

The Sounds of Social Change: Phonology and Identity in Elba, Alabama

by

Anna Ruth Head

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
December 8, 2012

Copyright 2012 by Anna Ruth Head

Approved by

Robin Sabino, Chair, Associate Professor of English
Walter B. Hitchcock, Professor of English Emeritus
David Carter, Associate Professor of History

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine whether and to what degree integration impacted speakers' linguistic choices in the community of Elba, Alabama, with respect to three phonological variables: (ai), (oi), and (ING). Because history is integral to a project that investigates the effect of integration on language choice, and due to the cultural perspective offered by literature, the linguistic analysis is situated within the historical context of the Civil Rights Movement and its literary works. This study also defines integration emically, considering potential language differentiation in light of local events rather than national decisions and legislation. Using an interdisciplinary approach, this study of Southern English addresses issues relevant to the field of Southern studies as a whole.

This study draws from interviews conducted in 2002 that elicited flood narratives and interviews conducted in 2008 that elicited conversation about integration and race relations in Elba. Although 79 participants were recorded, in order to maintain a balanced sample in terms of age, ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status, only 64 interviews were included in the present study. These interviews were coded for both external (social) and internal (linguistic) variables, and statistical analysis was conducted using JMP 9 statistical discovery software.

The study finds that African-American and European-American and older and younger speakers in Elba treat each of the phonological variables differently and that speakers' choices can be characterized in terms of the interaction of age and local, regional, and national orientation toward nonstandardized variants. For (ai), which contains the most identifiably

Southern variant, this study finds that African-American and European-American speakers are becoming less alike in the middle (b. 1963-1989) and youngest (b. 1990 or later) age groups, indicating that speakers' choices were impacted by integration. For (oi), which contains a local nonstandardized variant, use of diphthongs increased for both ethnic groups, with the difference disappearing for the middle age group, which includes the first speakers to have a completely integrated school experience. For (ING), which contains the most nationally widespread nonstandardized variant, the youngest speakers converge. These findings speak to the complexity of linguistic choices made by speakers, both as individuals and as members of social groups in response to social change.

Acknowledgments

My deepest thanks go to my major professor, Dr. Robin Sabino. It was her foresight that resulted in my working in a community that is very dear to me and her encouragement, dedication, and expertise as both a teacher and a researcher that enabled me to complete this project. She supported my exploration of ideas that were barely sketched in their beginning stages and spent countless hours guiding their development. I am very grateful for her many contributions both to this project and to my graduate education as a whole.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Bert Hitchcock and Dr. David Carter, for their time, knowledge, and encouragement as well as for their role in the interdisciplinary nature of this work. Many thanks also go to Dr. Tom Nunnally for his time and wisdom in the initial stages of this project and for his continued support and to Dr. Iulia Pittman for her willingness to serve as a critical eye for this project in its final stages. I am also indebted to Dr. Howard Clayton for his continued willingness to share his knowledge of statistics.

Special thanks also go to my network of supporters: my colleagues at both Enterprise State Community College and the Auburn University ESL Program, my fellow graduate students – very specially Jessie Mercuro and Stephen Rygiel, a number of close friends from both Auburn and Elba, and my family. Each of my siblings – Alan, Jonathan, Andrew, and Mary Katherine – has contributed to the completion of this dissertation, and my parents have provided not only endless support but also their experiences and memories, which have long inspired my interest in this subject. To Bert, who has patiently endured these last months of work and made

me smile every day, I hope that one day this project may offer you a bit more understanding of your heritage. A special line of gratitude is for Greg Spence, whose support has been invaluable.

Finally, this project is dedicated to the people of Elba, whose interest, kindness, and knowledge made my research possible. Although my hometown is unique in many ways, it is truly its people that set it apart.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables	viii
Introduction	1
Linguistic Impact of Integration	1
Background	1
Contextualizing the Research Question	4
Review of the Literature	5
Southern English: Origins, Development, and Features	5
African-American and European-American English in the South	17
Impact of Segregation, Integration	22
Qualitative Methodology	28
Language, Identity, and the Social Basis of Language	28
Domestic Workers	30
The Role of the Southern Church in Race Relations and Civil Rights.....	42
Sports, Integration, and Race Relations	47
Community Integration Insights: The High School Prom and The Swimming Pool ..	50
Summary	57
Quantitative Methodology	58

Introduction	58
Research Community	59
Data Collection	60
Transcription and Coding	64
Results and Discussion	71
The Variables Under Analysis: (ai), (oi), and (ING)	71
Analysis of the (ai) Data Set	71
Analysis of the (oi) Data Set	87
Analysis of the (ING) Data Set	93
Summary of the Data Sets	98
Conclusions, Limitations, and Implications	100
Introduction	100
Conclusions	100
Limitations of the Study	105
Implications for Further Research	106
References	108
Appendix A	125
Appendix B	136
Appendix C	138
Appendix D	140

List of Tables

Table 1: Census 2000 Demographic Characteristics	59
Table 2: External Factor Groups for (ai), (oi), and (ING)	66
Table 3: Internal Factor Groups for (ai) and (oi)	67
Table 4: Internal Factor Groups for (ING)	68
Table 5: (ai) Frequency Quartile Distribution	73
Table 6: Frequency Quartile Distribution, Additional Categorical Speakers Deleted	74
Table 7: Grammatical Category, Original and Recoded Factors	74
Table 8: Following Environment, Original and Recoded Factors	75
Table 9: African-American Churches and (ai) Production	76
Table 10: European-American Churches and (ai) Production	77
Table 11: Church Categories	77
Table 12: Notable Dates in Elba's History	79
Table 13: Interactive Factor Group, Birth Date/ Ethnicity	80
Table 14: (ai) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, All Factor Groups	80
Table 15: (ai) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, Factors Added Weakest to Strongest.....	81
Table 16: Stress by Dependent Variable.....	81
Table 17: Style by Dependent Variable	82
Table 18: Grammatical Category by Dependent Variable.....	83
Table 19: Following Environment by Dependent Variable	84

Table 20: Gender by Dependent Variable	84
Table 21: African-American Church Categories by Dependent Variable	85
Table 22: European-American Church Categories by Dependent Variable	85
Table 23: African-American and European-American Age Clusters	86
Table 24: (oi) Final Data Set Logistic Regression	88
Table 25: (oi) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, Factors Added Weakest to Strongest	89
Table 26: Following Environment by Dependent Variable	90
Table 27: Birth Date/Ethnicity by Dependent Variable	91
Table 28: Gender by Dependent Variable	92
Table 29: Church Affiliation/Ethnicity by Dependent Variable	92
Table 30: (ING) Final Logistic Regression	94
Table 31: (ING) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, Factors Added Weakest to Strongest	95
Table 32: Preceding Phonological Environment by Dependent Variable	95
Table 33: Style by Dependent Variable	96
Table 34: Frequency by Dependent Variable	96
Table 35: Grammatical Category by Dependent Variable	97
Table 36: Stress by Dependent Variable	98
Table 37: Ethnicity/Birth Date by Dependent Variable	98
Table 38: Comparison of Ethnic Group Usage of Southern Variants	101
Table 39: Change in Apparent Time	101

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Linguistic Impact of Integration¹

That the American Civil Rights Movement has been of great importance culturally, historically, and, for many, personally is unquestionable. In the face of violence, oppressive politics, and day-to-day prejudice and antagonism, the rigid racial boundaries that defined the nation were crossed. This struggle has been of great interest to historians and political scientists; additionally, scholars of literature have given attention to voices that grapple with aspects of the movement in fiction, poetry, and other literary media. However, an under-explored area of Civil Rights research is the impact of integration on Southern speech.

Background

All researchers in Southern studies are faced with a basic geographic question – where is the South? Though it seems that a region with such historical and cultural saliency would be defined concretely from a geographic standpoint, this is not the case. Some definitions encompass only the eleven states of the former Confederacy, a definition which reflects not only Civil War history but also subsequent voting trends as these states have exhibited political solidarity. The Census Bureau's definition of the South includes these states as well as Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Oklahoma and divides the region into the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central states. Other characterizations of the

¹ One objective of this study was to determine whether research participants from Elba, Alabama, commonly use the term *desegregation* or *integration* to describe the ending of segregation. Of the 35 research participants interviewed in 2008, only five said that they would use the term *desegregation*. Of these five, only two were able to discuss meaningful differences between the terms. Therefore, *integration* is the term used throughout this text.

South include Missouri. Despite this range of geo-political definitions, sociologist (and Southern scholar) John Shelton Reed notes that the South is a shared concept, pointing out that one can “write ‘South’ with some assurance” that the reader’s interpretation will include Richmond and not Phoenix (1993, p. 5). Reed has discussed definitions of the South based on long-established features such as warm weather, a biracial population, and poverty as well as more creative characteristics such as “where kudzu grows” (p. 7). He also draws attention to the South’s shared history and culture and insightfully points out that “the South [...] exists as an idea” – “in people’s heads and in their conversations” (p. 26).

This saliency also exists from a linguistic perspective: Montgomery (1997) points out that “both Southerners and non-Southerners identify the South by its language patterns” (p. 5). Metcalf (2000) identifies Southern English as “the most notable and talked about style of American speech” (p. 5). Nagle and Sanders (2003) agree, stating that “[t]he English of the [S]outhern United States may be the most studied regional variety of any language” (p. 1). However, because definitions of the South are problematic, determining exactly where people speak Southern English has been challenging: “[T]o some extent the notions of both ‘the South’ and ‘Southern English’ entail a certain degree of abstraction, an emphasis on shared characteristics rather than features and details which vary from one state or area to another” (Schneider, 2003, p. 19). Similarly, in his work in perceptual dialectology, Preston (1989, 1996, 1997, 1999, 2005) repeatedly demonstrates a lack of agreement among lay respondents about where people speak Southern English.

Moreover, despite a general impression that the South exists, the region is not monolithic (Hitchcock, 2000), historically or culturally, and subregional differences extend beyond the traditional division of upper and lower South. For example, “in large portions of north Alabama,

yeoman disaffection with the Confederacy became a critical political force” (Fitzgerald, 1988, p. 566) with Winston County “vot[ing] to remain neutral as a ‘Free State’ during the War” (Dodd, 1972, p. 9). The Wiregrass region of Alabama² was also characterized by yeoman unionism during the war (Fitzgerald, p. 566). Southern literature similarly reflects the diversity of the region. Contemporary Southern writers “share a common interest in the stories of those whose voices have long been silenced, whose stories may heretofore have been told only in small, disenfranchised, and often oppressed communities: people of color, members of lower socioeconomic classes, or individuals from subregions whose populations have traditionally been stereotyped by their heritage or the area in which they live, such as the Cajuns in South Louisiana or the poor [w]hites in the Appalachian Mountains” (Disheroon-Green, 2005, p. 1077). Thus, despite the South’s distinctiveness, it is a diverse region, and scholars of Southern history and literature have been forced to examine the *cultures* of the South; likewise, though Southern English is distinctive “among regional varieties in the United States,” it contains “rich internal diversity” (Nagle and Sanders, 2003, p. 1). As Montgomery (1989) points out, “Although the South is the most distinctive speech region in the United States, it is hardly more uniform than the nation as a whole” (p. 761).³

For this reason, a study of one area of the South cannot be expected to characterize Southern English in its entirety.⁴ My hometown of Elba, Alabama, located in the aforementioned Wiregrass region of Alabama, serves as the research community for this

² The Archives of Wiregrass History and Culture at Troy University-Dothan Campus lists nine Alabama Wiregrass counties: Barbour, Coffee, Covington, Crenshaw, Dale, Geneva, Henry, Houston, and Pike. Some definitions include Butler County.

³ Dialect surveys have confirmed this regional diversity. Kurath’s 1949 landmark dialect map depicted “a Southern region that showed significant diversity” (Wolfram, 2008, pp. 263-264). More recently, by its “complex picture of subregions” the Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States (LAGS), directed by Lee Pederson, has “strongly counter[ed] the simple Upper South vs. Lower South dichotomy so often presented in the linguistic literature” (Montgomery, 1997, p. 10).

⁴ The Georgia and Alabama Wiregrass is one of Pederson’s (2001) eighteen subvarieties of Southern English.

investigation, and though for many of Preston's respondents, "the heart of the South is to be found in southeastern Alabama" (1997, p. 317), as C. Bernstein (2000) makes clear, "there is no single 'Southern dialect'" (p. 341). While this study, which investigates the impact of integration on the speech of one community in Southeast Alabama, contributes to the body of research that exists on Southern English, it cannot be expected to describe the language of the South as a whole.

Contextualizing the Research Question

The primary research question in this study is whether and to what extent integration has affected speech in Elba. Because history is integral to a project that investigates the effect of integration on language choice, and due to the cultural perspective offered by literature, the linguistic analysis described in the following chapters is situated within the historical context of the Civil Rights Movement and its literary works. Since this study also explores the importance of defining integration from a community-centered, emic perspective, it considers potential language differentiation in light of local events rather than national decisions and legislation. By informing linguistic analysis with insights from Southern history and literature as well as using an emic approach, this study contributes to the body of research on Southern English; it also contributes to the field of Southern studies as a whole.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Southern English: Origins, Development, and Features

Since the intent of this project is to determine how one Southern community's experience of integration impacted speakers' linguistic choices, it is useful to review what is known about the origins and history of Southern English. Linguists who have studied this language variety have discussed and debated the impact of settlement patterns, the emergence of a distinctive Southern English, the development of this regional variety, and the relationship between the Englishes of African-American and European-American⁵ Southerners.

Origins: Settlement History

While many European Northern settlers came to America for ideological purposes, many of their Southern counterparts came for economic wealth. The desire among European settlers to own property and produce marketable crops, perhaps the earliest identifying mark of "the South," served as a common denominator uniting settlers who had money and those who did not; it also led to class strife, war with Native Americans, and the propagation of chattel slavery.

The impact of settlement patterns on American speech is a debated issue (G. Bailey 1997, Schneider 2003), and Montgomery (2001) warns that too many studies have relied on these patterns rather than linguistic evidence. Nonetheless, as C. Feagin (1996) remarks, "The languages in contact with English [...] were radically different in the North and the South" (p. 137). Thus, it is relevant to consider the linguistic implications of settlement history.

⁵ The present study is concerned with identifying language that orients toward a particular culture. As such, the terms African American and European American are used throughout the text in order to reflect identification with a particular cultural heritage.

Although indigenous languages, French, and Spanish have had an impact on Southern speech, it is the English core, the Scots-Irish stratum, and the African stratum that are most important (Algeo, 2003). By 1550, changes in the British economy led to the abrogation of landowner-tenant agreements. Displaced peasants, pushed by circumstance and pulled by the opportunity to start over, became the backbone of Southern colonization; these settlers moved southwestward from Virginia and the Carolinas, forming the English core. However, as Montgomery (1989) observes, “[T]he influx of millions of Africans, speaking many dozens of languages and brought against their will, [...] multiplied the complexity of the situation manifold” (p. 762). For example, enslaved Africans “constituted the majority of the population in South Carolina at one time” (C. Feagin, 1996), a historical fact which can hardly be ignored when investigating the history of Southern English. Speakers of African languages used a number of strategies to adjust to the English they heard. For example, “diphthongs are rare in African languages” (Clements, p. 136, as cited in Sabino, 2012). C. Feagin (1997) further points out that “the influence of the speech of slaves on the speech of European-American children living in proximity should not be surprising” (p. 135). Dorrill (2003) categorizes African-American Vernacular English⁶ as an ethnic variety of Southern American English (p. 123).

A Conscious South and A Distinctive Southern Speech

The question of when a distinctive Southern speech emerged is a second area of debate. Citing the use of *tote* rather than Northern *carry* in the late 1670s, Metcalf (2000) argues that “by the end of the first century of English-speaking settlement – the South *was* becoming distinctive,” although he acknowledges that there was not “any notion of a Southern accent back then” (p. 3). It is the antebellum era (particularly 1831-1840) that some scholars of Southern

⁶ Not just in the South, but as a whole.

history point to as the period when conscious ideas about “a South” began to emerge. Flora & Mackethan (2002) suggest, “[T]he idea of [S]outhern literature entered the cultural discourse in the 1830s” (p. 828). Furthermore, Montgomery (1989) reports that “[i]n the early 19th century one can find extended published comments about speech in the South” (p. 763), and Metcalf (2000) observes that “in the nineteenth century, the growing conflict with the North over slavery, culminating in the Civil War, drew attention politically and culturally to the South as a whole, as distinct from the North,” and “[t]hus emerged a Southern accent” (pp. 3-4). How similar this Southern accent of the first half of the 19th century was to the Southern accent of today is another question that has received quite a bit of attention by scholars.

New South Developments

Citing New South developments such as the emergence of stores (particularly country stores that held liens on tenant farmers), villages and towns, and the expansion of railroads as potential “conduits for the diffusion of linguistic changes,” G. Bailey (1997, p. 271) posits that a number of core features of contemporary Southern English were the product of linguistic activity between 1875 and World War II. Unfortunately, G. Bailey’s conclusions are based on a sample that is small, excludes African-American speech, and includes speech from only one state, Texas.⁷ Though Schneider and Montgomery (2001) extend G. Bailey’s claims with the Southern Plantation Overseers’ Corpus, Montgomery (2004) cautions that “it remains premature to characterize many grammatical and phonological features of [Southern English] and other varieties of [American English] as late-nineteenth-century innovations, inasmuch as few speech records predate that time and intensive manuscript research has hardly begun” (p. 4).

⁷ It is notable that Texas was settled after other Southern states and is the one Southern state that has a westward orientation.

It must also be borne in mind that although “[t]he idea of a ‘New South’ was perhaps the preeminent intellectual innovation of the post-Civil War era” (Werner, 2001, p. 573), not all Southerners embraced the New South Creed. Proponents of Old South mythology (which developed in part from the need to heal the wounds of the Civil War) instead idealized an imaginary “cavalier” past. Simultaneously, a new myth developed which “fulfilled the old Jeffersonian dream of an independent yeomanry” by romanticizing the New South as land of “economic democracy” where small farmers were the “self-sufficient lords of a few acres” (Woodward, 1951, p. 175). Thus, some Southerners were resistant to the factors that G. Bailey (1997) suggests contributed to the spread of the new Southern English.

Phonological Features of Southern Speech: (ai) and (oi)

Dorrill (2003) points to “phonology as the most distinctive feature of the speech of the ‘most distinctive speech region in the United States’” (p. 120) and indicates that McMillan and Montgomery’s *Annotated Bibliography of Southern American English* (1989) “lists over 600 items concerned in whole or part with the phonetics or phonology of English in the South” (p. 119). Similarly, Thomas (2003) observes that “[d]iscussions of the vowel variants of Southern English have been extensive and have continued without interruption for over a hundred years” with “[n]o other region of the United States [attracting] this level of interest in its vowels” (p. 150).

A number of studies point to the variant [a:] as a “hallmark of Southern speech” (Thomas, 2003, p. 150). For example, Evans (1935) remarks that Southerners do not distinguish between [ai] and the regional variant [a:] “until their attention is called to the matter” (p.188), and Sledd (1966) refers to the “long i” as “the confederate vowel” (p. 25). More recently, Metcalf (2000) observes that “to be recognized as a Southerner, all you have to do is open your

mouth and say ‘ah’” (p. 5), and Dorrill classifies [a:] as “the closest thing to a generally identifying feature” of Southern phonology (Dorrill, 2003, p.123). Further, C. Feagin (2000) contends that “the monophthongal unglided vowel in *I* and *my* symbolizes all Southerners’ identification with the South” (pp. 342-343), and indeed, Head (2003) finds use of [a:] in the words *I* and *my* to be pervasive in Elba, Alabama. Regarding *I* (including its related forms *I’m*, *I’d*, *I’ll*, and *I’ve*), 493 of 498 items in the data set contain the [a:] form; for *my*, all 113 items contain [a:].

Although less studied, the regional variants of (oi) are also considered identifiable features. For example, Clopper (2000) reports that naïve listeners categorized talkers with a high rate of the monophthongal variants of both (ai) and (oi) as Southerners (p.63). Additionally, in North Carolina, in a study of Cherokee English, Anderson (1999) finds that the variable (oi) patterns similarly to (ai).

Social Conditioning of (ai) and (oi)

Social variables found to condition the production of (ai) and (oi) include socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity, and age.

In regard to socioeconomic status, Crane (1977) found that Tuscaloosa’s highest class was most likely to use the standard variant of (ai), and Edwards (1997) found that working-class African Americans in Detroit were most likely to use the monophthongal variant of (ai).

Gender has also been documented to have a significant effect on production of monophthongal variants. When controlling for age, both Edwards’ (1997) Detroit study and Bowie’s (2001) study in Southern Maryland found older men to use the monophthongal form of (ai) most. Although Head (2003) found gender to be non-significant, Topping (2010), who examined production of (ai) among textile mill workers born in Columbus, Georgia, and

Southeastern Alabama between 1896 and 1935, found males to produce the monophthongal variant more often than females.

In regard to ethnicity, the monophthongal variants of (ai) and (oi) have been investigated as features of both African-American and European-American Southern speech (e.g., G. Bailey and C. Bernstein, 1989; Dorrill, 1986; Edwards, 1997; Fridland, 2003; Head, 2003; Pollock et al., 1998). Dorrill (1986) “look[s] at the stressed vowels of paired African-American and European-American speakers interviewed for LAMSAS” and “[finds] a greater tendency for monophthong[al] vowels [...] among the African-American speakers” (Dorrill, 2003, pp. 123-124). Edwards (1997) finds African Americans living in Detroit, presumably preserving Southern speech behavior, to use monophthongal variants more frequently than their European-American neighbors. However, Head (2003) points to the possibility that in Elba European Americans use [a:] more frequently than African Americans. C. Bernstein and R. Bernstein (1998) report that in East Texas “[e]thnicity and age have the strongest effects on [phonological] innovation: [European Americans] tend to use more innovative phonology than do [African Americans]; older respondents [...] tend to use less innovative phonology than do younger ones” (p. 53).

In regard to age, studies have largely indicated that older speakers use the Southern variants more than do younger speakers (e.g., G. Bailey & C. Bernstein, 1989; Bowie, 2001; Crane, 1977; Doxey, 2007-2008; Edwards, 1997; Head, 2003). Research in Elba reveals an implicational scale for (ai): The 60+ age group use [a:] at a rate of 89 percent, the 40-59 age group at 76 percent, the 21-39 age group at 73 percent, and the 11-20 age group at 69.7 percent (Head, 2003). Fridland (2000) reports that all speakers in her Memphis sample are moving toward the variant [a:]. This is reaffirmed in her 2003 study. Examining the relationship

between age and ethnicity, Fridland finds that among European Americans, the over-65 subject group shows “a greater tendency for full glides in voiceless contexts” (p. 292). However, among African Americans, age does not play “much of a defining role” in voiceless, voiced, or free environments (p. 292). Since all of her research participants seem to be moving toward the regional variant, Fridland concludes that “African Americans in Memphis appear to be moving toward forms which symbolize involvement in the Southern community and its associated heritage” (p. 296).

Of particular importance for the present study is the question of whether and to what extent European-American and African-American Southerners in Elba use the monophthongal variants of (ai) and (oi) and how age interacts with ethnicity with respect to the frequency of these variants.⁸

Linguistic Conditioning of (ai) and (oi)

Linguistic variables found to condition production of (ai) and (oi) include following phonological environment, grammatical category, sentence stress, word frequency, and style. In regard to following phonological environment, which is discussed most in the literature, voiced obstruents have generally been shown to favor monophthongal variants (e.g. Anderson, 1999, 2002; Fridland, 2000; Labov and Ash, 1997) while voiceless obstruents have generally been shown to disfavor these variants (Bowie, 2001; Fridland, 2000; Hazen, 2000). However, some studies discuss production of the monophthong before voiceless obstruents as an emerging trend (Anderson, 2002; G. Bailey & C. Bernstein, 1989; Thomas, 2001). Following liquids have also been found to favor monophthongal variants (Bowie, 2001; Hazen, 2000; Thomas, 2001). Head (2003) and Topping (2010) found both following voiced obstruents and liquids to be more

⁸ Due to sampling methods used in Head (2003), it was not possible to answer these questions accurately. The earlier study did not include a balanced number of speakers in regard to ethnicity and age.

favorable environments for production of the monophthong than following voiceless obstruents.⁹ Holladay (2006), investigating the acquisition of monophthongal (ai), found that following liquids and nasals most favored the monophthongal variant after children had fully acquired the diphthong. For grammatical category, Bowie (2001) found nouns, adverbs, and verbs to favor the monophthongal variant;¹⁰ similarly, Head (2003) found content words to be more monophthongal than function words, with the exception of pronouns and the preposition *by*.¹¹ Although the children studied by Holladay (2006) produced more [ai] than [a:] in every grammatical category, the pronoun *I* was more frequently produced as a monophthong than other lexical items. Concerning sentence stress, Bowie (2001) found secondary stress within the word to slightly favor the monophthongal variant, while Topping (2010) suggests that stressed words are more likely to contain the monophthongal variant.¹² Looking at word frequency, Hay, Jannedy, and Mendoza-Denton (2000) found word frequency to be a significant predictor of the monophthongal variant. Although Topping's (2010) initial analysis of frequency did not find higher frequency words to be more monophthongal, analyses conducted after exclusion of *I*, though non-significant, suggested a pattern consistent with previous research. With regard to style, Bowie (2001) found reading from a word list to strongly disfavor the Southern variant.

Phonological Features of Southern Speech: (ING)

Although it is “one of the best-known sociolinguistic variables,” the sociolinguistic variable (ING) has received considerably less attention than the variables (ai) and (oi) in regard

⁹ Head (2003) reports the following implicational hierarchy: word boundary > voiced obstruents, liquids, nasals > glides, vowels > voiceless obstruents. Topping (2010) reports a similar one: voiced obstruents, nasals, word boundary > vowels and liquids > voiceless obstruents.

¹⁰ However, he excluded *I* and contractions containing *I*.

¹¹ Though initial analyses run by Topping (2010) for grammatical category were consistent with Bowie (2001) and Head (2003), the final analysis (which excluded *I* and words containing the roots *like* and *right*) did not find grammatical category to be a significant factor group.

