

# Palatalization and affrication in South African English - a sample study

*V.R. Limbrick*

*Department of Linguistics and English Language  
Rhodes University*

## THE AIM OF THE INVESTIGATION

The aim of the investigation was to determine the extent to which palatalization and the accompanying feature, affrication, in words such as [djuk] and [tʃuzdei] and [sjut] are features of South African English. It is an attempt to discover whether speakers of South African English look to RP as the standard and, if so, which speakers in the community aimed at this "standard" pronunciation. From this it may be possible to gauge the level of prestige associated with this feature of language in South Africa.

The age of the speakers was hypothesised to be the most important variable but it was also thought that the sex, social aspirations and, to a lesser degree, geographical region of origin of the speaker would have an effect on the way in which the above-mentioned type of words would be pronounced.

The investigation was conducted in the following manner:

## METHODOLOGY

Twenty people ranging in age from 12 years to 85 years were approached and asked whether they would be willing to be "interviewed" for a linguistic study. All agreed, some very willingly, while the reply from many was: "But I speak so badly!"

A word list and a set of sentences containing words which may or may not undergo palatalization and/or affrication was compiled. The informants were asked to read the list of words into a tape recorder with a condenser microphone which was running throughout the various readings. They were then asked to read the list again. This second reading was to be the one on which the examination of each case was based because, by the third reading (they had had the opportunity to read the list through in their heads before reading it aloud), they would have become familiar, and consequently a little more relaxed, with the material.

The informants were then required to read a list of ten sentences which contained many of the words found in the word list. These words occurred in several phonological contexts in the sentences. The informants were asked to speak the sentences as if they were being used in conversation and, while this obviously still produced quite a formal style, many of the informants went so far as to act out the sentences. The fact that so much feeling went into the renditions indicated that many were quite relaxed despite the tape recorder. This resulted in the readings of the sentences being of a slightly less formal nature than under a normal situation of reading aloud. As with the word list, the sentences were also read through twice, and the second, more familiar reading, has been used for analysis.

Finally, the informants were asked to recite the days of the week, once through slowly (which usually elicited careful speech), and once through "rattling it off" (which did not give them time to worry about their pronunciation).

## THE SELECTION OF WORDS/VARIANTS

(Please refer to Appendix I for word list and to Appendix 2 for list of test sentences.)

When compiling the word list, much care was taken to include both sounds that may or may not be palatalized and affricated, as well as ones which, although palatalized, are not likely to be affricated. For example, in a word such as "Neptune", the [t] followed by the [u] may or may not have been affricated and the extent of palatalization, too, was expected to vary from group to group and from speaker to speaker. The same applies to words such as "endure", "duke", "tuna", "fortune", etc. The word "tissue" was included in order to establish whether any speakers of the sample pronounced the word [tɪsju] - a pronunciation which is viewed as affected by most speakers of English these days. "New York" was included in order to establish whether any speakers had begun to assume the American pronunciation in the lack of a palatal following the [n] in "new". It was felt that this might become a factor, especially in the speech of the youngest informants, under the influence of the abundance of American media. The word "suit" was included to determine the extent of palatalization, if any, following the initial alveolar fricative, and whether such palatalization, if it did indeed occur, varied depending on the age, sex, etc. of the speaker. In addition, words such as "party", "shark" and "toothpaste" were included to provide a phonological distraction from the number of potentially palatalized sounds.

By comparison, the sentences were constructed in such a way that the linguistic environment in which the sound sequence is found may influence the pronunciation of that sequence. For example, "John's duty" and "Peter's duty" in which the initial [dʒ] in "John" might affect the extent of affrication in the variant at the beginning of "duty". Each sentence contains at least one word which may undergo palatalization and possible affrication. The use of a list of sentences also enables the study to cover a word cluster such as "don't you", in which palatalization may occur.

