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Abstract

This paper discusses the difference between a singer's singing pronunciation and their speaking accent. Two singers are discussed with this in mind, Adele Laurie Blue Adkins and John Lyndon (a.k.a. Johnny Rotten), who both grew up in Tottenham, although 32 years apart, and therefore have a similar dialectal background. It is apparent that their singing and speech pronunciation is not the same, but just how different is therefore the subject of this paper. Various factors outside phonetics are shown to be the probable cause of this difference, such as the socio-political climate in London in the late 1970s and the development of 20th century popular music. With regard to phonetics, the paper includes a discussion on London English, namely Estuary English and Cockney, as well as 'BBC English' or RP (Received Pronunciation). Furthermore, the paper touches upon the debate concerning Estuary English: how it should be defined and how it relates to RP and Cockney. In order to realize which dialect of English Adele and Johnny actually speak, their pronunciation is examined by comparing the phonetic variables they display in interviews (found in Appendices I and III) with known variables of each of the above mentioned dialects. With regard to their singing pronunciation, the notions of 'cool' and 'coolness' (as defined in Section 1.1 below) are used in order to explain what inspires and influences the two singers. This is done because what one thinks is cool can affect a singers singing pronunciation, although it might not be a fully conscious process.
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1. Introduction

1.0 General Remarks

A singer's singing pronunciation differs from that of their speech, sometimes even to the point that any trace of their speaking dialectal variety completely vanishes while singing. The reasons for this phenomenon are complex and many; or rather, how the many reasons relate to one another is complex. They can range from the effects of abstract and individual emotions, to the socio-political climate of a particular time and place. This paper will explore this phenomenon by discussing the cases of the recent pop-star singer and composer Adele and the 1970s Punk-Rock singer Johnny Rotten of the Sex Pistols. The reason for choosing these two is that both their speaking dialects are classified as types of London accents, whereas in song, Adele exhibits an American-like pronunciation, while Johnny retains many of the phonetic variables present in his regional dialect.

In order to ascertain what shapes a singer's singing pronunciation, it becomes paramount to discover their source of influence and inspiration, and shed light on the socio-political context in which their music is generated. It is usual in this sort of investigation, in the field of phonetics, to refer to 'prestige accents' as those the speaker wishes to emulate and 'non-prestige accents' as those not to be emulated. The former refers to speech varieties which are generally thought of as being more correct or better, while the latter entails the opposite. These terms impose a hierarchal structure on any given group of dialects ranging from best to worst, most prestigious to least prestigious. An example of this would be the dialect of the newscaster on the BBC, which was prestigious in 1950s England, while the dialect spoken by the working-class in London
was non-prestigious.

These terms are obviously quite subjective, as they depend greatly on whose viewpoint one takes and the period in question. They are also tied up with other notions of hierarchy such as class status. They are linked because the dialects spoken by the higher classes are usually considered to be dialects of prestige; higher class breeds greater social influence.

However, there is a different way to explore a singer's source of influence and inspiration, and to analyze the socio-political circumstances at a given time. This is done by boycotting the capricious hierarchal expressions and making use of another term: 'coolness'.

1.1 Defining 'Cool'

It is prudent to clearly define what 'cool' actually implies and how it is used in this paper. This notion is more pliable than 'prestige' or 'non-prestige', because it is inherently and intimately linked with the individual's emotional self: a collective term for things a person likes. 'Coolness' can also be used in the negative, as in 'uncool', and thus accounts for things a person dislikes. One might say 'coolness' is subliminal. The idea of 'coolness' is therefore necessary for any discussion regarding artistic inspiration and influence, since the reasons why one likes a piece of music are not always obvious. It makes sense as a feeling: an accumulation of the neural mesh of our minds. Therefore, our emotions can sometimes only be expressed with a word like 'cool', which is essentially an outcome of these emotional entanglements. If a speaker identifies a phenomenon as being cool, the listener senses that the speaker finds it appealing and
likes it: the phenomenon imposes on the speaker generally positive associations. If one assumes that a musician mostly listens to music that they think is cool, it is highly probable that much of that music will influence and inspire them. To what extent 'coolness' is subconscious is not clear, and on what occasion something starts being regarded as 'cool' is indefinable. Such is the tentative nature of 'coolness'. Yet when a speaker says something is cool, the listener unquestionably realizes the speakers meaning.

This is not to say that 'prestige' and 'non-prestige' are utterly unnecessary terms; they are simply different. When these terms are compared, 'prestige' can be seen as a subcategory of 'coolness' limited to discussion of vertical (hierarchically structured) phenomena, while 'cool' and 'coolness' can be used horizontally, i.e. not limited to discussion of hierarchically ordered phenomena. The popular theory of how uvular /r/ spread throughout Europe is helpful in explaining this difference between 'coolness' and 'prestige'. The spread of uvular /r/ throughout Europe is thought to have began in seventeenth century France with members of the high-class prestige. Since the French high-class were considered culturally prestigious, the uvular /r/ then spread to Germany, a part of Belgium, Denmark, southernmost Sweden and parts of Norway. This can be explained by saying that the Germans, Belgians, Danes, and the Scandinavians considered the French to be cool. However, the spread of uvular /r/ was an example of a hierarchically structured phenomena because the fad was initiated by a high-classed elite and then trickled down to lower tears of society. Thus, the more specific term 'prestigious' fits the occasion better than 'cool' (Trudgill, 241).

Both 'cool' and 'uncool' have the capacity to be associated with unconscious
thought, whereas prestige and non-prestige are more associated with those who are speech-conscious. One might remark that something or other is cool without really knowing why that is; it's something felt by the speaker. However, statements of prestige are more easily associated with conscious thought. For example, a member of a high-class elite might be thought of as being prestigious for reasons that are to a greater extent more obvious than obscure: more conscious than unconscious. In a way, coolness is more easily attainable by the individual than prestige. It works as a horizontal concept at all levels of social strata, from left to right; while 'prestige' is bound to the vertical comparison of social strata, from top to bottom. 'Coolness' is anchored in the sociopolitical backdrop of society, underlying its popular trends like fashion, lifestyle, and music. This makes 'coolness' a part of sociolinguistic trends, all of which contribute to shaping one's identity.

2. 20th Century Pop-Music

2.0 Development

It is generally accepted that 20th century (and what has passed of the 21st) popular music was greatly inspired by the Blues. This musical variety grew out of the African-American society in the late 19th and early 20th century in the southern United States, and flourished most prominently in the Mississippi Delta region in Louisiana. The rise and spread of the Blues as a genre in its own right probably began as a result of the Emancipation Act in 1863, which gave African-Americans new freedoms. With this new freedom of the individual there was a shift away from the traditional group style musical performances to individuals taking it upon themselves to both sing and play –
with a guitar in hand and a story to tell. This became the foundation for the Blues as a genre of popular music until the advent of the electric guitar, in the 1930s and '40s, with which the Blues was taken to the next level and thus triggered the rise of Rock and Roll. Some say that Rock and Roll began with Chuck Berry, who came directly out of the Mississippi Delta Blues scene, as Primal Scream's Bobby Gillespie stated: “Chuck Berry started the global psychic jailbreak that is rock'n'roll.” (“Chuck Berry”).

