

2015

L'essentiel ou Lagniappe: The Ideology of French Revitalization in Louisiana

Albert Camp

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [French and Francophone Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Camp, Albert, "L'essentiel ou Lagniappe: The Ideology of French Revitalization in Louisiana" (2015). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 3692.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/3692

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

L'ESSENTIEL OU LAGNIAPPE: THE IDEOLOGY OF FRENCH REVITALIZATION
IN LOUISIANA

A Dissertation

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

in

The Department of French Studies

by

Albert Camp

B.A., Moody Bible Institute, 2006

M.A., Louisiana State University, 2010

August 2015

©Copyright 2015
Albert Camp
All rights reserved

For Taylor, Isabelle, and Claire

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation director, Sylvie Dubois, without whom this project would not exist. I am extremely grateful for the direction, advice, and support that she has given me over the last seven years. I am very fortunate to have worked with her. I would also like to thank Lisi Oliver who passed away days after the defense of this dissertation. She worked so hard to keep the study of linguistics alive at Louisiana State University over past few years, and she was a great teacher and friend. I would like to thank Jack Yeager for his constant kindness and reassurance, and I also want to thank Hugh Buckingham who has been a great encouragement since the day I met him. I would like to thank my Dean's Representative Zevi Gutfreund for taking the time out of his summer to sit on my committee. I would also like to thank Denise Egéa-Kuehne for her guidance in the early stages of this project. I am also grateful to the research project *Le Français à la mesure d'un continent* who facilitated the cooperation of Annette Boudreau and Mourad Ali Khodja in the development of my interview guide.

I am profoundly thankful for my wife Taylor who has supported me constantly throughout my endeavors. My daughter Isabelle has been my inspiration; she keeps me going. Words cannot express how important you both are to me. I would like to thank all of our friends who have helped us build a life here, and my parents who helped me get this far.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION AND LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGY DEFINITION AND STUDIES	9
1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 Language Revitalization: Definitions and Literature Review	10
1.2.1 Modern Studies of Language Shift.....	11
1.2.2 Causes of Language Shift.....	13
1.2.3 Reasons for Reversing Language Shift	17
1.2.4 Defining Language Revitalization.....	19
1.3 Linguistic Ideology: Definitions and Literature Review	21
1.3.1 Ideology in Linguistics	24
1.3.2 Definitions of Linguistic Ideology.....	27
1.3.3 Linguistic Ideology and Language Revitalization	29
1.4 Conclusion.....	31
CHAPTER 2: LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION AND LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGY IN LOUISIANA STUDIES AND APPROACH	32
2.1 Introduction	32
2.2 Language Shift and Revitalization in Louisiana.....	32
2.2.1 The Beginnings of Language Shift in Louisiana	34
2.2.2 Twentieth Century Language Shift in Louisiana	36
2.2.3 The Origins of Language Revitalization in Louisiana.....	38
2.2.4 CODOFIL and the Reintroduction of French at School	39
2.3 Linguistic Ideology in Louisiana	43
2.4 Unknown Factors in the French Revitalization Movement.....	47
2.5 A Mixed Methods Approach to the Study of Ideology.....	52
2.5.1 The Use of Interviews for Collecting Quantitative and Qualitative Data	53
2.6 Conclusion.....	55
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	56
3.1 Creation of the Ideology of Revitalization Corpus.....	56
3.2 Interview Methodology	58
3.3 Selection of the Candidates	60
3.4 Selection of the Interview Questions	62
3.5 The Pilot Study	68
3.6 Changes to the Methodology Based on the Pilot Study	69
3.7 Completion of the IRC Corpus.....	71
3.8 The Coding Process	72
3.9 Creation of the IRC Database.....	74
CHAPTER 4: DATA DISTRIBUTION OCIO-BIOGRAPHIC PROFILES.....	76
4.1 Introduction	76

4.2 Profile: Students	76
4.2.1 Race, Gender, and Class Considerations	77
4.2.2 Family Background and Ethnicity	78
4.2.3 Exposure to French	79
4.2.4 Motivations for Teaching French	81
4.2.5 Student Profile Types	84
4.3 Profile: Administrators	86
4.3.1 Race, Gender, and Class Considerations	87
4.3.2 Family Background and Ethnicity	88
4.3.3 Exposure to French	88
4.3.4 Administrator Relationship to Immersion	91
4.3.5 Administrator Profile Types	91
4.4 Profile Comparisons	94
4.5 Participant Definitions of Cajun and Creole	97
4.6 Conclusion	98
CHAPTER 5: DATA DISTRIBUTION IDEOLOGICAL PROFILES	99
5.1 Introduction	99
5.2 Ideological Profile: Students	100
5.2.1 Ideology 1: French is not as Important as other Languages Because it is not Useful	101
5.2.2 Ideology 2: French Language Use is a Symbolic Marker of Identity, Not Practical for Daily Life	104
5.2.3 Ideology 3: The Government of Louisiana has a Responsibility to Promote and Preserve French Because of its Francophone Heritage	107
5.2.4 Exploring the Link Between Heritage and Government Responsibility	110
5.2.5 Ideology 4: The Survival of French in Louisiana Depends on Economic Usefulness Rather than on Intergenerational Mother Tongue Transmission	114
5.2.6 Student Ideological Profile Types	118
5.3 Ideological Profile Administrators	121
5.3.1 Ideology 1: French is not as Important as other Languages Because it is not Useful	122
5.3.2 Ideology 2: French Language Use is a Symbolic Marker of Identity Not Practical for Daily Life	125
5.3.3 Ideology 3: The Government of Louisiana has a Responsibility to Promote and Preserve French Because of its Francophone Heritage	127
5.3.4 Exploring the Link between Heritage and Government Responsibility	129
5.3.5 Ideology 4: The Survival of French in Louisiana Depends on Economic Usefulness Rather than on Intergenerational Mother Tongue Transmission	133
5.3.6 Administrator Ideological Profile Types	137
5.4 Profile Comparisons	139
5.5 Conclusions	141
CHAPTER 6: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGICAL BELIEFS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	143
6.1 Ideology 1: French is not as Important as other Languages Because it is not Useful	143
6.1.1 Ideology 1 in the Words of the Students	143
6.1.2 Ideology 1 in the Words of the Administrators	147
6.2 Ideology 2: French Language Use is a Symbolic Marker of Identity, Not Practical for Daily Life	150
6.2.1 Ideology 2 in the Words of the Students	150

6.2.2 Ideology 2 in the Words of the Administrators	152
6.3 Ideology 3: The Government of Louisiana has a Responsibility to Promote and Preserve French Because of its Francophone Heritage.....	154
6.3.1 Ideology 3 in the Words of the Students	155
6.3.2 Ideology 3 in the Words of the Administrators	157
6.4 Ideology 4: The Survival of French in Louisiana Depends on Economic Usefulness Rather than on Intergenerational Mother Tongue Transmission.....	160
6.4.1 Ideology 4 in the Words of the Students	160
6.4.2 Ideology 4 in the Words of the Administrators	164
6.5 Discussion of Findings	167
CONCLUSIONS.....	171
Recommendations and Application.....	181
REFERENCES	183
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDES	196
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS BY IDEOLOGY	202
APPENDIX C: CODING SHEETS	204
APPENDIX D: IRB APPROVAL.....	210
VITA.....	212

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Socio-biographic Questions.....	64
TABLE 2: Questions about Belief 1.....	65
TABLE 3: Questions about Belief 2.....	66
TABLE 4: Questions about Belief 3.....	67
TABLE 5: Questions about Belief 4.....	68
TABLE 6: Socio-biographic Data not Included in the Questions	75
TABLE 7: Student Race, Gender, and Class	77
TABLE 8: Student Cultural and Ethnic Links to Louisiana	78
TABLE 9: Student Exposure to French	80
TABLE 10: Student Educational Experience and Choices.....	82
TABLE 11: Students Divided by Ties to Louisiana Francophone Culture	85
TABLE 12: Administrator Race, Gender, and Class	87
TABLE 13: Administrator Cultural and Ethnic Links to Louisiana	88
TABLE 14: Administrator Exposure to French.....	89
TABLE 15: Administrators Divided by Ties to Louisiana Francophone Culture.....	93
TABLE 16: Both Groups Divided by Exposure to Louisiana Francophone Culture.....	96
TABLE 17: Recapitulation of Beliefs	100
TABLE 18: Student Statements Related to Belief 1	102
TABLE 19: Student Statements Related to Belief 2	105
TABLE 20: Student Statements Related to Belief 3	108
TABLE 21: Student Statements about Louisiana Ethnicity and Language.....	111
TABLE 22: Student Statements Related to Belief 4	115
TABLE 23: Student Statements about the Future of French in the Home.....	117
TABLE 24: Important Ideological Differences between Students.....	119
TABLE 25: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 1	122
TABLE 26: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 2	126
TABLE 27: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 3	128
TABLE 28: Administrator Statements Related to Louisiana Ethnicity and Language	130
TABLE 29: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 4	135
TABLE 30: Administrator Statements about the Future of French in the Home	136
TABLE 31: Important Ideological Differences between Administrators.....	138

ABSTRACT

Louisiana's French revitalization movement has received millions of dollars in taxpayer funding through its various initiatives such as music and cultural festivals, public school French immersion programs, and academic exchange programs, among others. Over forty years ago, the state of Louisiana created CODOFIL, a government agency dedicated to the promotion of Francophone language and culture in Louisiana, yet the number of Francophones in the state has continued to decline at an alarming rate according to the most reliable data available. My study investigates the ideology and demographics of those involved in French education programs in Louisiana's public schools. Who decides to become a French teacher and why? What do the administrators in charge of these programs really hope to accomplish and why?

Through analyzing the unique corpus of interviews that I have created by speaking with these individuals from around the state, I provide answers to these questions. The people who currently aspire to become French teachers in Louisiana are not deeply rooted in francophone culture through family or upbringing, but they seem to adopt the ideology of the larger French revitalization movement and see themselves within it. The administrators, however, show an opposite profile from both a socio-biographic and ideological perspective. The administrators of immersion schools tend to be Louisiana natives with personal connections to Cajun and Creole culture, but many of them do not speak French and typically find themselves in charge of an immersion program more by accident than design. Yet the administrators and those university students who aspire to teach French share at least one important ideological belief. They

both see French immersion schools as an essential part, if not the only essential part of the French revitalization movement.

INTRODUCTION

Louisiana is renowned for many things, some of them unsavory and some of them quite savory. So too the linguistic situation provides something of a paradox. Louisiana is known throughout the United States, and indeed the world, as the home of some of the most unique and interesting dialects of French. Yet the linguistic reality of Louisiana is a bit like Bourbon Street on Ash Wednesday. You can tell Mardi Gras was there, but anyone who shows up looking for it that day is in for an unpleasant surprise.

There are still tens of thousands of French speakers in Louisiana, and traces of francophone culture are everywhere. The food, the place names, the holidays, and even the dialects of English present in Louisiana show obvious links to the state's francophone past. However, Louisiana's francophone community has been battling the linguistic phenomenon of language shift that has proved lethal to many of the world's languages. Those who are attempting to resist this language shift are engaged in the work of language revitalization. Interestingly, many involved in this language revitalization movement are not French-speakers themselves.

Language revitalization movements are currently underway in communities throughout the United States and the world. In the 19th and 20th centuries when cultures around the world began to associate language use with national loyalty and identity, linguistic communities began attempting to promote the use of previously neglected or suppressed languages. The modern concept of language revitalization was born in this context. However, language revitalization necessitates a previous condition of language shift where a community is abandoning or has already abandoned one language in favor of another.

Numerous linguists such as Dubois, Klingler, Rottet, and Valdman have studied and described the situation of language shift which has been taking place in Louisiana's francophone communities for more than a hundred years. Yet the movement to revitalize French in Louisiana has been far less studied. The socio-cultural context of revitalization has been a subject of research for some linguists such as Brown and Henry, and scholars widely acknowledge that the task of French revitalization in Louisiana has been placed almost solely on the public school system. Yet only recently have linguists begun to research the methods and implications of language revitalization within Louisiana's schools.

The study described in this dissertation is intended to make a meaningful contribution to two different areas of sociolinguistic research simultaneously. Linguistic ideology is a fairly new field of sociolinguistic research to which many scholars such as Bourdieu, Kroskrity, Silverstein, and Woolard among others have greatly contributed in the last two decades. My study seeks to describe the linguistic ideology of the language revitalization movement in Louisiana through the words of individuals endeavoring to accomplish it in the vital sector of public education. As such this study has implications for the understanding of linguistic ideology and language revitalization not only in Louisiana but also more generally. Hopefully this study will contribute significantly to the ever-increasing body of literature on language shift and how, if at all, it can be reversed.

As French is acknowledged to be rarely passed on in the home in Louisiana, research on language revitalization in Louisiana has been forced to focus on French as it is taught in Louisiana's public schools. Studies like those of Barnett (2010), Egéa-

Keuhne (2006, 2012), Haj-Broussard (2003), Lindner (2008), and Torquist (2000) have provided important insight into the realities of French education in Louisiana and French immersion schools in particular. Yet the linguistic ideology of French revitalization has barely been explored in the school context in Louisiana. This study focuses on two groups who have been almost completely neglected in previous research on French revitalization in Louisiana's schools.

The administrators of Louisiana's French immersion schools have never been the focus of a linguistic study. University students preparing to become French teachers in Louisiana have never been a focus of linguistic study either. These two groups were chosen as the focus of this study, for which a corpus of interviews focusing on linguistic ideology was created. In this corpus, these students and administrators provide insight into their socio-biographic background and express their beliefs about language use in Louisiana and the societal and governmental factors that shape the linguistic reality of modern Louisiana. This corpus was then used to describe the linguistic ideology of these two groups and their place within the French revitalization movement as a whole.

I designed the study with a few different purposes in mind. First, the demographic profile of the two groups in question was relatively unknown. I hoped that by understanding what demographic factors led these individuals to the positions they have would help language planners to know which sectors of society are most likely to participate in language revitalization so they can focus their efforts there. Second I hoped that by understanding the linguistic ideology of these two groups, linguists would better understand what to expect for the future of the French revitalization movement which is undergoing an important generational shift. It was previously unclear to what extent

French teachers and administrators of French immersion programs realize that they are part of a language revitalization movement and, more importantly, whether or not they actually want to be a part of it.

My first chapter provides the context necessary to fully understand this study of linguistic ideology and language revitalization. Language revitalization and its necessary precursor, language shift, are defined and explained through a review of the most relevant research on the topics. Language shift must be understood in order to discuss language revitalization since the two usually occur concurrently and their long-term effects are mutually dependent. Then a review of the literature on linguistic ideology reveals that the term itself has no single definition, and that the way one views linguistic ideology can have important consequences for the methods used to study it.

Once these terms have been sufficiently explained, the second chapter shows what previous research on language shift and revitalization has revealed about Louisiana. The current state of the French revitalization movement and the methods it employs are directly related to the nature and timeline of language shift in Louisiana that the literature so thoroughly describes. The literature review in chapter two describes the history of French language use and its decline in Louisiana from the seventeenth century through the twenty-first century. In recent decades it has been in the study of language attitudes that linguistic ideology and language shift and revitalization have come together. So a review of the literature on language attitudes in Louisiana forms the essential background knowledge for understanding linguistic ideology in this context. From an ideological perspective, the explicit and more often implicit discourse on language revitalization in Louisiana reveals those aspects of linguistic ideology that are vital to this study. One

example is the ideological belief that the government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote French through the public schools. Much of the research that touches on French revitalization in Louisiana assumes this belief to be widely held though it is not always explicitly stated (Barnett 2010; Dubois et al. 1995; Lindner 2008; Tornquist 2000).

Once the background on French revitalization and some of the movement's underlying ideology has been established, I present the scientific methods and approach employed in this study. A mixed-methods approach was used to analyze the data from both a quantitative and a qualitative perspective. The methodology chapter then describes how the content and the participants of the study were chosen. In the end, nine students and nine administrators took part in recorded interviews. This same chapter describes the pilot study used to refine the methodology, and how the corpus was completed. The methods for codification of the data and analysis using JMP statistical analysis software are then described in detail.

The fourth chapter provides a distribution of the socio-biographic data from the corpus. Here, the students and administrators are described using the data provided during their interviews. Obvious considerations such as race, gender, and socio-economic class are considered alongside information such as the participants' links to Louisiana's francophone communities and their exposure to French in schools and outside of schools. All of this data is then used to create socio-biographic profiles that are later considered alongside their ideological differences. First I divide the participants by group because the socio-biographic data shows that the two groups exhibit important differences not only in age but also in terms of socio-economic background, education, geographic origin, and exposure to French. Within the student and administrator groups

the participants are further subdivided by the degree to which they have been immersed in Louisiana culture, specifically Louisiana's francophone culture.

Using a similar format to the chapter that precedes it, the fifth chapter explains the distribution of the ideological data in numbers. The ideological data was codified and analyzed in order to determine which participants likely agreed with four specific ideological beliefs that had been described in the methodology. The ideology of those who agreed and disagreed with the beliefs in question was then considered in light of their socio-biographic profiles. At this point patterns began to emerge relating the participants' ideology and their socio-biographic profiles. Often the administrator group would tend to share one ideological belief and the students another. At other times it seemed readily apparent that some social factor such as geographic origin shaped the ideology of one or both groups in a similar way. For example, the administrators who were from Louisiana all felt that French was more important for children in Louisiana to learn than children in other states while the outsiders disagreed, but for the students geographic origin showed no correlation to their beliefs on this subject.

The sixth chapter provides a qualitative analysis of the data presented in the other chapters. The participants' own statements are presented to create a clearer understanding of the ideological beliefs the participants expressed or implied. In the previous chapter, participants tended to show patterns in their statements in the database that agreed or disagreed with the beliefs in question. When their interviews were analyzed qualitatively, they would usually provide statements that clarified the participants' ideology as it had been described using the more quantitative analysis. In the case of the administrator group, an analysis of numerous statements that had been coded by type of

response suggested that two-thirds probably believed that other languages were more important than French because French is not useful. Though many administrators merely implied such sentiments, one of them openly stated:

if you're outside of the school and you're outside of Acadiana there are just not enough opportunities for the language to seem important because you need it for survival...um I think more and more we're gonna find you need Spanish for survival.

This chapter ends with a summary of the study's findings related to the linguistic ideology of both groups as well as the socio-biographic profiles of both groups and how these profiles affect their ideologies.

After this final chapter I provide a conclusion where the linguistic ideology and socio-biographic profile that the majority of each group exhibits is compared to that of the leaders of the French revitalization movement. In this section important discoveries from this study can be shown to have practical applications for the leaders of Louisiana's French revitalization movement. As an example, the leadership of the French revitalization movement has recently had trouble attracting young people in Louisiana to careers as French immersion teachers. This study found that students who wanted to become French teachers came from homes with highly educated parents with little or no connection to Louisiana francophone culture. Thus, my conclusions show that these types of college students are precisely the demographic that the revitalization movement should be targeting.

The ideological profile of the students also suggests that the revitalization movement must do more to convince this demographic that becoming an immersion teacher is one of many economic benefits available to Louisiana's francophone population today, which is something the students in this study did not often see.

Hopefully future research will confirm that the findings of this study can have practical applications for the French revitalization movement in Louisiana and make an important contribution to our understanding of the link between linguistic ideology and language revitalization in general.

CHAPTER 1: LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION AND LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGY DEFINITION AND STUDIES

1.1 Introduction

To date, no studies have sufficiently questioned the place of French education in Louisiana within the movement of language revitalization. That is to say, no previous studies have addressed the questions of why people become involved with this particular aspect of the language revitalization movement or what they hope to accomplish. It has not even been investigated whether or not French and immersion teachers in Louisiana even recognize that a language revitalization movement exists.

Few if any language revitalization movements in the world can be described as an unqualified success. Any evaluation of the success or failure of a language revitalization movement would depend on the goals and perspectives of the people involved. For example, the goal of the Irish language planners is not to completely replace the English language with Irish as the language of daily life in the entire country. Yet Hebrew language planners did intend to create a society where Hebrew would be the primary language of government, education, commerce, and social interaction.

The study described in the following chapters should be able to shed some light on the goals and ideology of the people most intimately involved in Louisiana's language revitalization movement. Given the prominence of French education in the revitalization movement, it is arguably the teachers of French and not the government employees of the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL) or language activists working in the various communities who will have the most profound influence on Louisiana's French revitalization movement. The first director of CODOFIL, James Domengeaux, famously said, "The schools have destroyed French, the schools will make

it live again” (Cheramie 2003)¹. This sentiment seems to have been the guiding ideology of Louisiana’s French revitalization movement since the late 1960’s. Yet it remains to be seen whether or not this sentiment has actually taken root in the hearts and minds of those who teach French. This study can hopefully assess whether the schools have actually accepted this mission.

1.2 Language Revitalization: Definitions and Literature Review

Language shift and language revitalization, treated together for practical purposes, are fields of study with a well-developed body of research. Language shift is one of the natural outcomes of language contact. Throughout human history, societies have abandoned their native language in favor of another. The Hittite language, once widespread, ceased to exist thousands of years ago. When the Hittite Empire collapsed, its former subjects simply adopted neighboring languages. In another case, one biblical writer comments “Moreover, in those days I saw men of Judah who had married women from Ashdod, Ammon and Moab. Half of their children spoke the language of Ashdod or the language of one of the other peoples, and did not know how to speak the language of Judah” (Nehemiah 13:23-23, New International Version).

Many widely spoken languages such as Gaulish and Thracian were completely replaced by dialects of Latin and Greek during the period of the Roman Empire. The Pictish people of Scotland abandoned their language in favor of English and Goidelic dialects during the early middle ages. European languages have displaced unknown thousands of languages in the Americas since their arrival, and those indigenous languages that remain are still battling language shift. Linguists have been aware of this

¹ This quote appears with many minor variations in wording throughout the literature on Louisiana French.

phenomenon for a very long time. However, it is only since the mid-twentieth century that a large amount of serious research has been undertaken on the topic of how, why, and when language shift occurs. Often this research seeks to do no more than explain a naturally occurring linguistic phenomenon. Other times research into language shift has sought to understand this phenomenon in hopes of reversing the process. That is to say, many linguists have sought to understand why and how people abandon their language in order to prevent them from doing so.

Language shift is often referred to as language endangerment because the language or dialect in question will cease to exist once a given community has abandoned it. However, it is vital to note that attempts to reverse language shift carry an implicit ideology. The notion that languages should be saved necessitates a value judgment. The belief that language shift is bad, though very widely held, depends more on sentiment than science. Thus, it is important to consider all studies of language shift very carefully because it can be very easy to forget that no language lasts forever. Even if language shift could be eliminated, the linguistic universal of language change would inevitably have the same result.

1.2.1 Modern Studies of Language Shift

The very first forays into the study of language shift by modern linguists can be said to have taken place in the early twentieth century. Leonard Bloomfield's article, *Literate and illiterate speech*, comments on the phonological, morphological, and lexical deviance of young speakers of the Menomini language of Wisconsin as early as 1927. Later in 1948, Morris Sawdesh's article, *Sociologic notes on obsolescent languages*, called for the collection of systematic data on disappearing languages including the

sociological make-up, language attitudes, and language use of the speech communities in question. In the second half of the twentieth century, numerous scholars began to conduct research into language shift and proposed various methods for such research: Weinreich 1951; Haugen 1969; Fishman 1964; Miller 1971; Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter 1977; Dressler 1981 and 1982; Sasse 1992; etc. Thus, in the later twentieth century numerous methods for conducting field research into the phenomenon of language shift accompany an explosion of research into these communities where language shift is occurring.

At its core, language shift is merely the event of a speech community abandoning one language in favor of another. This phenomenon can take many forms however, and the consequences of language shift can vary greatly for the communities involved as well as for the world as a whole. One common consequence of language shift is language death where a language may disappear forever once a specific speech community abandons it entirely (Dorian 1989). Similarly, dialect death is the phenomenon whereby a specific dialect of a language disappears as a result of language shift though the language as a whole will live on (Jones 1998b).

This distinction between language death and dialect death is an important one. For example, if one day French is no longer spoken in Louisiana, it will most likely continue to be spoken in France, Canada, Africa, etc. Yet if one day Breton is no longer spoken in Brittany, then it will not be spoken at all. The phenomenon whereby language or dialect death becomes a realistic possibility in the near future due to language shift is referred to language or dialect endangerment. Thus, in the case of Louisiana French, it

can be said that language shift has been occurring for generations, but it is only dialect endangerment and not language endangerment that is occurring as a consequence.

However, the study of dialect endangerment as a result of language shift is no less legitimate than that of language endangerment, and the methods for studying the phenomenon are the same. As Tsunoda points out, language and dialect endangerment have the following similarities:

- (a) Social setting: they have similar - if not identical - social settings. For example, they are surrounded by a dominant dialect or language
- (b) Disuse: their use decreases, often leading to their demise
- (c) Structural changes: they go through similar structural changes (2005:5)

Since language and dialect endangerment have similar if not identical causes and consequences, they will be treated as a single phenomenon for the purposes of this study.

1.2.2 Causes of Language Shift

Despite decades of study by linguists around the world, no sufficient consensus on the causes of language shift has yet been established. Joshua Fishman was perhaps the first to investigate the phenomenon of language shift at a macro level. In 1964, Fishman wrote, “It is currently impossible to specify in advance an invariant list of psychological, social, and cultural processes or variables that might be of universal importance for an understanding of language maintenance or language shift” (p.49). More recently, Crawford stated “no one has developed a comprehensive theory of language shift –what causes it under widely varying conditions, what prevents it from happening, what can help to reverse it” (1996:53). Several decades of intense study of language shift have come to show that it can happen in many seemingly contradictory situations (Tsunoda

2005:70-71). All seem to agree, though, that there are usually many underlying causes of language shift, and thus, in any given situation each of these underlying causes would have to be identified, and furthermore redressed in order to achieve language revitalization.

Generally speaking, the root causes of language contact, and eventually language shift, are thought to be extra-linguistic. In order for language shift to occur two languages have to be in contact. One language group may conquer another militarily or one group may be driven to a new territory in order to flee some natural disaster such as drought or famine. However it may occur, languages come into contact with one another for non-linguistic reasons, and some form of societal bilingualism develops.

Unsurprisingly, linguists tend to state that language shift presupposes a preceding stage of bilingualism (Campbell 1994; Denison 1977; Mesthrie 1994; Mougion and Beniak 1989; and Sasse 1992).

Once language contact and societal bilingualism occur, there are only three possible outcomes. Either a form of stable bilingualism will develop and continue indefinitely; the two languages will combine to form a new language; or one language will eventually displace the other. From a sociolinguistic perspective, a bilingual community usually has one language with a higher level of prestige than the other. Ruth King calls these the “high language” and “low language” (1989). The low language will be used in domains of life which are seen as less prestigious by the community such as within the family or only within the local community, and the high language will be associated with those domains perceived as more prestigious (Fishman 1964, 1965, 1972; Hymes 1967, 1968; Tsunoda 2005). Obviously, the prestigious domains of life will vary

from place to place. A religious society may assign a high level of prestige to the language of their religion as has traditionally been the case with Arabic in Muslim areas, while a more secular society may assign very little prestige to the language of religion. Or the language of international commerce may have a high level of prestige in a developed Western society while it could have a low level of prestige in a remote agrarian society. It is generally the language with the lower level of prestige that is eventually abandoned, but there are exceptions such as Anglo-Norman in England or Lithuanian in Prussia prior to World War I as noted by Tsunoda (2005).

Patrick McConvell has proposed the “functional choice theory of language shift” in which it is the desire to either distance oneself from or become associated with a certain social group that determines language choice in a bilingual setting and eventually leads to language shift (1991:150). Similarly, Mougeon and Beniak suggest that “language shift will happen only to the extent that the minority lets it or desires it. Shift will take its course only if and when the minority no longer wishes to be seen as a distinct socio-cultural collectivity” (1991:43). But McKay (1996:205) and Martin-Jones (1989) believe the reasons behind language shift lie more in the unequal political and economic power of one language over another and speakers are essentially left with little or no choice but to adopt a new language (as cited in Tsunoda 2005:72). The truth about language shift is most likely a combination of the two theories. Obviously, there is some level of choice on the part of the speakers of a language who choose not to pass the language on to their children. Nevertheless, the fact that the language of political and economic power is rarely the one abandoned suggests that any choice to stop using a language is never made free from outside influence. Those who study modern situations

of language shift often cite situations of mandatory public schooling and military service as the ways that the language of political and economic power forces language shift upon a population (Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter 1977; Rottet 2001).²

During the process of language shift, which rarely takes place in less than three generations (Brenzinger 1998; Edwards 1984; Fishman 1965; Jones 1998b), many structural changes occur in a language before it falls into complete disuse. Linguistic attrition, as it is often called, results in changes to the linguistic structure of a language as speakers either fail to acquire it completely as children or experience a reduction in fluency due to lack of use (Mougeon and Beniak 1991; Sasse 1992). These generations with an imperfect level of fluency in the disappearing language will essentially create a new form of the language as they use it imperfectly.³ Tsunoda cites numerous researchers who have noted the loss or reduction of sounds, replacement of synthetic morphology with more analytic syntax, the loss of case systems in exchange for more rigid word order, the loss or reduction of subordination, and an increase in linguistic innovation as cross-linguistic characteristics of linguistic attrition in situations of language shift (2005:101-108). Therefore, linguistic attrition leads to massive structural changes within a language between the time when language shift begins and the time when the language disappears completely, and all this typically occurs in a matter of about three generations.

² It should also be mentioned that McConvell (1991) and Dixon (1997) among others have suggested that the complexity of a language may influence language shift. Their theory is that in a situation of language contact, the language which is linguistically more complex will be abandoned in favor of the less complex language because it is easier for children to learn and use. Yet this theory does not seem particularly likely or useful since linguistic complexity is not always easily measured and many situations of language shift involve languages that are apparently of relatively equal complexity.

³ This phenomenon shares many of the features of creolization.

1.2.3 Reasons for Reversing Language Shift

As language shift is constantly occurring all over the world, many also work to halt or even reverse language shift. The question of whether or not linguists should be involved in efforts to reverse language shift is a complex one that has been addressed many times. Fishman (1991) and Tsunoda (2005) have written two seminal works on reversing language shift, and each of them devotes an entire chapter to the question of why anyone should work to reverse language shift. As scientists, one could argue that linguists should not be for or against the phenomenon of language shift and they should merely remain impartial observers. Yet arguments for reversing language shift can be made on purely scientific grounds as well. Ken Hale points out that “without linguistic diversity it will be impossible for us to perform the central task of linguistic science, i.e. the task of developing a realistic theory of human linguistic competence” (1998:193). This argument for linguistic diversity has been touted by many others as well (Bradley 2002; Dorian 1993b; Krauss 2007; etc. as cited in Tsunoda 2005:54). Indeed, it does seem entirely logical that for the sake of future scientific discovery in linguistics, all languages that exist today should be preserved.

From a somewhat less scientific perspective some have argued that all languages should be preserved because they contain an irreplaceable cultural knowledge belonging to the people who use them. Pawley eloquently states the value of languages: they are “the product of generations of experience of countless intelligences applied to problems of human condition” (as cited in Tsunoda 2005:149). However, these arguments recall the often-refuted Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, that people's thoughts and actions can be

influenced or determined by the language they speak (Sapir 1951; Whorf 1956). The great proponent of reversing language shift, Joshua Fishman acknowledges that such cultural knowledge is not necessarily lost through language shift, but he still suggests there is some merit in the argument:

After all, in the long run, all languages are equally capable of expressing any and all sociocultural realities. However, no one lives in the long run; we all live in the short run, in the here and now, and in the short run the pro-RLSers [reversing language shift] are right: in the short run (which is to say, at any particular point in time) no language but the one that has been most historically and intimately associated with a given culture is as well able to express the artifacts and the concerns of that culture. (1991:21)

Nevertheless, these arguments for irreplaceable cultural knowledge seem far less convincing from a linguistic perspective than the scientific need for linguistic diversity.

One final argument for reversing language shift given by Tsunoda is for purely aesthetic reasons (2005:156). He cites Dorian (1992); Trudgill (1991); and Krauss (2007) among others who all believe that the world is a richer place for having many different languages. According to this argument, any language that disappears makes the world a slightly less diverse and interesting place. This argument is clearly entirely dependent upon sentiment, but Fishman agrees that those who believe in fighting against language shift “should not be embarrassed about the fact that theirs is basically a value position...because the position of their opponents is also no more than a value position” (1991:19). Thus, the reasons given by linguists for reversing language shift range from purely scientific to purely sentimental, but whatever their reasons, linguists continue to engage in the work of language revitalization. In light of these facts, it seems logical that the reason why linguists and non-linguists engage in language revitalization is a phenomenon worthy of further study in its own right.

1.2.4 Defining Language Revitalization

In reviewing the previous research into reversing language shift, one finds several different terms associated with this task. Fishman uses language maintenance, language revival, and reversing language shift (1964, 1991). Tsunoda cites authors who use no less than twelve different terms including language preservation, language reproduction, language restoration, and language resurrection among others (2005:168). Language revitalization will be used for the purposes of this study in line with Jones (1998b); Reyhner (1999); Spolsky (1995); Tsunoda (2005); and others.

Having chosen language revitalization as the preferred label for this task, I must now define it. Undoubtedly the definitions for this task are almost as numerous as the studies conducted on the topic. Bradley and Bradley (2002); Fase, Koen, & Sjaak (1992); Fishman (1991); Grenoble and Whatley (2009); Hinton and Hale (2001); and Tsunoda (2005) have devoted entire books to the general topic of language shift and language revitalization. Individual studies and specific accounts are too numerous to name.⁴ Understandably, every situation of language shift has some unique characteristics, and the process of language shift is a relatively slow one. Therefore, language revitalization can be thought of as a process that exists on a continuum. Language revitalization is the process of reversing the progress of language shift at whatever stage it may be (Fishman 1991). This is perhaps why Fishman prefers the term “reversing language shift” over language revitalization. Thus, language shift and

⁴ However, Tsunoda (2005) makes an admirable attempt in his thorough treatment of the subject.

language revitalization can be thought of as two processes moving in opposite directions along the continuum between a healthy language and a dead one.

Tsunoda sums up language revitalization as the attempt to “maintain or restore a language to such a state that it is spoken by a reasonable number of people, reasonably fluently, and in a reasonably intact form” (2005:171). However, this definition is rather vague, as Tsunoda acknowledges.⁵ By contrast, Fishman states many times that the eventual goal of language revitalization efforts should always be “self-perpetuating inter-generational mother-tongue transmission” (1991). Though he acknowledges that achieving this goal is a very difficult task for any threatened language, it does seem the most logical goal in that this returns the language to the status of every other language that is not undergoing language shift.

Many still debate whether reversing language shift by this definition is actually possible (as discussed by Amery 2000:21; Fishman 1991:10-38; and Schmidt 1990:104-106). Hebrew is generally held up as the model for every language seeking to achieve revitalization. It is widely acknowledged that modern Israeli Hebrew does show some linguistic differences from the form which died out as a vernacular language thousands of years ago. Nevertheless, the Hebrew example clearly meets the goal of self-perpetuating intergenerational mother tongue transmission, so such an outcome is clearly possible (Fishman 1991; Spolsky 1995). Through studying the cases of language revitalization that have met with some success such as Hebrew, Welsh, or Maori, linguists hope to learn what makes some attempts at revitalization successful while others fail.

⁵ By this definition, language revitalization has already been completely successful in many places such as Ireland, New Zealand, and Louisiana.

