Part II

Language Ideologies and Practices of Learning
1 Introduction

Simply stated, “language ideologies” are the “beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use, which often index the political economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation-states” (Kroskrity 2010: 192). While this recent definition suggests the dual focus on the linguistic awareness of speakers and on their positionality within socioeconomic systems that display various kinds of social inequality, it does not reveal the contested emergence of this orientation in the late twentieth century. As used by linguistic anthropologists today, the concept of language ideologies first emerges in the work of Michael Silverstein, who defined what he called “linguistic ideologies” as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (1979: 193). Silverstein argued that linguists needed to recognize the role of speakers’ partial awareness of their language in order to understand such historical linguistic changes as the development of the Javanese honorific system or the loss of second-person pronouns like “thee” and “thou” in English. He argued persuasively that these and many other linguistic developments could not be accounted for by explanations based solely on linguistic structures. Adequate explanations could only be effected by appealing to speakers’ awareness of linguistic form and their necessarily social interpretations of those forms. This claim does not seem so controversial today but at the time Silverstein made the case for including linguistic ideologies as an additional linguistic level to which linguists must attend, it refuted the theory and practice of most linguistic and anthropological linguistic models of the day. The founder of American anthropology, Franz Boas (1911: 69), had categorically dismissed what he regarded as the “misleading and disturbing factors of secondary explanations” of members of a language community. Preferring his “direct method” of analyzing linguistic categories and bypassing native interpretation, Boas ignored the social context of language in favor of reading linguistic forms as direct evidence of cultural cognition. In twentieth-century linguistics, under the influence of either Bloomfield or Chomsky, an emphasis on linguistic structures, whether surface or “deep,” provided no room for considering speakers, their metalinguistic awareness, or their social worlds.

While Silverstein opened the door to the consideration of social forces on speakers’ beliefs and practices regarding language, scholars still needed to connect the theme of awareness to
considerations of the material world, including the role of economic value and pervasiveness of social inequality. Addressing both linguistic and cultural anthropologists, Judith Irvine (1989) argued that academic and Euro-American folk models of language have all too often linked it exclusively with the “thought” worlds of mental representation and not enough with the distribution of economic resources and political power in the material worlds of speakers. She argued effectively for recognizing this comparatively neglected side of language and developed a useful and more socially oriented definition of language ideology as “the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (Irvine 1989: 255).

Before elaborating on the history suggested by these definitions, it is useful to delimit further the subject of this essay and to distinguish it from similar approaches. The theoretical notion of “language ideologies” – a default plural for reasons to be explained later – includes a body of research that simultaneously problematizes speakers’ consciousness and awareness of their language, as well as their positionality (in political economic systems) in shaping their beliefs, expressed feelings, and evaluations of linguistic forms and discursive practices (Kroskrity 2000). Though a language ideologies approach is similar to Critical Discourse Analysis (e.g. Fairclough 1995, Wodak and Meyer 2001) in attempting to connect language with power and social inequality (Blommaert and Bulcaen 2000), it differs from CDA in its emphasis on awareness, its recognition of multiple and contesting ideologies, and on its preferred use of ethnographic approaches to collecting and interpreting data. Because of the significant differences in these attempts to understand language, power, and social inequality, I will devote this chapter exclusively to the approach that is clearly centered in linguistic anthropology: language ideologies.

2 Historical Perspectives

Taking Silverstein’s 1979 article as the inception of a “language ideologies” approach allows us to observe two significant historical patterns. One, briefly mentioned above, is the comparatively long history, including most of the twentieth century, in which speakers’ linguistic awareness, along with the social worlds that influenced their awareness, was dismissed by anthropologists and linguistic scientists. A second observation concerns the rapid acceptance, within less than three decades, of a language ideologies approach as it moved from a marginal concern to one now clearly identified as a mainstream approach, even one that has crossed over into cultural anthropology (Cody 2010: 200).

Why were speakers’ understandings of their own linguistic practices so marginalized within anthropology? Much of this has to do with the Boasian agenda for language in the then newly emerging discipline of anthropology. While Boas must be credited with insisting on the inclusion of linguistics in US anthropology as both an effort to professionalize the field and, in his view, to access the native perspective, he was almost exclusively concerned with description and analysis of languages as categorization systems and with historical linguistics rather than with understanding culturally contected speech. For him, native analyses of linguistic structure so lacked any understanding of the grammatical patterns recognizable to professional linguists that they were a kind of linguistic “false consciousness.” What Boas failed to see was that any cultural “distortion” of linguistic facts was a noteworthy contribution useful to an ethnography of communication. But his preoccupation with linguistic structures as the loci of the cultural minds of natives led him to dismiss local notions about language as unworthy of anthropological attention.

