Stereotypes of English in Hollywood Movies

A Case Study of the Use of Different Varieties of English in *Star Wars, The Lord of the Rings* and *Transformers*.

Niklas Andersson

Stockholms universitet

Stereotypes of English in Hollywood Movies

A Case Study of the Use of Different Varieties of English in *Star Wars, The Lord of the Rings* and *Transformers*.

Abstract

This essay deals with the use of linguistic stereotypes in Hollywood movies. It investigates whether attitudes towards English dialects found in studies on perceptual dialectology are reflected in the selected movies and discusses the notion of linguistic identity and how standard and nonstandard speech, respectively, are used symbolically to emphasize features of characters in eleven movies from three different movie series, namely *The Lord of the Rings*, *Star Wars* and *Transformers*, with a main focus on syntactic and phonological dimensions. The essay finds a correlation between standard speech and features of competence and wisdom, and nonstandard speech and features of solidarity, sociability and traits of stupidity and humor. Moreover, very specific perceptions of certain varieties of English are probably utilized as amplifiers of equally specific characteristics of some characters. The use of dialects and accents in these movies is probably intentional and not coincidental.

Keywords

Contents

1. Introduction

How we say things can be as important as what we say; we tend to classify people based on the way they speak and "there are some who feel that language differences serve as the single most reliable indication of social position in our society" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 1). We distinguish ourselves from others with language and we form a linguistic identity among our peers. Notions of differentness, identity, standards, power and prejudices are important here, as we divide people into different categories and ascribe features to them, based on their dialects and accents.

Since the way we speak can mean so much in everyday life, it would be strange if this were not reflected in media and culture. TV, music and movies may be the most prominent media reflecting and/or providing us with language norms and it would therefore be an interesting task to explore how language is used in this field. This essay is about stereotypical language and its symbolic use in Hollywood movies.

1.1 Aim

The aim of this essay is to investigate how dialects and accents are used in movies. In general, the intent here is to explore the use of English varieties in Hollywood movies and the essay aims to investigate whether language is being used to mark identity in movies and highlight certain features of the characters in them. Using three different movie series, the essay aims to find answers to the following general questions:

- Are there instances of stereotypical use of English varieties to be found in the individual Hollywood movies?
- Are dialects and accents used symbolically to highlight and emphasize characters' features in the selected Hollywood movies?
- Is it possible to see a correlation between linguistic studies on people's attitudes towards varieties and the use of different varieties in the selected Hollywood movies?

2. Theory

2.1 Phonology, Phonetics, Technical Terms and Definitions

The reader of this essay needs to be fairly familiar with technical linguistic terms. Most terms will be explained as the essay progresses but a few other terms can be found in the appendix, most importantly the terms dialect, accent and variety.

Also available in the appendix are the so called Standard Lexical Sets for the reference varieties Received Pronunciation (RP) and General American (GA) (see below). The Standard Lexical sets are used for vowel and diphthong realization comparison between varieties of English (see Melchers & Shaw 2003: 17-19, as derived from Wells (1982)).

2.2 The Diversity of English

English is more than a single entity; it consists of a wide variety of different accents and dialects, it exists in standard and non-standard forms and is spoken natively and non-natively all over the world. Therefore, the term World Englishes has become useful for its wideness in meaning and for emphasizing that English is not a monolithic concept. Figures of the number of speakers of English (1997), adopted from Melchers & Shaw (2003: 8), show that English is spoken by as many as one and a half billion people worldwide of different background and proficiency.

Interestingly, Melchers & Shaw stress that "there is no such thing (at present) as a Standard English which is not British, American or Australian etc." (2003: 31), meaning that only local standards exist and that different varieties of English can and probably have different norms. One should not, however, underestimate the impact of British English and US Standard English upon the rest of the world. Moreover, degrees of prestige exist in every variety of English and the terms acrolect, mesolect and basilect are important for this essay. Acrolects are the most prestigious dialects in a society, "associated with status, education and wealth" even by "those who do not speak it" (Collins & Mees 2008: 3). Basilects, conversely, are at the other extreme, where overt social prestige is nearly nonexistent, even though covert prestige may exist. Mesolects lie in between these extremes and are mostly associated with the middle class.

One can also focus on the differences in the degrees of standard between varieties, even though (as mentioned) it is hard to identify what a certain standard might look like. Wolfram & Schilling-Estes distinguish between standard and non-standard varieties of American English, but their classification is probably equally valid for any variety of English. At the one extreme there is the Formal Standard English, "based on the written language of established writers and […] typically codified in English grammar texts" and the standard varieties of spoken English are the accepted ones that adhere to the formal norms of spoken English (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 10). At the other end of the spectrum we find the nonstandard varieties, often labeled as vernaculars. These are usually only spoken and are "defined by the presence of a set of socially stigmatized linguistic structures" (ibid. 16). Between these extremes there is a continuum of intermediate varieties and forms of language and it is important to

recognize that different forms may be used in different contexts, even by the same speakers. This division of varieties into standard and nonstandard varieties has a lot in common with the notions of acrolects, mesolects and basilects, of course, but tends to offer a clearer image of how varieties may be perceived as either standard and formal or nonstandard and perhaps stigmatized, which serves the purpose for this essay very well, since the essay, to an extent at least, deals with stereotypes and extremes. Both systems of division are mentioned throughout this essay but the main focus lies on standard vs. nonstandard English.

2.3 Linguistic Identity

The notion of linguistic identity relates to "how we perform our identities in the way we speak, and no less importantly, how we interpret the identities of others" "(Joseph 2006: 262). Languages and dialects "give people a sense of belonging […] by defining an 'us' in opposition to a 'them'" (ibid.). Joseph states further that our linguistic identities are best understood as "a complex interplay of [both] construction and essentialism" (264). This means that our linguistic identities, the way we speak, might *reflect* our personalities, origins etc. but at the same time *construct* our personalities according to how we speak.[1] Wolfram & Schilling-Estes state that when you hear any speech you "unconsciously assign a set of character attributes to the speaker" (2006: 42). In other words, while language might tell us who we are, it will also define us and perhaps more importantly define others.

This might be a problem, especially when bearing in mind that language can be a tool for power and prejudices. For instance, an individual speaking a non-standard variety of a given language might define and construct his or her personality according to the expectations based on his or her way of speaking. Thus, segregation and an unequal distribution of power and prestige in everyday life might gain strength from a phenomenon as 'simple' as varieties of speech.

Since the media in general and perhaps movies in particular are such major components of Western popular culture today, the notion of linguistic identity and the constructionist view are of great significance for this essay.

2.4 Perceptual Dialectology

Perceptual dialectology[2] can be defined as "[t]he consideration of speakers' subjective viewpoints" towards varieties and "where speakers themselves draw mental dividing lines between dialects" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 159). Furthermore, perceptual dialectology "focuses on people's commonsense beliefs and subjective mental categories rather than spoken language data" (ibid., see also Preston (1999)). A common way of studying this has been to let respondents draw lines around regional speech zones, in order to see where they perceive that one dialect ends and another takes over. This is, of course, a vital field of study for this essay, since the perceptions of and attitudes toward dialects and accents may provide the basis for language variety use in movies.

---

[1] For a general account on constructionist views in sociology (and concerning the creation of social gender in particular) see Wharton (2008).

[2] Also called 'folk dialectology'.