1.3 Linguistic Ideology: Definitions and Literature Review

Not all linguistic research is purely scientific. One key notion of science is that it is free from passion and makes no value judgments. Linguistics is normally defined as the scientific and systematic study of language. Yet every human being on earth uses language and most language users are not linguists; thus, value judgments and opinions about languages and their use are rampant. Over the past few decades, linguists have begun to classify the study of these opinions, value judgments, and metalinguistic commentaries as linguistic ideology.

The term ideology first appeared in the writings of the French Enlightenment philosopher Antoine Louis Claude, Comte Destutt de Tracy. In his four-part discourse *Éléments d'idéologie*, first published between 1801 and 1815, Destutt de Tracy proposed a new field of scientific study called ideology. For him, the field of ideology was to be a subfield of zoology, which would be applicable only to human beings. Ideology would be the study of ideas or the study of how humans think. Michael Silverstein says that “Destutt de Tracy proposed it as a formation parallel to any of the other ‘-ologies’ of a systematic scientific outlook” (1998:124). Yet this term was quickly adopted by other speech communities and its meaning now bears little semblance to the one its creator envisioned. Kathryn Woolard points out that even within Destutt de Tracy’s lifetime the term had already been commandeered:

The term was soon given its negative connotation in Napoleon’s effort to discredit Destutt de Tracy and his colleagues, whose institutional position and work were tied to republicanism. In Napoleon’s use, ideology became “mere” and “ideologue” a dismissive epithet for proponents of abstract theories not based in or appropriate to human and political realities. (1998:5)

Napoleon's use of the term has definitely endured, and Destutt de Tracy's usage is essentially unknown today. Still, the term is not always used pejoratively, and it is this other usage of the word that social scientists have generally adopted.

In the world of social science there are many different usages of the word ideology. In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, Woolard lays out at least four distinct views of ideology (1998). The first of these views is that of ideology as “ideational or conceptual, referring to mental phenomena; ideology has to do with consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs, ideas” (1998:5). This view seems most similar to that of the term's inventor. Nevertheless the conceptual representations being studied are partisan and necessarily detached from reality in the sense that they are abstract and unique to an individual or group and not universal truths. Yet Gouldner points out that these “reports about the world, or social theories” must be “rationally and empirically supported” (1976:31). So, in this view, ideology is still scientific in the sense that it must have an empirical basis.

Others who hold this mental conceptual view of ideology still argue that it is not necessarily subjective though it is a mental phenomenon. Louis Althusser speaks of ideology in terms of “lived relations” which cannot be true or false (1971). Eagleton takes this to mean that ideology is thus a matter of lived relations between individuals and institutions in a society (1991:18). In this view, ideology is a mental phenomenon and it exists only in the actions that it produces, and therefore, it is inappropriate to speak of it in terms of subjectivity or objectivity.

A second view of ideology according to Woolard is that of a response to “the experience or interests of a particular social position” (1998:6). In this sense ideology is

not an ideational concept that originates in the mind, but rather a reaction to outside societal forces. Gouldner suggests that the famous “ideology” by Marx and Engels was an ideology in line with this definition in that they saw the invention of ideology as a reaction of the bourgeoisie to the French Revolution (1976:195-209). Importantly, though, this view of ideology is essentially neutral in that the reactions manifested as ideology need not be selfish.

Woolard’s third major view of ideology defines it as “ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power” (1998:7). This definition is related to the second view in that it is dependent upon the reaction to outside forces. J.B. Thompson describes ideology as part of “the process of sustaining asymmetrical relations of power – that is, to the process of maintaining domination” (1984:4). This view of ideology is separated from the second only in that it is necessarily linked to self-interest at the expense of others.

One final view of ideology discussed by Woolard is that of ideology as a distortion or rationalization “in defense of interest and power” (1998:7). This distorted view is thus more intellectual than social in nature since it is in some way detached from reality. Yet this distortion need not be some type of voluntary delusion; it can also be a product of human limitations of cognition and perception. Talcott Parsons suggested this view and saw ideology as inherently unscientific in nature. He believes that cognitive distortions and deviations from scientific objectivity are always present in ideology by definition ([1959] 1970:294-295 as cited in Woolard 1998). This view is probably the most negative one since it defines ideology both by its inherent interest in domination of others and by its distortion of reality.

Ideology is rarely used in a completely neutral fashion. Woolard believes “even the most doggedly neutral social-scientific uses are tinged with disapprobation, the truly neutral stance more often encoded by the choice of other labels such as culture, worldview, belief, *mentalité*, and so on” (1998:8). However, in order to be of any use for scientific purposes, the negative and distorted connotations of the term cannot be allowed to distract from the important role that ideology plays in discourse and social actions. Clifford Geertz openly acknowledges that the use of the term ideology by social scientists is often seen to negate the scientific nature of their study:

Although the arrival of a scientific sociology has been repeatedly proclaimed, the acknowledgment of its existence is far from universal even among social scientists themselves; and nowhere is resistance to claims to objectivity greater than in the study of ideology. (Geertz 1973:195)

Geertz’s work on the study of ideology by social scientists is arguably one of the most eloquent in its defense of the idea that social scientists can, and indeed must, study ideology from a neutral scientific perspective.

Ideologies do make empirical claims about the condition and direction of society, which it is the business of science...to assess. The social function of science vis-à-vis ideologies is first to understand them – what they are, how they work, what gives rise to them – and second to criticize them, to force them to come to terms with (but not necessarily to surrender to) reality. (Geertz 1973:232)

Social scientists, including sociolinguists, can approach the study of ideology in this way. Forcing humanity to look at the world, and indeed itself, in the cold light of scientific rationalism is the job of every scientist.

1.3.1 Ideology in Linguistics

Exactly how, if at all, ideology affects language use has been a point of contention among linguists for some time. Koerner argues that linguists in the Bloomfieldian tradition long neglected the study of many of the more abstract characteristics of

language until Chomsky's theories allowed for a more theoretical approach to the study of language and its problems, and the application of "logic, mathematics, psychology and other fields of epistemological relevance" (1970:162). Woolard says that these earlier linguists "assumed that linguistic ideology and prescriptive norms have little significant – or paradoxically, only pernicious – effect on speech forms" (1998:11). In the first half of the twentieth century, even fields such as semantics, a staple of linguistic study today, were viewed by many linguists as too unscientific to place within the field of linguistics (cf Koerner 1970). However, in the second half of the twentieth century, linguists began to explore new subjects of linguistic relevance including what effect ideology may have on language use.

William Labov has argued that ideology, which he does not clearly define, could not affect speech forms (1979:329). He says one individual's case from his New York study "shows that a profound shift in social experience and ideology could not alter the socially determined pattern of linguistic variation" (1979:329). As if to anticipate the argument that one individual case is not reliable, he continues "there was a wide individual variation in placement on the use of the variables, but the individual's place in that spectrum reflected his early social experience, almost independent of his individual ideology or self-image" (1979:329). However, he never clearly defines the term ideology, and his denial of the importance of ideology in language use may be a semantic misunderstanding. In the same essay, he concedes "individual differences in psychological orientation have led to differences in social experience and social aspiration which in turn are reflected in predictable, socially patterned differences in behavior" (1979:330-331). That which Labov calls "psychological orientation" could

easily be interpreted as ideology depending on one's definition. Furthermore, other linguists such as Joseph Errington argue that Labov's generalizations apply more to the study of phonological variation than to other fields of linguistic study (1988:230-237).⁶

Many other linguists in the late twentieth century clearly argue that linguistic ideology does affect language structure and use. Alan Rumsey states, "language structure and linguistic ideology are not entirely independent of each other, nor is either determined entirely by the other" (1990:357). Michael Silverstein argues that the important shift from *thou* to *you* in English came about as a result of the term *thou* being interpreted as inherently ideological and thus a term that many wanted to avoid (1985:242-251). Silverstein states very plainly "to 'understand' one's own linguistic usage is potentially to change it" (1979:233). From a theoretical standpoint, linguists usually begin any discussion of linguistic ideology with a reference to the critical work of Pierre Bourdieu whose theories of linguistic capital have become foundational to the study of linguistic ideology. Woolard paraphrases him thus: "Structure conditions ideology, which then reinforces and expands the original structure, distorting language in the name of making it more like itself" (1998:12). Bourdieu suggests not only that ideology can affect language but, more importantly, that language reveals and shapes ideology, making them co-dependent. He speaks of "the *competitive struggle* which leads each agent, through countless strategies of assimilation and dissimilation...constantly to change his substantial properties (here, pronunciation, diction, syntactic devices, etc.) [emphasis in the original]" (Bourdieu 1991:64).

⁶ The New York study where Labov mentions ideology was a study of phonological variation.

For linguists, the study of ideology is particularly problematic given the ethereal nature of language itself. Woolard mentions that many linguists believe “ideology is variously discovered in linguistic practice itself; in explicit talk about language, that is, metalinguistic or metapragmatic *discourse*; and in the regimentation of language use through more implicit metapragmatics” (1998:9). Blommaert (1994) and Kroskrity (1998) among others emphasize a methodology that relies on the interpretation of the unsaid or implicit ideology present in metalinguistic discourse. Blommaert, in reference to his study of linguistic ideology in post-colonial Tanzania, says “apart from the way in which one talks about Kiswahili, the discourse will reveal ideas, attitudes, and assumptions about how Kiswahili should function as a medium of social interaction in general” (1994:214). Most linguists accept that a thorough study of linguistic ideology requires both an investigation of the overt ideologies expressed in metalinguistic discourse as well as the implicit ideologies, which are not overtly expressed therein. The exact methods linguists employ to study linguistic ideology, however, depend greatly upon their definitions of the term.

1.3.2 Definitions of Linguistic Ideology

If one accepts that linguistic ideology does indeed have the power to affect language use and structure, then it is definitely a subject of great importance for linguists. Blommaert says “there is now a widespread recognition of language ideologies as a crucial topic of debate in the study of language and society” (1999:1). For this reason, many linguists have set out to study linguistic ideology in many different contexts such as the studies of Boudreau (2009), Dubois et al. (1995), Egéa-Kuehne (2012), Jones (1998a), and Mertz (1989), but unfortunately there is not yet any consensus on how

exactly linguistic ideology should be defined. There is, as yet, no accepted core literature on linguistic ideology and the methods and emphases of ideological studies of language can vary greatly (Woolard 1998:3).

Definitions of linguistic ideology can be rather broad, as in Rumsey's "shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world" (1990:346). Rumsey's definition may imply that these "commonsense notions" are scientifically accurate. He claims to credit this definition to Silverstein; however, Silverstein's definition is quite a bit more specific. In 1979, Silverstein defined linguistic ideology as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" because he wanted to emphasize that the truth value of these beliefs was not necessarily relevant to their effect on language (p. 193).

Judith Irvine defines linguistic ideology as "the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (1989:255). Her definition expands the term beyond language itself, but also to the interaction of language and society. This idea addressing the importance of society is echoed and expanded by Shirley Heath, who defines linguistic ideology as "self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of the group" (1989:53). Thus, for Heath ideology exists as a group rather than an individual phenomenon. Errington seems to adopt this view in referencing a " 'state idea' of language and identity, ethnic and national" (1998:273). Monica Heller also makes reference to this group or state ideology of language (1999:143-170).

Many linguists abide by the definition of linguistic ideology as “representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world” (Woolard 1998:3).⁷ This definition notes importantly that linguistic ideology is something that is observable through either implicit or explicit behavior or speech. Annette Boudreau defines linguistic ideology as “beliefs so completely ingrained in the minds of individuals, that the speakers take them as a given and do not seek to question their origins” (2009:440). Boudreau’s definition draws attention to the important fact that linguistic ideology exists below the level of meta-linguistic awareness.⁸ Accepting these two definitions, I will define linguistic ideology as subconscious beliefs about language, unquestioningly accepted by individuals or groups, which are observable through explicit and implicit discourse.

1.3.3 Linguistic Ideology and Language Revitalization

Although linguistic ideology has been a topic of study in many different linguistic contexts, it seems to have taken on a special importance in the study of language contact situations. Colin Baker traces the evolution of the study of language attitudes from its beginnings in second language acquisition to its modern importance in situations of language contact (1992:22-47). The idea of one language, one people has been present for most of recorded history. As far back as the biblical story of the tower of Babel, writers were either implying or openly stating that a people is defined by the fact that it shares a common language. More recently, nineteenth- and twentieth-century

⁷ This definition is used by all of the authors in an important collection of essays by Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity (1998).

⁸ For the purpose of this study, a combination of Woolard's and Boudreau’s definitions seems most useful.

nationalism has expanded this idea to a widespread belief that one political nation should be characterized by a common language.

This idea has been perpetuated by the studies of descriptive linguists who seek to catalogue and name the world's languages and dialects while defining them as separate in the process. Without these labels, studies of language contact could not exist. These labels are obviously important, but their ideological importance has only recently begun to be recognized. Nancy Dorian has pointed out the importance of prestige values in situations of language shift (1981). Similarly, Elizabeth Mertz has stated "although we cannot make a simple correlation between external pressure or prestige values and language shift, there is no doubt that the difference in status between Gaelic and English played a role in shaping the interpretive filter through which Cape Breton Gaels understood their linguistic situation" (1989:109). Not only in the context of language shift, but also in the context of language standardization, attitudes about language came to be seen as an important component in language structure and usage (cf Le Page 1988; Romaine 1994). In recent decades it has been in the study of *language attitudes* that linguistic ideology and language shift and revitalization have come together.

However, language attitudes are not the only component of linguistic ideology. A thorough study of linguistic ideology requires investigation into attitudes and perceptions not only about language, but also about the socio-cultural and political issues that are relevant to the particular linguistic situation. Recent studies in situations of language shift and revitalization have tried to take this much broader approach to the study of language ideology (Boudreau 2009; Murtagh 2007; O hlfearnain 2007; Riagain 2007; Trenchs-Parera and Newman 2009). It is the inclusion of beliefs about extra-linguistic

issues that ultimately separates linguistic ideology from language attitudes. Thus, beliefs about some extra-linguistic factors such as political, social, and cultural realities combine with beliefs about language to form the underlying linguistic ideology of an individual or a group.

1.4 Conclusion

Language shift is a naturally occurring linguistic phenomenon. Language revitalization on the other hand, is usually an act of human endeavor. As such, attempts at language revitalization naturally carry an ideological component. Accepting that linguistic ideology refers to unquestioningly accepted beliefs about language, the linguistic ideology of Louisiana's French revitalization movement can now be investigated. If language revitalization seeks the end result of stable intergenerational mother tongue transmission, it seems logical that only those who seek this end are actually part of a language revitalization movement. The linguistic situation of Louisiana must now be considered through this lens. What is the goal of Louisiana's language revitalization movement and who shares this goal? This study will attempt to answer these questions.

CHAPTER 2: LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION AND LINGUISTIC IDEOLOGY IN LOUISIANA STUDIES AND APPROACH

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented definitions of the key terms of this study such as language shift, language revitalization, ideology, and more specifically linguistic ideology. The previous chapter also provided an overview of the most notable literature addressing these subjects. This chapter presents an overview of the literature addressing these subjects in the Louisiana context. Once I have established what is known about language revitalization and linguistic ideology in Louisiana, I will be able to present some research questions, which have not been answered by previous studies, and my approach to answering these questions.

2.2 Language Shift and Revitalization in Louisiana

The first official permanent French settlement in the Mississippi delta region was established at Fort Maurepas (modern-day Biloxi) in 1699. The Louisiana colony eventually expanded and its capital was established in New Orleans. Throughout the period of French rule, "the majority of its inhabitants had a native language other than French" (Dubois 2014:160). Even those inhabitants who came from France or other French colonies would have spoken primarily regional dialects or patois. As Dubois notes:

The francophone population of colonial Louisiana was comprised of a small educated elite, in charge of the colony, who had to speak and write the French of Ile de France in order to communicate with the French administration situated in Paris. Its members probably also spoke a regional dialect as their native language. (2013:203)

Outside of this small elite the majority of the francophone population was illiterate (Richard 1989:121). Nevertheless, a form of colonial French became the dominant

language in Louisiana. In his book on eighteenth-century German immigrants to Louisiana, Deiler notes, "French gradually became the family language even in those German families which had preserved the German language during three generations" (1969:118). Later, throughout the period of Spanish rule 1762-1800, the adoption of the French language by other immigrant groups continued. Smith and Parenton state:

In many ways the acculturation of the Spanish and Anglo-Saxons by the Louisiana French population is even more significant, since it took place in spite of official efforts [during the period of Spanish rule] to accomplish the opposite. (1938:339)

Undoubtedly, the influx of French speakers from Acadia, Haiti, and Europe during the Spanish period also contributed to the dominance of French in Louisiana. Larbi Oukada describes the linguistic situation under Spanish rule by saying "the French language was not seriously challenged by the Castilian idiom. Conversely it continued to be the language of the colony" (1977:9).

The language shift away from French in Louisiana did not begin until the nineteenth century. The majority of Louisiana's population was most likely francophone prior to the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. Carl Brasseaux states, "It has been estimated that in 1803 French-speakers enjoyed a seven-to-one numerical advantage over English-speakers among Louisiana's free population" (1992:93).⁹ However, francophone numerical superiority did not last long, as Brasseaux states that francophones only outnumbered anglophones by three-to-one in 1812, and that by the time of the American

⁹ Though Brasseaux does not state where he finds this number, it appears to have originated with Larbi Oukada's 1977 doctoral thesis in which he cites William Claiborne, Louisiana's first American governor, who states in 1809 that "the fact is, Sir, that my countrymen (with some few exceptions) who have emigrated here, although they don't exceed one-sixth of the population would wish to govern the Territory to the exclusion of the ancient inhabitants" (Oukada 1977:14).

Civil War, francophones represented roughly thirty percent of Louisiana's population (1992:93). Oukada estimates that Anglophones became the majority in Louisiana some time between 1810 and 1820 (1977:15). This huge demographic shift was bound to have significant linguistic consequences.

2.2.1 The Beginnings of Language Shift in Louisiana

The legal power in Louisiana would shift from French to English only slowly at first. The United States federal government, however, was not neutral in the legal struggle between French and English in the state. The first Louisiana state constitution, which was a prerequisite for statehood, included an English language preference clause. Yet Roger Ward notes "the drafters of the 1812 constitution included this English language preference clause to satisfy one of the prerequisites for statehood required under the Enabling Act" (1997:1293). The Enabling Act passed by the United States Congress specifically required that any laws passed in the territory of Orleans, which would become the state of Louisiana, be written and recorded in the same language as the United States Constitution (Act of Feb. 20, 1811, ch. 21, 2 Stat. 641). Nevertheless, the first Louisiana Constitution was debated and written in French before being translated into English for submission to the United States Congress. Furthermore, all acts of the Louisiana State Legislature were promulgated in both English and French between 1812 and 1867 (Ward 1997).

Within fifty years of its purchase, the political, economic, and cultural power in Louisiana shifted into the hands of the new English-speaking American majority. As is usually the case, the linguistic prestige of French decreased as French speakers became an ever smaller and less powerful minority. Carl Brasseaux's book on Acadians in the

nineteenth century examines in detail the historical context of Louisiana's great language shift (1992).¹⁰ Self-identified Acadians or Cajuns were the most populous group of French-speakers in Louisiana throughout the twentieth century; the majority of literature on language shift in Louisiana, therefore, has focused on them.

One feature common to the vast majority of Louisiana French-speakers regardless of ethnicity was that they were Catholic. Aside from the fact that non-Catholic religious ceremonies were banned in colonial Louisiana, almost all immigrants during the colonial period came from Catholic regions of Europe, whether they were French-speaking or not. Thus, one way to study the overall language shift from French to English in Louisiana is through the investigation of the records of Louisiana's Catholic Church. An investigation of the sacramental registers and other documents from churches throughout south Louisiana found that it was in 1844 that the first church switched from French to English, and the last made the change in 1954, with the vast majority transitioning some time before 1920 (Dubois, Leumas, & Richardson 2007; Leumas 2009). Though it is difficult to determine exactly how much these communities continued to use French after their church's documents switched to English, these findings of adaptation to English mirror those of others who have studied language shift in Louisiana (Trépanier 1988).

Gold cites increased urbanization of Louisiana's francophone population in the first half of the twentieth century (1979). Urbanization is often noted as a key element in situations of increasing language shift (Rottet 2001:18). Even though French may have survived to a great extent in rural communities in the early twentieth century, many

¹⁰ However, it should be noted that Acadians formed only one part of Louisiana's francophone population and language shift occurred differently among different sociolinguistic groups.

factors would soon change this. Other scholars mention the expansion of the highway system in the 1920's, the expansion of radio (exclusively in English) in the 1930's, compulsory military service in the 1940's, the expansion of television in the 1950's, and the rise of the Louisiana oil industry throughout these decades as key factors which brought an end to the long isolation of the francophone communities (Larouche 1981; Rottet 2001). Aside from these indirect pressures to learn and use English, the Reconstructionist Louisiana legislature had mandated in 1864 that all public schooling in Louisiana take place in English (Ward 1997:1297). Though this provision meant little to francophones in rural communities whose children rarely attended public schools, the introduction of mandatory public schooling in 1916 would bring English to the ears of all Louisiana children. Then in 1921 the new state constitution officially eliminated all rights and protections that had been granted to French in every previous state constitution, and French thus had no official status.

2.2.2 Twentieth Century Language Shift in Louisiana

Researchers tend to agree that the decline in the intergenerational transmission of French in the home accelerated to a point of no return in the 1920's (Brown 1993:17; Dubois 2000:125; Dubois 2005; Henry 1990; Waddell 1993:230; Rottet 2001:61). This is to say that even in those isolated areas where French had persisted as the language used most in the home, the 1920's saw more and more families beginning to use English at home while raising their children. Through her fieldwork creating a corpus of audio recordings of Cajun French speakers, Sylvie Dubois found that the francophone children raised during this crucial time period often went on to use both French and English in the home to raise their own children during the 1940's and 1950's (1997; 2005). Indeed

Larouche defines the 1940's as the definitive period in the shift from French to English, mostly because of the social stigma attached to French by an influx of people from outside communities (1981).

Dubois found that as the shift continued to gain steam, these children raised in bilingual homes of the 1940's and early 1950's spoke primarily English amongst themselves and would go on to raise their own children exclusively in English (2005:289). Rottet even believes that the academic community in Louisiana recognized this period as the terminal phase of language shift: "It is clear that Louisiana State University's policy in the 1930s and 1940s of sending students completing a master's thesis in French into Cajun communities to document the local lexicon was motivated by a perception that the language would die out" (2001:62). Dubois notes the existence of one last generation of French speakers who by some unusual circumstance, such as being raised by their grandparents, would acquire French as a native language, but even this phenomenon would cease by the 1970's (2005:290).

Thanks to a grant from the National Science Foundation, Sylvie Dubois and a team of researchers were able to create a corpus of recordings of spoken Cajun French which included 120 speakers of varying ages in four communities spread across South Louisiana (1997). Studies of this corpus have found a great deal of linguistic attrition among younger speakers of Cajun French, notably those born after World War II in the period of rapid language shift (Dubois 2001; Dubois 2005; Dubois & Noetzel 2005; Dubois, Salmon, & Noetzel 2006; Salmon 2007). Furthermore another independent study of spoken French in Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes found a similar pattern of

attrition (Rottet 2001). This pattern of language loss was also confirmed in a series of interviews conducted in 35 communities of Acadiana in 1981 and 1982 (Trépanier 1993).

Thus, the shift from French to English in South Louisiana is recognized to have been mostly completed by the mid-twentieth century. Therefore, despite the existence of speakers, the imminent death of Louisiana French in all its varieties was widely recognized by the 1960's since the intergenerational mother tongue transmission of the language had ceased. Ironically, it is only after the widespread recognition that the language had ceased to be transmitted that any real efforts were made to preserve it. The question for contemporary researchers is whether these efforts were too little and too late.

2.2.3 The Origins of Language Revitalization in Louisiana

Any discussion of attempts to revitalize French in Louisiana must begin with the so-called Cajun Renaissance of the 1960's. As discussed above, language shift in the areas previously resistant to English began in the early twentieth century, and after a period of bilingualism these communities shifted almost entirely to English both at home and in the community by the mid-twentieth century. In this context a group of activists including many politicians and musicians began organizing "socio-cultural events like Cajun music festivals, radio programs, and television programs in vernacular French" (Tornquist 2000:58). This social activist movement in South Louisiana came to be known as the "Cajun Renaissance".

Barry Ancelet has described one of the leaders of this movement, politician Dudley LeBlanc, as "a champion of the Acadian ethnicity since the 1960's who used the bicentennial in 1955 of the Acadian exile as a rallying point for the revitalization of the ethnicity among Cajuns" (1988:345). The most important result of the efforts of the Cajun Renaissance and Dudley LeBlanc in particular was the creation of the Council for the Development of French

in Louisiana in 1968. Louisiana Legislative Act 409 commissioned CODOFIL to "do any and all things necessary to accomplish the development, utilization, and preservation of the French language as found in Louisiana for the cultural, economic and touristic benefit of the state" (CODOFIL). Also in the 1960's there was a general shift in societal attitudes towards French-speakers in Louisiana, especially Cajuns. Once seen as backward and ignorant, being "Cajun" and later "Creole" came to be sources of pride for the residents of South Louisiana. Ancelet attributes this shift in attitude to the work of CODOFIL (1989:40). However, Dubois points out that this Cajun Renaissance was more important among a Cajun elite and had little effect on the sociolinguistic landscape of Louisiana as a whole, as Ancelet also admits (Dubois 1998:328; Ancelet 1988:345). Furthermore, despite the admonitions of CODOFIL, the current Louisiana State Constitution drafted in 1974 provides no status or protection for the French language specifically (Ward 1997).

Nevertheless, the Cajun Renaissance and the creation of CODOFIL signaled that some in South Louisiana intended to resist the death of the French language in this area. Mainly through the introduction or reintroduction of French into Louisiana's public schools, certain members of society would go on to make concrete efforts to pass the language on to new generations of speakers in the second half of the twentieth century. French would be introduced into public schools as a foreign language subject, and eventually French immersion programs would evolve where students would study content area subjects through the medium of French.

2.2.4 CODOFIL and the Reintroduction of French at School

CODOFIL's first chairman was a lawyer and politician from Lafayette named James Domengeaux. Many researchers have commented on Domengeaux's choice to institute the teaching of a more standardized international variety of French rather than a more vernacular

local variety. Valdman describes CODOFIL's early primary objective as "the institution of bilingualism based on the teaching of French as a foreign language in schools" (1998:280). Along with the formation of CODOFIL, the Louisiana State Legislature instituted Legislative Act 714 which stated that all public schools in Louisiana were obliged to provide second language education for every student from fourth to eighth grade.¹¹ A lack of oversight, enforcement, and funds meant that this law would never be fully implemented. However, foreign language education did slowly expand in Louisiana as a result. Ninety-five schools offering five years of foreign language education in 1972 had risen to five hundred thirty-six schools by 1992 (Valdman 1998:280).

One reason for the slow and inadequate implementation of French education in Louisiana was the lack of sufficiently trained teachers. Though Louisiana had no shortage of French speakers at this time, very few had the necessary education and level of French literacy necessary to teach the language. Ancelet and LaFleur concede that this was the reason why CODOFIL set about importing French teachers from France, Belgium, and Quebec (2005:415). Denise Egéa-Kuehne chronicles the development of CODOFIL's foreign recruiting practices beginning with a meeting between James Domengeaux and Georges Pompidou in 1969 (2006:123). Formal accords were eventually signed between the Louisiana Department of Education and the French government in the early 1970's, followed shortly thereafter by the Belgian and Canadian governments, and eventually those of other francophone countries (Egéa-Kuehne 2006). CODOFIL still relies heavily upon the importation of French teachers from overseas to fill the demand for teachers of French and

¹¹ This law did not say that the foreign language had to be French, though CODOFIL's efforts combined with the natural preferences of school districts led to a large-scale expansion of French second language education.

teachers in French immersion schools. As of 2008-2009, for example, 125 of Louisiana's 160 French immersion teachers came from outside the United States (Barnett 2010:32).

French immersion education in Louisiana was another accomplishment of CODOFIL.¹² French immersion programs for anglophone children in Canada inspired the creation of similar schools in Louisiana. Children in these programs typically spend about 60% of their school day taking classes through the medium of French in order to comply with both state laws about English instruction and the guidelines of the Consortium of Louisiana Immersion Schools (Tornquist 2000:94). The Louisiana Department of Education guidelines for the administration of immersion programs demands that, "students in immersion programs receive no less than 60% of core content instruction in the target language" (Louisiana Department of Education 2010:15). The Department of Education also provides models for school schedules in immersion schools where students can spend 66%, 60%, or 50% of their school day in French.¹³ Basically according to all these schedules the core instruction (math, science, social studies, French language, and art/music) must take place in French (Immersion).

Each immersion program is administered by the parish school board, and for this reason the details of the programs may vary greatly. Furthermore, until recently individual school principals had to request the creation of a program in their school, and these requests depended on permission of the parish school boards. The complex nature of immersion education in the United States makes it difficult to make generalizations. In some areas,

¹² Louisiana's French immersion schools have been a focus of numerous research projects in the areas of linguistics and pedagogy. (Caron & Caldas 1997, 1999, 2000, 2002; Tornquist 2000; Haj-Broussard 2003; St-Hilaire 2005; Egéa-Kuehne 2006; Caldas 2007; Olson Beal 2008; Barnett 2010; Camp 2010, Atran-Fresco 2014).

¹³ The Department of Education provides a 50% immersion schedule despite the fact that it would be contrary to their own stated guidelines.

immersion magnet programs have been used as a tool for desegregation (Olson Beal 2008).¹⁴ In a related way, these programs are sometimes used to place a cohort of high-performing children in an underprivileged school in order to artificially boost the school's overall test scores (Tornquist 2000:96). The varying motives for the implementation of these immersion schools plays a role in how the programs will be administered.¹⁵

Immersion programs in Louisiana usually last from kindergarten through fifth grade. The children are placed there voluntarily by the parents and may be withdrawn at any time.¹⁶ A handful of immersion programs exist for sixth through eighth grade children, but most immersion students in Louisiana resume all-English education after fifth grade either by choice or necessity. However, the number of immersion programs has been consistently increasing since 1980, and many students who are training to be French teachers in Louisiana may find themselves working in those programs in the future. Louisiana is, understandably, the leader in French immersion education in the United States. As of the 2004, 30% of America's French immersion schools were located in Louisiana (Eg  a-Kuehne 2006:140). As of 2012, there were 3,715 students in Louisiana in public French immersion schools in nine parishes (Bronston 2012). A new charter for CODOFIL (Act 679) adopted by the state legislature in 2010 requires that at least one immersion school be present in each of the 22 parishes of the legally defined Acadiana region by September of 2015.¹⁷

¹⁴ Immersion programs are typically "magnet" programs within a public school district that tend to attract wealthier families and more white families who might otherwise send their children to private schools.

¹⁵ In the future, however, this system may change significantly with the passage of Legislative Act No. 361, called the "Immersion School Choice Act", which will require any school which receives a written request from the guardians of at least 25 kindergarten children to form an immersion program beginning with the school year 2014-2015.

¹⁶ Several school principals did state that they put significant pressure on parents not to withdraw their students from the immersion programs.

¹⁷ This rather ambitious goal is not going to be met by 2015.

Undoubtedly, CODOFIL's purpose in assisting in the creation of French immersion programs as well as French second-language programs in public schools is the revitalization of French by creating a new generation of French-English bilinguals in South Louisiana. Even if one assumes that revitalization is theoretically possible, the effectiveness of the programs currently in place has been questioned. Dubois (2005:290) says "the knowledge of International French by a minority of young people in immersion is too poor to qualify them as speakers." This begs the question: what does success look like for CODOFIL?

"Because the Francophone population of Louisiana continues to age, the learning of French as a second language at school has almost completely replaced the natural acquisition of French at home in Louisiana" (Tornquist 2000:40). No scholars dispute this statement by Tornquist, and thus French programs in Louisiana's schools are the best and, possibly, the only hope that Louisiana has for maintaining French as a spoken language. Because the schools represent the front line of language revitalization efforts in Louisiana, they are the best place to look in order to understand to what extent revitalization efforts have been successful in the past and what their chances are for the future. Worryingly for language activists, the schools and particularly the immersion schools seem to be the corner-stone of revitalization efforts in Louisiana; this is exactly what Fishman warns against when he says "without considerable and repeated societal reinforcement schools cannot successfully teach either first or second languages" (1991:371).

2.3 Linguistic Ideology in Louisiana

Linguists have extensively studied the situation of language shift and revitalization in Louisiana, and language attitudes have been a major part of these studies. Numerous studies have addressed questions of dialect preference between Cajun, Creole,

and international varieties of French (Dubois et al. 1995; Dubois 1997; Dubois and Melançon 1997; Ryon 2000; Tornquist 2000; Lindner 2008; Barnett 2010). Studies of this nature have focused on all types of subjects, from inhabitants of Acadiana chosen at random to school teachers and school children. Questions of French dialects and particularly their presence or absence in education have been more than sufficiently explored.

These studies of language attitudes as well as studies in other branches of linguistics have touched on language revitalization in Louisiana. Ancelet and LaFleur (2005) provide a thorough history of the revitalization movement and its various aspects from Cajun music to Cajun French classes at Louisiana State University. Brown (1993), too, discusses the history of language shift and revitalization efforts in Louisiana in relation to the standardization of Louisiana varieties of French. Atran-Fresco (2014) discusses French immersion as one of a few processes by which Cajuns have sought to reclaim their identity. Caldas & Caron-Caldas (1997), Caldas & Caron-Caldas (1999), Haj-Broussard (2003), and Camp (2010) all provide a glimpse into the revitalization movement through describing the habits of language use among immersion students both in and outside of school. Egéa-Kuehne describes the history of language shift and revitalization in Louisiana, and the evolution of the French immersion programs including detail about their size, scope, and administration (2006).

Picone and Valdman (2005) describe the varieties of French present in Louisiana and their place within the revitalization movement. Dubois et al. (1995) conducted a thorough study of language attitudes toward the different varieties of French present in Louisiana and their place in education, and found that a majority of informants look

favorably upon Cajun and Creole French; nevertheless, Standard French is widely seen as more appropriate for formal education. Other studies of high school students in Lafayette and the parents of immersion students found similar results (Tornquist 2000; Lindner 2008). Albert Valdman and Thomas Klingler describe the movement to revitalize Cajun and Creole varieties of French and the way it has often been at odds with CODOFIL and the public education system (Valdman 1998; Valdman & Klingler 2002). Valdman even goes so far as to say, “It is clear that with the best understanding that we have of the sociolinguistic situation in what is called francophone Louisiana, we know that the School cannot contribute to the revitalization of vernacular varieties in a state of advanced decline. But it is capable of playing a useful role, that of making known and understood these varieties traditionally marginalized and discouraged” (1998:291). St. Hilaire (2005) provides excerpts from interviews with community language activists who are working to support and expand French immersion in Louisiana, and this information is particularly useful for illustrating the ideology of the revitalization movement outside the educational system itself. However, despite all this research, some aspects of the ideology of the revitalization movement, as a whole, have remained relatively unexplored from a scientific perspective.

Ryon argues vehemently that the ideology of this movement is in dire need of exploration because “linguistic revitalization starts first at the psycholinguistic level, that is to say at the level of linguistic representations, for speakers (or semispeakers or passive speakers), language experts, and educators” (2002:282-283). Language activists such as Ancelet and LaFleur have more or less chronicled the revitalization movement from their own perspective thus revealing their own linguistic ideologies to one extent or another in

the process (2005). Valdman also attempts to describe the ideology of this movement through a discourse analysis of the relevant academic and non-academic literature, eventually concluding that:

The choice of objectives for the teaching of foreign languages in schools and universities depends to a large extent on the interested parties: the political powers, the various community representatives, the educational administration, and the students themselves. (1998:290)

The ideologies of these various groups, which shape the movement, must be studied in different ways. The public discourse of the political powers provides a window into their ideologies, and the various studies of language attitudes provide insight into the ideology of the students and community representatives. However, apart from a lack of information on the educational administration, the data that exists for students and teachers fails to address some vital issues of linguistic revitalization.