In the linguistics of the early and mid twentieth century, a similar marginalization amounted to a proscription of not only speakers’ linguistic ideologies but also their social worlds. Both Leonard Bloomfield’s (1933) paradigmatic rejection of all meaning, and certainly of the
“secondary responses” of speakers, and Chomsky’s (1965) concoction of an “ideal speaker–hearer” worked to professionally proscribe any concerns for actual speakers, their linguistic ideologies, and the social meanings of their languages. Thus even though the mainstream paradigm of twentieth-century linguistics swung from behavioralist to cognitivist, the shift had no impact on rethinking language as a social phenomenon or speakers as cultural actors.

In part, as a reaction to the asocial formalism that Chomskyan linguistics represented, fields like correlational sociolinguistics (e.g. Labov) and the ethnography of communication (e.g. Gumperz and Hymes) provided a critical counterpoint and introduced the possibility of studying language, especially its actual use by speakers, as a sociocultural phenomenon. These approaches opened new horizons in exploring the social foundations of language use and in rethinking linguistic anthropology as a field of anthropology and not just a “service” discipline for other subfields. But the early formulations of these movements initially provided few resources for inclusion of speakers’ language beliefs and practices as part of political economic systems. In actual practice, the ethnography of communication tended to valorize the study of language use but its “speech event” model encouraged an apolitical, broad-brush depiction of speech norms that often ignored their social distribution, or the larger political economic context. While correlational sociolinguistics clearly observed the speech variation associated with socioeconomic class, William Labov, its most famous practitioner, explicitly denigrated the importance of attending to speakers’ linguistic ideologies. Based on a detailed study of a New York City English speaker, “Steve K.,” Labov concluded “that a profound shift in social experience could not alter the socially determined pattern of linguistic variation” (Labov 1979: 329). Labov’s objectivist model relied solely on phonological criteria and ignored lexical choice and grammar, while his dismissal of speakers’ ideologies mistakenly viewed their own analyses, say about talking like the “working class,” as competing with his expert perspective rather than as an ethnotheory that attends to alternative criteria for its own purposes. Even when scholars in these traditions did devote considerable attention to local language ideologies, depicting local ideologies in spectacular terms – as in Gossen’s (1974) exploration of Chamula metalanguage – they were presented as cultural givens rather than understood as connected to political economic factors.

At a time when most models of meaning, including Chomsky’s linguistic semantics and anthropology’s ethnoscience, reduced linguistic meaning to denotation, or “reference,” and predication, Silverstein (1979) recognized the need for alternative approaches and turned to semiotic models of communication based on the theories of C. S. Peirce (1931–58). For researchers, a key theoretical advantage of semiotic models was their capacity to recognize the multiple meanings of linguistic signs that emerged from “indexical” connections between those signs and the social contexts of their usage. This theoretical orientation, especially as formulated by Jakobson (1957, 1960) and later translated into a functional trope by Hymes (1964), helped to create the foundation for the ethnography of communication and its quest to explore language use and relate it to topics, institutions, settings, genres, and other aspects of their sociocultural worlds. Over time the initial zeal to explore language use in micro-contexts grew more sophisticated and confronted the mapping of linguistic forms onto patterns of social stratification, including national political economic systems. Hymes (1974: 26, 33) called for the inclusion of a speech community’s local theories of speech and the study of its “communicative economy.” John Gumperz (e.g. Blom and Gumperz 1972: 43; Gumperz 1982: 39) often considered the “social meaning” of dialect choices for speakers within the context of their social networks and the larger political economic context.

