



The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society

Ofelia García (ed.) et al.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.001.0001>

Published: 05 December 2016 **Available in print:** 05 January 2017

Online ISBN: 9780190212919

Print ISBN: 9780190212896

Search in this book

CHAPTER

5 Language Ideologies

p. 103

Jonathan Rosa, Christa Burdick

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.013.15> Pages 103–124

Published: 05 December 2016

Abstract

Over the last several decades a robust language ideologies literature has forged new paths in the study of relations between social and linguistic structures. Rather than viewing ideas about language as epiphenomena of marginal importance in scholarly analyses of linguistic form and function, language ideologies theorists persuasively argue that cultural conceptions of language are fundamental structuring components of communicative praxis. This language ideologies perspective hinges on ethnographic accounts of culturally specific ways in which language is construed, as well as careful analyses of referential and non-referential elements of linguistic practice. This chapter shows how language ideologies research has developed and moved beyond accounts of language attitudes in sociolinguistics to powerfully theorize linkages among linguistic forms and cultural contexts across interactional, institutional, and political-economic scales. It concludes by pointing to emergent directions in work on language ideologies, focusing specifically on questions surrounding the agents and objects of language ideologies.

Keywords: [institutional](#), [political economy](#), [language](#), [ideology](#), [sociolinguistics](#)

Subject: [Sociolinguistics](#), [Linguistics](#)

Series: [Oxford Handbooks](#)

Collection: [Oxford Handbooks Online](#)

Introduction

HOW do linguistic form and function interact? What is the relationship between linguistic structures and societal structures? How does language change take place? How do linguistic practices in different modalities shape one another? How is language linked to forms of societal power? What is the status of language vis-à-vis other forms of communication? These are just some of the long-standing questions that have been richly reinvigorated over the last several decades through the development of the concept of *language ideologies*. In this chapter we seek not only to chart this development, highlight its contemporary iterations, and point to potential future uses, but also to frame the stakes of a language ideologies perspective. Specifically, we show how a focus on language ideologies can disrupt presumptions about the discrete, empirically objective, and self-presenting nature—the always already recognizability—of linguistic forms that undergird a great deal of scholarship on language. Indeed, a potential unintended interpretation of the now canonical insight that ideas about language are never simply about language is that ideas about language are not about language at all. Such interpretations are often rooted in questionable distinctions between the study of language and culture, thereby relegating a focus on language ideologies to those concerned with the latter rather than the former. In contrast, we hope to show here how a focus on language ideologies is not just relevant but crucial in efforts toward understanding the nature of linguistic forms and practices.

p. 104

Purportedly non-ideological approaches to the study of language characteristically take for granted the nature and meanings of linguistic signs. From this viewpoint, linguistic forms are objective phenomena, and the goal of language analysis is to understand their fundamental structure. Conversely, language ideologies approaches locate the meaningfulness of linguistic signs in relation to other signs in particular historical, political-economic, and sociocultural contexts, and interrogate from what perspectives a given sign comes to take on particular value. This involves a rejection of the notion that ↪ some perspectives on language are objective while others are ideological. Any view of language is ideological because it reflects a specific perspective and emerges within a particular context. Such an approach requires a reconsideration of foundational analytical categories, including the notion of language itself as an objective way of drawing boundaries between linguistic forms or practices. Far from an abstract theoretical exercise in deconstruction or relativism, a focus on language ideologies can shed new light on the joint (re)production and (trans)formation of social and linguistic structures in context.

We begin by tracing the theorization of language ideologies by linguistic anthropologists and fellow analysts of language and culture; we then show how insights about language ideologies are deployed in contemporary research, and we conclude by pointing to emergent conceptualizations of language ideologies. Throughout the chapter we emphasize the pivotal status of language ideologies as part of what Silverstein (1985b) has formulated as the “total linguistic fact,” consisting of the dialectic relationship between linguistic structures as practiced in social contexts whose meanings are mediated by culturally situated perspectives. Thus, we aim to show how a focus on language ideologies is not simply a fad or minor concern, but rather a foundational site from which to apprehend the dynamic nature of language and semiotic practice more broadly in social life.

Historical Overview: From Language Attitudes and Secondary Rationalizations to Ideologies

p. 105

It should come as no surprise that research on language ideologies has grappled with a range of presumptions about the nature of language on the one hand, and ideology on the other. These presumptions include the notion that language forms should be studied apart from ideas about them, as well as the conceptualization of ideologies as inherently distorting phenomena that can and should be avoided in scholarly research. In order to combat these presumptions, linguistic anthropologists have synthesized insights from various intellectual approaches, including structuralism, pragmatism, interactional sociolinguistics, and the ethnography of communication, to conceptualize language ideologies as powerful, multi-scalar phenomena that link social and linguistic structures (Kroskrity, 2004). This multi-scalar perspective is reflected in the combination of Silverstein's definition of language ideologies as "a set of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (1979: 193), with that of Irvine, who formulates language ideologies as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (1989: 225). Silverstein and Irvine show how a focus on language ideologies can facilitate the joint analysis of "language structure and use" and "moral and political interests." Wortham combines these approaches in his pragmatic conceptualization of language ideologies as "models that link types of linguistic forms with the types of people who stereotypically use them" (2008: 43). These ideological linkages between types of linguistic forms and types of people who stereotypically use them are key components of processes of enregisterment that have gained increasing attention in recent linguistic scholarship across a range of disciplines (Agha, 2007a; Adams, 2009).

Prominent historical figures in US-based anthropology, linguistics, and sociolinguistics, such as Boas, Bloomfield, and Labov, continually note(d) and disavow(ed) what we might now call language ideologies. For Boas (1911), it was simultaneously crucial to take into account "native" points of view and to recognize that the analytical import of language as a cultural system stems from the fact that it is minimally affected by such "secondary rationalizations." Boas referred to language users' conceptions of their linguistic practices as "secondary rationalizations" because he argued that language patterns are independent of local ideas about them. For Bloomfield, local conceptions of language "are merely a part of the linguist's data" (1933: 22). He suggested that an ideological distinction, such as that between what might be conceptualized as a "correct" and an "incorrect" form from some perspectives (e.g., "am not" vs. "ain't"), "is only one of the problems of linguistics, and since it is not a fundamental one, it can be attacked only after many other things are known" (1933: 22). Thus, for Bloomfield, language ideologies were not of primary concern. Unlike Boas and Bloomfield, Labov's work foregrounds the importance of "social attitudes" toward language (1964: 241). This is particularly evident in the sustained attention to "linguistic insecurity" throughout his career (1984: 28). However, in Labov's theorization of linguistic change, he suggests that the most consequential mechanisms of change are not subject to speakers' awareness (1979). In Labov's variationist paradigm, correlations between linguistic variables and demographic categories are naturally occurring social facts rather than ideologically mediated processes; linguistic practices index preexisting identities rather than dynamically reproduce, create, and potentially transform them. The dismissive view of language ideologies in these influential scholars' work is reflected in the marginalization or complete erasure of culturally specific conceptions of language in the fields of linguistics and sociolinguistics.

