Propredicate Do in the English of the Intermountain West
Author(s): Marianna Di Paolo
Source: *American Speech*, Vol. 68, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 339-356
Published by: Duke University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/455771
Accessed: 24-07-2017 19:27 UTC

# PROPREDICATE *DO*
# IN THE ENGLISH OF THE
# INTERMOUNTAIN WEST

MARIANNA DI PAOLO

*University of Utah*

ACCORDING TO THE CURRENT LITERATURE, propredicate *do* in main clauses (pro-*do*)—constructions such as those in examples (1) and (2)—is not characteristic of American English.[1]

> 1. "Well, I cán dò. Is it important? Then I wíll dò." [Prof. Barker Fairley, native Englishman, Toronto, 1939; from Joos 1964, 69]
> 2. "Did Frank love nature or fair play?"—"Why, he múst hăve dòne. Great figure in letters and all that; honored by the King." [Evelyn Waugh, *The Loved One*, Penguin No. 823, 1951, 51ff.; from Joos 1964, 69]

Most Americans produce such sentences without the pro-*do*, that is, (1) is typically *Well, I can. . . . Then I will*. And (2) is *Why, he must have*. In fact, pro-*do* constructions are considered to be syntactic regionalisms peculiar to England and Australia (Butters 1983, 1989, and Kato and Butters 1987). The earliest discussion of the propredicate *do* may be Joos (1964), who provides a description of this propredicate, including that it carries tertiary, not primary, stress. Joos also suggests that it has gained prominence in this century in England.

Butters (1983) adds that pro-*do* was possible as long ago as Middle English although it was not common in England until about the 1920s in the written sources which have been examined. Butters also presents historical evidence suggesting that pro-*do* spread from subordinate clauses to main clauses in the early part of this century. Most dialects of present-day English, including American English, probably preserve the conservative forms in dependent clauses, as in the following example:[2]

> 3. 53A: // Well I . I ne-// I never would because . I'm not a "me" person and I don't /// E: mm hum /// you know, I kinda take a back seat which I probably shouldn't DO but /// [E chuckles] /// my one friend was always interested in what the fellows thought about her. [#53A,147A; 24.31]

Butters (1983) and, later, Kato and Butters (1987) provide many other examples of propredicate *do* in subordinate clauses in American English.

Butters also points out that the semantics of the propredicates may have become more generalized in recent times. In independent clauses, earlier usage may have normally been with the meaning of 'insistent', as Joos claims. However, the connotation no longer seems to be 'insistent'. This

broadening of meaning may have been a correlate of the wider usage the construction now enjoys, being almost categorical for some speakers. The more generalized meaning may have also led to a greater probability of occurrence.

The present article gives evidence that pro-*do* occurs in at least one dialect of American English, that of the Mormon Dominance area of the Intermountain West.[3] It also explains that its current geographic and ethno-religious distribution is probably a result of the relatively large-scale migration to Utah by members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (the LDS or Mormons) from England in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Finally, it presents evidence that this syntactic regionalism is more acceptable to Mormons, especially to polygamist or Fundamentalist Mormons (PLDS), than to other natives of the area who are not Mormon.[4]

NATURALISTIC DATA

Ten examples of pro-*do*, (4)–(13), were collected from spontaneous speech and written texts. All of the people producing the examples in this diary sample have American accents and sound like natives of the area.

4. "I don't know if Martha saw it. She may have DONE." [Middle-aged West side Salt Lake Valley man on phone with me. Summer 1986]

5. In addition, three of the males in the main conversation were son-in-laws and the other one was just a live-in friend. Even, "Dad" did not interrupt or converse that much, but he did DO more than most of the other males, probably because of his own solidarity in the family conversation. [Middle-aged female, March 1990, term paper, undergraduate course]

6. "I (?have sent/?send) Express Mail to foreign countries and have DONE for several years." [Middle-aged woman on phone to KSL Sound-Off, radio talk show, Winter 1990. Topic: What do you think about the upcoming increase in the postal rates?]

7. DW: "We should get these phones ringing."
   BL: "We should DO, Doug." [Bob Lee, middle-aged male talk show host. KSL radio during a radiothon. 10:10 a.m. 2/6/90]

8. "How will the Clinton people deal with this, or can they DO?" [Doug Wright, KSL radio talk show host (middle-aged, Mormon, native of East side of Salt Lake Valley) speaking to another newsman in regard to Ross Perot's announcement that he will not run for President. 7/16/92]

9. A: What about night classes? We haven't DONE //( )//
   B: //Have DONE.// [Female professor, 60+, in faculty meeting, 1990.]