The recording and distribution of music, and the technologies in the early 20th century available for public use, e.g. the gramophone, recording equipment, record pressing, radio, etc., were absolutely pivotal to the development of pop-music. The public's ability to choose what music was bought and listened to gave musicians an edge they had never previously had. Singles could be listened to again and again, and fanbases could emerge in places that the artist might never have heard of. Thus, via technological innovations and with the power of the media, musicians were in the hands of the public that could now have a say in which ones get heard and which ones don't, i.e. the popular music scene was born.

2.1 Effects on pronunciation

Peter Trudgill, in his paper “Acts of Conflicting Identity: The Sociolinguistics of British Pop-Song Pronunciation”, talks about the unsuccessful attempts of British pop-singers to imitate the social group from which they drew their influence. According to Trudgill, this group turned out to be southern Americans (Trudgill, 146). He goes on to talk about the British pop-singers' inability to identify their model group’s dialect, as if they were consciously aware of the southern American dialectal variety and then tried to imitate it.
Trudgill is right in saying that they were unsuccessful in imitation; the British pop-singers' accents did not exactly conform to the southern American variety, but in fact retained a great deal of 'Britishness'. However, saying that the British pop-singers make errors and are unsuccessful in their attempts is actually irrelevant. The reason is that the British musicians were reacting to music they regarded as cool; therefore, consciously imitating a certain dialect may not have been a part of their agenda. 'Coolness' is associated more with feelings, emotions, and the unconscious, as opposed to the rational and logical mindset of the speech-conscious and prestige-orientated mind.

That being said, the British pop-singers were quite conscious of what music they thought was cool. What one regards as cool will influence one to the extent of imitation, but not necessarily a fully conscious one. This being the case, the imitator's own accent will certainly affect the outcome, giving the observer the false impression that the singer is an unsuccessful dialect impressionist. It's therefore sensible to refrain from using words like 'imitation' and incorporate more fitting terminology, such as 'influence' and 'inspiration'. This is due to the fact that the British pop-singers were listening to and gaining inspiration from the music as a whole: the ensemble of instruments and singing. Therefore, the acquisition of some form of the southern American accent was merely a by-product.

3. Cockney and Estuary English

3.0 Discussion

The two singers, Johnny Rotten and Adele, grew up in North London (see Sections 4.2 and 5.0 below, respectfully). Both of them exhibit phonetic variables in the general
vicinity of Cockney and Estuary English (EE). The former dialect is fairly well established in terms of its rules, variables and region; while the latter is more like the new kid on the block, and its rules, variables and region subject to some debate. David Rosewarne was the first to identify and describe this new English dialect, which he called 'Estuary English', in an article published in *The Times Educational Supplement*, in 1984. At the beginning of the article, Rosewarne describes EE as situated between the Received Pronunciation dialectal variety at the time, and Cockney, which he calls 'London speech': “If one imagines a continuum with RP and London speech at either end, 'Estuary English' speakers are to be found grouped in the middle ground” (Rosewarne). He states that its region stretches along the banks of the river Thames towards its estuary – hence its name – and predicts that its position will allow it to become the most influential dialect in south-east England, “‘Estuary English’ is in a strong position to exert influence on the pronunciation of the future” (Rosewarne).

Ten years later, John C. Wells, of the University College London, confirms Rosewarne's prediction for the establishment of EE as a dialect of influence in England:

Many of our native-speaker undergraduates use a variety of English that I suppose we have to call **Estuary English**, following Rosewarne 1984, 1994, Coggle 1993, and many recent reports on press and television.... That is, they use the popular speech of the southeast of England. (“Transcribing Estuary English”)

Wells's confirmation of the rise of EE is important, in light of his reluctance to even use the term. He admits that it has been generally accepted by the public and the media, and *not* using it has become almost unavoidable: “As with the equally unsatisfactory term 'Received Pronunciation', we are forced to go along.” (“Transcribing Estuary English”).
It is apparent that Wells was first in identifying phonetic variables of London speech other than RP and Cockney, that is to say before Rosewarne. However, he doesn't want give it a specific name and solidify it from the liquidity of English dialect varieties in London. Instead he refers to it as 'popular London', 'General London' or 'London Regional Standard'. He does indeed describe its phonetic variables, but is careful not to pin it down: “…'[P]opular London', 'London Regional Standard' do not refer to entities we can reify but to areas along a continuum stretching from broad Cockney (itself something of an abstraction) to RP.” (Wells, 303). Interestingly, this is very similar to Rosewarne's statement on EE's place in the phonetic landscape of south-east England (discussed above), except Wells's claim was published two years prior.

3.1 Phonetic Variables
As mentioned above, Wells initially disliked labeling the speech of those in phonetical limbo between Cockney and RP as speakers of Estuary English; in 1994 he showed that it proved difficult to assess its variables in detail, pan-phonologically (“Transcribing Estuary English”). He expresses this problem again in the article “What is Estuary English”, published in 1997, apparently with no consensus in sight. In that same article, Wells states that the spread of London based speech to other parts of England, and to higher social strata, has actually been a process going on for more than 500 years. The phenomenon of EE is therefore nothing new, except for its name and quicker expansion due to the diminishing class distinctions and greater social mobility of contemporary England (“What is Estuary English?”). Consequently, Rosewarne's term 'Estuary English' seems somewhat deficient when it comes to phonological application.
Nevertheless, it has reached heights of social recognition to the extent that it seems impossible to use either a different term, or to not use it at all.

3.1.1 Cockney

Traditionally, Cockney is the variety of English spoken by the working-class of London, specifically in the suburbs of east London. It is a fully fledged dialect with its own vocabulary, exclusive phrases and quite an idiosyncratic system of phonetic variables (Wells, 302). These are some of the variables unique to Cockney, differentiating it from the other forms of London speech: monophthongalization of MOUTH words, \([\text{mæ:f} \sim \text{ma:f]}\); glottaling of fricatives, \([\text{ˈsəo}t\,\text{ə}]\) safer; STRUT words have the vowel \([\text{a}]\), \([\text{lav}\,\text{lov}]\); open /ə/ in final position, \([\text{ˈdɪnər}]\) dinner, \([\text{ˈmərəv}]\) marrow (Wells, 301-321). Another important feature of Cockney are the Diphthong Shifts where the starting points of the front-closing diphthongs shift in a counter-clockwise manner, on the one hand, and the starting points of the back-closing diphthongs shift in a clockwise manner, on the other hand, relative to the vowel chart. Table 3.1 lays out these shifts from RP to Cockney, differentiating between Wells's 'popular London' (arguably Rosewarne's EE) and Cockney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Popular London</th>
<th>Cockney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front-closing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iː</td>
<td>iː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɵː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʊː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʌː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td>ɪː</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Back-closing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɑːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɒːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʌː</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
<td>æːʊ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few consonantal variables are of particular interest in this context, such as yod phenomena, TH Fronting, T Glottaling, L Vocalization, and H Dropping. ‘Yod phenomena’ refers to the difference in pronunciation of words where /j/ follows /t, d, n/ specifically, and contrasting manifestations in EE, Cockney and RP. As in General American, traditional Cockney has Yod Dropping, e.g. [tʊŋ] tune, [dʊŋk] duke, [nʊŋs] news, while in RP these are pronounced [tjuːn] tune, [djʊŋk] duke, [njʊŋs] news. In contemporary popular London speech, EE included (“What is Estuary English?”), a third form occurs called Yod Coalescence in the environment where /j/ follows /t, d/, e.g. [fʊŋ] tune, [dɡʊŋk] duke; however, Yod Dropping in the environment /j/ follows /n/ is preserved (Wells, 330-331). TH Fronting, where [f, v] respectively replace [θ] medially and initially, and [ð] medially; T Glottaling, the replacement of /t/ with /ʔ/ in certain environments (see Table 3.2); and L Vocalization, where pre-consonantal and word-final /l/ is vocalized; are conventional Cockney phenomena, but all of them can be heard to some degree in most varieties of adult London speech as well (Wells, 328; 323; 314).