¹² However, the final analysis did not find stress to be a significantly conditioning factor group.

to Southern speech (Campbell-Kibler, 2006, p. 22; see also Chambers 2003). However, “linguists and nonlinguists alike have a sense that speakers in the American South use more [In] than the rest of the country” (Campbell-Kibler, 2006, p.39). For example, Labov (2001*b*) states that in the Southern U.S. “the [In] form is used almost exclusively in speech, even of the most formal kind” (p. 90), and Labov et al. (2006) report that “the pressure to use [In] in formal settings is much less [in the South] than in the North” (p. 114). Additionally, perceptions about Southern use of the [In] variant may be linked to ethnicity, as exhibited by the “Marengo Jake” stories by Jake Mitchell and Robert Wilton Burton. These tales in the local-color tradition were published in Alabama newspapers between 1886 and 1891. Mitchell was an African-American man whose “literary medium was the spoken word” (Sport and Hitchcock, 1991, p. 2); Burton, a European-American man, preserved Mitchell’s tales in “the written language” (p. 2). In this dialog, Burton represents himself as using the [In] form categorically, while Mitchell’s speech is represented with both forms.

Studies Examining (ING) in the South

A few studies specifically address (ING) in the South; those that do address the effects of both social and linguistic variables. In East Central Alabama, McMillan (1946) reports [In] use at all social levels. Anshen (1969), working in a small African-American community in North Carolina, argues that [In] use is correlated with education and ethnicity. Comparing African-American speakers in New York City to Anshen’s data, Labov (1966) finds African-American speakers in the South to use a higher percentage of [In]; however, in Labov’s data, African-American speakers often represent “transplant Southern communities” (Wolfram, 2007, p. 308). Thus, it is difficult to make claims regarding region based on comparison of these data. In a study of European-American Appalachian speech, Wolfram and Christian (1976) report that

“speakers show higher rates of [In] use than most other [European-American] speakers, including those in the non-Appalachian South” (Campbell-Kibler, 2006, p. 39); however, Hazen et al. (2006) find [In] use in Appalachia to be only 50 percent overall (though Southern Appalachian speakers were found to have a higher rate of [In] production than Northern Appalachian speakers). Returning to East Central Alabama, C. Feagin (1979) notes a high frequency of [In] use in Anniston, Alabama. In another study, A. Houston (1985), who focuses primarily on British speech, presents data from two Southern communities, West Texas and Atlanta, as points of comparison. She finds differences in the conditioning factors among the dialects examined, particularly for grammatical category (p. 158). Kiesling (1998) analyzes fraternity men’s discourse in Virginia and argues that [In] is a masculine signifier for these speakers, finding higher [In] use in fraternity meetings than in other social situations.

Undergraduates at Auburn University (Bowling et al., MS) found males to use [In] with nouns more than females do. Overall, the speakers included in the project used [In] most with verbs, followed by nouns, pronouns, and then adjectives and adverbs. Two dissertations completed in 2006 deal with (ING) in the South. Holladay (2006), who investigated the variable (ING) in addition to (ai) and (oi), finds pronouns and verbs to favor [In]. Campbell-Kibler (2006), investigating social evaluations of (ING), collected listener responses to speech from the South and the West Coast (from group interviews and a survey); she finds that [In] “increases the perceived ratings of accented speech on the part of the Southern speakers” (p. 18).

Social Conditioning of (ING)

Social variables often found to condition the production of (ING) include socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity, and age. Although McMillan (1946) reports [In] use at all social levels

in East Central Alabama, studies have generally indicated that higher social status is correlated with higher levels of [In] production (Reid, 1978; Shuy et al., 1967).

In regard to gender, the research cited above (Bowling et al., MS; Kiesling, 1998) indicating that men are likely to use higher levels of [In] than women in the South is consistent with findings in other regions (Houston, 1985; Shopen, 1978; Shuy et al., 1967; Trudgill, 1974).

In regard to (ING) and ethnicity, African Americans have been shown to use [In] more frequently than do European Americans in Philadelphia, New York City, and Detroit (e.g., Cofer, 1972; Labov, 1966; Shuy et al., 1967), although as noted above regarding New York, in each of these cities, African-American speakers may be preserving Southern language patterns. However, this finding also holds true in a comparison of (ING) use among African Americans and European Americans in the South. Anshen (1969) compared his work on African-American speech in Hillsboro, North Carolina, to that of Levine and Crockett's (1966) on European-American speech in the same community. Though speaker ethnicity is not a factor in Campbell-Kibler (2006), her study suggests that African-American listeners see "[In] as more stigmatized than [European-American] or [Asian-American participants] [do]" (p. 121).

In regard to age, studies in New York (Labov, 1966), Ottawa (Woods, 1979), and Sydney (Horvath, 1985), find younger speakers to use [In] more frequently than older speakers. In Detroit, Shuy et al. (1967) find a slightly different pattern, with teenagers using [In] most frequently, but with children (age 9-12) and adults (30-50) using [In] in essentially equal amounts. A project conducted by undergraduates at Auburn University (Forsyth et al., MS) finds that the oldest speakers interviewed use the [In] variant more than a younger speaker. This study, unlike the previous four, uses Southern informants. All speakers included in the study are over age 60, and one is a native of Elba. At the intersection of age and ethnicity, whether and to

what degree the process of integration impacted the variable (ING) in Elba is of concern to the present study.

Linguistic Conditioning of (ING)

Linguistic variables often found to condition the production of (ING) include preceding and following phonological environment, syllable stress, frequency, grammatical category, and style. In regard to phonological environment, preceding velar stops (k,g) have been shown to favor [In] while preceding alveolar stops (t,d) favor [In] (e.g., Cofer, 1972; A. Houston, 1985; Shuy, Wolfram, and Riley, 1967); following alveolar stops have been shown to favor [In] while following velar stops favor [In] (e.g., Cofer, 1972; A. Houston, 1985; Shuy, Wolfram, and Riley, 1967). For syllable stress, [In] has been shown to occur primarily in unstressed environments (A. Houston, 1985). Studies taking frequency into account suggest that [In] occurs more in everyday words of frequent use (Fischer, 1958; Wald and Shopen, 1985). When considering grammatical category, in most English dialects, verbs and pronouns are more likely to contain the [In] variant (Wald and Shopen, 1985); however, the patterning of nouns broadly differentiates the Northern and Southern American English patterns (A. Houston, 1985). Although Holladay's (2006) Southern children mirrored adult patterning in regard to verbs and pronouns, no noun forms with the [In] variant occurred in the data. In regard to style, the variable has largely exhibited consistent behavior, "with greater [In] use shown in those contexts with more formality or more of a focus on careful speech and greater [In] use in those which are more casual, with less of a premium on standard speech" (Campbell-Kibler, 2006, p. 29).

African-American and European-American English in the South

From Dialectologists to Sociolinguists

Research examining the relationship between African-American and European-American English in the South dates to the late 1940s with the work of dialect geographers Krapp, Kurath, and McDavid, “who analyzed spoken data from African Americans and [European Americans] in an effort to counter the racist views [...] that genetic inferiority and cultural deprivation of African Americans were the principal causes for differences between [African-American] and [European-American] speech” (Cukor-Avila, 2003, p. 82). The main proposition of dialect geography was that “[African-American] speakers use the dialects of their region and not a linguistically unique variety” (Edwards, 1989, p. 616), since both African-American and European-American speech emerged from British dialects (Cukor-Avila, 2003, p. 83). During the 1960s and 1970s, concurrent with “the fundamental social transformation that the nation was undergoing at the time,” there was “a virtual explosion of work” on African-American language varieties (Smitherman and Baugh, 2002, p. 8). Work grounded in creole studies rejects the anglicist position of dialect geography, offering instead the creole-origin hypothesis. This line of thought hypothesizes that contemporary African-American English emerged from one or more plantation creoles.

For example, Dillard (1972) “popularized [the creolist] view, convincing many that AAE [...] was much more African than anyone had realized” (Holm, 2004, p. 2). Dillard (1972) asserts that the African-American dialect, “a new force on the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ population, was innovative rather than archaic” (p. 191) and suggests that it is “more likely to have produced some [...] of the differences between Southern [European-American] dialect and Northern

[European-American] dialect than to have been originally identical with a [European-American] Southern dialect” (p. 191).

The creolist position was taken up by linguists such as Baugh, Edwards, Fasold, Holm, Rickford, Singler, Smitherman, and Spears. In reviewing the testimony given by linguists in *Martin Luther King Junior Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor School District Board*, Labov (1982) describes African-American English as showing “evidence of derivation from an earlier Creole that was closer to the present-day Creoles of the Caribbean” (p. 192). Providing linguistic evidence such as copula absence in European-American speech, Rickford (1997) suggests that “[i]t is in the South that we should look most closely for the possibility that pidginization and creolization took place in the U.S” (p. 323).

At the other extreme is the anglicist position. Fasold explains the challengers’ position as follows: “[D]ifferences between [African-American] and [European-American] language that cannot be explained on the basis of regional and social factors result from the differential preservation of British dialect features brought to North America by colonists” (1981, p. 163). For example, Montgomery, Fuller, and Demarse (1993) find “constraints on verbal –s marking which parallel those in the writing of Scotch-Irish immigrants” (p. 335), concluding that “some, perhaps many, African Americans used varieties of English with little or no creole influence” (p. 335). Additionally, Poplack (2000) maintains “that the grammar of AAVE originated largely from the regional and nonstandard Englishes to which the early African Americans were exposed, and not from any widely-spoken creole” (p. 2).

Between these two positions are scholars such as Winford, who “chart a middle course between the two extremes and argue that while [African-American English] is not simply a variety of [European-American Southern English] spoken by African Americans, neither is it the

direct descendant of a plantation creole” (Louden, 2000, p. 224). Mufwene (1992) also states that “neither the dialectologist nor the creolist positions accounts adequately for all the facts of AAE” (p. 158).

Sociolinguists such as Labov, Wolfram, and Fasold “concentrated on Northern urban areas such as Detroit and New York,” and thus “produced limited data useful for direct comparisons of [African-American] and [European-American] speech in the South” (Montgomery and G. Bailey, 1986, p. 15). As Wolfram (2007) explains, “the effect of the Northern, urban vernacular sampling bias was not always recognized in the emerging canon of AAE description, nor was it adequately acknowledged that these communities were often transplant Southern communities from different regions of the South” (p. 308).

Although early sociolinguistic descriptions of African-American English say little about the relationship between African-American and European-American speech in the South, their sociolinguistic framework was influential in subsequent studies, including those of Anshen (1969); S. Houston (1969, 1970, 1972); Summerlin (1972); Fetscher (1971); Dunlap (1973); Graves (1967); and Wolfram (1971, 1974) (Montgomery and G. Bailey, 1986, p. 17). These sociolinguists working on Southern data generally stood between the creolists and anglicists; the greatest problem with these studies is that the populations sampled were primarily children. C. Feagin (1979) describes Southern European-American speech in Anniston, Alabama, comparing her findings to Labov’s for African-American speech of Northern cities and finds several similarities between the varieties.

Like C. Feagin (1979), both G. Bailey (1997) and Schneider (2003) acknowledge that differences exist between African-American and European-American Southern speech. However, they make claims regarding the history of Southern English in its entirety without

analyzing the speech of African-American Southerners. Such a position is untenable: the narrative of Southern history has unfolded around race relations, and the impact of language contact between the two groups is a central element in this narrative. However, because relationships between African-American and European-American Southerners throughout the history of the South have been complex, there has not been a clear path for researchers seeking to understand the linguistic impact of these relationships.

Divergence Controversy

In the mid-1980s, a debate as contentious as the creole/anglicist question emerged. Labov's research on both grammatical and phonological variables in New York and Philadelphia led him to the conclusion that "regardless of how different the origins of the [African-American] vernacular and [European-American] dialects may have been, there is evidence that [African-American] vernacular dialects are becoming increasingly different from surrounding [European-American] dialects" (Fasold, 1987, p. 3). Relevant for this study, the divergence hypothesis holds that "although the [African-American] and [European-American] vernaculars, especially in the South, were converging for many years, that convergence has ended and those varieties are now actually diverging" (G. Bailey and Maynor, 1989, p. 13). G. Bailey and Maynor's (1987) Texas study of seven adults and twenty children suggests divergence (1989, p. 18), and C. Feagin (1990) finds younger European Americans in Anniston, Alabama, moving away from the "r-less" pronunciation shared by African Americans. More recent work reveals evidence of both convergent and divergent tendencies. Hinton and Pollock (2000) find convergence in Davenport, Iowa, but both convergence and divergence in Memphis. Similarly, Fridland (2002) finds both convergent and divergent tendencies in speakers in Memphis. Wolfram and his research group working in eastern North Carolina report divergence from local dialects toward a supraregional

African-American English; however, this has not been the case for all of the communities they have studied.

The Speech Community

The speech community is a complex concept, and its definition has differed among linguists. One influential definition of the speech community has been put forth by Labov, whose work on the speech community emerged from research on language variation and change in his 1966 survey of the Lower East Side of New York City. His definition, empirically-rooted, was “the first to posit both shared norms and linguistic uniformity (as structured variation)” (Patrick, 2002, p. 584). Labov (1972b, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*) writes:

The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms. These norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage. (pp. 120-121)

In other words, for Labov, a group of speakers constitutes a distinct speech community when it can be distinguished on two levels: attitude and speech (Patrick, 2002, p. 587). For example, he ultimately differentiated African Americans from European Americans in his Lower East Side study because they both reversed European-American attitudes toward the cultural values of New York City speech and differed phonologically (Labov, 1966).

C. Feagin (1979) utilizes Labov’s definition of the speech community in her investigation of European-American English in Anniston, Alabama. C. Feagin asserts that African Americans and European Americans belong to separate communities.

Blanton (1988) writes that “[t]he value of southern sociolinguistic research lies in the fact that we can observe that speech varieties [in] speech communities manifest a core of reticulated features and values” (p. 121). With respect to the variables investigated here, whether language use among African-American and European-American community members has changed over

time, and whether and to what degree integration shaped this configuration is of concern to the present study.

Impact of Segregation, Integration

Despite Wolfram's 1971 observation that Southern African-American and European-American language systems have diverged over the years due to racial discrimination and segregation, Montgomery (1997) points to this as a question that "linguists [had] hardly begun to address" (p. 16). Since Montgomery's observation, research directed by Wolfram has addressed "the issue of a supraregional AAVE norm," focusing increasingly on the role of school integration in local language change (Fought, 2006, p. 58); however, additional work is needed before sociolinguistics can claim to have fully grappled with the linguistic impact of racism and integration. Moreover, although racial integration also encompasses the workplace, housing, and places of public accommodation and recreation, the effect of increased contact in these places also remains largely unexamined. This study addresses this lacuna by examining the nature of the relationship between African-American and European-American Southern speech in a non-urban Southern community where integration happened at both a local and a personal level. What follows is a review of the discussion and/or research on segregation and integration that has occurred since Montgomery's (1997) observation.

Sociolinguistic discussion of segregation has been limited to speculation. For example, Mufwene (2000, 2003) believes that commonalities between African-American and European-American Southern English "can be explained primarily by their common, coextensive histories of over 200 years" and suggests that "many of today's differences between the two vernaculars can be attributed to the divergence that resulted from the widespread institutionalization of segregation" (2003, p. 64). Poplack (2000) holds a similar view, hypothesizing that "the

grammatical core of contemporary AAVE developed from an English base” and that “the many grammatical distinctions between contemporary varieties of AAVE and American and British English are recent developments” (p. 1). Labov (2001*a*), in his laudatory foreword to Poplack and Tagliamonte’s *African American English in the Diaspora*, states that “[n]o observer of the scene can fail to be impressed by the linguistic consequences of racial segregation in the United States: the rapid reduction in the rates of verbal –s, the rise of habitual *be* and innovative *had*, the elaboration of new tense and aspect markers” (p. xvii).¹³

These non-Southerners seem not to appreciate that in the South, extended, personal contact between African Americans and European Americans continued after slavery ended and during segregation. African Americans and poor European Americans continued to associate, and in many cases, as discussed in the next chapter, African Americans continued to work in the homes of European Americans. In fact, the amount of time European-American children have historically spent with African-American caregivers leads one to question when contact between African Americans and European Americans in the South has been greatest. Algeo (2003) contends that it was through house servants, often serving “as nurses for the [European-American] family’s children,” and skilled craftsmen, “that the language of African slaves became an important influence on Southern English” (p. 11).

However, the intricacy of African-American/European-American relationships cannot be ignored; it is possible that even sustained contact did not prevent linguistic divergence due to segregation in public spaces. Kelley (1993) reminds us that African-American household workers (as well as other working-class African Americans) used theft, sabotage, and slowdowns

¹³ It should be noted that Labov is referring not only to legal segregation in the South, but also to Northern (urban) segregation that occurred during and after the Great Migration.

“in order to control the pace of work, increase wages, compensate for underpayment, reduce hours, and seize more personal autonomy” (p. 89). Language too, could be employed in achieving such goals; Sabino (2012) reminds us that manipulation of language variety can be used to achieve social, political, and economic ends. Moreover, research on language and identity amply demonstrates that when ethnolinguistic differences exist, especially in settings characterized by social distance and/or hostility, substantial and sustained contact often reinforces such boundaries (Sabino, 2012). Thus, the linguistic outcome of contact and separation depends on local events and individual situations and on whether antagonisms increased, decreased, or remained the same, which is directly tied to integration.

As noted previously, recent research in North Carolina addresses “the issue of a supraregional AAVE norm” (Fought, 2006, p. 58), indicating that integration has not necessarily eroded ethnolinguistic boundaries and, in fact, that some ethnolinguistic boundaries are intensifying rather than dissipating (Wolfram, 2008, p. 269). Early work on this question led to speculation about the role of integration, and as a pattern emerged, later work began to focus on integration more specifically. Green (1998); Wolfram (2000); Wolfram, Thomas, and Green (2000); and Wolfram and Thomas (2002) find younger African-American speakers in Hyde County, North Carolina, to be moving toward a supraregional norm. Green (1998) hypothesizes that “AAVE in Hyde County is moving away from local dialect identity towards a more uniform AAVE norm as part of the larger cultural reorientation of African-American identity that evolved coterminously with the Civil Rights [M]ovement and school [integration]” (Thesis Abstract); similarly, Wolfram and Thomas (2002) suggest that following integration “African Americans started intensifying the ethnolinguistic divide [...] by reducing the alignment with the local Pamlico Sound features and increasing [...] core AAVE structures” (201). Carpenter’s (2004a,

2005) analyses of morphosyntactic features on Roanoke Island also indicate movement toward a supraregional AAE norm. She points out that the first generation of African Americans to attend integrated schools led this movement toward AAE, an indication that integration served to heighten rather than diminish ethnic marking in speech. In contrast to the aforementioned studies, Childs and Mallinson (2004) find that younger speakers in Texana did not seem to be moving toward a supraregional norm although middle-age adults were aligned to AAE norms. Speculating on the role of integration, they call for exploration of “factors related to individual and group identity” (p. 45).

Carpenter and Vadnais (2005), Carpenter (2004b), and Vadnais (2006) demonstrate an increasing focus on the linguistic impact of integration. The first two studies observe that “in Hyde County and Roanoke Island, the use of locative *to*¹⁴ is sharply reduced in the speech of African Americans who first attended integrated schools” (Vadnais, 2006, Thesis Abstract). Carpenter (2004b) re-examines data from Hyde County, Roanoke Island, and Texana, focusing on the evolution of African-American English “by looking at the specific linguistic responses of speakers to the cultural changes mandated by the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (34). Her analysis suggests that each of these “communities reveal[s] a marked morphosyntactic alignment to AAE norms for the generation of speakers who attended schools during or immediately following integration” (p. 35); Carpenter concludes that this pattern “indicates that major historical events, particularly those that impact the day-to-day lives of communities, are another factor that may influence both group and individual dialect accommodation and development” (p. 46).

As illustrated by the above statement, these studies largely use major historical events to determine age groups, although familial relationships are also used. The major historical events

¹⁴ As in “*I worked to the crabhouse*” (Carpenter, 2004a, p. 40).

utilized are local events consisting primarily of school integration in the communities being examined; however, events such as bridge access to Roanoke Island are taken into account as well.

Age groups for the earliest study – Green (1998) – roughly correspond to the generations of a family; age divisions used in Wolfram (2000) and Wolfram, Thomas, and Green (2000) reflect Green’s (1998) study. Age divisions were reconstructed to reflect integration history as this began to emerge as potentially significant with regard to alignment with AAE norms. In Wolfram and Thomas (2002), integration is used in the determination of sociohistorical periods: “speakers who were born and raised in the early twentieth century up through World War I; speakers born and raised between World War I and school integration in the late 1960s; speakers who lived through the early period of school integration as adolescents; and those who were born and raised after integration” (Wolfram and Thomas, 2002, p. 200). In the studies following Wolfram and Thomas (2002), local school integration is the primary determiner of age groupings. The breakdown has generally consisted of pre-integration speakers (b. 1905-1943), those who were in school during or immediately following integration (b. 1948-1969), and post-integration speakers (b. 1972-1997), though there are slight differences among the studies. Regarding the use of major events in local history, Carpenter (2004*b*) notes that “some variation cannot be accounted for by grouping speakers on the basis of traditional generational demographic groups” (p. 35). She stresses that “personal histories, interactional networks, communities of practice, and cultural values and attitudes have to be taken into account” (p. 35).

In the present study, an emic approach to the research is shown to be particularly useful, and interview topics leading to discussion of local integration history were drawn from both history and literature. The next chapter reviews the historical and literary context of the five

primary interview modules¹⁵ used in this study: the role of (1) domestic workers, (2) church, (3) sports, (4) the Jr./Sr. prom, and (5) the swimming pool during integration. This chapter links these themes to language study through analysis of their impact on linguistic accommodation and distancing.

¹⁵ The interview modules are included as Appendix A.

CHAPTER III. QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY

Language, Identity, and the Social Basis of Language

Sociolinguists recognize that language reflects the choices and identities of individuals; linguistic alliances and loyalties emerge from social history and cultural heritage, personal and familial history, group affiliation, and cultural orientation (e.g., LePage and Tabouret Keller, 1985; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988; Wolfram and Thomas, 2002; Wolfram, 2008; Sabino, 2012). People also form linguistic bonds based on who or where they want to be or what groups they want to belong to; conversely, they may use language to distance themselves from groups they do not want to belong to or want to be recognized as different from (e.g., LePage and Tabouret Keller, 1985; Chambers, 2003). Historians also recognize the important role played by choice, viewing “history [as] the essential ‘raw material’ from which all group identities are manufactured” (Hobsbawm, as cited in J. Cobb, 2004, p. 606). With respect to the present project, Monteith and Jones (2002) argue, “It is the historical framework through which an individual views the South that determines what is seen” (p. 1).

Another discipline that holds implications for identity construction is literature. Literature is often a reflection of or commentary on history and culture, and like spoken language, it is one of the ways that cultural groups identify themselves. In fact, the very emergence of Southern literature is connected to identity, as a conscious idea of Southern literature entered the cultural discourse during the 1830s (Flora and MacKethan, 2002, p. 828), a time when the South was concerned with asserting itself against Northern dominance. Since that time, Southern literature has evolved coterminously with Southern and American identity.

Thus, because linguistic choices (conscious and unconscious) are anchored in identity, it is imperative to consider the history and culture of the individuals who produce the sounds that are the focus of this study. Keeping “the social basis of language” in mind (Beaugrande, 1998, p. 1), this chapter focuses on the American South as it is revealed by history and literature.¹⁶

As has been pointed out, in contemporary thought there exists an understanding that there are *cultures* of the South, and the complexities stemming from contact between groups are an essential aspect of Southern identity. Perhaps no time period better represents this feature than the Civil Rights Era, during which people grappled with race relations at a social and a political level; indeed, Robert Penn Warren argued that it was through the Civil Rights Movement that the South “might achieve ‘moral identity’ and contribute leadership to the nation because it had been forced ‘to deal concretely with [precisely this] problem’” (as cited in Hobson, 1983, pp. 353-354). Not surprisingly, authors struggled with issues regarding race at a literary level as well. Examining evidence from history and literature provides insight into the cultural context of the speakers whose language is included in this study on two levels: (1) Regional identity and (2) Group identity within Southern culture. These divisions speak to the primary goal of this study – to examine the trajectory of language choice in Elba and to determine whether and to what degree the linguistic choices of groups were impacted by the Civil Rights Era.

This chapter not only informs the analysis, it elucidates the ways in which history and literature inform linguistic methodology by illustrating their value in designing interview modules. Themes, particularly local/private themes, treated in history and literature are part of informants’ memories and hence, useful as interview topics. Further, the following discussion examines the socio-historical patterns that are hypothesized to delineate the age divisions

¹⁶ Though not the focus of the chapter, examples from film are used to illustrate an awareness of particular issues in the popular consciousness.

considered in the linguistic analysis. Hypotheses about age cohort divisions tested with linguistic data are initially motivated by common identity-shaping historical events and trends, especially those shared by the local community. Likewise, because literary works of different time periods reflect generational experiences and identities, they speak to grouping of participants into categories of shared experience. In fact, Levine (1998) insightfully argues that “[t]he urge to focus largely on the macrocosm has obscured the activities, the attitudes, the thoughts, indeed the lives, of everyday people” (p. 179). Thus, by focusing on local and private life during segregation and integration, this study takes an emic approach in its effort to understand research participants’ identities, and hence, linguistic choices. Five components of local and/or private life are considered: the roles of (1) the domestic worker (2) church (3) sports (4) the high school prom and (5) the swimming pool during the pre-Civil Rights, Civil Rights, and post-Civil Rights Eras – which reflects the age range of the research participants. Though several of these themes received national media attention during the Civil Rights Era, particularly church and sports, they all have special significance in local culture. In order to examine language from an interdisciplinary perspective, the following sections position these themes in history and provide examples of their literary representations.

Domestic Workers

The first theme discussed by research participants was the role of domestic workers in local history; particularly, participants were asked to recount their own experiences. This theme worked well as an interview topic because many participants were able to discuss personal, sometimes emotional, experiences. This was especially true for female participants. For example, one African-American woman remembered the importance she placed on saving an employer’s ring during the 1990 flood while a number of European-American females recalled

the close bonds they felt they shared with an African-American employee or caregiver. Though it was often adult speakers who shared these memories, some of the youngest European-American speakers recollected spending substantial amounts of time with and discussed feelings of closeness toward African-American caregivers. However, though many of the interviews suggest the likelihood of linguistic accommodation, not all did. For example, one European-American speaker explained that the closeness she felt toward her African-American caregiver was complicated by loyalty to her mother. This type of complexity might have promoted linguistic distancing.

