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1 Introduction

It may be commonly heard in social science discourses that race is a social construct. This pithy assertion does not mean that race is merely an illusion but that racial categorization is an ideological process that defines the material conditions and embodied experiences of many (Omi and Winant 1994, Smedley 1998). Race remains a basic dimension of social differentiation in many cultures because racialization is a semiotic process that naturalizes social difference: signs that point to race, such as skin color, hair texture, and voice quality, are thought of as self-evident visible, tangible, or audible cues that differentiate human types on a primordial, genetic basis.

In this respect, race is often thought to be different from seemingly flexible social dimensions like sexuality, nationality, or class; you can change your nationality, but not your race. Yet racial differences necessarily intertwine with cultural, geo-political, or economic configurations (see McElhinny 2010, and in this volume), and the slippage between “racial” terms and “ethnic,” “national,” or “class” ones (e.g., black/African American, Asian/Chinese, white/American/privileged) in contexts such as the United States reflects complex convergences across sociocultural axes (see Leap, this volume; Baugh, this volume). In other settings, naturalizing and structured forms of discrimination may be talked about in terms of “immigration,” “ethnicity,” or “nation,” not “race” (see Lemon 2002; Huayhua, this volume; Pujolar, this volume). We thus use the term “ethnoracial” to refer to a historically situated local ideology of human distinctiveness, and “racialization” to emphasize the naturalizing character of this process.

Language plays a key role in semiotic processes of racialization (Alim, Ball, and Rickford, forthcoming), and scholars’ assumptions about the relationship between language, race, and ideology have undergone important conceptual shifts over the past fifty years. In this chapter, we provide a brief overview of the three main approaches, noting the basic questions, objects, sites, methods, and objectives of this body of work. We highlight research on linguistic racialization, or the sociocultural processes through which race – as an ideological dimension of human differentiation – comes to be imagined, produced, and reified through language practices. Such an approach shows how the material and experiential reality of race is kept alive; it also provides nuanced insights about how language can convey sociocultural meanings that are often implicit, complexly layered, and dynamically shifting.
2 Historical Perspectives

2.1 Approaches to Understanding Language, Race, and Ethnicity

Linguistic anthropology as a field owes its origins to ideas about race and language that were developed by American anthropologists. Working alongside sociologist W.E.B. Du Bois, anthropologist Franz Boas rejected the racist beliefs of his time that some races were inferior to others and that certain languages were “primitive.” In particular, he showed that scholars’ inability to hear distinctions in Native American languages reflected their habits of perception rather than deficiencies of the language being studied (Hill and Mannheim 1992). For Boas, language alone thus provided a privileged window into cultural patterns that were otherwise distorted by “secondary explanations” (Bauman and Briggs 2003). Documentation of the linguistic practices of populations threatened by racism was an important focus of early work in linguistic anthropology that continues today (see Brittain and MacKenzie, this volume; Meek, this volume).

Scholarship on race in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics has reflected varied assumptions about what language is and where language is to be studied. The DISTINCTIVE ETHNORACIAL LANGUAGE perspective attends primarily to linguistic patterns that distinguish ethnoracial groups. It locates language as an abstract system of communication shared by group members that can be characterized in terms of linguistic features or discourse strategies. The Acts of Ethnoracial Identity (cf. Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985) perspective shifts attention to the moment-to-moment construction of ethnoracial identities within speech events, treating linguistic elements not as features of groups but as resources for achieving interactional ends. Here, too, language remains a relatively abstract object, but one recruited by speaking subjects who creatively and performatively exercise agency. A final Racialization approach expands the focus to include the “listening subject” (Inoue 2006): language is an object only insofar as it has come to be understood as such; it is necessarily subject to situated interpretation, cultural production, and regimes of power, emerging and circulating over various scales of space and time in interactional events and cultural institutions. While our identification of three trends may misleadingly suggest discrete theoretical ruptures, we emphasize that most studies are, at least peripherally, concerned with the full range of analytical objects and sites mentioned here.

