Dialectologia 16 *(2016), 1-18.*
ISSN: 2013-2247

Received 27 August 2014.
Accepted 29 December 2014.

LANGUAGE CHANGE IN A POST-CREOLE CONTACT SETTING: NON-STANDARD *AIN'T* NEGATION IN SUFFOLK

Michelle BRAÑA-STRAW
University of Gloucestershire*
mstraw@glos.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper describes preliminary research on the role *ain't* for two groups of British speakers living in Suffolk: Anglos and Barbadians. The issues addressed are of relevance to sociolinguists and creolists. In most Anglophone countries, including Britain, the functions of *ain't* are remarkably similar - occurring with present tense verbs *be* and *have* only. An Anglophone pattern, based on previously reported tendencies and hierarchies is proposed and is used as the basis for comparison. Bajan[1] is one of the less often studied creoles and absent from work discussing their typological status in relation to L1s. Preliminary results provide some evidence of creole forms among first generation Bajans. Ethnically-aligned contrasts are also found for each generation as Bajans adopt the Anglophone pattern. The paper concludes that any interpretation of social and linguistic factors needs to be supplemented by further interactional analysis to account for the considerable inter-individual variation.

Keywords

syntactic variation, non-standard negation, British English, Barbadian English, Creoles

* Dept of Humanities. Swindon Road. Cheltenham. Gloucestershire, UK.

[1] Henceforth, I refer to the speakers of Barbadian heritage and the non-standard forms spoken in Barbados as 'Bajan'. This is a term used by Barbadians, in Barbados and in Britain, to refer to themselves and their language.

©Universitat de Barcelona

CAMBIO LINGÜÍSTICO EN UN ENTORNO DE CONTACTO POSTCRIOLLO:

LA NEGACIÓN NO ESTÁNDAR *AIN'T* EN SUFFOLK

Resumen

Este trabajo describe la investigación preliminar sobre el papel de *ain't* en dos grupos de hablantes británicos que viven en Suffolk: anglos y barbadenses. Los temas tratados son de interés para los sociolingüistas y criollistas. En la mayoría de los países de habla inglesa, incluyendo Gran Bretaña, las funciones de *ain't* son notablemente similares – ocurre sólo con los verbos *ser* y *tener* en presente de indicativo. Se propone un patrón anglófono, basado en tendencias y jerarquías indicadas anteriormente, que se utiliza como base para la comparación. Bajan es uno de los criollos estudiados con menos frecuencia y está ausente de trabajos que cuestionen su tipología en relación con la L1. Los resultados preliminares proporcionan alguna evidencia de formas criollas entre la primera generación de Bajans. Los contrastes étnicamente alineados también se encuentran en cada generación cuando los Bajans adoptan el patrón de habla inglesa. El artículo concluye que cualquier interpretación de factores sociales y lingüísticos necesita ser complementado con un posterior análisis interaccional para dar cuenta de la considerable variación interindividual que existe.

Palabras clave

variación sintáctica, negación no estándar, inglés británico, inglés de Barbados, criollos[2]

1. Introduction

This paper reports on preliminary research on a well-know dialect feature, *ain't.* It is one of a number of features, which tends to recur in varieties of English. Szmrecsanyi & Kortmann's (2009) survey of 76 features across 46 English varieties, found that L1 varieties are distinct from creoles, with L2 falling somewhere in between the two. They suggest a number of implicational tendencies based on highly significant patterns across the varieties. Neither Suffolk, nor Bajan are included in the survey. However, Suffolk resides in the larger region of East Anglia, which is one of the British regions included in the survey and which conforms to the implicational tendencies.

The main tendency identified *ain't* — a variety of English will either have *ain't* for *be* and *have*, or it will have neither. We can further refine the tendency for L1 varieties, which I call the Anglophone pattern. This pattern is widely attested and occurs in the

[2] De ahora en adelante, me refiero a los hablantes patrimoniales de Barbados y las formas no estándar que se hablan en Barbados como "Bajan". Este es un término utilizado por los barbadenses, en Barbados y en Gran Bretaña, para referirse a sí mismos y a su idioma.

©Universitat de Barcelona

present tense of *be* and *have* only. Furthermore, it is restricted to the aux *have* but cannot occur with *have* as a main verb.

