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Thesis

In this study I investigate whether people of Owensboro, KY and Evansville, IN, have significant linguistic variation between them, and what it means for the dialect boundary to be drawn in between these two cities as is frequently done. This paper analyzes lexical, phonetic, syntactical, and socioculturally perceived linguistic differences between speakers of these two cities by focusing on key Southern and Northern features. This analysis is done in order to determine where Owensboro and Evansville should lie in respect to the dialect boundary line and even how boundary lines should be drawn. This study continues the long tradition of studying Northern/ Southern American English language variation and evaluates the dialect trends that have occurred in this area since previous studies¹. This paper will consider past studies conducted in the region and compare their lexical and phonetic results with the lexical and phonetic results of this study. This paper will also consider how participants perceive their city’s language socioculturally when compared to the other city, and whether these sociocultural perceptions are in accord with the recorded findings. Finally, I hope to compare established Northern/ Southern dialect boundary lines with my own findings, based on my recent data collection. It is important to note, however, that this study is broad and somewhat preliminary. While I will make conclusions based on what my data suggests, I am in no way saying that my conclusions are definitive. This project has become merely an index of what might be interesting to study in the future.

Image 1

This image shows the location of Evansville, IN and Owensboro, KY in proximity to each other.

(Image from: University of Texas)

¹ The main studies used as a baseline are Robert Dakin’s Analysis of the Ohio River Valley, Craig Carver’s American Regional Dialects published in 1989, and The Atlas of North American English 2006.
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Linguistic Record

“Variation can make various kinds of difference, sometimes indexing differences in denotational meaning, sometimes differences among speakers’ identities, sometime differences among situations and so on. A feature that has been indexically linked with a particular social identity or recurring situation, is, to use Asif Agha’s term, “enregistered”. A set of features that have been enregistered with the same identity or situation can come to be thought of as an (objectively delimitable) variety: a register, in the more traditional sense, a style, a dialect, or a language.” (Johnstone p.8-9)

Many atlases and maps within the last forty-five years have differing opinions on where the dividing line of the Northern and Southern dialects lies. There are also many debates about the existence of a Midland dialect and the boundaries of such a region, if it exists. This debate stems from the dearth of linguistic research conducted in the middle of the nation (Kentucky, Missouri, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio). Many studies have been conducted on dialects of the east coast, big cities, Appalachian English, and the Lower South, but little research has been done in western Kentucky and southern Indiana. Because the most recent large scale, nationwide survey contained in The Atlas of North American English (ANAE) based participants off of a population of 50,000 or greater, Evansville, IN had two participants and Owensboro, KY none at all. The closest Kentucky participants were located in Louisville and Lexington, Kentucky, the two largest cities in the state, and thus unlike the rest of the state linguistically (Cramer). Louisville and Lexington are over 120 miles and 180 miles away from Owensboro, respectively. The Dictionary of American Regional English (DARE) did not conduct surveys in Owensboro or Evansville either, although they did have more participants in the surrounding area. The article “On the Status of Low Back Vowels in Kentucky English; More Evidence of Merger” did not look at southern IN, but did provide significant data on western KY, although, again, not in Owensboro itself (Irons). Upon its completion, the current study will provide a broad base of data for both Owensboro and Evansville, two cities located within this neglected area of study.

In American Regional Dialects, Craig Carver, uses the DARE data to draw many of his conclusions. He creates many different collections of words which is called an isogloss. He uses these isoglosses to draw a geographic linguistic boundary. People within an isogloss share a certain lexical term, or a certain group of lexical terms, and people outside the isogloss will use a different term. Based on these isoglosses, in Carver’s final analysis, he places the Northern/Southern dividing line following the Ohio River, separating Owensboro, KY and Evansville, IN. In this map separating southern Indiana from Kentucky, Carver uses the label Lower North

---


dialect for Evansville, while Western Kentucky and Owensboro receive the label Upper South dialect.

When defining each region, Carver uses many different layers of isoglosses that he has compiled. To define the south he has two main isogloss layers. The first layer includes southern IN, commonly referred to as the Hoosier Apex, as a part of the Southern dialect. This is shown in Image 3. In this area some southern features were found to be quite common and accepted. It is interesting however, that Carver never includes western KY as part of the Lower North dialect in any isogloss.

Image 2

Carver has this to say about the Lower North, “The Lower North by contrast (to the Upper North) is very mixed. Southern features intermingle in varying degrees with Northern features, the former dominating in southern Illinois, Indiana, and southern Ohio…” (Carver p.202). Carver says that Northern features are not found south of the Ohio River and for this reason draws the southern boundary of the Lower North dialect at the Ohio River.

In Image 3 below you can see the boldest lines are the boundaries for the Lower North dialect. You can also see the first Upper South isogloss which includes the Hoosier Apex. This boundary over laps the Lower North boundary along the Ohio River between Ohio and Kentucky but diverges in Indiana to include Southern Indiana with the Upper South.
Carver does entertain the idea proposed by Hans Kurath³ and Robert Dakin⁴ about the existence of a Midland region, which would include Owensboro and Evansville perfectly in its core, shown in Image 5⁵. However, Carver later dismisses the idea of a distinct Midlands region because this area has no unique, unifying characteristics which distinguish it from the surrounding regions. Rather, the region is remarkable due to its retention of some Northern and some Southern features and its loss of others. “But perhaps more than anything else, Dakin’s map illustrates the transitional nature of this area” (Carver p.102). Carver goes on to describe this area (Lower North and Upper South) as a “transitional” zone. In the end Carver doesn’t use the Midlands labels and instead labels his areas as Upper North, Lower North, Upper South, and Lower South. By separating each of the North and the South dialects further into Upper and Lower he is stating that there are two areas which represents the North or South respectively, but in different ways, and that each related Upper and Lower section also fit within its larger boundary.