2.2 Distinctive Ethnoracial Language

One early line of research on language and race examines how ethnoracial groups use language in distinctive ways, approximating a one-to-one mapping of people, linguistic varieties, and cultures (Bauman and Briggs 2003). Under this DISTINCTIVE ETHNIC LANGUAGE paradigm, which emerged in the 1960s, ethnolects, such as African American English (AAE), are internally cohesive and systematically patterned structures of sound, grammar, words, and discourse (Green 2002). This conception aligns with a structuralist view of language as an abstract system of speaker competence, where linguistic units (phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases) combine according to complex rules.

By adopting a language of structuralism to describe language-internal distinctions (e.g., voiced/voiceless) as well as language-external ones (e.g., black/white), scholars mobilized tools of science to provide intellectually compelling arguments of moral, cultural, and linguistic equality: working-class blacks used a system of communication that was as referentially logical, structurally complex, and culturally sophisticated as that used by middle-class whites (Bucholtz 2003). This body of research was aimed at exposing the workings of linguistic racism, an important legacy that continues today (Purnell, Idsardi, and Baugh 1999).
While work in sociolinguistics has sought to describe the distinctive phonology, syntax, and lexicon of ethnolects such as AAE (Labov 1972, Smitherman 1977, Baugh 1983), Chicano English (Fought 2003), and Native American English (Leap 1993), anthropological studies have attended to distinctiveness in discourse. For example, this research has highlighted how African Americans, Asian Americans, European Americans, and Native Americans may have varied discourse practices with respect to bedtime narratives (Heath 1983), oral narratives (Au 1980), classroom interactions (Michaels 1981, Philips 1983, Cazden 1988), game disputes (Goodwin 1990), and indirect critique (Mitchell-Kernan 1972). As noted in these studies, differing communication styles can lead to misunderstandings in institutional settings, whether as a result of contrasting participation frameworks (Philips 1983), narrative sequences (Michaels 1981), prosodic cues (Gumperz 1982), causal ordering (Young 1994), or expectations of sociability (Bailey 1997).

Yet the concept of ethnic distinctiveness in language has remained undeniably slippery (Eckert 2008, Jaspers 2008, Benor 2010). After all, no linguistic element is exclusive to a single variety and all dialects are historically and contextually variable (Agha 2007, Wolfram 2007). In addition, the tacit equivalence of “ethnically distinct” and “non-white” has been challenged in studies that have examined white ethnic communities (e.g., Schiffrin 1984, Benor 2012). In its focus on the ethnolect as an abstract system that can be objectively described, it has overlooked a key question: Who hears language as “ethnoracial”? As noted by Bucholtz (2003), the linguist – often an outsider to the group being studied – has ultimately served as the arbiter of which features to classify as ethnically distinctive. In addition, descriptions typically refer to linguistic difference from a white, middle-class standard (e.g., copula deletion [from Standard English], monophthongization [of Standard English diphthongs]), presupposing the normativity of Standard English and erasing the linguist’s own subjectivity in the process (Silverstein 1996).

2.3 Acts of Ethnoracial Identity

In the 1980s, some language scholars turned their attention to identity as an object of investigation, conceptualizing language not in terms of characteristic features of groups but as resources that individuals draw upon to construct ethnoracial selves. Scholars of the Acts of Ethnoracial Identity approach concentrate on how linguistic elements index (Ochs 1992, Silverstein 2003) – that is, point to and create – ethnoracial meanings. Aligning with social constructionism more generally, this view frames identity as an outcome of linguistic practice (Bucholtz and Hall 2004). This turn to the performative subject reflects a political recognition that speakers are not bound to a singular biographical fate; their linguistic agency allows them to contest hegemonic ascriptions of ethnoracial identity.

Rather than identifying linguistic norms across a group, this approach has theorized moment-to-moment negotiations of identity among co-participants in everyday conversations and public performances. Research on code-switching and style-shifting, for example, has highlighted the multiple possibilities of ethnoracial identifications when racialized speakers strategically deploy their varied linguistic repertoires. Studies of Puerto Rican American children (Zentella 1997), Dominican American high school students (Bailey 2002), and white middle-class American boys (Cutler 1999) have depicted multilingual and multidialectal speakers as flexible and creative interlocutors, celebrating linguistic heterogeneity as the outcome of speaker choice and virtuosity rather than disorder or confusion. For example, Barrett (1999) has shown how African American drag queens adopt multiple styles – namely the use of a “white woman” style in addition to an African American and gay male styles – in ways that challenge racist and homophobic ideologies even while maintaining certain misogynistic assumptions. Similarly, Alim and
Smitherman (2012) have illustrated how US President Barack Obama adopted various linguistic strategies in order to “Whiten,” “Blacken,” “Americanize,” and “Christianize” himself, thus hitting a cultural “sweet spot,” despite marginalizing discourses of language, citizenship, religion, and race (p. 23). In addition, one subset of this research has attended to speakers who use language understood as belonging to ethnic outsiders, a practice called “crossing” (Rampton 1995), which may be leading to the emergence of new language varieties in urban youth communities (Alim, Ibrahim, and Pennycook 2009, Rampton 2011).