## THE SELECTION OF INFORMANTS

The initial selection of informants for the study was made on the basis of age. As one of the initial hypotheses was that the extent of palatalization would vary depending of the age of the speaker, informants were chosen across a wide age spectrum. The youngest informant was 12 and the oldest was 85. They were divided into three age groups in order to facilitate comparison; Group III included informants who ranged in age from 12 to 15 years, the members of Group II were aged between 20 and 30 years, while the youngest member of Group I was 45, with the oldest being 85 years of age. Besides age, informants were also grouped in this way so that all the members of Group III were scholars, the members of Group II, students, while the members of Group I were drawn from a variety of occupations, ranging from a music teacher, a university professor and businessmen to a retired seamstress. (For list of informants see Appendix 3).

## DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The data was collected on a tape cassette. Following the collection of the data, a lengthy period of time was spent listening to the tape over and over in order to capture the sound nuances found there.

In most of the words, the standard [tj] or [dj] variables were generally found to have one of the following five variants:

1. [d<sup>j</sup>(u)] - almost straight vowel, little palatalization (uncommon).
2. [dj] - the variant usually encountered in RP, and the standard at which many informants appeared to aim.
3. [dj<sub>↓</sub>] - slightly more palatalization and higher than (2).
4. [d(ʒ)] - has become slightly affricated but the initial alveolar stop is still audible separately from the fricative portion.
5. [dʒ] - a full affricate.

When analysing the recordings, the above-mentioned variants were the ones generally encountered, although (1) was extremely rare. The informants tended to vary the variant employed, depending on their familiarity with what they were reading, whether they were reading words or sentences, etc.

After transcribing the relevant script, an obvious similarity was noticed between the pronunciation of the palatalized sound on certain words, for example, between "Tuesday" and "tuna", and between "duty" and "duke". For this reason, when some of the words are discussed separately, it may be motivated that the pronunciation of "tuna", for example, will exhibit similar tendencies to those shown by "Tuesday". Consequently, a detailed description and analysis of only one word in each group will be given.

### FINDINGS

The findings of the study as regards the pronunciation of "duke" may be represented as follows:

FIGURE 1: DUKE in context of word list

	dj	dj <sub>↓</sub>	d(ʒ)	dʒ
Group I	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Group II		<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Group III		<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Key:  - male     - female

Figure 1 is a graphic representation of the way in which the initial sounds in "duke" were pronounced when read from a list of words. This may be said to be the most formal context and consequently the speakers tended to monitor their speech very carefully as a rule.

When discussing the ways in which "duke" was pronounced, the first phenomenon that should be noted is the fact that all the speakers in Group I (the informants aged from 45 to 85 years of age) used the variant [dj]. This variant is the one generally used in RP and it consequently reflects the most conservative pronunciation. The variant [dʲ] may be seen as a more extreme version of [dj] as it shows a pronunciation which borders on a complete lack of palatalization.

The informants in Group II showed a complete rejection of [dj] in favour of the other three variants. The nine informants in this group were split evenly between the remaining possible variants. The most interesting and valuable fact about the separation is that the males tended to favour the two more extreme variants, while the females tended to favour [dj<sub>1</sub>] and [d(ʒ)] almost to the exclusion of [dʒ]. The only female who used the most extreme [dʒ] variant tended to use this throughout. She is Subject 14 and comes from Durban, as does Subject 12, who produced a pronunciation almost identical to hers. It is interesting to note that Subject 12 was the most nervous when speaking into a tape recorder, and yet continued to use the affricated form. In this situation, one would expect the speaker to assume a more conservative pronunciation. The fact that Subject 12 has not done this is perhaps an indication of the level to which this extreme is part of his language use. As Subject 14 also tended to use a much more extreme pronunciation than might be expected, it may be possible to find a link between their area of origin and the extent of palatalization in their speech. This hypothesis, however, cannot be confirmed on as limited a sample of data as was available here.