The historical literature provides a context from which to anticipate such reports. Both law and class-consciousness promoted the view of women as secondary-wage earners. However, African-American women, including married African-American women, stand as a “telling exception to this pattern” (Boydston, 2005) and have traditionally had higher labor-force participation than European-American or Hispanic women in the U.S. Much of this participation has been in domestic service.

Due to substantial migration after the Civil War, African-American women began to fill domestic positions in the North and the Midwest. Many also remained at work in Southern European-American households (Chasin, 1995, p. 80.) Because domestic work was one of the few occupations available to African-American women in the South, until the 1960s some 45 percent of wage-earning Southern African-American women were employed as domestic workers – “maids, cooks, laundresses, and child minders” (McMillen, 1998, p. 86). Nationally, until the 1970 census, household work remained the largest form of employment reported by African-American women (as cited in Chasin, 1995, p. 80). Domestic work continued to be an important source of employment for African-American women through the 1990s although by

2007 management and professional occupations surpassed service positions (U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics, p. 210).

While African-American women have been employed as domestic workers nationally, the most intense focus has been on Southern domestic experiences, and domestic work is among the most dominant of all images in Southern literature (Campbell, 2002). This emphasis is perhaps due to its seminal role in Southern society in the pre-Civil Rights and Civil Rights Eras. Because as Tucker (1987) observes, the African-American female domestic, “more than any other person in the segregated South, witnessed the very personal lives of both [African Americans] and [European Americans], [and] thus became the key person through whom each race claimed to know the other” (p. 6). Linguistically, the language of domestic workers has been identified as having had an important influence on European-American Southern English (Algeo 2003, Feagin 1997). As demonstrated above, this topic is of particular interest to this study.

Unlike the arenas of human contact discussed below, the domestic worker is an agent, and because of this, the most multifaceted of the themes explored in this project. Among the complexities of the domestic labor dynamic are the intra-personal relationships between domestics and European-American children, domestics and their European-American female employers, and resistance by domestics to an exploitive economic system. All of these topics have been explored through oral interviews with domestics and female employers (Barnes, 1993; Dill, 1994; Tucker, 1988) and portrayed in literature.

Southern African-American Domestic Workers and European-American Children

Working-class characters have long been admired, even praised; they have also been stereotyped, and certainly, the meaning of work has been understood and described differently

for African-American and European-American laborers (Campbell, 2002, p. 993). In literature and the popular mindset, the African-American domestic is often stereotyped as a strong mother to her biological children and mother surrogate to her European-American charges (Tucker, 1988, p. 5).

In part, this depiction reflects historical reality since many African-American domestics were working mothers who also served in a mothering capacity while at work. Further, it is the domestic's mothering role that has been most evident in both African-American and European-American Southern cultures (Tucker, 1988, p. 16). Dill (1994), pointing out that workers cultivated their strongest bonds with their employers' children (p. 134), discovered in her interviews with domestics and female employers that domestics not only participated in the child rearing process but also restructured it (p. 128). Further, Berkeley (1990) suggests that European-American children were probably more knowledgeable than their elders about the internal workings of their caregivers' communities, noting that youngsters often visited African-American neighborhoods while on errands with their caregivers (p. 385).

Berkeley's (1990) point raises an important issue in regard to language, one that is highlighted in Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960),¹⁷ a literary example that demonstrates popular awareness of this linguistic phenomenon. In the novel, on a visit to the African-American community two child characters, Jem and Scout, learn that their caregiver, Calpurnia, speaks differently with African Americans than with European Americans. Accommodation theory suggests that "style is essentially speakers' response[s] to their audience[s]" (Bell, 1984, p. 145). Because women working as domestics are likely to have modified their speech to some degree in European-American homes, children were more likely to be privy to natural speech

¹⁷ The magnitude of *To Kill a Mockingbird's* success demonstrates the resonance of the domestic/child theme. The novel has never been out of print, selling over 30 million copies since 1960.

while in the African-American community, and this exposure is reported to have impacted children linguistically (Algeo, 2003; C. Feagin, 1997). However, the nature of the influence would depend on a number of factors, including how deeply children entered the African-American community and whether and to what extent African Americans monitored their speech while European-American children were present.

It should also be noted that though children's elders may too have been in the care of domestics at one time, visits to African-American neighborhoods usually ended when adolescence began, and hence, so did access to intimate details of African-American life (Berkeley, 1990, p. 385). Therefore, while adults may have witnessed the inner workings of the African-American community of their generation, it was children who typically had the most current window into African-American life. Further, adolescence is a time when acceptance in peer-groups demands linguistic conformity and hence, a time when European-American children would have felt increased pressure to follow group norms, possibly turning away not only from the language of their parents but also that of their African-American caregivers (see Chambers 1995, 2003). Such linguistic choices speak to whether African-American and European-American speech has changed in Elba and the degree to which both African-American and European-American children may have differentiated themselves from their parents' and caregivers' generations.

Although African-American caregivers often served as mother figures for European-American children, the numerous literary depictions of the Southern African-American domestic worker as mother may represent something more. In *Killers of the Dream* (1949, 1961) Lillian Smith makes clear that "education [about] racism occurs first through the [African-American] domestic" (as cited in Tucker, 1988, p. 17). She writes, "I learned the bittersweet thing that a

child can learn: that the human relations I valued most were held cheap by the world I lived in” (Smith, 1961, p. 29). As children, many (perhaps most) European-American adolescents witnessed unfair treatment of their surrogate mothers, and saw these women living in poverty or relegated to the balcony in a movie theater (C. Head, personal communication, May 2008). Tucker (1988) includes a personal memory in her collection of oral-history narratives which focus on the complex relationship between domestics and their female employers: “I remember a feeling of sadness that their houses – which I, like other [European-American] children, might visit – seemed very substandard” (p. 13). Such images may not only have influenced language but also have contributed to the active participation of Southern European-American young people in changing their world.

Conversely, the African-American domestic worker/European-American family relationship was among the last of the “master/servant” relationships to exist in the South, and the children of these families are among the last people to have had personal experience with this rigid social hierarchy. Thus, the presence of conflicting value systems must be considered. Tucker (1988) describes such inner discord: “Probably because I came of age at the time of the [C]ivil [R]ights [M]ovement, I retained this image of poverty alongside the other image of the benign workings of the segregated South of my childhood” (p. 14). Thus, while emotional ties to domestic workers may have inspired impulses of tolerance and even activism, ascribed social roles are likely to have had a lingering influence. Of particular interest for this study, European-American children of this era may have equated speaking like their caregivers as inappropriately lowering themselves to a different social group, especially if parental corrections were frequent. This would have led to linguistic distancing and conscious attempts to differentiate their speech from that of African-American caregivers. Such linguistic differentiation is likely to have

increased as children became young adults and both had less contact with their caregivers and encountered social pressures from their European-American peer-groups and the European-American community as a whole.

Literary representations of the child/domestic relationship at times express social viewpoints not otherwise available for inspection since as Honeyman (2005) points out, child characters, unlike their adult counterparts, are protected because they question “from a place of unknowing” (p. 136). In the British tradition, children are generally the only focal characters to make friends with servants, and this tradition is “Americanized to include enslaved and exploited laborers and domestic workers” (Honeyman, 2005, p. 136). For example, in *To Kill a Mockingbird*, Calpurnia, though described as a cook, is in reality a mother figure having raised Jem and Scout in the absence of their own mother. The closeness of such relationships undoubtedly increased the likelihood of linguistic influence; however, this is not to imply that the children are unaware of social restrictions, as exemplified by Scout’s comment when Calpurnia knocks on the Radley’s front door: “She’s supposed to go around in back” (Lee, 1960, p. 102), and such practices might have served to retain linguistic boundaries. Nonetheless, throughout the novel, both the words and actions of the children make it clear that she is their friend, confidante, teacher, and de-facto mother, regardless of race.

The popularity of Kathryn Stockett’s *The Help* (2009) speaks loudly to the continued significance of the domestic/child theme. The novel portrays not only a current domestic/child relationship from the perspective of the domestic, but also a past domestic/child relationship through the reflections of the European-American child. Mae Mobley and her African-American caregiver, Aibileen, have an extremely close bond, and Aibileen serves as a constant source of unconditional love for her European-American charge. At one point in the novel, Mae Mobley

states, “Aibee, you’re my real mama” (Stockett, 2009, p. 284). Further, Aibileen provides instruction in tolerance to Mae Mobley, especially through their “secret stories,” which sometimes involve wrapping presents in different colors of paper and explaining “how it ain’t the color a the wrapping that count, it’s what we is inside” (Stockett, 2009, p. 295). It could be that the closeness of such a relationship, combined with an informal education in diversity and acceptance, would have resulted in linguistic accommodation. However, as Aibileen knows all too well, her relationship with Mae Mobley is one that will change in time. By her own choice, Aibileen stays with families only until the children are eight or nine years old because as she expresses, “How we love they kids when they little...And then they turn out just like they Mamas” (Stockett, 2009, p.128). The women to whom Aibileen refers are consumed by the lines between themselves and their employees, and this shift in attitude implies linguistic distancing post-childhood. The genuine love felt between domestics and children in spite of the domestics’ knowledge of the inevitable paints a complicated picture. The complexity of such relationships also speaks to the difficulty in forming hypotheses regarding linguistic influence.

Stockett’s central European-American character, Skeeter, provides readers with a picture of the domestic/child relationship through the eyes of a now-grown child. The mystery of the novel revolves around the disappearance of Constantine, Skeeter’s childhood caretaker, and as Skeeter searches for answers, she reflects on their relationship. Just as Mae Mobley adores Aibileen, Skeeter loved Constantine, remarking that the only thing she did not like about her upstairs bedroom growing up was that “it separated me from my Constantine” (Stockett, 2009, p. 58). Much as in Aibileen’s relationship with Mae Mobley, Constantine showed Skeeter unconditional love, shared her secrets, and served as a teacher, and it was Constantine who first taught Skeeter that she had a choice about what she could believe. Importantly, Skeeter fondly

remembers sometimes being allowed to go home with Constantine on Friday afternoons and explains, “It was a thrill to be in such a different world” (Stockett, 2009, p.61). Skeeter serves as an example of a European-American charge who does not turn out just like her mother: ultimately she comes to write a book from the perspective of the women who were called “the help.”

Southern African-American Domestic Workers and the Other

Employer/employee, mistress/servant, friends/rivals, exploiter/exploited – all were within the realm of the female employer/domestic relationship. McMillen (1998) summarizes information provided by oral interviews:

Some relationships [...] were exploitive and frustrating and others [...] were close and affectionate. Some women expressed [...] loyalty to [employers]; many remained with [a] family for decades. Some [European-American] women admitted [...] they felt closer to their maids than to their own mothers or sisters. But maids often resented the way [European-American] women addressed them and the requirement that they enter the house by the back door. (p. 86)

One problem in these relationships stemmed from the child/mother/surrogate mother dynamic. As Dill (1994) explains, tension was ever-present in such relationships because domestic workers played a seminal role in the upbringing of the children of the employing family, yet they held a replaceable position (p. 133). Knowing this, some domestics may have accommodated to European-American speech while in their employers’ homes. Also, European-American women who allowed domestics to raise their children while wanting to preserve their place as mother undoubtedly felt a certain amount of jealousy. As mentioned previously, this may also have led to linguistic distancing, not only because these mothers would likely have steered their children to use language that resembled their own but also due to the fact that European-American women possibly used linguistic differentiation from their employees to reinforce their status in the home.

Additional tension stemmed from giving and receiving (e.g., food, used clothing). Tucker (1988) points out that when European-American employers gave to alleviate guilt, domestics had no choice but to accept the recycled gifts as if they were not degrading (p. 148). Certainly, this dynamic could have created both social and linguistic distance. However, in contrast to guilt-gifting, Tucker (1988) suggests that domestics gave a valuable gift: With a talent for listening and an intimate knowledge of European-American lives, they often gave European-American female employers emotional support (p. 147). Through these conversations, domestics might have gained access to European-American speech while employers again accessed an earlier learned variety.

Roy Hoffman (1983) focuses on the complexity of the employer/domestic relationship in the South. Hoffman's novel juxtaposes the voices of Vivian Gold, a wealthy Jewish woman, and Nebraska Waters, her African-American, Baptist maid. Despite differences of ethnicity, religion, and socioeconomic status, the women share similar concerns about family and home, and to a large extent, their lives. While shared values might have led to linguistic accommodation in relationships such as these, Hoffman also depicts the tension that exists in such relationships, hence the title of his novel, *Almost Family*. Very early in the novel, Vivian exclaims to herself: "It's all too confusing [...]. You try to be a mother, it's hard. You try to be an employer, it's hard. You try to be a friend, it's hard. You try to be all three and it's impossible" (Hoffman, 1983, p. 49). Spanning the years between 1946-1975, the novel examines Vivian and Nebraska's relationship, depicting strain during the Civil Rights Movement due to Nebraska and Vivian's conflicted inner feelings as well as outside pressures. It is possible such tension resulted in linguistic distancing.

Like *Almost Family*, Ellen Douglas's *Can't Quit You, Baby* (1988) centers on the relationship between an African-American domestic, Julia Carrier (called Tweet), who has been employed by a European-American woman, Cornelia O'Kelly, for many years. However, Tweet and Cornelia's relationship is much more explosive than Nebraska and Vivian's, largely because Tweet is never silent. Unfortunately, Cornelia, who is partially deaf, does not often listen; unlike the aforementioned adolescents who might have been prompted to engage in cultural change, she is both literally and figuratively deaf to the changing world around her. In fact, Cornelia's self-absorption is at the root of the love/hate relationship with Tweet. Perhaps Tweet's relationship with Cornelia is best described by the words Tweet sings to Cornelia after a confrontation: "Oh, I love you, baby, but I sure do hate your ways" (Douglas, 1988, p. 256). This captures the complexity of some real-life domestic/employer relationships – though feelings of closeness could develop through day-to-day contact, a European-American employer's refusal to recognize her employee's plight could also lead to resentment.

Stockett also portrays both the closeness and the distance in domestic/employer relationships. Mae Mobley's mother, Elizabeth Leefolt, treats Aibileen in a calloused manner and joins the "Home Help Sanitation Initiative" that promotes separate bathrooms in European-American homes for African-American help. Such debasing treatment would likely have resulted in linguistic distancing. Creating further distance in the relationship, and perhaps linguistic distance, Aibileen's employer is jealous of her relationship with Mae Mobley. However, Aibileen insightfully observes, "I reckon that's the risk you run, letting someone else raise you chilluns" (Stockett, 2009, p. 2). In contrast, a close relationship is depicted in *The Help* between Aibileen's best friend Minny and Miss Celia (as Minny refers to her). Though they have a complicated relationship at first, as time passes, the two women discover more about one

another, and Minny is able to give Celia advice while Celia ultimately shares her deepest secret with Minny. As noted above, such conversations may have resulted in linguistic accommodation. Thus, as Skeeter finds when she begins conducting interviews for her book, “There is undisguised hate for [European-American] women, there is inexplicable love” (Stockett, 2009, p. 257).

Resistance in the Domestic Sphere

Because the domestic/employer relationship could be exploitive, it is not surprising that some domestic workers resisted, and the following discussion highlights commonly employed strategies, all of which would likely have promoted linguistic distancing. One form of resistance was the practice of “living out.” Clark-Lewis (1994) describes how domestics in Washington, D.C., migrants from the rural, post-Reconstruction South, transitioned from live-in to live-out service and reveals that living out allowed for greater control over work hours and conditions, more privacy, and increased participation in the African-American community (p. 6). In fact, although living out was more challenging economically, extended the work day, and did little to change power dynamics (Levine, 1998, p. 180), the desire among African-American domestics to retain control over their lives led to the predomination of the live-out system across the South (Tucker, 1988, p.73). Certainly, retaining a separate home and the increased participation in the African-American community that this would have allowed would also have resulted in linguistic distancing and divergence.

As pointed out in the previous chapter, domestics also engaged in direct resistance, “including slowdowns, theft (or ‘pan-toting’), leaving work early, or quitting, in order to control the pace of work, increase wages, compensate for underpayment, reduce hours, and seize more personal autonomy” (Kelley, 1993, p. 89). Language could also be used to achieve such goals.

The Role of the Southern Church in Race Relations and Civil Rights

Fundamental for this study is the fact that church life is important in both African-American and European-American culture, and that the South's "religious culture" (composed of both African-American and European-American traditions) "remains central to the idea of Southern distinctiveness" (C.R. Wilson, 1985, p. 12). Southern Christians instituted racially distinct denominations in the Reconstruction era (C.R. Wilson, 2004, p. 245),¹⁸ and although racially diverse congregations exist in today's South, in many communities African Americans and European Americans continue to worship separately, a choice which reflects group identification and cultural heritage.

When asked to discuss this topic, most research participants cited the difference in worship styles as the primary reason that African-American and European-American churches have largely remained distinct in many Southern communities, including Elba. No speakers expressed hostility over this fact or cited instances of being turned away from any church. Most participants claimed that if a person of another ethnicity came to their church, they would be welcomed, and some described instances in which church members from either predominately European-American or African-American churches would visit one another for particular church events. At the time interviews were conducted, two local churches, one African-American and one European-American, were in the process of combining. When respondents were asked their opinions about this, most stated that they thought it would be a positive experience (although a few made remarks such as, "We'll see..."). Interestingly, among European-American participants, this combining did not generate nearly the level of commentary and concern as did the controversial split of a local European-American church. One positive issue that was

¹⁸ "Although a few sympathetic [European Americans] ... helped establish [African-American] churches" during slavery, and "black slaves were permitted to attend their master's church," most slaves "gathered in the churchyard to hear the singing and the sermon" (Proach, 2009).

discussed was the community leadership provided by local African-American ministers. It was noted by a European-American respondent that although this leadership was not always at the surface level, these ministers had done much for race relations in Elba over the years. When considering linguistic accommodation and distancing, it seems most likely that in Elba church has served to reinforce ethnolinguistic boundaries, as churches have largely remained separate and, as respondents made clear, churches provide social centers for each ethnic community. However, because church has provided some interaction between African-American and European-American community members, and because local African-American ministers have worked to improve race relations in the community, it cannot be assumed that the role of church has been strictly to reinforce boundaries.

During the Civil Rights Era, Southern churches, especially in the African-American community, played a key role in social protest and change (Lincoln, 1985; Williams, 1999; Calhoun-Brown, 2000; Gadzekpo, 2001; C.R. Wilson, 2004). As the center and a “powerful [symbol] of meaning in the [African-American] community” (Calhoun-Brown, 2000, p. 172) as well as constant advocate for African-American freedom and civil rights, the church played a critical role during the Civil Rights Era. Culturally and spiritually, the beloved community ideal¹⁹ “arose out of a religious culture steeped in the rituals of mass meetings, revivalistic preaching, and sacred singing” (Harvey, 2005, p. 172). Practically, the church offered “social communication networks, facilities, audience, leadership, and money” to the Movement (Calhoun-Brown, 2000, p. 170). Though research participants in Elba did not discuss the involvement of any particular local church in the Civil Rights Movement, speakers did discuss the role of local African-American churches in community politics more generally.

¹⁹ A term coined by philosopher-theologian Josiah Royce and popularized by Martin Luther King, Jr. For King, the beloved community, in which brotherhood was a reality, was the goal of nonviolent protest (“The Beloved Community,” 2004).

The role of the African-American church in the Movement is well-known nationally, from the first meeting of the largely Christian Montgomery Improvement Association at the Holt Street Baptist Church, to the leadership of ministers such as Martin Luther King Jr., Fred Shuttlesworth, and Ralph David Abernathy, to the creation of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Because many of the events that received national media attention occurred in Alabama, they were firmly cemented in research participants' minds, and respondents sometimes pointed to these well-known religious leaders (particularly Dr. King) as having impacted their understanding and/or perception of the Movement. However, as Jones (1992) points out, although the national media focused on Martin Luther King Jr., community-based, religious-led groups across the nation agitated and demonstrated for "equal social, political, and economic justice" (p. 192). In fact, the grassroots efforts of "local churches and lay religious leaders [...] made the movement a true regionwide protest" (C.R. Wilson, 2004, p. 250), and Morris (1984) argues that African-American churches were the key organizers of the movement, "drawing from their traditional role as institutions well-rooted in local communities" (as cited in C.R. Wilson, 2004, p. 250).

In literature, William Cobb's *A Walk Through Fire* (1992) examines the role of the local preacher-activist, and Alice Walker's *Meridian* (1976) demonstrates the importance of the local church to the national movement. *A Walk Through Fire* chronicles the experiences of Eldon Long, pastor of the Mount Sinai A.M.E. Zion Church, as he seeks to incite change in the small town of Hammond, Alabama. Walker's novel depicts a church memorial service after King's death in 1968 where Meridian finds that, unlike the church of her childhood, which preached "resignation and salvation after death," the Civil Rights Era church preaches "resistance" (Stein, 1986, p. 9). This message is delivered by a preacher who sounds remarkably like King, and

Meridian realizes that this local minister is deliberately imitating King, consciously keeping his voice alive. In the interviews conducted for the present study, one adolescent African-American speaker discussed the fact that her church provided instruction in the history of the Civil Rights Movement, and particularly the contributions of Dr. King. Not only would such instruction serve to keep the memory of Civil Rights religious leaders alive, it might also orient younger African-American community members toward their shared national heritage. Linguistically, this might increase distancing from the European-American community.

Because the church has been a center of the African-American community and a center of civil rights activity both nationally and locally, it has also been a target of Civil Rights Era violence. Robin D. G. Kelley has argued that the sacred world was held by African Americans to be a weapon of both protection and attack (as cited in Harvey, 2005, p. 171), and, as Harvey (2005) explains, the bombers of Birmingham's Sixteenth Street Baptist Church and numerous other religious buildings clearly recognized this (p. 171). However, such violence also had an unintended effect. It galvanized European-Americans sympathetic to the goals of the Civil Rights Movement. As a literary example, Sena Jeter Naslund's novel *Four Spirits* (2003) examines Stella, a liberal European-American college student in the 1960s who has no intention of becoming involved in the Movement until after the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing. Linguistically, such involvement on the part of European-Americans might have resulted in convergence for speakers who embraced a liberal Southern identity. In Elba, no European-Americans discussed becoming involved in the movement. Violence, including violence targeted at the African-American church, was one area that some participants were able to discuss. Because such violence often evoked sympathy, this would possibly have impacted attitudes, increased interaction, and perhaps influenced language.

During the Civil Rights Movement, nearly all Southern European-American churchgoers were Protestants, and all the major denominations endorsed racial integration in principle, at least (Bartley, 1995, p. 271- 273). This is reflected in interviewees' discussions of racial integration in churches today. Much like these Protestant denominations that endorsed integration in principle during the Civil Rights Movement, many of the respondents seemed to endorse the idea of present day church integration more in principle than in reality. Hence, a positive attitude toward the idea of African Americans and European Americans worshiping together in a taped interview does not necessarily suggest a genuine desire for change. Returning to the Civil Rights Era, although segregationists dominated the pew and the pulpit, a number of Southern European-American religious leaders did defy mainline opinion in order to promote equality (Bartley, 2005, p. 273). Also, evidence that some European-American Southerners were impacted by beliefs and experiences tied to Christianity is offered through the example of SNCC activist Robert (Bob) Zellner. As the the son of a circuit rider preacher,²⁰ he was influenced by his parsonage days as a youth in Wiregrass Alabama (B. Zellner, personal communication, November 11, 2004). As Zellner explains, he understood growing up poor and admired his father for breaking ties with his family's Klan heritage due to the fact that he "could not make his Klanism and his Christianity jive..." (as cited in Carson et al., 1991, p. 127). Thus, while the commitment to equality was less central among most Southern European-American churches than among most Southern African-American churches, European-American churches were not devoid of civil rights supporters. Much like relationships involving domestic workers, church is a complex issue that involves both pushes and pulls, socially and linguistically.

²⁰ A circuit rider preacher is an itinerant preacher "who travels from church to church, especially in a rural district" ("Circuit Rider," 2009).

Sports, Integration, and Race Relations

Often represented “as among the most ‘open’ arenas in race relations” (Dawkins, 2004, p. 327) and heralded as “a model of racial integration” (Hoberman, 2000), sports provide some of integration’s most enduring images: Jesse Owens upsetting “Hitler’s Aryan Nation apple cart” in the 1936 Olympics (“Sports: Jesse Owens,” n.d.), white America pulling for Joe Louis in his rematch with German boxer Max Schmeling in 1938, and Jackie Robinson breaking the color barrier in professional baseball by signing with the Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947. In the South, sports were an “instrument of the [C]ivil [R]ights [M]ovement” (Roberts, 2004, p. 299). Baseball, particularly, anticipated integration in the broader society, as Southern minor league teams broke color barriers by the early 1950s (Roberts, 2004, p. 305). Further, there has been an endless popularization of the integration of sports. The box office success of films such as *Glory Road* (2006), and *Remember the Titans* (2000) demonstrates the continued presence of the integration of sports in the popular consciousness. Based on this popular awareness of the integration of sports, it is not surprising that respondents in Elba were eager to discuss this topic.

Although community members interviewed for this study acknowledged that sports do sometimes divide African Americans and European Americans, this was the one area of contact that speakers overwhelmingly agreed has an ability to bring the two groups together. Although younger adults and adolescents usually discussed this theme from a personal experience standpoint, older adults often referred to their children’s experiences or to their remembrances of the integration of sports at a regional or national level, and such images were as dominant in these research participants’ minds as any images of Civil Rights activism. Some respondents did discuss competition over positions between African-American and European-American players, and others (both African-American and European-American) discussed perceived unfairness on

the part of coaches based on race. In literature, this is illustrated through the character of Narvel Blue in *Everybody's All-American* (Deford, 1981). Additionally, some speakers discussed tense games between predominately African-American and predominately European-American teams. In spite of this, most research participants discussed the way in which sports have the ability to bring African Americans and European Americans together, and most younger speakers indicated that sports led them to make friends with people with whom they would not otherwise have become friends. Many of these younger speakers made the point that they interacted with these friends not only at practice and games but also off the field or court, a fact that is certainly important from a linguistic perspective. Some of these respondents discussed the way in which the injury of a local high school football player brought the community together during a turbulent time in Elba's history in terms of race relations, resulting in one of the dates hypothesized to define an age cohort. More than any other theme presented in this chapter, community members indicated that "sport has a unique power to unite" (Duru, 2007, p. 486), which points to the possibility of increased linguistic accommodation.

