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Editorial

Lauren Hall-Lew

It is my pleasure to present the first issue of the third volume of Lifespans & Styles: Undergraduate Working Papers on Intraspeaker Variation. This issue includes five papers on topics about within-speaker variation that are largely under-researched in the field of variationist sociolinguistics.

The first two papers pair nicely: Michaelov’s is a study of elder-directed speech, or “elderspeak”, while Blackwood’s is a study of child-directed speech (CDS). CDS has been studied quite extensively in the language acquisition literature but less so within sociolinguistics. Neither CDS nor elderspeak are typically analysed from the perspective of style-shifting or intraspeaker variation in sociolinguistics, although both are clearly the result of audience-driven effects. Both Michaelov’s and Blackwood’s papers focus on the production of /t/ by British women in their 40s. Michaelov focuses on word-final occurrences, whereas Blackwood considers all environments that permit glottalized variants. Michaelov’s analysis of the (Scottish) host of the BBC Radio 4 programme Desert Island Discs, Kirsty Young, finds a greater proportion of /t/-release when the guest on the programme is older than when the guest is younger. Blackwood’s study of the Supernanny television presenter (from London), Jo Frost, finds a greater proportion of glottal /t/ when the addressee is an adult than when the addressee is a child, a result that holds even in an American context.

The next two papers, by Ingold and Lee, focus on vowel production by young British men. Ingold’s analysis of the musician Zayn Malik tracks his production of the GOAT vowel over the first 6 years of his career, as well as comparing differences within years according to style. Ingold’s paper is a contribution to the growing sociophonetics literature on the speech of British Asians, and considers what the experiences of both fame and overt racism might have had on Malik’s vowel production. While Ingold considers the stylistic contrast of “casual, interview, and performative” styles (p. 20, this issue), Lee’s study of YouTuber Phil Lester looks at styles specific to the YouTube context of “solo vlog, collaborative vlog, gaming video, and live video” (p. 28, this issue). By diving into the as-yet-unexploited treasure trove of speech data offered by YouTube, Lee sets the stage for future studies by providing the criteria relevant for distinguishing YouTube video categories, and by doing so in terms of the classic Labovian metric of attention paid to speech.

While the other four papers in this volume are studies of British English speakers in the UK, as well as sociophonetic studies of segmental variation, the final paper by Klinger is something different entirely: the analysis of Hindi-English code-switching in Dehradun, Northern India. Of course, some of the earliest and most influential studies of intraspeaker variation in sociolinguistics were based on code-switching in India, and so Klinger’s paper presents an interesting, classical contrast to contributions such as Lee’s analysis of YouTube. At the same time, Klinger frames her analysis in terms of the shift from traditionalism to modernity, marked by the increased use of interclausal code-mixing among younger speakers. Indeed, another way in which her study is unlike the other papers is that it examines both interspeaker and intraspeaker variation, contrasting the code-switching patterns of older speakers with the code-mixing patterns of younger speakers, and framing both in terms of what it means to use intraspeaker variation to construct a modern Indian identity.

This issue was once again made possible by our brilliant and meticulous copyeditor, Dr Marion Nao, our tireless volunteer Editorial Board (Victoria Dickson, Francesca Shaw, Maria Dokovova, Joel Merry, Ruaridh Purse, and Abigail Salvesen), and our librarian, technical support, and all around cheerleader, Angela Laurins. We continue to be grateful for the PPLS Teaching and Learning Initiative Fund provided by the School of Philosophy, Psychology and Language Sciences at the University of Edinburgh, and this year we are additionally thankful to the department of Linguistics and English Language for dedicating financial support to keep Lifespans & Styles running until 2020!

Here’s to the celebration of variation in all its forms…

Lauren Hall-Lew
Editor
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