p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–55: (M=10.18, SD=2.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55: (M=10.00, SD=1.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC: (M=8.95, SD=2.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>F(2, 77)= .915, p=.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC: (M=8.44, SD=2.743)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC: (M=9.32, SD=1.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree: (M=9.06, SD=2.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>F(2, 77)= 4.615, p=.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level/equivalent: (M=7.90, SD=2.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 16: (M=9.95, SD=2.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-prestige: (M=8.72, SD=2.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>F(2, 77)= .544, p=.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-prestige: (M=8.63, SD=2.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-prestige: (M=9.38, SD=2.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.16 shows that age, IdQ total, and education condition lexical recognition task results. Those with higher IdQ totals typically recognise a higher number of Anglo-Cornish lexical items than those with a low IdQ total (independent samples t-test, p<.004). Also, those who are older recognise a greater number of Anglo-Cornish dialect words than those who are younger, both when age is classified as a binary (independent samples t-test, p<.001) and a trinary (one-way ANOVA, p<.001) category. Post-hoc testing reveals that those who are <30 recognise fewer Anglo-Cornish words than those aged 40–55 (Scheffé’s test, p<.001) and those aged >55 (Scheffé’s test, p=.001). There is no statistically significant difference between those aged 40–55 and those aged >55. There was also a statistically significant relationship between education and lexical recognition (one-way ANOVA, F(2, 77)= 4.615, p=.013). Those with formal education up to the age of 16 recognised more Anglo-Cornish words than those with A-levels/ equivalent (Scheffé’s test, p=.015). No other pairwise comparisons yield statistically significant results. CGP also exhibits a statistical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoD</th>
<th>Low-deprivation: (M=9.65, SD=2.23)</th>
<th>Mid-deprivation: (M=8.33, SD=2.72)</th>
<th>High-deprivation: (M=9.16, SD=2.00)</th>
<th>One-way ANOVA</th>
<th>F(2, 77)= 2.131, p=.126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: (M=8.00, SD=2.61)</td>
<td>1: (M=8.28, SD=2.49)</td>
<td>2: (M=7.62, SD=2.82)</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>r=.292, p=.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: (M=10.37, SD=1.68)</td>
<td>4: (M=9.55, SD=2.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationship with lexical recognition scores, with those with higher numbers of CGP relating with higher scores (Pearson correlation, $p=.009$).

The interaction effects between the social variables and overall recognition can be seen in the CHAID decision tree in Figure 5.7.
While Section 5.3.1 & 5.3.2 showed that younger speakers are typically less likely to use Anglo-Cornish lexical variants, Table 5.16 and Figure 5.7 also show that younger
Cornish people are less likely than their older counterparts to recognise Anglo-Cornish forms. Those who are older are more likely to identify a greater number of Anglo-Cornish words (see Figure 5.7) than those who were younger ((mean recognition scores 10.150 and 7.650, respectively) $F(1, 78) = 25.64, p<.001$).

There are no statistically significant interaction effects within the category of older speakers. Within the category of younger speakers, those with PoD was categorised as ‘mid-deprivation’ were significantly less likely to recognise Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis than their ‘low-deprivation’ and ‘high-deprivation’ counterparts ((mean recognition scores 6.6 and 8.7, respectively) $F(1, 38)= 8.526, p=.020$). This is consistent with the finding that language change, in this case, a lack of recognition of local dialect words, is led by those in the middle of the socioeconomic hierarchy (Labov 1972a; Milroy & Milroy 1985).

As well as testing overall recognition, I tested whether or not the recognition of each of the 13 words (see Section 4.3) is conditioned by the social parameters used in this study. I used 2-tailed Fisher’s exact tests for all independent variables with binary independent variables, such as age, linear-by-linear associations for ordinal independent variables, such as occupation, and logistic regression for CGP. These data are presented in Table 5.17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Item</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>IdQ</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sec_3</th>
<th>Age_3</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>PoD</th>
<th>CGP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emmet</td>
<td>‘tourist’ or ‘ant’</td>
<td>Older: 40/40</td>
<td>High: 45/45</td>
<td>WC: 40/40</td>
<td>Male: 21/21 UWC: 1/34</td>
<td>&lt;30: 39/40</td>
<td>Degree: 30/30</td>
<td>High-prestige: 39/40</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 14/15</td>
<td>0: 14/15</td>
<td>1: 7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=0.044</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=0.809,</td>
<td>p=0.368</td>
<td>Low-prestige: 18/18</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 34/34</td>
<td>3: 34/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.025*</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.013*</td>
<td>p=.371</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.416,</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=8.032,</td>
<td>p=.005 **</td>
<td>Low-prestige: 8/18</td>
<td>High-deprivation: 17/34</td>
<td>4: 17/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>croust</td>
<td>‘food provisions’</td>
<td>Older: 30/40 Younger: 8/40</td>
<td>High: 30/45 Low: 8/35</td>
<td>WC: 19/40 MC: 19/40 Male: 20/40 Female: 18/40</td>
<td>MC:12/21 UWC: 13/34 WC: 13/25 $\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=.070$, $p=1.00$</td>
<td>$&lt;30$: 8/40</td>
<td>$40–55$: 15/22</td>
<td>$&gt;55$: 15/18</td>
<td>Degree: 15/30 A-level/ equivalent: 8/30 Up to 16: 15/20</td>
<td>High-prestige: 20/40 Mid-prestige: 8/22 Low-prestige: 10/18</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 14/20 Mid-deprivation: 16/42 High-deprivation: 8/18 $\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=2.211$, $p=.791$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dreckly</td>
<td>‘in the future’</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger: 30/40</td>
<td>Low: 29/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.252</td>
<td>p=.782</td>
<td>p=.568</td>
<td>p=.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger: 8/40</td>
<td>Low: 3/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
<td>p=.047 *</td>
<td>p=.020 *</td>
<td>p=.252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger: 29/35</td>
<td>Low: 29/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square values are calculated with degrees of freedom (df) and sample size (n).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tuss</th>
<th>'idiot'</th>
<th>Older: 27/40</th>
<th>Younger: 18/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 27/45</td>
<td>Low: 18/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 24/40</td>
<td>MC: 21/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 25/40</td>
<td>Female: 20/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>17/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 18/25</td>
<td>18/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30: 18/40</td>
<td>40–55: 18/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 9/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree: 16/30</td>
<td>A-level/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equivalent: 15/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 16:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-prestige: 20/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-prestige: 13/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-prestige: 12/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 12/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 24/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-deprivation: 18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 25/40</td>
<td>Female: 20/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>UWC: 17/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35/40</td>
<td>WC: 18/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.071</td>
<td>p=.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.500</td>
<td>p=.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.652</td>
<td>p=.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.652</td>
<td>p=.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=2.897, p=.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.880, p=.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.082, p=.298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.478, p=.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.799, p=.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.774, p=.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.886, p=.503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=9.200, p=.002 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=3.24, p=.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.416, p=.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=2.259, p=.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>maid</th>
<th>'woman'</th>
<th>Older: 39/40</th>
<th>Younger: 35/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 44/45</td>
<td>Low: 30/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 39/40</td>
<td>MC: 35/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 36/40</td>
<td>Female: 38/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>25/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30: 35/40</td>
<td>40–55: 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 18/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree: 27/30</td>
<td>A-level/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equivalent: 27/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 16:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-prestige: 35/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-prestige: 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-prestige: 18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 18/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 37/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-deprivation: 18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 36/40</td>
<td>Female: 38/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/40</td>
<td>35/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.201</td>
<td>p=.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.081</td>
<td>p=.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.201</td>
<td>p=.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.675</td>
<td>p=.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=3.385, p=.066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.082, p=.298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.478, p=.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.799, p=.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.774, p=.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.886, p=.503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=9.200, p=.002 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=3.24, p=.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.416, p=.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=2.259, p=.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stank</th>
<th>'walk/hike'</th>
<th>Older: 28/40</th>
<th>Younger: 12/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High: 25/45</td>
<td>Low: 15/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 18/40</td>
<td>MC: 22/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 22/40</td>
<td>Female: 18/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>17/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 13/25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30: 12/40</td>
<td>40–55: 16/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 12/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree: 16/30</td>
<td>A-level/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equivalent: 11/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 16:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-prestige: 21/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-prestige: 8/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-prestige: 11/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 18/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 37/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High-deprivation: 18/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: 22/40</td>
<td>Female: 18/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/40</td>
<td>17/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001 ***</td>
<td>p=.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.367</td>
<td>p=.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.503</td>
<td>p=.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.886, p=.503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=9.200, p=.002 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=3.24, p=.569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.416, p=.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=2.259, p=.133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.248</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td>p=.100</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17 shows that age exhibits the strongest statistical relationship with lexical recognition task scores (see also Trudgill 1988; Lawrie 1991; Macafee 1994; Simmelbauer 2000; Britain 2009; McColl Millar et al. 2014), with this social parameter being in a statistically significant relationship with five of the thirteen investigated words. For each of these examples, older speakers are more likely to recognise Anglo-Cornish dialect words than their younger counterparts. The recognition of four Anglo-Cornish words exhibit a statistically significant recognition with IdQ total. In each case, those with higher IdQ totals are more likely to recognise the word than those with lower IdQ totals.

5.3.4. Inter-speaker variation summary

In Section 5.3, I have presented the quantitative data for semasiological and onomasiological usage as well as the recognition of Anglo-Cornish words. The two semasiological variables both exhibit an identity effect and age-related variation, but in different ways. Maid exhibits age-related variation in the first-elicitation prompt, but no overall socially-conditioned variation. This suggests that the older sense maid ‘woman’ is becoming less core for younger speakers (see Section 8.1). Younger speakers with low IdQ totals are the most advanced group in this semasiological change in progress. The older sense of emmet, ‘ant’, is obsolescing within the Camborne-Redruth community. Within the older middle-class population, those with a
strong sense of Cornish identity are the most likely to use the recessive semasiological variant, *emmet* ‘ant’.

From the perspective of onomasiology, Anglo-Cornish lexis is conditioned by a range of social factors. For each of the four investigated onomasiological variables, speakers with high IdQ totals use the Anglo-Cornish variant more frequently than those with low IdQ totals. Thus, overall, IdQ total is the best predictor of Anglo-Cornish onomasiological usage. Age also exhibits statistically significant variation for three of the four variables, namely *LUNCH BOX*, *WOMAN*, and *WALK*. For *TOURIST*, although age does not condition frequency of the usage of *emmet*, age exhibits distinct interactions with other social categories for younger and older speakers, particularly SEC and IdQ total, respectively. Both *emmet* and *crib/croust* exhibit a socioeconomic class effect, with working-class speakers using local forms more frequently than middle-class speakers. The social variation of all investigated Anglo-Cornish onomasiological forms are summarised in Table 5.14.

Table 5.18 The social variation of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th><em>crib/croust</em></th>
<th><em>maid</em></th>
<th><em>stank</em></th>
<th><em>Emmet</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.001 ***</td>
<td>p=.005 **</td>
<td>p=.026</td>
<td>p=.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.001 ***</td>
<td>p=.008 **</td>
<td>p=.033</td>
<td>p=.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.010 **</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
<td>p=.201</td>
<td>p=.039 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.781</td>
<td>p=.712</td>
<td>p=.675</td>
<td>p=.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>p=.023*</td>
<td>p=.769</td>
<td>p=.469</td>
<td>p=.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>p=.011*</td>
<td>p=.017*</td>
<td>p=.056</td>
<td>p=.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>p=.004**</td>
<td>p=.635</td>
<td>p=.499</td>
<td>p=.020*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5.3.2.5 demonstrates the value of conceptualising multiple variables as a compound variable to overcome the small token count which is characteristic of studies of lexical variation (see Section 4.4.1). The use of the compound variable enabled me to analyse the social variation of composite Anglo-Cornish lexical usage which is conditioned by an interaction of the social categories of age and strength of Cornish identity, as measured by IdQ total. In Section 5.4, I explore onomasiological variation from the perspective of intra-speaker variation.

In Section 5.3.3 I demonstrated that not only is the Anglo-Cornish vocabulary usage conditioned by social factors, so too is the recognition of Anglo-Cornish lexis. This suggests that members of different social categories receive different rates of Anglo-Cornish words in the linguistic input that they receive from their social networks. The patterns of recognition were broadly similar to patterns of Anglo-Cornish lexical usage. For example, the two social categories which exhibit the most and the strongest statistical relationships with both the usage and recognition data are age and strength of local identity.

In this section I have explored the inter-speaker variation of Anglo-Cornish lexis. Next, I explore onomasiological usage data along the axis of intra-speaker variation.
5.4. Intra-speaker onomasiological variation

The onomasiological variation described in Section 5.3.2 displays complex patterns of inter-speaker variation. This variation can be further unpacked from the perspective of intra-speaker variation. Speakers used onomasiological variants of the investigated lexical variables in casual and careful speech styles through SD tasks and naming tasks, respectively. A comparison of onomasiological usage between these tasks can be considered to be a study of sociolinguistic style.

The investigated onomasiological variables exhibit subtly different patterns of socially-conditioned variation (see Section 5.4.2). From the perspective of intra-speaker variation, the distribution of the data is less complex, yet, perhaps more unusual. Each of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants exhibits statistically significant variation with regard to speech style. Recall from Section 2.1.2. that sociolinguistic theory predicts that as attention-to-speech increases, so does the frequency of standard linguistic variants (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974). The stylistic variation in the data collected in this study displays a monotonic pattern, as all speakers who did style-shift, did so in the same direction. However, contrary to traditional accounts of sociolinguistic style-shifting (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974), the recessive and overtly stigmatised Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants are more likely to be observed in careful (naming tasks), as opposed to casual (spot-the-difference tasks), speech styles.
From the 80-participant sample, 67 tokens of onomasiological Anglo-Cornish dialect forms were produced by 38 participants. Of these 67 tokens, 62 were elicited from the careful speech style, while only five tokens, from four speakers, were elicited in the casual speech style (see Figures 5.8 & 5.9). Each of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants were statistically significantly more likely to occur in the careful speech style than in the casual style. 19 tokens of *crib/croust* were elicited, of which 16 were elicited during the careful speech style (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.025$). There were eight tokens of *maid* elicited from the participants in this study. All of these tokens were elicited in the careful speech style, which is statistically significant (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.007$). Stank also exhibits statistically significant intra-speaker variation as all six tokens of *stank* were elicited from the careful speech style (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=.028$). Of the 34 tokens of *emmet*, 32 were elicited from the careful speech style (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=<.001$). Overall, Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis was more likely to occur in the careful style than in the casual style (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, $p=<.001$).

I display the intra-speaker variation for each Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variant in Figure 5.8 and overall in Figure 5.9. In Appendix 7, I present the intra-speaker variation of the attested non-Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants of *LUNCH BOX*.

---

122 See Section 5.1 for a discussion of how I coded the usage of variants in the casual speech style.
123 None of the other variants of *LUNCH BOX* exhibit statistically significant intra-speaker variation (see Appendix 7.1).
124 Conversely, *lady* is more likely to be used casual speech styles (see Appendix 7.2).
125 Conversely, *walk* is more likely to be used in casual speech (see Appendix 7.3).
126 For the *TOURIST* variable, *#-on-holiday* is more likely to be used in the casual speech style while *tourist* is more likely to be used in careful speech (see Appendix 7.4).
(Appendix 7.1), WOMAN (Appendix 7.2), WALK (Appendix 7.3), and TOURIST (Appendix 7.4).

Figure 5.8 The intra-speaker variation in the usage of the investigated Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants.

Figure 5.9 The variation between careful and casual speech styles for all five of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants.
By accounting for social and stylistic variation, one can account for not only who uses Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis, but when they do so, too. Specifically, the group most likely to use Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants are those who have a high IdQ total and are ‘older’ (see Section 5.3.2.) and they are most likely to do so in careful speech styles.

5.5. Summary

In this chapter, I have provided inferential and descriptive statistical interpretations of the usage of two semasiological and four onomasiological variables and the recognition of thirteen Anglo-Cornish words and senses using the methods that I described in Chapter 4. I have taken a first-wave variationist perspective in order to examine sociolinguistic patterns of variation and change of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis.

The usage of Anglo-Cornish lexis is conditioned by a variety of social factors. For example, *crib/croust* are less likely to be used by younger participants. Older middle-class participants are more advanced in this age-related change than their working-class counterparts. This is consistent with existing sociolinguistic theory which predicts that where an innovative form diffuses from a source associated with greater prestige (such as Standard English), the innovative form will be led by those of higher social strata (Meyerhoff 1993: 236). In this case, middle-class participants are more likely to use a non-regionally marked variant, whereas the working-class participants are more likely to use the recessive local variant(s). The semasiological variation is also largely consistent with sociolinguistic theory. For example, the change from *emmet* ‘ant’ to
emmet ‘tourist’ displays apparent-time change which is consistent with the direction of real-time change as evidenced by the OED and Anglo-Cornish dialect dictionaries (see Section 4.3). Moreover, this change is mediated by socioeconomic class, with older middle-class speakers being the least likely to use the stigmatised (see Section 7.1.5) innovative form emmet ‘tourist’ (see Appendix 6.1.2).

Not all of the distributions of lexical usage presented in this chapter are typical of sociolinguistic variation. A key point of difference between this study and typical sociolinguistic patterns is that onomasiological variation exhibited a non-canonical style-pattern (see Section 8.2.1). Local forms are more likely to be found in careful, as opposed to casual, speech styles. Speakers are not shifting away from overtly stigmatised lexical forms as their attention-to-speech increases, but they are actually shifting towards these forms. This pattern appears to challenge the attention-to-speech model of style-shifting (see Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974). However, in light of the social variation perhaps this finding should be less surprising than it may initially seem. Speakers with a strong sense of Cornish identity are orienting towards a locally meaningful prestige in careful speech styles (see Section 8.2.1). Another point of difference between this and most other variationist sociolinguistic studies is that I have shown the interaction effects between the strength of local identity and other social parameters such as age and socioeconomic class (cf. Baranowski 2017).

In addition to variation in the use of Anglo-Cornish lexis, in Section 5.3.3 I have shown that recognition of local dialect words is conditioned by social factors, including age and IdQ total. This suggests that many younger speakers not only do not use many ‘traditional’ Anglo-Cornish dialect words (see Section 5.3.2), but that they do not
recognise the forms at all (see Section 5.3.3). Thus, non-use of many of these Anglo-Cornish words is not a stylistic choice for many of these younger speakers, these local words are not in their repertoire at all. This suggests a lack of Anglo-Cornish vocabulary in the input from the surrounding community and its speakers which is consistent with the lack of Anglo-Cornish words found in casual speech.

In the following chapter, I provide a qualitative perspective on Cornish identity which complements the quantitative usage data in the current chapter. The findings presented in this chapter are interpreted in light of the complex ideological landscape in Cornwall and the social meanings of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants which are discussed in the following chapters (see Chapters 6 & 7, respectively).
6. Cornish identities

By engaging with local social practices and immersing myself within the local community through ethnographic participant observation (see Section 4.1), I developed insights into local identity and ideologies in Camborne-Redruth, upon which I reflect in the current chapter. This perspective also sheds light on the production (see Chapter 5) and perception (see Chapter 7) of the Anglo-Cornish dialect, which I bring together in Chapter 8. Primarily drawing on a thematic analysis (see Nowell et al. 2017) of the narratives and responses of participants in this study, as well as from ethnographic participant-observation, I introduce two Cornish identities, the ‘Industrial Celt’127 and ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’128, in relation to Bakhtin’s (1981) ‘chronotopes’. These identities, embedded in a spatio-temporal reality, are a lens through which individuals attribute social meanings to linguistic forms (see Chapter 7).

My pilot-study, Sandow & Robinson (2018) and Sandow (2020), noted a binary distinction between those for whom Cornish identity was central to their conceptualisation of self, and those for whom Cornishness was a less important defining factor, who were termed Kernowcentrics and Kernowsceptics, respectively. Based on IdQ totals, the majority of older participants were categorised as Kernowcentrics, while the majority of younger participants were categorised as Kernowsceptics. This is consistent with the received narrative which is that the youth

127 I borrow this term from Deacon (2018) who uses the term Industrial Celts to describe a Cornish identity which developed in the 18th and 19th centuries (see also Payton 2002b).
128 The term Lifestyle Cornwall has been used by Kennedy (2013) to describe a ‘brand’ which is used by the tourism industry to market Cornwall to potential visitors (see also Deacon 2007a; Kennedy 2016).
are losing, or have lost, their Cornish identity, such as ‘I don’t think [being Cornish] means anything to [younger] generations’ (KMF29) and ‘the older population’s [identity] is a lot stronger than the younger people’s’ (TMF22). This is supported by the finding that older people are more likely to have high IdQ totals (see Section 4.5.4).

Although a purely quantitative analysis of identity using IdQ totals is useful (for example, see Chapter 5), this approach alone is necessarily limited. On the aggregate, older speakers are more likely to have higher IdQ totals than their younger counterparts (see Section 4.6.4). Yet, only two participants, one older and one younger, either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement ‘I am proud to be Cornish’. If the younger cohort is overwhelmingly proud to be Cornish, it is not immediately clear why they have significantly lower IdQ totals. An exclusively quantitative reading of the data fails to provide insight into why this pattern was observed. Ethnographic observations suggest that this may be because a much more complex ideological matrix exists, as opposed to a simply strong/weak binary of identity. I suggest there is more than one way to be Cornish in twenty-first century Cornwall (see also R. Harris 2016; cf. Dubois & Horvath 1999; Watt 2002; Braber 2009; Remlinger 2009). The changing ways in which people align with Cornwall has implications for both the usage (see Chapter 5) and perception (see Chapter 7) of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis.

When I was engaged in conversations with members of the Camborne-Redruth community about what being Cornish meant to them, the discourse content of the responses contained a great deal of variation. It quickly became clear that different meanings were being attached to ‘Cornish identity’. These were not just quantitative
differences in the strength of identity, but qualitative differences, too. Within this study, participants exhibit alignment to the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall identities. Cornish people can align exclusively to one of these identities or simultaneously embrace or reject both.

Although, typically, local identity is considered as a binary strong/weak affiliation to a geographically defined place (e.g. Labov 1963; Reed 2016) or between alignment to one place over another (e.g. Frazer 1983; Llamas 2007), other research has suggested that local ideologies are more complex (e.g. Watt 2002; Braber 2009; Johnstone; 2016). Payton (1992a) proposes that there are discrete stages of Cornwall’s social history, each of which is tied to Cornwall’s peripherality (see Section 3.1.1). These ‘phases of peripherality’ each spawn a new iteration of Cornish identity. The dynamic quality of Cornwall’s peripheral condition means that the relationship between an individual and their sense of place is not static. Cornishness is a dynamic lived experience which is perpetually being reimagined and reconstructed. Consequently, each individual has a slightly different schema for Cornishness and Cornish identity. However, in order to conduct a community-level analysis, some degree of (strategic) essentialism (see Bucholtz 2003) is required. While explicitly acknowledging intra-group differences and the necessary limitations that such differences cause, the primary focus of the analysis in this chapter is on common, shared identities and experiences. I ground my observations regarding multiple Cornish identities in a particular theory of diachronically and synchronically dynamic identities, namely ‘chronotopes’ (see Bakhtin 1981).
6.1. Chronotopes

Directly translated, *chronotope* means ‘space-time’ (see Bakhtin 1981). Blommaert & De Fina (2016: 5) state that chronotopes refer to:

> socially shared, and differential, complexes of value attributed to specific forms of identity, as expressed […] in the description of the looks, behaviour, actions, and speech of certain characters, enacted in specific timespace frames.

In this chapter I focus on *cultural chronotopes* (Agha 2007). Agha (2007: 321) defines cultural chronotopes as ‘a semiotic representation of time and place peopled by certain social types’. I follow the recent applications of cultural chronotopes to narrative analysis (e.g. Perrino 2015; Eugenia et al. 2019; Pritzker & Perrino forthcoming) and identity (e.g. Agha 2007; Pardue 2018; Johnstone 2018; Gao 2020; Szabla 2020).

By applying chronotopes to identity, one can explore how individuals, and larger social groups connect ‘specific space-time arrangements with moral orders, projecting possible and preferred identities’ (Blommaert 2017: 96). Chronotopes enable the researcher to consider ideological frames in the context of a spatio-temporal reality. That is to say that identities pertaining to a single place evolve over time. For example, Johnstone (2018) identified four chronotopes based on distinct types of Pittsburgh identity; the ‘golden age’, the ‘timeless local’, the ‘contemporary other’ and the ‘new Yinzer’. Though anchored by a shared locality, identities of place are not stable. Chronotopic identities enable one to account for variation in both the
temporal and spatial dimension. For example, a 21st-century Cornish identity is different from an 18th-century Cornish identity and is differently different from a 21st-century Geordie identity.

Chronotopic identities can be identified and described through ethnographic research methods (Blommaert & De Fina 2016, see Woolard 2013; Karimzad 2016; Wang & Kroon 2017; Karimzad & Catedral 2018). A chronotope is a “mobile” context enabling not just precise ethnographic description but explanatory potential as well’ (Blommaert 2017: 96). Through the lens of chronotopic identities, individuals can imbue behaviours and social practices with social meanings. Blommaert & De Fina (2016) state that chronotopes ‘invoke orders of indexicality valid in a specific timespace frame [...] indexicals that acquire a certain recognizable value when deployed within a particular timespace configuration’. Through ethnographic participant-observation in Cornwall (see Section 4.1), it became clear that chronotopes provide a theoretical frame to account for the multiple ‘Cornwalls’ that were identified in the community.

6.2. Cornish chronotopes

As mentioned in Section 3.1.1, D.H. Lawrence (1916/1981: 503) once commented that ‘I like Cornwall very much. It is not England’. This raises the question, if it is not England, what is it, exactly? I endeavour to answer this from a perspective informed by my encounters with the very people who live and work in Camborne-Redruth in 2017–18. These chronotopes provide context for the understanding of sociolinguistic
patterns and social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis as discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.

In England, rural communities are characterised as ‘backward, conservative, boring, dangerous, threatening, uncultured, and uneducated’ (Britain 2017: 174, see also Woods 2011). Britain’s (2017) account of the perception of rural communities in England is consistent with the stigma attached to Cornwall. This stigma is exemplified by DWF27 who states that the perception of Cornish people is that they are ‘rough, a bit less intelligent […] they hate all sorts of cultures’ and that ‘they eat their young in St. Just [a village in West Cornwall]’. Similarly, EWM26 observes that ‘a lot of people see [the Cornish] as being less smart […] like we’re a level below’. The negative stereotypes of rural life are echoed by many participants, including SWM49, who comments on a perception that the Cornish ‘have straw in [their] ears’. These quotes demonstrate that Cornish people are very much aware of the stigma attached to them by outsiders.

There is geographical variation in identity within Cornwall. For example, fishing would undoubtedly have been a much more central theme in this study had it been conducted in a Cornish fishing village such as Newlyn. Indeed, identity in Camborne-Redruth ‘is different to a Cornish seaside town’ (CMM54). Within Cornwall, there is a view that Cornish identity is ‘more militant’ in the West (SMM45), while ‘Truro is up its own arse’ (TMM49) due to perceived gentrification. Thus I make no claims about the

---

129 This quote makes reference to the trope that infanticide and cannibalism is practiced in rural communities, with St. Just, a village in west Cornwall being the archetypal traditional rural community within Cornwall.
extent to which these identities are applicable to other Cornish locales, but limit the scope of my analysis to the Camborne-Redruth area.

Within Cornwall, Camborne-Redruth is particularly stigmatised. The notion that Cornish people have additional fingers and toes, due to alleged incestuous relationships, is a trope often associated with Camborne-Redruth. This can be seen in a Facebook post by the satirical local news page ‘Cornish news’ (see Figure 6.1). This is evidence of the trope of incestuous relations being endorsed by Cornish people, when limited to Redruth.

Connected with this trope, is the trope that people from Redruth are uneducated, even illiterate, as exemplified by Figure 6.2, which shows a school shirt signed by a student’s peers, a common practice in British schools among school leavers.

---

130 This image was posted by the satirical local news Facebook page ‘Cornish news’ on 9/04/2019.
This could have been us, but we never learnt to read or write at Redruth School

Similarly, negative perceptions of Camborne are also commonplace, as is evidenced by Figure 6.3, which implies that Camborne is comparable to Hell.

Figure 6. 2 A image and accompanying caption suggesting that those who attended Redruth school are illiterate. 

Figure 6. 3 A meme which showcases the widespread negative perception of Camborne.