⁵ Here Evansville, IN is marked by a blue dot while Owensboro, KY is marked by a red dot.
This presence of Southern features in southern Indiana is due to early migration patterns in the area. Southern Indiana was populated in three different ways, which are listed in chronological order: migration northward from Kentucky across the Ohio River, migration from the Northeast down the Ohio River, and migration from Pennsylvania across Ohio. This is shown in Image 6. It is this first migration pattern of Kentucky residents crossing the river to the north that causes the intermingling of southern and northern features in the area (Carver ch.3-5). This one-way migration movement, from the south to the north, explains why Southern features are found in the Lower North dialect but no Northern dialect features are found in the Upper South.
Image 5

The image shows early migration patterns in the eastern half of the United States.

(Image from: Carver p. 96)

The Atlas of North American English draws the northern line of its Southern dialect border running from above Louisville, KY, thus including Louisville in the Southern region. The boundary continues down below Owensboro, and thus excluding Owensboro from the Southern region. This atlas also draws the lower line of their Midland region through Owensboro with a sort of no-man’s land strip between the Midland and Southern dialects that covers the other half of Owensboro. Evansville, IN is included in the Midland region, which corresponds roughly to Carver’s Lower North region. This can be seen in Image 6. The dialect lines drawn by ANAE in western KY and southern IN seem almost arbitrary and ad hoc since they have no participant data from this area of the state to make qualified data-based generalizations. This lack of data is, like I stated above, due to qualifications that a city must have 50,000 residents to be interviewed for the ANAE project. Although Owensboro didn’t have 50,000 residents at the time of ANAE interviews, it has now surpassed this mark. Unlike Carver, the ANAE mostly used phonetic and not lexical data to draw their boundaries. My project is a mix of the two.
Image 6


(Image from: Labov, Ash and Boberg p.148)

Methods

For this paper, data was collected from twenty-three participants in both cities for a total of forty-six participants. Data was collected in three different forms: a survey of twenty-six lexical and syntactic questions, a recorded reading passage designed to elicit phonetic differences, and a discussion section about perception of dialect differences between Owensboro and Evansville. All participants in this study were Caucasian, but varied in age from 25 – 77 years of age, and had varied economic backgrounds. All participants were natives of their respective city and had lived there for the majority of their lives (most importantly during adolescence). Participants were volunteers who agreed to participate after being approached at local parks and churches.

The survey was collected using the following method: participants were read the twenty-six questions by the facilitator, who then recorded their responses. The facilitator could supply possible answers to the participant in the case that the participant was unsure of what to answer,

6 See Appendix C
7 See Appendix B
8 It is believed that after puberty it is very difficult to change ones native speech and even if one tries they will always slip back into their natural dialect in certain (usually highly emotion or extremely fatigued) situations.
but for the majority of the responses this was unnecessary. Some questions allowed only one answer per participant, while others allowed for multiple responses per participant.

The reading passages and perception questions were recorded using an Olympus WS-400S Recorder. Some data discussed in the phonetic section required acoustic analysis while some did not. For acoustic analysis I used the computer program Praat, which allows one to look at waveforms, spectra, pitch, and a variety of other phonetic features from files uploaded to the program. Praat has been used in many dialect studies, including studies by Dr. Jennifer Cramer and Dr. Kirk Hazen. For the data that only required auditory analysis, I listened to each word several times and recorded what I heard. The situations in which these two methods are being used differ in the amount of detail that is required. Some phonetic comparisons in the study require the exact precision that Praat can offer (low back vowel merger) while other are easily distinguished using only auditory analysis (the difference in /s/ or /z/ in the word “greasy”). The main use of Praat in this study is to look at formants in vowels. Every vowel has certain formants, or resonant frequencies, that uniquely produce that vowel sound. Each vowel has at least four easily distinguishable formants, although only the first three are necessary in analysis for distinguishing the vowel. Comparing formants allows for a very precise method of measuring vowel sounds and articulation location which allows vowels to be distinguished quantitatively.

I was introduced to Praat by Dr. Hazen. I learned the program under the tutelage of Dr. Lockett, who showed me the basics, and Dr. Cramer, who showed me how to add and use additional scripts in Praat. Before I was able to analyze my data using Praat, I also used a program called NORM (Thomas and Kendall) which allowed me to normalize my data from participant to participant and thus make comparisons across a population.

The sociocultural perception portion of the study was collected at the end of the interview. Each participant was asked their opinion, whether they thought people from Owensboro and people from Evansville sounded different or sounded the same. If the participant said there was a difference in speech between the cities, follow up questions were asked to elicit examples of ways that people’s speech was different.

Throughout this paper, separated by [ ] are sounds rendered into the International Phonetic Alphabet. For statistical significance in this study I used both a proportions formula (Z test) and Fisher’s Exact Test which is similar to a Chi Squared test but better suited for smaller populations like mine. The Z test is used to compare the likelihood that Owensboro and Evansville would have the same number of participants answer the same answer for a given question. If the P value is smaller than .05, then it is a significant difference. If a question is significant it means that it is unlikely that the cities would have the same number of participants reply with similar answers for this particular question. A limitation of the Z test is that it could only be used if each city had at least 5 responders for the object being analyzed. So in some instances there is clearly a significant difference but I was unable to prove this statistically. Fisher’s Exact Test works to see if a city’s participants’ responses are significant to the city.

---

9 Question 12: “Call to players to return to base during hide and go seek?” required the most prompting.
10 See Appendix D for help with the IPA.
the P value is again less than .05 then this shows that the response is significant to the tested city. This means that that response could be used as an identifying feature for someone from the city. For example, as we will see later, the use of the term “Coke” for a carbonated beverage is an identifying feature for the city of Owensboro.

