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Abstract

The textiles and clothing industries helped to shape the identity of the West Yorkshire area in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and were major sources of employment. This study examines the changing status of the industries in the area, the consequences of their rise and decline for those who worked in them, and to what extent a worker’s role in the trades influenced their sociolect and idiolect, with a focus on local vocabulary and grammatical features.

Two corpora of oral history interviews with former mill and clothing factory workers, five from the Leeds Archive of Vernacular Culture which were conducted in the 1980s, and eleven conducted by the researcher in 2018, formed the study’s primary data source. The pre-existing and new datasets were compared in order to track the progression of the industries over the course of the twentieth century, and to assess if they could provide any evidence of linguistic change. The project has an interdisciplinary focus, combining oral history with linguistics in its approach to the fieldwork and data analysis.

The dense and multiplex network ties created by the industries had consequences for the identity and idiolect of the speakers in both corpora, with the study finding some evidence of trade-specific vocabulary. Analysing the interview data at the level of individual speakers highlights the importance of going beyond abstract patterns of language-use based on broad demographic categories, taking into account social networks, rapport and speaker attitudes. This study suggests that the industries’ affiliation with the area endures despite their decline in recent decades. Although the dense social network ties formed through the trades have been severed, some speakers still maintain friendships made in the mills and clothing factories.
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**Transcription Conventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Pause</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Pause</td>
<td>(..)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Pause</td>
<td>(…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause lasting longer than a second</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlapping utterance</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{ overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Start</td>
<td>w-word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriber Doubt</td>
<td>[word]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAVC</td>
<td>LAVC corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2018 corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y.</td>
<td>Speaker age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Working class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWC</td>
<td>Upper working class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMC</td>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*e.g. Jim (LAVC 71y. MC)*
Chapter 1: Introduction

From the late nineteenth to the mid twentieth century, generations of families found work in the many textile mills and clothing factories across the West Yorkshire area. The wool and worsted\(^1\) cloth produced in the region’s mills was exported across the globe as well as providing the material for the clothing industry which emerged in Leeds in the 1850s and rapidly expanded in the following decades. Clothing factories were not confined to the districts of Leeds but sprung up in other towns and cities in West Yorkshire such as Castleford and Wakefield. The availability of local employment, especially for women, in the mills and factories resulted in strong community ties, with friends and family members often working alongside one another. The centrality of both industries to the local economy resulted in a host of trade-related terms and phrases. This study examines the changing status of the industries in the area, and the consequences of their rise and decline on the identities of those who worked in them and their language use, with a focus on local vocabulary and grammatical features. The analysis primarily draws on two sets of interviews conducted with former mill and clothing workers. The earlier dataset comprises five interviews conducted in the 1980s which now form part of the Leeds Archive of Vernacular Culture (LAVC), a multi-media archive of materials relating to the Survey of English Dialects and the former Institute of Dialect and Folk Life Studies (IDFLS) based at the University of Leeds. Eleven new interviews were then conducted in 2018 by the researcher. The study aims to answer four questions:

- What impact has there been on a speaker’s identity as a result of their time in the trades and the social network ties they formed?

- To what extent do social and occupational factors influence a speaker’s idiolect and how they construct their identities linguistically throughout the interview, including in oral narratives?

- What evidence is there in each corpus of vocabulary, both trade-specific and general, associated with ‘West Yorkshire’ or ‘Northern’ identity?

\(^1\) Underlined words are defined in the Glossary (Appendix D).
• What similarities and differences are there between the LAVC and 2018 recordings regarding workplace practices, solidarity, and working conditions?

The project’s methodology draws on both oral history and linguistics in light of its joint socio-historical and linguistic focus. Speakers’ responses to questions are not merely treated as linguistic data but are also valued for their socio-historical contribution. An electronic text analysis was carried out on the interview transcripts to quantify the linguistic variables under investigation. The datasets were compared to find any evidence of linguistic change.

Chapter 2 provides an overview of the history of the wool textiles and clothing industries in West Yorkshire. Chapter 3 outlines the selection of the datasets, and the project’s methodology and fieldwork techniques. Chapter 4 begins with a reflection on the fieldwork process in action before exploring the common threads and differing experiences amongst speakers’ testimonies about their time working in the industries, such as working conditions, attitudes to work, and camaraderie between workers. Chapter 5 examines trade-specific and general West Yorkshire vocabulary words found in the resulting data and their distribution amongst individual speakers. It also examines non-standard grammatical features in the interview data and how these varied not only according to broad social factors such as gender, age and social class, but in relation to: social network ties and career history, interview setting, and the degree of rapport established between the speaker and researcher. Chapter 6 considers how the narratives which emerged in the interviews do not merely provide a window onto the ‘past’ but perform an identity-construction function.
Chapter 2: History of the West Yorkshire Textiles and Clothing Industries

This chapter explores how the textiles and clothing industries have played a significant role in the history and prosperity of West Yorkshire, although the clothing industry is principally associated with Leeds. While each is examined in turn, in reality the industries had an interdependence as the cloth for the two- or three-piece woollen suits which came out of the Leeds factories and workshops was often supplied by local mills. The gradual decline of both industries following the Second World War was catalysed by several common factors.

West Yorkshire and Wool

Much of the prosperity of West Yorkshire, including Leeds, was founded on the production of wool and worsted cloth, both of which are made of the same basic fibre, wool. The primary difference is that the fibres in worsted yarn have been laid relatively parallel to each other, whereas the fibres in woollen yarn are crossed in all directions. This gives worsted cloth a smoother, shinier finish. Fig 1 provides an overview of the stages involved in both wool and worsted production. As Fig 1 shows, a series of drawing operations in the early stages of the production process help to straighten out the worsted fibres. As these additional stages are rather time-consuming, worsted firms tended to specialise in one stage of the process, such as top-making, spinning or wool-combing, whereas in the ‘vertical’ woollen mills, every stage of production from sorting to finishing could be carried out under one roof. Many of the industrial towns and cities within West Yorkshire had their own particular specialism (see Fig 2).

Bradford was once the ‘international capital of the wool textile industry’ (Mitchell, 1978:9), and by the mid-nineteenth century ‘Bradford borough had 32% of the spindles, 40% of the power looms and 32% of the labour force in the country’s worsted industry’ (James, 1990: 25). For the next twenty years Bradford ‘dominated world markets’ (1990: 47) in the worsted field. Huddersfield, although smaller than

---

2 The dyeing of the wool can occur at two stages. If it is dyed in-between the blending and carding stages, it is said to be ‘dyed in the wool’. It can alternatively be dyed once the wool has been woven into cloth, termed a ‘piece’, which is referred to as being ‘dyed in the piece’ or ‘piece dyed’. The process is sometimes carried out by independent dye houses. Scouring can also occur at the beginning or end of the process.
Bradford, was also well-known for weaving fine worsteds. Ossett, Batley and Dewsbury were the main centres of the ‘Heavy Woollen District’, known for producing fabric made from re-used fibres, such as ‘shoddy’ and ‘mungo’. Each area in the District had its own specialism. For instance, Dewsbury made woollen blankets (Mitchell, 1978: 10) and Osset was the centre for rag-sorting (Gee, 1950: V). Batley was the birthplace of both shoddy and mungo manufacturing. Wakefield was primarily a cloth-merchanting town until the 1820s, which saw ‘the spectacular rise of a specialised form of textile production in the form of worsted spinning for knitting and for carpet manufacture’ (Goodchild, 1981: 6). Leeds was the predominant centre for finishing and marketing cloth by the early seventeenth century, and had many wool and worsted mills operating in many of its districts until the late twentieth century, when the textile industry went into decline. The mills were often the socio-economic heart of districts such as Bramley and Armley, with generations of one family sometimes working at the same mill.

West Yorkshire has been affiliated with the wool and worsted industry from as early as the fourteenth century (see Thornes 1987). There was no greater concentration of Britain’s woollen manufacture than in West Yorkshire from the mid nineteenth to the late twentieth century. While a number of different reasons have been put forward as to why the production of wool and worsted cloth became centred in the region (see Brearley and Iredale (1977), and Thornes (1987) who offer differing views), the textile industry has undoubtedly left a lasting legacy on the heritage and lexicon of the region. The spinning and weaving of wool and worsted cloth was a domestic industry throughout Britain prior to the Industrial Revolution before labour and machinery gradually converged in mills and factories, a great number of which were situated in West Yorkshire and adjoining parts of Lancashire. Specific roles within the mills were divided along gender lines, with Busfield (1988) arguing that women came to dominate the workforce by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries because they could be classified as ‘unskilled’ and paid less than the men.
Fig 1: The Woollen and Worsted Cloth-Making Process

**Woollen Cloth**

1. **Blending**
   - Mixing of fibres.

2. **Spinning**
   - Wool reduced to the thickness required and machine inserts a twist into the yarn (2).

3. **Warping**
   - Cones of yarn wound over a drum (swift/mill) and a lengthwise thread, the ‘warp’, is made for weaving (3).

4. **Weaving**
   - ‘Weft’ (horizontal threads) are taken across the warp (4).

5. **Mending**
   - Woven pieces are checked for any faults. Consists of ‘perching’, ‘burling’ and ‘mending’.

6. **Finishing**
   - Final processes to give the finished cloth its desired properties, quality or appearance such as ‘scouring’ and ‘fulling’.

**Worsted Cloth (additional stages)**

1. **Raw wool cleaned, scoured and dried.**

2. **Gilling**
   - Draws out and levels prepared slivers of wool by passing them through multiple sets of rollers.

3. **Combing**
   - Removes short fibres and separates the remaining longer fibres.

4. **Drafting [+ Drawing]**
   - Slivers elongated by passing them through a series of rollers, each moving faster than the last.

(Adkisson and Adkisson, [no date])
Fig 2: Map of Specialisms in West Yorkshire Area

Google Maps, 2018b)
Changing Fortunes of the Mills

The ‘climactic period’ for the West Yorkshire woollen mills was around 1853-1873 (Mitchell, 1978), experiencing fluctuating demand throughout the next several decades. The picture of the industry was one of incurable, yet steady, deterioration in the decades following the Second World War, fuelled by a number of factors. Hardill (1982) argues that changing domestic demand and static consumer expenditure levels, import penetration of the home market, loss of export markets, the cyclical nature of the industry, and poor calibre of management were the major factors responsible. Price cites ‘new dominance of other markets’ and ‘slow innovation and modernisation’ (2014:34) in addition to the loss of export markets in the inter-war years amongst the industry’s problems. She highlights the significant labour shortages the industry experienced following the Second World War, with school-leavers escaping ‘the poor wages and conditions of wool mills for better-paid, cleaner jobs’ (2014:32). UK production of wool and worsted cloth declined by 26 per cent from 1971-79, and wool employment fell by 56 per cent from 1970-80 (Hardill, 1982). Despite the multitude of problems the industry was facing, Oxtoby (1970) argues that even as late as 1969 the wool industry remained a significant source of employment in the Yorkshire and Humberside region, claiming approximately ‘71 per cent of the total employment in the industry was in this region’ (1970:195). Nevertheless, Oxtoby (1970:200) acknowledges that production was falling, with woollens falling by 31 per cent and worsteds by 24 per cent from 1966-1969.

Changing fashions and a move towards more casual styles of dress meant that the demand for more old-fashioned, but durable, woollen garments fell. There was an increasing popularity of synthetic as opposed to man-made fibres. Some firms took the costly step of converting their machinery to produce synthetic, or synthetic and wool blend, fabrics, although for a great number of firms it was already too late. Many firms responded to the downturn in demand with a series of mergers. Hardill argues that this could have been an ineffective response which ensured the survival of ‘less efficient, large firms’ (1982:6). In the case of the Bradford-based industry, documented in detail by Keighley (2007), this merely prolonged their existence for several more years.
Numerous intact mills are now used for alternative purposes. Many are used as office or studio spaces, while some such as Armley Mills in Leeds and Moorside Mills in Bradford became museums in the second half of the twentieth century. However, it would be inaccurate to claim that the industry can be entirely consigned to the region’s past. There are a number of mills still in operation today that have survived and thrived by concentrating on producing a high-quality product for a specialist market. Bramley-based Alfred Brown, a worsted mill founded in 1815, produces men’s jackets, while Guiseley-based Abraham Moon, one of the last remaining vertical woollen mills in Britain (Moon, 2018), produces fashion and interior products. A.W. Hainsworth in Pudsey has specialised in producing cloth for military uniforms for over 250 years, but they have diversified into other areas such as printed table-top cloth for snooker and pool tables.

**The Leeds Tailors**

Until the 1850s, Leeds had no greater proportion of tailors than any other major city, but over the next three decades, the number of wholesale clothiers in Leeds rapidly expanded. Many trace the roots of the Leeds clothing industry to John Barran, who in 1856 established the first wholesale clothing factory in Alfred Street, where garments were ‘made for distribution and not against any order’ (Thomas, 1955:9). The wholesale clothing industry eventually surpassed engineering and textiles as Leeds’s staple industry by the inter-war years and became one of the largest sources of employment. Honeyman claims that at the industry’s peak in 1939 ‘the manufacture of clothing and its ancillary industries employed upwards of one in four working people in the city and almost one in two working women’ (2000:7). The Leeds industry specialised in men and boys’ tailored outwear as the suit ‘formed the basis of most male wardrobes from the 1920s to the 1960s’ (2000:2), whereas it is now reserved mainly for formal occasions rather than everyday wear, having regained its elitist status. From the mid nineteenth century, the woollen two- or three-piece suit gradually became a ‘democratic’ garment worn by all classes of men, reaching its peak popularity in the 1920s and 1930s. The clothing industry initially concentrated on ‘readymade’ garments in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but this was later surpassed by ‘made-to-measure’ suits. A change in working methods led to the emergence of ‘wholesale bespoke’ (Kershen, 1995: 29), dominated by a handful of large firms known as the ‘multiple tailors’
who both manufactured and marketed their own products, the largest of which was undoubtedly Burton. 1939 marked the industry’s peak before it, like the textiles industry, entered a period of initially imperceptible decline in the decades following the Second World War, gathering pace from the 1970s onwards.

**Structure of the Industry**

The interdependence between the large wholesale clothing factories and the Jewish-run workshops\(^3\) was crucial to the industry’s development. ‘Improved production techniques and increased demand’ (Kershen, 1995:28) led to Barran sub-contracting work out to Herman Friend’s small workshop in Templar Street, where the making-up of coats and jackets was sub-divided into a series of small, menial tasks, and the completed garments were then sent back to the factory. The practice of sub-contracting work from the factories to be made-up in workshops when demand was high\(^4\) and the factories were stretched to their full capacity was soon adopted by other factories, and became standard practice in the late nineteenth century. This was a more economical alternative to purchasing new premises or recruiting more staff due to the seasonal nature of the clothing industry, which experienced ‘slack’ periods throughout the year.

**The Clothing Workers**

From its earliest days, the wholesale clothing industry was a labour intensive one characterised by long hours for poor pay and, especially in the case of the smaller workshops or ‘sweatshops’, unwholesome conditions.\(^5\) Workers generally started at around eight o’clock in the morning and finished at five o’clock in the evening, with the addition of a half-day on Saturday and overtime. Roles within the factories and workshops became sharply divided along gender and religious lines. The women in the factories were, to begin with, strictly Gentile, while Jewish women found work in the workshops. This divide gradually weakened over time and Jewish workers of both sexes began to enter the factories and occupy a number of different positions. Women eventually came to dominate the clothing industry’s workforce, although

---
\(^3\) The vast number of European Jewish immigrants escaping persecution who arrived in Leeds in the late nineteenth century provided a source of cheap labour for the industry, as did their descendants.

\(^4\) The practice of sub-contracting had its origins further back in the century, but it was Friend and Barran who exploited it to a scale previously unseen.

\(^5\) There was also a small number of homeworkers.
they were usually classified as ‘unskilled’ or ‘semi-skilled’ workers, primarily working as machinists, tailoresses, and eventually office workers. Hiring women machinists presented an obvious advantage to employers, as they could be paid lower wages for doing essentially the same work as the men. They were also considered less likely to become involved with trade unions due to their lack of understanding about them or their time being preoccupied by domestic duties. Busfield (1985) argues that the definition of ‘skill’ was more a matter of gender prejudice on the part of the male workers and bore little relation to the training or ability required for the work. Cutters were the ‘aristocracy’ of the tailoring trade, with their higher wages, which were paid on a day rate, reflecting their ‘skilled’ status. Their position was protected for many years through effective trade union organisation as they fought fiercely to keep women out of the cutting rooms. Women were maintained on a piece rate system, where they were paid for the amount which they produced, as opposed to day rate as this was more economical for the employers, but the relatively poor levels of pay throughout the clothing industry as a whole remained a source of tension throughout its history.

The Multiple Tailors
The industry was still largely heterogeneous and atomistic prior to the First World War. It was relatively easy for an individual to establish themselves in the industry due to the low start-up capital required, resulting in a large number of small factories often sharing and changing premises. In the late nineteenth century, the garments produced by the wholesale factories were sold onto retailers who then sold them under their own trade name. Competition in the clothing industry was fierce, with supply outstripping demand. In response to the stiff competition, a number of the larger clothing manufacturers opened their own independent retail outlets, marketing as well as manufacturing their products. Hepworths and Blackburn are credited as being the first wholesale tailors to open retail outlets in the 1880s, although some such as John Barran’s resisted this move and concentrated on wholesaling. This in turn led to the emergence of ‘wholesale bespoke’, pioneered by firms such as Burton. The customer would enter one of their retail outlets and, after selecting his choice of pattern and cloth from the style books and fabric samples on display, his order and his individual measurements would be sent back to the factory where his suit would be made to his exact specifications on a production line. It was then sent
back to the shop for the customer to try on. This system essentially brought the possibility of owning a bespoke suit to working-class men.

The scale on which the factories operated and the low labour costs helped to keep the price of their suits down. Price’s stores were once known as ‘The Fifty Shilling Tailors’, boasting that the ordinary man could purchase a bespoke suit for this rather modest sum, which is equivalent to spending around £40 on a suit today. The multiples consisted of only a handful of Leeds-based firms operating on a national scale, with retail outlets located across Britain. Levitt estimates that by the 1930s the multiples were providing 30 per cent of all men’s tailored clothes in Britain and that they ‘helped to improve the nation’s standard of dress’ (1991:189). Burton was undoubtedly the largest of the multiple tailors. At their peak, there were over 10,000 people working on-site producing 30,000 suits a week at its Hudson Road factory, which was said to be the largest clothing factory in the world. It is claimed that the phrase ‘The Full Monty’ originally meant a three-piece suit from Burton (OED, 2017). Given their wide range of clientele, the multiples offered limited styles in dull, ‘safe’ colours in what Montague Burton referred to as ‘style monotony’. More recently, however, Sprecher’s (2016) research has emphasised the individuality afforded by a made-to-measure suit, which was more nuanced and not so strictly ‘conformist’ due to its scope for customisation. The affordability of their made-to-measure suits meant that the Leeds multiple tailors could participate in ‘subversive dress forms’ (2016:10), such as those worn by the 1950s Teddy Boys and the 1960s Mods. She argues that the multiple tailors continued to play a dominant role in influencing male fashion even between the 1940s and 1980s when the industry’s fortunes were beginning to deteriorate.

The Industry Unravels

In the decades following the Second World War, the Leeds clothing industry faced increasing problems as bespoke suits began to fall out of fashion. Men’s tastes were changing. Far from being a symbol of democracy, the suit came to be seen as stuffy and old-fashioned. Young men became more casual and particular in their choice of apparel. A significant influence on fashion trends were pop culture figures such as The Beatles and The Rolling Stones. The days of ‘style monotony’ were over. Men were no longer content to look alike, nor was a purchase of a piece of clothing an
investment, as younger generations were more likely to discard clothes and purchase new ones depending upon fashion trends. This was compounded by ‘growing competition from both cheap and higher-quality imports from abroad’ (Honeyman, 2000:227) as ready-made usurped made-to-measure. The fact that the backbone of the industry was cheap, and mostly female, labour proved to be part of its downfall. This had ‘provided manufacturers with a low-cost route to maintaining profits’ (2000:226), but provided little incentive to invest in new production methods or products, meaning that they could not restructure their production to make ‘better-quality and more fashionable items and to seek alternative markets’ (Honeyman, 2000: 226) in the wake of imports from abroad.

The multiple tailors were, for the most part, slow to respond to changes in fashion trends. Some efforts were made in the form of collaborating with designers such as Hardy Amies in the case of Hepworths (Sprecher, 2016:11), but for the most part they sought to combat the slump in demand by increasing the productivity of their existing workforce and keeping wages low. This was made more difficult by the outcome of the 1970 Leeds Clothing Strike, the latest in a long line of disputes over the poor wages and conditions which workers in clothing factories were subjected to. Honeyman argues that the strike ‘marked the conclusion of a long period in which the low pay of clothing workers of both sexes supported an inefficient industry’ (2000:209). Its scale was unprecedented, with an estimated 12,000 workers going on strike, although the figure soon escalated to 20,000 as the strike radiated outwards from Leeds. The strikers were demanding a shilling per hour increase in wages for both men and women, and while the increase which they eventually received exceeded their demands, the increased cost of production incurred by clothing firms as a result only catalysed the waves of redundancies and firms going into liquidation which followed. Some retailers such as Burton and Hepworths ensured their survival by concentrating solely on retailing, but the manufacturing of clothing moved overseas and Leeds factories closed their doors.

Conclusion
This chapter has explored how the textiles and clothing industries played a significant part in the history of West Yorkshire, and the reasons for their decline. It examined how the working methods of the clothing and textiles industries were
established, relying on labour-intensive production methods where the division of labour reduced the skill of the work involved, with the prominence of women in the industries being due to the fact that they were cheaper to employ than men. In Chapter 4 we shall see what attitudes the workers had towards such working conditions from the speakers’ testimonies. Chapter 3 outlines the make-up of both speaker samples and the development of the fieldwork methods.
Chapter 3: Methodology and Data Selection

The project’s methodology combines oral history with linguistic fieldwork, with both frameworks influencing the fieldwork design. This approach was adopted as the project is not only concerned with gleaning insights about the evolution of local lexical and grammatical features, but also with what it was like to work in the industries for those interviewed, and whether working practices have changed over time. The primary method of acquiring data to address these objectives was through semi-structured, informal interviews with former textile and clothing workers. This chapter consists of two sections. The first section outlines the LAVC materials which were the starting point for the project, and the make-up of the two speaker samples. The second section explores the underlying theory and objectives of each framework, and how these were combined. It examines the various elements of the fieldwork design, including: the choice of data-collection methods, the interview structure, the designing of the topic list, and transcription, analysis and ethics.