The informants in Group III (aged between 12 and 15 years) were spread relatively evenly over the three variants, [dj<sub>1</sub>], [d(ʒ)] and [dʒ]. The youngest informant in the study, Subject 20, aged 12,

used the most extreme variant [dʒ] in all situations where the context permitted, even though he was having to read more carefully than any of the others, and all his data was read, quite painstakingly at times, into the tape recorder. One might therefore assume that this was the pronunciation he always uses and that it has not occurred to him to vary it according to situation.

It may therefore be seen that the use of the variants was very similar in Groups II and III, who tended to favour the more extreme variants. As opposed to this, Group I was unanimous in its use of the most conservative form [dj].

Figure 2 details the pronunciation of the initial sound(s) in "duke" when this word occurs in the sentence, "Prince Andrew, the Duke of York, wore a brown suit to the jukebox party".

FIGURE 2: DUKE in the context of a sentence

	dj	dj <sub>↓</sub>	d(ʒ)	dʒ
Group I	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Group II	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Group III		<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Key:  - male  - female

When a word is read as part of a sentence, less attention is paid to the pronunciation than when it forms part of a word list. Speakers consequently tend to use a more "extreme" pronunciation, that is,

the pronunciation they generally use, rather than one which is carefully monitored. This may be seen when Figure 2 is compared with Figure 1.

Group I showed little change from the first rendering of "duke". Only one speaker, Subject 7, showed a change in pronunciation. Before the interview, she kept saying how "badly" she spoke and throughout the duration of the interview she monitored her speech carefully to keep it in line with what one assumes she perceived as the standard. In the light of her preoccupation with her accent, it is interesting to note that she is also from Durban and may consequently tend to make quite extensive use of palatalization in casual speech, as is the case with Subjects 12 and 14 who extended their usage of it into formal speech as well.

Group II showed more change than either Group I or Group II, whose speakers retained their original pronunciations. Over half of the informants in this group used the most extreme [dʒ] variant with males outnumbering females in this variant. This tendency among females to use a more conservative pronunciation than males occurs again and again in this study and coincides with the phenomenon of women tending to be more conscious of prestige, or lack thereof, in accents. This results in females generally using more standard forms of the language than do men. (By standard is meant the perceived standard.)

The same trends and use of the variants described above were encountered in the pronunciation of "duty". In the sentences, however, all groups were likely to exhibit a tendency to use the more affricated variant when "duty" was spoken in conjunction with "John" i.e. in "Was it John's duty to go?". "Was it Peter's duty to go?", by contrast, involved the use of a less affricated variant. This is an example of interference from the surrounding words. All speakers exhibited this, from the most conservative (Subject 2 who speaks RP) who used [dʒuti] with "Peter", but [dʒ<sub>1</sub>uti] with "John", to the most extreme speakers who either used [d(ʒ)uti] with "Peter" and [dʒuti] with "John", or the most extreme [dʒuti] with both.



An analysis of the pronunciations of "Tuesday" follows here, in which one will be able to observe a change from the word's use in a word list, when used in the sentences, and finally, when used in a recitation of the days of the week.

Figure 3 provides a graphic representation of the variants of the initial sound in "Tuesday"

FIGURE 3: TUESDAY in context of the word list

	tj	tj <sub>↓</sub>	t(f)	tʃ
Group I	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> </div>	
Group II		<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> </div>
Group III			<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">□</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">X</div> </div>

Key: X - male □ - female

As may be seen from Figure 3 above, Group I shows no clear differentiation into any of the variants, although the most extreme variant, [tʃ] was not used at all. The way in which their use is spread across the board, however, becomes extremely interesting when one compares it with the pronunciations of both Group II and III. These latter two groups favoured [tj<sub>↓</sub>], [t(f)] and [tʃ], with the last-mentioned being extensively used.

In Group II, one may once again observe the manner in which the male informants tended to use the least standard forms, while the female informants tended more towards the conservative forms. As may be seen, however, although the women tended to use the more conservative variants than the men, the ones they actually utilized were nevertheless generally less conservative than those employed by the speakers in Group I. All the males in Group II employed [tʃ], except one, Subject 10, who used [tj]. His using the more conservative form here (as he does throughout most of his reading) may be explained by the fact that he is also a Theology Student who has been trained in the art of public speaking and consequently monitors the way in which he speaks. Once again, the only woman to employ the most extreme [tʃ] was Subject 14 and it is still maintained that her area of origin may have something to do with this.