**Lexical study**

Lexical comparisons are some of the oldest types of dialectology studies done in the United States. Although the lexicon is only one facet of language and dialects, it can be a very telling feature; if lexical differences are apparent between two groups, it follows that there are probably other differences. For that reason, this paper will start with some lexical findings. The lexical and syntactic survey, as stated above, consisted of 26 questions and was carried out using the methodology also explained above. The statistics will be given in the following manner in the charts below:

**THIS MANY PEOPLE** out of 23 (total interviewed) responded with a particular response.

Because participants were allowed to give multiple answers on some questions, the percent of participants for each question doesn’t necessarily equal 100%. The more important pieces of data will be in bold.

**Carbonated Beverage**

The first question this paper will consider is a well-known and very stereotyped lexical item which can reveal strong regional variation across the United States. Question 11: “What do you call a carbonated sugar drink?”

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owensboro, KY</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
<th>Evansville, IN</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>14 out of 23</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6 out of 23</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soda</td>
<td>5 out of 23</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9 out of 23</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft drink</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8 out of 23</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soda-pop</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop</td>
<td>2 out of 23</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5 out of 23</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coca-Cola</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that the preferred name for a carbonated sugar drink varies between Owensboro and Evansville. The data shows that participants in Owensboro clearly favor the term “Coke,” a significance of P = .0087 while participants in Evansville prefer “soft drink,” a significance at P = .0057 both using Fischer’s Exact Test. Owensboro had 8 more participants who replied “Coke” than Evansville, a significance at P = .0188 using a Z Test. Evansville had four more instances of people responding “soda” than did Owensboro. Evansville had eight participants who replied “soft drink” while Owensboro had none\(^\text{11}\). This means that the term “soft drink” was unique to Evansville. This uniqueness is interesting because participants in

\(^{11}\text{Although this is significant Statistical significance can’t be shown because of limitations of Z test}\)
Evansville also use “Coke,” the term preferred by participants in Owensboro, but not the other way around. Evansville had more evenly distributed responses, meaning several answers were close in number of responders, while Owensboro had a greater variety of responses, but its favored response was significantly more favored than the other terms.12

The many varied names for this type of beverage are well documented across the nation and over time. It was even included recently in the survey used for the Atlas of North American English in 2006. The ANAE, being deficient in participants in the region of this study, has unfortunately drawn their isogloss boundary for so that southern Indiana and northwestern Kentucky are outside of the lines for this token. According to the ANAE findings for the general South, the most common term for “carbonated beverage” was “Coke” while the North (including the two Evansville participants) favored “pop” (Labov, Ash and Boberg p.290). In my study, there were five participants who answered “pop” in Evansville, accounting for 22% of the interviewed population, rather than the 100% received by the ANAE. So while the ANAE findings on the use of “pop” in Evansville are in accord with this study, it may not be the best representation of the actual occurrence of the word in relation to the actual variety that is found in the city according to my study. The ANAE also has this to say about the use of “Coke” in the Hoosier Apex, “In Indiana there is a striking northward expansion of coke to include the Hoosier Apex, with a strong presence of coke in Indianapolis” (Labov, Ash and Boberg p.289). This finding is also strongly in accord with this current study where 26% of participants responded “Coke” in Evansville. This result shows that using “Coke” in Evansville may not be novel to residents.

Although there is some overlap in terminology used by the residents in Owensboro and Evansville, this study has found that there is significant enough variation to say that word choice for a carbonated beverage is a distinguishing feature. While “Coke” is used in the Hoosier Apex, it is still a highly stigmatized southern feature in this region that labels its users as “backwards”13. The use of “Coke” in Owensboro is more wide spread and less stigmatized. Also distinguishing the two cities is the preferred term “soft drink” in Evansville, which doesn’t occur at all in Owensboro. Although residents of Owensboro would understand what “soft drink” means, it might distinguish one who used it as a non-native in Owensboro.

2nd Person Plural

The next question is also one with strong stereotypes attached. Question 19 was presented in the following manner: “Please fill in the blank with the 2nd person plural, such as if you were asking a group of people, “Are _____ coming over later?””14

---

12 Owensboro having more variation but less even distribution than Evansville is a theme that will continue through the survey.
13 Evansville participants who replied “coke” were very aware and vocal about the fact that this was a “Southern” feature and that it labeled them as “country.”
14 This frequently required more explanation although the words “you, you all, y’all, etc” were never used, so that, hopefully, a more natural response was elicited.
An Analysis of Regional Linguistic Variation and Perception: Owensboro, KY & Evansville, IN

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owensboro, KY</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
<th>Evansville, IN</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>you all</td>
<td>11 out of 23</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5 out of 23</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y’all¹⁵</td>
<td>7 out of 23</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7 out of 23</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you guys</td>
<td>3 out of 23</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9 out of 23</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you folks</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of you</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3 out of 23</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Owensboro participants’ preferred 2nd person plural was “you all” with eleven responses, while only five Evansville participants responded “you all,” a difference of six participants. Evansville participants instead favored “you guys” which received the most responses in Evansville with nine responses; Owensboro received only three responses for that term. “You guys” is the only significant difference between the two cities where P=.0465. The surprising result is the tied responses from both cities for the choice “y’all.” Both cities had seven participants respond “y’all.” Typically a highly stigmatized term, “y’all” is used widely in the south but less so in the north (Cassidy Vol.V p.1132).