---

131 This image was posted by the satirical local news Facebook page ‘Cornish news’ on 03/02/2020.
132 This meme was posted by the satirical local news Facebook page ‘Cornish news’ on 27/11/2019.
The widespread negative evaluation of Camborne-Redruth is further exemplified by MMF25 who recalls that ‘when I first started at [an independent school] we had to introduce ourselves and when I said that I was from Redruth, people laughed’. Indeed, Redruth has developed a pejorative nickname which is particularly popular among school children, namely, *dead-rough*, meaning ‘very uncultured’. Conversely, Redruth is positively valorised by others. For example, ‘one of the reasons we like living in Redruth is that it still has a Cornish feel to it’ (RMM67). Thus, although people from Cornwall as a whole are generally stigmatised, this stigma is particularly concentrated in Camborne-Redruth, some display a positive affect to Redruth’s perceived Cornish traditionality.

Cornwall’s peripheral condition has meant that a sense of difference has endured; at the same time, a dynamic social history (see Section 3.1.1) has led to Cornish identity being perpetually reinvented (Payton 1989, 1992a). That is, what it means to be Cornish has been imagined and reimagined throughout history in response to the structural conditions of Cornwall’s peripherality (see Section 2.1.1). According to Bourdieu (1986: 241), ‘[t]he social world is accumulated history’. Bourdieu’s statement is echoed by Blommaert (2015: 11) who noted that ‘[e]vents, acts, people, and themes can be set and reset, so to speak, in different timespace frames, in such a way that the setting and resetting enable and prompt indexicals ordered as socioculturally recognizable sets of attributions’. These observations are consistent with my observations in Cornwall and are discussed throughout this chapter.
In Cornwall, there are a number of interwoven heritage narratives which, while distinct, cannot be entirely separated (Kennedy & Kingcome 1998: 58). Kennedy & Kingcome (1998: 46) observe that ‘Cornish culture is a multi-layered affair, a series of historical strata. Each layer of material and cultural attributes is laid down over previous ones, to an extent replacing what went before, but never completely obscuring it’. Indeed, there are ‘contested representations’ of Cornishness (Dickinson 2008: 170, see also Deacon 2007a: 2). That is, due to the changing nature of Cornwall’s peripherality, there is not a strong consensus on what constitutes a Cornish identity among the Cornish population.

Cornwall now finds itself at something of a tipping point. Fundamental socio-economic and cultural changes are taking place (see Section 3.1 & 3.2), yet, there is widespread disagreement on how to respond to these changes- to reject or to embrace? On the one hand, many Cornish people want to undo these changes and revert back to what they perceive to be a ‘golden age’ when Cornwall was perceived to be more distinctly Celtic and was sustained by traditional industry. On the other hand, many Cornish people feel Cornwall’s Celtic and mining pasts add to the rich tapestry of Cornwall’s history but reject the notion that these pasts should be central to Cornwall’s future. Instead, they favour capitalising on the demand for tourism and hospitality and exploring alternative future directions for development.

I describe two chronotopic identities that I encountered through my participant-observation in Camborne-Redruth, namely, the ‘Industrial Celt’ and
‘Lifestyle Cornwall’, in Sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2, respectively. The former is a traditional, historically-oriented chronotope which is heavily reliant on Cornwall’s Celtic and industrial pasts. The latter is a more modern reconceptualisation of Cornishness, much of which is manifested from a meta-cultural awareness of traditional Cornishness. This change in identity has not gone unnoticed by some, particularly younger speakers. For example, one participant noted that ‘the ideologies are different between generations [...] we see the world differently’ (TMM23). Another states that ‘I wouldn’t say I have the same sort of pride in being Cornish as my Dad does’ (JWM23). Each of these chronotopes were forged in different historical epochs yet coexist in twenty-first century Cornwall (cf. Remlinger 2009). It is important to note that these chronotopes are not mutually exclusive. It is possible for an individual’s belief system to include some aspects which are typical of Industrial Celts and others which are typical of the Lifestyle Cornwall identity.

6.2.1. The Industrial Celt

The Celtic history of Cornwall remains a key ingredient to Cornish identities and is enduringly present through Celtic iconography such as geometric shapes carved into stone, language (Kernewek), as well as in local oral histories. After being at the vanguard of the industrial revolution in the early 18th century, an industrial identity was forged into the Cornish consciousness. Together, these factors form what has

---

133 It is likely that other chronotopes have existed in the past such as ‘West Barbary’, see Deacon (2018). However, my focus here is on the chronotopes of contemporary Cornwall.
been the identity which is most readily associated with Cornwall, the ‘Industrial Celt’ (see Deacon 2018). This Cornish identity is ‘based on its rich industrial past and elements of Celtic mysticism’ (Zwegers 2018:18). Based on a thematic analysis of participants’ narratives and responses as well as my ethnographic participant-observation, I suggest that the Industrial Celt chronotope is chiefly characterised by:

- The belief that Cornwall is a nation
- The belief that Cornish identity is a Celtic identity
- A tendency to ‘other’ England and the English
- An industrial (particularly mining) identity
- A general negative affect pertaining to tourism and concomitant industries
- A conservative attitude to change in Cornwall

Industrial Celts reject the increasingly evident Englishness of Cornwall as this process of Anglicisation further reinforces Cornwall’s peripheral status as a fringe English county. Instead, Industrial Celts desire Cornwall to be free of English dominion, as the centre of an alternative geo-political structure, as a Celtic nation. Cornwall’s Celtic history is often used as a justification to assert that Cornwall is not a county of England, but a Celtic nation. Over 52,000 people, or 9.9% of the Cornish population, claimed that their national identity was Cornish, according to 2011 census data, up from 6.8% in 2001 (Cornwall Council 2013). A further c.20,000 stated that their national identity is Cornish plus British, English, Welsh, Northern Irish etc., bringing the total number of people who claimed at least partial national Cornish identity to 13.8%

---

134 Examples of this mysticism include the tale of King Arthur and distinct spiritual beliefs associated with the Celts (see Gibson et al. 2013).
135 This was despite ‘Cornish’ not being a selectable option on the census, meaning that people had to select ‘other’ and write in their Cornish identity (see Section 3.2.2),
of the Cornish population. This national identity is predicated on Cornwall’s Celtic history. Deacon (2018: 79) states that ‘what made the Cornish identity fundamentally different from English regional identities was an underlying ethnic [Celtic] component’. This identity was given further legitimacy, when in 2014, Cornwall was identified as a national minority by the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe.

The revival of the once extinct Cornish language is an expression of Cornish identity (Davies-Deacon 2017). Deacon (2010: 7) states that Kernewek has been a ‘standing reminder well into the 1700s and even now’ that Cornwall’s history is not that of an English county, but of a ‘British Britain’, which pre-dates England and the English. Indeed, (Harasta 2013: 12) states that for ‘the users of Kernewek, one of its primary attractions is its ability to mark Cornish difference […] and [that it] is integrated into a wider project of Cornish nationalism’. The Celtic, even nationalist, Cornish identities, associated with Kernewek are characteristic of the Industrial Celt identity.

In interviews with participants, an ethnic or national Cornish identity was a common theme (see also Appendix 8). For example, DMM83 states that ‘I am Cornish, that’s my native identity’, while JMF67 remarks that when asked to provide ethnic or national identity on forms they always select, or write, ‘white Cornish’. Furthermore, GWM63 notes that ‘the indigenous population [of Cornwall] is being diluted’ and SWM49 comments that ‘the indigenous Cornish person is hard-working’. Similarly, EWM26 states that ‘we [Cornish people] are Celtic, we’re not Saxon’ and GWM63 comments that ‘we are a Celtic nation, like the Scots, the Welsh, the Bretons, and the
Isle of Man’. RMM67 even says that ‘[the Cornish] are like the aborigines and the Eskimos, we have become an **endangered species**’. This perspective was given further credence when in a widely circulated article in *Nature* (Leslie et al. 2015) reported a genetic difference between the populations of Cornwall and neighbouring Devon. This ethnic component enables people to feel connected to Cornish history and to feel solidarity with their ancestors, which is exemplified by LWM26’s comment that ‘going back to ancient history you are always being told stories which make you more proud to be Cornish, more so than being English’. Many participants feel a sense of solidarity with their Cornish ancestors. For example, note the use of the first-person plural pronoun, *we*, in the following quote from TMM49:

> The nature of the separation [of England and Cornwall] by distance has fostered a certain independence of spirit that is, I think, identifiable [...] there is an element of the history of the Tamar¹36 being that clear border and historically *we* were all pushed down this way.

The border between Devon and Cornwall is often discussed in relation to Cornish identity (see Appendix 8). For example, SMM45 suggests that there is ‘a noticeable difference when you cross from Devon to Cornwall’. This is echoed by JWF55 who remarks that ‘there's a different sense when you cross over [the Tamar] bridge into God's country [Cornwall] [...] it makes you feel warm and fuzzy inside’. Cornish identity, in its Industrial Celt guise, is described by SWM49 as being ‘patriotic’. Many of those who embody the Industrial Celt chronotope are keen to distance themselves from England and the English. SWM50 states that ‘I get offended when the English come in [to Cornwall] and say [to the Cornish], ‘you’re English, get used to it’, well, we’re not’.

---

¹³⁶ The river Tamar is located at the border between Cornwall and Devon, and, to some, England.
This sense of difference between England and Cornwall is reinforced by PWM71 who says that ‘I don’t want the bastards [English people] coming down here to live [...] [English people] are foreigners just the same, it doesn’t matter if they’re from England or Romania’.

This othering of ‘the English’ also has implications for the contested constitutional status of Cornwall. This is exemplified by AWM55’s comment that ‘we aren’t English, people say we’re a county, but we aren’t’. Somewhat colourfully, when discussing Cornwall’s relationship with England, JMF75 proudly asserts that ‘the Cornish have attacked England, going right back to the Saxons, and we’ve always resisted them [the English] [...] the Cornish are fucking bloody bastards because we’re always up and fighting’. This ethnic or nationalistic perspective on Cornish identity has implications for centre-periphery relations with many of those who align with the Industrial Celt chronotope refuting that Cornwall is a county, and, therefore, a peripheral region of England. Instead, they conceptualise Cornwall as a nation, and, therefore, at the centre of an alternative structural paradigm.

The Industrial Celt theme is also manifested by the ‘Cornish tick box bus’. In a census, if a Cornish person wishes to state their national identity as Cornish, they must select ‘other’ and write ‘Cornish’ below as there is no designated box for ‘Cornish’, as there is for other Celtic nationalities such as ‘Welsh’ and ‘Irish’. There has been a great deal of opposition to the lack of Cornish representation on the census which has commented upon by Cornish M.P. Steve Double in the House of Commons (see Appendix 8). A double-decker bus painted with St. Piran’s flag travelled around Cornwall in 2018 attempting to raise awareness and support for the campaign to add a
Cornish tick-box to the 2021 UK census. Members of the public were invited onto the bus, named the ‘Cornish embassy’, to participate in a quiz, or ‘Cornish citizenship test’, and receive a ‘Cornish passport’. The idea of a Cornish ‘passport’ is by no means new. In Cornwall, when residents travel over the Tamar bridge into Devon, they are frequently reminded, semi-jokingly, to take their (fictional Cornish) passport (cf. Beal 2009a). Although most references to a putative Cornish passport are at least partially tongue-in-cheek, this is further evidence of the widespread belief that Cornwall is a Celtic nation and, thus, separate from England.

While the ethnically Celtic component of the Industrial Celt identity is literal, a metaphorical mining gene is often claimed, as clearly indicated by KMF29’s statement that ‘mining is in my DNA’. The metaphorical link between genetics and mining is also seen in local folk songs, such as Harry Glasson’s ‘South Crofty’, in which a lyric states that ‘all we’ve ever wanted, it’s in our blood and bone, to work down where our Father’s worked and break the tin from stone’.

The link between Cornish identity and mining was a common theme throughout both my ethnographic participant-observation and interviews with participants. SWM50 notes that ‘in order to understand what it means to be Cornish, you have to understand mining’. Cornwall’s industrial past remains visible in the landscape and mining is prominent in the Cornish collective consciousness. This is exemplified by GWM63 who comments that ‘we have a lot of heritage in tin and china clay [...] it was things like that that gave us our identity’. RWM52 instructed me to ‘look out the window here and you’ll see three or four tin mines’ and then commented that

---

137 Available at: https://tickboxbus.org/quiz.php
'I've never had any dealings or involvement with mining in my life but would feel proud if [South Crofty mine] opened again'. Similarly, Glasson’s song ‘South Crofty’ contains a lyric which states that ‘it would feel so good to Camborne boys to welcome [South] Crofty [mine] back’. The Industrial Celt chronotopic identity perpetuates a version of Cornishness that is perceived as authentic, as it is grounded in history and this historical basis is thought to give this identity legitimacy (see also R. Harris 2016).

When South Crofty closed in 1998 after being operational for 400 years, the chorus of Roger Bryant’s (1996) song ‘Cornish lads’ was graffitied at the mine. This evidences the cultural mourning that many Cornish people feel for the demise of the mining industry.

Around the time of the industrial revolution, steam locomotion augmented Cornwall’s existing industrial prowess (see Gray 1993; Guthrie 1994; Rundle 2011) and become assimilated into a Cornish identity. For example, two highlights of the calendar in the Camborne-Redruth area are Murdoch Day and Trevithick Day. Redruth annually hosts Murdoch day in honour of the inventor William Murdoch (1754–1839), who, among many things, built Britain’s first steam powered locomotive in 1784. Similarly, since 1983, held in Camborne each April, Trevithick day celebrates the life and achievements of Richard Trevithick (1771–1833), who constructed the world’s first steam railway locomotive in Camborne in 1804. Even today, in the high streets of Camborne and Redruth, there are visible reminders of the area’s industrial past. For example, in Camborne, the Wetherspoons pub is named ‘The John Francis Bassett’ after a local mine-owner who lived in the 19th century. In Redruth, a bronze statue of a

---

138 ‘Cornish lads are fishermen and Cornish lads are miners too, but when the fish and tin are gone, what are the Cornish boys to do?’
tin miner towers over the lower-half of the town’s high-street. As well as reflecting existing identities, such visible reminders of Cornwall’s industrial past crystallises the Industrial Celt chronotope within the community.

This ‘Industrial Celt’ chronotope is characterised by a broadly conservative attitude to cultural change. For example, Industrial Celts are often wary of tourists and the consequences of the tourism industry on Cornwall. The threat that is felt pertains to Cornwall’s autonomy and traditional way of life which many believe to have ‘changed because of emmets [tourists]’ (CWM80). JWF55 states that ‘[Cornwall is] being inundated with emmets [tourists] […] if they don’t like it down here, they can go back to where they came from’ (JWF55). Another speaker surmises that ‘people from up-country [England] are coming down and ruining [Cornwall]’ (MMF50), while LMF52 states that ‘we [Cornish people] do feel a bit threatened by them [tourists]’. DMM83 conceptualises in-migrants to Cornwall as colonialists; ‘it’s a shame that the nice coastal areas have been colonised by incomers’. These quotes speak to a territorial identity which is felt to be undergoing undesirable changes due to increased tourism and counter-urban migration patterns.

Those who embody this chronotope feel that the outcome of globalisation and cultural levelling has been retrogressive. For example, ‘it was better when the place was less trendy but felt like home’ (a participant cited in Kennedy 2013: 264). This is echoed by the informants in this study, such as ‘I know it is progress but I hate it’ (JWF55), ‘I liked it better the way it was’ (PWM71), and ‘the changes need to stop’ (CWF49). The participants are referring to a process of gentrification (see Deacon
One of the consequences of this gentrification is a resentment from members of the community towards these changes and those who are perceived to be responsible for such changes (see Butler 2003; Gant 2016).

Antagonism towards perceived gentrification and the developers who are alleged to be responsible for this process is a common narrative theme within the community (see also Deacon 2013b). Some perceive these developer-led and financially-oriented changes to be ‘turning Cornwall into a theme park’ (MMF50) and to be taking ‘the heart out of Cornwall’ (LWF55). Similarly, there is a backlash against tourism which ‘distorts house-prices and distorts the labour market with its low-wage economy’ (RMM63). The perceived benefits of tourism, are, according to CWF54 ‘like a band aid [...] we need something more’, that is, they are superficial and mask larger socioeconomic issues facing Cornwall.

The negative attitudes towards changes which are perceived to be led by or for the benefit of non-Cornish people is symptomatic of a much broader ideology which schematises outsiders rather pejoratively. For example, SMF46 states that ‘there are lots of people in Cornwall who aren’t Cornish and the Cornish people resent that’. This is exemplified by a protest at ‘County hall’ in Truro on 9/07/2019, where a group of protesters remonstrated to the council regarding their frustration with the perceived overdevelopment of housing in Cornwall. They argued that the majority of new-build housing was overwhelmingly being sold to non-Cornish buyers (see also Bewnans Kernow 2014). The protest claimed legitimacy from the 2014 Framework Convention for National Minorities which recognised the Cornish as a national minority.

---

139 The OED defines *gentrification* as ‘[t]he process by which an (urban) area is rendered middle-class’.
Specifically, they claim that such developments violate Article 16 of the ‘Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, which states that governing bodies ‘shall refrain from measures which alter the proportions of the population in areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities’.

Over time, Cornwall has lost much of its political, social, and cultural autonomy (see Chapter 3). For example, Cornwall was the only region to qualify for Objective One funding which did not administer the funds internally (see Section 3.2). That is, the distribution of Objective One funding was not allocated by people within Cornwall. In the interviews, participants often made clear that they resent the lack of control and agency that Cornwall has over its own affairs. For example, a lack of Cornish autonomy was lamented by AWM55 who states that ‘we don’t decide nothing here, it’s all done in the houses of parliament’. Perhaps an extreme take on centre-periphery relations can be seen in graffiti that I observed in Redruth in early 2018 (Fig 6.4)

![Graffiti observed in Redruth in January 2018](image)

Figure 6.4 Graffiti observed in Redruth in January 2018
The ‘Angof’ in Figure 6.4 refers to Michael Angof, one of the leaders of the Cornish rebellion of 1497 (see Section 3.1.1.1). This type of graffiti is not an isolated incident as similar graffiti was reported by *The Falmouth Packet* (2007). In 2004, at Portreath beach, the beach closest to Redruth, the harbour wall was graffitied with the words ‘locals only’. These examples of graffiti were evidently created by those who believe Cornwall to be in an undesirable geo-political relationship with England. In this centre-periphery paradigm, many believe Cornwall to be England’s ‘first and last colony’ (Deacon et al. 2003). This conceptualisation of Cornwall’s peripheral condition is emotive for many Cornish people. Some believe that in order to be ‘free’ (see Figure 6.4), Cornwall must sever, or at least loosen, ties with England. Cornish autonomy is seen as desirable for much of the Cornish population. This is exemplified by TMM23 who says ‘I like the idea of being independent [...] because it makes us our own entity, we’re Cornwall and we can do our own thing and stand on our own two feet and prove ourselves’. Indeed, according to a poll by Survation (2014), 57% of a sample of the Redruth community favoured greater devolved power for Cornwall and 47% advocated a Cornish assembly.

6.2.1.1. The social variation of the Industrial Celt identity

I have suggested that the Industrial Celt identity is considered to be traditional and is particularly associated with the mining industry. Alignment to this particular Cornish identity tends to be strongest among older Cornish people. Whilst this was evident from ethnographic participant-observation, it can also be shown by considering
participants’ responses to the IdQ. Although the overall IdQ is primarily oriented towards traditional notions of Cornishness, the two statements which most directly relate to the Industrial Celt identity are statements one and six. Specifically, these state that ‘Cornwall is a Celtic nation first, a county of England second’ and ‘Cornwall council should be given more control over the county and, therefore, Westminster should have less control’ (see Appendix 4).

I combined the numerical value assigned to participants’ responses, where a total of ten would be given to a participant who ‘strongly agreed’ with both statements and a score of two would be given to a participant to ‘strongly disagreed’ with both statements. The aggregated responses formed a continuous variable. The two statements which were most oriented to the Industrial Celt identity do display social variation.  

I use independent samples t-tests (see Section 5.2.2) to examine the relationship between responses to the two IdQ statements oriented towards the Industrial Celt identity and the socio-demographic features of the participants (see Table 6.1).

Table 6.1 The relationships between independent variables (socio-demographic features) and participants’ responses to the two IdQ statements oriented specifically towards the Industrial Celt identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Younger ((M=6.58, SD=1.52)) Older ((M=8.00, SD=1.83))</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>(t(78)=-3.79, p&lt;.001^{***})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC ((M=7.55, SD=1.69)) MC ((M=7.02, SD=1.91))</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>(t(78)=1.30, p=.198)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{140}\) IdQ total was removed from this model as the dependent variable is a constituent part of the overall IdQ total.
Table 6.1 shows that for the overall sample the social variables which exhibit statistically significant relationship with responses to IdQ statement one and six is age, when classified as binary (independent sample t-test, $t(78)=-3.79, p<.001$) and trinary (one-way ANOVA, $F(2, 77)=7.645, p=.001^{***}$) categories, and education (one-way ANOVA, $F(2, 77)=4.229, p=.018^*$). Older participants were more likely to score highly on
the Industrial Celt-oriented statements. Education also exhibits a relationship with the most Industrial Celt-oriented statements (one-way ANOVA, $F(2, 77) = 4.229$, $p = .018$). Post-hoc tests show that those who received formal education up to the age of 16 are more likely to agree with IdQ statements six and nine than those with A-level/equivalent education (Sheffé’s test, $p = .023$). There were no other statistically significant pairwise comparisons between educational groups. There is also a correlation between higher CGP and higher totals in response to the most Industrial Celt-oriented statements (Pearson correlation, $p = .001$). The social categories that are significantly related with overall IdQ totals are the same social categories (age, education, SEC, and CGP) which exhibit statistical relationships with the most Industrial Celt oriented questions. This, along with the Cronbach’s alpha statistic (.858) for the overall IdQ (see Section 4.5.4) suggests that the overall IdQ is oriented towards the Industrial Celt identity.

I also employed a CHAID decision tree in order to explore the interaction between the independent variables in relation to the responses to IdQ statements one and six (see Figure 6.5).
Figure 6.5 A CHAID decision tree which displays the social variation of participants’ responses to the most Industrial Celt (IC) oriented IdQ statements (one and six)
Figure 6.5 shows that the strongest predictor of a high score for the Industrial Celt statements is age (binary), with higher scores being associated with higher age ($F(1, 78)=14.414, p=<.001$). Within the older population, the next best predictor was the number of Cornish grandparents that a participant had. Those with three of four CGP scored higher than those with two or fewer Cornish grandparents ($F(1, 38)=10.494, p=0.010$). This suggests that the group most likely to be Industrial Celts are older participants with strong family ties to Cornwall. Conversely, younger participants are the group least likely to align to the Industrial Celt identity. There is no further variation within the younger group of participants. The decision tree further splits older speakers with three or four CGP on the basis of PoD. Specifically, those with a PoD which experiences high or mid-levels of deprivation (>low, see Figure 6.5) are more likely to have been agreeable to the most Industrial Celt oriented statements than those who experience low levels of deprivation ((<=low, see Figure 6.5)$F(1, 24)=6.392, p=0.037$). Thus, those who are most agreeable to Industrial Celt oriented statements are older speakers, with a high number of CGP, and with a PoD which experiences high or medium levels of deprivation.

While many participants, particularly those who are older, strongly align with the Industrial Celt iteration of Cornish identity, many others explicitly distance themselves from such an identity. In Section 6.2.1.2 I explore why participants oppose the Industrial Celt chronotopic identity.
The anti-English iteration of the Industrial Celt chronotope is perhaps the most visible. This translates to a great deal of media coverage and can be seen in representations of Cornwall in television (e.g. the BBC’s ‘Wild West’, 2002–2004, and ITV’s ‘Doc Martin’, 2004–2019) and film (e.g. ‘Bad Education’, 2015). Many Cornish people associate a range of negatively valanced social characteristics with this form of Cornish identity. For example, Sandow & Robinson (2018) note that a participant referred to people with a strong ‘traditional’ Cornish identity as ‘blinkered’. This is reinforced in this study, where this type of identity is routinely described as ‘insular’, and those with a traditional Cornish identity are perceived as having an ‘island mentality’ (TMM23). Although the alleged insular attitudes are by no means ubiquitous in the ‘Industrial Celt’ chronotope, such attitudes are common among those who reject this perspective (see ‘out-group homogenisation’ effect, Park & Rothbart 1982). For many Cornish, as well as non-Cornish, people, this alleged aggressive anti-English iteration of this chronotope is the most salient feature. I suggest this is an example of ‘cognitive grouping’ which, according to Islam (2014: 1781):

\[ \text{involves “judgmental accentuation” where cognitive categories lead to the increased salience of distinguishing features between categories, exaggerating category differences. Applied to social groups, this principle could be used to explain biased and exaggerated perceptions of difference between groups.} \]

It is important not only to consider how individuals conceptualise their own identity, but also to explore how out-groups are conceptualised, too. While the vast majority of

\[\text{141 This refers to the tendency to assume that ‘they’ are all the same but ‘we’ are a diverse group.} \]
the participants in this study are proud to be Cornish, many are keen to distance themselves from the type of Cornishness exemplified by the Industrial Celt chronotope.

Participants’ commentaries demonstrate a great deal of opposition to this ‘Industrial Celt’ identity. For example, TMF58 states that ‘we [Cornwall] are not a nation’ and TMF22 ‘associate[s] fierce nationality and the whole independence thing as being quite uneducated’. The importance of local identity is questioned by some. DMM83 states that they ‘resist the ultra-Cornishness [...] those who won’t go to visit a relative in Falmouth [a seaside town on the south-coast of Cornwall] because they live in ‘Diana Close’ [a particular residential area] because it is an English name and won’t holiday anywhere but Brittany [due to the Celtic connection]’. In a similar vein, JMM24 notes that ‘people are more concerned with identity than the economy’. These observations suggest that some members of the Camborne-Redruth community feel that local identity, particularly in its Industrial Celt manifestation, is detrimental to social and economic growth.

This chronotope has aspects which can be perceived as being isolationist and hostile to outsiders, generating an *us* vs. *them* narrative. Indeed, according to TMM24, there is ‘an inherent dislike of outsiders’. One younger speaker observes that older people resist integration with (permanent) non-Cornish incomers with ‘self-inflicted segregation’ (JMM24). This is echoed by GMM24 who recounts that when his English parents and grandparents moved to Cornwall in the early 1980s, ‘they were segregated by the community’. Speaking of the older population, one younger speaker observes that ‘they say “it's Cornwall for Cornish people” it's very insular’ (MMM46).
This leads to the othering of non-Celtic peoples. For example, the Cornish folk song ‘Cousin Jack’ contains the lyric, ‘the English, they live in our houses, the Spanish, they fish in our seas’.

I suggest that the anti-English sentiment expressed by many Industrial Celts is an example of a process described by Hall (1997: 184), whereby ‘the movements of the margins are so profoundly threatened by the global forces of postmodernity, they can themselves retreat into their own exclusivist and defensive enclaves’. Such attitudes are not well received by much of the younger population. For example, DWF27 states that ‘[Cornish] people are so hostile’ and TMM23 comments that ‘a lot of Cornish people get unnecessarily angry at people outside of Cornwall’, indicating that many Cornish people distance themselves from the perceived antagonism from other Cornish people towards (the rest of) England. Indeed, a participant in Dann’s study described those who support Cornish ‘independence’ as ‘racist dickheads’ (Dann 2016: 83).

The loss of the mining industry is mourned by many Industrial Celts, such as JWF73, who states that:

I used to work at the job-centre [...] we had men coming in, proud men who had never been out of work with the hardest job you could think of but they didn’t know how to do anything else [...] it was heart-breaking to see [...] masses of them left Cornwall, where they were valued [...] as far as culture, that was the biggest body-blow [...] It changed Cornwall forever, even if we got mining back it would never be the same [...] they could never imitate what we lost.

However, many Cornish people have no desire to see the return of the mining industry. This is exemplified by GWM63 who bemoans the working conditions of miners by saying that those who mined of South Crofty ‘took [arsenic] home, it just
goes with them. You’re taking home a killer, that’s your bonus’. Indeed, RWF48, states that ‘you don’t want to go back to [mining] [...] it was harsh and people lost their lives’. Whereas the capitalist class profited greatly from the mining industry, it cannot be said that the mining industry in Cornwall was a good advert for trickle-down economics. According to RWM52, the conditions faced by the Cornish miners ‘wasn’t slavery, but it wasn’t far off it’. Thus, mining exemplifies the diametrically opposed stances that members of the same community can have towards the same event, that is, the loss of the Cornish mining industry.

