

The contributions in this volume illustrate why the count/mass distinction is so fascinating. Even though there is a large amount of crosslinguistic variation, there are also striking parallels between languages that are not or only distantly related. As indicated by Ghomeshi and Massam, the ‘haunting similarities’ suggest the presence of underlying unity.

REFERENCES

- CHIERCHIA, GENNARO. 1998a. Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of ‘semantic parameter’. *Events and grammar*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 53–103. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- CHIERCHIA, GENNARO. 1998b. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6.339–405.
- CONSTANTINESCU, CAMELIA. 2011. *Gradability in the nominal domain*. Leiden: Leiden University dissertation.
- MORZYCKI, MARCIN. 2009. Degree modification of gradable nouns: Size adjectives and adnominal degree morphemes. *Natural Language Semantics* 17.175–203.
- RIJKHOFF, JAN. 1991. Nominal aspect. *Journal of Semantics* 8.291–309.
- SOUČKOVÁ, KATEŘINA. 2011. *Pluractionality in Hausa*. Leiden: Leiden University dissertation.
- SYBESMA, RINT. 2008. *Classifiers, number and countability*. Leiden: Leiden University, MS.

LUCL

PO box 9515

2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

[j.doetjes@hum.leidenuniv.nl]

Sociolinguistic fieldwork. By NATALIE SCHILLING. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. 313. ISBN 9780521127974. \$36.99.

Reviewed by JAMES A. WALKER, *York University*

In contrast with other subfields of linguistics that rely on native-speaker intuition, grammaticality judgments, or laboratory experiments, conducting sociolinguistic research involves venturing into the field and satisfying two (potentially conflicting) goals: recruiting a representative sample of speakers, and obtaining recordings of their speech that are as close to ‘natural’ as possible (see e.g. Labov 1984). These considerations raise particular methodological and practical challenges that can be daunting, especially to students engaged in their first experience of sociolinguistic research. Those students lucky enough to study at a university that offers courses in sociolinguistic fieldwork are often confronted with lists of readings culled from different sources in linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and social psychology. In this book, Schilling draws on her many years’ experience in conducting sociolinguistic fieldwork in different communities in the United States, as well as her colleagues’ and students’ experiences in other locales, to offer a unified account of the steps involved in conducting sociolinguistic fieldwork, from research design, through speaker recruitment and data collection, to community advocacy and empowerment. Although her focus is on issues of relevance to fieldwork for the analysis of linguistic variation and change, the book is also intended to be useful for researchers in other areas of sociolinguistics. In Ch. 1, ‘Introduction’ (1–16), she begins by providing a brief history and overview of sociolinguistic fieldwork and outlining the structure of the book.

Ch. 2, ‘Designing the study’ (17–65), details the steps involved in designing a sociolinguistic research project. Because we cannot hope to include in the study every speaker in the speech community being studied, we have to develop a sample of speakers whose behavior can be generalized to the community, stratified for the locally relevant social distinctions that we want to test. As S points out, the traditional social categories (social class, sex/gender, ethnicity), in which ‘objectively’ measurable (‘etic’) categories have given way to explorations of subjective (‘emic’) social meaning, can create practical problems in sampling speakers. ‘Real-time’ studies of lan-

guage change (replications of earlier studies of the same community) need to consider whether the same speakers should be contacted again (a panel study) or whether a new sample of speakers should be recruited (a trend study), as well as whether the techniques or even the interviewers should be the same. Once the stratified sampling frame is developed, researchers need to decide whether to recruit speakers through random sampling, judgment sampling (filling cells through the friend-of-a-friend technique), or a mixture of the two.