As linguistic anthropologists became more and more successful into the 1980s in defining language as a sociocultural phenomenon that required attention not just to linguistic theory but
also to social and cultural theories, linguistic anthropologists, like their sociocultural colleagues, became increasingly concerned with practice theory and with the agency of social actors, as well as with syncretic attempts to wed Marxist materialism with a Weberian idealism (Ortner 1984: 147), in an attempt to achieve an analytical balance in the representation of human agency within social systems (Giddens 1979), often characterized by pervasive inequality. As Marxist and other political economic perspectives became staples of sociocultural theory in the US and in Europe (Bourdieu 1977, 1984), they also inspired some of the earliest works in the linguistic anthropological tradition of language ideologies, as a way of integrating these concerns with the now legitimated interests in speakers’ awareness of linguistic systems. The works included Susan Gal’s (1979) *Language Shift* and “Language and Political Economy” (Gal 1989), Jane Hill’s (1985) “The Grammar of Consciousness and the Consciousness of Grammar,” Judith Irvine’s (1989) aforementioned “When Talk Isn’t Cheap: Language and Political Economy,” and Kathryn Woolard’s (1985) “Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony.” These works adumbrated many of the key concerns that have since flourished through the remainder of the twentieth century and into the present, producing a series of important anthologies devoted to language ideological work (Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity 1998; Blommaert 1999c, Kroskrity 2000, and Gal and Woolard 2001). More recently, with the language ideological perspective more widely adopted, anthologies have appeared that specialize in the Pacific and Native American regions (Makihara and Schieffelin 2007, Kroskrity and Field 2009).

3 Critical Issues and Topics

In previous overviews (Kroskrity 2000, 2010), I have analyzed four and five key aspects of this approach but, in this condensed treatment, I will focus on what may be regarded as the three main planks of the language ideologies approach: *positionality, multiplicity and awareness*.

The first of these attributes, *positionality*, is the understanding that language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest, or from the perspective, of an economically positioned social or cultural group. Members’ notions of what is ‘true,’ ‘morally good,’ or ‘aesthetically pleasing’ about language and discourse are grounded in social experience and often demonstrably tied to their political economic interests. These notions often underlie attempts to use language as the site at which to promote, protect, and legitimate those interests. Nationalist programs of language standardization, for example, may appeal to a modern metric of communicative efficiency, but such language development efforts are pervasively saturated by political economic considerations, since the imposition of a state-supported hegemonic standard will always benefit some social groups over others (see Woolard 1985, 1989; Errington 1998, 2000; Silverstein 1996; Collins 1996). State policies and practices regarding the promotion or suppression of multilingualism are differentially evaluated by linguistic minorities, like Puerto Ricans in New York City (Urciuoli 1996; Zentella 1997) or zealots of the “English-only” movement (Schmidt 2007), who both see their emblematic languages as threatened. What positionality refutes is the myth of the sociopolitically disinterested language user or the possibility of unpositioned linguistic knowledge. Though interests are rendered more visible when they are embodied by overtly contending groups – as in the struggle for airtime on Zambian radio (Spitulnik 1998), the disputes of Warao shamans (Briggs 1998), the political debates in Corsica about the institutional status or cultural role of the Corsican language (Jaffe 2003, 2007), the competing discourses linked to Mexico’s vacillating language policies toward indigenous languages (Messing 2007), or the confrontations of feminists with the traditional grammarian defenders of the generic ‘he’ (Silverstein 1985), one can also extend this emphasis on grounded social experience to seemingly homogeneous cultural groups by
recognizing that cultural conceptions “are partial, contestable, and interest-laden” (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 58). Even overtly shared language practices, such as Arizona Tewa kiva speech (Kroskrity 1998), can represent the constructions of particular elites who obtain the required complicity (Bourdieu 1991: 113) of other social groups and classes. Rather than accepting linguistic conservatism as an irreducible, cultural given, a language ideological approach asks how does this perspective become widely accepted, how do indexical connections to political power and religious authority promote culturally dominant beliefs?

Rosina Lippi-Green’s (1997) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination* explicitly emphasizes language ideologies in her examination of contemporary educational and other institutionalized policies and practices, by demonstrating the class-based interests behind what she calls, following Milroy and Milroy (1999), the *standard language ideology*. She defines it as “a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the speech of the upper, middle class” (Lippi-Green 1997: 64). This language ideology promotes ‘the language subordination process,’ which amounts to a program of linguistic mystification undertaken by dominant institutions designed to simultaneously valorize the standard language and other aspects of ‘mainstream culture’ while devaluing the nonstandard and its associated cultural forms. For example, so-called ‘double negatives’ (as in “He does not have no money”) may seem repulsive embodiments of ignorance to those attuned to the norms of the standard and yet the supposed deficiency is not traceable to any logical flaw that obscures its ‘meaning’ but rather comes from its association with a class of speakers who use it and the fact that it is grammatically proscribed by state-supported educational institutions. For Lippi-Green, in accord with a language ideological stance, the proclaimed superiority of Standard English rests not on its structural properties or its communicative efficiency but rather on its association with the political economic influence of affluent social classes who benefit from a social stratification that consolidates and continues their privileged position.

