

Louisiana State University

LSU Scholarly Repository

LSU Master's Theses

Graduate School

2014

"Mais, you talk like me? /ju ra:/": kindergarteners' use of five Cajun English phonological features

Hannah Joy Smitherman

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses



Part of the [Communication Sciences and Disorders Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smitherman, Hannah Joy, "'Mais, you talk like me? /ju ra:/": kindergarteners' use of five Cajun English phonological features" (2014). *LSU Master's Theses*. 1719.

https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/1719

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Master's Theses by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

*MAIS, YOU TALK LIKE ME? /ju ɔra:/: KINDERGARTENERS' USE
OF FIVE CAJUN ENGLISH PHONOLOGICAL FEATURES*

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

The Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders

by
Hannah Joy Smitherman
B.A., Louisiana State University, 2012
May 2014

for my Pawpaw,
thank you for starting my love for Cajun culture
and inevitably inspiring my studies

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are too many people that have helped, encouraged, and supported me throughout this process and I hope I can properly thank them all. To Lee, my wonderful fiancé who has now stood by me through two thesis projects, I cannot thank you enough for all of the late night trips to Hatcher Hall, for the many hours you have listened to more than you want to know about Cajun English, and for the genuine undying support you have provided me through graduate school. To my parents, for always encouraging me to pursue my dreams and for providing my siblings and me with endless opportunities, I truly couldn't have done any of this without you. To my sister Emily, for setting the bar high and always pushing me to be my very best; thank you for all of the encouraging words you have provided over the last two years, even while being 900 miles away. To my brother Jacob, thank you for allowing me to take over our living room this last year with my work and for making me have fun when I needed it. To my amazing and loving grandparents, Mimi and Didi, I cannot begin to tell you how much your involvement in my life has meant to me and how much I appreciate everything you have done for our family.

To the most patient, driven, and understanding mentor I could ever hope to have had, Dr. Oetting, you have provided so many opportunities to me over the last three years. I have grown as a student, researcher, and clinician because of you and what you have allowed me to do. I am so thankful I walked into your office as a nervous undergraduate and told you that I enjoyed transcribing language samples. To my second mentor, Andy Rivière, you are the sole reason that I started this project. Your love for Cajun studies is inspiring and I could not have completed this without your continuing encouragement and support. To my committee, Dr. Dubois and Dr. Kim, thank you for all of your time and feedback. And finally, to my committed and hard working lab mates, thank you for all of the countless hours you have put towards this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	2
History of the Cajun Culture and Language	2
Identifying as Cajun	5
Nonmainstream English Features of Adult CE Speakers	6
CE Features of Child Speakers	10
Purpose	14
METHODS	15
Design	15
Participant Pool	15
Measures for Determining Typical Language Development and SLI	17
Measures of CE Phonological Features	19
RESULTS	22
/t, d/ for /θ, ð/ Substitution	22
Unaspirated /p, t, k/	23
Heavy Vowel Nasalization	24
Monophthongization	25
Glide Weakening on Vowels	26
DISCUSSION	28
Findings Related to Past Research	28
Limitations	31
Future Directions	32
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX A	36
APPENDIX B	38
APPENDIX C	39

APPENDIX D.....	40
VITA.....	41

LIST OF TABLES

1. Mean Number of Features by Dialect and CE Influence from Oetting and Garrity (2006)	12
2. Profile of Participants by Cajun Status and Clinical Status	16
3. Mean Participant Performance Scores by Cajun Status and Clinical Status	18
4. Profile of Participants by Cajun Status	19
5. Mean Participant Performance Scores by Cajun Status	19
6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of /t, d/ Feature	22
7. Words Produced with /t, d/ for /θ, ð/	23
8. Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of Unaspirated /p, t, k/ Feature	23
9. Words Produced with Unaspirated /p, t, k/	24
10. Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of Heavy Vowel Nasalization Feature	24
11. Words Produced with Heavy Vowel Nasalization	25
12. Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of Monophthongization Feature	25
13. Words Produced with Monophthongization	26
14. Means, Standard Deviations, and Frequencies of Glide Weakening Feature	27
15. Words Produced with Glide Weakening on Vowels	27
16. Means and Standard Deviations of Past Research Compared to Current Study	29

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Map of Acadiana Triangle	5
2. Map of Ascension Parish	11
3. Map of Assumption Parish	13

ABSTRACT

Cajun English (CE) is an understudied dialect that is spoken in and around the Acadian triangle of Louisiana. Of the studies that exist, almost all have been completed with adults. The purpose of the current study was to determine if children whose parents have identified their family as Cajun use five phonological features of CE (/t, d/ for /θ, ð/, nonaspirated /p, t, k/, heavy vowel nasalization, monophthongization, and glide weakening on vowels) more frequently than those identified as non-Cajun.

The participants were 11 kindergarteners who were identified as Cajun or non-Cajun and who resided in Assumption Parish in rural south Louisiana. Cajun status was determined through a questionnaire that asked families about their family history, self and familial exposure to Cajun French, and self and familial French-speaking abilities. Measures of the children's use of CE phonological features was based on an analysis of one-minute audio clips that had been randomly extracted from 30-minute, examiner-child play-based language samples.

The participants with Cajun status produced the /t, d/, heavy vowel nasalization, and monophthongization features more frequently than the participants with a non-Cajun status, and the difference was statistically significant for the monophthongization feature. This finding may suggest that CE phonological features are currently heard in the vowels that children produce. In addition, all of the participants produced higher frequencies of the CE features than did a group of same-age participants who lived in a neighboring parish and who had been previously studied. This finding may indicate parish effects on children's CE phonological use that need to be considered as a contributing factor in discussions of dialect variation and change.

Keywords: Cajun English, dialect, phonological features, children

INTRODUCTION

Louisiana is filled with a variety of nonmainstream American English dialects including Southern African American English (SAAE), Southern White English (SWE), Cajun English (CE), Creole English (CrE), and many others. These dialects are rooted in a deep sense of culture and identity that help to distinctly define what Louisiana represents as a whole. My deep love and appreciation of the Cajun culture stems from my own heritage. My mother taught me at a young age of my Acadian ancestors who migrated from Nova Scotia to Louisiana in the late eighteenth century. Despite growing up in Texas, we celebrated Mardi Gras as a family and shared the history of the holiday, king cake, and my grandparents' parade costumes with our neighbors and classmates to educate others of our culture. This personal tie has sparked my interest in researching the CE dialect. I want the children who present with a Cajun family history to have knowledge about the CE dialect. Finally, as a future speech-language pathologist in South Louisiana, I want my studies of CE to help others understand the defining features of CE so that children's use of CE is not incorrectly classified as a disorder. Educators and other professionals often consider nonmainstream American English dialectal features grammatically incorrect when compared to the structures of mainstream American English because they do not understand the differences between a dialect and a disorder (Seymour, Bland-Stewart, & Green, 2002). This idea of *dialect versus difference* motivated the current study in which I examined phonological features characteristic of CE.

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of the Cajun Culture and Language

According to Henry and Bankston (2002) and Bernard (2003), Cajuns are typically defined as descendents of Acadians from *Acadie*, or Acadia in English (the present-day provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island in Canada) who originally settled in Louisiana between 1765 and 1785. This migration, or rather deportation, from Canada began after the French ceded control of Acadia to the British in 1713 with the Treaty of Utrecht. The Acadian people were treated as hostages by the British and were slowly removed from the area. *Le Grand Dérangement*, or The Great Upheaval, resulted in the deportation of nearly 11,500 Acadians.