10. MDP: (Someone from the Physical Plant turned off the heater inside the wall last year. In fact, it might have been you.)
    HM: "I may have DONE. I'll have to just bang on it for just a second. . . ." [Heater repairman from U Physical Plant (40+ white male) trying to

figure out where the steam pipes needed to be repaired. 12/17/90]

11. MDP: I thought she had a joint appointment [in Philosophy and Law].
    MR: Well [rising intonation]. She may DO. [Professor during a conversa-
    tion with me about a colleague that he knows better than I do; 60+ white
    male. Spring 1991]

12. CR: "I háve DONE [collected data on vowel laxing before /l/] before. . . ."
    [BYU English major (white male, 20+, Salt Lake Valley native, currently
    lives in Orem, well-dressed) in conference with me on his research
    project. 1991]

13. "I haven't done in ages, but I. . . ." [GL at beginning of his speaking-turn
    talking to neighbors, KCR and JL, in driveway about goose- and pheas-
    ant-hunting. Middle-aged white male. 7:30 pm, 5/12/92, Sandy, UT]

Other propredicates that form part of the naturalistic sample came from
the tape-recorded interview data of the Intermountain Language Survey
(ILS). In all, 149 long-time residents of the Salt Lake Valley participated in
this survey. All but one interview were conducted between July 1986 and
April 1987. The speakers ranged in age from 15 to 90 and an effort was
made to collect data from one individual from each of three generations of
a family. About an equal number of males and females participated in the
project. The transcripts were searched by computer for all instances of the
words *do, doing,* and *done.* In spite of the large sample of spontaneous
speech (approximately three-quarters of a million words), only ten unam-
biguous examples of pro-*dos* occur in the interviews from six unrelated
and, to my knowledge, unacquainted speakers, examples (14)–(23).[5] De-
mographic data on the ILS speakers appear in table 1.

14. And we were going home one night and we weren't watching very close
    and the team went o- over where there were snowdrifts and the camp
    tipped- it tipped over /// E: Oh dear! /// and we had a fire in the stove.
    [laughs] /// E: Oh you're kidding! /// But—I mean it didn't set fire to
    the camp but it could'a DONE. /// E: yeah /// But I don't remember
    being . especially . afraid at that. [#543.2, 197A; 8.10]

15. He did start to go to college . but it wasn't college, it was trade tech but
    /// E: mm hum /// you know . for uh auto mechanics and body and
    fender . and . things like that and he almost completed it. And I think if
    he wouldn't have been married at the time, he probably woulda DONE
    but he . was still married . uh to Wanda. . And he just—he couldn't—he
    was going to school full time and working a full-time job. [#402.1, 095B;
    16.51]

16. 133B: Maybe people thought- maybe some of // the kids thought—//
    E: // You were a clique. // [laughs]
    133B: that was a clique, I don't know. It. They coulda DONE. But we uh .
    . that was . sufficient for what . /// E: okay /// what I was interested in.
    [#133B.1, 136A; 16.24]

17. Uh . oh I don't know. Uh . I don't think any of the kids . uh . that went
    to the Park City High School . any of 'em had really any more money .
    uh than any of the rest of 'em. Uh . I don't think any of 'em had . any

nicer clothes or /// E: uh huh /// anything like that. They might DO
nowadays. /// E: yeah /// I think maybe // a lot of 'em do. //
[#133B.1, 136A; 16.24]

18. E: Okay. . Umm . did the cliques have names . do you know?
133B: I don't remember /// E: okay /// whether they did or not. I'm
sure some of 'em might DO. [#133B.1, 136A; 20.21]

19. Got a good mark and . /// [E chuckles] /// I never [chuckles] felt like
I deserved as good a mark as I got /// E: oh! /// but I'm sure I musta
DONE 'cause I don't think I was anybody's teacher's pet. [#133B.1, 136B;
8.40]

20. E: Do you ever have family reunions? And it, but it . not . not at
somebody's house let's say . in a hall or something.
183A: We used to . but I haven't DONE since I was in a car accident, which
is eleven years ago. [#183A, 110A; 16.02]

21. E: Do you think that people from other parts of country . like Salt Lake
Valley English?
183A: Well, they must DO. Otherwise uh . I think that's what you see on
T.V. Your newscasters speak it. [#183A, 110B; 14.05]

22. E: // [laughs] // Did you ever get blamed for something you didn't do?
122: Oh, I'm sure I must have. I don't . recall offhand anything. But I'm
sure I . must have DONE. Been blamed on a few things. [short laugh]
[#122, 031A; 26.09]

23. 61: We can't get into Xenon or anything to go dancing so we just goof
around . hang out.
E: A lot of people I've been interviewing have been talking about the
Xenon club.
61: Yeah . they . that . it's . I've . we've been there once but . that . you
know we got in but . it . it's really fun. There's a lot of fun people there
and it's fun to dance and stuff . but we . we haven't gotten in for or gone
for awhile but . . Darla she has a job now so she work . she will be
working probably . till later so we probably won't DO. We probably won't
go dancing for awhile until like school starts or something maybe . I
don't know.

A number of generalizations can be drawn from the naturalistic sample.
None of the examples contains *doing* as the form of the propredicate. This
seems to be in line with the previous studies, none of which reported the
propredicate in the present participle. The sample does, however, contain
examples of both *do* and *done,* although *done* is more common.

The sample also suggests some demographic trends. Although the diary
sample shows that both males and females produce pro-*do,* there are no
clear examples from males in the interview context. Fourteen of the 16
people represented in the sample were middle-aged or older. Related
observations on the sex and age of those who produce utterances with pro-
*do* were made by an anonymous student in her early twenties during one of
my guest lectures on Utah English. She explained that she had heard pro-

Intermountain Language Survey Speakers Using Pro-*do*

| Speaker | Age (in 1986) | Native of | Reported English Ancestor |
|---------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| 543 | 75 | Woodruff, UT | Paternal grandmother |
| 133B | 72 | Peoa, UT | Paternal grandfather |
| 183A | 55 (approx.) | Salt Lake City | None |
| 402 | 39 | Park City, UT | None |
| 122 | 38 | Salt Lake Valley | Maternal great-grandfather |
| 61 | 16 | Salt Lake Valley | No information |

*do* sentences, but she would never use them because they sounded like something her mother would say. Others in the class agreed.