The LAVC Materials

Background to the LAVC

The Leeds Archive of Vernacular Culture (LAVC) is comprised of two halves. The first consists of materials relating to the Survey of English Dialects (SED), a ground-breaking, nationwide survey which attempted to compile a comprehensive atlas of ‘the oldest and most conservative forms of dialect speech’ (Orton et al., 1978:2), directed by Harold Orton of the University of Leeds and Eugen Dieth of the University of Zurich throughout the 1950s and 1960s. This material includes fieldworkers’ notebooks, audio recordings, and other written documents relating to the SED. The second half consists of material from the former Leeds Institute of Dialect and Folk Life Studies (IDFLS), an institute within the University which studied different aspects of ‘Folk Life’, including subjects such as traditional songs, superstitions and traditional crafts. Amongst the materials in this multi-media collection are audio recordings and student dissertations on a range of topics, including a number of items relating to the West Yorkshire textiles industry, and it was these materials that were the inspiration for the current project.
The Textiles Materials

The foundation of the project was five audio recordings of interviews with former textile workers in the 1980s from around the Leeds area. Table 1 gives a summary of each of these interviews while Fig 3 shows the locations of the firms where the speakers most recently worked. Four of the interviews were conducted by Fiona Byron, a former IDFLS student, as part of her research for her M.A. thesis into women’s traditions in the Leeds tailoring industry (1981).\(^6\) The interview conducted by Patricia Morris is one of a number carried out with former mill workers from the Bramley district of Leeds. The specific purpose and objective of these interviews is not entirely clear, as the content of the interviews is not always centred entirely on mill work. No thesis connected to the interviews was found. The fact that Patricia Morris was a former mill worker herself does suggest that gathering information about the work and lives of mill workers in Leeds, at a time when the industry was rapidly in decline, was the primary purpose of the interviews. The five interviews in the LAVC corpus are very varied in length and subject matter, with the researcher often allowing speakers to digress about aspects of their home life and formative years.

\(^6\) I was unable to consult Fiona Byron’s thesis as this was recorded as missing from the LAVC catalogue at the time of writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age (at time of interview)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Interview Date and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Albrecht</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Director of Leeds-based clothing firm Albrecht &amp; Albrecht Limited</td>
<td>20th January 1981; premises of Albrecht and Albrecht Limited, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Blackburn⁷</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Sample machinist and designer at several factories, including a ladies dress factory in Woodhouse Lane, Leeds</td>
<td>December 1980; unknown factory, Leeds(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Gaunt</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Winder at Yates’ mill</td>
<td>July 1981; own home, Bramley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Rosentalks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Cutter and shop steward at Burton’s Hudson Road Factory</td>
<td>14th January 1981; own home, Leeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Roche</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Apprentice at John Barrans-run workshop; tailor and shop steward at Burton’s Hudson Road factory; Chairman of trade union</td>
<td>December 1980; own home, Leeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷ No Christian name provided.
Fig 3: Most Recent Locations of Speakers’ Workplaces (LAVC)

(Google Maps, 2018a)
Written Sources

While the five audio recordings formed one of the current project’s two datasets, there were also a number of written sources in the LAVC that provided invaluable background information, as well as terminology and dialect words. *The Leeds Tailoring Papers*, assembled by Paul Smith, an IDFLS student of Stewart Sanderson, is a collection of textiles-related ephemera mostly relating to Burton, and was a valuable resource. Amongst the items in the collection are pamphlets, wage books and training manuals published by Burton from the mid twentieth century. These were significant as they provided an insight into the principles and working methods of what was once the largest of the ‘multiple’ tailors in Leeds. A pamphlet published by the Textile Research Department of Montague Burton Ltd., *Textile Techniques* (Stephenson, 1934) was also useful in providing a step-by-step guide of the wool-making process. Other items in this collection included manuscripts for books on tailoring, pattern books from Hepworths, and a file of newspaper clippings about Burton. Mary Fieldhouse’s dissertation, *Glimpses of Industrial Bradford* (1972), was also an important source in the early stages of the research, documenting the history of the wool and worsted industries, and the working lives and traditions of those who worked in the mills based upon the testimonies of six individuals from Bradford. Fieldhouse’s short glossary of local terms offered a brief glimpse into the local lexis.

LAVC Speaker Overview

The backgrounds and occupations of the five LAVC speakers are somewhat varied: four worked in the wholesale clothing industry while only one, Lily, worked in a worsted mill. All of the interviews were conducted within a year of each other, although the speakers themselves were born sometimes decades apart. Jim’s interview is the longest of the five, with almost every question producing an extended turn. He is a natural orator, and his responses are rich in narratives as he paints a vivid picture of what it was like for the people who lived and worked in East Leeds in his time. Narratives are highly sought after by sociolinguists and oral historians alike, and it is through storytelling, as Langellier and Peterson note, that ‘people make sense of their experiences, claim identities, interact with each other, and participate in cultural conversations’ (2004:1). Leslie similarly produces extensive periods of talk about what it was like to work in the clothing industry. Mrs
Blackburn’s responses are somewhat shorter. Lily’s interview with Patricia has a far more conversational tone, perhaps due to the fact that both women are from the same in-group as former Leeds mill workers, with Patricia participating in far longer stretches of talk than Fiona Byron in her interviews. This is perhaps at odds with the more stereotypical notion of interviewing where the interviewer is strictly confined to the role of questioner. Jim and Leslie’s lengthier digressions can perhaps be attributed to their heavy involvement in the tailoring trade, not only as master craftsmen in their respective occupations, but also as shop stewards who had leading roles within the trade union and the 1970 Leeds Clothing Strike. A proportion of each recording is dedicated to the speaker’s general life history. While this is not directly related to textiles, it nonetheless has socio-historical value, even more so thirty-five years after the interviews were conducted, as the customs and ways of life related are so different from today. However, broader socio-economic conditions played a vital part in determining the opportunities available to people in the area, as the textiles and tailoring industries were not always the speakers’ preferred career choice.

2018 Interviews Overview

Table 2 provides a summary of the 2018 speakers. Like the LAVC interviews, the 2018 sample contained a mix of proprietors, managers or supervisors, people on the shop floor and mill workers. Fig 4 shows the most recent and identifiable locations where the speakers worked in the trades. The audio file for Jack Rigg’s interview was unfortunately lost but detailed notes were obtained from the interview. While Carol Swann lives in Royston which is now part of South Yorkshire, this was once part of West Yorkshire prior to the Local Government Act of 1972, and Carol herself was originally from Wakefield. I examine the selection of the 2018 sample in greater detail in the next section.
Table 2: 2018 Speaker Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Interview Date, Location and Length (hh:mm:ss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Berwin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Former Director of Leeds-based clothing firm Berwin &amp; Berwin, Roseville Road, Leeds</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018; Cafe Nero, Chapel Allerton (00:32:59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Butcher</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Apprenticed at The Albion factory, worked at several Leeds-based clothing firms; proprietor of Oakwood Tailors, Roundhay Road, Leeds</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018; Oakwood Tailors, Oakwood, Leeds (01:23:54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Grainger</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Machinist at Prices Tailors, Kirkstall Road, Leeds</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; February 2018; Leeds Art Gallery café, Leeds (01:02:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Horsman</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>79(?)</td>
<td>Machinist at Sumrie, York Road, Leeds</td>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018; Leeds Art Gallery café, Leeds (01:06:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Olsen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Machinist at Hepworths, Claypit Lane, Leeds</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018; Cross Gates Library, Cross Gates (00:58:55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Richardson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Piecer at mills in Morley</td>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018; Hillside Enterprise Centre, Beeston (01:28:17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Rigg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Worked in finishing department at Woodhouse’s mill, Town Street, Farsley</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2018; own home, Bramley (audio lost-2hrs. approx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Rose</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Director of The Master Tailor, Sovereign Street, Leeds</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; March 2018; Laidlaw Library, University of Leeds (00:50:48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Smith*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Machinist at several factories including Sugdens, Wakefield</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January 2018; Womack Fisheries, Normanton (00:26:00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Swann</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61(?)</td>
<td>Machinist at several factories</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January 2018; own home, Royston (00:35:57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Underwood</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Machinist at Charles Barkers, Marsh Lane, Leeds</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; January 2018; Leeds Art Gallery café, Leeds (00:49:20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*pseudonym
Fig 4: Most Recent Locations of Speakers’ Workplaces (2018)

Female Worker

Male Worker

(d-maps.com, 2018)
Defining Oral History and Linguistic Fieldwork

Oral history is something of a catch-all term, referring ‘both to a method of recording and preserving oral testimony and to the product of that process’ (Oral History Association: 2017). The ‘product’ of the interview process can include the resulting audio-recorded narrative, transcription, or any interpretation of the data by the researcher or others. For Abrams, oral history’s defining feature which sets it apart from other forms of interviewing is ‘the act of remembering about the past’ (2016: 3), while the traits of orality, narrative, subjectivity, credibility, objectivity and authorship are what set it apart from other forms of historical study as ‘the researcher, with the cooperation of interviewees, creates his or her own sources’ (2016:24). For the purposes of the current project, I will offer my own definition of oral history, adapted largely from Yow’s (2014) definition of oral history, as ‘a research practice that records memories and personal narratives of historical significance in oral form for research purposes beyond the recording itself’. While this is by no means ideal, it summarises my own understanding of oral history, and how it is applied to the project. Oral history does not just seek the ‘facts’ of a past event or topic, but the memories of the individuals interviewed, the emotions they felt, and their reflections on their life experiences. The resulting texts, whether oral or written, aim to preserve their words and make them accessible for the future, both to other researchers and to the public.

What constitutes ‘fieldwork’ in linguistics has been subject to debate. I have adapted both Sakel and Everett (2012) and Bowern’s (2008) definitions of ‘fieldwork’. Sakel and Everett’s definition, while admittedly limited, does cover a number of basic elements of linguistic fieldwork, which they define as ‘the activity of a researcher systematically analysing parts of a language, […] usually within a community of speakers of that language’ (2012: 5). This could include conducting surveys, interviews or ethnographic studies. While this project analyses ‘parts of a language’, namely grammatical and lexical features of West Yorkshire dialects, it is perhaps not as ‘systematic’ as a purely linguistic investigation. Given the oral history dimension of the project, more emphasis is placed on the actual historical and personal content of the interviews, as opposed to speakers’ responses being raw data from which to distil tokens of linguistic variables.
In Labov’s frequently cited definition, a speech community is not marked by ‘any marked agreement of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms’ (1972: 121), although this too has faced criticism as it ‘seems to imply a uniform orientation toward language standards that real communities do not seem to share’ (Schilling, 2013: 21). A useful concept to be viewed in connection with the speech community is the ‘community of practice’, which gained significance in linguistics largely through Eckert and McConnell-Ginet’s application of the concept to their work on language and gender (1992: 2007). While speech communities are defined in terms of broad categories such as age, gender, class etc., or simple co-presence in a neighbourhood or workplace, communities of practice are instead linked ‘in virtue of shared practice’, with individuals being linked by a shared goal and regular interaction as well as a shared linguistic repertoire. Communities of practice go beyond broad demographic categorisations, and ‘offer links to social networks, institutions, and larger, and imagined, communities’ (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2007:29). The emphasis on 'practice' highlights the constructed nature of the social meaning of linguistic variables, with one variable possibly possessing different values between a speaker’s different communities of practice. While the mill and clothing workers could be seen as communities of practice as they had a shared goal, i.e. the manufacture of woollen or worsted goods, and regular interaction, more detailed knowledge of the linguistic repertoire used within an individual factory, or perhaps even an individual department, would require an in-depth study which in many cases was not possible as the firms have now closed. I reserved judgement in identifying a speech community or community of practice in my areas of research given the study’s scope.

Bowern (2008:7) offers a broader, looser definition of fieldwork emphasising three key elements: the collection of accurate data in an ethical manner, producing a result which both the community and the linguist approve of, and the linguist interacting with a community at some level. Bowern places particular emphasis on the ethical aspect of conducting research in a community, something that was crucial to the present project. With these points in mind, I define fieldwork as ‘the activity of a researcher systematically analysing parts of a language in an ethical manner, usually working with the community of speakers of that language’. An ‘ethical manner’ refers to such points as being honest with your speakers about your research agenda,
not using material recorded without the speaker’s knowledge or permission, ensuring speakers will not be asked to do anything that may inflict harm, and considering how the personal data of those interviewed will be stored and used both during and after the research. A rigorous ethical review process was undertaken prior to commencing the fieldwork, for which I received approval from the Arts, Humanities and Cultures Faculty Research Ethics Committee (reference number PVAR 17-022). I argue that an ‘ethical manner’ should also include taking into account the interests of those interviewed who ‘may feel that their contribution to the research should not be limited to answering the questions that you think up for them’ (Bowern, 2008: 150). It was felt that ‘working with’ was preferable to ‘working within’ a community of speakers, as this did not merely present the researcher as a detached observer inserted into an unfamiliar environment. It also presented the ‘community’ of study, and the individuals within it, as having a more pro-active and involved role, collaborating with the researcher in producing the data and shaping the outcomes of the study.

What these different definitions of oral history and linguistic fieldwork reveal is that each discipline has a different agenda. While oral history aims to capture historically significant stories and memories, linguistic fieldwork is more interested in how the words are spoken and what they are, with the questions on the interview schedule acting as conversational triggers to produce extensive passages of ‘naturalistic’ speech from the speaker in as close an approximation to everyday conversation as possible. Abrams cautions that we should ‘not ignore the orality of oral history’ (2016: 20) lest we rob it of its emotional impact, as the way a testimony is given is equally as important as its subject matter. This may include attempting to replicate the speaker’s dialect in the transcript instead of using Standard English.

**Terminology**

I will briefly make a note about the terms used to refer to those interviewed and those conducting the interview. As Douglas (2016) notes, a variety of terms are used by both oral historians and linguists, including: informant, consultant, interviewee, participant, witness, narrator, and speaker. Many of these were felt to have connotations which made them unsuitable for the project, a hypothesis confirmed by the British National Corpus (2017). For example, ‘informant’ was often used in the
sense of a witness to a criminal activity, while ‘consultant’ was frequently used in the sense of a medical consultant. The term ‘speaker’, often favoured by linguists, was eventually decided upon as this term was felt to be the least value-laden. ‘Researcher’ will be used in the place of ‘interviewer’, as this more fully reflects their role as someone who shapes the interview questions and frames the resulting recorded interview, as opposed to simply conducting the interview itself.

**Anonymity**

The point at which oral history and linguistics differ which caused the greatest challenge in designing the study was the degree of anonymity granted to the speakers in the transcription, analysis, and outcomes of the research. Sociolinguists would typically advocate that all such material be anonymised, with pseudonyms being used in the place of the speakers’ real names, and any personal details being either omitted or changed to protect their identities. Oral historians on the other hand maintain that ‘because of the importance of context and identity in shaping the content of an oral history narrative, it is the practice in oral history for narrators to be identified by name’ (Oral History Association, 2017). I therefore desired to preserve such details with the speaker’s permission, which was obtained through an Informed Consent Form following the interview. My intentions were made clear in the Information Pack issued to speakers during the recruitment process. The real names of speakers, locations and company names are given throughout the thesis unless otherwise specified.

**Data-Gathering Methods**

Informal, tape-recorded interviews were felt to be the best method of gathering data for the project. Interviewing has many advantages, with the project being influenced by sociolinguistic interviewing as well as dialectology. One of the main advantages of sociolinguistic interviewing is that its chief goal ‘is to elicit lots of talk rather than specific forms and features’ (Schilling, 2013: 93), with interview questions being designed to ‘steer attention away from language itself toward topics of interest to interviewees’ (2013: 93). This is something that was in accordance with the oral history dimension of the study where the aim is to get the speaker talking at length on a particular subject, although this is regardless of their speech ‘style’. More crucially, this means that they will produce large quantities of more naturalistic data
than one would obtain by much more direct elicitation techniques, producing a sufficient amount of data to carry out a quantitative analysis. Questionnaires like those used in traditional dialectology would be more likely to elicit brief, undetailed responses, although as will be seen in the topic list design, this approach does sometimes serve a purpose. The sociolinguistic approach to interviewing is nevertheless perceived as having many drawbacks (see Schilling, 2013), and as it is a type of speech event in its own right, ‘the naturalness and certainly the informality of the recorded speech can be called into question’ (Feagin, 2002: 26). Moreover, as this is not a purely linguistic investigation, exercises typically involved in linguistic interviews, such as reading tasks intended to elicit more ‘careful’ or ‘formal’ speech styles, were not included in the fieldwork design as this was not the focus of the study. A quantitative analysis of both the LAVC and the 2018 datasets was also decided upon as ‘statistical manipulations of the data can show whether the occurrence of a variable is happenstance or patterned’ (Feagin, 2002: 26). Recording the interviews was therefore essential for clarification as well as preservation.

A Constructivist Approach to Interviewing

It has recently been recognised that interviews are essentially ‘intersubjective’ and ‘constructive’ in nature, as opposed to the researcher simply extracting information from the speaker. Yow argues that speakers bring ‘their intimate knowledge of his or her own life and often a different perspective’ (2014:1) to the interview, which complements the researcher’s knowledge of their discipline. She also argues that completely eliminating ‘researcher’s bias’ in qualitative research is never possible; ‘because it is the researcher who forms the research questions, the bias is present from the beginning’ (2014:7). It is also usually the researcher conducting the interview who then frames and moulds the raw data into the research outputs. The researcher’s age, gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic background also play a part in determining the speaker’s attitude towards them, as well as their choice of speech style. The researcher therefore will very likely only glimpse one dimension of a speaker’s linguistic repertoire in the interview situation. I was conscious of how my position as a young, inexperienced, female researcher would affect my speakers’ reaction to me, most of whom were female and past retirement age. As the interview

---

8 An alternative opinion was to conduct an ethnographic study of the area, but given the limited time frame of the project, this was deemed to be unfeasible.
is a joint construction and the researcher can never be reduced to a passive observer, it must be treated more like a conversation, albeit one ‘with a purpose’ (Berg and Lune, 2014: 105), and the researcher should not aim to provide minimum feedback. Schilling argues that ‘the interview is an exchange, not a one-way street’ (2013:210) and that speakers will feel more inclined to speak at length if they feel that they are ‘participating in a friendly conversation rather than a formal interview’ (2013:210), a view supported by my own experience of conducting interviews. This does not necessarily permit the researcher to dominate the conversation, or allow the speaker to assume the role of questioner for an extensive amount of time. I argue that a balance must be maintained, and the researcher must ensure the interview stays on track. Despite the fact that the researcher cannot recede entirely into the background, this does not mean to say we should pay no attention to how we present ourselves. Rather, we should be conscious of how our own position and appearance might affect the course of the interview and the speaker’s response to us.

Cave argues that, in his experience of conducting interviews in Royston, concepts of ‘insider’ and 'outsider' ‘seemed inadequate as they failed to reflect the uncertain and dynamic feelings that were experienced during the fieldwork’ (2001: 58). Despite being a native and having worked as a miner in the area, Cave discovered that:

While it is true that I had connections in the mining community on which this study focuses, I never felt a complete insider. A more accurate description would be to say that, during each fieldwork encounter, my status was continually renegotiated, rendering the labels of insider or outsider inadequate. (2001: 51)

This was not entirely dissimilar to my own position. While, like Cave, I am a native of the location I have chosen to study and have ‘insider knowledge’ of its terms and customs, my position is ultimately one of periphery, with my status as a university researcher marking me as an ‘outsider’ or ‘other’. In this light, establishing ‘rapport’ and building on shared connections between the researcher and speaker are important in diminishing the ‘outsider’ status.

**Location and Sample**

West Yorkshire’s long affiliation with the textiles industry, and the fact that it is where the five LAVC interviews in my data were conducted, meant it was the ideal
place to conduct the investigation. Fig 5 gives a rough indication of the area of study. Originally this encompassed the cities of Leeds, Wakefield, Halifax, Huddersfield and Bradford, all of which were once major producers of wool and worsted cloth, as well as the smaller towns in the Heavy Woollen District of Batley, Dewsbury and Ossett, meaning this was the most suitable area for locating ‘native’ speakers who had both worked in the industry, or had a family connection to it, and who spoke the local dialect. In practice, most speakers recruited were in the Leeds and Wakefield area.
Fig 5: Locations in 2018 Sample (West Yorkshire)
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(d-maps.com, 2018)
Given the wide geographical scope of the area, to expect the individuals between, as well as in, each major town or city to be linguistically homogeneous would be absurd. Such a wide scope was deemed necessary in order to recruit a sufficient number of participants in the time frame of the study as opposed to narrowing the focus to Leeds alone, which was where all five LAVC speakers lived and worked. As the project is not purely linguistic, a representative sample of the local population was not the objective. Instead, a judgement sampling technique was favoured. Speakers were recruited on the basis of two main criteria: that they were born or raised in the area and can be considered as having ‘native’ status, and that they have worked in the textiles or clothing trade in the area at some point. The latter is essential given the historical as well as linguistic orientation of the project, while the former is somewhat problematic as a concept. Having speakers who are ‘natives’ of the area would increase the probability of them speaking the ‘local’ dialects. However, it was recognised that the nature of the population of these areas has altered somewhat since the LAVC interviews, largely due to immigration, which problematises who should be granted ‘native’ speaker status and the notion of a ‘speech community’ even further.

The ideal sample consisted of ten to fifteen individuals, as this was deemed to be a feasible number for interviewing, transcribing, and analysing in the time frame of the project, and enough for a reasonable comparison of the variables under investigation. This sample was mixed in terms of age, sex, and socio-economic backgrounds. The make-up of the actual sample was ultimately determined by the response rate to the recruitment efforts. As most of those in mill or tailoring work are now past retirement age, the majority of those recruited were in the same age category. This was not an attempt to obtain ‘NORMS’ (Non-mobile Older Rural Males) as in traditional dialectology like the SED, as it has since been recognised that the focus on older males meant that the majority of speakers in the ‘community’ and their language were ignored. It was desirable to include women in the study sample as they were an important part of the workforce of both industries.