For older adult and mature research participants in Elba, well-known images of the integration of college football in the South were most familiar, particularly in regard to the University of Alabama. Perhaps this is because in the South, sport is a "civil religion" which expresses Southern identities (Roberts, 2004, p. 298). Roberts (2004) explains: Southerners "choose teams to invest with honor, virtue, and local pride. Sporting affiliation is similar to church denomination: most people are born to one" (p. 298), and this attitude was expressed by many community members interviewed for the current study. Yet, amidst this general popularity (marked by enthusiasm for professional, college, and high school teams), "Football, especially

college football, is the [...] premier sport” (Roberts, 2004, p. 308). As Emmett Creed expresses in Don DeLillo’s *End Zone* (1972), “It’s only a game, but it’s the only game” (p. 15).

Perhaps not surprisingly, “[t]he [SEC], established in 1932, was the last major intercollegiate conference [...] to integrate,” and in the early civil rights years, most Deep-South colleges welcomed neither “integration of their own [...] teams” nor competition “against integrated teams” (Paul, McGhee, and Fant, 1984, p. 284). The integration of University of Alabama football marked the breaking of the color barrier in a segregation stronghold. This speaks to the fact that research participants in Elba related memories of the integration of sports alongside memories of Civil Rights activism. It is not known whether such awareness impacted language directly; however, it may have impacted attitudes toward integration and interaction between ethnic groups. As a member of the research community, it was apparent to me that this topic allowed research participants to feel comfortable enough to use natural speech.

Sports and Racial Tension

In spite of the fact that research participants in the present study indicated that among the interview topics discussed sports was the most likely to decrease social distance, as noted previously, they did not portray sports as devoid of racial tension. H.G. Bissinger’s book *Friday Night Lights* (1991)²¹ exemplifies the importance of local (high school) football teams in the South, a theme that resonated with me as a lifelong resident of Elba and that was easily discussed with research participants. This work tells how in Odessa, Texas, “the year’s big game could draw 20,000 people” (Roberts, 2004, p. 308). However, as the true story of the 1988 Permian Panthers, it also brings to the forefront another issue: racial tension in sports. Though it might seem that a high school football team capable of drawing 20,000 spectators could undermine any

²¹ I refer to the novel here.

racial disharmony (Duru, 2007, p. 488), in 1988 Odessa had not long emerged from an extended history of racial segregation, and racial tension lingered. *Friday Night Lights* touches on race relations at various points, both intra-team and among teams.

Nonetheless, sports do have “the power to cut across racial and socioeconomic lines and join individuals, regardless of background, in athletic competition” (Duru, 2007, p. 486). Despite acknowledgement that racial tension does exist in sports, community members interviewed still insisted that sports were more likely to bring African Americans and European Americans together than to divide them. A particularly poignant example was provided by a number of research participants who pointed specifically to the way the community pulled together, letting go of differences, after the aforementioned accident of an African-American high school football player during the 1995 homecoming football game. In the spring of that year, the community had experienced a period of racial tension after a racially charged incident that took place at the high school received local media attention. However, the serious injury of this student brought students as well the larger community together. Finally, as a popular topic, the sports theme offers an interview module that is both comfortable enough for research participants to discuss and consuming enough to promote natural speech.

Community Integration Insights: The High School Prom and The Swimming Pool

In terms of local integration events, school integration was certainly a transforming experience for Elba, and one that was discussed by community members. Because *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) did not establish a timeline for integration, like many Deep-South school systems, integration in Elba began with a Freedom of Choice plan that technically allowed students and their parents to choose between schools originally designated for African-American students (Mulberry Heights Schools) and those originally designated for European-

American students (Elba City Schools). In practice, most Southern schools remained segregated. In Elba, only a few African-American students chose to attend the city schools, and no European-American students chose to attend schools in Mulberry Heights. The process of consolidating grades was initiated under U.S. District Court order, and the spring of 1968 marked the last graduation at Mulberry.²² Complete integration of the lower grades was achieved in the 1970-71 school year. These school-related dates were hypothesized to establish age cohorts.

Because Southerners are acutely aware that integration proceeded in a social dimension, encompassing more than public schools, research participants discussed two additional local sites of integration: the high school prom and the swimming pool. These two themes, in particular, tap into Elba's specific integration history and thus are also relevant to the identification of age cohorts. Like the other themes discussed in this chapter, both historical and literary research enhanced my understanding of these topics. Preliminary interviews with several citizens of Elba who played key roles in the town's integration history, along with an investigation of the local newspaper, city records, local country-club records, and high school yearbooks, aided in the development of community-specific questions for the interview modules.

The High School Prom in the Southern Community

“Without love, life is like a prom that won't invite us.” These words, sung in the 2007 remake of the musical *Hairspray* by Seaweed J. Stubbs, one half of the film's focal interracial couple, undoubtedly have greater significance than the average banality about the bleakness of

²² In *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County* (1968), the Supreme Court held that school boards had to adopt desegregation plans that “promise[d] realistically to work now” (391 U.S. 430, p. 439). Although Freedom of Choice plans were not deemed inherently unconstitutional, it was held that such plans should not perpetuate segregated school systems; hence, this essentially invalidated Freedom of Choice. As was held in *Brown II* (1955), U.S. District Courts were responsible for overseeing the creation of “racially nondiscriminatory school system(s)” (349 U.S. 294, p. 301).

life without love. The picture, originally produced in 1988, chronicles 1960s Baltimore in the wake of change. During the Civil Rights Era, the prom became a center of European-American fears regarding integration across the South, and from Opp, Alabama, to Newport, Arkansas, many high school proms were canceled (C. Head, personal communication, May 2008; “W.F. Branch,” 2008; C. Wilson, 2005; D. Johnson, 2004). Often, “private parties” were held in lieu of traditional proms, or two proms were held. Though the prom was never canceled in Elba, proms were held at both EHS and Mulberry in 1969, as discussed by research participants. Seaweed’s words speak to such behavior.

The history of prom integration in Elba is relevant to the research question because Elba’s High School’s Jr./Sr. prom was never canceled, a fact that was noted with pride by older adult research participants. The second African-American student to graduate from Elba High School attended the prom without incident, and although there were contrasting memories among informants as to why two proms were held in 1969, none recollected open controversy surrounding the prom. This certainly has not been the case in many small Southern communities, as discussed in this section. That the prom was not canceled has implications for language choice. There was not so much animosity in this community that people would have their children stay home rather than dance together, and increased contact provides opportunity for both accommodation and distancing. Additionally, for younger adult and adolescent speakers, the prom may have served to decrease social and perhaps linguistic boundaries because African-American and European-American speakers in the junior class now have, for many years, worked together to plan and decorate for the prom. When considering prom night specifically, younger speakers indicated that some mixed African-American/European-American couples attended and that this was not an issue; however, these speakers also sometimes

discussed differences in musical tastes and dance styles. Hence, the prom is, again, a complex issue.

Prom cancellation and segregation were linked directly to a spike in European-American fears regarding interracial sexuality after the 1954 *Brown* decision. Wolcott (2006) claims that for European Americans, “[y]oung [African Americans] and [European Americans] [...] dancing together suggested a level of intimacy that breached deep societal taboos” (p. 65). In literature, Mark Childress highlights the integration era prom as a contested site in his novel *One Mississippi* (2006). It is relevant to note that although research participants included in this study did not discuss the prom as a contested site of integration in Elba, most were well aware that that the prom was a controversial issue in many Southern communities, and a number of older adult research participants did discuss nearby communities where this was the case.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the prom remains a contested cultural site in some Southern communities. As evidence, several high schools in two Deep-South states – Georgia and Louisiana – still hold separate proms or have only recently integrated (Kane, 2003; Clotfelter, 2004; “Ga. High School Holds,” 2004; “School plans 1st,” 2007; “Outdated separation ends,” 2008). However, while this has not been the case in Elba, the shared swimming space met greater resistance.

The Shared Swimming Space: A Site of Contention

The swimming space (swimming pools as well as other bathing places) is much like the prom insofar as it was a site of integration that is particularly contentious due to European-American fears regarding interracial sexuality, though racially charged hygiene paranoia also infiltrated the swimming space. Wolcott (2006) explains: “In the water [European-Americans] directly confronted stereotypes about African Americans’ health and cleanliness and the dangers

of interracial contact between scantily clad bathers” (p. 93). Also like the prom (though more often), the swimming space has remained segregated in some locations well past the Civil Rights Era, and speakers were able to discuss such segregation in Elba.

As was the case for many places in the Deep South, swimming pool integration in Elba did not occur alongside public school integration. Instead, the construction of both an exclusively European-American country club, discussed by mature and older adult speakers, and a pool specifically designated for the African-American community of Mulberry Heights, discussed by mature, older adult, and younger adult speakers, served to maintain segregated swimming for many years. As pointed out by many adolescent speakers, the increased number of swimming pools at private residences still allows for segregated swimming. The local city pool, constructed in the 1980s, is a site where integrated swimming occurs; however, some speakers cited this as a reason for not patronizing this pool. Over the years, the various swimming facilities that have served to maintain separate swimming in Elba have prevented some amount of social and, hence, linguistic interaction between African Americans and European Americans. Even more, contention surrounding this aspect of integration may have contributed to linguistic distancing.

The characterization of the swimming pool as a site of contention by research participants in Elba corresponds with the larger historical framework: The contentious nature of the shared swimming space is demonstrated by repeated instances of discrimination and controversy at swimming pools and public beaches. For example, in 1919 a race riot occurred at Lake Michigan after an African-American youth, who was subsequently stoned and drowned, wandered into an area unofficially reserved for European-American bathers (Pitts, 2007). This early display of hostility toward interracial swimming was followed by years of stringent

European-American opposition to swimming space integration, including outright barring of African Americans from pools designated as white-only (sometimes leading to protests and even violence), closing of “public” pools, construction of African-American community pools, and the opening of exclusively European-American private clubs. Numerous examples of exclusion and/or contention both pre-1964²³ and post-1964²⁴ substantiate the controversial nature of the swimming space not only in the South, but across the nation (Oggs, MS). Additionally, studies of public recreation establish interracial swimming as especially controversial by pointing to swimming pools as recreational facilities particularly unavailable to African Americans (Blalock and Blalock, 1960; Henderson, 1940; Katona, 1948), citing European-American beliefs about the unacceptability of interracial swimming (Erskine, 1973; Jarmon, 1980), and revealing the swimming pool as a continued site of racism (J. Feagin, 1991). Such evidence of discrimination and segregation points to the swimming space as a cultural establishment that would have reinforced ethnolinguistic boundaries.

²³ 1920s – Daytona Beach; Seaside, New York; and Los Angeles; 1930s – East Orange, New Jersey; Oakland, California; New Central High School in New Jersey (see *Patterson v. Board of Education*); Newton, Kansas; Playland Beach in Rye, New York; Brighton Beach at Coney Island, New York City; Sunken Meadow State Park on Long Island; Bear Mountain State Park/Palisades Park in New York; Long Branch, New Jersey (see *Allie Bullock v. City of Long Branch*); Glennland Pool at Pennsylvania State College; and New Castle, Pennsylvania; 1940s – Columbus, Georgia; Euclid Beach Park outside of Cleveland, Ohio; Youngstown, Ohio; Homestead, Pennsylvania; the Anacostia swimming pool in Washington, D.C.; the Fairgrounds Park Pool in St. Louis, Missouri; late 1940s-1950s – York, Alabama; Bimini Baths in Los Angeles, Bennettsville, South Carolina; Highland Park Pool in Pittsburgh; Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Peekskill, New York; Wilcox Lake near Petersburg, Virginia; Philadelphia (see *Everett v. Harron*); St. Petersburg; Cincinnati’s Coney Island; late 1950s-1964 – Monroe, North Carolina (a particularly notable site due to armed resistance on the part of African Americans); Lenape Park in Westchester, Pennsylvania; Biloxi, Mississippi; Rainbow Beach in Chicago, Illinois; Greensboro, North Carolina (see *Tonkins v. City of Greensboro*); Atlanta, Georgia; Memphis, Tennessee (see *Watson v. Memphis*); Tift Park Pool in Albany, Georgia (see *Albany v. King and Webb*; *Albany v. Rothstein*); Audubon Park Pool and Lake Pontchartrain in New Orleans; Cairo, Illinois; the Birmingham, Alabama, community of Ensley; Cascade Plunge Swimming Club in Nashville, Tennessee; City Park Pool in Baton Rouge, Louisiana; notoriously, the Monson Motor Lodge swimming pool in St. Augustine, Florida; Halifax County, Virginia; Lakeside Amusement Park in Salem, Virginia; Jonesboro, Louisiana; and Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana

²⁴ post 1964 – Fontaine Ferry Park in Louisville, Kentucky; Cambridge, Maryland; Hot Springs, Arkansas; Stonewall, Mississippi; and as late as 1971 – Jackson, Mississippi (see *Palmer v. Thompson*). (Note: Though 1971 is the last date listed, post-1964 “black pools” and private clubs served to maintain segregation across America and particularly in the Deep South [and notably, in Elba, Alabama]).

Several literary works comment on the strength of European-American opposition to a shared swimming space, including Richard Wright's "Big Boy Leaves Home" (1936). Summarizing the situation in the narrative, one of the characters in the story remarks, "The white folks got plenty swimmin pools n we ain got none" (Wright, 1936, p. 27). Here too there is death: one of the African-American characters in this story is lynched after the events that transpire while swimming in a "white" swimming hole. Allen Tate's poem "The Swimmers" (1952), William Cobb's *A Walk Through Fire* (1992), and Breena Clarke's *River, Cross My Heart* (1999) also connect race, death of an African-American character, and water. Works that depict the controversies associated with interracial swimming in the Civil Rights Era include Elba native Robert Inman's *Old Dogs and Children* (1991), Mark Childress's *Crazy in Alabama* (1993) and Deborah Wiles' *Freedom Summer* (2000). Each addresses the struggle for the integration of the public pool in the small town South. In *Old Dogs and Children* and *Crazy in Alabama*, European-American resistance to interracial swimming leads to the death of an African-American child, reminiscent of Wright's earlier story, though there is a shift from Wright's story to the novels of Inman (1991) and Childress (1993). In the later works, death is met with resistance rather than fear and flight and ultimately the pools are integrated. Intended for a young audience, *Freedom Summer* (2000) does not depict death; in this story two young friends (one African-American and one European- American) cannot go swimming together because European Americans fill in the town's public pool with asphalt. However, this children's tale reminds us of Wright's story when the African-American child, John Henry, remarks to his European-American friend, Joe, that "white folks don't want colored folks in their pool" (Wiles, 2001). Because the shared swimming space was so contentious, remained an issue for such a

long time, and was associated with violence and protest, this site of integration would not have promoted (and perhaps still does not promote) linguistic accommodation.

Summary

Language, literature, and history are often studied independently; however, King (2004) points out that “the historiography of the [C]ivil [R]ights [M]ovement (taken broadly) must make even more of an effort to break down, not confirm, disciplinary, generic, and even ontological boundaries” (p. 235). This chapter demonstrates the value of interdisciplinary studies by informing the central research question concerning linguistic accommodation and distancing with historical and literary context. By considering the contributions of other disciplines, it is possible to better understand the culture, and hence, identity, of the informants as well as to gain insights into meaningful interview topics derived from socio-historical periods. The quantitative research method that builds on these insights and those derived from previous sociolinguistic research on the variables under consideration is discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV. QUANTITATIVE METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As has been established in the preceding chapters, the purpose of the present study is, with respect to three phonological variables, to explore whether language use among African-Americans and European-Americans in a Southern community has changed over time, and whether and to what degree integration shaped this configuration. The dependent variables investigated are (ai), (oi), and (ING). The objectives are met through quantitative analysis. The study builds on Head (2003), drawing from interviews that primarily elicited narratives of personal experience regarding the floods that have taken place in Elba. The second interview corpus elicited both integration narratives and conversation about integration and race relations in Elba and was conducted in 2008.

The null hypothesis to be tested within the patterning of the linguistic data is that there are no differences among the speakers. Alternate predictions derived from the literature are as follows: In regard to ethnicity, African Americans use regional variants more frequently than European Americans; in regard to age, older speakers use regional variants of (ai) and (oi) more frequently than do younger speakers while younger speakers use [In] more frequently than older speakers do. The analysis of external (social)²⁵ and internal (linguistic)²⁶ variables allows for a detailed response to the primary research question. However, the complexity of this issue demonstrated in the previous chapter, lack of agreement on the issue of divergence between

²⁵ An external factor is “a social attribute or characteristic such as status, ethnicity, or gender that may correlate with linguistic variation” (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998, p. 363).

²⁶ An internal factor is a linguistic constraint, “such as a type of linguistic environment or structural opposition, which systematically affects the variability of fluctuating forms” (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998, p. 356).

African-American and European-American speech, and the limited amount of research exploring the relationship between integration and linguistic change make it difficult to develop an informed prediction about this question.

Research Community

Located in Alabama’s Wiregrass region (the southeastern section of the state), at the juncture of the Pea River and Whitewater Creek in Coffee County, Elba’s population in 2000 was 4,185. Table 1 provides information about Elba’s social makeup.

Table 1: Census 2000 Demographic Characteristics

Female-Male Breakdown	Ethnic Breakdown	Age Breakdown
50.82% Female	34.29% African American	6.28% Under 5 years
49.18% Male	63.92% European American	17.40% 5-17 years
	1.79% Other	57.54% 18-64 years
		18.78% 65 years and over

Elba is a typical small Southern town – almost. It is typical in the sense that it is infected by Friday Night Football Fever in the fall and that, as county seat, its center is the courthouse square. However, while Elba is undoubtedly a quintessential small Southern town in many ways, it is also a meteorological and political anomaly. It is atypical in that the flooding of the Pea River has shaped its history and that among its citizens has been a curious assortment of Alabama historical and political figures. Additionally, because the antebellum Wiregrass was predominately inhabited by yeoman farmers rather than planters, Union sentiment largely characterized the region, including Elba. Elba’s voting patterns are another anomaly. “Changing Church in the South: Religion and Politics in Elba, Alabama,” a study conducted by the Carsey Institute at the University of New Hampshire, reflects these voting trends. While much of

Alabama was either overwhelmingly Democratic or overwhelmingly Republican, Elba exhibited an uncharacteristic degree of political balance (J. Ardery, personal communication, April 23, 2007). Ultimately, Elba's typicality yet simultaneous uniqueness makes it an interesting research community, particularly for a study that employs an emic approach as this one does.

Data Collection

Human Subjects Review Board

As required for all research involving human research subjects, a protocol was submitted to the Auburn University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB). This project was approved by IRB Expedited procedure.

The Interview Modules

On the basis of interview modules informed by history and literature, participants were asked to discuss local events. Because the objective of this study was to obtain linguistic data from adolescent as well as younger and older adult speakers, separate modules were developed for each age group. As additional, community-specific topics emerged in the early part of data collection, these were worked into subsequent interviews (although they were not formally scripted). The interview modules appear as Appendix A.

Locating Research Participants

After developing interview modules, I began locating the 2008 research participants by utilizing community networks. I began by contacting people whom I personally knew to have knowledge of our town's history and/or insights on race relations in Elba. Thus, like C. Feagin in her 1979 study of Anniston, Alabama, I utilized my "knowledge as 'a native of the town, with local relatives and other contacts' to select a [...] complex judgment sample" (qtd. in Chambers, 2003, p. 45).

In several cases these participants directed me to other research participants. This proved to be a particularly useful strategy for adolescent informants. Two adolescents (one African-American female and one European-American male) contacted other teenagers and explained my project to them. In several cases they scheduled interviews and were present during the interviews to increase the comfort level of the adolescent being interviewed.

The Research Participants

Between 2002 and 2008, 79 participants were recorded. However, in order to maintain a balanced sample, only 64 interviews (14 European Americans 18 African Americans from the 2003 study and 18 European Americans and 14 African Americans recorded in 2008) were utilized for the current study. In keeping with the objectives of this study, the birth dates of the participants span more than eighty years (1914-1997), allowing for the analysis of speech from informants who attended school in the pre-integration, integration, and post-integration eras. Data from 32 male and 32 female participants, 32 middle-class and 32 working-class participants,²⁷ 32 African-American and 32 European-American participants, and 16 participants per age group (16 adolescent [11-20], 16 younger adults [21-40], 16 older adults [41-59], and 16 mature [60+])²⁸ were included in the current study. The table in Appendix B lists the social characteristics of each of the 64 participants included in the present study.

²⁷ For sampling purposes, half of the speakers included were initially categorized as working-class and half were categorized as middle-class; however, because it was felt that the church membership might better characterize the socioeconomic divisions in Elba, church membership was also coded. The relationship between socioeconomic status and church is documented later in this chapter and discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

²⁸ Although for sampling purposes the categories for age followed the categories that emerged in my 2003 study – adolescent, younger adults, older adults, and mature speakers – age was initially coded by birth year. As discussed in the following chapter, final age groupings were determined during analysis of the linguistic data for the variable (ai), the most characteristic phonological indicator of Southernness.

Interview Equipment

The interviews were recorded with an Optimus CTR-114 cassette recorder and a Radioshack 33-3013 external microphone positioned approximately six inches from the research participants' mouths.

Data Elicitation

It is the goal of the sociolinguistic interview to capture the most natural speech possible. The first and perhaps the most challenging step in eliciting natural speech is getting informants to talk. In the present study, an emic approach proved especially useful in eliciting speech because my research participants had firsthand experience with the interview topics. Additionally, the study design specifically addressed the issue of collecting natural speech in an interview setting. This issue, known as the observer's paradox, challenges us to determine through observation how people speak "when they are not being observed" (Labov, 1972a, p. 256).

The first way that this study addresses the observer's paradox is that the interview topics used for both the 2003 study and the present study were selected in order to elicit "styles analogous to how people talk in everyday situations" (Bell, 1984, p. 150). In the 2003 study, when participants discussed the flooding in Elba, some told me what they could about one or more floods in a format close to interview style. However, many performed narratives of personal experience, sharing stories they had told time and time again. In the present study, the questions developed for the interview modules elicited both conversation and narration. Thus, both sets of interviews promoted styles that are characterized by unmonitored speech.

This study also addresses the observer's paradox by bringing community membership to bear on data collection. I am a lifelong resident of Elba whose family has been in the area for

more than four generations. Because I chose residents of my hometown as my research population, many of my research participants were less inhibited when talking to me than they would have been discussing socially-sensitive subjects with a community outsider. Additionally, familiarity with community opinions, values, and even prejudices allowed me to approach socially-sensitive subjects in a manner that did not offend my research participants, and many assumed that I agreed with their viewpoints on the issues covered in the interviews. Although initially I considered enlisting another community member to assist with interviews if community members were reluctant to talk in a natural fashion due to gender, ethnicity, or other social factors, that turned out not to be necessary. All respondents were willing to speak openly with me. In fact, most were excited to share their viewpoints.

Another way that I addressed the observer's paradox was by having participants choose a location where they felt comfortable: We talked in homes, offices, places of business, classrooms, local churches, and the county courthouse in downtown Elba.

Finally, I increased the participants' comfort level both by beginning the interviews with less sensitive questions and by developing interview modules that addressed a range of issues. In regard to the ordering of interview topics, I opened interviews by asking informants about their knowledge of the history of Elba, encouraging interviewees to discuss the floods as well-known events. By beginning with less socially-sensitive material, participants became comfortable with the interview process before discussing integration and race relations. Even these topics were made less sensitive through the use of interview modules that addressed a range of issues and experiences. For example, discussions about the prom not being canceled allowed European-American participants to acknowledge that Elba's integration history was not entirely characterized by resistance, and discussing community attachment to the Mulberry pool with

African-American informants allowed for a less guarded discussion of swimming pool integration in certain instances.

A problem encountered in data elicitation required an adjustment in the interview protocol. Because (oi) is a low frequency vowel sound, my research participants used very few words containing (oi) in their narratives. Though word lists are generally known not to promote natural speech, in order to collect more tokens with (oi), I developed a word list (see Appendix C) early in the interview process and from that point forward asked participants to read the list at the end of each interview. Words with and without tokens of (oi) were included on the word list in order to avoid research participants producing unnaturally standardized tokens.²⁹ Fortunately, because the word list included terms designed to generate conversation, in many instances natural speech resulted from the word list. A second decision that increased the number of (oi) tokens was to retain the 2002-2003 interviews that included the most opportunities to analyze the variable (oi).

A reading passage containing a number of (ai) tokens was also incorporated at this time (see Appendix D), which provided another formal style for comparison. However, like the word list, this reading passage also often generated conversation and, hence, more opportunities to analyze natural speech.

Transcription and Coding

Once audio recorded, interviews were transcribed by the researcher using a Panasonic RR-830 cassette transcriber. Interviews were transcribed in their entirety, and the mode of transcription used was naturalistic (i.e., grammar was not modified in the direction of

²⁹ Words containing 49 (ai) tokens, 28 (oi) tokens, and 32 (ING) tokens were included on the word list.

standardized English, and interview noise, hesitations, and pauses were noted). Words containing a variant of (ai), (oi), or (ING) were represented phonetically in the transcriptions.

The interviews were first examined to establish which events were important in Elba's integration history since these would motivate the hypotheses about age clusters discussed in the next chapter. After these were established, tokens of the three variables were coded.

In order to maximize the likelihood of participants habituating to the tape recorder and microphone, when the interviews were sufficiently long, tokens were collected for statistical analysis starting approximately one-third of the way into each interview. The dependent variables were coded impressionistically for both external (social) variables and internal (linguistic) variables.

