What is the Sociolinguistic Monitor?

- The sociolinguistic monitor: “tracks, stores, and processes information on linguistic variation” (Labov et al. 2011).
  - Tested reactions to nonstandard ING using a “newscast paradigm.”
  - Logarithmic effect for the older speakers.
  - Develops with age (specifically in the workforce, post-college).
- Explicit social salience plays a role (Levon and Fox 2014).
  - Almost no effect for ING and TH-fronting, due to unclear indexical meaning of ING variation in UK.
- Possible difference in processing phonological vs. syntactic variables (Buchstaller and Levon, 2014).

Data and Methods

- Exp. 1: Undergraduates at UPenn and family and friends were recruited (22 for ING and 37 for GET/BE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphophonological IN vs. ING</th>
<th>Syntactic GET-Passive vs. BE-Passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Salient</strong></td>
<td><strong>Salient</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Changing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave Jennings $50,000</td>
<td>BE LIKE: 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave $50,000 to Jennings</td>
<td>Won't ever work Walsh said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got arrested</td>
<td>Won’t never work Walsh was like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Concord</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ditransitive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t ever work</td>
<td>Ditransitive: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won’t ever work</td>
<td>GET-Passive: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsh was like</td>
<td>Negative Concord: 46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Almost no effect for ING and TH-fronting, due to unclear indexical meaning of ING variation in UK. Possible difference in processing phonological vs. syntactic variables (Buchstaller and Levon, 2014).

- Exp. 2: Prolific Academic used to recruit 100 participants for each of 4 syntactic variables.

| Each condition contained 6 randomly presented trials with different frequencies of the nonstandard variant: 0/6, 1/6, 2/6, 3/6, 4/6, 5/6, 6/6. Participants were asked to judge the “professionalism” of the newscaster on a scale from 0-100 (“perfectly professional”).

Experiment 1: Syntactic vs. Morphophonological
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Experiment 2: Syntax and Change
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Discussion and Conclusion

- Direct correlation between positive slope and fraction of participants who explicitly mentioned the variable under consideration when asked if anything “stuck out to them”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ditransitive: 0%</th>
<th>GET-Passive: 6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Concord: 46%</td>
<td>BE LIKE: 68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Suggests that overt social salience plays a key role in what constructions are monitored.
- Therefore, syntactic variables can be attended to as long as they are sufficiently socially salient.
- No difference between younger speakers and older speakers
  - Sociolinguistic Monitor does not develop with age for these variables
- Changes in progress are not more salient (GET-passives show almost no effect).
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