In sociolinguistics and social psychology, the study of "language attitudes" (Baker, 1992; Garrett, Coupland, and Williams, 2003; Garrett, 2010) shares many concerns with research on language ideologies. This work typically involves the use of experimental and survey methods, such as matched-guise tests and interview questionnaires, to track views of language. Research on language attitudes is often linked to applied efforts, including language planning (Ruiz, 1984), securing linguistic human rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006), and challenging standard language hegemony in everyday institutional contexts (Lippi-Green, 1997). However, an

important distinction between traditional work on language attitudes and language ideologies is the former's tendency toward locating "attitudes" at the subjective level and then taking the overt expression of views regarding language at face value as direct reflections of deeply held beliefs rather than modes of performativity in particular cultural settings. That is, language attitudes research tends to focus exclusively on referentiality—the denotational content of what is said about language—rather than looking at the multiple potential functions of language ideologies and the linguistic practices through which they are articulated.

In much of the work on language attitudes there is the suggestion—alternately implicit and explicit—that changing these attitudes is the means to more socially just ends. For example, it is often implied that if attitudes toward nonstandardized language varieties were to change, then the social circumstances and forms of stigmatization faced by speakers of these varieties would improve. However, this perspective neglects the fact that some speakers of what are widely recognized as stigmatized varieties can be simultaneously derided for their language practices and yet elevated to the highest positions of political and economic power. Silverstein (2003) has argued that former President George W. Bush's perceived linguistic shortcomings powerfully contributed to his broader political "message"—namely, that he was an approachable "regular" guy as compared to more eloquent and less relatable presidential election competitors, Al Gore and John Kerry. Thus, from a language ideologies perspective, it is crucial to track the expression and implications of "language attitudes" ethnographically. The failure to do so contributes to the troublesome linguistic tendency toward equating the valorization of minoritized language varieties with improvements in the social circumstances of their users. Language ideologies scholarship has been particularly critical of this problematic tendency in the context of language preservation efforts (Hill, 2002; Perley, 2012), which often invoke questionable metaphors of death, resurrection, and value, thereby positioning linguists as saviors and contributing to the marginalization of so-called "endangered" languages and the communities in which they are used.

Careful ethnographic attention to language ideologies can disrupt these presumptions about the relationship between language and power. Gal (1995a) shows how influential research on language and resistance has characteristically reproduced questionable ideas about the ways that language can be interpreted as a sign of power. For example, she points to the presumption that for subordinate individuals, public presentations of self are dissimulations in which they must acquiesce to existing power relations and dominant norms. Gal suggests that this presumption has led to the problematic classification of speech as relatively "authentic" or "inauthentic" based on essentialized ideas about a given person's "true" characteristics and practices. This is reflected in Labov's (1973) faulty distinction between "careful" and "relaxed" speech, which positions some language practices as more "authentic" than others and overlooks the fundamental Goffmanian (1959) insight that every interaction is necessarily a performance; "careful" and "relaxed" are not objective qualities of speech itself, but rather performative categories of speech that are construed through language ideologies. Moreover, theories of performativity have shown that identity and authenticity should be understood as phenomena that are produced in particular historical and institutional contexts, rather than naturally occurring characteristics that emanate from one's true nature (Butler 1990). Returning to the earlier discussion of language and power, the broader point here is that powerlessness must not simply be equated with dissimulation and empowerment with authenticity. For example, research on ideologies of accent has shown how the inability to escape "authenticity" is a central mechanism of linguistic disempowerment (Lippi-Green, 1997), as well as the ways in which linguistic "authenticity" can become commoditized and profitable, often by invoking stigmatizing stereotypes. Shankar (2012, 2015) shows how ideologies of linguistic authenticity are central to modes of population management. In the context of her research focused on language, race, and advertising, ideas about linguistic authenticity problematically participate in the transformation of Asian Americans from "model minorities" to "model consumers." Based on this research, we must be careful not to equate authenticity with empowerment. Conversely, in societal realms such as electoral politics, the alignment of communicative dissimulation and empowerment is a common characteristic of the cultural logics surrounding presidential "style." Building on previous research by Silverstein mentioned earlier, Lempert and Silverstein (2012) argue that George W. Bush's alleged linguistic gaffes and bloopers were in fact strategic dissimulations

that allowed him to cultivate power by erasing his elite background and presenting himself as an approachable everyman. In this example, linguistic dissimulation operates as a platform for political empowerment. Thus, the relationship between linguistic practices and power depends on the language ideologies that exist in particular cultural contexts.

Similarly, Gal's (1995b) work on language and gender has shown how stereotypes equating femininity with silence and subordination, and masculinity with speech and dominance, are belied by countless contexts—from religious confession to psychiatric evaluations to police interrogations—in which silence is often an index of empowerment and speech is an index of disempowerment. She calls for a reconsideration of language and power based on the language ideologies through which the meaningfulness of communicative practices is interpreted in particular contexts. Such an analysis challenges naturalized ideas about the relationship between particular language practices and power, as well as the presumption that domination and subordination correspond to distinct subject positions that any given individual experiences in absolute and continuous ways.

Building from these insights regarding language and power, González (2005) shows how Latina/o students draw on seemingly contradictory language ideologies in their strategic performances of identity in specific educational contexts. From a conventional language attitudes perspective, these students' alternately negative and positive evaluations of the Spanish language might suggest that they suffer from misrecognition, internalized discrimination, or self-hate. However, by approaching their expressions of language ideologies and articulations of linguistic insecurity as situated presentations of self in particular interactional and institutional settings, it becomes possible to consider contested ways in which they are engaging with—and potentially reconfiguring—existing power dynamics rather than simply reproducing them (Zentella 2007). This approach also avoids the problem of celebrating the valorization of stigmatized languages and varieties as a straightforward exercise in agency and empowerment. For example, Rosa (2014) shows how Latina/o students understood as capable of speaking “unaccented” English and Spanish valorize “Spanglish” language practices while simultaneously deriding their “Spanish-dominant” peers. These insights demonstrate the importance of tracking the complex ways in which modes of performativity and presentations of self participate in processes of linguistic empowerment and subordination.

p. 108 By shifting from a view of language attitudes as marginal factors in sociolinguistic analysis to language ideologies as central mediating forces through which language is made meaningful in culturally specific ways, language ideologies scholarship has made crucial contributions to the analysis of the relationship between linguistic and social structures. Recalling Silverstein's and Irvine's respectively micro- and macro-oriented definitions of language ideologies described earlier, the following section shows how these perspectives have been productively integrated in recent language ideologies research that has connected semiotic practices across interactional, institutional, and political-economic scales.

