Dissertation Proposal: The relationship between ethnicity and French in Louisiana

Joshua McNeill

March 17, 2022

The idea of Louisiana in the public imagination is most often rather that of South Louisiana and the New Orleans metropolitan area, the former as shown in Figure 1 and the latter just east of the South Louisiana outline on the southern border of Lake Pontchartrain. Indeed, the boundary between North and South Louisiana is traditionally a division in culinary practices, religion, and language (Trépanier, 1988, p. 309), where those cultural features that most distinguish Louisiana from the rest of the Deep South are those of South Louisiana. This has led to a situation where even South Louisiana locals will sometimes derisively refer to North Louisiana as "South Arkansas", a reference to the perceived indistinguishability of North Louisiana from the rest of the mostly Anglo, Protestant American South. For sociolinguists, South Louisiana is of interest for two reasons: The two major local ethnic categories – Creole and Cajun – have over time been redefined to align with the Black and White American racial binary, respectively, and French is spoken there as a heritage language where it was the dominant language as recently as the mid 20th century.

Figure 1: Map of South Louisiana, also referred to as Acadiana

This context provides an opportunity to better understand the salience and persistence of local ethnic categories both in the face of the imposition of broader racial categories and in a linguistically tenuous situation. In particular, this study will focus on whether and to what extent the general social segregation of Black and White Americans in the United States (J. A. Smith et al., 2014) has been recapitulated between Creoles and Cajuns and found expression in the linguistic patterns of Creoles and Cajuns. This subject will be approached by submitting data collected from around Lafayette Parish in South Louisiana to traditional variationist methodology, social network analysis, and textual analysis cenetered around subject pronouns as linguistic variables, as these have been found to vary along ethnic lines in other contexts (Dajko, 2009; Rottet, 1995), and ethnicity and race as the primary social variables.

1 Ethnicity and race in South Louisiana

The complexity of ethnicity in South Louisiana is perhaps due to the variety of colonizing forces that have controlled it as well as immigration patterns. It was initially colonized by France, who turned over control to Spain in the 1760s, who then gave control of the region back to France very shortly before France sold it to the United States in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 (Fortier, 1884; Johnson, 1976; Klingler, 2003a). Additionally, Louisiana has been the landing point for influxes of people from Saint-Domingue[1] after the slave revolts (Debien & Le Gardeur, 1981, as cited in Klingler, 2003a), Acadia[2] after the mass expulsion known as the *Grand dérangement* (Fortier, 1884; Klingler, 2003a; Neumann, 1985), and even the Canary Islands (Klingler, 2003a). The result has been the formation of two general South Louisiana ethnic categories – Cajun and Creole – which have come to be redefined by the introduction of the Black-White racial binary of the United States (Dajko, 2012). The overarching goal of this study is to better understand, through the lense of French subject pronoun variation, to what extent this racial binary has led to similar boundaries being drawn between Cajuns and Creoles, and so it is important to understand how Cajuns and Creoles have been defined.

The typical description of Cajuns is that of a poor, isolated, and stigmatized people. This negative evaluation, however, began shifting towards being more positive in the 1960s with the establishment of the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL) (R. A. Brown, 1988, pp. 31-33), which also brought with it the Americanization of the group. Criteria for membership once included speaking French, being rural, being Catholic, and especially having Acadian ancestry (Johnson, 1976; Neumann, 1985; H. Smith & Phillips, 1939). The assimilation of South Louisiana into the broader American culture, however,

[1] Present day Haiti.
[2] Roughly the present-day provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in Canada.

has brought with it the American Black-White racial binary resulting in a shift towards membership being strongly based on being White. For instance, research participants who self-identify as either Creole or Black have been reported as often defining Cajuns as White and Creoles as Black (Giancarlo, 2019, p. 34), which has been the case even for participants who have acknowledged that Cajuns may be darker skinned Whites and Creoles may be lighter skinned Blacks (Stanford, 2016, as cited in Giancarlo, 2019, p. 32).

The definition of Creoles has changed even more dramatically over time than the definition of Cajuns. In the early colonial history of Louisiana, the term Creole was applied to White people of French and Spanish descent (Fortier, 1884, p. 98; Kein, 2000, as cited in Susberry 2004, pp. 7-8), matching how some still define Creoles today. Free, mixed-race people were not at that time called Creoles but were rather derisively called mulattos, quadroons, and octoroons. The negative stigma associated with these terms, however, led Free People of Color to eventually co-opt the term Creole for themselves (Martin, 2000, as cited in Susberry, 2004, pp. 7-8), creating a three tier racial system that consisted of Whites at the top, Creoles in the middle, and Blacks (i.e., slaves) at the bottom. By the 20th century, though, there were strong societal forces in Louisiana pushing to have mixed-race Creoles identified simply as Black, which some resented (Susberry, 2004, pp. 12-13), The result is a situation today in which Creoles may racially define themselves any number of ways, such as White, Black, Creole, fluid, etc. (Susberry, 2004), though society likely treats them all as simply Black. Like with Cajuns, where part of the definition of a Creole also included being francophone or creolophone (Neumann, 1985, p. 11), the racial criteria for membership has effectively subsumed all other.