Of the people whose affiliation I know, all were active Mormons or descendents of Mormon families. Half of the ILS speakers had an English ancestor. Some individual preference may also enter into the use of pro-*do*. Two ILS participants, 133B and 183A, produced six of the ten examples in the interviews. The others produced one each.

Finally, with the exception of 183A, the ILS speakers who produced a pro-*do* utterance had interviews of more than an hour in length. This is noteworthy in a sample in which only 34% of the interviews were over an hour in length. Thus, these speakers were more talkative than the majority of those who participated in the ILS. There are two possible links between the use of the pro-*do* and the longer interviews. The first is that talking longer may have given participants more opportunities to use these propredicates. Alternatively, longer interviews may indicate that informants were more at ease and pro-*do* is a mark of casual style.

The fact that even ten unambiguous examples appear in the interview data suggests that they are part of the common everyday speech of at least part of the population of the Salt Lake Valley. This is a strong possibility given the previous work in syntactic regionalisms. For example, in a previous study in Texas, I found only nine spontaneous double modals in 62 tape-recorded interviews of about an hour in length. In spite of the limited number of double modals during the interviews, the other naturalistic data I collected indicates that double modals are quite common in everyday speech when the pragmatic constraints are met.[6] For example, I collected eight double modal utterances from participants or potential participants in the study during short bits of conversations while we were engaged in making arrangements on the telephone or during greetings and leave-takings, most of which were produced off tape. Similarly, the paucity of propredicates in the ILS interviews might be explained by the pragmatics if we knew what those constraints were.

Finally, I have heard speakers from other parts of the Mormon Dominance areas using propredicate *do*. (Unfortunately, this occurred before I began to note all of the utterances.) In particular, they were especially prevalent in the speech of a young, educated female from rural southeastern Idaho, with whom I worked several years ago. In her speech, the propredicate may have been almost categorical. Interestingly, she did not seem to be consciously aware of them, and she did not know that Americans from other areas did not use this construction in independent clauses.

## MIGRATION HISTORY

In order to understand how pro-*do* can be found in England and Utah, two areas so geographically separated from one another, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the migration history of the Mormons. The LDS church had its official beginning in 1830. The areas from which the early members were recruited tended to be areas of heavily English ancestry (Meinig 1965; May 1980; and Allen and Turner 1988). Arriving in Utah beginning in 1847, Mormons were first recorded in a United States census there in 1850. At that time, 17% of the reported Utah population was foreign-born, which represents almost one in six of the original population of the Mormon nucleus (US Census 1850). Of this number, 53% were English, 18% were Scottish or Welsh, and 17% were from British America. Given the historical records of very active Mormon missions in Canada, it seems likely that the large majority of British-American foreign-born were English-speaking Canadian in origin. Combining these three populations gives a total of 88% of Utah foreign-born who had their origins in English-speaking, British-governed populations. In the United States as a whole in 1850, 11% of the total population was foreign-born. Of the foreign-born, 12.6% were English, 6.7% British American, and 4.5% Scottish or Welsh.

At the beginnings of Utah's settlement the English foreign-born community comprised 9.3% of the total population. Additionally, the English were numerically dominant, as they were then politically dominant in the British Empire, in a larger foreign English-speaking community which contributed an additional 6.1% of the total Utah population.[7] Thus, 15.4% of the total population of Utah in 1850 were foreign-born English speakers. This strong presence of English foreign-born takes on additional significance given the large role played by the original settlers in populating the Intermountain area and in defining its distinctive culture.

The census of 1890 records the wave of European immigration in the second half of the nineteenth century and testifies once again to the strength of English foreign-born in Mormon-dominant areas of the West.

While the English foreign-born made up only 1.5% of the total United States population in 1890, they comprised 10% of the Utah population (US Census 1890).

In 1890 the position of the nineteenth-century English immigrant community should have been very strong. After having provided 9.3% of the initial population of the state, they contributed another 10% of the total population through English foreign-born in the next forty years of extremely rapid population growth. The group tracing English ethnicity only through nineteenth-century arrivals would have been larger than any other ethnic group and substantially larger than any except Scandinavian. An ethnic group of this size, in relation to other foreign-born and to the total population, with a long history in the community, and speaking the same language, would be expected to have a significant impact on the culture of the area where they resided.

The census of 1920 is the next reference point. This allows us to examine the final period of substantial but declining English and western European immigration, which is also the opening period of dominant southern and eastern European immigration to the United States. Furthermore, 1920 probably marks the beginning of the expansion of the pro-*do* in England (see Butters 1983). By 1920 English foreign-born represented only 3.3% of the total Utah population and 0.8% of the total United States population (US Census 1920). What is more telling in the 1920 population data is the Foreign White Stock count, defined as whites who were foreign-born or who had at least one parent who was foreign-born. The census data show English Foreign White Stock to constitute 14.3% of the population of Utah, substantially more than the 2.2% of English Foreign White Stock in the United States as a whole. Added to this would be the grandchildren of the nineteenth-century English foreign born who constitute 9.3% of the total Utah population of 1850. A population of this size, with continuing immigration and a strong relative standing among ethnic communities, may be expected to have had a great impact on the general culture.

