

4. “DO I SOUND LIKE A VALLEY GIRL TO YOU?” PERCEPTUAL DIALECTOLOGY AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES IN CALIFORNIA

DAN VILLARREAL

AS THE CHAPTERS in this volume demonstrate, vowel features play an important role in sociolinguists’ understanding of California as a unique dialect region of Western U.S. English. However, this research leaves open the question of whether California vowels matter as much to speakers of California English as they do to sociolinguists; that is, how do vowels play a role in Californians’ linguistic self-perceptions? The present study aims to address this question through the lens of folk linguistics by using a dialect recognition task (Williams, Garrett, and Coupland 1999).

FOLK LINGUISTICS AND PERCEPTUAL DIALECTOLOGY

The object of study in folk linguistics is nonlinguists’ responses to language, whether in the form of overt commentary or unconscious reactions. Of particular importance to this study is the subfield of perceptual dialectology, which seeks to understand speakers’ mental maps of linguistic variation over geographical spaces (Preston 1996). One method for eliciting these mental maps is simply to ask for them directly by giving respondents a map of a region (e.g., the United States, Ohio) and asking them to indicate where people speak differently. The results of these map-drawing tasks reveal not only where respondents find regional speech to be salient, but also attitudes toward these regions. One North Carolinian respondent, for example, labeled a portion of the Northeastern United States “Boston & New York & New Jersey: fast & rude” (Preston 1996, 308). These attitudes are rarely presented in ways that are coherent with the phrasing of linguistic description, but they nevertheless indicate the shape of folk-linguistic belief. Such is true of a Chicagoan’s label for California: “High Class partying Slobs & Stuck up sound” (Preston 1996, 307). While a “stuck up sound,” of course, has no inherent linguistic reality, to this particular Chicagoan it

is sufficiently self-evident to function as a linguistic descriptor that his audience is assumed to readily recognize.

Other perceptual dialectology methodologies utilize auditory stimuli to investigate the relationship between variation and perception of speaker region. Plichta and Preston (2005) found that listeners from Michigan and Indiana were able to distinguish BITE tokens on a fine-grained continuum between monophthongal [a] and diphthongal [aɪ], attributing more monophthongal tokens to more Southern speakers. Such sensitivity to fine phonetic detail may be surprising in light of the relatively crude, under-detailed labels found on hand-drawn maps (e.g., “Potatoe Land” for Idaho [Preston 1996, 308]); as Plichta and Preston suggest, however, distinctive features may be perceptually available to listeners even in the absence of overt folk-linguistic commentary.

Finally, perceptual dialectology studies have demonstrated the usefulness of comparing how dialects are perceived by both IN-GROUP members (speakers of that dialect) and OUT-GROUP members (speakers not of that dialect). Allbritten (2011, 186), for example, found that perceptions of Southernness and rurality strengthened with an increase in Southern features, indicating that rurality is connected to the notion “sounding Southern.” Not all features created this effect uniformly, however; while (ing) did not affect Southerners’ perceptions, non-Southerners perceived [ɪn] samples significantly more Southern than [ɪŋ] samples. Whereas [ɪn] plays into non-Southerners’ percepts of Southern speech, Southerners do not necessarily view themselves as [ɪn] users. In other words, with respect to (ing), Southerners (in-group perceivers) have a different notion of “sounding Southern” than do non-Southerners (out-group perceivers). This is a finding quite relevant in California since, as I will discuss shortly, in-group and out-group perceptions of California English differ in substantial ways.

FOLK LINGUISTICS OF CALIFORNIA. Similar to the South, California is another region for which the folk-linguistic beliefs of out-group perceivers (i.e., non-Californians) are rather different than those of in-group perceivers. In short, non-Californians align California speech with persistent cultural tropes that index Southern California, whereas Californians identify greater distinctions within the state and de-emphasize these tropes. Seventeen percent of the Michigan respondents surveyed by Preston (1996, 305) identified a California speech region on hand-drawn maps. Labels for the state included “not so much a diff[erent] lang[uage] but completly diff words: totally rad etc.” (310), “Fer-Sher [for sure] Valley People” (308), and (for a small area roughly west of Fresno) “valley girl” (307). The latter two labels apparently respond to the “Valley Girl” stereotype popularized by Frank

Zappa's popular 1982 song of the same name ("Valley" referring to the suburban San Fernando Valley north of Los Angeles).

A limited amount of perceptual dialectology research has investigated Californians' perceptions. Fought (2002) found that Californian students do not share Michiganders' notion of Upper Midwestern speech as "standard"—indeed, Fought's data call into question whether Californians share even the same underlying schema of "standardness" as Michiganders. Whereas New England states were more likely to be labeled "proper English," Western states (especially California) were more likely to be labeled "good/better/best English." Fought attributes this apparent contradiction to Californians' acknowledgment of marked speech within the state but overall linguistic security: "Californians seem to see their own speech in a fairly positive light, as natural and relaxed, but with its positive value tempered by the idea that it is also not 'accurate' speech in some sense, and that it reflects the negative aspects of the surfers and the Valley girls" (132).

Bucholtz et al. (2007) restrict their analytic scope to California, collecting Californian students' hand-drawn maps of the state itself. Many maps included a north/south division, which typically surfaced as an opposition between the state's two most populous regions: the San Francisco Bay Area and the Los Angeles area. This distinction often rested on the intensifier/quantifier *hella*, reported to be far more prevalent in the Bay Area and often derided by nonusers, but linguistic features otherwise received rather little overt comment. Chinese and "Diverse" also featured prominently in the Bay Area, and few dialects of English received particular mention (other than "Ebonics" in Los Angeles and "Spanglish" inland and in San Diego). Folk-linguistic labels also included "surfers" and "Valley girls" in Southern California, but most frequently mentioned was "hicks"—a stereotype of California speech that is not well known outside the state—in the least populous parts of the state: Northern California and inland. These regions were also subject to substantial erasure (Irvine and Gal 2000): "*Almost no one lives here; Does Anyone Live Out Here?; No man's land; Nothing—oppression, ennui, desert; and DEATH VALLEY (NO ONE SPEAKS)*" (Bucholtz et al. 2007, 338). In general, Californians' perceptions of California speech appear to hinge more on social differences than simply sociolinguistic or geographic differences.