Perhaps as a result of the negative attitudes towards the Industrial Celt chronotope, Deacon (2018: iv) suggests that this classic conceptualisation of Cornish identity is ‘increasingly residual and a focus of nostalgia’. This is supported by my ethnographic observations and the narratives provided by the informants in this study. Although much of the Camborne-Redruth community opposes the ‘Industrial Celt’ chronotopic identity, it is not the case that those who oppose this chronotope are devoid of a local identity. Many other Cornish people align themselves towards a type of identity that is perhaps less marked, certainly less overtly stigmatised, namely ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’.

6.2.2. Lifestyle Cornwall

In recent decades a different type of Cornish identity, referred to as ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’ (see Kennedy 2013; Deacon 2018), has gained popularity. Based on a thematic analysis of participants’ narratives and responses as well as my ethnographic participant-
observation, I propose that the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope is chiefly characterised by:

- The belief that Cornwall is a county of England
- An identity which is regional, rather than national, in character
- A tendency to ‘mock other’ England and the English
- A general positive affect towards Cornwall’s industrial aesthetics, such as engine houses
- An overall positive affect towards tourism and concomitant industries
- A general acceptance of change in Cornwall
- The belief that Cornwall is ‘cool’

I suggest that by building on traditional tropes of Cornish identity, ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’ is a chronotope; a rebranded, contemporary Cornishness, apposite for the 21st century. The roots of this identity can be traced back much earlier. As early as the 1870s, Cornwall was rebranded ‘in a different guise, cosier, less threatening and more homely, but backed up by the power of the broader Romantic movement that had colonised British aesthetic culture from the late eighteenth-century’ (Deacon 2004: 189). In the mid-20th century, the tropes of this modern Cornish identity were being fashioned by artists such as Barbara Hepworth and have been further reconstrued in the 21st century by musicians (such as Ben Howard and ‘Boardmasters’ and ‘Tunes in the Dunes’ festivals), restauranteurs (such as Rick Stein), and nationally recognised surf brands (such as ‘Finisterre’, ‘Gul’, and ‘Saltrock’). Add to this the plentiful escapist

---

142 Ben Howard is from Devon but is strongly associated with Cornwall due to a high number of performances within the Duchy during his formative years.
fictions (such as One Cornish Summer, Fenwick 2018; The House We Called Home, Oliver 2018) set within the Duchy, and Cornwall can claim to be a hub of premium contemporary arts and leisure culture. The people, companies, and fictions identified above are highly visible to Cornish and non-Cornish people alike.

The Celtic aspect of the Industrial Celt identity is much less present in the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope. For example, MMF25 remarked that ‘the Celtic element links Cornwall to Wales and Brittany, but I don’t feel that young people who have a Cornish identity are necessarily thinking about that’. The ethnic component of some Cornish identities is not present in this modern iteration, as exemplified by TMM49 who states, ‘I’m a cultural Cornishman rather than ethnic’143 and TMF58 observes that ‘we are not a nation, we are a different area’.

Geo-politically, those who orient towards the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identity do not desire greater Cornish autonomy. For example, LWM26 observed that ‘a lot of people would love Cornwall to be a completely separate country but those with their heads screwed on realise that it wouldn’t be long until we struggle’. Similarly, in saying ‘if we were to devolve we’d go “ohh shit, there’s no money here, we’ve got no income”’ JMF62 recognises the economic benefit of alignment with England. From the perspective of centre-periphery relations, those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope conceptualise Cornwall as a peripheral region and do not desire greater autonomy for Cornwall or a radical shift in relations with England and London.

143 The participant did not mean that he had no Cornish ancestry, just that that wasn’t important for him. In fact, he identified his parents as being Cornish.
In contrast to the Industrial Celt identity, another marker of ethnicity, language, is not a salient feature of the Lifestyle Cornwall identity. For example, I observed conflicting attitudes towards Kernewek in the planning committee for Redruth’s St. Piran’s day.\textsuperscript{144} There was tension between members of the group regarding the extent to which the Cornish language, Kernewek, and the Anglo-Cornish dialect or Standard English should be used in activities for children. On the one hand, some members of the group were concerned about being perceived as ‘backwards’. On the other hand, other members argued the activities served as a good opportunity to engage young people with Cornwall’s heritage. Kernewek is perceived rather negatively by many of those with a Lifestyle Cornwall identity. DMM65 feels that ‘it’s almost elitist to speak Cornish [Kernewek]’ (see also Kent 2006: 12) and TMF58 states that ‘I respect [Kernewek], but it’s not where I want my energy to be because I feel that it can lead you into a less inclusive version of Cornishness than I’d like to see’. These comments suggest that those who embody the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope do not align their identity with Cornwall’s Celtic (linguistic) past to the same extent as the Industrial Celts.

Due to an assimilation of desirable motifs from other Cornish chronotopes and the acquisition of entirely new ones, Lifestyle Cornwall is a synthesis of older Cornish identities reimagined in a post-modern context as a civic, alienable manifestation of regional identity (cf. Remlinger 2009). This is an example of Hall’s (1996: 232) assertion that ‘[y]oung people [...] who can’t even spell ‘postmodernism’ [...] already inhabit such a universe in their heads’. Indeed, Lifestyle Cornwall is a post-modern realisation of

\textsuperscript{144} I attended this meeting as a part of the ‘Redruth revival’ community interest group.
Cornwall’s peripheral condition. In recent decades, a meta-cultural awareness of Cornish culture and identity has grown. This consciousness has changed the very nature of Cornish identity. For example, one older speaker noted that ‘my children are more aware of being Cornish now than [my siblings and I] were in the [19]60s’ (RMM63). Traditional emblems of Cornish industry, and by extension, Cornish identity, have been reimagined as a rugged and romantic aesthetic which forms a part of Cornwall’s heritage culture, such as ‘I love all of the old engine-houses and stuff, I think it’s pretty cool’ (EMF21). Engine houses, such as the one in Figure 6.6 have been revalorised by many locals and visitors alike, from icons of industry and endeavour in the Industrial Celt chronotope to an aesthetic feature of the landscape in the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope (cf. Remlinger 2009).

This revalorisation of industrial landscapes makes use of a frame of authenticity. This often involves the juxtaposition of traditional mining structures, such as engine houses, and café culture which is a part of a larger service economy in Cornwall. Likewise, the sea is a staple of Cornish identity. But the relationship between Cornish identity and the sea is not static. Again, there has been a shift in identity, from industry to leisurely recreation. Although seafaring, fishing, and maritime ports formed a part of traditional Cornish identities, these are peripheral to the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope. Instead, surfing and its cultural appendages are increasingly becoming a part of Cornish identity. For example, when asked what she is proud of about Cornwall, EMF20 replied, ‘it’s the beaches’. Indeed, KMM22 remarks ‘nothing

---

145 An awareness of Cornish identity can be traced back to the mid-19th century (see Deacon 2018).
146 Although there are no beaches in Camborne-Redruth, there are beaches accessible by a ten-minute car journey and, therefore, frequented by much of the Camborne-Redruth community.
beats being able to go to the beach a couple of minutes away or going for a walk and seeing green pastures’. Such a positive affective stance to the aesthetic value of Cornwall’s landscapes is echoed in the comments of SWM49; ‘[Cornwall] is a beautiful place and I feel privileged to live here’. Similarly, JWF73 remarked that ‘Cornwall now is perceived as a great place to live for leisure [...] not a great place to work’ and KMM22 states that ‘Cornwall is a great place to come on holiday and a great place to retire but it’s a career killer. Cornwall is a career killer’. This highlights a shift from the Industrial Celt identity, which is centred on industry, such as mining, to the Lifestyle Cornwall identity, for which industry is a much less central feature.

Despite the pull factors associated with leaving Cornwall and seeking employment beyond the Tamar, JWM24 comments that ‘it’s the lifestyle that’s keeping me here’ and SWM24 states that ‘I think Cornish people are pretty chill’. Cornwall has acquired the nickname ‘Kernowfornia’ due to perceived similarities with the west coast of the USA (see Figure 6.6).
Rather than the occupational and heritage-oriented identities of the Industrial Celt chronotope, the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope is primarily centred on recreational identities. Although the occupations that are found in Cornwall are becoming more homogenous with other parts of the country, its leisure culture is a point of difference. Informants in this study consistently identified this as a point of departure from urban life. For example, ‘in Cornwall things slow down relative to the rest of the world’ and as a consequence ‘there is less pressure on people down here’ (HMM23). Similarly, MMF50 comments that Cornish identity ‘is not having to keep up with the Jones’ [...] it’s not feeling pressured to have the newest trainers or the best hairdo, it’s a kind of laid back approach [...] that’s who we are’. Ultimately, for much of the Cornish
population, it is the lifestyle associated with contemporary Cornwall that forms the basis of their pride in their sense of place.

Food is another feature of the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identity. While many of Cornish traditional culinary dishes such as ‘Stargazy pie’\textsuperscript{147} and ‘thunder and lightning’\textsuperscript{148} are not commonly made or consumed in 21\textsuperscript{st} century Cornwall, some foods remain a source of pride for many Cornish people (see Everett & Aitchison 2008). For example, RWF48 states that ‘the pasty and the clotted cream are a part of the heritage too, and the scrumpy cider, and Cornish fudge’. According to JMF62, Cornwall is ‘now a really cool place to be because it’s got the food and the lifestyle and the sophistication’. However, while Trelawny (2014) states that in Cornwall there are ‘Michelin starred restaurants, luxury hotels and champagne flutes as standard’, this is not the reality of Camborne-Redruth.

Despite being inaccessible to the Camborne-Redruth area and its people, high-end tourism, and the restaurants largely populated by holiday-makers are a source of pride by many of those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope. For example, RWM23 states that ‘[Cornish] people are proud of living here because people come down and take holidays because it’s a beautiful place’. Thus, the fact that tourists visit Cornwall is a source of pride to some who embody the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope. Similarly, CWF21 comments that ‘it is nice that people come here on holiday’. This shows an amiable relationship between those who embody the Lifestyle

\textsuperscript{147} A pie which contains pilchards with their heads exposed through the pastry.  
\textsuperscript{148} A bread roll, or ‘Cornish split’, containing clotted cream and treacle.
Cornwall chronotope and visitors to Cornwall, in contrast to the othering exhibited by many Industrial Celts (see Section 6.2.1).

The discursive othering of non-Cornish people reported in Section 6.2.1 for the Industrial Celt chronotope does exist within this Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope, too. However, such narratives manifest in a much more jocular manner (see also Section 7.1.5). This duality of hostile/jocular othering is observed by a younger speaker; ‘everyone has a pride in Cornwall and has a competitive edge against everyone north of the Tamar. On the whole this is probably a more jovial and jolly thing, although there are some people who do take it very seriously’ (HMM23, see also Appendix 8). This evidences the lack of hostility that those who align with Lifestyle Cornwall feel towards England and the English.

The Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope is much more likely than the Industrial Celtic chronotope to be nested in other identities of place. That is, for example, some Cornish people feel their Cornish identity to be a part of a broader English identity. For example, DMM83 states that ‘I can be Cornish first, then British and English; this allows me to feel that Shakespeare is my compatriot’. Similarly, CMM54 notes that ‘local heritage is important but [...] it's a big world and you have to be a part of it’ and that ‘you need to remember that you are a part of a wider Britain but never forget your roots’. Nested English and Cornish identities are common in 21st century Cornwall (cf. Braber 2009), as exemplified by LWM26 who states that ‘when there is sport on, I love watching England [...] I’m Cornish but I’m also English’. Thus, those who embody the Lifestyle Cornwall identity typically feel no contradiction in simultaneously asserting Cornish and English pride. While those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity do
not conceptualise Cornwall as a nation, many still attest that Cornwall’s status is
different to a typical county of England. For example, BWM19 states that ‘in Cornwall
we say we’re from Cornwall but people from Devon say they’re from England’.

There are certainly parallels between the comments above and Watt’s (2002)
study of urban youth language and identity in Newcastle (see also Dubois & Horvath
1999). Watt’s young participants rejected the ‘cloth cap and whippet’ (Beal 1999: 44)
type of identity associated with older Geordies and endeavoured to reinvent their
(supra-)local identity. Analogously, many young Cornish people are keen to make it
known that they are ‘not all brought up in the mud’ (DWF27) and that they aren’t all
‘seven-fingered baby eaters’ (pilot study pp.1) as some stereotypes149 pertaining to
Cornwall suggest. There is a willingness to remove the stereotype that ‘everyone in
Cornwall is a farmer and drives a tractor’ (EMF21). Simultaneously, the younger
population endeavour to stay true to their heritage; ‘Cornish people will always be
proud of their roots but I think the younger generation are more open to new ways’
(LMF52). Indeed, TMM23 suggests that Cornwall ‘needs a rebranding’. I suggest that
this is precisely what ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’ is, a reconfiguration, a reimagination, and a
new iteration of an overtly stigmatised culture and ideology.

Lifestyle Cornwall is often not perceived to be a valid Cornish identity at all by
Industrial Celts. It is the received wisdom that Cornwall is ‘losing its identity’ (MMF50).
Due to its relative recent development, many deem the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope
to not be a legitimate Cornish identity. This attitude is also clear in academic

149 Specifically, these quotes make reference to the tropes that rural communities do not have access to
basic housing and, thus, live outside and that people in rural communities practice infanticidal
cannibalism, respectively.
discourses. For example, Deacon (2018: v) evocatively describes ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’ as having a ‘stranglehold’ on Cornish communities (see also Willett 2009; Kennedy 2016). This is consistent with Hall (1997: 175), who notes that many believe that ‘identities ought to be some stable points of reference that were like that in the past, are now and every shall be, still points in a turning world’. I challenge traditional narratives of regional, particularly Cornish, identities by suggesting that Lifestyle Cornwall is a legitimate Cornish identity.\(^{150}\) However, this identity is not well represented in the statements which comprise the IdQ used in this study (see Appendix 4). Thus, those who have a strong Lifestyle Cornwall identity do not necessarily have high IdQ totals in this study (for discussion, see Section 9.1).

6.3. Summary

While the Industrial Celt identity has existed since the mid-18\(^{th}\) century (see Deacon 2018), the first signs of Lifestyle Cornwall can be seen at the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century. There appears to have been a continuous increase in the centrality of leisure culture in Cornwall throughout the post-war years which seems to be continuing to become more and more central to the notion of Cornishness. In reaction to globalisation, there has been a ‘return to the local’ which involves a ‘struggle of the margins to come into representation– not just to be placed by a dominant, imperializing regime but to reclaim some form of representation for themselves’ (Hall 1997: 183). This return to

\(^{150}\) No IdQ statement corresponded to the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope in a similar way to the Industrial Celt chronotope. Thus, no social variation of the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope was possible. However, it is consistently reported that this identity is associated with younger Cornish people.
the local is largely manifested in Cornwall in two ways or a combination thereof. Many Cornish people reject post-modernism by returning to what are perceived to be an ‘authentic’ Cornish identity. Alternatively, much of the Cornish population embrace the post-modern turn in a local context. Both the ‘Industrial Celt’ and ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’ chronotopes coexist in a single temporal and spatial frame, that is, Camborne-Redruth in 2017-2018.

The notion that there are multiple Cornish identities is summed up by TMF22:

The older people hold onto the image of Cornwall as being romantic but also having gone through the struggles of mining [...] and its rich heritage [...] whereas for the younger people it’s more about the surfing and beaches and the whole lifestyle that goes with it.

This was echoed by many other speakers, particularly JMF62, who observes that those with a traditional Cornish identity are typically concerned with:

The heritage and [...] mining [...] but there has been a renaissance in Cornwall in the last 20 years [...] before it used to be straw chewing [...] whereas now it’s a really cool place to be because it has got the food and the lifestyle and more sophistication. [Cornwall] has changed its image.

These commentaries provided by this study’s participants evidence that Cornish identity has been reimagined by drawing on traditional tropes and aesthetics as well as supra-local dimensions of social change (see also R. Harris 2016). Rather than eradicating Cornish identity, Lifestyle Cornwall is testament to the dynamic and enduring nature of Cornish identity in response to its evolving peripheral condition (see Payton 1992a). Cornish identity has once again evolved, this time in response to a loss of distinctive industrial practices such as mining, fishing, and farming, on the one hand, and the growth of Cornwall as a hub of tourism, hospitality, and leisure culture,
on the other. Lifestyle Cornwall, unlike the Industrial Celt chronotope is not predicated on an ethnic identity, such as Celtic DNA and language, but aesthetics, space, and, as its name suggests, lifestyle. I outline the key aspects of the two chronotopic identities in Table 6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Celt</th>
<th>Lifestyle Cornwall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall is a country</td>
<td>Cornwall is a nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic identity</td>
<td>Regional identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othering of England and the English</td>
<td>Mock othering of England and the English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (particularly mining) identity</td>
<td>Positive affect to Cornwall’s industrial aesthetics, e.g. engine houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect pertaining to tourism and concomitant industries</td>
<td>Overall positive affect pertaining to tourism and concomitant industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative attitude to change</td>
<td>Welcoming of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall is ‘cool’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many Cornish people embody the chronotopes that I detail in sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2. These identities do not only coexist within a simple space-time frame, they also exist within the same individuals. An individual can exhibit traits characteristic of both chronotopes without contradiction (see also Bucholtz 2003: 408). Rather than a single continuum, in this chapter I have argued that Cornish identity is multi-layered, multi-faceted, and ideologically complex. The ‘Industrial Celt’ and the ‘Lifestyle Cornwall’ Cornish identities are neither mutually exclusive nor mutually entailing. Indeed, while there is typically a dominant chronotope, this may co-exist with other subsidiary chronotopes (see Bakhtin 1981: 252; Woolard 2013). Just as Eckert (2000) noted differences between burned-out burn-out and regular burn-outs, that is, central and peripheral members of a community-of-practice, there are levels of gradation in the extent to which individuals conform to particular chronotopic identities.
Various combinations of strong and weak chronotopic identities are possible within any one person. Indeed, many informants maintain pride in Cornwall’s industrial and Celtic pasts and simultaneously take pride in Cornwall’s rugged aesthetic, its leisure culture, and consume its commodified culture. For example, DMM83 comments that ‘it is a shame that the nice coastal areas have been colonised by incomers’ and ‘I am Cornish, that is my native identity’ are typical of an Industrial Celt identity. Yet, the very same participant, DMM83, also states that ‘I can be Cornish first, then British and English; this allows me to feel that Shakespeare is my compatriot’, which is typical of a Lifestyle Cornwall identity. Similarly, TMM49 says that his Cornish identity has a ‘Celtic core’ which is indicative of an Industrial Celt identity. TMM49 also states that ‘I’m a cultural Cornishman rather than ethnic’ which is indicative of an Industrial Celt identity. These examples highlight the ways in which an individual can align with aspects of both the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopes in constructing their Cornish identity.

Although I present an account of identity in Camborne-Redruth, the observed cultural and ideological variation is not unique to this locale. The tensions between juxtaposed older and newer identities appear to be common in post-industrial peripheries, such as Newcastle (Watt 2002) and Pittsburgh (Johnstone 2013b). For example, Dieterich-Ward (2018) notes that in Pittsburgh, a post-industrial vision of regional identity competes with a desire to reopen the shuttered steel mills. Such tensions appear to be an ideological corollary of industrial to post-industrial transitions. While I have focused on the specific context of Cornwall, the chronotopic identities are not independent of a broader supra-local direction of travel of socio-cultural change. Lifestyle Cornwall evidences both the dynamism and the durability of
Cornwall’s peripheral condition. These two chronotopes can only be understood with reference to the genealogy of Cornwall’s shifting social, economic, and cultural relationship with England and the ideologies that these processes have begotten (see Chapter 3).

In this chapter I have identified, detailed, and explored two Cornish identities. These identities are not only interesting in and of themselves but are crucial categories for explaining the social meaning potential of many Anglo-Cornish dialect features. Understanding these two distinct chronotopes is essential in order to comprehend the social meaning of the Anglo-Cornish dialect. Just as Moore & Podesva (2009) found different communities of practice to attribute a range of indexical meanings to a singular linguistic feature (tag questions), in Cornwall, chronotopic identities act as the lens through which social meaning is filtered. Supported by usage patterns (see Chapter 5) and meta-linguistic observations from the participants in this study, as well as the two Cornish chronotopes, in Chapter 7 I provide a detailed account of the social meaning of the investigated Anglo-Cornish dialect lexical items, as well as the Anglo-Cornish dialect more broadly.
7. The social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis

In this chapter, I use thematic analysis to present the attested social meanings of the investigated Anglo-Cornish dialect words, namely, *crib/croust, maid, stank*, and *emmet*. I use speakers meta-linguistic observations to account for the quantitative usage patterns presented in Chapter 5 through the lens of the Cornish identities described in Chapter 6. Through these meta-linguistic observations, the role of the participant is reimagined, as they take an active role in the analysis. I suggest that participants in this study are expert informants due to their local lived experiences of the Anglo-Cornish dialect and the rich meta-linguistic data that they provide. After all, these are the people who are using and interpreting these forms on a day-to-day basis. The use of expert informants to inform an analysis of social meaning of lexis is particularly apposite as ‘the lexical level is a subject of interest to and comment by laypersons, as it is perceived to be the level most susceptible to comment without specialist knowledge’ (Armstrong 2001: 212).

Just as the investigated Cornish variants are not homogenous in their patterns of social distribution, it is far too simplistic to simply say that Anglo-Cornish lexis indexes X or Y. There are many layers, or ‘orders of indexicality’ (see Section 2.1.3.1), which together constitute indexical fields (see Eckert 2008) of the social meaning of Anglo-Cornish lexis. I present indexical fields for *crib/croust, maid, and emmet* and describe the social meanings associated with *stank*. The indexical fields visualise the pool of meaning potentials (see Section 2.1.3) found in and accessible to at least some
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151 I consider all participants in this study to be expert informants.
members of the community in Camborne-Redruth. By understanding how Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis is perceived by both those who embody the Industrial Celts and Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopes, one can develop a more thorough understanding of the social and stylistic distribution of Anglo-Cornish lexis (see Chapter 5). This is consistent with a growing body of research which uses the notion of chronotopes to analyse social meanings (e.g. Weichselbraun 2014; Williams & Stroud 2015; Barrett 2017; Karrebæk & Møller 2020; Szabla 2020).

I explore perceptions of the Anglo-Cornish dialect held by the expert informants in this study and also consider evidence for the enregisterment of the Anglo-Cornish dialect. As I did in Chapter 6, I use thematic analysis to identify pertinent themes in the data. I use supporting evidence primarily from quotes from interviews with expert informants which are indicative of widely attested meta-linguistic beliefs within the Camborne-Redruth community. I first do this by considering the Anglo-Cornish dialect in general (see Section 7.1), before focusing my analysis on the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants investigated in this study, namely crib and croust (see Section 7.2), maid (see Section 7.3), stank (see Section 7.4), and emmet (see Section 7.5), in detail.

7.1. Perceptions of the Anglo-Cornish dialect in Cornwall

Broadly, the Anglo-Cornish dialect is overtly stigmatised (see Beal 2006: 100; Montgomery 2007: 248; Dann 2016). That is, the evaluative judgements of the Anglo-Cornish dialect tend to be broadly negative and the dialect often the source of ridicule.
Cornish people are very much aware of these widely held beliefs about the dialect and, by extension, the people of Cornwall. For example, RMM63 describes the perception of Anglo-Cornish dialect users as being ‘slow and a bit stupid, with straw coming out of our ears’. This is echoed by SWM49 who states that ‘there was a time when I was a young man when I would have been as far removed from having a Cornish accent as possible [...] you were stereotyped as having straw in your ears’. Similarly, RWM52 states that ‘if you were to go somewhere speaking broad Cornish people would think you are a bit simple’. Moreover, TMF22 describes the times when she used Anglo-Cornish features in her speech as ‘really bad’. These meta-linguistic commentaries are indicative of a standard language ideology (as defined in Section 2.1.3.1) which castigates deviance from an overtly proscribed standard and a general schema which characterises English rural communities negatively (see Britain 2017).

Despite the overt stigmatisation that is widely associated with the Anglo-Cornish dialect, it is undergoing a process of revalorisation whereby it is developing more positive evaluations. For example, RWM23 comments on the Anglo-Cornish dialect greeting wozzon ‘what is on?’; cf. ‘what’s up?’, he recalled that ‘people went through school saying things like wozzon, it was massive, wasn’t it? It was cool to say it’. Additionally, RWM23 states that the Anglo-Cornish phrase proper job is ‘pretty cool at the minute’, while CWM63 states that proper job is ‘a fashionable thing to say now’. Many other speakers report that they use Anglo-Cornish words to be ‘funny’ or when they are having a joke (e.g. EMW20, EMF21, TMF22, RWM29, HMM23). Such comments (see also Section 7.1.5) demonstrate a sea change in the social meaning of Anglo-Cornish lexis. While typically associated with older speakers and being overtly stigmatised, these comments suggest that dialect lexis is celebrated among some
younger speakers (see also Johnstone 2009; Remlinger 2009). This evidences that while Cornish identity is perceived as being ‘cool’ by many who orient towards the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope, the Anglo-Cornish dialect can, likewise, be similarly evaluated as ‘cool’ by those who align with this identity.

The Anglo-Cornish dialect is used performatively by many who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity to parody the Industrial Celt identity. For example, when discussing the Anglo-Cornish dialect word dreckly ‘at some point in the future’, RWM52 states that ‘it’s a bit mimicking the Cornish […] I wouldn’t use it, unless mimicking’. Similarly, EMF20 states that ‘I feel like older people use [dreckly] […] that’s traditionally Cornish but is used by the younger generation as a bit of a joke’. Discussing the dialect words in the lexical recognition task more generally, GMM24 states that ‘[t]hese are words that my grandparents use in their general conversation or other people when they’re having a joke’. This is echoed by RWM23 who states that ‘I’d use [Anglo-Cornish dialect words] in a jokey sort of way but it is traditional for the older generation’. TMM24 claims to use dialect words ‘to play up to a stereotype’. These quotes attest that the same Anglo-Cornish forms are often thought to be traditional when used by older speakers, but are used in jest by many younger speakers. This highlights the complex range of dynamic social meanings that Anglo-Cornish dialect can index.

Other members of the community, both Industrial Celts and those who align with Lifestyle Cornwall, are less than pleased with such performative usages, such as NWM24 who states that ‘there is a stigma behind [the Anglo-Cornish dialect] but you also get people who over exaggerate it, they try to use it to be funny but I don’t see
what’s funny about it’. Similarly, GMM24 reflects that ‘people start talking in a Cornish accent to get a laugh and I think that belittles being Cornish’ and DWF27 comments that ‘the younger people are using social media to try to get a laugh out of [the Anglo-Cornish dialect] […] I don’t think that’s the way to go about it’. DMM83 observes that ‘[the Anglo-Cornish dialect] now seems not quite authentic, lots of dialect words are becoming less authentic as they’re becoming a badge of a Cornishman’. Indeed, the performative use of the Anglo-Cornish dialect widely is perceived to erode its authenticity. The implication is that if it is not authentic, it is in some way contrived. Similarly, HMM23 notes that ‘some people are putting [the Anglo-Cornish dialect] on’ and that the Anglo-Cornish dialect is used ‘for tradition’s sake’.

Despite negative evaluations of the Anglo-Cornish dialect, both exogenously and endogenously, there are many Cornish people who positively evaluate Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis and who are proud to use it. This is demonstrated by the shift towards greater use of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis in careful speech styles by those with a high IdQ total (see Chapter 5). This pattern of intra-speaker variation is consistent with the observations of the expert informants in this study. For example, TMF58 states that ‘most [Anglo-Cornish dialect words] are working-class words but are also used as a marker when you want to assert your Cornishness’. TMM24 explains that ‘[the Anglo-Cornish dialect] is reflective of a Cornish identity. It is an identity statement […] [people] go out of [their] way to use [Anglo-Cornish dialect words] to let people know where [they] are from’. Similarly, DMM83 states that ‘I use [the Anglo-
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152 Here, I make no epistemological claim as to what linguistic authenticity is. I merely reflect the usage of the term by expert informants in this study. For discussions of what authenticity means, from a theoretical sociolinguistic perspective, see the Bucholtz (2003), Coupland (2003), Eckert (2003).
Cornish dialect] to assert my own pride in being Cornish and my sadness that the dialect is dying out’. The link between performative use and local identity is highlighted by SMF46 who says that ‘some people […] seem to really put on their Cornish accent, almost bigging themselves up, they really like it, they really like the identity thing’.

Thus, though the style-pattern shown in Section 5.4 may seem surprising in the context of variationist sociolinguistic theory (e.g. Labov 1972a, see Section 2.1.2), it is consistent with the observations of many of the expert informants in this study, based on their experiences of Anglo-Cornish dialect usage in their local community.