2 Louisiana French

Some Cajuns and Creoles do still speak French today, despite this no longer being a necessary criteria for membership, though it is likely a sufficient criteria for membership when met. The French variety that would gain one access to membership in one of these groups is specifically Louisiana French, which is sometimes also referred to as Cajun French[3]. Traditionally, there have in fact been three French-based language varieties delineated in Louisiana: Colonial or Plantation French, Louisiana French, and Louisiana Creole. Colonial French is thought to be all but extinct but was spoken primarily by recent French immigrants after the Louisiana Purchase. While there are still francophone immigrants coming to Louisiana even today, they have not coalesced around a variety that might still be called Colonial French but have instead continued to speak a wide range of French varieties. Louisiana French, is the French variety that was the

[3]It is somewhat of a *faux pas* to use this term today as it presumes that all speakers are Cajuns and all non-Cajuns are non-speakers, though even local francophones will still sometimes use the term.

dominant language of rural South Louisiana up until the mid 20th century. Finally, Louisiana Creole is a French-based creole that has similarities with other Atlantic French-based creoles such as Haitian Creole but is not likely to be related to them (Dajko, 2012, pp. 280-281).

The linguistic focus of this study will be on ethnic variation in subject pronouns in Louisiana French, the variety being broadly defined, meaning Louisiana Creole will not be excluded as these two varieties are quite close structurally, particularly in the parishes that are adjacent to Lafayette Parish where participants will be sought out. Indeed, in cases of code-switching between Louisiana French and Louisiana Creole, it can be extremely difficult to distinguish where one variety ends and another begins (Klingler, 2005) as there are very few lexical differences (Neumann, 1985, p. 52; Rottet, 2000, as cited in Klingler, 2005, p. 352). It has also been noted that Louisiana French displays syntactic features that are closer to Louisiana Creole than other varieties of French in parishes where the two are in contact (Baronian, 2005). Furthermore, speakers and sometimes even researchers have defined these two varieties more by who the speaker is than by their linguistic structures in the sense that Creoles are said to speak Louisiana Creole even when their speech patterns resemble French and Cajuns are said to speak Louisiana French even when their speech patterns resemble Creole (R. A. Brown, 1988, p. 5; Klingler, 2003b). Given these facts as well as claims that the two varieties are mutually intelligible (Neumann, 1985, p. 29), excluding Louisiana Creole would be difficult at best and questionable at worst, and so "Louisiana French" here may include speech that appears Creole-like.

Louisiana French differs from varieties of French spoken outside of Louisiana in several ways, but there is also variation within Louisiana itself. Some of the more salient features that set Louisiana French apart from varieties such as Quebec French or Hexagonal French[4], though some of these features can appear in other varieties, include an explicit progressive construction using the preposition *après* as in sentence 1 (Papen & Rottet, 1997), /ʒ/ produced as [h] (Carmichael & Gudmestad, 2019; Papen & Rottet, 1997), the flap [ɾ] where most varieties have [ʁ] or [ʁ] (Blainey, 2013), and importantly for the present study, a unique subject pronoun system that includes items such as *ça* being used for animate 3rd person plural referents whereas this pronoun is generally reserved for inanimate singular referents in other varieties (Dajko, 2009; Rottet, 1995). The subject pronoun system is one that has been found that be variable within Louisiana French itself, as will be discussed in detail below.

1. il (est) après manger
   he is after to eat
   'He is eating.'

[4]French as spoken in France.