In its focus on the performative subject, this approach acknowledges that identity is an outcome of language rather than prior to it. However, such work maintains the assumption that languages are classifiable, nameable, juxtaposable objects (Woolard 2004) and may attribute more agency to individuals than is often the case, by describing speakers who construct identities, deploy linguistic forms, and determine their attendant ethnoracial meanings. Thus, while an Acts of Ethnoracial Identity approach recognizes the heterogeneous complexity of language, it sometimes lacks reflexive attention to linguists’ and community members’ language ideologies that underlie these acts of identity. In the next section, we describe an approach that places such ideologies at the center of its analysis.

2.4 Racialization

A final body of work, grounded in a linguistic anthropological tradition, brings language ideologies to the analytical foreground, namely, how languages become enregistered (Agha 2007) as racialized objects, how linguistic differences are created and mapped onto social differences, including race, gender, class, and sexuality (Irvine and Gal 2000), and how these webs of social meaning are mapped onto interactions. Under the Racialization view, scholars attend to the cultural processes by which such associations emerge and move across various scales of space and time – across interactional and institutional sites. Indeed, some of the most stimulating work in linguistic anthropology has examined the complex relationship between racialization and language, tracing how ideologies of authentic ethnolects and universal standards point to the workings of standard language ideology, how ideologies of language and race are reproduced and disrupted, and how racialized indexical values and identities are complex and indeterminate.

3 Critical Issues and Current Contributions

3.1 Ethnolect as Ideology

A key contribution of linguistic anthropology is its recognition of ethnolects as ideological – namely, a component of standard language ideology (Silverstein 1996, Walters 1996). According to this ideology, produced through European encounters with linguistic and racial others (Bauman and Briggs 2003), some languages – “authentic” nonstandard languages – are well-suited to expressing one’s identity, anchoring the self in a particular time, place, and community, while others – “anonymous” standard languages – represent “a voice from nowhere” (Gal 2006, Woolard 2008). One important strand of this research examines, from a historical perspective, how ethnoracial difference is projected onto forms of linguistic difference, whether in European efforts to describe the peoples and languages of Africa (Irvine and Gal 2000, Irvine 2001); Spanish attempts to write grammars and prepare dictionaries in the colonial Yucatan (Hanks 2010); or the creation of the category of Standard American English, which located authentic English in the white rural Midwest, away from racialized urban centers (Bonfiglio 2002).
Framing racialization as an encounter between a listening subject and a speaking subject (Inoue 2006), rather than as a self-evident production, has revealed how racializing ideas about linguistic difference are embedded in the idea of the Indo-European language family (Olender 1992) and the creation of the categories of creole and pidgin (Bolton 2000). In other words, what we hear as a distinct ethnolectal variety is not based on a pre-existing empirically verifiable linguistic reality but on the ways that we are socialized to recognize certain distinctions while erasing others (Irvine and Gal 2000) in the service of specific ideological interests (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994). For example, many Americans have been socialized to hear “double negatives” as a distinctive feature of African American language, although many white speakers in the US South also use this feature, and black speakers employing it do so in particular discourse contexts. Moreover, what counts as a vernacular as opposed to a standard can shift (Gal 2006, 2012): Standard American English can be framed as a timeless, placeless standard when contrasted against AAE, for example, but as a temporally and regionally specific vernacular against British English.

