Linguistic innovators: the English of adolescents in London
Final report submitted to the Economic and Social Research Council, February 2008
Jenny Cheshire, Sue Fox, Paul Kerswill and Eivind Torgersen

1. Background

Change in present-day spoken British English is reportedly characterised by *dialect levelling* – the reduction of regional differences between dialects and accents. The details, however, are complex, with homogenisation across a region (Torgersen/Kerswill 2004, Kerswill/Williams 2005) alongside geographical diffusion from a metropolis (Kerswill 2003). Yet there is also local differentiation and innovation (Britain 2005, Watson 2006). Phonology and grammar do not change in tandem (Britain 2007). The role of London has been held to be central, with its influence claimed for the diffusion of TH-fronting (Kerswill 2003:233–7), labiodental /r/ (Foulkes/Docherty 2000) and T-glottalling (Sivertsen 1960). Vowels, in contrast, seem to homogenise within a region, focusing on a local centre: thus around London there is strong convergence across the 'Home Counties' (Cheshire et al 1999, Williams/Kerswill 1999, Torgersen/Kerswill 2004).

Grammatical and discourse features are also subject to levelling and diffusion (Cheshire et al. 1989, 2005). In the past, London has both promoted dialect mixtures and spread morphosyntactic innovations, following the in-migration of speakers of non-contiguous dialects (Nevalainen/Raumolin-Brunberg 2003:165) and different languages. Immigration to London continues, so London should still be influential linguistically. However, the paucity of studies of London English is a lacuna in our understanding of levelling and diffusion, as we have no direct evidence that innovations have started here. Our project, as the first large-scale sociolinguistic study of spoken English in London, aimed to fill this gap.

Until recently (e.g., Fox 2007, Khan 2006), sociolinguistic research in the UK has mainly neglected ethnicity as a factor in language variation and change. We included ethnicity, partly as a way of assessing the impact of multilingualism on London English, and partly to investigate claims about an adolescent 'multiracial vernacular English' which may be implicated in language change (Hewitt 1986:151; Rampton 1995:125f, Sebba 1993:59f). We built on Eckert's work in Detroit (Eckert 2000) on language change in inner vs. outer city areas, basing our research in an inner London borough (Hackney, in the traditional East End) and an outer London borough (Havering, further to the east; map, Annexe). The two sites differ on a range of sociodemographic factors, including ethnicity. This design allows us to test the claim that linguistic innovation originates in inner London as well as to consider the effect of speaker ethnicity on London English.

As in Detroit, we expected innovations to begin in London without reference to other urban centres. Some changes found in Havering might relate to changes in the inner London area which are more advanced (presumably, therefore, diffusing); others might be more advanced in Havering, and associated with more 'mainstream' features that are levelling or diffusing across the southeast.

2. Objectives

1. To increase our understanding of the social dynamic of language change by focusing on the interaction of the factors of late adolescence, ethnic diversity, geographical mobility, gender, social network type and social identity, within the context of a metropolis, in the innovation and propagation of change.

As expected, we find several changes originating in inner London and diffusing from there (e.g., diphthong-shift reversal). We have operationalised these social factors. A complex picture is revealed, with quantifiable factors statistically significant for several linguistic features, sometimes acting as independent social constraints (ethnicity, particularly), most often interacting (friendship network with ethnicity). The outlines of a dialect contact model remain intact: innovation, diffusion and supralocalisation are all relevant, as are aspects of a language contact model (notably shift-induced interference and 'negotiation'; cf. Thomason 2001).

2. More specifically, to find possible recent innovations in London and to establish their current social distributions in terms of the factors mentioned in (1), in a way that allows conclusions to be drawn about which social types and social groups are the leaders of different sorts of change.

We identified many phonological, grammatical and discourse innovations. All factors mentioned in (1) were relevant. For some changes ethnicity as a single factor was significant; for others it was social network type, with members of multi-ethnic friendship groups being high users of innovative forms. Within these groups we identified seven individuals who are representative of the social and personality types that lead innovative phonological and grammatical changes (discussed in Cheshire et al. in press).

