

Interdisciplinary Applications of Sociolinguistic Frameworks and Methods

Marilyn Plumlee*

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Frameworks and Models in Sociolinguistics
3. Methods of Investigation in Sociolinguistics
4. Conclusion

1. Introduction

This paper attempts to extract pedagogical inspiration from the field of sociolinguistics which can be applied to the teaching of a variety of fields found in departments of English language, literature, translation and interpretation and general linguistics. I refer to these pedagogical applications of sociolinguistic methods as interdisciplinary applications, because the focus is primarily on applying them in subject areas not ostensibly devoted to sociolinguistic issues and in such a way that faculty members need not feel they must re-tool themselves as sociolinguists in order to make use of them.

The genesis of this paper lies in my own attempts to combat psychologically demotivating aspects in the learning of English as a

* College of English, Department of English Linguistics Hankuk University of Foreign Studies mariplum@yahoo.com

foreign language by employing investigative methodologies commonly practiced in sociolinguistics which awaken in students a sense of curiosity and excitement at the myriad aspects of language in actual use. It has been my experience teaching in a Korean university context that adopting the sociolinguistic perspective of analyzing language usage in actual social contexts can infuse virtually any language, literature or linguistics class with considerable relevance to our students. This approach can also fruitfully be applied to other classes, e.g. area studies, which take a more macro approach to social and political issues. Other secondary by-products are also likely to accrue. Students who actively participate in collecting language data and analyzing it for class projects are empowered to be more involved in the learning process in general and to take more responsibility for their own educational outcomes. Reflecting on applications of these methods for student projects and assignments may also directly benefit teaching faculty by suggesting alternative research approaches that could be employed in their fields of expertise.

This paper will focus primarily on sociolinguistic models and methods for use with students in Korea who are studying English or using English as a foreign language, with the limitations regarding access to communities of native speakers of any of the varieties of English which that entails. As only a brief overview can be provided here due to space limitations, I highly recommend that persons interested in developing their own sociolinguistically-based classroom practices peruse some of the excellent resource books available. An outstanding collection of articles covering numerous sociolinguistic issues which teachers might reasonably encounter in North America is contained in Sandra McKay and Nancy Hornberger's *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. The McKay and Hornberger volume is sprinkled with suggestions for awareness- and consciousness-raising activities for teachers and students at

various ages and educational levels and many of these could be adapted to the Korean context. Another highly recommended book is *Language Variation in North American English: Research and Teaching*, edited by Wayne Glowka and Donald Lance which, although written for use in the North American context, is a rich source of inspiration for students as well as more advanced researchers. For students based in Korea, the methods discussed in Glowka and Lance could be pedagogically exploited in conjunction with the detailed and up-to-date presentation of variation in American English presented in Finegan and Rickford's edited *Language in the USA*. Another valuable volume containing both theoretical background and practical ideas relating to language learners' development of discourse competence, based on a pragmatically-oriented and socially-situated conceptualization of language, is that of Marianne Celce-Murcia and Elite Oshtain, entitled *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*, based on Michael Canale and Merrill Swain's framework for communicative competence in second language learning. (See also Celce-Murcia "Discourse Analysis and Grammar Instruction" and Celce-Murcia "Discourse Analysis and the Teaching of Listening" for discussion of the use of a discourse analytic approach to the teaching of these skills.) Finally, a volume with a British orientation which is highly accessible to undergraduate students and which contains a rapid overview of many subfields of linguistics, including sociolinguistics, along with hundreds of suggestions for mostly short-term language research projects is *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*, co-authored by Alison Wray, Kate Trott and Aileen Bloomer.

The paper was born out of an increasingly acute dilemma. On the one hand, from the level of positive student response in terms of both involvement and accomplishment noted in classes where I have attempted to apply sociolinguistic methods through out-of-class

assignments and in-class activities, I've sensed that I'm "on to something" when inciting and inviting students to use sociolinguistic models and methods in a variety of language learning and language research tasks. On the other hand, I've sensed that the framework for these undertakings was somewhat muddled and diffuse, lacking focus. This lack of focus and explanatory power is partly due to the fact that the field itself lacks a central, unifying theory (See Coulmas, "Introduction" 3-6; Le Page, 31; Cameron "Demythologizing"), and partly due to the inherently multi-faceted nature of sociolinguistic inquiry. However, in order to be useful to students who are not on a career path in linguistics and for whom one brief exposure to sociolinguistic models and methods may be their only direct contact with the field, I felt there must be a way to synthesize the essence of the sociolinguistic agenda in a pedagogically useful manner without leading to excessive reductionism which would result in the elimination of the inherent but ever-so-interesting problems of the field, thus defeating the purpose of the endeavor altogether. This paper is a first attempt to resolve that dilemma.

Two major sections follow. In section two, I will review some of the major frameworks and models having currency in contemporary sociolinguistics. In section three, I will briefly summarize analytical approaches and some investigative methods frequently used in sociolinguistic research which can have immediate application to related fields. At the end of this section, I propose some specific pedagogical applications of the previously reviewed models and methods which can be applied to the study of English. These applications and approaches can be equally well applied to the study of other languages, including Korean, and to other subject areas such as communication and media studies, political science, and sociology, all fields where language is the vehicle used to convey and shape social relations. A brief conclusion to the paper is offered in section four.

By attending to socially- and contextually-situated language phenomena, by following lines of inquiry formulated by sociolinguists of various stripes, and by adapting investigative methodologies in widespread use in sociolinguistics, my contention is that students can be awakened not merely to general principles underlying language structure and language use, but, more generally, they can be inspired to take an active role in their own learning. Using sociolinguistic models and methods allows students to expand their study of language to encompass aspects of language use which extend far beyond conventional analyses of discrete language-specific grammatical points or broad linguistic theories. An added benefit for those who subscribe to or are intrigued by a socially-situated perspective of language analysis is that experimenting with applications of sociolinguistic models and methods in the classroom can infuse our teaching of language(s) and linguistics with a focus aligned with our own convictions, an approach which narrows the gap between classroom practices and research interests.

2. Frameworks and Models in Sociolinguistics

Since the main purpose of this paper is to provide an impetus for student-centered investigations which draw on sociolinguistic approaches and methods under the supervision of faculty who may not be trained in these approaches, a basic characterization of the field is called for. In broad terms, a confluence of three primary disciplines can be discerned as having formative influences on contemporary sociolinguistics: anthropology, historical linguistics, and sociology. Each of these fields has spawned different traditions of fundamental questions in sociolinguistic research. These traditions have been concerned with, respectively, the interaction and reflexivity

of the relationship between language and cultural practices, the origin and diffusion of linguistic sound changes over time, and the distribution of institutional and individual power and its mediation through language. The various fields of investigation most commonly treated by sociolinguists (see Appendix 1, Table 2. Principal topics included in widely-used English sociolinguistics textbooks and anthologies, 1970-2000) can all be traced to one or a combination of these three major research traditions.

The sociolinguistic framework adopted here places the role of language at the core of the human social experience. Sociolinguistics concerns itself with the study of relationships between language use and social structure and it distinguishes itself from “autonomous” or “theoretical linguistics” by its emphasis on analyzing the social embeddedness of language. As noted sociolinguist Florian Coulmas phrased it in his description of the contents of *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, the field of sociolinguistics can be seen as having two divisions: that which analyzes the social dimensions of language and that which analyzes the linguistic dimensions of society (back cover). He depicts sociolinguistics as “concerned with describing language use as a social phenomenon and, where possible, it attempts to establish causal links between language and society” (2). The applications of sociolinguistic methods and models suggested here thus reflect an approach which considers both the correlations and the reflexive relationship between language and society, in line with Coulmas’ identification of is commonly considered to be one of the major dichotomies in the field of sociolinguistics, that of the micro-sociolinguistic approach, which “investigates how social structure influences the way people talk and how language varieties and patterns of use correlate with social attributes such as class, sex, and age” and the macro-sociolinguistic approach, which “studies what societies do with their languages, that is, attitudes and attachments

that account for the functional distribution of speech forms in society, language shift, maintenance, and replacement, the delimitation and interaction of speech communities” (2). Coulmas notes, however, that “there is no sharp dividing line between the two, but a large area of common concern” and further, that “any rigid micro-macro compartmentalization seems quite contrived and unnecessary in the present state of knowledge about the complex interrelationships between social and linguistic structures. Contributions to a better understanding of language as a necessary condition and product of social life will continue to come from both quarters” (3). According to Coulmas, micro-issues are “more likely to be investigated by linguists, dialectologists, and others in language-centered fields, whereas macro-issues are more frequently taken up by sociologists and social psychologists”, but he notes further that “many questions can be investigated with equal justification within micro- or macro-sociolinguistics” (2).