Henry and Bankston (2002) also state that after facing many hardships in their various new homes, many Acadians found a sense of comfort in the idea of settling in a community-like area similar to Acadia. Roughly 3,000 Acadians found this idea of comfort in geographically isolated Louisiana, which was under Spanish control at the time. Contact with Spanish, German, Irish, and Italian immigrants in isolated areas of Louisiana led to a distinct dialect of French with unique vocabulary, phonology, morphology, and syntactic structures (Dubois & Melançon, 1997). Dubois and Melançon describe the Cajun community who spoke this distinct French dialect as an isolated group until they began to integrate into the dominant culture in the mid twentieth century.

In 1929, the Louisiana state government ruled English to be the sole language of the state, specifically in education and law. The major effects of banning French in schools are summarized by Emmitte (2013) to be:

- 1) Cajuns became ashamed of their language, 2) it forced Cajun French speakers to actively learn English for the first time, 3) those who spoke English now had to learn how

to read and write it as well, and 4) Cajuns were confronted with claims that their language was now invalid (p. 22).

Emmitte (2013) describes Cajuns of the “old generation” as hesitant to use Cajun French outside of their homes after this ruling, which in turn greatly decreased the usage of Cajun French in the Cajun community. Beginning in the nineteenth century, a period of bilingualism began, as described by Dubois (2010), in which Cajun French speakers perceived learning English as more or less beneficial to their economic status. They were punished for using French in school including the writing of *I will not speak French at school* on the blackboard and kneeling on a bed of uncooked rice (Ancelet, 1988). This stigma ultimately began the attrition of Cajun French. Gradually, use of Cajun French declined through periods of transition that have seen vacillations of acceptance and rejection by members of the Cajun community (Dubois & Melançon, 1997).

Dubois and Horvath (2002) describe the children of the “older generation” of Cajuns as the “middle-aged generation” who began to regularly attend school, which in turn meant that they would learn more English than their parents. With the decline of agricultural occupations and the rise of industry jobs, Cajuns began to integrate into American culture (Bernard, 2003). This started a chain reaction of rejecting Cajun culture and adopting more of the American consumer habits from foods to entertainment (Henry & Bankston, 2002). The English that was learned by these families was initially influenced by their use of French, and this dialect of English was, and continues to be typically referred to as Cajun English (CE; Ancelet, 1988). As will be evident from studies of CE, this dialect has evolved and is now considered to be no longer influenced by French (Dubois & Melançon, 1997; Dubois & Horvath, 2002; Emmitte, 2013).

Beginning in 1968, a Cajun Renaissance, which was supported by the state government of Louisiana and the creation of the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL), brought back Cajun types of music, food and literature. The initial objective of CODOFIL was to offer French in schools in order to *preserve the use of French* in the state. CODOFIL brought teachers from France, Belgium, Canada, and other nations to Louisiana and installed more than 26 French-language immersion programs in Louisiana for the revitalization and preservation efforts of French in Louisiana. Unfortunately, these programs focused and continue to focus on instruction of academic or “standard” French and this instructional emphasis has brought even more stigma towards the use of Cajun French in the state (Emmitte, 2013).

Another effort of preservation of French in Louisiana occurred in 1978, when CODOFIL led a movement to coin the term “Cajun,” reflecting the English pronunciation of *cadien*. CODOFIL organized a committee to standardize a written form of Cajun French or Louisiana French (Henry & Bankston, 2002; Ryon, 2002). By establishing the acceptance and developing orthographic representations of an oral-only dialect helped the Cajun culture become more self-identified and codified. More recently, in order to preserve French in Louisiana, the terms *la francophonie*, or the French-speaking world, and *adiens*, or Cajuns have emerged (Henry & Bankston, 2002). The adaptation of these French terms has helped to revive the acceptance of Cajun identity in a more positive light than it was portrayed in the past. Also, some young generations of Cajuns comprised primarily of young men, were, and presently still are, trying to revive Cajun French (Dubois & Melançon, 1997).

Identifying as Cajun

Dubois and colleagues have studied the revival of Cajun identity, which is referred to as the Cajun Renaissance. For example, Dubois and Melançon (1997) created a questionnaire sent to over 1,000 individuals in four Cajun communities (Lafourche, Vermillion, St. Landry, and Avoyelles Parishes). The authors chose these communities based on the following criteria:

They are in regions that according to the 1990 U.S. census contain the largest number of individuals who claim to speak French at home, each of the towns contains the largest number of Caucasians who say they speak French at home, they contain a large proportion of individuals claiming Acadian ancestry, they offer sample coverage of the geographic diversity of CF, they differ among themselves with respect to social and economic levels, and they range from largely rural to more urbanized areas (Dubois & Melançon, 1997, p. 69).



Figure 1. Map of Acadiana Triangle

Above is a map displaying the Acadiana Triangle. The parishes located in Dubois and Melançon's study included Avoyelles, St. Landry, Vermilion, and LaFourche. The questions focused on usage of the language, networks of linguistic contacts, linguistic ability, opinions about maintaining and using Cajun French, attitudes about the varieties of French, Cajun identity, and the efforts of CODOFIL. Sample questions included "I can count to ten, I can name the days of the week, I can give the date (month and year), I can order a meal in a restaurant, and I can give biographical information" (Dubois & Melançon, 1997, p. 75). Results from this survey showed "the more one has access to the Cajun French language, the more one self-identifies as Cajun" (Dubois & Melançon, 1997, p. 63). Those defined as native speakers or semi-speakers identified themselves as Cajun most often, while the passive speakers considered themselves to be Cajun American. The middle generation was found to be the most reluctant to declare themselves Cajun; they reached adulthood during the time when Cajun identity was looked down upon. The qualification for identifying a "real" Cajun was also included in the survey. The two answers with the highest frequencies were to have Cajun ancestry (80%) and to have parents or grandparents who speak Cajun French (67%). Speaking Cajun French oneself, living in Louisiana or living in a Cajun community were not seen to be important to the majority of the respondents.

Nonmainstream English Features of Adult CE Speakers

Phonological features. Some nonmainstream English phonological features have been documented for CE. Although these features were initially tied to Cajun French, data from Dubois and Horvath (1998, 1999) show that there has been a recent recycling of and even an increase in the use of these features in CE. Dubois and Horvath (1998) presented a variationist study examining four phonological features of CE including using /t, d/ for /θ, ð/, nonaspiration

of the stops /p, t, k/, monophthongization of /aɪ/ and vowel nasalization in the St. Landry community. The data for this sample was used from the “Cajun French/English Sociolinguistic Survey” (Dubois, 1997c), which was designed to include a representative sample of French speakers in the Cajun community. The total sample consisted of 120 fluent, bilingual French and English speakers who were born, raised, and still live in their home parish. The sub-sample for this particular study consisted of 28 speakers divided into three age groups (old, middle-aged, and young). The authors predicted that if there were interference from French, then a decrease in frequency over time would be documented in the speakers’ CE usage. Specifically, they predicted that these features would be more frequently used by the older generation, less by the middle-aged generation, and even less by the younger generation. The results displayed their expected pattern where the old generation used more of the features than the other two generations, and the middle generation produced a dramatically decreased rate of the vernacular features. However, the authors also found that the young generation produced all of the features of CE except for nonaspiration of /p, t, k/, and their rate of use was higher than that of the middle generation. The authors attributed the young speakers’ use of CE features to the Cajun Renaissance. They posit that the young generation has pride in their Cajun identity, and they express this identity through their use of CE. This new development of CE is not tied to the influence of the French language, but rather reflects an evolution of the CE dialect.