1. Present tense aux *be* (e.g. *You ain't talking to me*)
2. Present tense cop *be* (e.g. *He ain't taller than my brother*)
3. Present tense aux *have* (e.g. *We ain't seen his friend*)
4. *Present tense *have* main verb (e.g. **I ain't have sugar with my tea*)

Kortmann & Szmrecsanyi (2004: 1147-1153) report that *ain't* occurring with a main verb as in example 4 is one of the rarest of the 76 features surveyed; present in only 7 of the 46 varieties, including two creoles: Gullah and Trinidadian/Toboganian Creole. A number of scholars have suggested that *ain't* acts as a general negator in Anglophone creoles (example 5), occurring in a wider range of contexts than L1 varieties.

5. *ain't* as generic negator before a main verb (e.g. *I ain't know him*)

The site for this research is the post-creole, contact setting, in the town of Ipswich, Suffolk. The speakers in this study comprise Barbadian immigrants, their descendants and Anglos. The Suffolk data allows us firstly to compare speakers from L1 and creole backgrounds to gauge the extent that they are typologically distinctive. We can expect that Anglos would conform to the Anglophone Pattern described above, given that Suffolk lies in East Anglia. Neither Bajan, nor related Eastern Caribbean creoles are included in the survey. However, a number of Caribbean scholars consider *ain't* to be a general negator in Bajan.

This leads to our first research question: how typologically distinctive are Suffolk English and Bajan? In order to answer this question, I compare old Anglos with 1st gen. Bajans to see whether:

1.a) Suffolk Anglos and Bajans conform to the Anglophone Pattern?

1.b) Bajans have any evidence of a general negator *ain't*?

The work of Anderwald (2002) is relevant in helping to determine further tendencies of the Anglophone pattern. Her study is based on the British National Corpus of spoken English (BNC). She concludes that *ain't* has undergone a process of regularisation, with infrequent contexts producing higher frequencies of *ain't* than

©Universitat de Barcelona

higher frequency environments which tend to retain more complexity. The highest frequency environment is **cop *be*** followed by **aux *have*** and then **aux *be*.**

Idealised	**aux *be***	**> aux *have***	**> cop *be***
BNC corpus average	aux *have* 14.1%	aux *be* 13.3%	cop *be* 7.6%
East Anglia region	aux *have* 31.3%	aux *be* 17.3%	cop *be* 8.2%
Reading, South West	aux *have*	cop *be*	aux *be*

(Anderwald 2002; Cheshire 1982)

Table 1. Anglophone Pattern frequency hierarchy of *Ain't* [3]

Table 1 is based on Anderwald's BNC corpus research. She describes an idealised pattern based on absolute frequencies of occurrence of verbs *be* and *have,* in the corpus; the BNC average across all British regions surveyed; and the figures for East Anglia (EA). I also include the hierarchical order reported by Cheshire (1982) for Reading in the South West. The table shows clearly a common tendency for *ain't* to occur more frequently with *have* than *be*. This tendency can therefore be included in the Anglophone pattern, at least as it occurs for British English (BrE). The figures included for the BNC average and EA are included here as relevant points of comparison with the Suffolk data. EA has higher rates of *ain't* with *have,* than the BNC average.

This leads to our second question: to what extent do Suffolk speakers conform to the Anglophone pattern found in the BNC data and EA region, in particular?

Ain't comprises a number of variants that may be linguistically and socially conditioned. Kortmann & Szmrecsanyi (2004: 1147) highlight one notable example the invariant form *innit* as in example 6, which occurs only in tag questions

6. invariant non-concord tags (*They had them in their hair, innit?)*

This feature has been observed in British varieties of English, especially in London and the South East, but not in Caribbean Creoles (see for example, Stenstrom 1997 and Torgersen & Gabrielatos 2009). Gunnel & Hoffman (2006: 283, 286) compares the BNC to an American corpus and finds that whilst tag questions occur in both varieties, they were nine times more frequent in the British data. She also observes the invariant form *innit* does not occur in American English. *Innit* seems to be exclusively British.

[3] Aux refers to Auxiliary, Cop refers to Copula.

©Universitat de Barcelona

This leads to our third question:

3.a) What are the range of variants for *ain't* in the Suffolk data?

3.b) What linguistic and social factors condition the variation?