In one of the early attempts to delineate the scope of the field and to differentiate it from related fields, Carol Eastman, in her book *Aspects of Language and Culture*, provided a useful contrast between the study of language and culture, defined as the study of “thought, cognition, or meaning”, with sociolinguistics, which “looks outward to examine the social context in which linguistic and cultural activity occurs” (113). Reflecting sociolinguistics' early debt to Joshua Fishman's work in the sociology of language, Eastman attributes to him the claim that the sociolinguistic domain of inquiry is the “patterned co-variation of language and society” (113). Eastman also notes Fishman's observation that “sociolinguistics is the only discipline concerned with language in its behavioral context” (*Aspects* 113, referring to Fishman 5-13). Eastman notes that in addition to Fishman's sociologically-oriented delineation of the field, which generally concerns itself with macro-level phenomena such as

language policies, language birth (e.g., pidgins and creoles), language socialization, language loss and death, the field has also been significantly shaped by the perspective taken by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes, a perspective more deeply rooted in the anthropological tradition and which considers that the scope of sociolinguistics is the study of factors affecting or reflecting “communicative competence”, famously defined as “what a speaker needs to know to communicate effectively in culturally significant settings” (qtd in Eastman *Aspects* 113). According to Eastman, Gumperz and Hymes' view of the scope of inquiry of sociolinguistics is “the appropriateness of verbal messages in context or their acceptability in the broader sense” (*Aspects* 113). Eastman also notes the pioneering influence of early scholars such as Uriel Weinreich, of Columbia University, and the productive research team of Uriel Weinreich, William Labov and Marvin Herzog, working in the tradition of historical linguistics which concerned itself with sound changes. Each of these scholars, collectively and individually, contributed significantly to opening up the consideration of dialect variation, bilingualism and language contact phenomena as socially-constituted linguistic phenomena having the potential to shed light on fundamental questions regarding the properties of language, by virtue of the fact that such phenomena display regular patterns.

Any introduction to sociolinguistics must include mention of the seminal work of William Labov and the nature of his influence on the field of sociolinguistics. Emanating from his then-unique and far-sighted commitment to “socially realistic linguistics” Labov (see Labov “Social Stratification”; Labov *Sociolinguistic Patterns*; Labov “Transformation”; Labov “Study of Language”; Labov *Principles*) pioneered new field research methodologies, which led to the collection of large amounts of urban dialect data, the analysis of which ultimately garnered academic respectability for the field of

sociolinguistics and its field-based methodologies in the face of the dominant paradigm, which was based on introspective insights. The measure of Labov's impact can be taken if one considers the groundbreaking efforts he made in the face of the dominant linguistic ideologies at the time he began his work in the 1960s, described in the following terms:

The early projects that I constructed were 'essays in experimental linguistics,' carried out in ordinary social settings. My aim was to avoid the inevitable obscurity of texts, the self-consciousness of formal elicitations, and the self-deception of introspection....A simple review of the literature might have convinced me that such empirical principles had no place in linguistics: there were many ideological barriers to the study of language in everyday life. First, Saussure had enunciated the principle that structural systems of the present and historical changes of the past had to be studied in isolation...The second ideological barrier explicitly asserted that sound change could not in principle be directly observed...The empirical study of linguistic change was ...removed from the program of 20th-century linguistics. A third restriction was perhaps the most important: free variation could not in principle be constrained...Relations of *more* or *less* were...ruled out of linguistic thinking: a form or a rule could only occur always, optionally, or never. The internal structure of variation was therefore removed from linguistic studies and with it, the study of change in progress. It was also held that feelings about language were inaccessible and outside of the linguist's scope...The social evaluation of linguistic variants was therefore excluded from consideration (Introduction, *Sociolinguistic Patterns* xiii-xiv; qtd. in Coupland and Jaworski 23-24).

In his subsequent work, not only did Labov amass significant amounts of urban dialect data bearing on the questions of the

directions and social motivations of contemporary sound changes in progress, but most importantly for the garnering of respectability for the overall sociolinguistic research endeavor, he demonstrated that such socially-motivated changes display regularity, a claim essentially deemed impossible to support prior to his work. Labov also brought sociolinguistics into the public consciousness by demonstrating that research into sociolinguistic variables¹ can have practical relevance to society. He achieved this by demonstrating to educators that regular linguistic patterns can be discerned in the speech of speakers of non-standard dialects (Labov et al; Labov and Harris “De Facto”; Labov and Harris “Addressing”). In so doing, he contributed significantly to society’s awareness of sources of educational handicaps, an awareness which ultimately led to at least one landmark legal decision (e.g., the 1979 *Ann Arbor* case), a decision which is still having repercussions on educational policies in the United States with respect to speakers of the African-American Vernacular English dialect. (For details of the *Ann Arbor* case, see, *inter alia*, Cameron et al.; Wiley 132-133; Labov “Objectivity”.)

More than any other single figure, with the possible exception of Hymes, Labov has also had the most impact on the methodologies now widely adopted and adapted for the gathering of data for all types of sociolinguistic inquiries, pioneering methods for the gathering of socially stratified linguistic variables and making explicit the concept of the observer's paradox.

2.1 Dominant Models

The essential questions posed by scholars such as Weinreich,

¹ A sociolinguistic variable was defined by Labov as “one which is correlated with some non-linguistic variable of the social context: of the speaker, the addressee, the audience, the setting, etc.” (“Transformation” 188).

Fishman, Gumperz, Hymes, and Labov significantly framed the field of sociolinguistics for a generation of researchers, situating it at the confluence of linguistics, anthropology, and sociology. In Nikolas Coupland and Adam Jaworski's terms, sociolinguistics is now conceived as “the study of language in its social contexts and the study of social life through linguistics” (1). They see the field, which they describe as “probably the most active but also the most diverse area of contemporary language studies” as lying “at the intersection of linguistics, sociology and social theory, social psychology, and human communication studies” (1).

While healthy critiques of old paradigms emerge and new research directions continue to evolve (areas falling within the interactional sociolinguistic approach being among the most flourishing, as exemplified by the work of Elinor Ochs, Emanuel Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson in their edited collection of studies devoted to interactional grammar, and by that of Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, in their edited volume containing studies of the interactionally-conditioned uses of prosody), nowadays the extant sociolinguistic research is most commonly divided into macro-level approaches vs. micro-level approaches, although there is unavoidable overlap in these categories, as discussed above. (See, *inter alia*, Coulmas; McKay and Hornberger x; Newmeyer 2-4 for fuller treatments of this dichotomy.)

Enumerated below are some of the major topics, organized within this dichotomy of macro- and micro-level approaches, which I have found most suitable for generating projects designed to enhance general language awareness and which can be handled by students of general academic English who have no prior training in linguistics or linguistic research methodology.

Grouped under the macro-level approaches are those studies which focus on language issues at the societal level, including,

obviously, language planning and language policies, as well as applications of sociolinguistic inquiry to educational problems, social policy, and the maintenance and loss of heritage languages in multilingual societies. When language phenomena and issues of social justice intersect, e.g., in the consideration of legal ramifications of access to the language(s) of the establishment as in the above-cited *Ann Arbor* case, these, too, would be considered macro-level studies. Macro-level approaches also include issues of language socialization, the acquisition of communicative competence, interethnic relations and language attitudes, as well as the establishment of social networks and their relation to the diffusion of sound changes.

The study of pidginization and creolization processes should also arguably be placed under macro-level approaches, since these processes clearly reflect processes of affecting social aggregates and speech community norms, but many scholars classify pidgin and creole studies as belonging to micro-level approaches, since the linguistic processes themselves operate at the individual level and are usually studied at this level as well.

Also somewhat ambiguously categorized as micro-level approaches are the dialect studies which focus on linguistic variation and change, as well as the rapidly expanding body of work which examines individual social and identity factors such as age and gender. Examples of research projects related to these general sociolinguistics topics for Korea-based students will be provided in section three, below.

2.2 Sociolinguistic Theories: A Work in Progress

While the (essentially Labovian) research paradigm searching for regularity in variation and sound change, the erecting of a dichotomy between micro- and macro-level approaches to the study of language,

or the tracing of research traditions to their origins in sociology, anthropology, psychology or other fields may be useful heuristics to orient students to the field, one major problematic consideration remains, and that is the fact that the field as a whole lacks a unified theory with sufficient explanatory power to predict the seemingly infinite variations in language phenomenon. (See Coulmas 3-6 for a critical discussion of the sources and ramifications of this lack of a single theory in sociolinguistics and for an account of the fundamental flaw of linguistics in refusing to account for language variation data in its theory of language.) The lack of an explanatory theory in sociolinguistics may provide additional impetus for some scholars in their research, but for students it proves disconcerting, not only from an intellectual point of view, but also because it is contrary to the majority of their prior educational experiences where their pursuit of knowledge was a pursuit of learning established facts. Sociolinguistic inquiry, on the other hand, is essentially a continual quest to uncover changes in progress, to bring to light new, heretofore unnoticed phenomena, to confirm or disprove trends noted in comparable but different socio-cultural circumstances. The differences between this discovery approach and students' prior educational experiences needs to be explicitly pointed out before they embark on any sociolinguistically-oriented research undertaking. The lack of an explanatory theory does have the merit, however, of providing a backdrop against which students can be encouraged to formulate grounded hypotheses. It is also, perhaps, the very sense of being on the cutting edge, the sense of "treading where no one has tread before" which appeals to students as they become acquainted with sociolinguistic questions and methods of inquiry.

Deborah Cameron, in a provocative article entitled "Demythologizing Sociolinguistics", discusses the implications of the field's lack of explanatory theory and proposes a solution for what has

been called the “correlational fallacy” (see Romaine “Status”) engendered by the Labovian quantitative research agenda which correlates linguistic variables with social variables:

By insisting on the importance of heterogeneity, and developing methods of analysing it, [Labovian] sociolinguistics clarified questions of real theoretical importance which were not addressed in any principled way by existing paradigms...Labov's work may with justice be called 'demythologizing' because it pointed this out...But the approach he founded is not without myths and blindspots of its own. Quantitative sociolinguistics has certainly clarified some aspects of language in society. But other aspects remain mysterious, the crucial questions unanswered, or even unasked.