All the academic research on French in Louisiana accepts that French is generally no longer transmitted in the home, and that the French immersion schools and French second-language education have become the norm for the preservation and proliferation of French in Louisiana. As a result, the fate of the language revitalization movement in Louisiana lies squarely in the hands of educators and educational administrators for the time being. My study seeks to describe the linguistic ideology of the language revitalization movement in Louisiana through the words of individuals endeavoring to accomplish it in the vital sector of public education.

The public discourse of CODOFIL and other political leaders provides some access to the linguistic ideology of the political sector. The writings of academics and grassroots language activists provide access to their ideological views. For example Barry Ancelet, a professor at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette and a noted

language activist in the Cajun community, says with regard to the spelling of Cajun French:

If we begin to change the spellings to reflect all the dialect variants in Louisiana, we run the risk of making the French spoken in Louisiana an orphan, to push it back further in its corner. I believe we must try rather to establish means of communication between ourselves and the francophone world. (1999:4)

Ancelet's statements seem to suggest multiple ideological stances. He appears to believe that Louisiana is marginalized as he says he does not want to push it back "further in its corner," suggesting it is already in a corner. His statements also suggest that the standardization of Louisiana French is not a threat but rather an essential element of its preservation. This study provides the data needed to describe the linguistic ideology of educators, those most directly involved with language revitalization, and fill a major gap in the ideological landscape of the revitalization movement.

2.4 Unknown Factors in the French Revitalization Movement

As mentioned in the introduction, the first director of CODOFIL famously said that "The schools have destroyed French, the schools will make it live again." The fact that most of CODOFIL's resources are invested in expanding French education in public schools suggests that at an organizational level they are still driven by this ideology. However, it remains to be seen whether or not the people who help CODOFIL in their efforts by actually teaching or administering the teaching of French are willing participants in this revitalization movement. The two groups represented in this study are university students who desire to teach French in Louisiana and school administrators in charge of French education in Louisiana's public schools.

Hopefully, this study can answer several important questions about the ideology of the revitalization movement. Although these participants are heavily involved in the

movement (or hope to be), do they share CODOFIL's views of the responsibility of public schools to revitalize French? Do they see themselves as a part of the revitalization movement or are they simply doing a job for reasons, which have nothing to do with language revitalization? Are Louisiana's French teachers different from those in other states? That is to say, has their ideology been shaped by the presence of the French revitalization movement that is unique to Louisiana?

Though it would be impossible to accurately assign a date to the beginning of the French revitalization movement in Louisiana, the founding of CODOFIL in 1968 was probably the first sign of state recognition that a revitalization movement was present. This movement has therefore been in existence for nearly fifty years if not longer. Obviously multiple generations have participated, but there seems to be no clear answer about where the new participants in this movement come from. According to Denise Egea-Kuehne (2006), the ratio of American to foreign-born teachers in Louisiana's French immersion schools was at 35% in 2001 and dropped steadily in the following two years as well. More recently, Barnett published figures that show a continuing drop down to 28% in 2009 (2010). The percentage of French immersion teachers in Louisiana who are from Louisiana or even America in general has dropped precipitously since the mid-1990s and it continues to decline. Why has the Louisiana French revitalization movement never succeeded in creating a sufficient population of native-born teachers devoted to revitalization to the point of becoming immersion teachers?

In seeking to answer these questions, this study provides valuable insight into how CODOFIL or any other group implicated in language planning can actually inspire community members to make minority language revitalization their life's work. The

study also helps to judge how effective the Louisiana French revitalization movement has actually been in affecting the choices Louisianans are making with regard to French.

For the purposes of the study, linguistic ideology was defined as subconscious beliefs about language, unquestioningly accepted by individuals or groups, which are observable through explicit and implicit discourse. This definition is a combination of two separate definitions by Kathryn Woolard (1998:3) and Annette Boudreau (2009:440). The beliefs about and representations of language that I sought to elicit through discourse were drawn from the literature on language revitalization in Louisiana. Four ideological beliefs about language have been chosen based on the literature: the questions were designed to elicit data on the participants' ideology through their representations.

The four ideological beliefs to be explored in this study are summarized as follows:

1. French is not as important to know as other languages because it is not useful.
2. French language use is only a symbolic marker of identity, not practical for daily life.
3. The government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote and preserve French because of its francophone heritage.
4. The survival of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness rather than on intergenerational mother tongue transmission.

An analysis of these underlying ideologies should facilitate a better understanding of the ideology of current and future participants in the revitalization movement.

Anecdotally, I have heard people in Louisiana commonly express the first belief, that French is not as important as other languages because it is not useful. The Baton

Rouge public school system¹⁸ has sixteen public middle schools of which seven offer no foreign language at all, eight offer Spanish, and only three offer French. These numbers suggest that the Baton Rouge public schools most likely believe Spanish will be more useful to their students than French. Among high school French students in Acadiana, a group one would expect to be more likely to see the utility of French, only 45.6% believed French would be useful for jobs in Louisiana (Lindner 2008:130). Thus, it may be vital to understand whether the participants in this study share this belief.

The second belief, that French language use is only a symbolic marker of identity, not practical for daily life, has appeared in numerous studies of Louisiana French in one form or another. The fact that the French language in its various varieties is seen as a maker of ethnic identity in Louisiana is undeniable. However, many studies have questioned just how important the language symbol is to ethnic identity in Louisiana today.¹⁹ Lindner says "the extent to which Cajun French is considered an important part of Cajun identity...is questionable at present" (2008:250). The perceived impracticality of French for daily life in Louisiana seems clear though.²⁰ Therefore, I wished to see if

¹⁸ East Baton Rouge parish has the second largest public school system in the state of Louisiana.

¹⁹ A 1997 study by Dubois and Melançon found that 56% of the 1,440 men and women from four different parishes of Acadiana surveyed said that one did not have to speak some form of French to be considered a true Cajun (82). Ryon found that among college students 15% of women and 7% of men felt language was a defining characteristic of Cajun ethnic identity (2000:184). Tornquist found that "the Franco-Louisianan identity is no longer tied to linguistic competence among the parents of [French] immersion students" (2000:131).

²⁰ A recent *New York Times* article stated that the number of French speakers in Louisiana had dropped from about 250,000 in 1990 to about 100,000 in 2013 (Fausset 2015). This number appears relatively accurate, though how it was calculated is unclear since the U.S. Census Bureau statistics for 2013 only list an estimate of the number of speakers of "Other Indo-European languages" [besides Spanish or Spanish Creole] at 154,092 without distinguishing among languages. If those numbers are accurate then it

those working toward French revitalization see a symbolic value for French Louisiana even if it may not be practical for daily life.

The third belief, that the government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote French because of its francophone heritage, stems from both the previous research on Louisiana French and this belief's central importance for understanding linguistic ideology. Tornquist found that 54% of French immersions students' parents felt that the state government is responsible for promoting French (2000:259). The separation between language attitudes and linguistic ideology lies in the inclusion of extra-linguistic factors such as the political and socio-cultural realities of the language situation in question. Thus, the questions about the government and society's role in the language revitalization movement are perhaps the most crucial to any understand of the movement's ideology.

The final belief investigated in the study, that the survival of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness rather than on intergenerational mother tongue transmission is based mainly on research into language revitalization in other countries and contexts. Heller proposes an alternative view of language maintenance strategies pointing out that globalized economies "attribute value to bilingual linguistic resources since it is all about serving a national and international market" (2003:489). She even proposes that this commodification of language could "provide a different alternative for restructuring the economic basis of francophone communities" (Heller 2003:490). The economic incentivizing of language maintenance has been used in places like Ireland for

should come as no surprise that French is not seen as practical for daily life since only about 2.3% of the state's population speaks French.

decades with limited success.²¹ It also stands in stark contrast to Fishman's view that the goal of language revitalization should be intergenerational mother tongue transmission in and of itself regardless of economic usefulness (1991). The end goals of the language revitalization movement in Louisiana have never been adequately expressed, and it is very important to know what they are.

In addition to identifying important aspects of the linguistic ideology of future teachers and school administrators, the study also sought to explain who becomes a French teacher in Louisiana or who runs the immersion schools. The demographics of these two groups were relatively unknown. With this study I also hoped to identify the socio-biographic factors that may influence who becomes involved in the revitalization movement in these two ways.

2.5 A Mixed Methods Approach to the Study of Ideology

As described in the review of literature on linguistic ideology, language attitudes have been a popular area of study in recent decades for those investigating language shift and revitalization. Questions related to language attitudes are an important aspect of this current study; however, they are only part of the study. In order to create a broader well-rounded picture of the ideology of Louisiana's French revitalization movement, my approach includes a concentrated interest in the socio-cultural and political issues that affect the linguistic situation in Louisiana in the present and the future. It is precisely this broader approach that separates studies of linguistic ideology from studies of language attitudes (Myerhoff 2011).

²¹ However, the global nature of the francophone community makes the French situation very different from that of Irish.

Studies of linguistic ideology almost necessitate a qualitative approach. Mary Lichtman says that "qualitative questions tend to ask why and how rather than what and how many" (2006:29). Ideology is always a question of why, and thus at least a partial qualitative approach is necessary. Nevertheless, quantitative data is generally considered "easier to accumulate, average or meta-analyze across studies" and easier to "'engineer' ...into a usable product for practitioners or policy-makers" (Gorard and Taylor 2004:42). For these reasons among others, mixed-method approaches have become more and more prevalent in the social sciences.

2.5.1 The Use of Interviews for Collecting Quantitative and Qualitative Data

Interviews present special challenges for collecting quantitative data because the process of finding participants, conducting the interviews, and coding the data can be highly tedious and time-consuming. Questionnaires or tests that can be distributed to large numbers of people and collected easily with no direct contact necessary offer clear advantages. They can provide large amounts of data relatively quickly. Interviews, on the other hand, are less used for quantitative analysis because their time-consuming nature usually requires that the number of participants be lower, and thus, the amount of data collected much smaller. In the case of this particular study, however, that handicap was mitigated to some extent by the small size of the populations being considered.

Numerous authors have discussed the triangulation design for mixed methods studies though what is meant by the word triangulation can vary greatly (Creswell 2009; Freebody 2003; Gorard and Taylor 2004; Lichtman 2006). In the context of this particular study, I use the term triangulation in the sense of combining questions for

quantitative analysis and questions for qualitative analysis into a single-interview format.

As Gorard and Taylor explain:

...if triangulation means anything in social science terms it is about complementarity, and nothing at all to do with mutual validation. The two observations or methods must be directed at different aspects of the wider phenomenon to be investigated. (2004:45)

Once the data is coded, some can be used for quantitative study while other parts will be used for qualitative analysis and still some of the data can be used for both. The quantitative results and the qualitative results will each provide different insights into the single phenomenon that is the linguistic ideology of French revitalization.

This study employs a concurrent mixed methods approach, as defined by Creswell, where the quantitative data and the qualitative data were gathered simultaneously (2009). The quantitative data is of a non-experimental or survey nature gathering mainly socio-biographic data on the populations in question. By contrast, the qualitative portion of the study is based in Grounded Theory according to which “the researcher derives a general abstract theory of a process, action, or interaction grounded in the views of participants” (Cresswell 2009:13). According to Grounded Theory, the qualitative data is coded in order to find the common concepts that emerge and then these concepts are then categorized to construct a theory (Lichtman 2006). The concurrent mixed methods research design of this study allows for a very economical data collection process where a single interview with each participant generates both sets of data.

Socio-biographical survey data is typically gathered in a written format to allow a maximal amount of data to be gathered in a minimal amount of time. However, given the small size of the populations investigated in this study, it was convenient to simply combine the socio-biographical quantitative questions with the open-ended qualitative

questions within a single interview. Moreover, by beginning the interview with innocuous socio-biographical questions, I was able to build some rapport with the interview subjects by getting to know them to a small extent before asking them the more difficult and often abstract qualitative questions.

2.6 Conclusion

French language shift in Louisiana began in the early nineteenth century, though it was little studied until the twentieth century, and no efforts to slow or stop it really began until the 1960's. Since that time, research has proliferated and there is an enormous amount of data on the language shift, language change, and attitudes toward these phenomena as well as attitudes toward efforts to revitalize French. Despite the long history of research on French in Louisiana, the revitalization movement has not been adequately scrutinized from an ideological perspective. Some aspects of the movement's ideology have been hinted at in the literature, and others have remained relatively unexplored. Using a mixed-methods approach in a way that emphasizes the qualitative data, this study will be able to articulate clearly many aspects of the linguistic ideology of the French revitalization movement.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This study uses an interview corpus to describe the linguistic ideology of individuals participating in or training to participate in the revitalization of French in Louisiana through public education. The first phase of the study involved the creation of the interview corpus, and the second phase required the codification and analysis of the data collected in those interviews. The methodologies used in both phases of the study are described in the following chapter.

3.1 Creation of the Ideology of Revitalization Corpus

The first phase of this study necessitated the creation of a linguistic corpus. The interview format that was eventually created was intended to study the linguistic ideology of those who either work or hope to work in French education in Louisiana. Though some studies of French teachers in immersion schools have been conducted in the past, these tended to focus on specific language attitudes related to the dialects of French present in Louisiana and their usage or lack thereof in schools (Barnett 2010; Deslauriers 1999; Lindner 2008; Tornquist 2000). Therefore, an entirely new corpus of data needed to be created in order to study the linguistic ideology of the language revitalization movement from a more holistic perspective. I decided to refer to the interview corpus as the *Ideology of Revitalization Corpus*, hereafter IRC.

The IRC had two main goals. The first of these goals was to create a corpus of data that articulates many different aspects of the linguistic ideology of those studying to become French educators as well as that of active educational administrators in Louisiana. The second goal of the corpus was to provide data on the sociolinguistic factors which influence the linguistic ideology of the language revitalization movement.

In order to collect adequate data on the beliefs and representations or perceptions of language held by the target groups, I chose open-ended questions in the hope that they would provide the most reliable data. Previous studies of language attitudes related to Louisiana French have primarily used written questionnaires that posed multiple-choice or yes-no questions and varied in length from a handful of questions to dozens (Dubois et al. 1995; Tornquist 2000; Lindner 2008; Barnett 2010). These studies have provided invaluable information, but the topics covered and the level of detail used by study participants to describe their views were undoubtedly limited by this written format though it did allow for a much larger sample size. Obviously, a quantitative analysis necessitates a relatively large sample size, and these previous studies benefitted from that format.²² Yet, if linguistic ideology is subconscious and often revealed through implicit discourse, it would be more difficult to study linguistic ideology if subjects were not allowed to choose their own words and thus make their own implicatures.

Therefore the IRC was designed as a corpus of video-recorded interviews, during which subjects were asked open-ended questions designed to elicit both their beliefs and perceptions of language through their explicit and implicit statements. Obviously interviews better lend themselves to greater depth of response than written questionnaires when it comes to open-ended questions. Milroy states “from the interviewee’s point of view, a co-operative response is often one which is maximally brief and relevant”

²² Lindner 2008 did include a qualitative analysis of open-ended interviews, though these included only a small sample of the study participants and yielded little usable information. Dubois et al. 1995 and Barnett 2010 also used a small number of interviews with open-ended questions in their studies, but they were secondary to the main analysis.

(1987:41). Nevertheless, an interview allows for the researcher to request elaboration when a subject's response is inadequate in some way.²³

3.2 Interview Methodology

The methodology of this study was based on the field methods for sociolinguistic research pioneered by William Labov. Two of his five working principles were particularly relevant to my methodology:

1. The vernacular, in which the minimum attention is paid to speech, provides the most systematic data for linguistic analysis.
2. Any systematic observation of a speaker defines a formal context where more than the minimum attention is paid to speech.

Though much of my analysis was qualitative, I believe that the same principles apply. Subjects who are conscious that they are being observed will alter their responses to questions and possibly hide their true linguistic ideology in the process. Thus my field methods were designed to capture speech that was as natural as the context of a face-to-face interview will allow.

The IRC was designed to be a corpus that would be sufficiently rich in data that multiple studies can be conducted thereupon. The interviews for the corpus were recorded with a digital video camera. The use of video provided multiple advantages. The videos allowed for the interpretation of gestures and expressions, which were sometimes particularly relevant for identifying implicit meanings.

The interview participants were asked to read and sign an informed consent script before the interview so that they understood the purpose and methods of the study, and

²³ These types of interviews have long been a staple of sociolinguistic research (cf. Labov 1966; Dorian 1981).

they would be comfortable knowing that their rights and their privacy would be respected. The informed consent script was also a requirement of Louisiana State University's Institutional Review Board (See Appendix D).

The interviews were semi-directed. That is to say, the interviewer asked questions from a list but allowed the subjects to answer as they pleased and asked for elaboration or clarification when necessary. The script of questions, however, was vitally important for maintaining continuity throughout the corpus. These types of interview have a long history in sociolinguistic research, and particularly in research focusing on French in linguistic minority settings. In his article on the history of sociolinguistic research on Canadian French, Raymond Mougéon says:

the semi-directed interview is often done with a series of semi-closed questions on subjects which are likely to encourage the production of a more formal discourse (for example the linguistic attitudes of speakers)... This methodological procedure produces data which gives a certain idea of intra-individual linguistic variation. (1996:186)

Every aspect of the interviews was designed to maintain the comfort of the interview subjects as much as possible. I conducted the interviews myself. For the comfort of the participants, the interviews were conducted in English.²⁴ The subjects were almost all English-dominant and some were even monolingual, so they were obviously more effective in expressing their views in English.²⁵

In a further effort to provide a comfortable environment for the study's participants, the interviews were conducted in public places familiar to the interview

²⁴ Several students hoping to become French teachers specifically asked if the interview would be in French or English before agreeing to participate.

²⁵ As Labov notes, "the initial effect of the ... recorder is usually to increase self-consciousness and the atmosphere of formality. Though this effect is sharply reduced as the interview progresses, it probably never disappears entirely" (1982:91). Nevertheless, every effort was made to keep interview subjects as comfortable and relaxed as possible.

subjects. The interviews were designed to last twenty to thirty minutes to ensure the process did not become tiresome for the subjects, and almost all of the participants completed their interview in between twenty and forty-five minutes. The interviews were conducted individually in order to prevent bias from the responses of other participants in the study as well as for practical reasons when distance became a factor.

3.3 Selection of the Candidates

The corpus is comprised of interviews with two separate groups of subjects. The first group in the corpus was university students who met three main criteria. The students must be majoring or minoring in French. They must have the desire to pursue a career teaching French or teaching in a French immersion school after they graduate. They must also have less than four more semesters of study to complete before graduation. Choosing students who were close to graduation was intended to mitigate the chances that the students were uncertain of their chosen career path and would change majors before they graduate, though some level of uncertainty was acceptable.

University students, or prospective future French teachers, were selected rather than current teachers for multiple reasons. First, my previous research in Lafayette Parish's French immersion schools proved difficult because of practical issues arising from the need for permission and organizational assistance from the various school and parish officials. The university students chosen had the advantage of acting as individuals who did not represent a particular organization, and thus they created no legal liability for other individuals or organizations. Additionally, I hypothesized that the ideology of these students who desire to be teachers would likely be much more open to optimistic views because they have not yet had their hopes and perceptions tempered by

the harsh realities of working in the public school system. Furthermore, university students who intend to teach French have not been the subject of any previous linguistic studies related to Louisiana French and therefore provided unique data.

In order to obtain a diverse sample representative of the state as a whole, my intention was to find students from the four largest universities spread throughout south Louisiana. The research sites were intended to be Louisiana State University, the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Tulane University, and McNeese State University. The universities located in Baton Rouge, Lafayette, and New Orleans attract students from all over the state, and they all offer majors and minors in French. McNeese State in Lake Charles only offers a major in "Foreign Languages" though a concentration in French or foreign language education is available.

Social variants were used for quantitative analysis of the corpus as well as to inform the qualitative analysis, and therefore, it was necessary not only to collect information on social variants but also to make every effort to create a corpus that was as diverse as possible in terms of the sociological variants represented. In the end, however, all eligible student participants were included in the study regardless of social background due to the small sample size. Participants for the study were found primarily in two ways. French or Education department faculty at the universities included in the study were asked if they knew of students who met the study criteria and might be willing to participate. Participants themselves were also asked if they knew of fellow students who met the study criteria and might be willing to participate as well, but the students proved less effective than the faculty at locating other students. Though no form of

compensation was offered for the study participants, it did not seem necessary as all eligible students located readily agreed to an interview.

The second group included in the study was administrators from public schools that had immersion programs. Any administrator who had some direct influence over the French immersion program was considered eligible. In South Louisiana there are 28 public schools with French immersion programs (Barnett 2010). Due to the great distances involved in traveling to these schools as well as the difficulty of scheduling interviews with busy school administrators, this group was limited to nine participants from five of the nine parishes that have immersion programs. This represents about one-third of the immersion schools in South Louisiana and made comparisons easier between the student and administrator groups since they were even in number.

The methodology of the interviews with the administrators was the same as that for the future teachers. The wording of the questions was altered where necessary to make it applicable to the individual participants, and a few different questions were included for the administrators that were not asked of the university students. Administrators from both elementary and middle schools were represented in the study.

3.4 Selection of the Interview Questions

The interview guide was designed with two main goals in mind. First, some questions were needed to elicit information about the sociolinguistic variables that I hypothesized might influence the linguistic ideology of these individuals. Second, other questions would be designed to actually elicit their thoughts and opinions on various subjects that would combine to form a representation of the participants' overall linguistic ideology as it relates to French revitalization in Louisiana. The linguistic

ideology of these participants was evaluated through their explicit and implicit statements. In accordance with the principles of my methodology, questions were also designed to seem as non-invasive and straightforward as possible in order to minimize the self-consciousness of the interview participants.

The interview guide can be found in Appendix A. The format of the interview guide and many of the questions were inspired by an interview guide used by Annette Boudreau and Mourad Ali Khodja for linguistic interviews in New Brunswick, Canada (n.d.).²⁶ Twenty-three questions were selected for the interviewees (see Table 1 below). These questions were used to determine the social background of each interviewee; they represent the social variables which were correlated to the ideological beliefs in the qualitative and quantitative analyses (age, regional origins, economic and ethnic background education profile, degree of exposure to French outside education, their career goals, type of immersion programs). It should be noted that questions about career goals were reserved for only university students where those about immersion programs were only posed to administrators.²⁷

I chose to investigate four different aspects of language ideology in Louisiana. To elicit statements related to these four ideological beliefs, I asked a series of questions related to them. Some were intended to provide insight into more than one of the ideological beliefs simultaneously. A full table of these questions and the beliefs to which they are related can be found in Appendix B.

²⁶ This cooperation was facilitated by the research project *Le Français à la mesure d'un continent* in which Annette Boudreau, Sylvie Dubois, Mourad Ali Khodja and myself are all participating; the project is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Counsel of Canada.

²⁷ Also, some sociolinguistic factors, such as gender and race, were included in the final analysis even if no questions were necessary to establish them.

TABLE 1: Socio-biographic Questions

	Sociolinguistic Variables	Interview Guide Questions to elicit data
1	Gender and Race	n.a.
2	Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is your name and age?
3	Regional origins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are you from and where are your parents from? • Where all have you lived?
4	Socio-economic background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did your parents do for a living while you were growing up? • What type of education did your parents have? • Would you consider yourself to have been wealthy, middle-class, working-class?
5	Ethnic background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any French or francophone ancestry that you know of? • Would you consider yourself “Cajun” “Creole” or something like that? • What does it mean to be Cajun or Creole?
6	Exposure to French outside education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does anyone in your family speak French and to what extent? • What was your interaction with French as a child/adolescent? • Did you ever use French in your daily life as a child and do you now? • Have you ever been to another country or region where French is spoken?
7	Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you say you learned French? • Where did you study French? What schools/places? • Why did you decide to study French?

8	Career goals for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did you decide to teach French? • What age students do you want to teach? • Would you consider teaching in an immersion school?
9	Details about individual immersion programs for administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the nature of your interaction with the immersion program? • Were you involved with starting the immersion program at this school? • What changes would you make to your immersion program if resources were unlimited?

The first belief examined relates to the usefulness of knowing French. Table 2 below lists the interview questions related to this belief. French is rarely acquired at

TABLE 2: Questions about Belief 1

<i>Belief 1:</i> French is not as important to know as other languages because it is not useful.
<p><i>Questions:</i></p> <p>Why do you think it is important to know more than one language? Why do you think most people (in America) don't learn a second language? Do you think that it is more important for Louisiana's children to know French more than another language like Spanish? Why? Do you believe it is more important for students to know English than French? Why? Do you believe it is more or less important for French children to know English than Louisiana's children to know French?</p>

home in Louisiana today, but rather it is learned in school. However, learning another language is difficult and time consuming. Students and parents must believe that a second language will be useful for them or their children or they will not put forth the enormous effort necessary to learn it. Popular belief in America generally and in Louisiana specifically is that knowing Spanish is becoming increasingly important because of the constantly increasing Hispanic population of the United States. Parents in

Louisiana find it increasingly difficult to see reasons for their children to study French rather than Spanish. If people in Louisiana do not find some value in the French language then they will have no incentive to preserve it. These questions elicited statements from the participants which reveal their views of the importance of knowing French.

The second belief investigated is the importance of the French language as a marker of identity in Louisiana. Previous linguistic research has shown that knowing a variety of French is no longer seen by many as essential to the cultural identities of people in Louisiana. It was the symbolic importance of French in Louisiana rather than its practical uses that has been one of the principal motivations behind efforts to preserve it. If teachers and school administrators do not share the belief that the French language is deeply connected to Louisiana's cultural identity, then the future of the revitalization movement could be in jeopardy. Table 3 presents the questions related to the belief in the symbolic value of French.

TABLE 3: Questions about Belief 2

<i>Belief 2:</i> French Language use is only a symbolic marker of identity, not practical for daily life.
<p><i>Questions:</i></p> <p>Why do you think most people in Louisiana don't make an effort to learn French and make sure their children learn French? Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to be from Louisiana? Why? Do you believe it is more important for students in Louisiana to know French than students in other states? Why? What do you think Louisiana's students have to gain by learning French?</p>

The third belief investigated was that the government has a responsibility to promote and preserve French. It was CODOFIL, a state-funded government agency, in

conjunction with the state Department of Education that was responsible for the proliferation of French programs in Louisiana throughout the last several decades. Yet, most administrators and teachers today were not a part of the generation that experienced the Cajun renaissance of the 1960's that led to the founding of CODOFIL. The belief that the government should be funding CODOFIL or promoting French in other ways may not be shared by these younger generations. The questions in Table 4 below were designed to illicit statements about the participants' beliefs about the role of government in promoting French.

TABLE 4: Questions about Belief 3

<i>Belief 3:</i> The government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote and preserve French because of its francophone heritage.
<p><i>Questions:</i></p> <p>Do you believe that French should have the same place in education all over the state or should it vary depending on the region? Why? Do you see the standardized variety of French in most textbooks as a threat to Louisiana's native varieties of French? Why? Do you believe the government has a responsibility to promote French? If you were given complete control of education in Louisiana, what would you change with respect to the teaching of French? If you were in a position of power like the governor what would you do to promote French in Louisiana outside of schools? Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to have French ancestry? Why? How do you feel about the importation of French Immersion teachers from other countries? Do you plan to teach your students about Louisiana's unique varieties of French? How so?</p>

The final set of questions investigated the belief that the survival of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness rather than on intergenerational mother tongue transmission. Proponents of French immersion schools in Louisiana regularly discuss the higher standardized test scores of immersion students and the ability to be more competitive in the global economy. Using French in the home is rarely, if ever,

discussed by CODOFIL or other organizations in Louisiana. These are really two different aspects of ideology: the beliefs that French has an economic value, and that French will only survive if it is passed along in the home. While on the surface it may seem that these two ideas are not codependent, their link is crucially important in the Louisiana context. Perhaps the most important question addressed in this corpus is what these two groups think will help French survive. Do they believe that the "economic opportunities which attribute value to bilingual linguistic resources" will be enough to preserve French in Louisiana (Heller 2003:489)? Or do they see "self-perpetuating inter-generational mother-tongue transmission" as necessary for preserving French (Fishman 1991)? The final set of questions in Table 5 below was designed to elicit statements about the end goals of language revitalization and the motivations behind them.

TABLE 5: Questions about Belief 4

<i>Belief 4:</i> The survival of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness rather than on inter-generational mother-tongue transmission.
<p><i>Questions:</i></p> <p>Do you believe that French/English bilingualism in Louisiana will become very common in the future? Why? How do you think society would benefit from having a large community of French/English bilinguals in Louisiana? If your students become fluent in French, what role would you like to see the language playing in their daily lives? In an ideal world, in what areas of daily life should French be present for the average person in Louisiana? Do you believe that future generations in Louisiana will pass French on to their children at home? Why?</p>

3.5 The Pilot Study

The interview methodology was tested in a pilot study with a small group of students from Louisiana State University. The interviews for the pilot study took place in January and February of 2013. After I designed the Interview Guide, three interview

subjects were sought who met the criteria for the future French teachers. Locating eligible candidates for the pilot study was rather simple. At the time of the pilot study, I was teaching a senior level course on French phonetics and phonology in the French department, and most of the students in this class were French majors within two years of graduating. Furthermore, this class is required for French majors with a concentration in secondary education. Of the eight French majors in the class, four had the stated intention of becoming French teachers in Louisiana. The three of these four students who had been in the French program the longest were selected for the pilot study.

The interviews each lasted from twenty to thirty minutes, and the interview guides were followed very closely. Therefore, it seemed that the interview guide was well designed for length. Occasionally, questions had to be restated or reworded in order for the interview subjects to understand, and these questions were eventually reworded on the interview guide. The videos provided valuable visual information, such as allowing me to record when subjects nodded affirmatively or negatively, and to record that in the interview transcriptions. The transcriptions were then divided into sections by discussion of the different questions on the interview guide. This allowed for quick reference to the part of the interviews which addressed a certain question or topic.

These transcriptions allowed for the creation of a coding sheet which categorized the participants' responses (see Appendix C). This coding sheet was designed to allow a quantitative analysis of the data gathered in the IRC.

3.6 Changes to the Methodology Based on the Pilot Study

The methodology designed for the pilot study seemed to be very effective and require very little alteration. The two major contributions of the pilot study were to

clarify a few questions that needed rewording and also to allow for the creation of the coding sheet for responses. Otherwise the methodology for the pilot study was exactly the same as that for the creation of the IRC.

Regarding the changes to the wording of questions, there were a few questions added and some divided into separate questions. The first change I made to the interview guide was to expand the questions about the socio-economic background of the participants. I had originally included only question four from the interview guide, because I believed that detailed questions about the socio-economic status of the participants would make them uncomfortable and less willing to be forthcoming in the interviews. However, the results of the pilot study revealed that more detail would be needed if socio-economic background were to be used as a factor for analysis similar to the findings of Lindner (2008). The information found in the transcripts of the pilot interviews was insufficient for coding into clearly separate socio-economic groups. Questions about their parents' education and self-described social class clarified the socio-economic background of the participants.

The question about what the words Cajun and Creole mean was added after the pilot study as well. I believed this question would give insight into why some participants may or may not have considered themselves to be Cajun or Creole. I thought it would reveal important ideological views on the relations between language and ethnic identity. Additionally, three questions had all been combined into a single question during the pilot study.²⁸ They were later divided to avoid confusion.

²⁸ Do you believe it is more important for students to know English than French? Why? Do you believe it is important for children in France to learn English? Is that more or less important than for Louisiana's children to learn French?

The question "Should Louisiana native teachers have priority over teachers from other states?" was added after the pilot study in an effort to better understand the participants' views on Louisiana identity as opposed to American identity. Lastly, the question about Louisiana's cultural and music festivals was also added after the pilot study because the participants mentioned Cajun music and local festivals as ways to promote French. Since these are the two aspects of life in Louisiana where French is most often present outside of schools, I hoped to elicit their opinions about their importance.

The coding sheet created from the pilot study transcripts was intended to allow for a quantitative analysis of the data. While creating the coding sheet it seemed readily apparent that the open-ended nature of the interview questions meant that the coding sheet would have to remain flexible until the codification of the IRC was complete. In doing so, I was able to add new categories of responses as I encountered them. Thus, there was no need to force a response into a particular category where it did not fit well since I could always add or alter categories to fit the data. This method is consistent with my approach based in grounded theory.

3.7 Completion of the IRC Corpus

The IRC was intended to include as many students as possible from each of the four universities. Thirty university student participants was the goal for the study because of the amount of time needed to conduct open-ended interviews. However, personal communications with professors from McNeese State and the University of Louisiana at Lafayette revealed that in the year 2014, they were unable to locate a single

undergraduate junior or senior at their university who desired to become a French teacher.²⁹ This was an important discovery that will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapters.

Thus, the IRC only includes students from two universities: 4 students from Tulane University and 5 students from Louisiana State University. There is only one eligible student known to the researcher between these two universities in the year 2014 who did not participate in the study. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that this sample of 9 students, though small, represents almost the entire population of undergraduate juniors and seniors in South Louisiana who desire to become French teachers in the year 2014.

Similarly, the original aim of the study was to conduct interviews with as many French immersion school administrators as possible with a goal of completing at least 10. Eventually, 9 administrators were interviewed representing 5 of the 9 parishes that have immersion programs. As predicted, many administrators expressed no interest in participating in the study, and many simply did not have the time. These facts coupled with the extensive travel necessary to conduct the interviews made it difficult to reach the modest goal of 10. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, having nine interviews from two different populations does allow for simpler quantitative comparisons across groups.

3.8 The Coding Process

In accordance with my approach based in grounded theory, the coding sheet was continually modified throughout the coding process. The original coding sheet based on

²⁹ The minutes from CODOFIL's 2014 annual meeting state that Barry Ancelet from ULL believed he knew of as many as five French majors at ULL who were going to seek teacher certification, though three other faculty members in their French program were unable to find students who met the study criteria.

the transcriptions from the pilot study allowed me to compare the answers in each interview to those from previous interviews and determine if new categories of answers needed to be created. For example the question from the interview guide, "Why do you think it is important to know more than one language?" seemed to provoke a response from the administrators that was slightly different from the categories of response created using the pilot interviews with students. The original coding sheet included only "Freedom of communication," "Being well-rounded," "Job/opportunities," and "combination of the two" as categories of response. Yet many administrators responded by pointing out the "cognitive benefits" of multi-lingualism discussed in much of the literature on education. The coding sheet was then modified so that "Being well-rounded/Cognitive Benefits" could include both perspectives of the general increase in quality of education.

In another example, the question "Do you plan to teach your/Do your teachers teach their students about Louisiana's unique varieties of French?" required an entirely new category of response to be added during the coding process. The coding sheet based on the pilot studies included only two categories of response; "a little about the history" or "point out a few differences". By the final interviews the three possible categories of response were "a little about the history," "point out a few differences/vocabulary," "no/not sure." It was not until the last several interviews that I conducted, that I found students and administrators who did not consider this a priority.

Thus, the coding sheet evolved throughout the study to reflect the ever-growing diversity of responses to these open-ended questions. Were it possible to conduct twice as many interviews, the coding sheet would most likely continue to evolve. However, the

fact that the final coding sheet is not radically different from the original can be seen as confirmation that the original coding sheet was mostly adequate.