2. The Data and Methodology

The Suffolk data consists of sociolinguistic interviews from 24 speakers supplemented by ethnographic participant and non-participant observations over a three year period, between 2000 and 2003. The data are a sub-sample from a larger dataset of 74 speakers comprising, Anglos, and Caribbeans from a range of islands including, Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua, Nevis, St Vincent. The largest two groups are from Jamaica and Barbados. This paper reports preliminary findings for Anglos and Barbadians only. Speakers are grouped according to life-stages, old — retired or nearing retirement, mid — established in work and with families and, young — mostly secondary school children. These life stages also coincide with the settlement patterns of the Barbadians. The first generation[4] of Barbadians came to England as adults in the 1950s and 1960s and are over 60 years old. The second generation arrived in the 1970s age 10 or are British born. This group is in the mid-age category. The third generation are all British born and are in the young category. The results are grouped by ethnicity and age. I also provide a qualitative account of other social factors where relevant.

A total of 809 tokens are analysed split between *be* and *have*. Tokens of *be* are three times more frequently occurring than *have*. A further breakdown in verb *be* will not considered at this point. Rather I compare the data against the main tendency shown in Table 1, i.e. that *ain't* occurs more often with *have* than *be*.

For the purposes of comparison with findings from the BNC, the linguistic environment is coded for non-tags and tags. The dependent variable is coded as *ain't*, negative contraction, auxiliary contraction and full negation. The main forms of *ain't* are further coded (*ain't*, *in't* and *innit*). Initial indications, are that *innit,* may not be completely invariant. For example, Anderwald (2002: 147) suggests that it is semi-

[4] Henceforth, I refer to the generations as 1st gen., 2nd gen. and 3rd gen.

©Universitat de Barcelona

invariant. In the first instance, I shall include *innit* in the overall figures and then focus in more detail on its distribution. *Innit* is considered to be a peculiarly British feature, but tends to be excluded from larger studies (Gunnel & Hoffmann 2006). This smaller study provides the opportunity to examine how this form behaves in two ethnic groups.

The descriptions of Bajan have either emphasised its similarities with British English or its typological distinctiveness, as a creole. Others, such as Walker & Sidnell (2011) consider the possibility of co-existent systems rather than a single highly variable system along classic continuum model proposed by (e.g. Bickerton 1975; DeCamp 1971). A variationist approach does not have to make judgments of this kind. As well as presence-absence of a feature, variationists look at relative frequencies and consider linguistic or social determinants. A variationist approach is used here, because Bajan has the longest sustained links with British English and, because the Bajans in this study are assimilating to a local form of British English. This kind of complex situation where contact occurs at several stages of development requires a more open approach. Initial empirical results allow us to identify the main patterns of variation across the data. This is supplemented by qualitative observations with a view to establishing the best way to interpret the data.

3. Bajan negation

I now summarise the literature on Bajan negation before presenting my analysis of the Suffolk data. Van Herk (2003: 243) observes that descriptions of Bajan tend to assume that all non-standard features are creole forms. *Ain't* in particular, is considered to be part of a creole grammar, perhaps a mesolectal feature, rather than dialectal feature of English. Walker & Sidnell (2011) conducted a variationist study of Bequia, an Eastern Caribbean variety, historically related to Bajan. They found different patterns of Creole and English forms linked to historical and geographical settlement patterns on the island. As well as differences in terms of presence/absence of features, the co-occurrence of other non-standard features, e.g. negative concord, TMA[5]s are also relevant. The authors interpret different rates of occurrence and linguistic conditioning,

[5] TMA – tense, mood and aspect markers.

©Universitat de Barcelona

as being due to the same underlying system, with subsequent restructuring for some communities. Their discussion avoids the need to classify features in terms of varying degrees of creole.

A number of scholars provide examples to show that in Bajan, *ain't* can occur across a wider range of verb and tense contexts than L1 English varieties. *Ain't* may be functioning like the preverbal *no*. Burrowes (1983) is one of a number of scholars who considers *ain't* to be part of a creole grammar. She identifies Anglophone Creoles as having the following forms as a negator — *no, n, in* and that Barbados has related variants *in, din* and *ain't*. (see Kortmann & Szmrecsanyi 2004; Szmrecsanyi & Kortmann 2009: 1646, for a review of the main differences between creoles and L1 varieties). In example 11 *ain't* occurs before a verb phrase in Bajan:

11. *Uh ain't did stan fo lie much – I didn't stand to lie much* (Burrowes 1983: 43).

The form *din* is derived from *didn't* but with a different distribution/function in English-Based Creoles from British English (Meyerhoff & Walker 2012: 217-8; Walker & Sidnell 2011: 3). *Din* is also found in Barbadian Creole. Van Herk (2003: 255) describes the system of an elderly Bajan lady. She represents the most basilectal speaker in his sample. Her use of *ain't* covers a much wider range of contexts than in BrE including where BrE would use *do* in present and past tense and *be* in past tense. The following examples indicate a number of functions for *ain't* and *din* that are not found in BrE.