Table 1: The subject pronoun system of Louisiana French

Variable	Description	Variants
(1sg)	1st person singular	*je*, *mo*, *ø*
(2sg.T)	2nd person singular T form	*tu*, *to*
(2sg.V)	2nd person singular V form	*vous*, *tu*, *to*
(3sg.AF)	3rd person singular animate feminine	*elle*, *li*
(3sg.AM)	3rd person singular animate masculine	*il*, *li*
(3sg.IF)	3rd person singular inanimate feminine	*ça*, *elle*, *li*
(3sg.IM)	3rd person singular inanimate masculline	*ça*, *il*, *li*
(1pl)	1st person plural	*nous*, *nous-autres*, *on*
(2pl)	2nd person plural	*vous*, *vous-autres*, *zo*, *tu*
(3pl.F)	3rd person plural feminine	*elles*, *ça*, *eux*, *eux-autres*, *yé*
(3pl.M)	3rd person plural masculine	*ils*, *ça*, *eux*, *eux-autres*, *yé*

2.1 Ethnicity and subject pronouns

Subject pronouns in the French spoken in South Louisiana, summarized in Table 1, have previously been found to vary according to the ethnicity of the speaker (Dajko, 2009; Rottet, 1995), though the ethnic groups included in these studies have been Cajuns and Houma Indians, who have not been oppositionally racialized in the way Cajuns and Creoles have. The results from these previous studies demonstrate however that subject pronouns can work as indexicals on some level in Louisiana French. Furthermore, as working with Creoles also implicates Louisiana Creole and the subject pronouns often associated with that variety, as will be discussed below, subject pronouns would be a likely place to find expression of a Black-White segregation being applied to Cajuns and Creoles if such a segregation exists.

In general, 3rd person plural subject pronouns have been found to be the locus of ethnic variation in the Louisiana French subject pronoun system. Rottet (1995) found Houma Indians to strongly prefer *eux* whereas Cajuns were relatively split across *ils*, *ça*, *eux*, and *eux-autres*. Dajko's (2009) results were much the same with Houma Indians using more *eux*, though Cajuns had moved towards preferring *eux*, as well, since the time of Rottet's (1995) study. The variant *yé* was not considered as it is described in grammars as a marker of Louisiana Creole rather than Louisiana French (Klingler, 2003a; Neumann, 1985).

Indeed, several of the pronouns listed in Table 1 – *to*, *li*, *zo*, *yé* – come from descriptions of Louisiana Creole and not Louisiana French, though they are not exclusive to Louisiana Creole. Rottet (1995) himself reported the use of *mo* as a variant despite it being a common marker of Louisiana Creole. Klingler (2005), for example, described *mo* as a "*variante créole*" 'Creole variant' and *je* as a "*variante cadienne*" 'Cajun variant' (i.e., French variant) in his examination of how to delineate between Louisiana Creole and Louisiana French in instances of code-switching (p. 355). In light of the stronger presence of Creoles and people who claim to speaker Louisiana Creole in the parishes around Lafayette, where this study will take place, as well as the conflation of speaker identity with the label they use to describe their language and the similarities between

the two language varieties, maintaining these more Creole-oriented subject pronouns in the analysis for the present study is not only appropriate but may yield ethnically conditioned variation across more subject pronouns that just the 3rd person plural. Specifically, the first research question here is the following:

RQ1: Do subject pronouns vary in Louisiana French between Cajun and Creole speakers, and what role does race play in this variation?

3 Personal social networks

While analyzing personal social networks and asking if ethnicity is a predictor for subject pronoun usage will provide evidence for or against the idea that Cajuns and Creoles are segregated from each other in the same way that Blacks and Whites tend to be in the United States generally, greater depth will be given to the results by also employing social network analysis to examine the ethnic make-up of personal networks. For instance, a case where ethnicity proves to be a good predictor for subject pronoun usage would suggest that ethnic groups are segregated into networks with a great amount of homophily. However, this is not inevitable as speakers are not precluded from using variants that index their ethnicity versus another even when regularly interacted with members of another ethnic group. Social network analysis therefore provides the ability to search for associations between the homophily of speakers' networks and the pronoun variants they use. Additionally, while work in sociolinguistics has previously been done using the ethnic make-up of personal networks (Holliday, 2016; Li et al., 2000; Sharma, 2017; Zhang, 2012), it has not been done in Louisiana and has more often been done in order to better understand phenomena such as language choice rather than variation within a variety, making the analysis here an useful addition to the literature.

Although almost no explicit social network analysis has been carried out on the ethnic and racial composition of personal social networks in South Louisiana, there have been observations and analyses that suggest some qualities of these social networks. As briefly mentioned in Section 1, a common theme in describing Louisiana social networks is the idea of isolation. For instance, Gold (1979) described the area around Mamou in Evangeline Parish as consisting of many close knit, isolated sharecropping neighborhoods surrounding the town (p. 272) until residents began migrating into Mamou starting around 1945 (p. 270). This arrangement would presumably repeat over much of South Louisiana given that it has been estimated that 60% of the population once lived in rural areas (Bobo & Charlton, 1974, as cited in Johnson, 1976, p. 27). Moreover, smaller towns such as Mamou have been said to themselves be isolated from larger cities such as Lafayette (Gold, 1979, p. 268), which H. Smith and Phillips (1939) argued was the result of

French-speaking South Louisianians being farmers of singular cash crops, meaning what money they did make was spent on foods that they themselves did not grow but needed for sustenance (p. 198). This sort of isolation was relieved later on when highways were finally built connecting places like Mamou to bigger cities (Gold, 1979, p. 268).