3. Using a range of existing and original data, to test the conventional assumption that London speech is linguistically the most innovative in Britain, and that changes tend to spread from there to other parts of the country. On a more detailed level, to examine individual changes already observed by ourselves and others outside London, and to check the validity of the view that they have a London origin.

We identified innovations, some of which appeared to be spreading to outer London. The inner London adolescents were more advanced in several changes that are widespread elsewhere in Britain (e.g., grammaticalisation of BE LIKE, generalisation of relative *that*, loss of H-dropping), suggesting a metropolitan source. They showed an increased use of some mainstream non-standard forms (e.g., negative concord) relative to elderly speakers and earlier studies. However, for some changes known to occur outside London, inner-London adolescents were following an independent trajectory, especially *was/wasn't* versus *was/weren't* levelling and the 'backing' and 'raising' of the vowel of words like GOAT instead of general southeastern 'fronting'. In both cases, inner London diverges sharply from current regional trends.

4. To look for language-internal and discourse-level explanations for differences in the rate of change and the social trajectory of change between different kinds of linguistic feature (vowels, consonants, morphology, syntax, discourse features).

Analysis is ongoing, but for phonology, one change is *contrary* to natural processes: diphthong shift, though 'natural', is being reversed. Some morphosyntactic changes may be natural outcomes of language and dialect contact (e.g., simplification of the complex relativiser system, levelled *was/wasn't* in inner London), or conforming to typological principles (*was/weren't* levelling, increased negative concord). Syntactic features seem better explained in discourse-level terms (e.g., the *why…for* blend usually frames reported speech).

5. To add to our understanding of relations between ethnicities at the adolescent life stage with respect to language use, and to present our findings to teachers (as practitioners), language education specialists (as policy formers) and young people (as language users) in such a way as to inform policy and practice in the education of an ethnically diverse population.

Adolescents from groups that are less integrated into mainstream society (notably Bangladeshis in our study) used more standard grammatical forms and phonological forms showing the effect of language transfer. Multiethnic friendship groups encouraged the use of innovative forms and their members used linguistic features drawn from all components of language (including <kissing teeth>) that cannot be linked to specific ethnic groups. We have termed this variety Multicultural London English in our dissemination to the press and language educationists and received feedback from a workshop with London adolescents.

3. Methods

3.1 Sample and data collection

Our guideline sample size was 32 speakers in each location, with at least 8 male and 8 female white 'Anglo' speakers (whose families had relatively local roots), and the remaining speakers distributed across other ethnicities in the area, including mixed race (**Table 1** shows the sample structure, with 98 adolescents as against the planned 64). The non-Anglos were children/grandchildren of immigrants from less developed countries (**Table 2**). As planned, speakers were recruited from pre-existing friendship groups, whose ethnic composition could not be predetermined. We recognised that our simple division between 'white Anglo' and 'other-ethnic' or 'non-Anglo' might be irrelevant for some friendship groups but perhaps salient for others. In Hackney, approximately half the adolescents had a white London Anglo background. In Havering, the friendship groups consisted mainly of local white Londoners. In order to get a comparable number of non-Anglo speakers, adolescent 'commuters', mainly from inner-city boroughs, had to be recruited.

The adolescents were recorded in relaxed conversation-like interviews with their friends and individually. Several participants made self-recordings. We recorded 8 elderly people in

each of Hackney and Havering. All were Anglo, those in Hackney being working-class while, reflecting the borough, some of those in Havering were broadly lower middle class.

Our corpus far exceeds that envisaged in terms of both size and flexibility. We have a corpus of 1.4 million words representing 110 hours of interview speech, orthographically transcribed using *Transcriber*, which provides time-aligned sound files, greatly adding to functionality. Transcriptions were checked by another team member. ESDS has accepted the anonymised transcripts.

