TITLE: Appalachian Linguistic Potpourri 2: Language Perception and Use Across the Region

This panel will explore various aspects of Appalachian language varieties. Given that language is one of the principal components of culture, these papers engage with the impact that culture and identity have on variation across the region and across the different aspects of language. These language topics have received much recent academic attention, as demonstrated by Clark and Heyward (2013) and the forthcoming *Appalachian Englishes* volume edited by Hazen. At the same time, these topics also have much popular attention in various media sources including Twitter, YouTube, and other social media platforms as well as blogs, articles, and other journalistic sources. The papers in this panel discuss the perceptions and usages of varieties of Appalachian Englishes. The first paper explores where insiders and outsiders of the region think Appalachian English is spoken and what they think of the varieties. The second paper discusses Appalachian Ohio and how the speech patterns there serve as a type of transitional zone from the Southern, Midlands, and Northern dialectal regions. The third paper investigates how the different sub-regions of Appalachia might have different perceptions of language and as a result different rates of change. The final paper evaluates how speakers utilize Appalachian English features (and the concomitant connotations) for particular speech purposes. The goal is to show the breadth and depth of the diversity among Appalachian language varieties via the different perspectives, methodologies, and analyses of the panelists.

Understanding Perceptions of Appalachian Englishes

Jennifer Cramer

As entities immersed in mythologies of being isolated, unchanging, monolithic, and monolingual, what people *know* about Appalachian Englishes comes with a fair share of misunderstandings. This paper explores various data sets and analyses from research in linguistics as a field to bring together the many diverse and nuanced understandings about perceptions of the varieties of English spoken in, across, and around the Appalachian Mountains. To elucidate the (mis)conceptions that surround these varieties, I present research from educational linguistics, dialectology, sociophonetics, linguistic anthropology, and other fields where language, communication, and perception are jointly engaged, presenting the rather bleak picture of places, peoples, and languages shrouded in pejoration.

Going beyond what has already been said, I also present some research in progress aimed specifically at measuring what Appalachian Englishes are and where they can be found. Using a perceptual dialectology approach (e.g., Preston 1989, Cramer and Montgomery 2016), and drawing heavily on Ulack and Raitz (1982), this project asks nonlinguists to indicate whether they believe any Appalachian varieties of English exist, and, if so, where, given a map, such varieties can be found. In addition to the map drawing task, participants are also asked what characteristics they associate with Appalachia, its people, and its languages. Preliminary engagement with this type of data reveals that, like in Ulack and Raitz, insiders, outsiders, and cognitive outsiders vary in how they perceive Appalachian Englishes, but the major (primarily negative) stereotypes still surface, even for those who value their Appalachianness.

"Continuity and Change in Ohio English: South Midland, General Midland, or Appalachian?"
Beverly Olson Flanigan and Michelle Haugh O'Malley
Ohio University

Studies of the English of southern Ohio have been many, starting with the Linguistic Atlas of the North Central States (Marckwardt 1957; McDavid & McDavid 1960; Kurath & McDavid 1961) and continuing through Dakin's 1966 study of the Upper Ohio Valley, the Dictionary of American Regional English (1985-2013), and smaller studies of several localities extending from Youngstown in the northeast to Athens County in the southeast and Cincinnati in the southwest (Hankey 1972; Flanigan 2005, 2008; Flanigan & Norris 2000; Thomas 1996, 2010; Boberg & Strassel 2000). In addition, student theses have contributed to a mapping of boundary distinctions in this region (Allen 1997; Kelley 1997; Humphries 1999; Nesbitt 2002; Van Wey 2005). All have suggested that a diagonal belt running southwest along the western Appalachian foothills shows influence from Appalachian or Southern Mountain speech that is neither Northern nor Southern nor even "general" Midland in the traditional sense of those dialect labels.

The stability of this "trans-Appalachian" dialect area (Dakin 1966) may be in question now, however. Migration to and from large urban centers like Cleveland/Akron, Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati may be affecting the younger generations in southeastern and southern Ohio. Recent work by Lee, O'Malley, and colleagues (2018; in preparation) will be compared with previous studies to determine whether or not these patterns reflect a fundamental change in the 200-year-old speech patterns of this area.