The past tense of *be* (*wasn't)* can be replaced with either *ain't* or *din*, as in:

12. *I din born big* or *I ain't born big - wasn't* (Van Herk 2003: 254)

The verb *do* present tense, can be replaced with *ain't* as in:

13. *It ain't concern you - It doesn't concern you* (Van Herk 2003: 254).

Rickford & Handler suggest that a related form (y)ent is a mesolectal feature derived from *ain't* that can occur with *do* past as in:

14. *I yent say nothing to she? - I didn't say…* (c 1800s: Rickford & Handler 1994: 242-3).

©Universitat de Barcelona

4. Results

I present examples of the linguistic environment for *ain't* for 1st gen. Bajans. Examples 15 and 16 indicate that *ain't* is typologically distinctive. It occurs with a greater number of verbs and tenses than BrE. There is some evidence to suggest that *ain't* co-varies with the Barbadian contraction *din* mostly for the verb *do*, and for past tense *be*.

15. *Ain't/din* with verbs *do* past

a) dey pick me for one dat I ***ain't*** had a cat in hell of wining [274Buster] - didn't have

b) we ***ain't*** get de treatment [86Bessy] – didn't get

c) I ***din*** know a lot of people [93Betty] – didn't know

16. *Ain't/din* with *can*, *be* past,

a) I think you can go on the back, ***ain't*** you mm [230Bessy] - can't you

b) she couldn't let me in because her husband ***ain't*** der [124Bessy] wasn't there

c) we were black ***ain't*** we [92Bessy] – weren't we

d) I ***din*** so acquainted with [294Betty] – I wasn't so acquainted with

The examples occur mostly in Bessy's speech and to a lesser extent, Betty, even though the latter is the most basilectal speaker. 1st gen. males use the most acrolectal speech. Buster uses the Bajan *din* for *didn't* and in 15a) *ain't* is used with the lexical verb *have*, that is blocked in the Anglophone pattern. The apparent gender distinction can be explained to an extent by social factors. The men came from the main city of Bridgetown and had wider social networks. The women came from rural communities and their social networks were confined to family and close contacts. In addition, Berty had some post-16 privately-paid, education. Scholars working on Eastern Caribbean varieties have noted that geographical settlements can account for such linguistic differences. In particular, the rural/urban distinction is an important social factor as to whether an individual uses basilectal features. Whilst the differences between 1st gen. men and women can be explained by the differences in social networks afforded by the urban/rural environments, it is not the whole picture. Betty has the most basilectal features in her speech including copula deletion, non marking of the past tense (Braña-

©Universitat de Barcelona

Straw 2011: 66). She grew up in the rural environment in the parish of St John. Bessy grew up in the less rural parish of Christchurch and had more frequent access to the urban centre, having spent time in Bridgetown working for a family friend. We might expect that Betty would be the most frequent user of basilectal forms of *ain't*. Individual factors seem to be at play and will be addressed in the discussion.

I now turn to the empirical results for *ain't* with verbs *be* and *have* in the present tense. This allows us to determine the extent that each group conforms to the Anglophone pattern and to compare both frequency of occurrence of *ain't* and its main variants with the BNC data (as per Anderwald 2002).

Groups	Verb	Aux		Neg (ex. *ain't*)	(inc. *ain't*)
Bajans	*be*	**58.33**	>	21.83	34.52
	have	6.6	<	80.19	**92.45**
Anglos	*be*	46.82	<=	31.53	**48.09**
	have	5.88	<	77.94	**92.45**

Table 2. Anglophone Hierarchy for *be* and *have*, present tense (%)

Table 2 shows the frequencies of aux versus neg. The expected hierarchy is aux > neg for *be* and aux < neg *have*. The hierarchy certainly holds for Bajans, but is not so clear cut for the Anglos who have similar rates of aux and neg for *be*. In addition, overall rates of aux for *be* are comparatively low (58% Bajans, 47% Anglos) compared to the BNC data (80% EA, 92% BNC average)**.** The neg rates for *have* are in line with EA (97%) if we include *ain't*, (Bajans and Anglos 92%).