Ch. 3, 'Data-collection methods' (66–133), addresses appropriate methods of collecting data for sociolinguistic research, in which the main challenge is overcoming the OBSERVER'S PARADOX—'to observe how people talk when they are not being observed' (Labov 1984:30)—since the fieldworker's very presence may define a situation in which the type of linguistic behavior we are interested in observing is unlikely. While sociolinguistic surveys (used in dialectological studies), whether conducted face to face or remotely (by post, telephone, or internet), allow us to collect a large amount of data from many speakers, they heighten the observer's paradox and do not approximate natural speech. Sociolinguistic fieldwork more commonly relies on the 'sociolinguistic interview' (unfortunately named, since, if successful, it should be as little like an interview as possible), in which the goal is to engage the speakers in natural interaction so that their attention is focused more on what they are saying than on how they are saying it. A great deal of thought and planning must be given to the structure of the interview and the types of questions asked, as well as to whether different tasks should take place during the interview to elicit stylistic variation. While acknowledging the criticisms leveled at the sociolinguistic interview, S situates it within a taxonomy of speech events and suggests modifications to suit the purposes of particular research questions and contexts. The sociolinguistic interview was developed as a less time-consuming alternative to collecting data through ethnographic observation (or participant observation), which is more successful at overcoming the observer's paradox, although ethnographic observation raises questions about the appropriate degree of involvement in the community. S offers practical guidelines about conducting ethnographic observation, what to observe and how to observe it, and different degrees of participation. As she points out, however, these methods are not mutually exclusive and may be combined in a particular study.

The considerations involved in investigating stylistic variation are discussed specifically in Ch. 4, 'Designing research on style' (134–76). S examines Labov's (1972) 'attention to speech' approach (based either on different tasks or on topic- or interaction-based variation within the interview; Labov 2001) and its shortcomings. She also considers Bell's (1984) 'audience design' approach, the theoretical questions it raises, and its application to the role of interlocutor ethnicity and sex/gender in stylistic variation (Bell 2001, Rickford & McNair-Knox 1994). The recent move toward so-called 'third-wave' (or 'speaker-design', p. 160) studies, which investigate speaker 'stance' (Schiffrin 2006) and the use of the 'indexical field' (Eckert 2008) to construct meaning, present challenges to sociolinguistic research design and data collection. Using several examples from work conducted by herself and her students and colleagues, S illustrates how these challenges can be overcome. Despite the current popularity of the third-wave approach, she notes its roots in the previous 'waves' (e.g. Bell 1984, Labov 1963) and some of its theoretical and methodological limitations, cautioning readers about the need to approach sociolinguistic research from a range of perspectives.

Ch. 5, 'In the field: Finding contacts, finding a place' (177–215), deals with perhaps the most stressful aspect of fieldwork, that of making initial contacts in the community and recruiting speakers. Researchers have to decide how to present themselves and their project to the community, walking a line between full disclosure and the observer's paradox. As S says, 'there is no single "best" type of initial contact' (190). Although researchers are often wary about relying on community 'gatekeepers' or 'brokers' (those who filter outsider contact with other members of the community), this wariness may be a legacy of traditional dialectology's concern with locating the most 'unspoiled' or 'authentic' speakers, and S argues that there may also be advantages to working with such people. Similarly, while random sampling may provide the most representative sample of the community, fieldworkers who are completely unknown to the speaker are less likely to overcome the observer's paradox.

Ch. 6, 'Recording and record-keeping' (216–67), discusses the technical aspects involved in recording spoken-language data and keeping track of the data collected. With constantly changing technology, any discussion of recording equipment risks becoming rapidly outdated. However, S's overview is sufficiently technical yet not too machine-specific. She also discusses the practical considerations of recording in the field, as well as moving beyond the sociolinguistic interview, by either increasing the level of control (laboratory recordings) or removing the fieldworker from the recording situation altogether. Finally, she deals with the time-consuming but essential issue of developing a system of (meta)data management, which often evolves during data collection but ideally should be established prior to entering the field. Not only are detailed field notes and the database of information about the speakers and the recordings crucial, but so is preserving the confidentiality of the materials.

In the final chapter, 'Giving back to the community' (268–86), S goes above and beyond other discussions of sociolinguistic fieldwork to outline ways that researchers can give something back to the community. Drawing on Labov's (1982) principles of community involvement and Wolfram's (1998) principle of 'linguistic gratuity', she moves through advocacy to empowerment, illustrating the implementation of Labov's and Wolfram's principles in issues of education and discrimination. She cautions, however, that this implementation may uncover tensions between the intentions of the researchers and the goals of the community (or even different members or groups within the community).