Coding Scheme: External Variables

The external factor groups considered in this study are ETHNICITY, AGE, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, and GENDER. All participants interviewed were coded as African American or European American. AGE was initially coded by birth year, and during preliminary data analysis, all speakers' birth years were run separately. Speakers were coded as male or female. For SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, both occupation, bifurcated into working-class and middle-class, and church membership were coded, as religious affiliation has been connected with socioeconomic status in a number of socio-historical studies (Neibuhr, 1929; Myrdal, 1944; Hault, 1950; Bartley, 1995; Dougherty, 2003; Flynt, 2004; Ardery, 2006; Reimer, 2007). For each dependent variable, external factor groups analyzed in this study are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: External Factor Groups for (ai), (oi), and (ING)

ETHNICITY	AGE	SES	GENDER
African American, European American	Individual birth year, birth-year clusters	Working-Class, Middle-Class; Church Affiliation	Male, Female

Coding Scheme: Internal Variables

Internal factor groups for (ai) and (oi) included FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, SENTENCE STRESS, WORD FREQUENCY, and STYLE. FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT reflected the discussions in the literature: Segments following the dependent variable were initially identified as voiced obstruent, voiceless obstruent, liquid, nasal, glide, vowel, morpheme boundary, or word boundary. For GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, each word containing the dependent variable was identified as noun, adverb, verb, adjective, pronoun, preposition, conjunction, interjection, or quotative.³⁰ The word *my*, which is described as a pronoun and an adjective in the grammatical literature, was initially coded as a separate factor, in order to determine how it would pattern. Finally, tokens produced when the word list was read sometimes prevented GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY from being determined, and in these cases, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY was coded as does not apply. In regard to STRESS, this variable was impressionistically assessed within the clause. That is, words containing the dependent variable were coded as stressed or unstressed. Tokens included in the word list containing (ai) could not be coded for this factor and instead were coded as does not apply. Following Head (2003), to determine FREQUENCY of the lexical item containing each token the current study used *The American Heritage Word Frequency Book*, a volume of more than 5 million words of running text from over 1,000 different publications (Carroll, Davies, &

³⁰ Quotatives, including *like*, are used to mark reported speech.

Richman, 1971). However, because this volume extracts words from written text, and this study analyzes speech, several alternatives were available for assigning the frequency for the names of years (e.g., 1929, 1990, 1998). To resolve this issue, I assigned the frequency for these words on the basis of their stem forms (e.g., *nineteen*, *ninety*). Additionally, words that did not appear in the *Word Frequency Book* were assigned a FREQUENCY of 0. For style, tokens were coded as flood narrative, integration interview, and word list. As mentioned previously, a reading passage containing a number of (ai) tokens was used with some speakers, and these tokens were coded for style accordingly. Internal factor groups for (ai) and (oi), which based on Anderson (1999) are anticipated to pattern similarly, are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Internal Factor Groups for (ai) and (oi)

FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT	GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY	SENTENCE STRESS	WORD FREQUENCY	STYLE
voiced obstruent, voiceless obstruent, liquid, nasal, glide, vowel, morpheme boundary, word boundary	noun, adverb, verb, adjective, pronoun, preposition, conjunction, interjection, quotative, my, does not apply	stressed, unstressed, does not apply	0-25932	flood narrative, integration interview, word list, reading passage [(ai) only]

For (ING), whose variants contain either an alveolar or velar nasal, factor groups included PRECEDING and FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, SYLLABLE STRESS, FREQUENCY, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, and STYLE. The factors in the factor groups PRECEDING and FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT reflected the discussions in the literature and were coded as velar stop, alveolar stop, and other.³¹ For tokens containing (ING) included in the word list, FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT was not available and was coded as does not apply. For GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, each word containing the dependent variable was identified as progressive verb form, irregular verb, participial modifier, adjective, non-gerund noun,

³¹ This included all sounds other than t, d, k, and g.

gerundive noun, pronoun (i.e., *something, nothing, anything, everything*), or preposition. When inclusion in the word list prevented GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY from being determined, tokens were coded as does not apply. Each token was coded as stressed or unstressed based on syllable stress as determined by *New Webster's Dictionary*. Again, FREQUENCY was determined using *The American Heritage Word Frequency Book*. For some words containing (ING), this volume offered frequencies for standard and nonstandard variants, and when this was the case the frequencies were combined. Again, words that did not appear in the *Word Frequency Book* were assigned a frequency of 0. For STYLE, tokens were coded as flood narrative, integration interview, and word list. Internal factor groups for (ING) are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Internal Factor Groups for (ING)

PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT	FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT	GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY	SYLLABLE STRESS	FREQUENCY	STYLE
velar stops, alveolar stops, other	velar stops, alveolar stops, other/ does not apply	progressive verb form, irregular verb, participial modifier, adjective, non-gerund noun, gerundive noun, pronoun, preposition, does not apply	stressed, unstressed	0-25932	flood narrative, integration narrative, word list

Additional Coding Issues

Prior to transcribing and coding the data for this study, I was aware that the variable (oi) has two monophthongal variants: [ʌ] and [ɔ]. Because only [ɔ] has been discussed in the literature, in this study no distinction was made between the two forms; alternatively, regional vs. standardized forms are examined.

Additionally, for the variable (ING), it was discovered during coding that speakers used three, rather than two variants: [Iŋ], [In], and [in]. The nonstandardized variant [In] has been discussed in the literature as a national variant. Since there was no discussion of the local variant in the literature, no distinction was made between the two nonstandardized variants; again, the traditional regional/standardized split is examined.

Finally, when coding words containing (ING), I observed that the phrase *going to* was often reduced to *gon* and *gonna*, as is typical in American English. These items were regarded as separate lexical items. Thus, they were not considered.

Statistical Procedure

This study utilizes two methods of analysis commonly used in quantitative sociolinguistics: chi-square and logistic regression. Chi-square is a bivariate test “used to determine if observed data deviate from those expected under a particular hypothesis,” typically, “whether or not two samples are different enough in a particular characteristic to be considered members of different populations” (“Chi-Square Test,” 2012). Logistic regression is a multivariate test which can be used to predict a dependent variable on the basis of independent variables to determine the percent of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables, to rank the relative importance of independent variables, and to assess interaction effects (Garson, 2009). In other words, this test “reveals the total percentage of variance explained by all the variables³² and the relative amounts explained by the specific variables” (Berstein, 1993, p. 235).

Statistical analysis was conducted using JMP 9 statistical discovery software. JMP 9 presents results in both numeric and graphic form, which allows the researcher to work

³² This statistic is known as the coefficient of multiple determination (r-squared).

interactively on a data set to discover patterns (Head, 2003). Though quantitative sociolinguistic studies often use Varbrul, JMP is both more user friendly than Varbrul and provides a somewhat more conservative analysis (Sabino, Diamond, and Oggs, 2004). Additionally, Bayley (2004) indicates that if the goals of a study include examining “potential interactions among various social factors,”... “a more general logistic regression model is preferable” to Varbrul, the statistical package generally used in sociolinguistic studies (pp. 131-134). The results of the statistical analysis conducted for this study are reported in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Variables Under Analysis: (ai), (oi), and (ING)

As anticipated by the carefully constructed interview modules informed by historical research, literary texts, and my own experiences in the research community, the questions included in the integration interviews generated conversation containing substantial tokens of (ai) and (ING) and a sufficient number of tokens of (oi) for analysis. In total 8944 (ai) tokens, 728 (oi) tokens, and 3505 (ING) tokens resulted from a combination of data elicitation techniques. Analysis of each variable was conducted independently. The (ai) data set is discussed first in this chapter because it contains the largest number of tokens and is therefore most reliable. Since (ai) and (oi) were analyzed in terms of similar independent variables, (oi) is treated next. The variable (ING) is the final data set to be discussed. As indicated in the previous chapter, Appendix B contains information for each of the 64 speakers included in this study and the data they produced. While all 64 speakers produced tokens of (ai) and (ING), only 52 speakers produced tokens of (oi).

Analysis of the (ai) Data Set

Invariant Speakers

As is the case for all sociolinguistic inquiries, the present study is concerned only with factors that condition variation, and for this reason, it was first necessary to remove tokens produced by speakers who produced invariant forms from the data set. For (ai), there were nine

speakers who together produced 907 tokens of [a:].³³ After removing these tokens, 8037 tokens remained for analysis. A logistical regression was performed using factor groups discussed in the literature review: SPEAKER, ETHNICITY, BIRTH DATE, GENDER, STYLE, CLASS, FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, FREQUENCY, STRESS, and GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY. SPEAKER, STYLE, FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, and STRESS were identified as contributing significantly to the speakers' choice of the monophthong or diphthong in this initial analysis, which provided a baseline R-Square value of .59.³⁴ However, this is only a baseline because the large number of factors in some factor groups results in "more parameters in the model than can be estimated by the data" (JMP Support Notes, 2012). Thus, the probabilities associated with the factor groups are unreliable. Therefore, to the extent possible, as determined by the distribution of the tokens and the similarity of the factors within each factor group, the number of factors should be reduced. Refinement of the factor groups is discussed below. But, since the object of interest is the Elba speech community, first it is necessary to control for individual speaker variation as discussed by Saito (1999).

Contributions of Individual Speakers

Although many sociolinguistic studies fail to account for the contributions of individual research participants, it is easily accomplished. A second logistic regression was run with only the factor group SPEAKER (H. Clayton, personal communication, April 26, 2012). This produced an R-Square of .14, indicating that that SPEAKER accounts for 14 percent of the variation in the (ai) data set. This factor group was then excluded from further consideration.

³³ There were no speakers who produced only [ai].

³⁴ As discussed in the previous chapter, this is the fraction of variance accounted for by the model.

Refinement of Factor Groups

Three factor groups, GENDER, STYLE, and STRESS, could be run as they were originally coded. Other factor groups were modified as discussed below.

Because operationalizing FREQUENCY as a continuous variable resulted in factors being reported as unstable, tokens originally coded by individual word frequency were recoded into categories reflecting quartiles. For (ai), these were 0-543, 544-6915, 6916-25931, and 25932. In the recoded factor group, the third quartile did not follow the expected pattern, which is that higher frequency words are more likely to contain the monophthongal variant (Phillips, 1998, 2000; Hay, Jannedy, and Mendoza Denton, 2000; Bybee, 2007; Topping, 2010).

Topping (2010) found the word *like* to disfavor the monophthongal variant. Due to this unusual behavior, Topping excluded tokens contained in this word from further analysis, which resulted in an increase in the monophthongal variant in her third frequency quartile. In the present study, examination of words in the third quartile also revealed that *like* patterned atypically. As shown in Table 5, after the exclusion of *like*, the frequency quartiles patterned as expected:

Table 5: (ai) Frequency Quartile Distribution

Quartile	<i>like</i> included		<i>like</i> excluded	
	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
0-543	75.21	2001	75.21	2001
544-6915	85.28	1977	85.28	1977
6916-25931	74.31	1806	98.30	999
25932	99.20	2253	99.20	2253

The exclusion of *like* resulted in two additional changes in the data set. First, regarding GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, both interjections and quotatives were eliminated by the exclusion of this word. The removal of *like* further resulted in the emergence of two more categorical

speakers³⁵ who together produced 163 tokens. When the tokens produced by these speakers were excluded, 7067 (ai) tokens remained for analysis. However, this did not disturb the frequency quartiles for the monophthongal variant, as shown in Table 6:

Table 6: Frequency Quartiles Distribution, Additional Categorical Speakers Deleted

Factors	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
0-543	74.75	1964
544-6915	85.08	1950
6916-25931	98.26	977
25932	99.17	2176

Turning to GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, the factors remaining for this factor group after the exclusion of *like* included noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, preposition, conjunction, *my*, and does not apply. When *my* was compared to adjective, the difference was significant ($p < .0001$). However, the probability for the comparison of *my* and pronoun did not reach significance. Thus, *my* was recoded as a pronoun. Also, because prepositions and conjunctions (which are both function words) patterned like the tokens coded as does not apply (two items from the word list), these factors were combined as other. Recoding the factor group produced the results shown in Table 7.

Table 7: GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, Original and Recoded Factors

Original Factors	Recoded
Noun	Noun
Verb	Verb
Adjective	Adjective
Adverb	Adverb
Pronoun	Pronoun
<i>my</i>	
Preposition	Other
Conjunction	
Does Not Apply	
Interjection	
Quotative	

³⁵ These speakers were born in 1938 and 1997. Refer to Appendix B for complete characteristics.

The FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT factor group was also refined. Although two boundary types were initially coded, morpheme boundary (e.g., my#self, ply#wood, high#way) was not significantly different from word boundary, and these factors were collapsed into a single factor. Additionally, liquids and nasals were not significantly different. Since both are +consonantal/+sonorant these factors were also collapsed.

Table 8: FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT, Original and Recoded Factors

Original Factors	Recoded
Morpheme Boundary	Boundary
Word Boundary	
Liquid	Liquids/Nasals
Nasal	
Voiced Obstruent	Voiced Obstruent
Voiceless Obstruent	Voiceless Obstruent
Vowel	Vowel

Interactive Factor Groups

The traditional social variables of ETHNICITY, CLASS, and AGE coded as BIRTH DATE were run in the initial logistic regression. However, the historical research and literary works discussed in Chapter 3 suggest that two interactive factor groups might be more revealing. These two factor groups are CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY and BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, church affiliation is closely linked to socioeconomic status. For the present study, it was of interest whether church affiliation or a middle-class/working-class dichotomy is a better indicator of socioeconomic status in Elba.

Using logistic regression, it was determined that CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY accounts for more of the variation in the data set than CLASS. When running the traditional factor groups (GENDER, ETHNICITY, BIRTH DATE, CLASS, STYLE, STRESS, FREQUENCY QUARTILES, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, and FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT), the R-square value was .52, which differs from the baseline R-square previously reported in that this run does not

include the factor group SPEAKER. Additionally, *like* and tokens produced by two categorical speakers were excluded. When CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY was used in place of CLASS under the same conditions, the R-square improved to .55.

Church was originally coded by individual affiliation, with research participants who attended more than one church and European-American research participants drawn to two rural churches that had experienced recent growth categorized as other. Because the large number of factors in this factor group resulted in instability in the model, the number of factors in this factor group was reduced. As discussed previously, churches in Elba have largely remained distinct in terms of ethnicity. Thus, churches were first divided by ethnicity, reflecting church membership in Elba at the time of the interviews. The churches were then ranked from greatest to least percent in terms of production of the monophthongal variant as shown in tables 9 and 10.

Table 9: African-American Churches and (ai) Production

Church	Location	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Harris Temple Church of God & Christ	Elba/Mulberry Heights	97.32	112
Bethlehem Baptist	Rural	94.74	114
Triumph Church & Kingdom of God and Christ	Elba/Mulberry Heights	93.10	58
New Philadelphia Church of God & Christ	Rural	88.89	81
Elba Zion Baptist	Elba	86.79	280
Other		86.11	36
Shady Grove AME	Rural	84.85	297
Bethel AME	Elba/Mulberry Heights	83.07	378
Springfield Baptist	New Brockton	74.30	179
Greater New Zion	Elba	70.71	652
Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	Rural	69.14	904
Nazareth Baptist	Opp	59.70	268
Oak Grove	Rural	58.42	380

Table 10: European-American Churches and (ai) Production

Church	Location	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Shiloh Baptist	Rural	99.03	26
Whitewater Baptist	Rural	95.87	121
Other		94.05	1312
Basin Baptist	Rural	93.10	927
United Methodist	Elba	91.23	1026
First Baptist/Covenant	Elba	90.28	319
First Baptist	Elba	88.63	387

After churches were ranked in terms of production of the monophthongal variant, chi-square and Fisher exact probability tests (when cells contained fewer than five tokens) were used to determine when churches could be combined into categories given their other characteristics. When differences in the linguistic patterning proved not to be significant and other characteristics were sufficiently similar to warrant recoding, tokens in the original factors were combined. The following four categories emerged for the African-American churches, and the following three categories emerged for the European-American churches included in this study:

Table 11: Church Categories

African-American Church Categories	European-American Church Categories
Harris Temple, Bethlehem, Triumph Church	Shiloh Baptist, Whitewater Baptist
New Philadelphia, Elba Zion, Other, Shady Grove, Bethel AME	Other, Basin Baptist
Springfield, Greater New Zion, Rocky Head	United Methodist, First Baptist, Baptist/Covenant
Nazareth Baptist, Oak Grove	

The patterning of the linguistic data, which is reflected by the church groupings above, was consistent with my own intuitions with respect to the European-American community. Churches whose members are predominately working-class are in both the top and middle groupings while the middle grouping contains speakers who have switched from predominately middle-class churches to working-class churches and vice versa. The third grouping contains

traditionally middle-class churches. The patterning of the African-American community was more complex. The lowest two groupings were consistent with the intuitions of a knowledgeable research participant. However, she was not able to explain the first two categories, which do not reflect patterns in the data in terms of socioeconomic status. Thus, it may be that additional church-related factors such as church location and denomination are influencing church membership.

The second innovative factor group tested in this study is BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY. Because this study asks whether and to what degree local events affecting race relations impacted linguistic choices in this community, it was necessary to examine the intersection of age and ethnicity. However, in order to justify my using this method, it first had to be determined whether running BIRTH DATE and ETHNICITY together would account for more or less of the variation than running these factor groups separately. Using logistic regression, it was determined that running BIRTH DATE and ETHNICITY together did indeed account for more of the variation in the data set. When running the factor groups separately (using GENDER, ETHNICITY, BIRTH DATE, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, STYLE, STRESS, FREQUENCY QUARTILES, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, and FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT) the R-Square was .55. Running BIRTH DATE and ETHNICITY as a single factor group improved the R-Square to .61.

Although running BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY as an interactive factor group increased the amount of variation accounted for by the model, the large number of ages in the data set resulted in instability.³⁶ Thus, the next step in examining the intersection of age and ethnicity in this study was determining age clusters. This was done by testing hypotheses with respect to notable

³⁶ Unstable factors do not affect the R-Square Value, so this was not a concern when testing whether ethnicity and birthdates should be run together or separately.

dates in Elba’s history. The dates selected for testing on the basis of the discussion in Chapter 3 are listed in Table 12.

Table 12: Notable Dates in Elba’s History

Year	Event
1963	The birth year of the first children to have a completely integrated school experience
1964	The construction of an exclusively European-American country club
1968	The last graduation from Mulberry
1969	The first fully integrated class to graduate from Elba High School and the construction of the Mulberry community pool
1970	The complete consolidation of grades achieved in the Elba City Schools
1990	A flood that some research participants indicated set back race relations for economic reasons
1993	The closing of the Mulberry pool, which could have increased contact in Elba primarily among young people
1995	The injury of an African-American high school football player, which resulted in the town’s coming together after a period of racial disharmony in the community

Based on information provided by research participants and my experience as a community member, four dates were initially selected for analysis: 1963, 1990, 1993, and 1995. When the data were examined, it was realized that only two speakers were born in 1993 or later, and tokens produced by one of these speakers had been excluded due to categorical use of the monophthongal variant; thus, the 1993 and 1995 dates could not be used. In order to test whether 1963 was significant linguistically, speakers were first coded by ethnicity and as having been born before or after 1963. Within each ethnic grouping, first, the number of monophthongal variants produced by research participants born before 1963 was compared, using chi-square, to those produced by the remaining research participants. For each ethnic group, the difference was significant at $p < .0001$. That is, African-American speakers born before and after 1963 used the monophthongal variant at significantly different rates. This was also the case for European-American research participants. To further test the validity of the hypothesized age cohorts, a second division was made. This time, the number of variants

produced by speakers born between 1963 and 1989 and those born in 1990 or later were compared. These comparisons were also highly significant for both ethnic groups at $p < .0001$. This resulted in the clusters shown in the table below. Additional testing revealed significant differences ($p < .0001$ for each comparison) across ethnic boundaries for each age group.

Table 13: Interactive Factor Group, Birth Date/Ethnicity

African-American	European-American
Pre-1963	Pre-1963
1963-1989	1963-1989
1990+	1990+

Final Logistic Regression for (ai)

After refining factor groups and testing interactive factor groups, logistic regression was performed on the final data set. The factor groups included the innovative, interactive factor groups BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, and the traditional factor groups GENDER, FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, FREQUENCY, and SENTENCE STRESS. When these factor groups were run, the R-Square was .56, with a probability $< .0001$. All factor groups were significant as shown in Table 14.

Table 14: (ai) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, All Factor Groups

Factor Groups	Probability
GENDER	0.05
STRESS	0.0007
STYLE	$< .0001$
FREQUENCY	$< .0001$
PART OF SPEECH	$< .0001$
BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY	$< .0001$
CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY	$< .0001$
FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT	$< .0001$

It has been determined that the factor group SPEAKER accounts for 14 percent of the variation in the (ai) data set. In order to determine the amount of variation accounted for by each of the other factor groups, they were added one at a time, weakest to strongest as determined by

the probabilities of the logistical regression (H. Clayton, personal communication, April 26, 2012). When the probabilities alone failed to afford a distinction, a binominal analysis was done to differentiate them. The contributions of each of the factor groups is shown in Table 15.

Table 15: (ai) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, Factors Added Weakest to Strongest

Factor Groups Added	Contribution
GENDER	5%, p <.0001
GENDER, STRESS	16%, p <.0001
GENDER, STRESS, STYLE	17%, p <.0001
GENDER, STRESS, STYLE, FREQUENCY	20%, p <.0001
GENDER, STRESS, STYLE, FREQUENCY, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY	22%, p <.0001
GENDER, STRESS, STYLE, FREQUENCY, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY	29%, p <.0001
GENDER, STRESS, STYLE, FREQUENCY, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY	31%, p. <.0001
GENDER, STRESS, STYLE, FREQUENCY, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT	56%, p. <.0001

Analysis of Internal Variables

Because all internal factor groups were significant in the final logistic regression, each of these variables is discussed in greater detail within the context of previous research.

The first factor group to be described is STRESS. Bowie found secondary stress within the word to slightly favor the monophthongal variant. In Head (2003) and Topping (2010) who examined only European-American speech, stress was a non-significant factor group; however, in the present study,³⁷ the data indicated that unstressed words are significantly (p. <.0001) more likely to contain the monophthongal variant than stressed words as shown in Table 16.

Table 16: STRESS by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Unstressed	98.77	3262
Stressed	80.54	3057
Does not apply	75.00	748

³⁷ The current data set is both larger and based on a more carefully stratified sample.

In regard to STYLE, as expected, speakers used the monophthongal variant more often in less formal styles (specifically, flood narratives and conversations about integration). As shown in Table 17 below, the results indicate a hierarchy for STYLE: flood narratives > integration interviews > word list > reading passage (p. <.0001). However, patterning of the more formal styles does not fully reflect the research literature. Labov (1972b) concludes that “[s]tyles can be arranged on a single dimension, measured by the amount of attention paid to speech” (p. 208). For Labov, word list represents greater attention to speech than reading passage. However, in this study, speakers produced more of the monophthongal variant when reading the word list rather than the reading passage. Also, while Bowie (2001) found reading from a passage to strongly disfavor the monophthongal variant, no style disfavored the Southern variant in this study.

Table 17: STYLE by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Flood Narratives	93.05	2761
Integration Conversations	89.36	3272
Word List	75.00	748
Reading Passage	66.78	286

As expected, the flood narratives most often contain the monophthongal variant. This may speak both to participant comfort level since respondents typically told their stories without interruption, and they often became quite involved in them. However, the integration interviews involved conversation which may have been a reminder of the interview setting. Alternatively, greater use of the monophthongal variant in the flood narratives may reflect the participants’ comfort level with the interviewer, as many of the 2003 research participants were in my own social network.

The next factor group to be discussed is FREQUENCY. Head (2003) did not find FREQUENCY to be a significant factor group. However, in the present study, after the word *like* was excluded, as predicted by the literature, higher frequency words were found to more often contain the monophthongal variant as predicted by Phillips, 1998, 2000; Hay, Jannedy, and Mendoza Denton, 2000; Bybee, 2007; Topping, 2010.

Turning to GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, as discussed above, both interjections and quotatives were eliminated when the word *like* was excluded from the data set. Nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and two items from the word list that could not be coded for GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY remained for testing. Studies (Topping, 2010; Head, 2003) which exclude high frequency function words such as *I*, contractions containing *I*, and the preposition *by* that often favor the monophthongal variant have found content words (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and interjections) to more strongly favor the monophthongal variant than function words. The present study, which does not exclude such words, finds that content words are less likely to contain the monophthongal variant. As shown in Table 18, the results indicate a hierarchy for grammatical category: pronouns > other (prepositions, conjunctions, two items from the word list) > verb > adverb > noun > adjective (p.= .0001).

Table 18: GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Pronoun	98.56	3266
Prepositions, Conjunctions, Word List	94.74	190
Verb	88.07	612
Adverb	85.71	385
Noun	78.87	1642
Adjective	70.13	971

The final linguistic factor group to be discussed is FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT. As is demonstrated by the improvement in the R-Square value for the logistic

regression when following environment is added (see Table 15, above), this factor group accounts for 25 percent of the variation in the model. This is not surprising, considering the extent to which this variable has been discussed in the literature. As shown by Table 19, the hierarchy for following environment in the present study is as follows: boundary > liquids and nasals > voiced obstruents > vowels > voiceless obstruents ($p < .0001$). This hierarchy is similar to those reported in Head (2003) and Topping (2010). It is also consistent with research indicating that voiceless obstruents generally disfavor the monophthongal variant (Fridland, 2000; Anderson, 1999, 2002; Labov and Ash, 1997).

Table 19: FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Boundary	97.87	3242
Liquids and Nasals	95.91	1860
Voiced Obstruents	92.79	846
Vowels	85.71	112
Voiceless Obstruents	40.36	1006

Analysis of External Variables

As was the case for the linguistic variables, each of the social variables included in the (ai) data set is significant. These are described below.

In contrast to several prior studies (Edwards, 1997; Bowie, 2001; Topping, 2010), as indicated by Table 20, females in Elba are significantly more likely to produce the monophthongal variant than are males ($p = .0001$). However, gender is the least significant factor group in the present study and was not significant in Head (2003).

Table 20: GENDER by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Female	90.06	4146
Male	85.96	2921

The next factor group to be discussed is CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY. As discussed

above, this study found that the interactive factor group CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY accounts for more of the variation than the traditional working-class/middle-class dichotomy. Although the top two factors in the African-American church categories are not readily explainable in terms of socioeconomic status, the lower groupings indicate that members of working-class churches are using less of the monophthongal variant (see Table 21 below). This is unlike the pattern reported in the literature which is that working-class speakers are more likely to use [a:] (Crane, 1977; Edwards, 1997).