In a second study, Dubois and Horvath (1999) examined the use of the dental stops /t/ and /d/ in the place of the interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ in the St. Landry community. The data for this study was taken from the same sub-sample mentioned above, consisting of 28 fluent CF and CE speakers who were born, raised, and still lived in their home parish. A native English speaker from South Louisiana interviewed the speakers in English, and themes of the interview

included sociodemographic topics such as residence, work, education, and parents' origins, their social network, and their linguistic usage of French versus English (Dubois & Horvath, 1999). Nine speakers were classified as young, 10 as middle-aged, and nine as old. About 40% of the speakers had a more open social network because they worked outside the parish or had a spouse who was not from the parish. Most of the old and middle-aged speakers were over 40 years old and learned French as their first language. In contrast, the young speakers were fluent in French but learned English as their first language. Through analyses of stress, number of syllables, word class, and type of function word, Dubois and Horvath (1999) found that the older generation used more of the dental variants /t, d/ than all other ages. The middle-aged group decreased their usage, and the younger generation demonstrated higher rates of usage than the middle-aged group. The authors also found that men substituted with /d/, whereas women dropped the dental variants /t, d/ almost entirely. The authors interpreted their findings as showing women using less CE features than men due to their involvement in social networks outside of their Cajun communities.

Next, Dubois and Horvath (2003b) examined the Creole English (CrE) speaker's use of interdental fricatives /θ, ð/ as dental stops /t, d/ and the monophthongization of the diphthong /aɪ/ to compare CrE speakers to CE speakers. The authors were interested in Louisiana CrE because they share a French-speaking history with CE speakers. Both CE and CrE are considered to be spoken by "rural speech communities" and are known to share some characteristics. Twenty-four male CrE speakers were examined from the Creole African American population in St. Landry Parish. This data was taken from a corpus including 42 CrE speakers born, raised, and still living in their home parish. The men were divided into four age groups: old (born between 1915-1920), senior (1932-1940), middle-aged (1945-1955), and young (1966-1980). Fifteen

male CE speakers from St. Landry Parish were included as well. The analyses were based on interviews conducted in English with Creole African American, African American, and white Cajun interviewers (Dubois & Horvath, 2003b). When analyzing the use of /d/ for /ð/, the authors found that the two older speakers of CrE and CE used higher rates of /d/ than the others. The middle-aged speakers of both dialects decreased in their use of /d/, but in CE and not CrE, the young speakers increased their use of /d/ to be similar to that of the older CE and CrE speakers. In contrast, when examining the use of /a:/ for /aɪ/, high rates of use were produced by the older and younger speakers of both CE and CrE.

Morphological structures. Adult CE also includes morphological structures that help distinguish it from other nonmainstream American English dialects. Dubois and Horvath (2003a) examined five of these CE features, which were: zero regular verbal –s (he give me six), zero regular past tense (she wash my face), zero is (she pretty), zero are (what we doing?), and was leveling (they was neighbors). Their data were taken from 16 fluent French and English speakers of the 120 speakers of the Cajun French/English Sociolinguistic Corpus, who were born, raised, and still lived in their home parish. Four speaker groups were created based on age (old and young) and language learned first (French or English). The Old/French group included four speakers born between 1911 and 1931 who learned French first from parents who were monolingual in French. The Old/English group included four speakers born between 1912 and 1923 who learned English as a first language. The Young/French group included four speakers born between 1961 and 1965 who learned French as a first language. The Young/English group included four speakers born in the same decade as the other young group, but who learned English first.

Through the use of Goldvarb, a statistical program in the field of sociolinguistics, the authors analyzed the speakers' use of the five morphological features during a 45- minute interview conducted in English. The use of these features varied amongst generations. The Old/French group displayed higher rates of the five morphological features than any other group with 81% zero regular past tense, 65% zero regular verbal –s, 47% zero is, 88% zero are, and 72% was leveling. The Old/English group displayed variable rates with 49% zero regular past tense, 19% zero regular verbal –s, 14% zero is, 72% zero are, and 22% was leveling. The Young/French speakers displayed a high rate of use for three features (48% zero regular past tense, 73% zero are, and 50% was leveling) and low rates of use for two features (25% regular verbal -s and 32% zero is). The Young/English group displayed a high rate of use for zero are with 73% and decreased rates of use for the other features including 29% zero regular past tense, 16% zero regular verbal –s, 11% zero is, and 16% was leveling.

CE Features of Child Speakers

Two CE studies have been completed with child speakers. First, Oetting and Garrity (2006) examined five phonological and five morphological features of CE used by children. All of the features were those that had been studied by Dubois and Horvath (1998, 1999, 2003a). The phonological features included: the substitution of /t, d/ for /θ, ð/, nonaspirated /p, t, k/, monophthongization, heavy vowel nasalization in word-final positions, and glide weakening on vowels. The five morphological features included: zero regular verbal –s, zero regular past tense, zero is, zero are, and was leveling.

All of the children resided in a community of the Acadiana area; however, it is located on the eastern border where few individuals claim to speak French at home.



Figure 2. Map of Ascension Parish

Above is a map displaying the parish where the participants resided. All of the 93 children included in the study were documented to be speakers of SAAE or SWE, but in addition to this, a subset of 31 children were also classified as presenting a CE influence within their dialects. Graduate students who listened to 1-minute audio excerpts of each child's language sample completed the phonological coding. Morphological coding was completed by graduate students who used each child's full 20-minute language sample.

Results indicated that more (87%) children classified as having a perceived CE influence produced the phonological features than those without a CE influence (47%). In addition, two patterns, nonaspirated stops and glide weakening, showed statistically significant group

differences (Oetting & Garrity, 2006). In contrast, the authors found that the children's use of the CE morphological structures was unrelated to their CE status.

Table 1 displays results from the Oetting and Garrity (2006) study. This table presents the results as a feature of the child's primary dialect (SAAE and SWE) and Cajun status (+/-).

Table 1. Mean number of features by dialect and CE influence from Oetting and Garrity (2006)^a

	Excerpts with a CE influence	Excerpts without a CE influence
Nonaspirated stops (<i>n</i> = 41)		
SAAE	1.06 (1.66)	.68 (1.13)
SWE	.85 (1.21)	.10 (.38)
/t, d/ for /θ, ð/ (<i>n</i> = 91)		
SAAE	1.44 (1.72)	1.41 (1.99)
SWE	.92 (1.15)	.60 (2.10)
Heavy vowel nasalization (<i>n</i> = 31)		
SAAE	.08 (.28)	.36 (.58)
SWE	.67 (.97)	.25 (.77)
Monophthongization (<i>n</i> = 50)		
SAAE	.15 (.38)	1.32 (1.36)
SWE	.94 (1.79)	.05 (.22)
Glide weakening on vowels (<i>n</i> = 110)		
SAAE	1.31 (1.38)	1.59 (2.67)
SWE	2.33 (2.03)	.40 (1.08)

^a Standard deviations reported in parentheses.

In a second study, Spedale (2013) examined children's use of the morphological features of CE. In this study, the children's Cajun status was determined based on the schools they attended. Those classified as Cajun attended a school in a French area and the school contained a French immersion program. Those classified as non-Cajun attended a school in a less French area and this school did not contain a French immersion program. All of the children lived in Assumption Parish, LA and attended either Pierre Part Primary or Bayou L'Ourse Primary. As indicated by the map in Figure 3, Spedale's participants lived further into the Acadiana Triangle and closer to the CE speaking adults who have been studied by Dubois and Horvath (1997, 1998, 1999, 2003a, 2003b).



Figure 3. Map of Assumption Parish

The children's use of the five CE morphological features (zero regular verbal –s, zero regular past tense, zero is, zero are, and was leveling) was examined through transcribing and coding each child's 30-minute language sample. Results again showed that the effect of Cajun status resulted in non-significant findings for each CE morphological feature. From the results of Spedale (2013) and Oetting and Garrity (2006), it is likely that a child's Cajunness cannot be determined by the morphological features of CE. Given this, the current study focused on CE phonology.