People were recruited through: a poster campaign at Leeds libraries, blog posts and social media outlets for local museums and libraries, approaching organisations via email, and asking family and friends from the area. A ‘snowballing’ method was
also used where a speaker was asked if they had any friends or former work colleagues who might be interested in participating in the project. Contacting working mills in the area to ask whether any of their current employees might be interested in participating in the project proved unsuccessful.

The decision was taken not to interview speakers in their own homes as, while this is advantageous as this is a place where speakers are likely to feel the most relaxed, it was not appropriate for the researcher to work alone at an isolated location, especially if they were perhaps unfamiliar with the local area. Exceptions were made when the speaker expressed a desire to be interviewed at home, in which case a friend accompanied the researcher to the interview. Otherwise public locations such as community centres, libraries, or cafes that were known to both the researcher and speaker were viewed as a more favourable alternative. Conducting the interviews in a place known to the speaker on their ‘home ground’ may help to put them more at ease, while also providing a relatively quiet space where background noise will not interfere with the quality of the audio recording. No set time limit was set for the interviews, although the ideal range was between twenty and sixty minutes, as this would allow sufficient time for information on all topic questions to be gathered, would not tax the speaker or cause them to grow tired, and would produce a manageable amount of audio data to transcribe. In actuality, the interviews ranged from twenty minutes to over two hours. Conducting interviews with multiple speakers or having another person present in the room, for instance a family member or friend, was not only acceptable, but highly advantageous. There is admittedly some disagreement between my two frameworks on this point. Yow argues that conducting interviews where there is only a single interviewer and interviewee is the best practice as ‘the presence of a third person changes the interview’ (2014:105), leading to the possibility of one person dominating the interview or, if the interviewer is an ‘out-group member’, solidifying ‘their feeling of being in their own out-group’ (2014:105), with speakers not offering much information to the researcher in their responses. Linguistics has a different view. From this perspective, having a third person present who is familiar to the speaker may result in the speaker adopting a more ‘natural’ or ‘informal’ speech style if they converse with that person, or if the other person makes comments on the topics discussed. Having
multiple generations of the same family also allows the researcher, if they are fortunate, to observe inter-generational language change.

**Interview Style, Structure and Topic List**

A ‘semi-standardised’ model was felt to be the most ideally suited for the project. While the questions for a semi-standardised interview are predetermined and relate to a specific topic or number of topics, there is a greater deal of flexibility allowed with this approach as opposed to a ‘standardised’ interview, where the ordering and wording of the questions must be strictly maintained. In Berg’s discussion of the features of a semi-structured interview, he notes that the questions are ‘typically asked of each interviewee in a systematic and consistent order, but the interviewers are allowed freedom to digress’ (2014:112). The insertion of probes between questions is also permitted for a semi-standardised interview to allow for clarification and expansion by speakers on a given topic area. This is highly beneficial as it allows the researcher to ‘approach the world from the subject’s perspective’ (Berg and Lune, 2014: 113). These categories of interviewing, however, are not rigid. For instance, while the questions on the topic list are in an intentional order, this is not fixed. The order varied between interviews depending on whether a speaker covered several topics in one turn, or if the interview appeared to be drawing to a close and some points situated near the start of the topic list had not been covered which the researcher then returned to. The topic list in a semi-standardised interview is highly adaptable in the sense that questions can be inserted or deleted between interviews, depending upon the individual speaker. Questions on the topic list were adapted as the fieldwork progressed, or new topic lists were developed for certain individuals such as clothing firm directors. The general topic list and additional questions used for some speakers are listed in Appendices A-C.

The development of the topic list was influenced by three factors: the questions used by the researchers in the LAVC interviews, my own pre-existing knowledge of the industries from growing up in the area, and guides on conducting such interviews. Beginning the interview by asking the speaker a few questions to elicit biographical information about themselves is a preferable way into the interview for several reasons. This is useful from a linguistic perspective as this provides demographic information such as a speaker’s age, where they grew up, where they
went to school, where they have worked, and what social networks they have been part of, as these are all factors that can potentially contribute to language variation. This also acts as an ice breaker, and sometimes resulted in the speaker entering into a free-flowing narrative about themselves. In addition, this introduces a number of threads to be picked up on later in the interview. The questions were divided under the headings ‘Background Information’, ‘Career Choices’, ‘Work Life’, ‘Social Life’, ‘Clarification Questions’, and ‘Closing’, although this ordering is largely for the researcher’s benefit rather than a required order. These categories were intended to cover all main aspects of the speaker’s working life, and to hit upon topics that were of interest to the speaker, and would thus produce extended periods of talk.

While most of the questions are general and relate to different aspects of working in the trades, some questions are aimed specifically at those who worked in the mills or at those who worked in the clothing factories. Follow up questions which were dependent upon speaker response, were also included in the topic list.

A point on which both oral history and linguistic fieldwork are in agreement is the general avoidance of leading or closed questions, and this was something that was taken into account in designing the topic list. Closed questions were generally avoided, as Wray and Bloomer argue that they require only short answers, tend to prejudice the issues under discussion and possible responses, and can appear patronizing (2012: 167). Using more ‘open’ questions acts as a ‘gateway to following up interesting issues’ (Wray and Bloomer, 2012:167) and, more crucially, they do not imply that there is a single ‘correct’ answer and allow the speaker to talk at length on a matter in as much detail as they choose. For example, a question such as ‘wouldn’t you say that you were paid low wages?’ is somewhat leading as, even though there is much evidence to suggest wages in both mill work and tailoring were relatively low, Ritchie argues that such questions are ‘designed to produce a response that fits a particular hypothesis’ (2015:82). This contrasts with the question ‘what did you think about the rate of pay?’ which invites speakers to present their own opinion. Closed questions can still serve a purpose in achieving direct elicitations, such as those used in the SED, and ‘allow you to gather many pieces of precise information’ (Wray and Bloomer, 2012: 167). Such an approach is used to elicit lexical features, using indirect questions, so as to not suggest a ‘correct’ answer, although this might be followed up with a more direct elicitation as
‘interviews can only tell us what forms people happened to use on that particular occasion of talk’ (Schilling, 2013: 69). For example, the question ‘Do you have a name for this [cleaning the machines in the mill]?’ could then be followed by ‘Have you heard of the term fettling?’ if this word is not produced.

Questions were generally not intended to elicit specific grammatical items. Petyt argues that investigating grammatical variables presents two disadvantages as they ‘cannot be easily elicited’ and ‘may occur very infrequently’ (1985:190) compared to phonological features. The topic list contains one or two attempts at eliciting particular morpho-syntactic features. For example, the clarification question ‘How long ago was that?’ served a double purpose: to both help establish a clearer chronology of events if needed, and to try and determine whether the unmarked plurality of nouns of measurement was present in their speech. Good listening is also an element key to both frameworks, as the interview is ultimately directed by what speakers feel should be on the record, and the researcher should be willing to deviate from the pre-prepared questions sometimes ‘to follow the interviewee’s detours, which may provide valuable information’ (Ritchie, 2015: 75).

Transcription and Analysis
The decision was taken to produce orthographic transcriptions of both the LAVC and the 2018 interviews. The transcript can never capture the speech event which was the interview in its entirety, and any transcript, even an extremely detailed one, is only a ‘semblance of similarity’ (Abrams, 2016:13). Nevertheless, producing transcripts can be extremely useful both during the interpretation and write-up stage of the investigation, and serve as a written record for future researchers. The transcription conventions, inspired by Ochs (2006), can be found on page viii of the thesis. Words and pronunciations were translated into a semi-phonological representation which did not rely on IPA so they would only be included as one token, for instance /wɒnt/ (‘wasn’t) is represented in the transcripts as ‘wont’.

Conclusion
While the different aims and preoccupations of oral history and linguistic fieldwork offered a number of challenges in the fieldwork design, I argue that the two are not as disparate as they initially appear to be. Both employ qualitative interviewing and
engage with real human beings, meaning there are a number of points on which they are in agreement. The interdisciplinary approach to the fieldwork allowed for a more holistic view of the speakers as sentient, multi-dimensional beings instead of viewing them as a set of disembodied demographic data. The insights gained from the interviews about working practices, language attitudes, and reminiscences might not otherwise have been obtained had the interviews had a more strictly linguistic focus. Employing reading passages and a greater devotion to elicitation may have yielded a greater variety of vocabulary words and speaker styles, but at the cost of hampering the flow of the conversation and not devoting as great attention to the speaker and the content of their testimonies. The next chapter begins with a reflection on the interview process before exploring the resulting socio-historical data.
Chapter 4: Recollections of Working Life in the Industries

This chapter explores some of the common threads which emerged in both interview sets about speakers’ working lives in the textiles and clothing industries. While there were points on which the two interview sets differed, such as the standard of working conditions, there were many points of continuity despite the thirty-eight year gap between the two corpora. One or two of the 2018 speakers started work as early as the 1930s, while the majority of the LAVC speakers started work in the 1920s and 1930s.

Reflections on Interviewing

Some interviews were more focused on the speakers’ time in the textiles or clothing industry than others. This was sometimes because they were not in the industry for many years and it did not play as significant a role in their life history. Some speakers’ interviews, such as Charles Butcher (2018 74y. MC), Harold Rose (2018 74y. UMC) and Malcolm Berwin (2018 90y. UMC) remained consistently focused around the clothing industry due to their greater involvement in it. Most speakers appeared relaxed in the interview situation and spoke with some degree of fluency, although the length of their turns gradually increased over the course of the interview in many cases. I quickly discovered that if the speaker becomes too comfortable, they may reveal personal information which they might not wish to have recorded. When one speaker began telling me about an accident in which their father was killed, I pointed out to them that the recorder was still running to make sure that they were aware of the fact. I then agreed to wipe that section of the recording afterwards. The addition of a linguistic dimension to oral history interviewing had its drawbacks and at times achieving a balance between the two was difficult. I sometimes had to decide whether to abandon an elicitation attempt if the speaker began digressing on another topic or appeared to not understand the question. It is sometimes challenging when a speaker begins an extensively long turn which might offer various points of interest, especially if there are still a number of outstanding questions on the topic list, to know which lead to follow. Speakers did not always provide precise dates for when they worked at a given place. In such cases, they were not pressed too hard into trying to remember lest should they become frustrated with themselves or the researcher. There were occasions where speakers misunderstood or misheard certain questions or
comments, meaning a particular question might not have received a response. Nevertheless, even if the oral history or linguistic content was not as rich as it might have been in some cases, a deficiency in one would often be redeemed by an ample supply in the other. Several speakers also commented that they had enjoyed the experience of being interviewed.

**Attitudes to Work**

The length of time individual speakers spent in the industries varied. For some it was as little as three or four years before they moved on to a different line of work, while others remained in textiles or clothing from leaving school right until retirement age, or still continue to work in them today. Some enjoyed their time in the mills and clothing factories more than others. Both Lily (LAVC 59y.WC) and Brian (2018 ?y. WC) enjoyed their time in the textiles industry and regretted that the mills which they had formerly worked at had closed down. Lily continued to work as a weaver for over forty years, despite not receiving very high wages. Brian expressed great pride and pleasure at having worked as a piecer in Morley, moving from one mill to another as they closed down. The closure of the third and final mill which he worked at, Glen Mills, he recalls, made him cry. Jack Rigg (2018 91y. MC) had a rather different attitude to working in the mills. Jack went to work at Woodhouse’s mill, now known as Sunny Bank Mills, in approximately 1941, at age fourteen. He did not know what to do when he left school, although he always wanted to draw and paint. His father’s acquaintance said that he should go into Woodhouse’s mill, which is what everyone in the village did. Jack started work in the mill’s finishing department the following Monday and went to work in his school cap. He said that some people loved the mill and some did not, although it was all some people knew as their families had also worked there and they referred to it as ‘our place’. It was not until later in life, after serving in the armed forces in the Second World War, working at another mill and in other occupations, that Jack finally achieved his ambition of becoming a painter.

There were comments from speakers in both corpora that working in clothing factories was monotonous and boring. Machinists in clothing factories were expected to perform the same small task at a given stage of production, such as overlocking or sewing on collars, over and over again for around nine hours each
day, with some workers being expected to do overtime if there was a large order in need of completion. Jim Roche (LAVC 71y. MC) recalls that at his first job at John Barran’s, in 1923, ‘it wasn’t unusual to work ‘till half past nine at night and even later, particularly on Friday night’, and that there were some nights where he worked until past midnight. None of the 2018 clothing workers said that they worked overtime to this extent, with some doing none at all, although some of the machinists worked half days on Saturdays. This difference was most likely due to more strict work regulations than those Jim experienced in his early years in the trade in the 1920s. Some of those interviewed found enjoyment in their work, or explained that the piecework system, whereby they were paid for the amount that they produced, encouraged them to keep sewing to earn a better rate. Music, usually in the form of a radio, helped to relieve the boredom and pass the time. Workers would often sing in the factory. The songs they chose to sing were usually popular songs of the day. Jean (2018 79y. MC) explained how she knew that if she completed four pocket parts of a jacket per hour, she would earn a sufficient rate and this formula made it more interesting for her. Some speakers such as Mrs Blackburn (LAVC ?y. UWC), Marie (2018 45y. WC) and Jean who worked in tailoring had a pre-existing interest in sewing. Some continue to sew or knit, while others have lost interest. The two proprietors interviewed, Harold (2018 74y. UMC) and Malcolm (2018 90y. UMC), expressed a genuine passion for their work in the clothing trade, which they had been exposed to from an early age, as both took up managerial roles in their family’s firm. Charles (2018 74y. MC) told me that he could not see himself retiring from running his tailoring shop in Oakwood, and that he loved ‘sorting problems out for people’.

**Camaraderie between Workers**

A recurring feature of many interviews in both corpora was the sense of friendship and camaraderie which existed between the mill and clothing workers, which for many was what contributed to the pleasant atmosphere of their workplace and, for some, was the factor which made life in a mill or clothing factory enjoyable. Brian remarked that his co-workers at the mills were friendly and that there was ‘no arguing’. Both of his parents worked at Gillroyd Mill, Morley, the first mill where Brian worked as a teenager after leaving school, and he was happy when his father told him that he too was to work there. Brian stressed that there was no racial
prejudice against Asian workers where he worked and he recalled how if one of them was getting married, the others workers would be invited to the wedding. Lily remarked that there were a lot of displaced persons who came to work at her mill following the Second World War, as well as ‘two Dutch ladies’. While there was some resentment at immigrant workers having taken the local mill workers’ jobs, Lily nevertheless acknowledged that they were good workers. Lily enjoyed the company of the ladies who she worked with and the foremen alike. Jack, however, said that people tended to stay within their own departments, although each person had a ‘mate’ doing the same job as them.

In the clothing industry, Jim (LAVC 71y. MC) claimed that women were more likely to make a friendship last outside of the factory than men, while Leslie (LAVC 70y. MC) said that both men and women would socialise with factory friends outside work. Both worked at Burton’s Hudson Road factory in Leeds, which employed as many as 11,000 people at the time, and said that the factory was like ‘a microcosm of society’. In many cases the female factory workers interviewed in 2018 socialised with one another outside work and some still maintained friendships formed in the factory even after going their separate ways and finding work elsewhere. Jim mentioned that friendships formed inside of the factory were no less significant than those formed outside of the factory, and that the workers supported one another as they were all subjected to the same conditions. He demonstrated this through a narrative which he told where the tailors on his table prevented one man from being unfairly fired by threatening to also leave.

In the 2018 corpus, Frances (63y. WC) said that she enjoyed her time at Price’s in Leeds because there was no stress once the working day was over and she felt that she was, as she phrased it, ‘in wi’ crowd’. Jean (79y.? MC) claimed that at Sumrie’s factory where she worked, workers usually did not know anyone beyond their own ‘bench’ which was like a ‘little island’. The people within the bench did get on well together in Jean’s case. She described it as ‘like a camaraderie. We were all in it together’. Carol (61y.? WC) commented that she enjoyed sewing but that it was a bit monotonous. She enjoyed the company of the girls who she worked with and ‘had a laugh’ with them. Betty (93y. UWC) befriended another teenage girl when she started work at Hepworth’s factory and the two of them would go to Leeds Grand
Theatre every Friday night. Betty’s sister also worked upstairs in the trousers room with their mother. Christine’s (2018 61y. WC) siblings and mother worked alongside her at the same factory. Despite Jim and Leslie’s adversity to the overbearingly ‘restrictive’ and ‘medieval’ management they encountered at Burton’s, in both corpora there were some cases of good relations between employers and employees. Lily said that the management at Yates’ mill were very considerate. They did not dismiss her even after she lost the use of her hand and was unable to work full-time, suggesting that she work part-time instead. The clothing factory proprietors who were interviewed expressed a genuine concern for their workers’ wellbeing and regarded them as individuals. Cyril Albrecht (LAVC ?y. UMC), director of Albrecht & Albrecht Limited, spoke of how everyone was on Christian name terms in his factory and if anyone was ill then he would take them their wages on a Friday night. Malcolm Berwin (2018 90y. UMC) recalled how when his firm opened up a factory in South Yorkshire, they were keen to change the workers’ attitude towards bosses as people ‘not to be dealt with’, even telling one worker ‘if you stick a needle in me I’ll bleed, same as you. I’m a human being’. Harold Rose (2018 74y. UMC) described their clothing factory in Allerton Bywater as being like a ‘family business’ and it was impossible to upset any machinist as they were either friends, relations or neighbours of one another, coming from a small, close-knit community. If he sees a former employee in public now, ‘it’s rather like bumping into an old friend who you haven’t seen for years’.

Working Conditions

Brian (2018 ?y. WC) said that the wooden floors in the mills became slippery as when the machines were oiled, the oil would run down and spread over the floor, ‘and when you wor walking on it, it wor squeak, squeak, squeak’. The workers had no protective footwear for some time. Speakers in both datasets claimed that weavers often became deaf because they did not have adequate ear protection from the noise of the weaving shed. Jack (2018 91y. MC) said that the hours at Woodhouse’s were long: 7:30-5:30pm Monday to Friday and 7:30-12pm on Saturdays. Workers received a morning tea break and three quarters of an hour for lunch. The mill had a canteen but Jack went to his aunt’s as it was nearby and cheaper. There was something of a contrast between the LAVC and 2018 testimonies regarding the conditions in the clothing factories. Three of the LAVC
speakers reported that the conditions in the smaller clothing factories and workshops were not entirely adequate. Larger factories were far cleaner than smaller factories with a regular staff of cleaners, with Jim only ever feeling comfortable enough to use the lavatory in one of the places that he worked at. The atmosphere of the smaller factories was ‘more intimate’ compared to the larger factories. It was rare that they would have central heating but there would be a gas stove in the corner and the body heat of the workers helped to warm up the small rooms. In winter, it would take the workers half an hour to be able to do any work as their fingers were so cold that they wouldn’t be able to hold a needle and thimble. Charles (2018 74y. MC) experienced this in his earlier days in the trade, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, before he began to work for himself. Mrs Blackburn (LAVC ?y. UWC) commented that her former workplaces in the clothing trade were old buildings ‘with years of dust and dirt in them’, although there was generally a ‘happy atmosphere’. Leslie (LAVC 70y. MC) described his father’s tailoring shop as a ‘dump’ and made reference to some factories as ‘back-street dumps’.

Conditions in the clothing factories were generally reported as being adequate in the 2018 corpus, possibly with regulations improving over time and the gradual erosion of the practice of contracting out work to small workshops over the course of the twentieth century. The larger factories in the early to mid-twentieth century, such as Burton’s and Hepworth’s, also contained facilities such as canteens for workers. Betty recalled how, as a learner, she was impressed by the size of the room at Hepworth’s factory, and at the sheer number of toilets. There was a canteen and a sick room where the nurse gave the girls Indian brandy and let them have a sleep if they were ill. Frances recalled how at her factory, Price’s, someone would arrive at the factory at ten o’clock in the morning from Newton’s pork pie shop at the bottom of Kirkstall Road, Leeds, the factory being at the top, and sell fresh pies to the clothing workers. The pies, she recalled, were ‘gorgeous’. She said that the factory ‘could have done with more sweepers-uppers’. The topic list (Appendix A) contained the question ‘Where there ever any serious accidents that happened in the mill/factory?’ as a parallel to Labov’s (1972b) ‘Danger of Death’ question. Most of the speakers responded that no major incidents had ever happened, although a lot of machinists, including Jean, Frances and Marie, had sewn through their thumbs which was a rather painful experience. This was a common incident, with Charles
(2018 74y. MC) commenting that ‘you’re not a machinist until you’ve had a needle through your finger’. Harold (2018 74y. UMC) even suspected that one of the women who he employed had done this deliberately so the insurance money would cover the cost of her holiday. Charles told a story about a cutter who almost cut his finger off and Brian about a man at a mill which he had worked at who slipped on the greasy floor and got his foot caught in the machinery. Jack said that when his mill was being converted to electricity, an electrician was killed. None of the speakers reverted to a strikingly more ‘vernacular’ style of speech when recounting such stories. As most of the accidents were not life-threatening or did not happen to the speakers themselves, they did not produce a very emotive response.

**Production Methods**

Production methods changed little in the clothing industry over the course of the twentieth century, with manufacturers employing the ‘line system’ where the parts of the garment would be cut out in the cutting room and then passed down the line of machinists for each to perform their particular function, before the finished garment was pressed and prepared for transportation. There were some technological innovations over the course of the century from Jim’s experiences as a tailor in the 1920s and 1930s, when buttonhole machines were so expensive that they had to be rented. Charles demonstrated the sheer speed of the buttonhole machine in his tailoring shop, which was far more efficient than having one or two ladies sewing buttons on by hand as had once been the practice in the small tailoring shops. He said that fusible materials were increasingly being used in tailoring and that the cloths were now a lot thinner as this was more cost effective. Malcolm commented that the machines ‘had a lot more chips in them now’ and that the cutting of cloth can now be done by laser rather than by a man with a pair of tailor’s shears.