In addition to letting respondents draw geographical speech lines, researchers have sometimes asked respondents to grade different varieties according to certain attributes, the most common being pleasantness, differentness and correctness. Fridland & Bartlett (2006) performed a study like this in the US, while McKenzie (2008) performed a study on non-native speakers' of English attitudes towards a few varieties of English (see details below). In the latter study, McKenzie adopted theory and methodology from perceptual dialectology and performed a more detailed study and focused more on nuances in people's attitudes towards varieties of English.

Furthermore, one should be aware of the effects that attributes *of the respondents* can have on studies like these. After all, what we are dealing with here is 'speakers' subjective viewpoints' towards other varieties of English than their own. It is likely that speakers of different regions answer differently, especially, and for natural reasons, when considering the 'differentness' attribute (see Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 159). Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that attitudes toward dialects and accents are not necessarily monolithic.

2.5 Attitudes towards Varieties of English

There have been a number of studies dealing with attitudes towards different varieties of English, most of which are concerned with perceptual dialectology and notions of differentness, pleasantness and correctness. In this section there will be a particular focus on varieties that are important for the purposes of this essay.

2.5.1 Standard vs. Nonstandard Varieties

As stressed, dialects and accents have a great influence on how we are perceived and how we perceive other people. Garret, Coupland & Williams conducted a study in 2003 on attitudes towards different varieties of English among English-speaking respondents in Wales and concluded that "[d]ifferent language varieties are often associated with deeprooted emotional responses – social attitudes, in short – such as thoughts, feelings, stereotypes, and prejudices about people, about social, ethnic and religious groups, and about political entities" (Hernández-Campoy 2005: 467). One's language or dialect can have great significance in everyday life, as de Klerk & Bosch show (1995: 17) when they conclude that "social position [in South Africa] depends primarily and significantly on race and linguistic affiliation, which have determined education and employment opportunities".

McKenzie states that

"Studies focusing specifically on native speaker attitudes towards varieties of English speech have demonstrated that standard varieties tend to be judged positively in terms of 'status', and hence are frequently rated highly on traits such as ambition and intelligence. This appears to be the case both when the judges are speakers of standard varieties and when the judges speak non-standard varieties of English. In contrast, non-standard speech tends to be evaluated more highly in terms of 'solidarity' when compared to varieties of standard speech." (2008: 64-65).

The focus of McKenzie's study was non-native (Japanese) speakers' of English attitudes towards a few varieties of English and the findings are very similar to those of the previous studies of native speakers' attitudes: in the ratings of social attractiveness "a clear preference is expressed for the non-standard Varieties" (McKenzie 75) and, conversely, high ratings of competence and correctness are attributed to the standard varieties of English (UK as well as US varieties).

Furthermore, Preston found evidence of "stereotypes about the less correct but pleasant speech spoken in the American South and the more correct speech used in the North by asking respondents from Michigan and Indiana" (Fridland & Bartlett 2006: 361). Using the same methodology, Fridland & Bartlett and Fought (2002) find basically the same north-south division in terms of standard and nonstandard speech among their Memphian and Californian respondents, respectively, as Preston, and thus it seems valid that standard speech and competence/intelligence on the one hand, and nonstandard speech and social attractiveness on the other, are interrelated.

2.5.2. Attitudes towards some Varieties of English

Interestingly, Wolfram & Schilling-Estes state that

> "Americans do not assign strong positive, or prestige, value to any particular dialect of American English. The basic contrast in the US exists between negatively valued dialects and those without negative value, not between those with prestige value and those without. Curiously, Americans still assign positive value to British Dialects" (2006: 13).

The one British variety in particular referred to by the authors is Received Pronunciation (RP) (see ibid. 183), which is supported by Melchers & Shaw: "Standard EngE is often inextricably linked to Received Pronunciation" (2003: 47), and McKenzie, who states that RP "is generally regarded highly as a model for pronunciation amongst learners of English" (2008: 66).

Ladegaard & Sachdev (2006: 91-92) state that there is "strong evidence suggesting that RP is perceived as the highest status variety of English, both among native speakers of English, and amongst nonnative speakers of English" and, furthermore, RP was "evaluated most favourably on key dimensions such as intelligence, education, leadership and self-confidence" (100) in their study of perceptions of different kinds of English in Denmark. In Australia, Ball (1983) explored English variety stereotypes and found converging attitudes among his English-speaking (Australian) respondents as well. More specifically, he suggests that "English Received Pronunciation consistently elicits stereotypes of competence and unsociability" (Ball 163).[3]

At the other extreme of British varieties lies the Cockney variety, which is very much associated with the working class in Greater London. The "Cockney accent may have *hard*, *dishonest*, *uneducated* or *comic* connotations" (Levey & Harris 2002: 18); it is surely not associated with very much (overt) prestige (see 2.1 above). Moreover, while "[t]he Australian and Scottish speakers were upgraded on most

---

[3] It should be noted that RP often is confused with its near approximants NRP (Non-Regional Pronunciation) and Estuary English (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 47) but all will subsequently be treated as one variety, due to their significant resemblance and, of course, to the severe limitations of this essay.

dimensions of social attractiveness and personal integrity, and downgraded on status and competence, relative to the RP speaker" in Ladegaard & Sachdev (2006: 101), the Cockney speaker was evaluated low on almost every dimension.

Furthermore and important for the subsequent discussion is Kerswill & Williams' (2002: 202) finding of the West Country variety (UK) as "rural" through their study of dialect recognition in England, which also is mentioned in Collins & Mees (2008: 164).

In the linguistic context of the US, Wolfram & Schilling-Estes generally distinguish between standard and nonstandard varieties by simply referring to the reference variety General American (GA) and its near approximants as standard and those that have salient nonstandard features as nonstandard varieties.

African American (Vernacular) English, abbreviated AAVE (or AAE), deserves some extra attention. This is due to its distinctiveness compared to other varieties and, more importantly, its socio-ethnic ties. It is true that AAVE shares a lot of features with those of other vernaculars but some features are unique for AAVE and, more importantly for this essay, listener perception studies confirm that AAVE is very distinct from nearly all other vernaculars in the US (See Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 213-218). Moreover, "AAE continues to be controversial because race and ethnicity in American Society remain highly contentious and politically sensitive" (ibid. 212), considering African-American history. Furthermore, "[a]ttitudes toward AAE are symbolic of the evaluation of behavior perceived to be associated with African Americans" (ibid.). Hence, notions of an unequal distribution of power and even racism might be important when considering how AAVE is perceived.

In summary, there seems to be no doubt that RP, and to some extent (northern) GA, are widely perceived as correct, intelligent, educated and competent, albeit perhaps unsocial and a bit dull by native as well as non-native speakers of English all over the world in the studies mentioned. In general, non-standard English vernaculars and basilects are rated high in terms of differentness and low on correctness whereas standard varieties are perceived as more correct and educated, albeit unsocial.

2.6 Varieties of English in Arts and Literature

There is plenty of evidence that writers of fiction use dialects and accents symbolically as a literary device. Shuttlesworth's (2005) study of the use of Southern American varieties, by looking for Southern language features such as multiple modal verbs, *y'all/you-all*, and *ain't*, in literature and film, concludes that Southern AmE is used in a way that linguistic features are presumed to be in an inherent relationship with the group of speakers. Put somewhat differently, this means that Southern varieties, in the works studied by Shuttlesworth, are inseparable from the speakers, as the dialects and accents seem to provide information and ascribe additional features to the speakers. Additionally, Ramirez Luengo (2005) states that nonstandard speech has been in use in literature as a means to add comicality and highlight differentness for hundreds of years, as these 'comic types' simply speak differently; their dialects and accents are usually "parodies of a way of speaking that mark a difference from that which is considered to be standard" (Ramirez Luengo, abstract[4]).