DIALECT RECOGNITION. In Williams, Garrett, and Coupland's (1999) original study of dialect recognition, adolescent listeners in six regions of Wales were asked to rate speakers from each region on affective scales (e.g., likability, "Welshness") and guess speakers' regional origin.

The overall rate at which listeners accurately recognized speakers' regions was roughly 25%, but some speakers were accurately recognized at a far higher or lower rate. (Here and below, I use ACCURATE RECOGNITION to refer to correctly identifying a speaker's region of origin.) The authors' analysis of likability ratings helps to explain this variation in accurate-recognition rates, as the speakers who were rated most likable were also more likely to be identified as belonging to a listener's in-group (whether or not this was actually true). Cardiff listeners, for example, found Northwest speaker 2 more likable than Northwest speaker 1 and misidentified Northwest speaker 2 (but not Northwest speaker 1) as a Cardiffian. From this pattern, the authors find evidence for a social-psychological CLAIMING effect, with individuals grouping themselves with those they find desirable (356).

In pairing regional identification with affective scales, this type of task demonstrates that dialect recognition is a sociolinguistic process rather than a purely phonetic process; that is, when listeners make a judgment on where a speaker is from, they are not simply matching the speaker to preexisting acoustic templates of regional speech, but they are also drawing on their attitudes toward certain regions, including their own region. The present study uses a similar task to investigate attitudes toward vowel variation in California English, as well as which attributes are claimed by Californians as marking their regional in-group.

VOWEL VARIATION IN CALIFORNIA ENGLISH

The two phonetic innovations that are most associated with California English are the low back vowel merger, a general feature of Western dialects (Labov, Ash, and Boberg 2006), and the so-called California Vowel Shift (CVS) (Eckert 2008; Holland 2014). In short, the vowel features associated with what has often been referred to as the CVS involve mid and high back vowels fronting, mid and high front short vowels lowering and retracting, and a nasal split for BAT such that it raises and fronts prenasally (BAN) but retracts elsewhere. Kennedy and Grama's (2012) more recent study found that BOOT has fronted extensively, overlapping in F2 with BAT and BET. Another possible feature of California English is prelateral mergers between tense/lax pairs, such as *pool-pull*, *hole-hull*, and *pull-hole* (Guenther 2000; Holland 2014); Labov, Ash, and Boberg (2006, 285–86) mentions these mergers as a possible Western feature, which accords with studies finding these mergers in the Mountain West (e.g., in Utah [Baker and Bowie 2010]).

Whereas most studies of California English have investigated speakers from either the Bay Area or Southern California (assuming that either group adequately stands in for the state as a whole), recent studies have begun to address potential intrastate variation in California vocalic features. Hall-Lew (2009) investigated phonetic variation in a single neighborhood of San Francisco. Holland (2014) compared speakers from the Bay Area, Southern California, and the inland Central Valley but found little evidence for intrastate vocalic differences. D’Onofrio et al. (2016 [this volume]) find evidence that the merged BOT/BOUGHT vowel occupies the higher and more retracted space of /ɔ/ in the Central Valley as opposed to /ɑ/ in coastal California.

An important caveat about the CVS is that its currently accepted formalization generalizes over phonetic environments and words (save for the BAT/BAN nasal split). It is possible that finer details of linguistic conditioning (such as the multiple linguistic constraints on sociolinguistic variables [e.g., Guy 1980]) may reveal regional differences in a way that broader vowel categories do not. Holland (2014, 17) finds that BEN is fronted relative to BET for Southern California and Central Valley natives, but not Bay Area speakers. Recent work on San Francisco English suggests that front lax vowels are raising in the pre-/ŋ/ environment (Cardoso et al. 2016 [this volume]). Labov, Ash, and Boberg (2006, 68, map 9.5) also show striking intrastate variation in the PIN-PEN merger; whereas almost all Caucasian speakers in coastal cities exhibit no merger, four of five Fresno and Bakersfield speakers (all Caucasian) are fully merged. In sum, little evidence currently exists to suggest major intrastate differences in California English; however, it is possible that future work may uncover intrastate differences.¹

THE PRESENT STUDY

This study aims to reconcile the findings uncovered in previous sociolinguistic work on California English (especially the variants associated with the CVS) with folk-linguistic perceptions by investigating the role that vowels play in Californians’ perceptions of California English. Using Williams, Garrett, and Coupland’s (1999) dialect recognition task as a model, the present study asked respondents to “place” speakers in one of five regions (four Californian regions and one catchall “outside California” region) and rate speakers on semantic differential scales for affective traits. Unlike Williams, Garrett, and Coupland’s task, however, the stimuli in this study were identical in content, meaning listeners responded primarily to vocalic variation among speakers. The data were analyzed to find how accurately Cali-

fornians recognize speakers from across the state, who they perceive to be its “best” speakers, and which traits they associate most strongly with speakers they perceive to be a Californian or a member of their own regional group.

METHODS

Before conducting the recognition task, it was first necessary to define the regions of California that would be used. Stimuli were acquired from two sources: the Nationwide Speech Project corpus (NSP) (Clopper and Pisoni 2006) and a small corpus of newly recorded speakers. Fifty-three listeners participated in the recognition task, and the responses of 41 listeners were analyzed.

