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Abstract

According to previous works on the two infinitives such as Fischer, et al. (2006), the to-infinitive and the bare infinitive have been in competition throughout the history of English. The competition between two infinitives seems to be still going on in present-day English. Here is an example: That will make him _leave versus That will make him to leave.

This thesis deals with linguistic and social factors which may have an influence on this phenomenon, namely, variability in the use of ‘to’ in present-day English. The goal of this study is to further document on-going variation between the two infinitives and to explore the linguistic and social variables correlate to this variation. To achieve the goal, real examples on the internet are documented and grammaticality ratings of 196 sentences are collected from a total of 22 native speakers of English, using a questionnaire-type survey. Linguistic variables examined are the type of sentence (i.e. statement, negative, interrogative), and the negation of the infinitives (i.e. make him not leave vs. make him leave). The social variable examined is gender.

My hypothesis was that negation would play a key role in acceptability of the construction with to-infinitive.
The results confirm my hypothesis in that speakers rate the negated sentences with ‘to’ to a similar degree to the negated sentences without ‘to’. In addition to the confirmation, the results show that negation has more influence on speakers’ judgments than the type of sentence.
Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my family.
Acknowledgments

I would like to give special thanks to Brian D. Joseph, who has given me a great deal of remarkable advice as an advisor. This project began from discussion with him regarding morpho-syntactic variation in general. I am very grateful to him for all of the many ways that he has encouraged me and taught me over the years.

I am also appreciative of the support and comments that Robert Levine and Donald Winford have provided as master’s committee. Specifically, thanks to Robert for bringing up syntactic aspects and to Donald for sociolinguistic aspects.

I am also thankful to a number of the faculty and colleagues at Linguistics department at The Ohio State University including Cynthia Clopper and Changelings. Cynthia Clopper advised me regarding statistical analysis. I appreciate Changelings, including Hope Dawson and Kathryn Campbell-Kibler, for their feedback on my pilot study and presentation.

Most of all, I thank God for the wisdom, knowledge, and every specific way that He has led me throughout this study.
Vita

February 2001 .......................................Dae-il Foreign Language High

2006 .........................................................B.A. English Linguistics,
                      Hankuk University of Foreign Studies

2009 ........................................................B.A. Linguistics, The Ohio State University

2011 ........................................................M.A. Linguistics, The Ohio State University

Fields of Study

Major Field: Linguistics
# Table of Contents

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... ii

Dedication ......................................................................................................................................... iv

Acknowledgments ............................................................................................................................ v

Vita .................................................................................................................................................. vi

Table of Contents ........................................................................................................................... vii

List of Tables .................................................................................................................................... ix

List of Figures ..................................................................................................................................... x

1. Introduction ............................................................................................................................... 1

   1.1 Standard English Judgments ................................................................................................. 1

   1.2 Presence of Speakers with Different Usage ......................................................................... 4

   1.3 Goals ....................................................................................................................................... 6

2. Brief History of to infinitive in Association with bare infinitive ................................................... 8

3. Variation between to-infinitive and bare infinitive in Present-day English: More internet results ................................................................................................................................. 14

4. Methodology (Survey) ................................................................................................................ 18
4.1 Method of Data Collection ................................................................. 18
  4.1.1 Subjects .................................................................................. 18
  4.1.2 Design of the Questionnaire ....................................................... 18
4.2 Method of Analyzing Data ............................................................... 22
  4.2.1 Quantitative Method ................................................................ 22
5. Result: Make/ Let/ Have ............................................................... 25
  5.1 Linguistic Variables ................................................................... 25
    5.1.1 Overall Pattern ................................................................... 25
    5.1.2 Interactions between Variables ............................................. 28
    5.1.3 Discrepancy (bare – to)........................................................ 38
  5.2 Social Variables ......................................................................... 46
    5.2.1 Overall Pattern ................................................................... 46
    5.2.2 Interactions between Variables ............................................. 47
    5.2.3 Discrepancy (bare – to)........................................................ 48
6. Discussion ...................................................................................... 49
7. Conclusion ...................................................................................... 51
References .......................................................................................... 54
Appendix A: Survey ............................................................................ 56
List of Tables

Table 1. Tests of Within-Subjects Effects .......................................................... 26
Table 2. Means for the sentences with each infinitive (bare vs. to).......................... 27
Table 3. Inf * Neg .......................................................................................... 29
Table 4. Inf * Sentence Type ............................................................................. 34
Table 5. Tests of Within-Subjects Effects (Discrepancy) ........................................ 39
Table 6. Discrepancy (Negation) ...................................................................... 41
Table 7. Difference of Discrepancy between +Neg & -Neg.................................... 41
Table 8. Discrepancy (Sentence Type) ................................................................. 44
Table 9. Difference of Discrepancy between Sentence Types ............................... 44
Table 10. Tests of Within-Subjects Effects .......................................................... 47
List of Figures

Figure 1. ±Negation: bare vs. to................................................................. 30
Figure 2. bare/ to: Non Negation vs. Negation............................................. 32
Figure 3. Sentence Type: bare vs. to............................................................. 35
Figure 4. bare/ to: Statement vs. Negative vs. Interrogative............................ 37
Figure 5. Negation (Discrepancy)................................................................. 42
Figure 6. Sentence Type (Discrepancy).......................................................... 45
1. Introduction

1.1 Standard English Judgments

Standard present-day English exhibits three different patterns of infinitival usage after verbs which express a causal relationship (between subjects and objects): one in which only a bare infinitive is acceptable, another in which only the infinitive marked with to, hereafter the to-infinitive, is acceptable, and yet another in which there is variability between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive.

The bare infinitive is governed by the causative verbs make, have, and let as in (1):

(1) a. I will make John leave.

a-1. *I will make John to leave.

b. I will have John leave.

b-1. *I will have John to leave.

c. I will let John leave.
c-1. *I will let John to leave.

In contrast, the to-infinitive is construed with all the other verbs which denote causation, such as cause, force, and get. In addition to these verbs indicating causation, the verbs of permission such as allow and permit are followed by the to-infinitive. Examples are given in (2):

(2) a. I will cause John to leave.

   a-1. *I will cause John leave.

b. I will force John to leave.

   b-1. *I will force John leave.

c. I will get John to leave.

   c-1. *I will get John leave.

d. I will allow John to leave.
d-1. *I will allow John leave.

According to the history of the infinitives, to-infinitive has been spreading at the expense of bare infinitive (details later). Thus, make, let, and have represent a pocket of archaic syntax.

There are some cases which show variability between the to-infinitive and the bare infinitive. Specifically, as illustrated in (1), make is followed by the bare infinitive in an active construction. In a passive construction, however, make takes the to-infinitive, as in (3b). Compare (3a) with (3b):

(3) a. Make John leave.

b. John is made to leave.

b-1. *John is made leave.

As shown in examples (3), with make, the variation is linguistically conditioned. To put it explicitly, the variation between the two infinitives correlates with the linguistic context, i.e. active versus passive with make.

---

1 Perception verbs and modals are included in this ‘pocket’.
Some free variation even in Standard English between the to-infinitive and the bare infinitive is observed. With the verb help, both the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive are used without an obvious difference in meaning. In other words, here it appears to be free variation, as in (4):\(^2\)

(4) a. They *help* John *win*.

b. They *help* John *to win*.

*Help* syntax given in (4) suggests that the competition between the to-infinitive and the bare infinitive is continuing.