The second attribute of language ideologies is their *multiplicity*. Language ideologies are profitably conceived as multiple because of the plurality of meaningful social divisions (class, gender, clan, elites, generations, and so on) within sociocultural groups that can produce divergent perspectives expressed as indices of group membership. Language ideologies are thus grounded in social experience that is never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale. Thus, in Hill’s (1998) study of Mexicano (Nahuatl) linguistic ideologies, when older Mexicano speakers in the Malinche Volcano area of Central Mexico say the Mexicano equivalent of “Today there is no respect,” this nostalgic view is more likely to be voiced by older men. Although both genders recognize the increased ‘respect’ once signaled by a tradition of using Nahuatl honorific registers and other polite forms, ‘successful’ men are more likely to express this sense of linguistic deprivation of earned deference. Mexicano women, on the other hand, are more likely to express ambivalence; having seen their own lot in life improve during this same period of declining verbal ‘respect,’ some women are less enthusiastic in supporting a symbolic return to practices of former times (Hill 1998: 78–79).

Another very revealing application of multiplicity is the exploration of internal diversity as a driving force in linguistic change. In Errington’s (1998, 2000) research on the complementary, if not contradictory, language ideologies underlying the development of standard Indonesian, he examines the conflicted efforts of the Indonesian government to domesticate exogenous modernity and modernize domestic traditions. Though often viewed as a success story in terms of ‘the national language problem’, standardized Indonesian does not readily conform to a number of facile claims by scholars and policy makers who share an instrumentalist ideology of language development in nationalism. Gellner (1983), for example, sees development of a national
standard language as a key element in making the transformation to nationalism. Representing a
nonideological development perspective, he portrays standardized Indonesian as an “ethnically
uninflected, culturally neutral language” that is both universally available to its citizens and itself
subject to development by the state.

But Errington demonstrates that though the Indonesian state’s New Order attempts to efface
the derivativeness of national high culture and national language by erasure of its ethnic and class
sources, the language itself provides a key example of an apparent contradiction. Recent lexica-
lar change displays a proliferation of both archaic or archaized terms traceable to Old Javanese
and Sanskrit, as well as the incorporation of almost one thousand terms from English. This dual
development of the lexicon can hardly be defended as ‘communicatively efficient’ or as contrib-
uting to some neutral language widely available to all as an emblem of national identity. Rather,
it represents continuity with a supposedly abandoned linguistic past in which exemplary elites
rule through a language over which they have specialized control. And since knowledge of the
local prestige charismatic languages (Javanese and Sanskrit) and the prestige international lan-
guage, English, is socially distributed, this standardizing project joins other nationalist projects
in both creating and legitimating a state-endorsed social inequality.

Another trend in this emphasis on multiplicity is to focus on contestation, clashes, or dis-
junctions in which divergent ideological perspectives on language and discourse are juxtaposed,
resulting in a wide variety of outcomes (e.g. Briggs 1996). In one such example from Alexandra
Jaffe’s research on language politics in Corsica (1999a, b), she examines the ideological debate
regarding the translation of French literature into Corsican – a language that has undergone
language shift and has lost many functions to the state’s official, written language – French. The
contestation that emerges is between instrumentalists who see such translations as acts of pro-
motion or enhancement for the symbolic value of Corsican and romanticists who adopt a more
classic language and identity perspective. For them, such translations are a perversion of lan-
guage and identity relationships because the act of translation suggests a common or colonized
identity rather than an expression of a uniquely Corsican identity. In Jaffe’s analysis, as in others
that use this strategy, contestation and disjuncture disclose critical differences in ideological per-
spectives that can more fully reveal their distinctive properties as well as their scope and force.

Multiplicity is also an attribute that makes language ideological approaches especially appro-
priate for studying cultural contact and social transformation. In such cases the goal is not to
identify and describe a single dominant ideology but rather to examine ideological contact,
contention, and transformation. Many California Indian groups, as exemplified by the Western
Mono of Central California, had indigenous language ideologies that valued multilingualism
and linguistic syncretism, but did not strongly elevate particular languages as emblems of tribal
identity (Kroskrity 2009a). Many of these groups were hunter-gathering communities that
moved to more ideal locations seasonally and they typically maintained strong relations with
neighboring groups that resulted in widespread intermarriage and multilingualism. Though
these communities were more likely to emphasize the practical value of languages as economic
tools rather than as vehicles of group identity prior to Euro-American domination, the influence
of nationalist language ideologies from above provided a model for linking a single language
with group identity that contributed symbolic resources for the ethnonationalist movements of
the late twentieth-century postcolonial period (Kroskrity 2009a).