Core Issues and Topics in the Present: Identities, Institutions, and Questions of Materiality

As scholars have demonstrated, talk about language is never just about language (Kroskrity, 2000; Schieffelin et al., 1998; Woolard, 1998; Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994). Rather, metalinguistic and metapragmatic commentary serves to connect language use and social structure, and in fact leads to linguistic change, as Silverstein (1979, 1985a) has shown in his analysis of changing gender pronouns in the United States and elsewhere. Kroskrity (2000) has described language ideologies as a “cluster concept,” consisting of four overlapping dimensions: (1) language ideologies serve the interests of certain groups; (2) language ideologies are always multiple; (3) group members may display varying degrees of awareness of language ideologies; and (4) language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk. Taking these four layers of language ideologies as a point of departure, this section provides a general review of recent work in the area of language ideologies, focusing particular attention on scholarship regarding language and identity, institutions, and materiality.

Reconceptualizing Language and Identity

p. 109 Ideas about language are always partial, just as all views come from somewhere (Haraway, 1991, cited in Urla, 2012b). Language ideologies scholarship has sought to examine the ways in which our common-sense notions about language are always situated, biased, and the result of historical and contemporary processes. How is it, therefore, that certain languages are said to be more or less “logical,” “correct,” or “elegant” than others? How are certain speakers seen to embody such characteristics merely through their speech? These conceptions of language and people often undergird decisions about what languages to protect, promote, or abandon; they are also motivated by political and economic interests that benefit certain groups and disadvantage others. ↴ National languages, for example, are frequently taught and promoted with an eye toward national unity, progress, and modernity, and scholars of nationalism have pointed to language as a central organizing factor through which national identity (and the nation itself) was formed (Anderson, 1991; Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998; Gellner, 1983). Such projects, however, assume the superiority of the chosen national language over others, and simultaneously erase multilingual realities in the discursive construction of the nation (Errington, 1998, 2000; Silverstein, 1996). Errington’s (1998, 2000) analyses of the promotion of standard Indonesian as a national language demonstrate the constructed, yet power-laden dimensions of the connection of language to the nation-state. In his account, despite the fact that Indonesian lacks a clear traditional ethnic speech community, it is seen as a highly effective national language for its connections to the rhetoric of “development.” Yet, the success of national standard Indonesian is contingent on its ideological distinction from Javanese, which serves as “a reference for a territorialized ethnic identity” (Errington, 1998: 281).

In contexts of language shift, decline, and revitalization, social movements demanding revitalization and political recognition have emerged throughout Europe and elsewhere. Such movements constitute important sites for the contestation of national language ideologies as well as the promotion of locally held, plural ideologies of language (Jaffe, 1999b; McEwan-Fujita, 2010; Meek, 2010; Urla, 2012a). In Jaffe’s (1999b) ethnography of the Corsican revitalization movement through which Corsican speakers sought to gain political recognition in the face of the French national language, members of the movement constantly contested, negotiated, and disagreed about the form the movement would take, as well as the kind of Corsican to be promoted.

Despite the linguistic hegemony of national standardized languages, recent work on the relationship between language and identity demonstrates the ways in which “language and communication are critical aspects of the production of a wide variety of identities expressed at many levels of social organization” (Kroskrity, 2001:

106). Linguistic identities co-naturalize other social identities such as gender (Hoffman, 2008; Queen, 2005) and ethnicity (Makihara, 2007; Shankar, 2008), as well as national identities, in significant ways. More than this however, authors have shown that the linguistic construction and construal of identity is never uncontested, nor are constructed identities static or monolithic. Thus, language does not simply reflect preexisting identities—it actively participates in the construction, reproduction, and transformation of identity.

Promising work in the realm of language and race has expanded on the long-standing anthropological tradition of seeking to denaturalize racial categories from both linguistic and broader cultural perspectives (Alim and Smitherman, 2012; Bucholtz, 2001, 2011; Hill, 2008; Meek, 2006; Roth-Gordon, 2011; Shankar, 2008). Attempting to understand the ways in which racialized identities are assumed to *sound* a certain way has become a central concern in the study of language ideologies. As Bucholtz (2011) has explored in her ethnography of a California high school, styles, linguistic and otherwise, allow students to embody racialized identities in various ways. For example, although acting and talking “White” are normatively associated with a lack of style or an absence of culture, Bucholtz (2011) demonstrates the ways in which White high school students engage in ↵ both linguistic and semiotic practices that construct contingent identities along racial, ethnic, and gendered lines. Conversely, Lo and Reyes show how a stubborn commitment to the distinctiveness paradigm in sociolinguistics contributes to the erasure of Asian American linguistic practices that disrupt “the ideology that group x speaks language x, a distinguishable speech variety from language y spoken by group y” (2009: 6). These cases exemplify how language ideologies can play a central role in shaping conceptions of racial authenticity, which involve associating some groups with emblematic racialized linguistic forms and other groups with a lack thereof (Chun, 2011). Urciuoli (2011) suggests that this dynamic relationship between markedness and unmarkedness is a characteristic component of racializing discourses.

Alim and Smitherman’s (2012) account of Barack Obama’s controlled and strategic style-shifting, and perhaps more important, mainstream media reactions to Obama’s language use, demonstrate the strongly held racial ideologies that extend into perceptions of language. As Alim and Smitherman (2012: 3) have suggested, we need to *language* race or, in other words, to “examine the politics of race through the lens of language.” They show how Obama derives profound value from linguistic practices that are often viewed as deficiencies in African American children. Specifically, Alim and Smitherman argue that Obama’s dexterous style-shifting between African American and mainstream varieties of English is central to his political success. Conversely, Hill’s (1998) analysis of “mock Spanish” shows how White Americans are able to cultivate social cache from the adaptation and public use of Spanish, while Latinas/os face profound stigmatization for their public Spanish language use. Dick and Wirtz (2011), Dick (2011), and Urciuoli (2009) argue that these maneuvers reflect the ways that racializing discourses often work based on forms of indirect indexicality and interdiscursivities that allow racially unmarked persons to reproduce modes of racial stigmatization while maintaining the semblance of color-blindness or racial egalitarianism.