The recorded interviews were coded during the same period that the interviews were being conducted. Some interviews were coded immediately thereafter. Others were coded a few days or weeks later, but no written notes were taken during the interviews in order to reduce distractions and anxiety for the participants. Because I always coded the interviews after the fact, I had to watch every video in its entirety at least once. Often I viewed the interviews, or portions of them, several times in order to be sure that I had adequately matched the participant's responses with the appropriate codes. In so doing, I was able to carefully consider the data before categorizing it and ensure that no technical difficulties had rendered any of the interviews invalid.

3.9 Creation of the IRC Database

Once every interview had been coded, the codes were entered into a database to assist in quantitative analysis. A database of all the coded interviews was created using the statistical analysis software JMP. The codes for question responses can all be found on the sample coding sheet (Appendix C). Four additional socio-biographic factors were also coded and entered into the database. These additional variants represented socio-biographic information that could be determined from the interviews without asking any questions. These factors and their corresponding codes can be found in Table 6. Each participant was also given a pseudonym during the coding process and this pseudonym was also entered into the database with the coded information about each participant. Not including the pseudonyms, the database contains 48 different codes representing analyzable data for each of the 18 participants.

TABLE 6: Socio-biographic Data not Included in the Questions

Variants	Codes
Institution Location	N = New Orleans B = Baton Rouge A = Acadiana T = Tulane L = LSU
Gender	M= Male F = Female
Race	W = White B = Black
Student/Administrator	S = Student A = Administrator

CHAPTER 4: DATA DISTRIBUTION SOCIO-BIOGRAPHIC PROFILES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the socio-biographic profiles of the students and administrators. These profiles based on their answers from the IRC interviews are useful for determining how these individuals became implicated in the French revitalization movement in the first place, whether by choice or by chance. Furthermore, these profiles illustrate the clear socio-biographic differences between these groups and the leaders of the French revitalization movement.

The purpose of comparing these profiles is to determine which, if any, social factors can influence a person's decision to become involved in language revitalization. Linguistic ideology is not simply invented by individuals; rather it develops slowly over time under the constant influence of environmental factors. The socio-biographic data presented here will show whether the two groups present homogenous demographic profiles. In turn, it will eventually show whether the social characteristics which one would assume to influence the linguistic ideology of these individuals actually has little or no effect.

4.2 Profile: Students

Students' answers to the questions on the interview guide are divided into categories of data including: race, gender, and class; family background and ethnicity; exposure to French; and education. Within these categories I present the details describing each of the student participants.

4.2.1 Race, Gender, and Class Considerations

Table 7 presents the most basic demographic characteristics of the students: that of race, gender and social class as well as the institution where they are studying. Several commonalities are readily apparent in the data.

TABLE 7: Student Race, Gender, and Class

Students	Race	Gender	Institution	Social Class	Socio-economic status of parents
Ashley	white	female	LSU	Middle class	One advanced degree
Brad	white	male	Tulane	Middle class	Two advanced degrees
Bridget	white	female	Tulane	Middle class	One advanced degree
David	white	male	LSU	Middle class	One advanced degree
Ellen	white	female	LSU	Wealthy	Two advanced degrees
Felicia	white	female	LSU	Middle class	One advanced degree
Jenny	white	female	Tulane	Middle class	One advanced degree
Kelly	white	female	Tulane	Middle class	Two college degrees
Louise	white	female	LSU	Middle class	One college degree

Only two of the student participants were male. The homogeneity of the student group with regard to race and social class is also noteworthy though unsurprising. The student population at both universities is roughly 75% white. All but one student self-identified as "middle class", but the number of advanced degrees that the parents of these students possess probably suggests a more upper-middle class background if not simply upper class. Most had two parents with a Bachelor's degree and all but two had at least

one parent with an advanced degree.³⁰ Therefore, the profession of French teacher in Louisiana appears to attract not only upper class individuals but also those whose parents were highly educated.

4.2.2 Family Background and Ethnicity

Table 8 presents the data related to the students' cultural and ethnic links to Louisiana. Obviously, students raised in Louisiana by parents from Louisiana with Cajun or Creole ancestry would seem the most likely candidates to seek involvement in the French revitalization movement. However, the questions of whether they had ever lived outside Louisiana or had parents from other states showed a completely opposite profile. Two thirds of students had lived outside of Louisiana at some point growing up. Similarly, two thirds of the students had at least one parent from another state, and four had no parents from Louisiana at all.

TABLE 8: Student Cultural and Ethnic Links to Louisiana

Students	Lived outside Louisiana	Parents from Louisiana	Ethnicity
Ashley	No	One	None
Brad	Yes	None	None
Bridget	Yes	None	None
David	Yes	None	French
Ellen	Yes	Both	None
Felicia	No	One	None
Jenny	Yes	None	None
Kelly	No	Both	None
Louise	Yes	Both	Cajun

When asked if they would “consider themselves Cajun, Creole, or something like that,” the students tended to respond the same way. One student, David, self-identified as

³⁰ For the purposes of this study, an "advanced degree" was any degree beyond a Bachelor's such as MA, JD, PhD, etc.

French and one, Louise, as Cajun while the other seven all stated that they were none of those. The out-of-state origin of many of the students' parents provides some explanation, but it may be a worrying trend for the French revitalization movement if indeed self-identified Cajuns and Creoles do not desire to become French teachers.

4.2.3 Exposure to French

The data in Table 9 gives an indication of how much exposure to French the students have had as well as what kind of exposure they had. Early exposure to French seemed to have little or no correlation with a desire to teach French.³¹ Two-thirds of students had little or no exposure to French until high school. In keeping with the more out-of-state origins of their parents, the students were far less likely to have relatives who speak French, with only Bridget and Louise saying they had distant relatives who spoke French.³² Given the extent of language shift in Louisiana the number of people involved in the French revitalization movement with francophone relatives is likely to continue to decrease. Thus, having francophone relatives is unlikely to be a motivating factor for those within the revitalization movement in the future.

As would be expected given the lack of francophone family present, when asked about childhood exposure to French, none of students claimed to have heard French daily. One-third of students claimed to have heard French regularly, though this was usually in the context of an elementary or middle school classroom. Only Louise claimed to have heard French occasionally outside of school. The other five students claimed to have no exposure to French as children.

³¹ Similar to the questions on family background, this data seems to defy logical assumptions about people involved in language revitalization.

³² A "distant relative" was classified as a person two or more generations removed with whom they had only irregular contact.

TABLE 9: Student Exposure to French

Students	Francophone family	Childhood French exposure	Use French outside school currently	Visited a francophone region	Levels studied French
Ashley	none	regular	sometimes	many times	multiple primary education
Brad	none	none	never	one time	high school only
Bridget	distant family	regular	sometimes	many times	elementary or middle only
David	none	none	daily	a few times	multiple primary education
Ellen	none	none	sometimes	one time	high school only
Felicia	none	none	daily	many times	high school only
Jenny	none	none	sometimes	many times	multiple primary education
Kelly	none	regular	sometimes	never	multiple primary education
Louise	distant family	occasional	daily	a few times	high school only

Yet most of the students claim that now they use French outside of school on a regular basis. Only Brad claimed to never use French with most claiming to use it

sometimes and a few even claiming to use French daily.³³ The student group should be expected to make an effort to use French since they are majoring in French at the university level, and their usage of French is probably unrelated to the revitalization movement since the same amount of French usage would be expected among any university students majoring in French outside of Louisiana.

Another factor hypothesized to significantly influence the linguistic ideology of these students and administrators was the amount of time they had spent in other francophone countries or regions. The responses about visits to francophone regions were divided into categories of never, one time (a brief visit), a few times (for a few brief amounts of time), or many times (for multiple visits or stays of several months). Only Brad had never visited a francophone region, and four of them had visited many times with another two visiting a few times and the last two visiting only once. While these types of travel habits would not be unusual for any university student majoring in French, further qualitative analysis shows that the revitalization movement may have played some role in their ability to travel to francophone regions.

4.2.4 Motivations for Teaching French

Table 10 shows the last set of socio-biographic data collected for the students. These questions reflect decisions that the students made for themselves which influenced their desire to teach French in Louisiana. Though the students obviously chose to study French abroad, their ability to do so was likely influenced by the revitalization movement. Aside from expanding French education at the primary school level,

³³ Though given the linguistic context of Baton Rouge and New Orleans, their daily use of French is limited to mostly francophone media sources and other students rather than interaction with fluent speakers according to their own admissions.

CODOFIL has worked to provide scholarships and opportunities for students in Louisiana to participate in academic exchanges in francophone regions.

TABLE 10: Student Educational Experience and Choices

Students	Education in a francophone region	Initial reason for studying French	Reason they desire to teach French	Desired grade level to teach	Desire to teach in an immersion school
Ashley	year or more	liked language/s	simply like teaching	elementary school	preferable
Brad	one semester	liked language/s	simply like teaching	high school	open to it
Bridget	year or more	family/heritage	simply like teaching	middle school	preferable
David	year or more	liked language/s	simply like teaching	high school	open to it
Ellen	a few weeks	liked language/s	simply like teaching	high school	preferable
Felicia	a few weeks	liked language/s	simply like teaching	high school	preferable
Jenny	year or more	family/heritage	simply like teaching	elementary school	preferable
Kelly	none	liked language/s	simply like teaching	not sure	open to it
Louise	one semester	family/heritage	simply like teaching	not sure	no

All of the students except Kelly had studied French in another country with four having spent a year or more, two having spent a semester, and Ellen and Felicia having

participated in a short immersion program. This could be an important factor when considering what motivates future generations to revitalize the language.

After all of the background information that was hypothesized to influence these students' decisions to learn and teach French had been gathered, they were directly asked why they had chosen to study and teach French. Bridget, Jenny, and Louise replied that they chose to study French because they either had French heritage or family members who spoke French or had studied it. However, the majority of the students had no original motivation for learning French beyond what might be expected of Americans outside of Louisiana. They said they simply liked the language. However, that does not mean that their motivations to teach are necessarily the same as other French teachers outside Louisiana's revitalization movement.

The second direct question on motivation was why they decided that they wanted to teach French. One answer that I hypothesized would emerge for some was that they wanted to preserve French in Louisiana, or in other words be part of the revitalization movement. Somewhat surprisingly, every student responded the same way. All of them stated that the reason they wanted to teach French was simply that they enjoyed teaching or liked the idea of teaching and French was simply their preferred subject. While this type of statement may be suggestive of an ideology quite different from the main proponents of the revitalization movement, one must also consider the implicit discourse to be found in their more ideologically oriented responses later in the interview.

The grade levels the students want to teach are quite varied. Ashley and Jenny preferred elementary level, Bridget preferred middle school, and the rest preferred high school, except Louise and Kelly who weren't sure. While these results were mixed, the

fact that nearly half of the students desired to teach high school may partially explain why CODOFIL has found it difficult to retain a high number of American or Louisianan teachers in their immersion programs. As of the time of these interviews there was not, nor had there ever been, an immersion program in a public high school in Louisiana. Thus, teachers who desire to teach French or in the medium of French at the high school level must seek employment as French second language teachers who are not normally hired through CODOFIL.

Lastly, the students were asked if they would like to teach in a French immersion school. The majority, five of them, responded that they would prefer to teach in an immersion school. David, Kelly, and Brad were open to teaching in immersion, and only Louise had no desire to teach in a French immersion program.³⁴ Among those four students who preferred to teach high school, Ellen and Felicia said they would prefer an immersion school while David and Brad were at least open to it. Thus, from these responses, it seems that if CODOFIL were to begin high school French immersion programs, that might attract more of the students in Louisiana universities who desire to become French teachers.

4.2.5 Student Profile Types

The student who wants to become a French teacher in Louisiana will typically be an upper-middle class white female. Surprisingly, she will not typically be firmly rooted in Louisiana's francophone community through family history or upbringing. She will have studied French in school for close to a decade or more starting in elementary school, and she will usually have traveled or studied overseas in France and/or Canada. When

³⁴ Louise stated, however, that she would not want to teach in immersion only because she believes she lacks the necessary fluency.

asked about her motivation to teach French in Louisiana, her reasons will typically be a love for the French language in general,³⁵ and a love of teaching. Language revitalization will be an afterthought if it is mentioned at all. This profile describes the characteristics that are common to most of the students.

However, there are important differences among the students. Table 11 shows how the students can be divided based on the origin of their parents and exposure to French. The students can be divided by these traits, but the divisions made are inconsistent from one socio-biographic characteristic to the next.

TABLE 11: Students Divided by Ties to Louisiana Francophone Culture

Students	Parents from LA	Childhood French exposure	Levels studied French
Brad	None	none	high school only
David	None	none	multiple primary
Jenny	None	none	multiple primary
Bridget	None	regular	elementary or middle only
Louise	Both	occasional	high school only
Kelly	Both	regular	multiple primary
Ashley	One	regular	multiple primary
Ellen	Both	none	high school only
Felicia	One	none	high school only

For example Brad, Bridget, David and Jenny are unlike their peers in that they have no familial connection to Louisiana. Yet Bridget³⁶ is also found with Ashley, Kelly, and Louise among those who had exposure to French as a child. Ashley, David, Jenny, and Kelly had more French education prior to the university level, but there is apparently no

³⁵ This will not be a love of local varieties of Louisiana French in particular.

³⁶ When she was a child, Bridget's grandfather married a French woman and moved to France where Bridget often visited them.

correlation between initial motivation for studying French and the amount of French education the students received since only Jenny joined Bridget and Louise in stating that family heritage was the source of their motivation.

The only correlation among these differences is that students who studied French before high school may be more likely to choose to teach French at the elementary or middle school level. Ashley, Bridget, and Jenny all expressed interest in teaching elementary or middle school, and they had all studied French in elementary or middle school themselves. However, the fact that David and Kelly had also received early education in French and did not express a desire to teach younger ages casts doubt onto this correlation. Nevertheless, the fact that Brad, Ellen, Felicia, and Louise did not have opportunity to study French before high school could be an important influencing factor in considering their beliefs about French education.

4.3 Profile: Administrators

In this section a profile of the administrators is constructed using mostly the same socio-biographic questions from the IRC interviews as in the previous section. The administrators' answers are divided into the same categories of data including: race, gender, and class; family background and ethnicity; and exposure to French. The administrators also responded to questions about their perceptions of the immersion programs rather than their education and motivations for teaching French since they were not applicable. The same format is used within these categories to present the data describing each of the administrator participants.

4.3.1 Race, Gender, and Class Considerations

The race and gender information in Table 12 shows that the administrators are not significantly different from the students in this respect. The administrators are overwhelmingly white, though there were two black participants.³⁷ They are overwhelmingly female as only two of them were male. These are the exact same gender proportions as the students.

TABLE 12: Administrator Race, Gender, and Class

Administrators	Race	Gender	Social Class	Socio-economic status of Parents
Ms. Adams	white	female	Middle class	No college
Mr. Boudreaux	white	male	Working class	No college
Ms. Carver	black	female	Working class	No college
Mr. Clark	white	male	Middle class	No college
Ms. Dudley	black	female	Middle class	No college
Ms. Ford	white	female	Middle class	No college
Ms. Hill	white	female	Working class	No college
Ms. Jones	white	female	Working class	No college
Ms. Lewis	white	female	Middle class	Two advanced degrees

From a social class perspective the administrators are quite homogenous. All of the administrators except Ms. Lewis grew up in a house where neither parent had a bachelor's degree. Of these administrators, half of them described their family as working class or sometimes "poor." The other administrators described themselves as

³⁷ Several other black administrators were contacted to take part in the study, but they either did not respond or said they did not have time.

middle class, though these class descriptions were self-designated, and given their comments, I believe many might have described themselves as lower-middle class had I presented the option.

4.3.2 Family Background and Ethnicity

From a cultural and ethnic perspective, the administrators are heavily rooted in Louisiana. Only Ms. Lewis, Ms. Dudley, and Ms. Adams had ever lived outside of Louisiana. However, both of Ms. Lewis' parents were born and raised in Louisiana. In terms of ethnic identity, Ms. Dudley was the only administrator who did not describe herself as Cajun, Creole, or French. It is worth noting that Ms. Adams was a Belgian national, and her French ethnic background was not related to the francophone population of Louisiana.

TABLE 13: Administrator Cultural and Ethnic Links to Louisiana

Administrators	Lived outside Louisiana	Parents from Louisiana	Ethnicity
Ms. Adams	Yes	None	French
Ms. Dudley	Yes	None	None
Mr. Boudreaux	No	Both	Cajun
Ms. Carver	No	Both	Creole
Mr. Clark	No	Both	Cajun
Ms. Ford	No	Both	Cajun
Ms. Hill	No	Both	Cajun
Ms. Jones	No	Both	Cajun
Ms. Lewis	Yes	Both	French

4.3.3 Exposure to French

Despite the relatively homogeneous local origins of the administrators, Table 14 shows quite a bit of variation in terms of exposure to French. An important distinction to make is that Ms. Adams and Ms. Dudley are both outsiders who have no familial

connection to Louisiana and never lived in Louisiana as children. However, Ms. Adams obviously had more exposure to French than any other administrator since she was born and raised in Belgium.

TABLE 14: Administrator Exposure to French

Administrators	Francophone family	Childhood French exposure	Use French outside school now	Visited a francophone region	Levels studied French
Ms. Jones	both parents	daily	daily	a few times	never
Ms. Ford	one parent	daily	daily	never	college only
Ms. Carver	one parent	daily	never	never	college only
Mr. Clark	distant relatives	occasional	never	one time	high school only
Ms. Hill	distant relatives /husband	occasional	never	never	never
Ms. Lewis	distant relatives	occasional	never	a few times	never
Mr. Boudreaux	distant relatives	occasional	never	never	never
Ms. Adams	both parents	daily	daily	many times	multiple primary education
Ms. Dudley	none	none	sometimes	never	multiple primary education

Ms. Adams, Ms. Carver, Ms. Ford, and Ms. Jones all had at least one parent who was a native speaker of some variety of French. Ms. Dudley was the only administrator who had no francophone relatives whatsoever.³⁸ Ms. Dudley is also the only

³⁸ Ms. Dudley was also the only American administrator with no familial ties to Louisiana.

administrator who had no exposure to French as a child.³⁹ However, as has been common in Louisiana throughout the twentieth century, occasional or even daily exposure to French was no guarantee that the administrators could speak French as adults. Nevertheless, those who were exposed may be more sensitive to the issues surrounding French revitalization.

Obviously, since five of the administrators said they could not speak French, they did not use French outside of their schools. The only administrators who did use any French outside of their schools on a regular basis were Ms. Adams, a Belgian with many expatriate friends, and Ms. Ford and Ms. Jones who claimed to speak French daily with friends and family who were also Cajun French speakers.⁴⁰ Aside from Ms. Adams, the administrators had done very little or no traveling in francophone areas. This is most likely reflective of their less wealthy family backgrounds and the fact that many did not speak French.

Mr. Clark, Ms. Carver, and Ms. Ford had all had some minimal education in French as a second language at either the high school or college level, but only Ms. Ford considered herself a French speaker and she says she learned French at home. Ms. Adams had been completely educated in French while growing up in Belgium. Ms. Dudley claimed to be a French speaker with a low level of fluency, but all of her knowledge came from FSL classes in another state. Overall, the administrators were poorly educated in FSL if they had any academic exposure to French whatsoever. Given

³⁹ Interestingly, a few administrators said they had "no" exposure to French as a child and would then go on to tell stories about grandparents speaking French. In light of this, their exposure was classified as "occasional".

⁴⁰ Though Ms. Hill claims not to speak French, she did have francophone grandparents and her husband and in-laws are all native Cajun French speakers meaning she does have regular exposure to French outside of school.

the fact that most of the administrators were born before CODOFIL was founded, it is no surprise that they had little access to French education.

4.3.4 Administrator Relationship to Immersion

All but two of the administrators inherited an immersion program that had started decades ago, long before they began their post. Only Ms. Lewis and Mr. Clark work with a recently started program and only Ms. Lewis had actually been involved in founding the program. Most of them knew little, if anything, about how the program had actually been founded. While this sample of administrators only represents about one third of the state's public immersion programs, it is probably true that many programs have been in existence for decades and that expansion has slowed. From these questions it also seems apparent that there is rarely any consideration given to whether a new principal at an immersion school can speak French.

4.3.5 Administrator Profile Types

Like the students, the administrators tend to be a very homogenous group. However, the socio-biographic profile of the typical immersion school administrator is much more what one would expect to find in Louisiana. The typical administrator of a French immersion program could be black or white, but she is most likely female. She is typically from a lower-middle class or working class background and probably of the first generation in her family to obtain a Bachelor's degree. She is deeply rooted in Louisiana's Cajun or Creole culture through family history and upbringing. She almost certainly had francophone grandparents and may have even had francophone parents. However, she probably only had a couple of years of FSL education if she had any, and she may or may not be capable of speaking any French herself. She most likely had nothing to do with founding the immersion program that she administers and her

qualifications are unlikely to be much different from any non-immersion administrator. The immersion school administrators are typical representations of their generation, and their position directing an immersion program is usually more by chance than by plan.⁴¹

Despite how much they have in common, there are a few elements that differentiate the administrator group. These elements are significant and could potentially influence their linguistic ideology. Table 15 brings these differentiating factors together. Ms. Dudley, Ms. Adams, and Ms. Lewis are the only administrators to have ever lived outside Louisiana. They all spent significant portions of their lives, if not the majority, in other states or countries which would logically allow them to consider the issues related to French in Louisiana from an outsider's perspective.

The usage of French outside of school is another potentially important difference between the administrators. Ms. Adams, Ms. Ford and Ms. Jones all use French in their personal lives to one extent or another, suggesting that they might take a different view of the utility of French than the other administrators. Similarly, Ms. Adams, Mr. Clark, Ms. Jones, and Ms. Lewis have all traveled to other countries where French is spoken. This too may have an important influence on their view of the utility of French, particularly from an economic point of view since they have all traveled to economically prosperous francophone regions.

The last significant differentiating quality is the level of French education the administrators received. Mr. Boudreaux, Ms. Hill, Ms. Jones, and Ms. Lewis have never studied French in an academic setting. It would be very surprising if people who had

⁴¹ Only one administrator was at a school that was exclusively an immersion school. Most of the administrators worked at schools where the immersion program only includes a small portion of the student body.

TABLE 15: Administrators Divided by Ties to Louisiana Francophone Culture

Administrators	Francophone family	Childhood French exposure	Lived outside LA	Use French outside school currently	Visited a francophone region	Levels studied French
Ms. Dudley	none	none	Yes	never	never	multiple primary
Ms. Adams	both parents	daily	Yes	daily	many times	multiple primary
Ms. Lewis	distant relatives	occasional	Yes	never	a few times	never
Mr. Boudreaux	distant relatives	occasional	No	never	never	never
Mr. Clark	distant relatives	occasional	No	never	one time	high school only
Ms. Carver	one parent	daily	No	never	never	high school only
Ms. Hill	distant relatives/husband	occasional	No	never	never	never
Ms. Ford	one parent	daily	No	daily	never	college only
Ms. Jones	both parents	daily	No	daily	a few times	never

never studied French in school had the same beliefs about French education as those who had. All of these administrators are career educators, and that fact may contribute to a similarity of opinion. Nevertheless, this is an important factor to keep in mind when considering their ideology.

4.4 Profile Comparisons

Given that the two groups under consideration represent completely different generations of people, it should come as no surprise that they exhibit many differences. The surprising fact though, is that they share few if any of the socio-biographic characteristics that were predicted to influence one's involvement in the French revitalization movement in Louisiana. When comparing the demographics of the two groups, there are two obvious demographic correlations that one would expect.

The first characteristic that both groups share is their gender distribution. For both the students and the administrators, 2 of the 9 interview participants were male. This is approximately 28.5%, which is higher than the Louisiana average of 18.4% but not that much higher than the national average of 23.7% for public school teachers (National Education Association, 2014). This comes as no surprise, since the public education sector is one where women have long predominated.

The only other demographic trait that is similarly represented in both groups is that of racial make-up. Among the administrator group only Ms. Carver and Ms. Dudley were black, whereas among the students, all of the participants were white. There are many well-known social factors that could contribute to this racial discrepancy: notably, the disproportionately low number of minorities who chose to study French in Louisiana

as illustrated in the studies of Tornquist (2000), Haj-Broussard (2003), and Lindner (2008). Dubois and Horvath describe the reasoning for this lack of interest: "By and large the CAAVE [Creole African-American Vernacular English] community is still impoverished. Only higher education, not pride in French heritage, can offer Creoles economic prosperity" (2003:202). Regardless of the reasons involved, these two groups share the characteristic of being disproportionately white.

Race and gender are the only two socio-biographic characteristics that the students and administrators share. There is undoubtedly some correlation between language ideology and both race and gender. However, these characteristics were not predicted to affect a person's choice to become involved in language revitalization. The students who study French at the university level are typically white and female, and thus the teachers and perhaps eventually the administrators of immersion schools will have to be drawn from this pool. The students overall tend to be a very homogenous group who would not seem out of place at any American university.

The most important differences between the two groups seem readily apparent. The difference in social class is stark, with the students growing up in houses with highly educated parents and the administrators having parents with little higher education. It is likely related to the fact that most of the administrators identify as Cajun or Creole with most having relatives who spoke French. The Cajuns and Creole populations have typically been among the least educated and therefore least wealthy groups in Louisiana. Lastly, the students all currently study French at the university level in addition to having studied French at lower levels as well, but no administrator studied French at both the

college level and a lower level, with almost half having never studied French at all.

These factors are likely influential in the ideology of the two groups.

Table 16 categorizes both the students and the administrators into groups based on their level of exposure to Louisiana's francophone culture.

TABLE 16: Both Groups Divided by Exposure to Louisiana Francophone Culture

Level of Exposure	Students	Administrators
1. Outsiders (no LA family)	Brad, David, Jenny, Bridget	Ms. Adams, Ms. Dudley
2. Culturally integrated into LA	Ashley, Ellen, Felicia, Kelly	Mr. Boudreaux, Mr. Clark, Ms. Lewis
3. Deeply immersed in LA francophone culture	Louise	Ms. Carver, Ms. Hill, Ms. Ford, Ms. Jones

However, these divisions do not preclude other possible commonalities within the cohorts: for example, Ms. Lewis has lived outside Louisiana like Ms. Adams and Ms. Dudley. Also, in light of the generational differences between the two groups, it seemed natural that the student group and the administrator group should have different criteria for level of exposure to Louisiana francophone culture.

For both groups the "Outsiders" are those who have no familial connection to Louisiana.⁴² For the students, the "culturally integrated" group consists of those students who are from Louisiana, but had virtually no exposure to Cajun or Creole culture or language as children. For the administrators, those who are "culturally integrated" had

⁴² Note that Bridget and Ms. Adams are considered outsiders despite their childhood exposure to non-Louisiana francophone culture.

much more exposure to Louisiana francophone culture than the students, but they speak no French themselves and do not have any close francophone family either. Louise is the only “deeply immersed” student because she had significant interaction with grandparents who spoke Cajun French. The administrators in the “deeply immersed” group are all French speakers themselves or the children and/or spouses of native Louisiana French speakers.

4.5 Participant Definitions of Cajun and Creole

To better understand their responses about these ethnic terms, I asked the students and the administrators how they would define the terms Cajun and/or Creole. As expected given the findings of Dubois and Melonçon (1997), Lindner (2008), and Tornquist (2000), among the students only Ellen claimed that Cajuns and Creoles were defined by the fact that they speak Cajun or Creole French. Two-thirds of the students defined the terms based on the national and geographic origins of the groups in question. David and Felicia listed a number of cultural factors that defined the Cajun and Creole communities, but only David included language among these factors. Thus, most students agree that language plays no part or only a small part of these identities.

In the same way, when the administrators were asked to define the terms Cajun and/or Creole, only Ms. Adams, a non-American, was unsure how to define them. Ms. Carver, Mr. Clark, and Ms. Hill who were all self-described Cajuns or Creoles defined the terms as ethnic labels describing the national and geographic origins of the two groups. Only Ms. Jones gave a definition of the terms that included use of the Cajun and Creole dialects. The other administrators all gave definitions revolving around various cultural factors that did not include language. Again, in keeping with the findings of

previous research in Louisiana only one of the administrators saw language use as even part of the definition of the terms Cajun and Creole.

4.6 Conclusion

The students described by this data would probably look the same as students who want to teach French in California or Ohio. There is little in their socio-biographic profiles to suggest a desire to revitalize French. They were not raised by activists in an area surrounded by Cajun and Creole culture. They are certainly not the stereotypical Louisiana French speaker. The questions of ideology and motivation addressed in the next chapter are crucial for understanding why they want to be part of this movement, if that is their desire at all.

The administrators look more like the type of person one would expect to find in a language revitalization movement. They are deeply rooted in the local culture and personally connected to the speakers of the disappearing dialects. They also come from the more humble backgrounds typically associated with linguistic minorities. Yet most of them speak little or no French and they usually find themselves at a French immersion school by chance rather than design. Thus, the questions of ideology in the next chapter will be crucial for understanding whether these administrators actually consider themselves to be working for language revitalization or if they simply look the part.

CHAPTER 5: DATA DISTRIBUTION IDEOLOGICAL PROFILES

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents ideological assessments of the data collected for all of the study participants. As in the preceding chapter, profiles of the students and administrators are constructed using their answers from the IRC. Unlike the preceding chapter, however, the questions addressed in this chapter are purely subjective. The statements made by participants during the interviews will be grouped together to reveal an implicit agreement or disagreement with the ideologies in question. The actual responses of the participants can then be used to show why the participants agree or disagree.

Because we defined linguistic ideology as subconscious beliefs about language, it would have been ineffective if not counterproductive to ask the participants directly whether or not they agreed with the ideological beliefs in question. A subconscious belief is, by definition, a belief that one holds without being aware of it or capable of expressing it. As discussed in the methodology, the interview questions were open-ended. Rather than ask if a student agrees "French is not as important as other languages because it is not useful," we ask "Why do most people in Louisiana not make an effort to learn French?" The participant may then openly state the belief in question or respond in a way that either implies agreement or disagreement with the belief in question.

The tables in this chapter show the most common or most applicable statements of belief. The statements of individuals who differed from their peers were then explained. Note that the participants were not asked whether or not they agree with most of these statements; rather, they were asked an open-ended question and responded with

the statements presented in one form or another. Commonalities within the statements were then employed to create ideological profiles which were then compared within and across the two groups. Though it is difficult to say with absolute certainty whether or not an individual holds a particular subconscious belief, the statements they do make are used to suggest whether or not the individuals probably share these beliefs.

TABLE 17: Recapitulation of Beliefs

Belief 1: French is not as important to know as other languages because it is not useful.
Belief 2: French Language use is only a symbolic marker of identity, not practical for daily life.
Belief 3: The government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote and preserve French because of its francophone heritage.
Belief 4: The survival of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness rather than on inter-generational mother-tongue transmission.

Table 17 recapitulates the four beliefs presented in the discussion of methodology. The response coding sheet in Appendix C shows the codes of responses represented in the tables in this chapter. Not every response nor every question related to these ideologies is represented in the tables below, but only the most common or most relevant responses that can be used to show a probable agreement or disagreement with these beliefs.

5.2 Ideological Profile: Students

In this section an ideological profile of the students is constructed using the ideological questions from the IRC interviews. Several statements of belief are grouped largely as the questions that elicited them were grouped in the interview guide. The students' agreement with the statements grouped together was then used to determine whether or not the students shared an implicit agreement with the ideological beliefs in question. Agreement with the statements in the tables was determined based upon the

answers given by the students during the interviews. The statements of those who appear to disagree with the underlying ideological belief can then be analyzed to determine why.

5.2.1 Ideology 1: French is not as Important as other Languages Because it is not Useful

Two-thirds of students spoke of the fact that Americans have no need to learn another language. The increasingly globalized world where English is the lingua franca of the Internet may, in fact, be increasing the belief among younger generations that other languages are not necessary. Though Ashley, Ellen, and Jenny did not explicitly say so, their agreement with the other statements suggest that they feel the same as the majority of their peers. That is to say, they tend to see little use for French in Louisiana though they feel learning other languages is generally important. Furthermore, a deeper analysis of their statements in the next chapter reveals that many openly admit that Spanish may be more useful than French as a second language in Louisiana. The only student who did not seem to show agreement with the first ideology was Bridget. She tended to express the thought that all languages were equally important for all students everywhere. She is also the only outsider to have had significant exposure to French as a child.

The students' responses to the question of why learning a foreign language is important were almost identical. As Table 18 shows, almost all students said that foreign language education is important because of the educational benefits it provides in terms of either cognitive improvement or simply providing a well-rounded education, or because of the job opportunities it can provide, or some combination of the two. The only outlier was Kelly who said foreign languages were important so people can communicate cross-culturally. Her response did not seem to show the same utilitarianism present in the

statements of the other students. The students tend to view foreign languages as important for practical reasons, perhaps even for self-advancement.

TABLE 18: Student Statements Related to Belief 1

Students	Foreign languages provide cognitive benefits and/or job opportunities	Americans don't want to learn other languages because they don't need them	People in LA don't learn French because it's <u>not</u> useful	English is more important for France than French is for LA	French is <u>not</u> more important for LA than other languages
Brad	✓	✓	✓	✓	
David	✓	✓	✓		
Jenny	✓	✓		✓	
Bridget	✓				✓
Ashley	✓	✓		✓	✓
Ellen	✓	✓		✓	✓
Felicia	✓		✓		
Kelly			✓	✓	
Louise	✓	✓	✓		

When asked why they believed Americans tend not to learn a second language, every student except Bridget, Kelly, and Felicia stated that Americans do not learn other languages because they have no motivation since Americans never need to use another language. Bridget and Felicia said that Americans do not learn other languages because of a nationalistic pride, and Louise mentioned American pride in addition to a perceived lack of necessity. Again Kelly was the outlier blaming the poor American education system for a lack of interest in foreign languages.

There were five students who directly said people in Louisiana do not learn French or make sure their children learn French because it is not useful. Of those who did not give the lack of utility as a reason, Ashley said it is probably because of the historical stigma attached to Cajun and Creole French. Jenny and Ellen believed it was

related to a lack of appreciation for or understanding of Louisiana's history.

Nevertheless, Table 18 showed that Ashley, Jenny, and Ellen all agree that Americans in general do not learn other languages because they don't need them, and that sentiment also implies that people in Louisiana don't need French. Bridget was the only student who did not in any way suggest a lack of utility for French. She said that people in Louisiana do not learn French because learning languages is hard and other educational priorities take precedent.

Regarding the importance of French in the Louisiana context compared to the importance of English in the context France, they were asked whether they felt French was more important for Louisiana's children or if English was more important for France's children. Most of the students said that English is more important for French children. Only Bridget felt the two languages were of equal importance for both sets of children. David, Felicia, and Louise said that French is more important for Louisiana's children because there are plenty of English speakers in the world already. This last response, however, could be interpreted as an astetism or backhanded compliment toward the French language suggesting a latent acceptance of English dominance over French in the international community. It is also possible that these four felt that French was more important for Louisiana's children because of their understandable bias toward French given their current career path.

There were five students who stated that French was the most important second language for Louisiana's students because it is part of their heritage. Again Kelly went further than the other students actually going so far as to state that French was the most important language for Louisiana's children because we need to maintain or revitalize

French. One obvious consideration is the inherent bias toward French that one would expect among people who study French and plan to teach it. Yet Ashley, Bridget, and Ellen were willing to admit that French is not more important for the children of Louisiana than another language. Their statements seem more in keeping with the students' overall utilitarian view of second languages.