Purpose

The purpose of the proposed study was to answer the following research question: Do children whose parents have identified their family as Cajun use the five phonological features of CE (/t, d/ for /θ, ð/, nonaspirated /p, t, k/ in the initial position of a word, heavy vowel nasalization, monophthongization, and glide weakening on vowels) more frequently than those identified as non-Cajun? Based on previous research, I hypothesized that children whose parents identify their family as Cajun would use the five features more frequently than those not identified as Cajun. I also predicted that of the five features, the children identified as Cajun would produce nonaspirated stops and glide weakening the most.

METHODS

Design

This study employed a between-subjects design using a pool of data that had already been collected as part of a larger study by Oetting, Hegarty, and McDonald (2009-2014). The independent variable was CE self-identification of the participants: Cajun or non-Cajun. Cajun self-identification was determined by responses received on a questionnaire. The dependent variables were five CE phonological features, operationally defined as: (1) /t, d/ for /θ, ð/, (2) nonaspirated /p, t, k/ in the initial position of a word, (3) monophthongization, (4) heavy vowel nasalization, and (5) glide weakening on vowels. For each participant, these features were identified through phonological coding of a one-minute excerpt of conversational speech.

Participant Pool

The participant pool included 54 kindergarteners who lived in Assumption Parish, which is the same parish from which Spedale's (2013) participants were drawn. The participants attended either Pierre Part Primary ($n = 23$) or Bayou L'Ourse Primary ($n = 31$). All who were selected for the participant pool passed a hearing screening. A questionnaire was given to the families of the children who made up the participant pool. This questionnaire was created using one that was given to adults by Dubois and Melançon (1997). Questions pertained to categories such as self and family identity as Cajun or Creole, self and familial exposure to Cajun or Creole French, and self and familial French speaking abilities (see Appendix A). The families included in this study were called or sent the questionnaire by mail depending on whether they included their phone number or address on the initial consent form.

Once the completed questionnaires were collected, the children's Cajun status was determined. Non-Cajun status was determined when the family answered that they didn't

consider themselves Cajun and there were no family members who spoke CF. Cajun status was determined if family members identified themselves as Cajun and had family members who spoke CF. Of those classified as Cajun, responses to questions about CF exposure varied widely. Results ranged from the children being exposed to CF their whole lives and knowing some common phrases themselves, to their grandparents being the only family members to speak CF in their daily lives. Some caregivers reported to speaking CF at home whereas others reported their children being exposed to CF only a few hours per week. However, every questionnaire from the 8 classified as Cajun reported that the caregivers' grandparents and parents (or the participants' great-grandparents and grandparents) spoke both CF and English.

Five groups were created from these results included three groups of children with typical development (TD) and non-Cajun, children with TD and Cajun, and children with TD and Cajun and enrolled in the French immersion program at Pierre Part Primary. The final two groups were comprised of children classified as specific language impaired (SLI) based on their performance on tests that examined their non-verbal intelligence, language, and articulation. These two SLI groups included one child classified as non-Cajun and three classified as Cajun. Table 2 lists the means and standard deviations for the five Cajun status groups' age (in months) and level of maternal education (in years).

Table 2. Profile of Participants by Cajun Status and Clinical Status

Characteristic	TD & non-Cajun (<i>n</i> = 2)	TD & Cajun (<i>n</i> = 4)	TD & Cajun & immersion class (<i>n</i> = 2)	SLI & non-Cajun (<i>n</i> = 1)	SLI & Cajun (<i>n</i> = 2)
Mean Age in Months	64.50 (3.54)	67.25 (5.32)	72.50 (2.12)	62.00 (-)	68.50 (0.71)
Mean Level of Maternal Education	9.50 (2.12)	13.75 (2.63)	16.50 (0.71)	17.00 (-)	16.50 (0.71)

Measures for Determining Typical Language Development and SLI

To confirm the language abilities of the children in the participant pool, each child was given a battery of tests, including the *Primary Test of Nonverbal Intelligence* (PTONI; Ehrler & McGhee, 2008), *Peabody Picture Vocabulary – 4th Edition* (PPVT-4; Dunn and Dunn, 2007), *Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation – 2nd edition* (GFTA-2; Goldman & Fristoe, 2000), and *Diagnostic Evaluation of Language Variation – Norm Referenced Syntax Domain* (DELV-NR; Seymour, Roeper, & de Villiers, 2005).

The PTONI was administered to assess nonverbal intelligence based on standardized scale. The participants were shown a set of pictures and were asked to point to the picture that is different from the others. For the PTONI, a standard score of 100 with a standard deviation of 15 was considered to be within normal limits.

To assess receptive vocabulary, the PPVT-4 was administered. The participants were required to point to a target word from a set of 4 pictures. The difficulty of the stimuli increased based on a developmental scale. A standard score of 100 with a standard deviation of 15 was considered to be within normal limits.

The syntax subtest of the DELV-NR was also administered to measure performance in three syntax domains: comprehension of *wh*-questions, comprehension of passive sentences, and use of articles. Scores from the three subtests were combined to form a standard syntax score. A standard score of 10 with a standard deviation of 3 was considered within normal limits. For a child to be considered TD, their standard syntax score was above -1 standard deviation. For a child to be considered SLI, their standard score was below -1 standard deviation.

The GFTA-2 *Sounds in Words* subtest was administered to measure a child's ability to spontaneously or imitatively produce consonant sounds in the initial, medial, and final positions

of words. A standard score of 100 with a standard deviation of 15 was considered to be within normal limits. The mean and standard deviation of the children's test scores for the five Cajun status groups are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. Mean Participant Performance Scores by Cajun Status and Clinical Status

Assessment	TD & non-Cajun (<i>n</i> = 2)	TD & Cajun (<i>n</i> = 4)	TD & Cajun & immersion class (<i>n</i> = 2)	SLI & non-Cajun (<i>n</i> = 1)	SLI & Cajun (<i>n</i> = 2)
PTONI	109.50 (13.43)	108.00 (15.56)	104.00 (1.41)	112.00 (-)	90.00 (16.97)
PPVT-4	98.00 (2.83)	107.75 (8.38)	100.50 (3.54)	88.00 (-)	86.00 (14.14)
DELV- NR Syntax Domain	8.50 (0.71)	9.75 (0.96)	11.00 (1.41)	5.00 (-)	4.50 (0.71)
GFTA-2	110.50 (2.12)	109.00 (4.69)	109.00 (2.83)	108.00 (-)	108.00 (1.41)

As shown in Table 3, the TD groups earned higher PTONI scores than did the SLI groups, but all of the children's scores were within normal limits on this nonverbal IQ assessment. The TD groups also earned higher language test scores on the PPVT-4 and DELV-NR than did the SLI groups, and this was expected because low scores on these tests were used to classify the children as SLI. Finally, there was not a difference between the TD and SLI groups for scores on the GFTA-2; all children earned scores within normal limits based on this articulation assessment. In other words, children with SLI did not differ in articulation when compared to their peers with typical development. Based on these results, the children with SLI were not excluded from the current study because their clinical status was not expected to affect their phonology. Preliminary analysis of the five phonological CE features also indicated that the findings were not altered with the inclusion of the children with SLI.

Given these findings, the five groups were combined to form two groups, which consisted of eight children classified as Cajun and three classified as non-Cajun. Table 4 lists the means and standard deviations for the children with Cajun status' and the children with non-

Cajun status' age (in months) and level of maternal education (in years). The mean and standard deviation of the children's test scores for the Cajun and non-Cajun groups are displayed in Table 5.