All the above mentioned phonetic variables are subject to variability within the RP-Cockney range, though some more than others. TH Fronting, for example, is a well known feature of Cockney, but is used to some extent in all the London accents, and therefore it cannot be used to show that the accents are systematically different: “It is wrong to suppose that TH Fronting implies a systematic difference between Cockney
and other accents...Dental fricatives are used, at least sporadically, by all native adult Londoners, barring only those with speech defects” (Wells, 328). Wells makes similar statements pertaining to L Vocalization and H Dropping in sections 4.2.7 and 4.2.9, in *Accents of English 2: The British Isles*, respectively. Oddly enough, however, in 1997 Wells noted that EE does not involve H Dropping or TH Fronting, suggesting this as a feature of Cockney distinct from EE (“What is Estuary English?”), though TH Fronting is now becoming a common variable of EE. Cockney speakers simply exhibit the most extreme usage of these variables, whether it be in terms of intensity or frequency; hence, it is placed on the opposite end of the platonic London dialectal scale to RP.

### 3.1.2 Estuary English

There are some similarities between what is commonly thought of as EE and Cockney, both being London based dialects, displayed in table 3.2. Here are five variables found in Cockney, but only three of them are also considered traits of EE. The plus sign means that the phonetic variable is considered a trait of that dialect and the minus sign means that it isn't.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonetic variables</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Cockney</th>
<th>EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TH Fronting</td>
<td>['fɪŋk] think</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/-glottalling, V_V</td>
<td>['bʌʔə] butter</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/-glottalling, V_C/#</td>
<td>['ɡæʔwɪk] Gatwick</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Vocalization [l]</td>
<td>['mɪo k] milk, ['pɪpə] people</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Dropping</td>
<td>['ɑːʔ] heart</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yod Coalescence</td>
<td>['fuzdə] tuesday</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variables in Table 3.2 have been dealt with above, except for H Dropping. This is the deletion of /h/ only when it occurs at the beginning of stressed syllables, since all varieties of English can exhibit some random h-deletion in non-stressed environments. Speakers of Cockney have H Dropping to the highest degree in all of the London accents, and therefore it’s usually considered a phonetic variable only of Cockney, allowing phonologists to use that variable to mark a speaker as either Cockney or not (“What is Estuary English?”).

In addition to the phonetics, Wells notes another difference between the two dialects, which is that speakers of traditional Cockney exhibit non-standard grammar and usage, e.g. “We *was young,” while EE’s grammar is standard (“What is Estuary English?”).

In a talk in Heidelberg in November 1994, Wells recommended different transcriptions for EE with respect to traditional RP. To begin with he states that one should transcribe EE as RP, but place /ɪ/ in the final/prevocalic position in weak syllables, /ɪ/ in RP, e.g. /ˈhæpi/ happy, /ˈvɛəriəs/ various; and /ʊ/ in the final-prevocalic position in weak syllables, /ʊ/ in RP, e.g. /ˈθæŋkju/ thank you, /ˈɡrædʒuəɾiən/ graduation. The following table includes some of the more fundamental variable changes in transcription.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RP</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aɪ</td>
<td>aɪ</td>
<td>/ˈpraɪs/ price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aʊ</td>
<td>æʊ</td>
<td>/ˈmæθəʊr/ mouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is some debate among phoneticians about whether /o/ or /w/ should be used to mark a pre-consonantal or word-final /l/, i.e. in marking L Vocalization. The latter has a glide quality, which is sometimes heard in an EE or Cockney speaker, while the former is more back and rounded. In this paper /o/ will be used, though in reality the mark for L Vocalization ranges between the two, depending on the surrounding consonants and vowels.

4. Johnny Rotten and Punk

4.0 The Rise of Punk

In England, in the latter half of the 1970s, a new form of popular music was taking shape in the wake of '70s legends such as Black Sabbath, Iron Maiden, Led Zeppelin, Pink Floyd, and The Who. It was a genre intimately linked with the socio-political spirit of the times and is said to have properly begun in New York with the release of the Ramones's self-titled 1976 album (Godfrey). This was Punk-Rock, or simply Punk.
Almost simultaneously in London many underground bands, with their hard and fast paced, guitar driven, do-it-yourself music, were steadily gaining popularity. The biggest names in the Punk scene in England were the Sex Pistols and the Clash. As for becoming well-known to the general public via the media, the Sex Pistols got quite a bit more attention than the Clash and subsequently achieved legendary status.

In the book *Popular Music Theory: Grade 4*, the Sex Pistols are said to have been greatly influential despite having a relatively short career. Their music focused on energy and spunk, for which they were praised, and stood contradictory to how musicians had been valued in the past: mostly based on technical ability. The Sex Pistols was the most prominent of the Punk bands, at Punk's humble beginnings, and they gave way to numerous and quite a varying range of music styles such as grunge, indie, thrash metal and rap (Sheldon, 29). Sheldon and Skinner go on to say that thanks to the publicity, the band became a household name and their first album went to number one in 1977, without even being played on the radio, advertised on TV, or easily available in stores.

In the song *God Save the Queen*, it's clear that the Sex Pistols wanted to keep and even emphasize the London accent in-song. The reason for this is not clear, but speculations range from the idea that they wanted to appeal to the working-lower-class, to that they didn't want to sound American and therefore exaggerated their British, specifically London, accent. The latter reason is refuted in Section 4.2.3. Nevertheless, no one specific explanation is correct in and of itself. It is clear, however, that the reasons of consequence have socio-political connotations: how they experienced themselves in society, society's response to them, and the anti-authoritarian atmosphere of the late 1970s in London.
4.1 The Socio-Political Spectrum

Phenomena outside the domain of the music business can best account for the Sex Pistols's incredible rise in popularity and exposure. Socio-political phenomena play a much larger role in explaining what music is heard – which artists 'make it' – than what is generally thought, and 'coolness' is a major contributing factor in that explanation. Who gets heard is vitally important to the argument of inspiration and influence. If Muddy Waters had never been recorded, he wouldn't have inspired and influenced Bob Dylan, who in turn would never have inspired and influenced the Beatles, and so on.

Human beings are social in nature, but significantly, some humans are more social than others.