All the subjects of the youngest group, Group III, employed the most extreme variant, [tʃ], except for Subject 19, who used the slightly more conservative [t(ʃ)]. When listening to this subject, it is obvious that she has been taught to talk "well", and that this has had an obvious influence on the extent of palatalization in her pronunciation.

Figure 4 provides an analysis of the pronunciation of the first sound in "Tuesday" when this word occurs in the sentence, "Does Tuesday suit you, or would Wednesday be more convenient?".

As far as Group I is concerned, Figure 4 illustrates that the informants generally moved towards the less conservative variants as compared with Figure 3. As was the case throughout the interview, Subject 2, the RP speaker, used the most conservative [tj] variant again, while the rest of the informants in this group were split between the other three variants. Males and females showed no preference for different variants, with a third employing each variant.

FIGURE 4: TUESDAY in context of a sentence

	tj	tj <sub>ɹ</sub>	t(f)	tʃ
Group I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Group II		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Group III			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Key:  - male  - female

Compared with the pronunciation in Group I, which changed quite dramatically, the variants employed by Groups II and III barely changed at all. The only subject who changed his pronunciation from the word list to the sentences was Subject 10, who has been mentioned above. He moved to a slightly more extreme form when reading the sentences. As mentioned above, the pronunciations among the informants of Group III remained unchanged. This may perhaps indicate that these speakers were using their general casual variant throughout, even when reading the word list. This, in turn, indicates that they may as yet be slightly less influenced by the prestige factor in speech, although this is rapidly becoming important, particularly amongst the girls.

In Figure 5, in this particular context of "Tuesday", the group that showed the most significant change was Group I. Here, Subject 2 retained the [tj] variant, while all the others either employed [t(f)] or [tʃ]. The other two groups showed minimal to no change with the result that, overall, 50% of the informants used the [tʃ] vari-

FIGURE 5: TUESDAY as part of a recitation of the days of the week

	tj	tj <sub>↓</sub>	t(ʃ)	tʃ
Group I	☒		☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	☐ ☒
Group II	☐	☒	☐ ☐ ☒	☐ ☒ ☐ ☒ ☐ ☒
Group III				☐ ☒ ☐ ☒

Key: ☒ - male ☐ - female

ant when reciting the days of the week very quickly, while 35% used the [t(ʃ)] variant. Consequently, 85% of the informants used the two variants which show the greatest degree of affrication. From this one might propose that the majority of speakers of all ages used less conservative forms when reciting something they knew well, while men still tended to use the least conservative [tj] variant significantly more frequently than women.

During this study it was also noticed that certain words, although they contained almost identical potentially palatalized sounds, were not palatalized to the same extent. For example, although "endure" is theoretically of the same type as "duke", it showed disparity with the pronunciations of this word.

As may be seen in Figure 6 four of the informants from Groups II and III actually used the [dj] variant when pronouncing "endure"

FIGURE 6: ENDURE in context of the word list.

	dj	dj <sub>↓</sub>	d(3)	dʒ
Group I	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Group II	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Group III	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Key:  - male  - female

in the context of a word list. This context of "endure" was, in fact, the only occurrence of [dj] (or the most conservative variant) among the informants in Groups II and III in the course of the study. One can only assume that the speakers were more aware of the "correct" way to pronounce this word than was the case with other words. This may be as a result of its being in less frequent use than most of the others used in the study, although one cannot be sure of this.