These attributions and recognitions of identity are contingent on semiotic processes of differentiation through which particular social identities become recognizable. As Irvine and Gal (1995, 2000) have powerfully demonstrated, it is only through the semiotic processes of rhematization/iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure that social and linguistic categories can be recognized and regimented in the first place. Rhematization/iconization involve the processes by which a linguistic feature becomes iconic of an entire group. As such, rhematization/iconization can help to conceptualize how elements of language are ideologically attached to models of personhood, becoming emblematic in their own right. The second aspect of semiotic differentiation, fractal recursivity, “involves the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level” (Irvine and Gal, 2000: 38). It is these oppositions, Irvine and Gal claim, that create and reproduce identity. Finally, the process of erasure simplifies the sociolinguistic field by erasing difference, rendering invisible some persons or activities that do not fit a given ideological understanding (2000: 38).

We might think of ideologies surrounding the distinction between “Northern” and “Southern” US language and culture as an example of differentiation that demonstrates ↵ these semiotic processes. The North/South distinction exemplifies rhematization/iconization, for example, in the way that language is stereotypically slower in the South than the North and the South is stereotypically associated with a slower pace of life than the North. Thus, slowness becomes an emblem that stereotypically links language and social life through rhematization/iconization. The North/South distinction demonstrates fractal recursivity by distinguishing between linguistic and cultural practices that are more and less Southern and Northern. That is, the North/South distinction can be refracted across scales, such that some Northern places and linguistic practices are perceived as relatively Southern and vice versa. Lastly, the North/South distinction is organized by the erasure of vast linguistic and cultural heterogeneity within the North and South, respectively. These semiotic processes powerfully structure ideologies of language and identity.

The understanding that language ideologies mediate interrelated semiotic processes of communication and identity formation allows for a more precise examination of *how* ideas about language are constructed and circulated by social groups, nations, and individuals. Building on these foundational concepts, anthropologists have sought to better understand the productive effects of language ideologies in the delineation of communities, the production of borders, and the ideologization of identities (Das, 2008; Park, 2009; Rosa, 2014). This focus on language ideologies makes it possible to understand the situated local perspectives from which particular claims about language and identity are advanced, as well as to envision alternative realities in which boundaries that problematically circumscribe languages and identities can be reimaged and reconstituted (Canagarajah, 2005; Makoni and Pennycook, 2007; Urciuoli, 1995).

Institutional Formations

In addition to tracking the iterative nature of language ideologies, their sites of production have become equally important in understanding the relationship of social structures, power, and language. As Silverstein (1998: 138) has suggested in his analysis of rituals and ritual centers, “the site of institutionalized ritual and ritualization, then, provides an essential place where societies and social groups in effect articulate the ideological.” As he notes, it is in institutions that ideological forms are ordained or transformed with respect to the linguistic codes they regiment, through indexical grounding (1998: 138). The sites themselves, in which ideologies are (re)produced, circulated, or authorized, are centers of powerful metapragmatic commentary. Philips (1998, 2000) has also emphasized the importance of exploring the sited-ness—particularly the multi-sited-ness—of ideologies. She notes the necessity of language ideological research that is grounded in institutions, without which it would be impossible to ask how language ideologies are socially ordered across institutions, where there are and are not commonalities across institutions in the language ideologies they promulgate, and how language ideologies are transformed as they move from one setting to another (Philips 1998: 222).

Scholars have addressed the production, implementation, and management of standards and modes of indexicality attached to particular institutional frameworks and cultural domains, including courtrooms (Haviland, 2003; Mertz, 1998; Philips, 2000), electoral politics (Lempert and Silverstein, 2012; Makihara, 2007), governmental agencies (Blommaert, 2009; Duchêne, 2008; Leeman, 2004), and religious settings (Baquedano-López, 2004; Fader, 2009; Keane, 2007). These authors emphasize the importance of carefully tracking the institutional actors, perspectives, procedures, and categorizations involved in the apprehension of linguistic practices. Carr (2009, 2010, 2011) has elaborated on these insights to show how language plays a central role in the recruitment to and enactment of institutional identities, as well as the conceptions of expertise that endow particular actors with the capacity to recognize, classify, and respond to institutional subjects.

Educational institutions have often been the focus of language ideologies research (Davis, 2012 Heller, 1999). This includes research on language ideologies in elementary and secondary schools settings, as well as within

the academy, past and present (Bauman and Briggs, 2000, 2003; Irvine and Gal, 1995; Milroy, 2001). In his work on language ideologies in educational contexts, Wortham has shown how “schools are important sites for establishing associations between ‘educated’ and ‘uneducated,’ ‘sophisticated’ and ‘unsophisticated,’ ‘official’ and ‘vernacular’ language use and types of students” (2008: 43). In mainstream US educational settings, linguistic practices are often construed through “monoglossic ideologies” that promote socialization to the language that “ideally express[es] the spirit of [the] nation and the territory it occupies” (Gal, 2006: 163; García and Torres-Guevara, 2010). Monoglossic ideologies reify notions such as “Standard English” and “academic language” by representing them as discrete, empirically identifiable linguistic categories that can be taught and assessed (Flores and Rosa, 2015). These representations are contradicted by infinite variation across institutions, but monoglossic ideologies erase this diversity by promoting the notion that there is a single standard variety. The embrace of these ideologies contributes to the stigmatization of students who are framed as incapable of demonstrating particular kinds of language proficiency based on imagined linguistic ideals. These modes of stigmatization are deceptively presented as innocent linguistic classifications, such as “native speaker,” “English Language Learner,” and “Long Term English Learner.” Each of these categories privileges monoglossic perspectives over heteroglossic ones by positioning linguistic practices associated with normative monolingualism as communicative ideals (Bonfiglio, 2010; Flores and García, 2013; Flores, Kleyn, and Menken, 2015).

p. 113

These various accounts underscore the importance of attending to the specific institutional contexts in and across which language ideologies take shape. A focus on institutions can provide insights into the rituals through which language ideologies are reproduced, the social roles that participate in these processes of reproduction, and the modes of authority required for their ritual efficacy. Inter-institutional investigations can also point to the ways that the intersubjective contestation of language ideologies is organized by contrasting conceptions of language within differing institutional contexts. Analyses of distinctive ideological frameworks across institutions can reveal the ways in which conceptions of language participate in the reproduction of structural inequality, as well as the potential for alternative, more inclusive institutional approaches to linguistic diversity.

Merging Language and Materiality

Institutional analyses, as well as the long-standing interest in the political economy of language, have contributed to the increased focus on issues of materiality in language ideologies research. What are the material consequences of language ideologies? How can the study of language ideologies help to overcome divisions between materiality and ideology? While linguistic anthropologists and sociolinguists have long been concerned with such issues (Gal, 1979, 1989; Irvine, 1989), recent contributions have foregrounded relations between processes of commodification, materiality, and language in analyses that explore issues such as the complex “material consequences of sounding local” (Cavanaugh, 2005).