Being Cornish is a very different experience for those who conform to the Industrial Celt chronotopic identity as opposed to the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identity (see Chapter 6). For example, while Industrial Celts often feel ‘the English’ to be ‘other’, those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity typically conceptualise themselves as English. However, in practice, most Cornish people embody aspects of both chronotopes. Many young Cornish people reject the stigmatised stereotypes of older Cornish generations without rejecting Cornishness wholesale. They are reinventing what it means to be Cornish through the Lifestyle Cornwall identity (see Section 6.2.2). This shift in identity is visible in the perceived social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis by the Camborne-Redruth community. As Remlinger (2009: 121) observes, the ‘values associated with particular features can shift over time, indexing different ideologies for different speakers, even at the same time’.

The comments of expert informants suggest that the Anglo-Cornish dialect has a complex indexical milieu. However, they do indicate two key themes. On the one hand, the Anglo-Cornish dialect is overtly stigmatised, and associated with straw-
infested ears. On the other hand, it is used as a proud sign of Cornish identity, even by younger speakers.

7.1.1. The enregisterment of the Anglo-Cornish dialect

The Anglo-Cornish dialect can index interactional stances, such as humour, and social meanings at the second, such as ‘local’, and third, such as performative social identity work, orders of indexicality. Features which index social meanings at the second and third-orders of indexicality can become enregistered (see Agha 2003). That is, linguistic features become identifiable as part of a socially recognised register of forms and its users become identifiable as part of a population associated with those forms. When a feature, or set of features, become enregistered at the third-order of indexicality (see Section 2.1.2.2), they can be ‘commodified’ (see Beal 2009a; Johnstone 2009, 2013b, 2016).\(^{153}\) While I use thematic analysis to outline the social meanings of the Anglo-Cornish dialect, I present evidence of the enregisterment of the dialect by primarily drawing on my ethnographic participant-observation, both online and offline.

Typically, symbolic capital is conferred on language usage (see Bourdieu 1991, see also section 8.2.1.1). However, through commodification dialects can become ‘available for conventional exchange in a market’ (Heller et al. 2014: 545), through the exchange of economic capital. As a result of printing dialect features on an object such as a tea-towel, a vendor can sell the product at an inflated price. Clearly, there is no logical or functional link between the Anglo-Cornish dialect and a tea-towel. Yet, the

\(^{153}\) While Cooper (2013: 35) suggests that enregisterment can occur with only second-order indexicality, for commodification to occur, third-order indexicality is required.
dialect is commodified in order to propagate the sale of souvenirs, from the perspective of the vendor, and to reinforce a link with Cornwall, from the perspective of the consumer. Consumers of such dialect products including those living in the local area, tourists, and diasporic communities (Beal 2009a; Johnstone 2013b).

The shift in identity from the Industrial Celt to Lifestyle Cornwall, and the way that this has begotten a market for commodified Anglo-Cornish dialect material closely resembles the process discussed by Heller (2003: 475) whereby:

new identities necessarily build on old ones (the value of authenticity presupposes some ideology of essentialized ethnonationalism), while the conditions of the market, which accords new value to formerly stigmatized identities and products, require (visibly) inauthentic processes of standardization and commodification.

In Cornwall, we see examples of many of the typical vehicles for dialect commodification, such as clothing, mugs, pin badges, tea-towels, and bumper stickers (see Figure 7.1).

Figure 7. 1 A bumper-sticker featuring the Anglo-Cornish dialect word dreckly\(^\text{154}\)

The commodification of the Anglo-Cornish dialect is noticed by members of the Camborne-Redruth community. For example, CWM63 comments that ‘[the Anglo-Cornish dialect is] becoming a bit t-shirted now’. This is indicative of a broader attitude whereby it is felt that Cornwall, and its culture, is being trivialised in order to create income from the tourism and hospitality sector (see Section 6.2.1). This highlights a frustration that many Industrial Celts feel regarding the way that they perceive Cornish culture, particularly dialect, to have become trivialised.

Cornwall’s economy has become heavily reliant on tourism (see Section 3.2.1). Allied to this is a market for commodified dialect. As incomers and locals converse, dialect variation becomes a highly visible marker of differences between the groups (see Johnstone 2013b). Cornwall’s post-modern rebranding as a desirable tourist destination (see Sections 3.2.1 & 6.2.2) has led to an appetite for commodified dialect material. This bears similarities with the process observed by Heller et al. (2014: 561), whereby:

> tourism in sociolinguistic peripheries, and the role in it of linguistic commodification in particular, shows some of the ways in which peripheral communities opt to rethink themselves under current political and economic conditions.

The shift towards a greater reliance on the tourism and hospitality sector, and the concomitant dialect commodification, is a response to a shift in Cornwall’s peripheral condition. Dialect commodification is a consequence of tourism, which is an industry that has developed in post-industrial Cornwall. This commodification is only possible due to the enregisterment of the Anglo-Cornish dialect.
In the following section, I explore the social meaning and, where appropriate, the enregisterment of each of the Anglo-Cornish forms investigated in this study. In doing so, I provide a much more specific analysis which should be considered in the context of the broader perceptions of the Anglo-Cornish dialect as a whole that I have presented in the current section.

7.1.2. The social meaning of *crib* and *croust* ‘food provisions’

*Crib* and *croust* exhibit similar quantitative usage patterns (see Section 5.3.2.1). For example, they were both most likely to be used by speakers who are older and working-class with a high IdQ total. These two lexical forms also elicited similar meta-linguistic comments from expert informants. For example, according to HMM23 their perception of *crous* is ‘similar to *crib*’ and SWM50 states that it is ‘on the same lines as *crib*’, while RMM63 states that *crib* is ‘interchangeable with *croust*’.

While not all participants recognised *crib* and *croust* as Anglo-Cornish (see Section 5.3.3), many expert informants were remarkably consistent in providing meta-linguistic commentaries relating to these forms. It is widely attested that *crib/croust* is used by the ‘working-class’ (e.g. CMM24, RWM52, NWM24, GWM80, AWF72, MMM46, RWM23, TMM23, JMF 75, NWF20 and KWF56), particularly those engaged in the mining industry (CMM24, HMM23, CWF49, NWF20, AWF72, RMM67). As a corollary of an association with miners, who were exclusively male, many of the expert informants report that they associate these forms with males (GWM80, AWF72, TMF22, MMM46, RWM23, DWF27, KWF56, NWM24, RWM52, LMF52, and CWM63).
SWM50 even states that ‘if I heard someone using [croust] I would put money on it that they were an ex-miner’. Allied to this association with a traditional industry, crib and croust are perceived to be ‘traditional’ (e.g. AWW72, AMM65, GWM63, and RWM23). Thus, crib and croust are emblematic not only of Cornwall but also traditional industries associated with Cornwall. As a result of this indexical link with traditional industries, the specific Cornish identity that is typically indexed by crib and croust is the Industrial Celt.

Building on the traditional associations with traditional industry in Cornwall, crib and croust have been further construed by the Camborne-Redruth community to index complex social meanings. According to SMF42, ‘[croust] is being reclaimed’. DMM83 sheds more light on this process by explaining that croust was ‘very common in my childhood. Now it is more likely to be used in a half-mocking way by the educated middle-class Cornish to prove that they are Cornish’. DMM83’s statement alludes to the use of croust to perform a Cornish identity. DMM83’s comment also suggests that the lexical item croust can index a humorous interpersonal stance. The third-order indexical function of parody is further highlighted by EMF20 who states that they use crib ‘as a joke’. This humorous use of Anglo-Cornish lexis is consistent with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity (see Section 6.2.2). However, this attested humorous usage was not widespread throughout the panel of expert informants.

As crib/croust is thought to be ‘traditional’, they are associated with the Industrial Celt identity. I suggest that when speakers are using crib/croust, particularly in the careful speech style, they do so in relation to the frame of the Industrial Celt chronotope. However, to many, this type of Cornish identity is undesirable as it is
perceived by some to be insular and hostile to outsiders (see Section 6.2.1.2). In the naming-task, two older women with low IdQ totals (CWF52 & JMF62) did use *croust* but were clear to distance themselves from the usage. For example, JMF62 responded to the LUNCH BOX stimulus by providing the referent *lunch box*, but then went on to say that ‘I know other Cornish [inaudible] would say *croust*’. By making use of in-group knowledge and simultaneously distancing themselves from the term *croust*, they also distance themselves from the potentially undesirable social indices, such as those associated with the Industrial Celt chronotope (see Section 6.2.1.2). If there were not positive indices associated with these forms, surely speakers would simply refer to concepts with Standard English variants. The two speakers who reported *croust* in the naming-task are keen to index their Cornish credentials, but in a way that does not bring with it all of the ideological baggage of the negatively valenced attitudes which are associated with the Industrial Celt identity.

In reporting knowledge of but not using *croust*, these participants simultaneously make use of an interpersonal stance of solidarity with the interlocutor (me), as members of a Cornish in-group, while distancing themselves from a range of negatively evaluated social meanings. For example, TMF22 states that it is seen to be ‘backwards’ to use traditional Cornish words. These ‘traditional’ dialect words can index an Industrial Celt persona, which, for many, particularly those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity, is highly undesirable.

Based on the meta-linguistic observations of the expert informants, the social meanings of *crib/croust*, as outlined in this section, are visualised through an indexical
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field (see Section 2.1.3) in Figure 7.2. In the indexical fields in this chapter I use a novel visualisation technique (cf. Figure 2.2 & Figure 2.3). I distinguish between the social meanings that are attributed to and attributed by those who embody the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identities. For example, those who align with Lifestyle Cornwall may interpret the use of crib/croust to be ‘backwards’ when used by someone they perceive to be an Industrial Celt, yet ‘humorous’ when used by a speaker who aligns with Lifestyle Cornwall. This reinforces the view that the social meaning of linguistic forms should not be viewed in isolation, but in the context of a broader system of semiotic communication (see Eckert 2008). Variation between the chronotopes is identifiable by the squares in the indexical field in Figure 7.2. Where social meanings are shared across the identities, the visualisation accounts for this by locating these meanings at the intersection of the relevant squares. Within each square, the placement of each label, such as if one label is further to the right or further above another label, is not meaningful.

Within the indexical field, I distinguish between the social indices at the level of social group, such as gender, social class, age, and occupation, persona types, such as ‘traditional’ or ‘backwards’, and interactional stances, such as ‘humorous’. All indexical fields presented in this thesis are indicative, not exhaustive.
7.1.2.1. The (de-)enregisterment of *crib* and *croust* ‘food provisions’

Throughout my ethnographic participant-observation (see Section 4.1) I observed multiple examples of the enregisterment of *crib/croust* throughout Cornwall. An example of this is the use of *crib* is found in a song by Cornish comedian Steve Heller (‘Dropped it ‘cause it’s hot’). In a parody cover of Snoop Dogg ft. Pharrell’s ‘Drop it Like it’s Hot’, Heller substitutes the lyric ‘when the pimp’s in the crib’ for his alternative ‘had a pasty for my crib’. While the onomasiological form *crib* remains constant between the original and the parodied form, Heller is clearly making use of the Anglo-Cornish dialect sense of *crib* ‘food provisions’ as opposed to *crib* ‘house’ as in the original. In doing so, Heller (performatively) indexes his localness, which is meaningful
to his target audience because of the enregisterment of *crib* as Anglo-Cornish (cf. Beal 2009b).

Further evidence of the enregisterment of *crib/croust* comes from linguistic landscapes in Cornwall, particularly with respect to food outlets. SWM50 states that ‘you see [*croust*] on old pasty shops and things like that’. This perception is consistent with linguistic landscapes in Cornwall. For example, there is the ‘Croust Hut’ in Camborne, Helston’s ‘Croust House’, Cornish food producers ‘Curds and Croust’ in Redruth, and ‘Mossel and Croust’ which trades at markets throughout west Cornwall. Similarly, in St. Austell there is ‘Crib Box Cornish Pasties’, ‘The Crib Box’ in Liskeard, Camborne’s ‘The Crib Stop’, the ‘Crib Hut’ in Newlyn, Padstow’s ‘Ben’s Crib Box’ and St. Agnes’ ‘Crib Shack’ (see Figure 7.3). The geographical distribution of the shops named *crib* or *croust* mostly reflect the SED’s isogloss boundary for these forms (see Figure 4.4), with *croust* being found in west Cornwall and *crib* in east Cornwall.
By naming a food outlet with a local dialect word, a company can be seen to be embedded within the community, by engaging with local linguistic practices and contributing to the Anglo-Cornish linguistic landscape. This relies on a target-audience making the indexical link between the word form and localness. However, it is not the case that all Cornish people make such a connection. Both usage (see Section 5.3.2.1) and recognition (see Section 5.3.3) of *crib* and *croust* are lower for younger Cornish people as opposed to their older counterparts. That is, not only do many speakers simply not use Anglo-Cornish words, such as *crib* and *croust*, many are not familiar with the words at all. Many younger people no longer associate such words with the
Anglo-Cornish dialect and are unable to distinguish them from nonce words. *Croust* and *crib* were recognised by eight and ten of the 40 younger participants, respectively. Thus, for much of the younger Cornish population, *crib* and *croust* do not index any social information, including Cornishness. As a result, I suggest that *crib* and *croust* are undergoing a process of deregisterment (cf. Cooper 2013, 2017) as they are not enregistered as being Anglo-Cornish for many younger speakers, who typically align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity.

7.1.3. The social meaning of *maid* ‘woman’

*Maid* ‘woman’ is part of a repertoire of words which are perceived to belong to a ‘traditional’ Cornish dialect. It is described as ‘traditional’ (HMM23, EMF21, & TMM24) and by DMM83 as ‘an authentically Cornish thing’ while JWM24 states that it is used by ‘people from farming backgrounds and their dads and grandads’. These quotes are indicative of key themes that were present throughout the meta-linguistic commentaries of *maid* provided by the expert informants.

Participants consistently attest observed patterns between *maid* ‘woman’ and particular socio-demographic groups. Many participants states that they associated *maid* with older people (RWM23, LWF52, & SMF46), particularly older men (MMF50, CWF49, TMM23, TWF22, HMM23, & MMM46). Another key theme was an

156 In the meta-linguistic discussions, I did not specify that I was interested in *maid* ‘woman’ as opposed to *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’, but the informants invariably discussed the former.
association between the usage of *maid* and the working-class (e.g. TMM23, GWM80, GWM62, KWF56, & LMF52).

*Maids* can also index stances in interactions. Specifically, *maid* can index an endearing interpersonal stance. For example, CWF49 states that *maid* is ‘meant as a lovely thing [...] a term of endearment’. The word ‘endearing’ or ‘endearment’ was also used in association with *maid* by TMF22, CWM63, MMM46, & NWF20. Similarly, MMF50 states that using *maid* was ‘more pleasant than using a personal name’.

DMM83 provides the example sentence ‘lovely little maid she is’. As a corollary of this perceived endearing interpersonal stance, a positive affect pertaining to the stance object (a woman or women in general) is also perceived to be indexed by *maid*.

Similarly to the pan-English *love* or *sweetheart*, *maid* may be perceived to be endearing to some, yet considered offensive or demeaning by others. Although some, particularly older, participants denied that *maid* had any negative connotations, for example, SWM50 states that ‘*[maid]* is not offensive’ and SMF46 says ‘I don’t think it’s condescending’, many other participants disagreed. For example, GWM63 noted that using *maid* ‘offends people nowadays’. Some speakers noted that they would perceive the use of *maid* to be endearing if used by older speakers, but offensive if used by younger speakers. For example, LWF55 states that ‘I wouldn’t mind if an older person called me a *maid* but I would be offended if a younger person did’. Similarly, NWF20 says that *maid* is ‘a term of endearment but I don’t think it would go down too well with the younger generation [...] it could be a bit derogatory, it is really all down to the context’.
The ‘offence’ cited by various participants pertains to sexism. Some, particularly younger, Cornish people perceive the use of *maid* to be derogatory to women. For example, TMM24 states that ‘there is a slightly sexist undertone to [maid]’. Under this interpretation, *maid* indexes a negative affect pertaining to the stance object (a specific woman or women in general). While for Industrial Celts, *maid* may index a positive affect in relation to the stance object, many who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity perceive their use of *maid* to index a negative affect.

Perceived negative indices can impact the production of *maid*. For example, AMM65 notes that ‘I will use the word *maid* but only to real Cornish maids because it could be offensive’. In light of *maid*’s indexical meaning potentials, speakers can stylistically manipulate their use or non-use of *maid* depending on the context of interaction. All eight of the speakers who used the onomasiological form *maid* in the naming task (there were no tokens of *maid* in the SD tasks) were older and had high IdQ totals (see Section 5.3.2.2), and, thus, can primarily be considered to be Industrial Celts. Despite the attested negative affect towards women, three of these eight speakers are female.

*Maid* can also be used in order to perform Cornishness and validate one’s status as a member of the Cornish in-group. This is exemplified by SMM45 who states that ‘[using *maid*] accentuates your Cornishness. If I’m being playful with the wife, I might call her maid’. The use of *maid* to ‘accentuate’ Cornish identity can be seen in the greater use of *maid* and the other four Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants in careful speech styles (see Section 5.5.2). SMM45’s comment also touches on another
meta-pragmatic function of *maid*, that is, its use in playful interaction, which suggests that it can index social meaning at higher orders of indexicality.

The second-order index of a ‘traditional’ persona have been reconstrued to index humorous interpersonal stances at the third-order of indexicality. Similarly to the quote from SMM45 regarding his wife, SWM24 states that ‘I use [*maid*] for comedic effect if I’m having banter with a girl I’d call her *maid*’. This suggests that there is a distinction between those who use *maid* to make use of the second-order indices such as ‘endearing’ and those who make use of the third-order indices in playful interactions. The humorous stance is reinforced by various other meta-linguistic comments such as ‘if [*maid*] is used by the younger generation then it is as a joke’ (OWF24), ‘I would use [*maid*] if I were joking [...] I wouldn’t use it generally’ (SMF42), and ‘I associate [*maid*] with older men [...] I would call someone that as a bit of a joke’ (TMF22). Similarly, HMM23 states that *maid* is typically used by Cornish people who are ‘older, more likely to be a man’ and someone who is ‘traditional’, while his ‘friends use [*maid*] in a jokey way’. These meta-linguistic observations that *maid* can index an interpersonal stance of humour by mocking Industrial Celts, with whom *maid* is typically associated.

The diverse character traits and interpersonal stances attributed to *maid* by the expert informants highlight the distinction between hearer-oriented and speaker-oriented social meanings (cf. speaker-oriented and hearer-oriented meaning, McConnell-Ginet 2014, cf. also Traugott & Dasher 2002: 34–40). Though no speakers are agentively making use of the backwards index of *maid* to do social identity work, this is indeed how many who embody the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope evaluate (at
least non-parodic) uses of maid, and by extension, its users. The negatively valenced readings of maid are largely in the domain of the hearer. For users of maid, the positive social meanings outweigh the negative social meanings in maid’s indexical field, but this is not necessarily the case for hearers. While a speaker may use maid to do ‘being endearing’, the hearer may interpret the very same usage to be not ‘endearing’ but ‘derogatory’ (cf. Johnstone & Kiesling 2008).

The social meanings of maid as outlined above and supported by participants’ meta-linguistic commentaries are visualised as an indexical field in Figure 7.4.

![Indexical field for maid](image)

**Figure 7.4** Indexical field for maid. Capital letters = social groups. Regular text = persona types. Italics = stances

*Maid* can index stances and social characteristics associated with both the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopes (see Figure 7.4). In the elicitation procedure, none of the uses appeared to be used to stylise a humorous interpersonal stance (for
discussion, see Section 9.1). Thus, all attested uses of *maid* were of the type associated with Industrial Celts.

### 7.1.3.1. The enregisterment of *maid* ‘woman’

The meta-linguistics observations of the expert informants in this study evidence that *maid* ‘woman’ is enregistered as Cornish. Further verification of higher-order social meaning potentials come from the commodification of *maid*. *Maid* has been commodified as is evidenced by clothing (see Figure 7.5) which contain the phrase ‘Cornish maid’. There is also a café called ‘The Cornish Maid’ near Falmouth.

![Figure 7.5 A t-shirt which evidences the commodification of *maid* in Cornwall](https://www.49degrees.co.uk/women-s-c5/t-shirt-vests-c10/black-and-gold-ladies-cornish-maid-t-shirt-grey-marl-p892)

One striking example of enregisterment occurred after I had finished an interview with a participant. The participant’s daughter showed me her tattoo which contained the

---

157 This t-shirt is available at: https://www.49degrees.co.uk/women-s-c5/t-shirt-vests-c10/black-and-gold-ladies-cornish-maid-t-shirt-grey-marl-p892
words ‘maid in Cornwall’ (a play on words of the phrase ‘made in Cornwall’ which is often employed by Cornish manufacturers and producers of goods) and a topographical outline of the Duchy. Such a semiotic link between dialect words, the place, and the individual is only possible due to the enregisterment of maid.

7.1.4. The social meaning of stank ‘walk’

Half of all participants were unable to identify stank as being Anglo-Cornish (see Sections 5.3.3). For those who did identify stank as being Anglo-Cornish in the lexical recognition task, most were unable to engage in explicit meta-linguistic discussions. This is consistent with TMM49’s comment that stank ‘is not as clichéd as some of the other [Anglo-Cornish dialect words]’. However, some participants state that stank is associated with the Cornish people who are ‘working-class’ (e.g. EMF21, AWF72) and ‘older’ (e.g. GWM80, AWF72, CWM63, MMF62), and that it is ‘traditional’ (EMF21). Similarly, stank is associated with traditional industries such as mining (DMM65) and farming (GWM80).

There are two main pieces of evidence to suggest that stank indexes social meaning at higher indexical orders, at least for some speakers. The first piece of evidence comes from its stylistic distribution, as Johnstone et al. (2006) suggest that stylistic variation is indicative of at least second-order indexicality. Speakers in this study did indeed show stylistic variation with respect to stank, as I only observed stank in speakers’ careful speech styles. This would suggest that some identity work is being done, as the speakers who used stank demonstrate stylistic manipulation of their
lexical repertoire. Secondly, evidence of higher-order indices can be found from some speakers’ meta-linguistic commentaries. For example, MMF25 states ‘if I used [stank] it would be quite deliberate, it would be when I think ‘let’s use that dialect word now’’. Similarly, SMM45 comments that ‘I would only use [stank] for effect’. Additionally, TMM49 explains that he has ‘incorporated [stank] into [his] vocabulary because [he] wanted to’. This is consistent with the style pattern observed for stank in Section 5.4 and suggests that speakers are using stank in order to construct a Cornish identity.

As stank is associated with older, allegedly ‘traditional’ speakers, it is allied with the older Industrial Celt chronotopic identity. Similarly to crib/croust and maid, stylistic moves by older speakers with high IdQ totals towards the use of stank in careful speech styles indexes a positive alignment to Cornwall, specifically making use of the frame of the Industrial Celt chronotope.

7.1.5. The social meaning of emmet ‘tourist’

Unlike the other investigated Anglo-Cornish forms, the use of emmet as a variant of TOURIST does not exhibit age-related variation (see Section 5.3.2). Consistent with the findings of the quantitative data elicited in this study, speaker’s meta-linguistic commentaries report that the use of emmet, unlike crib/croust, maid, and stank, is not primarily associated with older Cornish people.158 Emmet is typical in relation to the

---

158 While I did not direct speakers to focus on a particular sense of emmet, speakers invariably discussed emmet ‘tourist’. Thus, no meta-linguistic commentary was provided for emmet ‘ant’.
other Anglo-Cornish dialect words as it is perceived to be primarily used by the working-class population and by those with a strong Cornish identity.

The meta-linguistic commentaries provided by expert informants for *emmet* show that higher-order social indices are not accessible to all participants, particularly those who are largely non-mobile and engage in primarily local social networks. For example, NWM24 states that ‘*emmet* is just a word use down here’ (RWM52, FWF72, JWF55, and JMM24 provided similar observations). These speakers made no association between the use of *emmet* and any specific social group or any evaluative stance, either towards Cornwall or towards tourists. Similarly, for these participants, *emmet* simply indexes ‘Cornish’. However, an awareness of the localness of *emmet* is indicative of second-order indexical meaning (see Section 2.1.3.1).

The expert informants do not consistently report any age or gendered pattern with the use of *emmet*. However, an association between *emmet* and working-class Cornish people is often reported, e.g. GWM80, CWM63, LMF52, AMM65, and CWM23. Despite the limited amount of reported associations with socio-demographic groups, many speakers describe a broad range of higher-order social meanings of *emmet*.

*Emmet* can be used in order to confirm one’s Cornish provenance and highlight one’s status as a local. For example, KWM23 states that *emmet* is used by ‘proud Cornish people’. The use of *emmet* is, according to JMF75, ‘very much an identity thing, we are Cornish and we are a unit and we are excluding you, there’s a whole load of cultural stuff within [the word *emmet*], there is always that tone of us and them and it reinforces identity’. By othering non-Cornish people and reinforcing one’s Cornish
credentials, *emmet* serves to signal in-group membership. This is consistent with the Industrial Celt persona which can conceptualise the Cornish people as a distinct group.

A common theme found in the meta-linguistic commentaries of *emmet* is that it indexes a territorial identity, which is associated with the Industrial Celt identity (see Section 6.2.1). JMF62 comments that the use of *emmet* is indicative of a ‘Cornwall for the Cornish’ attitude. This perception is reinforced by RWF48 who states that *emmet* is used by ‘people who see non-Cornish people as an intrusion’. Similarly, KMM22 who observes that ‘a lot of people who use [*emmet*] are quite traditional and think Cornwall is its own place’. This index of a territorial identity is further evidenced by EMF21 who explained that *emmet* is used by ‘the Cornish people who are quite patriotic and kind of feel like they are a bit more entitled because they are Cornish and can look down on others’. This is reinforced by CWF49 who says that *emmet* ‘can be used as a derogatory term to say “you don’t live here and you’re annoying”’. Indeed RWM23 reports that the use of *emmet* is used to signify ‘ownership’ and ‘taking Cornwall as your own’. This is echoed by TMM23 who states that he thinks that people who use *emmet* are:

> quite heavy on localism. I don't think it's a particularly nice term [...] if we say *emmet* we are talking down about someone [...] I think it's a working-class thing [...] that's because it affects us most [...] a lot of younger people learn it from older people [...] [my friends and I] would use it because we're proud to be Cornish and a lot of people get angry at people coming down and while its good for Cornwall, it is still a pain in the ass, so we would use it just because we feel like this is our place and they're coming into it.

To many Industrial Celts (see Section 6.2.1) tourism in Cornwall curtails the Duchy's autonomy. This anti-tourism stance can be indexed by *emmet*. This is exemplified by JMF62, who states that *emmet* is used by ‘people who don’t realise how valuable tourism is to Cornwall’ and, according to HMM23, it is used by ‘people who resent
tourists’. Indeed, MMF25 states that *emmet* ‘is associated with a negative attitude towards tourism’ (also LWF55, HMM23, TMF22, CMM24, MMM46, SMF46, JMM18, EMF21, MMF25, RWM23, & TTMM24). Thus, *emmet* can index a negative affect pertaining to the specific stance object, that is, tourists. These meta-linguistic commentaries suggest that *emmet* can index both a territorial identity and an anti-tourism stance, which are features also associated with the Industrial Celt chronotopic identity.

*Emmet* can also index a frustrated interpersonal stance. *Emmet* can index this frustrated stance in interactions, as exemplified by MWF49 who states that *emmet* is ‘used when [Cornish people are] frustrated’. Many Cornish people who embody the Industrial Celt persona feel negatively impacted by the tourist industry (see Section 6.2.1). This is exemplified by SWM24 who states that ‘everyone from Cornwall uses *emmet* in the summer, all ages will say *emmet* at one point or another out of frustration’. Indeed, according to MMF25, ‘it is a nice way of expressing frustration with tourism without actually having to insult anyone’.

Participants did not consistently comment that the use of *emmet* was in any way ‘nice’, as MMF25 suggested. JWM23 comments that it is ‘aggressive’ and RMM67 suggests that *emmet* is a ‘term of abuse’. This is reinforced by the consistent collocation with the intensifiers *fucking* and *bloody*. SWM50 says that ‘if I got stuck in a traffic jam and it’s full of holiday-makers, I’d just think ‘f-in emmets’ and that ‘I’ve used *emmet* when I get teasy [frustrated] when you get stuck in traffic full of holiday-makers and you’re thinking ‘bloody emmets! I just want to get home’’. This index of a frustrated stance is reinforced by SWM24 who suggests that when using *emmet*, one
can ‘be really neutral with it or you could be like ‘fucking emmets!’’. If you’re Cornish you complain about emmets, it’s drilled into you from birth’. As a result, it has developed an index not just of frustration, but of hostility towards holiday-makers.