The trend of a continuing cultural affinity for English born in Utah continues through the census of 1980 (US Census 1980b), which shows that the Utah English percentage of total foreign-born is 224.0% of English foreign-born nationally. The number of English foreign-born in 1980 would not have a major cultural impact in isolation, making up only 0.24% of the total population. However, given the majority English ancestry population in Utah and its relatively recent origins, this continuing recruitment from the mother country represents an important cultural connection through which elements of English culture could continue to be transmitted.

The ethnic identity question of the 1980 census provides another way to measure the strength of English ancestry in Utah.[8] For this study, I will make use of the single-ancestry figures because, as Allen and Turner (1988) argue, single-ancestry data is preferable for comparison of relatively important groups and is to be prefered generally in a study in which the emphasis is on comparison of group size between geographic areas.[9] Only 20% of the United States population reports English as their single ancestry as compared to 56.1% of Utahns (US Census 1980c; Allen and Turner 1988). Thus, Utah English single ancestry is 280.2% of the figure for the entire United States as a whole. Furthermore, the responses to the ethnicity question show that Utah is unique in its geographical region as well as in the country as a whole. Utah also reported 280% more English single ancestry than the Mountain Division and 343.5% more than the Western Region.[10] The next highest single-ancestry identification for Utah is Scandinavian, at 8.7%.

As a trade area, a large city and its commercially dependent region, the Mormon Dominance area is undoubtedly one of the most English regions in the nation. An examination of the map of Allen and Turner's (1988, 41) single-ancestry data suggests that several trade areas of the Upper South and portions of northern Maine are the only areas of comparable English ethnicity. Moreover, in their analysis Allen and Turner confirm that, of the areas of high English ethnicity in 1980, only the Mormon region's is attributable to nineteenth-century immigrants. The others preserve their English character from the colonial period, long before the spread of pro-*do*.

Allen and Turner (1988, 39–42) go on to stress the connection between English ethnicity and Mormon religion. They attribute the prevalence of English ancestry among Mormons both to the faith's origins in areas of high English ancestry in the United States and to direct immigration from England. They say that English foreign-born predominate over most of the region where Mormons were the earliest white settlers.

In spite of this observed connection between the LDS religion and English ethnicity, historians generally consider the English immigrants to the United States in the nineteenth century to be the "lost ethnic group" in the story of American immigration. Archdeacon (1983, 52) gives a good summary of this view when he says, "The men and women who left England, Scotland, and Wales to come to the United States in the last decades of the nineteenth century are for several reasons the forgotten immigrants of American history." (See also Erickson 1980, 336.) While the English were one of the four major populations of the great immigrant movement of this period, they assimilated so quickly into the general culture that specific

examples of their ethnic identity and contributions are hard to discover. One important factor in this rapid assimilation is the incomplete structure and short life of geographically-defined English ethnic communities.

Even scholars of the ethnicity of the Mormon Dominance area argue that the primary cultural influence of the area is not English but Mormon.[11] As May puts it (1980, 723; see also Meinig 1965):

Rapid assimilation of ethnic groups entering the Mormon Zion has led to considerable uniformity in cultural expression. European immigrants were not moving out of their old life into relative freedom, as happened elsewhere in the American West, but rather into tightly structured, hierarchical, closely knit villages where pressures to conform were great. . . . During the 19th century, European converts to Mormonism were expected to leave their homeland and go to Deseret, where they were utterly dependent on the Utah church leaders for both temporal and spiritual guidance. Under these circumstances the immigrants rapidly assimilated and use of their native languages soon died out.

A key word in this passage is "languages." The other immigrant languages may have died out, although some persisted even in religious services until the latter part of this century, but English, of course, did not. Particular features of the English of English immigrants could have easily, but unconsiously, surfaced in the region as Mormon English. This development may have been spurred on because of the LDS Church members' need to show their separation. It is clear in May (1980) that Church leaders were interested in developing clear outward markers of their separate cultural influence as early as the mid-nineteenth century. Among the failed Church-sponsored ethnic markers reported in May were the Deseret alphabet and a Mormon standard for women's clothing. (It is not clear whether either had a historical basis in the culture.) When polygamy failed as well, a religiously dominated social life and the prohibition against the use of alcohol and tobacco helped to maintain a Mormon ethnic identity.

In terms of Giles (1979), the Mormons as an ethnic group do not have HARD nonlinguistic boundaries. Their general appearance is that of northwestern Europeans. Their outward dress does not generally call attention. Similarly, they do not have hard linguistic boundaries. They were encouraged to abandon their non-English languages to show allegiance to their new Mormon identity. Thus, they are prime candidates to develop SOFT linguistic ethnic markers in the form of variants of English that are not commonly found or not found to the same extent in the English spoken by others in the United States. The English of immigrants from England provided a ready source of such variants. Therefore, the current geographic and ethnoreligious distribution of the pro-*do* in the United States may be a result of the LDS community's need to develop linguistic bound-

aries coupled with the opportunity provided by immigrant English dialect variants which were not as readily available to neighboring non-Mormons. Interestingly, then, in forging a new ethnic identity, the Mormons may be the only group in the United States that preserved ethnic markers of the "forgotton immigrants" from England.