What are these crucial questions? Very briefly, they concern the reasons *why* people behave linguistically as they have been found to do in study after study. Sociolinguistics does not provide us with anything like a satisfactory explanation. The account which is usually given--or worse, presupposed--in the quantitative paradigm is some version of the proposition that 'language reflects society'...

Two things about this kind of account are particularly problematic. The first problem is its dependence on a naive and simplistic *social* theory...Secondly, there is the problem of how to *relate* the social to the linguistics...The 'language reflects society' account implies that social structures somehow exist before language, which simply 'reflects' or 'expresses' the more fundamental categories of the social. Arguably, however, we need a far more complex model that treats language as *part* of the social, interacting with other modes of behaviour and just as important as any of them (56-57).

Cameron asserts that “the purported explanation does not in fact explain anything” (59), and she invites researchers to more actively pursue satisfactory explanations for attested phenomena, reasoning that “linguistic variation cannot be described sensibly without reference to its social conditions; and if sociolinguistics is to progress from description to explanation (as it must unless it wants to be vulnerable to renewed charges of 'butterfly collecting') it is obviously in need of a theory linking the 'linguistic' to the 'socio' “(59).

Cameron argues quite forcefully for the implementation of sociolinguistic research which incorporates social theories into its perspectives. Because I believe Cameron's point is well taken, and because her arguments are provocative and could serve as a guidepost for those of us entrusted with the education of a new generation of students who are situated at the vanguard of changes in language practices in Korea, I include an extended citation from Cameron:

[We must] acknowledge that languages are regulated social institutions, and as such may have their own dynamic and become objects of social concern in their own right. With its emphasis on microanalysis and its suspicion of social theory, sociolinguistics tends to push this kind of perspective into the background...A demythologized sociolinguistics would incorporate such an approach as a necessary complement to quantification and microanalysis. *It would deal with such matters as the production and reproduction of linguistic norms by institutions and socializing practices; how these norms are apprehended, accepted, resisted and subverted by individual actors and what their relation is to the construction of identity* (62) [emphases added].

Cameron goes on to propose components of a research agenda of a “demythologized sociolinguistics”. Some of these components could be usefully researched by students or students affiliated with

experienced researchers as assistants, and for this reason, I will conclude this section with another extended excerpt which includes these practical suggestions, inviting readers to consider potential adaptations to research into language practices in Korea:

Metalinguistic activities and beliefs have received, at least in urban Western societies, less attention than they merit. For it is surely a very significant fact about language in these societies that people hold passionate beliefs about it; that it generates social and political conflicts; that practices and movements grow up around it both for and against the status quo. We may consider the well-attested fact that many people, including those with minimal education, read a dictionary for pleasure, that there is a vast market for grammars, usage guides and general interest publications, radio and TV programmes about the English language; that many large-circulation newspaper and periodicals... have a regular column on linguistic matters.

... [T]his is the task I would set for a demythologized sociolinguistics: to examine the linguistic practices in which members of a culture regularly participate or to whose effects they are exposed. As well as being of interest in itself, this undertaking would help us to make sense of the process noted by Romaine: the constraining of linguistic behaviour by the social relations in which speakers are involved and the linguistic resources to which they have access. We might also discover how language change may come about through the efforts of individuals and groups to produce new resources and new social relations. For language is not an organism or a passive reflection, but a social institution, deeply implicated in culture, in society, in political relations at every level. What sociolinguistics needs is a concept of language in which this point is placed at the centre rather than on the margins (65-66).

It has been my experience that students are quite aware of the fact that due to changing social norms and the impact of technological forms of verbal transmission, language practices are undergoing rapid changes in Korean society and they are equally cognizant of the fact that they and their generational peers are the ones leading these changes. It behooves us to be alert to the issues of language change raised by our students and to associate them with our own ongoing research interests, since we may not always be immediately aware of changes taking place “on the ground” (or online in the PC-bang, as it were!). I am of course particularly well-positioned to posture myself as an outsider, and I sometimes make explicit use my natural guise as a “foreigner” in Korea in need of explanatory insights into the local culture to elicit ethnographic accounts of language and social practices, but I believe that Korean professors, too, can credibly strike a pedagogically useful guise as outsiders to their students' worlds, if in less extreme form than my own.

Suzanne Romaine (*Language*) echoes Cameron's analysis of the state of the field of sociolinguistics when she states that

[a]lthough there are no ready-made social theories for sociolinguists to lug their data into which will cover all the aspects of language..., there is also no reason to dismiss the enterprise of sociolinguistics. As a discipline, sociolinguistics is still rather young and more empirical research is needed in non-western societies....[M]ost sociologists have preferred to ignore the role of language in constructing society, so major developments on the theoretical front will probably have to proceed on the basis of closer collaboration between sociologists and sociolinguists (247).

Although the lack of a sociolinguistic theory does not allow us to test or analyze research findings with an explanatory framework, this should not deter us or our students from proceeding to gather reliable

data regarding socially-constituted language practices in Korea, as these will need to be accounted for in any future theory which may claim universality.

3. Methods of Investigation in Sociolinguistics

3.1 General overview

As is well known to practicing sociolinguists, 'in the field of sociolinguistics, much stress is placed on procedures for eliciting data and on a necessary interdependence between linguistic data and the procedures which elicited the data' (Eastman 114). As Eastman (*Aspects*) stated in her discussion of methodology in an era when sociolinguistic research was in a nascent stage,

description and descriptive methods in the areas of study dealing with language and culture share a concern for discovery procedures and a common goal of observational adequacy. The methodology being proposed for the new field of sociolinguistics shares such goals and a number of techniques with descriptive linguistics and ethnoscience. The extension of sociolinguistics to a concern with attitudes of speech use...moves beyond description to the understanding of thought as attitudes... (116).

The years intervening since Eastman's sketch of sociolinguistic methodology was written have seen a profusion of investigative methodologies, yet the detailed attention to data collection procedures has, if anything, become even more rigorous as sociolinguists have become increasingly aware of the fact that conditions of elicitation and data gathering significantly affect the naturalness of the data they propose to analyze. The methodological traditions of the field are

very reviewed in an accessible format in Barbara Johnstone in *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. Johnstone places sociolinguistic field methods and analytical methods into three categories, based on the academic research traditions which gave birth to that particular area of sociolinguistic research, e.g., researchers engaged in the study of language change rely on traditions established in historical/comparative linguistics, whereas those pursuing social and regional variation use data “collected by dialectologists, in a field-method tradition initiated in the nineteenth century” (6). Ethnographers of communication “draw on research techniques developed in anthropology and descriptive linguistics” (6) and, finally, “[t]urn-by-turn sociolinguistic analyses of conversations borrow from the methodology of Conversation Analysis developed by sociologists” (6). For extensive discussions on the repercussions of methodology on sociolinguistic research outcomes, see the volumes by Yvonna Lincoln and Egon Guba, Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, and of David Silverman (*Interpreting and Doing*).

3.2 Research Methods Accessible to Student Researchers

I will now briefly review some of the investigative methodologies used in sociolinguistics which have proven useful to Korean students in completing data-based research projects. Time and space considerations do not allow a full development of theoretical underpinnings nor of potential problems and drawbacks with any of these methodologies. For the interested reader, detailed discussions of methodological issues can be found in specialized volumes on this topic (e.g., Saville-Troike; Cameron, *Working*; Silverman *Doing*; Johnstone, Gee; Denzin and Lincoln; Fetterman; Coffey and Atkinson; Psathas; Wolcott; Sokolov and Snow; Edwards and Lampert; Glesne and Peshkin; Du Bois et al.; Nunan; Briggs; Wolcott; Lincoln and Guba; Stubbs; Spradley).

Investigative methodologies appropriate for use by novice researchers in whom we would like to instill a curiosity about language must surely include, at a minimum, the data elicitation field methods considerations pioneered by Labov for the investigation of dialect variation (see Labov “Transformation”; Labov “Social Stratification”; Labov *Principles*), as well as techniques employed in determining the characteristics of a speech community in order to pursue an analysis based on the ethnography of communication as proposed by Hymes (“Ethnography”; “Models”) and elaborated on by Saviile-Troike.

The matched guise technique originated by Wallace Lambert and used in many subsequent studies of language attitudes toward socially stigmatized varieties is another investigative technique which students have successfully pursued. A matched guise study is designed to detect dialect stereotypes or prejudice towards speakers of a particular language . Essentially, the technique consists of measuring attitudes by creating several guises for a single speaker (typically, speaking with a different dialect or in a different language), then asking subjects to indicate their attitudes toward the speaker under each guise. (For references to such studies and summaries of the procedure, see Wray; Fasold, *Sociolinguistics of Society*; Wardhaugh.)

Finally, mention should be made of the general approach known as qualitative research, which is employed in many sociolinguistic research projects and which students can be encouraged to explore. Qualitative methodology can be defined as follows: an array of techniques and assumptions which take a contextually-situated approach to the collection, analysis and interpretation of data. The most insightful qualitative studies are rigorous and systematic in the collection of data, and they draw on continuously emerging insights recursively during the analysis stage in order to interpret the data. It is

a complex methodology which can best be learned by doing under supervision and with generous amounts of feedback, but in its emphasis on triangulation and grounded hypothesis generation, I find that it is potentially an excellent pedagogical tool for novice researchers to use to explore questions which interest them.

