



# AN INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLINGUISTICS

RONALD WARDHAUGH  
AND JANET M. FULLER

SEVENTH EDITION



WILEY Blackwell

# Contents

Companion Website	xiii
List of Figures	xiv
List of Tables	xv
Preface	xvi
Acknowledgments	xvii
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Key Concepts	1
Knowledge of Language	3
Competence and performance	4
Variation	5
Speakers and Their Groups	7
Language and Culture	10
Directions of influence	10
The Whorfian hypothesis	11
Correlations	14
The Boundaries of Sociolinguistics	15
Methodological Concerns	17
Data	18
Research design	18
Overview of the Book	19
Chapter Summary	20
Exercises	20
Further Reading	22
References	22

**Part I Languages and Communities**

25

<b>2 Languages, Dialects, and Varieties</b>	<b>27</b>
Key Concepts	27
Language or Dialect?	28
Mutual intelligibility	29
The role of social identity	32
Standardization	33
The standard as an abstraction	34
The standardization process	35
The standard and language change	36
Standard English?	36
The standard–dialect hierarchy	37
Regional Dialects	38
Dialect continua	39
Dialect geography	39
Everyone has an accent	40
Social Dialects	42
<i>Kiezdeutsch</i> ‘neighborhood German’	43
Ethnic dialects	45
African American Vernacular English	46
Features of AAVE	47
Development of AAVE	48
Latino Englishes	50
Styles, Registers, and Genres	52
Style	52
Register	53
Genre	53
Chapter Summary	54
Exercises	54
Further Reading	56
References	57
<b>3 Defining Groups</b>	<b>62</b>
Key Concepts	62
Speech Communities	63
Linguistic boundaries	63
Shared norms	65
Communities of Practice	68
Social Networks	70
Social Identities	72
Beliefs about Language and Social Groups	74
Ideologies	75
Perceptual dialectology	76

# List of Figures

Figure 4.1	Linguistic landscapes in Berlin, Germany: Café Happy Day	87
Figure 4.2	Linguistic landscapes in Berlin, Germany: Your multicultural fresh market	87
Figure 5.1	The life cycle model of pidgins and creoles	117
Figure 6.1	The Rhenish Fan	144
Figure 6.2	Isoglosses	144
Figure 6.3	H-dropping means for five social groups	163
Figure 6.4	H-dropping: within-group ranges for five social groups	164
Figure 7.1	'Model' boy versus 'typical' boy: percentages of <i>-ing</i> versus <i>-in'</i> use	171
Figure 7.2	'Model' boy's preference for <i>-ing</i> versus <i>-in'</i> by formality of situation	171
Figure 7.3	Use of (r) pronunciation by department store	173
Figure 7.4	Pronunciation of (r) in New York City by social class and style of speech	174
Figure 7.5	Percentage of use of <i>-in'</i> in four contextual styles of speech in Norwich	176
Figure 7.6	Percentage of [z] absence in third-person singular present tense agreement in Detroit Black speech	178
Figure 7.7	Percentage of (r) absence in words like <i>farm</i> and <i>car</i> in Detroit Black speech	179
Figure 8.1	The Northern Cities Vowel Shift	201
Figure 8.2	Degree of centralization of (ay) and (aw) by age level on Martha's Vineyard	206
Figure 8.3	Degree of centralization and orientation toward Martha's Vineyard	207

# List of Tables

Table 5.1	Pidgins and creoles by lexifier language	124
Table 7.1	Percentage of [r] use in three New York City department stores	172
Table 7.2	The (ng) variable in Norwich	177
Table 7.3	Final cluster simplification among Black speakers in Washington, DC	181
Table 7.4	Final cluster simplification among Black speakers in Detroit	182
Table 7.5	Final cluster simplification in several varieties of English	183
Table 8.1	Percentages of informants overreporting and underreporting variants in Norwich	209
Table 10.1	Uses of <i>tóngzhì</i> in 1980s China	271

# Preface

When I was asked to work on the seventh edition of *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* I jumped at the chance, having often used the textbook myself and knowing it was something I would be proud to have my name on. As I worked on the project, my respect for Ronald Wardhaugh only grew; the depth and breadth of his knowledge provides the basis for these chapters. While I am responsible for the content of this textbook, this project was only possible because I had as a starting point such excellent material.