### 1.2 Presence of Speakers with Different Usage

While the patterns described in section 1.1 are the only ones acceptable in Standard English, there are speakers with different usage. More specifically, currently in present-day English, the to-infinitive is used by some native speakers of English after causative verbs like *make*, *have*, and *let*. Examples of such sentences with the to-infinitive, written by English users who may, on the other grounds, be presumed to be English native speakers, were retrieved from the internet through Google and are provided in (5):

\(^2\) Some linguists claim that there is a difference in meaning (Duffley). But not all speakers see this, however (Brian Joseph and Robert Levine, p.c.).
(5) a. You have to *make* him *to leave* the town.


b. They are under no pressure to *let* him *to leave*.


[accessed 06, March, 2010])

c. *Have* them (i.e. guests) *to leave* their shoes at the door.

(http://celebrationblogs.com/ [06, March, 2010])

Moreover, Duffley (1992, p. 73) mentions that “although rare, there are some examples of *make* followed by the *to*-infinitive” in present-day English\(^3\). Examples are given in (6):

(6) a. So also history is full of anomalies and single events giving colouring to periods and *making* things *to be* what they are.

(Stubbs 1906: 1; in Kruisinga 1931: 240; in Duffley 1992: 74)

\(^3\) “Present-day” in present-day English is not as straight forward as it might seem. That is, is 1906 “present-day”?
b. … what he saw there made him falter and repeat himself and then suddenly to explode into a cry.

(Hughes 1961: 22; in Visser 1973: 2262; in Duffley 1992: 76)

1.3 Goals

As illustrated in section 1.2, variation between the two infinitives seems to be going on in present-day English. Moreover, positions after causative verbs are relevant to this phenomenon.

This study deals with variability in the use of ‘to’ in present-day English. Since the examples with to appear to be nonstandard, I will call this phenomenon “Nonstandard to.”

This study has two goals. One goal is purely descriptive, which is to further document the variation between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive which is currently taking place in present-day English. In particular, variability in the markings of infinitives after causative verbs is the focus of this thesis.

The other goal of this study is more analytic in nature, and is associated with my research questions. With any variability, it is natural to seek a basis for the variation, in particular linguistic factors and/or social factors. Here are the factors I chose to investigate: negation and sentence type as linguistic factors, and gender as a social factor4. My research questions are, first, whether the linguistic context, such as the type

4 With a “convenience sample”, as used in this study, the age range of my subjects happened to be such that it was not really useful to look at age as a possible variable.
of sentence and negation, and the social context, such as the speaker’s gender, make a
difference in the acceptability of the different infinitive variants. Second, if they correlate
each other, what linguistic and social setting, among others, offer a catalyst for the
variation between the two infinitives. To put it differently, the goal of this investigation is
to see what linguistic and social variables correlate with this variation and how they do
so. Admittedly, this is a relatively modest analytic goal but it can be seen as a first step
towards a full understanding of the variation between the to-infinitive and the bare
infinitive.

To achieve these goals, as described in more detail in section 4, two different
methods were employed: internet searches to find natural examples, and survey of
speakers’ acceptability of the two infinitives.
2. Brief History of to infinitive in Association with bare infinitive

In this section, I describe a brief history of the *to*-infinitive in association with the bare infinitive. This brief history is illuminating because the present-day variation continues the process of *to* spreading at the expense of the bare infinitive.

According to the online etymological dictionary and Oxford English Dictionary, the English morpheme/word *to* originates from PIE (Proto-Indo-European) pronominal base *do-*, which means ‘to, toward, upward.’

In Old English, *to* was preposition meaning ‘direction towards.’ It was normally followed by the dative case in Old English as in (7):

(7) **c893 K. AELFRED** Oros. V. xi. §4 Mon lædde Aristobolus *to Rome* ebundenne.  
(www.oed.com)

In Middle and modern English, by taking the place of the OE inflected dative case, *to* came to represent not only a preposition implying motion, but also a marker for the dative inflection. An example is given in (8):

(8) **1887 A. BIRRELL** Obiter Dicta Ser. II. 156 He lost his heart *to Peg Woffington*.  
(www.oed.com)
Another big change in the late Old English and early Middle English period is the advent of the *to* infinitive. This was derived from reduction of a dative form of deverbal nouns which had the endings *-anne, -enne* in Old English and which ultimately coincided with the uninflected verb-stem. In the midst of this process, the *to*-infinitive came to be leveled in form with the bare infinitive, which had the ending *-an* in Old English. In more detail, the form of the ending of the *to*-infinitive was reduced to *–ene, -en, -e* in Middle English and of the bare infinitive to *–en, -e*. This is how the original verbal noun and the original bare infinitive came to have the form of the uninflected verb-stem. Examples from OE, ME, and early ModE can be seen in (9): (Fischer and Van der Wurff, 2006: 174)

(9) a. ne Pe nan neodÞearf ne lærde to wyrcanæne þæt þæt ðu worhtest
   nor you no need not taught to do that that you did
   ‘Nor did any need teach you to do what you did.’ (Bo 33.79.16)

   b. Godde we scullen bihaten, ure sunnen to beten
      God we must promise our sins to atone-for
      ‘We must promise God to atone for our sins.’ (Layamon, Brut(Clg) 9180)

   c. they forbore *to* assist it with their purses
      (Drake, *An Essay Concerning the Necessity of Equal Taxes* 949 (1702))
Moreover, in the process of time, to’s original prepositional sense, which is direction, purpose, etc., became weakened and ultimately to became the link showing syntactic relation of an infinitive to a preceding element such as a verb and an adjective. This brought a potential for ambiguity into the interpretation of the sentence, especially when the verb can be both transitive and intransitive: i.e. a transitive verb and its object (simple (accusative) infinitive) versus an intransitive verb and to + the dative infinitive. This resulted in the use of the infinitive with to in place of the simple infinitive in the late OE and early ME period, and subsequently in Modern English, the to infinitive is more extensively used while the bare infinitive is restricted to certain positions such as after auxiliaries and some verbs of causing. An OE example which shows that the bare infinitive had somewhat wider use is given in (10):

(10) Da sona he nydde his leorningcnihtas on scyp stigan.
    then immediately he forced his disciples on ship climb
    ‘Then straightaway he forced his disciples to go on board.’

(Mk(WSCP) 6.45; in Fischer and Van der Wurff 2006: 174)

Apart from the increase in the use of the to-infinitive at the expense of the bare infinitive, some pervasive changes have taken place in Middle English. First, Fischer et al. (2006) claim that the emergence of the –ing-form may have been another reason for the restricted use of the bare infinitive. More specifically, the original present participle
competed with the bare infinitive after perception verbs and replaced some bare
infinitives. Second, in contrast to the bare infinitive, according to Los (2005), the to-
infinitive becomes more and more frequent because the form had other uses, in particular
as a replacement for that-clauses, as in (11). The examples in (11) are from different
manuscripts of the OE translation of Gregory’s Dialogues. (11a) was translated sometime
between the early 870s and early 890s, which is about a century or a century and a half
earlier than (11b) was translated:

(11) a. Dauid, ðe gewunade, þæt he hæfde witedomes gast in him
    David, who was-wont, that he had of-prophecy spirit in him
    ‘David, who was wont, that he had the spirit of prophecy in him’
    (Gregory Dialogues 4.40.26,C; in Los 2005: 180)

b. Dauid, ðe gewunode, to hæbbenne witedomes gast on him
    David, who was-wont, to have of-prophecy spirit in him
    ‘David, who was wont to have the spirit of prophecy in him’
    (Gregory Dialogues 4.40.26, H; in Los 2005: 180)

Through this competition and these changes, “the overall outcome is that, by the
early Modern English period, the to-infinitive has become vastly more common than it
had been in OE” (Fischer, et al. 2006). In contrast, the bare infinitive becomes more
restricted in its use and is confined to occurrence after modal auxiliaries, verbs of perception, and verbs of causation. See the examples in (12):

(12) a. I will make cease from me the grudgynges of the children of Israel

([HC] Tyndale Numbers 17.5; in Rissanen 1999: 287)

b. he dyd let swere al his people, that …

([HC] Elyot 152 (1531); in Rissanen 1999: 287)

c. They made us work harder.  
(Fischer and Van der Wurff 2006: 174)

d. We saw him come in.  
(Fischer and Van der Wurff 2006: 174)

As for the causative verb make, Mittwoch (1990, p. 125) and Risannen (1999, p. 298) observe that historically the two constructions, i.e. with and without to, varied with the causative verb make for a long time into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, as in (13):

(13) a. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures.