Table 21: African-American Church Categories by Dependent Variable

Church Groupings	Percent[a:]	Total [a:]
Harris Temple, Bethlehem, Triumph Church	96.06	279
New Philadelphia, Elba Zion, Other, Shady Grove, Bethel AME	88.24	995
Springfield, Greater New Zion, Rocky Head	77.97	1489
Nazareth Baptist, Oak Grove	66.37	559

In contrast, for (ai), church affiliation among European-American speakers is consistent with previous studies (Crane, 1977; Edwards, 1997), with working-class speakers using the monophthongal variant more frequently than middle-class speakers (see Table 22 below).

Table 22: European-American Church Categories by Dependent Variable

Church Groupings	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Shiloh Baptist, Whitewater Baptist	97.97	296
Other, Basin Baptist	96.42	1815
United Methodist, First Baptist, Baptist/Covenant	93.45	1634

The final social variable to be discussed is BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY. This factor group is particularly important because it addresses the primary research question in this study: how and to what extent integration has affected speech in Elba. Table 23 reveals the results for this factor group. The data indicate that integration has affected the linguistic choices that people in this community make to a substantial degree.

Table 23: African-American and European-American Age Clusters

African-American Age Clusters	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]	European-American Age Clusters	Percent [a:]	Total [a:]
Pre1963	88.68	954	Pre1963	93.45	1633
1963-1989	79.71	1119	1963-1989	95.78	1066
1990+	75.62	1284	1990+	97.82	1011

The linguistic patterning indicates decreased use of the monophthongal variant by African-American speakers over time. In the European-American community, however, there is increased use of the monophthongal variant over time. This pattern of divergence is like that reported by Wolfram’s research group for North Carolina speakers. However, unlike speakers included in the North Carolina studies who are adopting supraregional African-American forms, African Americans included in this study appear to be moving toward standardized English. This difference may reflect the fact that most of the African Americans born in 1990 or later were, at the time my interviews were conducted, college-bound adolescents. Fewer European Americans in this age category had this aspiration. Thus, although some studies have connected use of the monophthongal variant with African-American speech (Dorrill, 1986; Edwards, 1997), these results confirm findings in Head (2003), which indicate that in Elba, European Americans use the Southern variant more frequently than African Americans do. Finally, while most studies have indicated that older speakers use the Southern variant more than younger speakers (e.g., Crane, 1997; G. Bailey & Bernstein, 1989; Edwards, 1997; Bowie, 2001; Head, 2003; Doxey, 2007-2008) this holds true in Elba only for African-American speakers.

Analysis of the (oi) Data Set

Initial Exclusion of Tokens

With 728 tokens, the original (oi) data set was considerably smaller than the (ai) data set. It was reduced to 719 tokens after examination of the data revealed nine tokens were neither monophthongal nor diphthongal variants of (oi). Two of the excluded tokens occurred in a disyllabic variant of *coin*: [ko\$In]. Additionally, the word list elicited seven disyllabic tokens of *coincide* (i.e., ko\$In\$sa:d).³⁸ These were excluded from the data set. Two monophthongal tokens and one diphthongal token of *coincide* from the word list were retained.

Invariant Speakers

Because most of the speakers who were interviewed prior to the inclusion of the word list only produced a few tokens of (oi), there was a high number of categorical speakers for this variable. The 23 categorical speakers produced a total of 47 tokens. When these were removed from the data set, 672 tokens remained for analysis.³⁹

A logistical regression was performed on these data using the factor groups previously established through analysis of (ai). These were SPEAKER, CHURCH/ETHNICITY, BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, GENDER, STYLE, FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, FREQUENCY, STRESS, and GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY. The logistical regression provided a baseline R-Square value of .55. SPEAKER, FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, FREQUENCY, and STRESS were the significant factor groups in the initial analysis.

Contributions of Individual Speakers

³⁸ Because the rate of production of the monophthongal variant of (ai) in Elba is quite high (88 percent in the final data set), speakers are likely to have used this variant in the word *coincide*. However, this word was not coded for variants of (ai).

³⁹ This data set included 29 speakers. Of these speakers, 18 were African-American and 17 were European-American, and the age breakdown was as follows: 11-20 (9), 21-40 (9), 41-59 (7), 60+ (4).

A second logistic regression was run in order to determine how much of the variation could be accounted for by the language patterns of individual speakers. This produced an R-Square of .15, indicating that 15 percent of the variation in the (oi) data set is attributable to individual choice, not community norms.

Refinement of the Factor Groups

Since CHURCH/ETHNICITY and BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY had already been refined, for (oi), the only large factor group that resulted in model instability was FREQUENCY. As before, the solution was to divide the data into quartiles. These were 0-16, 17-82, 83-410, and 411-2529. Again, the third quartile was deviant. However, for this variable, examination of the distribution of the tokens in the third quartile failed to reveal a solution,⁴⁰ so no changes were made.

Final Logistic Regression

With the modification of the factor group FREQUENCY, a logistic regression was performed on the final data set. The factor groups included in the analysis were BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, GENDER, FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT, PART OF SPEECH, FREQUENCY, and SENTENCE STRESS. This analysis resulted in an R-Square of .49, with a probability <.0001. The significant factor groups conditioning this variable are listed in Table 24 below.

Table 24: (oi) Final Data Set Logistic Regression

Factor Group	Probability
ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE	.0039
GENDER	<.0001
CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY	<.0001
FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT	<.0001

⁴⁰ Though I deleted tokens that were both categorically and near-categorically monophthongal and diphthongal, this did not improve the quartile. This strategy was abandoned when this quartile became so small that it threatened the integrity of the factor group.

It has been determined that the factor group SPEAKER accounts for 15 percent of the variation in the (oi) data set. In order to determine the amount of variation accounted for by the other factor groups, they were added one at a time, weakest to strongest as determined by the probabilities of the logistical regression. Again, when the probabilities alone failed to afford a distinction, a binominal analysis was done to differentiate them. The contribution of the significant factor groups is shown in Table 25 below.

Table 25: (oi) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, Factors Added Weakest to Strongest

Factor Groups Added	Contribution
ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE	5%, p <.0001
ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, GENDER	8%, p <.0001
ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, GENDER, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY	12%, p <.0001
ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, GENDER, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENT	46%, p <.0001
Total contribution of non-significant factor groups	3%

Analysis of Internal Variables

For (oi), the only significant linguistic factor group is FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT. As is demonstrated by the improvement in the R-Square value for the logistic regression when this factor group is added (see Table 25), it accounts for 34 percent of the variation in the model. Anderson (1999) finds that (oi) patterns similarly to (ai), and the substantial amount of variation accounted for by this factor group reflects this finding. However, the hierarchy for FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT for (oi) differs somewhat from the hierarchy for (ai) in the present study. The hierarchy for (oi) is as follows: liquids > nasals > morpheme boundary > voiceless obstruents > voiced obstruents > word boundary (p.<.0001). As Table 26 reveals, only the last of these favors the monophthongal variants and the likelihood that words such a *boy* and *destroy* will be pronounced as in standardized English is very high.

Table 26: Following Environment by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [ʌ] & [ɔ]	Total [ʌ] & [ɔ]
Liquids	83.69	233
Nasals	39.85	133
Morpheme Boundary	32.61	46
Voiceless Obstruents	30.49	82
Voiced Obstruents	18.18	121
Word Boundary	5.26	57

Analysis of External Variables

The external variables identified by the model as conditioning the variation associated with (oi) are BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, GENDER, and CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY. The first external variable to be discussed is BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY. As was the case for (ai), this factor group is particularly important because it addresses the primary research question in this study. Using the age cohorts identified in the analysis of (ai), the data indicate that speakers in both ethnic groups use the monophthongal variants less over time.

When comparing across ethnic boundaries, the oldest African-American and European-American speakers are significantly different ($p = .0025$). Additionally, the oldest African-American speakers are significantly more monophthongal than middle and younger speakers in both ethnic groups. Initially, there is a decrease for both groups. That is, research participants born between 1963 and 1989 are less monophthongal than those born earlier. However, while the decrease is not significant for European Americans, it is both significant and substantial for African Americans. For the middle group, which experienced school integration, the difference across the ethnic groups disappears. For African Americans, the youngest group is not different from the middle group; for European Americans, the difference between the youngest group and

the middle group is significant ($p = .0028$). In sum, for both ethnic groups, there is a decrease in the use of the monophthongal variants; however, the decrease occurs at different rates.

That a significant difference in the linguistic patterning of this variable reappears between ethnic groups for the youngest age group may speak to the insightfulness of an observation made by several research participants, particularly, though not exclusively, younger community members. These participants suggested that the present relationship between African-American and European-American adolescents in Elba is characterized by neither social distance, as was often the case for the oldest research participants, nor extensive social interaction, which was often the case for the middle group of research participants. Rather, members of this age cohort are comfortable socializing both across and within ethnic groups.

I recently witnessed evidence consistent with this interpretation of the data. In Elba's Subway restaurant, I noticed a group of cheerleaders, all European-American, come into the restaurant. Later, a second group of cheerleaders, all African-American, came into the restaurant, ordered lunch, and left. Based on their style of dress, it was obvious to me that all the girls were participating in an activity together that day, so it struck me as odd but confirmed the research participants' observations: These girls had decided to eat separately. That people of both ethnic groups are participating in the same activities, though in different ways, appears to be reflected in speakers' choices with respect to the frequency with which they produce the monophthongal variants of (oi). This patterning is shown in Table 27.

Table 27: BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY by Dependent Variable

African-American Age Clusters	Percent [ʌ] & [ɔ]	Total [ʌ] & [ɔ]	European-American Age Clusters	Percent [ʌ] & [ɔ]	Total [ʌ] & [ɔ]
Pre1963	84.85	33	Pre1963	56.30	135
1963-1989	46.63	163	1963-1989	50	76
1990+	40.35	171	1990+	27.66	94

The next external variable to be discussed is GENDER. As shown in the next table, in contrast to the (ai) data set, the (oi) data set followed the expected pattern with men using the nonstandard, monophthongal variants significantly ($p < .0001$) more than women.

Table 28: GENDER by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [ʌ] & [ɔ]	Total [ʌ] & [ɔ]
Female	33.43	356
Male	61.39	316

The final external variable to be discussed for (oi) is CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY. For (oi), use of the nonstandardized variants by church members does not reflect the socioeconomic pattern predicted by the literature. However, African-American church members pattern for (oi) in the same way that they did for (ai). That is, members of working-class churches use fewer monophthongal variants. For the European-American churches, the difference between the churches in the first two categories (i.e., other/Basin category and United Methodist, First Baptist, Baptist/Covenant) is not significant. Like the African-American churches, working-class church members used less of the monophthongal variants. The patterning of (oi) for church members in Elba is shown the table below.

Table 29: CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY by Dependent Variable

African-American Churches	Percent [ʌ]/[ɔ]	Total [ʌ]/[ɔ]	European-American Churches	Percent [ʌ]/[ɔ]	Total [ʌ]/[ɔ]
New Philadelphia, Elba Zion, <i>other</i> , Shady Grove, Bethel AME	73.79	103	Other/Basin	49.51	204
Springfield, Greater New Zion, Rocky Head	40.59	170	UM, FB, and Baptist/Covenant	40.91	88
Nazareth Baptist, Oak Grove	29.79	94	Shiloh/Whitewater	23.08	13

Analysis of the (ING) Data Set

Invariant Speakers

The original (ING) data set contained 3505 tokens. Removing tokens produced by invariant speakers left 3496 tokens for analysis. An initial logistical regression was performed using the following factor groups: SPEAKER, CHURCH/ETHNICITY, BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, GENDER, STYLE, PRECEDING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, FREQUENCY, STRESS, AND GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, and all but GENDER, STYLE, and FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT were significant in this initial analysis which provided a baseline R-Square value of .49.

Contributions of Individual Speakers

Controlling for the language patterns of individuals produced an R-Square of .10, indicating that the factor group SPEAKER accounts for 10 percent of the variation in the (ING) data set.

Refinement of the Factor Groups

For the analysis of the (ING) variable, the only factor groups that could not be run as originally coded were WORD FREQUENCY and GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY. To avoid model instability, FREQUENCY was recoded as quartiles. These were 0-123, 124-627, 628-1335, 1336-4070. For the factor group GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, each word containing the dependent variable was originally identified as progressive verb form, irregular verb, participial modifier, adjective, non-gerund noun, gerundive noun, or pronoun. A final category, does not apply, included tokens from the word list. Because the probability for the comparison of adjectives and participial modifiers was not significant, they were recoded as a single factor. Additionally, the one adverb in the data set was recoded as does not apply.

Final Logistic Regression

With these modifications, a logistic regression was performed on the final (ING) data set. The factor groups included in the analysis were BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY, CHURCH AFFILIATION, GENDER, PRECEDING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, FREQUENCY, and SYLLABLE STRESS. This resulted in an R-Square of .48 with a probability <.0001. The significant factor groups conditioning this variable are listed in the table below.

Table 30: (ING) Final Logistic Regression

Factor Groups	Probability
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT	.0058
ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE	.0017
STYLE	<.0001
FREQUENCY	<.0001
GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY	<.0001
STRESS	<.0001

Controlling for speaker accounts for 10 percent of the variation in the (ING) data set. To determine the amount of variation accounted for by the other factor groups, they were added one at a time, weakest to strongest as determined by the probabilities of the logistical regression. Factor groups with identical probabilities in the logistical regression were differentiated using binomial analysis. The contributions of significant factor groups are listed in the table below.

Table 31: (ING) Final Data Set Logistic Regression, Factors Added Weakest to Strongest

Factor Groups Added	Contribution
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT	3%, p <.0001
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT, ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE	5%, p <.0001
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT, ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, STYLE	9%, p <.0001
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT, ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, STYLE, FREQUENCY	11%, p <.0001
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT, ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, STYLE, FREQUENCY GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY	35%, p <.0001
PRECEDING ENVIRONMENT, ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE, STYLE, FREQUENCY GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, STRESS	47% , p <.0001
Total contribution of non-significant factors	1%

Analysis of the Internal Variables

Nearly all of the significant factor groups for the (ING) data set were linguistic. The first of these to be discussed is PRECEDING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT. Consistent with the literature on (ING), for the data analyzed here, preceding velar stops (i.e., /k/, /g/) favor [In] (see Table 32 below). However, while the published literature indicates that preceding alveolar stops (i.e., /t/, /d/) favor [In], this was not the case in the present study; preceding alveolar and velar stops all favored the nonstandard variant, [In] (p.<.0001).

Table 32: PRECEDING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [In]	Total [In]
Velar	90.71	323
Alveolar	83.15	558
Other	70.39	2611

The next internal variable to be discussed is STYLE. Unlike the (ai) data set in which the nonstandard variant most frequently occurred in flood narratives, [In] occurs most frequently in conversations about integration and word list, which were not significantly different from each other (p. <.0001) (see Table 33 below).

Table 33: STYLE by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [In]	Total [In]
Integration conversations	82.30	1610
Word list	80.31	589
Flood narratives	61.64	1293

The second significant factor group was FREQUENCY. When the patterning in the first and second quartiles was tested, it was found to be the same. This was also the case for the third and fourth quartiles. While the linguistic literature has suggested that more frequent words are more likely to contain the alveolar variant (Fischer, 1958; Wald and Shopen, 1985), the pattern shown in Table 34 below indicates a reversal of the pattern predicted by the literature. However, the discussion in the literature is based on a single speaker (Fischer, 1958). Additionally, although frequency has been implicated in reductive changes, the alternation between [In] and [Iɲ] is not a reductive change. Rather, this is an alternation in place of articulation.

Table 34: FREQUENCY by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [In]	Total [In]
0-123	84.56	868
124-627	83.14	854
628-1335	63.70	887
1336-4070	66.36	883

The patterning of (ING) with respect to the factor group GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY is partially consistent with the literature which indicates verbs and pronouns are most likely to contain the nonstandard variant (Wald and Shopen, 1985). As indicated by Table 35, in this study, progressive verbs are most likely to contain [In]; however, pronouns are slightly disfavoring ($p < .0001$). The hierarchy for this factor group is as follows: progressive verb > gerund = adjective = preposition > does not apply > pronoun > non-gerund noun > irregular verb. The number of factors in this factor group did not cause instability in the model.

Table 35: GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY by Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [In]	Total [In]
Progressive verb	93.66	1167
Gerund	87.33	576
Adjective	83.10	284
Preposition	81.48	27
Does not apply	80.11	367
Pronoun	47.18	479
Non-Gerund Noun	38.99	554
Irregular Verb	2.94	34

As indicated by Table 36, the final internal variable to be discussed, STRESS, follows the pattern discussed by A. Houston (1985) who reports that [In] occurs primarily in unstressed environments (p. =.0001).

Table 36: Stress By Dependent Variable

Factors	Percent [In]	Total [In]
Unstressed	82.38	3116
Stressed	7.45	376

Analysis of the External Variables

The only external variable that conditions (ING) is ETHNICITY/BIRTH DATE. The three age clusters for African-American speakers are significantly different from each other. However, while the oldest and middle European-American age clusters are the same, the youngest age cluster is significantly different from these (p.<.0001). When comparing the two ethnic groups, the oldest African-American and European-American speakers are different (p. = .0022). This is also the case for the middle speakers (p. <.0001). However, the youngest European-American and African-American speakers are the same, which indicates convergence for this variable, each group preferring the nonstandardized variant. These results are summarized in Table 37.

Table 37: Ethnicity/Birth Date by Dependent Variable

African-American	Percent [In]	Total [In]	European-American	Percent [In]	Total [In]
Pre1963	73.4	500	Pre1963	65.35%	834
1963-1989	79.53	552	1963-1989	68.64%	660
1990+	84.93	511	1990+	82.07%	435

Turning to the linguistic literature on ethnicity and [In] use, studies have indicated that African Americans use [In] more than do European Americans (Labov, 1966; Shuy et al., 1967; Cofer, 1972; Anshen, 1969; Levine and Crockett, 1966). In this study, only the oldest and middle groups of African Americans were found to use [In] more than the oldest and middle groups of European Americans do.

In the literature on age and [In] use, several studies have associated [In] with younger speakers (Labov, 1966; Woods, 1979; Horvath, 1985). This is also the case in Elba, Alabama.

Summary of the Data Sets

Overall, the rate at which speakers included in this study produce the monophthongal variant of (ai) is quite high. In the original data set, which included 8944 tokens, the rate of [a:] production was 86 percent. In the final data set, which excluded tokens produced by invariant speakers as well as tokens contained in the lexical item *like*, [a:] production increased to 88 percent. Interestingly, all factor groups, both internal and external, were significant for this data set.

With 728 tokens in the original data set, the (oi) data set is much smaller than the (ai) data set. It also contains substantially less use of the monophthongal variants. In the original data set, 45 percent of the tokens are monophthongal. In the final data set, which consists of 672 tokens and excludes tokens produced by invariant speakers as well as tokens that were neither

monophthongal nor diphthongal variants of (oi), the rate of production of the monophthongal variants is 47 percent. The low rate at which the monophthongal variant appears may be due to the fact that the majority of tokens contained in both the original and final data sets resulted from the inclusion of the word list,⁴¹ one of the most formal styles. In this data set, only four factor groups were significant: FOLLOWING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, GENDER, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, and BIRTH DATE/ ETHNICITY.

Though the rate of [In] production is not as high as [a:] production in this study, it is still considerable. The original (ING) data set includes 3505 tokens, and the rate of production of the [In] variant is 74 percent. For (ING), the exclusion of tokens produced by invariant speakers eliminated nine tokens, and the rate of production remained 74 percent in the final data set. The significant factor groups for (ING) are STRESS, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY, PRECEDING PHONOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT, STYLE, FREQUENCY, and BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY.

The next chapter reviews the major findings of this study resulting from analysis of these three data sets, addresses the limitations of the study, and indicates directions for future research.

⁴¹ 73 percent of the original (oi) data set and 78 percent of the final (oi) data set resulted from the inclusion of the word list.

CHAPTER VI. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

Some national events affect all of us. Many people can remember where they were when they heard about the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King, the Challenger explosion, and the bombing of the World Trade Center. But such events are not likely to impact the linguistic choices we make when speaking with family, friends, and neighbors. In an effort to understand the connection between identity, language choice, and social change, this study has focused on the linguistic impact of local and private life before, during, and after integration. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to determine whether and to what extent local integration events have affected speakers' choices in the small Southern town of Elba, Alabama, with respect to three phonological variables: (ai), (oi), and (ING).

Conclusions

Two sets of conclusions, linguistic and methodological, are drawn from this study. The major linguistic findings of this study relate to the ways in which African-American and European-American speakers, divided into age clusters by watershed events in the community's integration history, have treated the variables under examination. The data reveal that these speakers make choices that are significantly correlated with local watershed events. For (ai), African-American speakers are less monophthongal than European-American speakers in each age cluster (pre1963, 1963-1989, and 1990+). However, for (oi), which, based on Anderson (1999) was expected to pattern similarly to (ai), a difference emerged in the middle age group, only to disappear for the youngest group. For (ING), while the two oldest groups of African-

American research participants used more [In] than did European-American participants, this distinction disappears in the youngest age group. The relative frequency of use of the Southern variants of these variables is compared across ethnic groups in the table below.

Table 38: Comparison of Ethnic Group Usage of Southern Variants

	[a:]	[ʌ]/[ɔ]	[In]/[in]
Pre1963	AA<EA	AA>EA	AA>EA
1963-1989	AA<EA	AA=EA	AA>EA
1990+	AA<EA	AA>EA	AA=EA

Another way of looking at the data is change over time, as is indicated by Table 39 below. For (ai), while language change is occurring in this community, it is occurring in different directions in each of the ethnic groups. For the other two variables, the ethnic groups are moving in the same direction. On the one hand, for (oi), although change is occurring at significantly different rates, both African-American and European-American speakers in this community are using the Southern variants less over time. On the other hand, for (ING), both groups of speakers in this community are using the nonstandardized variants more over time. Table 39 summarizes use of these variables in regard to language change.

Table 39: Change in Apparent Time

	[a:]	[ʌ]/[ɔ]	[In]/[in]
African Americans	Pre1963>1963-1989>1990+	Pre1963>1963-1989=1990+	Pre1963<1963-1989<1990+
European Americans	Pre1963<1963-1989<1990+	Pre1963=1963-1989>1990+	Pre1963=1963-1989<1990+

The patterns summarized in Tables 38 and 39 indicate that speakers' choices can be characterized in terms of the interaction of age and local, regional, and national orientation toward nonstandardized variants. For (ai), which is the most identifiably Southern variable

examined, this study finds that African-American and European-American speakers are becoming less like one another in the middle and youngest age groups, a language change that is discussed in the sociolinguistic literature as divergence. Although the oldest African Americans used the monophthongal variant less than the oldest European Americans, the difference between these two ethnic groups increased substantially with integration and again after the 1990 flood.

The variable (oi) functions differently. As indicated by the tables above, there are two nonstandardized variants of (oi) used in Elba: [ʌ] and [ɔ]. While this study did not examine this difference quantitatively, impressionistically, people in Elba use [ʌ], which has not been discussed in the literature, considerably more than [ɔ], which has been documented as a regional variant. Thus, it is likely that [ʌ] signals local rather than regional identity. For both African Americans and European Americans, the data showed increased use of diphthongs, with the difference between the groups disappearing for speakers born between 1963 and 1989. This age group includes not only the first speakers to experience integration but also members of the Sesame Street generation, who experienced the first waves of popular embracement of multiculturalism. As discussed in the previous chapter, that a significant difference in the linguistic patterning of this variable reappears between ethnic groups for the youngest age group may speak to the observation made by research participants that members of this age cohort are comfortable socializing both across and within ethnic groups.

The nonstandardized variant of (ING), while used higher up the style continuum by Southerners, often in formal contexts, is widespread in American English. Zwicky (2008) indicates that “most native speakers of English use the [In] variant on occasion (even if they don't think they do)” in his discussion of Sarah Palin’s language choices during the 2008

presidential election. Thus, it is quite interesting that in this study, the youngest speakers are found to converge on nonstandardized use of this variable.

However, like (oi), (ING) turned out to be more complex than initially expected. As indicated by Tables 38 and 39, in this community, there are two nonstandardized variants of (ING): [In] and [in]; the latter variant does not appear in the literature. That younger speakers in the two ethnic groups are using [ʌ] at different rates but converge on nonstandardized use of (ING) seems to speak to the pattern of social interaction described above.

That African-American and European-American and older and younger speakers included in this study are treating each variable differently is one of the most important findings in this study. The data reveal the complexity of divergence and convergence and speak to previous studies that have found both in a single community (Fridland, 2002; Hinton and Pollock, 2000). The data also emphasize the importance of examining multiple variables in a single community, a strategy that has been used by Wolfram's research group in North Carolina as well. Studies conducted by this group have examined both morphosyntactic and phonological features within single communities in order to determine local and supraregional alignment. This study demonstrates that in Elba, people are making different choices for different variables, and that the local, regional, or national symbolic value of these variables impacts such choices.

In addition to the patterns revealed through the examination of multiple variables, several conclusions can be made about the success of the other methodological strategies used in this study. First, drawing upon history and literature in order to enhance themes developed on the basis of my experiences as a community member contributed to the success of the interview modules. The incorporation of locally relevant themes into the interview modules in combination with an emic approach addressed two issues that were essential to this study:

getting people to talk freely and naturally and creating analytic categories pertaining to important dates in Elba's history. Because of my position as a community member, research participants were willing to speak with me openly about sensitive social topics. Detailed knowledge of the community's history and social organizations also allowed me to evaluate the accuracy of their descriptions of community events and history; this was crucial in determining age clusters. Finally, my interdisciplinary approach and sense of this community allowed me to successfully enact the decision to use non-traditional, interactive factor groups successfully. The BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY factor group allowed me to directly address the primary research question in this study. When compared to the analysis which coded for AGE and ETHNICITY, this factor group accounted for more of the variation. The second interactive factor group, CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY, also accounted for more of the variation in the data than a working-class/middle-class dichotomy, and so was a better predictor of socioeconomic status.

Further evidence of the importance of being able to tailor interview modules and define independent variables for a research community is provided by the relatively high R-Squared values associated with each of the analyses. In the final logistic regressions, for the (ai) data set, 56 percent of the variance is explained by the model; in the (oi) data set 49 percent of the variance is explained, and in the (ING) data set 48 percent of the variance is explained. Other linguistic studies provide comparison. Utilizing tape-recorded telephone interviews designed to elicit particular phonological features, Bernstein (1993) investigated 12 linguistic variables, which resulted in four clusters; for each cluster, between 9 and 27 percent of the variance was explained. In her study of (ai) in Columbus, Georgia, and Southeastern Alabama, Topping (2010), who analyzed archival data, reports final R-Square values between 10 and 27 percent.