The changes I have made are both thematic and organizational. Throughout the text, I have sought to incorporate research which reflects contemporary social theories, in particular social constructionist and critical approaches, as applied to the study of language in society. Further, I have sought to position sociolinguists as potential actors and activists, not objective observers who necessarily remain outside of the worlds they study; this perspective culminates in the final section, which has been titled 'Sociolinguistics and Social Justice.'

In terms of chapter layout, some re-arrangement of the materials will be apparent to those who have used the textbook in the past. The first section contains chapters on the same topics, although with some different titles to the sixth edition. The second section has been updated, but retains its focus on variationist sociolinguistics. The section now titled 'Language and Interaction' contains chapters on ethnography, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. The final section on social justice continues to include chapters on language and gender (and sexuality) and language policy and planning, but also a chapter focusing on language and education in sociolinguistic research.

Finally, the seventh edition of *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* also has an accompanying website, where students can find a review guide, vocabulary lists, and links to related websites for each chapter. There are also materials for instructors, including discussion topics and guides to the explorations and exercises that are provided in the textbook.

May your introduction to sociolinguistics be the beginning of new interests and insights!

Janet M. Fuller



# Introduction

## Key Concepts

How to define and delineate the study of sociolinguistics

What it means to 'know' a language

How language varies across speakers and within the speech of one person

The social construction of identities

The relationship between language and culture

Research design and methodologies for sociolinguistics research

Sociolinguistics is the study of our everyday lives – how language works in our casual conversations and the media we are exposed to, and the presence of societal norms, policies, and laws which address language. Since you are reading this book, you may already have some idea what the study of sociolinguistics entails; you may already have an interest in, and knowledge about, regional dialects, multilingualism, language policy, or non-sexist language. And we will cover all of these topics, along with many others – what social class and ethnicity might have to do with language use, why we do not always 'say what we mean,' the role of language in education.

But we would like to encourage readers to approach the study of sociolinguistics not as a collection of facts, but as a way of viewing the world around you. In sociolinguistics, we seek to analyze data so that we can make generalizations about

language in society, but also to question both our findings and the very process of doing research. Take, for instance, the topic of nicknames. There is a stereotype that men use nicknames and women do not, exemplified in the following joke:

If Diana, Natalie, Naomi, and Maria meet for lunch, they will call each other Diana, Natalie, Naomi, and Maria. But if Matt, Peter, Kirk, and Scott go out for a brewsky, they will call each other Dutch, Dude, Doofus, and Pencil.

We could investigate this sociolinguistic phenomenon by surveying people about their nicknames and also observing or recording interactions in which they are addressed by close friends and family members. We might find, indeed, that the men in our study are often called nicknames, while the women rarely are. But we would like to go deeper than this generalization; why do we ask this question in the first place? Why do we assume that the categories of 'men' and 'women' are socially relevant? What is it about nicknames that makes using them, or not using them, significant social behavior? And even if most men are called by a nickname and most women are not, how do we explain the existence of individual men who do not have nicknames, and the individual women who do?

Thus, while in sociolinguistics we do analyze speech with the goal of making generalizations, we also question these generalizations and examine how they, in turn, influence how we use language. In short, sociolinguistics is not a study of facts (e.g., men call each other nicknames) but the study of ideas about how societal norms are intertwined with our language use (e.g., what it means to be a male or female member of a particular society may influence the terms we use to address each other).

We will come back to these points repeatedly: language, society, and sociolinguistic research findings must all be viewed in their social contexts, interpreted, and redefined. To begin, however, we will offer a starting point for discussing language in society. By **society**, we mean a group of people who are drawn together for a certain purpose or purposes; this is a rather vague and broad term, and throughout this book we will be engaged in discussing how to draw meaningful boundaries around a group of speakers for the purposes of studying their language. We use the term **language** to mean a system of linguistic communication particular to a group; this includes spoken, written, and signed modes of communication.

These terms are, as you will undoubtedly have noted, inextricably intertwined. A society must have a language or languages in which to carry out its purposes, and we label ways of speaking with reference to their speakers. This connection is inevitable and complex; our purpose here is to study the relationship between language and society in more specific ways which help us more clearly define and understand both the social groups and the ways they speak.

In this introductory chapter, we will present some of the basic concepts in the field of sociolinguistics: what it means to 'know' a language, the nature of differences across and within languages, the importance of social group membership in language use, and different ideas about the relationship between the worldviews of



these groups and the languages they speak. Further, we will outline the field of study in terms of approaches and methodologies.