Group	*be*		*have*
Bajans	12.70	=	12.26
Anglos	16.56	>	13.24
BNC	8.90	<	14.10
EA[6]	10.50	<	31.30

Table 3. Frequency of *ain't* for the Anglophone pattern (%)

Table 3 compares the relative frequencies of *ain't* in the Suffolk and BNC data. Suffolk Anglos have the highest rates of *ain't* for *be,* followed by Bajans, then EA. For *have,* EA has higher rates than the BNC average, whereas rates for Anglos and Bajans

[6] East Anglia region.

©Universitat de Barcelona

are slightly lower than the BNC average. A noticeable difference is that *ain't* occurs more frequently with *have* than *be* in the BNC data. The reverse pattern is found for Suffolk Anglos, whilst there is no difference in rates for Bajans. This result is likely to be due to the decision to include *innit* forms, rather than to any inherent differences.

Group	Verb	Non-Tags		Tags
BNC	*be*	5.8	<	14.8
BNC	*have*	12.9	<	18.2
Anglos	*be*	3.9	<	**35.2**
Anglos	*have*	**13.6**	**>**	**12**
Bajans	*be*	4.15	<	**37.23**
Bajans	*have*	10.3	<	17.4

Table 4. Percentage Frequency of *ain't* non-tags v tags

Table 4 compares the frequency of *ain't* in non-tags and tags. Bajans follow the BNC pattern, in which *ain't* occurs more frequently in tags than non-tags for both verbs. Anglos have the same pattern for *be* but not for *have*. Both groups have substantially higher rates of occurrence than in the BNC data with verb *be*. This is largely due to inclusion of *innit*. However, the decision to include *innit* does not affect the overall patterns found in the data.

Group	Form	Non-tags	tags
Anglos	in't	70	<10
	innit	Nil	>60
	ain't	30	30
Bajans	in't	10	<10
	Innit	Nil	>75
	Ain't	90	15

Table 5a. Forms of *ain't* occurring with verb *be* (%)

Group	Form	Non-tags	tags
Anglos	in't	Nil	nil
	innit	Nil	nil
	ain't	100	100
Bajans	in't	nil	20
	innit	nil	40
	ain't	>85	40
	han't	<15	nil

Table 5b. Forms of *ain't* occurring with verb *have* in percentages

©Universitat de Barcelona

Tables 5a and 5b show the distribution of the main variants of *ain't*. According to Anderwald (2002: 130) *in't* does not occur at all with *be* in EA. The Suffolk data provides evidence to the contrary. Anglos have *in't* as the main form in non-tags at 70% compared with only 13.3% BNC average. By contrast in tags, *in't* is the least frequent form at less than 10% compared with the BNC average of 65.9%. Bajans also have the *in't* form in tags at 20%. The percentages are probably not directly comparable due to my inclusion of *innit*. However, the main point holds, that the Suffolk data contradict Anderwald's claim that *in't* is not used in East Anglia. Now to compare Anglos with Bajans, the main difference is in non-tags. The main form for Anglos is *in't*, whereas the main form for Bajans is *ain't*. If we look at tags, we can see that the main form is *innit* for both groups and that they have a similar distribution of forms *innit>ain't>in't.*

Table 5b charts the distribution of forms between non-tags and tags with verb *have*. For both groups, the form *ain't* occurs categorically in non-tags[7]. Anglos also have categorical use of *ain't* in tags, whereas Bajans have a fairly even distribution between the forms *ain't, innit* and *in't*. Whilst, *innit* is restricted to tags for both groups, the figures indicate that Bajans are using *innit* in a greater number of linguistic environments than simply as an alternative form of *isn't it*, as their Anglo counterparts do. Further examination of the data reveals that it is Bajan-born speakers from the 1st and 2nd gen. who use *innit* in this way. British-born speakers do not, rather they use the Anglo pattern, if at all[8]. Example 17 provides examples of the different ways in which the two ethnic groups use *innit*. For the Anglos, *innit* can only replace *isn't it.*

17. *Innit*

a) Oh right, yeah that's nice, *innit?* And you can see all of the bird life, all the waders and that sort of thing (Sadie, mid-age Anglo)

b) Life is like that, *innit?* (Simon, old Anglo)

c) It's a sanctuary for them, to retreat from London, you have to come up here, *innit*? (Bernard, 2nd gen. Bajan)

d) I thought to myself the word type don't seem write there, *innit*? (Bessy 1st gen. Bajan)

[7] Given the small number of token numbers we can consider Bajan results to be categorical. There was only one instance of another form *han't* by Bernard.
[8] Many speakers in the sample use only standard forms.