Book reviews usually catalogue the book's deficiencies as well as its virtues, but the few times that I found myself disagreeing or wanting to see a fuller discussion of some topic or question, I realized that my objections had more to do with differences between the types of community in which we have engaged in fieldwork. The main limitation of the book is its predominant focus on (American) English-speaking communities. While there is some discussion of the issues faced by fieldworkers in other languages, countries, and cultural contexts (and in signed as opposed to spoken languages), the book's focus might give some researchers or students the unfortunate impression that techniques of sociolinguistic fieldwork are not suitable outside of Western societies. This deficiency, however, stems less from S's expertise than from the history of variationist sociolinguistics, which has tended to focus on a few European-origin languages in Western countries.

Given the recent appearance of a number of books and handbooks dealing with sociolinguistic fieldwork, one might wonder what this book offers that the others do not. First, other books typically devote only one or two chapters to fieldwork, usually within the larger context of conducting (socio)linguistic analysis (e.g. Podesva & Sharma 2014, Tagliamonte 2006, 2012). Moreover, in contrast with edited volumes (e.g. Mallinson, Childs, & van Herk 2013, Podesva & Sharma 2014), having a single voice throughout the book gives a real sense of sociolinguistic fieldwork as a dynamic and evolving process—S returns to the same projects at different stages throughout the book, illustrating how different fieldwork situations can lead to different decisions about the most appropriate methods. An extra dimension is added by the numerous insets of 'Case studies', illustrating specific points by drawing on actual fieldwork experiences, and of 'Students in the field', focusing on the mistakes and successes of her own students. As S notes, 'what feels to you like an embarrassing (or even stupid) gaffe can serve as an excellent teaching tool for field researchers on human behavior across a range of disciplines' (259).

This book will serve well as a textbook in a graduate or advanced undergraduate course on sociolinguistic fieldwork (whether for variationist sociolinguistics or other types of sociolinguistics). As S observes, there is no one 'correct' way of doing fieldwork, and I have already recommended this book to a number of students as a valuable starting point (rather than a 'how-to' manual). I would also recommend it to colleagues beginning their first fieldwork project or as a refresher for others (like myself) who may have developed their own fieldwork practices but will always benefit from a slightly different perspective.

REFERENCES

- BELL, ALLAN. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13.145–204.
 BELL, ALLAN. 2001. Back in style: Reworking audience design. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*, ed. by Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford, 139–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- ECKERT, PENELOPE. 2008. Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12.4.453–76.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1963. The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19.273–309.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1982. Objectivity and commitment in linguistic science: The case of the Black English trial in Ann Arbor. *Language in Society* 11.165–201.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 1984. Field methods of the project on linguistic change and variation. *Language in use: Readings in sociolinguistics*, ed. by John Baugh and Joel Sherzer, 28–54. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- LABOV, WILLIAM. 2001. The anatomy of style-shifting. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*, ed. by Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford, 85–108. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MALLINSON, CHRISTINE; BECKY CHILDS; and GERARD VAN HERK. 2013. *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications*. New York: Routledge.
- PODESVA, ROBERT J., and DEVYANI SHARMA (eds.) 2014. *Research methods in linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RICKFORD, JOHN R., and FAYE MCNAIR-KNOX. 1994. Addressee- and topic-influenced style shift: A quantitative sociolinguistic study. *Perspectives on register: Situating register variation within sociolinguistics*, ed. by Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan, 235–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHIFFRIN, DEBORAH. 2006. *In other words: Variation in reference and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TAGLIAMONTE, SALI. 2006. *Analysing linguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TAGLIAMONTE, SALI. 2012. *Variationist sociolinguistics: Change, observation, interpretation*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- WOLFRAM, WALT. 1998. Scrutinizing linguistic gratuity: A view from the field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2.271–79.

Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics
York University
4700 Keele St.
Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada
[jamesw@yorku.ca]