([Psalms 23] King James Bible (1611); Mittwoch 1990: 125)

b. it is neyther French King nor Emperoure that can make me sell my country …

([HC] Throckmorton 65 Cii (1730); in Rissanen 1999: 287)
c. god ledethe them into experience of them selfe, that is to saye: makethe them to knowe themselfe by aduersities.

([HC] Boethius Colville 110 (1556); in Rissanen 1999: 287)

Moreover, as described in the section 1.2, Duffley (1992) mentions that “although rare, there are some examples of make followed by the to-infinitive” in present-day English. PDE examples are given in (6) in section 1.2.

Even though, according to Mittwoch (1990, p. 125), Risannen (1999, p. 287), and Duffley (1992, p. 56), make has vacillated between selecting complements with to and zero, generally, the bare infinitive is only accepted after causative verbs, including make, in present-day Standard English. In other words, from the Standard English point of view, the bare infinitive, not the to-infinitive, is expected to occur after modal auxiliaries, verbs of perception, and verbs of causation.
3. Variation between *to*-infinitive and bare infinitive in Present-day English: More internet results

For Standard English, the positions after the causative verbs, auxiliaries, perception verbs, etc. seem to be fairly well entrenched for the bare infinitive as opposed to the *to*-infinitive. However, it seems that the *to*-infinitive is “invading” more of the territory of the bare infinitive in present-day English. For example, the *to*-infinitive seems to be used as a variant in bare-infinitive-only positions such as after verbs of causing, i.e. *make*, *have*, and *let*. To give some “naturalistic” data with the relevant patterns, examples from the internet (i.e. Google) are given in (14):

(14) a. How can I *make* him *to love* me again?

(http://www.backwithextips.com/how-to-make-him-love-me-again-tips-and-advice

[accessed 29, November, 2010])

b. *Make* him *to take* a short nap everyday.

(http://www.mamapedia.com/article/my-6-year-old-son-is-out-of-control

[accessed 29, November, 2010])

c. Ignoring problems won’t *make* them *to go* away.
d. What does she make him to eat instead?

(e. The policy involved store managers locking their employees inside the store, forcing them to work, refusing to let them to leave, and threatening to fire employees if they tried to escape through the building’s fire exit.

f. … overtime would let them to leave their day job.

g. Then, maybe, reporters would let him to eat in peace.
h. Do not let him *to go* to bed past 9 o’clock.

(http://www.mamapedia.com/article/my-6-year-old-son-is-out-of-control
[accessed 29, November, 2010])

i. It didn’t seem the staff was in any hurry to *have* them *to leave*.

(http://www.yelp.com/biz/flamma-steakhouse-north-miami-beach
[accessed 29, November, 2010])

j. *Have* him *to eat* 6 cloves of garlic mixed in yogurt.

(http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20071109104629AAnVylQ
[accessed 29, November, 2010])

k. *Have* them *to go* through the different rooms in the house.

[accessed 29, November, 2010])

I documented on-going variation between the *to*-infinitive and the bare infinitive with the internet examples given above. However, a serious limitation of data from the internet is that it is realistic but also unreliable because of wide use of English on the internet by nonnative speakers. In other words, even though a researcher goes over all examples on the internet thoroughly, he/she cannot be 100 percent sure if the examples are written by native speakers of English. Furthermore, even if from native speakers, the
internet examples do not describe the linguistic and social conditions this “nonstandard to” occurs in.

For this reason, it is not enough to just let the internet examples “speak for themselves,” and therefore, more work on this variation is needed. As a supplementary method, I conducted a survey in order to provide further documentation of “nonstandard to” under controlled circumstances and to explore the correlation between linguistic and social factors and “nonstandard use of to.” More details of the survey are presented in next section.
4. Methodology (Survey)

4.1 Method of Data Collection

A questionnaire-type survey was conducted in 2010, to investigate how speakers’ grammaticality judgments of sentences with and without to after certain verbs correlate with both linguistic and social variables. Depending on the subjects’ preference, the survey was carried out either at the subjects’ house, at church, or by email.

4.1.1 Subjects

A total of 22 subjects participated in the survey. All of them are native speakers of English who are residents of Ohio. Among 22 subjects, 13 subjects are female and 9 subjects are male. The age range of subjects is between 19 and 57. Except for two subjects (one at the age of 19 and the other at the age of 57), all subjects are either in their twenties or early thirties.

4.1.2 Design of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of 196 sentences which are based on Google examples. It contains the variants selected to test how speakers judge the acceptability of the various sentences. Subjects are asked to circle the number that best indicates the extent to which they feel they could say the sentence. If we have too small rating scales, subjects
“collapse true distinctions arbitrarily” (Schütze, 1996, p. 78). In other words, if a binary grammatical/ungrammatical choice is given to subjects, sentences that subjects rate as “grammatical” may not be exactly equivalent to each other in the degree of speakers’ internal feeling about the sentences. Therefore, a simple binary grammatical/ungrammatical choice is not used. Instead, as it is commonly used in syntax research, a five-point category rating scale is used. This provides a more continuous rating scale compared to a simple grammatical/ungrammatical choice. Number 5 indicates “I could (and/or do) produce the sentence and consider it perfectly acceptable” while number 1 indicates “this sentence cannot be produced/is ungrammatical.” Further, numbers 2 to 4 were included to allow speakers to indicate to what degree the sentence is not completely acceptable, or not entirely ungrammatical. With this method, I intended to indirectly measure acceptability overall via means.

180 sentences out of 196 sentences consist of five sets according to the verbs: three causative verbs (i.e. make, let, have), help and need. The main focus of this study is causative verbs. I also tested help, and added in need to see how it (need) was judged even though it is not a focus. Essentially, testing of grammaticality ratings of help and need is a separate experiment done out of curiosity. Each of these five sets of sentences consists of two sub-sets, one with to-infinitive and the other with bare infinitive. These two sub-sets can be divided into another two sub-sets: one set has negation of the infinitive (i.e. make him not love me) and the other no-negation (i.e. make him love me). Each of these two sub-sets, one with negation and the other without negation of the infinitive, is made up of a statement/affirmative sentence, a negative sentence, and an
interrogative sentence. Negation\(^5\) of the infinitives and sentence type are linguistic variables that I chose to look at\(^6\). This is why the survey contains sentences with and without negation and sentences with three different sentence types, which are statement, negative, and interrogative. Sample sentences from the questionnaire are given below in (15):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label: [Inf., Neg., Sentence Type]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will make him love me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot make him love you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I make him love me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will make him to love me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot make him to love you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I make him to love me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will make him not love me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot make him not love you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do I make him not love me?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) I have been intrigued by needs to go vs. need not go which drew my attention to negation even though the facts with need(s) are very different from the facts with make, let, and have.

