

Evolving Questions for Data-Coding Conventions

Christopher Cieri & Malcah Yaeger-Dror

ccieri@ldc.upenn.edu & malcah@email.arizona.edu



Intro to NSF-LDC Satellite

◆ Today's main foci –

- **Ethics**

- **Demographic coding:** has been upgraded constantly to reflect linguists' needs, but there are recurring problems where we under-differentiate.

- **Attitude coding:** towards one's own and others' groups

◆ Tomorrow's main focus

- **Social Situation—**

- **interaction among speakers' demographics**

- **Drawing some conclusions**

- ◆ **Given**
- ◆ **that the questions we ask set the IV mood**
- ◆ **that insufficient information precludes sharing**
- ◆ **that often there are difficulties getting permission**
- ◆ **A few do's and don'ts of ethical review board interaction**
 - **Natasha Warner— LSA's ethics panel**
 - **Denise DiPersio—LDC's ethics proposal writer**

Coding: Labov's Rule #1

- ◆ **Use more distinctions than you need!**
- ◆ **It is easier to merge groups later**
- ◆ **Than to recode from scratch.**
- ◆ **You can't put back what you didn't code...**
- ◆ **You can't compare if the features aren't there to compare – “Pollock/Hinton effect”**
- ◆ **So, even if there were little evidence for the importance of X in Y community, but more evidence for its importance in Z community: do**

- ◆ **Today's main focus –**
- ◆ **Demographic coding:** has been upgraded constantly to reflect linguists' needs, but there are recurring problems where we under-differentiate.
- ◆ ***EMPHASIZING***
- ◆ **The speaker's expertise**
- ◆ **Research design adapted to permit sharing.**

- ◆ **Region**
- ◆ **Sex (M/F)**
- ◆ **Racial or Heritage group(s)**
- ◆ **Years of education**
- ◆ **Age**
- ◆ **..**

- ◆ **Socioeconomic background/place within the society{SES ML...}**
- ◆ **Sexuality--Eckert**
- ◆ **Racial or Heritage group(s)**
 - ◆ {how far back? How mixed? How strongly identified?}
 - **Black—Blake**
 - **Hispanic—Fought**
 - **Asian—Wong/Hall-Lew**
- ◆ **Age –Bowie**
- ◆ **Religious affiliation--Bowie**

Egypt: Copts, *vs.* Brotherhood



- ◆ **The province of historical linguists or social psychologists**
- ◆ **Blanc's work in the 60's**
 - **Bagdad – entirely based on religion, with sociophonetic distinctions.**

Milroy's work in the 70's Belfast

- ◆ **Giles' early work in the -70's**
 - **Belgian [French/Catholic] vs. Flemish [Dutch/Protestant]**
 - **Quebecois [French/Catholic] vs. Anglophone [Protestant]**

More recent work on 'language and religion' in the Near East

- **/q, r,/ varies with religion/ or degree of religiosity.**

More recent work on 'degree of religiosity' in the US

- ◆ **Today's main foci –**
- ◆ **Demographic coding**
- ◆ **Attitude coding: towards one's own and others' groups**
 - **Llamas – North of England**
 - **Nagy, Hoffman – Toronto**
 - **Noels—conceptual**
 - **Poplack--Sociolinguistic importance of attitudes**
- ◆ **Tomorrow's main focus**
- ◆ **Social Situation--Attitude Coding: attitudes towards one's own and others' group**

◆ Social Situation—

- **Tagliamonte**
- **Rickford**
 - **The interlocutors, and the relationship between them**
 - **The overhearers –ratified and not. (Bell)**
 - **Taking advantage of ‘serendipitous situational switching’**
 - **Place**
- **Llamas**
 - **Interaction of demographics among interlocutors**
 - **Interaction of degree of commitment to each other or outsiders (Bell)**

◆ Discussion of how to archive factors

- **Interaction between interlocutors’ demographics**
- **Attitudes towards ones own and interlocutors’ demographics**

Whatever groups we have they should *a//*be represented

We want to suggest ways in which we can accommodate our coding conventions to new insights about

Speaker demographics

Speakers' attitudes

the influence of social attitudes on self-identification.

As well as our need to attend to variability in self-identification perspectives, even when interacting with a single interlocutor.

These talks focus on possible ways to determine these factors,

And how best to unify our coding protocols to permit us to *share data* among ourselves



*Thanks to
NSF
&
LDC
for funding*

Thank You