REGIONS. The four Californian regions defined in this study are Far Northern California (FN), the Bay Area (BA), the Lower Central Valley (CV), and Southern California (SC) (see figure 4.1).² Although the existing evidence for intrastate differences in California English is minimal, these regions were selected on the basis of economic, geographic, and ethnolinguistic differences—in other words, sociocultural factors that Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (2006, 29–35) identify as being responsible for dialect differentiation. The two most populous regions, Southern California and the Bay Area, are heavily urbanized, whereas the Lower Central Valley is mostly farmland (with the exception of its two largest cities, Fresno and Bakersfield) and Far Northern California is mostly undeveloped forest. Speakers in different regions also experience different language-contact situations, as nearly half of all residents of the Bay Area, Lower Central Valley, and Southern California reside in households where English is not spoken.³ These regions also enjoy rather different folk-linguistic status among both Californians and non-Californians. Californians typically construct difference along a north-south dichotomy (Fought 2002; Bucholtz et al. 2008), often erasing the less-urbanized Far Northern California and Lower Central Valley (Bucholtz et al. 2008), whereas to outsiders Southern California linguistic stereotypes tend to stand in for the state as a whole (e.g., Preston 1996).

SPEAKERS AND STIMULI. The stimuli were short sound clips drawn from 12 Caucasian speakers: two speakers (one female and one male) from each California region and four speakers (two females and two males) from outside the state. The male Bay Area speaker, both Southern California speakers, and all four non-Californian speakers were recorded as part of the NSP

FIGURE 4.1
 Californian Regions in This Study



corpus. To complete the stimulus sample, 10 additional Californian speakers, students at Northern California University (NCU) (a pseudonym) were recruited via social networks. Speakers were required to self-identify as Caucasian, speak English natively, have lived in the same region their entire lives (prior to attending NCU), be between 18–29 years of age, and report normal speech and hearing. Five NCU speakers were chosen for the recognition task based on their regional origin and use of Californian/Western vocalic features. Four speakers from the NSP’s Mid-Atlantic region were chosen for the “outside California” region based on a lack of Californian/Western vocalic features. Table 4.1 displays information on the speakers.

The NCU speakers were recorded following similar procedures to the NSP, under my supervision. Unlike the NSP, NCU speakers only participated in one task: recording the 102 sentences from the NSP’s high-probability sentence list in randomized order. Four of these sentences, 9, 43, 83, and 36, were chosen for the stimuli based on 10 CVS/Western features.

TABLE 1
Speakers Included in Recognition Task

<i>Region/Corpus</i>	<i>Code</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Age^a</i>	<i>Hometown</i>	<i>Order^b</i>
California					
Northern California Univ.	FN1	F	21	Red Bluff	1
Northern California Univ.	FN2	M	28	Grass Valley	7
Northern California Univ.	BA1	F	21	San Geronimo	6
Nationwide Speech Project	BA2	M	19	San Mateo	3
Northern California Univ.	CV1	F	22	Bakersfield	9
Northern California Univ.	CV2	M	21	Fresno	8
Nationwide Speech Project	SC1	F	20	Los Angeles	4
Nationwide Speech Project	SC2	M	18	Santa Clarita	11
Mid-Atlantic					
Nationwide Speech Project	Out1	F	18	Middletown, N.J.	5
Nationwide Speech Project	Out2	F	18	Oradell, N.J.	12
Nationwide Speech Project	Out3	M	18	Long Island, N.Y.	10
Nationwide Speech Project	Out4	M	18	Plainview, N.Y.	2

- a. Age is listed at the time of recording. Nationwide Speech Project recordings were completed in 2003; Northern California University in 2013.
b. Order of presentation in the recognition task was the same for all listeners.

For each speaker (NSP and NCU), these sentences were sampled from the speaker's original sound file and spliced together into a stimulus sound file with 1-second intersentence intervals. These sentences are given in table 4.2 in order of presentation in the recognition task. As there was variation across speakers in baseline speech intensity and background noise, Praat (Boersma and Weenink 2013) was used to equalize files' intensity level to 60 dB and equalize background noise. All stimuli were around 10 seconds in duration.

TABLE 4.2
Sentences Chosen for Stimuli and CVS/Western Features Represented in Each

<i>Sentence</i>	<i>NSP #^a</i>	<i>Features</i>
Follow this <u>road</u> around the <u>bend</u> .	9	BOAT, BET, BEN
The <u>blood</u> hound followed the <u>trail</u> .	43	BUT, BAIL
The <u>swimmer's</u> <u>leg</u> got a <u>bad</u> <u>cramp</u> .	83	BIT, BET, BEG, BAT, BAN
<u>Ruth</u> <u>had</u> a <u>necklace</u> of <u>glass</u> beads.	36	BOOT, BAT (×2), BET

NOTE: Underlines indicate location of features; some features overlap (e.g., the vowel in *bend* could undergo either BET lowering or the PIN-PEN merger).

- a. "NSP #" refers to the sentence number in the Nationwide Speech Project.

In controlling for the content of the sound clips, this study differed from Williams, Garrett, and Coupland (1999), which used excerpts from speakers’ spontaneous narratives for stimuli.⁴ Listeners’ responses were thus tied only to phonological/prosodic differences among speakers, and the primary differences between speakers were vowel features.