Just as language practices have been found to be the subject of hierarchies of prestige and power, they are also caught up in projects of material valuation. Although scholars had previously determined that political economies impact the linguistic choices people make (Gal, 1987, 1989; Woolard, 1985), that language practices are related to perceptions of class (Labov, 1973), and that language constitutes a form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1977, 1991), recent scholarship has renewed the interest in language and political economy by attending to contemporary forms of global capitalism.

While research has increasingly yielded productive discussions of the commodification of culture (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2009; Dávila, 2001; Yúdice, 2003), the reconfiguration of language to the exigencies of global markets has only been recently addressed (Duchêne and Heller, 2012; Heller, 2010; Shankar and Cavanaugh, 2012). Research reviewed by Shankar and Cavanaugh (2012) under the title of language and materiality has conceptualized the semiotic objectification of language (Cavanaugh, 2005; Keane, 2003; Shankar, 2006), in

which words, accents, and other forms and practices are commoditized, such that they can take on material value, or may even be recontextualized through marketing. However, interrelations between commodities and language are not entirely new. Rather, as Agha (2011) has shown, registers of language, what he calls commodity registers, work together with commodities to produce value, and to establish both the emblematic characteristics and the material trappings of valuable lifestyles. Such lifestyles, complete with their enregistered language and emblematic words, accents, or phrases, can be endlessly recontextualized and circulated (Blommaert, 2010; Lee and LiPuma, 2002).

p. 114 The materialization of language in late capitalism is also contingent on the production of authenticity (Cavanaugh, 2007; Coupland, 2003), and “authentic” linguistic objects are meaningful only through the management of indexical relations (Heller, 2011; Jaffe, 1999a; Shandler, 2006), which are often structured by chronotopes that bring a particular emplaced past into relation with the present (Bakhtin, 1981; Cavanaugh and Shankar, 2014). As Heller (2011) demonstrates in her ethnographic study in a francophone community in Ontario, Canada, language and cultural commodification are organized by carefully structured renderings of such markers of authenticity as a maple leaf, plaid flannel, or a carefully scripted French phrase, which can simultaneously index recognizable authenticity as well as commodifiable profitability.

In their recent volume entitled *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit*, Alexandre Duchêne and Monica Heller (2012) chart shifting ideologies around language, particularly languages in decline and minoritized languages. As they note, language is no longer understood solely in terms of national pride, inherently valuable for its connection to national identity. Rather, language is also understood as economically valuable, subject to promotion, management, and standards of efficiency, alongside other objectifiable commodities. Research on language commodification has sought to identify the global economic processes that render language available to commodification (Duchêne and Heller, 2012), in which language has been operationalized as a technical skill in the workplace (Duchêne, 2009; Heller, 2003). The economic management of language also extends into arenas of revitalization, where language preservation is reframed in terms of economic viability rather than rights-based national discourses (McEwan-Fujita, 2005; Silva and Heller, 2009; Urla, 2012b). As opposed to seeing this as the end of valuations of language within national tropes, these authors demonstrate the tensions in which national discourses remain intertwined with profit-based discourses of economic distinction (Duchêne and Heller, 2012). Indeed, as Gal (2011) has recently shown, ideological framings of “pride” and “profit,” like all language ideologies, are relationally constituted. Thus, discourses of profit are reproduced alongside national tropes of local discourses of “pride”—demonstrating how ties between identity, place, and language are contingent and co-constructed.

Research on language ideologies has sought to examine the intersections of language use, social structure, and ideas about language to track relationships between language and social power. While identity, differentiation, and institutions have constituted significant loci through which scholars have come to understand language within cultural contexts, recent turns toward locating language squarely within the realm of the material can allow the lens of ideology to turn toward contemporary dynamics of globalization, neoliberalism, and commodification. These recent developments are gestures toward exciting future research on language ideologies.

Perspectives for the Future: Reconsidering Agents, Objects, and Scales of Language Ideologies

p. 115 The initial theorization and continued honing of the language ideologies concept has paved the way for emergent questions focused on issues such as the scales and ↪ ontological statuses of entities—linguistic and otherwise—associated with the enactment of language ideologies. That is, are language ideologies necessarily created, articulated, and mobilized by people, whether individuals or groups? How might nonhuman entities, such as institutions, technologies, and other seemingly inanimate objects, enact language ideologies in consequential ways? In short, what entities can have language ideologies? Conversely, what is the ontological status of linguistic forms targeted by language ideologies? It is clear that there can be varying ideologies about a given form, but in what ways might these ideologies create the very forms that they purport to construe? What is the relationship between the functions of language ideologies on inter-subjective and inter-institutional scales, as well as in varying spatial and temporal and contexts? On a more applied level, how might considerations of ideological agents, objects, and scales shape efforts toward disrupting and eradicating stigmatizing ideas about language through the promotion of “critical language awareness” (Alim, 2010)?

Linguistic anthropologists have contributed to the so-called “ontological turn” by building from theorizations of language ideologies to semiotic ideologies more broadly (Keane, 2003; Kockelman, 2013). This involves a consideration of semiotic actors and their statuses vis-à-vis processes of causality and contingency. Note that the term “actors” here does not necessarily pertain to biographical individuals, but rather entities endowed with the capacity to act in much broader terms. For future research, this approach might lead to the analysis of new typologies of language ideologies based on a broader range of entities understood to enact conceptions of language. For example, in what ways are language ideologies built into the design of emergent technologies, from voice recognition programs to digital orthographies? How do these technologies recognize language, and how do their users embrace or reject their language ideologies? These questions point to the need for new conceptualizations and methodologies that move beyond approaches in which language ideologies are exclusively understood as ideas explicitly expressed by people.