## Knowledge of Language

When two or more people communicate with each other, we can call the system they use a **code**. We should also note that speakers who are multilingual, that is, who have access to two or more codes, and who for one reason or another shift back and forth between these languages in some form of multilingual discourse (see chapter 4) are also using a linguistic system, but one which draws on more than one language. The system itself (or the **grammar**, to use a well-known technical term) is something that each speaker 'knows,' but two very important issues for linguists are (1) just what that knowledge comprises and (2) how we may best characterize it.

In practice, linguists do not find it at all easy to write grammars because the knowledge that people have of the languages they speak is extremely hard to describe. Anyone who knows a language knows much more about that language than is contained in any grammar book that attempts to describe the language. One of the issues here is that grammar books tend to be written as **prescriptive** works; that is, they seek to outline the standard language and how it 'should' be spoken. What sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropologists do is provide **descriptive** grammars of languages, which describe, analyze, and explain how people actually speak their languages.

One example of this difference can be found in the *less/fewer* distinction. Prescriptively, *less* should be used with non-count nouns, such as water, rice, or money; *fewer* is used with count nouns (or noun phrases) such as drops of water, grains of rice, or pesos. So something may be worth *less money*, but it costs *fewer pesos*. Descriptively, however, this distinction does not hold; *less* is often used with count nouns. Most notable is the common sign at US grocery stores indicating that certain cashier lines are for patrons with 'ten items or less.' Chances are you will also hear people saying things like *there were less students present today than yesterday*, although of course there may be some dialects of English where this distinction is still commonly employed.

While linguists are aware of prescriptive rules of language as dictated in reference grammars, the focus of linguistics is not prescriptive rules but the rules inside the heads of speakers which constitute their knowledge of how to speak the language. This knowledge that people have about the language(s) they speak is both something which every individual who speaks the language possesses and also some kind of shared knowledge. It is this shared knowledge that becomes the abstraction of a language, which is often seen as something which exists independent of speakers of a particular variety.

Today, most linguists agree that the knowledge speakers have of the languages they speak is knowledge of something quite abstract. It is a knowledge of underlying

rules and principles which allow us to produce new utterances. It is knowing what is part of the language and what is not, knowing both what it is possible to say and what it is not possible to say. Communication among people who speak the same language is possible because they share such knowledge, although how it is shared and how it is acquired are not well understood. Individuals have access to it and constantly show that they do so by using it properly. As we will see, a wide range of skills and activities is subsumed under this concept of 'proper use.'

### *Competence and performance*

Confronted with the task of trying to describe the grammar of a language like English, many linguists follow the approach associated with Chomsky, undoubtedly the most influential figure in linguistics for the last half century. Chomsky distinguishes between what he has called **competence** and **performance**. He claims that it is the linguist's task to characterize what speakers know about their language, that is, their competence, not what they do with their language, that is, their performance. The best-known characterization of this distinction comes from Chomsky himself (1965, 3–4) in words which have been extensively quoted:

Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker–listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance. This seems to me to have been the position of the founders of modern general linguistics, and no cogent reason for modifying it has been offered. To study actual linguistic performance, we must consider the interaction of a variety of factors, of which the underlying competence of the speaker–hearer is only one. In this respect, study of language is no different from empirical investigation of other complex phenomena.

Pinker (2007, 74) points out the consequences of such a view: 'Though linguists often theorize about a language as if it were the fixed protocol of a homogeneous community of idealized speakers, like the physicist's frictionless plane and ideal gas, they also know that a real language is constantly being pushed and pulled at the margins by different speakers in different ways.' It is just such 'pushing and pulling' that interests Labov, arguably the most influential figure in sociolinguistics in the last fifty or so years. He maintains (2006, 380) that 'the linguistic behavior of individuals cannot be understood without knowledge of the communities that they belong to.' This is the focus of sociolinguistics, and what makes it different from Chomskyan linguistics. We are primarily concerned with real language in use (what Chomsky calls performance) not the language of some ideal speaker (i.e., an idealized competence). This distinction is reflected in methodological differences; syntacticians such as Chomsky will often use **grammatical judgments** to get at

competence, while sociolinguists tend to use recordings of language use (see section below on methodologies, and chapter 11 on Discourse Analysis).