To quantify these vowel differences, each stimulus was coded for the presence or absence of the CVS/Western features in table 4.2 using a three-point scale: 0 for nonshifted, 0.5 for partially shifted, and 1 for shifted. For BET, for example, [ɛ] would be coded 0, [ɛ̃] would be coded 0.5, and [æ] or [æ̃] would be coded 1. All of the non-Californian speakers also raised the vowels in *bad* and *glass* to varying degrees, a feature characteristic of a Mid-Atlantic short-*a* system (Labov, Ash, and Boberg 2006), so this feature was also coded for. These codes were then converted to indices to determine the degree to which stimuli contained CVS features (divided into front and back vowels), non-CVS Western features, and Mid-Atlantic *bad/glass* raising. Indices were calculated by dividing the sum of codes by the number of tokens and multiplying by 100; for example, CV1’s stimulus was coded 1 for BOOT, 0 for BOAT, and 0.5 for BUT, so her CVS back index was 50. The CVS index was then calculated by averaging the CVS front index and CVS back index. Speakers’ indices are displayed in table 4.3.

Speakers BA1 and SC1, for example, were the heaviest user of California-shifted vowels, with CVS indices of 66, whereas BA2 was the least California-shifted Californian, with a CVS index of 13. The CVS and *bad/glass* indices clearly differentiate the Californian and non-Californian speakers: all of the non-Californian speakers had lower CVS indices than the least

TABLE 4.3
Indices by Speaker

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>CVS Front</i>	<i>CVS Back</i>	<i>CVS</i>	<i>Other West</i>	<i>bad/glass</i>
FN1	25	67	46	33	0
FN2	25	33	29	0	0
BA1	81	50	66	0	0
BA2	25	0	13	17	0
CV1	25	50	38	100	0
CV2	31	83	57	0	0
SC1	31	100	66	0	0
SC2	19	33	26	17	0
Out1	13	0	6	0	100
Out2	19	0	9	17	75
Out3	0	17	8	17	50
Out4	6	17	11	0	75

California-shifted Californian, while all of the non-Californians and no Californians had at least some *bad/glass* raising. CV1 had a high rate of non-CVS Western features and was the only speaker to exhibit the PIN-PEN merger; in this respect, CV1 patterns as Labov, Ash, and Boberg (2006) predicts, as she is a second-generation Bakersfieldian. Aside from CV1's PIN-PEN merger, it is difficult to determine whether the Californian speakers are exemplars of their respective regions within the state due to the relative lack of previous findings on intrastate vocalic differences. However, this research attempts to ascertain whether Californians attach social meaning to vocalic features in the same way that Bucholtz et al. (2008) found that they attach social meaning to lexical differences.

RECOGNITION TASK. Fifty-three NCU undergraduates participated in the recognition task. The task consisted of 12 trials (following a practice trial) in which listeners guessed where each speaker was from and rated speakers from 1–6 on 14 semantic differential scales (see table 4.4). Most scales were selected to correspond to the “correctness” and “pleasantness” groupings found in perceptual dialectology studies (Preston 1996). Each trial lasted 60 seconds, with the sound clips played twice. Stimuli were presented in the same order to all listeners (displayed in table 4.1). Listeners then filled out a brief questionnaire, which included a space to list where they had lived and which of those places they considered their hometown.

ANALYSIS. Listeners' questionnaire responses were coded for hometown and mobility. Hometown categories were Far Northern California, the Bay Area, Lower Central Valley, Southern California, other California locations, non-Californian U.S. locations, and international locations. Mobility categories were nonmobile (listeners had never lived outside their home region of California), mobile across multiple regions of California, mobile across multiple states, and mobile across multiple countries.

TABLE 4.4
Semantic Differential Scales and Categories Used in Perceptual Task

<i>Category</i>	<i>Scales</i>
Correctness	smart–dumb; educated–uneducated; confident–not confident; good English–bad English; fast–slow; unaccented–accented
Pleasantness	attractive–unattractive; friendly–unfriendly; polite–rude; likable–not likable
Self-similarity	speaks like me–doesn't speak like me; familiar–unfamiliar
Place	Californian–not Californian; rural–urban

The data analysis fell into three broad categories: regional identification, affective scale ratings, and the interaction of identification and attitudes. Accurate-recognition rates were calculated for individual speakers, speaker regions, listener regions, and listener mobility. Identification rates were also investigated independently of accuracy, with special attention paid to PERCEIVED REGION (the region into which a plurality of listeners placed a speaker), IN-GROUP IDENTIFICATION RATES (the proportion of listeners from a given region who identify a speaker as being from their home region), and OUTSIDE IDENTIFICATION RATES (the proportion of California listeners who identify a speaker as being from outside the state).

Average ratings for affective traits were calculated by region in two ways: speakers' actual region and speakers' perceived region. To assess the presence of CLAIMING in California (as Williams, Garrett, and Coupland 1999 found in Wales), average ratings were also calculated for listeners from the two regions most heavily represented in the listener sample (the Bay Area and Southern California), and correlation tests were performed to compare average ratings with in-group identification rates. Finally, correlation tests were performed to compare Californian listeners' average ratings with outside identification rates.

RESULTS

A one-way ANOVA analysis of recognition revealed a significant effect of listener mobility on accurate recognition ($F(3, 49) = 3.83, p = .015$). Post-hoc Scheffé tests showed that listeners who had lived outside the United States were significantly less accurate than those who had moved among Californian regions and those who had lived in other U.S. states ($p < .05$). As a result, these 12 listeners were removed from the sample for the analyses described in this section; after removing these listeners, there was no significant effect of listener hometown ($F(4, 35) = 1.01$).

In the remaining 41-listener sample, Far Northern California ($n = 1$), the Lower Central Valley ($n = 2$), and outside California ($n = 4$) were underrepresented compared to the Bay Area ($n = 11$), Southern California ($n = 13$), and Greater Sacramento ($n = 10$). As a result, it was feasible to analyze in-group identification only for the Bay Area and Southern California.