Collecting and sampling of publicly available corpus materials, advertising texts, published media transcripts, online texts and other written texts is another accessible methodology for students to employ, particularly in projects relying on discourse analytic or conversation analytic methodologies. (See Appendix 2 for descriptions of and references to accessible corpora such as the British National Corpus, the Buckeye [Ohio] Natural Speech Corpus, the International Corpus of English, the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English, and the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English.) Table 1 at the end of Section 3.3, below, lists some projects in which corpora can be used in various disciplines.

3.3 Practical Considerations and Examples of Applications of Sociolinguistic Models and Methods

In using research methodologies with students for whom pursuit of publishable quality linguistic research is not the goal, care must be taken to find the right balance of ethical procedural considerations and a level of linguistic detail and rigor appropriate to the goals of the project in question. Sociolinguistically-oriented projects will defeat their purpose of instilling curiosity and generating a grasp of language phenomena if students are overwhelmed with procedural considerations and linguistic details more appropriate for publishable linguistic research but which they are not prepared to handle in the course of a one semester course. On the other hand, no insights of value will be gained if students are allowed to randomly collect

samples of “interesting data” without some guidance in the elaboration of a research question or in appropriate methods of data collection, processing and analysis. I provide orientation and require students to use appropriate methods of obtaining informed consent from all research informants and I strongly discourage the use of surreptitious recordings. I also encourage students to conduct at least one preliminary pilot study of any questionnaires or surveys they plan to administer, and in order to instill a data-based, empirical approach to language study, I insist on inclusion of transcriptions of sample illustrative data in written and oral reports.

Among published studies of article length which I have found useful as models of research methodology and which can be replicated or used for inspiration are Cheshire and Moser for the international status of English; Maltz and Borker or the classic Gal for gendered language usage; Honna for the influence of English on Japanese; Lee, Song, O’Grady and Park for bilingual child language acquisition methodology and for exemplification of the use of romanization of Korean when reporting results in English; Agar (164-167) for an orientation to the ethnography of speaking; Eastman (“Establishing”) and Eastman and Stein for social group identity and intergroup communication; and of course Labov’s New York City department store study (Labov “Social Stratification”) for initiation into the concept of sociolinguistic variables. (For a succinct summary of the Labov study, but with sufficient detail for present purposes, see Edward Finegan (399-402).) The article-length studies collected in Gumperz and Hymes, Baugh and Sherzer, Bauman and Sherzer, Coates, and Bergvall, Bing and Freed, as well as the collections in Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, mentioned previously, are also of course exemplary, albeit not as accessible to novice researchers, and illustrate the socially-situated, interactional approach to language study. Where these original

English readings would be too challenging for lower level English proficiency students, the contents can be summarized by the instructor in lecture format.

For orientation to data collection and analysis techniques, I have successfully used Carter and McCarthy², Nunan, Cameron *Working*, Johnstone and Saville-Troike with classes at various levels of language and linguistic sophistication. For all projects involving student researchers, I make a reading packet which include samples of consent forms, transcription conventions and sample transcripts, the specifics and level of detail I require depending on the sophistication of the class and the scope of the projects being undertaken. Sources I have used for sample transcripts, romanization symbols and transcription conventions include Sohn for romanization tables, Lee and Thompson for a comparison of phonetic and McCune-Reischauer transcription systems of Korean versions of the “Pear Stories”, and Cameron *Working*, Schiffrin, Gumperz and Berenz, and Du Bois et al. for general advice on transcription conventions.

Much less rigorously elaborated methodologies are of course also appropriate for some types of classes. Suggestions of sociolinguistically-inspired research activities for classroom use which involve less formal methodologies can be found in Peter Stockwell’s *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students*, Ann Egan-Robertson and Jerri Willett’s “Students as Ethnographers,

² The volume by Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy is a collection of transcribed conversations from the CANCODE (Cambridge-Nottingham Corpus of Discourse in English), a corpus of spoken British English housed at the Department of English Studies at the University of Nottingham in Great Britain. An audio tape containing all the texts is available. Each text is preceded by an explanation of relevant language or discourse features which students should attend to and a suggested activity for analysis. This text is appropriate for initiation to conversation/discourse analytic research projects which will involve students in the collection, transcription and analysis of authentic spoken data.

Thinking and Doing Ethnography”, and in Clive Seale, ed.’s *Researching Society and Culture*. Extensive additional bibliographic suggestions can be found in Egan-Robertson and Willett.

I am mindful that many of the leading sociolinguistic studies have been conducted in multilingual, multiethnic societies, and some might contend that the relative homogeneity of the Korean language does not lend itself so readily to the study of sociolinguistic topics or that Korean social norms are not conducive to fieldwork investigative procedures. On the first point, I would argue that this perceived “homogeneity of language” is primarily the reflection of an ideology and that this ideology masks a social complexity consisting of regional, generational, situational and gendered diversity which begs to be discovered. The ideology of language itself is an area falling within the purview of sociolinguistics and systematic studies on the relation of politico-linguistic ideology and language practices should prove fertile. On the second point--the fieldwork/accessibility issue--it has been my experience supervising both graduate and undergraduate students engaged in class projects and term papers that the strong tradition of close-knit networks in Korean society can work to the benefit of sociolinguistic research, in the sense that everyone is a member of several supportive networks, both on- and off-line, and researchers can appeal to the members of their networks for participation or for leads to further networks.

I believe that in the Korean context, doing sociolinguistic research can contribute to students' general education and awareness of social and political forces and the results of empirical sociolinguistic studies can be used profitably by educators (see, for example, W.-P. Lee 1998; W-P Lee 2000; E-J Kim 2000; Paik 2000).

A number of interesting studies published in English, many by the *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, also illustrate how topics relating to Korean language usage can provide a rich lode of topic ideas and

research methods for student investigation. Although the data being analyzed are Korean, the research methods and publication standards are those in use in English language academic journals. These articles by Korean scholars thus constitute exemplary models of the use of English academic register for Korean students. Because of either their high interest in terms of topic or their accessibility in terms of research methods employed, I recommend the following published papers to student researchers: Choi H-K, Choi J-S, Chung Y-C, Kim H-Y; Kim K-H ; Park Y-J 2006; Ryoo H-K, Suh J-H, Suh and Kim, Suh K-H, Yu K-A, Yun and Jung.

For the study of English dialects and language variation and a provocative discussion of how these are represented in literature, I recommend the following: Cheshire and Edwards, Cheshire, ed., Boyd, Fine, Macaulay, Preston “Mowr bayud spellin’”, Preston “Ritin fowklower” and Preston “Mowr and mowr bayud spellin’”.

In conclusion, I will give some examples of the ways sociolinguistic models and methods have informed my own teaching and project assignments. I offer these not because they were exemplary projects or assignments--far from it, as I am constantly revising my materials and my expectations--but, rather, in the spirit of collegial sharing, in the hope that these ideas might stimulate discussion, as I am always looking for ways to articulate more clearly what it is I do in 'sociolinguistics' and to show the relevance of the field to non-linguists. What follows is a sample of some of the general sociolinguistic themes that can be treated in various types of classes and a cursory mention of projects or assignments that can be generated and their outcomes.

Table 1. Some Sample Project Assignments Based on Sociolinguistic Frameworks and Methods (can be adapted to either undergraduate or graduate level)

Type of Class/Level	Project/Assignment	Outcome & Major Benefits
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING		
English Composition	Ethnography of local speech community, with oral & written report; can be effectively done collaboratively	Fosters research and writing skills; also oral skills if presentation required; students empowered by validation of their own communities
Conversation/Communication on Fluency	Analyze discourse markers on TV or radio tapes/transcripts; Analyze “making of meaning” moves by speakers Attend organized functions where English is lingua franca; write-up simplified ethnography of speaking report of the event (guidelines provided)	Develops observational & analytical abilities and fosters awareness of cross-cultural differences in interaction; Broadens students horizons and leads to realization of domains in which English is used in Korea. Models indiv. participation & reflection as a learning strategy
Classes with Components on Society & Culture		
LANGUAGE AND CULTURE	Ethnography of speaking in speech community of students’ choice;	Fosters research, writing & English presentation skills; raises awareness of phenomena in own social network which were studied in academic English texts
Area Studies: British & No. American Language & Culture; applicable to any country or region	Internet access to international sources and overseas libraries; Use immigrant census data & analyze ethnic and linguistic makeup of city, region. Combine	Fosters awareness of effect of social and economic forces on ethnic and linguistic developments; Develops research skills and broadens perspectives