\(^6\) Passive as with be made to vs. make Ø is not a good factor to look at with let and have. Therefore, passive is not included in linguistic variables I chose to look at.
I will make him *not to* love me. [+to, +Neg.]

You cannot make him *not to* love you. [+to, +Neg., +Neg.]

How do I make him *not to* love me? [+to, +Neg., +Qn]

Each verb has three sets of this sort given above. 16 sentences, the remainder of the questionnaire, are six completely ‘fine/good’ sentences, six completely ‘bad’ sentences, and four sentences as fillers. The design of the questionnaire can therefore be formulated in the following manner:

For the five sets with five different verbs (i.e. make, let, have, help, need):

5 (3 causative verbs: make, let, have, and 2 other verbs: help, need) x 3 (sentence content) x 2 (negated vs. non-negated) x 2 (bare infinitive vs. to-infinitive) x 3 (sentence type: statement, negative, interrogative) = 180

(36 sentences with each verb)

For the completely ‘fine’ and ‘bad’ sentences and fillers:

6 (completely ‘fine’ sentences) + 6 (completely ‘bad’ sentences) + 4 (fillers) = 16

For the whole questionnaire:

180 + 16 = 196

21
It must be admitted that there may be potential problems with presenting sentences in such a survey with no context\(^7\). That is, sometimes, sentences are hard to judge without a context. However, giving a context for each sentence is difficult as well in that it requires too much time for subjects. For this reason, I chose in the survey, to present the sentences without contexts.

In the actual questionnaire given to the participants, the sentences were arranged in a random order so that the focus of this study would not be directly evident to participants while they take the survey. Meanwhile, I modulated the order as well, to make the sentences with the two variants evenly distributed.

### 4.2 Method of Analyzing Data

This paper focuses on the variability of the *to*-infinitive after causative verbs, *make*, *have*, and *let*. For the purpose of looking at this linguistic context more closely, only the 108 sentences with causative verbs are analyzed in this paper.

#### 4.2.1 Quantitative Method

To analyze the data collected, a quantitative method has primarily been used. More specifically, I did statistical analysis by running an Analysis of Variance

---

\(^7\) The pragmatics of CAUSE-NOT (i.e. causative verbs with negation which follows the causative verbs) may be tricky and so may present problems for speakers asked to judge such sentences. Semantically, causative verbs make speakers expect something to be induced, but negation after the causative verbs brings the antithesis of speakers’ expectations.
(ANOVA). In my formulation of hypotheses, the infinitive (i.e. to vs. bare) is an
dependent variable since I wanted to see how other factors (independent variables)
affected it. However, to run an ANOVA, the infinitive is thrown in with all other factors
as independent variables while means of ratings are categorized as a dependent variable.
That is, three linguistic variables and a social variable are considered to see the patterns
of the variation involving the two infinitives and the correlation between the patterns (i.e.
the ratings) and the variables. The linguistic variables considered therefore in the running
of an ANOVA are the infinitives (i.e. the presence and absence of to), negation of the
infinitives, and sentence type (i.e. statement/affirmative versus negative versus
interrogative). The social variable considered is gender. The age range of my subjects
was such that it was not really useful to look at age as a possible variable.

Specifically, I did an analysis by subjects, in which the values I submit to the
ANOVA are means over items (i.e. 12 different sentence patterns) for each subject. I ran
a repeated measures ANOVA with within variables as repeated measures and a between
variable as a between factor. Linguistic variables are distinguished into within-subjects
variables while a social variable is distinguished into as a between-subject variable.

Statistical analysis with these variables was utilized to show the patterns of the
variation between to-infinitive and bare infinitive. More specifically, the result would
demonstrate whether the type of sentence and negation make a difference in the
variability of the two infinitives as well as whether gender correlates with the variability
in the marking of the infinitives. Furthermore, the results would indicate how the
variability of the infinitives correlates with linguistic and social variables considered in this study.
5. Result: Make/ Let/ Have

In this section, the output of Repeated Measures ANOVA and its interpretation is presented. Patterns of linguistic variables and patterns of social variables are described in section 5.1 and 5.2, respectively. In each section with linguistic and social variables, overall patterns are reported first, interactions between variables second, and the patterns regarding discrepancies between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive the last. Here, a “discrepancy” means the difference between the ratings of the bare infinitive constructions and of its paired to-infinitive constructions. For instance, a “discrepancy” is calculated by subtracting the rating of the sentence with the feature [+to, -negation, +interrogative] from the rating of the sentence with the feature [-to, -negation, +interrogative]. This would show more clearly how variation between the two infinitives correlates with linguistic and social context.

5.1 Linguistic Variables

5.1.1 Overall Pattern

To show the overall patterns of the variation between the two infinitives regarding the linguistic variables, Table 1, “tests of within-subjects effects,” is given:
Table 1 displays if each linguistic variable correlates with the ratings of all 108 sentences with causative verbs (*make, have, and let*) and how significantly they correlate. The p-values for all linguistic variables, i.e. infinitive, negation, and sentence type, are below 0.05. This means there is a significant difference in ratings according to each linguistic variable.

Specifically, first, the F value and p-value for infinitive are 231.259 and 0.001<sup>8</sup>, respectively. To interpret it, this demonstrates that a difference of the ratings of the sentences with the bare infinitive and the *to*-infinitive is significant. In other words, whether the sentence is with or without *to* has a big influence on the rating of the sentence. Table 2 displays mean-values of ratings of sentences with each infinitive. The mean value for the constructions with the bare infinitive is 3.679 while the mean for the one with *to*-infinitive is 1.391. The mean difference of these two mean-values is 2.288.

<sup>8</sup> Given that a p-value cannot be zero in any case according to statistical theory, it is given as 0.001 instead of 0.000.
Since the p-value for the infinitive is below 0.05, the mean difference is significant. As, in general, only the bare infinitive is accepted in present-day Standard English, the result of the survey indicates that speakers accept the bare infinitive as a better choice than the to-infinitive after causative verbs.

However, it is remarkable that the mean for the bare infinitive is 3.679, not 5, nor close to 5. In contrast, among “control” sentences in the survey, the mean for completely fine sentences is 4.955. This highlights the fact that this phenomenon, i.e. variation between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive, is indeed a real one.

Furthermore, it is surprising that there are individuals who chose 5, indicating the sentence is perfectly grammatical, for the sentences with to. Therefore, the result reveals that the use of to-infinitive after causative verbs becomes acceptable (to some speakers) even though bare infinitive is still considered overall, across the sample taken in aggregate, as a better choice. Or at least, the result confirms that the variation between the two infinitives exists in the American speech community at large.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (bare)</td>
<td>3.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (to)</td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Means for the sentences with each infinitive (bare vs. to)

Second, the F value and p-value for negation is 95.084 and 0.001, respectively. This indicates that the presence and the absence of the negation of the infinitives make a difference in ratings. The mean for the constructions with negation of the infinitives is 2.099 while the one for the constructions without negation of the infinitives is 2.971. The
mean difference of the two values is 0.872. The fact that the p-value is below 0.05 shows that this mean difference is significant.