*Emmet* has undergone a process of stance accretion, where an index of a frustrated stance has developed into an index of an insular and bigoted persona type, which is in turn associated with the Industrial Celt chronotope. For example, AMM65 states that *emmet* was used by people who are ‘bigoted […] along the lines of nationalist beliefs’. Similarly, TMM49 comments that *emmet* is used by ‘the worst sort of Cornish nationalists […] very inward looking’. Also, SMF46 comments that *emmet* is used ‘in a kind of racist way’. Nationalist beliefs, such as those attested to be associated with *emmet*, are also a feature of the Industrial Celt chronotope (see Section 6.2.1).

Younger participants, despite not being entirely familiar with the older sense, *emmet ‘ant’*, are often aware of its less than complementary connotations. For example, NWM24, who, according to the *who/what* questions is unaware of the ‘ant’ sense of *emmet*, describes the tourists in the casual elicitation procedure as ‘a pack of emmets’. This suggests that while many younger speakers are not familiar with the older meaning, *emmet ‘ant’*, for at least some of these speakers, it remains as a ‘trace’ (see Fitzmaurice 2017: 6). The trace of *emmet ‘ant’* is evidence by NWM24’s use of the collective noun *pack* which would typically collocate with animals, such as ants. The collocation between *pack* and *emmet* remains in the speech of NWM24 despite his lack of awareness of the sense *emmet ‘ant’*. 
Many of the expert informants, particularly those aligned with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity, view the use of *emmet* as being incompatible with a progressive, inclusive worldview. Yet, many who attest *emmet*’s indices of isolationism and antagonism towards outsiders, also use *emmet* themselves. The index of the bigoted persona is parodied by many of those who embody the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope. For example, SMF46 admits to using *emmet* ‘as a joke’ and KMM22 uses it as ‘banter’ with his non-Cornish friends. Many participants in this study provided meta-commentaries which evidence the reconstrual of *emmet* at the third-order of indexicality to index a humorous take on centre-periphery relations in Cornwall. This mock-othering of non-Cornish people is consistent with the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope (see Section 6.2.2). Thus, through stance accretion, a mock-othering of the stance object, tourists, can index alignment to the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope.

There is a wealth of evidence from participants’ meta-linguistic commentaries that *emmet* can index social meaning at the third-order of indexicality. For example, AWM24 states that he uses *emmet* ‘as a joke [...] it has become a self-aware thing in people in my generation, we don't use it unless it's made in jest’. This is reinforced by TMF22 who states that *emmet* is ‘used by bitter old people who are really against tourists’ and then goes on to say that ‘I use it in jest’. Similarly, SMF46 says ‘I think people who use that, it's a bit derogatory, they don't really like people coming down on holiday [...] It's a negative term, in a kind of racist way [...] I wouldn't use that, [but I would] in a jokey way’. These quotes demonstrate that *emmet* is being used to construct a humorous interpersonal stance as well as a positive orientation to Cornwall. This also highlights the juxtaposition between the use of *emmet* to construct
an identity consistent with the Industrial Celt chronotope and the use of the same lexical form to construct an identity consistent with the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope.

Many Industrial Celts style shift towards the use of *emmet* in careful speech styles as they seek to construct an identity based on a Cornish identity of the Industrial Celt type. Yet, many of those who align towards the Lifestyle Cornwall identity are likely to avoid the use of *emmet* due to the very same social meanings. However, this indexical association between *emmet* and an Industrial Celt persona is parodied by other speakers in order to index alignment to Lifestyle Cornwall. As *emmet* can index alignment to both chronotopic identities, I suggest that it has *bivalent chronotopic indexicality* (cf. Cotter & Valentinsson 2018), as the same form can index traditional and modern Cornish identities. This accounts for why, unlike *crib/croust, maid,* and *stank,* *emmet* does not exhibit quantitative age-related variation, yet there are age-related interaction effects with socioeconomic class and strength of Cornish identity (see Section 5.3.2.4). Specifically, while the use of *emmet* exhibits the strongest statistical relationship with IdQ total for older speakers, for younger speakers those whose who are working-class are the group most likely to use *emmet.*

Even when it is being used in jest, *emmet* does identity work by reinforcing in-group membership between Cornish interlocutors. The complexity of *emmet*’s indexical meaning potentials is exemplified by NWF20 who reports that *emmet* is:

> A bit of a bigotry [sic] word. I take it in tongue-in-cheek. Young people do use it because they think it’s funny. It’s more humorous than serious. Some people use that word very seriously, some use it humorously. I wouldn’t use that word to people who were here on holiday because I wouldn’t want to offend them but I would use it with my peer group.

Indeed, TMF59 suggests that *emmet*:
has a political dimension because it is quite pejorative but it can also be used light-heartedly [...] it is often used in inverted commas and as an identifier by people who want to assert their local status. It’s something that is being used more and more as a flag of Cornishness.

Many young people who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity and who use *emmet* to index Cornish in-group membership and a humorous interpersonal stance also associated *emmet* with being ‘cool’. For example, EMF21 states that ‘people try and sound cool when they say it’ and RWM23 comments that ‘it is seen as cool to say it’. The index of ‘cool’ and the third-order parody of Industrial Celt chronotopic identity are often made use of by those who embody a Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identity, as this identity is also considered to be ‘cool’ (see Section 6.2.2).

Some speakers feel that *emmet* is mildly taboo such as HMM23 who states that it is ‘an insult [...] it's a word your parents would tell you not to use’. This taboo factor is evident when many, particular younger, participants use *emmet*. Many younger speakers would say *emmet* with a smirk which is indicative of the playfulness and jocularity of mock-othering of England and the English which is associated with the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope (see Section 6.2.2, see also ‘bricolage’ Hebidge 1979; Eckert 2008).

TMM24 very accurately predicts the quantitative distribution of *emmet* from his meta-linguistic commentary. He states that:

*Emmet* is a word that is only likely to be used by Cornish people [...] it is a pejorative word for tourists [...] the sort of person who is likely to use this word is someone with an inherent dislike of outsiders and who feels threatened by influxes of tourism [...] I think that if there was a class thing to it, it would probably be used more by working-class Cornish people. Gender, I don’t think it matters nor does age, I think it’s more of an identity thing, a national identity [...] I associate this word with a slightly insular quality based on a dislike of others, in this case, tourists. It is reflective of a traditional attitude. I think people use it to
advertise their Cornishness as a sort of Cornish badge of honour to dislike tourism. I don’t find it problematic but I know lots of people who do.

As predicted by TMM24, the use of *emmet* does not correlate with gender or age but does significantly correlate with SEC and strength of local identity (see section 5.5.1.4). TMM24 also touches upon the use of *emmet* in the construction of local identities; ‘people use it to advertise their Cornishness as a sort of badge of honour’. This is consistent with the stylistic variation of *emmet* (see Section 5.4). Also, TMM24 discusses the link between the use of *emmet* and ‘traditional’ Cornish identity. This identity which is described as ‘a national identity’ is associated with an ‘insular’ persona that *emmet* is thought, by many of those who embody aspects of the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identity, to index. The national identity as mentioned by TMM24 is strongly associated with the Industrial Celt manifestation of Cornish identity (see Section 6.2.1).

*Emmet* highlights the contrast between hearer-oriented and speaker-oriented social meanings. While some speakers may use *emmet* to do being Cornish and to index their Cornish pride, their hearers may interpret this to be insular and hostile to tourists. In the context of centre-periphery relations, those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopic identity consider Cornwall to be a ‘cool’ county of England, as opposed to an autonomous (proto-)nation as do many Industrial Celts. They believe such a geo-political perspective to be ‘insular’ and even worthy of derision, as exemplified by the parodic use of *emmet* and its use to index a humorous interpersonal stance. This humorous stance is only successful, that is, funny, when
both the speaker and hearer understand the frame of reference, which, in this case, is the perceived negative traits associations with those who use *emmet*.

In this section I have shown that *emmet* exemplifies a wide range of social meanings. I present these in the form of an indexical field in Figure 7.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributed by:</th>
<th>Attributed to:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Celts</td>
<td>Lifestyle Cornwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Celts</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>solidarity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle Cornwall</td>
<td>bigoted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hostile</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anti-tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORNISH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>frustrated</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORKING-CLASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>humorous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.6 Indexical field for *emmet*. Capital letters = social groups. Regular text = persona types. Italics = stances

In the naming-task, one participant used the supra-local variant *tourist* but reported that many Cornish people use *emmet*. The motivations for this reported usage appear to be very similar to the two participants who similarly reported on the use of *croust* (see Section 7.1.2). That is, there is a desire to develop an interpersonal stance of solidarity with their interlocutor (me) as a member of the in-group by showcasing their knowledge of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis, while simultaneously distancing themselves from undesirable social meanings, such as hostile and bigoted.
7.1.5.1. The enregisterment of emmet ‘tourist’

The pool of features enregistered as ‘Cornish’ is not static. It is evolving with some features being added and others disappearing. I have suggested that crib and croust are becoming deregistered (see Section 7.1.2.1). Contrastively, though a relatively recent addition to the Anglo-Cornish dialect in the ‘tourist’ sense (see Section 4.3.2.2), emmet is enregistered as Anglo-Cornish. In fact, emmet was probably the most commonly observed commodified dialect word that I observed during my ethnographic participation in Camborne-Redruth. Bumper-stickers which contain the St. Piran’s flag and the words ‘non emmet’ are very popular in Cornwall (see Figure 7.7). They identify one’s car, and, by extension, oneself, as being Cornish. This is particularly pertinent in light of the frustration that many Cornish people feel towards non-Cornish road users, particularly during the busy summer months and the concomitant traffic. The ‘non emmet’ bumper sticker serves to index in-group membership and make a claim regarding that road users’ perceived legitimacy.
Another area in which the enregisterment of *emmets* is clear is from its presence in various memes which are shared on social media pages throughout Cornwall. These memes play on some of the social meanings of *emmets* as detailed in Section 7.1.5. For example, the Drake meme (see Figure 7.8) is indicative of an ideology which perceives Cornish people to be happier when tourists, or ‘emmets’ (spelt *emmits*), are not in Cornwall. Similarly, the desired humour in the meme in Figure 7.9 is predicated on the reader’s understanding that emmets, are perceived to be frustrating to many Cornish people.
Figure 7.8 The ‘Drake’ meme, depicting a dislike of tourists in Cornwall159

Figure 7.9 A meme depicting how tourists are perceived by some Cornish people160

159 This meme was posted by the ‘Cornish Oafs’ Facebook page on 17/09/2019.
160 This meme was posted by the ‘Cornish Oafs’ Facebook page on 18/09/2019.
While the memes in Figures 7.8 and 7.9 could be considered to be a humorous take on the relationship between Cornish people and tourists, the anti-tourist stance is clearly parodied in Figure 7.10. The scene in Figure 7.10 draws parallels between the anti-immigration rhetoric of U.S president Donald Trump and the anti-tourist sentiment in Cornwall, which is particularly associated with Industrial Celts (see Section 6.2.1). This parody is constructed multi-modally. The use of *emmet*, along with the masks of Donald Trump with an unflattering facial expression, and signage associated with Trump’s fanbase all serve to parody both Cornish hostility to tourists and Donald Trump.

![Figure 7.10 People mocking the anti-tourist sentiment in Cornwall](http://www.stivessurfschool.co.uk/blog/)

161 This image is reproduced with the permission of St. Ives surf school. The original image is available at: http://www.stivessurfschool.co.uk/blog/.
7.2. Summary

In this chapter I have taken the perspective of social meaning, using orders of indexicality (see Silverstein 2003; Johnstone et al. 2006) and stance (see Du Bois 2007) to explore the perceptions of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis by using thematic analysis. I engaged in explicit meta-linguistic commentaries with participants regarding their perception of the investigated lexical forms as well as the Anglo-Cornish dialect more broadly. These commentaries largely reflect the patterns of socially- and stylistically-conditioned variation shown in Chapter 5, which demonstrates the validity of participants as expert informants. In addition, expert informants were able to engage in detailed discussion pertaining to stances and second- and third-order social meanings. The overtly positive meta-linguistic commentary regarding Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis demonstrates that its prestige is not covert (cf. Trudgill 1972), but overt and local. These findings showcase the value of engaging with participants’ linguistic knowledge in order to inform sociolinguistic analysis.

Informed by the meta-linguistic commentaries of expert informants, I have visualised the indexical fields (see Eckert 2008) for *crib/croust, maid*, and *emmet* and discussed the social meaning of *stank*. While each of these variants have a great deal of differences, they are anchored by a core set of social meanings such as the first-order index of Cornish, the second-order index of localness, and, to varying extents, performative parodies which are indicative of third-order social meanings. However, each Anglo-Cornish lexical item confers social meanings not shared by the others, such as *emmet* can index a hostile interpersonal stance and *maid* can be perceived to index
a ‘backwards’ attitude towards gender relations. Moreover, both maid and emmet index particular attitudes towards the stance object, that is evaluations towards the concept that the lexical item represents, that is, WOMAN and TOURIST, respectively. This reinforces Acton & Potts’ (2014) observation that for lexical items, referential meanings can influence social meanings (see also Eckert & Labov 2017; Beltrama 2018).

Through stance accretion, the direct indices of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis, such as a hostile stance to tourists for emmet, also indirectly index particular enregistered Cornish identities, such as alignment to the Industrial Celt persona. These social meanings motivate speakers’ stylistic moves, that is, whether or not they employ the Anglo-Cornish form over an alternative standard English variant in particular contexts. Chronotopic identities can be considered as frames, as shared reference points from which identities can be constructed in an interaction.

The dialectic between non-local and local forms of prestige is exemplified by EWM26 who states that many Cornish people ‘want to use the [the Anglo-Cornish dialect] but are a bit embarrassed to say it, but they want to talk like that but if you say it seriously nowadays people take the piss out of you’. EWM26 goes on to suggest that by using performative phrases in a hyper-Cornish accent, the speaker can index the desirable social characteristics associated with the Anglo-Cornish dialect such as in-group membership and simultaneously distance themselves from perceived negative social meanings. This suggests that while the speaker is keen to broadcast their Cornish identity, the parody enables participants to distance themselves from the indices that they evaluate as undesirable, such as associations with the Industrial Celt chronotope.
This reinforces the argument in Chapter 6, that many younger people are simultaneously proud to be Cornish, and have a strong orientation to Cornwall, yet wish to distance themselves from some of the negative stereotypes associated with the Industrial Celt chronotope.

As well as considering the social meanings that the expert informants did report, it is important to note a theme that was entirely absent. Typically, non-standard forms index ‘incorrectness’ (e.g. Johnstone 2009; Snell 2010; Reed 2016). Interestingly, none of the expert informants described the local lexical forms as ‘incorrect’. It is unclear whether this is because lexical forms are less likely to be ‘incorrect’ than non-standard phonological or morpho-syntactic variants or because of the language ideological context in Cornwall. This could be clarified by further research.

The social meanings attested in this chapter provide an explanation for an apparent discrepancy between high levels of recognition but low levels of usage for maid and, in casual speech, for emmet (see Chapter 5). Although SD tasks and naming tasks can elicit a referent for a concept, it is often difficult to recreate emotive contexts which give rise to particular stances. For example, maid was identified by over 90% of informants as being Anglo-Cornish. Yet, only eight speakers used maid in the elicitation tasks. As well as the negatively valenced social meanings such as ‘backwards’, I suggest that the low number of elicited tokens of maid is largely because it is heavily laden with non-referential meanings pertaining to emotional closeness between speaker and referent, including interpersonal stance and affect. In the Anglo-Cornish dialect, maid is often used as a term of endearment for a female friend, relative, or otherwise loved
one. The onomasiologically-oriented elicitation tasks that I developed in this thesis (see Chapter 5) are not able to recreate this emotional attachment. This could explain why the usage data for maid was so sparse even though it is an enregistered feature of the Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis and was recognised by almost all participants as being Anglo-Cornish. Similarly, participants reported that emmet was likely to be used when speakers were frustrated (see Section 7.1.5), but it was not possible, or ethical, to recreate a situation in which the speaker became vexed during the elicitation procedures.

By considering the perception of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis through the lens of Cornish chronotopic identities, I have developed a more nuanced understanding of the socially- and stylistically-conditioned patterns of lexical distributional patterns discussed in Chapter 5. In Chapter 8, I present a more holistic analysis, bringing together quantitative data patterns, chronotopic identities, and the social meaning discussed in this chapter in order to shed further light on variation, change, and social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis in Camborne-Redruth.
8. Discussion of findings

In this chapter I bring together the Anglo-Cornish lexical usage data from Chapter 5, the Cornish chronotopic identities introduced in Chapter 6, and the social meaning of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis discussed in Chapter 7 in order to provide an account of sociolinguistic patterns of lexis variation in Cornwall. I draw on existing theory and develop novel interpretations of language variation based on the data collected in this study.

I reflect on the original contributions to theory, method, and analysis that I have provided throughout this thesis. In Section 8.1 I explore the semasiological variation of the usage data in this study. I consider this from variationist sociolinguistic and cognitive linguistic perspectives. In Section 8.2 I account for the observed variation within the onomasiological usage data. I analyse the diachronic trajectory of the overall obsolescence of Anglo-Cornish vocabulary from the perspective of ‘stylistic shrinkage’ (Campbell & Muntzel 1989). I reflect on the implications of an inverted pattern of style-shifting for the sociolinguistic analysis of style and sociolinguistic theory more broadly. I then discuss the style pattern found in this study in relation to language ideology (see Section 2.1.4) and Bourdieu’s (1977, 1983, 1986, 1991) theory of capital and of the linguistic marketplace. In doing so, I challenge and refine Bourdieu’s theory of the linguistic market (see Section 8.2.1.1). I also expand Labov’s (1972a) ‘attention-to-speech’ model of style to develop an attention-to-self model which can account for local identity and an alternative linguistic marketplace in the context of intra-speaker variation (see Section 8.2.1.2).
8.1. Accounting for patterns of Anglo-Cornish semasiological variation

This thesis has reinforced Robinson’s (2010a) finding that semasiology is a level of language to which one can apply variationist sociolinguistic methods of analysis. This is evidenced by the social variation exhibited in the realisation of the semasiological variables *emmet* and *maid*. In addition to the finding that semasiological change is conditioned by age and SEC (see also Robinson 2010a), I also find that semasiological usage is predictable based on speakers strength of local identity, as measured by the IdQ. For example, *emmet* ‘ant’ is most likely to be used by middle-class participants who are older and have high IdQ totals, while in response to the first *who/what* elicitation prompts, *maid* ‘woman’ is most likely to be used by older speakers and least likely to be used by younger speakers with low IdQ totals (see Section 5.3.1).

Semasiological change involves cognitive as well as social processes. Semantic meaning at the level of the community is determined by cognitive and conceptual structures in the minds of speakers (Győri 2002). A shift in these meanings, either creative or conventional, must also be cognitive. One cognitive process that can enable such a change is metaphor (see Győri 2002; Traugott & Dasher 2002). The semasiological change of *emmet*, from ‘ant’ to ‘tourist’ is an example of conventionalised metaphor (see Traugott & Dasher 2002). Thus, the semasiological change of *emmet* can be considered as a cognitive process. By mapping a target domain, such as TOURISTS in relation to a source domain such as ANTS, a conceptual link between the two domains is established which becomes more conventionalised by
subsequent use of and exposure to this metaphor. Ultimately, most younger speakers are not aware that *emmet* ‘tourist’ is in any way metaphorical.

This cognitive reconceptualisation of *emmet* follows a socially-mediated trajectory. The semasiological variation of *emmet* is conditioned by a range of social factors, including socioeconomic class, age, and strength of local identity. The finding that *emmet* ‘ant’ is used most by middle-class speakers is typical of conservative variants, which have often been found to be used at a higher frequency by those of higher social strata when the innovative form is stigmatised (Williams & Kerswill 1999; Milroy 2003; Labov 2006: 205–208), as is the case with *emmet* ‘tourist’ (see Section 7.1.5). The age-related variation of *emmet* is consistent with real-time evidence of semasiological change provided by the OED and Anglo-Cornish dialect dictionaries (see Section 4.3). This challenges Labov’s (2001a: 123) assertion that it is ‘not likely that a study of lexical change could profit from the use of apparent time distributions’ (see also Robison 2010a). The social distribution of *emmet* ‘ant’ shows interaction effects between age, social class, and strength of Cornish identity (see Section 5.3.1.2) which evidences the structured heterogeneity of this polysemous word.

The semasiological change of *maid* is also a cognitive process. Specifically, I suggest that this shift can be considered from the perspective of diachronic prototype semantics (see Geeraerts 1997). The cognitive structure of *maid*, as a flexible polysemous category, is undergoing change in apparent-time. Specifically, there is an ongoing change, from *maid* ‘woman’ to *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’, through the addition of a [+DOMESTIC SERVANT] specification. We can consider this change in light of the degree of typicality (see Geeraerts 1997) of *maid* ‘woman’. A speaker’s
prototypical sense of a polysemous word can be considered to be the sense elicited from the first round of the who/what elicitation prompts, while peripheral senses are elicited from subsequent repetitions of the same stimulus. This is consistent with Gilquin’s (2006) claim that a key indicator of prototypicality is ordering in elicitation tasks, with prototypes tending to be used in first responses (see also Gilquin 2008; Arppe et al. 2010; Gilquin & McMichael 2018). Coding the first and second who/what questions separately has enabled a novel perspective on the socio-cognitive processes which underpin semasiological changes.

There is no overall ongoing change in the use of maid ‘woman’. However, this need not be the case for semasiological change to happen. Change in typicality can provide evidence for a cognitive restructuring of polysemous senses (see Geeraerts 1997). Indeed, I suggest that it is the case that there are changes in the degree of typicality of these senses between younger and older speakers. For older speakers, maid ‘woman’ is the prototypical sense, while for younger speakers, maid ‘female servant or attendant’ is the prototypical sense (see Section 5.3.1.1). By considering prototypicality, one can account for the conceptual structure of maid which enables this process of semasiological change. However, further empirical study is needed to validate the claim that prototypical senses are elicited in the first who/what questions while peripheral senses are elicited from subsequent repetitions.

\[162\] This claim is also supported by the finding that when asked to provide a member of a category, the initial response is likely to be a prototypical one (see Murphy 2010: 53). For example, when asked to provide an example of a VEGETABLE, a prototypical vegetable, such as ‘broccoli’, is much more likely to be the first response than a peripheral member of the category, such as ‘chickpea’. I suggest that the same principle applies with the who/what questions.
Strength of local identity is one of the social parameters to exhibit a statistical relationship with both *emmet* and *maid*. Labov (2001a: 191) questioned the validity of identity as a social parameter, suggesting that the observed relationship between local forms and local identity merely reflects ‘interlocutor frequencies’. Labov (2001a) argued that speakers with strong local identities are also more likely to engage with local social practices and local social networks, which leads to greater exposure to local dialect variants through a greater frequency of interlocutions with local people (see also Blythe & Croft 2012). As a result of greater exposure to local variants, Labov (2001a) suggests that those speakers with stronger local orientations are more likely to use local variants in their own speech. The alternative explanation, is that those with strong local identities are more likely to use local variants in ‘acts of identity’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985). The interlocutor frequency and act of identity interpretations provide radically different explanations for the relationship between language use and identity. It is necessary to consider which interpretation best accounts for the observed variation in this study.

I suggest that Labov’s (2001a) interlocutor frequency interpretation of linguistic usage and strength of local identity accounts for the relationship between IdQ totals and the semasiological variation of *maid* and *emmet*. The change from *maid* ‘woman’ to *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ is led by younger speakers with low IdQ totals. The interlocutor frequency interpretation (Labov 2001a) suggests that these speakers with low IdQ totals are less likely to engage with local social practices than their counterparts with high IdQ totals. Thus, those who are least likely to use the local variant, *maid* ‘woman’, are those with the least engagement in locally-oriented social networks and social practices. I suggest that as both *emmet* ‘ant’ and *emmet* ‘tourist’
are Anglo-Cornish, alignment to traditional social practices and engagement in social networks comprised of like-minded individuals shields against innovation, even when that innovation is endogenous to the community. As Labov (2001a) suggests, social preferences can influence social network structure, which can, in turn, influence linguistic variation. This accounts for why those with high IdQ totals are more likely to use the conservative variant *emmet* ‘ant’ as opposed to the more innovative variant *emmet* ‘tourist’.

The interlocutor frequency interpretation is a sufficient explanation for the observed relationship between IdQ totals and semasiological usage (see Section 5.3.1) and lexical recognition scores (see Section 5.3.3). This is because there is no evidence to suggest that the semasiological variation is used to ‘do’ Cornishness. Nor do participants ‘do’ Cornishness by recognising a large number of Anglo-Cornish words. In other words, speakers are not performing a ‘Cornish’ identity through their use of Anglo-Cornish semasiological variants or through the recognition of Anglo-Cornish lexis. Increased exposure to local linguistic forms though a higher frequency of interactions with, particularly socially- and linguistically-conservative, Cornish interlocutors can account for the observed statistical relationship between IdQ total and semasiological variation and lexical recognition scores. Thus, I reject the interpretation that the semasiological variation observed in this study can be considered to be an act of identity.

The social variation of the usage-data of both investigated semasiological variables suggests that variationist sociolinguistics is a suitable analytical framework through which to analyse variation and change of semantic meaning. This study
provides the empirical evidence which demonstrates this to be the case for nominal polysemous words. The cognitive processes involved in semantic change are conditioned by a range of social parameters, including age and strength of Cornish identity. This evidences the duality of the cognitive and the social in linguistic variation and change. That is, the cognitive processes which account for much of semantic change do not occur in a social vacuum, but follow a socially-mediated trajectory.\textsuperscript{163}

8.2. Accounting for patterns of Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variation

The key findings from the perspective onomasiological variation in this study are that Anglo-Cornish lexical usage is, overall, conditioned by age, strength of Cornish identity, and by speech style (see Chapter 5). As it is used more by older speakers and is much more likely to be used in careful speech styles, the stylistic shrinkage of Anglo-Cornish follows a bottom-to-top trajectory, as opposed to the more typical top-to-bottom pattern (see Section 2.1.2). While \textit{emmet} does not follow the age-related variation of the compound variable (see Section 5.3.2), it follows the same pattern of stylistic variation.

This process of stylistic shrinkage provides a lens through which one can explore the social psychological processes which mediate the trajectory of linguistic attrition. In careful speech styles, speakers in this study are agentively, proactively, and, in light of the social meanings associated with its local prestige, attempting to preserve their recessive local variety. The observed stylistic shrinkage of Anglo-Cornish

\textsuperscript{163} Further research is required to determine whether or not semasiological change is mediated by stylistic factors.
dialect lexis has parallels with lexical attrition in Martha’s Vineyard, which led Labov (1972d: 120) to state that where obsolescing forms remain ‘it is not due to an automatic inheritance of the past, but rather a conscious preference for the older world. The older unconscious regional marker may now be giving way to a consciously marked rural stereotype’. There are many parallels between Cornwall and Martha’s Vineyard, particularly pertaining to tourism and the subsequent seasonal population fluctuations, and it appears that the trajectory of local dialect attrition does indeed exhibit similarities, too.

8.2.1. Inverted style-shifting

In the rest of the chapter I problematise the assumption that, although we accept that some individuals primarily conform to locally prestigious ideals (e.g. Trudgill 1972, 1974), we anticipate that they use more standard forms of speech when they pay greater attention to their speech (Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974). Labov (1972a: 106) suggests that the regular pattern of stylistic variation towards the standard as attention-to-speech increases is a manifestation of a speech community’s, such as New York’s, shared evaluation of sociolinguistic variables. However, as shown in Chapter 7, the perception of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis is not uniform. I suggest that if speakers do not align with the standard language ideology, we should expect them to continue not to do so when they pay attention to their speech and that this will be reflected in their linguistic usage patterns across speech styles.
While stylistic shrinkage offers a perspective on diachronic change, intra-speaker variation can also be considered synchronically. Synchronic variationist sociolinguistic studies of intra-speaker variation have consistently reported on a uniform pattern of stylistic distribution (see Section 2.1.2). Typically, this involves a higher frequency of standard features being elicited when the speaker is conscious of their speech, while non-standard forms typically occur in more casual or less formal styles (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974). Yet, the opposite pattern has been observed in this study (see Section 5.4). I have found that Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis occurs more frequently when speakers are aware that their word-usage is being observed. Specifically, Anglo-Cornish dialect words are more frequently used in careful, rather than casual, speech styles. This style pattern is the inverse of the typical direction of style-shifting (e.g. Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974). Thus, this is an inverted style pattern (Stuart-Smith 2014: 254; Sandow 2020).