This disruption of presumptions about agents of language ideologies is paralleled by an emergent reconsideration of the objects of language ideologies. In particular, Inoue’s (2006) theorization of the “listening subject” has called into question approaches that treat language ideologies as construals of self-evident linguistic forms. Rather than seeking to empirically document linguistic forms as produced by a given language user and then tracking the ideologies through which these forms are interpreted, Inoue redirects analytical attention to the role of the listener in the production of linguistic forms. Specifically, she shows how the male listening subject within a particular political, economic, and historical moment played a crucial role in the production of the category of “Japanese women’s language.” By redirecting her analysis to the listening subject, Inoue demonstrates how linguistic practice can become overdetermined, such that the forms that are perceived from one ideological perspective might not be perceived at all from another ideological positionality. Reyes (2014) has drawn on Inoue’s insights to interrogate the recently introduced and widely embraced sociolinguistic category of “superdiversity,” which posits increasingly “diverse” modes of linguistic practice associated with new migration patterns. However, Reyes suggests ↪ that “this speaker focus neglects a thorough conceptualization and interrogation of the listening subject: how change may not in fact begin with speaking subjects (migrants) but may be brought into being by listening subjects (those authorized to speak about migrants) and whatever anxieties and desires motivate the circulation of representations of speakers” (2014: 368). By shifting attention from “speaking subjects” to “listening subjects,” it becomes possible to understand how some populations are stigmatized and perceived as linguistically “other” or inferior regardless of the linguistic practices they produce. On the one hand this presents new ways of challenging stigmatizing language ideologies, while on the other it raises questions about the limitations surrounding critical language awareness and the ability to shape the perception and interpretation of one’s linguistic practices. If one’s

p. 116

practices can be perceived as deficient regardless of the extent to which they might seem to mirror standardized norms (Flores and Rosa, 2015), then how might the focus on learning to navigate differing linguistic norms advocated by some proponents of critical language awareness obscure the nonlinguistic structures that shape perceptions of language use?

The relationship between linguistic structures and broader societal structures is a central component of emergent language ideologies research focused on the organizing properties of scale. This research is largely inspired by Irvine and Gal's theorization of linguistic and social differentiation discussed earlier, as well as conceptualizations of language and identity across spatial, temporal, and mediatized scales (Wortham and Reyes, 2015). Building on her previous work concerning linguistic and social differentiation, Gal (2012) has more recently proposed the notion of "axes of differentiation" in order to grasp the systematic ways in which distinctions are mapped across sociolinguistic scales. While Gal focuses on "pride" and "profit" as one such axis linking language and political-economic structures, axes of differentiation can frame dimensions of relationality across a range of social and linguistic scales (e.g., ideological binaries associated with categories such as race, gender, sexuality, class, and geography). Work on chronotopes (Silverstein, 2005), or space-time constructions, as well as mediatization in a digital era (Agha, 2007b), has also taken up the analysis of scale as a theme for future research on language ideologies. Harkness (2014) shows how attention to scale can be mobilized to understand chronotopic linkages between embodied practices and conceptions of modernity. Specifically, he analyzes the semiotic processes through which the voice becomes a site for anxieties and enactments of modernity in contemporary South Korea. Meanwhile, Bonilla and Rosa (2015) argue that dimensions of space, time, and bodily materiality are renegotiated through the communicative participation in digital protests surrounding state-sanctioned violence enacted on racialized populations. Collectively, these projects gesture toward the ways that considerations of scale can powerfully contribute to future research focused on relations between linguistic and social structures across contexts.

These emergent analyses of agents, objects, and scales of language ideologies highlight exciting future pathways for analysis. By widening the analytical purview from language ideologies to semiotic ideologies, we are able to consider a much broader range of entities associated with cultural conceptions of language. And by redirecting analytical focus from speaking subjects to listening subjects, it becomes possible to denaturalize presumptions about the objective, empirical nature of linguistic signs. Lastly, by attending to relationships among language ideologies across scales, it becomes possible to track the processes through which language ideologies shape social and linguistic structures. These conceptual and methodological innovations point to the ongoing robustness of language ideologies research, and the potential for this research to generate new scholarly insights about the nature of language and social life.

Conclusion

Ideology is a fraught concept that is frequently used in a pejorative way to ascribe bias and a lack of analytical integrity. In this chapter we have sought to show how the creation of language ideologies as a central concern in studies of language and culture can productively reject the notion that some perspectives are “ideological” while others are scientifically objective. Language ideologies studies show us how views of language and culture are situated within particular cultural contexts, and how within any given moment these contexts are structured across intersubjective and institutional scales. This critical conception of language ideologies not only merges linguistic and social analysis in highly productive ways, but also speaks to applied concerns regarding the potential for language to participate in processes of marginalization. Scholars coming at language ideologies from diverse vantage points are poised to mobilize this concept in the creation of both new theorizations of language and new interventions seeking to disrupt stigmatizing linguistic commonsense. Widespread interest in language ideologies across intellectual divides highlights the potential for this concept to reinvigorate long-standing discussions and spark new conversations linking the analysis of social and linguistic structures.