Again, although Groups II and III employed less conservative variants than Group I on average, more actual informants used the reasonably conservative [dj<sub>↓</sub>] when pronouncing "endure" than during the pronunciation of other words containing palatalization. The pronunciation of "endure" therefore tends to be less extreme in all contexts than the pronunciation of "duty", for example. The reason for this is not clear, although it may possibly be as a result

FIGURE 7: ENDURE in context of a sentence

	dj	dj <sub>l</sub>	d(ɜ)	dʒ
Group I	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">X</div> <div style="display: flex; gap: 10px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">X</div> </div> </div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin: 0 auto;">X</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>
Group II		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin: 0 auto;">X</div>		<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">X</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">X</div> <div style="display: flex; gap: 10px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">X</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; gap: 10px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">X</div> </div> </div>
Group III		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin: 0 auto;">X</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin: 0 auto;">X</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 15px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>

Key: X - male  - female

of the less frequent occurrence of "endure" in general language, as mentioned above.

"New York" was included in order to ascertain whether the RP pronunciation, [n<sup>h</sup>u] was falling into disuse in favour of the unpalatalized [nu]. As was the case with all the other words previously discussed, the speakers of Group I all used the [n<sup>h</sup>u] pronunciation. The informants in Group II, however, either used this standard pronunciation, or [u] i.e. the high back vowel was fronted, but not so much as to create a palatal. This latter pronunciation was largely encountered among the men, while the women were again more likely to use the [n<sup>h</sup>u] pronunciation. As is the case with the other words, the less standard [nu] pronunciation was the more frequently used in the context of the sentence "Don't you love going to New York?" than in the context of the word list. The pronunciation of the youngest group corresponded with that of the informants in Group II.

As mentioned above, "tissue" was included in order to ascertain whether any speakers used the hypercorrect form, [tɪsju]. Only one subject, Subject 7, used this variant and pronounced "tissue" as [təsju]. As even Subject 2, the RP speaker, did not use such a conservative form, one could say that Subject 7 was being hypercorrect. Perhaps she perceived the variant with a palatal following the fricative as being the prestigious form in general, but over-applied this to contexts where a palatal fricative has become perfectly "acceptable".

Another previously palatalized sound that is apparently dropping out of South African English is that found in "suit". Only two informants pronounced this word as [s<sup>j</sup>ut], while the rest employed a straight vowel to render [sut]. These two informants were both members of Group I, as might be expected on previous evidence. One was Subject 2, the RP speaker, while the second was Subject 5, a 60 year old woman. It is interesting to note that while discussing this study with her after her interview, she said that she had actually been taught to say [s<sup>j</sup>ut] when a child, and had been severely reprimanded each time she lapsed into the [sut] pronunciation. This shows that [s<sup>j</sup>ut] was, and may still be, regarded as the prestige pronunciation. Among most South African English speakers, however, this is probably no longer the case, with even conservative speakers using [sut] while retaining palatalization in other words.

## CONCLUDING RESULTS

The initial hypothesis of this study was that the age of the speaker would have the greatest effect of the extent of palatalization and affrication in his or her speech. Prestige and the sex of the speaker were also presumed to play a role.

As far as the age of the speaker is concerned, the evidence of the study indicates that this does indeed have a significant effect on pronunciation. The oldest group most frequently used the standard variant and even when they used less standard variants, these more closely approximated the standard than those used by either of the

other groups. Groups II and III showed great similarity, although Group III tended to use the less standard forms more consistently. As may be seen from the graphs in the section on the findings of the study, the difference in pronunciation is not completely clear cut, but rather a significant trend away from the standard can be noted among the younger groups.

The importance of the difference between the pronunciations of the male and female informants cannot be underestimated. In all groups, the women used the more standard variant quite consistently. There were obviously one or two exceptions to this rule, but, on the whole, the women proved less likely to use the more affricated variant. It is a well-known sociolinguistic phenomenon that women tend to aim at what is perceived as the standard more than do men. They also tend to make less use of the more extreme forms of the language. This has been ascribed to women usually being more aware of, and subject to, the influences of prestige in language. In agreement with this phenomenon, the women in this study tended to use more standard forms than the men, and were less likely to use the extreme forms of affrication.

