## SOCIOLINGUISTICS II LING 4/533, ANTH 433

Fall 2020

Instructor: Betsy Evans Email: evansbe@uw.edu

#### **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course aims to do two things: to continue to build familiarity with key frameworks 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 research methodology
- Identify and critique current debates and methodology surrounding sociolinguistics
- Recognize key features in the design and collection of sociolinguistic research

To achieve the learning objectives, students will select a linguistic phenomenon and create a proposal for research on that phenomenon. The final project for the course is the research proposal, which will be a culmination of writing assignments on various methodological challenges throughout the quarter.

#### **COURSE COMPONENTS**

#### Texts

Readings are provided on the course website. Class discussions and writing assignments will draw directly from reading assignments.

# **Assessment of learning**

Grades are based on the following point accumulations:

65% Writing assignments

35% Research proposal

**Please note** that late assignments will be accepted only if discussed with me first. You must contact me <u>as soon as you know</u> 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 prerequisites: Students enrolled in this course must have taken LING 4/532.

## **COURSE ORGANIZATION**

This course is conducted completely online.

- **Lectures** on readings and additional topics are created with Panopto and uploaded to the Canvas website
- Office hours are conducted live with Zoom
- Readings are available on the Canvas website 'Modules'
- Assignments are uploaded to the Canvas website
- **Discussion board** is a forum for raising questions and connecting with students and the instructor
- Study groups can be created using the Canvas 'Conferences' tool

**Disability Accommodation:** It is my goal to insure that our learning environment is accessible to everyone. If you have a learning disability or other circumstance that requires accommodation, please contact me or Disability Resources for Students in order to make suitable arrangements (011 Mary Gates Hall, <a href="mailto:uwdrs@uw.edu">uwdrs@uw.edu</a>, 206-543-8924 (Voice & Relay), 206-616-8379 (Fax)).

**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 <a href="http://depts.washington.edu/grading/pdf/AcademicResponsibility.pdf">http://depts.washington.edu/grading/pdf/AcademicResponsibility.pdf</a>). 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).

#### STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS

The most successful students in this course:

- Read reading assignments carefully
- Prepare writing assignments thoughtfully and include connections made to prior knowledge, connections to texts, content areas, etc beyond LING 4/533 course content.
- Form study groups to enhance their learning

# **LECTURES AND ASSIGNMENTS\* LING 4/533**

| Week | Date           | Topic   | Assignments  |
|------|----------------|---|--|
| 1    | Wed<br>Sept 30 | What is Sociolinguistics? What is research?                         | Eckert 2016: Variation, meaning & social change<br>Tagliamonte 2012 Sociolinguistics as Language<br>Variation and Change                         |
|      |                |   | Sunderland 2010: Research questions in linguistics supplemental: Milroy & Gordon: Sociolinguistics Models and Methods                            |
| 2    | Mon oct<br>5   | Choosing a sociolinguistic research topic Literature search and use | Hart 1998: Reviewing the Research Imagination Feldt 2010 Guest lecture: Dan Mandeville, UW Linguistics Librarian                                 |
|      | Wed Oct        |   |  |
|      | Fri oct 9      |   | Assignment 1: Identifying a linguistic variable due  |
| 3    | Mon oct<br>12  | Ethics in research Planning data collection: sampling               | Wolfram, Reaser & Vaughn 2008 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Belmont Report UW Human subjects Division Introduction (video link) |
|      | Wed oct<br>14  |   | Charity Hudley 2017: Language and racialization Eckert 2014: The problem with binaries   |
|      | Fri Oct<br>16  |   | Assignment 2: Reviewing the Literature due   |
| 4    | Mon oct<br>19  | Planning data collection:<br>Operationalization of variables        | Tagliamonte 2007: Quantitative analysis  |
|      | Wed Oct<br>21  |   |  |
|      | Fri oct<br>23  |   | Assignment 3: Choosing a variable and Operationalizing the variable due  |
| 5    | Mon Oct<br>26  | Planning data collection: interviews, surveys, corpora              | Labov 1984: Field methods<br>Choi 2005<br>Lambert et al 1960: Evaluational reactions to spoken<br>languages                                      |
|      | Fri Oct<br>30  |   |  |