---

[4]

http://csaweb106v.csa.com/ids70/view_record.php?id=3&recnum=14&log=from_res&SID=1pkl5crc0ukm4kju ce9oiu1gs2&mark_id=search%3A3%3A17%2C10%2C20, *see reference list*.

In J.R.R Tolkien's novel *The Lord of the Rings* (henceforth abbreviated *LOTR*) variations in language are also used to separate characters from each other, as shown by Johannesson (1983). As Johannesson points out, authors may "represent certain properties of individual characters as well as of communities of speakers by means of linguistic constructions" (149). Johannesson identifies several syntactic variations used to "indicate different properties that these [characters] have" (135). These syntactic variations range from the use of double negatives, nonstandard subject-verb agreement to the use of *ain't*. Johannesson finds that characters of the working class use more nonstandard features than those of the higher classes. The character Samwise Gamgee, a working-class hobbit, for instance, uses all of the nonstandard linguistic features mentioned whereas upper-class hobbits, such as Frodo Baggins, use none.

Finally, it is not only in literature these linguistic tools can be seen but in media in general. As Levey & Harris point out in their discussion on prestige varieties in Great Britain and how attitudes toward these varieties survive: "Cinema, TV and the media have helped to enhance these stereotypes, where RP speakers are habitually portrayed as superior snobs, while Cockneys are still foul-mouthed criminals with little education or manners" (2002: 18).

3. Methodology

Dialects and accents in literature have been studied extensively before, as section 2.6 above shows, but the concept of dialects and accents in movies seems to be more of an uncharted territory; no previous extensive and explicitly linguistic studies were found concerning this field of study. As mentioned, the general aim of this essay is to explore the use of stereotypical language in movies and to see if there is a correlation between attitudes toward English varieties found in linguistic research and the use of dialects and accents in the selected movies. The hypothesis is here that film makers utilize the fact that dialects and accents can highlight character features and distinguish characters from one another. The assumption is that film makers are more or less forced to use the tools of dialects and linguistic identities (see discussion above) due to the shortage of time in presenting, distinguishing and highlighting the characters and their features in movies. Unlike reality, where "linguistic distinctions between [social] groups exist on a continuum rather than in discrete forms" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 172), film makers cannot perhaps often afford this luxury.

This is related to other uses of (visual) symbols, symbolic names and clothes and iconography in movies and literature. For instance, in the movie *Truman Show* we encounter a world totally made up and staged by a TV company in order to make a reality TV show and the only thing that is not faked in this world is its main character, Truman, which we know through his highly symbolical name – Truman, or, True Man. Clothing is another tool filmmakers have used extensively; it is probably no coincidence that Darth Vader in *Star Wars* dresses in black, which traditionally is the color of evil.[5]

Just as clothes and names can be used symbolically, so too can dialects and accents.

One should remember that this essay does not deal with 'real' speech but fictional and that there is a discrepancy between the two types. Even so, using studies on perceptual dialectology as a framework for the exploration of stereotypical or symbolic use of dialects and accents in movies is probably helpful, since the attitudes found in these studies may provide the basis for the fictional and symbolical speech that moviemakers make use of.

3.1 Selection of Movies and Characters

The movies chosen for this study are such that have had relatively few restrictions in creating their characters, compared to other movies and genres. This is important for this essay. For instance, a realistic movie about, say, police officers in Kentucky would probably involve a lot of Kentuckian speakers, but a movie like *Star Wars,* where realistic constraints are nearly nonexistent, does not suffer from such a limitation and the use of stereotypical language is thus more probable.

---

[5] See also Ramírez Berg (2002) concerning the stereotypical representation of Hispanics in Hollywood movies, for instance. Ramírez Berg shows that stereotypes about Hispanics as something quite exotic are very much alive in Hollywood today, which might indicate that stereotypes in general are used as amplifiers of certain features of the characters.

The movie series *Star Wars* (henceforth abbreviated *SW*) and *The Lord of the Rings* (*LOTR*) have been chosen precisely due to their unrealistic and non-constrained natures. These movies take place in worlds very different from ours and a great variety of different species can be found here, which make *SW* and *LOTR* very suitable for this study. Moreover, the novel *LOTR* showed, as discussed, that variants of speech have been used before to distinguish the characters from each other and it would therefore be interesting to see whether the creators of the *LOTR* film trilogy use linguistic devices as well.[6]

The third movie franchise is *Transformers* (labeled *T* throughout this essay) and it will mainly be used in support and to provide us with an American dimension, since it mainly takes place in America with American actors. The robots in *T* are very much nonhuman and it might therefore be expected that the speech of the robots are used symbolically to highlight and differentiate. All films in each series (all eleven) will be considered and each movie series is treated as an individual entity, thus resulting in three objects of study. Finally, Hollywood is probably very diverse and one needs to be careful in drawing conclusions too eagerly.[7]

An essay like this one cannot of course study all characters in each movie series. The criteria used for the selection of the characters are: (1) they have to speak English and (2), they have to be relevant for the story. Relevance is judged mainly from the casting list, simply, and all major different species/fractions are considered. The English-speaking criterion excludes characters such as Chewbacca from *SW* and Bumblebee from *T,* and criterion 2 excludes characters such as Treebeard from *LOTR* (even though he is important for the story, he is not one of the main characters). Only the robots in *T* will be considered, not the humans, as the robots do not suffer from the constraints of reality that the humans probably do (see above). This provides us with the following characters and species/fractions.[8]

---

[6] See also Drout (ed.) (2007: 329-331) regarding J.R.R. Tolkien's substantial interest in languages in general and the 'aesthetics of languages' in particular, and (ibid. 332ff) concerning Tolkien's creation of the languages in the world of *LOTR*.

[7] The notion of 'Hollywood' is here quite difficult to specify to any detailed extent, but for the purposes of this essay, Hollywood relates to the industry and tradition of moviemaking with big budgets, more or less famous actors and professional teams of writers, producers and directors. Finally, Hollywood is a major component of Western popular culture and hence it shares a lot of Western pop-culture features, especially the American.

[8] Note that reasons of space further limit the number of characters that can be analyzed; even though Faramir, for instance, is highly important for the story, he will not be analyzed since a member of his family and country (Boromir) already has been included in the selection, who can be seen as a representative for his kind.

Table 1. Characters to be analyzed

LOTR	Star Wars	Transformers
Frodo	Qui-Gon Jin	Optimus Prime (Good)
Samwise	Jar-Jar Binks and the Gungans	Megatron (Evil)
Gandalf	Palpatine (The Emperor)	Starscream (Evil)
Merry	Master Windu	Skids & Mudflap (Good)
Pippin	Anakin Skywalker	The Fallen (Evil)
Aragorn	Obi-Wan Kenobi	Jetfire (Good)
Boromir	Princess Leia	
Legolas and the Elves	Luke Skywalker	
Gimli	Han Solo	
Saruman	Darth Vader	
Orcs and Uruk-Hais	Yoda	

3.2 Research Questions

The questions asked in the beginning of this essay (1.1 Aim) can now be made more specific and be supplemented with a few more. They all relate to the aim and the general questions of this essay and the studies discussed in section 2.