References

Allen, Ashlea. 1997. The speech of Portsmouth, Ohio. Unpublished M.A. essay, Ohio University, Athens.
Boberg, Charles, and Stephanie M. Strassel. 2000. Short-*a* in Cincinnati: A change in progress. Journal of English Linguistics 28: 108-126.
Dakin, Robert F. 1966. The dialect vocabulary of the Ohio River Valley: A survey of the distribution of selected vocabulary forms in an area of complex settlement history. 3 vols. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
DARE: Dictionary of American Regional English. 1985-2013. Vols. 1-6. Ed. by Frederic G. Cassidy and Joan Houston Hall. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Flanigan, Beverly Olson. 2005. Mapping Ohio: Dialect boundaries revisited. In Language diversity in Michigan and Ohio: Towards two state linguistic profiles, ed. by Brian Joseph, Carol Preston, and Dennis Preston, 1-24. Ann Arbor, MI: Caravan Books.
Flanigan, Beverly Olson. 2008. Don or dawn? Perception and production of /ɑ ~ ɔ/ in Southern Ohio. Ohio University Working Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching, 16:1-15. (Available at: http://www.ohio.edu/linguistics/workingpapers/2008/flanigan_2008.pdf.)
Flanigan, Beverly Olson, and Franklin Paul Norris. 2000. Cross-dialectal comprehension as evidence for boundary mapping: Perceptions of the speech of Southeastern Ohio. Language Variation and Change 12: 175-201.
Hankey, Clyde T. 1972. Notes on West Penn-Ohio Phonology. In Studies in Linguistics in Honor of Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Ed. Lawrence M. Davis.

Tuscaloosa: Univ. of Alabama Press, 49-61.

Humphries, Stephanie D. 1999. The low vowels of Chauncey, Ohio. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Ohio University, Athens.

Kelley, Mark. 1997. An acoustic analysis of an Appalachian dialect. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Ohio University, Athens.

Kurath, Hans, and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. 1961. The pronunciation of English in the Atlantic states. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lee, Sinae, Peter Andrews, Olga Sormaz, Khalid Alharbi, LeNora Candee, and Michelle O'Malley. 2018. "The Athens bubble": The /aw/ diphthong in an urban-oriented enclave in rural Southeast Ohio. Presented at SECOL, Blacksburg, VA. (Article in preparation.)

Marckwardt, Albert H. 1957. Principal and subsidiary dialect areas in the North-Central states. Publication of the American Dialect Society 27: 3-15.

McDavid, Raven I., and Virginia G. McDavid. 1960. Grammatical differences in the North Central states. American Speech 35: 5-19.

Nesbitt, Sandra. 2002. Morphosyntactic features of Southeastern Ohio speech: How Appalachian are they? Unpublished M.A. essay, Ohio University, Athens.

Thomas, Erik R. 1996. A comparison of variation patterns of variables among sixth graders in an Ohio community. In Focus on the USA, ed. by Edgar Schneider, 149-168. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Thomas, Erik R. 2010. A longitudinal analysis of the durability of the Northern-Midland dialect boundary in Ohio. American Speech 85: 375-430.

Van Wey, Emily. 2005. Vowel variation in Stark County, Ohio. Unpublished M.A. essay, Ohio University.

Linguistic Change and Subregionality in Appalachia

Becky Childs and Daniel Hasty

Appalachian English is often thought of as a single, traditional form of speech associated with the older generation (Dial 1972, Montgomery 1979, Wolfram & Christian 1976). However, within the past two generations the social and linguistic landscape of Appalachia has greatly changed. Communities that lived mainly in isolation now experience immigration and emigration with the surrounding communities outside of Appalachia. With this openness come new language features and social practices. Recent research indicates that traditional Appalachian English features are in flux: with some dying out (Hazen 2006, Hazen, Butcher, & King 2010, Hazen, Hamilton, & Vacovsky 2011), others remaining stable (Hazen 2008), and others increasing among the younger generations (Hazen 2005, Childs & Mallinson 2004, Hasty 2011). These changes however are adapted and integrated differently by community members based on identity with the region and proximity to communities outside the region.