If pro-*do* is a SOFT linguistic ethnic marker, it is predicted that Mormons from the Mormon Dominance area would be more likely to recognize pro-*do* as a feature of their own speech than non-Mormons would. Likewise, more conservative and more culturally isolated Mormons are predicted to be more positively inclined towards pro-*do*. Fundamentalist Mormons (PLDS) are such a group. The evidence from the usage survey on pro-*do*, discussed below, supports these hypotheses.

The PLDS research site for testing the hypothesis was Colorado City, Arizona, a community whose present population is a direct result of the official end of polygamy among mainstream LDS. In the late nineteenth century, polygamy became the primary focus of the anti-Mormon movement. In 1890, the president of the LDS Church, Wilford Woodruff, issued what has come to be called "the Manifesto," a document advising the Saints not to contract any marriages forbidden by the laws of the land where they reside. The document was written with the stated interest of saving the church from being destroyed by the United States government. This break with the previous tradition did not relieve all the pressures on the church, however, because the Manifesto did not renounce polygamy. Some Mormons continued to secretly contract polygamous marriages, and at least some of these marriages were solemnized. The issue finally came to a head in 1904 when it appeared that the United States Senate might prohibit Utah Senator Reed Smoot from being seated on the grounds that he sanctioned polygamy, a felonious act. During the Smoot Hearings, the LDS president, Joseph F. Smith, a nephew of the LDS founder, issued the Second Manifesto, which stongly prohibited the solemnization of polygamous marriages by Mormons anywhere in the world (May 1987).

Founded in 1913 (under the name Short Creek), Colorado City is located 400 miles from its county seat of Kingman, Mohave County, Arizona, but only 28 miles from Hurricane, Utah—a strategic geographic position which was recognized by polygamists as an ideal refuge. In 1935, they organized to make the town "the first city of the Millenium." Although the polygamists were persecuted by the legal authorites in Arizona up to the Short Creek raid of 1953, an estimated 30,000 PLDS remain in the western United States and about 3,000 of these are led by the Colorado City community (Van Wagoner 1986). Although the 1980 US Census (1980a) does not report figures for Colorado City, it probably contains most of the non-Indian population for Mohave North division, which is reported as 1,786.

## Usage Survey: Methods

To test the hypotheses concerning pro-*do* as a marker of Mormon ethnicity, questionnaire data were collected on pro-*do* usage. Two main versions of the questionnaire were used. Questionnaire 1 was written by Norma Barlow Richter, a native of Colorado City, as part of a class project at the University of Utah. Richter administered the questionnaire in a school in her home community. Her data will be designated the PLDS data.

The subjects consisted of 189 13- to 18-year-olds and three of their teachers. In this sample, there are 97 males and 95 females. Questionnaire 1 consisted of six questions, three of which pertained to pro-*do* (i–iii). The other three items were meant to assess the acceptability of the form of the complement of the verb *need,* the focus of Richter's study.

     i. I don't know if Martha saw it. She may _____.
       (a) have done (b) have seen it (c) have
       _____ 1. most often
       _____ 2. sometimes
       _____ 3. least often or not at all
    ii. I wonder if they made that book into a movie. They may _____.
       (a) have made one (b) have (c) have done
       _____ 1. most often
       _____ 2. sometimes
       _____ 3. least often or not at all
   iii. I don't believe Bill did his homework last night, but he _____.
       (a) could have (b) could have done (c) could have done it (d) could'a done
       _____ 1. most often
       _____ 2. sometimes
       _____ 3. least often
       _____ 4. not at all

The informants responded by writing the letter of the choice they made into the space beside the rating. This is an unusual layout for this type of questionnaire, and some of the respondents in a University class used for a pilot study found it frustrating to perform a ranking task and instead attempted to rate the various phrases. The result was that some of these people used the same ranking for more than one choice. It is also problematic that "least often" and "not at all" are not separated for the first two questions. In spite of these problems, the questionnaire provides useful data.

In order to determine the wider distribution of pro-*do* in the Mormon Dominance area, I used Questionnaire 1 to collect comparable data from students in an introductory linguistics course at the University of Utah. Half of the participants in each class of the course were given Questionnaire 1. The other half were asked to respond to Questionnaire 2, designed

to check for finer distinctions between subsamples. This version presented the items in a more standard format using a scale of "1" to "7"—"1" indicating "always use it" and "7" indicating "never use it." The pro-*do* items from Questionnaire 2 are presented in (iv–vi). The participants were instructed to indicate how often they thought that they would use each target sentence or clause in the given context. They were told to use the scale and that any of the numbers on the scale could be used more than once.

   iv.  I don't know if Martha saw it.      (a) She may have done.            _____
                                            (b) She may have seen it.         _____
                                            (c) She may have.                 _____
    v.  I wonder if they made that book into a movie.
                                            (a) They may have made one. _____
                                            (b) They may have.                _____
                                            (c) They may have done.           _____
   vi.  I don't believe Bill did his homework last night,
                                            (a) but he could have.            _____
                                            (b) but he could have done.       _____
                                            (c) but he could have done it. _____
                                            (d) but he coulda done.           _____

   All participants in the study were told that the questionnaire they were given was a usage survey, not an English test, and they were to respond according to what they would use in everyday speech with their friends and family.