Table 4. Profile of Participants by Cajun Status

Characteristic	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)
Mean Age in Months	68.88 (4.26)	63.67 (2.89)
Mean Level of Maternal Education	15.13 (2.30)	12.00 (4.58)

Table 5. Mean Participant Performance Scores by Cajun Status

Assessment	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)
PTONI	102.50 (14.41)	110.33 (9.61)
PPVT-4	100.50 (12.27)	94.67 (6.11)
DELV-NR Syntax Domain	8.75 (2.82)	7.33 (2.08)
GFTA-2	108.75 (3.33)	109.67 (2.08)

Measures of CE Phonological Features

Data. The data that were coded for the CE phonological features came from a language sample that had been collected from each child. Methods for the language sample elicitation replicated those used in Oetting and McDonald (2002). Graduate research assistants elicited spontaneous language samples through a play-based interaction during a 20-25 minute session. The play materials used to elicit the language samples included: a gas station and cars, a baby doll and bottle, and a miniature picnic set and family. The examiners elicited language by using prompts such as “I wonder if you’ve ever been on a car trip before” and “Tell me about a time you went on a picnic.” Four Apricot picture cards (Arwood, 1985) depicting children at a

grocery store, children playing basketball, children fishing, and children in a fight were also shown to elicit stories from each child.

Coding. From the language samples, randomly selected one-minute audio clips were extracted to examine the participants' use of the five CE phonological features. Phonological coding was completed using procedures by Oetting and Garrity (2006). A coding sheet was created in order to identify and count the number of CE features produced during the one-minute excerpts (see Appendix B). The author first identified the number of opportunities for each CE feature to occur on printed copies of the transcriptions. The author then listened to one CE feature at a time for all of the participants and identified when she heard the targeted CE feature. From the coding sheets, the participants' use of each CE feature was calculated in two ways. Following the methods of Oetting and Garrity (2006), the frequency of each CE phonological feature within the one-minute excerpt was summed for each child. Then following the methods of Dubois and Horvath (1998, 1999, 2003b), the frequency of each CE phonological feature was divided by the number of opportunities each child produced within the one-minute excerpt. Both calculations were completed to allow comparisons to be made across studies.

The features that were examined included substitutions of /t, d/ for /θ, ð/, nonaspirated stops /p, t, k/, monophthongization, heavy vowel nasalization, and glide weakening on vowels. A sixth category titled *Other* was provided on the cover sheet so that the children's use of any other pattern (i.e., a trilled /r/ or the dropping of /h/ in the word initial position) that sounded characteristic of CE could be documented (Oetting & Garrity, 2006). The author worked independently and listened to the audio excerpts multiple times. At no time during coding did the author have access to the Cajun status of the participants.

Reliability of Cajun feature coding. A second graduate student also independently coded each child's one-minute audio excerpt. This student was also blind to the Cajun status of the participants during coding. Reliability was evaluated by having the two coders compare their coding sheets for each participant. Out of 885 coding decisions, there were 169 disagreements recorded which yielded 81% agreement between the coders.

The reliability of the coding for each feature was also examined. Out of 122 coding decisions for /t, d/ for /θ, ð/, there were 22 disagreements with an agreement of 82% between the two coders. Out of 278 coding decisions for /p, t, k/, there were 39 disagreements with an agreement of 86% between the two coders. Out of 232 coding decisions for heavy vowel nasalization, there were 51 disagreements with an agreement of 78% between the two coders. Out of 168 coding decisions for monophthongization, there were 35 disagreements with an agreement of 79% between the two coders. Out of 78 coding decisions for glide weakening on vowels, there were 20 disagreements with an agreement of 74% between the two coders. Although the level of agreement between coders was relatively high, all CE tokens that yielded disagreement between the coders were excluded from the analyses.

RESULTS

Recall that the children's use of the five CE phonological features was calculated in two ways, first as the frequency of each CE feature within each one-minute excerpt and second as the percentage of use of each CE feature out of the total number of possible opportunities for each feature. Both calculations are reported in the results. Given that both calculations led to the same findings, percentage of use was used when group differences (Cajun vs. non-Cajun) were examined with statistical tests. Each phonological feature is examined separately. Given that there were only 11 participants, results are also presented for each child in Appendix D.

/t, d/ for /θ, ð/ Substitution

Table 6 displays the sums, means, and standard deviations of the participants' use of the CE phonological feature /t, d/ for /θ, ð/ as a function of Cajun status. Additionally, there is a column displaying the data combined for the Cajun and non-Cajun participants.

Table 6. Means, standard deviations, and overall frequencies of /t, d/ feature

	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)	Combined (<i>n</i> = 11)
Frequency of Feature in 1-Minute Excerpt <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	4.25 (3.54)	1.67 (2.08)	3.55 (3.33)
Percent of Feature from Total Number of Possible Opportunities <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	42.50 (35.25)	26.99 (35.10)	38.27 (34.19)
Group's Total Frequency of Feature	34	5	39
Group's Total Number of Possible Opportunities	86	18	104

Table 6 shows that participants with a Cajun status produced /t, d/ for /θ, ð/ with a higher frequency than the non-Cajun participants. Two out of the three non-Cajun participants produced this feature, whereas six out of the eight Cajun participants produced this feature. The words included in these productions are shown in Table 7. As indicated by the table, most

examples of the feature were in the initial position of a word. In addition, the CE feature was observed for “birthday” in the medial position, and for “with” in the final position.

Table 7. Words produced with /t, d/ for /θ, ð/

Initial Position	Medial Position	Final Position
The	Birthday	With
There/They’re		
That		
Then		
These		
They		
Those		
This		
Them		

To further examine the data, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the use of the /t, d/ feature in the Cajun and non-Cajun groups. There was no significant difference in the percents of occurrence between the groups’ use of /t, d/ for /θ, ð/; $t(9) = .651, p = .532$.

Unaspirated /p, t, k/

Table 8 shows that participants with a Cajun status produced unaspirated /p, t, k/ in the initial position of a word with an almost equal frequency as the non-Cajun participants. Three Cajun participants and two non-Cajun participants produced this feature. The words included in these productions are shown in Table 9.

Table 8. Means, standard deviations, and frequencies of unaspirated /p, t, k/ feature

	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)	Combined (<i>n</i> = 11)
Frequency of Feature in 1-Minute Excerpt <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	0.87 (1.25)	1.00 (1.00)	0.91 (1.14)
Percent of Feature from Total Number of Possible Opportunities <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	11.70 (16.68)	16.19 (14.66)	12.92 (15.56)
Group’s Total Frequency of Feature	7	3	10
Group’s Total Number of Possible Opportunities	51	26	77

Table 9. Words produced with unaspirated /p, t, k/

Initial Position
Probably
Could
To
Car

To further examine the data, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the use of unaspirated /p, t, k/ in the initial position a word in both the Cajun and non-Cajun groups. There was no significant difference in the percents of occurrence between the groups' use of unaspirated /p, t, k/; $t(9) = -.408, p = .692$.

Heavy Vowel Nasalization

Vowel nasalization was more difficult to identify and code than expected. Some children were naturally more nasal than others. To address this issue, the coders made the decision to identify when vowel nasalization occurred when they heard a vowel similar to a French nasalized vowel. Table 10 shows that participants with a Cajun status produced heavy vowel nasalization with a slightly higher frequency than the non-Cajun participants. Two out of the three non-Cajun participants produced this feature compared to six out of the eight Cajun participants. The most frequently produced words included in these productions are shown in Table 11.

Table 10. Means, standard deviations, and overall sums of heavy vowel nasalization feature

	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)	Combined (<i>n</i> = 11)
Frequency of Feature in 1-Minute Excerpt <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	3.50 (2.67)	1.67 (2.08)	3.00 (2.57)
Percent of Feature from Total Number of Possible Opportunities <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	24.31 (21.04)	8.62 (9.13)	20.03 (19.50)
Group's Total Frequency of Feature	28	5	33
Group's Total Number of Possible Opportunities	121	60	181

Table 11. Words produced with heavy vowel nasalization

/m/	/n/
Him	When
Time	On
Ham	Man
Came	In
Sometimes (both m's)	And
Aimer	Then
	Running (/n/)
	One
	Open

To further examine the data, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the use of the heavy vowel nasalization feature in both the Cajun and non-Cajun groups. There was no significant difference in the percents of occurrence between the groups' use of heavy vowel nasalization; $t(9) = 1.217, p = .255$.