It is important not to confuse being cool with being popular. They can easily be mixed up and regarded as the same thing, but they are fundamentally and crucially different. The Mississippi Delta bluesmen were not socially privileged in the sense that they had a higher social status, yet their influence and inspiration is what shaped – or rather begot – popular music in the past century and continues to do so. Musicians are often socially reclusive, suffering from depression and the like; nevertheless, they are able to gain popularity and emit coolness to the masses. Hence, the rules that apply to the standard social setting, e.g. at a dinner party or a general meeting of people, aren't the same as the ones in the art domain, in this case the musical domain. In terms of 'cool' and 'uncool', what seems to be necessary for a musician while making music is 'honest work'. This means approaching one's artistic work with honesty, integrity and sincerity, but excludes the artist's own – possibly very flawed – personality. If musicians do not conform to the requirements of 'honest work', it is easier to discredit them and
think of them as uncool. Coincidentally, in the interview with Johnny Rotten (see Appendix I), the interviewer asks him how he became famous, to which he replied “I don’t know ... through being honest.”

London in 1975 saw much turmoil, both socially and politically. John Albert Walker wrote in *Left shift: radical art in 1970s Britain*, that the optimism of the 1960s had given way to pessimism in the 1970s, and he points to the mantra of *God Save the Queen*, “No future”, to illustrate his point (Walker, 13). The socio-political situation during the ’70s was indeed grim, and there were many factors that contributed to an overall negative mood in the society. As a result of the restoration of the Special Powers Act in '71, conflict in Northern Ireland was inflamed once again in early ’72 when 13 people in Londonderry were killed by British paratroopers (“The 1970s”). The constant threat of military action by both parties involved made the citizens of Britain ever uneasy, adding having to worry about bombing to mundane activities like grocery shopping. Inflation caused cuts in public expenditures and unemployment steadily increased. As a result, by 1977 1.6 million people in Britain were registered unemployed and the winter of 1978-79 was dubbed the 'Winter of Discontent' – as one by one Britain's public unions went on strike (Walker, 15). There were also rather rapid shifts in political leadership. Right-wing conservatives had power at the beginning and the end of the decade, leaving the middle years to the left-wing liberals (Walker, 13). This sort of political instability bred an anti-authoritarian atmosphere, seeing as how the authorities failed to secure long-term solutions for a society which desperately needed them.

It is therefore no wonder that the music scene gave rise to bands like the Sex
Pistols, which bluntly exhibited their anti-government and mainstream opinions publicly, and were praised for it. The fact is that being anti-authoritarian during those times of turmoil was cool, and the story of the Sex Pistols's success is a clear testament to that.

4.2 Dialectal Properties

John Lyndon, a.k.a. Johnny Rotten, was born in London in 1956, to an Irish immigrant family. He was raised in Finsbury Park, an impoverished neighborhood and melting pot of immigrants, where he acquired a specific London accent ("The Public Image?"). The popular opinion is that Johnny's in-song pronunciation is thought to be similar to, if not the same as, his speech. In an interview conducted in 1977 by a Dutch reporter, Johnny reluctantly answers his questions regarding punk and his attitude, but in the process sheds a light on the nature of his dialect. A number of interesting variables can be heard in the Sex Pistols song *God Save the Queen*, which seem to be an exaggeration of his speech. This gives one the impression that his in-speech and in-song pronunciation is the same accent. Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 concern his speech pronunciation, while 4.2.3 deals with in-song pronunciation.

4.2.1 Consonant Variables

In the interview (Appendix I) Johnny never exhibits TH Fronting, since throughout the interview a clear pronunciation of both /θ/ and /ð/ is evident, e.g. lines 2, 5, 6, 11-13, 17-20, 22-26, 30, 31, 36. On the subject of H Dropping, there's really only one instance in the interview where it would be heard, e.g. *hippies* (line 18), but again Johnny tests
negative for this variable by pronouncing the /h/. L Vocalization is quite variable throughout the interview. The lines where there are instances of a vocalized /l/ are 10, 13, and 29, which conform to the definition of L Vocalization (discussed above in 3.1.1). There are no examples in the interview which can be claimed to be Yod Dropping, i.e. in the environment where /j/ follows /n, m, d/; however, there are examples of Yod Coalescence in lines 4, 20, 21, 29-31. All these examples are where the previous word ends in /t, d/ and the next begins with /j/, resulting in /ʧ, ʤ/ respectively. T Glottaling is prominent in Johnny's speech, as almost every line in the interview has examples of it, and it's seen occurring in all the following environments: V_#, V_C, V_V and C_C. Thus, in the environments C_# and C_V it never occurs: lines 2 and 16 containing the only examples of where C_# T Glottaling would occur. Furthermore, examples of /t/ pronunciation under the first four conditions can also be seen; hence, a clear rule cannot be established, and T Glottaling must therefore be said to occur sporadically. In table 3.2, phonetic variables two and three occur only in Cockney or both Cockney and EE, respectively, according to Altendorf. These are the environments V_V and V_C/#, and Johnny shows examples of both. V_V occurs 7 times in the interview, e.g. lines 5, 10, 11, 15, 19, 25, and V_C/# occurs 12 times, e.g. lines 4, 6, 9, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24. K Glottaling also occurs in the interview, 4 times, e.g. lines 23, 28-29, 31.

When these consonantal variables are tallied up, the evidence is in favour of Johnny not being a speaker of Cockney, but rather falling somewhere between it and RP. It can readily be called Estuary English, since its phonetic variables are not as clearly apparent as Cockney's, and it seems to be a sort of categorical name for speakers
of popular London speech that falls between the two extremes (see discussion in Section 3). H Dropping and T Glottaling cancel each other out, because H Dropping is mainly a Cockney variable, which he doesn't have, and his T Glottaling slants more towards Cockney than EE. Yod Coalescence and L Vocalization are variables of both dialects, but occur sporadically, and therefore they have no say in the outcome. Hence, the real defining factor is TH Fronting, because a speaker of Cockney would exhibit it to a noticeable degree, but Johnny doesn't at all. In recent times, TH Fronting is increasingly heard in southern English, especially EE, but since the interview is from 1977 the previous claim holds true.

4.2.2 Vowels and Diphthongs

The vowels and diphthongs expressed in the interview do not conform to either RP or Cockney, but, again, fall somewhere in between, i.e. they fall closest to the popular London column of table 3.1. In lines 6 and 13 for example, counts becomes [kæun?] s; all throughout, I is almost always [aɪ]; word-final /i:/ is most often diphthongalized to /ɪi/, etc. He also displays one example of PRICE shifting from RP /ai/ to Cockney / ði/, e.g. [ɪntdɪʔo d] entitled (line 10). That being said, one diphthong in particular is rather troublesome, /əu/, as according to table 3.1 Wells would have it transcribed /ʌu/ for it to conform to the middle ground – popular London (arguably EE) – shift from RP. However, for the most part, Johnny retains the RP /əu/ pronunciation for the GOAT vowel in the interview. He at least leans more towards the RP version than the other. Nevertheless, Johnny most often has vowels that differ from the RP set, e.g. you: RP [jʉ:], Johnny [jʉ]; think: RP [θɪŋk], Johnny [θeɪŋk].
4.2.3 God Save the Queen