One question related to this aspect of ideology brought a unanimous response. The question was whether it is more important for children in Louisiana to know English than French. Logically, every participant responded that Louisiana's children need to know English more than French for practical reasons. While this question may seem rather obvious, it was included in order to know conclusively that there is no extremist element present in this group who wishes to supplant English as Louisiana's primary language. This is an important difference between Louisiana's revitalization movement and many other language revitalization movements around the world. Nevertheless, the answer to this question was not included in Table 18 because it did little to enlighten our understanding of the students' overall ideology given their other statements.

5.2.2 Ideology 2: French Language Use is a Symbolic Marker of Identity, Not Practical for Daily Life

All of the students except Ashley seem to share the belief that French is an important symbol of Louisiana's heritage and by extension one could say a marker of Louisiana identity. Unsurprisingly, they seem to support efforts to expand French education, and with it the embracing of Louisiana's heritage and cultural identity. Yet only a minority of students mentions any practical reasons for learning French such as economic advantages or improved overall education. Almost all the students express in one way or another an acknowledgment that French is not practical for daily life in

Louisiana despite its symbolic value. The only student who seems to differ in regards to ideology two is Ashley who seems to put little or no symbolic value on French and sees the language as purely practical in nature.

TABLE 19: Student Statements Related to Belief 2

Students	It doesn't matter if French teachers are from LA	French is more important for LA than other states	French education should be concentrated in Acadiana	Heritage awareness is the benefit of French for students	French has economic benefits for students
Brad	✓	✓	✓	✓	
David	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Jenny	✓	✓		✓	✓
Bridget	✓	✓		✓	
Ashley	✓				✓
Ellen	✓	✓	✓		✓
Felicia	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kelly	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Louise	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

If French is perceived to be a symbol of ethnic identity for people in Louisiana, one might expect some preference for French teachers to be ethnically Louisianan. Yet when asked if it was important for French teachers in Louisiana to be from Louisiana every member of the student group said it was not important. In order to further explore the idea of the French language as a symbolic marker of identity in Louisiana, they were also asked if it was more important to teach French in Louisiana than in other states. Here, however, the answer was overwhelmingly yes, with everyone but Ashley stating that French was more important for Louisiana because of its heritage. These numbers stand in contrast to the responses to the previous question. Everyone except Ashley feels that French is more important for Louisiana than other states because of its French

heritage, but they do not feel it is important for the teachers of French to have a connection to that heritage.

Similarly, when asked whether French education should be uniform throughout the state or concentrated in areas where it was historically more present, the majority agreed that efforts should be concentrated in South Louisiana or Acadiana where the francophone heritage is strongest. Those who disagreed were again Ashley and two of the outsiders, Jenny and Bridget. Jenny disagreed because she felt that the whole state shared in the French heritage regardless of how present the language was in a particular area, and in saying so also expressed the important link between French heritage and French language instruction. In contrast, Ashley and Bridget felt French education should be equally available statewide simply because it would improve the education system. Note that Ashley and Bridget mention a practical benefit of French language instruction despite the fact that the question does not make reference to its benefits.

The last two columns in Table 19 show the benefits that students said French has for children in Louisiana. Five brought up the fact that they would be learning about their heritage as the only benefit mentioned. Jenny and Louise mentioned education about heritage in addition to cultural and economic development of the state, while Ashley and Ellen mentioned only economic advantages. Ashley clearly lacks the same preoccupation with Louisiana's francophone heritage exhibited by her peers, though it is unclear why. Everyone except Ashley mentioned the importance of Louisiana's French heritage multiple times despite their insistence that French teachers don't need to share in that heritage.

Overall, the students seem to share the belief that French is an important symbol of Louisiana's heritage and by extension a marker of Louisiana identity. Unsurprisingly, they seem to support efforts to expand French education, and with it the embracing of Louisiana's heritage and cultural identity. Yet only a minority of students mentions any practical reasons for learning French such as economic advantages or improved overall education. The fact the students, with the exception of Ashley, mention the importance of heritage repeatedly and only four ever referenced a practical use in response to these questions suggests a perception that French has more symbolic than practical value for Louisiana.

5.2.3 Ideology 3: The Government of Louisiana has a Responsibility to Promote and Preserve French Because of its Francophone Heritage

The third ideological belief is considered in two parts. The first part is whether or not Louisiana's state government has a responsibility to promote French, and what the nature of that responsibility is. The second part investigates the nature of the link between Louisiana's francophone heritage and its responsibility to promote French. All of the students believe that Louisiana's state government has an important role to play in the revitalization of French, even if Ashley and Ellen are unwilling to call it a responsibility. Everyone except for Ashley and Ellen openly stated that the state's French heritage gives the government this responsibility.

First, Table 20 addresses the students' beliefs about whether or not Louisiana's state government has a responsibility to promote French, and if it should be doing something other than teaching French in public schools.⁴³ Everyone except for Ashley

⁴³ Throughout the corpus, the participants' comments about "the government" and those about "CODOFIL" are treated the same. CODOFIL is a government agency whose new

and Ellen openly state that the government is responsible for promoting French, and even they believe the government should be doing more to promote French even though it has no inherent obligation.

TABLE 20: Student Statements Related to Belief 3

Students	Promoting French is the state govt's responsibility	The govt should promote French through cultural activities	The govt should promote French through official use (signs/forms,etc.)	LA festivals inspire people to learn French
Brad	✓			
David	✓		✓	✓
Jenny	✓	✓		✓
Bridget	✓	✓		✓
Ashley		✓		✓
Ellen		✓		
Felicia	✓	✓		✓
Kelly	✓		✓	✓
Louise	✓		✓	

The students were directly asked whether or not the government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote French. Everyone except Ashley and Ellen stated that it definitely does. All of those who said yes claimed the government has this responsibility because of the state's heritage. Ashley and Ellen both said the state did not have a responsibility to promote French, but their hesitation, body language, and tone when answering the question conveyed an air of ambivalence. Furthermore, their answers to the next question reveal that they would like to see the government promoting French even if it does not have an inherent mandate.

charter places them as one of five divisions of Louisiana's Office of Cultural Development. Similarly, comments about other government entities such as the "Department of Education" and "the Lieutenant Governor's Office" are treated as statements about "the government."

As the literature on language revitalization tends to agree that schools alone cannot revitalize a language, the next question related to their views on this topic. The question of what the government should do outside of schools to promote French provided a variety of answers, but they tended to fall into one of two categories shown in the middle columns of Table 20. Only Brad believed that the government had no responsibility to promote French outside of schools. The idea of more cultural activities subsidized and promoted by the government such as fairs, festivals, camps, and francophone media such as television and radio programs was mentioned by Ashley, Bridget, Jenny, Ellen, and Felicia. David, Louise, and Kelly mentioned the idea of the government using French in a more official capacity such as public signage and government services and forms. While the students acknowledged that there are examples of government support for French in these areas, everyone except for Brad believes the government should be doing more.

Because Louisiana's music and cultural festivals are one of the few places outside of schools in Louisiana where French often has a public presence, the participants were asked whether or not they believed these types of events can actually inspire people to learn French. There was generally some degree of optimism about such events, with only Brad, Ellen, and Louise stating that they do not inspire people to learn French. On the positive side, Ashley, Bridget, Kelly, and David said that these festivals probably inspire people to learn French to some extent, while Felicia and Jenny said that these festivals definitely inspire people to learn French. The optimism about the effectiveness of these cultural festivals goes some way to explaining the belief that the government should do more to promote them.

5.2.4 Exploring the Link Between Heritage and Government Responsibility

Having established which students share the third ideology, the five questions whose responses are illustrated in Table 21 were intended to explore the link between Louisiana's francophone heritage and the government responsibility to promote French.⁴⁴ These questions gauge to what extent the two groups believe CODOFIL's somewhat controversial practices undermine the government's responsibility to promote Louisiana's cultural heritage. Specifically, these questions address the issue of whether or not CODOFIL's methods promote French at the expense of promoting Louisiana's specific francophone languages and cultures. Without inquiring directly, these questions are intended to determine whether these groups believe the government has a responsibility to promote French language and culture in general or Louisiana's French languages and cultures specifically. Though the students show differing opinions on certain issues, all of the students are in favor of promoting Standard French in Louisiana.

With regard to the preservation of Louisiana's local French dialects, the students were asked whether they perceived the standard French used in schools as a threat to Louisiana's native varieties. Only Ashley, David, and Louise said Standard French does pose a threat that to Louisiana French, but they were all in favor of promoting both. Bridget, Kelly, and Brad said Standard French is a threat to these varieties but conceded that schools had to use Standard French because it was more practical. Ellen, Felicia, and Jenny did not perceive Standard French as a threat to Louisiana French at all, and saw no reason to consider not using it in schools. So two-thirds of the students concede that Standard French is the only realistic option for Louisiana's public schools. Those who

⁴⁴ Ashley and Ellen were the only two who did not openly recognize this responsibility.

TABLE 21: Student Statements about Louisiana Ethnicity and Language

Students	Standard French <u>not</u> a threat /preferable to LA varieties	French teachers do <u>not</u> need to have francophone heritage	French immersion teachers should come from overseas	LA teachers should be preferred to other Americans	Integrate some LA French into class through some history lessons	Point out occasional differences between LA French and SF
Brad	✓	✓	✓	✓		
David		✓	✓			
Jenny	✓	✓	✓			✓
Bridget	✓	✓	✓			✓
Ashley		✓	✓			✓
Ellen	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Felicia	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kelly	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Louise		✓	✓		✓	✓

are aware of the threat it poses to Louisiana's heritage varieties, still feel that Standard French should be taught in schools.

The next question was whether or not it was important for French teachers in Louisiana to have francophone ancestry. The answer was resoundingly no, with all of the students responding that it was irrelevant. They tended to respond that as long as they could speak French well or loved the language, their ancestry was irrelevant. The global nature of the French language perhaps makes Louisiana somewhat different from other minority language revitalization efforts. In France, some Breton language activists have criticized the usage of Welsh teachers in Breton immersion schools even if they are teaching in Breton (Jones 1998a). It seems unlikely that one would find many non-Irishman teaching Irish in Ireland or non-Maori teaching Maori in New Zealand. However, the ethnic connection to the French language is obviously irrelevant for these students.⁴⁵

To the question of whether or not CODOFIL should bring in teachers from other countries, the answer was again unanimous. Brad stated that it was absolutely necessary because the American and Louisianan teachers were lacking in quantity or quality. The others all said that a variety of teachers from Louisiana/America and some from other countries would be ideal. There was no suggestion from the students that CODOFIL should cease or phase out its Foreign Associate Teacher program.

Similarly, when asked if it teachers from Louisiana should have preference over teachers from other states when it came to hiring French or French immersion teachers, the students were mostly in agreement. Two-thirds of students stated that teachers from

⁴⁵ This is understandable given the fact that most of them have no ethnic connection to the language themselves.

Louisiana should not have priority over teachers from other states. However, Brad, Kelly, and Felicia responded that Louisiana teachers should have priority.⁴⁶ Obviously, such discrimination would be illegal in the United States; nevertheless the majority seems to agree that a Louisiana ethnic identity is not relevant to teaching French in Louisiana.

The last in this series of questions was how, if at all, the students planned to integrate Louisiana's unique varieties of French into their classrooms. The different answers are represented in the final two columns of Table 21. Ellen and Felicia responded that they would point out a little about Louisiana history. Ashley, Bridget, Jenny, Louise, and Kelly said they would point out occasional differences in vocabulary or grammar between standard French and Louisiana varieties. Louise said she planned to do both; probably not coincidentally, Louise was the only student to self-identify as Cajun. David and Brad, however, said they would probably not integrate Louisiana French into their classrooms. Brad said he would not simply because he does not know enough about the subject, and David said he would probably integrate information about Louisiana French only if he were teaching in "Cajun Country". Though there was clearly no animosity towards Louisiana French, integrating it into the classroom seemed to be only a minor concern at best.

None of the students seemed to agree with the often stated criticism that CODOFIL, and by extension the state, employs methods that promote the French language at the expense of Louisiana's native French heritage. The literature is quite clear about the rift between some sectors of the French revitalization movement and the various government agencies involved in French education. The statements in Table 21

⁴⁶ Remember that Kelly and Felicia are both from Louisiana, and their answers appeared to be tongue-in-cheek.

revealed many complex ideas that will be more deeply explored in the next chapter, but none of these questions elicited any great dissatisfaction with CODOFIL or the status quo of French education. Every student who believes the government has a responsibility to promote French because of Louisiana's heritage believes the government is already doing this fairly well. Since Ashley and Ellen do not believe the government has a mandate to promote and preserve French, they, too, are obviously comfortable with the government's efforts

5.2.5 Ideology 4: The Survival of French in Louisiana Depends on Economic Usefulness Rather than on Intergenerational Mother Tongue Transmission

The answers to the final set of questions in Table 22 reveal the students' beliefs about what will help French survive in Louisiana. These questions revealed an overall lack of optimism about the future of French in Louisiana, with two-thirds believing bilingualism will either decrease or stay the same in the future. However, Ashley, David, and Ellen did actually believe it would become more common. Ashley and Ellen join the outsiders except for Bridget in seeing the economic benefits of French as part of the language's future in Louisiana. Felicia and Louise mentioned that they want their students to speak French with their families when they grow up, revealing some level of disagreement with this ideology. Bridget and Kelly do not seem to share this belief simply because they are comfortable suggesting that French will not have a place in Louisiana in the future, and therefore the survival of French does not depend on either of these factors.

The question of how society benefits from French and English bilingualism in Louisiana elicited many varied responses, but only the most common is seen in the

TABLE 22: Student Statements Related to Belief 4

Students	French/English bilingualism will NOT be more common in LA in the future	French provides economic benefits to LA society	My students should use French at work	My students should use French at home	French should be ubiquitous like English in LA	French should be on signs, products, menus, etc.
Brad	✓	✓			✓	
David		✓				✓
Jenny	✓		✓		✓	
Bridget	✓					✓
Ashley		✓	✓			
Ellen		✓				✓
Felicia	✓			✓		✓
Kelly	✓					✓
Louise	✓			✓	✓	

second informational column. Many participants provided more than one answer. The most common asset mentioned was the ability to attract tourism and business from other francophone countries. Ashley, Brad, David, and Ellen mentioned this and it is categorized as "economic benefit" in Table 22. The other economic benefit mentioned was the ability to attract more American tourism but only Brad mentioned this. The other benefits mentioned were not economic in nature, but rather linked to improvements in education within the state.⁴⁷ Bridget, Felicia, Jenny, and David mentioned a more culturally-aware citizenry as the benefit, or a benefit in the case of David. Kelly, and Louise mentioned only a generally improved quality of education as the asset French provides. Importantly, the majority of students mentioned only non-economic benefits. Thus, less than half of the students immediately identify French/English bilingualism as economically beneficial for people in Louisiana.

Columns three and four on the table show that the students did not seem overly concerned that their students speak French in their home when asked where they would like to see their students using French in their daily lives as adults. Only Louise and Felicia said they would like to see their students using French with their families. From an economic perspective, Ashley and Jenny said they would like to see their students using French in their jobs. The most common answer, however, was not related to economics or the transmission of French in the home. Two-thirds of students mentioned travel and enrichment activities like watching French movies as the way they would like to see their students use French, though Jenny did mention this in addition to using

⁴⁷ Though there is a link between better education and economic prosperity, none of the students suggested this.

French at work. Less than half of the students mentioned either an economic use or transmission of the language at home as the desired outcome of teaching French.

The last two columns of the table show where, in an ideal world, average people in Louisiana would encounter French in their daily lives according to the students. Ashley said that average people do not necessarily need to encounter French in their daily lives. Bridget, David, Kelly, Ellen, and Felicia mentioned public displays such as signs, product labels, and menus. Interestingly, in an ideal imaginary world, only Jenny, Louise, and Brad said that French would be ubiquitous and used in all aspects of life alongside English. This last group then went on to provide examples of hypothetical situations where French would be present.⁴⁸ However, only Jenny specifically mentioned French being present in the home of an average Louisianan in an ideal world.

TABLE 23: Student Statements about the Future of French in the Home

Students	Yes, interest in French is growing	Only if more is done to encourage it	Not likely
Brad		✓	
David			✓
Jenny			✓
Bridget		✓	
Ashley	✓		
Ellen	✓		
Felicia			✓
Kelly		✓	
Louise	✓		

Lastly, Table 23 shows how the students answered the final question of whether or not they believe future generations in Louisiana will pass French on to their children in the home. Only Ashley, Louise, and Ellen gave an unqualified answer of yes. Bridget,

⁴⁸ People would use French in the schools, in stores, on the bus, in the home, community events, overhearing people on the street switching between English and French, etc.

Kelly, and Brad were somewhat optimistic, saying that if more were done to promote French then people may pass it on at home; Jenny, David, and Felicia were openly pessimistic. David had previously stated that he believed bilingualism will increase, but as will be seen in the next chapter his answer seemed disingenuous. Thus, only one-third of these students who want to become French teachers in Louisiana believe that future generations will pass French on at home if Louisiana's situation does not change.

5.2.6 Student Ideological Profile Types

As expected, the students share many ideological tendencies. They all view learning multiple languages as important, though they acknowledge that Americans do not have much use for languages other than English. Moreover, most acknowledge that French is not particularly useful in Louisiana. Bridget is the only student who does not show agreement with the first belief.

All of them except Ashley seem to view French as an important aspect of Louisiana's heritage and by extension an important marker of Louisiana culture. They also believe that the government is responsible for promoting French and that the government could do more to promote it. Yet they tend to agree with the strategies that CODOFIL and the state government have adopted in promoting French in public schools.

The students generally believe that local heritage is the underlying reason why French should be promoted in Louisiana, but they exhibit no nationalistic or tribalistic tendency to exclude anyone from outside Louisiana. All of them except for Ashley and Ellen are pessimistic about the future of French in Louisiana, and they generally show ambivalence toward the use of French within the home. Despite these commonalities, the students are not as uniform ideologically as they are demographically.

TABLE 24: Important Ideological Differences between Students

Students	French is not more important for LA than other languages	English is more important for France than French is for LA	Heritage awareness is the benefit of French for students	French has economic benefits for students	French/English bilingualism will NOT be more common in LA in the future	People will definitely pass French on at home
Brad		✓	✓		✓	
David			✓			
Jenny		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Bridget	✓		✓		✓	
Ashley	✓	✓		✓		✓
Ellen	✓	✓		✓		✓
Felicia			✓		✓	
Kelly		✓	✓		✓	
Louise			✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 24 brings together several ideological beliefs that divide the students. Ashley, Bridget, and Ellen were the only students who openly stated that French is not more important for Louisiana's students than other languages. Their reasons were varied. Ashley felt that students should be able to study whatever language appeals to them personally. Bridget felt that learning any language was beneficial for educational reasons and it does not matter what that language is.⁴⁹ Ellen felt that students should choose a foreign language to study based on their goals in life and choose the language that will be most useful. These views, while perfectly logical, were not shared by two-thirds of their peers, who felt that Louisiana's heritage was sufficient reason to have students study French rather than other languages.

Similarly, a sizable minority of students felt that French was more important for Louisiana's children than English is for children in France. Those who did not simply acknowledge that English's global dominance made it more important than French, tended to show a somewhat illogical bias toward French. David, Felicia, and Louise made cynical remarks about the global importance of English. This may be related to their belief in the importance of preserving Louisiana's heritage. However, it could be an indication of insecurity with their own beliefs about the importance of French. That is to say, perhaps they feel the need to denigrate English in order to justify their own career choices. Only Bridget felt that the languages were equally important for children simply because any second language has the same educational value.

Table 24 also shows that when asked what benefit French has for Louisiana's children, the students are split between those who see practical economic uses for French

⁴⁹ That sentiment is shared by many of the administrators as will be seen in the next section.

and those who do not. Even Jenny and Louise, who mention both the heritage aspect and the economic aspect, mention heritage first and foremost and go on to mention economic benefits as a convenient byproduct. So even if some students do see practical economic advantages to learning French, they still tend to see connecting students to their heritage as the primary purpose of teaching French.

The final, and probably most important, difference among the students is their views on the future of French in Louisiana. The pessimistic view is clearly the majority opinion. However, the last two columns of Table 24 show that Ashley, David, Ellen, and Louise all express some form of optimism about the future of French. It is somewhat surprising that more of the students who would like to spend their careers teaching French in Louisiana are not more optimistic about the prospects of language revitalization.

5.3 Ideological Profile Administrators

In this section an ideological profile of the administrators is constructed using the same ideological questions from the IRC interviews. The statements are grouped in the same way as for the students, and the administrators' statements are analyzed in the same way to determine whether or not the administrators share an implicit agreement with the ideological beliefs. As before, be aware that the statements in the tables represent common statements made by administrators. If an administrator did not make a particular statement, that does not necessarily mean that he or she disagrees with it, simply that he or she did not say so directly. The statements that the administrators do make are considered together to determine whether or not they likely share the beliefs presented in question.

5.3.1 Ideology 1: French is not as Important as other Languages Because it is not Useful

The administrators show a lack of bias toward French in their statements about why people in Louisiana do not learn it. All but two administrators openly state that French is not useful in Louisiana, yet they all agree that learning other languages is important for the cognitive and financial benefits they provide. For two-thirds of the administrators an overall agreement with the first belief seems rather clear. The only administrators who seem to disagree say that French is more important for Louisiana's children than other languages. Not coincidentally, these are three of the four administrators who are deeply immersed in Louisiana francophone culture.

TABLE 25: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 1

Admin.	Foreign languages provide cognitive benefits and/or job opportunities	Americans don't want to learn other languages because they don't need them	People in LA don't learn French because it's not useful	English is more important for France than French is for LA	French is <u>not</u> more important for LA than other languages
Ms. Dudley	✓	✓			✓
Ms. Adams	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mr. Boudreaux	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mr. Clark	✓		✓		✓
Ms. Lewis	✓		✓	✓	✓
Ms. Carver	✓	✓	✓		
Ms. Ford	✓		✓		✓
Ms. Hill	✓			✓	
Ms. Jones	✓		✓		

The administrators' responses to the first set of questions are illustrated in Table 25. They were almost unanimous in stating that foreign language education is important

because of the educational benefits it provides in terms of either cognitive improvement or simply providing a well-rounded education. Mr. Boudreaux mentioned only that foreign languages were important for job opportunities, while Mr. Clark, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Lewis mentioned a combination of both career opportunities and educational benefits.

There were several answers put forward as to why they believed Americans tend not to learn a second language. The second column in the table shows that four said Americans do not learn other languages because they have no motivation because Americans never need to use another language. Ms. Adams and Ms. Dudley, the outsiders, gave this as the only reason. Mr. Clark, Ms. Ford, and Ms. Jones gave nationalistic pride as the only reason. Mr. Boudreaux and Ms. Carver gave some combination of these first two reasons among others. Ms. Lewis said the United States' poor education system was the reason for American monolingualism, and Ms. Hill was not sure of any reason.

The third column shows that only two administrators did not openly state that people in Louisiana do not learn French because it is not useful. Ms. Hill stated that it was because of the negative historical stigma attached to French. Ms. Adams, Ms. Carver, and Ms. Jones mentioned both the negative stigma and its lack of usefulness as reasons. Ms. Dudley gave separate reasons other than the stigma and its lack of practicality. She spoke of a lack of connection with Louisiana's heritage coupled with the fact that the schools focus on standardized tests which have no sections on or in French.

Another divisive issue for the administrators was the importance of French in the Louisiana context compared to the importance of English in the context of France. The

administrators were also asked whether they felt French was more important for Louisiana's children or if English was more important for France's children. The second-to-last column shows that Ms. Adams, Mr. Boudreaux, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Lewis said that English is more important for French children because of the global importance of English. Conversely, all of the other administrators said that French is equally important for children in Louisiana as English is for children in France. It was interesting to note that no administrators felt that French was more important for Louisiana's children, perhaps another reflection of their lack of bias toward French over other languages.

The administrators were more unified than the students in response to the question on the importance of French relative to other languages for children in Louisiana. As seen in the last column two-thirds of administrators openly stated that French was not more important for children in Louisiana than other languages. One important consideration regarding the administrators' answers to this question is that most of them do not speak French, and thus, they would logically be freer from bias. Only Ms. Carver, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Jones stated that French was the most important language for Louisiana's students because it is part of their heritage. The only member of deeply immersed cohort⁵⁰ who did not say French was the most important language for Louisiana's children to learn was Ms. Ford, though she qualified her answer by saying that since practicality necessitates choosing some languages over others, kids in Louisiana might as well learn French.

As with the students, the administrators were asked whether it is more important for children in Louisiana to know English than French. Again, every participant

⁵⁰ Table 16 in the previous chapter showed how the participants had been categorized according to their personal connection to Louisiana francophone culture.

responded that Louisiana's children need to know English more than French for practical reasons. Unsurprisingly, the administrators do not have any extremist element hoping to supplant English, and once again the answer to this question was not included in Table 25 because it did little to enlighten our understanding of the administrators' overall ideology given their other statements.

5.3.2 Ideology 2: French Language Use is a Symbolic Marker of Identity Not Practical for Daily Life

Together their statements suggest the administrators do see French as a symbol of Louisiana's heritage or marker of Louisiana identity. The only exception is Ms. Adams, the Belgian, who understandably sees the French language as very practical and important for reasons that have nothing to do with heritage. Four administrators generally admit French has little practical use in Louisiana today, and this may be why they rely on its importance as a symbol of heritage. Yet all of the French speakers and Mr. Boudreaux see pragmatic reasons for learning French, such as economic advantages and improved overall education. Of those three administrators who do express some agreement with this second belief, they all expressed a hope that French will have practical applications for the future later on in their interview.

Though not as unanimous as the students, when asked if it was important for French teachers in Louisiana to be from Louisiana the vast majority of administrators did say it was not important. Ms. Adams even went so far as to say that not only is it not important to be a Louisiana native, it is actually preferable to have teachers from other countries.⁵¹ However, Ms. Hill and Ms. Jones did believe that Louisiana native teachers

⁵¹ Though it should once again be noted that Ms. Adams was the only non-American included in the study.

would be preferable. They both complained of a lack of understanding of the English language among foreign immersion teachers, and said that local teachers could better teach about local francophone culture.

TABLE 26: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 2

Admin.	It doesn't matter if French teachers are from LA	French is more important for LA than other states	French education should be concentrated in Acadiana	Heritage awareness is the benefit of French for students	French has economic benefits for students
Ms. Dudley	✓		✓		✓
Ms. Adams	✓				✓
Mr. Boudreaux	✓	✓	✓		✓
Mr. Clark	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Ms. Lewis	✓	✓		✓	
Ms. Carver	✓	✓		✓	
Ms. Ford	✓		✓		✓
Ms. Hill		✓		✓	✓
Ms. Jones		✓	✓		✓

The second informational column shows that two-thirds of administrators stated that French was more important for Louisiana than other states because of its heritage. Ms. Adams, Ms. Dudley, and Ms. Ford disagreed. The two outsiders disagreed because they felt that learning French or any language would be equally beneficial to all children. Ms. Ford's disagreement is based on a belief that all children should learn the "language of their ancestors" whatever that may be. While three administrators answered no, it is clear that the majority of administrators feel, as do the students, that French is more

important for Louisiana than other states because of its French heritage, but not that the teachers need some connection to that heritage.

Regarding what Louisiana's students gain by learning French, the answers were similar to the last question. The last two columns of Table 26 show that learning about their heritage was the only benefit mentioned by Mr. Clark, Ms. Carver, and Ms. Lewis, while Ms. Hill noted education about heritage in addition to the cultural and economic development of the state. Ms. Adams, Mr. Boudreaux, Ms. Dudley, Ms. Ford, and Ms. Jones cited only the cultural and economic development of the state. Thus, the administrators were split about what the advantage of French immersion is to Louisiana's students.

As with the students, the majority of administrators believed French education should be concentrated in Acadiana where the francophone heritage is strongest. Ms. Carver, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Lewis disagreed because they felt that the whole state shared in the French heritage. Ms. Adams was the only administrator who felt French immersion education should be equally available statewide because it provides a better education in general. This illustrates once again that Ms. Adams sees little connection between francophone heritage and the importance of French education.

5.3.3 Ideology 3: The Government of Louisiana has a Responsibility to Promote and Preserve French Because of its Francophone Heritage

Table 27 provides the administrators' statements about whether or not Louisiana's state government has a responsibility to promote French, and if they should be doing something other than teaching French in public schools. When asked directly if the government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote French, every administrator except Ms. Hill said yes. Like the students, they too said the state has this responsibility

because of its heritage. Though Ms. Hill said that she was not sure that the state has a responsibility to promote French, she did state that it is "in the state's best interest." So, the idea of a government involvement in French revitalization is obviously endorsed by every administrator.

TABLE 27: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 3

Admin.	Promoting French is the state govt's responsibility	The govt should promote French through cultural activities	The govt should promote French through official use (signs/forms,etc.)	LA festivals inspire people to learn French
Ms. Dudley	✓		✓	
Ms. Adams	✓	✓		✓
Mr. Boudreaux	✓		✓	✓
Mr. Clark	✓		✓	
Ms. Lewis	✓		✓	✓
Ms. Carver	✓	✓		✓
Ms. Ford	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ms. Hill		✓		
Ms. Jones	✓	✓		✓

All of the administrators agreed that the government should be working to promote French outside of schools. The two middle columns show the ways in which the administrators think this should be done. As with the students, ideas such as more cultural activities like fairs, festivals, camps, and francophone media were proposed by Ms. Adams, Ms. Carver, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Jones. Also like several students Mr. Boudreaux, Mr. Clark, Ms. Dudley, and Ms. Lewis mentioned more official government

usage of French such as public signage and government services forms, and Ms. Ford mentioned both the more official usage and a greater support for cultural activities.

The administrators were also generally optimistic about the impact of French cultural festivals on French revitalization. Only Mr. Clark, Ms. Dudley, and Ms. Hill stated that festivals and cultural activates do not inspire people to learn French. Mr. Boudreaux and Ms. Ford said that these festivals probably inspire people to learn French to some extent, and the rest said that these festivals definitely inspire people to learn French. Thus, the administrators seem generally as favorable toward government assistance with cultural festivals as were the students.

5.3.4 Exploring the Link between Heritage and Government Responsibility

Having established as before which administrators agree with third ideology, Table 28 shows statements by the administrators that shed light on their view of the link between Louisiana's heritage and the government responsibility to promote French. Table 28 shows the administrators' views on CODOFIL's practices that critics believe undermine the government's responsibility to promote Louisiana's cultural heritage. Even more than the students, the administrators do not seem to believe that Louisiana's state government neglects Louisiana's French languages and cultures in favor of a European one. Their statements were quite consistent.

All but one administrator openly stated either that Standard French posed no threat to Louisiana French or that it may pose a threat but Standard French is preferable. Once again it was Ms. Adams who differed by expressing concern about the threat to Louisiana French. She says that she does her best to make sure the students at her school get occasional exposure to Louisiana French, and she did not openly state that Standard

TABLE 28: Administrator Statements Related to Louisiana Ethnicity and Language

Admin.	Standard French not a threat or preferable to LA varieties	French teachers do <u>not</u> need to have francophone heritage	French immersion teachers should come from overseas	LA teachers should be preferred to other Americans	Integrate some LA French into class through some history lessons	Point out occasional differences between LA French and SF
Ms. Dudley	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Ms. Adams		✓	✓			✓
Mr. Boudreaux	✓	✓	✓			
Mr. Clark	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Ms. Lewis	✓	✓	✓			
Ms. Carver	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Ms. Ford	✓	✓	✓			✓
Ms. Hill	✓		✓	✓		✓
Ms. Jones	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

French was the only practical option. Two-thirds of administrators actually said that standard French posed no threat to Louisiana French. Mr. Clark and Ms. Lewis stated that despite the threat it poses, Standard French was the only practical choice. It is probably not a coincidence that the three administrators who believed Standard French posed a threat all work at schools outside of Acadiana. Perhaps more frequent contact with Cajun and Creole French speakers in Acadiana leads the administrators there to see Louisiana French as more vibrant.

As with the students, the administrators' answers to the questions of whether or not French teachers need French heritage were quite uniform. Every administrator said that it was irrelevant except Ms. Hill. She said if teachers did not have a francophone ancestry, then they would probably not be passionate about their work. The rest of the administrators said that as long as teachers could speak French well or loved the language their ancestry was not important. As with the students there is no conflation of language and ethnicity for the administrators with the possible exception of Ms. Hill.

To the question of whether or not CODOFIL should bring in teachers from other countries, the administrators were unanimous like the students. Ms. Lewis stated that it was absolutely necessary because the American and Louisianan teachers were not typically qualified in terms of language skills or subject-matter education. The other administrators said having a mix of American/Louisianan teachers and foreign teachers would be ideal, though qualified Americans were hard to find. As with the students there was no suggestion that CODOFIL should cease or phase out its Foreign Associate Teacher program.

The fourth column of Table 28 shows that two-thirds of administrators stated that teachers from Louisiana should not have priority over teachers from other states.

Understandably, the administrators were quicker than the students to note the illegality of the proposition. However, Ms. Carver, Ms. Ford, and Ms. Hill did believe that Louisiana teachers should have priority. They felt that a better understanding of Louisiana culture would help the teachers interact with their students. However, the three schools where these administrators work are the smallest most heavily isolated schools in heavily Cajun and Creole areas. As such the students in these areas may have a stronger tie to local culture than students in other more populated areas.

The last of these questions was how, if at all, the administrators believed their teachers integrate Louisiana French into their classrooms. The last two columns of Table 28 show the types of responses the administrators gave. Most, administrators said they believe their teachers point out differences in vocabulary or grammar occasionally. Mr. Clark and Ms. Dudley said they believe their teachers do not integrate Louisiana French into their classrooms at all because they do not know enough about it, but they said their students do learn about Louisiana's francophone history. However, Mr. Boudreaux and Ms. Lewis said they do not believe their teachers integrate Louisiana French language or culture into their classrooms at all. Like the students, the administrators show no animosity towards Louisiana French. Yet many of those who believe their teachers do try to integrate it into the classroom seemed to be assuming or hoping that was the case more than actually speaking from experience.

5.3.5 Ideology 4: The Survival of French in Louisiana Depends on Economic Usefulness Rather than on Intergenerational Mother Tongue Transmission

The administrators' statements about how they see the future of French in Louisiana are illustrated in Table 29. The first statement in the table makes clear that the administrators share the students' lack of optimism. Only Ms. Adams and Ms. Dudley, the two outsiders, believed that French/English bilingualism would increase in Louisiana in the future. Ms. Ford and Ms. Hill said that French/English bilingualism would not be common because of too much pressure from American culture. More often than the students, the other administrators believed that the rise of Spanish would be the demise of French/English bilingualism in Louisiana. Mr. Clark said he simply was not sure, but his tone and facial expressions suggested he was not optimistic. Thus, all of the administrators with roots in Louisiana are pessimistic about French/English bilingualism in Louisiana.

However, all but two of the administrators believe either that French can bring economic benefits to Louisiana or that their students will be able to use French in their professions. Thus, the administrators are much more likely to agree that the survival of French is probably more dependent on economic utility than using French at home. Ms. Dudley and Ms. Carver are the only two who would probably disagree with this fourth belief because they did not mention the economic utility of French during this part of the interview.

Regarding the benefits of French/English bilingualism to Louisiana society as a whole, the second column of Table 29 shows the administrators were much like the students, the main difference being that those administrators who mentioned economic benefits were more likely to mention a few different benefits. Mr. Adams, Mr.