It has been argued that this general isolation had ended entirely by the 1980s, at least for Cajuns (Esman, 1985, as cited in R. A. Brown, 1988, p. 25), though there are certainly still isolated communities in South Louisiana. For instance, Rottet (1995) described Houma Indians as living primarily in "subcommunities" (p. 130) "at the far ends of the bayous" (p. 57) in Southeast Louisiana. Indeed, this was something of a confounding factor in his results showing different linguistic behavior between Houma Indians and Cajuns as the two groups were also geographically separated.

Perhaps the most relevant work on social networks in Louisiana for the present study comes from Beggs et al.'s (1996) study of the distinctiveness of rural versus urban communities. While their focus was not on the ethnic or racial make-up of personal networks, they did provide data on this characteristic which they simplified into a measure of whether personal networks were primarily White, non-White, or mixed. The results showed that, at the time in the two rural southwestern Louisiana parishes that they surveyed, personal networks were very racially homogenous, more so than personal networks in urban areas and more so even than personal networks in rural areas generally in the United States. To the extent that Cajun and Creole identities had been collapsed into White and Black by then, respectively, this would suggest that it was not particularly common for Cajuns and Creoles to associate in 1992 when the survey interviews took place, though this is admittedly an extrapolation. Either way, the ethnic make-up of these networks today is not clear, and better understanding this characteristic of Cajuns' and Creoles' networks clarify what Beggs et al.'s (1996) results meant for ethnicity and/or whether they still hold. As such, the second research question of this study is the following:

RQ2: How does the homophily or lack thereof in the ethnic make-up of personal networks among French speakers in South Louisiana relate to variation in subject pronoun usage?

4 Views on ethnicity and race

Asking whether ethnicity is a predictor for subject pronoun usage and asking what the ethnic make-up of personal social networks looks like will generate a reliable description of whether Cajuns and Creoles are socially segregated, but it will not explain why this situation is as it is. The way speakers discuss ethnicity and race could provide some insight, though. This will be especially important in cases where

ethnicity's predictive value for subject pronoun usage does not match the expectations one would then have for personal networks. For example, if pronoun usage were to vary neatly according to ethnicity so that Creoles use one set of pronouns and Cajuns another, the expectation would be that personal networks would show strong homophily as a lack of interaction between the groups would explain why they speak differently. However, as was mentioned in Section 3, this result is not inevitable and there may indeed be substantial heterophily in personal networks instead. A qualitative examination of the way participants speak about these relationships would help explain such a result as well as the more expected results.

Previous qualitative work on Creole and Cajun relations suggests that the two groups share habits and traditions but also that there is a sense that they are not the same regardless. For instance, Spitzer (1977) and Esman (1985) both reported that Blacks, presumably those who by that time would be identified as Creoles, partook in Cajun culture (as cited in R. A. Brown, 1988, p. 43). There is an assumption here of what constitutes culture that specifically belongs to Cajuns and what does not, but regardless of ownership, the two groups were described as having cultural similarities.

The question of cultural ownership does, however, still suggest an oppositional relationship between Creoles and Cajuns. Since the 1960s, Cajun stigma has progressively subsided and pride has replaced it. This shift has resulted in nearly all cultural exports and landmarks being branded as Cajun to the contention of at least some Creoles (Giancarlo, 2019). For instance, study participants as well as scholars have argued that food that is branded as Cajun is actually Creole (Giancarlo, 2019, pp. 39-40). While this clearly suggests oppositional stances, it is also more evidence of shared cultural traditions in food. Likewise, the term *Cajun* was used when naming several locations at the University of Louisiana Lafayette, such as the civic center being named the Cajundome. The ire this caused among Creoles was enough that they rerouted their Mardi Gras parade to bypass the civic center. On the other side, Ancelet (1992), a noted Cajun folklore scholar, publicly suggested that this ire might just be the result of reverse racism (Giancarlo, 2019, p. 36).

Previous studies have therefore given some indications that Creoles and Cajuns have much in common but also that they sometimes take up oppositional positions to each other. However, it would be difficult to extrapolate from the way others have been reported discussing ethnicity in Louisiana to how the participants for the present study view ethnic relationships in order to better understand their subject pronoun usage and personal network compositions. Therefore, the third research question of this study is the following:

RQ3: What do Louisiana French speakers participating in this study have to say about ethnicity and race?