Contrary to the interview, one needs two phonemes of /r/ in transcribing the song, the retroflex [ɾ] and trilled [r], as Johnny exhibits both. This seems to be Johnny’s signature move, because the trilled /r/ also occurs in other Sex Pistol songs. This is very likely meant to be a mockery of the elite, traditional RP speaking population, who roll their r’s to sound more distinguished. As for the consonant variables discussed in 4.2.1: there are many examples of Yod Coalescence, L Vocalization, and T Glottaling, which occur in almost the same environments as in the interview. Yod Coalescence, for example, appears where the previous word ends in /t/ and the first sound of the next word is /ʃ/, e.g. lines 8 and 9, [wɒʃu:] what you. H Dropping is not present in the song; however, there is one example where /h/ is inserted where the Standard English pronunciation (according to the Oxford Online Dictionaries) does not, e.g. [hɪʃ] H (line 3). At the time when the song was recorded, this was considered to be a primarily Cockney phenomenon in stressed syllables, e.g. [1nʌʊ ai ʰaint] no, I ain’t, [3: ʰɛrənɔz] her errands (Wells, 322). However, the [hɪʃ] pronunciation has recently been gaining ground in southern English (Pétur Knútsson, personal communication). TH Fronting, like in the interview, doesn’t occur in the song.

The vowels in the song can be said to be slightly exaggerated. They are similar to the ones in the interview – where such a comparison is possible – e.g. the diphthong [ɪɾi] in the interview gets a more open and centralized onset, closer to [əi ]; sometimes it even lengthens to [əi:] as in [kwəi:n] queen, and [dʒei:məŋ] dreaming. Similar examples include when the RP diphthong [eɪi] becomes fully Cockney [ai], e.g. [səɪvz] saves (line 13), and [peɪd] paid (line 20), instead of the middle ground [ai],
as in the interview. However, this is not a rule since Johnny also has examples of 
\[seɪv\] save (lines 1, 4, 11) in its RP form; in fact, the RP form occurs much more 
frequently in the song than the Cockney form. Another exaggeration occurs in lines 10 
and 33 of the transcription column in Appendix II, where you, transcribed \[jʊ\] in the 
interview, becomes \[jʊː\].

In addition, Johnny sporadically uses the General American (GA), unrounded 
variety of the LOT vowel \([ɑ]\). It's particularly noticeable in his pronunciation of god, 
examples of which are found in lines 4, 11, 14, 17, 18 and 29 in Appendix II. The 
British Standard (except in South-West England) for this vowel is \([o]\); thus, the 
transcription of god is \([ɡɑd]\) for GA and \([ɡɒd]\) for RP. Johnny uses the GA LOT vowel 
again in lines 8, 9 and 16 of the transcription in Appendix II. This is what you \([wæʃuː\]), 
want \([wɒnt]\) (lines 8 and 9), and not \([nɑ?]\) (line 16). In the interview transcription in 
Appendix I, he says \([wɒʔ\)] and \([wɒnʔ\)] (line 11), clearly using the British Standard 
rounded LOT vowel \([ɒ\]) in speech. The interview transcription does not have an 
example of not, but the evidence suggests that Johnny would pronounce it \([nɒʔ\])]. This 
means that Johnny did sound American even though he might not have wanted to. 
Therefore, the hypothetical reason for his singing pronunciation being the way it is 
because he didn't want to sound American, as mentioned in Section 4.0, is incorrect.

It can be inferred from these consonants and vowels that Johnny Rotten's 
fundamental dialectal variables are retained in song, but are a bit more emphasized and 
slightly exaggerated at times. Perhaps this is done in order to showcase the non-standard 
nature of his pronunciation, setting him apart from the upper-class, RP-speaking elite, 
and by extension challenge the conventional social norms of previous decades. It is also
a factor that singers tends to lengthen the vowels while singing and Johnny seems to use those to exaggerate his accent, distorting the original phonological sets. As previously mentioned, Peter Trudgill discussed the Americanization of British pop-singers' pronunciation in “Acts of Conflicting Identity: The Sociolinguistics of British Pop-Song Pronunciation”. In it, he shows examples of usage for the LOT vowel and RP can’t [kəːnt] vs. GA [kænt], for example, and how Americanization decreased over time. It is therefore interesting that Johnny should exhibit the GA LOT American vowel in the song, but it can most likely be attributed to the song's overall satirization of authority and convention.

5. Adele

5.0 American Soul and R&B

Adele Adkins was born in 1988 and was raised in Tottenham, London, surprisingly in the same London Borough as Mr. Rotten, Haringey – except 32 years later. When she was 11 years old her family moved to south London, specifically Lambeth, where she fell for American Soul music and R&B. She graduated from the BRIT School for the Performing arts and Technology in 2006, and two years later released her first and commercially successful album 19 (Lamont). In the wake of its release, she gained notable fame, but when she released her second album 21, in January 2011, she became one of the brightest stars in contemporary popular music. The two main singles of the album were 'Rolling in the Deep' and 'Someone Like You'; the latter reached number one on the official charts, and Adele became the first artist since the Beatles to simultaneously hold a top five hit on both the Official Singles Chart and Official
Albums Chart (Lamont). Contrary to Johnny, Adele’s success story is being written in the now, but whether she’ll have an impact on popular music the way he did remains to be seen.

5.1 Consonant Variables

Having grown up in Tottenham, Adele is sure to have a firm London accent. Appendix III contains an interview from YouTube conducted by USA Today, where Adele was asked five questions. The transcribed portion covers about three of them. With regard to the five consonantal variables, i.e. H Dropping, L Vocalization, TH Fronting, T Glottaling, and yod phenomena, Adele exhibits almost all of them. L Vocalization is very much present in her speech, for example, in line 1 of the transcription she pronounces her name \[\text{ade\text{o}}\], and in line 8 she says \[\text{wi\text{o}}\] will. Her examples conform to the rules of L Vocalization, with all vocalized /l/s being [l], occurring word-internally or finally and only in non-prevocalic contexts, but not in words like \[\text{hou\text{f}lI}\] hopefully and \[\text{lo\text{s}}\] lots (line 7). T-Glottaling also appears deeply ingrained in her speech, with examples found in almost every line of the transcription. It occurs in almost all cases of word-final and internal /t/, e.g. \[\text{i\text{t}}\] (line 8), \[\text{pu\text{t}i\text{X}}\] putting (line 6), \[\text{ef\text{o}}\] effort (line 7). Interestingly, she also has glottaling of /p, k, b/ in a few places, e.g. \[\text{hou\text{f}lI}\] hopefully (line 7), \[\text{sp\text{es}i\text{f}i}\] specific (line 71), \[\text{la\text{i}}\] like (line 23), \[\text{al\text{e}m}\] album (line 24). Furthermore, /\text{O}/ is glottalized in at least two instances instead of becoming /\text{u}/, as in TH Fronting, e.g. \[\text{som\text{th}i\text{ng}}\] something (line 10), \[\text{m\text{an\text{s}}\text{s}}\] months (line 74). Adele’s pronunciation of like depends on her usage of the word. When she uses it as a preposition, an informal conjunction or an informal
adverb, /k/ is glottalized, but when using it as a verb the /k/ is retained, as can be seen in lines 10 and 12 in the transcription. TH Fronting becomes apparent towards the second half of the transcription, e.g. \textit{[wif him]} with him (line 44), \textit{[frůu]} through (lines 88), \textit{[nɔːf]} north (line 79), \textit{[wɪv ənənə]} with another (line 65). Most TH Fronting happens word-externally, or when there’s not a pause between words and the next sound is a vowel; however, there are a few exceptional examples where it \textit{does} occur word-initially or word-finally in Intonation-Phrase final instances. In terms of yod phenomena, the interview contains no clear examples of Yod Coalescence and she does not have Yod Dropping, because \textit{knew} is pronounced [njuː] (line 57), not [njuː]. Finally, Adele has no indication of H Dropping, pronouncing /h/ wherever it appears in stressed position.