**Gender Roles**

While roles within the mills were generally divided along gender lines, some of the positions men and women held changed over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Ponting (1970) argues that women did **spinning** and **combing** while men did **weaving** and **fulling** when woollen cloth manufacture was a cottage industry. The shift from weaving being the work of a man to that of a woman
coincided with the shift from hand loom to power loom weaving in the late nineteenth century. Collet (1891) argues that it was cheaper to pay the women to work the power looms in Leeds since they could be paid lower wages than the men. A male worker could work two looms with a boy or girl to assist him, as she claims was more often the case in Huddersfield where some firms only employed men (1891:462). The evidence in both corpora suggests that women were weavers. Both Lily and Brian remarked that women worked in weaving, although Lily worked as a spinner and a winder. Marie mentioned that her aunt worked at Pilgrim’s mill and Wira House and that she was head weaver. Jean’s aunt was also a weaver.

As noted in Chapter 2, roles within the clothing factories were divided along gender lines. The 2018 speakers’ testimonies suggest that this continued throughout the twentieth century, with women generally being machinists, pressers or cleaners while men were cutters, tailors, mechanics or warehouse drivers. Pressers could sometimes be men. Marie, however, recalls how Charles Barker’s, where she worked in the 1990s, was much more lenient regarding worker roles. If a woman wished to enter the cutting room or a man wished to operate a sewing machine they would be able to do so. Although each machinist had their own particular job, there were always two machinists for each task so one of them could leave their machine if someone further down the line needed assistance. The manager would even roll up his sleeves and get on a machine during busy periods, Marie recalled. She contrasts this with another factory which her friend worked at, Julien Dean’s, where there was no freedom of movement and a machinist was bound to one operation. This flexibility of gender roles could be because Marie was the youngest speaker, employed in the 1990s, when gender equality had progressed further, whereas the other speakers worked earlier in the century.

**Wages**

Lily said that she was not paid a great deal during her time at Yates’ mill and when they eventually reached £60 per week the firm closed. Brian was pleased with the wage that he received. He earned £112 per week and he believed he was on piece rate, although he does not say which mill or what date that was at. Brian did not provide exact dates, although I estimate that he worked in textiles until approximately fifty years ago when the last mill he was employed at closed. Jack
was paid 11s 6d a week when he first started at Woodhouse’s mill in 1941, although this should have been 14s. He recalled that he went into the foreman’s office, sat on desk and asked for a rise. He then went on strike for two days before coming back and receiving a three shilling rise. He eventually rose to the best job in the finishing department and received £7 a week. There were frequent comments that wages in the clothing industry were low, although Marie earned a decent wage even when she was transferred onto piece work, as she received £1.12 per lapel pocket that she sewed and she was producing 250 a week on average. Her higher earnings may be because she started work in 1990 and the factory produced ‘high-end’ suits.

**Practical Jokes and Traditions**

While some speakers felt that the amount of practical joking which went on in the clothing factories provided one way of relieving the monotony of the job, others felt that this was done simply because the people working there were ‘high-spirited’ and happy in their working environment. Learners and apprentices were often easy targets. A favourite joke in the clothing trade was to send the apprentice for a ‘long stand’, meaning a mannequin on a long stand, only they would be left to stand in a part of the factory for about half an hour. This was reported in both corpora. Other false errands mentioned included sending apprentices for ‘a bucket of blue steam’ or ‘tartan paint’. Sewing up pockets and buttonholes was also a common prank; Marie had her cardigan stitched up by the manager himself. Mrs Blackburn claimed that mechanics would have their trousers removed by the female workers on their birthday, although Leslie had no recollection of anybody being ‘de-bagged’ as he referred to it. Jack, coincidentally, also recalled being de-bagged by the burlers when he started at the mill. The tradition of dressing women up with scraps of material and trimmings before they got married was not ubiquitous. Mrs Blackburn reported it in the LAVC corpus, and Lily remarked how they would ‘trim up’ girls getting married in the mill and stuff their stockings with confetti. In the 2018 corpus, Marie recalled that at her factory they had the ‘Wedding Suit’, where the engaged woman would be passed down the line and each machinist would stick something to her. The manager would stick a wages wallet onto them at the end and everyone would have a photograph together. Carol said that her co-workers at Valusta shirt factory in Royston stuck ‘rude’ homemade things to her and tied her to a lamppost.
1970s Leeds Clothing Strike

Ritchie observes that ‘historical and personal experiences rarely intersect’ (2015:18), with people experiencing events through their own individual lens. Caution was therefore needed when inquiring about subjects such as the decline of the industries or the 1970 Leeds Clothing Strike. Reasons speakers gave for these events were not always expected to correlate with the written historical record, although there is no such thing as a definitive historical record as history is always tainted by ideological perspective. Despite its significance in the history of the Leeds clothing industry, not all speakers recalled the 1970s Clothing Strike. In the LAVC corpus, Jim and Leslie had very sharp recollections of the Strike because of their involvement as members of the joint striking committee. Mrs Blackburn had no recollection of the Strike at all. Of those who were asked in the 2018 corpus, Charles, Jean, Harold and Malcolm were aware of the Strike. Frances’ unfamiliarity with the Strike was unsurprising given that she started work at Price’s tailors around 1973, several years after the Strike. While Jean did not participate in the Strike, having left the industry to undertake her O-Levels at the time, she was aware of it and she knew one of the LAVC speakers, Jim, and his wife, Gertie, who were key figures in the Strike. Charles was a union steward the time of the Strike. Harold Rose said his firm in Allerton Bywater did not go on strike as they were outside Leeds, although they did have an afternoon off work once the strike was over as a token of support to the strikers. Malcolm Berwin was on the national negotiating committee and his firm were one of the last to go on strike, with some reluctance on the part of his workers.

The Future of the Industries

Jim (LAVC 71y. MC) predicted that the bosses of firms would ‘ruin the whole clothing and textile industry’ as they were rooted in a mentality of low wages and long hours. When asked what the future of the tailoring industry was in the area, the response from the 2018 speakers was almost unanimously that there was none. That does not mean to say that Leeds’s connection with textiles and clothing has been completely severed. Charles continues to do business at his tailoring shop and one of his cloth suppliers is Abraham Moon, one of the last woollen mills in Leeds. Malcolm’s son now runs the family clothing firm, although the cloth is now produced abroad. Harold also continues to run his bespoke tailoring business, The Master Tailor, which is based in Leeds.
Conclusion

While working conditions and technology have changed in the decades between the two corpora, there were several common themes which ran between them, such as long hours, low pay, a division of gender roles and traditions. Something which resonated across the interviews was the sense of camaraderie felt between both the factory and mill workers. This was what some missed the most and what compensated for the working conditions to which they were subjected. However, there was also a feeling that the Leeds textiles and clothing industries are ‘dying’, although this feeling is not necessarily recent as such comments are found in both corpora. The speakers’ testimonies also demonstrate that the clothing industry persists in a smaller, more specialised form, with small bespoke tailoring firms continuing to trade, even if the cloth is not always woven in the area as it most likely would have been a century ago.
Chapter 5: Oral History Interviews as Linguistic Data

This chapter discusses how the lexical and grammatical features under investigation were chosen and their distribution in the LAVC and 2018 interviews. The lexical items include trade-specific and more general vocabulary found in the West Yorkshire area, while many of the grammatical features are part of a ‘common core’ of non-standard dialect features such as non-standard *were* and *was*. I analyse whether any of these features are connected to a ‘West Yorkshire’ or ‘Northern’ identity, and how their distribution between speakers was influenced not only by social and occupational factors but also by factors such as social network ties and the interview setting. Analysing the data at the level of individuals avoided overgeneralisations or abstract patterns.

Dialect and Locality

The repeated reshaping of Britain’s political and cultural landscape means that many of the lexical and grammatical variables under investigation can be thought of as ‘Northern’ dialect features more generally. Halliday and Umpleby observe that the topographical boundaries of the Ridings\(^9\) of Yorkshire ‘are not dialectal ones’ (1949: vii), as a word associated with one Riding could also be found in another. This shows how isoglosses on dialect maps are ‘never firm boundaries restricting the movement of dialectal forms from place to place’ (Upton, Sanderson and Widdowson, 1987:15) as geographical boundaries are continuously changing. For instance, the Local Government Act 1972 (legislation.gov.uk) saw county boundaries redrawn and the abolition of the three old Ridings. Chambers and Trudgill (1998) envision a geographical or social dialect ‘continuum’, where effects of dialect differences are cumulative rather than there being clear divisions between neighbouring dialects. Observing patterns at a more localised level therefore avoids overgeneralisations about the gradual ‘erosion’ of dialect differences and can reveal more nuanced usages which may provide insights into a region’s history.

Identifying Variables

The starting point for identifying lexical and morphosyntactic variables was the LAVC interviews themselves. Subsequent research suggested that a number were

\(^9\) ‘Riding’ is derived from the Norse ‘thrithjungr’ or ‘thriding’ as all three were situated in an area of Viking settlement.
described by academics (see Petyt (1985), Rhodes (1998), Beal (2004), Wales (2006), and Buchstaller and Corrigan (2015)) as being characteristic of ‘Yorkshire’ or ‘Northern’ dialects. The most frequent and salient variables were then selected for analysis. I do not label the variables as ‘West Yorkshire’ per se, as Rhodes (1998:22) observes that a language variety may be associated with an area but can never ‘belong’ to it since it is a portable, human attribute. I consulted written sources to supplement audio recordings of the ‘traditional’ speech of the area, namely dialect poetry from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Poetry and written sources were helpful in uncovering dialect words that have perhaps fallen victim to the process of ‘lexical attrition’. Trudgill argues that the dialect vocabulary of modern England has been undergoing this process for some time, and that much of its diversity ‘will probably eventually disappear’ (2000:133). Poems specifically about working in textile mills were especially helpful as these contained trade-specific vocabulary, broadening my background knowledge in preparation for the interviews. While I consulted publications from the SED, including The Basic Materials, fieldworkers’ notebooks and The Linguistic Atlas of England (1978), this material was less relevant. Not many of the SED questionnaire items were textile or clothing-related. These materials provided an impression of the dialect of the area over sixty years ago, at least twenty years before the five LAVC interviews were conducted, meaning the SED Leeds speakers are an older generation than the five LAVC speakers. The materials were sometimes useful in comparing the meanings and distribution of words found in the 2018 interviews.

**West Yorkshire Words**

Directly asking speakers about any ‘Leeds’ or ‘Yorkshire’ words or sayings they know of was not the most effective method of gathering such information, as some seemed to feel pressured into providing an answer, resulting in them ‘going blank’. It might also be the case that a word which scholars consider to be dialectal appears normal to those who use it. A Glossary\(^\text{10}\) of words and phrases associated with West Yorkshire which appeared in both corpora and textile-related terminology is provided in Appendix D.

---

\(^{10}\) The Glossary definitions are primarily sourced from the *OED, EDD, Fairchild’s Dictionary of Textiles*, and my own knowledge.
**Trade-Specific Vocabulary**

The tailoring industry does not appear to have introduced many words and phrases into the general lexicon, with the exception of ‘The Full Monty’ and ‘Gone for a Burton’. However, the prominence of the textiles industry across England has undoubtedly left its mark on the language, with many modern idioms having their origins in millwork. For instance, the phrase ‘on tenterhooks’, meaning to be ‘in a state of painful suspense or impatience’ (*OED Online*, 2018), originates from ‘the hooks or bent nails set in a close row along the upper and lower bar of a tenter’ (*OED Online*, 2017). The ‘tenter’ was the wooden frame which the cloth was stretched onto once it had been fulled. Rhodes (1998) claims that it is a widely-reported phenomenon for technical or local words in declining industries to survive as metaphors in this way. There is evidence of more localised words for processes and substances in millwork and tailoring in both datasets. For instance, ‘fettling’ is listed in *The English Dialect Dictionary* as being a dialect term found in many areas across England, as well as Scotland and Ireland. In West Yorkshire, and also Lancashire, it carries the specific meaning ‘to remove the short fibres which clog the cards in the scribbling-machine’ or to ‘repair or rectify any faults in weaving’ (Wright, 1898-1905a:343). A man who cleans the cards of the carding-machine is therefore known as a ‘fetttler’ or ‘fettlur’. A carding-machine is alternatively known as a ‘scribbling-machine’, as it consists of a ‘scribbler’ and ‘carder’ which effectively carry out the same complicated process where the wool fibres are disentangled from each other by being passed through swiftly revolving rollers, covered in carded wire teeth, in preparation for spinning (see Chapter 2). The end product is a thick, twistless rope of fibres known as slivers. There are a variety of names to describe the substance which has undergone the intermediate drawing stage between carding and spinning. I have encountered a number of variants including; ‘row’, ‘rowan’, ‘roving’, ‘slubbing’, ‘rove’, ‘slub’, and possibly ‘cards’ or ‘carding’. ‘Slubbing’ appears to be a term specific to West Yorkshire. It is

---

11 The *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (2018) lists the former as meaning ‘Everything which is necessary, appropriate, or possible; ‘the works’, while the latter is defined as ‘(of an airman) to be killed; (of a person or thing) to be missing, ruined, destroyed’. While other possible origins of both phrases are listed, a common origin for both is getting a three-piece or a ‘demob’ suit from Burton.

12 Another more localised referent for this is a ‘slubbing-billy’ or simply a ‘billy’.

13 A tour guide at the Leeds Industrial Museum, a former woollen mill, identified this as being a Yorkshire word, with ‘roving’ being used ‘elsewhere’.
recorded in the *Dialect Dictionary* as ‘a long thread of slightly twisted cotton or woollen yarn’ (Wright, 1898-1905b: 540), although its precise origin is obscure.

**Trade-Specific Vocabulary: Findings**

‘Fettler’ occurred in both corpora, elicited from Lily Gaunt (LAVC 59y. WC) and Brian Richardson (2018 ?y. WC), although Jack Rigg (2018 91y. MC), who worked at a mill in Farsley, did not appear to have a specific word for cleaning the machines. Lily worked as a ‘winder’ at Yates’ mill in Bramley and the researcher, Patricia Morris, also worked at a mill in Leeds. Immediately prior to the following extract (1), Lily has just been recounting how they would clean the machinery every Friday at Yates’ mill.

(1)

PM: well the mill I worked in called it fettling

LG: fettling

PM: and in fact they ha-on the very big machine (..) uh (.) y’know y’know the scribbling machines that produced the rovings

LG: rovings

PM: well they used to have to employ (.) chaps (..) wh-who were called fettlers=

LG: fettlers

PM: =and they did nothing else except g-go round when these machines had stopped=

LG: machines stopped

PM:   =an-and they used to=

LG: clean them

PM: =clean the rollers=

LG: yeah (.) clean rollers for ‘em

PM: with all these spikes

LG: oh yes (.) spikes
PM: that’s these special brushes

LG: brushes (. ) wont they

Even though both women worked at mills in Leeds, only Patricia is familiar with this term. Since Patricia does not say what mill or what part of Leeds she worked in, and no information about her could be found, this made a more detailed comparison difficult. The fact that Patricia uses the older term ‘rovings’, which she describes as the product of the scribbling stage, suggests that **slubbing** was not the only variant present in the region at the time. In the 2018 interviews, Jack made reference to ‘slub’ while Brian did not appear to have a word to describe the substance, nor did any of the clothing workers who were familiar with the stages involved in woollen cloth manufacture. Jack also made reference to a ‘ligger’ in his interview, who was the person responsible for replacing the empty bobbins. The verb ‘lig’ frequently reoccurred in literature on West Yorkshire dialect (Robinson 1862; Paynter et al. 1997; Rhodes 1998), meaning to lie or idle about, which was not found in either corpus.

There were several examples of words and phrases relating to tailoring in the 2018 interviews. Betty (2018 93y. UWC) recalled being told as a learner to go to the cutting-room and ask for a ‘buggy back’, a small piece of material that goes in the back of a suit jacket, although she would not say the word as she thought it was ‘swearing’. Marie (2018 45y. WC) was also familiar with this term. Betty also recalled that putting in the lining of the coat was referred to as ‘bagged in’. Jean’s (2018 79y.? MC) job in the factory was ‘second sew’, which more specifically was putting the pockets into the coat, meaning they had to cut the coat. If the coat was cut in the wrong place, irretrievably damaging the garment, it was said that they had ‘killed the coat’. This would result in the machinist’s dismissal and the destruction of the garment. Jean claimed that this was a term used throughout the industry. In Isadore Pear’s memoir of working in the cutting department at Zimmerman Brothers, he similarly refers to ‘kills’ as the term used to describe the calamity whereby goods were irretrievably damaged during the process of being made up (1999:150), which would usually result in dismissal. Marie also made reference to a ‘welt tack’ which was the top pocket on a jacket.
Verbs

Petyt records one instance of ‘belong’ being used in the sense of ‘own’, as in ‘the lady ‘at belongs it’ (1985:240) which I was unaware of as being a local word. My data mirrors Petyt’s (1985) as I found one instance of ‘belonged’ in the sense of ‘own’ which, unsurprisingly, came from Lily (2).

(2) LG: well the groups aren’t same as what (. ) your own manger y’know (. ) what belongs to it theirselves (. ) they’re not like the same (. ) people

Lily also used ‘learn’ and ‘learnt’ in the sense of ‘teach’ and ‘taught’. Jim (LAVC 71y. MC) recalled how much ‘kalling’ (/kalɪŋ/ or /kalɪn/) was done over the fence in the area of Leeds where he grew up, in the sense of ‘to gossip or chat’. Robinson claims it has the more general meaning ‘to while away the time in other people’s houses (1862: 333). It is still frequently used today in the former sense, although perhaps more so amongst older generations.

Nouns and Phrases

Some of the nouns in the LAVC corpus were for everyday items that are no longer part of domestic life today, such as ‘bungalow bath’, ‘peggy-tub’ and ‘peggy-stick’, which were mentioned by speakers when discussing their childhood in the early twentieth century. There were also one or two items in the semantic field of clothing which arose in the 2018 interviews. Jean (2018 79y.? MC) made reference to ‘britches’ for trousers and ‘pullover’, but the latter is more of a common colloquialism (OED, 2018), although one that is perhaps not so much used by younger generations today. Frances (2018 63y. WC) also referred to ‘topcoat’ in the sense of ‘overcoat’, as found in the Leeds area by the SED and the majority of Yorkshire locations (Upton, Parry, and Widdowson, 1994: 434), as well as in other counties. It occurred when she was recounting an anecdote in relation to the idea of a ‘North-South divide’ (3).

(3) they’ve no idea [haven’t] Southerners ( .. ) they’ve no idea ( . ) I mean it’s- it’s like uh ( .. ) there’s a ( . ) a quip- ( . ) a quip on Facebook sometimes ( .. ) it’s uh ( . ) when we had cold- cold weather ( . ) cold weather it’s minus something tonight ( . ) so ( . ) northerners ( . ) you need your top coat- you need your big coat out ( . ) Southerners ( . ) you need to go [to bed with your] electric blanket
Frances was not the only speaker to display ‘anti-southerner’ rhetoric, as several speakers made reference to the comparative friendliness of Northern, or Yorkshire, people compared to those from the South. Whether this is Frances’s choice of word or the term used in the actual quote is unknown, but either way it could demonstrate that it is something of a stereotype which other northerners would be expected to know. ‘Fuddle’, meaning a social event usually held in the workplace around Christmas, occurred in both datasets, and was something I knew to be in current use. No entries for the word in the sense listed in the Glossary could be found in the OED or the Dialect Dictionary. Wright (1898-1905a) claims that in West Yorkshire, as well as other counties, this meant a drinking-bout. Whether this is a case of semantic change where it gradually came to be used in the sense of a festive social function is unclear. ‘Do’ was common in both corpora, including in the sense of a social event (4) which the OED simply lists as ‘regional and non-standard’ (OED, 2018). It also has a broader meaning of an affair or occurrence more generally, which is more specifically associated with Northern regional varieties (OED, 2018). In my data ‘do’ appeared in the sense of a social occasion (4) and also an argument (5).

(4) as far as organised dos go (LAVC)

(5) y- you could literally have a uh (.) a do with the boss (2018)

A phrase cited by two of the 2018 speakers was ‘put wood in t’oil’, meaning ‘close the door’. This is noted by Wales (2006) and Rhodes (1998), and to my own knowledge it is in common use. Two other phrases were ‘play ummer’, meaning ‘to reproach’, and ‘It’s nowt nor sommert’. ‘Owt’ and ‘nowt’, meaning ‘anything’ and ‘nothing’ respectively, are often stereotyped, appearing in both Cooper’s ‘historical’ and ‘modern’ Yorkshire dialect repertoires (2017:48). ‘Sommert’ for ‘something’ is similarly stereotyped. All three items appeared in both corpora, with two tokens even originating from the researcher in the 2018 corpus.

14 Hence to be ‘fuddled’ means to be intoxicated.
Kinship Terms

Wales argues that Northern speakers’ tendency to refer to strangers as well as family or friends as ‘love’ is one of several features which reinforces the image of ‘Northern friendliness’ (2006:193). One 2018 speaker, Charles Butcher, described ‘you alright love’ as a ‘Leeds saying’. There were five occurrences of ‘love’ in the LAVC corpus (Table 3) and five in the 2018 corpus (Table 4).

Table 3: Speakers and Addressess for ‘Love’ in LAVC Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Addressee known previously?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Rosentalks</td>
<td>Fiona Byron (researcher)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(speaker)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertie Roche (speaker’s wife)</td>
<td>Fiona Byron (researcher)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Gaunt (speaker)</td>
<td>Patricia Morris (researcher)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Speakers and Addresses for ‘Love’ in 2018 Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Addressee known previously?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Swann (speaker)</td>
<td>Lesley Smith (partner of speaker’s son, also present at interview)</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Swann</td>
<td>Customer at shop that Carol formerly worked at</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Berwin (speaker)</td>
<td>Former employee at Berwin &amp; Berwin</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Richardson (speaker) (x2)</td>
<td>Emily Owen (researcher)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 In a post-interview conversation between Carol Swann and me at her home in Royston, she said that ‘duck’ was used in Chesterfield.
The degree of intimacy between speaker and addressee is rather mixed. Carol’s use of a term of endearment towards Lesley would be expected, as Lesley’s partner is Carol’s son and she is treated as a member of the family. Carol also addresses a customer as ‘love’ to perhaps mitigate the ‘face-threatening act’ (Brown and Levinson, 1987) when she tells them something does not suit them (6).