A similar pattern of influence between the language ideologies of a nation state and those of
an indigenous group has been observed by Makihara (2007) for indigenous people of Rapa Nui –
a Polynesian island that is part of the Chilean state. Though, in everyday speech, community
members seem to prefer a linguistic syncretism of Spanish and their indigenous language, the
community’s growing interest in being recognized not merely as Chilean citizens but as an
indigenous people with special rights has led it to marshal linguistic and other resources for the cause. On the model of official Chilean Spanish, a puristic Rapa Nui register has been adopted and deployed by political activists who call attention to their distinctive identities through its use in public contexts. But not all instances of language ideological contact result in transmission, influence, or synthesis. In her study of the interaction of ‘new’ and native Gaelic speakers in the Western Isles of Scotland (McEwan–Fujita 2010), the author observes how the very disparate language ideologies of these different learners result in affect-laden stance displays that render their interaction dysfunctional for language learning and can hardly be viewed as promoting Gaelic language revitalization. In the case of Galician, in northwestern Spain, the clash of new and traditional speakers of the language has resulted in confrontation and contestation over issues of ownership, legitimacy, and authenticity (O’ Rourke and Ramallo 2013), showing the power of language ideologies to divide as well as to unify.

The third characteristic of language ideologies, *speakers’ awareness*, is simply the observation that members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies. While Silverstein’s (1979) definition, quoted above, suggests that language ideologies are often explicitly articulated by members, researchers also recognize ideologies of practice that must be read from actual usage. This research suggests a correlational relationship between high levels of discursive consciousness and active contestation of ideologies and, contrastively, between practical consciousness, or taken-for-granted beliefs and feelings about language, and relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized, dominant ideologies (Kroskrity 1998).

The types of social settings in which language ideologies are produced and commented upon constitute another source of variation in awareness. Silverstein (1998: 136) developed the notion of *ideological sites* “as institutional sites of social practice as both object and modality of ideological expression.” Such sites are often the loci of religious or secular institutional rituals in which specific beliefs are inscribed. In part because of the institutional focus on language as constitutive of the law, studies of US court rooms and law school classrooms (Mertz 2007), as well as Hopi Tribal Courts (Richland 2008) and Tongan courts (Philips 2000) provide especially revealing sites for language ideologies. In cases where the government monopolizes state resources, sites of ideological production and explication are one and the same. Under the influence of Ujamaa, the socialist ideology of the Tanzanian state, explicit state language ideologies promoted Swahili and encouraged bilingual writers to develop new genres of Swahili literature (Blommaert 1999b), designed to develop indigenous forms and exclude foreign literature. Having a monopoly on publishing, the state could use controlled media to explicate endorsed language ideologies and then publish only those works that exemplified those ideologies. Lacking comparable support for indigenous languages in the US, indigenous language activists have strategically examined language ideologies as a fundamental part of revitalization programs. Loether (2009), in his study of Shoshoni language renewal, discusses the need for language planners to ‘manipulate’ local language ideologies in order to create a better environment for successful language revitalization. Ideologies to discard include those involving indexing the Shoshoni language exclusively to a traditional past, to images of inferiority, or to assumptions that having Shoshoni ‘blood’ will ensure rapid acquisition of the heritage language. In a study of a variety of Southwestern tribal communities experiencing language shift to English, researchers have noticed a new ideological development in which indigenous language speakers both revalorize their heritage languages and re-ideologize English as a ‘dead’ language – one which lacks the beauty, vitality, and world-view of indigenous languages. The researchers conclude, “Replacing the labels of ‘dying,’ ‘moribund,’ and ‘obsolescent’ for Native languages with the perspective that it is English that is dead may well be a strong step forward in Native communities’ work toward reestablishing the heritage language and culture as dominant” (Gomez de Garcia, Axelrod, and Lachler 2009: 122).
Awareness is also a product of the kind of linguistic or discursive phenomena that speakers, either generically or in a more culturally specific manner, can identify and distinguish (Silverstein 1981). Nouns, our ‘words for things,’ display an unavoidable referentiality that makes them more available for folk awareness and possible folk theorizing than, say, a rule for marking ‘same subject’ as part of verb morphology. In my own analysis (Kroskrity 1993, 1998) of the contact history of the Arizona Tewa, a consistent pattern of indigenous purism can be established as both a local language ideology of the group and an established fact of language contact. But this program of purism is selectively imposed on linguistic phenomena that are more word-like, while grammatical diffusion from Apachean and Hopi seems to have evaded Tewa folk scrutiny (Kroskrity 1998). The importance of attending to awareness as a dimension of ideology is both the reversal of a longstanding scholarly tradition of delegitimizing common people’s views of language – a tradition extending back at least as far as Locke and Herder (Bauman & Briggs 2003) – and the recognition that when speakers rationalize their language they take a first step toward changing it (Silverstein 1979). As Coupland and Jaworski (2004: 37) have powerfully stated: “The concept of language ideology is the final rejection of an innocent, behavioral account of language and the focus of the strongest claim that sociolinguistics must engage with metalinguistic processes in the most general sense.”