5 Methods

To respond to the research questions above, variationist study design will be used, meaning participants will be recruited, interviews will be conducted and recorded, and the data will be analyzed statistically and textually. Research questions 1 and 2 are quantitative in nature and so will be given statistical treatments, whereas research question 3 will be given a qualitative treatment. The aim is to get a broad picture of how ethnicity interacts with Louisiana French subject pronoun usage and what those interactions might mean about the relationship between Creoles and Cajuns.

5.1 Lafayette and the surrounding parishes

The data that will be used for this study will come primarily from the parishes surrounding Lafayette Parish in the heart of South Louisiana as well as from Lafayette Parish itself. These parishes have been chosen for the high likelihood that both people identifying as Cajuns and Creoles will be found there. As practically all of South Louisiana has been branded Cajun (Giancarlo, 2019), members of this ethnic group can be found most anywhere. However, those identifying as Creoles are not found everywhere. Both Rottet (1995) and Dajko (2009), collecting data from Southeast Louisiana, relied on Cajuns and Houma Indians for ethnic categories as they did not find Creoles who spoke French in this region. On the other hand, the most comprehensive descriptions of Louisiana Creole came from data gathered in Pointe Coupee Parish (Klingler, 2003a) and St Martin Parish (Neumann, 1985), the latter of which is adjacent to Lafayette Parish. Given the tendency of speakers to conflate their ethnic identities with what they call their language varieties (R. A. Brown, 1988, p. 5; Klingler, 2003b), it is reasonable to assume this to mean that there are also self-identifying Creoles residing in these areas. Other parishes where it has been noted that Louisiana Creole is spoken include St James Parish and Cameron Parish (Rottet, 1995, p. 7). Additionally, descriptive linguistic work has been done in Opelousas in St Landry Parish that specifically relied on finding French speakers who identified as Creoles (Klingler, 2003b). Of the parishes mentioned, St Landry Parish and St Martin Parish are directly adjacent to Lafayette Parish while the rest are more distant with Pointe Coupee Parish being the next closest as it is adjacent to both St Landry and St Martin.

5.2 Sampling

In previous work in rural South Louisiana, snowball sampling has proven effective (R. A. Brown, 1988; Giancarlo, 2019; Rottet, 1995), so this approach will be used in the present study, as well, albeit taking several different starting points. One advantage of this approach is that, while personal social networks

rather than entire community networks are of interest in the present study, it could still be advantageous to see some overlap in personal networks. On the other hand, using different starting points will lend itself to approaching a balanced sample though likely not a true representative sample. The only characteristic participants need have in order to be included is that they identify as either Cajun or Creole regardless of any other identifications they might have, which will be used as a factor in statistical analyses.

5.3 Social variables

Race, which will be another factor in analyses, will on the other hand be self-identified by participants through an open-ended question as open-ended questions have been found to produce more accurate reporting than closed-ended questions (Cobb, 2018, p. 434). As has been suggested in sociolinguistic research on biracial people (Holliday, 2019) and has been shown for Creoles in particular (Susberry, 2004), there are many ways that mixed-race people may choose to racially identify. Ultimately, race will be coded using Rockquemore and Brunsma's (2007) typology wherein one may have a singular racial identity (in this case, likely Black or White), a border racial identity (i.e., consistently identifying as mixed, in this case, likely Creole), a protean racial identity (i.e., changing relative to the situation), or a transcendent racial identity (i.e., rejecting race as a concept altogether).

Other demographic information about participants that will be collected will include age, residence, where they were raised, profession, and education. In previous studies, age was shown to be an important factor in subject pronoun variation (Rottet, 1995). Profession and education were not included in previous work due to reports from participants that socioeconomic differences were a relatively recent phenomenon in rural Louisiana (Dajko, 2009, p. 66; Rottet, 1995, p. 64), though they will be included in the present study for completeness.

Outside of the demographics of participants, the ethnic and racial characteristics of those they name as part of their personal networks (i.e., who are called the participants' alters) will be obtained. This information will be gathered from the participants themselves rather than from those alters directly. While this potentially yields categories that do not match would those alters would have given, this is not expected to be problematic. As has been noted in the literature (Stark, 2018, pp. 245-246), the participants' perception of the characteristics of those in their network is often more meaningful than their true characteristics, and that is likely to hold true for the present study. Furthermore, surveys participants' reports on relatively fixed details of non-participants who are close to them have proven to be nearly as accurate as what would have been reported by the non-participants themselves (Cobb, 2018).