(6) I’d tell people if- if they looked a bugg[er] in it (. ) I’d tell them so she didn’t like me- I used to go (. ) no not that one love (. ) try this

When Malcolm addresses a former employee in a supermarket, whom he describes as being like ‘an old friend’, this too seems appropriate as they also share a personal bond. However, in Leslie (7) and Gertie’s (8) cases, they are addressing a university student who is younger than they are and who they do not know personally.

(7) LR: your tea’ill have go[ne] cold love
FB: I’ve drank it
LR: oh you’ve drank it (. ) do you want another one

(8)
FB: so y- will somebody be in if I-
GR: when love
FB: if I bring uh the tape and book back in the morning

In both cases, ‘love’ makes the speakers appear polite and accommodating towards the researcher, who may be experiencing discomfort at being in their home which is unfamiliar ground to them, mitigating the inconvenience imposed upon themselves in providing them with tea and allowing them to borrow something of theirs. In my interview with Brian Richardson (2018 ?y. WC), who I had not even spoken to on the phone beforehand, two tokens of ‘love’ were elicited from him. One served to mitigate the face-threatening act of correcting a false assumption about the cloth-making process on my part (9), while the other enhanced his expression of gratitude towards me after I had initially thanked him for his time at the close of the interview (10).
(9) oh (.) it’d go (.) somewhere else love

(10) oh you’re welcome love

These examples suggest that ‘love’ does not always signal familiarity and in-group membership, but can also be used to enhance the addressee’s ‘positive face’ (Brown and Levinson, 1987), or alternatively enhance the speaker’s own positive face by making them appear accommodating and friendly before the addressee. The term of endearment ‘doy’ was recorded by the OED (2018) as another kinship term used in Yorkshire. Jack mentioned this during a post-interview discussion about Yorkshire words, although he said that it was used by someone who came to work at Woodhouse’s mill from further north. To my knowledge, it is not used in this part of the county today.

West Yorkshire Grammar

Many of the grammatical features discussed are part of a ‘common core’ (Britain, 2010:37) of non-standard features found in regional varieties, or more ‘casual’ styles of speech, across the country, including: was-were levelling, non-standard relative pronouns, unmarked plurality of measurement nouns, non-standard pronouns, conjunction regularisation and irregular verbs, and negation and contracted forms. There were also other, more regionally-specific features in the data such as right as an intensifier (‘it was right good”), on + general time phrase (‘he comes on a night/ morning”) and inverted verb phrases as a tag (‘He’s nice, is Jack”). There was little evidence of on-going change between the two corpora regarding grammatical variables. Chamber observes that grammatical variables ‘tend to mark social stratification more sharply than phonological ones, and so most grammatical variables function as class markers’ (2009:56), which would explain the relative stability of some variables such as non-standard were across both corpora and the similarities in use across social class groups. I examine the idiolect of each speaker from both corpora in-turn instead of simply clustering the results under broad social factors such as age, gender and social class. Barlow argues that the grammatical analysis resulting from corpus studies ‘is abstract and to some extent an idealisation and diverges from the grammars associated with individual speakers of the language’ (2013: 444). A sweeping view of my data based on social factors alone
did mask individual uses which often off-set trends in the data, especially given the variation between interview length and setting. This approach allows interview setting and speakers’ social networks to be examined in greater detail. I examine the researchers’ linguistic performance where appropriate. As noted in Chapter 4, good rapport was established in each of the 2018 interviews, although some speakers were visibly more relaxed and prone to giving lengthier turns than others, which had an impact on their token scores.

Social Class
Social class can be defined by many different criteria including income, parents’ occupation, housing, speaker’s occupation, tastes and interests, attitudes and aspirations. Chambers argues that class is ‘a continuum rather than a set of discrete ranks’ (2009:42) as very few individuals will match one another exactly on the criteria listed above. Macaulay uses ‘the usual criteria of occupation, education and residence’ (2005a:38) and like him, I disfavour a numerical scale. My main indicators for determining social class are background, occupation(s) and education, although speakers’ perceptions of their class status, additional interests and aspirations are also taken into consideration. While I employ a social class scale, as Fig 6 shows, these categories are somewhat superficial and the criteria can be thought of as guidelines rather than a ‘checklist’. I do not refer to ‘style’ in the sense of Labov’s ‘attention to speech’ approach (See Schilling 2013b for an examination of the drawbacks of Labov’s approach to style as well as more recent approaches). It is also possible that the devising of the social class scale was influenced by the speakers’ linguistic performances themselves.
Upper Middle Class
Speaker has at least one parent in a Director position and occupies a similar role (most likely inherited). Educated to university level.

Middle Class
Speaker has at least one parent in a white-collar occupation. Educated to secondary level with additional training or qualifications gained later in life. Currently lives in affluent area. Has broad interests including arts, politics etc.

Upper Working Class
Speaker has at least one parent from a blue-collar occupation. Speaker began work in a blue-collar occupation but later progressed to a white-collar occupation at some point. Educated to secondary level with additional training or qualifications gained later in life.

Working Class
Speaker’s parents from blue-collar occupations. Speaker worked in blue-collar occupation(s). Educated to secondary level.
Table 5: Individual Speakers’ Social Class Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAVC</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>Upper Working Class</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Upper Middle Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lily Gaunt,</td>
<td>Mrs Blackburn</td>
<td>Jim Roche, Leslie Rosentalks</td>
<td>Cyril Albrecht,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Frances Grainger, Brian Richardson, Christine Smith, Carol Swann, Marie Underwood</td>
<td>Betty Olsen</td>
<td>Charles Butcher, Jean Horsman, Jack Rigg</td>
<td>Malcolm Berwin, Harold Rose,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAVC Results**

Table 6 shows the LAVC speakers’ individual scores for each variable. Non-standard tokens are quantified or compared to the total of standard and non-standard tokens where possible. I will then examine each speaker’s language use in turn.
Table 6: Individual Speakers’ Cumulative Feature Use (LAVC Corpus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C. Albrecht</th>
<th>Mrs. Blackburn</th>
<th>L. Gaunt</th>
<th>J. Roche</th>
<th>L. Rosentalks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Standard Were</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (70/115)</td>
<td>✓ (7/142)</td>
<td>✓ (5/98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Standard Was</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (6/13)</td>
<td>✓ (5/298)</td>
<td>✓ (1/167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked Plurality of Measurement Nouns</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (22/27)</td>
<td>✓ (1/34)</td>
<td>✓ (1/15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-standard Relative what</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That with animate antecedent</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (5/10)</td>
<td>✓ (1/2)</td>
<td>✓ (12/22)</td>
<td>✓ (1/32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Standard Pronouns</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past/Present Tense Verbs</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irregular Verbs</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negation and Contracted Forms</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative them</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (9/9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Us as a possessive determiner</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right as an intensifier</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On + general time phrase</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inverted verb phrase as a tag</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cyril Albrecht**

Cyril produced no non-standard tokens for any of the variables. This correlates with his upper middle class standing as the former Director of the family-run clothing firm, Albrecht & Albrecht Limited. His approach to his interview with Fiona Byron is also far less conversational in manner, as he aims to give a clear chronological account of the firm’s history and appears to be pressed for time. He produces two tokens of whom, one of which is near the beginning of his account of the family’s history (11).
(11) the (. ) original founder of our firm (. ) of whom we have any record

The second is from a narrative around seventy lines later (12).

(12) up to the building one day (. ) as he was sweeping the steps (. ) came a man whom he described as a Londoner

In Standard English, there are five possible forms of relative pronoun which are who, whom, which, that, and zero, amongst which who specialises as a human subject relative. Regional varieties may also have what, as and at, the latter of which is a borrowing from Old Norse, in their repertoires as alternatives to who, although there were no instances of this in either corpus. The fact that whom produced the lowest number of tokens out of all of the relative pronouns found in the LAVC corpus (Fig 7) is unsurprising, as D’Arcy and Tagliamonte found that ‘the fact that informal speech does not generally elicit genitive or pied-piping constructions limits the opportunity for whose and whom to occur’ (2010:389). As Albrecht’s interview is not ‘informal’ speech, his use of whom is not unusual given his upper middle class standing. The fact that the second example was from a narrative was nevertheless somewhat surprising, as narratives are more ‘informal’ styles of speech. He also uses who with a human subject in all cases as opposed to that.
Mrs Blackburn

Mrs Blackburn’s use of non-standard variants is very low overall. As she has occupied different roles, often as a designer rather than sewing garments on the shop-floor, and has moved workplaces frequently, one might expect her to use standard norms with overt prestige. She does, however, produce one token of weren’t (13) halfway through the interview, one inverted verb phrase as a tag, and 50 per cent of her tokens of that are with an animate antecedent.

(13) they had two or three and it weren’t satisfactory

She uses one contracted negative (14) and there is one instance of the verb ‘sat’ where Standard English would have the progressive ‘sitting’ (15) in the post-interview talk between herself and the interview Fiona Byron.

(14) if you ant got a husband or a wife you’ve had it

---

16 Buchstaller and Corrigan claim that conservative Germanic be perfect in constructions such as ‘she was sat’ is a feature found in Northern English grammars (2015:73).
This might suggest that she switches to a more informal style once the interview has ended. While her audience has remained unchanged, the speakers are no longer bound to their roles of researcher and speaker, and the topic shifts towards a party which Mrs Blackburn is attending that night.

**Lily Gaunt**

Lily was perhaps the ‘broadest’ speaker out of all of the LAVC and 2018 speakers, scoring highest on her frequency of many of the non-standard features examined. She produced the highest number of tokens of non-standard *were* of any speaker, and was the only speaker whose non-standard usage was significantly greater than their standard usage at 61 per cent. She also had the highest score of non-standard *was* at 46 per cent. She had the highest use of present tense verbs in the place of past tense, and the first person plural pronoun in place of the determiner ‘our’ (16), being the only speaker to do so in the LAVC corpus.

(16) we got *us* all *us* notice to flee- to leave

The non-standard relative pronoun *what* was also favoured most highly by her and she produced one token of a weak verb where Standard English requires a strong verb (17).

(17) it *ris*ed up a bit

She produced two tokens of *on* with a general time phrase (18) which was also not found amongst any other of the LAVC speakers. This construction was recorded in the speech of the Millennium Memory Bank’s Leeds respondent (British Library, [no date]) and Petyt (1985) found a few examples.

(18) I used to go in about six *on* a morning

Beal argues that the constructions favoured for ‘right-dislocation’ vary ‘from one Northern dialect to another’ (2004:397), with auxiliary verbs preceding noun
phrases or pronouns in Yorkshire dialect. In Lily’s case it is the pronoun which follows the verb (19). Lily produced twice as many tokens of the intensifier right as any other speaker in either corpus. In both corpora, this occurred with speakers at all social class levels except for the upper working class and upper middle class speakers. Tokens amounted to only one or two per speaker, although Lily gave twice as many with a total of four. The researcher, Patricia Morris, even produced one token (20).

(19) used to do cleaning me

(20) they [was] right old mates

This is unsurprising given that it is, to my knowledge, ubiquitous amongst West Yorkshire speakers, as well as many other regional varieties. One reason for Lily’s high use of non-standard variants compared to the other speakers besides her social class status, as the only working-class speaker in the LAVC corpus, could be social networks. Milroy and Milroy (1999) argue that covert and informal pressure produced by certain types of social networks can resist linguistic change and maintain norms. The sort of ‘dense’ and ‘multiplex’ ties which promote maintenance exist amongst ‘small territorial communities such as villages and well-defined urban communities’ (Milroy and Milroy, 1999:49). Bramley, where Lily lived and worked was one such community. Most residents worked in the wool and worsted mills upon leaving school, meaning that co-workers were often friends or relations who they would also socialise with outside of the workplace. Lily herself worked at Yates’ mill for over forty years, where her sisters-in-law, father-in-law and brother-in-law also worked at a given period, before being made redundant approximately a year before the interview was conducted. Rhodes (1998), who grew up in Bramley, implies that the strong social network ties in the area did act as a barrier against linguistic change, at least at the vocabulary level, and that on his return from the regular army he noticed that there were few of the local vocabulary words being used as well as fewer textile mills in production, even if the accent had remained. Patricia produced one token of non-standard were when asking Lily about wage rates approximately halfway through the interview (21).
Patricia appears to be from a similar class background to Lily, having also worked at a textile mill in the area, but her low non-standard use suggests that she is not converging towards Lily’s style of speech, possibly because as the researcher she is avoiding non-standard variants for greater clarity when putting questions to the speaker. The more conversational feel to the interview might also be partially because the interview was conducted in Lily’s own home.

**Jim Roche**

Jim produced only a few tokens of non-standard *was* and *were* as well as contracted negatives. He produced seven tokens of non-standard *were* and five of non-standard *was*. The first token of non-standard *were* occurred around forty five lines into the interview and its distribution is fairly even thereafter. The five tokens of *was* are scattered periodically across the interview as a whole as opposed to accumulating towards the end, nor do they occur with particularly emotive topics. He produced no tokens of *on* + general time phrase and *right* as an intensifier. Jim came from a large, working-class family and grew up in a poverty-stricken area of Leeds known as the Bank. From starting out as an apprentice at John Barran’s, he became shop steward of the tailors and chairman of the trade union at Burton’s factory. Despite only having secondary level schooling, he was ‘self-educated’, being a keen reader and becoming involved in local politics, which complicates his social class status. This interview was conducted in his own home in Leeds.

**Leslie Rosentalks**

Leslie’s scores are similar to Jim’s and the two share many similarities as they are both from working-class backgrounds, are around the same age, and occupied similar positions at Burton, as both were shop stewards. He produced five tokens of non-standard *were* and only one of non-standard *was*, both of which often occur with existential *there* (22, 23).

(22) a demonstration (.) there *were* any amount of demonstrations

---

17 A neighbour of Jim and Gertie Roche informed me that although they were from a working class background and lived on Queens Road in the Hyde Park area at the time, they felt as if they were entering an ‘intellectuals’ home’ with the books and furniture that they possessed.
(23) there was about four lavatories to a yard

He also produced two tokens of *them* as a demonstrative, as well as two tokens of *right* as an intensifier.

**2018 Results**

Tables 7 and 8 show each speaker’s cumulative feature use in the 2018 corpus.

**Malcolm Berwin**

Malcolm’s interview was the shortest in the 2018 corpus and his speech was somewhat impaired due to recent surgery on his mouth. He scored zero on almost all non-standard variables, which is perhaps reflective of his upper middle-class social status, being a university-educated proprietor of his family’s clothing business prior to his retirement. He did, however, remark that he ‘used to use one way of talking in the office and another way on the factory floor’. When asked about differences in the way that his workers at the firm’s factory in north Leeds spoke compared to the workers at the South Yorkshire factory which they later opened, he described the South Yorkshire workers as ‘tribal’ and ‘racist one village to another’. They were heavily influenced by the mining community around them, with many clothing workers being miners’ daughters, and were told not to work on Mondays as the miners did not do so. At this point in the interview Malcolm adopted the miner’s voice directly, quoting ‘tha doesn’t go to work on a Monday, lass’. This was one of two appearances of the archaic pronoun ‘tha’ (/ða/) in either corpus. Despite the fact that thou forms in northern speech ‘were expected to be recessive by the *SED* fieldworkers and used mainly by the elderly’ (Wales, 2006:182), the old distinction between ‘thou’, or ‘tha’ in this case, and ‘you’ appeared in Cooper’s ‘modern’ Yorkshire repertoire (2017:48), suggesting that it is still ‘enregistered’ as a feature of the dialect. The fact that it appears in quoted direct speech of a South Yorkshire miner from decades ago rather than in the speaker’s own speech is nevertheless unsurprising. Malcolm also used two tokens of *them* as a demonstrative, but I argue that this too is a more indirect appropriation of a miner’s voice (24).
Table 7: Individual Speakers’ Cumulative Feature Use - Part One (2018 Corpus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>FG</th>
<th>JH</th>
<th>BO</th>
<th>BR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Standard Were</strong></td>
<td>✓ (36/59)</td>
<td>✓ (82/137)</td>
<td>✓ (5/67)</td>
<td>✓ (38/89)</td>
<td>✓ (17/32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Standard Was</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (1/78)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (1/102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked Plurality of Measurement Nouns</strong></td>
<td>✓ (1/2)</td>
<td>✓ (16/44)</td>
<td>✓ (6/19)</td>
<td>✓ (1/5)</td>
<td>✓ (4/6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-standard Relative what</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>That with human antecedent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (9/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Standard Pronouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past/Present Tense Verbs</strong></td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>✓ (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td>✓ (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irregular Verbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negation and Contracted Forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrative them</strong></td>
<td>✓ (2/2)</td>
<td>✓ (10/10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (5/5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Us as possessive determiner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right as an intensifier</strong></td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On + general time phrase</strong></td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (3)</td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inverted verb phrase as a tag</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Individual Speakers’ Cumulative Feature Use - Part Two (2018 Corpus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>C. Swann</th>
<th>MU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard <em>Were</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?/?)</td>
<td>(45/59)</td>
<td>(61/72)</td>
<td>(77/118)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard <em>Was</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2/76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked Plurality of Measurement Nouns</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?/?)</td>
<td>(1/16)</td>
<td>(5/7)</td>
<td>(4/12)</td>
<td>(3/34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard Relative <em>what</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>That</em> with human antecedent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5/6)</td>
<td>(13/24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Standard Pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past/Present Tense Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular Verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation and Contracted Forms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(?/?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative <em>them</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2/3)</td>
<td>(13/14)</td>
<td>(2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Us</em> as possessive determiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Right</em> as an intensifier</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On</em> + general time phrase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted verb phrase as a tag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(24)

MB: [oh] they wouldn’t have [no-] *them* foreigners there

EO: hm (.) I see

MB: [?] wouldn’t have *them* foreigners there (..) very racist they are

It would be more likely for the working-class miners to use *them* as opposed to *those*, as the former variant is class-marked, and it is more reasonable for them to resent ‘foreigners’ as prospective rivals in the job market. Malcolm’s interview demonstrates how interviews can also act as gateways to other varieties known to the speaker, even if they themselves do not use them. A lengthier interview with Malcolm conducted by Sprecher and Raw (2012) showed that he again used non-standard features exclusively when recalling memories of former workers.

**Charles Butcher**

Despite being defined as middle class, Charles consistently scored highly on many non-standard variables. While the use of *us* as a possessive determiner was isolated to the working-class women in the 2018 corpus (Fig 8) as it was in the LAVC corpus, the two anomalous middle class tokens came from Charles (25).

(25) and we started a business on *us* own

He also produced two tokens of demonstrative *right* as well as of *on* + general time phrase. Although he is the manager of his own tailoring company in Oakwood and lives and works in an affluent area, Charles came from working-class origins and started as an apprentice in the cutting room of the Albion factory after he left school. He was also interviewed in his shop where customers would occasionally enter, possibly resulting in a less self-conscious speech style as he was in a familiar environment and speaking about a topic of interest to him.
Frances Grainger
Frances was another working-class speaker whose use of non-standard *were* was proportionally greater than their standard use, at 60 per cent. As Fig 9 shows, there was a strong negative correlation between higher social class status and use of non-standard *were*, with the exception of Charles’ high score.
Frances also scored highly for other non-standard variants such as demonstrative *them* and possessive *us*. She also produced tokens of all three more local features, one of demonstrative *right*, two of *on* + general time phrase, and at least two inverted verb phrases as tags (26).

(26) it were eleven o’clock [wor] service

Frances was one of the speakers who was most receptive to giving long responses, although this meant that she often would diverge from her initial answer to a question on the topic list. She, like Lily Gaunt, also originates from Bramley, and is close in age to Lily at the time of her interview with Patricia, although Frances was born almost thirty years after Lily. I was therefore curious to see if there would be any similarities between the two women’s scores which to some extent there was, although Lily’s non-standard scores are higher on average.
Jean Horsman
Jean produced low scores of most non-standard features, in most cases none, with only five tokens of non-standard were, of which only one occurred post-interview. This is unsurprising given her middle class status, although she came from a working-class background, having lived on council estates when young, and said that she felt out-of-place in a ‘middle class world’. She produced one token of a weak verb where Standard English has strong, ‘telled’ (27), although this arose when she was about to tell me a narrative which she requested to be taken out of the recording afterwards. She later granted me permission to use it at the end of the story.

(27) yeah I telled you I’m active in politics

Betty Olsen
While Betty had a high score of non-standard were, it only accounted for 43 per cent of her total use. She scored zero for them as a demonstrative and us as a possessive determiner. She did, however, produce no tokens of who, exclusively using that to refer to human antecedents, which accounted for 53 per cent of total antecedents of that in her case. She scored zero for use of right as an intensifier but elicited three tokens of on + general time phrase. Betty was placed in the upper working class category as she became a nurse in her forties. The interview was conducted in Cross Gates library where Betty attended a knitting group once a week. She came across as being rather polite and was eager to tell me all she could of her time at Hepworths. Her interview was one of the most relaxed with a good rapport being established between her and the researcher.

Brian Richardson
Brian was another working-class speaker with an overall high use of non-standard variants and was the only male speaker in the working-class category. He had the highest use of what as a relative pronoun of any speaker in either corpus, as well as the highest use of ‘wor’ (/wɔr/), although his non-standard were use was higher than his standard use at 53 per cent. I treat wor as a variant in its own right as it is phonologically distinct from was or were and occurred with both singular and plural
nouns, although it occurs most often with singular subjects in both datasets and Petyt (1985) perceives it as an alternative realisation of *was*. This feature did, however, appear to be very strongly class marked (Fig 10).

**Fig 10: Distribution of 'wor' by social class in 2018 corpus**

**Jack Rigg**

Despite Jack’s interview audio being lost, meaning that his use of linguistic variables could not be quantified, I still received an impression of his dialect from the initial phone call I had with him during the recruitment phase, observations made during his interview, and a recording of a previous interview conducted with Jack which is now held at Sunny Bank Mills where he formerly worked. He was a relatively broad Yorkshire speaker, despite now living in one of the more affluent areas of Bramley, and was more than willing to talk for extensive periods of time during both the phone call and interview itself. There was evidence of non-standard *were*, unmarked plurality of nouns of measurement, and contracted negatives in his speech. Jack also said that the people at Woodhouse’s mill ‘all talked broad’, which
might be unsurprising given the significance of the mill to Farsley’s socio-economic life at the time, which would expectedly create dense and multiplex social network ties. He did, however, say that there was a ‘class system’ within the mill, with the spinners and doffers being ‘working class’, the weavers ‘middle class’ and the menders ‘upper class’. The girls in the spinning and doffing were considered to be a bit rough. The second token of ‘tha’ in either corpus emerged during a narrative told by Jack about how he spent part of his first wage on a book which he had brought into the factory in a paper bag, and the foreman asked him ‘What’s tha got there then?’ before making a spectacle of the young Jack, as reading was not a common pastime amongst the mill workers. When I visited his home, he had an extensive collection of books, many of which were on art and literature.