REGIONAL IDENTIFICATION. The overall rate at which speakers' regions were accurately recognized was 31.2%, consistent with Clopper and Pisoni's (2004) 30% and Williams, Garrett, and Coupland's 25%. As table 4.5 shows, few listeners accurately recognized Californian speakers' region; for

TABLE 4.5
Percentage of Listeners Who Placed Speakers into Their Actual Region
and Perceived Region

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Actual Region</i>		<i>Perceived Region</i>	
FN1	Far North	19.5%	So. Cal.	39.0%
FN2	Far North	19.5%	Bay Area	26.8%
BA1	Bay Area	9.8%	Far North	34.1%
BA2	Bay Area	22.0%	Far North	31.7%
CV1	Cent. Valley	27.5%	Cent. Valley	27.5%
CV2	Cent. Valley	15.8%	Far North	42.1%
SC1	So. Cal.	48.8%	So. Cal.	48.8%
SC2	So. Cal.	24.4%	Bay Area	34.1%
Out1	Outside	61.0%	Outside	61.0%
Out2	Outside	25.0%	Cent. Valley	30.0%
Out3	Outside	70.0%	Outside	70.0%
Out4	Outside	31.7%	Outside	31.7%

NOTE: Shading indicates that perceived region matched actual region.

example, only 15.8% of listeners identified CV2, the male Lower Central Valley speaker, as from the Lower Central Valley. For six of eight Californian speakers, their perceived region (the region into which a plurality of listeners placed a speaker) did not match their actual region. For example, a plurality of listeners placed FN1, the female Far Northern California speaker, in Southern California (39.0%), whereas only 19.5% of listeners placed her accurately in Far Northern California. In contrast, listeners accurately recognized three of four non-Californian speakers; more than two-thirds of listeners identified Out3 as from outside California. Accurate-recognition rates ranged from 9.8% (BA1) to 70.0% (Out3).

To test whether listeners associated certain regions with the CVS or other features, Pearson correlations were calculated between the indices in table 4.3 and the rate at which speakers were placed into each region. There was a significant positive correlation between speakers' CVS index and the percentage of listeners who identified them as being from Southern California ($r = .69$, one-tailed $t_{10} = 3.05$, $p < .01$), although there was no significant correlation for the CVS front and CVS back indices; in other words, speakers who exhibited more CVS features were identified as being from Southern California at a higher rate.

Table 4.6 gives rates of in-group identification by Bay Area and Southern California listeners, as well as outside identification by all Californian listeners. Notably, over three-fourths of listeners from Southern California identified SC1 as a Southern Californian (76.9%), whereas no listeners from the Bay Area identified BA1 as from the Bay Area. Listeners from

both the Bay Area (45.5%) and Southern California (53.8%) identified FN1 as an in-group speaker. It is not clear how these in-group identification patterns relate to vocalic variation within the sample; while Bay Area in-group identification correlated negatively with CVS indices and Southern California in-group identification correlated positively with CVS indices, these correlations did not reach significance.

Not surprisingly, Californian listeners identified the non-Californian speakers as from outside California at a higher rate than they identified Californian speakers as from outside the state; for example, 72.2% of Californian listeners identified Out3 as from outside California, compared to just 2.7% for FN1 and SC1. The Californian speaker with the highest outside identification rate was CV2 (25.7%), which surpassed that of Out2 (19.4%). Outside identification rates correlated significantly with *bad/glass* raising indices ($r = .72$, one-tailed $t_{10} = 3.30$, $p < .005$); in other words, listeners were generally more likely to identify speakers with *bad/glass* raising as being from outside California.

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES. Tables 4.7 and 4.8 give average affective scale ratings for each region; table 4.7 shows average ratings based on speakers’ ACTUAL REGION (where speakers were actually from) and table 4.8 shows average ratings based on speakers’ PERCEIVED REGION (listed in table 4.5). (Recall that scales ranged from 1–6.) Turning first to table 4.7, it is clear that Southern Californian speakers enjoyed favorable attitudes across the

TABLE 4.6
Ingroup Identification Rates for Bay Area and Southern California Listeners
and Outside Identification Rates for All Californian Listeners

<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Ingroup Identification</i>		<i>Outside</i>
	<i>Bay Area</i>	<i>So. Cal.</i>	<i>Identification</i>
FN1	45.5%	53.8%	2.7%
FN2	9.1%	7.7%	16.2%
BA1	0.0%	30.8%	8.1%
BA2	36.4%	23.1%	8.1%
CV1	27.3%	30.8%	8.1%
CV2	0.0%	8.3%	25.7%
SC1	18.2%	76.9%	2.7%
SC2	45.5%	30.8%	0.0%
Out1	9.1%	15.4%	59.5%
Out2	27.3%	23.1%	19.4%
Out3	9.1%	0.0%	72.2%
Out4	9.1%	15.4%	32.4%

NOTE: Shading indicates in-group speakers.