3.2 Analysis

Social analysis

Speaker gender and ethnicity were independent variables. Ethnicity was self-defined in response to a question about where speakers 'belonged' in terms of their identity. We analysed speakers' friendship networks by asking each speaker to name their closest friends and to state whether they were boys or girls, from outside or inside college, and their ethnic background. Each speaker was then given a score of 1–5 depending on the ethnic makeup of the friendship network:

1 = all friends same ethnicity as self
2 = up to 20% of a different ethnicity
3 = up to 40% of a different ethnicity
4 = up to 60% of a different ethnicity
5 = up to 80% of a different ethnicity

The network analysis (**Table 2a,b**) shows that all the Hackney Anglo adolescents have network scores of *at least* 3, contrasting with Havering, where the *maximum* score was 3. Thus much of the linguistic difference between the boroughs can be linked to the ethnic composition of networks. However, the network score is a fundamentally different measure for the two groups. For the ethnically homogeneous Anglos, it measures the proportion of non-Anglos amongst the friends, and can be used in a quantitative analysis. Because the non-Anglo group is heterogeneous (with some 11 ethnicities), a quantitative analysis would not be meaningful. Therefore we discuss only the Anglos' networks.

No social class criteria were applied when sampling, as planned, but all the participants' backgrounds can be broadly described as working class.

Informant profiles show that outer Londoners were more geographically mobile than the inner Londoners. Although most confined their social activities to the local area, most spoke of holidays abroad and they ventured farther afield for shopping. Some had cars, part-time jobs and looser social networks. The inner Londoners, on the other hand, rarely left their locality and viewed neighbouring London areas (such as Islington, different postcode areas or even a different estate) as unsafe territory.

Linguistic analysis

The phonetic/phonological variables listed in our proposal were all analysed. Vowels were analysed acoustically using PRAAT/Akustyk and the data were automatically transferred to

a database for further analysis (vowel plots and statistical analyses). The vowel data were normalised using the Lobanov formula to facilitate direct comparison between speakers. Consonants were analysed auditorily. We also analysed existing datasets from London to provide comparative data: parts of the IViE corpus, original recordings from COLT, and recordings made by Labov in 1968.

We had planned to analyse only a small number of grammatical and discourse variables, since analysis could not start until transcription was complete. Furthermore, such a large corpus entails the extraction and analysis of a great quantity of tokens. In fact, we were able to analyse quantitatively, and comprehensively, three of the variables provisionally listed in the proposal, and to make a start on analysing negative concord and prepositions (to date, variation between *off* and *off of*). We also identified a range of innovations in vocabulary (not discussed here), syntax and discourse.

4. Results

4.1 Diphthongs

The 'Reversing "drift"' article documents how the *diphthong shift* attested in previous studies in London is undergoing reversal. The pattern for the vowels of words such as MOUTH, PRICE, GOAT and FACE is complex, as the paper shows. Briefly, in inner London, the diphthong-shifted variants (mostly broad diphthongs) are being ousted by new, often socially or ethnically marked variants (narrow diphthongs and monophthongs) generated from the ethnic mix. This makes these London diphthongs different from those found in the wider south-east, including Havering, where they are instead being replaced with regionally and socially neutral new forms, resulting in levelling across the region. In Havering, some diphthong shift reversal is also observed, though less strongly than in inner London: this suggests, then, that some innovative forms are diffusing out from inner London to neighbouring areas. Gender plays a role – males use the new variants more – but more significant are both speaker ethnicity and the ethnicity of speakers' friendship groups. Non-Anglo speakers are in the lead, followed by Anglo speakers with multiethnic rather than Anglo friendship groups. Thus, cross-ethnic social contacts seem to be the conduit for diffusion of the new diphthong forms.

4.2 Short vowels

Table 3 shows the normalised average formant frequencies, using the Lobanov formula (Lobanov 1971), for the short monophthongs KIT, DRESS, TRAP, STRUT, LOT and FOOT and the long monophthongs GOOSE and START, amongst elderly and young speakers in Hackney. F1 (first formant) is a representation of vowel height while F2 (second formant) describes frontness/backness. **Figure 1** shows a plot of these vowel qualities.