	<p>with access to corpus to study dialect features</p> <p>Varieties of English: Use corpus materials or multi-media sources to analyze lexical, phonological or structural features of regional or international varieties of English; Read or view documentaries about origins of these varieties</p>	<p>Familiarize students with varieties of English; stimulate discussion of relation between social development, migration trends, politics and language spread; educational implications of multilingual society; stimulate critical thinking on role of English as a global language</p>
Literature	<p>Compare portrayal of regional or marked social class dialect across literary works and/or in actor's portrayal in film with data from dialect speakers gathered from fieldwork or corpus collections</p>	<p>Foster awareness of the characteristics of authentic dialects; stimulate critical thinking on representations of dialects in literature and associated identity issues</p>
English Education/Teacher Training Classes		
Developing and/or Teaching Oral Communication Skills	<p>Linguistic Diversity/World Englishes: Analyze lexical, phonological or structural features of regional or international varieties of English using corpus materials and/or data collected by student</p> <p>Conversation Analysis or Discourse Analysis: Analyze authentic conversation & discourse structures</p>	<p>Increase knowledge of & respect for the wide diversity of English dialects & varieties & increase empathy for their speakers; Introduce concept of World Englishes & stimulate critical thinking on which varieties teachers & students need to recognize, understand & use.</p> <p>Develop analytical and independent thinking abilities; draw attention to</p>

	using corpus materials, TV or radio recordings and/or transcripts by following rigorous CA or DA methods	structure of oral speech in dialogic & monologic modes; foster awareness of speech register and speech styles when speaking to different audiences; develop awareness of cross-cultural differences in interaction
Language Policies	Literature review of language policies around the world; case study approach through readings in academic journals and publications of international organizations (UN, UNESCO) Letter to the Editor (fictitious or actual) of local newspaper expressing point of view on English language policies	Familiarization with world languages and societies beyond Korea and Anglo world; initiation into socio-political issues related to community & indigenous languages, minority and majority language status; familiarization with multitude of options for societies' resolution of language education issues Foster personal & professional responsibility and engagement with social issues related to language education
Self-Evaluation in classroom	Participant/Observer: Make videotape of self teaching or make tapes of other teachers' to analyze. Use Discourse Analytic methods to analyze student/teacher interactions	Analyze and reflect on roles of teachers/learners and use of language in classroom during learning process: handling questions, giving lectures, managing behavior, etc.
General or English Linguistics		
Introduction to Linguistics, Composition classes	Participant-Observer methods; investigate language of power & politeness; linguistic	Familiarize students with sociolinguistic methods as part of foundational bkgrd.; encourages

	features of specific social networks; gendered lg. use: Make notes or recordings of specific features heard over one week period (e.g. use of hedges by women, requests and demands, words used to mark in-groupness, etc.)	students to be self-directed in their own learning
Introduction to Linguistics, Composition classes	Data elicitation mini-fieldwork: incorporate elicitation of info on social, regional and ethnic stratification and related language use	Familiarize with data-gathering techniques & ethical issues in working with informants for field work
Introduction to Linguistics, Composition classes	Language Variation (Labov): Investigate generational differences in one family or region; code-switching practices of bilingual Koreans returned from overseas; attitudes toward different dialects	Apply gen'l socioling. theories and practices to processes of discovering aspects of own society
Graduate Level: Anthropological Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, Language Planning, Qualitative Research Methods classes	After reading published papers, analyze own social networks & language differences in each; Disc. Analysis of power and politeness; attitudes to non-standard varieties in school settings, etc.	Empower students to apply methods encountered in readings to research in own community and of own design
English Translation & Interpretation		
Various classes	Use written corpus materials for Discourse Analysis of syntactic & lexical differences in varieties of int'l. English and oral corpora to analyze pronunciation differences	Familiarize future translators and interpreters with registers and styles of varieties of English that will be encountered professionally

As can be seen in Table 1, above, these discussion themes and project assignments run the gamut from micro-level regional dialect variation to macro-level language contact and language planning issues relating to the role of English in Korean society. Across a broad spectrum of classes, the methods I have encouraged students to use most frequently and which have met with the greatest success in terms of accomplishing expected outcomes within one semester are those which involve the use of discourse analysis and ethnographic approaches, i.e., community ethnographies, ethnographies of speaking, ethnographic interviews.

4. Conclusion

Applying sociolinguistic methods to disciplines where these have not been previously tried has two primary advantages: students become active in the learning process and they become engaged with and fascinated by working with original source materials. When students take charge of their own learning path, more true learning and education results. The lessons are learned more deeply and are retained, judged by comments received from students throughout the semester and in succeeding semesters.

Furthermore, since sociolinguistics deals with language situated in the real world, introducing a sociolinguistic perspective cannot but broaden students' views in philosophy (cognition and linguistic relativity), geography (pidgins and creoles, language planning), economy and business (World Englishes, *linguae francae*), politics (language planning, access to education for minorities, language of instruction decisions, regional and social variation), psychology and education (language acquisition, pidgins and minority language varieties), sociology (social classes and power structures). It goes

without saying that students' understanding of language and the exigencies of language use in a social context will be sharpened by studying language phenomena embedded in social contexts. In sum, for those who are engaged in the teaching and learning of English, or any other foreign language, using sociolinguistic models and investigative methods provides an excellent means of generating more learner-centered learning experiences and more solidly acquired knowledge. This article has attempted to provide a justification for the use of sociolinguistic approaches in cognate fields related to English literature, general linguistics and language teaching and has provided resources for use by students and scholars should they choose to pursue research using the suggested frameworks.

Works Cited

- Agar, Michael. *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*. New York: William Morrow, 1994.
- . *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- Baugh, John, and Joel Sherzer, eds. *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.
- Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer, eds. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Beebe, Leslie M. "Five Sociolinguistic Approaches to Second Language Acquisition." *Issues in Second Language Acquisition Research*. Ed. Leslie Beebe. New York: Newbury House, 1988. 43-77.
- Bergvall, Victoria L., Janet M. Bing, and Alice F. Freed, eds. *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. London: Longman, 1996.
- Blount, Ben G., ed. *Language, Culture and Society: A Book of Readings*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop, 1974.
- Briggs, Charles. *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolinguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. *Teaching the Spoken Language: An Approach Based on the Analysis of Conversational English*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Cameron, Deborah. "Demythologizing Sociolinguistics: Why Language Does Not Reflect Society." *Ideologies of Language*. Ed. John E. Joseph and Talbot J. Taylor. London/New York: Routledge, 1990. 79-93. Reprinted as "Demythologizing Sociolinguistics" in Coupland and

Jaworski 55-67.

- . *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London/Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001.
- Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, Ben Rampton, and Kay Richardson. "Ethics, Advocacy and Empowerment in Researching Language." Coupland and Jaworski 145-162.
- Carter, Ronald, and Michael McCarthy. *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics* 1.1 (1980):1-48.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne. 1991. "Discourse Analysis and Grammar Instruction." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11 (1991):135-51.
- . "Discourse Analysis and the Teaching of Listening." *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson*. Ed. Guy Cook and Barbara Seidhofer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. 363-77.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne, and Elite Olshtain. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Cheshire, Jenny, ed. *English Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Cheshire, Jenny, and Viv Edwards. "Knowledge About Language in British Classrooms: Children as Researchers." Ed. Ann Egan-Roberston and David Bloome. *Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 1998. 191-214.
- Cheshire, Jenny, and Lise-Marie Moser. "English as a Cultural Symbol: The case of Advertisements in French-Speaking Switzerland." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural*

Development 15.2 (1994): 451-69.

Choi, Hee-kyong. "The Dynamics of Relationship between Two Children at the Computer". *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 10.1 (2002): 363-408.

Choi, Jin-sook. "Who Accentuates an Inter-Group Dialect in an Inter-Dialectal Place?." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 14.1 (2006): 165-185.

Chung, Young Cheol. "Korean Children's Socialization and English Learning: A Perseptive of Language Socialization." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 11.2 (2003): 253-75.

Coates, Jennifer. *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Oxford, UK/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998.

Coffey, Amanda, and Paul Atkinson. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*. Thousand Oaks, London: Sage, 1996.

Coulmas, Florian, ed. "Introduction". Ed. Florian Coulmas. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1997. 1-11.

Coulmas, Florian, ed. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell, 1997.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth, and Margret Selting, eds. *Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Coupland, Nikolas, and Adam Jaworski, eds. *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook*. London: Macmillan/New York: St. Martin's, 1997.

Crawford, James. *Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of "English Only"*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992.

Davis, Boyd. "When Students Collect Data: Ethics, Cooperation, Self—Discovery, and Variation in Linguistic and Cultural Behavior." Ed. A. Wayne Glowka and Donald M. Lance. *Language Variation in North American English: Research*

- and Teaching*. New York: MLA, 1993. 55-62.
- Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research: Vol. 3, Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA/London: Sage, 1998.
- Du Bois, John W., Susanna Cumming, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, and Danae Paolino, eds. *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 4: Discourse Transcription*. Santa Barbara, CA: Dept. of Linguistics, Univ. of California at Santa Barbara, 1992.
- Duranti, Alessandro. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Duranti, Alessandro, and Charles Goodwin, eds. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Eastman, Carol M. *Aspects of Language and Culture*. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp, 1975.
- . "Establishing Social Identity Through Language Use." *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 4.2 (1985):1-19.
- Eastman, Carol, and Robert Stein. "Language display: Authenticating Claims to Social Identity." *Journal of Multilingualism and Multicultural Development* 14.3 (1993): 187-202.
- Edwards, Jane A., and Martin D. Lampert, eds. *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1993.
- Edwards, John. *Multilingualism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994.
- Egan-Robertson, Ann, and David Bloome, eds. *Students as Researchers of Culture and Language in Their Own Communities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton. 1998.
- Egan-Robertson, Ann, and Jerri Willett. "Students as Ethnographers, Thinking and Doing Ethnography: A Bibliographic Essay." Egan-Robertson and Bloome 1-35.

- Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1992.
- Fasold, Ralph. *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford, UK/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990.
- . *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford, UK/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1984.
- Fetterman, David M. *Ethnography: Step by Step*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA/London: Sage, 1998.
- Fine, Elizabeth. "In defense of literary dialect: A response to Dennis R. Preston." *Journal of American Folklore* 96.381(1983): 323-330.
- Finegan, Edward. *Language: Its Structure and Use*, 3rd. ed. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt, 1999.
- Finegan, Edward, and John R. Rickford, eds. *Language in the USA: Themes for the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Fishman, Joshua A., ed. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.
- Foley, William A. *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction*. Oxford, UK/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997.
- Gal, Susan. "Language Change and Sex Roles in a Bilingual Community." Coupland and Jaworski 376-90. [orig. appeared as "Peasant Men Can't Get Wives: Language Change and Roles in a Bilingual Community." *Language in Society* 7.1 (1978): 1-16; orig. also reprinted in Baugh and Sherzer 292-304.]
- Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London/New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Giglioli, Pier Paolo, ed. *Language and Social Context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Glesne, Corrine, and Alan Peshkin. *Becoming Qualitative*

- Researchers: An Introduction*. White Plains, New York: Longman, 1992.
- Glowka, A. Wayne, and Donald M. Lance, eds. *Language Variation in North American English: Research and Teaching*. New York: MLA, 1993.
- Gumperz, John J. "Contextualization and Understanding." *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Ed. Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin. Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge UP, 1992. 229-52.
- . "The Linguistic Bases of Communicative Competence." In *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk (GURT 1981)*. Ed. Deborah Tannen. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown UP, 1982. 323-34.
- Gumperz, John J., ed. *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Gumperz, John J., and Norine Berenz. "Transcribing Conversational Exchanges." *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Ed. Jane A. Edwards and Martin Lampert. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1993. 112-121.
- Gumperz, John J., and Dell Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, 1972.
- Guy, Gregory R., Crawford Feagin, Deborah Schiffrin, and John Baugh, eds. *Towards a Social Science of Language: Papers in Honor of William Labov, Vol. 2, Social interaction and discourse structures*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1997.
- Haarman, Harald. *Basic Aspects of Language in Human Relations: Toward a General Theoretical Framework*. Berlin/New York: Mouton, 1991.
- Hatch, Evelyn. *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge/New

- York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Heath, Shirley Brice. *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Holliday, Adrian. *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Holmes, Janet. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London/New York: Longman, 1992.
- Honna, Nobuyuki. "English in Japanese Society: Language Within Language." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 16.1&2(1995): 45-52.
- Hymes, Dell. "The Ethnography of Speaking." *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Ed. T. Gladwin and W.C. Sturtevant. Anthropological Society of Washington. 1962. 13-53. Reprint in Joshua Fishman, ed. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton. 99-138.
- . "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life." *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, Ed. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes. New York: Holt. 1972. 35-71.
- Jaffe, Alexandra, ed. "Non-standard orthography and non-standard speech." Special issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.4 (2000): 497-513.
- Jaffe, Alexandra, & Shana Walton. The voices people read: Orthography and the representation of non-standard speech. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.4 (2000):561-87.
- James, Carl, and Peter Garrett, eds. *Language Awareness in the Classroom*. London/New York: Longman, 1991.
- Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland, eds. *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Johnstone, Barbara. *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. New

York/Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

- Kasper, Gabriele. "Data Collection in Pragmatics Research." *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures*. Ed. Helen Spencer-Oatey, London/New York: Continuum, 2000. 316-41.
- Kim, Hae-yeon. "Co-Construction as an Interactional Achievement in Korean Conversation." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*. 10.2 (2002): 181-211.
- Kim, Kyu-hyun. "Interactive Classroom Discourse as Context of Learning and Socialization." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*. 10.2 (2002): 213-41.
- Kramsch, Claire. *Language and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Labov, William. "The Exact Description of a Speech Community: Short *a* in Philadelphia." *Language Change and Variation*. Ed. Ralph Fasold and Deborah Schiffrin. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1989. 1-57.
- . *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1972.
- . "Objectivity and Commitment in Linguistic Science: The Case of the Black English Trial in Ann Arbor." *Language in Society* 11 (1982):165-201.
- . *Principles of Linguistic Change, Vol. 2: Social Factors*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001.
- . *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.
- . *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1972.
- [“Social Stratification of (*r*) in New York City Department Stores” from this volume reprinted in Coupland and Jaworski 168-78.]
- . "The Study of Language in its Social Context." *Studium Generale* 23 (1970):30-87. Excerpts reprinted in *Sociolinguistics*:

- Selected readings*. Ed. J[ohn] B. Pride and Janet Holmes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972. 180-202.
- . "The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax." In *Language in the Inner City*. By William Labov. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1972. 354-96.
- Labov, William, Paul Cohen, Clarence Robins, and John Lewis. "A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City. Cooperative Research Report 3288, Vols. 1 and 2." Philadelphia: U.S. Regional Survey (Linguistics Laboratory, University of Pennsylvania), 1968.
- Labov, William, and Wendell A. Harris. "De Facto Segregation of Black and White Vernaculars." *Diversity and Diachrony*. Ed. David Sankoff. Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1986. 1-24.
- Labov, William, and Wendell A. Harris. "Addressing Social Issues Through Linguistic Evidence." *Language and the Law*. Ed. J. Gibbons. London and New York: Longman, 1994. 265-305.
- Lambert. Wallace E. "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967): 91-109.
- Le Page, Robert. B. "The Evolution of a Sociolinguistic Theory of Language". *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Ed. Florian Coulmas. Oxford/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997. 15-32.
- Lee, Hyo Sang, and Sandra A. Thompson, eds. *Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 1. Korean: Papers and Discourse Data*. Santa Barbara, CA: Univ. Calif. Santa Barbara, Department of Linguistics, 1987.
- Lee, Mison, Minsun Song, William O'Grady, and Jungran Park. "Word Order Preferences for Direct and Indirect Objects in Children Learning Korean." *Korean Language in America: Papers from the Third National Conference on Korean Language Education*. Ed. S. Kang. Monterey, CA: American

- Association of Teachers of Korean (Defense Language Institute), 1999. 69-76.
- Lee, Won-Pyo. "Presidents' Inaugural Speeches: Rhetorical Structure and Democratization of Discourse." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 8.1 (2000): 87-138.
- . "An Analysis of the Interrogation in the Hanbo Hearings; Institutional Settings and Representation of Stance." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 6.1 (1998): 1-52.
- Leith, Dick. *A Social History of English*. London/New York: Routledge, 1983.
- Lincoln, Yvonna, and Egon Guba. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage, 1985.
- Macaulay, Ronald K. S. " "Coz it izny spelt when they say it": Displaying dialect in writing." *American Speech* 66.3 (1991): 280-91.
- Maltz, Daniel N., and Ruth A. Borker. "A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication." *Language and Social Identity*. Ed. John J. Gumperz, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. 196-216. Reprinted in *Language and Gender: A Reader*. Ed. Jennifer Coates. Oxford, UK/Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998. 417-34.
- McGregor, Graham, ed. *Language for Hearers*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1986.
- McKay, Sandra Lee, and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. "Mechanisms of Change in Urban Dialects: The Role of Class, Social Network and Gender." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3 (1993):57-78.
- Milroy, Lesley. *Language and Social networks*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.

- Milroy, Lesley, and James Milroy. "Social Network and Social Class: Toward an Integrated Sociolinguistic Model." *Language in Society* 21 (1992):1-26.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J., ed. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, IV, Language: The Socio-Cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Nunan, David. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson, eds. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Paik, Kyongsook. "On the Recent Demand for Officialization of English in Korea: A Sociolinguistic Review." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 8.1 (2000): 469-95.
- Park, Yun-joo. "Korean Children's Identity Construction While Living in Two Languages." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 14:2 (2006). 147-68.
- Parrott, Martin. *Tasks for Language Teachers*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Harlow: Longman/Pearson Education, 1994.
- Philipsen, Gerry. *Speaking Culturally: Explorations in Social Communication*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1992.
- Preston, Dennis. "Mowr bayud spellin': A reply to Fine." *Journal of American Folklore* 96.381 (1983): 330-39.
- Preston, Dennis R. "Mowr and mowr bayud spellin': Confessions of a sociolinguist." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.4 (2000):614-21.
- Preston, Dennis R. "'Ritin fowklower daun 'rong: Folklorists' failures in phonology." *Journal of American Folklore* 95.377 (1982): 304-26.

- Pride, J[ohn] B., and Janet Holmes, eds. *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Pridham, Francesca. *The Language of Conversation*. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Psathas, George. *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA/London: Sage, 1995.
- Romaine, Suzanne. *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- . "The Status of Sociological Models and Categories in Explaining Linguistic Variation." *Linguistische Berichte* 90 (1984):25-38.
- Ryoo, Hye-kyung. "Frame Shift as Interactional Resource in Service Encounters between Shopkeepers and Customers." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 13.1 (2005): 29-52.
- Saville-Troike, Muriel. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell, 2002 [1982].
- Schiffman, Harold F. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford, UK/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.
- Scollon, Ron. *Mediated Discourse as Social Interaction: A Study of News Discourse*. London/New York: Longman, 1998.
- Seale, Clive, ed. *Researching Society and Culture*. London: Sage, 1998.
- Shuy, Roger. *Language Crimes: The Use and Abuse of Language Evidence in the Courtroom*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Silverman, David. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London/Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000.
- Silverman, David. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*, 2nd ed.