TABLE 4.7
Average Affective Scale Ratings for Each Actual Region on a 6-Point Scale

Scales	Actual Region				
	Far North	Bay Area	Cent. Valley	So. Cal.	Outside
Correctness					
smart	3.94	3.66	3.72	4.31	3.58
educated	4.35	3.96	3.96	4.54	3.65
confident	3.85	3.46	3.61	4.23	3.46
good English	4.59	4.15	4.08	4.65	3.89
fast	3.48	3.52	3.38	3.83	2.76
unaccented	3.96	3.97	3.81	4.35	3.13
Pleasantness					
attractive	3.90	3.44	3.12	4.16	3.12
friendly	4.33	3.64	3.60	4.57	3.62
polite	4.43	3.77	3.68	4.52	3.87
likable	4.21	3.59	3.42	4.34	3.62
Self-similarity					
speaks like me	3.47	3.14	2.82	3.73	2.34
familiar	4.04	3.91	3.69	4.49	3.20
Place					
Californian	4.44	4.53	3.83	4.99	2.95
rural	2.89	3.09	3.56	2.43	3.87

NOTE: Average ratings for each scale are shaded from light to dark from highest to lowest, respectively.

board, ranking highest on correctness items, pleasantness items, self-similarity items, and “California-ness.” Because non-Californians ranked lowest on almost all scales, it is useful to examine the second-lowest average ratings for each scale. Here, it appears that the Lower Central Valley is viewed as the least prestigious Californian region (especially on pleasantness) and that the Bay Area also lacks prestige. The scale RURAL–URBAN (neither side of which was assumed a priori to correspond to correctness, pleasantness, or “California-ness”) shows the opposite pattern of the other scales, with Southern California ranking lowest and non-Californians ranking highest on rurality; it thus appears that urbanness carries an element of linguistic prestige to these listeners.

CVS indices did not correlate significantly with any scale ratings, but significant negative correlations were found between *bad/glass* raising indices and UNACCENTED, SPEAKS LIKE ME, FAMILIAR, and CALIFORNIAN ratings ($r_{\text{familiar}} = -.68$, $p < .01$; $r_{\text{speaks like me}} = -.72$, $r_{\text{unaccented}} = -.76$, $r_{\text{Californian}} = -.76$, $p < .005$).

TABLE 4.8
Average Affective Scale Ratings for Each Perceived Region on a 6-Point Scale

Scales	Perceived Region				
	Far North	Bay Area	Cent. Valley	So. Cal.	Outside
Correctness					
smart	3.65	4.35	3.90	3.89	3.45
educated	3.91	4.56	4.06	4.34	3.51
confident	3.50	4.23	3.77	3.85	3.31
good English	4.09	4.62	4.16	4.63	3.80
fast	3.43	3.76	3.57	3.54	2.47
unaccented	3.89	4.23	3.75	4.09	2.97
Pleasantness					
attractive	3.24	3.92	3.47	4.13	2.98
friendly	3.58	4.39	3.89	4.50	3.48
polite	3.73	4.52	3.99	4.43	3.74
likable	3.51	4.34	3.71	4.20	3.51
Self-similarity					
speaks like me	3.00	3.57	2.89	3.63	2.17
familiar	3.83	4.16	3.70	4.36	3.04
Place					
Californian	4.18	4.50	3.94	4.93	2.71
rural	3.36	2.66	3.47	2.65	3.93

NOTE: Average ratings for each scale are shaded from light to dark from highest to lowest, respectively.

INTERACTION OF IDENTIFICATION AND LANGUAGE ATTITUDES. Perhaps surprisingly, the average ratings by perceived region in table 4.8 show several differences from the average ratings by actual region. In particular, the Bay Area gains top ratings on 7 of 14 scales, including all correctness scales except GOOD ENGLISH. Southern California retains top ratings for self-similarity scales and “California-ness,” and Far Northern California becomes the least prestigious Californian region. The low regard in which listeners hold non-Californian speakers is even more pronounced in these ratings.

An important result from Williams, Garrett, and Coupland (1999) was that listeners were more likely to identify likable speakers as a member of their own regional group (claiming). In the present data set, Pearson correlations between in-group identification rates and affective scale ratings (table 4.9) suggest claiming effects for Bay Area and Southern California listeners. Listeners from both regions rated speakers who they perceived to be from their regional in-group higher on CALIFORNIAN and SPEAKS LIKE ME. In addition, Bay Area listeners claimed the speakers who they rated

TABLE 4.9
Correlations between Ingroup/Outside Identification Rates (table 4.6)
and Affective Scale Ratings

<i>Scales</i>	<i>In-Group</i>		
	<i>Bay Area</i>	<i>So. Cal.</i>	<i>Outside</i>
smart	.36	.05	-.43
educated	.39	.30	-.55
confident	.34	.21	-.46
good English	.52	.61	-.67*
fast	.34	.43	-.72**
unaccented	.50	.49	-.94***
attractive	.68*	.61	-.67*
friendly	.49	.51	-.42
polite	.49	.24	-.33
likable	.55	.23	-.38
speaks like me	.70*	.69*	-.87***
familiar	.58	.70*	-.83***
Californian	.72**	.78**	-.96***
rural	-.41	-.60	.72**

NOTE: In-group columns pertain to Bay Area or Southern California listeners only. Outside column includes all Californian listeners. Asterisks indicate significance (one-tailed *t*-test with *df* = 10): **p* < .01, ***p* < .005, ****p* < .001.

as more attractive, and Southern California listeners claimed the speakers who they rated as more familiar. Correctness was apparently not a factor in in-group identification for either group (with a virtually zero SMART correlation for Southern California).

Californian listeners' outside identification rates correlated significantly with eight attitudes scales. These correlations mostly suggested either a lack of correctness (BAD ENGLISH, SLOW, ACCENTED) or a sense of difference/distinction from the listener (DOESN'T SPEAK LIKE ME, UNFAMILIAR, NOT CALIFORNIAN). Unlike in-group identification, attitudes about (in)correctness, especially those relating to language, were implicated in outside identification.