Monophthongization

Table 12 shows that participants with a Cajun status produced monophthongization with a higher frequency than the non-Cajun participants. None of the non-Cajun participants produced this feature compared to four out of the eight Cajun participants who produced it. The most frequently produced words included in these productions are shown in Table 13.

Table 12. Means, standard deviations, and overall sums of monophthongization feature

	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)	Combined (<i>n</i> = 11)
Frequency of Feature in 1-Minute Excerpt <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	2.00 (3.18)	0.00 (0.00)	1.45 (2.77)
Percent of Feature from Total Number of Possible Opportunities <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	13.13 (15.63)	0.00 (0.00)	9.55 (14.44)
Group's Total Frequency of Feature	16	0	16
Group's Total Number of Possible Opportunities	112	28	140

Table 13. Words produced with monophthongization

/aɪ/	/ɔɪ/	/aʊ/	/oʊ/	/eɪ/
Time		Now	Hose	A
My		House	Almost	Maybe
Sometimes			Goes	They're
I'ma			Go	Came
I			Going	Day
Wild			Arrow	Play
I'm			Soap	Birthday
Right				Cake
Fighting				Table

To further examine the data, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the use of the monophthongization feature in both the Cajun and non-Cajun groups. There was a significant difference in the percents of occurrence between the groups' use of monophthongization; $t(9) = 2.376, p = .049$.

Glide Weakening on Vowels

Glide weakening was also difficult to identify and code. The coders based identification of one syllable glide weakening on the words following the glide. For example, when the glide “two” was followed the word “babies,” it influenced the weakening of the glide so the feature was identified in that instance. Also, glide weakening was categorized based upon which vowel it was paired with and how the child produced the particular vowel. For example, one of the participants produced “him” with a raised /i/ to be like that of the /i/ in “he.” Table 14 shows that participants with a Cajun status produced glide weakening with an almost equal frequency as the non-Cajun participants. All three of the non-Cajun participants produced this feature compared to five out of the eight Cajun participants who produced it. The most frequently produced words included in these productions are shown in Table 15.

Table 14. Means, standard deviations, and overall sums of glide weakening feature

	Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 8)	Non-Cajun status (<i>n</i> = 3)	Combined (<i>n</i> = 11)
Frequency of Feature in 1-Minute Excerpt <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	1.25 (1.28)	2.33 (1.53)	1.55 (1.37)
Percent of Feature from Total Number of Possible Opportunities <i>M</i> <i>SD</i>	28.69 (33.54)	32.59 (12.24)	29.75 (28.65)
Group's Total Frequency of Feature	10	7	17
Group's Total Number of Possible Opportunities	37	22	59

Table 15. Words produced with glide weakening on vowels

/ij/	/ej/	/uw/	/ow/
Him	There/They're	Could	On
Teasing	Air	To/two/too	Thought
Maybe	Man	Shoes	Arrow
He	Where	Juice	
Kids		Fruit	
Realized			
Cleaned			

To further examine this data, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the use of the glide weakening feature in both the Cajun and non-Cajun groups. There was no significant difference in the percents of occurrence between the groups' use of glide weakening on vowels; $t(9) = -.191, p = .853$.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the proposed study was to answer the following research question: Do children whose parents have identified their family as Cajun use the five phonological features of CE (/t, d/ for /θ, ð/, nonaspirated /p, t, k/ in the initial position of a word, heavy vowel nasalization, monophthongization, and glide weakening on vowels) more frequently than those identified as non-Cajun? Based on previous research, I hypothesized that children whose parents identify their family as Cajun would use the five features more frequently than those not identified as Cajun. I also predicted that of the five features, the children identified as Cajun would produce nonaspirated stops and glide weakening the most. When examining the number of occurrences and number of opportunities of each feature, the participants with a Cajun status produced the /t, d/, heavy vowel nasalization, and monophthongization features more frequently than the participants with a non-Cajun status, but the independent samples t-tests revealed a significant difference for only the monophthongization feature. This finding is interesting because it may suggest that CE phonological features are currently heard in the vowels that children produce.

Findings Related to Past Research

Recall that one existing study by Oetting and Garrity (2006) has examined the use of CE phonological features in children with and without a CE influence. Their results revealed that more (87%) children classified as having a perceived CE influence produced the phonological features than those without a CE influence (47%). In the current study, 100% of the children in both the Cajun and non-Cajun groups produced the CE phonological features. Also, in the previous study, two patterns, nonaspirated stops and glide weakening, were produced with a statistically higher frequency by the children perceived as having a Cajun influence as compared

non-Cajun. In the current study, only one feature, monophthongization, led to a statistically significant difference. However, when the children's use of the CE features are compared across studies, it is clear that the children in the current study, regardless of their Cajun status, produced more CE features than those studied previously. To illustrate this finding, Table 15 presents the mean frequencies of each CE feature for the two child studies. As can be seen, all five of the features were produced at higher frequencies by one or more of the current groups of children as compared to the children studied previously.

Table 16. Means and standard deviations of past research compared to current study

	Oetting & Garrity (2006) Participants with CE Influence	Current Study Participants with Cajun Status	Current Study Participants with non-Cajun Status
/t, d/ for /θ, ð/	.92 (1.15)	4.25 (3.54)	1.67 (2.08)
Nonaspirated stops	.85 (1.21)	9.25 (4.17)	10.33 (6.43)
Heavy vowel nasalization	.67 (.97)	3.50 (2.67)	1.67 (2.08)
Monophthongization	.94 (1.79)	2.00 (3.12)	0.00 (0.00)
Glide weakening on vowels	2.33 (2.03)	1.25 (1.28)	2.33 (1.53)

The differences found across studies may indicate a parish effect for CE phonology use in Louisiana. Recall that Oetting and Garrity (2006) collected data from children living in Ascension Parish, whereas in the current study, the author examined data in Assumption Parish. Interestingly, the 2010 United States Census reports the percentages of demographics in each parish. Ascension Parish was noted to have 26.3% of its population with French, French Canadian, or Cajun heritage, whereas Assumption Parish was reported to have 38.2% of its population with French, French Canadian, or Cajun heritage (United States Census Bureau, 2013). A higher percentage of residents claiming French or Cajun heritage in Assumption Parish as compared to Ascension Parish aligns with the CE phonologies of the children in these parishes.

To further confirm this conclusion, other possible explanations for the findings should be ruled out. For example, the two child studies differed in how Cajun status was determined. In the current study, the participants were chosen from a pool of 54 kindergarteners living in Assumption Parish and attending either Pierre Part Primary or Bayou L'Ourse Primary schools. A questionnaire was then sent to all of the families of the children who made up the participant pool. From these results, groups of Cajun status ($n = 8$) based on CF exposure and non-Cajun status ($n = 3$) based on no CF exposure were formed. In the previous study, all of the children ($n = 93$) included in the study were documented to be speakers of SAAE or SWE, but in addition to this a third of the children ($n = 31$) were also classified as presenting a CE influence within their dialects based on a listener judgment task (Oetting & Garrity, 2006).

To rule out a Cajun classification difference as contributing to the findings, I completed a post hoc listener judgment task to classify the children as Cajun or non-Cajun following the methods of the previous child study. To do this, three coders were given two different Likert Scales, one for SWE and another for CE. Each scale ranged from one through seven with one representing no use of SWE or CE and seven representing heavy use of SWE or CE. When this was done, seven of the participants were classified as producing CE and four were classified as not producing CE. Nevertheless, after examining the results based on these two new groups, no significant difference was found for any of the CE features. This finding suggests that it was not the methods of classifying the children's Cajun status that led to differences across the two child studies. In other words, regardless of the Cajun classification method, the children in the current study produced higher frequencies of the CE phonological features than the children studied previously.