   The student volunteers at the University of Utah also filled out a demographic questionnaire. Because the first versions of these questionnaires neglected to ask for the participants' sex, the data lacks this information for 80 respondents, making the use of sex as a between-subject factor problematic. Also because of the lack of overlapping age ranges in the Colorado City and the University samples, it was not possible to use age as a between-subject factor without confounding age and religion.

   The University participants were also asked what religious group, if any, they were a member of and how often they participated in religious services. On the basis of these questions, three religious groups were defined for inclusion in the analysis of Questionnaire 1: the PLDS (all from Colorado City), the LDS, and Other. "Other" included those who wrote down a religious affiliation other than LDS and those who declared themselves not to have any affiliation. It excluded those who did not write any response to the question. (A lack of response was coded as "missing data.") This was done because it appeared that some who did not respond assumed that the default category was LDS. The evidence for this is that many who did not respond to the affiliation question nonetheless reported that they

attended church "quite often." No University participant claimed PLDS as their religious affiliation.

Two other questions on the demographic questionnaire served to exclude subjects from the data analysis. The first was a question asking whether the respondents had begun to speak English before the age of 5. If they had not, their responses were excluded from the data analysis. The second, a question on current and previous residences of the participants, was used to exclude those who were not natives of the Mormon Dominance area. A total of 127 individuals' responses were included for the analysis of Questionnaire 1, and 129 for Questionnaire 2.

## USAGE SURVEY: RESULTS

One-way ANOVAs were performed with religion as the between-subject factor, the factor distinguishing the three groups, and the four pro-*do* choices listed in tables 2 and 3 as the within-subjects factors.[12] The means for the religious groups show that some individuals from each religious group of the Mormon Dominance area report using pro-*do* at least sometimes. More interestingly, the results of the ANOVAs shown in table 2 reveal that religion made a significant difference in the responses to three of the four pro-*do* phrases on Questionnaire 1, although (ii.c) is significant at a lower level than the others.

### TABLE 2
### ANOVA Results for Questionnaire 1

| | | *Means* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Item* | | *PLDS* | *LDS* | *Other* | *F* | *p =* |
| i.a. | *She may have done.* | 2.69 | 2.88 | 2.91 | (2,276) = 4.541 | .011 |
| ii.c. | *They may have done.* | 2.43 | 2.63 | 2.65 | (2,276) = 2.876 | .058 |
| iii.b. | *he could have done.* | 2.80 | 3.00 | 2.87 | (2,276) = 1.521 | .220 (n.s.) |
| iii.d. | *he coulda done.* | 3.33 | 3.82 | 3.96 | (2,276) = 12.016 | .000 |
| N | | 189 | 67 | 23 | | |

### TABLE 3
### ANOVA Results for Questionnaire 2

| | | *Means* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Item* | | *LDS* | *Other* | *F* | *p =* |
| iv.a. | *She may have done.* | 6.44 | 6.88 | (1,85) = 3.943 | .050 |
| v.c. | *They may have done.* | 5.71 | 6.48 | (1,85) = 4.608 | .035 |
| vi.b. | *he could have done.* | 5.76 | 6.08 | (1,85) = 0.796 | .375 (n.s.) |
| vi.d. | *he coulda done.* | 6.40 | 6.52 | (1,85) = 0.160 | .690 (n.s.) |
| N | | 62 | 25 | | |

Post-hoc tests (Scheffé's) show that the PLDS members who answered
Questionnaire 1 were involved in every pairing which showed a significant
difference. In every one of these pairings, they were significantly more
likely than members of the other groups to report that the pro-*do* choice
occurred in their own speech.[13] The Scheffé's tests show that on (i.a) the
PLDS differed from the LDS at the p < .05 level. The PLDS also differed
from the LDS on (ii.c) but at the nonsignificant p < .10 level. On the final
item showing a significant difference, *he coulda done,* the PLDS differed
from both the LDS and Other religious group at the p < .05 level, although
the two latter groups did not differ from each other.

Although the LDS and the Other participants did not differ on any
dimension on Questionnaire 1, the data from Questionnaire 2 show signifi-
cant differences between these two religious groups as well, as shown in
table 3. The analysis of the pro-*do* items from the second questionnaire with
a finer grained, 7-point scale shows that the LDS members were more likely
than members of Other religious groups to find (iv.a) and (v.c) to be
characteristic of their own speech.