**Harold Rose**

Harold’s scores were similar to Malcolm’s and Cyril Albrecht’s, the other directors in the two corpora, with low numbers of non-standard variants. Although he produced no non-standard *were* as I anticipated, he did produce two tokens of non-standard *was*, which was something of an anomaly in the data. The interview was conducted in the Laidlaw Library at the University of Leeds.

**Christine Smith**

Christine had a high score for most non-standard variables. She was also the only speaker in either corpus to use the suffix ‘-sen’ in personal pronouns (28), and the only examples of the non-standard pronouns *usselves* (29) and *hisself* (30) in the 2018 corpus also came from her.

(28) I might be pullin’ *mesen* down

(29) y’know we just did it *usselves*

(30) well he ant done bad *hisself*

Christine was the only speaker who I knew prior to their interview, as the mother of a friend who I have known for many years. The interview was held in a local fish and chip shop in Normanton, which was known to us both. This might have
contributed to her high use of non-standard variables as she felt comfortable enough to adopt a more informal style when talking to me. I discovered that my use of non-standard features was highest in Christine’s interview, as I was most likely also accommodating to a more informal style of speech.

**Carol Swann**

Carol, one of the working class speakers, showed the highest individual proportion of non-standard *were* at 85 per cent. She was interviewed in her own home with her son and his partner, the researcher’s friend, also present. This may have contributed to her high score, although it is not significantly higher than that of other high-scoring speakers and she was fairly consistent in her use of non-standard features across the interview as a whole. There were one or two points during the interview when she addressed the other people present in the adjacent room. Although her speech style did not change dramatically from that used towards me, this did produce one token of *us* used in the place of *me* (31) and *me* in the place of *my*.

(31) pass *us me* knitting bag a’ side o’ settee

She also produced the most tokens of demonstrative *them* of any speaker in either corpus. I also found that I used a small number of non-standard variants in Carol’s interview.

**Marie Underwood**

Marie also scored highly on non-standard *were*, which accounted for 65 per cent of her total *were* use. She did not score highly on some other non-standard features. My non-standard *were* use in this case might have been a deliberate attempt to project my ‘in-group’ membership as a West Yorkshire speaker, although it was not as high as that used with Christine or Carol. These were the first three interviews conducted, and my use of non-standard *were* decreased after this, possibly as I became more confident in my role as interviewer. She produced four tokens of *on* + general time phrase, one of the highest scores of this admittedly infrequent feature, and two inverted verb phrases as tags, but zero tokens of *right* as an intensifier.
Conclusion

The number of words and phrases which emerged in the interviews, while small, surpassed expectation. Some stereotypical Yorkshire features such as ‘nowt’ and ‘sommert’ were found in both datasets, suggesting their connection to the area persists. Nouns in the corpora could be grouped into semantic categories of ‘events and functions’, ‘clothing’, and ‘domestic life’. These categories can to some extent be linked to the major themes in both the LAVC and 2018 interviews, such as a speaker’s background and whether the employers provided trips. Patterns emerged with regard to grammatical variables such as was-were levelling and non-standard relative pronouns in relation to a speaker’s social class and their place in the industry hierarchy, whether this was textiles or clothing. Analysing the data in terms of idiolect helped to account for factors such as interview setting, topic, social networks, and style shifting. This was useful as there were idiosyncrasies in the data which could not always be explained by broad social groupings such as class and gender alone. It was sometimes the case that, even with working-class speakers, a non-standard feature could be used at one point in the interview, and then the standard form would be used only several lines later, sometimes without a topic shift. Such cases where the standard and non-standard variable perhaps seemed interchangeable and ungoverned by social factors highlights how ‘no two speakers have the same set of experiences from which to generalize, so no two speakers could possibly have exactly the same knowledge of language’ (Johnstone, 2000:410). Some non-standard features only appeared outside of the immediate interview context or in narratives. The next chapter examines the subject of narrative in greater detail, and its role in constructing speaker identity.
Chapter 6: Identity Construction through Narrative

Narratives help us to make sense of the world around us and our identities within it. The act of telling does more than merely communicate information about past experience; telling creates events and reshapes histories. Individuals’ reminiscences are not simply extracted from their memories and transmitted to their audience. They are highly constructed and context-bound creations, as Bauman argues that events are ‘not the external raw materials out of which narratives are constructed but rather the reverse: Events are abstractions from narrative’ (1986:5). How the speakers in my data frame their narratives, whether with explicit reference to a stretch of discourse as a narrative (‘I’ll tell you a funny story’) or otherwise, and how they construct their storyworlds reveals much about how they wish to viewed, both as a teller and character. In this chapter, I explore what constitutes a narrative, how narratives are structured, whether there are differences in telling style and subject matter between my speakers as a result of gender, and some of the stylistic devices speakers use to construct narratives.

Defining Narrative

The term ‘narrative’ is a broad one. Distinguishing the stylistic, semantic or thematic characteristics of an oral narrative which set it apart from other ways of conveying experience is a hermeneutic activity. This is largely because of the status of discourse as a linguistic unit, as ‘texts do not have the same kind of internally constrained, externally bounded structures as sentences’ (Schriffrin, 2006:12). Labov and Waletsky’s functional model identifies ‘oral narratives of personal experience’ as a discourse unit with a clearly-defined structure. They define a narrative as ‘one method of recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred’ (1967:20). Labov and Waletsky (1967) define a ‘minimal narrative’ as two clauses connected by at least one ‘temporal juncture’, although they identify six key elements found in more fully-formed narratives:

A. Abstract: a short summary of the whole narrative
B. Orientation: groups of free clauses orientating listeners with respect to person, place, time and behavioural situation
C. **Complicating Action:** the main body of a narrative, the ‘what happened?’ or ‘and then what happened?’

D. **Evaluation:** the part of a narrative which reveals the attitude of the narrator towards the narrative by emphasising the relative importance of some narrative units compared to others

E. **Resolution:** the final outcome of the narrative

F. **Coda:** a functional device which bridges the gap between the story world and the present, signalling that the narrative has come to a close, e.g. ‘and that was that’

Orientation and evaluation can occur at any point in the narrative; the latter does not serve any referential function but is crucial for making the story reportable, showing that temporality alone is not sufficient for a group of clauses to constitute a narrative. The crux of the narrative is what Labov later terms the ‘most reportable event’, or rather ‘the event that is less common than any other in the narrative’ (1997:406) and which is evaluated most strongly. In this respect, Labov argues, ‘a narrative of personal experience is essentially a narrative of the most reportable event in it’ (1997:406). Labov and Waletsky acknowledge, however, that not all personal narratives contain all six elements, as was the case in my data. Labov and Waletsky’s model had limited usefulness for the present study as it proved somewhat rigid, neglecting other ways in which coherence and meaning can be constructed in narratives. Nevertheless, their framework helped to determine what could be classed as a ‘narrative’ in my interview data. New strands of narrative research in the decades following Labov and Waletsky’s publication include alternative ways of building coherence in narratives other than through temporality (Herman, 2001), and narrative as a performative act which is instrumental in fashioning one’s identity (Holmes, 1997; Holmes and Marra, 2005; Bamberg and Georgakopoulou, 2008). While I do not provide a clear-cut definition of narrative, I established a set of criteria in classifying narratives in my data:

- The events being recounted were set in the past
- There was some sort of complicating action propelling the story forward
- The events being recounted were unique rather than habitual
I do not refer to the narratives in my data as ‘personal narratives’ due to the problems associated with their scope and how ‘personal’ they are, as ‘they may be less personal to the extent that a rhetorical audience, sociocultural forces, and/or group membership identifications influence how, why, and with what point those narratives are told’ (Ingraham, 2017:70). This was also appropriate as, in some narratives, the speaker does not feature in the narrative as a participant but may have witnessed ‘events’ as they unfolded. In some cases, the narratives did not run in a continuous, uninterrupted flow, featuring interjections and feedback from myself which were inseparable from the fabric of the narrative. The titles used to refer to the narratives were devised by the researcher and not by the speakers themselves.

**Narrative Frequency and Structure**

As the boundaries of narratives are somewhat hazy, there was admittedly an element of intuition in gauging whether a section of discourse constituted a narrative or not. For space and clarity, I will be restricting my discussion to the more fully-formed narratives containing most of Labov and Waletsky’s elements. Fig 11 shows the overall frequency of fully-formed and what I term ‘semi-structured’ narratives. Semi-structured narratives are briefer units of discourse that do not contain all of Labov and Waletsky’s elements, including minimal narratives and what Kalčik refers to as a ‘kernel story’: ‘a brief reference to the subject, the central action, or an important piece of dialogue from a longer story’ (1975:7). The overall frequency of fully-formed narratives was marginally higher for men than women, with 56 per cent being told by male speakers who formed 44 per cent of the speakers. This contradicts Coates’s (2003) findings in her narratives gathered from all-female and all-male conversations where the speakers in each group were known to each other, as the women showed a greater propensity for telling narratives. This could be because women are perceived in Western society as being more open to talking about personal matters, which are often the subject of conversational narratives. Unlike Coates’s narratives however, both the LAVC and 2018 narratives were elicited under interview conditions by an unfamiliar, female interviewer: Fiona Byron and Patricia Morris in the former case and myself in the latter. What bearing this difference had on narrative frequency is difficult to assess, although I do not suggest that gender is a factor governing a speaker’s tendency to tell narratives *per se*. The structure of some of the narratives also demonstrates that not all narratives
strictly follow Labov and Waletsky’s model as I anticipated. Ingraham asserts that the shortcomings of Labov and Waletsky’s model are to do with their structural approach, as the six elements ‘blur together, with certain clauses doing double duty: say, serving as abstracts and orientation’ (2017:62).

Jim Roche (LAVC 71y. MC) not only told the most narratives, but also demonstrated the greatest prowess as a storyteller. The average length of his narratives is about 33.5 lines, with a range of 10-126 lines. Only in one of these narratives, ‘Tie Him in the Bed’, is Jim absent from the narrative as a participant. ‘Lord Mayor’s Visit’ and ‘Balloons’ are what I refer to as conjoined narratives. These are narratives where the latter directly follows on from the former and the two perhaps share a common coda between them but are viewed as two distinct events.
In Jim’s case, the common coda highlights the necessity of humour for enriching the lives of the clothing factory workers, which both stories exemplify. Leslie Rosentalks’s (LAVC 70y. MC) narratives are not quite as well-formed and coherent as Jim’s but he nonetheless shows skill in manipulating the conventions of oral narrative, as I shall demonstrate later. The one possible instance of a fully-formed narrative in Lily Gaunt’s (LAVC 59y. WC) interview is somewhat less fluent in comparison to the two men, with more fillers and false starts. Several more examples of conjoined narratives appeared in the 2018 corpus, such as Carol
Swann’s (2018 61y.? WC) ‘False Eyelashes’ and ‘False Nails’. It was difficult at times to determine where a narrative started or ended, and which, if any, clauses constituted a ‘coda’. In some cases the abstract or orientation are signalled by formulaic utterances such as ‘I remember’ or ‘I’ll tell you a funny story’, and codas by similar utterances or deictic markers (‘that’, ‘there’, ‘those’), such as Carol’s ‘so I gave up on them things’, *them*, or rather ‘those’, referring both to the false lashes and nails. There were cases where there was no apparent coda, especially where narratives were embedded within a larger explanatory discourse unit. Linde (1993) proposes the concept of a ‘life story’ which consists of ‘all the stories and associated discourse units, such as explanations and chronicles, and the connections between them, told by an individual over the course of his/ her lifetime’ (1993:21). This is a far more fluid and open-ended unit than Labov and Waletsky’s personal narrative as ‘the properties of temporal discontinuity and structural and interpretive openness mean that a life story necessarily changes constantly’ (1993:31). This change is achieved ‘by the addition of stories about new events, by the loss of certain old stories and by the reinterpretation of old stories to express new evaluations’ (1993:31). This more inclusive approach to story-telling allows for structural openness and re-shaping as we change and reshape our life history. It appeared that some narratives were embedded within or linked to other narrative or discourse units stretching across part or the whole of the interview. For speakers such as Betty Olsen (2018 93y. UWC), Charles Butcher (2018 74y. MC), Frances Grainger (2018 63y. WC) and Jean Horsman (2018 79y.? MC) with a comparatively high frequency of narratives, each narrative can be viewed as an episode in a wider ‘life story’. In other cases, the course of the narratives was partially shaped by the researcher’s comments, as in the following excerpt from the close of Marie Underwood’s (2018 45y. WC) narrative ‘Interview’ (32).

(32)

43. EO: hm (..) what did he say to that

44. MU: and he went (.) well (..) w- we don’t have (.) high level- we don’t have high level (..) um (..) seamstresses

45. and I sez well (.) that’s not my problem (.)

46. I said but I don’t see why (.) if I come and work here (.)

I should have to do overtime (..)

when I- when I know I can do my job (.) in the day
that’s- that’s not my problem (.) that’s yours
and it- and he kept (.) he kept- he kept nagging and nagging
and I said I’m not coming to work-
I said I’m not coming to work for you
I sez (.) it’s not worth mi time (…)
so

EO: yeah (.) got- got him told

Marie had apparently reached the resolution of the narrative, marked by the filler ‘so’, although the final word came from the researcher. Jean’s narrative ‘What do you know about it?’ contains a number of clauses between lines 5-6 about music and how working class people couldn’t afford instruments which stretches the boundaries of orientation (33).

(33)

1. I’ll tell you (.) a funny story
2. cos my- y’know my three lads obviously grew up
   and got this sewing going on in the family (.)
3. in fact (.) one of them sez
   I was always ironing
4. and (.) I was at um (..)
5. Glenn- who’s the most middle class of- not him (.) but his family (.)
   he’s married into a middle class family (.)
   his wife’s parents are- his father’s a vicar
   and his (. ) mother- her mother (.) taught (.) till her retirement
   at a (.) grammar school (.) music (.) y’know (..)
   they all play the piano (.)
   cos people assume y’know
   that (..) working class people all had a piano
   but (.) we couldn’t afford a piano
   and (.) we’d got no musical instruments (.)
   people have this idea that we sat round a piano all day y’know
   in these poor houses (.)
   who can afford a piano (.)
   [we’ve] no musical background at all
   apart from singing (..)
6. um (..) and uh (.) I was there (.)
7. cos she’d asked me- uh Alice had asked me
   to (.) alter some (.) trousers for her (.)
8. so I went over to their house
9. cos he’s- he’s wheelchair dependent is Glenn (.)
   so he can’t get out (..)
10. and while she’s putting them on (.)
11. he- he made some comment- comment about what it needed (.)
It could more accurately be seen as a digression as its relevance to the main narrative is questionable. It does not provide any information on the four aspects Labov and Waletsky claim are found in the orientation element, nor is the subject of music relevant to the narrative’s progression which is on the subject of sewing. Macaulay asserts that people do not tell stories for nothing; the significance of stories does not lie in the events themselves but in what the speakers tell their audience about themselves ‘by telling the story in a particular way’ (2005b:83). This helps explain Jean’s digression as in both this section and the narrative as a whole, she wished to stress her identification with working-class life and its values now that she lives in a ‘middle-class world’.

**Topic, Gender and Identity**

Some narratives were more focused on the textiles and clothing industries than others. Speakers with high volumes of narratives also had consistent themes running throughout all or most of their narratives. Jim’s narratives were often concerned with class and social justice, while Frances’ narratives often concerned past romantic encounters. While some narratives were elicited in response to a researcher’s question, a great number unfolded spontaneously. Labov and Waletsky’s criteria for what makes a reportable story includes difficult or dangerous situations, or strange and unusual happenings (1967:34). The common goal of such narratives is ‘self-aggrandisement’, as they depict the speaker in a positive light through their actions or behaviour. While Coates (1996) argues that it is a trait of women’s narratives that they depict themselves as ‘failures’, self-deprecation serves a role in constructing identity, or rather foregrounds a particular identity which the speaker wishes to assume. For instance, Holmes and Marra (2005) show how two female managers maintain seemingly contradictory aspects of their identity through workplace narratives, although they do not accentuate the managers’ gender in their analysis. ‘Ordinary’ or ‘mundane’ events are also increasingly being considered suitable subjects for personal narratives, although what counts as ‘remarkable’ also varies between communities of speakers and listeners. For example, Brian Richardson’s (2018 ?y. WC) short narrative ‘Sofa’ may not be considered terribly remarkable, recounting the rather mundane experience of purchasing a new sofa, but he must still have viewed it as being of some interest to me in order to tell it. Langellier and Peterson claim that folklinguistics has a tendency to comment about
women’s talk being ‘trivial, uninteresting and notably unremarkable’ (1992:160), but they argue that such stories promote group solidarity rather than self-aggrandisement. Coates highlights how women are doing identity work in conversational narrative amongst female friends, as it is through storytelling that women ‘create and re-create identities and experiment with possible selves, in a context of mutuality and trust’ (196:115). She argues that in their stories, women ‘do not present themselves as heroes, and they are more often done to than doing (1996:115). Johnstone (1993) claims that even at the individual level, there is a difference in the stories that men and women choose to tell, and how they construct their storyworlds. In her corpus of spontaneous conversation amongst familiar individuals from an Indiana city, she found that ‘the women’s stories tend to be about community, while the men’s tend to be about contest’ (1993:69). There was no striking difference in the choice of topic between male and female speakers. The dichotomy of ‘community’ and ‘contest’ was also not applicable. In most cases, both male and female speakers were frequently the subject of their own narratives, although they did not always portray themselves in a positive light and were sometimes the butt of the joke. For instance, in Betty Olsen’s (2018 93y. UWC) narrative ‘Black Veil’ (34), the two women are initially cooperating with one another in lines 1-2 but it is a slight disagreement between them which lends the story its humorous punchline, also highlighting Betty’s error of judgement.

(34)

Black Veil

1. I remember once I were working with this (.) nun
2. (.) and (.) we worked all round (.)
   doing the beds (.)
3. and when we got to the last one (.)
4. he- he said to this nun (..)
5. why’ve you got that black (..) thing on your head (..)
6. so she sez (..) why didn’t you tell me (.)
7. she should’ve changed it to a white one (.)
8. I said I thought you were in mourning for one of the (.) priests

The best example of a ‘community’ orientated story is Jim’s (LAVC 71y. MC) story ‘Mr Jones’, although it displays elements of ‘contest’, as can been seen in his pronoun choice in the following extract (35).
15. and I managed to (.)
16. I remember the people involved (.)
17. Fred Barry
   who became a trade union official (.)
18. Ronny Harris
   who became a trade union official (.)
19. and Morris [Bar]
   who became (. a (.) a general manager at Burton’s (.)
20. and- and myself (.)
21. we decided we’d go and see (. the secretary (.)

Jim switches from ‘I’ to communal ‘we’, signalling a possible change of mind about the narrative’s intention. The narrative’s goal seems to switch from portraying Jim as a great leader who rectifies a social injustice, to showing what the collective efforts of a group of men can achieve. Nevertheless, the fact that it is Jim who gives the order to re-direct all 15,000 striking clothing workers into Mr Jones’s office (lines 37-38), which ultimately leads to the narrative’s resolution, shows that there remains an undercurrent of self-aggrandisement until the narrative’s close.

37. I sez to Ronny Ha- Ronny (.)
    go outside and (..) deflect them all down ‘ere (.)
38. and tell them all to come into this office (.)

The above extracts from Jim and Betty highlight Coates’s (2003) distinction between men and women’s narratives: that men have a greater tendency towards self-aggrandisement and depict themselves as successful, often acting alone, while women often cast themselves in a less favourable light and often fail in their endeavours. There are, however, many examples of women who succeed, take control or show themselves in a positive light, just as there are examples of men telling narratives that are other-orientated or self-deprecating. Jim is often the one who resolves others’ difficulties in his narratives, with the exception of one or two narratives in which he is absent. His contemporary Leslie’s self-orientated narrative, ‘Operating’, on the other hand is rather self-deprecating, in which a prospective love interest falsely assumes he is a doctor, leading to rather unfortunate yet comic consequences (37):
(37)
42. and as I’m working all of a sudden I notice-
43. I felt people stood round mi table (..)
44. and one of ‘em was this girl
45. and I was chopping a pair of trousers out
46. with a pair of [shears] (.)
47. and she just said to mi huh (.) operating
48. and went off-
49. I never met her of course (.)
50. but these are funny things that happened y’know (.)
51. and then the fellas kept coming to me uh-
52. huh somebody had heard it there like and (.)
53. can you gimme a sick note doctor
54. nearly drove me mad
55. but there you see those kind of things (.)
56. there was always something happening there (.) always

The narrative’s aim is to entertain rather than to depict him favourably. Betty’s narratives are typically other-orientated or self-deprecating, although ‘Wrong Collar’ (38) ultimately shows her in a positive light. While Langellier and Peterson (1992), Johnstone (1993), Kalčík (1985) and Coates (1996, 2003) look at co-told narratives, primarily amongst female familiars, my narratives are all conducted in a one-to-one interview situation, meaning that I cannot comment on this aspect of women’s narratives.