The knowledge that we will seek to explain involves more than knowledge of the grammar of the language, for it will become apparent that speakers know, or are in agreement about, more than that. Moreover, in their performance they behave systematically: their actions are not random; there is order. Knowing a language also means knowing how to use that language, since speakers know not only how to form sentences but also how to use them appropriately. There is therefore another kind of competence, sometimes called **communicative competence**, and the social aspects of that competence will be our concern here.

### Exploration 1.1: Grammatical Judgments

Here are a number of statements that can be 'tagged' to make them into questions. Add a tag question to each with the tag you would be most likely to use and also add any other tags you might also use or think others might use. See (1) for an example of a potential answer. Indicate for each example which tag you believe to be the prescriptively 'correct' tag, or if you might associate certain tags only with certain types of speakers. Compare your results with those of others who do this task. If there are differences in your answers, how can you explain them? Do such differences challenge the idea of a shared communicative competence?

1. He's ready, *isn't he?*  
*Other possible tags: 'innit,' 'ain't he.'*  
*Prescriptively 'correct' tag: 'isn't he.'*
2. I may see you next week, ...?
3. No one goes there any more, ...?
4. Either John or Mary did it, ...?
5. Few people know that, ...?
6. You don't want to come with us, ...?
7. I have a penny in my purse...?
8. I'm going right now, ...?
9. The baby cried, ...?
10. The girl saw no one, ...?

### Variation

The competence–performance distinction just mentioned is one that holds intriguing possibilities for work in linguistics, but it is one that has also proved to be quite



troublesome, because the performance of different speakers, and the same speaker in different contexts, can vary quite a lot. For instance, speakers in some areas of the Midwestern United States might utter sentences such as ‘The car needs washed’ while others would say ‘The cars needs to be washed’ or ‘The car needs washing.’ Further, an individual speaker might use all three of these constructions at different times. (These different structures for expressing the same meaning are called **variants**; this term will be discussed in more detail in chapter 6.) For sociolinguists, this **linguistic variation** is a central topic. The language we use in everyday living is remarkably varied. There is **variation** across speakers, that is, reflections of different ways that people speak in different regions or social groups, but also variation within the speech of a single speaker. No one speaks the same way all the time, and people constantly exploit variation within the languages they speak for a wide variety of purposes. The consequence is a kind of paradox: while many linguists would like to view any language as a homogeneous entity, so that they can make the strongest possible theoretical generalizations, in actual fact that language will exhibit considerable internal variation. One claim we will be making throughout this book is that variation is an inherent characteristic of all languages at all times, and the patterns exhibited in this variation carry social meanings. (See the link to a website which provides an overview of the field, the sociolinguistics page for the PBS series *Do You Speak American*, in the materials associated with chapter 1 in the web guide to this textbook.)

The recognition of variation implies that we must recognize that a language is not just some kind of abstract object of study. It is also something that people use. Although some linguists, following Chomsky’s example, are focused on what language (as an abstraction) is, sociolinguists have argued that an *asocial* linguistics is scarcely worthwhile and that meaningful insights into language can be gained only if performance is included as part of the data which must be explained in a comprehensive theory of language. This is the view we will adopt here.

We will see that while there is considerable variation in the speech of any one individual, there are also definite bounds to that variation: no individual is free to do just exactly what he or she pleases so far as language is concerned. You cannot pronounce words any way you please, inflect or not inflect words such as nouns and verbs arbitrarily, or make drastic alterations in word order in sentences as the mood suits you. If you do any or all of these things, the results will be unacceptable, even gibberish. The variation you are permitted has limits, and these limits can be described with considerable accuracy. For instance, we can say, ‘It is the fence that the cow jumped over,’ which is comprehensible if somewhat stilted, but most speakers would agree that ‘the fence jumped the cow over’ does not follow English word order rules and is largely incomprehensible. Individuals know the various limits (or norms), and that knowledge is both very precise and at the same time almost entirely unconscious. At the same time, it is also difficult to explain how individual speakers acquire knowledge of these norms of linguistic behavior, because they appear to be much more subtle than the norms that apply to such matters as social behavior, dress, and table manners.

Our task will be one of trying to specify the norms of linguistic behavior that exist in particular groups and then trying to account for individual behavior in terms of these norms. This task is particularly interesting because most people have no conscious awareness of how their linguistic behavior is conditioned by social norms. We will also see how the variation we find in language allows changes to occur over time and often points to the direction of change. A living language not only varies, it changes.