5.4 Linguistic variables

Table 1 outlines the 11 dependent linguistic variables that will be analyzed in this study. Some of these are, however, expected to collapse and are included here more for completeness and to avoid assumptions. To start, gender in the 3rd person singular pronouns is not likely to be overtly expressed as *elle* and *il*, the only two variants that are particular to one gender or the other, are not commonly used for inanimate referents in French outside of writing, and most Louisiana French speakers are not literate in French. Likewise, gender in 3rd person plural pronouns is not often expressed in any variety of French as the feminine form *elles* is reserved for groups in which the referents are all feminine, whereas *ils* is used if any referent at all is masculine. This is also the case in Louisiana French, which goes further in providing several other variants for 3rd person plural that are unmarked for gender. Table 2 therefore summarizes the linguistic variables that are expected to collapse in the data.

Table 2: Linguistic variables that are expected to collapse into single variables

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{3sg.IF}) + (\text{3sg.IM}) \rightarrow (\text{3sg.I}) \\ &(\text{3pl.F}) + (\text{3pl.M}) \rightarrow (\text{3pl}) \end{aligned}$$

Structural independent variables will also be included, namely the type of verb following the pronoun, be it a lexical verb, modal verb, or auxiliary verb. Personal experience and a small pilot study revealed that the use of *ils* for the 3rd person plural is heavily favored before the auxiliary verbs *être* 'to be' and *avoir* 'to have' even when it is disfavored for all other verbs types.

5.5 Data collection

All demographic, social network, and linguistic data will be collected through semi-structured sociolinguistic interviews. Interviews will be conducted one-on-one by myself in Louisiana French with the goal of collecting at least 30 hours of speech, ideally collecting 45-60 minutes from each speaker. To avoid the potential of my own subject pronoun patterns influencing the pronouns used by participants, effort will be taken in the interviews to both avoid using many pronouns myself, instead defaulting to naming referents, and to match the pronouns being used by the participants when I do use pronouns myself.

Interviews will begin with collecting demographic information other than race followed by casual conversation until discussing ethnicity and race in the later portions of the interviews and finally questions about social networks alters. In particular, as a wide-range of subject pronouns are desired, the casual conversation section will lean towards asking participants to relate stories that might involve describing events from different points of view.

Social networks questions will follow the typical practice of using a name-generator question to obtain alters followed by the name-interpreter questions to obtain details of those alters. While using computer technology to ask these questions likely reduces the mental burden placed on participants (Stark & Krosnick, 2017, as cited in Stark, 2018, pp. 248-249), these questions will instead be asked orally as many of the participants will likely be advanced in age and perhaps uncomfortable with computers. Additionally, asking orally allows the questions to be posed in French as most Louisiana French speakers do not read and write in French. This is beneficial as it keeps them in the French mode during the interview and will possibly cause them to report more of the francophones to whom they are close than they might otherwise do. Additionally, when posing name-interpreter questions, the participant will be asked to give one type of characteristic for all their alters before moving on to the next type of characteristic as this is known to yield data with more validity (Coromina & Coenders, 2006; Vehovar et al., 2008, both as cited in Stark, 2018, p. 247). The exact name-generator and name-interpreter questions to be used, as well as the rest of the interview module, are included in Appendix A.

5.6 Analyses

As this study is mostly quantitative in nature, fairly standard variationist methodology will be used in the analysis. Each person-number possibility for subject pronouns will act as a linguistic variable with the exception of 2nd person singular and 3rd person singular. In the former case, there will be two linguistic variables, one for the T term of address and one for the V term of address (R. Brown & Gilman, 1960). In the latter case, there will be four linguistic variables, each consisting of *li* versus one of the four other subject pronouns.

Given the lower frequency of morphosyntactic variables in speech than phonetic variables, it is possible that much of the quantitative analyses in this study will have to rely on simple proportions rather than robust statistical modeling. In the event that a sufficient token count is obtained for any variable, however, mixed-effects models will be constructed to better establish which social factors, if any, are associated with which pronoun variants.

6 Impact of the study

This study aims to expand researchers' understanding of how complex ethnicities interact with language variation as well as the role that race plays in those interactions through analyzing a rich sociolinguistic environment: South Louisiana. The relationship between the ethnic groups chosen for this study – Cajuns

and Creoles – is furthermore one that is well worth exploring more in terms of what it means for social equity. These groups have been pushed more and more into the racial binary system of the general US, and as has been shown (Giancarlo, 2019), the sort of marginalization that comes along with that system also exists in Louisiana. Finally, as Louisiana French is in all likelihood a heritage language at this point, results from this study may inform research on heritage languages and how ethnicity interacts with their structures generally.