- London/Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. *Korean*. London/New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Sokolov, Jeffrey L. and Catherine E. Snow. *Handbook of Research in Language Development Using CHILDES*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1994.
- Spradley, James P. *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, 1980.
- Stockwell, Peter. *Sociolinguistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London/New York: Routledge, 2002. [website for this textbook available at <http://www.routledge.com/textbooks/sociolinguistics>]
- Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Suh, Jin-hee. "The Grammar of the Naming of Brands in Korean: The Case of Cosmetics." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*. 10.2 (2002): 265-81.
- Suh, Kyung-hee and Kyu-hyun Kim. "An Analysis of TV Homeshopping Commercial: A Case of Multi-Party Talk." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 14.2 (2006): 197-232.
- Suh, Kyung-hee. "The Korean Sentence-final Marker *cianha* in Conversational Discourse." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*. 10.2 (2002): 283-309.
- Trudgill, Peter. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*, 4th ed. London/New York: Penguin, 2000.
- Verschueren, Jef. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London/New York: Arnold, 1999.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weinreich, Uriel. *Languages in Contact*. New York: Publication of the Linguistic Circle of New York, 1, 1953.
- Weinreich, Uriel, William Labov, and Marvin I. Herzog. "Empirical Foundations for a Theory of Language Change." *Directions*

- for Historical Linguistics*. Ed. Winfred P. Lehmann and Yakov Malkiel. Austin: U of Texas P, 1968. 97-195. [Also available online at <http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/books/hist05.html>]
- Wiley, Terrence G. "Language Planning and Policy." In *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Ed. Sandra McKay and Nancy Hornberger. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. 103-47.
- Wolcott, Harry F. *The Art of Fieldwork*, 2nd ed., Walnut Creek, CA/London: Sage-Alta Mira, 2004 [1995].
- Wolfram, Walt, and Nathalie Schilling-Estes. *American English*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998.
- Wolfson, Nessa. *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. New York: Newbury House, 1988.
- Wray, Alison, Kate Trott, and Aileen Bloomer. *Projects in Linguistics: A Practical Guide to Researching Language*. London: Arnold, 1998.
- Yu, Kyong-ae. "Impact of Culture in Communication: Different Verbal Styles and Miscommunications." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 14.1 (2006): 25-50.
- Yun, Sung Kyu, and Woo-hyun Jung. "Request and Question Perspective in Interlanguage Pragmatics." *Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea* 12.2 (2004): 195- 231.

APPENDIX 1

Table 2. Principal Topics Included in Widely-used English Sociolinguistic Textbooks and Anthologies, 1970 – 2000