### Exploration 1.2: Variation in Greetings

---

How do you greet your friends, your family, your colleagues, your professors and your acquaintances? Are there different verbal exchanges as well as different embodied practices (e.g., air kisses, shaking hands, fist bump)? Does the situation matter – that is, do you greet your family differently if you have not seen them for a long time, or friends in different ways depending on whether you run into each other by accident on campus or if you are meeting for dinner? Are there ways of greeting, either that you use or that you do not use, that index membership in particular groups? Are there ways of greeting that you find inappropriate – in general, or for particular addressees or in particular situations? Compare your own repertoires and practices with those of the other students in your class.

## Speakers and Their Groups

In order to talk about how speakers use language, we must talk about both individuals and groups, together with the relationships between people within and across groups. One of the current ways of thinking about this focuses on speaker identities. The term **identity** has been used in a variety of ways in both the social sciences and lay speech. In the current social theory, identities are not fixed attributes of people or groups but are dynamically constructed aspects which emerge through discourse and social behavior. Although we do look at identities of individuals, what we are primarily concerned with is *social* identity: 'Identity is defined as the linguistic construction of membership in one or more social groups or categories' (Kroskrity 2000, 111). Our special focus is on how language constructs speaker identity.

In such a view, identities are not preconceived categorical affiliations such as 'male' or 'female' but nuanced ways of being that we construct; while we may indeed reference such categories, our identities are not simply a matter of listing demographic identifiers (e.g., 'single white female, 45, architect, nature lover'). So while



a speaker may introduce a comment by saying *As a mother ...*, thus explicitly referencing this aspect of her identity, what will emerge is a more nuanced picture of what type of mother she is – for example, protective, feminist, one who encourages independence, one who is concerned with the upward mobility of her children. Named social categories are not our identities but concepts we use to construct our identities.

Further, our identities are fluid and we do not have a single identity but multiple levels of identity, and shifting and sometimes even conflicting identities which emerge in different contexts. To continue the example above, the speaker may reference her identity as a mother but then also focus on how she identifies strongly with her profession and struggles to balance this with the demands of parenthood; this may be intertwined with her gender identity and her social class identity. In another conversation, this same speaker might focus on her political affiliations to construct a different aspect of her identity.

Likewise, group identity categories are constantly being negotiated. What it means to be the member of a particular social category (e.g., ‘gay,’ ‘educated,’ ‘Latino’) may vary over time, space, and situation, and how particular speakers identify with or are assigned to these categories may also vary. We will revisit this concept of multiple identities throughout this text because it is highly relevant to our study of language in society.

So far, we have said that the term ‘society’ refers to a group of people unified through some purpose; other concepts such as ‘speech community,’ ‘social network,’ and ‘community of practice’ will be found in the pages that follow (see especially sections devoted to these concepts in chapter 3). We will see how these are useful if we wish to refer to groups of various kinds, since it is among groups that individuals form relationships or reject such a possibility. The groups can be long-lasting or temporary, large or small, close-knit or casual, and formally or informally organized. This is, therefore, another level of complexity we must acknowledge in the pages that follow as we refer to ‘middle class,’ ‘women,’ ‘speakers of Haitian Creole,’ ‘teenagers,’ and so on. We must remember that these categorizations also have a process side to them: all must be enacted, performed, or reproduced in order to exist. Socio-economic class, gender, language background, and age are only important aspects of our identities and groups if we choose to organize our lives in that way; in some contexts they may not be salient social categories and we may instead see ourselves as members of groups based on racial identification, sexual orientation, national belonging, or membership of a particular formal social group (e.g., a Choir, a professional association, or a fox hunting club).

In all of the above we must recognize that **power** has a significant role to play; it undoubtedly has a key role to play in how we choose to identify ourselves and how we form groups with others. Power is ‘the ability to control events in order to achieve one’s aims’ (Tollefson 2006, 46) and is also ‘the control someone has over the outcomes of others’ (Myers-Scotton 2006, 199). It is pervasive in society and never completely absent, although it is exercised on a continuum from extremely brutal to most subtle. It may be exercised and resisted through words as well as deeds.