Limitations of the Study

Although this study has revealed much about language variation in Elba, Alabama, there were limitations. The most challenging of these pertains to the use of the interactive factor group CHURCH AFFILIATION/ETHNICITY. This factor group was considerably more difficult to interpret than the BIRTH DATE/ETHNICITY factor group. Specifically, interpreting the distributions of tokens for the African-American church groupings was partially problematic. Reasons for this included participant identification with more than one church, community prestige surrounding church location and denomination, issues such as recent expansion of churches or church division, and community status (which does not necessarily correlate with socioeconomic status). Additional sociological research is needed to determine why in the South church membership correlates more highly with socioeconomic status than does class as determined by employment. Such research may also reveal how to modify this factor group so that it is more readily interpretable.

A second limitation, which is more easily addressed, is the limited number of (oi) tokens. Because I did not anticipate that collecting tokens of (oi) would be problematic, I designed the word list after I began the 2008 interviews. Future research should encourage participants to use this variable using a less formal style; the construction of interview modules designed to elicit this variable would address this issue.

A final limitation, also easily addressed, arises from the coding of frequency. In the present study, words that did not appear in the *American Heritage Word Frequency Book* were assigned a frequency of 0. Newer, larger online corpora should be investigated as a means of addressing this. An example of one of these corpora is the *Corpus of Contemporary American English*, which currently contains more than 425 million words.

Implications for Further Research

Most importantly, the methodological strategies employed in this study are likely to benefit other research projects. I am a native of my research community, and therefore had a sense of the types of issues research participants could and might be willing to discuss regarding integration and race relations. Nevertheless, reviewing literary texts and historical discussions associated with these issues provided me with a much clearer understanding of relevant local themes. For example, in this study, research was conducted on the significance of both the prom and the swimming pool nationally as well as locally. Researching history and literature could prove to be especially useful for researchers entering communities with which they are not familiar.

It is also the case that research needs to be done on the patterning of [ʌ], [ɔ], [In], and [in]. For [in], impressionistic assessment suggests that this variant encodes greater formality than [In] but is less formal than [In]. Further, two factor groups for (ING), STYLE and FREQUENCY, yielded unexpected results. This warrants further research.

Additionally, considerably less research has been conducted on (oi) than (ai), and although Anderson (1999) finds that (oi) patterns like (ai), this study demonstrates that the variables do not pattern alike in all respects. Thus, more research needs to be done on this complex variable within the Southern region.

Another area that is worthy of additional research concerns the word *like*. As in Topping (2010), in the present study, *like*, a multifunctional word, was found to affect data atypically. Data coded for the present study contained 807 tokens found in the word *like*. Plans for further research include the addition of tokens, examination of *liketa*, and analysis of a *like* data set with an eye toward the impact of age and ethnicity.

Finally, the impact of integration on Southern speech is still an under-explored area of Civil Rights research. While this study adds to our understanding of each of the variables examined, as stated in the introductory chapter, it only describes one Southern community. Additional questions can be raised about the impact of integration not only on these three phonological variables in other communities but also on other features of Southern speech. With the incorporation of interdisciplinary resources, an emic approach, and quantitative sociolinguistic analysis, more work can be done on the complex linguistic choices people have made in response to one of the most momentous social changes in American history.

REFERENCES

- Algeo, J. (2003). The Origins of Southern American English. In S.J. Nagle & S.L. Sanders (Eds.), *English in the Southern United States* (pp. 6-16). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Anderson, B. L. (1999). Source-Language Transfer and Vowel Accommodation in the Patterning of Cherokee English /ai/ and /oi/. *American Speech*, 74(4), 339-368.
- Anderson, B. L. (2002). Dialect leveling and /ai/ monophthongization among African American Detroiters. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 6(1), 86-98.
- Anshen, Frank S. (1969). *Speech Variation Among Negroes in a Small Southern Community*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Ardey, J. (2006). Changing Church in the South: Religion and Politics in Elba, Alabama. Retrieved February 6, 2008, from the University of New Hampshire, Carsey Institute Web site: http://www.carseyinstitute.unh.edu/documents/IB_changingchurch_06.pdf
- Bailey, G. (1997). When did Southern American English Begin? In E. Schneider (Ed.), *Varieties of Englishes Around the World* (pp. 255-275). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bailey, G. & Bernstein, C. (1989). Methodology of a Phonological Survey of Texas. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 22(1), 6-16.
- Bailey, G., & Maynor, N. (1987). Decreolization? *Language in Society*, 16(4), 449-473.
- Bailey, G. & Maynor, N. (1989). The Divergence Controversy. *American Speech*, 64(1), 12-39.
- Barnes, A. (1993). White Mistresses and African-American Domestic Workers: Ideals for Change. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 66(1), 22-36.
- Barra, A. (2006, September 1). The Troubled Heart of Southern Football. *The New York Sun*. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from <http://www.nysun.com/arts/troubled-heart-of-southern-football/39005/>
- Bartley, N. (1995). *The New South, 1945-1980*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.

- Bayley, R. (2004). The Quantitative Paradigm. In J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, and N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* (pp. 117-141). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Beaugrande, R. (1998). Performative speech acts in linguistic theory: The rationale of Noam Chomsky. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29, 1-39.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language Style as Audience Design. *Language in Society*, 13 (2), 145-204.
- The Beloved Community*. (2004). Retrieved November 2008, from www.thekingcenter.org/prog/bc/index.html
- Berkeley, K. (1990). [Review of the book *Telling Memories Among Southern Women: Domestic Workers and their Employers in the Segregated South*, by S. Tucker]. *The Journal of Southern History*, 56(2), 384-385.
- Berstein, C. (1993). Measuring Social Causes of Phonological Variation In Texas. *American Speech*, 68(3), 227-240.
- Bernstein, C. (2000). Misrepresenting the American South. *American Speech*, 75(4), 339-342.
- Berstein, C. and Berstein, R. (1998). Phonological Innovation in East Texas: Different Samples, Similar Explanations. *American Speech*, 73(1), 44-56.
- Bissinger, H.G. (1990). *Friday Night Lights: A Town, a Team, and a Dream*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Blalock, H.M. and Blalock, A.B.. (1960). Situational Factors and Negro Leadership Activity in a Medium-Sized Community. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 29(1), 85-90.
- Blanton, M. (1988). "Review." *South Central Review*, 5(1), 121-123.
- Bowie, D. (2001). The Diphthongization of /ay/. *JengL*, 29(4), 329-345.
- Bowling, S., Kelley, K., & A. May. (MS). Research Conducted at White Street Baptist Church for the variable (ING).
- Boydston, J. (2005). Women in the Labor Force. In P. Boyer (Ed.), *The Oxford Companion to United States History* [Electronic Version]. New York, NY: Oxford UP.
- Bybee, J. (2007). *Frequency of Use and the Organization of Language*. New York, NY: Oxford UP.

- Calhoun-Brown, A. (2000). Upon this Rock: The Black Church, Nonviolence, and the Civil Rights Movement. *Political Science and Politics*, 33(2), 168-174.
- Campbell, J. (2002). Work. In J. Flora & L. MacKethan (Eds.), *The Companion to Southern Literature: Themes, Genres, Places, People, Movements, and Motifs*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- Campbell-Kibler, K. (2006). *Listener Perceptions of Sociolinguistic Variables: The Case of (ING)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Carpenter, J.L. (2004a). *The Lost Community of the Outer Banks: African American Speech on Roanoke Island*. Unpublished master's thesis, North Carolina State University.
- Carpenter, J.L. (2004b). External and Internal Social Factors in the Development of AAE in Regional Communities. *Southern Journal of Linguistics*, 28(1/2), 34-48.
- Carpenter, J.L. (2005). The Invisible Community of the Lost Colony: African American English on Roanoke Island. *American Speech*, 80(3), 227-255.
- Carpenter, J.L. & Vadnais, J. (2005). On the Shifting Social Significance of Receding Dialect Variables: The Case of Static Locative to. Paper presented at the 2005 Meeting of the American Dialect Society, San Francisco, CA.
- Carroll, J., Davies, P., & Richman, B. (1971) *The American Heritage Word Frequency Book*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Carson, C., Garrow, D., Gill, G., Harding, V., & Hine, D. (Eds.). (1991). *The Eyes on the Prize Civil Rights Reader*. New York, NY: Penguin Books U.S.A., Inc.
- Chambers, J.K. (1995). *Sociolinguistic Theory*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chambers, J.K. (2003). *Sociolinguistic Theory* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Chasin, A. (1995). Class and Its Close Relations: Identities among Women, Servants, and Machines. In J. Halberstam and I. Livingston (Eds.), *Posthuman Bodies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.
- Childress, M. (1993). *Crazy in Alabama*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Childress, M. (2006). *One Mississippi*. New York, NY: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Childs, B. & Mallinson, C. (2004). African American English in Appalachia: Dialect accommodation and substrate influence. *English World-Wide*, 25(1), 27-50.
- "Chi-Square Test." (2012). Retrieved May 31, 2012, from <http://science.jrank.org/pages/1401/Chi-Square-Test.html>

- Circuit Rider. 2009. Retrieved April 9, 2009, from <http://www.answers.com/topic/circuit-rider>
- Clarke, B. (1999). *River, Cross My Heart*. Boston, MA: Back Bay Books.
- Clark-Lewis, E. (1994). *Living In, Living Out: African American Domestic In Washington, D.C., 1910-1940*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Clopper, C. (2000). Research on Spoken Language Processing, Progress Report No. 24, Indiana University. *Some Acoustic Cues for Categorizing American English Regional Dialects: An Initial Report on Dialect Variation in Production and Perception*, pp. 44-65.
- Clotfelter, C. (2004). An Imperfect Desegregation. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(30), p. B9-B9.
- Cobb, J. (2004). Searching for Southern Identity. In R. Gray and O. Robinson (Eds.), *A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American South* (pp. 591-607). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cobb, W. (1992). *A Walk Through Fire*. New York, NY: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Cofer, T. (1972). *Linguistic Variability in a Philadelphia Community*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Crane, L. B. (1977). The Social Stratification of /ai/ in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. In David L. Shores and Carole P. Hines (Eds.), *Papers in Language Variation* (pp. 189-200). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Cukor-Avila, P. (2003). The complex grammatical history of African-American and white vernaculars in the South. In S. J. Nagle and S. L. Sanders (Eds.), *English in the Southern United States* (pp. 82-105). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Dawkins, M. (2004). Race relations and the sport of golf: the African American golf legacy. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 28(1), 327-331.
- Deford, F. (1981). *Everybody's All-American*. New York, NY: The Viking Press.
- DeLillo, D. (1972). *End Zone*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dill, B. (1994). *Across The Boundaries of Race and Class: An Exploration of Work and Family Among Black Female Domestic Servants*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Dillard, J.L. (1972). *Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States*. New York, NY: Random House.

- Disheroon-Green, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Voices of the American South*. New York, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Dodd, D. (1972). *Winston: An Antebellum and Civil War History of a Hill County of North Alabama*. Birmingham, AL: Oxmoor Press.
- Dorrill, G. (1986). A Comparison of Stressed vowels of Black and White Speakers in the South. In M. Montgomery & G. Bailey (Eds.), *Language Variety in the South* (pp. 149-157). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Dorrill, G. (2003). Sounding southern: a look at the phonology of English in the South. In S. J. Nagle and S. L. Sanders (Eds.), *English in the Southern United States* (pp. 119-125). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP
- Dougherty, K. (2003). How monochromatic is church membership? Racial-ethnic diversity in religious community. *Sociology of Religion*, 64(1), 65-85.
- Douglas, E. (1988). *Can't Quit You Baby*. New York, NY: Atheneum.
- Doxey, J. (2007-2008). To [a:] or not to [a:] on the Gulf Coast of Alabama. *Tributaries*, 10, 150-162.
- Dunlap, H. (1973). *Social aspects of a verb form: native Atlanta fifth-grade speech – the present tense of be*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University.
- Duru, J. (2007). Friday Night 'Lite': How De-Racialization in the Motion Picture 'Friday Night Lights' Disserves the Movement to Eradicate Racial Discrimination from American Sport. *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal*, 25, 485-530.
- Edwards, W. F. (1989). Review of *Down Home and Uptown: The Representation of Black Speech American Fiction* by Sylvia Wallace Holton. *Black American Literature Forum* 23(3), 615-620.
- Edwards, W. F. (1997). The Variable Persistence of Southern Vernacular Sounds in the Speech of Inner-City Black Detroiters. In C. Berstein, T. Nunnally, & R. Sabino (Eds.), *Variety in the South Revisited* (pp. 76-86). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Erskine, H. (1973). The Polls: Interracial Socializing. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(2), 283-294.
- Evans, M. (1935). Southern 'Long I.' *American Speech*, 10(3), 188-190.
- Fasold, R. (1981). The Relation Between Black and White Speech in the South. *American Speech*, 56(3), 163-189.

- Fasold, R. (1987). Are Black and White Vernaculars Diverging? *American Speech*, 62(1), 3-80.
- Feagin, C. (1979). *Variation and Change in Alabama English*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP.
- Feagin, C. (1990). The dynamics of a sound change in Southern States English: From R-less to R-ful in three generations. In J. Edmondson, C. Feagin & P Mühlhäusler (Eds.), *Development and Diversity: Linguistic Variation across Time and Space* (29-146). Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics/ University of Texas at Arlington.
- Feagin, C. (1996). Peaks and Glides in Southern States Short-a. In G. Guy (Ed.), *Towards a Social Science of Language* (Vol. 1) (pp. 135-160). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Feagin, C. (1997). The African Contribution to Southern States English. In C. Berstein, T. Nunnally, & R. Sabino (Eds.), *Language Variety in the South Revisited* (pp. 123-139). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Feagin, C. (2000). Sound Change in the South. *American Speech*, 75(4), 342-344.
- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The Continuing Significance of Race: Antiblack Discrimination in Public Places. *American Sociological Review*, 56(1), 101-116.
- Fischer, J.L. (1958). Social influences on the choice of a linguistic variant. *Word*, 14, 47-56.
- Fitzgerald, M. (1988). Radical Republicanism and the White Yeomanry during Alabama Reconstruction, 1865-1868. *The Journal of Southern History*, 54(4), 565-596.
- Fetscher, M. (1971). *The speech of Atlanta school children: a phonological study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.
- Flora, J. & MacKethan, L. (Eds.). (2002). *The Companion to Southern Literature: Themes, Genres, Places, People, Movements, and Motifs*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- Flynt, W. (2004). *Dixie's Forgotten People: The South's Poor Whites* (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP.
- Forsyth, M., Head, M.K., & Henig, J. (MS). Project 2: Analysis of Recorded Conversational Interviews. English 4140: Language Variation, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.
- Fought, C. (2006). *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Fridland, V. (2000). The Southern Shift in Memphis, Tennessee. *Language Variation and*

Change, 11, 267-285.

- Fridland, V. (2002, April). Convergent and divergent tendencies in the African-American and European-American vowel systems in Memphis, TN. Paper presented at SECOL LXVI, Memphis, TN.
- Fridland, V. (2003). 'Tie, tied and tight': The expansion of /ai/ monophthongization in African-American and European American speech in Memphis, Tennessee. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 279-98.
- Ga. High School Holds Segregated Proms. (2004). *Fox News.com*. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from www.foxnews.com/printer_friendly_story/0,3566,120020,00.html.
- Gadzekpo, L. (2001). The Black Church, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Future. *The Journal of Religious Thought*, 53/54(1/2), 95-112.
- Garson, G. David (2009). "Logistic Regression," from *Statnotes: Topics in Multivariate Analysis*. Retrieved 01/05/2010 from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/statnote.htm>.
- Graves, R. (1967). *Language differences among upper- and lower-class negro and white eighth graders in east central Alabama*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Green, E.W. (1998). *A Marshland of Ethnolinguistic Boundaries: Conflicting Past and Present Paradigms in Coastal Carolina Speech*. Unpublished master's thesis, North Carolina State University.
- Harvey, P. (2005). *Freedom's Coming: Religious Culture and the Shaping of the South from the Civil War through the Civil Rights Era*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P.
- Hay, J., Jannedy, S., & Mendoza-Denton, N. (1999). Oprah and /AY/: Lexical Frequency, Referee Design and Style. Proceedings of the 14th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, San Francisco. Retrieved May 18, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ling.nwu.edu>.
- Hazen, K., Wise, A., Ross, I., & Edmond, K. (2006). A Vernacular Baseline for Appalachian English. Paper presented at NWA V 35, Columbus, Ohio.
- Head, A. (2003). *The Monophthongization of /ai/ in Elba and the Environs*. Unpublished master's thesis, Auburn University.
- Henderson, E.B. (1940). The Participation of Negro Youth in Community and Educational Programs. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 9(3), 416-424.
- Hinton, L. & Pollock, K. (2000). Regional variations in the phonological characteristics

- of African American Vernacular English. *World Englishes*, 19(1): 59-71.
- Hitchcock, B. (2000, January). Lecture Notes. English 0495: Southern Literature, Auburn University, Auburn, AL.
- Hoberman, J. (2000, November 13). *Race and Sport: The Social Costs of Black Dominance*. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from <http://www.playthegame.org/Knowledge%20bank/Articles/Race%20and%20Sport%20The%20Social%20Costs%20of%20Black%20Dominance.aspx>
- Hobson, F. (1983). *Tell About the South: The Southern Rage to Explain*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- Hoffman, R. (1983). *Almost Family*. New York, NY: The Dial Press.
- Holladay, L. (2006). *Language Development in Same-Sex Multiple Birth Siblings: A Retrospective Nature/Nurture Study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University.
- Holm, J. (2004). *Languages in Contact: The Partial Restructuring of Vernaculars*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Honeyman, S. (2005). *Elusive Childhood: Impossible Representations in Modern Fiction*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State UP.
- Horvath, B. (1985). *Variation in Australian English: The Sociolects of Sydney*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Hoult, T. (1950). Economic Class Consciousness in American Protestantism. *American Sociological Review*, 15(1), 97-100.
- Houston, A. (1985). *Continuity and Change in English Morphology: The Variable (ING)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Houston, S. (1969). A sociolinguistic consideration of the black English of children in northern Florida. *Language*, 45, 599-607.
- Houston, S. (1970). Competence and performance in child black English. *Language Sciences*, 12, 9-14.
- Houston, S. (1972). Child black English: the school register. *Linguistics*, 90, 20-34.
- Inman, R. (1991). *Old Dogs and Children*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Jarmon, C. (1980). Racial Beliefs Among Blacks and Whites: An Evaluation of Perspectives. *Journal of Black Studies*, 11(2), 235-247.

JMP Support Notes. (2012). Retrieved June 7, 2012, from <http://www.jmp.com/support/notes/36/686.html>

Johnson, D. (2004). From court to courts: Integration in the schools meant changes in athletics and after school activities as well. *Courant.com*. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from <http://www.courant.com/topic/dp-brown23,0,7359174.story>

Jones, L. (1992, November). The New Black Church. *Ebony*, 192.

Kane, E. (2003). Proms take unfortunate steps backward. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from <http://phobos.ramapo.edu/~jweiss/laws131/unit2/proms.html>.

Katona, A. (1948). Community Services and the Negro: A Survey of Discrimination in a Northern Town. *Social Forces*, 26(4), 443-450.

Kelley, R. (1993). "We Are Not What We Seem": Rethinking Black Working-Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South. *The Journal of American History*, 80(1), 75-112.

Kiesling, S. (1998). Men's identities and sociolinguistic variation: The case of fraternity men. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 2, 69-99.

King, R. (2004). The Civil Rights Debate. In R. Gray and O. Robinson (Eds.), *A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American South* (pp. 221-237). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. (1972a). *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black Vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: U of Pennsylvania P.

Labov, W. (1972b). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: U of Pennsylvania P.

Labov, W. (1982). Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: the case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society*, 11(2), 165-202.

Labov, W. (2001a). Forward. In S. Poplack & S. Tagliamonte (Eds.), *African American English in the Diaspora* (pp. xiv-xvii). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Labov, W. (2001b). *Principles of Linguistic Change, Vol. 2: Social Factors*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Labov, W. & Ash, S. (1997). Understanding Birmingham. C. Bernstein, T. Nunally, & R.

- Sabino. (Eds.), *Language Variety in the South Revisited* (pp. 508-573). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Labov, W., Ash, S., Baranowski, M., Nagy, N., Ravindranath, M., & Weldon, T. (2006). Listeners' Sensitivity to the Frequency of Sociolinguistic Variables. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 12(2), 105-129.
- Lee, H. (1960). *To Kill a Mockingbird*. Philadelphia, PA & New York, NY: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- LePage, R. and Tabouret Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge, United Kingdom & New York, NY: Cambridge UP.
- Levine, L. (1998). Imagining Freedom – Symposium on Tera Hunter: To 'Joy My Freedom. *Labor History*, 39(2), 179-182.
- Levine, L. & Crockett, H. (1966). Speech Variation in a Piedmont Community: Postvocalic r. *Sociological Inquiry*, 36, 204-36.
- Lincoln, E. (1985). The Black Heritage in Religion in the South. In C. R. Wilson (Ed.), *Religion in the South* (pp. 35-57). Jackson, MS: UP of Mississippi.
- Louden, M. (2000). African-Americans and Minority Language Maintenance in the United States. *The Journal of Negro History*, 85(4), 223-240.
- McMillan, J. (1946). *Phonology of the Standard English of East Central Alabama*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- McMillan, J. & Montgomery, M. (1989). *Annotated Bibliography of Southern American English*. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- McMillen, S. (1998). No Easy Time: Rural Southern Women, 1940-1990. In R.D. Hurt (Ed.), *The Rural South Since World War II* (pp. 59-94). Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- Metcalfe, A. (2000). *How We Talk: American Regional English Today*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Monteith, S. and Jones, S. (2002). Introduction: South to New Places. In S. Jones and S. Monteith (Eds.), *South to a New Place: Region, Literature, and Culture* (pp. 1-19). Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- Montgomery, M. (1989). Language. In C.R. Wilson & W. Ferris (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture* (pp. 757-792). Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P.

- Montgomery, M. (1997). Language Variety in the South: A Retrospective and Assessment. In C. Berstein, T. Nunnally, & R. Sabino (Eds.), *Language Variety in the South Revisited* (pp. 3-20). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Montgomery, M. (2001). British and Irish Antecedents. In J. Algeo (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language Vol. 6: English in North America* (pp. 86-153). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Montgomery, M. (2004). The History of American English. *PADS 88: Needed Research in American Dialects*.
- Montgomery, M. & Bailey, G. (Eds.). (1986). *Language Variety in the South*. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Montgomery, M., Fuller, J. & Demarse, S. (1993). "The black men has wives and Sweet harts [and Third person plural -s] Jest like the white men": Evidence for verbal -s from written documents on 19th-century African American speech. *Language Variation and Change*, 5, 335-357.
- Montgomery, M. & Nunnally, T. (Eds.). (1998). From the Gulf States and Beyond: The Legacy of Lee Pederson and LAGS. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Mufwene, S. (1992). "Ideology and Facts on African American Vernacular English." *Pragmatics* 2(2), 141-166.
- Mufwene, S. (2000). Some Sociohistorical Inferences about the Development of African American English. In S. Poplack (Ed.), *The English History of African American English* (233-263). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mufwene, S. (2003). The shared ancestry of African-American and American-White Southern Englishes: some speculations dictated by history. In S. J. Nagle and S. L. Sanders (Eds.), *English in the Southern United States* (pp. 64-81). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Myrdal, K. G. (1944). *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York, NY: Harper & Bros.
- Nagle, S. & Sanders, S. (Eds.). (2003). *English in the Southern United States*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Naslund, S.J. (2003). *Four Spirits*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Niebuhr, H. R. (1929). *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Oggs, A. (MS). "Sink or Swim": Exploring the Role of the Swimming Pool in American Integration History, Literature, and Memory. History 7180: Auburn University,

Auburn, AL.

- Outdated separation ends with integrated high school prom.* (2008). Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://blog.nola.com/SELU/2008/05/high_school_holds_its_first_in/print.html
- Patrick, P. (2002). The Speech Community. In J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, and N. Schilling Estes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change* (pp. 573-597). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Paul, J., V. McGhee, and H. Fant. (1960). The Arrival and Ascendence of Black Athletes in the Southeastern Conference, 1966-1980. *Phylon*, 45(4), 284-297.
- Pederson, L. (2001). Dialects. In J. Algeo (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Vol. 6: English in North America* (pp. 253-290). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Phillips, B. (1998). Lexical diffusion is not Lexical Analogy. *Word*, 49(3), 369-381.
- Phillips, B. (2000). Fast Words, Slow Words. *American Speech*. 75(4), 414-416.
- Pitts, Lee. (2007). Black Splash: The History of African-American Swimmers. Retrieved March 29, 2007, from http://www.ishof.org/pdf/black_splash.pdf.
- Pollock, Bailey, Berni, Fletcher, Hinton, Johnson, Roberts, & Weaver. (1998). Phonological Features of African American Vernacular English. Retrieved February 24, 2003, from www.ausp.memphis.edu/phonology/features.htm.
- Poplack, S. (Ed.). (2000). *The English History of African American English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Poplack, S. & Tagliamonte, S. (2001). *African American English in the Diaspora*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Preston, D. (1989). *Perceptual Dialectology: Nonlinguists' Views of Areal Linguistics*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.
- Preston, D. (1996). Where The Worst English is Spoken. In E. Schneider (Ed.), *Focus on the USA* (pp. 297-360). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Preston, D. (1997). The South: The Touchstone. In C. Bernstein, T. Nunnally, & R. Sabino (Eds.), *Language Variety in the South Revisited* (pp. 311-351). Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Preston, D. (1999). *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Preston, D. (2005, April). What Has Folk Linguistics Done For You Lately? Paper presented at SECOL LXXII, NC State.
- Proach, D. (2009). A History of the Black Church in the US: The Roots of African American Christianity. Retrieved May 28, 2012, from <http://suite101.com/article/a-history-of-the-black-church-in-the-us-a91138>
- Reed, J. (1993). *My Tears Spoiled My Aim, and Other Reflections on Southern Culture*. Columbia, MO: U of Missouri P.
- Reid, E. (1978). Social and stylistic variation in the speech of children: Some evidence from Edinburgh. In P. Trudgill (Ed.), *Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English* (pp. 158–171). Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Reimer, S. (2007). Class and Congregations: Class and Religious Affiliation at the Congregational Level of Analysis. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46(4): 583-594.
- Rickford, J. (1997). Prior creolization of African-American Vernacular English? Sociohistorical and textual evidence from the 17th and 18th centuries. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 1(3), 315-336.
- Roberts, D. (2004). Sports in the South. In R. Gray & O. Robinson (Eds.), *A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American South* (pp. 297-316). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sabino, R. (2012). *Language Contact in the West Indies: Giving Jack his Jacket*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Sabino, R, Diamond, M., & Oggs, A. (2004). A quantitative study of plural marking in three non-urban African American language varieties. Paper presented at the Third Conference on Language Varieties in the South (LAVIS III), University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.
- Saito, H. (1999). Dependence and Interaction in Frequency Data Analysis in SLA Research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21, 453-475.
- Schneider, E. (2003). Shakespeare in the Coves and Hollows? Toward a History of Southern English. In S.J. Nagle & S.L. Sanders (Eds.), *English in the Southern United States* (pp. 17-35). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Schneider, E. & Montgomery, M. (2001). On the Trail of Early Nonstandard Grammar: An Electronic Corpus of Southern U.S. Antebellum Overseers' Letters. *American Speech* 76(4), 388-410.