References

Baronian, L. V. (2005). Une influence probable du créole louisianais sur le français cadien. *La Linguistique*, *41*(1), 133–140. https://doi.org/10.2307/40605062

Beggs, J. J., Haines, V. A., & Hurlbert, J. S. (1996). Revisiting the Rural-Urban Contrast: Personal Networks in Nonmetropolitan and Metropolitan Settings. *Rural Sociology*, *61*(2), 306–325. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.1996.tb00622.x

Blainey, D. L. (2013). *First to come, last to go: Phonological change and resilience in Louisiana regional French* (PhD). Tulane University. New Orleans, LA.

Brown, R. A. (1988). *Pronominal equivalence in a variable syntax* (PhD). University of Texas at Austin. Austin, TX.

Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 252–281). The MIT Press.

Carmichael, K., & Gudmestad, A. (2019). Language Death and Subject Expression: First-person-singular subjects in a declining dialect of Louisiana French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, *29*(1), 67–91. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959269518000236

Cobb, C. (2018). Proxy Reporting. In D. L. Vannette & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Survey Research* (pp. 427–437). Springer International Publishing.

Dajko, N. (2009). *Ethnic and geographic variation in the French of the Lafourche Basin* (PhD). Tulane University. New Orleans, LA.

Dajko, N. (2012). Sociolinguistics of Ethnicity in Francophone Louisiana. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *6*(5), 279–295. https://doi.org/10.1002/lnc3.333

Fortier, A. (1884). The French Language in Louisiana and the Negro-French Dialect. *Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America*, *1*, 96–111. https://doi.org/10.2307/456001

Giancarlo, A. (2019). “Don’t call me a Cajun!”: Race and representation in Louisiana’s Acadiana region. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, *36*(1), 23–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/08873631.2018.1500088

Gold, G. (1979). The French Frontier of Settlement in Louisiana: Some Observations on Cultural Change in Mamou Prairie. *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, *23*(59), 263–280. https://doi.org/10.7202/021437ar

Holliday, N. R. (2019). Multiracial identity and racial complexity in sociolinguistic variation. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *13*(8), e12345. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12345

Holliday, N. R. (2016). *Intonational Variation, Linguistic Style and the Black/Biracial Experience* (PhD). New York University. New York, NY.

Johnson, J. (1976). The Louisiana French. *Contemporary French Civilization*, *1*(1), 19–39. https://doi.org/10.3828/cfc.1976.1.1.003

Klingler, T. A. (2003a). *If I Could Turn My Tongue Like That: The Creole Language of Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana*. LSU Press.

Klingler, T. A. (2003b). Language labels and language use among Cajuns and Creoles in Louisiana. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *9*(2), 77–90.

Klingler, T. A. (2005). Le problème de la démarcation des variétés de langues en Louisiane: Étiquettes et usages linguistiques. In A. Valdman, J. Auger, & D. Piston-Hatlen (Eds.), *Le français en Amérique du Nord: État-présent* (pp. 349–367). Presses de l'Université Laval.

Li, W., Milroy, L., & Sin Ching, P. (2000). A two-step sociolinguistic analysis of code-switching and language choice: The example of a bilingual Chinese community in Britain [origdate = 1992]. In W. Li (Ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader* (pp. 175–197). Routledge.

Neumann, I. (1985). *Le créole de Breaux Bridge, Louisiane: Étude morphosyntaxique, textes, vocabulaire*. Helmut Buske.

Papen, R. A., & Rottet, K. J. (1997). A Structural Sketch of the Cajun French Spoken in Lafourche and Terrebonne Parishes. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *French and Creole in Louisiana* (pp. 47–70). Plenum Press.

Rockquemore, K. A., & Brunsma, D. L. (2007). *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Rottet, K. J. (1995). *Language shift and language death in the Cajun French-speaking communities of Terrebonne and Lafourche parishes, Louisiana* (PhD). University of Indiana. Bloomington, IN.

Sharma, D. (2017). Scalar effects of social networks on language variation. *Language Variation and Change*, *29*(3), 393–418. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394517000205

Smith, H., & Phillips, H. (1939). The Influence of English on Louisiana 'Cajun' French in Evangeline Parish. *American Speech*, *14*(3), 198–201. https://doi.org/10.2307/451419

Smith, J. A., McPherson, M., & Smith-Lovin, L. (2014). Social Distance in the United States: Sex, Race, Religion, Age, and Education Homophily among Confidants, 1985 to 2004. *American Sociological Review*, *79*(3), 432–456. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122414531776

Stark, T. H. (2018). Collecting Social Network Data. In D. L. Vannette & J. A. Krosnick (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Survey Research* (pp. 241–254). Springer International Publishing.