Multivariate ANOVA was performed on average formant frequencies per speaker per vowel. There is no generational change for KIT, DRESS, LOT or START. However, a more open and centralised TRAP vowel, as well as a more back and less open STRUT, is attested for young speakers ($p<0.001$), who also have a more central FOOT ($p<0.05$) and a substantially fronter GOOSE ($p<0.001$).

Table 4 (cf. **Figure 2**) shows comparable data for Havering. As in Hackney, younger speakers have a more back TRAP and STRUT, and there is also raising of STRUT. GOOSE fronting, however, is less extreme than in Hackney.

Differences between the Anglo and non-Anglo young speakers were mainly very small, but significant differences were found for STRUT and GOOSE, as **Table 5** shows. In Hackney, non-Anglo speakers have a more raised STRUT and a closer and fronter GOOSE. Thus non-Anglo speakers are leading the raising of STRUT – in line with Hewitt's (1986:134) representation of a creole-derived raised quality for *come* – and fronting of GOOSE. Fronting of GOOSE is correlated, for Anglo speakers, with friendship group: those who are part of a multi-ethnic group (network score 4/5) have a more fronted vowel than those with a largely Anglo network (score 3). For Anglos, belonging to multi-ethnic friendship networks also correlates with a backer STRUT.

In Havering, Anglo adolescents with largely Anglo networks have a less backed TRAP vowel, more like the elderly speakers and thus suggesting conservatism.

The changes we observe between elderly and adolescent speakers are in line with what Torgersen/Kerswill (2004) have described (based on data from Reading and Ashford) as the southeastern Short Vowel Chain Shift, assumed to be driven by regional levelling. The recent stage of the shift involves TRAP lowering/backing from [æ] to [a], the backing/raising of STRUT, and the fronting/centring of FOOT (Torgersen/Kerswill 2004:45; cf. Trudgill 2004:42 on earlier stages). The GOOSE fronting in our London data is typical of the southeast. Taken overall, there is little further development amongst young London speakers relative to the Reading and Ashford changes. However, STRUT is more raised and GOOSE more fronted in Hackney, supporting the idea that *inner* London is the source of innovation. Furthermore, non-Anglo adolescents lead in both of these features; for GOOSE-fronting they are closely followed by Anglo adolescents with largely non-Anglo friendship groups, as with the diphthong changes. Again, we see that cross-ethnic friendships seem to be the conduit for the diffusion of innovations.

4.3 Consonants

We analysed 6 consonants whose distribution varies between the elderly speakers and the adolescents:

(i)　H-dropping in stressed word-initial position (e.g., in *hammer*), a long-standing feature of English in England, but recently declining in the southeast (Williams/Kerswill 1999);
(ii)　K-backing in word-initial position before non-high back vowels (e.g., in *cousin, car, cot, caught*), an innovation not previously described and not used by our elderly Londoners;
(iii) TH-fronting initially and finally giving [f] for [θ] (e.g., in *thin, bath*), a traditional feature but now well established in the south of England and beyond (Cheshire/Kerswill/Williams 2005);
(iv) DH-fronting non-initially, giving [v] for [ð] (e.g., in *mother*), another traditional feature, similarly well established;
(v)　DH-stopping, involving word-initial [d] for [ð] (e.g., in *then*), a traditional Cockney feature which is recessive (Wells 1982:329; Hudson/Holloway 1977 give [d] as a variant used by working-class boys);

(vi) Word-initial labiodental /r/ (e.g., in *red*), a form thought to be diffusing throughout Britain from London (Docherty/Foulkes 2000).

An average of about 15 tokens per variable per speaker were analysed.

Table 6 (**Figure 3**), for Hackney, confirms the reversal of H-dropping, but an increase in the formerly recessive DH-stopping. There is an apparent huge increase in TH-fronting, and both K-backing and labiodental /r/ appear to be innovations.