These findings reinforce the idea that the Ohio River valley, and particularly the Hoosier Apex, is a transitional area where some Southern features are present north of the Ohio River. The Dictionary of American Regional English shows that the use of “y’all” has always been associated with the South. “This form (y’all) is practically universal in the South” (Cassidy Vol.V p.1132). DARE identifies “y’all” as solely a Southern usage, which again, reinforces the idea of the Hoosier Apex being a transitional zone and reflecting some Southern features. The form “you-all” is also considered mostly Southern and South-Midlands by DARE (Cassidy Vol.V p.1132). This finding is supported with data from my study as well. Many Southern speakers will use both “y’all” and “you all” in their speech. It is possible, and even probable, that the number of “y’all” responses in my study and in other studies is lower than what may naturally occur in both cities. This could be due to the connotation that “you all” is a more acceptable formal form than “y’all” and studies are rather non-spontaneous circumstances so people are able to guard their language more by switching into a more formal mode.

The DARE entry on “you guys” says the following, “orig(in) chiefly Nth (North); now widespread” (Cassidy Vol.V p.1134). This is also reflected in the data. While “you guys” is found in Owensboro, the data still reveals a significant difference between Evansville, thus reflecting the word’s Northern origin. It is highly interesting that Evansville, IN and the Hoosier Apex are much more likely to show Southern features while to this day Owensboro, KY is still significantly different when it comes to using Northern features. This shows how the early northward settlement influences have truly impacted these two regions even to this day.

¹⁵ Frequently when the answer “y’all” was given by a participant it was with emphasis or understanding that it was stigmatized and “incorrect.”
Table 2 shows that the 2nd person plural is not a clear distinguishing feature between Owensboro and Evansville. Although the use of “y’all” or “you all” is more likely in Owensboro, it is not a statistically significant difference and is not out of place in Evansville. And although “you guys” is statistically significant, it is not truly out of place in Owensboro, either. It is a term that is used in Owensboro, perhaps even more frequently than my data shows.

If I were to have more data, more naturally elicited questions, or more tokens from each participant, my data could produce different results. This is especially true in cases like this where the results are very close and the term is so frequently in use.

Grandfather

The third question discussed in the paper is, “What is your family’s term for Grandfather?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Owensboro, KY</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
<th>Evansville, IN</th>
<th>Percent of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papaw</td>
<td>10 out of 23</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6 out of 2317</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandpa</td>
<td>4 out of 23</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15 out of 23</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandpap</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppa</td>
<td>2 out of 23</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>2 out of 23</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandaddy</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2 out of 23</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandad</td>
<td>3 out of 23</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peepaw</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paw</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppaw</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popo</td>
<td>0 out of 23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1 out of 23</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike with the term for carbonated beverage, in this instance, Evansville participants significantly preferred one term over the rest of the responses. The most preferred word by participants in Evansville was “Grandpa” with fifteen responses. “Grandpa” is statistically significant for Evansville with a P value of .0013. The most preferred word for Grandfather by participants in Owensboro was “Papaw” with ten responses. Owensboro participants once again showed more variation with their responses than Evansville participants.

Owensboro had four more participants respond “Papaw” than Evansville did. This gap becomes larger if you take all variations of “Papaw” into consideration. For example, if you consider all of the responses that end in “-paw)”18, including the free morpheme “Paw,” to be variations of the word “Papaw,” this would add another four responses to Owensboro’s total.

---

16 Instances of a particular participant saying the same feature
17 Half of participants who replied “Papaw” in Evansville also used another term.
18 Excluding the term Poppa
Owensboro would then have seven more “Papaw” responses than Evansville, making it a significant difference with a P value of .0188. *DARE* considers “-paw” and “Paw” to be variations of “Papaw” and includes them in their “Papaw” entry (Cassidy v.IV p.31). The *DARE* says this of “Papaw,” “…scattered but chiefly Sth, (South) S Midl (South Midland)” (Cassidy v.IV p.31). While I initially recorded each variation separately in the chart in order to show the numerous variation on “-paw” that Owensboro participants provided, considering all “-paw” responses together doesn’t misconstrue or misrepresent the data. Rather, it better highlights the differences between the participants in Owensboro and Evansville.

The *Dictionary of American Regional English* has many different pronunciations of “Grandpa,” which correspond to different geographic locations. |græn(d)pə, -pə, -pə| is more often found in the South or South Midland while |græmpə, -pə, -pə, -pr| is more often found in the North and North Midland (Cassidy v.II p.762). The pronunciation of “grandpa” however is outside of the scope of this current project although it may be an area for future study.

Image 7

This picture represents participants who replied “grandpa” with the pronunciation |græmpə, -pə, -pə, -pr| in the *DARE* survey.

(Image from Cassidy v.II p.762)

My data shows that there is significant variation between the two cities using only lexical differences for familial terms for grandfather. Grandpa is both a statistically significant response between the two cities with a P value of .0013 for the Z test, and as an identifier for Evansville, IN itself with a P value of .0048 using Fischer’s Exact Test. Using the suffix –pa(w), is a statistically significant difference between the two cities with a P value of .0188 for the Z test, but is not a significant difference for Owensboro using Fischer’s Exact Test with a P value of .0526, just outside statistically significant, and therefore cannot be used as an identifier.

“Papaw,” has always had an association with country and southern life and it is therefore not surprising that it was more frequent in Owensboro. The use of “Papaw” in Evansville may be frequent because much of the land and region outside of Evansville is also agricultural and quite similar to life in the traditional south.
Similarities

Above I have listed and explained some lexical differences that exist between the participants of Owensboro, KY and Evansville, IN. While these differences do exist, there are also many similarities. While I constructed my questionnaire to elicit certain Northern/Southern divisions, some questions didn’t produce any difference at all. Whether this is a fault of my construction or because Owensboro and Evansville share these Southern/Northern features remains to be seen in further research.

Some of the questions I asked which revealed little difference between the two towns include:

2. What do you call a device outside the house used to obtain water?
8. Do you know what a pole cat is?
12. What is the call to players to return to home base during hide and go seek?
14. Someone who won’t change his mind is called?
15. If you agree with someone who says something you might say, “I __________ you’re right.”
17. (Participants were shown a piece of paper with “3:45”) You might say that, “It’s a quarter __________ four.”
20. If you agree with someone who says“I’m not going!” You might say, “________________________”
26. Someone from the country is called a ________________?