- Are standard varieties in general used to highlight competence and intelligence, but social incompetence?
- Are vernaculars in general used to highlight social competence and solidarity, but stupidity and features of low education?
- Are vernaculars and non-standard varieties used to highlight differentness?
- Is there use of comic types through linguistic differentness to be found?
- Are varieties of English in general used to emphasize and amplify features of the characters?

3.3 Methodology

This essay is a qualitative case study exploring and investigating the assumptions and questions mentioned and asked above. The approach is to look for constructions and salient features that are specific for different varieties of English in the selected movies.

A methodology like this one has its limitations, of course. First of all, salient features can be missed and overlooked, no matter how many times and how thoroughly the movies are studied; the author of this essay is after all not a native speaker of English and may not recognize certain features of speech that might be important for this study. Secondly, certain linguistic features can be hard to distinguish as being exclusively found in a particular variety; features can be shared. However, varieties are often described as bundles of features rather than having features only exclusive to one particular variety (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 213-215). Thirdly, some varieties used in these movies can be very diffuse and more or less pronounced; the reader should remember that dialects and accents exist on a continuum rather than in discrete forms. Fourthly, no consideration is given to the fact that the actors of the characters have dialects and accents of their own; here the assumptions are that (1) the

actor has been chosen for the role partly due to his or her dialect and accent, or (2) that actors have been made to fake dialects and accents if they speak another variety than the one intended for the character.[9] This is of course a simplification but the limitations of this essay do not allow a deeper study of the actors' background. Finally, characters might speak differently according to who the addressee is; it is probably the case that Frodo and Samwise speak in a more casual and informal manner to each other since they know each other rather well.[10]

To tackle these problems this essay will focus on the more obvious characteristics of speech heard in the selected movies and each character chosen for this study will be studied according to the following linguistic dimensions. Note that while some are nonstandard, they are not necessarily all stigmatized.

- Nonstandard and/or stigmatized features
  - Syntactical features such as double negatives, the use of *ain't*, the use of habitual-*be*, subject-verb disagreement, double modals, double comparison, absence of copular verbs etc., and phonological features such as *th*-stopping, *h*-dropping etc.

- Regional-/Socio-ethnic specific features
  - Markers of certain varieties of English: syntactic features such as habitual-*be* constructions etc., phonological features, such as rhoticity and nonrhoticity etc., and culturally-specific slang, idioms and lexis.

- Archaic features
  - Archaic lexis and syntactic constructions such as non-use of contracted forms, the forming of questions without a *do*-construction, etc.

These dimensions follow the general purpose and aim of this study to explore the use of standard and nonstandard varieties, respectively, and the use of certain varieties of English as markers of identity etc. They can be divided into a phonological and a syntactical category of features, with the slang and lexis category as a complementary one. This is a qualitative study, not a quantitative one, and therefore no percentages, statistical data etc. will be presented.

---

[9] *LOTR* and *T* actually make use of dialect coaches and voice casters; see below.

[10] One could also think about the special master-servant relationship that Frodo and Sam has and what this might imply for their use of language. This, however, cannot be taken into account due to reasons of space.

4. Empirical Data

In this section each character will be presented and categorized according to how they speak. Linguistic evidence is given for each claim made here but the presentation of data is not exhaustive. While it would have been preferable to transcribe all speech in all movies, this is of course impossible within the confines of this type of essay; prototypical examples of speech are presented instead. Note that *The Lord of the Rings* Trilogy, consisting of *The Fellowship of the Ring*, *The Two Towers* and *The Return of the King* are labelled *LOTR1*, *LOTR2* and *LOTR3*, respectively, and the episodes of *Star Wars* are labelled *SW1*, *SW2*, *SW3* and so on; this is the case for the *Transformers* movies as well, which are labelled *T1* and *T2*.

4.1 The Lord of the Rings

4.1.1 Phonology

All speech in *LOTR* is that of British varieties of English and mostly RP and its near approximants. Legolas and the elves are definitely speakers of RP, as are Boromir, Gandalf, Saruman and Frodo. Aragorn is probably speaking some form of RP or near RP but uses less extensive intonation patterns. Nevertheless, all are speakers of standard British English. Phonological features that are typical of RP are to be found in every utterance, such as nonrhoticity, concordance with the standard lexical sets of RP (see appendix) and prosodic features.

       Pippin uses a clear Scottish accent, especially noticeable in his rhoticity and his pronunciation of /r/ as a so-called trilled /r/, very typical of the stereotypical Scottish accent (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 68). Gimli's accent is quite hard to establish accurately due to his grumpy and blurry pronunciation, but a good guess would be that he too speaks some form of Scottish. Support for this is his trilled /r/s, once again, and some lexis such as *laddie* (for *boy*). Moreover, both Gimli and Pippin tend to pronounce diphthongs (in RP) like monophthongs, as the word *home* in "this, my friends, is the home of my cousin" (Gimli, *LOTR1* 01:57:17) is pronounced [hom] (RP [həʊm]). Moreover, the word "pipe" in "full of pipe weed" (*LOTR2* 01:05:48) is pronounced by Pippin as [paep] (RP [paɪp]); this is also a feature very typical of Scottish English (Melchers & Shaw 66-67).

       The hobbits Samwise and Merry speak some form of West Country variety; there is consistent rhoticity in their speech and the quality of their vowels is that of West Country varieties. This is noticeable in the sentence "we can´t get past" (Sam, *LOTR2* 01:01:03) where the vowels in *can't* and *past* are realized much like an /æ/. A more clearly distinguishable feature, however, is the substantial impact of the rhoticity on the vowels, so-called vowel colouring. This feature is evident in every word or sentence with an /r/ in it. Furthermore, Samwise and Merry glottalize some of their /t/s. These are features of West Country varieties (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 51, Collins &

Mees 2008: 164-165). Samwise sometimes also pronounces final –ing as /ɪn/ instead of the more standard /ɪŋ/.[11]

The Orcs, an evil race of simple followers, use the London vernacular, Cockney, evident in the sentence "they cannot all be armed in time, we don't have the means" (*LOTR2* 00:20:04). The FLEECE vowel (RP /i/) in *means* resembles the diphthong [əɪ] and the PRICE diphthong (RP /aɪ/) in *time* sounds more like [ɔɪ] in this Orc's pronunciation. These diphthong shifts are features of Cockney (Collins & Mees 2008: 163-164). The Orcs and the similar Uruk-Hais speak very much alike, both in terms of phonology and syntax (see below). An exception to this, however, was found in *LOTR3*, where in one scene the speech of the Orcs and Uruk-Hais is not as obviously that of Cockney speech; it might as well be some form of Standard British English. The pronunciation of *mine* in the utterance "that's mine" (*LOTR3* 02:50:50), for instance, does not sound like [mɔɪn], but rather like RP [maɪn].

4.1.2 Syntax

Generally, there is limited use of contracted forms, as the full form in "you did what I could not" (Boromir, *LOTR1* 03:04:02) but this is not exclusive to any particular character; everybody uses these full forms to some extent. Merry and Pippin perhaps do use contracted forms more extensively but other characters, even those who speak RP, are heard using contracted forms as well.

More noticeable, however, are the variable (archaic) absence of *do*-constructions, in utterances like "I care not" (Boromir, *LOTR1* 01:49:23) and "you mean not to follow them" (Legolas, *LOTR1* 03:10:23). These are very limited and used by RP speakers only.