Because of their backgrounds, we did not expect the elderly Havering speakers to use traditional London features to the same extent. **Table 7** (**Figure 4**) confirms low use of H-dropping and minimal TH-fronting. The features used by the inner city adolescents, however, are also used by the adolescents in Havering, though, with the exception of DH-fronting, to a more limited extent. Taken at face value, the data suggest that the innovative London features are diffusing to outer London.

Before we consider issues of innovation and diffusion, we shift our focus to ethnicity. **Table 8** (**Figure 5**) compares scores for Hackney Anglo and non-Anglo young speakers. For two features, loss of H-dropping and use of DH-stopping, the non-Anglos greatly outstrip the Anglos (p<.001). Other differences are small and mostly non-significant.

Table 9 (**Figure 6**) shows that, in Havering, the use of the recent innovative features – loss of H-dropping and K-backing – by the Anglos is considerably smaller than in Hackney. The non-Anglos pattern with those in Hackney, with the result that the ethnic difference is greater in Havering. On these measures, Anglo speakers in Havering are more conservative (traditional) than their inner-city counterparts – cf. their conservative TRAP vowel. If this is right, the low DH-stopping score for Havering Anglos arguably suggests this feature has been reallocated as an ethnic marker – a point we return to. Finally, given that we had to seek non-Anglos among 'commuters' from the inner city, we claim that such mobile non-Anglo people are the channels for the diffusion of innovations.

Figure 7 shows that Hackney speakers with multi-ethnic networks have higher frequencies than speakers with Anglo networks for K-backing, TH-fronting (word initial), DH-stopping and labiodental /r/ – all significantly. The interpretations are, however, varied. K-backing is arguably an ethnic marker, suggested by its lower frequency in largely mono-ethnic Havering. This explanation does not work for TH-fronting, which is well established, and is equally frequent in Havering (**Figure 8**). The fact that DH-stopping is an older Cockney feature may explain its high use amongst those with Anglo networks – though this is not reflected in the Havering Anglo networks' score of 8.0% (**Figure 8**). Presumably it is reinforced in Hackney by high frequencies amongst Afro-Caribbeans.

4.4 Consonants – innovation and diffusion

The consonant variables have different histories, and we must propose different interpretations. Although TH-fronting is more frequent in the inner city, we cannot claim, *based on our data*, an origin for it there. This is because of its antiquity (Beal 1999). The loss of H-dropping in the southeast can, however, be dated to the last quarter of the 20th century (Cheshire et al. 1999). **Table 10** shows figures for H-dropping in the southeast suggesting a parallel between Milton Keynes (MK) and Hackney, both of which appear to lead in the change – surprisingly, because MK is highly mobile and largely Anglo, while Hackney is neither. The similarity between Reading and Havering is easier to explain: both are in the

London periphery and have upwardly mobile populations. We must probably recognise multiple causation for the loss of H-dropping: in MK, loose-knit networks allowed for both levelled and standard-like pronunciations, while in Hackney a scarcity of native London L1 models, coupled with exposure to H-pronouncing non-British English varieties, might have supported the acquisition of near-invariant /h/.

Different interpretations suggest themselves for the remaining variables. Labiodental /r/ is led by non-Anglos, but because it is so widespread it is difficult to claim a recent inner-London origin for it – the frequencies are no higher than those quoted for Derby of between ¼ and ⅓ of tokens (Foulkes/Docherty 2000:44). As we have noted, extreme K-backing and DH-stopping may function as ethnic markers. In Havering at least, DH-stopping seems to have gained salience as an ethnic marker:

Lisa (Havering): erm have you heard people talking Hackney? 'like [d]at' if you know what I mean

Derek (from Havering): … he has he's created somewhat of a black accent erm I don't think he knows he's doing it anymore but every now and again it sort of slips out . and he sort of 'speaks like [d]at' and it's you know it's it is strange it does happen erm .

Aggregates mask specific usages. For initial /t/ and /d/ (e.g., *ten*, *dash*), retroflex [ʈ] and [ɖ] were used near-categorically by speakers having particularly strong ties with Bangladesh.

