

“I might not be front desk material”: An Analysis of Language Ideologies and Hospitality Training

Tamara Shane Sniad
University of Pennsylvania

Many of the limitations minorities face arguably involve differing ideologies about how and where certain language forms can be used and what their use indexes. This paper looks at the language ideologies that manifest in an adult education program aimed at training African Americans for jobs in the hospitality industry and how these ideologies relate to the students' employment opportunities in customer service positions. By looking closely at how and what ideologies are explicitly and implicitly expressed, the local (re)production of certain sociocultural attitudes and their effect on the employment opportunities of the speakers may be better understood and addressed.

1. Introduction

For most of the last two centuries, education has been marketed as the answer to individual and national economic problems (Grubb, 1997). The assumption is that certain groups of people, particularly language or vernacular minorities, are underemployed because they do not have the appropriate training or education to obtain positions or advance in their current ones. In numerous communities the response to rather dismal statistics on minority employment has been to develop a number of educational programs to target these populations.

Researchers, such as Baugh (2000) and Bernstein (2000), however, have been critical of such programs, contending that educational institutions have had and continue to have a role in maintaining the economical, social, and political positioning of the targeted groups. Explicit in their arguments is the position that, through often well-meaning activities, certain ideologies about language and language users have been (re)produced in educational institutions. This is the focus of my research. Through my analysis in this paper, I will provide evidence of re-occurring *language ideologies* in one adult educational institution. The purpose is to illustrate some of the ways both the students and staff, most of whom are speakers of non-standard English, are talking about and interacting with the expectations for Standard English in the workplace.

This study of language ideologies, defined here as “a set of beliefs about language articulated by users as rationalizations or justifications of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979), developed from a general inquiry into work related education, language and the workplace, and customer service interactions. Through almost two years of fieldwork in my site, an educational program designed to prepare African American adults for customer service positions in the hospitality industry, a number of issues concerning language use in professional settings became salient. In the students’ life skills class, where discussions on workplace expectations, employee relations, and general “professional” behavior take place, ideologies become apparent. The underlying assumptions that emerge in these interactions suggest a complex and often conflicting set of beliefs concerning what constitutes a professional environment and what is expected linguistically in one. Identifying and making salient these assumptions and, even more importantly, how people are engaging with them, will lead not only to the development of more effective curricula, but also to a higher level of linguistic tolerance among the hiring personnel in the industry.

In this study, I will be focusing on the activity of interviewing and the training that goes on in the program around interviewing. Interviewing is a gate-keeping activity. If a prospective employee is judged poorly in an interview, it does not matter how qualified they are for the job, nor how well they will perform once they get there. Inadequate interviewing can, and in this industry often does, equal no job. Focusing on interviewing, therefore, not only makes this a more

manageable study, but, since one of the goals of such educational programs is to help students get a foot in the door, it also increases the potential for more practical pedagogical implications.

2. Ideologies

When we engage in interaction with others we both interpret and evaluate the contributions they make to the ongoing exchange, reacting not only to what people say, but *how* they say it and what they *do* with their speech. Consciously or not, we associate different styles of speech with particular personal and social characteristics, such as regional or ethnic background, education level, economic status, political stance, or profession. A significant influence on these associations is the social system in which we live. At the same time, the linguistic forms or strategies we use in our day to day interactions are recognized by researchers as having a role in the continuous (re)construction of certain social and political situations. Thus, macro-level social structures and micro-level interactions arguably maintain a more or less reciprocal relationship. This two-way relationship is sustained via a number of sources of knowledge that speakers draw on in making choices in their interactions and in construing meaning from them. One of these mediating knowledge sources is language ideologies (Silverstein, 1992).