For question two, sixteen participants in Owensboro replied “faucet” while fourteen participants in Evansville also responded “faucet.” Fourteen people in Owensboro replied that, yes, they knew what a pole cat was (and got it correct) while nine participants also knew and got it right in Evansville. In Owensboro and Evansville, seven and nine participants respectively answered “Allie, allie, oxen-free” to question twelve. Each city also had a similar number of participants who didn’t remember the answer to question twelve, five in Owensboro and four in Evansville. The almost unanimous response for question fourteen, “stubborn,” totaled eighteen in Owensboro and seventeen in Evansville. For question fifteen eleven participants in Owensboro replied “think” while six replied “believe,” in Evansville ten participants replied “think” and seven “believe.” For question seventeen, twenty participants in Owensboro and twenty-one in Evansville replied “till.” In Owensboro, for question twenty, six participants replied with some version of “neither” (“neither am I,” “me neither”) while thirteen replied with a version of “either” (“me either,” “I’m not either”), in Evansville ten participants replied with a version of “neither” while ten replied with a version of “either.” And finally, in question twenty-six, eleven participants from both Owensboro and Evansville responded “hick.” These are not all of the questions where participants in Owensboro and Evansville responded similarly, but it gives an idea of the diversity of lexical items where their usage is similar19.

---

19 For a chart of participants’ answers to all 26 questions please see Appendix D &E
Phonetic study

For this section of the study participants were recorded reading a story\textsuperscript{20} crafted to include particular words, phonemes, and situations that might elicit expected variation within the region such as “greasy,” “lawyer,” “cot & caught,” “my,” “time,” etc. The phonetic analysis for this study was conducted using two different methods\textsuperscript{21}. For some clearer phonetic differences, simple auditory analysis was sufficient, while for others acoustic analysis was used.

Low Back Vowel Merger

The first phonetic analysis that this paper will discuss is the low back vowel merger exemplified by the same pronunciation of “cot” and “caught.” Frequently in the Southern dialect “cot” and “caught” are distinct from one another due to an upglide on the vowel in the word “caught” (Labov, Ash and Boberg p.62) This means that the vowel in “caught” becomes a diphthong, or has two distinct vowel sounds, the second sound having a higher second formant. The Midland region, according to the Atlas of North American English, is mostly a transitional area, meaning that two distinct vowel sounds, found most strongly in the north east, are starting to merge, or become the same in this region. Some participants in the Midlands have distinctly different vowels in “cot” and “caught,” some have vowels which are merged to the [o] vowel, and the majority lie somewhere in-between (Labov, Ash and Boberg p.62).

The graph below show the first and second formant of the midpoint in the vowels which occur in “caught” and “cot” for twenty participants from Evansville and twenty from Owensboro\textsuperscript{22}. Each blue squares labeled “o” represents the vowel in “cot” for one participant while each red circles labeled “oh” represents the vowel in “caught” for one participant.

Graph 1

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{graph1}
\caption{Evansville caught/cot}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{20} See Appendix B for story.
\textsuperscript{21} Discussed in fuller details under the methods section.
\textsuperscript{22} Three participants from each city who participated in the survey chose to not read the passage, bringing the total of 23 down to 20.
Evansville’s data shows two discreet regions of production. One can almost draw a circle around where one vowel was produced, thus excluding the other vowel entirely. This shows that many Evansville participants, although well on the way to merging, are still in the process. The ANAE shows one participant from Evansville whose [o] and [oh] are distinct in perception and production and another whose is transitional (Labov, Ash and Boberg p.61). The production findings by the ANAE are in accord with the findings of this survey; perception of this feature is outside the scope of this study.

For Owensboro’s data it would be much harder to draw a circle around one vowel to exclude the other. This is because Owensboro’s production of the [o] and [oh] vowels are almost merged. Although there is still some progress to be made until the merger is complete, it is more merged than Evansville. This is interesting because there are no large sections of the country that have merged [o] and [oh] near Owensboro or Evansville. The closest merged region is a small region which includes the city of Lexington, KY. Owensboro may be more merged than Evansville because Lexington and Owensboro are both in Kentucky, but I have no evidence to back up this hypothesis. This is definitely a section that is a work in progress and will require further evaluation.
This map shows boundaries where [o] and [oh] are merged and where they are distinct. Areas surrounded by green boundaries are merged.

(Image from ANAE: p.61)

Lawyer

This study also compared the vowel production between the two cities in the word “lawyer”. The first vowel in “lawyer” is typically pronounced [oi] in the North, while the South typically uses [ɔ]. For this comparison simple auditory analysis was used. Although only using auditory analysis instead of acoustic analysis misses some of the subtleties of difference, for my purposes of merely distinguishing the two sounds, [ɔ] and [oi] are distinct enough that I don’t need Praat to sort out the subtleties.

In Owensboro ten out of twenty participants produced [ɔ] while only four out of twenty (20%) participants did so in Evansville. This is not a statistically significant difference. The appearance of [ɔ] in Evansville and the mixed production in Owensboro shows, once again, that this is a transition area. In this case it is not uncommon to find the Northern feature in Owensboro, nor is it unusual to find the Southern feature in Evansville.

As in the word “boy.”

As in the word “law.”
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Pin/ Pen

I also conducted an acoustic analysis on the word pairing “pin” and “pen” to see if speakers’ vowels [I] and [ɛ] were merged. The Atlas of North American English states that speakers from both the South and the Hoosier Apex are merged in this pairing. My data supports this. In Owensboro I found that eighteen out of twenty-three participants were merged while twenty out of twenty-three were merged in Evansville. There is no statistical significance between the two towns, and having the pin/pen merger is statistically significant for both towns, making it an identifying feature for both.