- School plans 1st non-segregated prom. (2007). Retrieved May 28, 2008, from <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/18034102>.
- Shankman, A. (Director). (2007). *Hairspray* [Motion Picture]. United States: New Line Cinema.
- Shopen, Tim. (1978). Research on the variable (ING) in Canberra, Australia. *Talanya*, 5,42–52.
- Shuy, R., Wolfram, W., & Riley, W.K. (1967). Linguistic correlates of social stratification in Detroit speech. USOE Final Report No.6-1347.
- Sledd, James. (1966). Breaking, Umlaut, and the Southern Drawl. *Language*, 42, 18-41.
- Smith, L. (1961). *Killers of the Dream* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Smitherman, G. & Baugh, J. (2002). The Shot Heard from Ann Arbor: Language Research and Public Policy in African America. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 13, 5-24.
- Sport, K. & Hitchcock, B. (Eds.). (1991). *De Remnant Truth: The Tales of Jake Mitchell and Robert Wilton Burton*. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P.
- Sports: Jesse Owens, 1913-1980. (n.d.). *Northwest Travel Magazine Online*. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from <http://www.u-s-history.com/pages/h3746.html>.
- Stein, K. (1986). *Meridian: Alice Walker's Critique of Revolution*. *Black American Literature Forum* 20(1/2), 129-141.
- Stockett, K. (2009). *The Help*. New York, NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Summerlin, N. (1972). *A Dialect Study: Affective Parameters in the Deletion and Substitution of Consonants in the Deep South*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Tate, A. (1970). The Swimmers. In *The Swimmers and Other Selected Poems*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Thomas, E. (2001). *PADS 85: An Acoustic Analysis of Vowel Variation in New World English*. Durham, NC: Duke UP.
- Thomas, E. (2003). Secrets Revealed by Southern Vowel Shifting. *American Speech*, 78(2), 150-170.
- Thomason S. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P.

- Topping, B. (2010). *Social and Linguistic Conditioning of the Sociolinguistic Variable (ai) Among Textile Mill Workers of Columbus, Georgia, and Southeast, Alabama*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Auburn University.
- Trudgill, P. (1974). *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge UP.
- Tucker, S. (1987). A Complex Bond: Southern Black Domestic Workers and Their White Employers. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 9(3), 6-13.
- Tucker, S. (1988). *Telling Memories Among Southern Women: Domestic Workers and Their Employers in the Segregated South*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). Profile of General Demographic Characteristics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.
- U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). *Household Data Annual Averages*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Vadnais, J. (2006). *A Cross Regional Study of Locative to in North Carolina*. Unpublished master's thesis, North Carolina State University.
- Wald, B. & Shopen, T. A researcher's guide to the sociolinguistics variable (ING). In *Style and Variables in English*, T. Shopen and B. Wald (Eds.), Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Pub., Inc.
- Walker, A. (1976). *Meridian*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Werner, R. (2001). The New South Creed and the Limits of Radicalism: Augusta, Georgia, before the 1890s. *The Journal of Southern History*, 67(3), 573-600.
- W.F. Branch High School. (2008). *The Encyclopedia of Arkansas History & Culture*. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from <http://encyclopediaofarkansas.net/encyclopedia/entry-detail.aspx?entryID=4305>
- Wiles, D. (2001). *Freedom Summer*. New York, NY: Atheneum Books for Young Readers.
- Williams, K. (1999, November 18). [Review of the book *Mighty Like a River: The Black Church and Social Reform*, by A. Billingsley]. *New York Amsterdam News*, p. 20.
- Wilson, C. (2005). Nothing prepares young men for the prom. *USAToday.com*. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from <http://cgil.usatoday.com/mchat/20050505001/tscript.htm>
- Wilson, C.R. (Ed.). (1985). *Religion in the South*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi.

- Wilson, C.R. (2004). Southern Religion. In R. Gray & O. Robinson (Eds.), *A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American South* (pp. 238-254). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wolcott, V. W. (2006). Recreation and Race in the Postwar City: Buffalo's 1956 Crystal Beach Riot. *The Journal of American History*, 93(1), 63-90.
- Wolfram, W. (1971). Black-White Speech Differences Revisited. In W. Wolfram and N. H. Clarke (Eds.), *Black-White Speech Relationships* (pp. 139-61). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram, W. (1974). The relationship of white southern speech to vernacular black English. *Language* 50, 498-527.
- Wolfram, W. (2000). Issues in reconstructing Earlier African American English. *World Englishes*, 19(1), 39-58.
- Wolfram, W. (2007). Sociolinguistic Folklore in the Study of African American English. *Language and Linguistic Compass*, 1(4), 292-313.
- Wolfram, Walt. (2008). American English since 1865. In Harulo Momma and Michael Matto, (Eds.), *Blackwell Companion to the History of the English Language* (pp. 254-73). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wolfram, W. and Christian, D. (1976). *Appalachian Speech*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram, W. and Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). *American English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wolfram, W. & Thomas, E. (2002). *The Development of African American English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wolfram, W., Thomas, E., & Green, E. (2000). The regional context of earlier African American speech: Evidence for reconstructing the development of AAVE. *Language in Society*, 29(3), 315-355.
- Woods, H. (1979). *A Socio-Dialectal Survey of the English Spoken in Ottawa: A Study of Sociolinguistic and Stylistic Variation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Woodward, C. V. (1951). *Origins of the New South: 1877-1913*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP.
- Wright, R. (1936). Big Boy Leaves Home. In *Uncle Tom's Children*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Zwicky, A. (2008). What Palin's Gonna Do. *Language Log*. Retrieved June 18, 2012, from languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu

APPENDIX A
INTERVIEW MODULES

Module 1: Pre-Civil Rights/Civil Rights Era Speakers (b. 1906-1963)

Pseudonym: _____

Tape Number: _____

Date: _____

Age/DOB: _____

Ethnicity: _____

Sex: _____

SES: _____ (include info regarding education and occupation; church affiliation)

Interview Questions:

Part One: General History

What events in Elba's history stand out in your mind as most important?

What can you tell me about Elba's floods?

How do you feel that the floods have impacted Elba? What would be different about Elba today if the floods of 1990 and 1998 had not occurred?

More broadly, to what extent do you believe that national events have impacted Elba?

Part Two: Desegregation/Integration

Do you remember much about the judicial decisions rendered and national legislation passed during the Civil Rights Movement?

What would you call the time when blacks and whites⁴² first began to attend school together?

What was Elba like before desegregation/integration (choice of term will depend on interviewee's answer to prior question)? What were these times like?

Did many African Americans work in white homes in Elba? If so, can you characterize these families/homes in terms of social class?

Did African Americans work in your home (if the subject is white)? What was this like (if the subject is white)? How did/do you view your relationship with this person/these people (if the subject is white)? How much time did you spend with this person/these people (if the subject is white)?

What was your occupation during this time (if the subject is African American)? Do you know anyone who worked in the homes of others (as domestic workers) or did you ever work in the home(s) of others (as a domestic worker) (if the subject is African American)? What was this like (if the subject is African American)? What stands out most clearly for you about this time? How did/do you view your relationship with the people who employed you (if the subject is African American)? How much time did you spend with adults (particularly women) in these homes/this home (if the subject is African American)? How much time did you spend with children in these homes/this home (if the subject is African American)?

How old were you during desegregation/integration?

⁴² The terms black and white (rather than African American and European American) were used in the interviews due to community familiarity/comfort with these terms.

What do you remember about this period in Elba's history? Are there any memories of this time that you would like to share with me? Do you have any stories that you would like to tell?

Did you serve Elba in any political capacity during this time?

Did you teach school during this time, have a child in school, or were you in school? What was school like during this time? Do you have any specific memories about school desegregation/integration?

If you left the Mulberry School to attend the previously all white school(s), what was this experience like (for African American subjects)? How did you feel about leaving the Mulberry School? How difficult was the transition? Do you think Mulberry should have been desegregated/integrated? Why or why not?

Do you remember if your prom was affected by desegregation/integration? What about earlier/later proms? Do you think that desegregation/integration has affected how proms are carried out today? How do you feel about interracial dating? How did/do you feel about the results of the vote on interracial marriage in 2000?

What can you tell me about the history of the swimming pools in Elba? Did you frequent the old city pool? Do you remember it being owned by the Brunson family? If so, what can you tell me about the pool during the years that the Brunsons owned it? Do you ever remember any African Americans swimming at the old city pool (if the subject is white)? Do you remember when the country club pool was built? Why do you think this pool was built? What do you remember about the Mulberry Pool? Do you remember when it was built or how long it remained open? Why do you believe this pool was built? Who used it? Did you swim at this pool? Why do you think it remained open for so long? Do you remember when the Hawkins-Williams pool was built? Do you remember any discussion about desegregated/integrated swimming in Elba when the Hawkins-Williams pool opened? Do you remember any concerns being expressed when the Mulberry Pool closed? When do you think a large number of people began to have pools at their homes? Do you have a pool at your home?

Do you attend church? If so, where do you attend church? If you were to describe the churches in Elba based on social class, how would you describe them? Do you think that more churches in Elba will become desegregated/integrated in the future? Do you know anyone who attends a desegregated/integrated church? Do you know much about the black churches in Elba (if the subject is white)? Do you know much about the white churches in Elba (if the subject is black)? Do you remember how churches in Elba reacted to desegregation/integration?

Do you remember anything about sports in Elba during desegregation/integration? How do you feel that desegregation/integration has impacted sports in Elba? What about football? Did desegregation/integration affect the process of selecting homecoming queen in Elba?

On the subject of sports, what do you remember about Shandez Daniels? What do you think people in Elba remember most about him? What do you think the effect of his accident was? Do you believe that his injury impacted Elba in regard to race relations? Do you remember the “fight not riot” incident in Elba? What can you tell me about that event? Do you believe that Shank’s accident brought people together after that event? Overall, how do think that his death affected people in Elba?

How do you feel about race relations in Elba today?

Part Three: Winding Down

Getting back to where we started, how do you feel about the new levee? Do you think there will be another flood in Elba?

Would you like to add anything else?

Module 2: Post-Civil Rights Era Speakers (Younger Adults) (b. 1964-1989/1990)

Pseudonym: _____

Tape Number: _____

Date: _____

Age/DOB: _____

Ethnicity: _____

Sex: _____

SES: _____ (include info regarding education and occupation; church affiliation)

Interview Questions:

Part 1: General History

What do you know about Elba's history? Do your parents or grandparents ever talk about Elba's history? If so, do they mention any specific events?

What do you remember about the floods of 1990 and 1998? Was your home flooded? What do you remember about school during this time? What do you remember about the first year in the new school? Do you have any stories that you would like to share about these floods?

Part 2: Race Relations

What was school in Elba like when you were in elementary, middle, and high school? Who did you socialize with in your extracurricular activities? Did extracurricular activities bring you closer to people you wouldn't have otherwise been friends with? Who did you go out with on the weekends? Do you remember if blacks and whites attended parties together? Who went to your senior parties? Did blacks and whites date? If so, was it accepted? Did blacks and whites go to the prom together? If so, how did people react to this? Do you have children? If so, how do you think school is different/will be different for them than it was for you?

Did you ever swim at the old city pool? If so, what can you tell me about swimming there? Do you remember much about the Mulberry Pool? Did you ever swim there? If so, what can you tell me about swimming there? Why do you think it stayed open so long? Do you remember the Hawkins-Williams Pool being built? Did you swim very often at the Hawkins-Williams Pool? Did you ever hear adults express concerns about blacks and whites swimming together? Were/are you a member of the country club? If so, when did your parents join? Why do you believe they joined? Or, did you join as an adult? If so, why? If you have children, do you take them to the Hawkins-Williams Pool? Did you have a pool at your home growing up? Do you have a pool at your home now? If so, did you build the pool or was it built when you bought the house? If you built the pool, why did you choose to have a pool at home?

Do you attend church? If so, where do you attend church? If you were to describe the churches in Elba based on social class, how would you describe them? Do you think that more churches in Elba will become desegregated/integrated in the future? Do you know anyone who attends a desegregated/integrated church? Do you know much about the black churches in Elba (if the subject is white)? Do you know much about the white churches in Elba (if the subject is black)?

Did anyone work in your home growing up (cleaning, cooking, sewing, etc.)? Does anyone work in this capacity in your home now?

How do you feel about race relations and sports? Do you feel that athletics foster friendships between blacks and whites? If so, why? If not, why not?

Also in regard to sports, do you remember who was elected homecoming queen during your high school years? Do you think that race relations ever impacted this election?

Were there any periods in your life in which you felt that race relations in Elba were tense? Do you remember the “fight not riot” incident in Elba? What can you tell me about this incident? Do you remember any race related incidents that happened the following summer? What can you tell me about these incidents? What do you believe was the cause of these incidents?

What do you remember about Shandez Daniels? What do you think people in Elba remember most about him? How do you think his accident affected people in Elba? Do you think his accident improved race relations in Elba? How do you think his death affected people in Elba?

Have there been any recent incidents that you feel have impacted race relations in Elba? Overall, how would you describe the current situation between blacks and whites in Elba?

Part 3: Winding Down

Getting back to where we started, how do you feel about the new levee? Do you think there will be another flood in Elba?

Is there anything you would like to add?

Module 3: Post-Civil Rights Era Speakers (Adolescents) (b. 1990/1991-1996)

Pseudonym: _____

Tape Number: _____

Date: _____

Age/DOB: _____

Ethnicity: _____

Sex: _____

SES: _____ **(include info regarding parents' education and occupation; church affiliation)**

Interview Questions:

Part 1: General History

What do you know about Elba's history? Do your parents or grandparents ever talk about Elba's history? If so, do they mention any specific events?

Do you remember the 1998 flood? How old were you? Was your home flooded? Do you have any friends whose homes were flooded?

Part 2: Race Relations

Who are your friends? How do you choose your friends? What is high school like today? Do all of the students at school get along?

Who do you sit with at break? Do different groups of people sit in different areas in the lunchroom? Who sits where? Who do you sit with at lunch? If you didn't have to sit with your class, who would you sit with at lunch? What extracurricular activities are you involved in? Who do you socialize with in your extracurricular activities? Would you socialize with these people if you weren't in clubs/organizations/band/sports with them? Who do you go out with on the weekends? Who goes to the same parties? Do blacks and whites go to parties together? Do

blacks and whites date? Are you old enough to go to a prom? Do blacks and whites go to the prom together? If so, is this accepted?

How do you feel about athletics? Do you think that athletics bring black and white students closer together? One the subject of sports, who has been elected homecoming queen while you have been in high school? Have there ever been any problems regarding this election?

Do you ever go swimming? If so, where do you swim? Do you ever swim at the Hawkins-Williams Pool? If not, why not? Are you a member of the country club? Do you have a pool at your home? If so, do you know when it was built?

Do you attend church? If so, what church do you attend? If you were to describe the churches in Elba based on social class, how would you describe them? Do you think that more churches in Elba will become desegregated/integrated in the future? Do you know anyone who attends a desegregated/integrated church? Do you know much about the black churches in Elba (if the subject is white)? Do you know much about the white churches in Elba (if the subject is black)?

Does anyone work in your home (cleaning, cooking, sewing, etc.)?

Do you remember anything about Shandez Daniels? If so, what do you remember about him? Do your parents or older brothers or sisters talk about him? What do they say?

Part 3: Winding Down

Getting back to where we started, how do you feel about the new levee? Do you think there will be another flood in Elbá?

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Module 4: Post-Civil Rights Era Speakers (Children) (b. after 1996)

Pseudonym: _____

Tape Number: _____

Date: _____

Age/DOB: _____

Ethnicity: _____

Sex: _____

SES: _____ **(include info regarding parents' education and occupation; church affiliation)**

Interview Questions:

Part 1: General History

What do you know about Elba's history? Do your parents or grandparents ever talk about Elba's history? If so, do they mention any specific events?

Do your older siblings, parents, or grandparents ever talk about any of the floods in Elba? What do they say about these floods?

Part 2: Race Relations

Who are your friends? How do you choose your friends? What is elementary school like today? Do all of the students at school get along?

Who do you talk to at break? Who would you pick for your team in P.E.? Who would you sit with on a field trip? Who would you invite to your birthday party? Who would you invite over to spend the night?

Do you go swimming? If so, where do you go swimming? Do you ever go to the Hawkins-Williams Pool? If you don't go there, do you know why you don't? Do you go swimming at the country club? Do you have a pool at your house?

Do you go to church? If so, where do you go to church? Who goes to your church? What are the services like? Which of your friends at school go to your church?

Does anyone work in your home (cleaning, cooking, sewing, etc.)?

Do you know the name Shandez Daniels? Do you know who he was?

Part 3: Winding Down

Getting back to where we started, do you know that Elba recently built a new levee? Do you think that Elba will ever flood again? Have you ever heard your parents talk about this possibility?

Would you like to add anything else?

APPENDIX B

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS⁴³

Birth Year	M/F	AA/EA	SES	Church Affiliation	Total (ai)	% [a:]	Total (oi)	% [Λ] & [ɔ]	Total (ING)	% [In]
*1914	M	EA	MC	United Methodist	54	98.15	3	66.67	23	47.83
*1917	F	EA	MC	United Methodist	46	100	4	100	27	77.78
*1918	M	EA	MC	United Methodist	58	93.10	1	100	31	80.65
*1924	F	EA	MC	First Baptist	229	91.70	0	0	93	53.76
*1927	M	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	41	100	1	0	11	72.73
**1928	F	EA	WC	Whitewater Baptist	121	95.87	13	23.08	87	74.71
*1930	M	AA	WC	Harris Temple Church of God & Christ	36	97.22	0	0	4	75
*1934	F	AA	WC	Greater New Zion Baptist	10	100	0	0	7	100
*1936	F	AA	WC	Harris Temple Church of God & Christ	76	97.37	0	0	54	38.89
*1937	M	AA	WC	Greater New Zion Baptist	11	81.82	0	0	2	100
*1938	F	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	18	83.33	2	100	9	77.78
**1939	M	EA	WC	Other	189	100	38	76.32	45	57.78
**1944A	F	EA	WC	Other	163	90.80	1	100	55	85.45
**1944B	M	EA	WC	Other	147	87.76	1	100	79	82.28
*1946A	M	AA	MC	Other	36	86.11	2	100	19	78.95
*1946B	F	AA	MC	Elba Zion Baptist	94	96.81	0	0	55	72.73
*1948A	M	EA	MC	United Methodist	308	94.81	10	40	106	58.49
*1948B	M	EA	MC	First Baptist	20	100	0	0	8	50
**1948C	F	AA	MC	Greater New Zion Baptist	98	72.45	4	75	25	76
*1951A	F	AA	WC	Triumph Church and Kingdom of God & Christ	58	93.10	3	100	30	80
*1951B	F	EA	MC	United Methodist	134	81.34	7	42.86	55	50.91
**1953	M	EA	WC	Basin Baptist	186	95.70	33	69.70	78	79.49
**1954	M	AA	MC	Greater New Zion Baptist	185	72.43	29	86.21	94	73.40
*1956A	F	EA	MC	United Methodist	130	91.54	1	0	68	26.47
*1956B	F	AA	MC	Shady Grove AME	72	86.11	1	100	12	91.67
*1957	M	AA	WC	Shady Grove AME	31	90.32	0	0	21	85.71

⁴³ Interviewed in 2003 (*) or 2008 (**).

*1958A	F	AA	WC	Bethel AME	181	88.40	0	0	85	77.65
**1958B	F	EA	WC	Basin Baptist	187	93.58	32	37.50	79	77.22
*1959	M	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	99	81.82	1	100	54	9.26
*1962	M	AA	WC	Other	36	86.11	0	0	27	62.96
**1964	F	EA	WC	Other	115	99.13	3	66.67	37	89.19
**1965	M	EA	WC	Other	101	100	5	40	47	82.98
**1968A	M	AA	MC	Shady Grove AME	194	83.51	31	64.52	112	89.29
*1968B	M	AA	WC	Bethlehem Baptist	114	94.74	3	0	57	82.46
**1969	F	AA	WC	Elba Zion Baptist	186	81.72	33	75.76	68	94.12
*1972A	M	EA	MC	Other	51	92.16	2	0	31	48.39
*1972B	F	EA	MC	Other	360	93.33	6	0	150	52.67
**1973	F	EA	WC	Other	192	100	26	46.15	96	76.04
**1975	M	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	184	60.87	36	63.89	88	79.55
*1977	F	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	41	85.37	1	0	11	81.82
*1978	M	EA	MC	First Baptist	158	84.18	1	0	42	47.62
**1979A	M	EA	WC	Other	120	95	1	0	54	79.63
*1979B	M	AA	WC	Bethel AME	81	87.65	2	50	56	64.29
**1980A	F	EA	WC	Basin Baptist	124	94.35	9	22.22	53	92.45
**1980B	F	AA	WC	Oak Grove	185	51.89	29	6.90	66	68.18
*1980C	F	EA	MC	United Methodist	225	90.67	0	0	79	56.96
**1982A	M	EA	WC	Other	194	100	35	57.14	59	84.75
*1982B	F	EA	MC	United Methodist	37	94.59	0	0	12	58.33
**1983	F	AA	MC	Springfield Baptist	179	74.30	34	14.71	60	73.33
*1985	F	AA	MC	New Philadelphia Church of God & Christ	81	88.89	2	0	34	70.59
**1990A	F	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	188	67.02	32	37.50	76	85.53
**1990B	M	AA	WC	Nazareth Baptist	268	59.70	30	50	108	89.81
*1990C	M	EA	MC	United Methodist	80	87.50	1	0	29	58.62
**1990D	F	AA	WC	Bethel AME	116	71.55	4	50	26	73.08
**1990E	F	AA	WC	Greater New Zion Baptist	358	68.99	41	24.39	134	80.60
**1990F	F	EA	WC	Other	285	97.19	30	40	119	87.39
**1991A	F	EA	MC	First Baptist/Covenant Community	319	90.28	35	20	123	78.86
**1991B	M	AA	MC	Oak Grove	195	64.62	38	28.95	55	78.18
**1991C	M	AA	WC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	219	61.19	29	65.52	74	87.84
**1991D	M	EA	WC	Shiloh Baptist	206	99.03	3	0	52	92.31
**1991E	M	EA	WC	Other	114	100	6	0	24	8.33
**1991F	F	EA	WC	Basin Baptist	310	90	30	23.33	69	75.36
**1993	M	AA	MC	Rocky Head Missionary Baptist	155	78.71	2	0	40	92.50
**1997	M	EA	MC	Other	155	98.06	1	0	21	80.95

APPENDIX C

WORD LIST

Floods	School/ Local Community	Other Communi- ties	Football	Politics	Church	Food/ Cooking	Miscellaneous
Raining	Elba High School	Ino	Mighty Tigers	Politicking	Singing	Ice Cream	Asteroid
Moist Soil	School Building	Enterprise	Fighting Tigers	Appoint	A Singing	Lima Beans	Boyfriend
Pouring	PTA Meeting	Zion Chapel	Friday Night Football Fever	Public Voice	Joyful Noise	Fried Chicken	Boxing
Flowing	Join Clubs	Troy	Tiger Time	Voting	Praying	Sweet Potato Pie	Choice
Thundering & Lightning	Vending Machine	Pike County	Linebacker		Camp Meeting Month	Boiled Peanuts	Coil
Rising River	Prom Night	Point A (Gantt)	Tight End		Revival	Thanksgiving	Coin
Sirens	Elba Skating Rink		Line Drive		Thy Word	Tinfoil	Coincide
Flooding	Thriving Community		Running Back			Broil	Desegregation
Floating			Yard Line			Parboil	Driving
Wading in			Wide Open			Spoil	Embroider
I waded in						Spoiled	Exploit
1929							I
1990							I'd
1998							I'll
Floodwaters Subside							I'm
Property Destroyed							I've
Drying out							I walked
Cleaning up							Joint
							Like
							My way
							Oil Rig
							Power Steering
							Sleeping
							Suggin

							Skank
							Toil
							Toilet
							Trying
							Turmoil

APPENDIX D

READING PASSAGE⁴⁴

There are about forty-nine types of roaches in Alabama. They are found everywhere. Some you might find on top of your table. Some just find you. If you sleep on a cot, you're better off on one that has a little more height. It's safe to say you can get caught on a cot.

One way to get rid of roaches is to get a cat. A cat can kill a roach with one swat. They'll kill roaches just out of spite. I recommend cats. If you don't like them, you can go fly a kite. One or the other, because kites and cats don't really mix.

Lots of people like kites and try to fly them often. That's just how they are. Lots of people are a lot like roaches in terms of their intelligence.

Some roaches fly around. They are usually large and easy to spot. When you have those roaches, I recommend that you wear a hat at all times. It is not always comfortable to wear hats: for example, it might be too hot for a hat.

Maybe you should just keep a flyswatter around.

⁴⁴ Created by Auburn University student Russell Higgins for a course project