When the speakers in this study are paying attention to their speech in naming tasks, they use Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis more than when their primary cognitive load is concerned with task-completion in SD tasks. As the investigated Anglo-Cornish dialect words are enregistered as ‘Cornish’, these words can be used to ‘do’ a Cornish identity (see Sandow & Robinson 2018). This interpretation is supported by the quantitative lexical data, specifically, that Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis is most likely to be used by those with strong local identities in careful speech styles. Additionally, the doing Cornishness interpretation is consistent with participants’ meta-linguistic commentaries on the use of Anglo-Cornish words to stylise a Cornish identity, such as ‘I can speak really Cornish when I want to’ (DWF27, see also Chapter 7).
The interlocutor frequency interpretation (Labov 2001a: 191, see Section 8.1) is not a satisfactory account of why IdQ total is a good predictor of onomasiological usage. Interlocutor frequency may have been a sufficient explanation of Anglo-Cornish onomasiological usage had the local variants occurred mainly in casual speech styles. However, it does not account for why those with strong local identities were more likely to use local forms to stylise their Cornish identities in careful speech. This is not an example of where linguistic output (the words one uses) simply mirrors linguistic input (the words one hears). Instead, speakers with a strong sense of local identity are using Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis in order to perform a locally meaningful identity. Thus, I reject the interpretation that the onomasiological usage patterns presented in this thesis can be dismissed as a consequence of interlocutor frequencies. Instead, I suggest that the use of Anglo-Cornish variants in careful speech styles is an example of an ‘act of identity’ (see Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985).

The inverted style-pattern exhibited in this study is not unique. A pattern of inverted style-shifting was observed in the Anglo-Cornish dialect by Dann (2016, 2019) for the BATH vowel (specifically in the F2 dimension) and by Sandow & Robinson (2018) and Sandow (2020) for the lexical items crib and croust. Some preliminary analysis of the lexical usage by Cornish participants presented in Sandow (2015) showed that middle-class males and working-class females were ten percent less likely to use the ‘U’ variant loo in careful speech styles, where toilet and bog were favoured. This suggests that many Cornish people are rejecting the standard language ideology, which becomes particularly visible in careful speech styles and manifests in the usage of non-standard variants.
Inverted style patterns, at the levels of phonetics and phonology, have also been observed in many other locations. These include Appalachia (Reed 2016), Texas (Legum, personal communication, cited in Labov 1972: 238n36), Belfast (Milroy 1987a: 102), Glasgow (Stuart-Smith et al. 2007; Stuart-Smith et al. 2013; Stuart-Smith & Ota 2014), Newcastle upon Tyne (Foulkes 1997), Israel (Gafter 2016), and among British Indian adolescents in London (Hundt & Staicov 2018). What these studies have in common is that the studied populations characteristically have strong local, supra-local, or ethnic identities which, in various ways, celebrate non-conformity with the places and institutions which are associated with the standard variety.

Inverted style patterns are often explained with recourse to the social meaning attributed to non-standard language which is perceived as desirable for various interactional or ideological reasons. In Austin, Texas, Stanley Legum (personal communication, cited in Labov 1972a: 238n36), found the non-standard apical variant of (ING) to occur more frequently in a reading passage than an interview context. Labov (1972a: 238n36) suggests that this pattern occurs as the non-standard variant is a ‘symbol of local identity’. In his study of Hebrew phonology, Gafter (2016) found a higher frequency of (the stigmatised) pharyngeal variants in a word-list task than in conversational speech. Gafter (2016: 33) attributes this finding to the performance of the Mizrahi ethnic identity which is associated with the pharyngeal variants. Similarly, Stuart-Smith & Ota (2014) found that while many older and middle-class Glaswegians conformed to the typical style pattern of using fewer non-standard forms in careful speech, many working-class adolescents did not. Specifically, the Glaswegian working-class adolescents used more non-standard variants in word-lists. Stuart-Smith & Ota (2014: 158) interpret this style pattern as a performance of localness and to be
indicative of ‘a particular stance to the task, and to the fieldworker’, clearly
distinguishing the speaker from the fieldworker who was perceived as ‘posh’ (Stuart-
Smith & Ota 2014: 163). Kiesling (1998) found that some speakers used a higher
number of stigmatised velar-nasal forms in formal contexts as opposed to informal
contexts. Kiesling (1998) attributed this to the velar nasal variant indexing physical
power. Those speakers who oriented towards physical, rather than structural power
indexed physically strong personas in formal speech contexts, such as in meetings.

Inverted style patterns are also visible in seminal studies of sociolinguistic style.
Even Labov’s (1972a) data from his New York study (see also Labov 2001b: 99–101)
reveal a slight inverted pattern for some speakers, including Abraham G. ((oh) variable,
Labov 1972a:102), Doris H. ((eh) variable, Labov 1972a: 103), and Steve K ((eh)
variable, Labov 1972a: 104). Labov (1972a: 103–104) attempts to account for Steve K’s
so-called ‘deviant’ pattern with recourse to his atypical language ideology. Trudgill
(1974: 108) found that, for the (o) variable, lower working-class men, and, to a lesser
extent, middle working-class women, used a higher rate of the non-standard variant in
‘formal’ speech as opposed to ‘casual’ speech. Similarly, Cheshire (1982b) found that
‘Barney’, an adolescent with a particular hostility towards his school, used a higher
frequency of non-standard present tense verb forms in the ‘school’ style as opposed to
the ‘vernacular’ style. More recently, Labov (2001b: 101) found 17% of participants
under the age of thirty (and 6% of those over thirty) ‘reversed’ the community-wide
pattern of style-shifting towards standard forms of (dh) in careful styles. That is, they used a higher frequency of non-standard forms in careful styles.

These studies demonstrate that the inverted style-pattern observed in this study is far from an anomaly. As a result, this regularly attested style pattern requires further analysis. The inverted pattern of style-shifting observed in this study is supported by two other sources of data. Firstly, the performative stylisation of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis was repeatedly reported by expert informants’ meta-linguistic commentaries (see Chapter 7). For example, ‘[Anglo-Cornish dialect words are] used as a marker when you want to assert your Cornishness’ (TMF58). This is consistent with Schilling-Estes (1998) finding that careful speech styles are seen as an opportunity to perform otherwise stigmatised identities through the use of stigmatised language. Secondly, during my ethnographic participant-observation, I seldom observed Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis, save for some performative uses. For example, at an awards ceremony for a surfing competition, Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis was often employed to stylise a ‘local’ identity in acceptance speeches from Cornish winners.

The inverted style pattern has previously been framed as evidence of a challenge to Labov’s analysis of style (Bell 1984: 149; Milroy & Gordon 2003: 203; Kiesling 2011b: 92). However, I propose that this pattern does not expose a weakness of Labov’s (1972a) model of style-shifting. With some additional theorisation, this pattern is consistent with Labov’s (e.g. 1972a) work. Specifically, I introduce the notion of a Cornish ‘micro-market’ (see Section 8.2.1.1) and an ‘attention-to-self’ (see Section

\[^{164}\text{Labov (2001b: 101) also found that 9\% and 12\% of participants under 30 exhibited a ‘reversed direction of style-shifting’ for the (ING) and (NEG) variables, respectively, as did 3\% and 12\% of those over the age of 30.}\]
8.2.1.2) model of style which accounts for this non-canonical pattern of intra-speaker variation.

8.2.1.1. The Cornish micro-market

I interpret the use of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis in careful, as opposed to casual, speech styles through the lens of Bourdieu’s (1977, 1991) linguistic marketplace theory. Under this interpretation, language practices are commodified on a market, the ‘linguistic market’, where they are assigned value as part of a model of symbolic capital. However, the existing conceptualisation of the linguistic market cannot fully account for the inverted pattern of style-shifting observed in this study. In this section, I refine and develop the theory of the linguistic market by incorporating more recent sociolinguistic theory including language ideologies and indexicality (see also Park & Wee 2012).

Typically, in the linguistic marketplace the standard variety is perceived to be ‘legitimate’ as it is validated by its association with legal, ecclesiastical, and political institutions (see Bourdieu 1991). The legitimate language is afforded greater prestige, and, therefore, greater symbolic capital, than overtly stigmatised regional varieties such as Anglo-Cornish. According to Bourdieu (1991: 67), ‘utterances receive their value (and their sense) only in their relation to a market, characterized by a particular law of price formation’. Thus, the linguistic market dictates the value that is conferred on forms of language.
Bourdieu (e.g. 1991, also 1982 cited in Woolard 1985) argues that there is no counter-legitimate language. For example, Bourdieu (1991: 45) states that the ‘official language’ or simply the ‘language is the one which, within the territorial limits of that unit, imposes itself on the whole population as the only legitimate language’. Bourdieu (1983: 81) argues that the linguistic marketplace is ‘relatively unified’. That is, there is a unified agreement on the value of linguistic forms on the linguistic market. For example, Bourdieu (1991: 45) states that ‘to impose itself as the only legitimate one, the linguistic market has to be unified and the different dialects (of class, region, or ethnic group) have to be measured practically against the legitimate language’. This suggests a hierarchical structure, with the standard, conceived of as the ‘legitimate’ language, occupying the topmost point of the hierarchy. Bourdieu (1991: 71) predicts greater use of the ‘legitimate’ language in formal speech. Bourdieu (1983: 85) accounts for the use of non-standard, that is, non-legitimate, language by noting that ‘plain speaking exists but as an island set apart from the laws of the market’. Bourdieu (1983: 84) gives an example of people talking in a village bar as a context in which the market is less dominant (see also Bourdieu 1991: 71).

The intra-speaker variation exhibited in this study challenges Bourdieu’s account of the linguistic market. Bourdieu (1983:85) suggests that market forces are less strong in contexts such as in the local bar example above. This does not account for why Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis was used most frequently in careful speech styles. I suggest that the shift towards the local forms indicate that the Anglo-Cornish dialect

165 Eckert (2018:174) states that Bourdieu’s notion of the linguistic market is ‘a monolithic market at the national level’. Thus, while there may be different markets which assign symbolic values to language in, for example, England and the USA, each nation has a relatively unified linguistic market.
has locally meaningful value. Similarly, Labov (2001a:105) recognised that
‘nonstandard forms represent an alternate form of symbolic capital that carries full
value in working class social networks, and serves the needs of the members of that
society’. This raises the question of where does this value come from?

A de-regulated market, such as in Bourdieu’s village bar example (1983: 84),
would not engender a structured marketplace. Without structure and a shared
understanding of the value of linguistic forms, the direction of style-shifting would be
random. Yet, in Cornwall, this pattern of style-shifting is not random. Of the Anglo-
Cornish dialect onomasiological variants used in this study, 62 of 67 occurred in careful
speech styles and all speakers who exhibited style-shifting did so in the same direction
(see Section 5.4). The shift towards Anglo-Cornish forms in careful speech suggests
that there is a widespread, though not ubiquitous, understanding of the value of local
forms, particularly from Industrial Celts. The inverted style-pattern suggests not just an
absence of negative value, but positive value conferred on the Anglo-Cornish dialect.
By using Anglo-Cornish lexis in careful styles, speakers indicate a rejection of the
standard language market and the limited value it assigns to the Anglo-Cornish dialect.
Thus, it is not the case that the speakers who exhibit the inverted pattern of style-
shifting align to the standard language market, nor is it the case that this pattern of
intra-speaker variation is a consequence of a weakening of standard language market
forces. Therefore, there must be an alternative market force assigning value with
Woolard (1985) suggests that there may be ‘alternative markets’ which assign value to
local linguistic forms (see also Milroy & Milroy 1992; Eckert 2000; Snell 2018).
I suggest that it is not the case that there is a unified linguistic market in Cornwall. This is evidenced by the mixture of negative and positive affect towards the Anglo-Cornish dialect in the meta-linguistic evaluations from many of the expert informants in this study (see Chapter 7). I propose that, in Cornwall, the standard language market competes alongside a Cornish ‘micro-market’ (for a discussion of a ‘micro-market’, see Bourdieu 1983: 80; see also Holzscheiter 2005; Liddicoat 2018). I suggest that this market is ‘micro’ as it has limited geographical scope in relation to the standard language market and is not necessarily validated by an association with state institutions. I suggest that the Cornish ‘micro-market’ is a local manifestation of a broader ‘vernacular market’ which assigns value to non-standard forms of language (see Woolard 1985; Milroy & Milroy 1992; Eckert 2000).

The standard language market and the Cornish micro-market endow different values to Standard English and Anglo-Cornish forms. They have different ‘exchange rates’ (see Skeggs 1977: 11). That is, the two markets assign different values to Standard English and Anglo-Cornish varieties. The Cornish micro-market sets its own exchange rates, independently, even in contrariety to the standard language market. For example, on the standard language market, using a local dialect variant rather than a standard variant is likely to depreciate the value of a speakers’ symbolic capital. Yet, on the Cornish micro-market, using a Cornish variant as opposed to a standard alternative is likely to appreciate the value of a speakers’ symbolic capital. In other words, on the standard language market, Anglo-Cornish forms lack status, but on the

---

166 While Bourdieu (1983: 80) described ‘micro-markets’, such as the price formation set in an interaction between two friends, as being ‘dominated by the overall structures’, I suggest that the Cornish micro-market exists at the level of the community and can assign value independently of the standard language market.

167 See also conversion (Park & Wee 2012).
Cornish micro-market, Anglo-Cornish forms can assert status (cf. Snell 2018). That is, in terms of symbolic capital, the Anglo-Cornish dialect is a liability on the standard language market, whereas it is an asset on the Cornish micro-market.\textsuperscript{168} This is evidenced by the shift towards Anglo-Cornish forms in careful speech styles.

Many of those with a strong local identity, particularly Industrial Celts, feel disenfranchised and disengaged. Consequently, they do not align with the standard language ideological orthodoxy as it takes its value from the very same institutions that these Industrial Celts reject (see Section 6.2.2). Indeed, they subvert the standard language ideology. I define a subverted language ideology as a set of beliefs which in part or in whole undermines, rejects, or challenges the standard language ideology (see also Coupland 2007: 89. cf. standard language ideology, see Section 2.1.4.1.1). The reason that, in Cornwall, a subverted language ideology leads to the positive evaluation of the Anglo-Cornish dialect, as opposed to, for example, Brummie, can be attributed to an ‘endowment effect’ (see Thaler 1980; Morewedge & Giblin 2015).

In behavioural economics, the endowment effect (Thaler 1980) refers to a tendency for one to over-value something that one possesses, relative to a disinterested measure of worth. When applied to linguistic variation, I suggest that those who ‘have’ a form of language in their sociolinguistic repertoire judge that form to be more valuable than is the consensus on the standard language market. This is supported by Coupland & Bishop’s (2007: 79) finding that individuals have a tendency to rate an ‘accent identical to [their] own’ very favourably. This accounts for why the

\textsuperscript{168} In business and accounting, the things that increase future profit are known as ‘assets’ (such as a property and land) and things that decrease future profit are known as ‘liabilities’ (such as outstanding accounts).
market which assigns value to Anglo-Cornish forms is the Cornish micro-market, not some generic ‘vernacular market’ (see Woolard 1985; Milroy & Milroy 1992; Eckert 2000).

The linguistic marketplaces in Cornwall can also be considered in light of the centre-periphery model and Cornish identity. Those who align themselves to the local micro-market position Cornwall at the centre of an alternative structural paradigm, in opposition to the conventional market, which assigns the greatest degree of capital to the cultural (and linguistic) output associated most with London and the South-East. This is consistent with those who embody the Industrial Celt chronotope who reject the notion that Cornwall is a county of England. However, this does not explain why, if the Anglo-Cornish dialect is so valuable in the Cornish micro-market, Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis was not more commonplace, particularly in casual speech styles. If the Anglo-Cornish dialect, and the indexed ‘Cornish’ identity, is aspirational for many speakers, why do they not use the Anglo-Cornish dialect all of the time? I suggest one primary reason for this.

In the face of perceived pressure to assimilate to Anglo cultural norms, I suggest that the use of Anglo-Cornish lexis mainly in careful speech styles is indicative of a ‘minority-group reaction’ (see Edwards 2018). Edwards (2018: 25) suggests that this reaction can occur when ‘the codes, postures and practices of the dominant becomes accepted and normative among the less dominant, even where such acceptance may be grudging’. From a sociolinguistic perspective, the minority group (the Cornish) are aware of the widely acknowledged stigma of their local dialect and conform to the normatively prescribed linguistic and other social practices yet reject
these very same practices when they feel that they are able to, such as in the sociolinguistic interview with a Cornish fieldworker. Speakers are aware that the ‘rules of the game’ (see Bourdieu & Waquant 1992) are different in the sociolinguistic interview, such that the Anglo-Cornish dialect can accrue value. Thus, speakers can adapt their stylistic repertoire in response the ‘anticipation of profits’ (Bourdieu 1991) that the Anglo-Cornish dialect can accrue on the Cornish micro-market which they recognise as being pertinent in the sociolinguistic interview. The meta-linguistic commentaries which relate to the use of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis to construct a Cornish identity (see Chapter 7) evidence that this phenomenon is not limited to the context of the sociolinguistic interview.

In light of the anticipated negative reactions that Anglo-Cornish lexical forms may incur (see Chapter 7), participants may habitually conform to the standard language market which manifests in the use of standard forms in casual speech styles. Yet, in the interview, where the Anglo-Cornish dialect was felt to be legitimised, participants identified an opportunity to present the ‘real me’ (cf. Sharma 2018). In this context, the value of a Cornish identity is validated by the Cornish micro-market. This construal of an ostensibly authentic or ‘real’ self in careful speech styles can be accounted for by the attention-to-self model that I have developed.

8.2.1.2. Attention-to-self model

While I attribute the use of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis to the presence of a Cornish micro-market, that is, a local system of (symbolic) price formation, the use of the local
forms in careful speech styles warrants further exploration as it does not appear to be consistent with Labov’s (1972a) attention-to-speech model. Labov’s (1972a) model accounts for a widely observed (e.g. Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974; Modaressi 1978; Stuart-Smith 1999; Sullivan 1992; Devlin 2014; Baranowski 2017) shift towards an idealised, typically standard, way of speaking in careful speech styles. Eckert (2000: 18) describes the standard language as ‘stylistic target’ in survey studies of variation (see also Labov 1990: 223–224). In Labov’s (1966) New York study, for most speakers, an idealised way of speaking resembled that of the overtly proscribed standard, guided by language ideologies of correctness. This idealised way of speaking has been widely used as a default assumption and assumes that participants align with a standard language ideology. I suggest that when the idealised way of speaking is not the overtly proscribed standard, but an overtly stigmatised local variety, such as when validated by a local micro-market, intra-speaker variation can exhibit an inverted pattern.

The intra-speaker variation in this study shows that speakers use more non-standard local forms when their focus is primarily concerned with language use. When speakers use stylised language, they are not only aware that they are changing their use of language, they are projecting a contextually idealised representation of themselves. Speakers use language to ‘point to’ who they are, who they think they are, or who they would like to be (see Kiesling 1998). Bourdieu (1977: 653) notes that ‘[w]hat speaks is not the utterance, the language, but the whole social person’. Thus, when their attention is elevated, speakers are not only aware that their use of language is being observed, they are also cognisant of the fact that their use of language provides clues to a range of social characteristics about their self. This self is stylised in careful speech styles.
I suggest that this intra-speaker variation should not be attributed to attention-to-speech (e.g. Labov 1972a), but as part of a broader attention-to-self model. This proposed model can be considered to be a speaker design interpretation of attention-to-speech (see Chapter 2). When speakers pay greater attention-to-self, they closer approximate a desired self, a target self which they aim to embody. For example, when speakers subvert the standard language ideology, their stylistic target may not be ‘educated’ or ‘posh’, but ‘local’. Thus, for many Cornish people the target is a ‘Cornish’ self. This identity can be constructed through the use of linguistic features enregistered as ‘Cornish’. More specifically, Cornish selves can be constructed through the use of variants associated with the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall identities.

In the specific interaction of the sociolinguistic interview, where participants were told that I was interested in Cornish dialect and identity, many speakers were keen to exemplify widely accredited values and social traits associated with Cornishness through Anglo-Cornish lexis. Lexis is a diagnostic for regional, and other social, identities (e.g. see Snell 2017; Sandow & Robinson 2018), and speakers know it (see Chapter 7). By employing regionally marked lexis over Standard English alternatives, speakers are making themselves socially and ideologically locatable. They are sign-posting their world-view with lexis as the semiotic index of their identity.

I suggest that ideological variation becomes more visible when speakers pay greater attention to their speech, and by extension, their attention-to-self. When speakers are highly conscious of the social meanings of their behaviours, they more closely approximate an idealised version of the self. If an individual aligns themselves to a standard language market, they conform to a standard language ideology, such as
prescriptive attitudes of ‘correctness’, which manifests in the use of non-regionally marked linguistic variants. Alternatively, if they align with a locally relevant micro-market, then they can stylise their identity, such as a regional identity, through the use of local dialect variants. These differences become more visible when individuals are more aware of the social meaning of their (linguistic or otherwise) behaviours, that is, when attention-to-self is elevated.

The post-modern globalised world has led to dialect levelling, on the one hand, and widespread attention to regional variation, on the other (Johnstone 2007: 49). In Cornwall, both levelling and increased awareness of dialect variation are present, simultaneously. There is a great deal of lexical levelling in casual speech styles, as the vast majority of speakers use regionally unmarked forms. Yet, when speakers pay attention to the social meaning of their language (lexical) use, many performed local identity by employing regionally marked lexis. Ryan (1979: 147) suggests that the ‘value of language as a chief symbol of group identity is one of the major forces for the preservation of nonstandard speech styles or dialects’ and that this use of non-standard forms can be used by speakers in order to ‘distinguish themselves from the established prestige groups’ (Ryan 1979: 148, see also Preston 1991: 47). This is significant in terms of centre-periphery relations in Cornwall, whereby some individuals with a strong sense of local identity, particularly Industrial Celts, choose not to align their value system with the overtly proscribed standard, but to revert to an alternative local prestige which is valuable on the Cornish micro-market. In doing so, they increase the linguistic, and, therefore, social distance between themselves, as ‘Cornish’, and ‘England’ and ‘the English’. 
The stylised self in careful speech styles can be considered from the perspective of chronotopic identities and social meaning. For example, Industrial Celts are more likely to use *crib/croust* when stylising a Cornish identity as the social meanings associated with these words, such as ‘traditional’, are typically consistent with the target self that they aspire to embody. However, many who primarily align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity, while keen to index a Cornish self, may be reluctant to construct an identity which may be perceived to be ‘backwards’ (see Section 7.1.2). Thus, these speakers are less likely to use *crib/croust*, yet, *emmet* may be used by those who align with the Lifestyle Cornwall identity in order to construct a ‘cool’ identity (see Section 7.1.5). When speakers stylise their identity through the use of Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis, they make a claim to a specific type of Cornish identity, such as a traditional Cornish self or a ‘cool’, modern, Cornish self. The social meaning of the words they use and the frame of chronotopic identities enables speakers to use lexis to construct a self that is identifiable and meaningful in the context of the ideological landscape in Cornwall.

8.3. Summary

The key developments that I have introduced in this chapter include a sociolinguistic analysis of change in polysemous structures (Section 8.1), including prototypicality, a reflection on the role of identity in lexical variation (Section 8.1 & 8.2), and a discussion of inverted style-shifting by considering the role of a Cornish micro-market and an attention-to-self model of style (Section 8.2).
I have discussed some of the complex and dynamic social and cognitive processes through which semasiological change occurs by considering the usage of *maid* and *emmet*. The semasiological change of *emmet* can be accounted for by metaphorical extension, with a shift from *emmet* ‘ant’ to *emmet* ‘tourist’ becoming conventionalised over time. This change is conditioned by a range of social factors, including age, socioeconomic class, and strength of local identity, as a proxy for interlocutor frequencies. While exhibiting no overall change, *maid* ‘woman’ evidences the value of considering prototypicality in semantic change. *Maid* ‘woman’ is undergoing a shift in apparent-time, from the prototypical sense of *maid*, to a more peripheral sense. For most older speakers, *maid* ‘woman’ is their core sense, while this is secondary for most younger speakers, for whom *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ is their primary sense of this polysemous word. This change is most advanced for younger speakers with low IdQ totals. I suggest that the relationship between semasiological variation and IdQ total can be accounted for by Labov’s (2001a: 191) interlocutor frequency interpretation.

From an onomasiological perspective, I have shown the structured nature of social and stylistic variation of word usage. The complex language ideological landscape of Cornwall’s linguistic marketplace can, to a large extent, account for this inverted-style pattern. In addition, I have introduced an attention-to-self model. I have argued that the lack of Anglo-Cornish forms in unmonitored speech styles can be attributed to a minority-group reaction, whereby some individuals, particularly Industrial Celts, begrudgingly conform to overtly proscribed norms in much of their life but perform their Cornishness when they feel Cornishness to be positively evaluated. In such contexts, when the cognitive load is focused on the presentation of the self,
locally meaningful ideologies become mobilised. This attention-to-speech model is a speaker design interpretation of attention-based style shifting.

This thesis further supports the growing consensus in variationist sociolinguistics, that language variation cannot solely be attributed to geographic and demography (see Drummond & Schleef 2016). Speakers with a positive orientation to Cornwall are using their onomasiological repertoire as a stylistic resource in order to signal their ideological non-conformity in relation to what they perceive to be dominant a centre, namely, England. I have argued that a speakers’ orientation to a subverted language ideology, measured by proxy of IdQ total, can account for why speakers stylistically shift towards Anglo-Cornish forms in careful speech styles. For these speakers, in some interactional contexts, the symbolic capital accrued by the use of the Anglo-Cornish dialect is greater than that of the standard. On the Cornish micro-market, the Anglo-Cornish dialect can both assert status and signal solidarity. A common criticism of Bourdieu’s (1977, 1983, 1991) theory of the linguistic market is that it does not explicitly engage with speaker agency (Park & Wee 2012: 32). By discussing attention-to-self in the context of linguistic markets, this chapter has gone some way to redressing this limitation of the theory of the linguistic market (see also Park & Wee 2012).

Inverted style-shifting has been present in sociolinguistic data of intra-speaker variation since Labov’s seminal work (e.g. Labov 1966). However, in this thesis I have presented, arguably, the most clear-cut case of an inverted style pattern. I suggest that there a variety of reasons for this. The categorical nature of lexical variation (as opposed to, for example, the F2 of a vowel) and the near-ubiquitous use of standard
forms in the casual speech style meant that the only possible direction of style-shifting for most speakers in this study was of the inverted type. Also, the standard alternatives are much less ideologically marked than the alternative Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants. Thus, in Cornwall, standard English lexis is not typically used to do identity work. For example, while *emmet* indexes localness, *tourist* and *holiday-maker* does not usually index non-localness and are not likely to be used to do identity work through stylistic variation. The ideological context of centre-periphery relations in 21st century Cornwall and the Cornish micro-market create a conducive environment for this inverted style-pattern to emerge.
9. Conclusion

In this thesis I have developed approaches to the sociolinguistic study of lexis and showcased the value that a lexical perspective can provide to the understanding of sociolinguistic variation, change, and social meaning, as well as identity of place. The key findings and claims of this thesis are that:

- Anglo-Cornish semasiological change is conditioned by social factors, such as age, SEC, and strength of local identity.
- Strength of Cornish identity best accounts for Anglo-Cornish onomasiological usage.
- Anglo-Cornish onomasiological usage is also conditioned by other social factors including age, SEC, and number of CGP.
- Cornish identity is not simply variable by strength, but also by type; the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall chronotopes. These chronotopic identities condition both lexical usage and perception.
- Participants, as expert informants, can provide rich meta-linguistic data which can enrich the interpretation of quantitative patterns of linguistic variation.
- Anglo-Cornish onomasiological usage exhibits an inverted style-pattern.
- I account for the inverted style pattern by introducing an attention-to-self model of style.
- The Anglo-Cornish dialect is assigned locally meaningful symbolic capital by a Cornish micro-market.
In my conclusion, I consider the findings of this study not only in relation to this thesis, but also how these findings can serve to inform future research in sociolinguistics.

Firstly, I reflect on the research questions presented in Section 1.1 and discuss how I have answered these questions in this thesis.

1) How can the social meaning and usage of lexis inform our understanding of (language) ideologies and identity of place (in Cornwall)?

