

SOCIOLINGUISTICS II
LING 4/533, ANTH 433

Winter 2019

Instructor: Betsy Evans

Office: 415D Guggenheim Hall

Email: evansbe@uw.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course aims to do two things: to continue to build familiarity with the classic literature in sociolinguistics and to learn how sociolinguistic research and sociolinguistic theory have an impact on the methods of data collection and analysis.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Students will:

- Analyze linguistic theory they already know in terms of the impact of social categories such as identity, socio-economic status, and group solidarity on language.
- Identify the basic principles of sociolinguistic theory and sociolinguistic variables
- Identify and critique current debates and methodology surrounding sociolinguistics
- Recognize key features in the design and collection of sociolinguistic research

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Texts

Readings are provided on the course website.

All reading assignments are expected to be completed before class the day they are indicated on the syllabus. Class discussions and writing assignments will draw directly from reading assignments.

In order to guide your reading, I ask that you identify two questions/reactions you have about the reading(s) and be prepared to discuss them with the class.

Assessment of learning

Grades are based on the following point accumulations:

65% Writing assignments

35% Research proposal

Please note that late assignments are only acceptable with documentation of a university sanctioned excuse. You must contact me as soon as you know you have a conflict with the due date of an assignment.

The following UW grading scale will be used
(www.washington.edu/students/gencat/front/Grading_Sys.html):

Percent = Grade

≥ 95% = 4.0	88 = 3.3	81 = 2.6	74 = 1.9	67 = 1.2
94 = 3.9	87 = 3.2	80 = 2.5	73 = 1.8	66 = 1.1
93 = 3.8	86 = 3.1	79 = 2.4	72 = 1.7	65 = 1.0
92 = 3.7	85 = 3.0	78 = 2.3	71 = 1.6	64 = .9
91 = 3.6	84 = 2.9	77 = 2.2	70 = 1.5	63 = .8
90 = 3.5	83 = 2.8	76 = 2.1	69 = 1.4	62 = .7
89 = 3.4	82 = 2.7	75 = 2.0	68 = 1.3	<.7=failing

Graduate students

While undergraduate and graduate students are enrolled together in this course and complete the same assignments, graduate students' work should reflect the higher level of scholarship expected of graduate students and will be graded with this additional expectation.

COURSE POLICIES

Course prerequisites: Students enrolled in this course must have taken LING 4/532.

Disability accommodation: It is my goal to insure that our learning environment is accessible to everyone. If you have a learning or other disability that requires accommodation, please contact me or Disability Resources for Students (DRS) in order to make suitable arrangements (011 Mary Gates, 206-543-8924 (Voice & Relay), uwdrs@uw.edu).

Academic integrity: Students are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic ethics, honesty and integrity. Academic misconduct includes (but is not limited to) plagiarism, harassment, cheating, or representing another person's work as your own and will not be tolerated. It is your responsibility to read and understand the University's expectations in this regard (which you can find online at <http://depts.washington.edu/grading/pdf/AcademicResponsibility.pdf>). Any student found to be in violation of proper academic conduct will be dealt with in the strictest manner in accordance with University policy.

Email: I will attempt to respond to email inquiries within 24 hours (excepting weekends and holidays).

Student responsibilities:

1. If you must miss a lecture or a section **it is your responsibility to obtain the information you missed.**
2. The assignment dates are not negotiable excepting for a university-sanctioned absence. Please see the University Handbook on excused absences.

Laptop computers:

1. Laptop computers may be used in class only for note-taking.
2. A student who is doing non-class related activities on his or her computer is not only hurting their own education, but possibly the educational experience of many others in the class: research has shown that a game or a picture on a laptop distracts not only the student using the computer but also those students nearby (Yamamoto 2007, Fried 2008). Therefore the use of laptops for non-class activity (e.g. email, games, web-surfing) is prohibited. Students using their laptop for non-class activity will be asked to turn off their laptop.

STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS

1. The most successful students in this course:
 - Attend every class meeting
 - Prepare readings and questions in advance of lectures
 - Expand on their learning by participating in class discussions
 - Prepare writing assignments thoughtfully and include connections made to prior knowledge, connections to other texts, other content areas, etc.
 - Form study groups to enhance their learning

LECTURES AND ASSIGNMENTS* LING 4/533

For each reading assignment, please identify two questions/reactions you have about the assigned reading(s) and be prepared to discuss them with the class.

Week	Date	Topic	Assignments
1	Jan 8	Introduction: Sociolinguistics as a discipline	Milroy & Gordon: Sociolinguistics Models and Methods
	Jan 10	Choosing a sociolinguistic topic	Tagliamonte 2012 Sociolinguistics as Language Variation and Change
2	Jan 15	Literature search and use	Eckert 2012: Three waves of variation study Sunderland 2010: Research questions in linguistics
	Jan 16		Assignment 1: Identifying a linguistic variable due
	Jan 17		Hart 1998: Reviewing the Research Imagination Discussion of literature search results: be prepared to discuss the articles you found
3	Jan 22	Quantitative methodology	Tagliamonte 2007: Quantitative analysis
	Jan 23		Assignment 2: Reviewing the Literature due
	Jan 24		Eckert 2014: The problem with binaries Lambert et al 1960: Evaluational reactions to spoken languages
4	Jan 29		Bailey 2018: Emerging from below the social radar Quelhas et al. 2011
	Jan 30		Assignment 3: Choosing a variable and Operationalizing the variable due
	Jan 31		Johnstone 2004: Place, Globalization, and Linguistic Variation
5	Feb 5	Qualitative methodology	Johnstone 2000: Standards of Evidence Jaworski and Coupland 2006: Perspectives on discourse analysis
	Feb 6		Assignment 4: Questionnaire design due
	Feb 7		Preston 2010: Variation in language regard Bauer 2000: Classical Content Analysis