Forthcoming

In the future I will continue to work on this project. A few phonological features that will be examined include: the monophonization of [aI], the pronunciation of [grizi] or [grisi], the intrusive /r/ in words like [war$], among others.

Syntax

Double modals

On the survey I also include a syntax questions about double modals. Modal verbs are used to show permission, likelihood, necessity, etc. Some modal verbs in English are “could,” “should,” “would,” and “might.” Double modals are when two of these verbs are used in conjunction with each other one after the other. Although not considered correct grammatically they are used frequently in the Appalachian Mountains, the Ozarks, and although less frequently, it is also common in the South. For this study I asked all participants “What, if any, changes would you make to the following sentence: “I might could go to the store with you after I’m done here.”” Below is a chart of participants’ responses. Each participant could make as many changes as they wished. For example a participant who deleted “might” from the sentence (listed as “no might” in the chart) could also have deleted “here.” If a participant has changed the sentence to “I can go…” they are not listed as having deleted “could” and “might” but fall under a different category altogether.
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owensboro, KY</th>
<th></th>
<th>Evansville, IN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No might</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No could</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No here</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done -&gt; finished</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After -&gt; once</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-&gt; when</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may go</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can go</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will go</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may be able</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I might be able</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I may could</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe I would go</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, four participants in Owensboro deleted “might” from the sentence while ten did in Evansville. This is barely outside the realm of statistical significance for a Z test with a P value of .0548. In Owensboro eleven participants deleted “could” from the sentence while only four did in Evansville. Using the Z test, this is a significant difference with a P value of .0301. “Could” is also a significant term for Owensboro, using Fisher’s Exact test, with a P value of .0484.

This means that participants in Owensboro are significantly more likely to delete “could” from the sentence than participants from Evansville, and participants in Evansville are almost significantly more likely to delete “might” from the sentence than people in Owensboro. What is interesting about this is I have no idea why this is the case. When I designed the questionnaire to contain this question I was hoping to find a significant difference between the two towns, where participants in Owensboro allowed the double modal to stay more than participants in Evansville, however, this was not the case. At this point in time there are no studies about regional preferences for one modal over another. If I were to conduct this research over again, I would not be surprised to receive different results with less of a difference between “could” and “might” as I found in this round. It is, however, something to look into in the future.

**Perception study**

This study also offers a look at perception at border regions similar to the studies conducted by Nancy Niedzielski on Detroit vowels and Canadian vowels (Niedzielski). The Ohio River can be used as a border for many reasons. Perhaps most importantly for perceptions, the Ohio River was the boundary during the Civil War between the Union and the Confederate camps. Although Kentucky was a border state and sent troops to fight on both sides during the war, it is usually grouped with the Confederacy, due to its geographic location. Another important perceptual factor, which also led to the Ohio River being the dividing line during the
Civil War, is the fact that the river naturally separates the two most distinct cultures in the nation from each other. This difference in cultures along both sides of the Ohio River tends to make any perceived differences innately and deeply attached with its respective location. “The same historical, social, and economic forces that divided the nation and led to the “Confederate War,” as it is still called in the South, are the same forces that shaped the geography and character of the two major dialects” (Carver p.95).

The study of border areas can be very productive places to study linguistic variation. One can expect either great linguistic difference at a border (two countries who speak different languages, like France and Germany) or hardly any at all (the difference between a Wyoming and Montana accent (Cassidy p.280)). No matter the degree of difference or lack thereof at the border, the perceptions of these differences by speakers at the border can vary widely from the actual recorded data. “National boundaries also influence listener phonetic boundaries, whether attributed to the speaker explicitly (Niedzielski) or merely unconsciously evoked” (Cambell-Kibler p.137). Whether participants realize that they consciously attribute variation to speakers based on where they’re from or not, isn’t important. It’s just that it occurs at all that is important.

This final section will discuss the perceptions of each city concerning the existence, or lack thereof, of lexical and phonetic differences between Owensboro and Evansville. Sociocultural perception questions and study are interested in how language differences are perceived by different groups of people, why this may be the case, and how to mitigate the negative stereotyping that is usually associated with these perceptions.

During my study, the twenty participants from each city who completed the reading passage section of the interview were asked the question, “Do you think that people in Evansville and Owensboro sound different from each other, or do you think they sound the same?” Below is a chart showing the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owensboro</th>
<th>Evansville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, different</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight/ Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, same</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Owensboro eight participants said, “Yes, there is a difference,” two said, “Slightly, or sometimes,” and ten participants said, “No.” In Evansville twelve participants said, “Yes, there is a difference,” four said “Slightly, or sometimes,” three participants said, “No,” and one said, “Not sure.” In Evansville four more participants said “Yes, Different” than in Owensboro, two more said “slightly or sometimes different,” and seven fewer said that the cities sounded “the same.” Using the Z Test there is not a significant difference between Evansville and Owensboro participants who said “Yes, Different.” There is a significant difference between participants in Owensboro and Evansville who replied “No, same” with a P value of .0250. That is a significant

---

difference in perception between the two cities, with participants in Owensboro not perceiving a difference between speakers from Owensboro and Evansville.

In Owensboro, participants who said that there was a difference had a difficult time actually identifying differences. Some participants said that word choice was slightly different, others just stated that Evansville had a more northern accent while Owensboro had a more southern accent. One participant from Owensboro said the following about people from Evansville, “Yes they sound different! They’re Hoosiers! Only a little piece north but they speak different.” One participant vehemently proclaimed, “They’re foreigners, they’re Hoosiers”26) Another Owensboro participant said of the accent in Owensboro, “We definitely have a Southern accent.” This same participant also told a story about one day when she was working in Evansville, IN, and her coworkers teased her about her southern accent. When she came home later that day her family told her she was getting a Northern accent from working in Evansville. Another participant from Owensboro said, “People from Evansville tend to notice our accent more. Yes, we sound different; I don’t notice it as much though.”