Samwise can be heard using nonstandard syntax, as in "I thought maybe if we was having a roast chicken" (*LOTR2* 00:04:56), where of course "we was" is an example of subject-verb disagreement. Pippin does so too in "you was sick" (*LOTR2* 01:05:52). Nonstandard syntax can be found among the Orcs as well: "We ain't had nothing but maggoty bread for three stinking days!" (*LOTR2* 00:27:54); here this Orc (an Uruk-hai, actually) uses the nonstandard *ain't* as well as double negatives (delivered with a distinct Cockney pronunciation, easily spotted in the diphthongs).

4.2 Star Wars

4.2.1 Phonology

While the varieties in *LOTR* all are British varieties of English, the varieties spoken in *Star Wars* come from all over the world. The Jedi knights Obi-Wan (from both trilogies, portrayed by different actors) and Qui-Gon are both speakers of RP. This is true for Palpatine/the Emperor (in both trilogies), as well. Anakin Skywalker, portrayed by two different actors in episodes one to three, speaks some form of General American (GA).

---

[11] Finally, there is a general consensus that the speech of Samwise and Merry is British West Country. See Wikipedia (2007) and AbsoluteAstronomy.Com (2009).

It is rhotic and it matches the lexical sets of GA. His speech is not substantially different when he becomes Darth Vader, even though his voice is made by a different actor. Master Windu, Princess Leia, Luke Skywalker and Han Solo are also speakers of some form of GA; they are all speakers of standard forms of American English. Yoda uses GA pronunciation as well but has very nonstandard syntax (see below).

Stigmatized phonological features are present in Jar Jar's and the Gungans' speech: *th*-stopping can be heard, in the realization of *there* as *dere* and *think* as *tink* (heard everywhere), nonstandard contracted forms such as "'tis a hidden city" (*SW1* 00:11:35), where "it is" is contracted to "'tis", which might be an archaic feature, and consistent *h*-dropping, as in *'im* for *him*, in the utterance "be gone wit 'im" (*SW1* 00:16:17).

4.2.2 Syntax

Nonstandard syntactic constructions are heard consistently throughout both trilogies. The case of Yoda is a curious one; he uses a very different grammar that cannot be found anywhere in any English-speaking community. Yet, it is highly systematic; constructions such as "see through you, we can" (*SW1* 01:26:39), "mourn them, do not" (*SW3* 00:32:55) and "my home, this is" (*SW5* 00:47:00) can be heard throughout both trilogies. Even though his dialect is nonstandard, he does not produce stigmatized syntactic strings, such as double negatives (or phonological ones, such as *th*-stopping etc.).

Jar-Jar Binks' speech is very different and nonstandard, like Yoda's, but here more stigmatized features are involved. It has been argued that Jar Jar and his primitive tribal people, the Gungans, are speakers of a Creole variety of English, and more specifically Jamaican English,[12] and this may well be the case. Moreover, the speech of Jar Jar and the Gungans is sometimes not as consistent as 'normal' speech is (Moore 2007). Even so, stigmatized and ungrammatical constructions such as "mostest safest" (*SW1* 00:11:30) (double comparison and a nonstandard form of *most*) are common. The construction "me-sa"/"you-sa" for "I/you shall/will" is used consistently and where a *do*-construction such as "do not" is needed, it is generally simplified to "no", as in "me-sa no have a booma'" (*SW1* 01:53:00). The combination of nonstandard, simplified and stigmatized syntax and phonology (see above) makes the speech of Jar Jar's and the Gungans' very nonstandard, highly stigmatized and perhaps that of a Creole speaker of English (see Melchers & Shaw 2003: 127-135).

Han Solo sometimes uses informal and nonstandard constructions, such as *ain't* variably throughout the films, as in "[w]hat good is a reward if you ain't around to use it?" (*SW4* 01:37:50) and "[t]raveling through hyperspace ain't like dusting crops, boy" (*SW4* 00:54:20). Furthermore, on single occasions Han Solo skips the copular verb, as in "[h]ow we doin'?" (*SW6* 00:27:27), and uses adjectives in slots where adverbs would be proper, as in "fly casual" (*SW6* 00:53:05). In general, Han Solo's speech is perhaps not very nonstandard but it is definitely very casual and informal compared to the other characters' speech.

---

[12] There is, as is the case with the speech of Samwise and Merry in *LOTR*, a general consensus regarding the speech of Jar Jar Binks and the Gungans. Most agree that Jar Jar is a speaker of a Jamaican variety of English, even though some disagree. See AllExperts (2006) and Is That One Good? (2009).

4.3 Transformers

4.3.1 Phonology

The speech in *T* is mainly GA; the leaders of both fractions, Optimus Prime and Megatron, speak GA and so do Starscream, The Fallen and other robots that were not included in the selection of characters in this study.

Jetfire is a speaker of Cockney, noticeable in the sentence "(wh)o's with 'im" (*T2* 01:24:35) where, of course, the *h*-dropping is obvious, and in "my boosters are fried" (*T2* 01:25:45) where "fried" sounds much like [frɔɪd] (RP [fraid]). Jetfire also glottalizes his medial /t/s extensively and his speech is nonrhotic; all of these are features of Cockney speech (Collins & Mees 2008: 163-164).

Skids and Mudflap definitely speak AAVE, easily recognized in both phonology and syntax (see below). The examples are numerous; the pronunciation of *wine* in "wine to your boyfriend" (*T2* 01:10:05) as [wa:n], "dat" in "I screwed dat up" (*th*-stopping) (*T2* 00:06:30) and numerous examples of how their *-ing* endings are realized as [ɪn], among others. These examples and the consistent nonrhoticity are very much features of AAVE (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 84, Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 82, 214-215, 218).

4.3.2 Syntax

There is not much use of nonstandard syntax in *T*, generally, except for Skids and Mudflap, who show numerous instances of nonstandard syntactical speech, very specific for AAVE. For instance, the non-use of copular verbs in "he scared" (*T2* 01:09:47), "he dead" (*T2* 01:58:01) and "you a pussy" (*T2* 01:14:28), subject-verb disagreement in "you is a wuss" (*T2* 01:09:43), the use of *ain't* and double negatives in "ain't nobody messing with me" (*T2* 01:58:31), certain idioms such as "bust a cap in his ass" (*T2* 01:09:49) and other nonstandard constructions such as "he got so ate" (*T2*: 01:58:02) are heard constantly. There is no doubt that Skids and Mudflap speak a highly stigmatized AAVE (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 82, Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 214-215, 218).[13]

Jetfire, albeit using a nonstandard pronunciation, does not use any explicitly nonstandard or stigmatized syntax and the speech in *T* in general is very standard, both when considering phonology and syntax.

---

[13] Moreover, there is a general consensus that Skids and Mudflap speak AAVE and many think that it is very stereotypical and even racist. See Azpiri, J. (2009), Afrospear/Tafari (2009).

4.4 Summary Table

The speech of all characters is presented in the table below before the analysis in the subsequent section.

Table 2. Summary of findings

Movie	Character	Standard speech	Dialect
LOTR	Frodo Baggins	Yes	RP
	Aragorn		
	Boromir		
	Gandalf		
	Legolas and the Elves		
	Saruman		
	Orcs and Uruk-Hais	No	Cockney
	Samwise		West Country BrEng
	Merry		
	Pippin		Scottish English
	Gimli	Unclear, see below	
SW	Anakin	Yes	GA
	Darth Vader		
	Luke Skywalker		
	Leia		
	Windu		
	Qui-Gon		RP
	Obi-Wan		
	Palpatine/the Emperor		
	Han Solo	No	GA
	Yoda		Unknown
	Jar Jar and the Gungans		A Creole variety[14]
T	Optimus Prime	Yes	GA
	Megatron		
	Starscream		
	The Fallen		
	Jetfire	No	Cockney
	Skids and Mudflap		AAVE

---

[14] Unclear, see discussions above and below.