©Universitat de Barcelona

5. Summary and Discussion

This results show that Suffolk Bajans (2nd and 3rd gen.) and Anglos mostly conform to the Anglophone pattern defined by the main tendency and frequency hierarchy proposed in the literature. The constraints for the Anglophone pattern are that *ain't* only occurs with verbs *be* (cop and aux) and *have* (aux), in the present tense. It cannot occur with *have* as a main verb. Furthermore, *ain't* occurs more frequently with *have* than *be*. A comparison with the BNC data and the regional figures for East Anglia have shown that the Suffolk data has similar patterns in terms of the hierarchy of usage between standard and non-standard variants.

The post-creole contact situation in Suffolk has thrown up a number of ethnically distinctive patterns in terms of the distribution of variant forms of *ain't* and the linguistic conditioning. Below is a summary of the main distinctions to be found between Bajans and Anglos.[9]

1. Anglos favour *in't* with *be* (non-tags) and *ain't* is categorical for *have*
2. Bajans favour *ain't* with *be* (non-tags) and variable forms for *have*
3. 1st gen. Bajans use of *ain't* is not restricted to the Anglophone pattern
4. 1st/2nd gen. Bajan-born speakers use the invariant *innit* form in tags, whereas Anglos only use it in place of *isn't it*, in tags.

There is considerable inter-speaker variation within the data. Many speakers have produced exclusively standard forms, whilst others are frequent users of non-standard forms. Analysing syntactic variation is problematic if treated purely from a quantitative perspective. Cheshire (2005) shows that qualitative analysis is useful to add further insights, especially in the context of tag questions and formulaic expressions. The remainder of the discussion will focus on the results 3. and 4. above, and highlight further areas for research.

Innit is increasingly used in tags and has multiple discourse functions (Cheshire 1982, 1991, 2005). Neither tags, nor *innit* are described in the linguistic literature for Bajan. The invariant form occurs with *be* and *have* across the person/number paradigm

[9] There are a number of other distinctions in the data that occur in each generation but these will be discussed in future work.

©Universitat de Barcelona

in the speech of 1st and 2nd gen. immigrants indicating that it could be an innovation. Bajans may have acquired both the form and the tag environment in Britain. The invariant form could have arisen independently from acquisition strategies based on overgeneralization, i.e. the extension of a linguistic form to a greater number of linguistic environments, and/or it could perform a range of discourse functions. On the other hand, Anglos use *innit* exclusively to replace *isn't it* in tags. Bajans could have extended the linguistic environment to include all person/number forms of *be* and *have*. Earlier research has shown that this strategy is used for other variables. For example, Edward, a 2nd gen. speaker was found to extend the use of glottalised forms of /t/ to environments that were blocked for Anglo speakers (Braña-Straw 2007: 16-17). Studies on the ethnically diverse population of London, suggest that ethnic minorities are the greatest users of tags and the invariant form *innit* (Palacios-Martínez 2010; Torgersen & Gabrielatos 2009). These earlier studies agree that *innit* as an invariant form is an innovation, led by young non-Anglo males in inner London. My findings seems to support the claim that invariant *innit* is an ethnically driven innovation. It also provides further evidence that the feature may have been present much earlier in immigrant speech, occurring as it does in the speech of Bajans who arrived in the 1960s. In Suffolk, invariant *innit* may be perceived as immigrant speech, an innovation that is not taken up by British born 3rd gen. Bajans and not present in Anglo speakers.

I stated earlier that the Suffolk data mostly conforms to the Anglophone pattern. However, 1st gen. Bajans provide us with evidence of a creolised system. *Ain't* can occur with *be* and *have* in the past tense, with *have* as a main verb and with other TMAs, particularly *do*. The data seem to point to *ain't* as a generic negator as claimed by creole scholars. Even with this small sample, there is considerable variation between individuals. The use of creole features could be attributable to sociolinguistic factors that have been transferred from the island situation. In this study, the female speakers exhibit most of the creole features. I include a summary of the main features of 1st gen. Bajan island background. These are some of the factors that are known to account for variation on Barbados (as described by Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 48-49; Van Herk 2003).