Third, the F value and p-value for sentence type is 3.867 and 0.029, respectively. This expresses that ratings are significantly related to the sentence type, i.e. statements, negative sentences, and interrogative sentences. The mean of the ratings of statements is 2.580 while the mean of negative sentences is 2.464, and the mean of the interrogative sentences is 2.562. The mean difference between the ratings of statements and negatives is 0.117, that between negatives and interrogatives is 0.099, and that between statements and interrogatives is 0.018. The p-value below 0.05 shows that the mean differences are significant.

To clarify it, the research question of this thesis is not how the infinitives, negation, and sentence type make difference in speakers’ judgment on the sentences. Instead, the focus of this thesis is how the linguistic variables such as negation and sentence type correlate with the variation between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive. For this reason, rather than discussing the correlation between the ratings and variables more, I will move on to the next section which covers interactions between variables, that is, interactions between infinitives and negation, and between infinitives and sentence type.

5.1.2 Interactions between Variables

Table 1 displays the p-values for interactions between the infinitive and negation, and between the infinitive and sentence type. Both values are 0.001, which is below 0.05
indicating significant interactions between variables. A significant interaction means that the factors involved in the interaction are not independent. More details are presented in the followings with mean-values and mean plots.

5.1.2.1 Infinitive x Negation

The F value and p-value for the interaction between infinitive and negation is 96.719 and 0.001, respectively. This signifies that there is a significant interaction between infinitive and negation, which further points out that the factors, infinitive and negation, are not independent regarding the speakers’ judgments on the constructions. To interpret the interaction, looking at the means for each of the following 4 cells in Table 3 would be necessary: bare and non-negation, bare and negation, to and non-negation, and to and negation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (bare)</td>
<td>1 (-Neg.)</td>
<td>4.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (+Neg.)</td>
<td>2.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (to)</td>
<td>1 (-Neg.)</td>
<td>1.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (+Neg.)</td>
<td>1.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Inf * Neg

Mean plots are provided in Figure 1 and 2 in order to show the comparison of the means in the 4 cells in Table 3 better. On the mean plots, ‘infinitive 1’ indicates the bare infinitive while ‘infinitive 2’ indicates the to-infinitive. In addition, ‘negation 1’ indicates non-negation of the infinitive while ‘negation 2’ indicates negation of the infinitive:
Figure 1 exhibits a difference in the acceptability of the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive in the constructions with and without negation of the infinitives. Line #1, the solid line, shows the difference between speakers’ judgments on the sentences without negation of the bare infinitive and speakers’ judgments on the sentences without negation of the to-infinitive (i.e. bare and non-negation vs. to and non-negation). The mean-value of ratings of non-negated sentences with the bare infinitive is 4.467 while the mean-value of ratings of non-negated sentences with the to-infinitive is 1.475. The mean difference is
2.992. Line #2, the dotted line, shows the difference between speakers’ judgments on the two infinitives in the sentences with negation (i.e. bare and negation vs. *to* and negation). The mean-value of the ratings of the bare infinitive in the constructions with negation of the infinitives is 2.892 while the one of the *to*-infinitive in the constructions with negation of the infinitives is 1.307. The mean difference is 1.585. This mean-values show that in both constructions with and without negation of the infinitive, the bare infinitive is rated higher than the *to*-infinitive. Comparing the mean differences (2.992 vs. 1.585), the acceptability of the bare infinitive is higher than the *to*-infinitive in the sentences without negation than in sentences with negation of the infinitives.
Figure 2. bare/to: Non Negation vs. Negation

Figure 2 exhibits a difference in the acceptability of the negated and non-negated sentences in the constructions with the two infinitives. Line #1, the solid line, shows the difference between the ratings of negation and of non-negation in the sentences with the bare infinitive (i.e. bare and negation vs. bare and non-negation). The sentences with the bare infinitive without negation of the infinitive are rated as 4.467 on average while the sentences with the bare infinitive with negation are rated as 2.892 on average. The mean difference is 1.575. Line #2, the dotted line, shows the difference between the ratings of
negation and of non-negation in the sentences with the *to*-infinitive (i.e. *to* and negation vs. *to* and non-negation). The sentences with the *to*-infinitive without negation of the infinitive are rated as 1.475 on average while the sentences with the *to*-infinitive with negation of the infinitive are rated as 1.307. The mean difference is 0.168. This mean-values show that regardless of the presence and absence of *to*, sentences with non-negation of the infinitives are rated higher than the one with negation. Comparing the mean differences (1.575 vs. 0.168), speakers accept sentences without negation of the infinitive as better ones than sentences with negation of the infinitive in the bare infinitive constructions than in the *to*-infinitive constructions.

The comparison of these four means explains that the effect of negation is larger for the bare infinitive than for the *to*-infinitive. However, negation of the infinitives lowers the grammaticality ratings of both constructions with and without *to*. In addition, when the sentence has negation of the infinitives, the difference between the ratings of the sentences with the bare infinitive and the ratings of the sentences with the *to*-infinitive is smaller.\(^9\) This shows that negation of the infinitives plays a role in variation between the two infinitives.

### 5.1.2.2 Infinitive x Sentence Type

The F value and p-values for the interaction between infinitive and sentence type are 12.394 and 0.001, respectively. This denotes that a significant interaction between

---

\(^9\) The difference of speakers’ judgments on the two infinitives will be illustrated better with ‘discrepancy’ in section 5.1.3.
infinitive and sentence type, exists. Namely, the infinitives and sentence types are not independent regarding the speakers’ judgments on the constructions. To interpret the interaction, the means for each of the following 6 cells are provided in Table 4: bare and statement, bare and negative, bare and interrogative, to and statement, to and negative, and to and interrogative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>SenType</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (bare)</td>
<td>1 (statement)</td>
<td>3.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (negative)</td>
<td>3.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (interrogative)</td>
<td>3.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (to)</td>
<td>1 (statement)</td>
<td>1.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (negative)</td>
<td>1.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (interrogative)</td>
<td>1.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Inf * Sentence Type

Mean plots are given in Figure 3 and 4 for the comparison of the means in the 6 cells in Table 4. On the mean plots, ‘sentence type 1’ represents statements, ‘sentence type 2’ represents negative sentences, and ‘sentence type 3’ represents interrogative sentences:
Figure 3 presents a difference in the acceptability of the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive in statements, negative sentences, and interrogative sentences. Line #1, the solid line, shows the difference between speakers’ judgments on statements with the bare infinitive and speakers’ judgments on statements with the to-infinitive (i.e. statements with bare vs. statements with to). The mean-value of the ratings of statements with the bare infinitive is 3.780 while the mean-value of the ratings of statements with the to-infinitive is 1.381. The mean difference is 2.399. Line #2, the dotted line, shows the
difference of speakers’ judgments on the two infinitives in negative sentences (i.e. negative sentences with bare infinitive vs. negative sentences with to infinitive). The mean-value of the ratings of the bare infinitive in negative sentences is 3.484 while the one of the to-infinitive in negative sentences is 1.443. The mean difference is 2.041. Line #3 shows the difference of speakers’ judgments on interrogative sentences with the bare infinitive and with the to-infinitive. The mean-value of the ratings of interrogative sentences with the bare infinitive is 3.774 while the mean-value of the ratings interrogative sentences with the to-infinitive is 1.350. These mean-values show that in all three different sentence types, the bare infinitive is rated higher than the to-infinitive. Comparing the mean differences (2.399 vs. 2.041 vs. 2.424), the acceptability of the bare infinitive is higher than the to-infinitive in statements and interrogative sentences than in negative sentences.
Figure 4 presents differences in the acceptability of three different types of the sentence with the two infinitives. Line #1, the solid line, shows the difference between the ratings of statements, of negative sentences, and of interrogative sentences with the bare infinitive (i.e. statement with bare vs. negative sentences with bare vs. interrogative sentences with bare). On average, the statements with the bare infinitive are rated as 3.780, the negative sentences with the bare infinitive are rated as 3.484, while the interrogative sentences with the bare infinitive are rated as 3.774. When the sentence has the bare infinitive, the negative sentence is rated the lowest. The mean difference
between the ratings of statements and negative sentences is 0.296, that of negative sentences and interrogative sentences is 0.29, while that of statements and interrogative sentences is 0.006. The mean difference is bigger when a negative sentence is involved.