3.2 Ideological Production/Disruption

Linguistic anthropologists have investigated how discursive processes play a key role in producing, and sometimes disrupting, ideologies of language, race, power, and authenticity – that is, how linguistic and other semiotic acts can produce racial categories and assign moral value to them in ways that benefit certain groups, often at the expense of others. As Jane Hill (2008) has argued in her book *The everyday language of white racism*, a single linguistic moment can index both overt and covert social meanings, such that racist ideologies can be reproduced in relatively hidden yet mundane ways (see also Dick and Wirtz 2011). White English monolinguals who draw on hyper-Anglicized Spanish may portray themselves as playful or cosmopolitan, yet this portrait covertly depends on racist images of lazy Latino others (Hill 1998). Similarly, male European Americans or Asian Americans who use AAE-influenced elements may perform masculine toughness or youthful coolness, yet they simultaneously reinforce stereotypes of black hypermasculinity (Bucholtz 1999, Chun 2001, Bucholtz and Lopez 2011). While racializing discourses are likely to depend on hegemonic ideologies of race, these ideologies can be contested, for example, when nonwhite speakers construct whiteness as a non-normative category (Gaudio 2001, Trechter 2001, Jacobs-Huey 2003, Chun 2004).

While racist discourse may emerge in explicit forms in some settings (Billig 2001, Lo forthcoming), explicit talk about race – a genre known as “race talk” – can be sanctioned as inappropriate. Consequently, speakers engage in extensive metalinguistic labor when participating in it, for example rationalizing the mention of race (Anderson 2008), seeking alignment from others (Pagliala 2009), or claiming a nonracist identity (Van Dijk 1992) by positioning others as racist (Keyes 2011, Koven 2013, Pardo 2013, Tetreault 2013). In other cases, participants position themselves as not talking explicitly or willingly about race through strategies of inarticulateness (McElhinny 2001, Bucholtz 2011a) or the claim that they are merely talking about “language” or “culture,” as illustrated in Urciuoli’s (1996) book *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Her important work illustrates how what is understood as “ethnic,” as opposed to “racial,” in US discourses is primarily a matter of framing, respectively as “acceptable, non-threatening difference” or as “unacceptable, threatening difference.” Linguistic acts that covertly reproduce racial stereotypes occur in a range of culturally significant everyday and institutional genres, including narratives (Bucholtz 1999, 2011a, Wortham 2011b), pretend play (García-Sánchez 2014), rap battles (Alim, Lee, and Carris 2010), and government documents (Dick 2011). Racializing processes also intersect with related ideologies about individual
agency, intentionality, and authenticity as participants reconcile what is “said” with what is “meant” (Hill 2008, Pardo 2013); which signs are “natural” and which ones are “acquired” (Bucholtz 1995, Hill 2008, Roth-Gordon 2011); whether ethnic identity is about “being” or “doing” (Kang and Lo 2004); whether an interaction is “naturally occurring” vs. “performed” (Hall 1995, Barrett 1999, Bucholtz 2003); and whose knowledge is “authentic” or “expert” and whose is not (Jacobs-Huey 2006).

3.3 Indexical Indeterminacy

As the cultural value of language is produced by those who listen from different ideological positions, what language indicates about the sociocultural context (e.g. its social indexicality) is not always shared (Agha 2007). Indexical values are multiple and often indeterminate (Silverstein 1992, Irvine 1996, Jaffe 2009). One of the earliest works in this vein was Basso’s (1979) Portraits of “the Whiteman”: Linguistic play and cultural symbols among the western Apache, which illustrated how linguistic practices that were understood by whites as perfectly normal were seen by Western Apache as intrusive and overbearing. Similarly, Morgan (1991) investigated how white women and African American women had sharply differing interpretations of African American expressions of indirectness. Such work built upon earlier studies of cross-cultural miscommunication (e.g., Twitchin 1979, Gumperz 1982) that illustrated how the same linguistic sign could have variable interpretations across listeners. Research on out-group talk has demonstrated how linguistic practices considered inappropriate in some settings (e.g. whites speaking AAE) may be ratified in local contexts (Cutler 1999, Sweetland 2002). Experimental research on race and language has made similar claims, documenting how the speech of African Americans and Asian Americans is not heard by everyone as indicating a speaker’s race (Hanna 1997, Lindemann 2003, Wolfram 2007).