Boudreaux, Mr. Clark, Mr. Ford and Mr. Jones mentioned the ability to attract tourism and business from other francophone countries. All of those administrators except Mr. Clark also mentioned the other economic benefit: the ability to attract more American tourism. Mr. Clark, Ms. Dudley, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Lewis mentioned a more culturally-aware citizenry, and Mr. Clark and Ms. Ford also mentioned the general improvement of education. As with the students, the benefits mentioned were split between economic and non-economic. However, the majority of administrators did mention economic benefits. Nevertheless, only about half immediately identify French/English bilingualism as an economic benefit for people in Louisiana.

Regarding where they would like to see their students using French, the third and fourth columns show only Ms. Jones said she would like to see her students using French with their families. Ms. Adams, Mr. Clark, Ms. Hill, and Ms. Lewis all said they would like to see their students using French in their jobs. As with the students, two-thirds of administrators mentioned travel and enrichment activities as the way they would like to see their students use French, though Ms. Adams and Ms. Jones mentioned this in addition to their other reasons. Thus, the majority of administrators hoped their students would use French for leisure activities, but the majority also hoped their students would find economic benefits or use French in the home, although the latter was only mentioned once.

The last two columns show where French would be present in Louisiana in the ideal world of the administrators. Ms. Adams and Ms. Carver both said that average people do not necessarily need to encounter French in their daily lives. Mr. Boudreaux, Ms. Dudley, and Ms. Lewis would like average people in Louisiana to see French in

TABLE 29: Administrator Statements Related to Belief 4

Admin.	French/English bilingualism will <u>NOT</u> be more common in LA in the future	French provides economic benefits to LA society	My students should use French at work	My students should use French at home	French should be ubiquitous like English in LA	French should be on signs, products, menus, etc.
Ms. Dudley						✓
Ms. Adams		✓	✓			
Mr. Boudreaux	✓	✓				✓
Mr. Clark	not sure	✓	✓		✓	
Ms. Lewis	✓		✓			✓
Ms. Carver	✓					
Ms. Ford	✓	✓			✓	
Ms. Hill	✓		✓		✓	
Ms. Jones	✓	✓		✓	✓	

public on signs, product labels, menus, etc. Among the rest of the administrators, less than half said that in an ideal world French would be ubiquitous and used in all aspects of life alongside English. Like the students, these administrators also provided examples of hypothetical situations where French would be present in this ideal world.⁵² Again only one participant, this time Ms. Hill specifically mentioned French being present in the home.

TABLE 30: Administrator Statements about the Future of French in the Home

Administrators	Yes, interest in French is growing	Only if more is done to encourage it	Not likely
Ms. Dudley			✓
Ms. Adams			✓
Mr. Boudreaux	✓		
Mr. Clark	✓		
Ms. Lewis	✓		
Ms. Carver	✓		
Ms. Ford			✓
Ms. Hill			✓
Ms. Jones			✓

The answers to the last question of whether or not the administrators believed future generations in Louisiana would pass French on in the home are shown in Table 30. Most of the administrators were openly pessimistic. Interestingly, every administrator who is from Louisiana but does not speak French was optimistic, stating that interest in French was growing and they believe it will be passed on at home more often in the future. None of the outsiders or French speakers was optimistic about future inter-generational transmission.

⁵² Examples would be people speaking French in the grocery store, the post office, in restaurants, in retail, in the hospitality industry, in social settings, etc.

5.3.6 Administrator Ideological Profile Types

The administrators present some similar overarching ideologies, as did the students. As would be expected, they all see learning foreign languages as important for both cognitive development and economic opportunities. Those who are not deeply immersed in Louisiana francophone culture share a general belief that French is not more important for people in Louisiana than alternative second languages. All but one of the non-French speakers probably agree that people in Louisiana do not learn French because it is of little practical value.

The administrators mostly agree that Louisiana's French heritage gives the language a special importance for the state, particularly in Acadiana, though most are also quick to emphasize the economic benefits that French can have in addition to its symbolic value. They all believe the state does have a responsibility to promote French, and that it could do more to promote French outside of schools though Ms. Hill does not use want to use the word "responsibility." They are also generally satisfied with the work the government and CODOFIL do to promote French in schools, and only one-third see Standard French as a threat to Louisiana's native varieties. They are all pessimistic about some aspect of the future of French in Louisiana despite the fact that most are quick to see the economic practicality of it.

Table 31 brings together some of the ideological differences that the administrators exhibit. They are divided on the reasons why Americans typically do not learn other languages. Though nearly half agreed that the reason was a simple lack of necessity, most gave other reasons. The reasons ranged from lack of opportunity or poor teaching methods, to extreme pride and nationalism. Most imply that Americans make a

conscious choice not to learn another language based on something other than lack of necessity.

TABLE 31: Important Ideological Differences between Administrators

Admin.	Americans don't want to learn other languages because they don't need them	English is more important for France than French is for LA	French is more important for LA than other states	Heritage awareness is the benefit of French for students	French is not likely to be passed on at home
Ms. Dudley	✓			✓	✓
Ms. Adams	✓	✓			✓
Mr. Boudreaux	✓	✓	✓		
Mr. Clark			✓	✓	
Ms. Lewis		✓	✓	✓	
Ms. Carver	✓		✓	✓	
Ms. Ford					✓
Ms. Hill		✓	✓	✓	✓
Ms. Jones			✓		✓

The administrators were also split almost evenly on whether English was more important for French children or French was more important for the children of Louisiana. Those who said English was more important for French children did so because they feel English is objectively more important to know than French because of its global dominance. Those who disagreed were unanimous in their reasoning. They do not deny that English is objectively a more important language to know. Rather, they believe that the educational value of learning any second language makes both propositions equally important.

Both the question about the importance of French for Louisiana compared to other states and the question about what benefit Louisiana students gain from learning French reveal a similar pattern. Three or four administrators in each instance are unwilling to

attach great importance to French for Louisiana simply because of its heritage. This seems to be in keeping with the overall statements of the administrators suggesting a greater concern with the economic and educational value of foreign language in general instead of a concern for maintaining the state's heritage. Nevertheless, in both instances the majority of administrators openly acknowledge the importance of French as a symbol of Louisiana's heritage.

As mentioned in discussing Table 29, the administrators are clearly divided on whether or not French will be passed on in the home in the future. The majority feels that French will continue to decline in the home. As noted before, none of the optimistic minority speaks French. Moreover, all of those who believe that interest is growing and French will be passed on at home more in the future are the children or grandchildren of Cajun and Creole French speakers who never learned the language themselves. Every one of them says they never interact with French outside of school. The only Cajun administrator who does not speak French but is still pessimistic is Ms. Hill, but Ms. Hill is married to a native Cajun French speaker and her in-laws have limited knowledge of English. All of this suggests that there may be some link between non-academic exposure to fluent French, and pessimism about immersion students using French at home. This may be some tacit acknowledgement that the level of fluency acquired by immersion students is insufficient for use in daily life outside of school.

5.4 Profile Comparisons

For each of the four ideological beliefs under consideration, the students and the administrators show similarities and differences. Within each group there are those who show some disagreement with their peers. However, the two groups both show strong

enough patterns of agreement that the overall similarities and differences between the groups can be easily compared.

With respect to the first belief that French is not as important as other languages because it is not useful, there are eight students and six administrators who seem to agree. These groups both seem to agree that French is not particularly useful in Louisiana today. Many express this openly, and many merely imply it by saying that Americans in general have no use for other languages. However, among the students and administrators who disagree and who see future economic opportunities for French speakers in Louisiana, they do not see many uses for it today.

Regarding the second belief that French has symbolic rather than practical value for Louisiana, eight students seemed to agree as compared to only four administrators. Both the administrators and the students see French as an important symbol of Louisiana's heritage and culture. In this respect they are not unlike the rest of America and the world. In terms of the practicality for daily life, however, the students rarely seek to justify teaching French for practical or economic reasons. They are generally content to let the symbolic value of French be all the justification that is necessary for the government's support of French. The administrators are much more prone to appeal to the economic and practical uses of French in order to justify teaching it rather than other languages which they generally admit can be equally useful if not more.

Regarding the government's responsibility to promote French because of Louisiana's heritage, the administrators and students express nearly identical beliefs overall. Seven students and eight administrators agree that the government has a responsibility to promote French. Even those who do not want to use the word

"responsibility" agree that the government should do more to promote French outside of schools. All students and administrators generally agree that the government and CODOFIL are promoting French education in the proper manner as well.

The final aspect of their ideology investigated was whether French revitalization depends on economic benefit or intergenerational transmission in the home. Here there are five students and seven administrators probably agreeing with the belief overall. The majority of both groups also believe that French/English bilingualism will not increase in Louisiana in the future. Only one-third of both groups are confident that students who learn French in school will pass it on to their children in the home. Thus it seems both groups are assuming that the schools will be mostly responsible for revitalizing French. However, both groups are generally pessimistic about the future of French in Louisiana.

The administrators differ from the students in that they are more prone to see a link between economic benefit and French revitalization. This difference has been consistent throughout the topics discussed. The administrators also illustrated a clear link between exposure to fluent French seen regularly in daily life and a pessimistic view of the future of French in Louisiana. The same link could not be established for the student group.

5.5 Conclusions

In contrast to their socio-biographic profiles, the students do show an overall tendency to be passionate about preserving Louisiana's cultural heritage through French. Though they stated that they all chose to teach French simply because they like it and they like teaching, most of them have also adopted the language revitalization movement's belief that preserving the French language is important for preserving Cajun

and Creole culture. Perhaps it is because this ideology has been adopted rather than passed down to them, they make little if any connection between ethnic identity and involvement in French revitalization.

Again, in contrast to their socio-biographic profiles the administrators tend to take a more pragmatic view of French revitalization. They recognize the symbolic importance of French and they would like to see it revived, but the preservation of Louisiana's heritage seems to be more of a secondary concern to them overall. They seem enthusiastic to participate in French revitalization, though more as a means to a different end. As educators they see the educational improvements and economic opportunities that French immersion provides as the primary reasons for its existence. French revitalization is presented as a positive possible byproduct. For this reason they show far less bias toward French than the students, since their ends of improved educational and economic outcomes can be achieved just as easily through immersion education in Spanish or Chinese. A qualitative analysis of the exact words of both groups will provide insight into the inconsistencies in ideology within each group and the philosophical basis for their ideologies.

CHAPTER 6: QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGICAL BELIEFS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

All of the answers to the interview questions were eventually coded into categories for quantitative analysis as discussed in the previous chapter. However, a thorough study of the ideologies represented depends upon a further analysis of the responses in their original presentation. The open-ended questions allow the study participants to express their ideology in their own words. Through examining the students' and administrators' answers word-for-word, a deeper understanding of their ideology becomes clear. This is particularly true with respect to the implicit information that can be gleaned from their statements due to the subconscious nature of the beliefs and representations that define ideology.

6.1 Ideology 1: French is not as Important as other Languages Because it is not Useful

The idea that French is not useful or not important is not one that would be expected among people who want to teach French or administer French immersion programs. Yet two-thirds of administrators and all but one student expressed similar sentiments. Even those who said French is the most important language for Louisiana's children to learn would often imply, if not openly state, that other languages are more practical or important for economic reasons. An examination of their statements provides useful insight into this seemingly paradoxical ideology.

6.1.1 Ideology 1 in the Words of the Students

Bridget was the only student whose comments did not suggest an agreement with the first ideological belief. Two-thirds of students acknowledge a widely held belief in American society that learning any language other than English is unnecessary for

Americans. They speculate on the reasons for this belief that they say they do not share.

Jenny from Tulane says:

I think because English is the most universal um language, I mean even when I was in France most of the media and all the TV shows everybody wanted to watch were in English...So um I can see why European countries or other countries have an incentive to learn English or can even learn it just watching TV shows or whatever but here everything's in English so we have no incentive to learn.⁵³

It is interesting to note the pronoun chosen in the last statement that "we have no incentive to learn." The lack of incentives to learn other languages was a common theme.

Another Tulane student, Kelly, expressed similar reasons, but was more eager to distance herself from them saying:

English like people in China know English people in Romania know English like...we're not expected to know French we like everyone goes over there and expects them to know English...I wish it was the other way, I wish everybody would go ahead and learn at least one other language.

David at LSU said:

In America we live in a society where we can we're fully self-sufficient just conversing in our language so I feel like over the years people have just gotten complacent they don't really see the ready value of learning a second language because...and it's true that we can live successful and happy lives without learning it.

David describes the lack of perceived importance of second languages for Americans and even explicitly agrees at the end saying, "it's true." Ellen spoke similarly:

[Americans don't learn other languages]⁵⁴ cause it's too "hard" [air quotes] and we're too lazy and everybody's gonna learn English anyway, so it's not, people only do what's necessary I think and if it's not necessary to know another one, I think they just don't do it.

⁵³ Ellipses in the quotations represent either tangential statements or longer portions of stops, restarts, or discourse markers that have been removed.

⁵⁴ Bracketed words within a quotation represent either words that the individual did not actually say, but were understood from the conversational context or meaningful gestures.

So too Ashley says, "lots of Americans have the perspective that oh everyone else speaks English, which is true."

Those who do not openly acknowledge that English is probably more important than French sometimes suggest that other languages might be. Felicia disagrees that English is important enough to be sufficient. She said:

I think that a lot of people in America think that we're the best and they think that it's unnecessary since everybody's learning English, they think that learning English is enough, but in reality every other country knows at least two languages if not three or four.

Yet she brings Spanish into the conversation and though she does not explicitly say she agrees, she makes no comment to dispute the fact that Spanish is more useful than French.

I think that we have a huge infiltration of Spanish in Louisiana and I hear people all the time say like oh I'm gonna take Spanish because you can use it more which is absolutely frustrating because it's our heritage and it's such an important part of our culture.

Kelly was more explicit. She said:

I guess 'cause Spanish is so up and coming like I know they cut the French program at my elementary school so I guess people just don't see it as important like you can walk outside you can go to the supermarket and see everyone speaking Spanish but you don't ever you rarely see people around here speaking French.

Every student stated that they believe learning a second language is important for various reasons, but only three openly stated that French was not a better choice than other languages as Kelly had in the previous statement. Ellen said:

I wouldn't place like a greater importance on it, I think it's like culturally like "cooler" [air quotes] maybe but I don't, I mean it all depends on what you're gonna use it for and stuff too, I wouldn't say it's more important to know French.

Ashley was not sure either that French was more important than Spanish in Louisiana's schools.

That's a difficult question because I think both are really valuable, I think it [pauses to think] you know I haven't decided on that, um me personally I prefer French, I love the way that it's spoken, I love the way that it sounds and everything but um I think that Spanish could also be um really helpful just um practically you know trading with our neighbor countries but um I don't know I think it should be a personal choice.

Overall, the students seem to agree that either English and/or Spanish are more useful and therefore more important than French.

Bridget was the only student who exhibited a constant disagreement with the first belief. When asked if French was more important for Louisiana's children to learn than other languages she nodded her head negatively and said:

um, I'd say it's all relative, honestly, there are a lot of influences in French here but also Louisiana had a huge Spanish presence, I think learning any language can bring a lot of opportunities.

She also said that English was not more important than French despite its obvious ubiquity:

I think, like it or not, English is a global language, in China they're starting to take English at something crazy like four years old, and same thing there's the British presence, I think it's a very crucial language...honestly it's so important to learn another language period...I'd say it's equal.

As illustrated in the last chapter, Bridget sees French much like the administrators do. For her languages are all useful for the educational and economic benefits they can provide.

However, most of the students tended not to express such pluralistic views of language. In fact, some students would even admit that teaching Spanish to students in Louisiana might be more beneficial. None disputed the increasing presence of Spanish in

Louisiana, though some did feel that the importance of heritage outweighed any possible practical benefits Spanish could impart. Felicia links heritage, culture, and language and sees them disappearing. She says, "I'd say it's more important for us to learn French because it's part of our heritage and it's disappearing." David at LSU agrees that keeping Louisiana's French culture and heritage alive depends on the language saying, "it's an integral part of keeping the culture alive and keeping that historical identity present." However, David was not sure that keeping Louisiana's heritage alive was sufficient motivation for learning a language, saying:

Learning another language is hard in general um and if you know you're gonna exert resources to learn a language you would obviously choose to learn the language that you believe is more useful...a lot of Louisiana residents nowadays...don't identify with Cajun ancestry and so they don't have that historical link to the language.

In the end, though some contradict it, the ideology that French is not important or as important as other languages because it is not useful is clearly present for all but one. The tension between a desire to preserve Louisiana's heritage and the lack of perceived additional benefits to learning French creates a schizophrenic representation of the place of French in Louisiana for these students.

6.1.2 Ideology 1 in the Words of the Administrators

As seen in the previous chapter, two-thirds of administrators seem to agree with the first ideology, that French is not important, because it is not as useful as other languages. While these administrators tend to view all languages as beneficial for cognitive and economic reasons, they are unlike the student Bridget in that they tend to acknowledge that English and/or Spanish are more useful and probably more important.

The three who clearly disagree are three of the four administrators who are heavily immersed in Louisiana francophone culture.

As with the students, most administrators said that learning another language is not really necessary for Americans. Ms. Ford said, "if I'm funding, I'm gonna fund the necessities and a second language is just not a necessity." Yet Ms. Ford did feel that children in France had to learn English saying, "I think if they're gonna compete, yes they do." This would seem to imply that usefulness of English makes it more important than French. Mr. Clark does not say that English is more important than French when he says:

in my mind it's just um a second language and in my mind, of course English is one of the more popular languages in the world, I understand that and it's the language of commerce and that kind of stuff.

Yet he does point out reasons why English is useful and important then he says, "I don't think they see the utility in [French] so um they see it more as a, an enrichment rather than something that's necessary." Ms. Dudley puts it a bit more diplomatically, saying:

in all truth and honesty, if you think about a global, you know, the whole world, is French the best language...probably not but just learning another language and what it does for your brain, that's important.

As with the students, the importance of Spanish was mentioned many times by the administrators. Ms. Lewis said simply "we have no reason to learn any other language because everybody speaks English." Ms. Lewis will then go on to point out that French is not very useful while Spanish probably will be.

if you're outside of the school and you're outside of Acadiana there are just not enough opportunities for the language to seem important because you need it for survival...um I think more and more we're gonna find you need Spanish for survival.

Ms. Adams said, "over here Spanish is overtaking everything else." Mr. Boudreaux is the most explicit.

You don't have many French-speaking farm workers you don't have many French speakers on your roof hammering away putting your roof up so I think when you're out there at Walmart and you see [the Spanish] on the signage that kind of explains the situation we're in and why Spanish uh is probably more uh more important to learn more uh more now you know more relevant now than French is.

The administrators who were heavily immersed in Louisiana francophone culture disagreed with this first ideological belief, not because they felt French was more useful than some other languages, but because they felt its cultural value was sufficient reason to make it more important to learn than other languages. Ms. Carver said:

when you look at the stats in terms of the it's Spanish really if we're learning another language so that we can be um go out into the business world and uh interact with people, technically it's uh it would be Spanish would be the language that you'd wanna learn if you plan to have the language grow you in terms of your uh your profession...but no here in Louisiana I think our best bet is to start with French.

Ms. Jones expressed a very similar sentiment when she said:

I think it's very important for the kids to learn French rather than Spanish, I know a lot of the movements are to Spanish...economically for economic reasons I'm sure that Spanish is being pushed but at for where we are where we belong I think French should be the target language in Louisiana.

So too Ms. Hill:

I think their first if they have to learn another language it should be French because it's part of their culture and their history but I'm not opposed you know to them learning Spanish or any other language really you know but I think French should be first.

Like the students, the administrators often show a schizophrenic attitude toward French.

Mr. Boudreaux makes little attempt to hide the paradoxical nature of his feelings:

To me French and Spanish are equal in my heart but in my mind I can see you know Spanish is everywhere...and for that reason I would say Spanish is to the general public probably more important.

6.2 Ideology 2: French Language Use is a Symbolic Marker of Identity, Not Practical for Daily Life

All of the students except Ashley seemed to agree with this second belief, but only four of the administrators seemed to share their sentiments. The students repeatedly express the importance of teaching French, because it is part of Louisiana's heritage even though they rarely suggest that it can have any practical application. The administrators, on the other hand, are mostly quick to point out that French may have a practical use for students in Louisiana one day even if it has few or no practical uses today.

6.2.1 Ideology 2 in the Words of the Students

The French heritage of Louisiana seems to be a strong preoccupation for the students, even though most of them have only a tenuous personal connection to that heritage. Five of the students mention connecting students to this important symbol of Louisiana ethnic identity as the only benefit that children will gain from learning French. Kelly says only "they definitely get a better view of their history." Felicia says that the benefit of French is simply "a connection to our past, an understanding of a lot of our history." Kevin says students gain:

a better understanding of the history of Louisiana, not only the history of Louisiana but the history of certain ethno groups that reside here that are from other places like Cajuns, Creoles, um it's just an integral part of cultural identity here.

Brad says:

I think it gives them a greater understanding probably of their culture and their heritage so you how this language ended up here and why they're speaking it here, why holidays and towns and signs all of that why that has this French aspect to it.

And Bridget, who had showed less bias toward French viewing all second languages as beneficial said only:

I think just from you know experiencing in the immersion schools especially is there's a sense of pride in knowing one's history through language.

For most of those who do see some practical value to speaking French, this comes as an afterthought or a secondary bonus. Jenny mentions a practical benefit of learning French but only after describing in length that students will get to connect to this important symbol of identity. She says:

[Students gain an] understanding maybe a little bit of their history, it can be helpful in learning history, and once again just being able to relate to I guess people that you are living in the same state with, um and yeah it opens up a lot of opportunities, for me it even I'm looking at jobs now and a lot of them are French related

Most of the students who see some practical applications for French see them in the future and not the present. Louise says:

[The benefit of French] for most of them it'd be, or for a lot of them, it would be a connection to their past and for a lot of their grandparents or I guess for their great-grandparents now for the younger kids it'd be a connection to them um it'd also be a connection to France and to Canada and these other places that are francophone since we are technically francophone but we don't speak it enough, so if we had if the kids learned it they'd have those connections to the francophone countries and opportunities would grow.

Her response is typical. Ellen says learning French provides:

cultural enrichment and I think it will be important in Louisiana in the near future with like tourism like if we, if more people here did speak French and we could attract that aspect of tourism we'd gain a lot of money from that so I think that would end up being important.

Ashley was the only student who saw the symbolic value of French as less important than its practical applications.⁵⁵ She does not even believe that Louisiana necessarily has some closer legitimate connection to French than other states. She says

⁵⁵ Ashley was not considered an "outsider" because she was born and raised in New Orleans and her father is from Shreveport, but it is probably important to note that she knows she has no personal connection to Louisiana's francophone heritage.

"I'd like us to be the state that's the most proficient in French but I don't think that it's necessarily mandatory that we have that status." She describes the benefits of learning French for Louisiana's children by saying:

I think the study of French has been romanticized in recent years, studying it is often seen as a kind of nostalgic nod to Louisiana's past or a romantic gesture of endorsing French *haute culture*, however, I think that Louisiana students can profit from learning French in many concrete ways, such as participating in international organizations like the United Nations, trading with any number of the dozens of countries around the world that speak French, and participating in and understanding local Cajun French culture.

6.2.2 Ideology 2 in the Words of the Administrators

Unlike the students only three of the administrators seemed to show a degree of agreement with the second ideological belief, that French language use is a symbolic marker of identity not practical for daily life. Mr. Clark, Ms. Lewis, and Ms. Carver only mention the symbolic connection to an identity when asked directly how students in Louisiana benefit from learning French. Mr. Clark says:

I think you learn more than French, you learn about cultural heritage, you learn about the history of this state, region, more than just acquiring the language, so that's why I think that French is important for our students.

Ms. Lewis and Ms. Carver echo his sentiments about the value of cultural education and a connection to their heritage. Ms. Lewis says:

I think they learn about their own history as a state, but I think also that they learn about the world... I think they gain a better understanding of themselves through understanding French language and French culture worldwide.

Ms. Carver, the only self-identified Creole administrator, sees the value of learning French as a type of vindication. She says students gain:

a greater sense of self...we have to undo that whole notion that that our heritage there was something inherently bad with it you know about, so you I think even though we may not think about it all the time the past does you know have an impact on who we are today and how we see ourselves.

However, two-thirds of the administrators probably disagree with the second belief. Ms. Hill definitely appreciates the symbolic value of French, but she also sees its practical benefit. She says students gain the ability, "just to be proud of their heritage, and also like I said before it opens up a lot of opportunities for anybody who speaks two languages, it's a benefit for them." Ms. Adams, from Belgium, understandably sees French as extremely practical. She believes parents choose immersion schools precisely for practical reasons. She says:

The bilingual school [*sic*] are usually the best ones, so the language is not the focus, it's more the education they receive, some it's because they feel the French curriculum is way better and deeper than the Louisiana curriculums, that's the reason why they choose immersions schools or French immersion or French schools, others it's because they realize it's developing the brain better to learn another language.

Ms. Adams actually had trouble imagining why people would not send their children to French immersions schools. The only reasons she says people might not choose immersion is:

because they don't know about it, or it could be, why wouldn't they care [about the better education that French immersion offers], because maybe it's a lack of education on their part, or they just don't want them to open up to a bigger vision of the world.

Most of the administrators are not as extreme in their views of how practical learning French is, but they definitely see practical value in it. They see learning French as a concrete advantage for their students. Ms. Ford says she believes learning French gives students "a competitive edge." She does not believe people in Louisiana do not learn French because it has no practical value, rather she believes people do not learn French:

because it's not tested, because it's not on the LEAP test, I don't think our state department of education pushes it...budgets for schools have been cut a lot...so if

I'm funding, I'm funding the necessities and a second language is just not a necessity.

For the American outsider, Ms. Dudley, practical uses of French are foremost among its advantages:

[the children] They're bilingual, that means, that kind of opens some doors for you, you never know you may have someone who goes to a French embassy and works there some day, uh it opens your mind that the world is bigger than [name of city] which is very very very important to know, then it's a tool for helping you be a better learner, makes you more culturally aware.

Mr. Boudreaux, who is a self-identified Cajun who does not speak French, sees the advantages of learning French as pure:

economics, tourism is a huge trade in Louisiana, and for someone to come from outside, they almost expect us to speak French, they do, they have stereotypes of us, you know they already need subtitles so why not speak in a foreign language and give 'em reason to have subtitles, I just think it's good economics, and also going back to the heritage.

Similarly Ms. Jones, a self-identified Cajun who speaks Cajun French as her first language, sees Louisiana cashing in on its French heritage. She says, "learning a second language to me, that's almost a given, I think it makes this state is unique in a sense cause, being Cajun [air quotes] it uh it uh it's a seller you know." However, she acknowledges that the state can profit and is already profiting from its francophone heritage without needing to speak the language. She says, "that language to me would just enhance that part of our culture, that's who we are, and the language would be like lagniappe, one more thing that we could offer."

6.3 Ideology 3: The Government of Louisiana has a Responsibility to Promote and Preserve French Because of its Francophone Heritage

As before, the students are mostly in agreement with this third belief. Only two of them are unwilling to openly state both that the state government has a responsibility

to promote French and that it's the state's heritage that gives it this responsibility.

Unlike the second belief, the administrators overwhelmingly agree with the third. Only one administrator was unwilling to use the word "responsibility," but she still believed the government should promote French.

6.3.1 Ideology 3 in the Words of the Students

The students were generally unequivocal in their belief that the government is responsible for promoting French in Louisiana. Ashley and Ellen, however, were uncomfortable saying that the state has a responsibility to promote French. Ashley simply said "no" when asked if the state has this responsibility. This seems in keeping with her previous statements such as that Louisiana does not need to "be the state that's the most proficient in French but I don't think that it's necessarily mandatory that we have that status." For her it seems Louisiana's history has little to do with modern Louisiana.

Ellen also disagreed with the idea that of government responsibility toward French though she did pause to think before answering, "no, I wouldn't say like they need to promote it like you mean over another language, no I don't think so." Though she is like Ashley in seeing practical value for French at least theoretically in the future, she does see that for some people in Louisiana French does have a real symbolic value because of their heritage. She simply does not place herself into that category and believes most people would not. She had previously stated that most people in Louisiana probably do not learn French because:

I don't know if everybody considers, importance isn't the word, like maybe like traditional value maybe because that is like our history and all that I don't think people really think about that, cause I mean that's not why I really started taking it wasn't like [in a sarcastic tone] oh I'm gonna value my state, it was just I just liked it.

Theirs is not the majority opinion though. Most are quite clear that the government is responsible for promoting French, and it is because of the state's heritage.

Felicia said:

Absolutely, I think that it's a government's responsibility to put money into programs that benefit the state, and I think that our French culture is such an important part of our state that it should be well-funded and it should be promoted all around the state.

Kelly said, "I feel like it does, just like the same way that they're responsible for promoting [French] education, cause that's part of preserving Louisiana culture."

The students in the outsider group were also clearly in favor of government responsibility for the promotion of French. When asked why the government has this responsibility, Jenny said:

state pride, ha ha, no I mean I think that it could be helpful for a lot of its residents in terms of academic success, future success like that, and there is a large French population here.

While Jenny does try to justify this responsibility for practical reasons, that is not before she jokingly ties it solely to its cultural value. The other outsider students did not even attempt to justify this responsibility based on anything other than cultural heritage.

Bridget said, "personally yes, I see that as a preservation of Louisiana culture or state history, I think they do [have a responsibility to promote French]." Brad says:

yes I think so...from my understanding it hasn't been an infallible job, but they've been doing a lot of work, I know the consulate general team here in New Orleans and they seem to be very engaged in promoting French and working with the Louisiana government and community organizers, um where there's potential...

Brad goes on to explain that "where there's potential" means "where it's gonna work" as in communities that have a connection to the state's francophone heritage. David also ties the reason for government responsibility toward French to cultural heritage saying:

I think that as any government has a responsibility to you know ensure the welfare of its people, whether it's economic welfare anything like that, I think that cultural welfare is also important for the state...I think that in some way it is important for the state to uphold those things.

Louise, the student who is most heavily immersed in or connected to Louisiana

francophone culture seems somewhat annoyed by the question of why the government is responsible. She says:

if they want to keep saying we're francophone they do, um so I would say yes, um cause we are francophone and they keep saying we are so you might as well give programs that have your kid learn French.

She seems to imply that the government has acknowledged this responsibility though it has not always attended to it well.

6.3.2 Ideology 3 in the Words of the Administrators

The administrators were even more unequivocal than the students in their belief that the government is responsible for promoting French in Louisiana. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Ms. Hill was the only administrator who was uncomfortable with the word "responsibility." However she said, "I don't know that it has a *responsibility* to promote French, but I think it's in its best interest to promote French [emphasis in the original]." She thinks before answering and the way she emphasizes the word responsibility suggests it is merely that word that causes a problem for her rather than the idea. As with the students who did not like the word responsibility, Ms. Hill still agrees that the state's support for CODOFIL and other aspects of the revitalization movement is positive and should continue.

The other administrators were very clear. Two of the most immersed in Louisiana francophone culture speak like CODOFIL's first director James Domengeaux. They

agree with the popular narrative that the school system is primarily responsible for the decline of French in Louisiana. Ms. Jones said:

I think they do because they're responsible for taking it away from us, I think if it's very important to the people, to your constituents, then yes I think they ought they should be responsible for providing it.

Ms. Ford said, "I sure do, and I think they drop that ball very often, especially the department of education."

Most explicitly mention heritage as the source of this responsibility, even if they do see other reasons like Mr. Boudreaux:

I do yes, mainly because of our heritage and economics as well, it's not just the heritage, we stand to make a lot of money, if we can promote French and learn French and deal with French countries and have French tourists come in.

Another self-identified Cajun who does not speak French, Mr. Clark, gave a very similar response when asked if the government has a responsibility to promote French:

Absolutely the history the heritage, and even if it's only for tourism you know to market this state as completely different from any other unique in so many different ways, you know keep our heritage alive.

The outsider, Ms. Dudley, also said:

I think it's part of the, if you were to define Louisiana you'd have to put that into the definition of the state, it's part of who we are, that's part of the history that's part of the culture, so from the very top you have to promote that, that's what makes this state rich and different and unique, and boy is it different and unique.

The link between Louisiana's heritage and the government responsibility to promote French is strong enough that most do not even have to be asked why the government is responsible for promoting French; they automatically make the connection.

For Ms. Adams, the heritage of Louisiana is linked to this responsibility, though she had to be asked specifically about the link. She said the government has a responsibility to promote French, saying " of course, they are the budget, so without them

we couldn't really survive." But when pressed to explain the source of the responsibility, she was asked "Is it their responsibility because of the French history of Louisiana or simply because it's good education?" She reflected a moment and said "both."

In similar fashion Ms. Lewis quickly responded that she sees the government as responsible for promoting French and she believes the state legislature agrees. She said, "I do, and they do... I believe not only do I believe that but our government, our state legislature, has shown that they believe it." When asked simply why that is, she said:

It's not a hard sell, this is not something that hurts anybody, this is not something that people would uh complain about or dispute, I mean we all have heritages and whether it is an African-American heritage that you're celebrating, you may have come by way of the Caribbean, you may have a French ancestry as well, um you know there are people of Louisiana for all different reasons that have French heritage backgrounds and so I think we should celebrate that.

The only administrator whose response about government responsibility to promote French was somewhat ambiguous about the reason why was that of Ms. Carver.

I do, I think that the government has a responsibility to promote anything that will help to build on, you know our children because children are citizens that become you know they are the ones that are going to move things forward so we have to raise 'em up correctly.

Though her response does not seem to mention heritage directly or indirectly, she would probably still agree with this third belief given her comments moments earlier that:

I love the fact that we were able to mix in our French heritage and in my case African heritage or you know that language is beautiful...so I think that we have a lot to gain by immersing us, but we need to do it in such a way that we celebrate the culture, we celebrate our ties to, to um our French heritage.

The link between French heritage and a government responsibility to promote French seems to be widely accepted. This belief crosses generational lines as well as lines of class, race, gender, and even regional origin.

6.4 Ideology 4: The Survival of French in Louisiana Depends on Economic Usefulness Rather than on Intergenerational Mother Tongue Transmission

The fourth and final ideological belief investigated in this study gives important insight into the way these two groups believe French can be preserved in Louisiana, if it can be preserved at all. Though there is an overwhelming pessimism about whether French can be revived at all in Louisiana, the majority of both administrators and students probably agree that tying economic benefits to speaking French is more essential to ensuring a future for French than transmitting the language at home. There are three students and at least one administrator who see intergenerational transmission in the home as an important piece of the revitalization movement, but they are a minority. There are even those in both groups who probably do not believe anything can revive French in Louisiana.

6.4.1 Ideology 4 in the Words of the Students

There are five students who probably agree that economic advantages provided by learning French will be key to preserving it in Louisiana. Though many students see few practical uses for French in Louisiana now, they are hoping that French revitalization will create the future economic benefits associated with bilingualism that do not currently exist. Jenny says she would like to see her students eventually use French to be able to "make new friends, being able to travel and with ease, being able to maybe in the future get some type of job that requires some type of French knowledge or French speaking." She would like her students to find work using their hypothetical bilingual skills, but this is "maybe in the future."

Again, the economic payoffs of becoming a French/English bilingual are seen as potential and in the future. Jenny continued:

I would hope that they would maintain some kind of contact with a French-speaking person just to like A maintain their fluency and to kind of spread...I would hope they would incorporate it into what they're gonna do with their everyday lives in the future.

Ellen also sees real future economic potential.

I think definitely like for tourism purposes, as far as just like anybody visiting from a French speaking country, if they know they can come to Louisiana and they know there's a large population at than other states speaking French, like that's gonna attract them immediately here.