This study investigates these changes in Appalachian English through the results of a web-based survey of university students from Appalachian communities. The survey presents traditional phonetic, lexical, and morpho-syntactic Appalachian English features and asks respondents to report their use of these features and their observation of the use of these features by other speakers in their area. Results indicate significant differences between an area of Northern Appalachia (NAPP) and Southern Appalachia (SAPP), with SAPP leading NAPP in both hearing and using many more traditional features. While the two Appalachian groups patterned together for a few variables perhaps indicating a small set of unique Appalachian features, SAPP patterned more often with the South. These results indicate that language change in Appalachia is affecting NAPP and SAPP differently. We analyze this as NAPP becoming more like the surrounding Northern areas while SAPP follows the surrounding Southern areas and indicates the importance of these surrounding dialect regions when constructing an Appalachian identity.

References

Childs, Becky and Christine Mallinson. 2004. African American English in Appalachia: Dialect accommodation and substrate influence. *English World-Wide* 25.1: 27-50.

Dial, Wylene. 1972. The Dialect of the Appalachian people. *West Virginia History* 30: 463-71.

Hasty, J. Daniel. 2011. I might not would say that: A sociolinguistic investigation of double modal acceptance. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 17.2, 91-98.

Hazen, Kirk. 2005. Mergers in the mountains: West Virginia division and unification. *English World-Wide* 26: 199-221.

Hazen, Kirk. 2006. The final days of Appalachian Heritage Language. In Beth Simon and Thomas Murray (eds.), *Language Variation and Change in the American Midland*. Varieties of English Around the World Series. Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 129-150.

Hazen, Kirk. 2008. (ing): A vernacular baseline for English in Appalachia. *American Speech* 83.2: 116-140.

Hazen, Kirk, Paige Butcher and Ashley King. 2010. Unvernacular Appalachia: An empirical perspective on West Virginia dialect variation. *English Today* 26.4: 13-22.

Hazen, Kirk, Sarah Hamilton, and Sarah Vacovsky. 2011. The fall of demonstrative *them*: Evidence from Appalachia. *English World-Wide* 32.1: 74-103.

Montgomery, Michael. 1979. A discourse analysis of expository Appalachian English. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida.

Wolfram, Walt and Donna Christian. 1976. *Appalachian Speech.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Linguistic Hybridity and the Construction of Pipeline Resistance Verbal Repertoires

Anita Puckett
Virginia Tech

The under-construction Mountain Valley Pipeline (MVP) crosses rural Appalachia on land owned by those who speak various forms of English, including Appalachian speech varieties, and whose demographics cross multiple categories. Historically, these speakers have formed social and political factions often indexed by their speech variety. The pressing need to organize to fight a common major environmental and land use threat, however, has brought hundreds of these residents to work together to engage in 80 or more new ways of communicating orally or in writing to each other. All rely on their various vernaculars to implement how to succeed. This presentation describes how these discursive modes have resulted in a communication hybridity in Montgomery County, Virginia. This hybridity draws on the local Appalachian vernacular, academic modes of speaking, business rhetoric, legal discourse, federal jargonize, and conversational Standard American English speech. Outcomes from these sociolinguistic changes are facilitating change in sociopolitical relations that promise to have implications for alterations in county political and economic structuring. This presentation analyzes these changes using data obtained through thousands of hours of linguistic ethnographic observation and participation in local and regional venues of pipeline protest. A typology of reconfigured discursive speaking practices has been created that reveals competing or complementary verbal repertoires that, in turn, have both positively and negatively impacted resistance efforts through both acceptance and rejection of discursive structural changes. Analysis of how this (non) hybridity has (not) changed underlying power configurations in the county concludes the presentation.