Whereas early ethnolectal work presumed that language reflects a speaker’s genuine identity – “who they really are” – and that a clear line can be drawn between when I’m “being me” and when I’m “performing someone else,” linguistic anthropologists have shown that participants are positioned in relation to their language and to social others through complex footings (Goffman 1981) or stances (Du Bois 2007, Jaffe 2009). People can fluidly position themselves in relation to figures of personhood (Reyes 2007) – distancing themselves from these figures in moments of mockery (e.g., Ronkin and Karn 1999, Kiesling 2001), adopting them in acts of alignment (e.g., Barrett 1999, Lo 1999), or commenting ironically on them in satire (e.g., Chun 2004, Bucholtz and Lopez 2011), as the performance frame itself can come to the fore (Barrett 1999). Analyses at the interactional scale have also revealed the nuanced negotiations of indexical value when multiple ideologies co-exist. For example, Lo (1999) has shown that participants negotiate whether an individual is a legitimate speaker of an ethnic variety or whether something counts as homage, alignment, or overperformance. In her study, she illustrates how a Korean ethnic slur is used by a young Chinese American in order to affiliate with his Korean American interlocutor, yet the use of this slur is rejected by the Korean American, given their different ideologies of language and ethnicity related to this term. Because indexical meanings are emergent and negotiated, terms like “Asian American” or “Black” do not necessarily have stable values across events (Reyes 2005, 2011), items that may be identified by linguists as “African American slang” can point to distinctions of race in one moment but age, region, and class in other moments (Reyes 2005), and Asian American stereotypes can serve as oppressive homogenizations as well as celebratory resources across a single interaction (Reyes 2007). Likewise, the value of discursive acts also unfolds moment by moment, as an act that appears to be accommodation can subsequently be transformed into mockery (Chun 2009). Whether a
speaker is challenging or reproducing hegemonic ideologies of language is therefore not always evident, as Chun’s (2004) analysis of Margaret Cho’s performances of Mock Asian demonstrates.

In recent years, scholars have examined how divergent interpretations of cultural signs, linked to local cultural figures, produce particular identity positions within and across institutions and communities. For example, in her book *White kids: Language, race, and styles of youth identity*, Bucholtz (2011c) shows how European American youth at a California high school in the 1990s position themselves in relation to local figures of coolness by variably aligning with AAE or Standard English. White hip-hop fans, for example, adopted terms used by their African American peers, such as *patna*, while preppies more readily used terms such as *hella*, which originated from AAE but was no longer associated with blackness. Nerds generally rejected AAE-origin terms, aligning themselves with Standard English instead. Bucholtz (2009) also analyzes how Chicano youth, adult teachers, and the US popular media position themselves in relation to the Spanish word *guay*; while students associate the term with cool, working-class masculinity, teachers and the media associate it with vulgarity and middle-class masculinity, respectively. Wortham has similarly demonstrated how residents in a Pennsylvania town variously interpreted racialized, plastic collectible figurines called “Homies,” viewed by some as celebrations of a Mexican gangster lifestyle yet viewed by others as authentic versions of their own Mexican experience (Wortham, Mortimer, and Allard 2009, Wortham 2011a).

Such work has shown that the constitution of ethnoracial identities does not depend on the use of ethnolects. Rather, it depends on how participants position themselves and become positioned in relation to racialized styles and figures of personhood, as in Rosa’s (forthcoming) discussion of the complex voicing involved in “Inverted Spanglish,” where Latino high school students speak Spanish in two different ways: mockingly vocalizing white figures attempting to use Spanish and performing “themselves” in cool, youth-oriented slang. In particular, research on Asian Americans has noted that while a recognizable variety of Asian American English may not circulate (Reyes and Lo 2004, Lo and Reyes 2009), participants can position themselves in relation to figures of Asian immigrants (Bucholtz 2004, Chun 2004, Talmy 2004, Reyes 2007, Shankar 2008b, Reyes forthcoming) or African American youth (Chun 2001, 2013, Reyes 2005, Bucholtz 2004). The production of an Asian American identity thus does not depend upon “distinctive” Asian American linguistic features, but on stances that speakers produce towards various kinds of ethnic figures.