5. Analysis

First of all, the use of dialects and accents in each individual movie series differs substantially; in *LOTR* and *SW*, different dialects and accents are used extensively, whereas in *T* dialects and accents seem to be of less significance. Below follow an account and analysis of each character in each movie series.

5.1 Standard Speech

Most speakers analyzed in the selected movies have been speakers of standard varieties of English, and more specifically, RP and GA. There is not very much variation at the upper, or more standard, scale of speech in any of the movies. One should remember, however, that variation is more common at the basilect levels than at the acrolect levels in general, due to the very nature of acrolects and standard varieties as standardized ways of speaking and writing (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 12).

It might be argued, however, that RP is used to signal wisdom or competence (and perhaps posh qualities) over solidarity or social skills, since the wise Elves and wizards in *LOTR* use this dialect as well as some Jedi knights, who, of course, possess great wisdom. This generalization cannot necessarily be made, however, since other characters not equally explicitly associated with wisdom use RP speech as well, such as Boromir, Aragorn and Frodo in *LOTR*, and characters who are arguably equally wise, as Optimus Prime in *T* and Jedi Master Windu in *SW*, among others, do use other standard varieties than RP. (Moreover, no other standard variety than RP seems to have been available to the creators of *LOTR*, since their linguistic universe is an exclusively British one.) Nevertheless, all of these characters are speakers of standard varieties of English and, generally, standard speech seems to go hand in hand with characters not associated with traits of stupidity and low education but rather correctness, wisdom and competence (see table 2 above). It should also be mentioned that the standard speakers, albeit being wise and competent, do not seem to be associated with unsocial qualities.

It might be expected that The Fallen in *T* would speak differently compared to the other characters in the movies, due to his special (old) nature (perhaps a more 'classic' dialect, like RP for instance, would be suitable), but this is not the case. Jetfire (see below) is distinguished linguistically but not The Fallen, even though they share many characteristics. This may be a case where dialects and accents have *not* been used to emphasize, differentiate and highlight, and other symbols may play this part instead.

Finally, it should be noted that archaic and perhaps hypercorrect features are heard in some standard speech in *LOTR* but not in nonstandard. The importance of this is questionable, however, since the use of these forms is very limited.

5.2 Nonstandard Speech

Much more variation of speech can be heard at the non-acrolect levels and it seems that moviemakers utilize nonstandard speech for differentiation much more than with standard speech. This may also be due to the very nature of non-acrolects, since more variation can be found at the basilect levels (see above). Even so, speakers of nonstandard varieties are more often associated with traits of solidarity than competence and wisdom.

First of all, it is a bit unclear whether the Scottish speech of Gimli and Pippin in *LOTR* should be treated as standard or non-standard, but it is true that Scottish English differs very much from the more standard RP and that it is not perceived as an acrolect. Moreover, Pippin does use stigmatized and nonstandard syntactical constructions. Scottish is without question very distinct and region-specific and is used in *LOTR* to distinguish the characters from the others; therefore, Scottish can be treated as somewhat nonstandard. The Scottish variety, then, is probably utilized to highlight solidarity more than traits of education and competence.

The case of Han Solo might be looked upon as a complex one; even though Han Solo's pronunciation is standard, he is a character with low educational competence and wisdom but high levels of solidarity and courage. This, however, is expressed through his nonstandard and casual syntax instead of pronunciation.

It is arguable whether the speech of Yoda deserves a great deal of attention or not. His speech may be nonstandard but he is not, however, a poor speaker of English and he does not use any stigmatized features. Moreover, his syntax is not something that can be found in any English-speaking community anywhere and thus it is hard to argue that any specific trait of any specific variety is utilized symbolically. One could argue, however, that his nonstandard syntax is used to highlight his differentness; he is extremely old and his syntax could be of a different time, and furthermore, he is of a different species. Additionally, Yoda is a character who possesses great wisdom and great solidarity at the same time and is thus not a clear-cut archetype in any way; this is also a reason why Yoda might not be very interesting to analyze.

For some cases it is probable that the filmmakers have utilized ways of speaking very carefully and with great attention to details; not only may they have relied on standard versus nonstandard speech, but perhaps also the more specific perception of certain varieties of English. For instance, the very distinct perception of the West Country variety as rural and the use of it in Samwise's speech: Samwise is an uneducated gardener, which of course is associated with rural qualities, just like the West Country variety. This might as well be true for the Orcs' speech, even though some variation could be found; the harsh, foulmouthed and uneducated perception of Cockney speech fits very well with the nature of the brutal Orcs. It might be argued that this is the case with Jar Jar Binks and his tribal people the Gungans in *SW*, as well; the perception of their simplified Creole-like way of speaking might fit well with their tribal qualities. Although this essay cannot confirm whether their dialect is Creole like, or more specifically Jamaican, or even perceived as uneducated or associated with tribal qualities in any study on perceptual dialectology, it nevertheless deserves some attention.

The creators of *T* chose to use the nonstandard Cockney variety for Jetfire but did not use any different variety for The Fallen than GA, which is used for almost every other character (see above). It is a bit difficult to specify what it is that distinguishes Jetfire from the other characters, except for old age (which, however, is shared with The Fallen) but he is definitely very different, and thus he has been given a distinct way of speaking. Still, he is not explicitly more social than wise or more friendly than competent; he is only different. The 'mystery' here, however, does not lie in why Jetfire has been given a special variety but why The Fallen has not. As mentioned, dialects and accents have not been utilized as much in *T* as in *LOTR* or *SW*.

5.2.1 Comic Types

Some characters with nonstandard dialects and accents can be categorized as 'comic types', in Ramirez Luengo's description. It is hard to argue that Samwise plays the role of a comic type, but this is not the case for Merry. Even though they speak the same variety, the West Country dialect, a nonstandard variety, it is used for different purposes - none of which that involve competence, intelligence or unsociability, but rather the opposite. Pippin fits the profile for the comic type, as well; the only difference here is that Pippin speaks Scottish English, perhaps not a nonstandard variety per se but definitely a non-acrolect, one that differs from the more "proper" RP substantially (and remember that Pippin uses stigmatized syntactical constructions as well). The other speaker of Scottish English, Gimli, has, like Samwise, a more serious part in the story and Scottish might thus have been used for different purposes for Pippin and Gimli, just as the West Country variety is used differently for Merry and Samwise. Nevertheless, Gimli can be seen as a comic type as the story goes on but he is definitely not as clear-cut as Pippin or Merry.

There cannot be any doubt that Jar-Jar Binks in *SW* fits the profile for the comic type; he uses a nonstandard variety, perhaps a Creole-like Caribbean variety of English, and his role in the movies is to provide humor. He and the Gungans are also definitely very primitive and stupid.

Skids and Mudflap in *T*, finally, are definitely comic-type characters. These robots are very different from every other character in *T*, both linguistically and generally. They are stupid, illiterate, and are supposed to provide some sort of comic relief, delivered with the nonstandard variety AAVE.

6. Conclusion and Discussion

In summary, there seems to be a substantial correlation between (1) standard speech and features of competence and wisdom, and (2) nonstandard speech and features of solidarity, sociability and, sometimes, traits of stupidity and humor in the movies and characters studied in this essay. Moreover, very specific characteristics of certain varieties, such as the rural associations of West Country or the harsh perception of Cockney, seem to have been utilized as amplifiers of equally specific characteristics of some characters. Thus, the attitudes toward different varieties found in the linguistic studies go very much hand-in-hand with the use of these varieties in the movies studied.