In Evansville, participants who reported a difference had more specific ideas than those in Owensboro. Evansville participants reported that speech in Owensboro was, “Slower, drawn out, stretched out, and twangy.” One participant stated, “Yes [there’s a difference], the word you all is used more commonly.” This was not proven by this study. In fact Evansville and Owensboro had exactly the same number of participants who reported they used the word you all. Another participant from Evansville said, “There’s a twang when you cross the river. Evansville has a southern accent, Owensboro’s is just stronger.” This statement not only shows the perception of Evansville about Owensboro but also the perception of Evansville about the state of Indiana. Evansville may be northern compared to Owensboro, but when considered within the state of Indiana they are southern, a border city. A participant who was originally from Evansville but had lived in Owensboro for the last twenty-five years said, “It [the accent] seemed hillbilly when I first moved, but I don’t notice it as much anymore...I’ve gotten lazy with it [his accent]. I catch myself talking like people over here a lot, just more southern.”

Conclusions

Owensboro, KY and Evansville, IN do have some distinguishing features. However, it is clear that none of these are so severe that communication is inhibited between the two cities. Even though a difference might give rise to some teasing, mostly due to negative stereotypes of southern varieties, people from both cities are likely to be the ones on the receiving end of the teasing, since participants in Evansville also exhibit some Southern tendencies.

This study aims to demonstrate that Evansville shows many southern characteristics such as the preferred form of the second person plural, while Owensboro shows no predicted northern features to any significant level. Bear in mind that people migrated across the Ohio River north, from Kentucky to Indiana, but not really south, from Indiana to Kentucky. This established the basis for southern features in southern Indiana early. Although these regions are similar, they do also have their differences and there comes a point where you have to decide where to draw the North-South dividing line. My findings from this study support establishing the Ohio River as

---

26 This is particularly amusing when one remembers that Owensboro and Evansville are only 50 miles apart and actually are contained within the same country.
the southern boundary of the Lower North dialect due to the relatively few Northern features found in Owensboro. However, like Carver’s isogloss which showed that the Upper South could extend into the Hoosier Apex, the data from this study also supports the inclusion of the Hoosier Apex into the Upper South region.  

The problem that this research and other research in the area really demonstrates is that this area is transitional. It is a mixture of Southern and Northern features. It’s very easy to draw a line on a map and say that everyone north of the line speaks one way and everyone south of the line speaks another, it’s much harder, however, to make people follow that division. Wherever boundary lines are drawn there is always going to be a strip of land on either side that will be transitional. I propose that a way to solve this misleading nature of our dialect maps is to draw overlapping regions which would include transitional zones in multiple dialect regions, thus representing the true linguistic nature of the area more accurately.

As my paper draws to a close, I must once again reiterate that my findings are tentative because, although I have collected a lot of data from both Owensboro, KY and Evansville, IN, it is spread over such a wide range of linguistic areas that I do not have enough data on any one question to give definitive answers or analyses. This does not mean that my research and analysis shouldn’t be disregarded, however. My research and analysis is a strong indication of what could be going on in the area and shows myself and other scholars what areas of linguistics should be looked at more closely in the region.

---

27 In this instance I’m keeping with the nomenclature of Carver
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Appendix

A. Participant Data Form28

By filling out this form, I give my permission for any information gathered from this form and the oral interview during the study to be released when/where it is necessary without any prior notification. I understand that the content will not be used against me in any way, nor will I be identified personally in the study by name or identifying characteristics. I understand that I have the right to stop the interview at any time and all previously recorded data will be destroyed and removed from the study.

Sex: ____________________  Race: ____________________
Age: ____________________

Birthplace: ___________________________________________________________

Current Residence: ____________________ Number of years lived in current residence: ______

Other places lived (please include approximate years): ____________________

________________________________________________________

Significant travel experiences (place, length/frequency): ____________________

________________________________________________________

Parents’ birthplace (state or country):

Father: ____________________  Grandfather: ____________________

________________________________________________________

Grandmother: __________________________________________

Mother: ____________________  Grandfather: ____________________

________________________________________________________

28 This form was based heavily off a form found in Chapter 21 Dialects: How They Differ by Roger Shuy in Language Readings in Language and Culture (Clark, Eschholz, Rosa).
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Grandmother:

___________________________________

Highest Education:

___________________________________

Occupation*:

__________________________________________________________________________

*If retired please note and then fill in former occupation. If your occupation is a house wife please note and then fill in your husband’s occupation.

Foreign Language experience:

___________________________________

Any information you feel might be relevant to the study:

___________________________________

Name (optional):

___________________________________
B. Story

One day my Aunt Mary was coming into town for a visit. I loved when my Aunt Mary visited, even if it meant I had to sleep on a cot in my brother’s room. My aunt was a professor at a big university up north. She taught law and she loved helping the students to learn. Because she was a professor she didn’t get to visit very often; she visited even less when she used to be a lawyer though. On days that I knew she was coming I’d sit in the driveway waiting for the time when I could see her old white car coming up the street. My parents used to scold me for waiting in the driveway all day. Whenever they caught me, they’d send me somewhere else to play but I always snuck back to the driveway to be the first to greet Aunt Mary when she arrived. She’d pull into the driveway and say “Hey kid! I’ve got an idea. Why don’t you and I go for some burgers?” This was something we always did when she came to visit. There was this tiny, local burger joint that she loved going to called Carol’s Place. They had the best kind of food, greasy and delicious. You could always tell how greasy the food was by the marks that it left on the paper bag they put the food in. But Aunt Mary and I didn’t care. We always got cheeseburgers and strawberry milkshakes with fries for sharing. Just across from Carol’s was a park where we’d go to sit and eat our food. When I was little, after I’d filled my stomach with delicious food, I used to play until I was so tired I’d collapse on the picnic table where my Aunt Mary would be waiting for me. She’d wash my hands and face, which were inevitably messy from the food, and then we’d get back into her big white car and go home. Those were the best days, the best times, the best a kid could ask for.