6	Feb 12		Labov, W. 1984. Field Methods
	Feb 13		Assignment 5: Qualitative analysis due
	Feb 14	Ethics	Wolfram, Reaser & Vaughn 2008 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's <i>Belmont Report</i>
7	Feb 19		Nevalainen 2014: Sociohistorical analysis
	Feb 20		Assignment 6: Ethical issues and human subjects review due
	Feb 21		TBA
8	Feb 26	Abstract writing	Hart 1998: Organizing and expressing ideas
	Feb 28		
	Mar 1		Assignment 7: Articulating the problem and research question due
9	Mar 4		Draft of abstract for projects due
	Mar 5		
	Mar 6		Peer feedback on abstracts for projects due
	Mar 7		
10	Mar 12	Presentation of and feedback on Research proposals	Assignment 8: Final Abstract due
	Mar 14	Presentation of and feedback on Research proposals	
Finals week	March 19	Research proposals due	Research Proposal due (by 12:00 noon)

*While we will strive to maintain the schedule as it stands here, we may need to adjust dates/assignments according to the needs of the class.

REFERENCES FOR REQUIRED READINGS

Below are references for required readings found in on the Canvas course website.

- Bailey, G. 2018. Emerging from below the social radar: Incipient evaluation in the North West of England. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 1-26.
- Bauer, M. 2000. Classical Content Analysis. In M. Bauer and G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook for Social Research* (pp.131-151). London: Sage.
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. April 18,1979. <<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/belmont.html> >
- Eckert, P. 2012. Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual review of Anthropology*, 41, 87-100.
- Eckert, P. 2014. The problem with binaries: Coding for gender and sexuality. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 8(11), 529-535.
- Hart, C. 1998. Reviewing the Research Imagination. In Hart, C. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. Los Angeles: SAGE. Pp. 26-43.
- Hart, C. 1998. Organizing and expressing ideas. In Hart, C. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. Los Angeles: SAGE. Pp. 109-141.
- Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. 2006: Perspectives on discourse analysis. In Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. (Eds.) *The Discourse Reader*. Pp 1-37.
- Johnstone, B. 2000. Standards of Evidence. In B. Johnstone, *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. (pp. 59-68). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johnstone, B. 2004. Place, globalization, and linguistic variation. In Fought, C. (Ed.) *Sociolinguistic variation: Critical reflections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. -pp. 65-83.
- Labov, W. 1984. Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In . Baugh and J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Language in Use* (28-53). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., and Fillenbaum, S. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60:44-51.
- Milroy, L. and Gordon, M. 2003. Sociolinguistics: Models and Methods. In. Milroy, L and Gordon, M, *Sociolinguistics: Methods and Interpretation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 1-19.
- Nevalainen, T. 2014. Sociohistorical Analysis. In Holmes, J. and Hazen, K. (Eds.) *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Pp 93-106.
- Preston, D. R. 2010. Variation in language regard. In: Zeigler, E., Gilles, P., Scharloth, J. (Eds.), *Variatio Delectat: Empirische Evidenzen und theoretische Passungen sprachlicher Variation (für Klaus J. Mattheier zum 65. Geburtstag)*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Wien, pp. 7--27.

- Quelhas, A., Santos, A., Araújo, B., Silva, C., Marques, C., Oliveira, C., Marafona, J.C., Gonçalves, L., Sousa, L., Sanhá, M. and Costa, R. 2011. *Biases in questionnaire construction: how much do they influence the answers given?*. [research report]
Retrieved from:
http://medicina.med.up.pt/im/trabalhos_10_11/Sites/Turma21/Protocolo%20Final.pdf.
- Sunderland, Jane. 2010. Research Questions in Linguistics. L. Litosseliti (ed.), *Research methods in linguistics*. London: Continuum, pp. 9 - 28.
- Tagliamonte, S. 2007. Quantitative Analysis. In Bayley, R. and Lucas, C. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic Variation: Theories, Methods, and Applications* (pp 190-214). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tagliamonte, S. 2012. Sociolinguistics as language variation and change. In Tagliamonte, S., *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change Observation Interpretation*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.1-22.
- Wolfram, W., Reaser, J., & Vaughn, C. 2008. Operationalizing Linguistic Gratuity: From Principle to Practice. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2, 6, 1109-1134.

SOCIOLINGUISTICS II
 LING 4/533
 Grading criteria for Assignments

<p>Outstanding (3.7-4.0) (92-95)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes all the qualities associated with a “Strong” answer • Offers a very highly proficient demonstration and insight of the concepts/theories associated with the task, including some creativity and/or consultation of sources beyond course material
<p>Strong (2.7-3.6) (82-91)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All aspects of the task addressed (for multiple part tasks) • Assignment shows a proficient understanding and insight of the concepts/theories associated with the task which could be further enhanced with revision
<p>Acceptable (1.7-2.6) (72-81)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment meets some of the “Strong” criteria but not all • Skills associated with the task are not fully demonstrated/realized and would benefit from significant revision
<p>Inadequate (.7-1.6) (62-71)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment does not meet any of the “Acceptable” criteria • Skills associated with the task are not adequately demonstrated and require substantial revision on multiple levels