The correlation between the attitudes toward varieties and the use of them is probably not a coincidence since (1) the strong correlation itself suggests so, (2) the big-budget and professional tradition of Hollywood suggests that nothing is left to chance, and (3) the fact that *LOTR* and *T*, at least, have made use of dialect coaches (*LOTR3*, end credits, 03:56:40) and voice casters (*T2*, end credits, 02:25:40); the use of dialects and accents is thus probably very deliberate.

An additional 'weak' conclusion is that all nonstandard varieties in the studied movies are utilized to mark differentness (see the discussions about Yoda and Jetfire).

Some varieties were not used at all in the studied movies, such as Australian English for instance, but one cannot of course expect to hear every linguistic variation of English in the world in only three movie series. Nevertheless, one could argue that the more pronounced and the more clearly distinguishable varieties are used, since they are linguistically different and that they are associated with differentness in general. An exception would of course be the very distinct Southern US English, which is perceived as very nonstandard and different in linguistic studies but it is not used at all in any of the selected movies. Other nonstandard varieties have been used for this purpose, instead, it seems, like AAVE and Cockney.

The use of standard varieties has been restricted to RP and GA and there may be various reasons for this, which are discussed above. Furthermore, while standard varieties in general seem to correlate strongly with features of wisdom, competence etc., RP in particular does not necessarily do so *more* than other standard dialects, which might have been expected due to the worldwide attitudinal consensus about RP as a prestige variety (see the discussion about RP above). Moreover, it cannot be shown that standard varieties are automatically used as markers of unsociability.

The use of comic types through linguistic differentness was found in all the selected movies and hence there is a strong correlation between (1) humorous characters and (2) the use of nonstandard speech.

Finally, the relation between the stereotypical use of language found in these movies and the notion of linguistic identity is worth some attention. While most cases of stereotypical language use found might be quite innocent, this is perhaps not the case with Skids and Mudflap. These characters speak in such an exaggerated way that any variety would sound humorous if it was done with such emphasis and with so many stigmatized features. Nevertheless, one has to bear in mind that AAVE is a variety of low prestige and that it is spoken mainly by African-Americans, and thus it is

generally the variety of a lower stratum of American society. The constructionist view on identities might warn us about perpetuating the differentness of AAVE in this way; it is perhaps unwise to underestimate what these language stereotypes might do for the expectations of how AAVE speakers are 'supposed to act' according to non-blacks as well as how AAVE speakers perceive themselves. It has in fact been argued that Skids and Mudflap represent the non-black view on African-Americans and that it is racist (see 4.3.2 above).

The results of this essay are not perhaps very surprising or astonishing, but the essay has shown that linguistic stereotypes are very much in use in modern cinema and that it might be worthwhile thinking about this fact, considering how movies and society in general perhaps are related as reflections of each other.

7. References

7.1 Reference Material

AbsoluteAstronomy.Com (2009). *West Country dialects*. Retrieved October 17, 2009, from http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/topics/West_Country_dialects.

Afrospear/Tafari (2009). *Transformers: Racism That Meets The Eye*. Retrieved October 27, 2009, from http://afrospear.wordpress.com/2009/06/25/transformers-racism-that-meets-the-eye/.

AllExperts (2006). *Jar Jar Binks*. Retrieved October 26, 2009, from http://en.allexperts.com/e/j/ja/jar_jar_binks.htm

Azpiri, J. (2009). *Skids and Mudflap: Are Robots from Transformers 2 Racist or Lame*. Retrieved October 27, 2009, from http://www.nowpublic.com/culture/skids-and-mudflap-are-robots-transformers-2-racist-or-lame.

Ball, P. (1983). Stereotypes of Anglo-Saxon and Non-Anglo-Saxon Accents: Some Exploratory Australian Studies with the Matched Guise Technique. *Language Sciences*, 5(2), 163-183.

Collins, B. & Mees, I.M. (2008). *Practical Phonetics and Phonology*. Oxon: Abingdon (UK): Routledge.

Drout, M. (ed.) (2007). *J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment*. New York: Routledge.

Estling Vannestål, M. (2007). *A University Grammar of English with a Swedish Perspective*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Fought, C. (2002). California Students' Perceptions of, You Know, Regions and Dialects?. In D. Long & D.R. Preston, *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology, Volume 2* (pp. 113-134). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fridland, V. & Bartlett, K. (2006). Correctness, Pleasantness and Degree of Difference, Ratings Across Regions. *American Speech*, 81(4), 358-386.

Hernandez-Campoy, J.M. (2005). Reviews: Peter Garret, Nikolas Coupland & Angie Williams, Investigating language attitudes: Social meanings of dialect ethnicity and performance. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003. *Language in Society*, 34, 467-488.

Is That One Good? (2009). *Jar Jar Binks*. Retrieved October 26, 2009, from http://www.itog.com/item_info.pl?id=146999.

Johannesson, N.-L. (1983). On the Use of Syntactic Variation in The Lord of the Rings. In S. Jacobson (Ed.), *Papers from the Second Scandinavian Symposium on Syntactic Variation* (pp. 135-151), Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Joseph, J.E. (2006). Linguistic Identities, Double-edged Swords. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 30(3), 261-267.

Kerswill, P. & Williams, A. (2002). Dialect Recognition and Speech Community Focusing in New and Old Towns in England, The Effects of Dialects Leveling, Demography and Social Networks. In D. Long & D.R. Preston, *Handbook of*

Perceptual Dialectology, Volume 2 (pp. 173-204). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

de Klerk, V. & Bosch, B. (1995). Linguistic stereotypes: nice accent – nice person?. *Int'l. J. Soc. Lang.*, 116, 17-37.

Ladegaard, H.J. & Sachdev, I. (2006). 'I Like the Americans…But I Certainly Don't Aim for an American Accent': Language Attitudes, Vitality and Foreign Language Learning in Denmark. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(2), 91-108.

Levey, D. & Harris, T. (2002). Accommodating Estuary English, a study in accentual compromise. *English Today 71*, 18(3), 17-20.

McKenzie, R.M. (2008). Social factors and non-native attitudes towards varieties of spoken English: a Japanese case study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 63-88.

Melchers, G. & Shaw, P. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Hodder Education.

Moore, B. (2007). *Mesa Jar Jar Binks: A Linguistic Look at the Gungan Language*. Retrieved October 26, 2009, from http://www.brycemoore.com/academic/linguistics/jarjar.html.

Preston, D. (ed.) (1999). *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology, Volume 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ramirez Berg, C. (2002). *Latino images in film: stereotypes, subversion & resistance*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ramirez Luengo, J.L. (2005). Dialectalism As a Basis of Linguistic Characterization in the 18th Century: On Fray Gerundio de Compazas Once Again. *Moenia*, 11, 369-378. Retrieved through the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts database online, November 17, 2009 from http://csaweb106v.csa.com/ids70/view_record.php?id=3&recnum=14&log=from_res&SID=1pkl5crc0ukm4kjuce9oiu1gs2&mark_id=search%3A3%3A17%2C10%2C20.