| 6      | Mon                | Planning data collection:                          | Nevalainen 2014: Sociohistorical analysis   |
|--------|--------------------|--|---|
|        | Nov 2              | interviews, surveys, corpora                       |   |
|        | Wed                |  |   |
|        | Nov 4              |  |   |
|        | Fri nov 6          |  | Assignment 4: Questionnaire design due  |
| 7      | Mon<br>Nov 9       | Planning data analysis: qualitative & quantitative | Preston 2010: Variation in language regard Bauer 2000: Classical Content Analysis |
|        | 1101 0             | strategies   | Johnstone 2000: Standards of Evidence   |
|        |                    |  | Jaworski and Coupland 2006: Perspectives on discourse analysis                    |
|        | Wed<br>Nov 11      | Veteran's Day uni closed                           | Assignment 5: Articulating the problem and research question due                  |
|        | Fri Nov<br>13      |  |   |
| 8      | Mon<br>Nov 16      | Abstract writing                                   | Hart 1998: Organizing and expressing ideas Assignment 6: Qualitative analysis due |
|        | Wed<br>Nov 18      |  |   |
|        | Fri Nov<br>20      |  | Assignment 7: Ethical issues and human subjects review due                        |
| 9      | Mon                | Peer review  | Draft of abstract of project for peer review d ue                                 |
|        | Nov 23             | Proposal writing                                   |   |
|        | Wed                |  | Peer feedback on abstracts for projects due                                       |
|        | Nov 25             |  |   |
|        | Thurs              | THANKSGIVING BREAK                                 |   |
|        | Nov 26,<br>Fri Nov |  |   |
|        | 27                 |  |   |
| 10     | Mon<br>Nov 30      | Proposal writing                                   |   |
|        | Tues               |  | Assignment 8: Final Abstract  |
|        | dec 1              |  | Assignment of Final Abstract  |
|        | Wed                |  |   |
|        | Dec 2              |  |   |
| 11     | Mon<br>Dec 7       | Proposal writing                                   | Submit draft of proposal for Peer review  |
|        | Wed                |  | Peer review due   |
|        |                    |  |   |
| Finals | Dec 9  Dec 12-     | Research proposals due                             | Research Proposal due (by 5:30PM)   |

<sup>\*</sup>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.

- Bauer, M. 2000. Classical Content Analysis. In M. Bauer and G. Gaskill (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook for Social Research*
- Charity Hudley, A. H. 2017. Language and racialization. *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society. Oxford, UK: Oxford Handbooks.* (pp.131-151). London: Sage.
- Choi B., Pak A. 2005. A catalog of biases in questionnaires. *Preventing Chronic Disease: Public Health Research, Practice, and Policy*, 2(1) 1-13. <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2005/jan/04\_0050.htm">http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2005/jan/04\_0050.htm</a>
- Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. April 18,1979. <a href="http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/belmont.html">http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/policy/belmont.html</a> >
- 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.
- Labov, W. 1984. Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation. In J. 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.
- Sunderland, J. 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.

| Outstanding<br>(3.7-4.0)<br>(92-95) | <ul> <li>Includes all the qualities associated with a "Strong" answer</li> <li>Submission demonstrates significant understanding of the concepts/readings associated with the task, including some creativity and/or consultation of sources beyond course material</li> </ul> |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Strong</b> (2.7-3.6) (82-91)     | <ul> <li>All aspects of the task addressed (for multiple part tasks)</li> <li>Submission shows a proficient understanding of the concepts/readings associated with the task which could be further enhanced with revision.</li> </ul>  |
| Acceptable<br>(1.7-2.6)<br>(72-81)  | <ul> <li>Submission meets some of the "Strong" criteria but not all</li> <li>Understanding of concepts/readings associated with the task are not fully demonstrated/realized and would benefit from significant revision</li> </ul>  |
| Inadequate<br>(.7-1.6)<br>(62-71)   | <ul> <li>Submission does not meet any of the "Acceptable" criteria</li> <li>Understanding of concepts/readings associated with the task are not adequately demonstrated and require substantial revision on multiple levels</li> </ul>   |