(38)

Wrong Collar

1. I remember- (.)
yes we had a- we had a (.) a chap there (.)
2. I think- I think he had artificial leg (..)
called him Mr White (..)
he was very nice (….) because um (…)
3. I’d uh- (…) I’d done some collars (.)
4. and I thought they were alright (..)
5. and the [?] I nearly said [?] (.)
6. the uh (.) supervisor said that (.) one- one wasn’t quite right (..)
7. and I said well I think it’s right (..)
8. and so she said no (.)
9. so I took it and altered it
10. and give her it back
11. and then I said (.) I’m sorry for saying that (..)
    that I’d said it was alright (.)
    I said because you were right (.)
12. and so the boss had me in his office (..)
13. and he said Betty (..) he said (..)
   I admire you he said (..)
   because you apologised (..)
   he said and it’s very hard to apologise (..)
14. when you know you’re in the right (..)
15. and that was- (.) I remember that ever so plain (.)
16. so when I go to school
17. and there’s children there waiting
18. to [see] because they’ve been naughty (..)
19. I say well say you’re sorry (..)
20. say you’re sorry (..) hm

The young Betty in the narrative makes an error but shows honesty and integrity when she admits that she was wrong, with the older Betty in the coda now taking on the manager’s role as the one reinforcing the moral ‘always tell the truth’.

**Storytelling Strategies**

While I discuss each feature in turn, this is somewhat misleading as they often work together to create units of meaning and coherence in narratives.

**Historical Present and Past Tense**

Wolfson argues that the switch between ‘conversational historical present’ and past tense partitions events from one another, ‘to give structure to the story and thereby focus attention on the events which the narrator sees as most important’ (1978:222), although the historical present in itself has ‘no significance’ (1978:222). Schiffrin (1981) builds upon Wolfson’s research, arguing that it is not simply the act of switching from one to the other but the direction of the switch which is significant. She notes that use of the historical present in narrative is solely confined to complicating actions, which my data supports, as only events reported within the complicating action have ‘an event time that is firmly established by the place of the clauses in the surrounding discourse’ (1981:51). She claims that there are two differing functions of historical present tense. When the switch is from past tense to historical present, historical present is an internal evaluative device: it allows the narrator to present events as if they were occurring at that moment, making the past more vivid. When the switch is in the opposite direction, historical present serves a partitioning function: switching out of the historical present to past tense separates narrative events from each other. In the case of Leslie’s narrative ‘Operating’ (39),
the switch from past to historical present tense appears to be performing an
evaluative function, especially on line 42 at the climax of the story. However, it also
appears to be partitioning the narrative. Leslie often backtracks to earlier episodes or
interrupts the narrative flow with chunks of orientation, but when he picks up the
main thread of the narrative once more, he switches from past to historical present
(lines italicised).

(39)

1. I once met a girl at Wetherby (.) Collingham
2. had a blazer on and flannels
3. I’d been rehearsing a play (.)
4. and I was on a punt (.)
5. I used to love punting
6. and I went out to Collingham for example
7. [an’ I] (.) punting away
8. and I was a good cricketer (.)
9. I played cricket for Burton’s
10. I’ve got a photograph of their cricket team there somewhere (...)
11. and uh (.) had mi blazer on and a pair of lovely grey flannels right wide
   bottoms y’know used to wear [?] and bangs (.)
12. *punting down there*
13. saw a very attractive girl
14. got her in the punt (.)
15. arranged to meet her on a Wednesday night (.)
16. and I was rehearsing a play
17. I was teking the part of a doctor (.)
18. and uh (.) the producer who was a doctor
19. he [lived in York Road]
20. said I didn’t know how to use a stethoscope
21. and he lent me one (.) y’know with the damage in (.)
22. told me how to use it (.)
23. tek it home and get used to it (.)
24. and I put this stethoscope in mi pocket
25. *and I go off to Collingham*
26. *I pick this girl up*
27. and then I took mi blazer off
28. and gave her it (.) y’know while I- used punt pole
29. (.) and she saw this (.) what you call it this stethoscope
30. said oh you’re a doctor (.)
31. well I didn’t say I wasn’t
32. my how interesting (.)
33. and uh (.) I’ll never forget I arranged to meet her on the Wednesday
   night at what was then (.) the Paramount then (.)
   it became the Odeon (.)
34. can tell how long ago (.)
   it was called the Paramount then
35. (…) now Burtons always had a lot of famous visitors coming round
36. the place (.)
37. everybody of any importance came by (.)
38. well on this particular bu- Wednesday (.I told mi foreman the day before
39. I wasn’t working over-
40. you could always have an odd night off y’see (.I didn’t like it [?] (…)
41. and on the Wednesday [all] I came dressed up to go to the Odeon and go
   y’know
   out with her at night (.)
42. and as I’m working all of a sudden I notice-
43. I felt people stood round mi table (..)
44. and one of ‘em was this girl
45. and I was chopping a pair of trousers out
46. with a pair of [shears] (.)
47. and she just said to mi huh (.I operating
48. and went off-
49. I never met her of course (.)
50. but these are funny things that happened y’know (.)
51. and then the fellas kept coming to me uh-
52. huh somebody had heard it there like and (.)
53. can you gimme a sick note doctor
54. nearly drove me mad
55. but there you see those kind of things (.)
56. there was always something happening there (.I always

Overall there are relatively few instances of historical present in the narratives. Betty
has one token, ‘give’, in her narrative ‘Wrong Collar’ (line 10), although I would
argue that this is not the most reportable event in the narrative, which might be the
manager calling Betty into his office (line 12), so its function is unclear. Jean also
has one instance of a switch from historical present to past tense in ‘What do you
know about it’ (lines 9-10) which does appear to serve a partitioning function,
although ‘while’ indicates that the two events are happening simultaneously rather
than in-turn. Given the idiosyncrasy of tense switching in my narratives, I suggest
that there may be factors other than narrative effect governing it, as it has already
been observed in Chapter 5 that the use of the preterite rather than progressive tense
in present participles is a feature of many regional dialects.

**Said and Sez**

I discuss ‘said’ vs. ‘says’ or ‘sez’ separately from historical present and past tense as
‘an inflected present tense form is the norm for narrative reporting verbs’
(Macauley, 1991:60), which Macauley argues is neglected by both Wolfson (1982)
and Schiffrin (1981) possibly because ‘says’ appeared to be used as an invariant
form. There were 134 instances of ‘sez’ as an introducer to direct speech in the narratives from both datasets compared to 71 instances of ‘said’. While ‘sez’ is the favoured variant, the two display some degree of interchangeability. Macaulay argues that there is ‘no evidence of a functional difference between ‘I says’ and ‘I said’ (1991:60). Johnstone (1987) suggests that the tense of the dialogue introducer varies according to the relative status of the speaker to the other individuals in the narrative, with the present tense form being favoured more generally for those perceived to have greater authority over the speaker in the narrative. She claims that ‘authorities can afford to be more colloquial, or can be put down a notch by being made to sound colloquial and slightly incorrect’ (1987:45), although I argue that this might not be the most desirable form of linguistic behaviour for someone in a position of authority. Johnstone, however, only elicits narratives specifically about encounters with authoritative figures. In my data, ‘sez’ is used with figures who have both greater and lesser authority in relation to the speaker, even if each’s ‘footing’ (Goffman 1981) can change over the course of the interaction. The following example (40) is from Jean’s narrative ‘Trousers’, where she is being shown around the school she has gone to teach at by the headteacher, her new boss and an authority figure over her.

(40)

1. um (.) and the head teacher suddenly said (.) now we have a problem (.)
2. cos we’re starting school the next day
3. (. .) um she said um (.) Miss [Coudery]
4. who’s this young teacher (.)
5. who’s still a [lifelong] friend (.)
6. that’s [who’s] messages I’ve just been ( .) doing
7. uh Miss [Coudery] ( .) doesn’t have um a ( .) dress ( .)
   she sez
8. she- she needs [to come in] trousers and she hasn’t time ( .) um ( .)
9. so um ( .) y’know I’m just letting you know y’know that this- this is the y’know
10. we’ve had to make allowances ( .)
11. and she turned to me and said
12. you won’t come in trousers will you ( .)
13. without thinking I just said ( .)
14. cos I’m still as gobby as ever ( .)
15. I said if she can ( .) I can ( .)
Jean switches from ‘said’ to ‘sez’ and then back again a few lines later, even though there has been no apparent shift in footing at this point in the narrative. Jean then switches back to ‘said’ a few lines later. The second example from Charles’s (2018 74y. MC) narrative ‘I’ll See You Later’ (41) is somewhat different. The man he is addressing is a barrister who, although an authoritative figure, is an old customer and friend of Charles’s.

(41)

1. uh (.) I had a chap in one Saturday (.)
2. and this other fella came in
3. and I just said oh are you alright (.)
4. he said yeah (.)
5. he sez I’ll see you later
6. well I know what that means (…) 
7. and the chap that were sat down sez to me (.)
8. do you know who he is (.)
9. I sez well (.)
10. you won’t believe this (.)
11. but me and my wife have actually slept in his bed (.)
12. and in a couple of months’ time (.)
13. I’m going to his daughter’s wedding (.)
14. because we were their godparents

In this instance, authority or footing does not seem to be the governing factor as Charles uses ‘said’ to introduce the first line of both his and the barrister’s dialogue before switching to ‘sez’ thereafter. ‘Said’ does not simply establish a new speaker, as the man sitting down’s first turn (line 7) is introduced with ‘sez’. In his later study of Glasgow, Macaulay notes ‘in the working-class narratives the form ‘says’ is frequently used for all persons, including the first person singular’ (2005a:146) and no great disparity between persons appeared in my data. There is evidence of a positive correlation between social class and use of the present tense form, as Fig 12 shows. The total number of tokens for both variables when preceding direct speech was divided by the number of interviews in each class group.
An analysis of the distribution of the two variables using *Wordsmith* (Scott, 2016) showed no clear indication that a speaker’s proportion of ‘sez’ increased over the course of the narrative as they became more ‘engrossed’ in their story, which was my initial hypothesis, with some speakers using ‘sez’ to accompany the first line of reported speech in their earliest narratives. It seems unlikely that the alternation between ‘said’ and ‘sez’ is highlighting key points in the narrative like other switches from present tense to historical present, given that some speakers employ one form in some cases. I conclude that the switch has no universal function and is utilised in different ways by different speakers, although there is some evidence that it is class marked.

**Introducers and Direct Speech**

I shall briefly examine the role of direct speech and introducers in narrative more generally. Direct speech, or dialogue, ‘can heighten the performance value of their
stories, thus making them more vivid’ (Ferrara and Bell, 1995:265). Overall, 64 per cent of the LAVC narratives and 85 per cent of the 2018 narratives contained direct speech. Johnstone (1993) found that women use more reported speech in their narratives than men, but this was not the case in my data as Figs 13 and 14 show.

**Fig 13: Percentage of Lines Containing Direct Speech in Women's Narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marie Underwood</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Swann</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Olson</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Horsman</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Gaunt</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Grainger</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 15 shows the overall frequency of different introducers from both datasets.
There is a clear preference for ‘sez’. ‘Went’ appeared exclusively in the narratives of two working-class women in the 2018 corpus: Frances and Marie.

**Parallel Structures and Repetition**

As noted earlier, temporality is not the only way narratives can be organised or links can be built between individual ‘events’. Other methods of building coherence include parallel structures which ‘accentuate central elements in oral narrative’ (Norrick, 2000:59) and repetition ‘to heighten the dramatic effect of the action described’ (2000:59). Although this was seen in a number of narratives, I focus on Jim’s narrative ‘Tie Him to the Bed’ which employed the most artistic use of syntactic and lexical repetition in both datasets, establishing ties of coherence across the narrative in addition to its temporal structure. The narrative is given in full below with reoccurring units underlined (42).

(42)

‘Tie Him in the Bed’

1. there was a lot of wife beating (..)
2. and I know one particular woman who (. ) came to my mother
3. and complained that her husband beat her every time he - he had too much to drink (..)
4. and my mother told her she sez next time he comes home drunk (..)
5. tie him in the bed (…)
6. tie him and then beat him (..)
7. and beat him hard (.)
8. and tell him that you’ll not let him loose
9. ‘till he promises not to hit you again (..)
10. and it took a long time for the woman to summon up enough courage
11. that one day when he did come home
12. she did tie him in the bed (.)
13. and she did beat him (.)
14. and she beat him with a broom handle (.)
15. and beat him hard (..)
16. and he swore he’d kill her
17. when he got loose (..)
18. and the woman came
19. she was frightened
20. she said (.)
21. what shall I do
21. she sez (.)
   leave him there (.)
22. all night (.)
23. all night and all day
   she said (.)
24. just leave him there (.)
25. and she did leave him there (.)
26. and the following morning he was begging (.)
27. he would never beat her again (.)
28. and when he loosened her- when she did release him (.)
29. he flew for her
30. and she ran out (.)
31. and she came to my mother
32. and he came (.)
33. and my mother sez
   you foolish man (.)
34. don’t you realise (.)
35. that if you don’t sign the pledge
36. and stop drinking altogether (.)
37. every time you’re drunk
   she’ll do it again (.)
38. so you’ve got your choice (.)
39. you either stop beating her (.)
40. or you stop drinking (.)
41. he didn’t want to stop drinking
42. so he stopped beating his wife ((laughs))

Jim presumably either witnessed the events that he describes as a child or his mother later recounted them to him. His mother’s quoted direct speech is assimilated by Jim himself following the temporal shift to a new episode in which the wife finally takes his mother’s advice and beats her husband. There is then another repeated episode towards the narrative’s resolution which opens with ‘she came to my mother’ but with the deviation ‘and he came’. As well as organising the narrative into discrete units, the triplication (lines 5-7, 12-15) has an almost poetic effect, generating a rhythm which helps to orientate the listener. Tannen argues that while written and spoken narratives are thought to have distinguishing stylistic features, in reality there is a degree of cross-over between the two, as ‘those features which are thought quintessentially literary (repetition of sounds and words, syntactic parallelism, rhythm) are all basic to ordinary spontaneous conversation’ (1982:2). This narrative highlights how the techniques Tannen describes as being associated with literary discourse are present in spoken discourse. Carter and McCarthy (2017) support a view of spoken or ‘conversational’ grammar which is not secondary to written grammar. They argue that in spoken discourse, clauses are chained together
paratactically by conjunctions, challenging notions of coordination and
subordination, being unrestrained by sentence-based organisation found in written
discourse. In Jim’s narrative, the conjunction *and* frequently begins a new narrative
unit following a pause, sometimes in chains of three or four, which would not be
considered ‘good’ written English. The fluency of this narrative also hints that it
might have been re-told a number of times, given the lack of fillers and the timing of
the pauses, although it is practically impossible to know how ‘authentic’ any
narrative is.

**Discourse markers**

Discourse markers (DMs) can be defined as short units which: do not alter the truth
conditions of an utterance; do not add anything to the propositional content of the
utterance; relate to the speech situation and not the situation being talked about, have
an emotive, expressive function rather than referential, denotative or cognitive
function (Holker, 1991:78-79). They can exhibit patterns of behaviour in oral
narratives which differ from both their lexical senses and their usual function as
discourse markers in conversational speech. DMs also possess a ‘polyfunctionality’
(Jucker, 1993), whereby they can perform multiple roles. Their specific function
within a narrative varies not only between different DMs, but also between different
speakers and within different narratives. Macaulay found that the use of DMs
‘seems to be highly sensitive to individual style, with some speakers showing highly
idiosyncratic use of certain features’ (1991:176), which was also the case for my
own speakers. Certain individuals showed a preference for one specific DM in a
given context, even if it performed the same function as a different DM used by
another speaker. I will be discussing *well*, *oh*, and *so* which were prolific in both of
my datasets. The different roles I assign to the DMs were derived from salient
categories used by academics and from my own analysis of each individual token of
the three DMs.

**Well**

*Well*’s versatility and pervasiveness means that it has come under much scrutiny by
those investigating DMs (Schriffin, 1987; Macaulay, 1991; Jucker, 1993; Norrick,
2001; Sakita, 2017), although it primarily signals that a forthcoming contribution is
insufficient in some way. I distilled its uses as they appeared in my data into eight categories, borrowing largely from those listed by Sakita (2017):

1. Introduces an explanatory comment relating to a previous utterance
2. Signals that a forthcoming utterance will be insufficient in some way
3. Hesitation: including rephrasing or searching for the right phrase
4. Indicates the beginning of direct speech
5. Signals that the forthcoming utterance is relevant to a question or previous statement, especially after an interruption by another speaker
6. Self-repair
7. Highlights narrative turn/ bracketing different narrative elements
8. Signals a forthcoming utterance’s significance/ builds suspense

Each instance of *well* in the data was tagged for each of these eight functions. The results are shown in Fig 16.
The majority of tokens were of ‘quotative’ well (Sakita, 2017:68), indicating the beginning of direct speech even when it is preceded by ‘I said’ or ‘I sez’. An obvious function of well in this scenario is that it increases the verisimilitude of the speech, demonstrating a speaker’s awareness of spoken discourse features. I argue that determining the function of a particular token is not always straightforward, as some appear to be performing multiple functions simultaneously. In the case of well introducing direct speech, this is also compounded by the fact that the listener does not know whether this is exact verbatim, or if the speaker is drawing upon their knowledge of the conventions of spoken discourse for rhetorical effect. This is demonstrated through two excerpts from Jim’s narrative ‘Trousers Leg Serger’ (43, 44).
18. she sez
   well (.)
19. he was harsh with me (.)
20. and he upset me (.)
21. and he’s (. ) upset me over a period (.)

1. I understand
   you’ve dismissed so-and-so (.)
2. yes he sez (.)
3. she was o- offensive (. ) impertinent (. ) and obscene and etc. etc. etc. (..)
4. I sez
   well (..)
5. she’s worked here three years (.)

In the first extract, a girl from the trousers room is explaining to Jim, who at this point is chairman of the trade union, why the manager of the trousers room has dismissed her. The girl’s use of well could signal her hesitation to respond to Jim’s proposition as much as it signals that she is about to issue a challenge in an attempt to justify her actions. The second extract occurs later in the narrative when Jim questions the manager of the trousers room about why the girl has been dismissed. In the second extract, well signals the beginning of Jim’s speech, but it also indicates that he is about to issue a challenge to the manager. The fact that the girl has worked there for three years is significant, as each new learner is supposedly taught four sewing operations within six months, although she never was. Jim therefore feels sympathy for the girl as she will struggle to find work elsewhere due to her lack of skill, eventually persuading the manager to agree to teach her how to make a pair of trousers.

Oh

Fig 17 shows the functions of oh as they appeared in the data, excluding its use as an ‘exclamation or interjection’ (Schriffrin, 1987:73).
Macaulay argues that *well* and *oh* ‘have many similarities […] although they are far from identical in their use’ (1991:146). Like Macaulay, I found that *oh*, like *well*, is used to introduce direct speech, both with and without a reporting verb (45, 46).

(45)

CB: there’s a ladder stitch machine there that I got in a sale with some other machines (,) oh yes I’ll have that

(46)

CS: and she goes oh I live at Staincross

As Fig 17 shows, this too was the most frequent function of *oh* as it was with *well*. In the cases where I used *oh*, it was as an exclamation or to signal my accord with a speaker’s proposition, as the following example from ‘Interview’ shows (47).
EO: oh yeah (.) oh it seems silly doesn’t it

So

Schiffrin claims that so fulfils a structural role as a ‘marker of main [idea] units’ (1987:195) in a narrative, including signalling the complicating action ‘so we g-get t’29th and Green’ (1987:192) or and the coda ‘So that’s out’ (1987:193). I found that so functions in a similar manner in my narratives, as the following examples (48, 49) demonstrate, although each example has a slightly different function.

(48)
1. umm (.) and uh (.) I was there (.)
2. cos she’d asked me- uh Alice had asked me to (.) alter some (.) trousers for her (.)
3. so I went over to their house

(49)
1. and uh (…) mi father played ummer with me y’know (.)
2. he sez uh (.)
   never do that again Brian (…)
3. I said (.)
   I couldn’t help it dad (.)
4. I had sommert else on mi mind (.)
5. And uh (…)
6. It won’t happen again (.)
7. I promise you that dad (.)
8. so I never did it again

Example 45 from Jean’s (2018 79y.? MC) narrative ‘What Do You Know about It?’ establishes a logical link to what has come before the explanatory section (line 2), propelling the narrative forward. Example 46 from Brian’s (2018 ?y. WC) narrative ‘Wrong Basket’ acts as a coda. Schiffrin also contrasts so against because, claiming that while so marks main idea units, because ‘is a marker of subordination’ (1987:195), or rather that so and because can signify a ‘result’ and ‘cause’ respectively. There was at least one instance in my data where so appeared to mark subordinate information, which was produced by Jean in ‘What do you know about it?’ (50).
(50)

(cos he’s-he’s wheelchair dependent is Glenn .)
so he can’t get out (.)

It marks part of an explanation in the orientation section as to why Jean went to her son’s house to alter a pair of trousers for her granddaughter, although this is not, in my view, a crucial detail to aid understanding of the narrative.

**Narrative and Speaker Style**

As noted earlier, narratives can provide a window onto a speaker’s ‘vernacular’ style of speech. One might therefore expect the frequency of marked, non-standard variables to increase. For instance, Fig 18 compares the frequency of non-standard *were* in non-narrative and narrative contexts for each social class group.

![Fig 18: Percentage of Non-Standard Were by Social Class- Overall and in Narratives (LAVC and 2018)](image)

The results of many of the upper-working class and middle-class speakers show a striking increase of non-standard *were* in narrative compared to non-narrative
contexts, with the upper middle class speakers’ frequencies remaining unchanged. There were some exceptions to these trends which Fig 19 masks. For instance, Brian’s narrative score appeared not to fit this trend, although this can be attributed to his preference for the form *wor over were* overall, with four tokens of the former and one of ‘was’ in his narratives. Quoted direct speech can also provide a glimpse of other speakers’ dialect features, although the style of language used in narratives was fairly consistent with that used across the interview as a whole. For instance, although the only instance of the non-standard weak verb in the 2018 corpus ‘telled’ occurred in a narrative context, this can be attributed more to the fact that the speaker, Jean, was telling me the story off-record, as noted in Chapter 5.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has shown that narratives are very fluid units of discourse which are not solely governed by temporality and cannot always be partitioned into a sequence of elements which follow one another. As can be seen from the interviews’ topics and themes, not all narratives are orientated towards the speaker with the aim of enhancing their positive face, nor is there much evidence for a general difference in men and women’s choice of style and subject matter. Even if self-aggrandisement is not the aim of the story or if the events recounted are rather unremarkable, narratives can reveal something about the identity which a speaker wishes to assume at that given moment. The small selection of storytelling strategies that I have explored have shown that features such as tense switching and discourse markers can have multiple functions between both speakers and narratives. Whether the speaker features in the narrative they are telling or not, we must ask why a particular speaker responds to a researcher’s question in the form of a narrative rather than a report and what is it that they wish to convey about themselves. Narratives are not a window onto ‘the past’, but constantly define and redefine it, and in doing so shape the present.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

This study has explored the significance of the textiles and clothing industries on the heritage of West Yorkshire, with a particular focus on Leeds, and on the identities and life histories of the people who worked in them. Two corpora consisting of sixteen semi-structured interviews with former mill and clothing workers formed the project’s primary data source. Five interviews originated from the LAVC and were conducted in the 1980s, while the remaining eleven interviews were conducted by the researcher in 2018. The decision was taken to compare an existing and new dataset in order to assess whether there had been any significant changes in the working methods used in the industries over the course of the twentieth century, whether their association with the area had diminished over time, and whether any insights into linguistic change could be glimpsed. The project’s socio-historical and linguistic aspects were not entirely disparate given that language and identity are inextricably linked.