So too, David speaks of the future potential economic benefits of French for people in Louisiana. He admits there is already some economic potential for Louisiana French speakers in theory, but he sees the direct correlation between increasing that population and increasing the associated economic benefits. He said, "economically like I said I think that it would sort of become sort of a, already a lot of French natives vacation here, but I think that it would definitely increase tourism."

Ashley had played down the cultural benefits of French or the importance of preserving heritage throughout the interview, and naturally she saw French as potentially economically advantageous:

From a global perspective America's influence is declining and I think that having a lot of French/English bilingual...people in Louisiana would give us a real edge because we'd be able to more readily communicate with other people, make more connections and kind of try to maintain our spot in the global scene.

She said even more clearly that the benefits of French revitalization should be seen as economic when she was asked where her students should use French if they become fluent. She said, "I'd want them to be able to apply it in like work at least...here specifically I think it would be more practical to really have that professional French."

However, a few students did not see the economic benefits of French revitalization as quite so obvious. Felicia said the benefit of French/English bilingualism

for Louisiana is "well even just having another language is going to benefit our society, but having French I mean what better can you ask for...I think that would just be the best thing for us." Felicia had consistently reiterated that maintaining heritage is the reason for teaching French and that the benefit is a state connected to its heritage. She does see passing the language on at home as vitally important for preserving the language.

I want to teach my children French, I want it to be part of my life forever, so I'd hope that if they're gonna take the time to learn something so deeply that it would be part of their daily life in every way.

When asked if she believed others would pass on French at home, she insisted on the importance of transmission in the home. She said, "I think that's kind of up to this generation now...I think we're losing it, so I think if we make something happen then it could but I think that's a really important thing to do now."

Felicia illustrated a general trend, for the students more closely connected to Louisiana to say that they wanted to pass French on to their children even though they varied in their belief about how many others would feel the same. Ashley, who definitely sees French as a future pragmatic economic tool for Louisiana, is from Louisiana and wants to teach her children French: " I plan to, I plan to teach my children French...I hope we don't have a relapse I hope it's not just a trend." Ellen, who also counts on future economic payoff to revitalize French also sees passing on French in her home as important: " I mean if they think it's important like I do yeah [people who learn French will pass it on at home], I plan on it."

Louise, the only Cajun student, did feel more people will pass on French in the home, and she said nothing of potential economic benefits.

I think so if they keep studying it, I think now because there's, we now know through science that babies who learn a second language they do better in school, they do learn it more quickly than they would if they learned it in school, so and the importance of teaching a language to a child is, has come to be known, it's no longer something to be ashamed of, so I think they'll be aware of it and they'll do it.

For her the benefits of learning French were simply that:

it would really help students in their critical thinking...and I think it would also give Louisiana something else, like we're not dumb people we speak two languages we have this culture that we've revitalized, saved a language all those good things.

Louise, Felicia, and Kelly were the only students who did not at least mention potential future economic benefits of French specifically as an important factor for revitalization.

Kelly does not mention the economic benefits of French, and though she does say she plans to speak French with her children she does not see that being common in the future. She said:

I mean my kids will be, and like I know a couple of teachers here that raise their kids to speak French and English, but just the people I graduated with in high school like none of them know French...like I see in New Orleans that the immersion school's becoming more prevalent but not just like at home teaching the language that way, I don't think that's that'll happen.

Kelly and Bridget both seem to suggest by their comments that they do not believe either economic benefits or passing French on in the home are realistically going to revive French in Louisiana. Bridget does mention, "job opportunities" as one of many, mostly cultural, benefits of learning French in Louisiana.

I believe starting with French bilinguals could lead to people reviving a lot of Cajun influences here, which would be really nice cause that is a language that really needs preservation at this time, also I think it would just make a lot of people more culturally inquisitive, It might lead to opening horizons for people, more job opportunities, people would explore a little bit more.

However, she does not seem to see anything as realistically reviving French in Louisiana.

When asked if people in Louisiana will pass French on, she said:

I'd like to say yes to that, but I just don't think I can, I don't see it being realistic with what I see in Louisiana now, I think if we start acting and inspiring people...that would be great, but it's hard to see.

6.4.2 Ideology 4 in the Words of the Administrators

For all but two of the administrators, there is a clear pattern of agreement with the fourth ideological belief. There is a great deal of pessimism about the future of French in Louisiana from all of the administrators except the two outsiders. Nevertheless, the administrators repeatedly mention economic advantages for French/English bilinguals and only Ms. Jones mentions passing French on in the home.

Ms. Jones said the way she would like to see her students using French is, "I don't know, I guess just the advantage of knowing a second language...definitely teach their children." However, she does seem convinced that this will actually happen.

I'm thinking that some will [pass French on at home], I'm not sure that we've managed to engrain the importance of passing it on...it may cause you'll have some but in proportion to how many kids we teach the French, I don't know how many, it is important, but I don't know how many will, so I'm not sure.

She was the only administrator who expressed the importance of passing French on in the home despite her pessimism. Yet she had readily mentioned the economic advantages of French when asked how Louisiana would benefit from having more French/English bilinguals. She said:

One [benefit] would be tourism, you know [name of tourist attraction] a lot of people from [name of town] work there because they speak French because they have these large groups that come in, definitely tourism would be one of them.

In this way she was not unlike her peers who repeatedly mentioned the economic advantages that French can provide throughout the interviews.

Most administrators felt like the Belgian, Ms. Adams, who said:

[Passing French on at home] that would be a dream, but I don't know if it's gonna happen...I would be surprised, knowing the English, you always come back to your first language...but enrolling their children to a French school, that would make sense.

She sees French as an economic advantage that some Louisiana children can have and for that reason parents will continue to enroll their children in immersion schools or have them learn French. She said the benefits of bilingualism were, "the economy, tourism, *le commerce*, education, that's what I have in mind" and that "I would love to see them using the French language, into their daily life through work."

Economics and the tourism industry in particular, were the recurrent themes during discussions about the future of French in Louisiana. Mr. Boudreaux said the benefits of learning French are "economics, back to economics again." He also said, "I would like to see them using it, I would like to see them being able to see a foreign tourist on main street and being to stop and say hello and talking and helping them." Though Mr. Clark initially mentions trade with francophone countries saying, "I think we'd have a better educated population, I think that trade with Francophone countries could improve," he, too, returns to tourism saying "I think it would make our city quite unique if it were more French to have people conversing casually in the language, having people working in restaurants, hospitality industry, retail all able to use the language at a moment's notice I think would be fabulous."

Those who did not readily mention tourism tended to at least speak in vague terms about the economic advantages of French/English bilingualism. Ms. Lewis believes that international business is a realistic career path for her students. She said, "they want to go to French universities, I think our kids see themselves as being hired in jobs outside of

America...so they are seeing themselves in the future using their languages." Ms. Ford said, "I just think society benefits from an educated citizenry...it just makes you global, it allows you to compete, it opens markets." Ms. Hill spoke in similarly vague terms saying, "I'd like to see it help them in their jobs...maybe even get them into a position that they wouldn't have had before had they not been you know French speakers."

Although Ms. Ford and Ms. Hill mention potential economic benefits of French, they are not sure how prevalent they will be. They see the future of French as very uncertain according to Ms. Ford:

I mean if you're in a business where you're having to read a letter in French well that's your business that would be great, [nods her head negatively] but for the average person here is not gonna have to do that but I would like for the average person to go into a restaurant and you know give their order in French.

Ms. Hill also seemed to think that children who will be able to use French for work were the exception and not the rule. She said for most, "it's not a daily part of their life so no, I don't think it's gonna be passed down unfortunately."

The two administrators who probably do not agree with this fourth ideological belief are Ms. Carver and Ms. Dudley. Though their disagreement would not be because they feel passing French on in the home is the key to revitalization. They would probably disagree simply because they cannot see any scenario where French has a real future in Louisiana. Ms. Dudley said:

I would hope that it would open up some doors for them possibly...like if they were looking for a job perhaps that would be one thing they had over the next candidate...or scholarship opportunities or travel opportunities.

Yet she never mentions students actually using French in their jobs. For her when a student learns French, "you're just aware of this is part of who we are in Louisiana this is part of our history...something to be proud of." But for her the schools are the only real

way to preserve this purely symbolic aspect of Louisiana society. She could not see children passing French on in the home. When asked she said, "[grimaces and shrugs] at home I don't know, at home, I think that if it's not provided in a school setting it may not [continue]."

Interestingly, the other administrator who feels like Ms. Dudley was Ms. Carver, the only other black administrator, both in majority black schools. As mentioned in Chapter Five, Dubois and Horvath found that "By and large the CAAVE [Creole African-American Vernacular English] community is still impoverished. Only higher education, not pride in French heritage, can offer Creoles economic prosperity" (2003:202). Though Ms. Dudley is not Creole, her comments suggest she may share the sentiments of Ms. Carver who is. Ms. Carver readily acknowledges the symbolic value of French saying "it is important that people acknowledge and celebrate their heritage, it helps to build the self," but she goes on to clarify:

in Louisiana like I see it, people speak English ok, when you're able to speak to someone in French, which is a good thing, it's like oh I have a little added something, *it's like lagniappe, it's not like a requirement*....I don't think that you can expect that the kids will go out in the business world and speaking French will you know give them a great advantage over anybody else, it's not that prevalent [emphasis added].

6.5 Discussion of Findings

The qualitative analysis in this chapter adds greater dimension to many of the findings of the previous two chapters. From a socio-biographic point of view, Chapter Four had shown that for the two groups there was an opposite pattern of immersion in Louisiana francophone culture. The administrators were mostly natives of Louisiana with at least some familial connection to Louisiana French-speakers, but Louise was the only student who had any familial connection to Louisiana French whatsoever. The

administrators are much more likely to be personally connected to Louisiana francophone culture than the students who want to teach French, despite the fact that most of the administrators do not speak French themselves. The fact that most of the administrators do not speak French in spite of their personal connections to the language helped to understand the beliefs analyzed in the previous chapter and those expressed in this one.

The students, with their lack of connection to Louisiana francophone culture, suggest that the demographics of Louisiana's revitalization movement will have to change if it is to survive. For decades, CODOFIL and grassroots organizations promoting French have been composed almost exclusively of members of this "Cajun elite" that Dubois has mentioned (1998:328). Though the administrators in this study resemble this group, the students are much more representative of the changing demographics of Louisiana. In the future, the revitalization movement will need to put less importance on a connection to Louisiana's francophone past and more importance on an ideological orientation towards its preservation.

The socio-biographic data also revealed that the students who wanted to teach French came from the wealthier end of the socioeconomic spectrum in households with highly educated parents. This fact, along with the data on their education, showed that there is only a weak correlation, if any, between a desire to teach French in Louisiana and exposure to French at an early age. Most of the students only studied French for a few years in middle school or high school prior to the university level. Unlike the administrators, the students had adopted their belief in the importance of French for Louisiana rather than inheriting it. Also, unlike the administrators, the students had chosen to become involved in French revitalization even if they did not express their

choices in those terms. The socio-biographic profiles seem to suggest that willing participants in the revitalization movement can be made even if few are being born.

From an ideological perspective, the students and administrators both tend to agree that the government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote French and that Louisiana's francophone heritage is at least part of the reason driving this responsibility. However, the administrators were much more likely than the students to express the thought that Spanish or some other language would be more beneficial to the children of Louisiana, though many students appear to share this belief on a subconscious level at least. Such sentiments on the part of the administrators are understandable given that their age and life experience have allowed them to witness the exponentially increasing presence of Spanish in the United States over the last few decades. Many of these administrators have also witnessed first-hand the precipitous decline in Louisiana's francophone population. Furthermore, it is entirely logical for the administrators to see Spanish as possibly more beneficial than French because they are also much more likely than the students to attach economic value to learning a second language. The idea that Spanish rather than some other second language will have the most economic benefit for Americans has been present in the education sector for decades.

The students often expressed the importance of French for children in Louisiana as stemming purely from the link it provides to Louisiana's heritage, while the administrators were generally focused on the economic benefits that French could provide. When students mentioned economic benefits to learning French tended to see them as potential future benefits rather than actual benefits in the present. The socio-biographic differences among the students appeared to have no influence on their

perception of the economic utility of French. Age and life-experience are probably the major factors in the perception of the economic advantages of reviving French. The students, who obviously lack much experience in the professional world, are not as preoccupied with the financial concerns as the administrators. The students also grew up in wealthier homes than the administrators, and economic concerns may have seemed less pressing throughout their lives.

Regardless of their views on the imminence of economic benefits, however, both the students and the administrators tended to place little importance on the usage of French in the home for preserving the language. Most students, outsiders and natives, were dubious about immersion students passing on French in the home, though many of the students claimed they planned to speak French at home with their own children. It remains to be seen whether or that they will follow through with the plans. However, all of the administrators who mentioned their own children said they had sent them to immersion schools and those who could still did not speak French with them at home.

In light of these observations, the ideology of students and administrators can be considered in relation to that of the French revitalization movement as a whole. CODOFIL and other leaders of the French revitalization movement show many similar ideological beliefs as well as important differences. These similarities and differences can now be considered, in addition to the long-term implications that they hold for the survival of French in Louisiana.

CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed to answer a few key questions about French revitalization. The data presented here has helped to situate two previously unstudied groups within the French revitalization movement in Louisiana. Although these participants are an essential part of the movement (or hope to be), do they share CODOFIL's views of the responsibility of public schools to revitalize French? Do they see themselves as a part of the revitalization movement or are they simply doing a job for other reasons, devoid of the ideological motivations of language revitalization? Does the French revitalization movement ideologically influence Louisiana's French teachers?

The data in the IRC provides clear answers to all of these questions. Rarely would the students or the administrators doubt that the government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote French, or that the schools are the appropriate venue for it to fulfill this responsibility. As Louise said, "we are francophone and they keep saying we are so you might as well give programs that have your kid learn French." Even the few who shy away from the term "government responsibility" to promote French believe that CODOFIL's efforts to promote French education should be encouraged and expanded.

As for the question of whether or not they see themselves as part of the revitalization movement, the answer is different for each group. The administrators with one exception had no connection to the French immersion schools or the teaching of French prior to working in their administration. It was pure serendipity that many had fairly strong connections to Louisiana francophone culture, and all but one are doing their jobs for reasons that are not connected to the ideology of the language revitalization movement. Yet the students who generally had little or no connection to Louisiana

francophone culture probably do see themselves within the French revitalization movement. Though their initial reasons for learning and/or teaching French were not ideologically connected to language revitalization, they have generally adopted the revitalization movement's belief that the French language is inextricably tied to Louisiana culture and needs to be preserved. Living in Louisiana where there is a strong francophone history and a French revitalization movement probably does influence the students ideologically. Ashley said that "the study of French has been romanticized in recent years, studying it is often seen as a kind of nostalgic nod to Louisiana's past or a romantic gesture of endorsing French *haute culture*," but it is precisely this romanticized view of the French language that the other students seem to have adopted. As previously stated, the tension between a desire to preserve Louisiana's heritage and the lack of perceived additional benefits to learning French creates a schizophrenic representation of the place of French in Louisiana for these students.

There is enough detail present in the public discourse of CODOFIL and other activists to make some general comparisons between the socio-biographic and ideological profiles of the groups in this study and that of the revitalization movement at large. There are a few facts in particular that warrant a brief comparison with those uncovered in the IRC. The cultural identity of the French revitalization movement seems to be one area where the public discourse may be somewhat misleading.

The CODOFIL website states "most of our teachers of French are Louisiana natives, thanks largely to the efforts of CODOFIL and the state's educational system" (CODOFIL). Some older publications cite statistics such as "in the 1988-1989 school year there were about 190 foreign teachers and 220 natives" (Angers 1990:50). These

statements may be true, but they need qualification. For example, CODOFIL was undoubtedly important in the early formation of French as a second language programs in Louisiana, but it was actually Louisiana's BESE (Board of Elementary and Secondary Education) that mandated foreign language instruction for fourth through eighth graders in 1985 and eventually placed the job of managing French second language education mostly in the hands of individual school boards and schools (Henry 1997:193). CODOFIL has since moved primarily to the more specialized role of administering the placement of teachers for French immersion programs.

Given the widespread acknowledgement that French is almost never transmitted in the home anymore, the revitalization movement has latched on to the immersion programs as the most realistic way of reviving the language. Yet the numbers of "native" teachers in the immersion programs tell a very different story. In the 2008-2009 school year, there were 125 foreign teachers and 35 Louisiana/USA teachers in immersion programs (Barnett 2010)⁵⁶. Since CODOFIL is almost solely responsible for filling the immersion positions but not the French second language teacher positions, the claim that most of their teachers are Louisiana natives seems somewhat misleading.

Regardless of whether BESE or CODOFIL hired them, even if Louisiana's French second language teachers are primarily "native" today rather than foreign, that term is never defined. Given that two-thirds of the student group in this study had either lived outside Louisiana or had one or more parents from another state, it is unclear how many of these future French teachers can be defined as Louisiana "natives". Furthermore, given the nature of the United States legal system there is no clear definition of a

⁵⁶ Note that this statistic provided by Terri Hammatt of the BESE does not or cannot distinguish between USA and Louisiana natives

Louisiana native. Louisiana issues no passports, and Louisiana law only recognizes "residents" and "non-residents". If being a Louisiana native is supposed to imply some connection with Louisiana's francophone past, then only one of the future teachers in this study would meet that qualification.

Admittedly, the administrator group's answers seem to define them as more stereotypical Louisiana natives. Yet the majority of administrators did not consider themselves French speakers and only one had ever taught French or taught in French. Also, most of these administrators are approaching the end of their careers and it seems more probable that the next generation of administrators will likely resemble the student group from a socio-biographic point of view.

Beyond the statements of CODOFIL, the revitalization movement would logically be perceived as similar to its most well-known representatives in socio-biographic terms. Often noted as the founder of the French revitalization movement in Louisiana, State Senator Dudley LeBlanc from Abbeville was "a full-blooded Cajun" who wrote two books about the Acadians and organized bus trips to take students to their ancestral homeland in Nova Scotia (Angers 1990:31-32). James Domengeaux, a former U.S. and State Representative, the founder and twenty-year head of CODOFIL "learned to speak French from his parents but was not taught to read or write the language" (Nytimes.com 1988). Language activists such as Barry Ancelet and Zachary Richard learned French from their grandparents and these self-avowed Cajuns are among the best-known champions of French in Louisiana (Laney 2014; Brasseaux 2013). These individuals who immediately spring to mind when talking about French revitalization in Louisiana are demographically similar to the administrator group, but they never taught French

themselves just as all but one of the administrators did not. If the student group in this study is any indication, it seems the future of Louisiana's revitalization movement is going to depend on a different demographic.

It is precisely the younger, wealthier, and more educated population represented by the students in this study who will be charged with revitalization in Louisiana.

CODOFIL's annual report to the governor stated that its number one goal for fiscal year 2015 is to "Increase number of Louisiana teachers of French" (CODOFIL 2014).⁵⁷

Though neither the students nor the administrators felt it mattered if French teachers in Louisiana were from Louisiana, CODOFIL obviously does not share that belief.

CODOFIL has created a program called Escadrille Louisiane⁵⁸ that is intended to prepare Louisiana students to teach in French immersion schools, but in 2014 only three students participated in a program designed to accommodate ten. Given the findings of this study, it may be advantageous for CODOFIL to direct more resources toward recruiting teachers from Louisiana's large universities if they hope to accomplish this goal. Furthermore, it is important to consider that students in Louisiana who have no familial ties to Louisiana French may still be useful in revitalizing the language.

Regarding the reasons why CODOFIL believes it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to be "native," it has been widely noted that, "the choice of SF [Standard French] and importation of foreign teachers generated opposition to the education program" (Henry 1997:194). The insistence that French in Louisiana is now taught

⁵⁷ The report listed nine different goals but this was one of two goals labeled "1."

⁵⁸ The Escadrille program administered at Centenary College partners with a preexisting program of the French government call TAPIF (Teaching Assistant Program in France) to provide students a masters in teaching and spend one year living in France teaching English.

mostly by “native” teachers seems a perfectly understandable attempt by CODOFIL to placate would-be critics who disapprove of the foreign teachers and the use of Standard French. There are obviously two ideologies competing within the revitalization movement. On one side CODOFIL sees the practical advantages of using Standard French in schools taught by native speakers from other countries. On the other side, there are grassroots activists who support ethnic revival which may or may not include the revival of the French language, but they often prefer a local variety of French if the language is going to be present at all. As Jacques Henry says, these grassroots activists have “a definition of Cajun ethnicity broader than CODOFIL’s language-based view” (1997: 200). At the same time, there are numerous grassroots organizations helping CODOFIL to expand immersion education with no apparent objection to the importation of foreign teachers (St-Hilaire 2005). Perhaps most importantly, CODOFIL has had a legal relationship with many foreign governments, notably that of France, who undoubtedly have their own foreign policy interests in mind when deciding what type of assistance to provide to CODOFIL. As state funding for CODOFIL’s efforts has continually diminished, the support of these foreign governments and their own foreign policy interests should not be entirely overlooked.

While the institutional and grassroots sides of the French revitalization movement seem to be in disagreement about the importance of Louisiana French teachers being native, the future teachers and administrators seem to find themselves clearly on the side of CODOFIL. Every member of the student group and two-thirds of the administrators stated that it is not important whether or not French teachers in Louisiana were from Louisiana though most felt it could help. Furthermore, every participant in each group

said that teachers from foreign countries were either preferred to native teachers or at least important to have alongside native teachers. Given these facts, it seems that any concern about how native Louisiana's French teachers are comes from outside the institutional and educational realm altogether.

Yet a crucially important secondary benefit to increasing the number of "native" Louisiana French teachers would be to create jobs in Louisiana, which demand that employees speak French. CODOFIL seems to show a clear agreement with the ideological belief that the revitalization of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness. The student group tended to emphasize the symbolic link to Louisiana's heritage that the French language provides as the primary benefit that French has for children. A greater historical understanding has been linked with the French language revitalization movement from the beginning. James Domengeaux is widely seen to have believed that "with the institutionalization of the [French language] program, Louisiana would become a truly bilingual state and the French language would shore up Louisiana/French ethnicity" (Dormon 1983:83). The manifesto of Action Cadienne, a grassroots organization promoting the establishment of French immersion programs, says "we demand that Cajun history be taught in the public schools of Acadiana" (Actioncadienne.org n.d.). A greater understanding of Louisiana's cultural heritage through learning the French language is apparently an important aspect of the ideology of the French revitalization movement at all levels.

The issue of the economic benefits of French revitalization, however, is an area where not everyone seems to see the same importance. Though no one denies that learning French is more likely to benefit than to harm Louisiana from an economic

standpoint, the importance of the economic benefits of learning French is rarely mentioned within the student group. Aonghas St-Hilaire's interviews with grassroots language activists made frequent reference to the fact that "a heightened appreciation for French Louisiana's unique culture and history has been a motivating factor among many parents," yet he did not reference a single language activist who touted the economic benefits of French (2005:170).

Conversely, the majority of the administrator group mentioned the economic benefits of learning French. From the beginning, CODOFIL was seen to have the goal of "enabling the area to reach out culturally and economically (by way of extensive trade contacts) to other French-speaking portions of the world" (Dormon 1983:83). An early study of the newly nascent revitalization movement in Louisiana found that "the state government sees the revitalization of French as a means to increase economic advantages in the region" (Baird 1977:26). These sentiments have not changed; as Jerome Degrave says, a careful consideration of recent legislative actions shows that the Louisiana legislature believes "the economic development of Louisiana, through tourism and foreign investments, hinges on French" (2013).

CODOFIL's nine goals for fiscal year 2015 include five that are either directly or indirectly related to job creation for French speakers:

1. Increase number of Louisiana teachers of French.
2. Engage youth. Assure that a minimum of 12 % of the products of French Immersion (former students) are actively engaged in "living, working and playing" in French in Louisiana.
3. Grow career paths through French, especially in tourism.
4. Improve Louisiana's standing with the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie.
5. Increase presence of Louisiana French in the media.

The new Executive Director of CODOFIL, Charles Larroque explained his views on the importance of economic incentives for learning French.

Our youth must be given the opportunities to live, work and play in their heritage language, so far, we've done quite well with the live and play part. It's the work part that needs to be enhanced. (Francingues 2014).

Thus, it appears that the more institutional members of the revitalization movement such as legislators, CODOFIL, and the school administrators are quick to attach an economic importance to French revitalization. Yet for grassroots activists and these students who hope to join the movement as teachers, the economic benefits of revitalizing French seem much more peripheral. CODOFIL hopes to change this perspective. As its director said, "we will need a more French school-to-work perspective throughout the education system and in our communities" (Francingues 2014).

The final and perhaps most important issue addressed in the interviews of the IRC corpus is the importance of intergenerational mother-tongue transmission of French. Fishman believes that this must be the goal of every revitalization movement that is going to be successful (1991). More than two-thirds of the students and all of the administrators stated that they believe children who are learning French now may or will pass it on to their children at home. Yet, finding any mention of using French in the home in any statements linked with CODOFIL is nearly impossible.⁵⁹ The 2010 Act 679 that acts as CODOFIL's official charter commissions them to do several tasks but makes no mention of promoting the usage of French in the home.

⁵⁹ Several banners distributed by CODOFIL prior to 1990 did have messages such as "PARLEZ FRANÇAIS AVEC VOS ENFANTS A LA MAISON" were the only examples I could find.

Grassroots activists make little mention of French use in the home as well. The manifesto of Action Cadienne says "the future of the Cajun people of Louisiana is their children speaking the language of their ancestors," but they also say:

The only truly efficient means of learning French is through immersion. Therefore, we demand that French immersion and bilingual education be made available to every student to desires to participate in one of these programs in all of the 22 parishes of Louisiana officially recognized as Acadiana (Actioncadienne.org n.d.).

When asked in what areas of life they would like to see their students using French if they become fluent, only two students and one administrator specifically mentioned family or the home. It seems that from top to bottom French revitalization movement does not see intergenerational mother-tongue transmission as a priority. On this vital issue everyone involved in the revitalization movement seems to be in agreement.

In the future, there are several ways in which this study could be expanded to answer some questions raised in its analysis. Expanding the IRC to include American teachers who are already working in Louisiana's immersion schools could provide valuable insight into how, if at all, the experience of actually teaching in a French immersion school affects an individual's linguistic ideology. The school environment and greater life experience could help bridge the gaps seen between the ideology of the students and administrators in this study. Additionally, a written questionnaire based on the findings of this study could be used to gather sufficient data from multiple groups to perform extensive quantitative analyses of the movement's ideology.

Furthermore, creating a similar corpus of interviews with people involved in the revitalization of other minority languages would provide an understanding of those ideological beliefs that are universal to language revitalization movements and those

which are local in nature. A comparative study would also provide valuable insight into the socio-biographic makeup of language revitalization movements and whether or not the same pattern of shift away from individuals with a close personal connection to the minority language is unique to Louisiana. As mentioned in the introduction, I hope that future research will confirm that the findings of this study can have practical applications for the French revitalization movement in Louisiana and make an important contribution to our understanding of the link between linguistic ideology and language revitalization in general.

Recommendations and Application

As it stands, this study has some important implications for French revitalization in Louisiana. The fact that only ten students who met the IRC criteria could be found in Louisiana's four largest universities is problematic. If only three students participated in the Escadrille teacher training program last year as the CODOFIL meeting minutes for September 2014 suggest, then it seems virtually impossible that the program will meet its stated goal of training 200 teachers to work in Louisiana by the year 2020. The fact that program is based at Centenary College, a small private school with only about 100 graduate students located four hours from Baton Rouge and five hours from New Orleans, may deter students who might otherwise be interested in participating. Basing the Escadrille Louisiane program at a larger university in South Louisiana may assist in attracting the kind of students who participated in this study. Furthermore, more effort needs to be made attract students at Louisiana's largest universities to careers in French. Recruiting events at these universities should probably be a priority.

Many of the students in this study also mentioned that they would like to integrate some Louisiana French into their classrooms, but they do not know enough about it. Though there are classes that teach this material, such as the well-known Cajun French program that Amanda Lafleur started at Louisiana State University, no classes focusing on Louisiana French are required for French majors at Tulane or Louisiana State University.

It may be that the most important recommendation that can be made based on this study is not directly related to French education. The lack of importance placed on using French in the home may be the biggest problem facing the French revitalization movement in Louisiana. In order to effectively raise children who speak fluent French at home, students would likely require a greater level of fluency than that which can be achieved through French immersion up to the eighth grade. Therefore, parents, students, and communities need to more aware of this. Revitalization movements around the world have made conscious efforts to encourage the use of minority languages in the home, and Louisiana's movement should be no different.

Ultimately, this study shows that everyone involved in revitalization agrees about the method: that is to say, they believe as James Domengeaux did that the schools should restore French in Louisiana. Yet they differ in their belief about why it should be restored. For some the economic advantages that French provides are essential to its future; for others it is merely *lagniappe*.

REFERENCES

- Actioncadienne.org.. *Action Cadienne*. Retrieved 11 January 2015, from <http://www.actioncadienne.org/manifesto.html>
- Ancelet, Barry. 1988. "A Perspective On Teaching The "Problem Language" In Louisiana". *The French Review* 61(3):345-356.
- Ancelet, Barry Jean. 1989. *Cajun Music: Its Origins And Development*. Lafayette, LA: Center for Louisiana Studies, University of Southwestern Louisiana.
- Ancelet, Barry Jean, and Amanda Lafleur. 2005. 'La Revitalisation Endogène Du Cadien En Louisiane'. Pp. 412-437 in *Le français en Amérique du Nord: état présent*, by. Albert Valdman, Julie Auger and Deborah Piston-Hatlened. Quebec City: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Angers, Trent. 1990. *The Truth About The Cajuns*. Lafayette, La.: Acadian House Pub.
- Amery, Rob. 2000. *Warrabarna Kurna!*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Atran-Fresco, Laura. 2014. "Les Cadiens Au Présent: Revendications Identitaires D'Une Population Francophone En Situation Minoritaire". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Louisiana at Lafayette.
- Barnett, C. Brian. 2010. "French Immersion Teachers' Attitudes Toward Louisiana Varieties Of French And The Integration Of Such Varieties In Their Classroom: A Quantitative And Qualitative Analysis". Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Baird, Emay. 1977. "The Revitalization Of French In Louisiana: Language Policy And Language Strategy". M.A. thesis, The American University.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1927. "Literate And Illiterate Speech". *American Speech* 2(10):432-439.
- Blommaert, Jan. 1999. *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boudreau, Annette. 2009. "La Construction Des Représentations Linguistiques: Le Cas De L'acadie". *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics / La revue canadienne de linguistique* 54(3):439-459.
- Boudreau, Annette, and Ali Khodja, Mourad. n.d. *Interview guide for the project Le Français à la mesure d'un continent*. 1-2.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and John B Thompson. 1991. *Language And Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Bradley, David. 2002. "Language Attitudes: The Key Factor In Language Maintenance". Pp. 1-10 in *Language endangerment and language maintenance*, ed. by David Bradley and Maya Bradley. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Bradley, David, and Maya Bradley. 2002. *Language Endangerment And Language Maintenance*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Brasseaux, Carl A. 1992. *Acadian To Cajun*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Brasseaux, R. 2013. "Zachary Richard | Entries | Knowla, Encyclopedia Of Louisiana". *Knowla.org*. Retrieved January 6, 2015 (<http://www.knowla.org/entry/1105/>).
- Brenzinger, Matthias. 1998. "Language Contact And Language Displacement". Pp. 273-284 in *The handbook of sociolinguistics*, ed. by Florian Coulmas. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bronston, Barri. 2012. "Louisiana Language Immersion Programs Observed By French Officials". *NOLA.com*. Retrieved May 16, 2015 (http://www.nola.com/education/index.ssf/2012/02/french_officials_tour_language.html).
- Brown, Becky. 1993. "The Social Consequences Of Writing Louisiana French". *Language in Society*. 22(01):67.
- Caldas, Stephen J. 2007. "Changing Bilingual Self-Perceptions From Early Adolescence To Early Adulthood: Empirical Evidence From A Mixed-Methods Case Study". *Applied Linguistics* 29(2):290-311.
- Caldas, Stephen J., and Suzanne Caron-Caldas. 1997. "Cultural Influences On French/English Language Dominance Of Three Louisiana Children". *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 10(2):139-155.
- Caldas, Stephen J., and Suzanne Caron-Caldas. 1999. "Language Immersion And Cultural Identity: Conflicting Influences And Values". *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 12(1):42-58.
- Caldas, Stephen J., and Suzanne Caron-Caldas. 2000. "The Influence Of Family, School, And Community On Bilingual Preference: Results From A Louisiana/Québec Case Study". *Applied Psycholinguistics*. 21(3):365-381.
- Caldas, Stephen J., and Suzanne Caron-Caldas 2002. "A Sociolinguistic Analysis Of The Language Preferences Of Adolescent Bilinguals: Shifting Allegiances And Developing Identities". *Applied Linguistics* 23(4):490-514.

- Camp, Albert. 2010. "Louisiana's Hope For A Francophone Future: Exploring The Linguistic Phenomena Of Acadiana's French Immersion Schools". M.A. thesis, Louisiana State University.
- Campbell, L. (1994). Language Death. In *The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 10, pp. 1960-1968). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Cheramie, David. 2003. "Immersion Advocacy And The Council For The Development Of French In Louisiana". *American Council on Immersion Education Newsletter* 6(2). Retrieved May 16, 2015 (http://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol6/Feb2003_CODOFIL.html).
- CODOFIL. 2014. *Annual Report Concil For The Development Of French In Louisiana*. Lafayette, LA: William Arceneaux. Retrieved May 9, 2015 (http://www.crt.state.la.us/Assets/OCD/codofil/CODOFIL%20Annual%20Report_September%202014%20%282%29.pdf).
- CODOFIL. n.d. *Conseil pour le développement du français en Louisiane*. Retrieved October 4, 2010 (<http://www.codofil.org/english/whatis.html>).
- CODOFIL. n.d. Louisiana DCRT. Retrieved January 5, 2015 (<http://www.crt.state.la.us/cultural-development/codofil/programs/other-programs/index>).
- Cohn, D'Vera, and Rich Morin. 2008. "Who Moves? Who Stays Put? Where's Home?". *Pew Research Center's Social & Demographic Trends Project*. Retrieved May 16, 2015 (<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2008/12/17/who-moves-who-stays-put-wheres-home/>).
- Crawford, James. 1996. "Seven Hypotheses On Language Loss: Causes And Cures". Pp. 51-68 in *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*, ed. by Gina Cantoni. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona State University.
- Degrave, Jérôme. 2013. "The Economics And Politics Of Louisiana's Latest French Renaissance". *Transatlantica. Revue d'études américaines. American Studies Journal* (1). Retrieved May 16, 2015 (<http://transatlantica.revues.org/6461?lang=fr>).
- Deiler, J. Hanno. 1969. *The Settlement Of The German Coast Of Louisiana And The Creoles Of German Descent*. Baltimore: Genealogical Pub. Co.
- Denison, Norman. 1977. "Language Death Or Language Suicide?". *Linguistics* 15(191).
- Deslauriers, Nadine. 1999. "L'intégration De La Culture Et De La Langue Cadiennes Et Créoles Dans Les Classes D'immersion De La Paroisse De Lafayette". Master of Arts, University of Southwestern Louisiana.

- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1997. *The Rise And Fall Of Languages*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1981. *Language Death*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1989. *Investigating Obsolescence*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1992. "Small Languages And Small Language Communities: News, Notes, And Comments 10". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 95(1).
- Dorian, Nancy. 1993a. "Working With Endangered Languages: Privileges And Perils". Pp. 11-22 in *Les langues menacées: actes du XVe Congrès international des linguistes, Québec, Université Laval, 9-14 août 1992*, ed. by Andre Crochetiere, Jean-Claude Boulanger and Conrad Ouellon. Sainte-Foy, Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Dorian, Nancy C. 1993b. "A Response To Ladefoged's Other View Of Endangered Languages". *Language* 69(3):575.
- Dormon, James. 1983. *The People Called Cajuns: An Introduction To An Ethnohistory*. Lafayette, LA: The Center for Louisiana Studies University of Southwestern Louisiana.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1981. "Language Shift and Language Death — A Protean Challenge for the Linguist". *Folia Linguistica* 15(5-28).
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1982. "Acceleration, Retardation, And Reversal In Language Decay?". Pp. 321-336 in *Language spread: Studies in diffusion and social change*, ed. by R L Cooper. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang, and Ruth Wodak-Leodolter. 1977. "Language Preservation And Language Death In Brittany". *Linguistics* 15(191): 33-44.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 1997. "Field Method In Four Cajun Communities In Louisiana". Pp. 47-69 in *French and Creole in Louisiana*, ed. by Albert Valdman. New York: Plenum Press.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 1998. "La Configuration Dynamique Des Communautés Cadiennes En Louisiane". Pp. 325-348 in *Français d'Amérique: variation, créolisation, normalisation : actes du Colloque--"Les Français d'Amérique du Nord en situation minoritaire" Université d'Avignon, 8-11 octobre 1996*, ed. by Paul Brasseur. Avignon, France: Centre d'études canadiennes, Université d'Avignon.

- Dubois, Sylvie. 2000. "Le Statut Du Français Et Les Politiques Linguistiques Dans Les Provinces Maritimes Canadiennes Et En Louisiane Aux Etats-Unis". Pp. 123-138 in *Kanada und die USA - interkulturelle Perspektiven: internationales Symposium Wien, 12. - 14. April 2000 = Aspects of interculturality - Canada and the United States*. Vienna: entrum für Kanada-Studien, Univ. Wiens.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 2001. "Attrition Linguistique Ou Convergence Dialectale: JE, MOI/JE Et MOI En Français Cadien". *Faits de Langues: Langues de diaspora, langues en contact* 18:149-165.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 2005. "Un Siècle De Français Cadien Parlé En Louisiane : Persistance Linguistique, Hétérogénéité Géographique Et Évolution". Pp. 287-305 in *Le français en Amérique du Nord : état présent*, ed. by A. Valdman, J. Auger and D. Piston-Hatlen. Quebec City: Saint Nicolas.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 2014. "Autant En Emporte La Langue: La Saga Louisianaise De La Langue Française". Pp. 155-178 in *Globalisation et vitalité du français : vieux débats, nouvelles perspectives*, ed. by Salikoko Mufwene and Cecile Vigouroux. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Dubois, S, W Geautreau, H Margot, M Melancon, and T Veler. 1995. "The Quality Of French Spoken In Louisiana: Linguistic Attitudes Toward The Varieties Of French In Cajun Communities". *The SECOL review/ Southeastern Conference on Linguistics* 19:126-150.
- Dubois, Sylvie, and Barbara Horvath. 2003. "Creoles And Cajuns: A Portrait In Black And White". *American Speech* 78(2):192-207.
- Dubois, Sylvie, Emilie Leumas, and Malcom Richardson. 2007. "Spatial Diffusion Of Language Practices Within The Catholic Church In Louisiana". *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers* 13(12).
- Dubois, Sylvie, and Megan Melancon. 1997. "Cajun Is Dead - Long Live Cajun: Shifting From A Linguistic To A Cultural Community". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 1(1):63-93.
- Dubois, Sylvie, and Sibylle Noetzel. 2005. "Intergenerational Pattern Of Interference And Internally-Motivated Changes In Cajun French". *Bilingualism* 8(2):131-143.
- Dubois, Sylvie, Carole Salmon, and Sibylle Noetzel. 2006. "Le Français Cadien Comme Héritage Linguistique En Louisiane". Pp. 163-177 in *Mémoires francophones : La Louisiane*, ed. by Guy Clermont, Michel Beniamino and Arielle Thauvin-Chapot. Limoges, France: Pulim.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

- Edwards, John. 1984. *Linguistic Minorities, Policies, And Pluralism*. London: Academic Press.
- Egea-Kuehne, Denise. 2006. "Enseignement Du Français En Louisiane: Préserver Un Héritage". in *Mémoires francophones : La Louisiane*, ed. by Guy Clermont, Michel Beniamino and Arielle Thauvin-Chapot. Limoges, France: Pulim.
- Egea-Kuehne, Denise. 2012. "Educational Rights: Language Rights And Rights To A Plural Education". Pp. 107-117 in *Reconsidering Canadian Curriculum Studies*, ed. by N. Ng-A-Fook. Ottawa, Canada: University of Ottawa Press.
- Errington, Joseph. 1988. *Structure And Style In Javanese: A Semiotic View Of Linguistic Etiquette*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Errington, Joseph. 1998. "Indoneisan('s) Development". Pp. 271-284 in *Language ideologies: practice and theory*, ed. by Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Wollard and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fase, Willem, K Jaspaert, and Sjaak Kroon. 1992. *Maintenance And Loss Of Minority Languages*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Fausset, Richard. 2015. "In Louisiana, Desire For A French Renaissance". *Nytimes.com*. Retrieved March 30, 2015 (http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/15/us/in-louisiana-desire-for-a-french-renaissance.html?smid=nytcore-ipad-share&smprod=nytcore-ipad&_r=0).
- Festivalsacadiens.com. *History / Festivals Acadiens et Créoles / Louisiana Music Festival*. Retrieved 12 January 2015, from (<http://www.festivalsacadiens.com/info/history.html>).
- Fishman, J. 1964. "Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry. A Definitions of the Field and Suggestions for its Further Development". *Linguistics* 2(9).
- Fishman, Joshua. 1965. "Who Speaks What Language To Whom And When.". *La Linguistique* 1(2):67-88.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1972. *The Sociology Of Language; An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach To Language In Society*. Rowley, Massachussetts: Newbury House.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Francingues, Mike. 2014. "CODOFIL To Focus More On More School To Work". *The Advocate*. Retrieved May 9, 2015 (<http://theadvocate.com/home/8863672-125/codofil-to-focus-more-on>).

- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation Of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gold, Gerald L. 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.
- Gouldner, Alvin Ward. 1976. *The Dialectic Of Ideology And Technology*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Grenoble, Lenore A, and Lindsay J Whaley. 2009. *Saving Languages: An Introduction To Language Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haj-Broussard, Michelle. 2003. "Language, Identity And The Achievement Gap: Comparing Experiences Of African-American Students In A French Immersion And A Regular Education Context". Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Hale, K. 1998. "On endangered languages and the importance of linguistic diversity". Pp. 192-216. in *Languages: An Introduction To Language Revitalization* 2009. ed. by Grenoble, Lenore A, and Lindsay J Whaley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, Einar. 1954. "Some Pleasures And Problems Of Bilingual Research". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 20(2):116-122.
- Haugen, Einar. 1969. *The Norwegian Language In America; A Study In Bilingual Behavior*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press..
- Heath, S. B. 1989. "Language Ideology". *International encyclopedia of communications* 393-395.
- Heller, Monica. 2003. "Globalization, The New Economy, And The Commodification Of Language And Identity". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4):473-492.
- Heller, Monica. 1999. "Heated Language In A Cold Climate". Pp. 143-170 in *Language ideological debates*, ed. by J. Blommaert. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Henry, J. 1990. "Le Francais nouveau arrive?". *Gazette de Louisiane* 1(3) :1-5.
- Henry, J. 1993. "Le CODOFIL dans le mouvement francophone en Louisiane". *Espace Francophone* 43:25-46.
- Henry, Jacques. 1997. "The Louisiana French Movement". Pp. 183-214 in *French and Creole in Louisiana*, ed. by Albert Valdman. New York: Plenum Press.

- Hinton, Leanne, and Kenneth L Hale. 2001. *The Green Book Of Language Revitalization In Practice*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1967. "Models Of The Interaction Of Language And Social Setting". *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2):8-28.
- Hymes, J. 1968. "The Ethnography Of Speaking". Pp. 99-138 in *Readings in the sociology of language*, ed. by J. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton.
- Immersion | Admin - frenchinlouisiana.com. (n.d.). *French consortium of Louisiana*. Retrieved October 1, 2013, from (<http://www.frenchinlouisiana.com/immersion.html>).
- Irvine, Judith T. 1989. "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language And Political Economy". *American Ethnologist* 16(2):248-267.
- Jones, Mari C. 1998a. "Death Of A Language, Birth Of An Identity: Brittany And The Bretons". *LPLP* 22(2):129-42.
- Jones, Mari C. 1998b. *Language Obsolescence And Revitalization*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- King, Ruth. 1989. "On The Social Meaning Of Linguistic Variability In Language Death Situations: Variation In Newfoundland French". Pp. 139-148 in *Investigating Obsolescence*, ed. by Nancy Dorian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koerner, E. F. 1970. "Bloomfieldian Linguistics and the problem of "meaning": A chapter in the history of the theory and study of language". *Jahrbuch fur Amerikastudien* 15:162-183.
- Krauss, M. E. 2007. "Mass Language Extinction, And Documentation: The Race Against Time". Pp. 3-24 in *The vanishing languages of the Pacific rim*, ed. by O. Miyaoka, O. Sakiyama and M. Krauss. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification Of English In New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. 1979. "Locating The Frontier Between Social And Psychological Factors In Linguistic Variation". Pp. 327-340 in *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*, ed. by C. Filmer, D. Kempler and W. S-Y Wang. New York: Academic Press.
- Labov, William. 1984. "Field Methods Of The Project On Linguistic Change And Variation". Pp. 28-53 in *Language in use: readings in sociolinguistics*, ed. by John Baugh and Joel Sherzer. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Laney, Ruth. 2014. "BARRY ANCELET HAS ESTABLISHED AN ARCHIVE OF CAJUN AND CREOLE MUSIC IN LAFAYETTE - The Attakapas Historical Associationthe Attakapas Historical Association". *Attakapaszette.org*. Retrieved January 6, 2015 (<http://attakapaszette.org/2014-issue-2/barry-ancelet-established-archive-cajun-creole-music-lafayette/>).
- Larrouche, A. 1981. "Ethnicité, Pêche, Et Pétrole: Les Cadjins Du Bayou Lafourche En Louisiane Française". M.A. thesis, York University, Downsview, Ontario.
- Leumas, Emilie. 2009. "Mais, I Sin In French, I Gotta Go To Confession In French : A Study Of The Language Shift From French To English Within The Louisiana Catholic Church". Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Le Page, R. 1988. "Some premises concerning the standardization of languages, with special reference to Caribbean Creole English". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 71:25-36.
- Lindner, Tamara. 2008. "Attitudes Toward Cajun French And International French In South Louisiana: A Study Of High School Students". Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Louisiana Department of Education. 2010. *Guide For Administrators Of Elementary-Level And Immersion World Language Programs In Louisiana Schools*. Baton Rouge, LA: Office of Student and School Performance.
- Martin-Jones, M. 1989. "Language, Power And Linguistic Minorities: The Need For An Alternative Approach To Bilingualism, Language Maintenance And Shift". Pp. 106-125 in *Social anthropology and the politics of language*, ed. by R. D. Grillo. London: Routledge.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1991. "Understanding Language Shift: A Step Towards Language Maintenance". Pp. 143-155 in *Language in Australia*, ed. by S. Romaine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- McKay, G. R. 1996. *The Land Still Speaks: Review Of Aboriginal And Torres Strait Islander Language Maintenance And Development Needs And Activities*. Canberra: Australian Government Publication Service.
- Mertz, E. (1989). "Sociolinguistic creativity: Cape Breton Gaelic's linguistic 'tip'". Pp. 103-116 in *Investigating Obsolescence*, ed. by Nancy Dorian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesthrie, R. 1994. "Language Maintenance, Shift, And Death". *The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* 10:1988-1993..
- Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2011. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.

- Miller, W. 1971. "The Death Of A Language Or Serendipity Among The Shoshoni". *Anthropological Linguistics* 13(3):114-120.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Observing And Analysing Natural Language*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.
- Mougeon, R., and E. Beniak. 1989 "Language contraction and linguistic change: The case of Welland French". Pp. 287-312 in *Investigating Obsolescence*, ed. by Nancy Dorian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mougeon, Raymond, and Edouard Beniak. 1991. *Linguistic Consequences Of Language Contact And Restriction: The Case Of French In Ontario, Canada*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mougeon, Raymond. 1996. "La Recherche Sociolinguistique Sur Le Francais Au Canada". Pp. 183-206 in *De la polyphonie à la symphonie: méthodes, théories et faits de la recherche pluridisciplinaire sur le français au Canada*, ed. by J. Erfurt. Leipzig, Germany: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- National Education Association,. 2014. "Rankings Of The States 2013 And Estimates Of School Statistics 2014". Retrieved December 17, 2014 (<http://www.nea.org/home/rankings-and-estimates-2013-2014.html>).
- Noetzel, Sibylle. 2007. "Local Norms And Innovations Within The System Of Locative Prepositions In Cajun French". Ph. D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Nytimes.com,. 1988. "Ex-Rep. James Domengeaux, 81". Retrieved January 6, 2015 (<http://www.nytimes.com/1988/04/13/obituaries/ex-rep-james-domengeaux-81.html>).
- Ó hIfearnáin, Tadhg. 2007. "Raising Children To Be Bilingual In The Gaeltacht: Language Preference And Practice". *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10(4):510-528.
- Olson Beal, H. K. 2008. "Speaking The Language Of Integration: A Case Study Of South Boulevard Foreign Language Academic Immersion Magnet". Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Oukada, Larbi. 1977. "Louisiana French : A Linguistic Study With A Descriptive Analysis Of Lafourche Dialect". Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Pawley, A. 1991, April 3. "Vanishing languages of the Pacific: What price progress?". Lecture conducted from The Faculties, Canberra, Australia.

- Picone, M.D., and A. Valdman. 2005. "La situation du français en Louisiane." Pp. 143-165 in *Le français en Amérique du Nord: État présent*, ed. by, A. Valdman, J. Auger, and D. Piston-Hatlan. Quebec City : Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Reyhner, Jon Allan. 1999. *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages*. Flagstaff, Ariz.: Northern Arizona University, Center for Excellence in Education.
- Rickard, Peter. 1989. *A History Of The French Language*. New York: Routledge.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1994. "Hawai'i Creole English As A Literary Language". *Lang. Soc.* 23(04):527.
- Rottet, Kevin J. 2001. *Language Shift In The Coastal Marshes Of Louisiana*. New York: P. Lang.
- Rumsey, Alan. 1990. "Wording, Meaning, And Linguistic Ideology". *American Anthropologist* 92(2):346-361.
- Ryon, Dominique. 2002. "Cajun French, Sociolinguistic Knowledge, And Language Loss In Louisiana". *Journal of Language, Identity & Education* 1(4):279-293.
- Sakiyama, O. 2001. *Lectures on endangered languages: 2: from Kyoto conference 2000*. Kyoto, Japan: Nakanishi.
- Salmon, Carole. 2007. "Français Acadien, Français Cadien: Variation Stylistique Et Maintenance De Formes Phonétiques Dans Le Parler De Quatre Générations De Femmes Cadiennes". Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University.
- Sapir, Edward. 1951. *Selected Writings In Language, Culture And Personality*. Berkeley: University of California Press..
- Sasse, Hans-Jurgen. 1992. "Theory Of Language Death". Pp. 7-30 in *Language death: factual and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa*, ed. by Matthaias Brenzinger. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B, Kathryn Ann Woolard, and Paul V Kroskrity. 1998. *Language Ideologies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, Annette. 1990. *The Loss Of Australia's Aboriginal Language Heritage*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. "Language Structure And Linguistic Ideology". Pp. 193-247 in *The elements, a parasession on linguistic units and levels, April 20-21, 1979: including papers from the Conference on Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR, April 18, 1979*, ed. by Paul Clyne, William Hanks and Carol Hofbauer. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Silverstein, Michael. 1985. "Language And The Culture Of Gender: At The Intersection Of Structure, Usage, And Ideology". Pp. 219-259 in *Semiotic mediation: sociocultural and psychological perspectives*, ed. by Elisabeth Mertz and Richard Parmentier. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1998. "The Uses And Utility Of Ideology". Pp. 123-145 in *Language Ideologies*, ed. by Bambi Scheffelin, Kathryn Woolard and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 1995. "Conditions For Language Revitalization: A Comparison Of The Cases Of Hebrew And Maori". *Current Issues In Language and Society* 2(3):177-201.
- St-Hilaire, Aonghas. 2005. "Louisiana French Immersion Education: Cultural Identity And Grassroots Community Development". *J. of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* 26(2):158-172.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1948. "Sociologic Notes On Obsolescent Languages". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 14(4):226.
- Tornquist, Lisa Linea. 2000. "Attitudes Linguistiques Vis-A-Vis Du Vernaculaire Franco-Louisianais Dans Les Programmes D'Immersion En Louisiane". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Louisiana Lafayette.
- Trenchs-Parera, Mireia, and Michael Newman. 2009. "Diversity Of Language Ideologies In Spanish-Speaking Youth Of Different Origins In Catalonia". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30(6):509-524.
- Trepanier, Cecyle. 1993. "La Louisiane Française Au Seuil Du Xxe Siècle. La Commercialisation De La Culture". Pp. 361-394 in *La construction d'une culture. Le Québec et l'Amérique française*, ed. by Gerard Bouchard and Serge Courville. Quebec City: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1991. "Language Maintenance And Language Shift: Preservation Versus Extinction". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1(1):61-69.
- Tsunoda, Tadanobu. 2005. *Language Endangerment And Language Revitalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Valdman, Albert, and Thomas Klingler. 2002. "Standardization Or Laissez-Faire In Linguistic Revitalization; The Case Of Cajun And Creole In Louisiana". Pp. 109-125 in *Romance languages and linguistic communities*, ed. by Manel Lacorte and Teresa Cabal Krastel. College Park, MD: Latin American Studies Center, University of Maryland.

- Valdman, Albert 1998. "Revitalisation du cadien et enseignement du français langue étrangère aux États-Unis". Pp. 280-292 in *Français d'Amérique: variation, créolisation, normalisation : actes du Colloque--"Les Français d'Amérique du Nord en situation minoritaire"* Université d'Avignon, 8-11 octobre 1996, ed. by Paul Brasseur. Avignon, France: Centre d'études canadiennes, Université d'Avignon.
- Waddell, Eric. 1993. "French Louisiana: An Outpost Of "L'Amérique Française" Or Another Country And Another Culture". Pp. 229-251 in *French America: mobility, identity, and minority experience across the continent*, ed. by Dean Louder and Eric Waddell. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Ward, Roger. 1997. "The French Language In Louisiana Law And Legal Education: A Requiem.". *Louisiana Law Review* 57(4):1283-1324.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1951. "Research Problems In Bilingualism, With Special Reference To Switzerland". Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages In Contact, Findings And Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1956. *Language, Thought, And Reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Woolard, Kathryn. 1998. "Introduction". Pp. 3-47 in *Language ideologies: practice and theory*, ed. by Bambi Scheffelin, Kathryn Woolard and Paul Kroskrity. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDES

Interview Guide

Socio-biographic Elements *Elicit info on socio-linguistic variables influencing ideology* *Elicit regional origin*

1. What is your name and age?
2. Where are you from and where are your parents from?
3. Where all have you lived?

Elicit socio-economic background

4. What did your parents do for a living while you were growing up?
5. What type of education did your parents have?
6. Would you consider yourself wealthy, middle-class, working-class?

Elicit ethnic background

7. Do you have any French or francophone ancestry that you know of?
8. Would you consider yourself “Cajun” “Creole” or something like that?
9. What does it mean to be Cajun or Creole?

Elicit exposure to French outside of education

10. Does anyone in your family speak French and to what extent?
11. What was your interaction with French as a child/adolescent?
12. Did you ever use French in your daily life as a child and do you now?
13. Have you ever been to another country or region where French is spoken?

Professional and Linguistic Development

Elicit education and linguistic development

14. How would you say you learned French?
15. Where did you study French? What schools/places?
16. Why did you decide to study French?

Elicit motivation for teaching

17. Why did you decide to teach French?
18. What age students do you want to teach?
19. Would you consider teaching in an immersion school?

Beliefs about Language Use in America and Louisiana *Elicit linguistic ideology*

20. Why do you think it is important to know more than one language?
21. Why do you think most people (in America) don’t learn a second language?
22. Do you think that it is more important for Louisiana’s children to know French more than another language like Spanish? Why?
23. Do you believe it is more important for students to know English than French? Why?

24. Do you believe it is important for children in France to learn English?
25. Is that more or less important than for Louisiana's children to learn French?

Beliefs about French in Louisiana

26. Why do you think most people in Louisiana don't make an effort to learn French and make sure their children learn French?
27. Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to be from Louisiana? Why?
28. Do you believe it is more important for students in Louisiana to know French than students in other states? Why?
29. What do you think Louisiana's students have to gain by learning French?

Beliefs about French education in Louisiana

30. Do you believe that French should have the same place in education all over the state or should it vary depending on the region? Why?
31. Do you see the standardized variety of French in most text books as a threat to Louisiana's native varieties of French? Why?
32. Do you believe the Louisiana state government has a responsibility to promote French?
33. If you were given complete control of education in Louisiana, what would you change with respect to the teaching of French?
34. If you were in a position of power like the governor what would you do promote French in Louisiana outside of schools?
35. Do you believe that Louisiana music and cultural festivals inspire people to learn French?
36. Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to have French ancestry? Why?
37. How do you feel about the importation of French Immersion teachers from other countries?
38. Should Louisiana native teachers have priority over teachers from other states?
39. Do you plan to teach your students about Louisiana's unique varieties of French? How so?

Beliefs about the future of French in Louisiana

40. Do you believe that French/English bilingualism in Louisiana will become very common in the future? Why?
41. How do you think society would benefit from having a large community of French/English bilinguals in Louisiana?

42. If your students become fluent in French, what role would you like to see the language playing in their daily lives?
43. In an ideal world, in what areas of daily life should French be present for the average person in Louisiana?
44. Do you believe that future generations in Louisiana will pass French on to their children at home? Why?

Interview Guide for Administrators

Socio-biographic Elements *Elicit info on socio-linguistic variables influencing ideology* *Elicit regional origin*

1. What is your name and age?
2. Where are you from and where are your parents from?
3. Where all have you lived?

Elicit socio-economic background

4. What did your parents do for a living while you were growing up?
5. What type of education did your parents have?
6. Would you consider yourself wealthy, middle-class, working-class?

Elicit ethnic background

7. Do you have any French or francophone ancestry that you know of?
8. Would you consider yourself “Cajun” “Creole” or something like that?
9. What does it mean to be Cajun or Creole?

Elicit exposure to French outside of education

10. Does anyone in your family speak French and to what extent?
11. What was your interaction with French as a child/adolescent?
12. Did you ever use French in your daily life as a child and do you now?
13. Have you ever been to another country or region where French is spoken?

Professional and Linguistic Development

Elicit education and linguistic development (If applicable)

14. How would you say you learned French?
15. Where did you study French? What schools/places?
16. Why did you decide to study French?

Elicit motivation for working with immersion

17. What is the nature of your interaction with the immersion program?
18. Were you involved in the starting the program at this school?
19. What changes would you make to your immersion program if resources were unlimited?

Beliefs about Language Use in America and Louisiana *Elicit linguistic ideology*

20. Why do you think it is important to know more than one language?
21. Why do you think most people (in America) don’t learn a second language?
22. Do you think that it is more important for Louisiana’s children to know French more than another language like Spanish? Why?
23. Do you believe it is more important for students to know English than French? Why?

24. Do you believe it is important for children in France to learn English?
25. Is that more or less important than for Louisiana's children to learn French?

Beliefs about French in Louisiana

26. Why do you think most people in Louisiana don't make an effort to learn French and make sure their children learn French?
27. Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to be from Louisiana? Why?
28. Do you believe it is more important for students in Louisiana to know French than students in other states? Why?
29. What do you think Louisiana's students have to gain by learning French?

Beliefs about French education in Louisiana

30. Do you believe that French should have the same place in education all over the state or should it vary depending on the region? Why?
31. Do you see the standardized variety of French in most text books as a threat to Louisiana's native varieties of French? Why?
32. Do you believe the Louisiana state government has a responsibility to promote French?
33. If you were given complete control of education in Louisiana, what would you change with respect to the teaching of French?
34. If you were in a position of power like the governor what would you do promote French in Louisiana outside of schools?
35. Do you believe that Louisiana music and cultural festivals inspire people to learn French?
36. Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to have French ancestry? Why?
37. How do you feel about the importation of French Immersion teachers from other countries?
38. Should Louisiana native teachers have priority over teachers from other states?
39. Do you plan to teach your students about Louisiana's unique varieties of French? How so?

Beliefs about the future of French in Louisiana

40. Do you believe that French/English bilingualism in Louisiana will become very common in the future? Why?
41. How do you think society would benefit from having a large community of French/English bilinguals in Louisiana?

42. If your students become fluent in French, what role would you like to see the language playing in their daily lives?
43. In an ideal world, in what areas of daily life should French be present for the average person in Louisiana?
44. Do you believe that future generations in Louisiana will pass French on to their children at home? Why?

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS BY IDEOLOGY

	Aspects of Linguistic	Questions to elicit data
1	French is not as important as other languages because it is not useful.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you think it is important to know more than one language? • Why do you think most people (in America) don't learn a second language? • Do you think that it is more important for Louisiana's children to know French more than another language like Spanish? Why? • Do you believe it is more important for students to know English than French? Why? • Do you believe it is more or less important for French children to know English than Louisiana's children to know French?
2	French language use is only a symbolic marker of identity not practical for daily life.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you think most people in Louisiana don't make an effort to learn French and make sure their children learn French? • Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to be from Louisiana? Why? • Do you believe it is more important for students in Louisiana to know French than students in other states? Why? • What do you think Louisiana's students have to gain by learning French?
3	The government of Louisiana has a responsibility to promote and preserve French because of its francophone heritage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you believe that French should have the same place in education all over the state or should it vary depending on the region? Why? • Do you see the standardized variety of French in most text books as a threat to

		<p>Louisiana's native varieties of French? Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you believe the government has a responsibility to promote French? • If you were given complete control of education in Louisiana, what would you change with respect to the teaching of French? • If you were in a position of power like the governor what would you do promote French in Louisiana outside of schools? • Do you think it is important for French teachers in Louisiana to have French ancestry? Why? • How do you feel about the importation of French Immersion teachers from other countries? • Do you plan to teach your students about Louisiana's unique varieties of French? How so?
4	The survival of French in Louisiana depends on economic usefulness rather than on inter-generational mother-tongue transmission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you believe that French/English bilingualism in Louisiana will become very common in the future? Why? • How do you think society would benefit from having a large community of French/English bilinguals in Louisiana? • If your students become fluent in French, what role would you like to see the language playing in their daily lives? • In an ideal world, in what areas of daily life should French be present for the average person in Louisiana? • Do you believe that future generations in Louisiana will pass French on to their children at home? Why?

APPENDIX C: CODING SHEETS

<u>Interview Subject</u>			
Age			
Places lived: 1 lived outside LA 2 never lived outside LA			
Parents from: 1 Both from LA 2 One from outside LA 3 Both from outside LA			
Socio-economic status: 1 No parent degree 2 One parent degree 3 Both parents degrees 4 One parent adv. degree 5 Both parents adv. degree			
Self-reported Social class background: 1 Wealthy 2 Middle-Class 3 Working-Class			
LA Ethnicity: 1 French 2 Cajun 3 Creole 4 None			
Define Cajun/Creole: 1 People who speak Cajun/Creole French 2 People who have Cajun/Creole ancestry 3 Other(Not including language) 4 Other (Including language)			
Family who speaks French: 1 none 2 distant relatives 3 One parent 4 Both parents			
Childhood exposure to French: 1 none 2 heard occasionally 3 heard regularly			

4 heard daily			
Currently use French outside of class: 1 never 2 sometimes 3 daily			
Visited a Francophone region: 1 never 2 one time 3 a few times 4 many times			
Personal opinion how they learned French: 1 home 2 primary education 3 college 4 other country 5 Admin (doesn't speak)			
Places studied French: 1 college only 2 elementary/middle school 3 high school only 4 multiple primary education			
Foreign education: 1 none 2 short overseas 3 semester overseas 4 year/s overseas			
Why they decided to study French: 1 liked their teachers 2 liked language/s 3 family/heritage			
Why they decided to teach French: 1 inspired by teachers 2 like teaching 3 to preserve French in LA			
What age they want to teach: 1 elementary 2 middle 3 high 4 any/not sure			
Would they teach in an immersion school: 1 no 2 open to it 3 prefer it			

Admin: How did the program come to be: 1 I founded it 2 I inherited it from decades ago 3 I inherited a recently started program			
Admin: What changes would you make to the program: 1 More stability of teachers 2 More resources in French 3 Teachers who speak better English 4 More curriculum Flexibility 5 Other:			

<u>Interview Subject/interview location</u>			
Why foreign languages are important: 1 Freedom of communication 2 Being well-rounded/cognitive benefits 3 Job/opportunities 4 combination			
Reason for American monolingualism: 1 lack of motivation 2 pride/nationalism 3 laziness 4 combination of these 5 poor US education system 6 don't know			
Importance of French for LA children as opposed to other languages: 1 not more important 2 part of their heritage 3 language maintenance			
Is English more important for LA students than French: 1 Yes for practical reasons 2 No it's ok for LA students to be different			
Is it more important for French students to learn English than LA students to learn French: 1 Yes English is more practical 2 No English doesn't need any help 3 Equally important			
Why people in LA don't study French: 1 French isn't useful 2 French has a negative stigma 3 both 4 Other			

Should LA French teachers be native to LA: 1 No, it doesn't matter 2 No, foreign teachers are better 3 Yes, native teachers would be better			
Is French more important for LA than for other states: 1 Yes, for heritage reasons 2 No			
How does French benefit LA students: 1 They learn about their heritage 2 Beneficial for cultural/economic development 3 Both			
Should French have equal importance in all parts of the state: 1 No, more in Acadiana/South 2 Yes, shared heritage 3 Yes, it's better for education			
Is Standard French a threat to LA varieties: 1 Not at all 2 Somewhat but SF is more practical 3 Yes			
Does the government have a responsibility to promote French: 1 Yes, a major responsibility 2 No they don't have to			
How would you change LA French education: 1 better materials/curriculum 2 more funding for CODOFIL, etc. 3 start younger 4 FSL programs more widely available 5 more immersion programs available 6 Other:			
How should the government promote French outside of schools: 1 Not at all/it should be grassroots 2 More French cultural activities (fairs, camps, media, etc.) 3 More govt./public use signage/forms, etc			
Do LA culture/music festivals inspire people to learn French: 1 No 2 Perhaps somewhat 3 Very much			
Do French teachers need to have French ancestry:			

1 No it doesn't matter 2 Yes			
Should immersion teachers be brought from overseas: 1 As long as US candidates have priority 2 It's nice to have variety 3 It's preferable 4 It's necessary			
Should teachers from LA have job preference over Americans from other states: 1 Yes 2 No			
Will you teach/Do your teachers teach LA varieties of French in you class: 1 a little about the history 2 point out a few differences/vocabulary 3 No/Not sure			
Will French/English bilingualism increase in LA in the future: 1 No, people who learn French want to leave 2 No, too much pressure from American culture 3 No, Spanish will surpass it 4 Not sure 5 Yes			
What are the benefits to society of having French in Louisiana: 1 Attract francophone tourism/business 2 Attract American tourism 3 Improve quality of education 4 More culturally aware citizens 5 Both 1&2 6 Both 1&3			
Where should your students use French daily: 1 Job 2 Family 3 both 1&2 4 travel/enrichment activities 5 both 1&4			
Where should everyone encounter French in LA daily life: 1 ubiquitous like English 2 home 3 signage/products/menus 4 Not everybody needs to see it			

<p>Will French survive in the home in LA:</p> <p>1 Yes, interest is growing</p> <p>2 not likely</p> <p>3 Yes, if French education/incentives expand</p>			
---	--	--	--

APPENDIX D: IRB APPROVAL

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/ projects using living humans as subjects, or samples, or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.



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

-- Applicant, Please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-F, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please submit two copies of the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at <http://research.lsu.edu/CompliancePoliciesProcedures/InstitutionalReviewBoard%28IRB%29/item24737.html>

-- A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:

(A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of parts B thru F.

(B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1&2)

(C) Copies of all instruments to be used.

*If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.

(D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)

(E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (<http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>)

(F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: (<http://research.lsu.edu/files/item26774.pdf>)

1) Principal Investigator:

Rank:

Dept:

Ph:

E-mail:

2) Co Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each
*If student, please identify and name supervising professor in this space

IRB#	<u>E7035</u>	LSU Proposal #
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Complete Application	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Human Subjects Training	

3) Project Title:

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 10/17/2015

4) Proposal? (yes or no)

If Yes, LSU Proposal Number

Also, if YES, either

☐ This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant

OR

☐ More IRB Applications will be filed later

5) Subject pool (e.g. Psychology students)

*Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

6) PI Signature

Date (no per signatures)

** I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changes, I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for three years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Screening Committee Action:	Exempted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Exempted <input type="checkbox"/>	Category/Paragraph <u>2</u>
Signed Consent Waived?:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes / No		
Reviewer	<u>Mathews</u>	Signature	<u>Robert C Mathews</u>
		Date	<u>10/18/12</u>

Informed Consent Form

study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 10/17/2015

1. Working Study Title: Who teaches French in Louisiana?
2. Performance Sites: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, The University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Nicholls State University, Tulane University
3. Investigators: Albert Camp
Department of French Studies
Louisiana State University
416 Hodges Hall
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
(225) 578-0452
acamp2@lsu.edu
4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research project is to create an accurate socio-cultural description of Louisiana residents who desire to teach French in Louisiana.
5. Subject Inclusion: Individuals over the age of 18 who desire to French or some other material through the medium of French in Louisiana. Additionally individuals over the age of 18 who work in an administrative capacity to facilitate the teaching of French in Louisiana.
6. Maximum Number of Subjects: 30
7. Study Procedures: The study will be conducted through individual oral interviews. The interviews will last less than one hour. There will be a video recording made for each interview.
8. Benefits: The study may provide valuable data for the French-speaking community of Louisiana and particularly for those who work to spread the teaching and usage of French in Louisiana.
9. Risks: There is no known risk associated with this study. No sensitive data will be collected, and all data collected will be kept completely confidential. Only the primary investigator will have access to the videos of the interviews which will never be stored in a public location.
10. Right to refuse: Participation in this study is completely voluntary and subjects may change their mind and withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.
11. Privacy: Results of the study may be published as either partial or whole transcriptions of the interviews, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.
12. Financial Information: Participation in this study is completely voluntary and there will be no compensation financial or otherwise.
13. Signatures:

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding the study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form.

Subject Signature: _____ Date: _____

VITA

Albert Camp studied linguistics at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia then at Moody Bible Institute in Chicago where he graduated *cum laude* in 2006. He received a Master of Arts in French linguistics at Louisiana State University in 2010. He continued his study of linguistics in the Department of French Studies as well as several other departments at Louisiana State University through the inter-departmental program in linguistics.

He has taught numerous French language courses as well as courses in linguistics in both the French and English departments at Louisiana State University. In the fall of 2015 he will begin working as an instructor of English as a second language in the Department of English at Louisiana State University. His research interests include: language contact, language shift, language revitalization, linguistic ideology, phonetics, phonology, syntax, historical linguistics, corpus linguistics, and immersion education.