Susberry, T. S. (2004). *Racial identification and ethnic identity in Louisiana Creole people of color* (PhD). University of Houston. Houston, TX.

Trépanier, C. (1988). *French Louisiana at the threshold of the 21st century* (PhD). Pennsylvania State University. State College, PA.

Zhang, D. (2012). Co-Ethnic Network, Social Class, and Heritage Language Maintenance Among Chinese Immigrant Families. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *11*(3), 200–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2012.686408

A Interview Module

A.1 Demographics

1. Dans quelle année que t'as été né?
   [In what year were you born?]

2. Éoù tu restes?
   [Where do you live?]

   (a) Ça c'est éoù t'as grandi, aussit?
   [Is that where you grew up, too?]

   (b) Ta famille reste dans le même village que toi?
   [Does your family live in the same town as you?]

3. Tu fais quoi comme métier?
   [What is your profession?]

4. T'as été au collège? Quel collège?
   [Did you go to college? Which college?]

A.2 Casual Conversation

A.2.1 3rd person plural

5. Quelles qualités de jobs le monde fait dans ton village?
   [What kind of work do the people in your town do?]

6. Quoi tu penses pour le monde dans ton village? Le monde se traite bien? T'as un exemple?
   [What are the people in your town like? People treat each other well? Do you have an example?]

A.2.2 3rd person singular

7. Y'a combien de personnes dans ta famille?
   [How many people are there in your family?]

8. Ton/ta <family member> est comment? T'as une histoire de <family member>?

A.2.3 1st person plural

9. T'as pris des vacances avec ta famille ou peut-être d'autre monde? Quoi c'était des vacances mémorables? [Have you taken vacations with your family or perhaps other people? What was a memorable vacation?]

10. Quelle activité t'aimes faire avec le monde? [What activity do you like to do with people?]

A.3 Race and Ethnicity

11. Quoi c'est un Cadien, d'après toi? [What is a Cajun, in your opinion?]

12. Quoi c'est un Creole, d'après toi? [What is a Creole, in your opinion?]

13. Tous les Cadiens et Créoles sont américains, aussit? [Are all Cajuns and Creoles also Americans?]

14. Y'a du monde de différent de races dans ton village? [Are there people of different races in your town?]

15. Si t'aurais besoin de déclarer ta race, quoi tu dirais? [If you had to name your race, what would you say?]

16. C'est vrai que tous les Cadiens sont d'une race et puis tous les Créoles d'une autre race ou c'est plus compliqué? [Is it true that all Cajuns are one race and all Creoles are another race or is it more complicated?]

A.4 French

17. Les Cadiens et les Créoles parlent français de la même manière? [Do Cajuns and Creoles speak French the same way?]

18. Quoi tu penses pour la langue française? [What do you think about the French language?]

19. Le français est toujours important dans la Louisiane? Combien de monde parle français au jour d'aujourd'hui? [Is French still important in Louisiana? How many people speak French nowadays?]

20. Tu veux qu'on continue à parler français à l'avenir? [Do you want French to continue being spoken in the future?]

A.5 Social Network Data

A.5.1 Name Generators

21. Tous les temps en temps, le monde parle pour les affaires importantes avec d'autre monde. Si tu peux jongler pour les six derniers mois, qui sont les individus avec qui toi tu parles pour les affaires qui te sont importantes? Donne-moi rien que leur prénom ou leurs initiales.
    [From time to time, most people discuss important matters with other people. Looking back over the last six months, who are the people with whom you discussed matters important to you? Just tell me their first names or initials.]

22. Qui sont les personnes avec qui tu parles souvent français? Donne-moi rien que leur prénom ou leurs initiales.
    [Who are the people with whoom you often speak French? Just tell me their first names or initials.]

A.5.2 Name Interpretors

23. Pour chaque personne sur cette liste, quoi c'est ton rapport avec lui? La personne est un(e) ami(e) ou un parent ou autre chose?

[For each person on this list, what is your relationship with them? Is the person a friend or a relative or something else?]

24. Quelles personnes sur cette liste sont des personnes avec qui tu parles souvent français?
    [Which people on this list are people with whom you often speak French?]

25. Pour chaque personne sur cette liste, quoi c'est son éthnicité, c'est-à-dire son *ethnicity*?
    [For each person on this list, what is their ethnicity, that is to say their ethnicity?]

26. Pour chaque personne sur cette liste, quoi c'est sa race?
    [For each person on this list, what is their race?]

A.6 Wrap-Up

A.6.1 2nd person singular

27. T'as des questions pour moi? [Do you have any questions for me?]