The interdisciplinary approach to the fieldwork, while experimental, was highly effective overall, taking a holistic view of the speakers and linking them to a particular discourse community instead of treating them as disembodied demographic data. They were viewed from a number of perspectives, including their place in a workplace hierarchy and their role as storytellers who shared reminiscences from their ‘life story’ with the researcher. This allowed for a more complete picture of their individual idiolect to be developed which went beyond forming abstract patterns and general conclusions in relation to broader social factors such as gender and social class. Maintaining a balance between the two aspects of the fieldwork proved challenging at times. The need to cover all of the areas on the topic list concerning aspects of working life meant that there was not as great an opportunity for eliciting linguistic variables as with a purely linguistic study, while inserting questions relating to language broke the flow of the preceding conversation. Nevertheless, a great deal of information on both aspects of the study was obtained. The atmosphere of each interview was generally relaxed with a good rapport being established. Linguistic features occasionally emerged spontaneously over the course of the interview instead of through more direct elicitation techniques. This was deemed the best approach without employing a tiresomely long questionnaire which was felt to be too time-consuming and pressurising for
speakers, deviating from the main topic which they had been invited to the interview to discuss: their time in the industries. A further development of this approach to the fieldwork could be an ethnographic investigation which focuses exclusively on one community, such as Rhodes’ (1998) study of how the decline of the textile industry in Bramley resulted in lexical attrition, and Cave’s (2001) study of the linguistic consequences of the breakup of the mining community in Royston. This would provide not only a larger dataset but also more definitive conclusions about linguistic variables based on community-specific meanings, as well as providing a greater variety of experiences about working in the industry under investigation.

The connection which each speaker felt to the industries and its relevance to their identities varied. Some had spent more time in them than others or took a greater degree of enjoyment and fulfilment out of their role. In the case of proprietors, they were born into a family-run clothing business which they themselves became involved in and succeeded the older generations of their family in running, meaning their affiliation with the industry was strong. Many speakers in both corpora who had somewhat more menial roles in the mills and clothing factories enjoyed their time at work, largely due to the friendships they made, although some found genuine enjoyment in their work. There were exceptions to this, with some speakers finding working in the trades monotonous or unpleasant. Many speakers spent only a few years in the industries before going on to raise families, work in other industries, or undertake further education or training, so their time in the trades only formed one part of their life history. One conclusion which the study drew is that the industries’ association with Leeds, and West Yorkshire as a whole, continues to endure, albeit on a smaller scale with firms now focusing on the quality of their product over the quantity. Many of those interviewed who worked in the tailoring industry felt themselves to be the last of a dying breed but still expressed pride at the place the clothing industry has in Leeds’ history and their involvement in it. One 2018 speaker Charles Butcher remarked ‘it’s always been the heart of tailoring has Leeds’.

The analysis of each individual’s language use took into account their time in the industries and any previous or subsequent occupations held, the area in which they lived, the friendships and networks formed within the industry, political beliefs, and their comments on their own language and that of others. This allowed for a more
complete picture of their idiolect to be developed which went beyond forming abstract patterns and general conclusions in relation to broader social factors. As seen in Chapter 2, there was a hierarchy within the mills and factories, and roles were often divided along gender lines. A characteristic of both industries was the creation of dense and multiplex network ties and what might possibly be deemed a community of practice which may have once inhibited linguistic change. The lexical and grammatical features which were analysed suggested some evidence of uniquely West Yorkshire features or patterns of features, but the majority of the variables analysed were common to other regional, non-standard dialects.

The study found some evidence of a linguistic tradition associated with the industries in the form of vocabulary, such as ‘fettling’ and ‘killing the coat’. There was some evidence of a sense of a distinctly Leeds or West Yorkshire identity, with speakers rarely identifying features which were exclusively ‘Leeds’ or ‘West Yorkshire’. Kinship terms such as ‘love’ arguably reinforced the image of Yorkshire friendliness rather than acting solely as a term of endearment, and were directly referred to by one or two speakers as being associated with Leeds or Yorkshire. There were examples of its being used by a president of a clothing company to a former worker, showing how some, although not all, firms had a close relationship with their workers. The idea of Yorkshire, or more broadly ‘Northern’ friendliness, was something found in several interviews in the 2018 corpus, alongside an ‘anti-Southerner’ rhetoric.

Some patterns arose in relation to wider social factors, particularly social class. A speaker’s position within the industries, whether at a manual, managerial, or director level, and their previous or subsequent career history were key criteria for determining their social class standing, although I view social class as a continuum. Non-standard grammatical features, especially non-standard were, appeared to be class-marked, which might explain the degree of stability in the patterning and frequency of grammatical features between the two corpora which showed no sign of on-going change. When the analysis was refined to an individual level, more nuanced patterns for the variables under investigation began to appear. Class-marked features were not always consistent with the social class that a speaker was assigned to. Other factors such as interview setting, rapport, and social network ties
might also have influenced speakers’ style in the interviews. Some features also occurred in more ‘casual’ stretches of talk, like during narratives or beyond the interview context. As no two individuals acquire language in the same way as they progress through life, it is not unreasonable to consider that their use of language is unique, even if they share a common background or shared linguistic repertoire. Linguistic features can have different meanings for different individuals and speakers can construct a particular identity by drawing on their linguistic knowledge of speech conventions.

I looked at narratives as both reminiscences and as discourse units which performed an identity construction function. As noted earlier, some narratives emerged in response to particular questions, while others unfolded more ‘naturally’ during a long stretch of discourse by a speaker. Most of the stories which speakers told were set far in the past, sometimes from their time working in the trades, providing glimpses into workplace practices and the practicalities of working in the industries. Each story a speaker told was for a particular purpose, although this may not necessarily be the same ‘point’ which the researcher sees, and portrayed them in a particular light. Given the temporal gap between the events of the ‘past’ and the present interview situation, such stories may have undergone significant reshaping and repackaging over the course of a speaker’s ‘life story’, as their relevance to each given occasion of telling will be different. For some speakers there were consistent themes running across several narratives, while for others the reasons they chose to tell each particular narrative varied.

One common thread running across both corpora was the sense of camaraderie and friendship which existed in both the mills and the clothing factories, with workers supporting one another in the face of low wages, a pressurised working environment, and the expendability of labour. There were many other points of continuity running across the two corpora regarding speakers’ experiences of working in the trades, although the LAVC speakers’ prediction that the clothing industry in Leeds would be practically obliterated due to a reluctance of firms to invest in labour and capital, competition from foreign labour and markets, or the desire of younger people to seek work in other industries had largely come to pass by the time of the 2018 interviews. The primary point of discontinuity was the state
of working conditions, which had improved significantly over the course of the twentieth century.

The findings of this thesis have shown the important role that the textiles and clothing industries played in shaping local identity for those who worked in them, not least through the ties that they forged through them. It has also shown the importance of conducting a qualitative analysis at an individual level to uncover more nuanced patterns. While the industries had a greater impact on the identity and idiolect of some speakers than others due to various factors, their ties to the area’s heritage, and its language, endure.
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Appendix A: General Topic List

Background Information

- Could you start by telling me a bit about yourself? Are you from [town/city]
  
  ➢ If answer ‘no’ and don’t elaborate, ask where

- Where did you go to school?
  
  ➢ How old were you when you left?

Career Choice

- What did you want to do when you left school? Did you know?

- How did you get into [mill work/ tailoring]?

- What did your parents do?

- [if in same area] Has the area changed a lot since you were younger?

Did a lot of people from the area go to work there?

Work Life

- What was your first job?

- What did the job involve?

- What hours did you work?

- Where you on piece-rate or day-rate?
  
  ➢ What did you think about the rate of pay?

- What tools/ machines did you use?

- What did you think about your work?

- Did people used to sing or talk while they worked?

- Did the men do different jobs from the women?

- Were there any traditions for when somebody got married?

- What were the managers like towards you? Did you see much of them?

- Where there ever any serious accidents that happened in the mill/ factory?

- Was there any practical joking?
Mills Only

- Was it a wool or worsted mill?
- How was the [wool/ worsted] made? Could you talk me through the process?
  - Would they have girls or boys whose job it was to remove the full [bobbins] from the thostle-frame?
- How were the machines cleaned/ how often/ by who?
  - Did you have a name for this? [fettling]
- What do you call the machine the slivers are put through to prepare them for spinning?
  [carding-machine/ scribbling-machine]
- What do you call the twistless web of fibres that are produced by this process?
  [slubbing*/ rovings/cardings]

Tailoring Only

- Do you remember anything about the Leeds Clothing Strike in 1970?
  [depends if from Leeds and when worked]
- Was the factory Jewish owned?
- I’ve heard from some people that the cutters were seen as the ‘aristocracy’ of tailoring. What do you think about that?

Social Life

- Did you socialise with your workmates outside of work?
- What sort of social activities did people used to do?
- Were there any clubs or trips provided by the employer?

Clarification Questions

- And what did you think about that?
- Earlier you mentioned X, can you tell me a little bit more about it?
- Do you have any other names for it that you’ve heard used here or anywhere else?
- When did that happen?/ How long ago was that? ['X year(s) ago']
Closing

- Is there anything I haven’t asked about that you’d like to share for the record, or anything important you feel I’ve missed out?
Appendix B: Malcolm Berwin Additional Questions

- So I understand that the firm has been going for over 130 years now. Could you tell me a bit about how it started? History of the firm?

- What was it you wanted to do for a career? Did you want to enter the tailoring business? When did you join the firm?

- What was it you produced? Has this changed over time [if not covered]

- Where are the suits produced?
  - How many suits do you produce per week?
  - Made to measure?

- Has the material the suits are made from changed over time?

- Have the working methods in the production of the suits changed over time?

- Has the firm had to change how it operates or its products in the light of changing fashion and trends?

- How did Berwin & Berwin withstand the downturn in demand in the tailoring industry in the decades following the Second World War which saw the closure of other clothing manufacturers?

- [If mention moving to South Yorkshire] Were there any noticeable differences between the South Yorkshire and North Leeds workers?
  - Any differences in ways they spoke or words they used for things?

- What do you think are the qualities of a good suit?

- As someone who has spent their whole life in the tailoring industry, what do you think the future is for bespoke tailoring?

- Are there any local words or sayings from the tailoring trade that you remember—such as any names for parts of suits or things used in the making of suits
  - Or elsewhere?

- Are there any other words or sayings that were used around Leeds but maybe not as often nowadays?
Appendix C: Charles Butcher Additional Questions

- Could you tell me a bit about how the firm started?
- What is your customer base like?
- How many suits do you produce per week?
- Where do the cloths for the jackets and trousers come from?
- Could you talk me through the process of [getting a suit made from Oakwood Tailors]
- What was the clothing and tailoring industry in Leeds like towards the latter half of the century? Were there many factories and tailors left?*
- Have the tools and methods you use changed much over the years?
- As someone who has spent many years working in the tailoring industry, what do you think the future is for made to measure tailoring?
- Is there much scope for young people who might want to enter the tailoring trade?
- Are there any local words or sayings from the tailoring trade that you remember-such as any names for parts of suits or things used in the making of suits?
  - Or elsewhere?
- Are there any other words or sayings that were used around Leeds but maybe not as often nowadays?
Appendix D: Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>Found in LAVC Corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td>Found in 2018 Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bold font</strong></td>
<td>Technical term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bagged in [baɡd in] phr. putting in the lining of the ‘coat’ 

Bobbin [bɒbɪn] n. a wooden or metal cylinder, perforated so as to revolve on a spindle, having a flange or ‘head’ at one or both ends (according to the purpose for which it is adapted), used to receive thread or yarn, and give it off by unwinding, in the processes of spinning, warping, weaving, frame-work knitting, etc. *^ 

Brass [braːs] n. money ^

Britches^ [brɪtʃɪz] n. trousers 

Buggy Back [bʌɡi bak] n. small piece of material that goes in back of a ‘blazer’ ^

Bungalow Bath [bʌŋɡələʊ bɑːθ] n. zinc bath around four and a half feet long * 

Burler [ˈbəːlə] n. one who dresses cloth by removing knots and extraneous particles ^

Burl [bɔrl] v. to dress (cloth), esp. by removing knots and lumps

Card [kɑːd] v. preparatory process which disentangles, mixes and equalises fibres by passing them through a series of rollers to produce ‘slivers’

Carding-machine [kɑːdɪŋ məˈʃiːn] n. [see Scribbling-machine]

Chopper [tʃɪpə] n. person [apprentice?] just starting work in the cutting room who would cut the cloth after the cutter had marked his chalk around the pattern ^

Combing [kəʊmɪŋ] v. process which ensures the fibres in wool are parallel and the same length. This differentiates worsted from woollen yarn 

Cutter [kʌtə] n. one who cuts pieces of cloth to be made into a garment *^ 

Dawn [dɔːn] v. broken fibres, lowest-priced worsted pinning waste when sold * 

De-bag [debag] v. to remove the trousers from (a person) as a punishment or for a joke * 

Do [du:] n. 

1. orig. Eng. *regional* and *nonstandard*. A social event, a party; a performance or show. Also in extended use: spec. (orig. *humorous*) a military engagement or raid (now rare) *^
2. orig. Eng. *regional (north.)* With modifying word. An affair, occurrence, experience, or situation (of the kind specified). *^*

Doff [dɒf] v. to remove a spool or bobbin when full of yarn from the spindle *^*

Doffer [dɒfər] n. a boy or girl employed in a factory to remove the full bobbins from the throstle-frame and replace them with empty ones *^*

Doy [dɔɪ] n. as a term of endearment or affectionate form of address ^

**Drafting** [draːftɪŋ] v. process of attenuating a strand of material by pulling it apart between pairs of rollers. The material may also be supported between roller pairs by aprons or sets of pins

**Drawing** [drɔː(r)] v. process in yarn manufacture in which a group of slivers is elongated by passing them through a series of rolls, each pair moving faster than the previous one

[Fairchild: combining several slivers promotes blending and uniformity; the drafting also straightens the fibres and improves strength and lustre in the yarn]

End n. warp thread; a thread of yarn, silk etc.; a single piece of cloth; thread of spun yarn or spinning machine

Fettle [fɛtl] v. to remove the short fibres which clog the cards in the scribbling-machine; to repair or rectify any faults in weaving *^*

Fettler [fɛtlə] n. a man who cleans the cards of a scribbling-machine *^*

**Finisher** [fɪnɪʃə] n. one who dyes and finishes textiles in the form of fibre, yarn or fabric

**Finishing** [fɪnɪʃɪŋ] v. chemical or mechanical processes which give a fabric its desired functional or aesthetic qualities prior to its being sold and/or made up into garments, includes scouring, washing, dyeing, fulling, perching, burling etc.

Fitter [fɪtə] n. person in the cutting-room who fits up the pockets and cuts everything more ‘net’ ^

Fuddle [fʌdl] n. a social event; a party, usually in the work place at around Christmas time *^*

**Fulling** [fʊlɪŋ] v. finishing process in the manufacture of woolens and worsteds in which the newly woven cloth is felted or compressed. The material is subjected to moisture, heat, friction, and pressure, causing it to shrink considerably in both directions, becoming compact and solid

Gilling [ɡɪlɪŋ] v. process which draws out and levels the prepared slivers of wool, putting multiple slivers through the machine at the same time. It also blends them together. Several slivers are passed together through multiple sets of rollers, one slow and one fast.

It’s nowt nor sommert [nəut nə somət] phr. it’s nothing nor something ^
Kalling [kallɪŋ(n)] v. chatting; gossiping *

Killing the Coat [kɪlɪŋ ðə kəʊt] phr. when a coat jacket is cut in the wrong place during the insertion of the pocket, ruining the garment ^

Lig [lɪɡ] v. to idle or lie about

Ligger [lɪɡə] n. one who puts the material on to a carding machine (i.e. in worsted manufacture) ^

Like you’ve been in fire back [laɪk jʊv biːn in faɪə bak] phr. a person is so dirty that they appear as if they have been in the back of a coal fire ^

Mending [mɛndɪŋ] v. process where irregularities in the woven cloth such as weaving imperfections, tears or broken yarns are repaired*

Millling [mɪlɪŋ] v. (see ‘Fulling’)

Mungo [mʌŋɡəʊ] n. material produced in a similar way to shoddy, but the rags used comprise new or old hard-woven or milled cloth or felt

Nowt [nəʊt] n. nothing *^*

Outwork [aʊtˈwɜːk] n. the making up of garments from pre-cut component parts in a worker’s own home which would then be returned to the clothing manufacturer

Owt [əʊt] n. anything *^*

Peggy-stick [pəɡi stɪk] n. a wooden implement used to stir and pound clothes in a washtub *

Peggy-tub [pəɡi tʌb] n. a large washtub in which a peggy is used *

Penny hole [peni ɔɪl] n. now inquiry office or time-keeping office in the mill, but used to be the place where the worker paid his penny fine when he was late

Perch [pəːtʃ] v. to stretch cloth on a perch in order to examine it for defects

Piece [piːs]/ Piecen [piːsn] v. to join or piece together; to repair; spec. to rejoin (broken threads or ends) in spinning ^

Piece dye [piːs daɪ] adj. when the wool is dyed as a woven piece of cloth as opposed to loose fibres

Piecer [piːsə]/ Piecener [piːsənə] n. A person, esp. a child, employed in a woollen or cotton mill to join together the ends of threads which have broken while being spun or wound ^
**Piece work** [piːs wʊ:k ]*/ Piece Rate^ [piːs rɛt] n. type of employment where the worker is paid a fixed price for each item produced regardless of the time taken to produce it

**Play ummer** [pleɪ ʌmə] phr. to reproach ^

**Plonking** [plɒŋkɪŋ] n. putting shoulder pads in between two layers of cloth ^

**Presser** [prɛsə] n. a person who is employed to press cloth, felt, etc., esp. in tailoring or hat-making; also the machine or equipment which presses the cloth *^*

**Pullover** [pʊləʊvə] n. a knitted garment put on over the head and covering the top half of the body; a jumper, a sweater ^

**Put wood in t’ oil** [pʊt wʊd in t ɔɪl] phr.. close the door ^

**Reel** [riːl] n. a device on to which yarn or thread is wound during production or processing and from which it may easily be wound off; a yarn-winder *^*

**Roving** [ˈrɔʊvɪŋ] v. 1. to make (carded or combed wool, cotton, etc.) into rovings n. 2. a long thin strand of wool, cotton, fibreglass, etc., drawn out and slightly twisted in preparation for spinning; a roll of this *

**Scour** [skɔːə] v. removal of impurities from raw wool by repeatedly washing it in a solution of warm water, detergent or alkali

**Scribble** [skrɪb(ə)l] v. to card or tease (wool) coarsely, to pass through a ‘scribbler’ [see Card]

**Scribbling-machine** [skrɪb(ə)lɪŋ maˈʃiːn ]/ Sribbler [skrɪb(ə)lə] n. machine on which the wool fibres are disentangled and made uniform by passing them through a series of rollers, forming a continuous web of fibres known as ‘slivers’ *

**Second Sew** [sek(ə)nd səʊ] n. to put the pockets into the coat jacket by means of cutting the garment ^

**Shoddy** [ʃədi] n. fibrous material produced by tearing up old and new knitted garments or loosely-woven fabrics in rag form

**Sliver** [sɪlvə] n. a continuous, rope-like strand of loose, untwisted fibres that are approximately uniform, ready for drawing, roving, or slubbing

**Slub** [slʌb] n. a lump on a thread ^

**Slubbing** [slʌbɪŋ] v. 1. a process of drawing and twisting by which cotton or wool slivers are prepared for spinning n. 2. one of the loosely-compacted threads obtained by this process (see Roving)

**Sommert** [səmət; səmat] n. something *^*


Spinning [spɪŋ] v. process which reduces the wool to the thickness required and inserts a twist in the yarn.

Spool^ [spuːl] n.
1. a small cylindrical piece of wood or other material on which thread is wound as it is spun, esp. for use in weaving; a bobbin.
2. a small shaped cylinder of wood on which sewing-thread is wound; a reel ^

Sweepers up [sweepəz ʌp] / Sweeper-upper [sweepə ʌpə] n. cleaner *^

Tenter [tɛntə] n. the wooden frame which the cloth was stretched on once it had been milled.

Top [tɒp] n.
1. spec. a bundle of combed wool prepared for spinning.
   Chiefly pl. (also collect. sing.).
2. a tuft or handful of hair, wool, fibre, etc.; esp. the portion of flax or tow put on the distaff.

Topcoat [tɒp ˈkəʊt] n. overcoat, great-coat, outer coat ^

Trimmer [trɪmə] n. person in cutting room who cut round the lining to fit the coat jacket ^

Twisting [twɪstɪŋ] v. process which joins together two or more of the single spun yarns produced in spinning which would usually be too weak for weaving (twist gives it strength) *

Warp [wɔːp] n. lengthwise threads *

Weft [weft] n. horizontal threads ^

Welt Tack [?] n. top pocket on a coat jacket ^

Winder [ˈwʌnda] n. operative employed in winding wool *

Woollen [wʊlən] n. wool yarn in which fibres are crossed in all directions and are not parallel, and therefore have a rough, whiskery appearance.

Worsted [wʊsrɪd] n. wool yarn in which fibres have been laid parallel to each other during manufacture, giving the yarn and the ultimate fabric a neat, smooth appearance *^