Indexicality determines that racial meanings always come bundled together with other meanings (Keane 2003), so signs that point primarily to race for some listeners can index age, place, class, and/or gender to others (Morgan 1994, Shankar 2008a, Sharma 2011, Wong and Hall-Lew 2014), and signs enregistered as indexes of regional or class dialects, like Pittsburghese or Standard English, can also be associated with speakers defined in racial terms (Lippi-Green 1997, Eberhardt 2012). Research on how signs and meanings are complexly bundled has analyzed the workings of implicit reference. For example, scholars have examined talk that alludes to but does not name race – discourse about culture, like “hard-working/lazy” or “diverse/non-diverse” (Urciuoli 1996, 2009); language, like “slang/standard” (Urciuoli 1996, Roth-Gordon 2009, Urciuoli 2009); place and class, like “urban,” “suburban,” “ghetto,” and “prep” (Modan 2007, Chun 2011, LaDousa 2011); or lifestyles, like “playboys,” “migrants,” or “FOBs” (“fresh-off-the-boat”) (Roth-Gordon 2007, Shankar 2008b). This research has also investigated how linguistic signs work together with non-linguistic signs. For example, in *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs*, Mendoza-Denton (2008) illustrates how Latina gang girls rely on a “lexicon” of make-up (lipstick, eyeliner, foundation) and language to identify either as Norteña or Sureña gang members.
Future Directions

Linguistic anthropological research has made significant contributions to our understanding of language and race, elucidating not only why race continues to be viewed as a natural dimension of human difference but also how linguistic markers of race are linked to complex ideological configurations. An issue that remains to be investigated is how scholars can best conceptualize this process across time and space, for example how can we connect what happens in face-to-face moments with what happens in media or legal discourses or how events of the past are brought to bear on those of the present or future. Some of the most stimulating work in this area has begun to address this very issue of language and race across temporal and spatial scales.

Moving beyond earlier research, which tended to provide post hoc explanations of how “micro” moments relate to “macro” structures or how “local” discourses draw on “global” ones, newer work has investigated how racialized signs are taken up along trajectories of speech events, moving across powerful institutions, including schools, the legal system, and the media (Wortham 2005, Dick 2011, Wortham 2011a, Reyes 2013, Chun forthcoming). As researchers investigate how racialized personas and varieties get linked to times and spaces (Dick 2010, Blanton 2011, Wirtz 2014), such as those that are “modern,” “backwards,” or “rural,” they have also focused increasing attention on how these ensembles are mediatized, or packaged and circulated as objects for media consumption, whether in live performances (Chun 2004, Wirtz 2014), television and film (Bucholtz 2011b, Bucholtz and Lopez 2011, Lo and Kim 2011, 2012), corporate advertisements (Limerick 2012, Shankar 2015), YouTube videos (Chun and Walters 2011, Walton and Jaffe 2011, Chun 2013), songs, or video games (Mendoza-Denton 2011). For example, Shankar (2015) describes how advertising executives craft ads that imagine, appeal to, and create Asian American consumers in ways that reproduce racist ideologies of white normativity, while Wirtz (2014) examines how folklore performances present images of Blackness, the past, and the present in Cuba. This new work attends to the ways that different participants take up and interpret media images, as in Chun’s (2013) analysis of how YouTube commenters evaluate an Asian American’s use of “black” linguistic features when performing racialized figures of “gangster” and “ironic” cool. Scholars have begun to attend to the ideological consequences of these mediatizing processes; Bucholtz (2011b), for example, has analyzed how cultural interpretations of white users of linguistic features linked to blackness were “indexically regimented,” or shaped over time, in American films from the mid-1990s to the 2000s.

The media is an especially persuasive and powerful institution, shaping ideas about our ethnorracial landscape, interpolating us to position ourselves within it, and guiding interpretations of the past and present (see Van Dijk, this volume; Wodak, this volume). As racialization involves both the centrifugal and the centripetal – moving outward as much as inward and backward as much as forward – the task remains for the scholar to unpack these layers and trajectories of time and space. By doing so, we might come to better understand what it is that we are doing with racialized language, how it relates to what we believe about race and language, and where it is that things might go from here.
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This insightful ethnography describes Spanish-English bilingual strategies and patterns among several Puerto Rican youth in a New York community, illuminating both the situated particularity and patterned generality of their language practices.