Since Adele is a non-rhotic speaker, it is of interest to mention a few /r/ variables that occur in the interview such as Linking-R, e.g. \textit{[səfmɔːr æl?m]} sophomore album (line 24), \textit{[tliːnɛidr əz]} teenager as (lines 56), and the infamous Intrusive-R, e.g. \textit{[eərɪər ɪn]} area in (line 79). Furthermore, there are occurrences of known Cockney phenomena in her speech. In two instances, both occurring in line 77 of the interview, /r/ is fronted to the voiced approximant /w/, in the case of \textit{[səurɪo]} surreal. There is also an opened realization of /ə/ in final position (Wells, 305), e.g. \textit{[tɛgevə]} together (line 66), and non-standard grammar deviations, whereas EE makes use of standard grammar (as previously mentioned in 3.1.2). In lines 102-103 Adele says “I got fluff on me arm init”, which deviates from standard grammar in two ways: she makes use of the nominative form of the first person pronoun \textit{me} where standard grammar employs \textit{my} and at the end of the statement standard grammar demands \textit{don’t I}, not \textit{isn’t it}. 
5.2 Vowels

Adele's vowels seem to fall into the popular London/EE category, with [əʊ u] becoming [əʊ u], [i:] becoming [ii], [ai] becoming [ai], for example, as opposed to Cockney [əʊ i:], [əi] and [dai] respectively. However, she doesn’t exactly conform to the changes noted in table 3.1, as the above mentioned might suggest. For example, in the interview in appendix III, the RP [ei] does not become popular London [æi], but rather has a few manifestations, e.g. [tædei] today (line 2), [eɪdɨ] age (line 16), [ɪfəɪndd] changed (line 43), [ɔ:əwɪz] always (line 54). Interestingly, despite these different realizations, the most common one is RP's [ei]. The same goes for the GOAT vowel, which in RP is [əu], in popular London or EE [æu], and Cockney [ə-u] (see table 3.1). Again Adele most frequently uses the RP [əu] when one would think the [æu] variety would be most prominent, e.g. [səʊni] sony (line 4), [dəʊn?] don't (lines 8 and 9), [wəʊu] wrote (line 18), [səʊu] so (line 27). As with Johnny, Adele has an [u] in you, when it's non-stressed and/or combined with another word to create a phrase, like [jʊəu] you know (line 42). This is more extreme than the PR [jʊə] you and the popular London/EE diphthong [juə]; there are no occurrences of the former, and the latter only occurs in stressed environments, sometimes even as a monophthongalized [u].

If one imagines the platonic RP-Cockney scale with RP on the far left, Cockney at the far right, and EE right in the middle, then Adele's accent seems to fall right in between EE and Cockney. When the consonant variables are tallied with reference to table 3.2, it becomes apparent that the points fall on the Cockney side. Since both T Glottaling in the V_C/# environment and L Vocalization are EE and Cockney variables, and there are no firm examples of Yod Coalescence in the interview, those variables
cannot be counted. Therefore, TH Fronting, the V_V type of T Glottaling, and H Dropping should be used to assess her accent. In that respect Adele scores 2 for Cockney (TH Fronting and V_V type T Glottaling) and 1 for EE (H Dropping). So far the initial speculation holds true; having said that, the same story cannot be told regarding her vowels. As the previous paragraph shows, Adele's vowels fall somewhere between RP and EE, essentially becoming the polar opposite of her consonants. As a result, one could claim that Adele's accent falls right in the middle of the RP-Cockney scale, making her a speaker of EE. However, certain hints, namely the additional comments in the last paragraph of Section 5.1, i.e. employing the voiced approximant /u/, the open realization of /ə/ and non-standard grammar usage, tilt the scale once again towards Cockney.

5.3 Adele's Singing Pronunciation

The song chosen for this discussion is the very recent hit-song by Adele “Someone Like You”, which has gained immense popularity over a relatively short period of time, and catapulted Adele to the heights of international fame. In the transcription of the song (Appendix IV) there is a drastically different pronunciation than in that of her speech. As for the variables discussed above, there is no more TH Fronting, T Glottaling or L Vocalization, e.g. *nothing* in the interview was [nʌfɪŋ] (Appendix III, line 62), while in song it’s [nʌθɪŋ] (line 17 and 30). Again, the vowels Adele uses in the interview are almost in every case substituted by the Standard English equivalent when it comes to the singing pronunciation, e.g. [jʊː] *you* and [miː] *me*, instead of [jʌ] or [jʊ] and [mɪ]; RP [aɪ] and [au] replaces EE [aɪ] and [æu]; [dəʊn?] *don’t* becomes
[dəʊnt]. Interestingly, hints of rhoticity can be heard right from the first line, e.g. [həːrd] heard and [ɡərl] girl. Although it is not a transition into full rhoticity, these words would never be rhoticized in her speech.

The combination of these changes invariably lead to her singing accent looking rather American. Peter Trudgill discussed this in a paper published in 1983, where he claims that British pop-singers in the sixties were thought to have acquired an American accent while singing. But in fact the real question is: which American accent was being copied (Trudgill, 144)? Generally speaking, the accent of African Americans impacted the British pop-artists of the sixties, mainly because that was the group of American society which developed the leading genres of influence in pop-music: the Blues and Rock and Roll (Trudgill, 144). However, as discussed in 2.1, it's not clear that these British artists were actually trying to copy the American artists' accents; it was the music that was subject to imitation, and the British artists' source of inspiration and influence. Thus, the acquired singing accent was an inadvertent side-effect, and for that reason it was more of a phonological Americanization, not an exact replica. As it turns out, Adele was heavily influenced by American singers such as Lauryn Hill (Hicklin, 3), Ella Fitzgerald and Etta James (“Adele a soulful singer”). It is noted that Etta James was of particular inspiration to her (“Adele: An Unforgettable Voice”). Interestingly, Etta James, Ella Fitzgerald and Lauryn Hill are all African Americans with non-rhotic accents, just as Adele had, and yet the rhotic tendencies of her singing pronunciation are intensified. This could be because her music is so heavily influenced by American Soul music and R&B, the likes of Etta and Ella, that American speech in general (GA) inadvertently affects her pronunciation.
In addition to rhoticity, Adele displays a few other Americanisms, most likely owing to the same phenomenon as discussed above: the RP diphthong [əʊ] is realized as the GA diphthong [oʊ] throughout the song, e.g. [səʊ] so and [oʊld] old (line 6), [həʊld] hold (line 7), [həʊp] hope (line 11) [əʊvər] over (line 13); medial and final /t/ is voiced instead of being glottalized, e.g. [sɛtʃ] settled (line 1), [ðeər] that I (line 5), [həɪt] hate [aʊt] out [ʌnɪnvaiətɪd] uninvited (line 9), [bɪtərswiːt] bittersweet (line 30); there is no BATH broadening, whereby TRAP occurs where BATH would occur in RP, e.g. [læsts] lasts (lines 18 and 20); DRESS is raised and diphthongalized to /ei/, which is a Southern American shift, e.g. [biəst] best (line 15), [berɡ] beg (line 16), [sɛid] said (line 17), [ɪnstead] instead (line 21).