4 Current Research Topics

In the last two decades, as language ideological approaches have flourished, some of the key themes they have been used to investigate include: 1) “the historical production and reproduction of language ideologies” (Blommaert 1999a: 1); 2) the exploration of social identities of various sorts (national, ethnic, professional, gender, indigenous) that are produced through language ideologies; and 3) language ideological involvement in processes of subordination, marginalization, and counterhegemonic responses to such forces. Regarding the historical production and reproduction, Irvine and Gal (2000) have demonstrated the way colonial politics helped to produce language ideologies and ideologies of linguistic differentiation in Africa and Macedonia that variously rationalized the inferiority of speakers of click languages or that read multilingual adaptations as a linguistic chaos in need of regimenting along the lines of European nationalisms. Also taking the long view, Collins (1999) situates the Ebonics controversy in the historical context of evolving US national language ideologies surrounding the increasing valorization of Standard English and stigmatization of minority languages and nonstandard varieties. This historical emphasis assumes a reflexive turn as many European and Euro-American language philosophers and foundational academic figures (Herder, Locke, Schoolcraft, the Grimms, and Boas) are examined from a language ideological perspective by Bauman & Briggs (2004) in their influential book, *Voices of Modernity*.

Language ideological research has been instrumental in the further exploration of how speakers and communities marshal linguistic resources to express traditional indigenous Kaska (Canadian Yukon) identities in the modern world (Meek 2007) or newly (re-)emergent ethnolinguistic identities such as Rapa Nui (Makihara 2007) or Catalonian (Digiacommo 1999). But for many groups, local ideologies valorize hybridity as expressed through code-switching. For example, in the Puerto Rican community of El Barrio in New York City’s East Harlem (Zentella 1997) speaking both Spanish and English in the form of intra-sentential code-switching is a valued expression of their status as bilingual ‘Nuyoricans.’ And multilingual practices can also be hybridized to create new ‘Desi’ identities for South Asian immigrants to California’s Silicon Valley (Shankar 2008a, b). And much as linguistic ideologies have been employed to support and create identities, they can also be used to marginalize, suppress, convert, and appropriate
identities. Notable achievements in this area are Kuipers’ (1998) study of the Indonesian suppression of “subversive” Sumbanese rhetorical forms, Errington’s (2000), and Schieffelin’s (2000, 2007) studies of missionary and colonial suppression of local identities. Studies of ‘crossing’ (e.g. Rampton 1995) and ‘styling’ (e.g. Bucholtz 1999; Cutler 1999) also powerfully demonstrate the language ideological construction of linguistic otherness that motivates such acts of identity appropriation, creation, and hybridization. Often the process of language ideological construction of one’s own identity is embedded in the construction of oppositional others. In Stasch’s (2007) study of how members of a Papuan community construct Indonesian, he represents the ambivalent view of that community with the demonization of some aspects of Indonesian society and the admiration of others. Other topics have also received recent attention and are likely to contribute to future research as well. These will be discussed below.