4.5 Grammatical/discourse analyses

Overview

A first 'sweep' of the transcripts identified (a) potential innovations, used only by Hackney adolescents and not, to our knowledge, reported elsewhere in the UK; (b) mainstream non-standard features used by both elderly and adolescent speakers. Due to space limitations we summarise only the main points.

- Havering elderly speakers used more standard forms overall.

- Mainstream (also traditional London) features such as past tense and participle verb forms (e.g., *see, drived*) and demonstrative *them* were used by Hackney elderly speakers and by adolescents of all ethnicities in both locations (though see below).

- Innovations include:

  o pronoun *youse* (2nd person plural): *and then youse can start talking that way*
  o indefinite pronoun *man* (cf. French *on*): *it's her personality man's looking at*
  o conjoined verbs without *and*: *like we just sit smoke*
  o absence of preposition *to*: *I'm going countryside*
  o plural *-dem: one of the boydem then went <sound effect>*
  o *why…for* question frame: *I said "why you searching my jacket for?"*
  o *this is* + Subject quotative expression
  o *enough* (and *nuff*) as intensifier

A single explanation for innovations is unlikely: possible sources include:

(a) Afro-Caribbean speakers:
- *-dem*
- *this is* +Subject

– used by second generation Afro-Caribbean adolescents in Sebba's 1980s London recordings (though one token only of *this is me*);

(b) Discourse strategies:
- quotative *this is* plus Subject: deictics are widely used as vernacular quotatives (e.g. *here's me* in Belfast English; Milroy/Milroy 1977 German *ich/er so* (Golato 2000:43-4)

- *youse*: repair of gap in pronoun system (Wright 1997);

- *why…for*: syntactic blend of *why* and *what…for* question forms, mainly used to frame reported speech

(c) language/dialect contact:
– probably relevant for several features: e.g., language transfer/imperfect learning could account for the first four innovations above.

The discourse marker *you get me* is used mainly in Hackney but is also used in Havering.

Quantitative analyses

Mainstream non-standard features

***Was/were* variation**

Please see nominated output 2. Briefly, we analysed 5328 tokens from all speakers, finding that levelling to a *was/weren't* system is well underway in Havering, as attested elsewhere in the UK. Inner London does not appear to be the source of this pattern. Speaker ethnicity there was highly significant, with Bangladeshi adolescents tending towards using standard English past BE forms, and Afro-Caribbeans leading a trend to levelled *was/wasn't*. White Anglo usage was affected by both levelling trends reflecting, we assume, the nature of individual speakers' friendship groups (to be investigated in our future research).

Relativisers

We analysed 1871 restrictive relative clauses, from all speakers. See **Figure 9** and **Tables 11–13.**
Non-standard *what* is declining in inner London, despite claims (e.g. Hermann 2005:58) that *what* is spreading as a supra-regional form via London (**Figure 9**). The loss may have begun in London; cf. **Table 11**.

Both Hackney and Havering show more extreme levelling to *that* than is reported elsewhere in the UK (Tagliamonte 2002, Tottie 1997): *that* predominates with the word *people,* which elsewhere correlates with *who* (Tagliamonte et al. 2005) and in existential clauses (68%) and clefts (75%), which elsewhere prefer zero. Unlike elsewhere in the UK (Britain 2007), the zero strategy is declining (cf. **Figures 9** and **10**), especially in inner London. Here the highest *that* users are individuals from minority ethnic groups, perhaps from learning a general *that* strategy for marking subordinate clauses. If so, language contact is reinforcing a general UK levelling of the system and the loss of non-standard *what*.

Who is stable (**Figures 9** and **10**) in London, though declining elsewhere in the UK (Tagliamonte 2002, Tottie 1997), and less frequent overall in Hackney than Havering (and preadolescents in Redbridge, who have 21% (Levey 2006)).

Negative concord

Preliminary analysis was of 517 tokens from a subset of speakers (all Hackney elderly speakers, 19 adolescents from Hackney and 16 from Havering). Usage shows a dramatic increase in adolescent speech relative to elderly speakers, earlier London teenagers (COLT), and other southern regions (**Table 14**), especially in Hackney. Ethnicity and gender are significant independent factors (**Table 15**). We are currently extending the analysis to include more speakers, a multivariate analysis and a qualitative analysis of discourse function.