Shuttlesworth, R.E. (2005). Language Ideological Factors in Twentieth Century Artistic Depictions of Southern American English. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 65(12), 4545-A. Retrieved through the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts database online, November 17, 2009 from http://csaweb109v.csa.com/ids70/view_record.php?id=2&recnum=0&log=from_res&SID=skfmbd7gki0ub302a1md40s4o0&mark_id=search%3A2%3A0%2C0%2C1.

Wells, J.C. (1982). *Accents of English 1, An Introduction*. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Wharton, A.S. (2005). *The Sociology of Gender*. MA: Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd..

Wikipedia (2007). *West Country dialects*. Retrieved October 17, 2009, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/West_Country_dialects.

Wolfram, W. & Schilling-Estes, N. (2006). *American English: dialects and variation*. MA: Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd..

7.2 Movies

Bates, K., Bay, M., Bryce, I., Clegg, A., Cohan, M., DeSanto, T., di Bonaventura, L., Goldner, B., McGonagle, M., Murphy, D., Nikolic, A., Orleans, L., Spielberg, S. & Vahradian, M. (Producers), Bay, M. (Director), Orci, R., Kurtzman, A., Rogers, J. & Kurtzman (Writers) (2007). *Transformers* [DVD]. USA: Dreamworks SKG.

Bates, K., Bay, M., Bryce, I., Clegg, A., Cohan, M., DeSanto, T., di Bonaventura, L., Goldner, B., Murphy, D., Spielberg, S. & Vahradian, M. (Producers), Bay, M. (Director), Kruger, E., Orci, R. & Kurtzman, A. (Writers) (2009). *Transformers: Revenge of the Fallen* [DVD]. USA: Dreamworks SKG.

Bloom, J., Kurtz, G, Lucas, G, McCallum, R. & Watts, R. (Producers), Kershner, I. (Director), Brackett, L., Kasdan, L. & Lucas, G. (Writers) (1980). *Star Wars: Episode V – The Empire Strikes Back* [DVD]. USA: Lucasfilm.

Bloom, J., Kazanjian, H.G., Lucas, G., McCallum, R. & Watts, R. (Producers), Marquand, R. (Director), Lucas, G. & Kasdan, L. (Writers) (1983). *Star Wars: Episode VI – Return of the Jedi* [DVD]. USA: Lucasfilm.

Jackson, P., Lynne, M., Ordesky, M., Osborne, B.M., Porras, R., Sanders, T., Selkirk, J., Shaye, R., Somers, E., Walsh, F., Weinstein, B. & Weinstein, H. (Producers), Jackson, P. (Director), Tolkien, J.R.R. (Writer, novel), Walsh, F., Boyens, P. & Jackson, P. (Writers) (2001). *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* [DVD] (Extended version). USA: New Line Cinema.

Jackson, P., Lynne, M., Ordesky, M., Osborne, B.M., Porras, R., Selkirk, J., Shaye, R., Walsh, F., Weinstein, B. & Weinstein, H. (Producers), Jackson, P. (Director), Tolkien, J.R.R. (Writer, novel), Walsh, F., Boyens, P. & Jackson, P. (Writers) (2003). *The Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King* [DVD] (Extended version). USA: New Line Cinema.

Jackson, P., Lynne, M., Ordesky, M., Osborne, B.M., Porras, R., Selkirk, J., Shaye, R., Walsh, F., Weinstein, B. & Weinstein, H. (Producers), Jackson, P. (Director), Tolkien, J.R.R. (Writer, novel), Walsh, F., Boyens, P., Sinclair, S. & Jackson, P. (Writers) (2002). *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* [DVD] (Extended version). USA: New Line Cinema.

Kurtz, G., Lucas, G. & McCallum, R. (Producers), Lucas, G. (Director), Lucas, G. (Writer) (1977). *Star Wars: Episode IV – A New Hope* [DVD]. USA: Lucasfilm.

Lucas, G. & McCallum, R. (Producers), Lucas, G. (Director), Lucas, G. (Witer) (1999). *Star Wars: Episode I – The Phantom Menace* [DVD]. USA: Lucasfilm.

Lucas, G. & McCallum, R. (Producers), Lucas, G. (Director), Lucas, G. (Writer) (2005). *Star Wars: Episode III – Revenge of the Sith* [DVD]. USA: Lucasfilm.

Lucas, G., McCallum, R. & Orleans, L. (Producers), Lucas, G. (Director), Lucas, G. & Hales, J. (Writers) (2002). *Star Wars: Episode II – Attack of the Clones* [DVD]. USA: Lucasfilm.

8. Appendix

8.1 Definitions and Terminology

Dialect, accent and variety: Dialect refers to the grammatical and lexical variation of a variety and accent to its pronunciation, while the term variety covers both the meanings of dialect and accent. Finally, *all* varieties, standard as well as nonstandard, are here treated and labeled as varieties, dialects and accents (see Melchers & Shaw 2003: 10-13).

Saliency and Stigmatization: "[s]alience is a term used to pick out a feature which outsiders notice" (Collins & Mees 2008: 158), features which of course are crucial in determining where a person is from, geographically as well as socially. A salient feature may suffer stigmatization and a "stigmatised accent characteristic is one which has low status, and accordingly is the subject of social disapproval" (ibid.).

Rhoticity: the presence of /r/ in word final position or before a consonant (Melchers & Shaw 2003: 17). The opposite is called nonrhoticity.

Glottal stop: The realization of medial /t/ as a glottal stop [ʔ], through t-glottalization, refers to the sound where "[t]he vocal folds and the arytenoids are close together so that the airstream coming from the lungs is momentarily stopped. On the release of the glottal closure the blocked air rushes out with an effect rather like a weak cough, or the noise one makes when lifting a heavy weight" (Collins & Mees 2008: 30).

H-dropping: the (variable) non-pronunciation of /h/ sounds (Collins & Mees 2008: 162).

Th-stopping: The realization of dental fricatives (th-sounds /θ/ and /ð/) as stops /t/ or /d/ (Collins & Mees 2008: 174).

Subject-verb agreement: The standard form of subject-verb constructions, such as 'they were' and 'he doesn't', not 'they was' and 'he don't' (see Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 89-90).

Habitual-be: The use of 'be' as a marker of a habitual state, as in 'she be reading a lot' for 'she (usually) reads' (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 52-53).

Double modals: The use of double modal verbs "to lessen the force of a verb in a way that a single modal does not" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 52).

Double comparison: "using both *-er/-est* inflection and *more/most*, as in *more happier*" (Estling Vannestål 2007: 225).

Double negatives: The use of double negative markers, such as "I didn't do nothing" for "I didn't do anything" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006: 52).

8.2 The Standard Lexical Sets for GA and RP

Table 3. The Standard Lexical Sets for GA and RP

Lexical Set	GA	RP
KIT	ɪ	ɪ
DRESS	ɛ	e
TRAP	æ	æ
LOT	ɑ	ɒ
STRUT	ʌ	ʌ
FOOT	ʊ	ʊ
BATH	æ	ɑː
CLOTH	ɔ	ɒ
NURSE	ɜr	ɜː
FLEECE	i	iː
FACE	eɪ	eɪ
PALM	ɑ	ɑː
THOUGHT	ɔ	ɔː
GOAT	o	əʊ
GOOSE	u	uː
PRICE	aɪ	aɪ
CHOICE	ɔɪ	ɔɪ
MOUTH	aʊ	aʊ
NEAR	ɪr	ɪə
SQUARE	er	eə
START	ɑr	ɑː
NORTH	ɔr	ɔː
FORCE	or	ɔː
CURE	ʊr	ʊə

(Melchers & Shaw 2003: 18)