Line #2, the dotted line, shows the difference between the ratings of statements, of negative sentences, and of interrogative sentences with the to-infinitive (i.e. statement with to vs. negative sentences with to vs. interrogative sentences with to). On average, the statements with the to-infinitive are rated as 1.381, the negative sentences with the to-infinitive are rated as 1.443, while the interrogative sentences with the to-infinitive are rated as 1.350. The mean difference is -0.062 for statement versus negative, -0.093 for negative versus interrogative, and 0.031 for statement versus interrogative. Even though it is a slight difference in terms of the mean-value, negative sentences are rated the highest when the sentences have the to-infinitive. In contrast, negative sentences are rated the lowest when the sentences have the bare infinitive.

Comparing the mean differences, speakers seem to accept statements and interrogative sentences as better than negative sentences in case of the construction with the bare infinitive. In contrast, speakers seem to like negative sentences better than statements and interrogative sentences in case of the construction with the to-infinitive.

The comparison of these six means demonstrates that negation plays a part in speakers’ acceptability of sentences with the two infinitives.

5.1.3 Discrepancy (bare – to)
To see more clearly how variation between the two infinitives associates with linguistic variables, I introduce a measure I will call “discrepancy”, which refers simply to the difference between the mean for the to-infinitive and the mean for the bare infinitive. To put it differently, a “discrepancy” is calculated by subtracting the rating of the sentence with the to-infinitive from the rating of the sentence with the bare infinitive. In other words, it is ‘bare minus to.’ The “discrepancies” between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive is considered and is analyzed.

5.1.3.1 Overall

The mean of the discrepancies between all 54 sentences with the bare infinitive and is the other 54 sentences with the to-infinitive is 2.288. It is interesting that the overall discrepancy is not close to 4 (i.e. 5-1= 4). This gives a clue that the variation between the two infinitives may exist in present-day American English.

To show the overall patterns of the discrepancy between the two infinitives regarding the linguistic variables, Table 5, “tests of within-subjects effects,” is given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>96.719</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SenType</td>
<td>12.394</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg * SenType</td>
<td>3.903</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg * SenType * Gender</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Tests of Within-Subjects Effects (Discrepancy)
Table 5 displays if each linguistic variable associates with the discrepancies between the ratings of 54 sentences with the bare infinitive and of the other 54 sentences with the to-infinitive and how significantly they associate.

The p-values for all linguistic variables, i.e. negation, and sentence type, are below 0.05. This means there is a significant difference in discrepancies according to each linguistic variable. That is, each linguistic variable (i.e. Negation: -negation vs. +negation, Sentence type: statement vs. negative vs. interrogative) is an important factor in the difference between the speakers’ judgments on the sentences with the bare infinitive and with the to-infinitive.

5.1.3.2 Negation

The F value and p-value for negation is 96.719 and 0.001, respectively. This indicates that the presence and the absence of the negation of the infinitives make a difference in discrepancies. In other words, whether the sentence has the negation of the infinitives or not has a big influence on the differences in the speakers’ judgments on the sentences with each infinitive. Table 6 displays mean-values of the discrepancies of the sentences with and without the negation of the infinitives. The discrepancy of the constructions with negation of the infinitives is 1.585 while the one of the constructions without negation of the infinitives is 2.992. As in Table 7, the mean difference of the two values is 1.407. The fact that the p-value is below 0.05 states that this mean difference is significant. In other words, a significant difference exists in speakers’ judgments on the
sentences with and without *to* and the difference is closely relevant to the presence and absence of the negation of the sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neg</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (-Neg.)</td>
<td>2.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (+Neg.)</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Discrepancy (Negation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Neg</th>
<th>(J) Neg</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig. a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (-Neg.)</td>
<td>2 (+Neg.)</td>
<td>1.407*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (+Neg.)</td>
<td>1 (-Neg.)</td>
<td>-1.407*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Difference of Discrepancy between +Neg & -Neg

Mean plot is provided in Figure 5 to show the pattern better. On the mean plot, non-negation of the infinitive is labeled ‘negation 1’ while negation is labeled ‘negation 2’.
Figure 5 exhibits a pattern of the discrepancies of the acceptability of the negated and non-negated sentences with the two infinitives. The left end of the line indicates the discrepancy between the ratings of sentences with the bare infinitive and without negation and of sentences with the to-infinitive and without negation (i.e. ratings of sentences with the feature [-to and -negation] minus ratings of the sentences with the feature [+to and –negation]), that is 2.992. The right end of the line indicates the discrepancy between the ratings of sentences with the bare infinitive and with negation.
and of sentences with the to-infinitive and with negation (i.e. ratings of [- to and +negation] constructions minus ratings of [+to and +negation] constructions), that is 1.585. As can be seen in Figure 5, the rating of the sentences with negation has a lower discrepancy compared to the rating of the sentences without negation (2.992 versus 1.585). Moreover, the mean difference between these two values representing discrepancies is 1.407 and the p-value is below 0.05. First, this demonstrates that negation of the infinitive makes a significant difference in speakers’ judgments on the sentences with the two infinitives. Second, speakers accept sentences with and without to to a more similar extent when the sentences have negation of the infinitives than no-negation of the infinitives. Therefore, it seems that negation of the infinitives plays a role in variation between the two infinitives.

5.1.3.3 Sentence Type

The F value and p-value for sentence type is 12.394 and 0.001, respectively. This expresses that discrepancies between the ratings of the two infinitives are significantly related to the sentence type, i.e. statements, negative sentences, and interrogative sentences. Table 8 displays mean-values of the discrepancies of each sentence pattern with and without the negation of the infinitives. The discrepancy between statements with the bare infinitive and statements with the to-infinitive is 2.399 (i.e. ratings of statements with bare minus ratings of statements with to). The discrepancy between negative sentences with the bare infinitive and ones with the to-infinitive is 2.042. The
discrepancy between interrogative sentences with the bare infinitive and ones with the to-infinitive is 2.424:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SenType</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Statement)</td>
<td>2.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Negative)</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Interrogative)</td>
<td>2.424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Discrepancy (Sentence Type)

As in Table 9, the difference between discrepancies of the statements and negatives is 0.358, the one between discrepancies of the negatives and interrogatives is 0.382, and the one between discrepancies of the statements and interrogatives is 0.025.

As presented in Table 5, the p-value for sentence type is 0.001, which is below 0.05. This implies that there is a difference in discrepancies in relation to the sentence type. The information given in Table 9 specifies which sentence type among all three (i.e. statements, negatives, and interrogatives) has an effect or a larger effect on discrepancies:
The p-values are below 0.05 when negative sentences are involved while they are much bigger than 0.05 when negative sentences are not involved. This demonstrates that the negative as a sentence type is the key factor of making a significant difference in speakers’ judgments on the sentences with and without to.