References

Adams, M. (2009). "Enregisterment: A Special Issue." *American Speech* 84(2): 115–117.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Agha, A. (2007a). *Language and Social Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Agha, A. (2007b). "Recombinant Selves in Mass Mediated Spacetime." *Language & Communication* 27: 320–335.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Agha, A. (2011). "Commodity Registers." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(1): 22–53.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Alim, H. S. (2010). "Critical Language Awareness." In N. H. Hornberger and S. McKay (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education* (pp. 205–231). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Alim, H. S., and G. Smitherman. (2012). *Articulate While Black: Barack Obama, Language, and Race in the U.S.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Anderson, B. (1991 [1983]). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes to Language*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 118 Baquedano-López, P. (2004). "Traversing the Center: The Politics of Language Use in a Catholic Religious Education Program for Immigrant Mexican Children." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 35(2): 212–232.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Bauman, R., and C. L. Briggs. (2000). "Language Philosophy as Language Ideology: John Locke and Johann Gottfried Herder." In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language* (pp. 139–204). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bauman, R., and C. L. Briggs. (2003). *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Blommaert, J., and J. Verschueren. (1998). "The Role of Language in European Nationalist Ideologies." In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 189–210). New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Blommaert, J. (2009). "Language, Asylum, and the National Order." *Current Anthropology* 50(4): 415–441.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Boas, F. (1911). *Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages*. *Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology* (pp. 1–83). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bonfiglio, T. (2010). *Mother Tongues and Nations: The Invention of the Native Speaker* New York: de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bonilla, Y., and J. Rosa. (2015). “#Ferguson: Digital Protest, Hashtag Ethnography, and the Racial Politics of Social Media in the United States.” *American Ethnologist* 42(1): 4–17.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Bourdieu, P. (1977). “The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges.” *Social Science Information* 16(6): 645–668.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Bourdieu, P., and J. B. Thompson. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bucholtz, M. (2001). “The Whiteness of Nerds: Superstandard English and Racial Markedness.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 84–100.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Bucholtz, M. (2011). *White Kids: Language, Race and Styles of Youth Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Canagarajah, S. (ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Carr, S. (2009). “Anticipating and Inhabiting Institutional Identities.” *American Ethnologist* 36(2): 317–336.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Carr, S. (2010). “Enactments of Expertise.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39: 17–32.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Carr, S. (2011). *Scripting Addiction: The Politics of Therapeutic Talk and American Sobriety*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Cavanaugh, J. R. (2005). “Accent Matters: Material Consequences of Sounding Local in Northern Italy.” *Language and Communication* 25(2): 127–148.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Cavanaugh, J. R. (2007). “Making Salami, Producing Bergamo: The Transformation of Value.” *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology* 72(2): 149–172.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Cavanaugh, J. R., and S. Shankar. (2014). “Producing Authenticity in Global Capitalism: Language, Materiality, and Value.” *American Anthropologist* 116(1): 51–64.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Chun, E. (2011). “Reading Race beyond Black and White.” *Discourse and Society* 22(4): 403–421.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Comaroff, J. L., and J. Comaroff. (2009). *Ethnicity, Inc.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 119 Coupland, N. (2003). "Sociolinguistic Authenticities." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3): 417–431.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Das, S. N. (2008). "Between Convergence and Divergence: Reformatting Language Purism in the Montreal Tamil Diasporas." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 18(1): 1–23.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dávila, A. M. (2001). *Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a People*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Davis, C. P. (2012). "'Is Jaffna Tamil the Best?' Producing 'Legitimate' Language in a Multilingual Sri Lankan School." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22(2): 61–82.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dick, H. P. (2011). "Making Immigrants Illegal in Small Town USA." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(S1): E35–E55.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dick, H. P., and K. Wirtz. (2011). "Racializing Discourses." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(S1): E2–E10.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Duchêne, A. (2008). *Ideologies across Nations: The Construction of Linguistic Minorities at the United Nations*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Duchêne, A. (2009). "Marketing, Management and Performance: Multilingualism as Commodity in a Tourism Call Centre." *Language Policy* 8(1): 27–50.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Duchêne, A., and M. Heller. (2012). *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Errington, J. (1998). "Indonesian('s) Development: On the State of a Language of State." In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 271–284). New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Errington, J. (2000). "Indonesian('s) Authority." In P. V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language* (pp. 205–227). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Fader, A. (2009). *Mitzvah Girls: Bringing Up the Next Generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Flores, N., and O. García. (2013). "Linguistic Third Spaces in Education: Teachers' Translanguaging across the Bilingual Continuum." In D. Little, C. Leung, and P. Van Avermaet (eds.), *Managing Diversity in Education: Languages, Policies, Pedagogies* (pp. 243–256). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Flores, N., and J. Rosa. (2015). "Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 85(2): 149–171.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Flores, N., T. Kleyn, and K. Menken. (2015). "Looking Holistically in a Climate of Partiality: Identities of Students Labeled Long-

Term English Language Learners.” *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 14(2): 113–132.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Gal, S. (1979). *Language Shift: Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gal, S. (1987). “Codeswitching and Consciousness in the European Periphery.” *American Ethnologist* 14(4): 637–653.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Gal, S. (1989). “Language and Political Economy.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18: 345–367.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Gal, S. (1995a). “Language and the ‘Arts of Resistance.’” *Cultural Anthropology* 10(3): 407–424.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Gal, S. (1995b). “Language, Gender, and Power: An Anthropological Overview.” In K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self* (pp. 169–182). New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gal, S. (2006). “Contradictions of Standard Language in Europe: Implications for the Study of Practices and Publics.” *Social Anthropology* 13(2): 163–181.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Gal, S. (2012). “Sociolinguistic Regimes and the Management of ‘Diversity.’” In A. Duchêne and M. Heller (eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (pp. 22–37). New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 120 Gal, S., and J. T. Irvine. (1995). “The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference.” *Social Research* 62(4): 967–1001.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

García, O., and R. Torres-Guevara. (2010). “Monoglossic Ideologies and Language Policies in the Education of U.S. Latinas/os.” In E. G. Murillo, Jr., S. A. Villenas, R. T. Galván, J. S. Muñoz, C. Martínez, and M. Machado-Casas (eds.), *Handbook of Latinos and Education: Theory, Research, and Practices* (pp. 182–194). New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Garret, P., N. Coupland, and A. Williams. (2003). *Investigating Language Attitudes: Social Meanings of Dialect, Ethnicity, and Performance*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gellner, E. (1983). *On Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

González, N. (2005). “Children in the Eye of the Storm: Language Ideologies in a Dual Language School.” In A. C. Zentella (ed.), *Building on Strength: Language and Literacy in Latino Families and Communities* (pp. 162–174). New York: Teachers College Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Harkness, N. (2014). *Songs of Seoul: An Ethnography of Voice and Voicing in Christian South Korea*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Haviland, J. B. (2003). "Ideologies of Language: Some Reflections on Language and U.S. Law." *American Anthropologist* 105(4): 764–774.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography*. London: Longman.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Heller, M. (2003). "Globalization, the New Economy, and the Commodification of Language and Identity." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4): 473–492.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Heller, M. (2010). "The Commodification of Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39: 101.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A Critical Ethnography of Language and Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hill, J. H. (1998). "Language, Race, and White Public Space." *American Anthropologist* 100(3): 680–689.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Hill, J. H. (2002). "'Expert Rhetorics' in Advocacy for Endangered Languages: Who Is Listening, and What do they Hear?" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12(2): 119–133.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Hill, J. H. (2008). *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hoffman, K. E. (2008). *We Share Walls: Language, Land, and Gender in Berber Morocco*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Inoue, M. (2006). *Vicarious Language: Gender and Linguistic Modernity in Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Irvine, J. T. (1989). "When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy." *American Ethnologist* 16: 248–267.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Irvine, J. T., and S. Gal. (2000). "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation." In P. V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language* (pp. 35–83). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Jaffe, A. (1999a). "Packaged Sentiments: The Social Meanings of Greeting Cards." *Journal of Material Culture* 4(2): 115–141.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Jaffe, A. (1999b). *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Keane, W. (2003). "Semiotics and the Social Analysis of Material Things." *Language & Communication* 23(3–4): 405–425.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Keane, W. (2007). *Christian Moderns: Freedom and Fetish in the Mission Encounter*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