Prepositions

Preliminary analysis of the traditional southern form *off of* (*take your shoes off of the table*) versus *off* (31 adolescents, 93 tokens) also reveals robust usage, especially among Hackney Anglo females.

<u>Other forms</u>

Quotative expressions

3158 tokens were analysed, from all elderly speakers and a subset of 41 adolescents. Compared to the elderly speakers, there is a high incidence of GO, especially in outer London (**Table 16**). *BE LIKE* is more frequent than in COLT (0.5%) and outer London preadolescent usage (5%; Levey 2007), and is further grammaticalised in inner London (**Table 17**). It seems unlikely that London was the first UK location to take up this globally innovating form: rather, the multilingualism and linguistic creativity of inner London adolescents may make speakers more receptive to new forms. They have an innovative *this is*+Subject quotative expression that is female led (**Table 18**), and used by all the individuals we have identified as linguistic innovators (Cheshire et al. in press).

Intensifiers

Preliminary analysis of the Hackney elderly (90 tokens) and a subset of 32 Hackney and Havering adolescents (640 tokens) found *really* and *very* accounting for 95% of elderly

speakers' intensifiers, with *very* the predominant form (**Table 19**). Havering adolescents use *really* twice as often as the Hackney elderly, and *very* rarely occurs. This is consistent with the generation change noted by Ito and Tagliamonte (2003) in York.

Havering usage is consistent with other researchers' claims that *really* and *well* are dominant for young speakers, but these changes do not seem to have inner London as the source. Here *very* and *really* account for 89% of all intensifiers. However this is due to 4 speakers from the minority ethnic groups who use only these two forms. Other individuals use a narrower range of forms than in Havering, except for Kim (one of the 7 identified innovators), who uses 9 different intensifiers, and is responsible for most tokens of the innovative *enough/nuff*. In this case, then, language and dialect contact results in an independent trajectory for inner London.

4.6 Sociolinguistic models of innovation, diffusion and levelling

Our data support a more complex model of innovation, diffusion and levelling than is often assumed, taking into account the social complexity of metropolises and inter-group relations. This is suggested under 4.5 above and in the Conclusion to the '*was/were'* article. It is elaborated in the final section of the 'Reversing "drift"' article. Grammatical features show the same range of possibilities as vowels and consonants: in particular, inner-city *was/wasn't* levelling is a striking parallel to GOAT-backing/monophthonging, where the change runs counter to regional tendencies. A comparison of linguistic components, using 'salience', is envisaged in future work including our current project (see 8, below).

5. Activities

There have been 14 refereed oral paper presentations at major international conferences, including NWAV, UKLVC and Sociolinguistics Symposium as well as invited lectures at Hamburg, Marburg, Singapore, Bangkok, Copenhagen, Wellington, Christchurch, Oxford, Essex.

6. Outputs

- In addition to the two outputs nominated for assessment, there have been two further publications:

  Torgersen, E., Kerswill, P. and Fox, S. (2006). Ethnicity as a source of changes in the London vowel system. In F. Hinskens (ed.). *Language Variation - European Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 249-263.
  Cheshire, J., Fox, S., Kerswill, P. and Torgersen, E. (in press) Ethnicity, friendship network and social practices as the motor of dialect change: linguistic innovation in London. To appear in *Sociolinguistica* 22..

- A workshop for lecturers and students at Hackney Community College, one of the fieldwork sites, has been conducted.

- In May 2006, issues raised by the project were disseminated to Heads of English schools and EFL teachers at the English UK conference.

- Lexical innovations taken from our corpus are to be included in the latest version of *Working with Texts* (Routledge) with links to the project website.

- The project website http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fss/projects/linguistics/innovators/index.htm contains uploaded publications and lectures.