The geographical origin of the speaker may prove to have an effect on the extent of palatalization and affrication in his or her speech. In this study, the informants from Durban used the affricated variants almost entirely, and this may prove to be a feature of Coastal Natal English. On the basis of this limited study, however, it is not possible to make any definitive statement on the subject.

The factor which could be said to link the influences of age and sex on the extent of palatalization is that of prestige. As women tend to use the more prestigious forms when there is a choice of pronunciation, one could argue that their use of less affricated variants in this study indicates that these are regarded as prestigious. Similarly, older speakers often tend to use a more conservative or standard form of the language as compared with younger speakers. In this study, as mentioned above, the older group tended to favour the palatalized variants rather than the affricated



ones. This is perhaps further proof that while palatalized sounds are regarded as standard, affricated ones tend not to be regarded as such. Another proof of this is the fact that speakers use palatalized forms when monitoring their speech carefully, but revert to the affricated forms when less attention is being paid to how they are speaking.

## APPENDIX I

Neptune  
endure  
toothpaste  
Tuesday  
literature  
duke  
tuna  
shark  
sue  
paper  
tissue  
lurid  
suit  
jukebox  
party  
a suit  
New York  
fortune

## APPENDIX 2

1. Should I have the pork chops, the chips or the tuna casserole?
2. No, not on Monday, you fool, on Tuesday!
3. Pass the tube of toothpaste please.
4. The soldiers endured weeks of hardship before they reached Tunisian soil.
5. Was it John's duty to go? Was John on duty?
6. Was it Peter's duty to go? Was Peter on duty?

7. Don't you love going to New York?
8. Prince Andrew, the Duke of York, wore a brown suit to the jukebox party.
9. Sue lives in Suite 16, Plaza Villas, New Haven.
10. Does Tuesday suit you, or would Wednesday be more convenient?

### APPENDIX 3

	sex	age	origin	occupation
<b>GROUP I</b>				
Subject 1	female	85	Port Elizabeth	retired seamstress
Subject 2	male	65	UK/Grahamstown	university professor
Subject 3	female	62	Port Elizabeth	housewife
Subject 4	male	60	Johannesburg	businessman
Subject 5	female	60	Port Elizabeth	music teacher
Subject 6	male	57	Port Elizabeth	businessman
Subject 7	female	45	Durban	shop assistant
<b>GROUP II</b>				
Subject 8	female	30	Cape Town	student
Subject 9	male	30	Johannesburg	student
Subject 10	male	24	Natal	theology student
Subject 11	male	23	Johannesburg	student
Subject 12	male	22	Durban	student
Subject 13	female	22	Natal Midlands	student
Subject 14	female	21	Durban	student
Subject 15	male	21	Cape Town	student
Subject 16	female	20	Grahamstown	student
<b>GROUP III</b>				
Subject 17	female	15	Grahamstown	scholar
Subject 18	male	14	Grahamstown	scholar
Subject 19	female	13	Grahamstown	scholar
Subject 20	male	12	Grahamstown	scholar

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baugh, A.C. & Cable, T. 1978. *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul plc.

- Branford, W. & Aldridge, M. 1968. *Sourcebook: for an Introductory Historical Study of the English Language, Part III: Middle to Early Modern English*. Grahamstown: ISEA.
- Bronstein, A.J. 1960. *The Pronunciation of American English*. USA: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Fanaroff, D. 1978. *South African English Dialect: A Literature Survey*. Pretoria: HSRC.
- Gimson, A. 1962. *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gray & Wise 1959. *The Bases of Speech* (Third Edition). USA: Harper and Brothers.
- Hawkins, P. 1984. *Introducing Phonology*. Great Britain: Hutchinson & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.
- Jember, G.K. 1975. *Eng-OE and OE-Eng Dictionary*. USA: Westview Press, Inc.
- Kokeritz, H. 1953. *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kokeritz, H. 1961. *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lass, R. & Anderson, J. 1975. *Old English Phonology*. Great Britain. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Conner, J.D. 1973. *Phonetics*. Middlesex. Penguin Books.