1. Berty post secondary, private education, urban, politically active, coloured

©Universitat de Barcelona

2. Buster secondary education, urban, politically active, black

3. Bessy secondary education, near urban, family networks, black

4. Betty secondary education, remote rural, family networks, self disclosed as poor, black

Pre-migration, the social networks for the women were constructed around family and domestic activities. They had a rural upbringing with relatively more geographical isolation, lower levels of education and income. By contrast, the men's networks were open and multiplex. An interesting component of their networks came from their political activities. Earlier research discussed in Braña-Straw (2011), has shown that political activism continues to be an important factor in Britain, with both men continuing to be politically active in local Anglo-dominated politics. The women's social networks are largely confined to the West Indian community. (Further discussion of the speakers' social situations, pre- and post-migration, are described in Braña-Straw 2011: 64-67.) Based on the social factors outlined, we can expect Berty to be the most acrolectal speaker and Betty to be the most basilectal speaker. Variationist studies often find that the highest frequency of non-standard features is found in the most vernacular speech. The above social factors would suggest that Betty should be the most vernacular speaker. However, looking at the data, Bessy (not Betty) uses *ain't* in the greatest number of non-standard environments.

Given that token numbers are too small to support further quantitative analysis, I chart speakers' use of forms, both standard and non-standard in terms of presence or absence. I define the acrolect as consisting of the use of aux and neg contractions for *be* and *have* in the present tense. The Anglophone forms consist of *ain't* and its variants also occurring with *be* and *have* in the present tense. The Bajan form is the use of *din* as a contraction of *didn't*. The creole forms consist of *ain't* or *din* occurring with the main verb *have*, *be* and *have* in the past tense, and other verbs.

Speaker	Standard/Acrolect	Anglophone	Bajan/Mesolect	Creole/Basilect
Berty	Yes	No	No	No
Buster	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bessy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Betty	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 6. Features present in individual speaker sample for 1st gen. Bajans

©Universitat de Barcelona

Berty as expected is the most acrolectal speaker; he uses standard forms, exclusively. Furthermore, he seems to have a more restrictive pattern than that permitted by the Bristish Standard pattern. Aux contraction is confined to *be* and neg contraction to *have*. Buster also has the same restrictions as Berty. This restricted pattern may represent a Bajan acrolect, rather then a British standard. Buster also has some non-standard forms: the Bajan use of *din* as a further contraction of *didn't*; and just one token of *ain't* with the main verb *have*. As well as social factors, a number of studies suggest that interactional factors play a role in the use of non-standard forms. For example, Palacios-Martínez (2010: 22) investigated the Corpus of London Teenagers for the use of non-standard negation. The corpus includes descendants of West Indian immigrants. She finds that *ain't* has several pragmatic functions. Speakers might style-shift to non-standard forms for a number of interactional purposes: to denote refusal or opposition or to insist on the point in question. The non-standard forms might appear in narratives, personal anecdotes, stories, jokes. Its function is to make the speech event more lively and realistic or to voice the words of a character. The non-standard was also subject to style-shifting towards the interlocutor. Buster's single use of *ain't* with the main verb *have,* occurs in an idiomatic expression *I ain't had a cat in hell,* at the end of a narrative. It has been suggested that British West Indians are more likely to code-switch between acrolectal and basilectal forms as an act of identity (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985; Sebba 1993). Further qualitative research is planned to examine pragmatic and interactional functions of these basilectal forms.

Now, we turn to the 1st gen. Bajan females. Social factors suggest that Bessy should be next on the continuum. While token numbers are too few for quantitative analysis at the level of the individual, the few standard tokens produced by Bessy suggests that she has the same restricted acrolect pattern as the males. She uses *ain't* with *be* present and past tense, with *can* present tense and, co-occuring with *din* to replace *didn't*. Betty hardly uses standard forms at all. She has one neg token with *be* and *have*. Betty uses *ain't* with *be* and *have* in present tense but does not with other TMAs; effectively she displays the Anglophone pattern. *Din* is used for *be* past tense and in place of *didn't*. Again further research is needed to look at possible interactional factors to account for the use of creole features in the females' speech.

©Universitat de Barcelona

The degree to which 1st gen. Bajans use features from the acrolect varies considerably, as does the degree to which they use mesolectal or basilectal forms. For example, neither male uses the Anglophone pattern whereas the females do. This apparent gender distinction may be due to the differences in social networks both before and after migration. Whilst I have been able to find useful patterns from preliminary quantitative analysis, it is clear that more qualitative research is needed to account further for the patterns observed.