DISCUSSION

It is clear from the correlations in table 4.9 that there are stronger attitudes associated with NOT being a Californian than being one, as correctness traits such as speaking "without an accent" are denied to non-Californian speak-

ers even if such traits are not necessarily attached to Californian speakers. This result makes sense given the linguistic security exhibited in perceptual dialectology map-drawing studies by Californians (Fought 2002), as well as Western speakers more generally (Fridland and Bartlett 2006). Consistent with Fought’s (2002) hand-drawn maps, these Californian listeners clearly had a notion of linguistic correctness as something non-Californians lack but did not ascribe correctness to Californians. The negative correlation between *bad/glass* raising and UNACCENTED indicates that listeners responded negatively to this non-Californian (and non-Western) feature, although *bad/glass* raising did not significantly affect listeners’ responses to any other correctness trait.

The in-group correlations reveal that self-perceptions differ slightly between California’s two most populous regions. Bay Area listeners claim the speakers who they also judge to be most attractive, Californian, and speaking like them; conversely, Southern California listeners claim the speakers who they also judge to be most familiar, Californian, and speaking like them. Interestingly, this creates a dispute between the regions, as each region believes their own speakers to be central (and other speakers peripheral) to a notion of sounding Californian. Southern Californians are apparently more comfortable staking a claim to the CVS itself, however, as the two speakers with the highest CVS indices (BA1 and SC1) had much higher in-group identification for Southern California listeners than Bay Area listeners.

These data are similarly mixed on which region is considered most linguistically prestigious; although Southern Californians are rated highest for correctness, pleasantness, and CALIFORNIAN scales, listeners ascribe higher correctness to speakers they believe to be from the Bay Area than those they believe to be from Southern California. This boost in correctness is in line with Bucholtz et al.’s (2008) finding that Northern California (including the Bay Area) is believed to feature the “best” English in California thanks to its educational institutions. More broadly, this result reinforces the general finding that folk beliefs about certain places can create a disconnect between what listeners assume they are hearing and what they actually hear (e.g., Niedzielski 1999). Bucholtz et al. also found a belief that Southern California has the “worst” English, which conflicts with the positive attitudes toward Southern California speakers found in the current study; it is possible that the factors cited as driving stigmatization (“slang” and ethnolinguistic diversity) were less relevant in the current study, as both word choice and ethnicity were invariant between speakers. Indeed, the degree to which a speaker used CVS features apparently had no effect on the affective scale ratings they received.

The less populous regions of California received less favorable ratings than the Bay Area or Southern California, a result that is perhaps not surprising in a schema where urbanness is a factor in prestige. As mentioned above, Lower Central Valley speakers were apparently confused with non-Californians, which may have something to do with the common erasure of this region (e.g., “Almost no one lives here” [Bucholtz et al. 2007, 338]). Despite the fact that most of the state is covered by farmland, forest, or desert, rural speakers are peripheral to a sense of “sounding Californian.”

Finally, the recognition results show that Californians encounter substantial difficulty in identifying the regional origin of Californian speakers, as only two of eight Californian speakers were accurately recognized by a plurality of listeners. Californians may be better able to guess at the regional origin of speakers in naturalistic interactions, of course, as these may feature strong identifiers, such as Southern Californians’ use of *the* preceding freeway names (Geyer 2001) or Northern Californians’ use of *hella* (Fought 2002). While there was variation in Californian and Western vocalic features between the speakers in this sample, it is unclear how much of this variation can be attributed to regional origin versus the host of other social factors that can drive variation. As a result, a follow-up study utilized vowel resynthesis to create matched-guise stimuli differing only in their degree of California shifting (Villarreal 2016). This follow-up study thus isolates Californians’ attitudes toward the CVS itself (including their perceptions of the regional origins of more or less shifted speakers) from the multitude of other inputs that contribute to sociolinguistic perception. Nevertheless, the present study provides a useful early picture of the role that vowels play in Californians’ self-perceptions.

NOTES

I would like to acknowledge the support of my adviser, Bob Bayley, the graduate students at UC Davis, Cynthia Clopper, and Sara Thomas.

1. Indeed, three speakers in the present study (FN1, NC1, and SC2) display BEG raising in *leg*, an established feature of the Pacific Northwest (Becker et al. 2016 [this volume]; Wassink et al. 2009; Wassink 2016 [this volume]) that had not been systematically investigated in California at the time of this study. More recently, Cardoso et al. (2016 [this volume]) found that BEG did not significantly differ from BET in San Francisco.
2. Note that these regions exclude some parts of the state, mostly sparsely populated areas (the Sierra Nevada mountains, Mojave Desert), as well as Greater Sacramento, a region that could arguably be called part of the Central Valley, an extension of the Bay Area, or its own region.

3. Data retrieved from American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau) 2007–11 five-year estimates, table B16001, available at <http://factfinder2.census.gov/>.
4. The method used here has the possible drawback of failing to capture the full range of cross-regional differences, since the controlled nature of the recording encourages speakers to style-shift toward standard variants. This drawback was addressed in a follow-up study that drew stimuli from a retell task in order to induce more casual speech while controlling content (Villarreal 2016).