In this study, IdQ total is a *de facto* proxy for ideology, which must be interpreted in light of Cornwall’s social, economic, and cultural peripherality. Within this broader ideological orientation regarding one’s sense of place, is a language ideology. I suggest that those with a high IdQ total are more likely to align with a language ideology which positively evaluates the Anglo-Cornish dialect. This language ideology can account for the socially agentive language practices evidenced in the stylistic variation discussed in Section 8.2.1. Specifically, those who evaluate the Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis positively are much more likely to construct a Cornish identity though the use of Anglo-Cornish words than those who conform to a standard language ideology which stigmatises Anglo-Cornish, and other non-standard, forms. However, to say that Anglo-Cornish dialect lexis is used to construct a Cornish identity is too simplistic. In light of the Industrial Celt and Lifestyle Cornwall identities, speakers can stylise their use of language not just to make a claim to be Cornish, but to make a claim about what being Cornish is (cf. Eckert 2018: 155).
By considering for the strength of local identity, augmented by chronotopic identities, I account for individuals’ lexical usage patterns which would have gone ‘under the radar’ (see Eckert 2008) if one were limited to the traditional variationists’ tools. For example, the usage and non-usage of Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants can largely be accounted for by social meaning (see Chapter 7) which is perceived through the frame of two types of Cornish identity, which were discovered through ethnographic participant-observation (see Chapter 6). These findings evidence the value of using third-wave sociolinguistic methods and analysis to explain quantitative patterns of sociolinguistic variation and change.

Variationist sociolinguistics, particularly from a first-wave perspective, would predict that recessive overtly stigmatised local dialect forms would be used primarily by the working-class population. In this study, some middle-class speakers do use the local dialect forms that were anticipated to be used primarily by the working-class (see Labov 1972a; Trudgill 1974). The typical social parameters used in variationist studies, such as age, gender, and SEC, cannot satisfactorily explain why this is the case. What all of the middle-class participants who used the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological forms of the compound variable (see Section 5.3.2.5) have in common is a strong sense of Cornish identity. Where middle-class participants align towards a language ideology which favours the Anglo-Cornish dialect, they can embody this orientation by performing their Cornish identity through the use of Anglo-Cornish lexis. Socioeconomic class alone cannot satisfactorily account for this pattern. However, this middle-class usage pattern can be accounted for by considering the interaction of
socioeconomic class and the strength of local identity. That is, those middle-class speakers who use the Anglo-Cornish variants have a strong Cornish identity.

The two main criticisms of the use of strength of identity as a social parameter in variationist sociolinguistics have been that studies of identity typically do not consider other social parameters such as social class (see Baranowski 2017) and that ostensible identity effects can be accounted for by interlocutor frequencies (see Labov 2001a: 191). I addressed these criticisms in this study. I considered how a range of social parameters could interact with identity, such as socioeconomic class and age, and demonstrated that identity effects are apparent even when one accounts for the interactions between socio-demography and local orientation. While I use the interlocutor frequency interpretation to explain the relationship between IdQ totals and semasiological usage and lexical recognition scores, I suggest that this is not an appropriate interpretation of the onomasiological usage data. As Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants are used most often in careful speech by speakers with a strong sense of local identity, I interpret this usage as an act of identity (see Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985).

I have accounted for the social psychological motivations for the inverted style patterns by framing my analysis of social meaning around the meta-linguistic narratives from participants, whom I reconceptualised as expert informants (see Chapter 7). I considered expert informant responses in the context of theoretical frames such as Bakhtin’s (1981) chronotopes and Bourdieu’s (1977, 1986) notion of capital. Chronotopic identities are increasingly being used across linguistic sub-fields, such as linguistic anthropology (e.g. Blanton 2011; Koven 2013; Woolard 2013; Perrino
However, seldom has this concept been applied to variationist sociolinguistics. I have demonstrated the value of chronotopic identities from the perspective of third-wave variation theory. For example, those who embody the Industrial Celt chronotopic identity attributed vastly different social meanings to *maid* ‘woman’ in comparison to those who conform to the Lifestyle Cornwall chronotope (see Section 7.1.4).

The meta-linguistic commentaries of expert informants (see Chapter 7) showcase the value of considering language ideologies to explore social meanings of individual lexical items. These commentaries shed further light on the quantitative patterns of variation and change. For example, those who align with the Industrial Celts and Lifestyle Cornwall identities attribute very different social meanings to *emmet* ‘tourist’. This can account for why different parameters condition social distribution of *emmet* in the usage data for older and younger speakers (see Section 5.3.2.4). As stated in Section 7.1.5, the overtly positive meta-linguistic evaluations of the Anglo-Cornish dialect evidence that the prestige attributed to it is not covert, but overt and local. I have shown that many Cornish people can provide complex, intricate, and largely accurate observations regarding the socio-demographic distribution of lexical items in the Anglo-Cornish dialect (see Chapter 7). This challenges Labov’s (1972a: 144) assertion that ‘[t]here is no vocabulary of socially meaningful terms with which our informants can evaluate speech for us’ (see also Romaine 1980: 214).

I account for the inverted style pattern observed in this study with reference to the linguistic marketplace (see Bourdieu 1977; Sankoff & Laberge 1978). On the
standard language market, the use of the Anglo-Cornish is a liability, that is, it
depreciates the value of the symbolic capital that a hearer confers on the speaker.
Alternatively, on the Cornish micro-market, the use of the Anglo-Cornish dialect is an
asset, which accrues the speaker greater locally valuable capital than the standard
variety. The dual linguistic marketplaces in Cornwall are evidenced by the inverted
style-pattern. Speakers habitually use non-locally-marked variants as they are aware of
the stigma of the Anglo-Cornish alternatives on the standard language market. This is
reflected in the higher use of non-Anglo-Cornish forms in casual speech styles, yet
when speakers pay greater attention-to-self (see Section 8.2.1.2.) in the naming task,
locally meaningful ideological (affective and interpersonal) stances are mobilised. The
stylisation of Cornish identities in careful speech is validated by the value conferred of
Anglo-Cornish lexis on the Cornish micro-market. This inverted pattern of style-shifting
cannot be accounted for by a traditional attention-to-speech approach, but can be
explained in light of my attention-to-self model, which is an interpretation of
attention-based stylistic variation from the perspective of speaker design.

By style-shifting in the inverted direction, many Cornish people are rejecting a
hierarchy of power that they feel does not serve them. Much of the Cornish
population, particularly Industrial Celts, feel disengaged and disenfranchised by
Cornwall’s peripheral condition. Rather than accepting a system that they feel does
not work for them, they orient towards an alternative value system, one which
attempts to re-establish the centres of power. Indeed, many Cornish people orient
themselves towards a Cornish micro-market, one which not only provides a greater
sense of autonomy, but also imbues their locale with a higher cultural value.
2) How can I further develop sociolinguistic approaches to the study of lexical variation?

I have defined the envelope of lexical variation, from the perspectives of onomasiology and semasiology (see Section 4.2). I also developed methodologies which elicit tokens of lexical variants which are consistent with my definitions of semasiological and onomasiological sociolinguistic variables. I devised naming tasks and spot-the-difference tasks to investigate intra- and inter-speaker variation at the level of onomasiology. I have also provided novel approaches to the analysis of lexical data. For example, I use a compound variable to investigate nuanced patterns of onomasiological variation for three variables which exhibit similar patterns of social variation but each have low tokens of Anglo-Cornish variants. By coding for usage in the first and second responses to the who/what elicitation prompts separately, I am able to provide further detail into subtle patterns of semasiological change. In Table 9.1, I state the contributions that this thesis has made to the study of lexical variation from the perspectives of onomasiology and semasiology.

Table 9.1 The theoretical, methodological, and analytical contributions to the sociolinguistic study of lexis developed in this thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Onomasiology</th>
<th>Semasiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical</strong></td>
<td>Onomasiological Variable Constraints</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodological</strong></td>
<td>Spot-the-difference tasks and naming-tasks, which enable an analysis of lexical style-shifting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytical</strong></td>
<td>Compound variables</td>
<td>Coding 1st/2nd <em>who/what</em> questions separately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have operationalised the onomasiological variable, by providing a theoretical foundation for onomasiological variation, namely the Onomasiological Variable Constraints. The OVCs define the theoretical scope of the onomasiological variation investigate in this thesis. These serve to ensure that the observed variation is socially- or stylistically-conditioned and not a result of semantic or conceptual variation. Consistent with the OVCs, I have developed methodologies which can elicit onomasiological usage data in both casual and careful speech styles. I elicited a casual speech style through the use of spot-the-difference tasks, while I employed naming tasks in order to elicit lexis in a careful speech style. Also, in light of the observation that approaches to the sociolinguistic variation of lexis are limited by low token counts (see Beeching 2011), I have also showcased the value of aggregating individual variables in order to explore patterns of variation through the notion of a compound variable.

The usage of the Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants investigated in this study exhibit statistical relationships with a number of demographic features typically studied in variationist sociolinguistics. Three of the four investigated onomasiological variables exhibit age-related variation. While *emmet* is not used more by one age-group than another, younger and older speakers exhibit different patterns of social variation. The social trajectory of these lexical changes is mediated by socioeconomic class (for *crib/croust* and *emmet*) and strength of local identity (all investigated onomasiological variables), but not gender. I attribute the lack of gendered variation to the context in which the majority of tokens of Anglo-Cornish lexical items were
elicited. When speakers employ Anglo-Cornish forms in careful speech styles, they are ‘doing’ Cornishness. There does not appear to be an enregistered way to ‘do’ gendered Cornishness. Thus, when ‘doing’ Cornishness, males and females made use of the same sociolinguistic repertoire in constructing a local identity.

I have shown that not only is onomasiological variation conditioned by various social parameters, it is also variable in the stylistic dimension. Though it is typical of sociolinguistic variables to exhibit stylistic variation, all four onomasiological variables exhibit stylistic variation in a non-canonical direction. The stylistic variation described in this study is perhaps the most striking example of an inverted style pattern.

The distribution of recessive Anglo-Cornish semasiological variants is conditioned by social factors. The use of maid is conditioned by age and strength of Cornish identity as older participants were more likely to use maid ‘woman’ and younger speakers with low IdQ totals were least likely to use the local form in response to the first who/what elicitation prompt. The use of emmet ‘ant’ is conditioned by age, socioeconomic class and strength of local identity. This study supports Robinson’s (2010a) findings that semasiological change can be conditioned by the socio-demographic categories that are typically found in variationist sociolinguistic studies, as well as the novel finding that semasiological variation can be conditioned by the strength of local identity. The finding that those with a higher sense of local identity are more likely to use emmet ‘ant’ and those with a less strong identity are less likely to use maid ‘woman’ can largely be attributed to interlocutor frequencies (see Section 8.1). The interlocutor frequency (Labov 2001a) interpretation suggests that associations between local identity and linguistic usage can be accounted for by more
local network structures of those with heavily local orientations. Also, by coding the first and second responses to the who/what elicitation prompts separately, I enable semasiological variation and change to be considered from the perspective of prototypicality.

9.1. Limitations and directions for future research

Although this study has answered the research questions posited in Section 1.1, it is necessary to explicitly discuss the weaknesses and limitations of this study. With a view to further developing a lexis-oriented branch of sociolinguistics and sociolinguistics more generally, I suggest some potentially fruitful lines of research. It has previously been noted that lexis is the ‘Cinderella of sociolinguistics’ (Beal 2010: 53; Beal et al. 2012: 73) who could not go to the ball because of ‘methodological difficulties’ (Durkin 2012: 3). By providing at least a partial solution to these methodological difficulties, I have demonstrated that lexis exhibits both socially- and stylistically-conditioned patterns of variation and that these patterns of structured heterogeneity can be empirically tested and observed. The methodologies employed in this thesis provide a window into sociolinguistic patterns of lexical variation. Yet, that is not to say that they are faultless. In the best interests of a future lexis-oriented branch of sociolinguistics, I review the semasiological and onomasiological elicitation procedures employed in this thesis.

In this thesis I applied Robinson’s (2010a) who/what elicitation prompts to nominal polysemous words. In doing so, I demonstrated that maid and emmet are
undergoing semasiological change in the Anglo-Cornish dialect. However, there are limitations to the application of the who/what elicitation procedure to nouns. When applied to nouns, participants tend to respond to the who/what questions with a response that is simultaneously a sense and a referent, as opposed to when applied to adjectives, in which case the who/what questions typically elicit a referent and the follow-up question is necessary to elicit a sense (see Section 4.4.3). Thus, when applied to nouns, as in this study, the who/what stimuli is a relatively direct approach. A method which reliably elicits senses of polysemous nouns, and other part-of-speech categories, less directly is desirable in the context of future socio-semantic research. Future sociolinguistic research at the level of semasiology would also benefit from a greater understanding of the differences between responses to the first and second who/what questions, with a view to considering whether or not this can be considered from the perspective of style.

A limitation of the onomasiological elicitation procedures is that they are somewhat artificial. The labels ‘careful’ and ‘casual’ speech are both relative terms. The spot-the-difference tasks are conceptualised as a casual style but are, in actuality much, more careful than spontaneous speech. By the very nature of elicitation procedures, I cannot claim to have elicited usage data which is identical to that which would be found in other contexts. However, triangulating the elicited data with my ethnographic participant-observation, participants’ meta-linguistic commentaries, and lexical recognition data can add weight to the interpretation of the usage data. Though largely independent sources, all data types provided very consistent results. Thus, I can be confident in the real-world validity of the findings presented in this study.
An advantage of SD tasks is that unlike reading passages and word lists, they do not rely on a participants’ literacy. Although, clearly, some people may be more familiar than others with problem solving tasks such as spot-the-difference, this did not appear to affect the completion of the task. A handful of participants appeared to have great difficulty in conducting reading passages due to their lack of regular practice in reading a lengthy text passage aloud. For some speakers, the anxiety caused by the reading tasks was evident (see also Milroy 1987b: 173). Also, participants with impaired sight appeared to struggle to a greater extent with the reading passage than with SD tasks. Moreover, participants seemed to enjoy the SD tasks much more than the reading passage, for example, AWF71 states that ‘[SD tasks] are quite fun’. If participants’ enjoyment can be increased, from an ethical perspective, this must surely be an advantage to any methodology.

Although the methodological framework employed here is most similar to first-wave type sociolinguistic interviews, the style work exhibited in intra-speaker variation can be interpreted from the perspective of speaker design through the attention-to-self model. This is consistent with Eckert & Labov’s (2017: 467) observation that style shifting is ‘an indirect indication of social meaning’. While conventional wisdom in variationist sociolinguistics posits that ‘what is interesting to language is what is beyond the conscious control of speaker agency’ (Eckert 2003: 394), I have shown that careful speech can also provide insight into linguistic variation, particularly from the perspective of local identity and ideology (see also Schilling-Estes 1998). The attention-to-self model could be further validated through applications in different contexts. For example, the model could be further tested by studying attention-based variation among speakers who align with various sub-cultures and observing whether, as
attention increases, they use a greater frequency of linguistic features which index membership to these subcultures or a greater frequency of standard variants.

Both this thesis and Robinson (2010a) primarily investigated the production of lexical variables. Although Robinson (2010a) and I considered the role of perception, this was largely based on participants’ introspection. While a rich source of data (see Chapter 7), meta-linguistic commentaries from participants as expert informants provide insight into social meanings only above the level of consciousness. I suggest that it would make a lexis-oriented sociolinguistics more holistic if a systematic methodology for the study of implicit lexical perception were to be developed. This could be achieved through an adapted matched-guise test (see Levin et al. 1994; Maddeaux & Dinkin 2017; Beltrama 2018; contra Hassall et al. 2008). Following Beltrama’s research (e.g. Beltrama & Staum Casasanto 2017; Beltrama 2018), matched-guise tests could complement usage data in order to provide an alternative perspective on lexical variation. While Beltrama’s (2018) research used written guises in order to limit variation to the level of lexis, future research could explore the interaction of phonological and lexical variation (see Levin et al. 1994). This would enable the researcher to systematically investigate the interaction of variation at the levels of phonology and lexis from the perspective of social meaning. If used in conjunction with the explicit meta-linguistic discussions used in this thesis, this would enable the researcher to compare implicit and explicit evaluations of sociolinguistic variation (see Trudgill 1974; Hassall et al. 2008; Pharao & Kristiansen 2019).

In this thesis, the IdQ served to quantity Cornish identity. However, there are many ways to be Cornish and Cornish identity can manifest in a variety of different
ways (see Chapter 6). The IdQ that I used in this study is primarily oriented to the Industrial Celt chronotopic identity. It may have provided further insight if I had developed a range of questions which specifically targeted each of the two Cornish chronotopes. That is, for example, ten statements specifically targeted at the Industrial Celt identity and ten statements which correspond to the Lifestyle Cornwall identity.

The IdQ also served as a proxy for alignment to linguistic markets, that is, the standard language market or the Cornish micro-market. This research may have been better served by developing a ‘linguistic market index’ (see Sankoff & Laberge 1978; Sankoff & Blondeau 2007). This may have accounted for why some middle-class participants with high IdQ totals used Anglo-Cornish lexical variants and others did not. For example, of the three middle-class speakers who used crib/croust, one is a tree surgeon and another is a retired foreman at South Crofty mine. These individuals are likely not to engage with the standard language market as much as prototypical middle-class participants. An integrated analysis of IdQ totals and a linguistic market index may have served to predict more accurately those who use Anglo-Cornish variants. This is something that future research should consider.

Future research would also benefit from an explicit comparison of methodologies for investigating strength of local identity, such as Reed’s (2016) rootedness metric, Llamas (1999) positive/neutral/negative affect, and quantitative identity questionnaires such as the one used in this study. Moreover, future research should consider more critically the metrics used in the composition of social class indices used to calculate speakers’ socioeconomic class.
In this thesis I employed an alternative approach classifying speakers’ socioeconomic status by double-weighting class indicators such as occupation and education (see Section 5.4.3.4). Only four speakers were classified into a different socioeconomic group on the basis of double-weighting one indicator in the index, in comparison to had I not double-weighted any of the indicators. For three of these four speakers, their lexical usage is more consistent with the socioeconomic group to which they were assigned with the double-weighting. Speakers RWM52, AWF71, and RWM23 were all working-class in the double-weighted index but would have been middle-class in an unweighted index. These three speakers all used onomasiological variants which were more typical of the working-class speakers of their age-group. This suggests that the double-weighted index may be a more reliable indicator of lexical usage than the unweighted index. The lexical usage for the fourth speaker, EWM26, who would have been classified as middle-class in an unweighted index, was not markedly better or worse with or without the double-weighted social class index. This is because he did not use any Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants, which is slightly more typical of middle-class younger speakers, but also consistent with many other younger working-class speakers.

9.2. Final comments

This study helps to fill two major gaps in the variationist sociolinguistic literature. Firstly, while the vast majority of sociolinguistic studies have focused on urban communities, what Britain (2012) described as sociolinguistics’ ‘urban fetish’, few have
studied rural peripheries, and no major studies have been conducted with adults in mainland Cornwall. Rural and peripheral communities do not exhibit the same social stratification as in urban communities. For example, the scarcity of statistically significant associations between linguistic usage and socioeconomic class in this study raises questions over the utility of socioeconomic class as a sociolinguistic variable in non-urban contexts (see also Rickford 1986; Reed 2016; Dann 2019) and in post-industrial localities (see also Burbano-Elizondo 2008). The findings from this study contribute to the limited body of research which has studied language variation in such non-urban, post-industrial contexts.

Secondly, research on lexical variation is extremely scarce, particularly from the perspective of intra-speaker variation (see Section 2.2). I have developed a framework for the sociolinguistic study of lexical variation and showcased the insight that lexis can provide in our understanding of how and why language exhibits the patterns of social and stylistic variation that it does. This study was the first to investigate attention-based variation in lexical usage systematically and the first to study the role of identity in conditioning lexical variation. In developing lexis-oriented elicitation procedures which vary along the plane of attention, and by defining onomasiological and semasiological variables, I have provided at least a partial resolution to the apparent incongruency between the study of lexis and variationist sociolinguistics. From this starting point, I have highlighted the rich patterns of variation that lexis can exhibit.

The usage and perceptual data in this study exhibit patterns of structured heterogeneity. This challenges the received wisdom that ‘words do not behave systematically’ (Adams 2014: 164). This is a timely contribution to the field of
sociolinguistics as the field continues to engage further with agency in language use (e.g. Sharma 2018; Snell 2018) and an uptick in sociolinguistic studies concerned with the level of lexis (e.g. Beaton & Washington 2015; Beltrama 2018; Snell 2018; Cotter & Valentinsson 2018; Grieve et al. 2018). Lexis is, arguably, the most salient and alienable level of language to the typical speaker (see Johnson 1996). Thus, it is a level of language which speakers stylise in order to do social identity work. Future research, particularly that which is concerned with the linguistic construction of identities, can benefit from incorporating a lexical perspective.

This thesis makes a contribution to variationist sociolinguistics by showcasing the validity of much of sociolinguistic theory at the level of onomasiological variation, as well as further validating it at the level of semasiological variation (see also Robinson 2010a). I have also further developed the sociolinguistic study of style by introducing an attention-to-self model which can account for non-canonical style patterns (cf. Labov 1972a). Although various other studies have found an inverted style pattern (see Section 8.2.1), I have provided a theoretical foundation for this intra-speaker variation. By accounting for strength of local identity and social meaning, one can understand the social psychological motivations for this style pattern, particularly in light of a broader language ideological framework. I have also redressed the lack of consideration of how linguistic production and perception interact by exploring both quantitative patterns of linguistic variation and social meaning. In doing so, I reconceptualised the role of the participant in sociolinguistic research, by considering them as expert informants (see also ‘citizen sociolinguistics’, e.g. Rymes & Leone 2014, and ‘folk linguistics’, e.g. Preston 1993.)
This thesis also makes a contribution to Cornish studies. Consistent with much of the research in Cornish studies, I have interpreted many of the findings in this thesis through the interpretative framework of the centre-periphery model (see Section 3.1). I have suggested that although it may be the consensus view among older Cornish people that their younger counterparts are losing their Cornish identity, in actuality, a new iteration of Cornish identity is emerging, namely, Lifestyle Cornwall. Moreover, although there is a great deal of research in the field of Cornish Studies relating to the Cornish language (Kernewek), there has been little to no engagement with the study of the usage of the Anglo-Cornish dialect. This thesis has redressed this gap in knowledge pertaining to the Anglo-Cornish dialect from the perspectives of both Cornish studies and variationist sociolinguistics. In doing so, I have demonstrated the potential for sociolinguistics, particularly those studies concerned with lexis, to engage further with regional studies.
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11. Appendices

11.1. Appendix 1: Sense Relation Network (SRN)
11.2. Appendix 2: Information sheet

Information Sheet

Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Rhys Sandow and I am a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Sussex. I would like to take this opportunity to invite you to take part in my doctoral research. You have been approached to participate in this research project due to your connection with Camborne-Redruth or surrounding areas. After reading this information sheet, if you have any questions, or anything seems unclear to you, please feel free to ask. If you agree to take part in this research, you are free to withdraw your consent at any time without giving a reason. Even if you decide to withdraw your consent after completing the interview, the data can be removed from the research database and destroyed.

I am currently conducting research on Cornish identity and the variety of language spoken within Cornwall, specifically in Camborne-Redruth. The aim of this research is to investigate how people’s use of language reflects categories and divisions within society and explore the ways in which this is linked to how people feel about their local community. I am interested not only in how people use language, but also what people think about language, too.

If you agree to take part in this research, it will consist of a tape-recorded interview which will take approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour of your time. It will involve three stages. Firstly, there will be a few short verbal reasoning tasks. Secondly, there will be a variety of tasks, questions and discussions regarding the variety of language that is used in Camborne-Redruth. Lastly, there will be an informal conversation discussing what being Cornish means to you and those around you.

This research has satisfied the University of Sussex research ethics committee and will be conducted in accordance with the university’s code of practice for research and the 1998 Data Protection Act. Any information provided throughout this interview is strictly confidential. Although this interview will not investigate any personal or sensitive topics, if any such information is disclosed, all names of people and institutions that could lead a reader to identify you will be changed.

You are free to ask any questions that you would like. After completing this interview, if you think of any questions or concerns, or would simply like to comment on the research please contact either myself or my research supervisor. Our contact details are provided below:

My contact details:
Mr Rhys Sandow
Arts B, School of English
University of Sussex
Falmer, Brighton
BN1 9QN
rs411@sussex.ac.uk

My supervisor’s contact details:
Dr. Justyna Robinson
Arts B, School of English
University of Sussex
Falmer, Brighton
BN1 9QN
justyna.robinson@sussex.ac.uk
11.3. Appendix 3: Consent form

**Participant Consent Form**

**Title of Project:** Semiotic Cornwall: Indexicality in the English Periphery  
**Name of Researcher:** Rhys Sandow

1. I am giving my consent to take part in this interview of own free will.

2. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent to participate at any time and even after the interview is finished I can ask for my data to be removed from the research database and destroyed.

3. I am aware that all of my responses will be anonymised. Although some of my comments may be reproduced at a later date, for example, in the researcher’s Ph.D. thesis or in research papers, all information that could lead to my identification will be changed. This means that nobody will be able to link me to the comments that I provide in this interview. This is consistent with the Data Protection Act 1998.

4. I have read the information sheet and have had the chance to answer any questions that I may have about this research project.

5. I give my consent for this interview to be audio recorded.

6. I agree to take part in the above project.

   **Name of Participant:**  
   **Name of Researcher:** Rhys Sandow

   **Date:**  
   **Date:**

   **Signature:**  
   **Signature:**
It is important to note that I have edited the title of this research project since the data were collected, which explains the difference between the project title stated in the consent form and the title of this thesis.
11.4. Appendix 4: Biographical information sheets

11.4.1. Appendix 4a: Biographical information sheet for students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Information Sheet - Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for agreeing to take part in this research project. Before we begin, please take the time to fill in this short form. If you need extra space to write, I will provide further sheets of paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What is your age?

2. What is your gender? (circle correct answer)
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other
   If other please state.

3. What is the postcode of your home address (not your student accommodation)? Please provide the postcode without the two final letters.
   e.g. TR15 2 (not TR15 2PL)

4. How many of your grandparents are/were Cornish?
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Not sure

5. What is the highest level of education that you received?
   - None
   - Primary School
   - Secondary School
   - 6th form/ college
   - University

6. What are your parents’ job titles?

   ..............................................................................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................................................................
### Participant Information Sheet - Retirees

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this research project. Before we begin, please take the time to fill in this short form. If you need extra space to write, I will provide further sheets of paper.

1. **What is your age?**

2. **What is your gender? (circle correct answer)**
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other
   If other please state.

3. **What is/was the postcode of your home address? Please provide the postcode without the two final letters.**
   e.g. TR15 2 (not TR15 2PL)

4. **How many of your grandparents are/were Cornish?**
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Not sure

5. **What is the highest level of education that you received?**
   - None
   - Primary School
   - Secondary School
   - 6th form/ college
   - University

6. **What was your job title?**
11.4.3. Appendix 4c: Non-adjusted biographical information sheet

**Participant Information Sheet**

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this research project. Before we begin, please take the time to fill in this short form. If you need extra space to write, I will provide further sheets of paper.

1. What is your age?

2. What is your gender? (circle correct answer)

   - Male
   - Female
   - Other

   If other please state.

3. What is the postcode of your home address? Please provide the postcode without the two final letters.

   e.g. TR15 2 (not TR15 2PL)

4. How many of your grandparents are/were Cornish?

   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - Not sure

5. What is the highest level of education that you received?

   - None
   - Primary School
   - Secondary School
   - 6th form/ college
   - University

6. What is your job title?
### Identity Questionnaire

To what extent do you agree with the following statements, using the scale:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

1. Cornwall is a Celtic nation first, a county of England second. □

2. I am proud to be Cornish. □

3. I would be more likely to vote for a local parliamentary candidate (MP) if they were Cornish. □

4. It is important that the people of Cornwall maintain a distinct identity. □

5. I would be happy to fly the Cornish (St. Piran’s) flag from my house/car. □

6. Cornwall council should be given more control over the county, and therefore, Westminster should have less control of Cornwall. □

7. Being from Cornwall and being Cornish has shaped who I am. □

8. Funding for the Cornish language and culture should be increased. □

9. I would be more likely to vote for a performer on a talent show if they were Cornish. □

10. I would not want to be from anywhere else. □

11. Tourism in Cornwall is a good thing. □
11.6. Appendix 6: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants

In this section I present the inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish semasiological and onomasiological variants used by participants in this study.

11.6.1. Appendix 6.1: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish semasiological variants

11.6.1.1. Appendix 6.1.1: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish semasiological variants of maid

The non-Anglo-Cornish sense of maid attested in this study is maid ‘female servant or attendant’. This sense was used by 57 speakers in response to the who/what stimuli (see Section 4.5.3). Table 11.1 displays the social variation of this usage overall, while Table 11.2 and Table 11.3 show the social variation of the responses to the first and second who/what elicitation prompts, respectively.