6. Conclusion

The questions raised in Trudgill's article, regarding the provenance of a singer's modified accent, touch upon a very interesting subject: the power of influence and inspiration, and its ability to affect our instinctive and native pronunciation. On the one hand, this is created by a singer being influenced by another singer or genre. On the other, a singer can be influenced by the socio-political atmosphere of the society in which they live. The power, or driving force, of influence and inspiration can therefore be summed up in what one thinks is cool (as defined in Section 1.1).

Punk music and the Punk “movement” as a whole was socially peripheral, and was often seen as a group of young people who had rebellious tendencies, and didn't want to assume the responsibility needed for partaking in society. This rings true for many of those who associated themselves with a Punk “movement”, when in truth no
actual “movement” existed; it was largely a product of the mass-media. Punk became the answer for many who questioned mainstream values and systems, and it was the instability of government in the late 1970s – at least in England – and various media outlets which added to the perpetuation of it. To Johnny Rotten, the ignorance of the ruling class of the social problems in England at the time was uncool. Hence, it was cool not to conform to their ideals, standards and rules. This includes the dialect of the ruling elite (RP), and thus could account for why Johnny's singing pronunciation emphasizes the dialect he grew up learning, which was (among other dialects) categorized as disgraceful, and socially stigmatized, as 'bad English'. In order to realize the source of his singing pronunciation, it becomes less relevant to look for a source of inspiration from other artists.

As previously mentioned, the Ramones's 1976 album is maintained by many to be the beginning of Punk music. When looking at Johnny's singing pronunciation, it's clear that the Ramones couldn't be the source of inspiration for it. The reason is simply that the Ramones are Americans with rhotic accents and American vowels, neither of which are found in Johnny's singing. In this sense there is a gap between the musical inspiration – the actual music being played – and the affect on pronunciation. The Sex Pistols's music – everything but the singing – is raw, fast, simple, and powerful. This they have in common with other Punk bands, like the Ramones. Since the pronunciation is not in synch with this explanation, one feasible reason for Johnny's singing pronunciation would be the socio-political argument.

The socio-political influence on Adele's pronunciation shift is considerably less relevant than its affect Johnny's. In her case it is more obvious that the musicians she
regards as cool are the agents of change. She has mentioned that there are various
British musicians that she thinks highly of, and have influenced her; however, the way
she speaks about her American inspirations, like Etta James, is noticeably with greater
reverence: “She went right through me — it was the first time that I’d ever been so
moved by someone's voice....It was like she was singing a song that was written for me,
about me, 50 years after she recorded it.” (“Adele: An Unforgettable Voice”). The split
between the musical inspiration and the affect on pronunciation that we saw with
Johnny, is not the case for Adele. The music genre of Adele's albums, _19_ and _21_, is the
same as Etta James' genre: American Soul and R&B. Not only is the music style – as
played by the instruments – the same genre of American music, the dialect Adele
employs in her songs is strongly influence by Southern American English. Hence, this
demonstrates a relationship between the musical inspiration and its affect on the singing
pronunciation.

Whether a singer's singing pronunciation is the product of the socio-political
mood or associates directly with the music itself, one result will be the same: there will
be a difference between one's singing pronunciation and one's speech pronunciation.
Just how great that difference is depends on the degree to which one is inspired and
influenced by various stimuli. There is a constant stream of information collected by our
senses and interpreted by our brains at all times, the effect of which can be
instantaneous or gradual. One way to make sense of this seemingly infinite amount of
information is to make use of terms like 'cool' and 'uncool' to describe whether our
choices invoke positive or negative associations, regardless of whether the choice has to
do with material things or more abstract concepts.
Appendices

Appendix I

The following is an interview with Johnny Rotten from 1977 conducted by a Dutch interviewer. Only Johnny's speech is transcribed. The audio is taken from a YouTube video called “SEX PISTOLS - JOHNNY ROTTEN INTERVIEW 1977”, which was uploaded by user publicpistols on May 21st, 2007. The audio file accompanying the transcription is track 1 on the enclosed CD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview with Johnny Rotten, text:</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription (Johnny's answers only):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q: You're quite famous, aren't you? A: Yeah, I suppose so.</td>
<td>1. jee a saapen uz se və di deʊn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: How did all that happen? A: I don't know. Through being honest. A: Yes I am, very.</td>
<td>2. nəu θiŋ k əni dəʊν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: Are you honest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q: I think you are trying to shock people. A: I don't give a shit what you think, I know what I think and that’s all that counts to me. I don't try and impress anybody but myself.</td>
<td>4. a deʊn? ɡɪv ə jɪ? woʊf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q: What do you want?
A: Freedom I think they call it, the hippies used to call it that. But I bet there's a better word for it.
Q: What?
A: I don't know that yet.

(Q's voice becomes 'rottenesque', high-pitched, nasal and coarse)
17. fri:dem ai Θiŋ-d α:ei kɔ:l i?
18. ðə hɪp'iːz jʌs tə kɔl i? ðæt
(Voice back to normal)
19. bʌ? a be? ðezə be?ə wɔ:d
20. fərɪ? ai ðænΙ nju ðæ ζeɪt

Q: Why all the infamous language?
A: Infamous language? You're joking. What language is that? I speak nothing but the fucking English language. That's the only thing I've been brought up with, and if that's infamous then ha ha ha tough shit.

(Q's voice back to normal)
21. ðæn mju Θiŋ-d? ɾɔn ai ðænΙ?
22. nju bʌ? sɪts Θiŋ-d? ɾɔn
23. wo wai ðe as mi ɾɪ α:li li:s
24. sɪli kwsdʒʌnzd ðe ri:lɪ
25. ɪkspe? 32. mɪ tu ænse ðæm

Appendix II

Below is a phonetic transcription of the 1977 punk rock song *God Save the Queen* by the Sex Pistols. The audio is taken from a YouTube video called “The Sex Pistols - God Save The Queen - Lyric Video” and was uploaded by user Gerardofaly on February 13th, 2011. The lyrics are found on the official Sex Pistols website, on the web page “NMTB Lyrics” under “Features”. The audio file accompanying the transcription is track 2 on the enclosed CD.

| The Sex Pistols, *God Save the Queen*, text: | Phonetic transcription: |
God save the queen, the fascist regime.
It made you a moron, potential H-bomb.
God save the queen, she ain't no human being.
There is no future, in England's dreaming.
Don't be told what you want.
Don't be told what you need.
There's no future, no future, no future for you.
God save the queen, we mean it man.
We love our queen, God saves.

God save the queen, 'cause tourists are money.
And our figurehead, Is not what she seems.
Oh God save history,
God save your mad parade.
Oh lord God have mercy, all crimes are paid.