Limitations

The results of the present study indicate that there is a relationship between children's Cajun status and the production of monophthongization. Limitations within the study may have influenced these findings. The current study included 11 participants only. This was due to the number of completed questionnaires received and the results reported on these questionnaires. If the study would have had more participants, especially more non-Cajun status participants, more group differences may have been statistically significant. The coding system that was created for the study was based off of what the author thought would be best when determining when features were produced. The system that was used in this study potentially differed from other studies of CE that affected the results. As an example, the author identified and coded all five diphthongs reduced to their monophthongs, rather than listening specifically for /aɪ/. A more narrow or specific coding system could have been created with a more thorough review of the literature.

Also, with the data limited to a one-minute sample, the number of tokens produced by each child was quite small. Using a larger sample would provide more opportunities for the participants to produce the CE features. The two coders had a reliability of 81% and any disagreements were excluded. If they had been more reliable, then more occurrences could have been kept in the study instead of excluded. And finally, a difference created by gender was not taken into account of the results. As seen in previous studies from Dubois and Horvath (1999), women use less CE features than men due to their involvement in social networks outside of their Cajun communities. As a post hoc analysis, I examined gender as a factor, and a visual gender difference was found for the /t, d/ for / θ, ð/, unaspirated /p, t, k/, and monophthongization features, with males producing these features more frequently than females. However, the

gender differences were not statistically significant. This could be related to the unequal and small number of participants in the study.

Future Directions

Future studies should seek to increase the number of participants classified as Cajun and non-Cajun. Indeed some of the null findings documented in the current study may have been due to the small number of participants in the study. Small samples reduce the statistical power to detect a difference. Additionally, comparing the Ascension Parish samples to the current Assumption Parish samples using the same methods of analysis would be useful to further rule out the possibility that the parish effects were unrelated to the methods by which the CE features were coded. Finally, future endeavors examining children's use of phonological CE phonology features should aim to gather data in other Louisiana parishes within and outside of the Acadian triangle. This work is needed to determine if children's use of CE phonology varies as a function of their place of residence.

The current study's results are useful for thinking about how the CE dialect is evolving over time. When examining previous CE studies from Dubois and Horvath (1998, 1999, 2003b), the authors argued that a V-shaped pattern has taken shape from the younger generation speaking with a higher percentage of CE features than the middle generation, or reverting to the older generations' vernacular use through a Cajun Renaissance. The children in the current study produced lower rates of the CE phonological features than the adults in the three studies discussed previously. However, the "young" participants in the Dubois and Horvath studies were born between 1961 and 1965, while the participants of the current study were born between 2005 and 2007. Comparing the results of these studies suggest the change and evolution of CE

over time. To further explore this possibility, multigenerational studies involving children should be pursued.

REFERENCES

- Ancelet, B. (1988). A perspective on teaching the “problem language” in Louisiana. *The French Review*, 61(3), 345–356.
- Arwood, E. L. (1985). *Apricot I Language Kit*. Portland, OR: Apricot.
- Bernard, S. (2003). *The Cajuns: Americanization of a people*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi.
- Dubois, S. (2010). Introduction. In S. Dubois (Ed.), *Une histoire épistolaire de la Louisiane*. Québec, QC: Les Presses de l’Université Laval.
- Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M. (1998). From accent to marker in Cajun English. *English World-Wide*, 19, 161-188.
- Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M. (1999). Let’s tink about dat: Interdental fricatives in Cajun English. *Language Variation and Change*, 10, 245-261.
- Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M. (2002). Sounding Cajun: The rhetorical use of dialect in speech and writing. *American Speech*, 77(3), 264-288.
- Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M. (2003a). Verbal morphology in Cajun Vernacular English: A comparison with other varieties of Southern English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31(1), 34-59.
- Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M. (2003b). Creoles and Cajuns: A portrait in black and white. *American Speech*, 78, 192-207.
- Dubois, S. & Horvath, B. M. (2003c). The English vernacular of the Creoles of Louisiana. *Language Variation and Change*, 15, 255-288.
- Dubois, S. & Melançon, M. (1997). Cajun is dead--Long live Cajun: Shifting from a linguistic to a cultural community. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 1, 63-93.
- Dunn, L. M. & Dunn, D. M. (2007). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, 4th edition (PPVT-4)*. San Antonio, TX: Psych Corp.
- Ehrler, D. J., & McGhee, R. L. (2008). *Primary Test of Nonverbal Intelligence*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Emmitte, A. (2013). *Un Cadjin qui dzit cher bon dieu!: Assibilation and affrication in three generations of Cajun male speakers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

- Goldman, R., & Fristoe, M. (2000). *Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation - Second Edition*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Henry, J. M. & Bankston, C. L. (2002). *Blue collar bayou*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Miller, J. & Iglesias, A. (2004). Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts (SALT), English & Spanish (Version 8). [Computer Software]. Madison, WI: Language Analysis Lab, University of Wisconsin – Madison.
- Oetting, J. B. & Garrity, A. W. (2006). Variation within dialects: A case of Cajun/Creole influence within child SAAE and SWE. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49, 16-26.
- Oetting, J. B. & McDonald, J. L. (2001). Nonmainstream dialect use and Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 44(1), 207-233.
- Oetting, J. B. & McDonald, J. C. (2002). Methods for characterizing participants' nonmainstream dialect use in child language research. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 45, 508-518.
- Oetting, J. B., Cleveland, L., Garrity, A., Moland, C., Morris, L., Newkirk, B., Pruitt, S., & Rodrigue, K. (2013). *Language Sample Transcription and Coding Manual*. (Unpublished Manuscript). Baton Rouge, LA: Language Development and Disorders Lab, Louisiana State University.
- Ryon, D. (2002). Cajun French, sociolinguistic knowledge, and language loss in Louisiana. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1(4), 279-293.
- Seymour, H., Bland-Stewart, L., & Green, L. J. (1998). Difference versus deficit in child African American English. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 29, 96-108.
- Seymour, H. N., Roeper, T. V., de Villiers, J. (2005). *Diagnostic Evaluation of Language Variation – Norm Referenced Test* (DELV-NR). San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corp.
- Spedale, C. V. (2013). *Effects of Cajun status on kindergarteners' use of five grammar structures*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- United States Census Bureau (2013, November 6). Summary population and housing characteristics: Louisiana 2010. Retrieved March 12, 2014, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/cph-1-20.pdf>.

APPENDIX A

(a modified version of Dubois & Melançon, 1997)

Number: _____ Alpha: _____ School: _____ Caller: _____

Attempt: _____

Hi, my name is _____ calling from LSU regarding a study about Cajun French/French. Recently, your child participated in a study that we have conducted at your primary school. May I have two minutes of your time to ask you some questions?

Voicemail: Hi, my name is _____ calling from LSU regarding a study about Cajun French/English. I will be giving you call at a later time. Thank you!

Section 1: Background

Do you...

1. **Have a Cajun/Louisiana Creole background?** Y / N

2. **Call yourself Cajun or Creole?** (If person identifies as **Creole**, modify by adding *Creole French*.)

(If not) **what do you refer to yourself as?** _____

a. How often do you/family talk about Cajun/Creole culture?

a. Only at holidays b. once a month c. once a week d. once a day e. never

b. **Does your family participate in things like:**

a. **Making gumbos/red beans and rice Monday/Crawfish boils** (Culinary)

b. **Mardi Gras/ knocking/paquiring eggs for Easter/Seafood on Fridays/** (Religious)

c. **Coup de mains/ Boucheries** (Helping Hand)

d. **Telling stories about the Rougarou/Loup Garou** (Story Telling)

3. **Speak French or Cajun French** (*Creole French; only if identify as Creole*)? Y / N (If **NO**, stop!)