Table 11. 1 The overall social variation of the use of maid ‘female servant or attendant’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used maid ‘female servant or attendant’ overall</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30:36/40 &gt;40: 21/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 29/45 Low: 28/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 30/40 MC: 27/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 29/40 Female: 28/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>MC: 13/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC: 26/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC: 18/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=.487$, p=.485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 36/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–55: 12/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55: 9/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=11.902$, p=.001***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 20/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-level/equivalent: 26/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 16: 11/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=.348$, p=.555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 18/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 24/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-deprivation: 9/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=1.490$, p=.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 26/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-prestige: 18/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-prestige: 13/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(\text{df}=1, \text{n}=80)=.664$, p=.413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 11/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: 7/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: 7/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: 4/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: 22/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Wald$\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)=.124, p=.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.1 shows statistical relationships between the overall use of *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ and the social category of age. Younger speakers use *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ more than their older counterparts, both when age is conceptualised as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.001) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, p=.001) category.

I present the social variation of *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ in the first round of *who/what* questions in Table 11.2.
Table 11.2 The social variation of *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ in the responses to the first *who/what* elicitation prompt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>maid</em> ‘female servant or attendant’ in first response to <em>who/what</em> questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Age** | <30: 19/40  
>40: 15/40 | Fisher’s exact test | p=.498 |
| **IdQ** | High: 20/45  
Low: 14/35 | Fisher’s exact test | p=.820 |
| **SEC** | WC: 18/40  
MC: 16/40 | Fisher’s exact test | p=.821 |
| **Gender** | Male: 19/40  
Female: 15/40 | Fisher’s exact test | p=.498 |
| **SEC_3** | MC: 6/21  
UWC: 17/34  
WC: 11/25 | Linear-by-linear association | $\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.961, p=.327 |
| **Age_3** | <30: 19/40  
40–55: 9/22  
>55: 6/18 | Linear-by-linear association | $\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=1.036, p=.309 |
| **Education** | Degree: 9/30  
A-level/equivalent: 17/30  
Up to 16: 8/20 | Linear-by-linear association | $\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.867, p=.349 |
| **PoD** | Low-deprivation: 8/20  
Mid-deprivation: 15/42  
High-deprivation: 11/18 | Linear-by-linear association | $\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=1.578, p=.209 |
| **Occupation** | High-prestige: 16/40  
Mid-prestige: 12/22  
Low-prestige: 6/18 | Linear-by-linear association | $\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.033, p=.856 |
| **CGP** | 0: 11/15  
1: 7/7  
2: 7/16  
3: 4/8  
4: 22/34 | Logistic regression | Wald $\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)=4.275, p=.039* |

Table 11.2 shows that the only social category to exhibit a statistical relationship with the non-local variant, *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ in the first response is CGP (logistic regression, p=.039). Specifically, those with fewer CGP are more likely to use this variant in this context.
I present the social variation of the use of *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ in the second round of *who/what* elicitation questions in Table 11.3.

Table 11.3 The social variation of *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ in the responses to the second *who/what* elicitation prompt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>maid</em> ‘female servant or attendant’ in second response to <em>who/what</em> questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 24/40; &gt;40: 10/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p = .003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 14/45; Low: 20/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p = .024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 19/40; MC: 15/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p = .498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 19/40; Female: 15/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p = .498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 8/21; UWC: 14/34; WC: 12/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80) = .467, p = .494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 13/30; A-level/equivalent: 16/30; Up to 16: 5/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80) = 1.166, p = .280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 5/20; Mid-deprivation: 22/42; High-deprivation: 7/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80) = .865, p = .352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 13/40; Mid-prestige: 12/22; Low-prestige: 9/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80) = 2.226, p = .136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 4/15; 1: 2/7; 2: 6/16; 3: 3/8; 4: 19/34</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Wald $\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80) = 4.377, p = .036*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 shows that age is in a statistically significant relationship with *maid* ‘female servant or attendant’ in the responses to the second *who/what* elicitation procedure,
as younger speakers are more likely to use this variant, both when age is classified as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.003) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, p=.003) category. Also, in their second responses, those with low IdQ totals are more likely to use the non-local variant, maid ‘female servant or attendant’, than those with high IdQ totals (Fisher’s exact test, p=.024). In a pattern which is the inverse of the results from the first elicitation procedure, those with a higher number of CGP are more likely to use maid ‘female servant or attendant’ in their second response (logistic regression, p=.036).

11.6.1.2. Appendix 6.1.2: The inter-speaker variation of emmet ‘tourist’

While this section (11.6) is concerned with non-Anglo-Cornish variants, the semasiological variation of emmet is an exception to this as both senses, emmet ‘ant’ and emmet ‘tourist’, are Anglo-Cornish. The social variation of emmet ‘ant’ is displayed in Section 5.3.1.2. In Table 11.2, I display the social variation of emmet ‘tourist’. As 79 of 80 speakers used emmet ‘tourist’ in at least one of their responses, I have not tested the overall social variation of this sense. Instead, I focus on specific usage in the first and second responses. 73 speakers used emmet ‘tourist’ in the first response (see Table 11.4) while 67 did so in their second response (see Table 11.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>emmet</em> ‘tourist’ in first responses to <em>who/what</em> questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 38/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 34/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 40/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 32/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 38/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 34/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 37/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 35/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 16/21</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=4.638, p=.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWC: 32/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 24/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 38/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=3.726, p=.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40–55: 20/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 14/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 23/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=8.103, p=.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-level/equivalent: 29/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 16: 20/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 17/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.937, p=.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 38/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-deprivation: 17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 34/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.656, p=.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-prestige: 21/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-prestige: 17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 4/15</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Waldχ² (df=1, n=80)=.480, p=.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: 2/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: 6/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: 3/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4: 19/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.4 shows that in the responses to the first *who/what* elicitation prompts, the use of *emmet* ‘tourist’ is conditioned by SEC, when conceptualised as a trinary category, and, more specifically, education (linear-by-linear association, p=.031 and
p=.004, respectively), with *emmet* ‘tourist’ being used most frequently by WC speakers and those who received formal education up to the age of 16.

In Table 11.5, I present the social variation of responses to the second round of *who/what* questions which focused on *emmet*.

Table 11.5 The social variation of *emmet* ‘tourist’ in the responses to the second *who/what* elicitation prompt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of speakers who used <em>emmet</em> ‘tourist’ in second responses to <em>who/what</em> questions</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 37/40 &gt;40: 29/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 34/45 Low: 32/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 35/40 MC: 31/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 34/40 Female: 32/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 20/21 UWC: 25/34 WC: 21/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.790, p=.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 37/40 40–55: 18/22 &gt;55: 11/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=8.113, p=.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 27/30 A-level/equivalent: 24/30 Up to 16: 15/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=1.973, p=.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 19/20 Mid-deprivation: 32/42 High-deprivation: 15/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.995, p=.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 32/40 Mid-prestige: 20/22 Low-prestige: 14/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.003, p=.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.5 shows a statistical relationship between use of *emmet* ‘tourist’ and the social category of age. Younger speakers are more likely than older speakers to use *emmet* ‘tourist’ second responses to the *who/what* elicitation stimuli, both when age is conceptualised as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.037) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, p=.004) category.

11.6.2. Appendix 6.2: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants

In this section, I conduct statistical analysis for the attested non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the investigated onomasiological variables. I conduct statistical tests for variants which occurred five or more times.

11.6.2.1. Appendix 6.2.1: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of LUNCH BOX

The attested non-Anglo-Cornish variants of LUNCH BOX are *lunch box*, *fruit box*, and *sandwich box*. *Sandwich box* was only used by one speaker, so I did not subject this
variant to statistical analysis. In this section I explore the social variation of *lunch box* and *fruit box*.

11.6.1.1 Appendix 6.2.1.1: The inter-speaker variation of *lunch box* as a variant of LUNCH BOX

76 speakers used *lunch box* as a variant of LUNCH BOX. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 39/40 &gt;40: 37/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 42/45 Low: 34/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 38/40 MC: 38/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 36/40 Female: 40/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 19/21 UWC: 33/34 WC: 24/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.654, p=.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 39/40 40–55: 20/22 &gt;55: 17/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.484, p=.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 28/30 A-level/equivalent: 28/30 Up to 16: 20/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.960, p=.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 17/20 Mid-deprivation: 42/42 High-deprivation: 17/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.978, p=.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 38/40 Mid-prestige: 21/22 Low-prestige: 17/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.004, p=.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CGP | 0: 15/15  
|     | 1: 6/7  
|     | 2: 16/16  
|     | 3: 7/8  
|     | 4: 32/34  
| Logit | Logistic regression  
| Waldχ² | Waldχ² (df=1, n=80)=.275, p=.600  

Table 11.6 shows that the usage of lunch box as a variant of LUNCH BOX by participants in this study does not exhibit any statistically significant patterns of inter-speaker variation.

11.6.1.1.2. Appendix 6.2.1.2: The inter-speaker variation of fruit box as a variant of LUNCH BOX

6 speakers used fruit box as a variant of LUNCH BOX. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.7.

Table 11. 7 The inter-speaker variation of fruit box as a variant of LUNCH BOX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Age      | <30: 1/40  
|         | >40: 5/40  
| IdQ      | High: 5/45  
|         | Low: 1/35  
| SEC      | WC: 3/40  
|         | MC: 3/40  
| Gender   | Male: 2/40  
|         | Female: 4/40  
| SEC_3    | MC: 2/21  
|         | UWC: 2/34  
|         | WC: 2/25  
| Age_3    | <30: 1/40  
|         | 40–55: 3/22  
|         | >55: 2/18  
| Education | Degree: 3/30  
|         | A-level/equivalent: 1/30  
|         | Up to 16: 2/20  
|          | Fisher’s exact test  
|          | p=.201  
|          | Fisher’s exact test  
|          | p=.233  
|          | Fisher’s exact test  
|          | p=1.00  
|          | Fisher’s exact test  
|          | p=.675  
|          | Linear-by-linear association  
|          | χ²(df=1, n=80) = .028, p=.867  
|          | Linear-by-linear association  
|          | χ²(df=1, n=80) = 1.924, p=.203  
|          | Linear-by-linear association  
|          | χ²(df=1, n=80) = .018, p=.893  

Table 11.7 shows that the usage of *fruit box* as a variant of *lunch box* does not exhibit any statistically significant patterns of inter-speaker variation.

11.6.2.2. Appendix 6.2.2: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of *woman*

The attested non-Anglo-Cornish variants of *woman* are *woman, girl, lady, and female*.

In this section, I explore the social variation of each of these onomasiological variants.

11.6.2.2.1. Appendix 6.2.2.1: The inter-speaker variation of *woman* as a variant of *woman*

41 speakers used *woman* as a variant of *woman*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.8.
Table 11.8 The inter-speaker variation of *woman* as a variant of WOMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 27/40, &gt;40: 14/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 21/45, Low: 20/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 23/40, MC: 18/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 21/40, Female: 20/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 12/21, UWC: 16/34, WC: 13/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>(\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=.095, p=.758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 17/30, A-level/equivalent: 19/30, Up to 16: 5/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>(\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=3.832, p=.050^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 10/20, Mid-deprivation: 21/42, High-deprivation: 10/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>(\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=.109, p=.987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 19/40, Mid-prestige: 12/22, Low-prestige: 10/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>(\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=.394, p=.530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 7/15, 1: 4/7, 2: 10/16, 3: 7/8, 4: 13/34</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Wald(\chi^2) (df=1, n=80)=.517, p=.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.8 shows that the use of *woman* as a variant of WOMAN is in a statistically significant relationship with age and education. Specifically, younger speakers are the most likely to use *woman*, both when age is conceptualised as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.007) and a trinary (linear-by-linear association, p=.004) social category. Also, those with higher levels of education are more likely to use *woman* as a
variant of WOMAN than those with less formal education (linear-by-linear association, p=.050).

11.6.2.2.2. Appendix 6.2.2.2: The inter-speaker variation of girl as a variant of WOMAN

51 speakers used girl as a variant of WOMAN. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.9.

Table 11.9 The inter-speaker variation of girl as a variant of WOMAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 21/40 &gt;40: 30/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 28/45 Low: 23/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 22/40 MC: 29/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 27/40 Female: 24/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 17/21 UWC: 20/34 WC: 14/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=2.874, p=.090 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 21/40 40–55: 16/22 &gt;55: 14/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=4.059, p=.031^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 21/30 A-level/equivalent: 14/30 Up to 16: 16/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=.166, p=.684 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 18/20 Mid-deprivation: 24/42 High-deprivation: 9/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=6.719, p=.015^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 29/40 Mid-prestige: 11/22 Low-prestige: 11/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=1.300, p=.162 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.9 shows that the use of *girl* as a variant of *WOMAN* exhibits a statistically significant relationship with age, as a trinary category, and PoD. Specifically, *girl* as a variant of *WOMAN* is more likely to be used by speakers who are older (linear-by-linear association, $p=.031$) and also by those with a PoD which experiences low levels of deprivation (linear-by-linear association, $p=.015$).

11.6.2.2.3. Appendix 6.2.2.3: The inter-speaker variation of *lady* as a variant of *WOMAN*

43 speakers used *lady* as a variant of *WOMAN*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.10.

Table 11.10 The inter-speaker variation of *lady* as a variant of *WOMAN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 25/40, &gt;40: 18/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.178$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 20/45, Low: 23/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.042^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 21/40, MC: 22/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=1.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 19/40, Female: 24/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>$p=.370$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 9/21, UWC: 22/34, WC: 12/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=.063$, $p=.802$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 25/40, 40–55: 12/22, &gt;55: 6/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2(df=1, n=80)=3.936$, $p=.027^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.10 shows that the use of *lady* as a variant of *WOMAN* is in a statistically significant relationship with IdQ total (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.027) and age (linear-by-linear association, p=0.27). Specifically, those with low IdQ totals are the most likely to use *lady*. Also, when age is categorised as a trinary, older speakers are least likely to use *lady* as a variant of *WOMAN*.

11.6.2.2.4. Appendix 6.2.2.4: The inter-speaker variation of *female* as a variant of *WOMAN*

8 speakers used *female* as a variant of *WOMAN*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.8.
Table 11.11 The inter-speaker variation of *female* as a variant of *woman*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 5/40 40: 3/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 4/45 Low: 4/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 4/40 MC: 4/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 5/40 Female: 3/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 2/21 UWC: 4/34 WC: 2/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.038, p=.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 4/30 A-level/equivalent: 2/30 Up to 16: 2/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.225, p=.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 1/20 Mid-deprivation: 5/42 High-deprivation: 2/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.416, p=.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>High-prestige: 4/40 Mid-prestige: 3/22 Low-prestige: 1/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.135, p=.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 1/15 1: 1/7 2: 3/16 3: 2/8 4: 1/34</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Wald$\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)=.480, p=.488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.11 shows that the usage of *female* as a variant of *woman* by participants in this study does not exhibit any statistically significant patterns of inter-speaker variation.
11.6.2.3. Appendix 6.2.3: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of WALK

The attested non-Anglo-Cornish variants of WALK are walk, ramble, stroll and hike. As ramble and stroll were only used by two speakers each, I do not subject these variants to statistical analysis. In this section, I explore the social variation of the onomasiological variants of WALK, walk and hike.

11.6.2.3.1. Appendix 6.2.3.1: The inter-speaker variation of walk as a variant of WALK

78 speakers used walk as a variant of WALK. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.12

Table 11. 12 The inter-speaker variation of walk as a variant of WALK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 38/40 &lt;40: 40/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 40/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 45/45 Low: 33/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 38/40 MC: 40/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 40/40 Female: 38/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 21/21 UWC: 33/34 WC: 24/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.716, p=.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 38/40 40–55: 22/22 &gt;55: 18/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.640, p=.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 29/30 A-level/equivalent: 29/30 Up to 16: 20/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=.467, p=.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.12 shows that the use of *walk* as a variant of *walk* is least likely to be used by those whose PoD is in an area which experiences high levels of deprivation (linear-by-linear association, \( p = .034 \)). However, this result should be treated with caution due to the very low \( (n=2) \) number of speaker who did not use *walk*.

11.6.2.3.2. Appendix 6.2.3.2: The inter-speaker variation of *hike* as a variant of *walk*

22 speakers used *hike* as a variant of *walk*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.13
Table 11.13 shows that the use of *hike* as a variant of *walk* does not exhibit any statistically significant patterns of inter-speaker variation.

11.6.2.4. Appendix 6.2.4: The inter-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of *tourist*

The attested non-Anglo-Cornish variants of *tourist* are *tourist*, *people-on-holiday*, *holiday-maker*, *foreigner*, *visitor*, *group-on-holiday* and *family-on-holiday*. However, due to the particularly low tokens counts for *foreigner* (n=2) and *group-on-holiday* (n=3), I do not subject these variants to statistical analysis. In this section, I explore the social variation of each of the remaining onomasiological variants of *tourist*. 
28 speakers used *tourist* as a variant of *TOURIST*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.14.

Table 11.14 The inter-speaker variation of *tourist* as a variant of *TOURIST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Age       | <30: 20/40  
>40: 8/40       | Fisher’s exact test         | p=.009** |
| IdQ       | High: 7/45  
Low: 21/35     | Fisher’s exact test         | p=<.001*** |
| SEC       | WC: 12/40  
MC: 16/40      | Fisher’s exact test         | p=.482 |
| Gender    | Male: 13/40  
Female: 15/40 | Fisher’s exact test         | p=.815 |
| SEC_3     | MC: 9/21  
UWC: 15/34  
WC: 4/25      | Linear-by-linear association| \( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=3.882, p=.049^* \) |
| Age_3     | <30: 20/40  
40–55: 5/22  
>55: 3/18       | Linear-by-linear association| \( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=7.227, p=.007^* \) |
| Education | Degree: 13/30  
A-level/equivalent: 12/30  
Up to 16: 3/20 | Linear-by-linear association| \( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=3.762, p=.052 \) |
| PoD       | Low-deprivation: 9/20  
Mid-deprivation: 16/42  
High-deprivation: 3/18 | Linear-by-linear association| \( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=3.213, p=.073 \) |
| Occupation | High-prestige: 16/40  
Mid-prestige: 9/22  
Low-prestige: 3/18 | Linear-by-linear association| \( \chi^2(\text{df}=1, n=80)=2.347, p=.126 \) |
| CGP       | 0: 8/15  
1: 4/7  
2: 3/16  
3: 5/8  
4: 8/34 | Logistic regression         | Wald\( \chi^2 \) (df=1, n=80)=3.557, p=.059 |

Table 11.14 shows that the use of *tourist* as a variant of *TOURIST* is in a statistically significant relationship with the social categories of age, IdQ total, and SEC (trinary).
Specifically, *tourist* is used the most by younger speakers, when age is classified as a binary (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.009) and a trinary category (linear-by-linear association, p=.007), by those with a low IdQ total (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=<.001), and by those in higher socioeconomic groups (linear-by-linear association, p=.049).

11.6.2.4.2. Appendix 6.2.4.2: The inter-speaker variation of *people-on-holiday* as a variant of *TOURIST*

60 speakers used *people-on-holiday* as a variant of *TOURIST*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.15.

Table 11. 15 The inter-speaker variation of *people-on-holiday* as a variant of *TOURIST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 28/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 32/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 38/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 22/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 32/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 28/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 33/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 27/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 14/21</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.840, p=.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UWC: 25/34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC: 21/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 28/40</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.242, p=.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40–55: 17/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;55: 15/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Degree: 21/30</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=1.323, p=.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-level/equivalent: 22/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 16: 17/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td>Low-deprivation: 13/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>χ²(df=1, n=80)=2.810, p=.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-deprivation: 31/42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-deprivation: 16/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.15 shows that the use of *people-on-holiday* as a variant of TOURIST is in a statistically significant relationship with IdQ total. Specifically, *people-on-holiday* is used the most by those with high IdQ totals (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, \( p=.038 \)).

11.6.2.4.3. Appendix 6.2.4.3: The inter-speaker variation of *holiday-maker* as a variant of TOURIST

12 speakers used *holiday-maker* as a variant of TOURIST. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Age | <30: 5/40  
>40: 7/40 | Fisher’s exact test | \( p=.755 \) |
| IdQ | High: 4/45  
Low: 8/35 | Fisher’s exact test | \( p=.116 \) |
| SEC | WC: 6/40  
MC: 6/40 | Fisher’s exact test | \( p=1.00 \) |
| Gender | Male: 6/40  
Female: 6/40 | Fisher’s exact test | \( p=1.00 \) |
| SEC_3 | MC: 2/21  
UWC: 6/34  
WC: 4/25 | Linear-by-linear association \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80) = .331, p=.565 \) |
| Age_3 | <30: 5/40  
40–55: 6/22  
>55: 1/18 | Linear-by-linear association \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80) = .073, p=.787 \) |
| Education | Degree: 5/30  
A-level/equivalent: 4/30  
Up to 16: 3/20 | Linear-by-linear association \( \chi^2(df=1, n=80) = .040, p=.842 \) |
**PoD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>deprivation</th>
<th>4/20</th>
<th>4/42</th>
<th>4/18</th>
<th>Linear-by-linear association</th>
<th>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80) = .018, p = .892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prestige</th>
<th>6/40</th>
<th>3/22</th>
<th>3/18</th>
<th>Linear-by-linear association</th>
<th>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80) = .013, p = .908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CGP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0: 1/15</th>
<th>1: 0/7</th>
<th>2: 3/16</th>
<th>3: 1/8</th>
<th>4: 7/34</th>
<th>Logistic regression</th>
<th>Wald $\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80) = 1.980, p = .159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 11.16 shows that the usage of *holiday-maker* as a variant of *tourist* by participants in this study does not exhibit any statistically significant patterns of inter-speaker variation.

11.6.2.4.4. Appendix 6.2.4.4: The inter-speaker variation of *visitor* as a variant of *tourist*

5 speakers used *visitor* as a variant of *tourist*. The inter-speaker variation of this usage is displayed in Table 11.17.

**Table 11.17 The inter-speaker variation of *visitor* as a variant of *tourist***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 0/40</td>
<td>40: 5/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 0/45</td>
<td>Low: 5/35</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 2/40</td>
<td>MC: 3/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male: 1/40</td>
<td>Female: 4/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td>MC: 2/21</td>
<td>UWC: 2/34</td>
<td>WC: 1/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Social variation</td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;30: 5/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;40: 3/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IdQ</td>
<td>High: 5/45</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: 3/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>WC: 12/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MC: 10/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.17 shows that older speakers are more likely to use *visitor* as a variant of *TOURIST* (linear-by-linear association, p=.002).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td><strong>Male:</strong> 4/40, <strong>Female:</strong> 4/40</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC_3</td>
<td><strong>MC:</strong> 1/21, <strong>UWC:</strong> 4/34, <strong>WC:</strong> 3/25</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.613, p=.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age_3</td>
<td>&lt;30: 5/40, 40–55: 0/22, &gt;55: 3/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.008, p=.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td><strong>Degree:</strong> 4/30, <strong>A-level/equivalent:</strong> 3/30, <strong>Up to 16:</strong> 1/20</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.900, p=.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoD</td>
<td><strong>Low-deprivation:</strong> 5/20, <strong>Mid-deprivation:</strong> 9/42, <strong>High-deprivation:</strong> 8/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=1.399, p=.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td><strong>High-prestige:</strong> 3/40, <strong>Mid-prestige:</strong> 5/22, <strong>Low-prestige:</strong> 0/18</td>
<td>Linear-by-linear association</td>
<td>$\chi^2$(df=1, n=80)=.135, p=.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0: 1/15, 1: 0/7, 2: 1/16, 3: 1/8, 4: 5/34</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
<td>Wald$\chi^2$ (df=1, n=80)=1.416, p=.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.18 shows that the usage of *family-on-holiday* as a variant of *tourist* by participants in this study does not exhibit any statistically significant patterns of inter-speaker variation.

11.7. Appendix 7: The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants

In order to determine whether or not the usage of non-Anglo-Cornish onomasiological variants display intra-speaker variation, I employed Fisher’s exact tests. As in Appendix
6.2, I only conduct statistical tests for variants which are used five or more times. For information regarding the coding of variants for stylistic analysis, see Section 5.1.

11.7.1 Appendix 7.1: The intra-speaker variation of the non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the LUNCH BOX variable

The intra-speaker variation of variants of the LUNCH BOX variable is displayed in Table 11.19.

Table 11.19 The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the LUNCH BOX variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Intra-speaker variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lunch box</td>
<td>Casual style: 72/80 Careful style: 62/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit box</td>
<td>Careful style: 5/80 Careful style: 2/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.19 shows that there is no statistically significant variation for any of the non-Anglo-Cornish variants of LUNCH BOX. However, the greater use of lunch box in casual speech styles does approach statistical significance (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.052).

11.7.2. Appendix 7.2: The intra-speaker variation of the non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the WOMAN variable

The intra-speaker variation of the non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the WOMAN variable is displayed in Table 11.20.
Table 11.20 The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the WOMAN variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Intra-speaker variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>Casual style: 23/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful style: 24/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girl</td>
<td>Careful style: 31/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful style: 31/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lady</td>
<td>Casual style: 33/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful style: 7/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>Careful style: 1/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful style: 6/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.20 shows that lady exhibits intra-speaker variation. Specifically, lady is more likely to occur in casual speech, as opposed to careful speech (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=<.001).

11.7.3. Appendix 7.3: The intra-speaker variation of the non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the WALK variable

The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the WALK variable is displayed in Table 11.21.

Table 11.21 The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the WALK variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Intra-speaker variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>Casual style: 70/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful style: 53/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hike</td>
<td>Careful style: 8/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Careful style: 16/80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.21 shows that walk exhibits intra-speaker variation. Specifically, walk is more likely to occur in casual speech, as opposed to careful speech (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.002).
11.7.4. Appendix 7.4: The intra-speaker variation of the non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the TOURIST variable

The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the TOURIST variable is displayed in Table 11.22. As the word *people* is included in the elicitation prompt for the naming-task for the TOURIST variable (see Figure 4.14), it is not possible to distinguish between *people-on-holiday*, *group-on-holiday*, or *family-on-holiday* in the careful speech style. As a result, I compare the three variants which included *on-holiday* in the casual speech style and simply *on-holiday* in the careful speech style.

Table 11.22 The intra-speaker variation of non-Anglo-Cornish variants of the TOURIST variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Intra-speaker variation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#-on-holiday</td>
<td>Casual style: 58/80 Careful style: 5/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holiday-maker</td>
<td>Careful style: 8/80 Careful style: 9/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourist</td>
<td>Casual style: 11/80 Careful style: 26/80</td>
<td>Fisher’s exact test</td>
<td>p=.008**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.22 shows that #-on-holiday and tourist exhibit intra-speaker variation. Specifically, #-on-holiday is more likely to occur in casual speech (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=<.001), as opposed to careful speech, while tourist is most likely to be used in careful speech (2-tailed Fisher’s exact test, p=.008).
There is no doubt or debate over the fact that the Cornish are a proud people who share an extraordinary history that can be traced back thousands of years. In calling for this debate to make the case for a Cornish tick box for national identity in the next census, there is a risk that some may see this as some sort of gimmick designed simply to boost our tourist industry or play into a stereotype of Cornish country folk. Nothing could be further from the truth. Although it is true to say that many of us Cornish can be guilty of having a playful jibe at the English, especially those from Devon—after all they do put their jam and cream on the wrong way round on their scones—this is not a whim or some notion based on a romantic view of the past.

The Cornish have, along with our Welsh cousins, the longest history of any people in Britain, dating back 12,000 years. It is believed that these ancient people entered this isle after the Ice Age from the area now occupied by the Basques. Genetic codes indelibly mark the Cornish with the DNA of their ancient ancestors. It is believed that a staggering 80% of the Cornish retain this genetic marker. The Cornish language, which is seeing a revival in recent times, has a 5,000-year history. We in Cornwall have our own culture and our own ways. Cornwall even has its own patron saint, St Piran, whose life is celebrated on 5 March every year. We have our own flag and even our own tartan, which I am modelling so well with my tie this evening.

We are all but an island, with the sea surrounding us on three sides and the Tamar River on the fourth, which falls only four miles short of making us an island. There has been many a Cornishman who has been tempted to get his shovel out and
dig those last four miles to finish the job, because in so many ways we have the
culture, the identity and the attitudes of an island race.

The 80 miles of granite protruding into the Atlantic stubbornly rebel against the
great ocean and yet have been shaped by it. The beauty and the desolation defy
description and yet somehow portray the spirit of the people who call it their land. It is
as if the people and the land are as one. This is not just an historic or romantic notion,
but a serious issue that is very much based on current, clear facts.