7. Impacts

- The project has been reported in numerous newspaper/magazine articles including a double spread in *New Scientist* (Dec 2005) and articles in *The Independent* (April 2006), *The Guardian* (April 2006) and *The Independent on Sunday* (November 2006).

- Radio interviews have included *Capital Radio* (April 2006), *BBC Radio London* (April 2006), *BBC Radio Lancaster* (November 2006), *Radio New Zealand* (February 2007) and *BBC Radio 3 Lingua Franca* (November 2007).

- The presentation English UK (see above) resulted in numerous invitations for talks at ESOL institutions, highlighting a growing awareness of spoken language in the teaching of English as a foreign or additional language.

8. Future research priorities

We are currently working on the 3-year project *Multicultural London English: the emergence, acquisition and diffusion of a new variety* (ESRC, RES-062-23-0814), which builds on findings from the present project.

We have a grant (British Academy, SG-47692) to perform a semi-automated corpus linguistic study, incorporating socio-demographic information, of grammar and discourse features not analysed in the original study. This represents an innovative cross-fertilisation of two linguistic subdisciplines.

RESEARCH PROJECT ON LANGUAGE AND CULTURE IN LONDON

I give permission for the recording that has been made of my speech to be used for teaching and research. I understand that this is the only purpose for which it will be used and that although extracts from the recording may be reproduced in handouts for teaching or in research publications, confidentiality and my anonymity will be preserved at all times.

I understand that this consent form will be stored separately from the recording, so that the recording cannot be traced to me.

Name…………………………………………………………………….

Signature……………………………………………………………

Date…………………………………………………………………

Transcription guidelines

- Type all figures as words [as in above example, not 'about 15 years']
- When the name of a person, school, specific road or specific place is mentioned, make the transcript anonymous as follows using curved brackets:
  > e.g. if the speaker says 'I went to Hackney Upper School for Girls' type in 'I went to (name of school mentioned)'
- Start each new utterance on a new line. This isn't necessary for very small feedback responses like *'mmm', 'right', 'yeah'* etc. Insert these where appropriate between square brackets, indicating the speaker by using their initial and remembering to use bold if it is the interviewer.
  > Mary: Hackney is a great place [**S: yeah**] and I wouldn't move
- Use no capital letters except for proper nouns and "I", and use a minimum of conventional punctuation:
  Use question marks, even if the grammatical structure does not indicate a question but the intonation does, as in the second utterance here:
  > **Sue: do you like rap music?**
  > Mary: yeah .. and you?

  Don't use commas or fullstops to indicate clauses and sentences.
  Instead, use the following conventions to indicate pauses;
  > 1 fullstop   .   = very short pause
  > 2 fullstops   ..   = pause
  > 3 fullstops   …   = long pause

  [This is subjective but use your own instinct on what constitutes short/long]
- Use conventional spelling most of the time but where necessary use colloquialisms such as *innit, yeah, gonna, dunno, wanna, cos etc* if this is what was **said**. If you are unsure of the pronunciation use the conventional spelling but put a question mark in curly brackets after the word:
  > **Sue: What are you doing at the weekend?**
  > Mary: I don't know {?} yet
- Fillers are to be transcribed as pronounced e.g. *mmm, mhm, er, um, ahh,* etc
- Direct speech reporting is to be enclosed within double quote marks:
  > Mary: ……..so he said "give me my cap back" but I just ran off
- Paralinguistic features are to be enclosed within angled brackets e.g. *<coughs> , <laughs> , <yawns> , <sniffs>,* etc. Use this method also if you want to record a comment, such as *<another person enters the room> , <mobile phone rings>* etc
- Where you can't decipher the speech, type xxxx, using one x per syllable where possible [to give an indication of the length of indecipherable speech]
- When speech is overlapping, use the overlap facility on 'Transcriber'. Then indicate the overlapping speech with italics, and place a single slash at each end of the overlapping parts of speech, for both speakers
  > **Sue: so on saturday you went */to the pub/*?**
  > Mary: */clubbing/* yeah <laughs> **..** got really drunk
- **Don't tidy up the speech. Leave in the repetitions, fillers and errors.**