CONCLUSIONS

The naturalistic evidence shows that pro-*do* occurs in at least one dialect
of American English, that of the Mormon Dominance area of the Inter-
mountain West. There is also some evidence that it may be marginal in the
Salt Lake Valley among younger speakers. However, the findings from the
usage questionnaire show that Mormons, especially the culturally-isolated
Fundamentalist Mormons, are more likely than are people claiming non-
Mormon religious affiliations to think of pro-*do* as a characteristic of their
speech. Thus, pro-*do* may still serve as a marker of Mormon ethnicity in
spite of its marginal status in some parts of the Dominance area. Interest-
ingly, very few nonlexical variables have been shown to be religiously based
in the United States. Some exceptions are those discussed in Labov (1972),
Hinton et al. (1977), and Laferriere (1979) for Jewish-American English
(reviewed in Di Paolo and Salmons 1982).

The migration history clearly indicates that the relatively strong and
continuous contacts with the English of English immigrants from 1850 to
the present brought pro-*do* into Intermountain English. Given this history,
it is not as surprising that some feature of the immigrant English may occur
in the Mormon Dominance area as that the current English of the area
sounds very much like other varieties of Western American English. Per-
haps the explanation may be related to the LDS teachings which hold
America, and the American West, in particular, as theologically important.

In any case, there are a few more linguistic variables found in the English of England that may also be serving as Mormon ethnic markers. Some lexical possibilities are *amongst* and *elastic* 'rubberband'. Modern transatlantic English may also have contributed to the laxing of tense vowels before /l/ in Utah English. The variables, discussed in Wells (1982, 313–17) and shown in Orton, Sanderson, and Widdowson (1978), are reminiscent of those found in Utah speech today[14] (Di Paolo 1988 and Di Paolo and Faber 1990). Transatlantic English may have also contributed to variable postvocalic /l/-vocalization and /l/-loss in current Utah English. Also, students here insist on unflapped intervocalic /t/ more often than would be expected from speakers of American English.

This study also provides further evidence that the expanded use of the propredicate in common speech did not occur until after the colonial period. If it had, it would be expected that the other areas of the United States with a strong colonial English population would also have pro-*do*. As it is, the only cisatlantic English variety with pro-*do* may be in the Mormon Dominance area, the only area with a concentrated post-colonial English population.

This study also raises the question of drift. How long before a change takes place is the stage set for the change? Did the much larger group of nineteenth-century English converts already have the beginnings of the expanded use of pro-*do* in their language, or was it introduced by the relatively smaller group of immigrants after the 1920s, when it apparently first came into vogue in English (Butters 1983)? Fortunately, because of the Mormon tradition of keeping diaries and passing them on as family records, there may actually be data available to answer these questions.

## NOTES

I would like to thank Kenneth Ranson and Kelly Magnussmon for research assistance on this project; Ray Freeze, Carol Georgopoulos, David Iannucci, Susan McKay, and Wick Miller for allowing me to conduct the usage survey in their classes; and Norma Barlow Richter for the use of the data from her usage survey of Colorado City, Arizona.

1. In these constructions, *do* stands in place of an entire predicate, hence it is a "pro-form."

2. The following notational conventions will be used in sentences from the naturalistic sample throughout this work:

> . = A pause of one second or less in duration. Each additional period indicates a second of silence.
> [ ] = Material in brackets is my interpolation into what was actually said in order to clarify the text.

( ) = Material in parentheses within the quoted material is a supposition (either mine or the person's who reported the piece of data to me) as to what was actually said since some of the data was lost, due either to a poor recording or to poor memory.
Material in brackets after the quoted material indicates the speaker (e.g., #53A), tape number and place on tape (147A; 24.31), reporter, and/or type of record made.
Parentheses surrounding a blank indicate that something indecipherable was said.
E = The interviewer.
The relevant forms of do are set in small caps merely to aid the reader to locate the pro-form, not to indicate stress.

3. The Mormon Dominance area for this study includes those counties in which the LDS make up 50% or more of the reported church membership as shown on the map of Christian Denominations of National Geographic Society (1988, 58).

4. According to Van Wagoner (1986) polygamists prefer to call themselves Fundamentalist Mormons.

5. The following may also be a pro-*do* example.

> E: Are you doing your geneology?
> 242: We have DONE some. [chuckles:] We're not very good at it. [#242.1, 062A; 24.02]

Although this utterance has higher stress on the auxiliary *have* than on *done*, making it likely to be a pro-*do* example, the following *some* is problematic. If *some* is the direct object of the sentence, this is not an example. Since pro-*do* replaces the entire predicate, it cannot have a surface direct object. *Some* has high stress and rising intonation and may be an adverbial meaning 'to some extent'. If it is an adverbial, then the construction is probably a Pro-*do*. It would not be surprising if this speaker, a 52-year-old male, used pro-*do*, since his paternal grandparents immigrated from England in the 1910s. He appears to have had extensive contact with his grandmother, recalling that she not only dropped /h/'s but also had intrusive /h/.

6. Di Paolo (1989, 198) presents a brief discussion of this issue. See Mishoe and Montgomery (forthcoming) for a more thorough treatment of the repercussions of the pragmatics of multiple modals on their frequency of occurrence.

7. The Scottish and Welsh made up 3.1% of the total population and the British Americans another 3.0%.

8. This question was asked only on the long form, except in the case of Hispanic ethnicity.

9. Single ancestry refers to those who report only one ethnic identity.

10. The Mountain Division is made up of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah. The Western Region includes these same states as well as those from the Pacific Division—California, Oregon, and Washington. For the purposes of this comparison, the contribution of Utah was omitted in calculating the figures for the regions.