_____ (check) but do **not** speak Cajun French.

(Leave blank until determined from Section 4)

passive speaker of Cajun French (*can complete tasks 1-5 on scale 4*).

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children

semi-speaker of Cajun French (*can complete tasks 1-7 on scale 4*).

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children

fluent speaker of Cajun French (*can complete 8 or more tasks on scale 4*).

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children

4. **How old are:**

a. **you?** _____

b. **your parents?** Mo: _____ Fa: _____

Section 2 : Exposure

1. **How many years have you been exposed to Cajun French** (*Creole French*)? _____

a. **Your children?** _____ b. **Your parents?** _____

2. How many hours per week are you and/or your child exposed to Cajun French (*Creole French*)?

a. Peer: ____ b. Children: ____

3. Is/Are your child(ren) in...(*circle response*)

a. English-only classroom b. French immersion program (how many years? _____)

Section 3 : Family History

Do your... (*adapt to Creole French if identify with Creole*)

1. **grandparents speak:**

(a) only Cajun French, (b) Cajun French and English, (c) only English.

2. **parents speak:**

(a) only Cajun French, (b) Cajun French and English, (c) only English.

3. **peers or people your age in your family speak:**

(a) only Cajun French, (b) Cajun French and English, (c) only English.

4. **children speak:**

(a) only Cajun French, (b) Cajun French and English, (c) only English.

Section 4 : French Speaking Ability

I'm going to ask you some questions, I want you tell me all the people that can do it. Who can.....

1. **Count to ten?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

2. **Name the days of the week?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

3. **Give the date (month and year)?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

4. **Order a meal in a restaurant?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

5. **Give biographical information (date of birth, family information)?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

6. **Speak to people in social situations** using appropriate expressions (**like church, meetings, parties**)?

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

7. **Describe my hobbies in detail using appropriate vocabulary?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

8. **Describe present employment, studies, and main social activities in detail with native speakers?**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

9. **Describe what they hope to achieve in the next five years using future tense verbs with native speakers.**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

10. **Can give my opinion on a controversial subject** (abortion, religion, pollution, nuclear safety) **with native speakers.**

(a) Grandparents (b) Parents (c) Peers/your generation (d) Children (e) none (f) all

APPENDIX B

Number of each CE phonological feature out of the number of opportunities

ALPHA:

NUMBER:

Cajun Feature Pattern	Line Number	Total
/t, d/ for /θ, ð/		
Nonaspirated /p, t, k/ Initial Medial Utterance Final Non-utterance Final		
Heavy vowel nasalization		
Monophthongization		
Glide weakening on vowels		
<i>Other</i>		

APPENDIX C

Institutional Review Board Document

Project Report and Continuation Application

(Complete and return to IRB, 131 David Boyd Hall.
Direct questions to IRB Chairman Robert Mathews 578-8692.)



Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
131 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.5983
irb@lsu.edu | lsu.edu/irb

IRB#: 2792 Your Current Approval Expires On: 7/15/2013

Review type: Expedited Risk Factor: Minimal

Date Sent: 5/2/2013

PI: Janna Oetting Dept: COMD Phone: (225) 578-3932

Student/Co-Investigator: see below

Project Title: Tense and Subject-verb Agreement in SAAE and SWE by Dialect Density and SLI Status

Number of Subjects Authorized: 500

Please read the entire application. Missing information will delay approval!

I. PROJECT FUNDED BY: NIDCD LSU proposal #: 33813

II. PROJECT STATUS: Check the appropriate blank(s); and complete the following:

- ☒ 1. Active, subject enrollment continuing; # subjects enrolled: 449
- ☐ 2. Active, subject enrollment complete; # subjects enrolled:
- ☐ 3. Active, subject enrollment complete; work with subjects continues.
- ☐ 4. Active, work with subjects complete; data analysis in progress.
- ☐ 5. Project start postponed
- ☐ 6. Project complete; end date 1/1
- ☐ 7. Project cancelled: no human subjects used.

III. PROTOCOL: (Check one).

- ☒ Protocol continues as previously approved
- ☐ Changes are requested*
 - List (on separate sheet) any changes to approved protocol.

IV. UNEXPECTED PROBLEMS: (did anything occur that increased risks to participants):

- > State number of events since study inception: 1 since last report: 0
- > If such events occurred, describe them and how they affect risks in your study, in an attached report.
- > Have there been any previously unreported events? Y/N N ?
(if YES, attach report describing event and any corrective action).

V. CONSENT FORM AND RISK/BENEFIT RATIO:

- Does new knowledge or adverse events change the risk/benefit ratio? Y/N N;
- Is a corresponding change in the consent form needed? Y/N N

VI. ATTACH A BRIEF, FACTUAL SUMMARY of project progress/results to show continued participation of subjects is justified; or to provide a final report on project findings.

VII. ATTACH CURRENT CONSENT FORM (only if subject enrollment is continuing); and check the appropriate blank:

- ☒ 1. Form is unchanged since last approved
- ☐ 2. Approval of revision requested herewith: (Identify changes)

Signature of Principal Investigator: Janna Oetting

Date: 5/15/13

IRB Action:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuation approved; Approval Expires: <u>5/20/14</u>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved
	<input type="checkbox"/> File closed
Signed: <u>Robert C. Mathews</u>	Date: <u>5/21/13</u>

APPENDIX D

Participant Number	/t, d/ for /θ, ð/	Unaspirated Initial /p, t, k/	Heavy Vowel Nasalization	Monophthongization	Glide Weakening on Vowels
36 (Male) Cajun	90% (9/10)	0% (0/2)	37% (7/19)	33% (3/9)	100% (3/3)
18 (Fem.) Cajun	50% (3/6)	40% (2/5)	25% (3/12)	0% (0/23)	20% (1/5)
7 (Male) Cajun	25% (2/8)	29% (2/7)	0% (0/7)	33% (9/27)	33% (2/6)
59 (Fem.) Cajun	25% (5/20)	25% (3/12)	12% (2/17)	27% (3/11)	33% (1/3)
10 (Male) Cajun	80% (8/10)	0% (0/7)	42% (5/12)	0% (0/4)	0% (0/5)
20 (Male) Cajun	70% (7/10)	0% (0/6)	0% (0/18)	11% (1/9)	0% (0/4)
16 (Fem.) Cajun	0% (0/7)	0% (0/7)	60% (6/10)	0% (0/15)	43% (3/7)
45 (Male) Cajun	0% (0/15)	0% (0/5)	19% (5/26)	0% (0/14)	0% (0/4)
30 (Male) Non	14% (1/7)	29% (2/7)	8% (1/13)	0% (0/12)	44% (4/9)
15 (Fem.) Non	67% (4/6)	0% (0/14)	18% (4/22)	0% (0/13)	20% (2/10)
39 (Fem.) Non	0% (0/5)	20% (1/5)	0% (0/25)	0% (0/3)	33% (1/3)

VITA

Hannah Smitherman was raised in Clear Lake City, Texas, a suburb southeast of the greater Houston area. During her undergraduate career at Louisiana State University, Hannah worked as a research assistant which was funded by an NIH grant exploring the nonmainstream English use of Louisiana kindergarteners with typical development and specific language impairment. As a member of the Honors College, she also completed an undergraduate honors thesis entitled “Children’s Nonword Repetition Skills as a Function of Their Race and Clinical Status.” Hannah graduated from LSU in 2012, earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in Communication Disorders and minors in French and Theatre. Hannah enrolled as a master’s student in Communication Disorders at LSU in the fall of 2012. She continued to work as a research assistant and began her thesis under the guidance of Dr. Janna Oetting as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Arts degree. Upon graduating, Hannah hopes to gain a clinical fellowship position in a medical setting as a speech-language pathologist who serves pediatric and adult populations.