Text ^a	C&J 1997	Coul 1997	Rom 2000 [1994]	Trudg ^c 2000 [1974]	Fas 1990 (Lg)	Fas 1984 (Sty)	Holmes 1992	Newm 1988	B&S 1984	P&H 1972	Fish 1970
~~~~~ Socioling Topics treated ^b											
<i>Cognitive analyses/Micro-level linguistic phenomena</i>											
World view/ Lx. relativity	√		√	√-	---	√	---	√	---	---	√
Dialect var.	√	√+	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Stylistic var. ^d	√	√	√	√-	√	---	√	---	√	√	√
Lg. var.&chg	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Pidg&Creoles		√	√	√	√	---	√	√	√	√	---
Lg loss /death		√	√		---	√	√	√	---	---	√
<i>Micro-level individual social factors</i>											
Age	√	√	√	---	---	---	√	---	---	-	---
Gender	√	√	√	√	√	---	√	√	√	-	---
Identity ^e	√	√	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-	---
Social class	√	√	√	√	√	---	√	√	√		√
<i>Macro-level social and interactional processes</i>											
Lg. contact; Bi/Multiling-- Codeswitch	√	√	√	√-	---	√+	√	√	√		√
Lg. Planning	√	√	√	√	---	√+	√	√	---		√

Interethnic communic./ networks/ lg. Attitudes	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	---	√	- -f	√
Comm.comp/ Lg. Socializ.	√	√	√	√-	---	---	√	---	√	√	√
<i>Investigative and analytical methods</i>											
Methods disc.	√+	√	---	---	---	√ ^k	√ ^h	---	√	---	---
Ethnog. of Spkg/Prag.	√	√	---	---	√	---	√	√	√	√	√
Politeness (Theory)	---	√	---	---	√	---	√	--	---	√	√
Disc Anal / ConvAnal	--- ^l	---	---	---	---	---	---	√	√+	---	---
<i>Applications of sociolinguistics</i>											
Lg & genl. ed	√	√	√	---	√	√	√	---	---	---	√
Other (law, bilingual ed.)	---	√	---	---	√	---	---	---	---	---	---
<i>Sociolinguistic theorizing</i>											
	√	√	√-	---	---	√	√	√	---	---	---?

a) The abbreviated names refer to the following sources: C&J=Coupland and Jaworski, eds.; Coul=Coulmas, ed.; Rom=Romaine; Trudg=Trudgill; Fas=Fasold; Newm=Newmeyer, ed.; P&H=Pride and Holmes; B&S=Baugh and Sherzer; Fish=Fishman, ed.

b) The symbol "√ " = topic is treated. "---" = topic is not treated. Category wordings below are not always identical to the chapter or article titles in the texts, but the category was counted as 'treated' if the labeled contents of at least one chapter or article in the relevant text dealt with the subject matter. Treatments are based primarily on chapter and section titles, rather than on detailed analysis of chapter contents. If a category received incidental mention within one or more chapters but did not figure in the chapter or section titles, it was not counted as "treated" in this overview. (This is the case for "world view/linguistic relativity" and "pidgins and creoles", for example.) This method of counting "treatments" was motivated by the

purpose of this summary, which is to illustrate the areas which receive emphasis by authors of introductory sociolinguistics textbooks, readers and handbooks. Whether a topic receives mention in the titles given to sections or chapters is deemed one of the most reliable measures of the importance and salience attributed to that topic within the field, or in the estimation of the particular author in question.

A (+) symbol beside a "√" indicates that the topic received considerably more coverage in that text than in the other texts considered. Similarly a (-) symbol beside a "√" indicates that the topic was allocated its own chapter or section, but did not receive in-depth coverage.

c) Because several of the chapter titles in Trudgill are very general (e.g., language and nation, language and geography, language and humanity), the criteria for inclusion of a topic as 'treated' were necessarily relaxed somewhat. If the topic was treated as a major focus of one of the general chapters, it was considered 'treated' in this text, regardless of whether the chapter designation used that specific terminology.

d) Stylistic variation includes chapters discussing differences between written and spoken registers.

e) The criteria for counting treatment of a topic which considered only those topics designated by a section or chapter title is particularly problematic for the category of "identity". Although not explicitly mentioned as a category in several of the texts assessed, for current purposes, I will assume "identity" to be implicit in the analysis of such categories as age, sex, ethnicity, and social class. (See, however, Cameron ("Demythologizing" 60) for a problematizing discussion of the reflexive relationship between identity and various social factors such as gender, age, ethnicity and social class.

f) A chapter by Fishman in the section devoted to "Multilingualism" deals with social relations and networks, but the article pre-dates the theoretical construct of linguistic networks, as developed in L. Milroy, J. Milroy and L. Milroy, and L. Milroy and J. Milroy, and is therefore not counted as a treatment of networks.

g) Fasold's *Sociolinguistics of Society* is one of the rare general sociolinguistics texts to include extended discussion of the use of statistics and quantitative analysis in the investigation of sociolinguistic features.

h) Holmes does not include any chapters devoted specifically to a discussion of sociolinguistic methodologies. However, each chapter contains several practical



exercises which readers are encouraged to complete. Each exercise is immediately followed by a discussion/answer. In total, these exercises, which are integrated into the text of the chapters rather than appearing at the ends of chapters, provide readers/students with an introduction to discrete aspects of sociolinguistic analysis, as well as with limited exposure to field work methods. An example of an exercise follows:

Mix the following words and phrases up with some others which do not involve the letter *r*. This will reduce the likelihood of people guessing which particular sounds you are interested in, which could lead them to pronounce them in an unusual way. Tape record ten people reading your list. Note whether they pronounce [r] or not in each context. Can you account for the [r]-pronunciations you identified? *star, start, soaring, drawing, law, lore, law and order, folklore and mythology*

(Holmes 214-215)

i) Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis were explicitly excluded from this volume, as the authors had another volume in preparation devoted exclusively to these topics at the time of publication. (See Jaworski and Coupland.)

## APPENDIX 2

### Annotated List of Resources for Researching Sociolinguistic Topics (Corpus Materials and Multi-Media Titles)

#### CORPUS MATERIALS

*British National Corpus* (BNC). <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>  
100 million words of both spoken and written British English. [Purchased by HUFs in 2007 and licensed copies available on designated computers at the HUFs main library and at the Graduate School Computer Center.] The BNC homepage suggests that the corpus can be used in the following contexts relevant to the context of this paper:

Linguistic Research: Raw data for studying lexis, syntax, morphology, semantics, discourse analysis, stylistics, sociolinguistics. English Language Teaching: Syllabus and materials design, classroom reference, independent learner research.

*Buckeye Natural Speech Corpus*. <http://buckeyecorpus.osu.edu>.  
Accessible online. Available to teachers and researchers in academia and can be made available to classes at no charge after simple registration procedure. Conversational speech of 40 speakers in Columbus, Ohio. Orthographically transcribed and phonetically labeled. Both audio and text files available.

*International Corpus of English* (ICE) <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ice/index.htm>

A collection of 1 million words of spoken and written English from 14 communities where English is spoken. Collected after 1990. Materials currently available from the following countries/communities: Hong Kong, East Africa (Kenya and Tanzania), Great Britain, Singapore, India, Philippines, New Zealand. Great Britain and New Zealand corpora available on CD ROM only. Others available under license for free download for non-profit academic use from the web. Allow turnaround time to get password

after submitting licensing agreement or to receive CD ROM by mail. Visit the homepage for details.

*Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English* (MICASE)  
<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/micase/>

Immediately accessible online at no charge. CD-ROM available for purchase. 152 transcripts, comprising 1,848,364 words. Audio recordings and orthographic transcripts available.

Speech events occurring in academic settings recorded at the University of Michigan in a variety of contexts: large and small lecture classes, lab sections, discussion sections, dissertation defenses, graduate seminars, student presentations, office consultations, advising sessions, interviews for research purposes, service encounters, tours, and tutorials. Speakers are undergraduate and graduate students, post-doctoral researchers, faculty members, off-campus visitors and non-teaching staff. Includes recordings of male and female speakers; native and non-native speakers of English; monologic, interactive, panel and mixed discourse types in a range of academic disciplines.

*Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English*. (SBC, part of the Linguistic Data Consortium at the University of Pennsylvania). The Santa Barbara Corpus provides the main source of data for the spontaneous spoken portions of the American component of the International Corpus of English. Visit the SBC webpage at: [http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/sbcorpus_summaries.html](http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/research/sbcorpus_summaries.html)

Parts 1-4 (60 discourse segments) contain approximately 249,000 words. Available as 3-CD set. The Santa Barbara Corpus may be purchased from the Linguistic Data Consortium on CD's and DVD's. Orders may also be placed directly with the University of California at SB. Contact John W. DuBois, Dept. of Linguistics, Director, Santa Barbara Center for the Study of Discourse Transcripts may be downloaded from TalkBank at <http://www.talkbank.org/data/Conversation/>. Audio recordings are available at <http://www.talkbank.org/media/conversation/SBCSAE/> Includes transcriptions, audio, and timestamps which correlate

transcription and audio at the level of individual intonation units.

Edited description from the Santa Barbara Corpus homepage: The corpus consists of recordings of naturally occurring spoken interaction from around the United States, representing a wide variety of people of different regional origins, ages, occupations, genders, and ethnic and social backgrounds. The predominant form of language use represented is face-to-face conversation, but the corpus also includes other daily uses of language: telephone conversations, card games, food preparation, on-the-job talk, classroom lectures, sermons, story-telling, town hall meetings, tour-guide spiels, and more.

#### DOCUMENTARIES ON LANGUAGE ISSUES (VHS videotapes)

(for additional educational video titles, check <http://www.insight-media.com>)

*American Tongues*. 1987. VHS only. Not captioned. New York: Center for New American Media. Produced by Louis Alvarez and Andrew Kolker. Order through: Insight Media (<http://www.insight-media.com>)

*Communities of Speech*. Walt Wolfram and Deborah Tannen discussing the concept of standard language vs. dialect.

Order through: Insight Media (<http://www.insight-media.com>)

*The Story of English*, 1986. 9 segments on 5 tapes available from Amazon.com. VHS only. No DVD as yet.

Not captioned. Award-winning high quality PBS documentary shot on numerous world-wide locations. Takes a socially situated approach to the development and spread of English; designed for general viewing audience but includes frequent interviews with world's leading linguists to comment on the history of the language. NOTE: some references on the first tape are somewhat outdated, e.g. mention of the "Soviet Union", the statistics on the use of English worldwide, but overall the tape is well worth viewing. Especially recommended for depiction and description of sociolinguistic processes are parts 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 & 9)

Part 1: "An English-Speaking World" (overview of the spread of English as a global language; most dated segment of the 9)

- Part 2: "Mother Tongue" (historical development of English from Anglo-Saxon origins through Norman Conquest, up to Chaucer and Shakespearean times)
  - Part 3: "A Muse of Fire" Illustrates influence of Shakespeare and the King James Bible on the development of English. Explores the expansion of the English language through borrowing from Latin, Greek, and American Indian languages. Mentions the creative freedom in spelling and usage in early modern English and illustrates how Shakespeare's pronunciation is different from today's.
  - Part 4: "The Guid Scots Tongue" (oppression of Scots and spread of Scottish language to the U.S., origins of Appalachian dialect; Traces the influence of Scottish influence on English, from Highlands and Northern Ireland to Appalachia in the U.S.)
  - Part 5: "Black on White" (influences of Black culture on American English; origins and spread of AAVE)
  - Part 6: "Pioneers! O Pioneers!" (contributions of westward expansion to American English)
  - Part 7: "The Muvver Tongue" (spread of Cockney with English colonialism around the globe)
  - Part 8: "The Loaded Weapon" (influence of Irish on the English language)
  - Part 9: "Next Year's Words: A Look into the Future" (re: development of Pidgins/Creoles in Africa & New Zealand, World Englishes; extensive excerpts of language use from Africa, India, Hong Kong, the Caribbean and interviews w/Jamaicans in the UK)
- Accompanying book: *The Story of English*, by Robert McCrum, William Cran and Robert MacNeil, 3rd. rev. ed. New York: Viking. 2002.

*Exploring Language: Men, Women and Language* (available from University of Pennsylvania Media Center). Informative yet entertaining presentation on gendered language use; combines insights from well-known linguists with practical observations from ordinary citizens, contemporary authors, academics and journalists. Covers the nature vs. nurture debate and the effect of the language planning approach to sexist language.

COMMERCIAL FILMS with SOCIOLINGUISTIC CONTENT  
(video/DVD):

- Daughters of the Dust*. 1991. Many examples of American [Black] Creole, with participation of descendants of slaves from an isolated community who have preserved the language.
- Stand and Deliver*. 1988. Commercially released film based on true story of Hispanic math teacher assigned to a Los Angeles barrio school who motivates low-achieving students. Many examples of Spanish/English code-switching indexing identity assertion and "slice of life" views of LA Hispanic teenage lifestyle.
- Children of a Lesser God*. 1985. American Sign Language. Ethnographically-based portrayal of conflicting language choice values in hearing and deaf culture. (Best Actress Oscar to Deaf actress Marlee Matlin).
- Beyond Silence* [Jenseits der Stille]. 1996. German & German Sign Language, Korean captions; available at local video shops. Realistic portrayal of deaf/hearing relationships within a family, including attitudes toward language usage.

RADIO BROADCASTS (order tapes & transcripts from National Public Radio at <http://www.npr.org>)

- Code-switching in South Africa. March 7, 1995. *All Things Considered*. Washington, D.C.: National Public Radio.
- New York Talk. March 12, 1999. *All Things Considered*. Washington, D.C.: National Public Radio. (Interview with William Labov on his 40-year study of the various accents of New York City.)
- Gullah Island, S.C. - Carolina's Coastal People. August 30, 2000. *All Things Considered*. Washington, D.C.: National Public Radio. (Recording & transcript at <http://www.npr.org> by following links to *The Changing Face of America*, an 18-month special series broadcast in 2000-2001.)

OTHER AUDIO MATERIALS:

- Spirits of the Present: The Legacy from Native America*. 1992. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. and Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium, Lincoln, Nebraska. 5-tape series on various topics related to Native American experience; several deal with language and identity and language revival efforts.

Abstract

## **Interdisciplinary Applications of Sociolinguistic Frameworks and Methods**

**Marilyn Plumlee**

Sociolinguistics places the role of language at the core of the human social experience and views language as the vehicle by which human beings shape their social roles. This subfield of linguistics deals with “the social dimensions of language and the linguistic dimensions of society” (Florian Coulmas) and tackles both macro-level issues (e.g. social dialects, language status, language spread, language planning and policies, societal multilingualism, the relationship between language and culture), and micro-level issues (e.g. dialectology and language variation, language contact and code switching, and individual bilingualism). The field is interdisciplinary and draws on insights and approaches not only from linguistics, but also from anthropology, sociology, psychology, history, literary criticism, mass communications and political science.

After reviewing sociolinguistic frameworks, emergent theories and some common research methodologies used in sociolinguistics, this paper proposes some specific applications of sociolinguistic investigative approaches to the teaching of English and related fields such as English linguistics and English education. The focus is on applications that can contribute to new ways of inspiring students (and scholars) in subject areas where sociolinguistic frameworks and approaches have not traditionally been incorporated.

The author's contention is that psychologically demotivating aspects in the acquisition and the identity-threatening use of English as a foreign language can be diminished by employing investigative methodologies commonly practiced in sociolinguistics which would awaken in students a sense of curiosity and excitement upon making their own discoveries of language in actual use. Adopting these methods for student projects may also directly benefit teaching faculty by suggesting alternative approaches that could be employed in their fields of expertise.

**Key Words:** sociolinguistics, sociolinguistic models, sociolinguistic research methods, interdisciplinary studies, pedagogy, English linguistics