- p. 121 Kockelman, P. (2013). *Agent, Person, Subject, Self: A Theory of Ontology, Interaction, and Infrastructure*. New York: Oxford.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Kroskrity, P. V. (ed.). (2000). *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2001). "Identity." In A. Duranti (ed.), *Key Terms in Language and Culture* (pp. 106–109). Oxford: Blackwell.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). "Language Ideologies." In A. Duranti (ed.), *Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Labov, W. (1964). "The Reflection of Social Processes in Linguistic Structures." In J. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 240–251). The Hague: Mouton.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Labov, W. (1973). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Labov, W. (1979). "Locating the Frontier between Social and Psychological Factors in Linguistic Variation." In C. J. Fillmore, D. Kempler, and W. Wang (eds.), *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior* (pp. 327–329). New York: Academic Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Labov, W. (1984). "Field Methods of the Project on Linguistic Change and Variation." In J. Baugh and J. Sherzer (eds.), *Language in Use: Readings in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 28–52). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Lee, B., and E. LiPuma. (2002). "Cultures of Circulation: The Imaginations of Modernity." *Public Culture* 14(1): 191–213.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Leeman, J. (2004). "Racializing Language: A History of Linguistic Ideologies in the U.S. Census." *Journal of Language and Politics* 3(3): 507–534.
[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)
- Lempert, M., and M. Silverstein. (2012). *Creatures of Politics: Media, Message, and the American Presidency*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Lo, A., and A. Reyes. (2009). "Introduction: On Yellow English and Other Perilous Terms." In A. Reyes and A. Lo (eds.), *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America* (pp. 3–17). New York: Oxford.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Makihara, M. (2007). "Linguistic Purism in Rapa Nui Political Discourse." In M. Makihara and B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies* (pp. 46–69). New York: Oxford.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)
- Makoni, S., and A. Pennycook. (2007). *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

McEwan-Fujita, E. (2005). "Neoliberalism and Minority-Language Planning in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 171: 155–171.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

McEwan-Fujita, E. (2010). "Ideology, Affect, and Socialization in Language Shift and Revitalization: The Experiences of Adults Learning Gaelic in the Western Isles of Scotland." *Language in Society* 39: 27–64.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Meek, B. A. (2006). "And the Injun Goes 'How!': Representations of American Indian English in White Public Space." *Language in Society* 35: 93–128.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Meek, B. A. (2010). *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabascan Community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Mertz, E. (1998). "Linguistic Ideology and Praxis in U.S. Law School Classrooms." In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 149–162). New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Milroy, J. (2001). "Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(4): 530–555.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

p. 122 Park, J. S. (2009). *The Local Construction of a Global Language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Perley, B. (2012). "Zombie Linguistics: Experts, Endangered Languages, and the Curse of Undead Voices." *Anthropological Forum: A Journal of Social Anthropology and Comparative Sociology* 22(2): 133–149.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Philips, S. U. (1998). "Language Ideologies in Institutions of Power: A Commentary." In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 211–225). New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Philips, S. U. (2000). "Constructing a Tongan Nation-state through Language Ideology in the Courtroom." In P. V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language* (pp. 229–257). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Queen, R. (2005). "'How Many Lesbians does it Take ...': Jokes, Teasing, and the Negotiation of Stereotypes about Lesbians." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15: 239–257.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Reyes, A. (2014). "Linguistic Anthropology in 2013: Super-New-Big." *American Anthropologist* 116(2): 366–378.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Roth-Gordon J. (2011). "Discipline and Disorder in the Whiteness of Mock Spanish." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(2): 211–229.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Rosa, J. (2014). "Learning Ethnolinguistic Borders: Language and Diaspora in the Socialization of U.S. Latinas/os." In R. Rolón-Dow and J. G. Irizarry (eds.), *Diaspora Studies in Education: Toward a Framework for Understanding the Experiences of Transnational Communities* (pp. 39–60). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Ruiz, R. (1984). "Orientations in Language Planning." *NABE Journal* 8(2): 15–34.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Schieffelin, B. B., K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.). (1998). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Shandler, J. (2006). *Adventures in Yiddishland: Postvernacular Language and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Shankar, S. (2006). "Metaconsumptive Practices and the Circulation of Objectifications." *Journal of Material Culture* 11(3): 293–317.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Shankar, S. (2008). "Speaking like a Model Minority: 'FOB' Styles, Gender, and Racial Meanings among Desi Teens in Silicon Valley." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 18: 268–289.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Shankar, S. (2012). "Creating Model Consumers: Producing Ethnicity, Race, and Class in Asian American Advertising." *American Ethnologist* 39(3): 578–591.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Shankar, S. (2015). *Advertising Diversity: Ad Agencies and the Creation of Asian American Consumers*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Shankar, S., and J. R. Cavanaugh. (2012). "Language and Materiality in Global Capitalism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41: 355–369.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Silva, E., and M. Heller. (2009). "From Protector to Producer: The Role of the State in the Discursive Shift from Minority Rights to Economic Development." *Language Policy* 8(2): 95–116.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Silverstein, M. (1979). "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology." In P. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (eds.), *The Elements* (pp. 193–248). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Silverstein, M. (1985a). "Language and the Culture of Gender." In E. Mertz and R. Parmentier (eds.), *Semiotic Mediation* (pp. 219–259). New York: Academic Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Silverstein, M. (1985b). "On the Pragmatic 'Poetry' of Prose." In D. Schiffrin (ed.), *Meaning, Form and Use in Context* (pp. 181–199). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Silverstein, M. (1996). "Monoglot 'Standard' in America." In D. Brenneis and R. Macaulay (eds.), *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 284–306). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 123 Silverstein, M. (1998). "The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary." In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 23–45). New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Silverstein, M. (2003). *Talking Politics: The Substance of Style from Abe to "W."* Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Silverstein, M. (2005). "Axes of Evals: Token vs. Type Interdiscursivity." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1): 6–22.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). "Language Policy and Linguistic Human Rights." In T. Ricento (ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 273–291). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Urciuoli, B. (1995). "Language and Borders." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 525–546.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Urciuoli, B. (2009). "Talking/Not Talking about Race: The Enregisterments of Culture in Higher Education Discourses." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 19(1): 21–39.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Urciuoli, B. (2011). "Review Essay: Semiotic Properties of Racializing Discourses." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(S1): E113–E122.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Urla, J. (2012a). *Reclaiming Basque Language, Nation, and Cultural Activism*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Urla, J. (2012b). "Total Quality Language Revival." In A. Duchêne and M. Heller (eds.), *Language in Late Capitalism: Pride and Profit* (pp. 73–92). New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Woolard, K. A. (1985). "Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: Toward an Integration of Sociolinguistic and Social Theory." *American Ethnologist* 2: 738–748.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Woolard, K. A. (1998). "Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry." In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3–47). New York: Oxford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Woolard, K. A., and B. B. Schieffelin. (1994). "Language Ideology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55–82.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Wortham, S. (2008). "Linguistic Anthropology of Education." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 37: 37–51.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Wortham, S., and A. Reyes. (2015). *Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Yúdice, George. (2003). *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Zentella, A. C. (2007). "'Dime con quién hablas, y te dire quién eres': Linguistic (In)Security and Latina/o Identity." In J. Flores and R. Rosaldo (eds.), *A Companion to Latina/o Studies* (pp. 25–38). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. ↵

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)