5 Research Methods

Most language ideological research, especially among anthropologists, has been concerned more with theoretical development and refinement than with research methods. This is in part because most of those who do language ideological research have used a wide variety of conventional methods: participant observation, formal and informal interviewing, life history, person-centered ethnography, conversational analysis, historical linguistics, and textual analysis. Since researchers read language ideologies both from actual practice and from speakers’ metalinguistic and metadiscursive responses in interviews, many researchers will collect data using two or more of the above methods. This is especially necessary for those studies in which researchers are concerned with discerning and refining the typology of speakers’ awareness (Silverstein 1981, 1993; Kroskrity 1998) in order to understand the influence of structure and agency. The one exception to this general pattern of not developing specific methodological works for language ideological research is Jef Verschueren’s (2012) volume that offers a rigorous pragmatics-oriented approach to studying language ideologies in written works.

6 Future Directions

In the past decade several language ideological trends have emerged that indicate productive directions for future research. Several of these can be briefly identified here. One of these is the language ideological deconstruction of linguistic racism (e.g. Bucholtz & Trechter 2001; Meek 2006; Barrett 2006; Reyes & Lo 2009). Within this literature, Jane Hill (2008) has expanded upon earlier work (Hill 1999) by using language ideological emphases on awareness to account for contrasts between stark linguistic racism (e.g. use of racial epithets) and “covert” forms of linguistic racism displayed in everyday usage by non-Hispanics of “mock Spanish.” Though a speaker’s use of this register is often associated with his or her attempt to be jocular or to convey a colloquial stance and not with attempts to be intentionally “racist,” Hill nevertheless reveals a consistent pattern of pejoration that is indexically tied to negative stereotypes of Mexican-Americans and other Hispanics as lazy, immoral, drunken or otherwise undesirable. In her argument, American English speakers’ linguistic ideologies of personalism and referentialism dilute and deflect attention away from the verbal harm done to others as a consequence of their propagation of defamatory images of Chicano/a “others.” This indirection coupled with the alternative ideological emphasis combines to explain why such “covert racist” practices fly below the radar of awareness for many speakers who would find overt racist speech reprehensible.

Another trend is the application of language ideological approaches to situations of language shift and to those attempts at reversing this process that are typically called language renewal.
and linguistic revitalization (Bunte 2009; Cavanaugh 2004, 2009; Nevins 2004, 2013; LeMaster 2006; Meek 2007, 2010; Perley 2011; Reynolds 2009; Smith-Hefner 2009; Kroskrity and Field 2009). Because language ideological approaches can treat the interaction of multiple ideologies and not merely attend to the beliefs and practices of dominant groups, they are particularly useful in the analysis of dynamic situations involving cultural contact, socioeconomic change, evolving gender relations, and even the hegemonic influence of states on linguistic and cultural minorities.

Another relatively new interest is centered in language and the mass media. In part because the mass media represent powerful sources of persuasion and influence that can reach a vast audience and because their operation can reproduce forms of social inequality, they are an important site for language ideological research. A sample of the many topics treated in this literature are: the media globalization of Standard Spanish (Paffey 2010), the reproduction of racial stereotypes in computer game discourse (Ensslin 2010), personalist language ideologies in US media discourse (Hill 2007), media discourses about language shift in Corsica (Jaffe 2007), and changing forms of mass mediated speech-making by politicians in Madagascar (Jackson 2013). In addition to these topics, it is also appropriate to give brief mention to other topics like language ideologies of specific professions (law, medicine, academia), of translation, and of verbal, visual, and musical aesthetics (Kroskrity 2009b; Black 2012).

Related Topics

4 The Social Imaginary, Unspoken in Verbal Art (Mannheim); 8 Social Subordination and Language (Huayhua); 11 Language Socialization and Marginalization (García–Sánchez); 14 Discursive Practices, Linguistic Repertoire, and Racial Identities (Baugh); 15 Language and Racialization (Chun, Lo); 19 Language and Political Economy (McElhinny); 20 Language, Immigration, and the Nation-State (Pujolar); 21 Language and Nationalism (Haque); 22 Language in the Age of Globalization (Jacquemet); 24 Discrimination via Discourse (Wodak); 25 Racism in the Press (van Dijk); 26 Legal Discourse (Conley); 30 The Politics of Language Endangerment (Meek).
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### Further Reading


*In this book the author develops an approach to linguistic racism that utilizes language ideological theory.*


*A collection of research on language ideologies that moves the field toward a more “reflexive” examination of academic and Western language ideologies.*


*A collection of interesting applications of a language ideological approach to various US institutions – from legal to Disney animated films. A useful introduction to the politics of language standardization.*


*The foundational collection of articles on the then emerging research area of language ideologies.*