To visualize the pattern, a mean plot is provided in Figure 6. On the mean plot, a statement is labeled ‘sentence type 1,’ a negative sentence is labeled ‘sentence type 2,’ and an interrogative sentence is labeled ‘sentence type 2’:

![Graph showing mean discrepancy by sentence type.](image)

Figure 6. Sentence Type (Discrepancy)
Figure 6 exhibits a difference between the discrepancies of the acceptability of each sentence type with the two infinitives. The left end of the line indicates the discrepancy between the ratings of statements with the bare infinitive and of statements with the to-infinitive, which is 2.399. The mid-point of the line indicates the discrepancy between the ratings of negative sentences with the bare infinitive and of negative sentences with the to-infinitive, which is 2.042. The right end of the line indicates the discrepancy between the ratings of interrogative sentences with the bare infinitive and of interrogative sentences with the to-infinitive, which is 2.424. As can be seen in Figure 6, the rating of the negative sentences has a lower discrepancy compared to the rating of the statements and interrogative sentences. This suggests that speakers accept sentences with and without to to a more similar degree when the sentences are negatives than when the sentences are statements and/or interrogatives. In addition, the p-value is below 0.05 whenever the negative construction is involved. This demonstrates that negative sentences make a big difference in speakers’ judgments on the sentences with the two infinitives. Therefore, it seems that the negative as a sentence type plays a role in variation between the two infinitives.

5.2 Social Variables

5.2.1 Overall Pattern

To show the overall patterns of the variation between the two infinitives regarding a social variable, Table 10, “tests of between-subjects effects,” is given:
As in Table 10, the F value and p-value for gender are 0.167 and 0.687, respectively. The p-value is below 0.05, which implies that the social variable gender is not a significant factor of this variation. As a brief description of the difference in terms of the mean-values, the mean of ratings of all 108 sentences given by male subjects is 2.498 while 2.573 is the mean of ratings given by female subjects. The mean difference is 0.075.

**5.2.2 Interactions between Variables**

As in Table 1 (in section 5.1.1), the F value and p-value for the interaction between infinitive and gender are 0.146 and 0.707, respectively. This denotes that there is no significant interaction between infinitive and gender. That is, there is no significant difference between speaker’s judgments on the sentences with and without *to* with regard to speaker’s gender. On average, male subjects rated the sentences with the bare infinitive as 3.671 while female subjects rated such sentences as 3.688. Overall, male subjects rated the sentences with the *to*-infinitive as 1.325 while female subject gave such sentences 1.457 as a rating. In both cases, female subjects gave a higher rating than male subjects. However, since the p-value is much higher than 0.05, we cannot consider this difference as significant.
5.2.3 Discrepancy (bare – to)

The overall difference in male speakers’ judgments on the sentences with the two infinitives is 2.346 in terms of ratings. The difference in judgments on the sentences made by female speakers is 2.231 in terms of ratings. The difference is 0.115 and female speakers rated the sentences with and without to less differently than male speakers. This may indicate that female speakers are more flexible/ open to ‘nonstandard use of to.’ However, as mentioned above, the fact that the p-value is above 0.05 states that the speakers’ judgments on this variation are not significantly related to the speakers’ gender. Therefore, a social variable, gender, is not an important factor of variation between bare and to.
6. Discussion

In this thesis, I have provided further documentation of the “nonstandard use of to” and I have determined which factors promote its use. Specifically, through this research, I intended to see if linguistic variables, such as sentence type and negation, and a social variable, such as gender, correlate with patterns of variation between to-infinitive and the bare infinitive. Additionally, it was aimed at observing how those variables correlate with the variation between the two infinitives.

According to the internet examples documented in this thesis and the survey conducted for this research, it seems that the variation between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive exists in present-day American English. In particular, positions after causative verbs such as make, let, and have are such places where this variation occurs.

In addition, all linguistic variables, i.e. negation and sentence type, seem to associate with the phenomenon ‘nonstandard use of to.’ Specifically, negation of the infinitives seems to play the most significant role in the variation between the two infinitives. Sentence type seems to matter as well. However, the sentence type ‘negative’ among others, such as statements and interrogatives, seems to correlate the most with the speakers’ judgments on the sentences with the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive.

In contrast, as a social variable, gender is not relevant to this phenomenon. This is contradictory to a well-known sociolinguistic theory regarding language and gender.
Specifically, Trudgill’s work (1998) on sex differentiation of linguistic variable proposes that female speakers use to a higher degree prestigious, standard language than male speakers. However, the results of the survey (in this study) were neutral as to gender, so at the very least, it is not as Trudgill might lead one to expect.

I also collected other demographic information of subjects than age and gender. Without running statistics but rather working from an informal impression, it seems that other social factor such as education level played no role.

Note that gender did not have an effect and neither did other social factors seem to. In Language Log (2004), Arnold Zwicky presents an informal observation about syntactic variation as not tied to social factors. The result of the survey fits in with his suggestion. It may well be then that to/bare variation is just this sort of “Zwicky-like” syntactic variation.

In sum, it seems that the variation between the bare infinitive and the to-infinitive after causative verbs is taking place in present-day American English. This phenomenon correlates with the linguistic context rather than the social context.
7. Conclusion

There are domains where more work is needed regarding “nonstandard use of to.” The problem of not providing context for each sentence was mentioned earlier. This is a real issue, even if a “necessary evil” in doing syntactic surveys, and thus a follow-up study to this one could focus more directly on negation and give a context.

Moreover, there are ways of collecting more data such as more internet search, different survey items, searching established corpora, and so on. Specifically, one can broaden the parameters of the internet search to collect more internet examples, each of which would need to be examined carefully and not taken at face value. For example, constructions with objects other than ‘him’ and constructions with subordinate verbs other than ‘leave’, ‘love’, and ‘eat’ can be examined (i.e. make them/her/John (to) teach/speak/cry as well as make him (to) leave/love/eat).

There are also other ways of analyzing data, such as looking at other variables. Each causative verb as a linguistic variable and age, geography, and level of education as social variables are some variables which one can investigate.

Additionally, finding answers to the following questions would lead to further research on this phenomenon, even if it may not be easy.
First, early cases of “nonstandard to” with make, as in the King James example in (13) in section 2, are observed. Then, is there any sort of historical connection between the early cases of “nonstandard to” with make and the ones I documented in this thesis?

Second, one variable that was easy to control for was geography, in that all of my speakers were from around Ohio. This raises a question of what the broader extent of the phenomenon is. Namely, is “nonstandard use of to” taking place in other American English communities than Ohio? If so, is it occurring under the same linguistic conditions?

Third, age was not considered as a social variable in this study due to the fact that the age range of my subjects was not well-enough dispersed to look at it as a possible variable. That is, all subjects except for the 57-year old were in the age groups of twenties and early thirties. In addition, there was a lack of subjects in an age pattern of the late fifties. However, age seems to have the potential to be relevant to “nonstandard use of to,” or at least, more so than gender does. Therefore, it would be interesting to investigate if age does matter.