When there's no future, how can there be sin.
We're the flowers in the dustbin.
We're the poison in the human machine.
We're the future, your future.

God save the queen, we mean it man.
We love our queen, God saves.
God save the queen, we mean it man.
There is no future, in England’s dreaming.

No future (x3) for you.
No future (x3) for me.
No future (x3) for you.
No future (x2) for you.
Appendix III

The audio for this interview with Adele is from a YouTube video called “Five Questions for British singer Adele”, which was uploaded by USATODAY on February 14th, 2011.

This is track 3 on the accompanying CD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview with Adele, text:</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hi I'm Adele, this is USA Today. I am in New York in a very hot and sweaty and dark artists room here at Sony [laugh]. Oh, and yeah, my album's coming out in a few weeks, so I'm just um, putting in the effort, so hopefully lots of you, um, will want to hear it. But don't buy it if you don't like it, don't feel forced to. Just get it if you hear something you like.</td>
<td>hai aim ædeʊ ʊdzi ju: es ei tɛdi ai æm ɪn ˈnuːʃən ɪn æ ˈvɛri ʰo? æn ˈswɛtɪ ɪn daːk ætəst rʊm hɪər ðə ˈseʊnI əʊ æn tɪə əʊ æbəmz ˈkæmæ æŋi ɪn ə fɪə wiːks sɛɪm ˈdɛstəm ˈpru?ɪn ði ə ɛfə fəu ˈhjuːfli: lɒs ən jʊ æm wiəʊ ˈwɒntə hɪər ɪ? ðə? ˈdeʊn? bai i? ɪf jə ˈdeʊn? laɪk tə ˈdeʊn? fəʊ fəs tu ˈdɛs ˈɡedɪ? ɪf jə hɪə ˈsʌm?ŋ ðə jə laɪk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This one's called 21 and my first one was called 19, and um, it appears to be a running theme [laugh] that I call my albums after my age at the time when I was sort of right in the thick of it, and um, I was 21 when I wrote and recorded and handed in this record.</td>
<td>ˈdɪs wɒnts kɔːd ˈtwɛnɪwən æn mə ˈdze s əʊbeʊm wɛz kɔːd nəintɪn ænəm ɪ? əriəz tə bɪi ə ˈrænɪŋ ðəɪm ə də ˈaɪn kəs əʊəbəmz əfə məi ˈaɪdʒ əðə təɪm wən æ wɛz ˈsə? æn ræt iːn: ðəɪk əv i? ænəm əz ˈtwɛnɪwən wənə a ˈrɛʊʔ ən rɛkəd æn hændɪd ɪn ˈdɪs rɛkəd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whether or not I'll continue doing it, I don't know, um, when people on my first album were like oh will your second album, your sophomore album, be 21, I was like no I do have an imagination guys. But I ended up calling it 21, so unless something really poignant and life defining happens, that's worthy enough of being titled after my age, then um, I don't know if I'll carry on, but yeah, it's tied in at the moment.

My first album was also all about one guy, this one was just a more intense relationship that 21's about. It was my first grown-up intense relationship, it was all or nothing, we did everything together. It was no longer me or I, or you know, him. It was us, we, them, they. And that was the first time it ever happened to me, and you know, I changed in a million ways when I was with him, in good ways and in probably bad ways that will come and haunt me and bite me on the [beep].

But um, my friends and family hated him, but I loved him. And I can take, I can give advice until I'm blue in the face, but I cannot take advice. And they just made me eager for life in general and like hungry to learn about things, and I've never been like that. I was always quite a stubborn person, I was a teenager as well before I met him, so, what I knew was all I needed to know [laugh].
And now it's like, I'm just like a sponge trying to soak everything up, and, we just fell out of love, it was devastating, there was nothing to blame. Unlike my first boyfriend who cheated on me, it was like, you know, you slept with another girl, that's the reason we're not together. This time it was like, I didn't know what I did wrong, I didn't know, he didn't do anything wrong.

Just stopped loving each other, which is more devastating than having a specific reason and I felt like a complete failure. And um, only recovered a few months ago, so. Yeah, it's a long thing, it was the love of my life and it was just bad timing.

It was uh, very surreal, surreal anyway because I'm from a pretty rough area in north London, so to be in Malibu at any point is like it's a dream thing, you don't end up there, so that was pretty spectacular. But then it got brought back down to earth very quickly and easily by recording in London as well. But you know, I'm very much like a London girl through and through.
So, it's actually quite nice I did some of it in Malibu, 'cause I felt very uncomfortable in Malibu, I felt very at home if it [???] and in the studio it was incredible. But Malibu is not my kind of area, um, everyone lives behind a gate, they've got so much money they don't leave [laugh]. It's not my kind of place, so, it was um it made a full circle by doing half of it there and half of it at home.

The Grammys was an out of body experience. Sorry I got fluff on me arm isn't it. It's because it's jumper, look. That's disgusting. If I had a make-up artist I wouldn't have to do it myself [laugh].

Appendix IV

The following is a transcription of Adele's song “Someone Like You”. The audio is taken from a live studio video made by BBC Radio 1's Live Lounge Special titled “Adele Someone Like You, Live Lounge Special pt6” and uploaded by user ukenglishuk1 on February 1st, 2011. The song is track 4 on the accompanying CD.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adele, <em>Someone Like You</em>. Text:</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I heard that you're settled down</td>
<td>1. ai h3:rd ətʃjou sæt daun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That you found a girl and you're married now</td>
<td>2. dæt ju: faund ði ɡ3:rl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard that your dreams came true</td>
<td>3. ænd ʃə mærıd nau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guess she gave you things,</td>
<td>4. ai h3:rd dæt ʃə dri:zm keɪm tʃu:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I didn't give to you</td>
<td>5. ges ʃi: ɡəivə ɵıŋz ətʃai dið ɡɪv tu ju:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old friend, why are you so shy</td>
<td>6. əuld frend wai æ ʃi sou fai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It ain't like you to hold back</td>
<td>7. tʃæin laik ju: ðə hould bæk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or hide from the light</td>
<td>8. ðə haid frəm ət lait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge:</td>
<td>Chorus:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hate to turn up out of the blue</td>
<td>Nevermind, I'll find someone like you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uninvited</td>
<td>I wish nothing but the best for you to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I couldn't stay away, I couldn't fight it</td>
<td>Don't forget me, I beg,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd hoped you'd see my face</td>
<td>I'll remember you said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And that you'd be reminded</td>
<td>Sometimes it lasts in love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That for me, it isn't over</td>
<td>But sometimes it hurts instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You'd know how the time flies</td>
<td>Sometimes it lasts in love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only yesterday was the time of our lives</td>
<td>But sometimes it hurts instead, yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were born and raised</td>
<td>You'd know how the time flies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a summery haze</td>
<td>Only yesterday was the time of our lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound by the surprise</td>
<td>We were born and raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of our glory days</td>
<td>In a summery haze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bridge) yet</td>
<td>Bound by the surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of our glory days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chorus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing compares, no worries or cares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regrets and mistakes they're memories made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who would have known how</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bittersweet this would taste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chorus) x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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