Bourdieu (1991) conceives of languages as symbolic marketplaces in which some people have more control of the goods than others because certain languages or varieties have been endowed with more symbolic power than others and have therefore been given a greater value. For example, speaking – and especially writing – what is considered the standard language in a given community (see discussion of this in chapter 2) is often necessary to gain employment, may open doors in terms of finding housing, and may lend the speaker more authority even in casual conversations. We cannot escape such issues of power in considering language, social relationships, and the **construction of social identities**. In chapter 2, we will address the issue of standard languages and issues of societal power; in chapter 11 we will discuss the interaction of language and power within social relationships; in chapter 12 we will address gendered aspects of power; and in chapters 13 and 14 we will discuss institutionalized power relationships between the speakers of particular languages (or particular varieties of languages).

**Solidarity** refers to the motivations which cause individuals to act together and to feel a common bond which influences their social actions. Thus the concept of solidarity is intertwined with both identity formation and group formation. We know that people can unite for all kinds of reasons, some of which they may not even be able to articulate, and the consequences may be great or small. We will also look at some of the consequences for language behavior. For instance, in the next chapter, we will discuss how a sense of belonging contributes to the classification of a particular code as a language or a dialect. In chapter 3, we will look more at how people use language to construct their identities as members of particular groups. Much variationist work (discussed in chapters 6–8) rests on the idea that the use of particular linguistic features corresponds with desired membership in particular social groups; in chapters 9 and 11, we look at how this can be examined with qualitative methods.

### Exploration 1.3: Idiolects

---

An idiolect is an individual's way of speaking, including sounds, words, grammar, and style. The first author of this book, Wardhaugh, speaks in such a way that he is regarded as North American almost everywhere he goes but in certain aspects shows his origins in the north of England. He pronounces *grass* and *bath* with the vowel of *cat*, does not pronounce the *r*'s in *car* and *cart*, and distinguishes the vowels in *cot* and *caught* (and pronounces the latter word exactly like *court*). He also distinguishes the vowels in *Mary*, *merry*, and *marry*. He sometimes pronounces *book* to rhyme with *Luke*, and finds he has to watch his pronunciation of *work* because he



"The foundational textbook in sociolinguistics is now more essential than ever. Wardhaugh and Fuller provide solid grounding in a full range of sociolinguistic perspectives while offering cutting-edge treatments of such timely concerns as multilingualism, identity construction, and socially responsible sociolinguistics."

Natalie Schilling, Georgetown University

"With this revised and revamped edition, Wardhaugh and Fuller bring us the text we have come to know and love in an exciting new guise, one that reflects the current state of the art, its complexities and myriad perspectives, and yet remains accessible and fluid in its presentation. This is unquestionably the 'go to' text for undergraduates."

Alexandra D'Arcy, University of Victoria

Thoroughly updated and revised, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Seventh Edition* presents a comprehensive and fully updated introduction to the study of the relationship between language and society.

Building on Ronald Wardhaugh's classic text, co-author Janet M. Fuller has updated this seventh edition throughout with new discussions exploring language and communities, language and interaction, and sociolinguistic variation, as well as incorporating numerous new exercises and research ideas for today's students. Taking account of new research from the field, the book explores exciting new perspectives drawn from linguistic anthropology, and includes new chapters on pragmatics, discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics and education. With an emphasis on using examples from languages and cultures around the world, chapters address topics including social and regional dialects, multilingualism, discourse and pragmatics, variation, language in education, and language policy and planning.

A new companion website, including a wealth of additional online material as well as a variety of new exercises and examples, helps further illuminate the ideas presented in the text. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Seventh Edition* continues to be the most indispensable and accessible introduction to the field of sociolinguistics for students in applied and theoretical linguistics, education, and anthropology.

**RONALD WARDHAUGH** is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Toronto. He is the author of a number of books, including *Understanding English Grammar, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2003) and *Proper English* (Wiley-Blackwell, 1998).

**JANET M. FULLER** is Professor in the Department of Anthropology at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. She has recently published two books dealing with multilingualism, discourse, and identity: *Spanish Speakers in the USA* (2013) and *Bilingual Pre-Teens: Competing Ideologies and Multiple Identities in the U.S. and Germany* (2012), and was the editor of the sociolinguistics section of the *Language and Linguistics Compass* (Wiley-Blackwell) from 2010 to 2013.



A companion website with additional resources is available at  
[www.wiley.com/go/wardhaugh/sociolinguistics](http://www.wiley.com/go/wardhaugh/sociolinguistics)

[www.wiley.com](http://www.wiley.com)

WILEY Blackwell



Also available  
at [wileyebook](http://wileyebook)

ISBN 978-1-118-73229-8



9 781118 732298