Finally, and this relates to the issue of whether age matters or not, the question of “Zwicky-like” syntactic variation is worth pursuing further with regard to the to versus bare infinitive variation. Of particular interest is that he found no obvious social correlates to the variation he discussed. Zwicky is not alone in this observation; Milroy and Gordon 2003:170, for instance, say that syntactic variables are “less available than phonological variables as resources for social evaluation and so less likely to be socially indexed”. If this view is right about syntactic variation not being subject to social
evaluation in the same way as phonological variation, then this would represent an important difference between these two types of variation. Since the variation reported on here seems to follow this pattern, pending further investigation of such factors as age, geography, and so on, “nonstandard to” in present-day American English may therefore help to differentiate among types of variation.
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Appendix A: Survey
Personal Information:
Name: Age: Gender:
Race/ethnicity: (e.g. Caucasian/ African American/ Other)
Level of Education:
Where have you lived and how long? (Include where you were born, where you grew up, etc.) :

Instructions:
This experiment examines English speakers’ judgments about the acceptability of a set of sentences. This experiment does not test “good English” but is about what you would say or would not say. There is no right or wrong answer.

For the following list of sentences, please circle/choose the number that best indicates whether you feel you could say the sentence. Circle/choose 5 to indicate you could (and/or do) produce the sentence and consider it perfectly acceptable, such as the example sentence below: “I love you.” Circle 1 to indicate that you could never produce the sentence or if you feel the sentence is ungrammatical, such as the example sentence below: “Love I you.” Use 2-4 to indicate to what degree the sentence is not completely acceptable, but not entirely ungrammatical.

Once again, there is no right or wrong answer here; simply your opinion.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Love I you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57
Sentences:

1 2 3 4 5

That will make him leave Ohio. ( )
There is no way to make him to leave. ( )

How do I make him leave me alone?
That will make him not to leave Ohio.
There is no way to make him not to leave.
How do I make him not leave me?
I will make him to love me.

The student needs not to enroll in that class.

You cannot make him love you.
How do I make him to love me?
Do they love each other?
I will make him not love me.

You cannot make him not to love you.
How do I make him not love me?
That will make him to eat less.
I cannot make him to eat real food.
How do I make him to eat?
That will make him not eat much.
He makes happy me.
I cannot make him not eat junk food.
How do I make him not to eat too much?

* 

1 2 3 4 5

His father let him leave for Russia. ( )

They won't let him to leave. ( )

Should I let him leave her?

We need not go there.

His father let him not to leave for Russia.

They won't let him not to leave.

Should I let him not to leave her?

Let him not love someone else.

I won't let him to love me anymore.

How do you let him not love you?

I won't let him not love me anymore.

John not is coming.

Let him to love someone else.

How do you let him to love you?

I would just let him eat.

They didn't let him eat properly.

Why won't she let him to eat?

I would just let him not to eat.

They didn't let him not eat vegetables.
Why won't she let him not to eat?

*

I will have him to leave the house.

1 2 3 4 5

I can't have him to leave her. ( )

Could you have him to leave? ( )

I will have him not leave the house.

I can't have him not leave her.

Could you have him not leave?

You should have him to eat vegetables.

We couldn’t have him not eat junk food.

How can I have him to eat healthy?

We couldn’t have him to eat vegetables.

You should have him not eat junk food.

How can I have him not eat junk food?

This soup has not bad.

I'd rather have them laugh than cry.

It’s not good to have them not to laugh while they learn.

Did you ever have them laugh while they learn?

I’m going to have them not to laugh at me.

I'm not going to have them laugh at me.

We need not to go there.
Did you ever have them not to laugh while they study?

*

His friends help him leave the country.

The department did not help him leave Iran.

1 2 3 4 5

Can you help him not to leave the house? ( )

His friends help him not to leave the country. ( )

The department did not help him not to leave Iran.

Can you help him leave the house?

I helped him to love himself.

How do I help him not love me?

You cannot help him not love you.

Do she love him?

I could help him not love himself.

How do I help him to love me?

You cannot help him to love you.

You should help him eat and drink.

There is no way to help him not to eat more.

How can I help him eat healthier?

You should help him not to eat at night.

There is no way to help him eat more.

How can I help him not to eat unhealthy?
I need him to leave me alone.

We don’t need him to leave.

Why does she need him not leave money?

I need him not leave me alone.

Why does she need him to leave money? ( )

I don't need you not agree with me right now. ( )

I need him love our kids.

Do you need him love the album?

I need him not to love our kids.

Sarah doesn’t need him love her.

I don't need you to not approve of my actions right now.

It was nice to see you.

Do you need him not to love the album?

I need him to eat right now.

I don’t need him to eat my food.

Do we need him not eat fast?

I don't need you not agree with me too.

I need him not eat right now.

Do we need him to eat fast?

**
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That will make him to leave Ohio.

There is no way to make him leave.

How do I make him to leave me alone?

That will make him not leave Ohio.

How do I make him not to leave me?

There is no way to make him not leave.

1  2  3  4  5

He makes me happy.   (   )

I will make him love me.   (   )

You cannot make him to love you.

How do I make him love me?

I will make him not to love me.

You cannot make him not love you.

How do I make him not to love me?

That will make him not to eat much.

I cannot make him eat real food.

How do I make him not eat too much?

I cannot make him not to eat junk food.

That will make him eat less.

Did I saw you in class yesterday?

How do I make him eat?

*
His father let him to leave for Russia.

They won't let him leave.

Should I let him to leave her?

His father let him not leave for Russia.

They won't let him not leave.

John is not coming tonight.

Should I let him not leave her?

1  2  3  4  5

Let him not to love someone else. ( )

I won't let him not to love me anymore. ( )

How do you let him love you?

Let him love someone else.

How do you let him not to love you?

I won't let him love me anymore.

I would just let him to eat.

They didn't let him to eat properly.

Why won't she let him not eat?

I would just let him not eat.

They didn't let him not to eat vegetables.

Why won't she let him eat?

*

I will have him leave the house.
I can't have him not to leave her.

Could you have him not to leave?

I will have him not to leave the house.

I can't have him leave her.

Could you have him leave?

You should have him eat vegetables.

You should have him not to eat junk food.

The student needs not enroll in that class.

1 2 3 4 5

We couldn’t have him eat vegetables. ( )

How can I have him eat healthy? ( )

We couldn’t have him not to eat junk food.

How can I have him not to eat junk food?

I will have them to laugh.

I'm going to have them not laugh at me.

Did I see you in class yesterday?

It’s not good to have them not laugh while they learn.

I'm not going to have them to laugh at me.

Did you ever have them to laugh while they learn?

Did you ever have them not laugh while they study?

*

His friends help him not leave the country.
The department did not help him to leave Iran.

Can you help him not leave the house?

The department did not help him not leave Iran.

His friends help him to leave the country.

Can you help him to leave the house?

How do I help him not to love me?

You cannot help him love you.

How do I help him love me?

I could help him not to love himself.

1 2 3 4 5

You cannot help him not to love you. ( )

I could help him love himself. ( )

You should help him not eat at night.

There is no way to help him not eat more.

It will nice to see you.

There is no way to help him to eat more.

How can I help him to eat healthier?

You should help him to eat and drink.

How can I help him not eat unhealthy?

* 

Why does she need him not to leave money?

I need him leave me alone.
I don't need you to not agree with me right now.

Why does she need him leave money?

We don’t need him leave.

I need him not to leave me alone.

Do you need him to love the album?

I need him to love our kids.

I don't need you not approve of my actions right now.

I need him not love our kids.

This soup is not bad at all.

Sarah doesn’t need him to love her.

Do you need him not love the album?  (  )

I don’t need him eat my food.  (  )

I need him not to eat right now.

Do we need him eat fast?

I don’t need you to not agree with me too.

I need him eat right now.

Do we need him not to eat fast?