11. The motivation for forging a new, separate ethnicity may be a response to the LDS religious teachings concerning the leadership role that church members are expected to play in the millenial reign. In keeping separate from others, they can better prepare themselves for the future.

12.  The ANOVA statistic or Analysis of Variance performs a comparison of the variability within each group around the group mean with the variability around the group means. The results are expressed in a number called the *F* statistic which can be interpreted as the probability that the differences were due to chance alone. For example, if variation within the PLDS, LDS, and the Other group is not substantial but variation between the PLDS, LDS, and the Other group is substantial, then the probability that the group means are equal is quite low. Therefore, we can conclude that the group means are significantly different. The ANOVA procedure is preferable to a series of individual t-tests performed on the same data set because it is less likely to err in the direction of significance when a pair of means are not significantly different (Norŭsis 1990, 198–203).

13.  Once an ANOVA establishes that the differences between three or more group means are significantly different, post hoc tests or multiple comparison procedures are used to pinpoint which of the pairs of group means that were entered into the ANOVA are significantly different from one another. The post-hoc test used in this study, Scheffé's, is a conservative method for the pairwise comparison of means (Norŭsis 1990, 198–203).

14.  In Orton, Sanderson, and Widdowson (1978) see, for example, the data for Southern England and the Midlands shown on the maps of *tail*, Ph165a and b.

REFERENCES

Allen, James Paul, and Eugene James Turner. 1988. *We the People: An Atlas of America's Ethnic Diversity.* New York: Macmillan.

Archdeacon, Thomas J. 1983. *Becoming American: An Ethnic History.* New York: Free.

Butters, Ronald R. 1983. "Syntactic Change in British English Propredicates." *Journal of English Linguistics* 16: 1–6.

————. 1989. "Cisatlantic *have done.*" *American Speech* 64: 96.

Di Paolo, Marianna. 1988. "Pronunciation and Categorization in Sound Change." *Linguistic Change & Contact: Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation in Language.* Eds. K. Ferrara, B. Brown, K. Walters, and J. Baugh. Austin, TX: Texas Linguistic Forum 30: 84–92.

————. 1989. "Double Modals as Single Lexical Items." *American Speech* 64:195–224.

Di Paolo, Marianna, and Alice Faber. 1990. "Phonation Differences and the Phonetic Content of the Tense-Lax Contrast in Utah English." *Language Variation and Change* 2: 155–204.

Di Paolo, Marianna, and Joseph C. Salmons. 1982. "Ethnic Identity and Jewish-American Language Choice." SCMLA. 28 Oct.

Erickson, Charlotte J. 1980. "English." *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups.* Ed. Stephan Thernstrom. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Giles, Howard. 1979. "Ethnicity Markers in Speech." *Social Markers in Speech.* Eds. K.R. Scherer and H. Giles. New York: Cambridge UP, 251–89.

Hinton, Leanne, with Martha Satz, Shirley Steele, and Dale Cooper. 1977. Paper presented at LASSO Conference. Baton Rouge, LA.

Joos, Martin. 1964. *The English Verb: Form and Meaning.* Madison: U of Wisconsin P.

Kato, Kazuo, and Ronald R. Butters. 1987. "American Instances of Propredicate
    Do." *Journal of English Linguistics* 20: 212–16.
Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P.
Laferriere, Martha. 1979. "Ethnicity in Phonological Variation and Change."
    *Language* 55: 603–17.
May, Dean L. 1980. "Mormons." *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Ed.
    Stephan Thernstrom. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
———. 1987. *Utah: A People's History*. Salt Lake City: U of Utah P.
Meinig, D.W. 1965. "The Mormon Culture Region: Strategies and Patterns in the
    Geography of the American West, 1847–1964." *Annals of the Association of
    American Geographers* 55: 191–220.
Mishoe, Margaret, and Michael Montgomery. Forthcoming. "The Pragmatics of
    Multiple Modal Variation in North and South Carolina." *American Speech*.
National Geographic Society. 1988. *Historical Atlas of the United States*. Washington:
    National Geographic Society.
Norušis, Marija J. 1990. *SPSS® Introductory Statistics Student Guide*. Chicago: SPSS
    Inc.
Orton, Harold, Stewart Sanderson, and John Widdowson. 1978. *The Linguistic Atlas
    of England*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities.
United States Bureau of the Census. 1850. *7th Census*. Final Volume. Washington:
    GPO.
———. 1890. *11th Census*. Vol. I, Part I, Report on Population. Reprinted in
    *Congressional Serial Set*. Vol. 3018. Washington: GPO.
———. 1920. *14th Census*. Vol. III, Population. Washington: GPO.
———. 1980a. *20th Census*. Vol. I, Chap. A, Part 4. Washington: GPO.
———. 1980b. *20th Census*. Vol. I, Chap. C, Part 1. Washington: GPO.
———. 1980c. *20th Census*. Supplementary Report S-10, Ancestry of the Popula-
    tion. Washington: GPO
Van Wagoner, Richard S. 1986. *Mormon Polygamy: A History*. Salt Lake City: Signa-
    ture.
Wells, J. C. 1982. *Accents of English*. Vol. 2: *The British Isles*. New York: Cambridge
    UP.