6. Conclusion

This study has found that 1st gen. Bajans exhibit patterns that suggest a creole negation system was present in Barbados. The group comparisons are useful to understand how the Suffolk data compares with the BNC. Both Anglos and Bajans conform to the main tendencies of the Anglophone pattern and at first glance it would seem that Bajans are a closer match to the BNC data, than Anglos. Preliminary figures have indicated a number of ethnically-aligned contrasts that are present in all three generations. However, the group figures conceal considerable individual variation. Initial qualitative observations suggest that pre- and post-migration social factors can account for some of the inter-speaker variation for 1st gen. speakers. In addition, a number of interactional factors have been noted in the literature as well as observed in the Suffolk data. More qualitative research will need to focus on the role of interactional factors.

References

ANDERWALD, Lieselotte (2002) *Negation in non-standard British English: Gaps, Regularizations, Asymmetries,* London: Routledge.

BICKERTON, Derek (1975) *Dynamics of a Creole System*, Cambridge: CUP.

BRAÑA-STRAW, Michelle (2007) "Maintenance or assimilation? Phonological variation and change in the realization of /t/ by British Barbadians", in M. Huber & V. Velupillai (eds.),

©Universitat de Barcelona

Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Contact Languages, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3-22.

BRAÑA-STRAW, Michelle (2011) "Putting individuals back in contact: accommodation strategies by Barbadians in Ipswich", in L. Hinrichs & J. Farquharson (eds.), *Variation in the Caribbean: From creole continua to individual agency,* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 57-78.

BURROWES, Audrey (in collaboration with Richard Allsopp) (1983) "Barbadian Creole: A note on its social history and structure", in L. Carrington, D. Craig & R. Todd Dandaré (eds.), *Studies in Caribbean Language,* St. Augustine, Trinidad: Society for Caribbean Linguistics, 38-45.

CHESHIRE, Jenny (1982) *Variation in an English Dialect: A Sociolinguistic Study*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHESHIRE, Jenny (1991) "Variation in the use of *ain't* in an urban British English dialect. In *Dialects of English: Studies in grammatical variation",* in P. Trudgill & J. K. Chambers (eds.), Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers, 54-73.

CHESHIRE, Jenny (2005) "Syntactic Variation and beyond: Gender and Social Class Variation in the Use of Discourse-New markers", *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 9, 4, 479-508.

DECAMP, David (1971) "Toward a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum", in D. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolisation of Languages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 349-370.

GUNNEL, Tottie & Sebastian HOFFMANN (2006) "Tag Questions in British and American English", *Journal of English Linguistics,* 34, 4, 283-311.

KORTMANN, Bernd & Benedikt SZMRECSANYI (2004) "Global synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in English", *A handbook of varieties of English*, vol. 2, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1142-1202.

LE PAGE, Robert Brock & Andrée TABOURET-KELLER (1985) *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MEYERHOFF, Miriam & James A. WALKER (2012) "Grammatical Variation in Bequia (St Vincent and the Grenadines)", *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages,* 27, 2, 209-234.

PALACIOS-MARTÍNEZ, Ignacio M. (2010) "'It Ain't Nothing to Do with My School.' Variation and Pragmatic Uses of Ain't in the Language of British English Teenagers", *English Studies,* 91, 5, 548–566.

RICKFORD, John R. & Jerome S. HANDLER (1994) "Textual Evidence on the Nature of Early Barbadian Speech, 1676-1835", *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages,* 9, 2, 221–55.

©Universitat de Barcelona

SEBBA, Mark (1993) *London Jamaican: Language Systems in Interaction*, London: Longman.

STENSTROM, Anna-B. (1997) "Tags in teenage talk", in U. Fries, V. Müller & P. Schneider (eds.), *From Ælfric to the New York Times. Studies in English Corpus Linguistics*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 139-147.

SZMRECSANYI, Benedikt & Bernd KORTMANN (2009) "Vernacular universals and angloversals in a typological perspective", in F. Markku, J. Klemola & H. Paulasto (eds.), *Vernacular universals and language contacts: Evidence from varieties of English and beyond*, New York: Taylor & Francis, 33-53.

TORGERSEN, Eivind & Costas GABRIELATOS (2009) "A Corpus-Based Study of Invariant Tags in London English", Paper presented at Corpus Linguistics 2009, 22-25 July 2009, University of Liverpool.

VAN HERK, Gerard (2003) "Barbadian lects: Beyond meso", in M. Aceto & J. P. Williams (eds.), *Contact Englishes of the Eastern Caribbean*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 241-264.

WALKER, James & Jack SIDNELL (2011) "Inherent Variability and Coexistent Systems: Negation on Bequia", in L. Hinrichs & J. Farquharson (eds.), *Variation in the Caribbean*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 39-55.

©Universitat de Barcelona