REFERENCES

- Allbritten, Rachael. 2011. “Sounding Southern: Phonetic Features and Dialect Perceptions.” Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University.
- Baker, Wendy, and David Bowie. 2010. “Religious Affiliation as a Correlate of Linguistic Behavior.” In “Selected Papers from NWAV 37,” edited by Kyle Gorman and Laurel MacKenzie. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 15.2: 1–10.
- Becker, Kara, Anna Aden, Katelyn Best, and Haley Jacobson. 2016. “Variation in West Coast English: The Case of Oregon.” In Fridland et al. 2016, 107–34. doi:10.1215/00031283-3772923.
- Boersma, Paul, and David Weenink. 2013. Praat: Doing Phonetics by Computer. Version 5.3.53. <http://www.praat.org>.
- Bucholtz, Mary, Nancy Bermudez, Victor Fung, Lisa Edwards, and Rosalva Vargas. 2007. “Hella Nor Cal or Totally So Cal? The Perceptual Dialectology of California.” *Journal of English Linguistics* 35.4: 325–52. doi:10.1177/0075424207307780.
- Bucholtz, Mary, Nancy Bermudez, Victor Fung, Rosalva Vargas, and Lisa Edwards. 2008. “The Normative North and the Stigmatized South: Ideology and Methodology in the Perceptual Dialectology of California.” *Journal of English Linguistics* 36.1: 62–87. doi:10.1177/0075424207311721.
- Cardoso, Amanda, Lauren Hall-Lew, Yova Kementchedjhieva, and Ruairidh Purse. 2016. “Between California and the Pacific Northwest: The Front Lax Vowels in San Francisco English.” In Fridland et al. 2016, 33–54. doi:10.1215/00031283-3772890.
- Clopper, Cynthia G., and David B. Pisoni. 2004. “Some Acoustic Cues for the Perceptual Categorization of American English Regional Dialects.” *Journal of Phonetics* 32.1: 111–40. doi:10.1016/S0095-4470(03)00009-3.
- . 2006. “The Nationwide Speech Project: A New Corpus of American English Dialects.” *Speech Communication* 48.6: 633–44. doi:10.1016/j.specom.2005.09.010.
- D’Onofrio, Annette, Penelope Eckert, Robert J. Podesva, Teresa Pratt, and Janneke Van Hofwegen. 2016. In Fridland et al. 2016, 11–32. doi:10.1215/00031283-3772879.

- Eckert, Penelope. 2008. "Where Do Ethnolects Stop?" *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12.1–2: 25–42. doi:10.1177/13670069080120010301.
- Fought, Carmen. 2002. "California Students' Perceptions of, You Know, Regions and Dialects?" In *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*, vol. 2, edited by Daniel Long and Dennis R. Preston, 113–34. Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi:10.1075/z.hpd2.13fou.
- Fridland, Valerie, and Kathryn Bartlett. 2006. "Correctness, Pleasantness, and Degree of Difference Ratings across Regions." *American Speech* 81.4: 358–86. doi:10.1215/00031283-2006-025.
- Fridland, Valerie, Tyler Kendall, Betsy Evans, and Alicia Beckford Wassink, eds. 2016. *Speech in the Western States*. Vol. 1, *The Coastal States*. Publication of the American Dialect Society 101. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Geyer, Grant. 2001. "The' Freeway in Southern California." *American Speech* 76.2: 221–24. doi:10.1215/00031283-76-2-221.
- Gunter, Josh. 2000. "What Is English /l/ Really?" In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Aspect*, edited by Lisa J. Conathan, Jeff Good, Darya Kavitskaya, Alyssa B. Wulf, and Alan C. L. Yu, 113–20. Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Linguistics Society. doi:10.3765/bls.v26i1.1163.
- Guy, Gregory R. 1980. "Variation in the Group and in the Individual." In *Locating Language in Time and Space*, edited by William Labov, 1–36. New York: Academic Press.
- Hall-Lew, Lauren. 2009. "Ethnicity and Phonetic Variation in a San Francisco Neighborhood." Ph.D. diss., Stanford University.
- Holland, Cory Lin. 2014. "Shifting or Shifted? The State of California Vowels." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Davis.
- Irvine, Judith T., and Susan Gal. 2000. "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, edited by Paul V. Kroskrity, 35–84. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press.
- Kennedy, Robert, and James Grama. 2012. "Chain Shifting and Centralization in California Vowels: An Acoustic Analysis." *American Speech* 87.1: 39–56. doi:10.1215/00031283-1599950.
- Labov, William, Sharon Ash, and Charles Boberg. 2006. *The Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, Phonology, and Sound Change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Niedzielski, Nancy. 1999. "The Effect of Social Information on the Perception of Sociolinguistic Variables." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18.1: 62–85. doi:10.1177/0261927X99018001005.
- Plichta, Bartek, and Dennis R. Preston. 2005. "The /ay/s Have It: The Perception of /ay/ as a North-South Stereotype in United States English." *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 37: 107–30. doi:10.1080/03740463.2005.10416086.
- Preston, Dennis R. 1996. "Where the Worst English Is Spoken." In *Focus on the USA*, edited by Edgar W. Schneider, 297–360. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Villarreal, Dan. 2016. “The Construction of Social Meaning: A Matched-Guise Investigation of the California Vowel Shift.” Ph.D. diss., University of California, Davis.
- Wassink, Alicia Beckford. 2016. “The Vowels of Washington State.” In Fridland et al. 2016, 77–106. doi:10.1215/00031283-3772912.
- Wassink, Alicia, Robert Squizzero, Mike Scanlon, Rachel Schirra, and Jeffrey Conn. 2009. “Effects of Gender and Style on Fronting and Raising of /æ/, /e:/ and /ɛ/ before /g/ in Seattle English.” Paper presented at the 38th annual meeting of New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAY 38), Ottawa, Oct. 22–25.
- Williams, Angie, Peter Garrett, and Nikolas Coupland. 1999. “Dialect Recognition.” In *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*, vol. 1, edited by Dennis R. Preston, 345–58. Amsterdam: Benjamins. doi:10.1075/z.hpd1.29wil.
- Wolfram, Walt, and Natalie Schilling-Estes. 2006. *American English: Dialects and Variation*. 2nd ed. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

DAN VILLARREAL is a postdoctoral fellow in the Department of English at the University of Nevada, Reno. His research area is sociolinguistics, with particular emphasis on the social meanings of language variation. He was awarded a Presidential Honorary Membership by the American Dialect Society in 2014. E-mail: djvill@unr.edu.