When I was thirteen I heard the fire-trucks go by the house, I didn’t think too much of it until later that night when I was watching the news with my parents and I saw that Carol’s Place had burned down in a fire. Apparently Carol’s hadn’t been passing the Health Department’s fire inspection tests for a while, and it finally caught up with them. The next time Aunt Mary came to visit, I was sitting in Mrs. Davis’s class in the front row of desks fidgeting, waiting for the final bell to ring. When it finally rang, I ran outside to my aunt in her big white car. She said “Hey kid! I’ve got an idea. Why don’t you and I go for a drive?” We drove to the park across from Carol’s and sat talking about all the good times that we’d had eating greasy burgers and playing in the park. We still had the best time, even without Carol’s, although it was truly missed.
C. Lexical & Syntactic Survey\textsuperscript{29}

To be read to participants and filled in by interviewer. Read first without examples, but provide if necessary for the participant to understand the question.

1. What do you call the center of a peach? (ex: pit, stone, seed, kernel, heart)

2. What do you call a device outside the house used to obtain water? (ex: faucet, spicket, spigot, fountain, water fountain, tap, hydrant, etc)

3. What do you call a device over a sink used to obtain water? (ex: tap, faucet, spicket, hydrant, spigot, etc)

4. Family word for Grandfather? (ex: grandpa, papa, gramps, grampa, etc)

5. Family word for Grandmother? (ex: grandma, grammy, mamaw, mammie, etc)

6. When it has rained the road is__________________? (ex: slick, slippery)

7. Black and white animal with a strong odor? (ex: polecat, skunk, woodpussy, etc)

8. Do you know what a pole cat is? Yes ____ No_____ What is it?

9. Answer the question by restating it as a statement. Are there five blue crosses? (ex: There are five blue crosses, There’s five blue crosses, etc)

10. What do you call a melon with orange insides? (ex: cantaloupe, muskmelon, mushmelon, melon, lope, etc)

11. What do you call a carbonated sugar drink? (ex: soda, soda pop, pop, tonic, soft drink, Coke, etc)

12. Call to players to return to base during hide and go seek? (ex: allie-allie-oxen-free, allie-allie-in-free, bee-bee-bumble-bee, everybody in free, etc)

13. How do you say this time of day: 10:45? (ex: 10:45, quarter to eleven, quarter till eleven, etc)

\textsuperscript{29} This Questionnaire was based heavily off questions found in Chapter 21 Dialects: How They Differ by Roger Shuy in Language Readings in Language and Culture (Clark, Eschholz, Rosa).
14. Someone who won’t change his mind is called? (ex: bull-headed, contrary, headstrong, ornery, pig-headed, set, stubborn, etc)

15. I __________ you’re right. (ex: reckon, guess, figger, figure, suspect, etc)

16. It’s half __________ six. (ex: past, after, etc)

17. It’s quarter __________ four. (ex: to, till, until, before, of, etc)

18. Here __________ your pencils. (ex: are, is, etc)

19. Are __________ coming over? (ex: you, youse, you all, y’all, youns, yuz, etc)

20. “I’m not going!” “______________________” (ex: Me either, Me neither, Neither am I, etc)

21. Correct this sentence for me. “I might could go to the store with you after I’m done here.” (ex: might could -> no change, might, could, can; after ->no change, once; done -> no change, finished; etc)

22. What is the past tense of dive? (ex: dived, dove, duv, etc)

23. What color is a banana? (ex: yellow, yeller)

24. How do you say pin and pen? (ex: with the same vowel or different)

25. The house needs ________________? (ex. to be painted, painted)

26. Someone from the country is called a ________________? (ex. redneck, hick, farmer, etc)
### KEY TO THE PRONUNCIATION

#### Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>cat, plait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>sit, myth, begin, theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>has, wash, rough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>put, good, should, ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>age, gather, flavour, cheetah, thorough, lemon, success, mistaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>arm, calm, locale, brahmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>her, earn, bird, spur, myrrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>hair, dare, pear, there, vary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>see, pea, seize, decent, foetus, paeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>saw, ball, board, horse, thought, applaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>too, glue, fruit, route, through, shrewd, rheum, lunatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
<td>German ein, frei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oy</td>
<td>German Häuser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Indicates length
- Indicates nasality

#### Consonants and Semivowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>my, high, ice, sign, seismic, bonsai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>how, plough, sound, kraut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>no, coco, soul, toe, though, glow, beau, mauve, yeoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>near, beer, theory, query, severe, enir, grenaditer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>boy, spell, Frendish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>poor, rural, dour, liqueur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ss</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>tire, byre, choir, quiet, diaphragm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>as in</td>
<td>sour, flower, coward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>chip, ditch, cello, Czech, culture, question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>jar, hedge, urge, logic, gentle, privilege, soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>ring, bank, conquer, junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>thin, throne, birth, health, tooth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>this, clothe, smooth, swarth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>she, ash, chef, station, mission, spacious, herbaceous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>vision, erasure, aubergine, bourgeois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>yes, tune, new, cology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>loch, German ach, Spanish Rioja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>German nicht, Kirche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Spanish olla, Hamar, Italian gli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>French mignon, Spanish piña, Italian gnocco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Stress

- Indicates primary stress on the following syllable
- Indicates secondary stress on the following syllable
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