Until the late 20th century, the term *ideology* was associated with a rather pejorative definition or definitions (van Dijk, 1998). The term has since been reclaimed and is used in linguistic anthropology research to refer to that which guides speakers in their recognition and interpretation of discursive events (Silverstein, 1993). Thus, how speakers come to recognize or identify a discourse or event as a particular kind of discourse or event (and decide how to participate in that event) may be attributed to ideologies (Silverstein, 1992). It is important to recognize, though, that ideologies are not preordained ways of thinking. Rather, ideologies are emergent and created within interactions (Silverstein, 1992). In other words, they are not determinant of language structures, but rather they are part and parcel to the structure of language. As such, language ideologies must be defined in terms of language-use-in-context.

When asked, most individuals are able to talk about their ideas or attitudes toward language and certain language users. However, as contemporary linguistic anthropologists have argued, there are often more

implicit ways that these views are shared or expressed by speakers, such as individuals' discourse strategies and language choices (Silverstein, 1992). These linguistic forms create patterns that, if examined, point to presupposed categories that the speakers rely on to create shared meaning. It is through these patterns of what are called *indexical signs*, or signs that point to or make relevant contexts that have or will occur, that texts gel and come to have meaning for speakers. A close analysis of these patterns will make salient the speakers' shared underlying assumptions, most of which tend to have a sense of naturalness for the speakers, and thus provide evidence of the speakers' ideologies.

A clear way to explain exactly what I mean by ideologies would be with an example. If I were to say in a conference presentation of this paper, "*Oye kivalt!* You wouldn't believe the bag I had to *schlep* through the airport this morning!," this statement might be called an index. When audience members hear it, it taps into what they know about language and language users. At the moment of the utterance, the audience members might think it is a joke, a quote, or possibly an attempt to build rapport with other *kvetchers* who might be in the room. Most likely, however, as I continued talking, they would soon come to recognize the utterance as an example for the academic talk. An important question is, how did they come to this understanding? The answer is, by drawing on a number of sources of knowledge about language--including, of course, ideologies (who speaks in what way and when, and what kind of person he or she is if he or she speaks in some particular way at some particular time). Individuals' ideologies play an important role in narrowing down the possibilities, so that they can make sense of situations.

When our day-to-day interactions and communications run smoothly, we can attribute much of the success to shared ideologies. This concept of sharedness, notably, is of great interest to linguistic anthropologists, because it suggests a social component to what had once been considered by many a mental concept (Silverstein, 1996). As will be addressed in the following section, macro-level social institutions have been examined for their role in these phenomena.

2.1. Institutional Discourse

Power and authority are reproduced through both the explicit actions of institutions and the more implicit practices within them. The

passing of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for example, rendered it illegal to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in both the hiring and firing of employees and in the terms and conditions of employment. This law, notably, does not explicitly mention language (Philips, 1998). Thus, employers can argue in court that even an accent may impede job performance as long as the assessment is "honest" (Lippi-Green, 1994). In 1978, for example, the U.S. District Courts for the Southern District of New York found in favor of the employer, a hotel, in a discrimination case brought by a Hispanic woman denied a promotion. The courts held that the employer had the right to judge the woman's ability to communicate effectively in English, since the promotion would bring her in contact with the guests (Piatt, 1993). In less explicit ways, various other occupational groups continue to redefine the world of work, requiring certificates and degrees for positions that previously had no such requirements (Collins, 1996). Such proceedings support the suggestion of researchers that "overt racism is declining in favor of forms of symbolic and economic racism that still have the same intended exclusionary effect" (Baugh, 2000).

In order for exclusions to be made on the basis of language, there needs to be an established norm or something against which language forms are measured (Silverstein, 1996). This is accomplished through the process of *standardization*. Standardization, or the means by which one particular way of speaking within a group becomes the ideal and valued way of speaking, is a process that cannot occur without some kind of motivating social, political, or economic force (Milroy, 1985). In other words, it is important to recognize that what is being held as the standard in a speech community is a code infused with values. There is nothing intrinsically more sophisticated or correct about the standard, in this case Standard English. Rather, its position in the language hierarchy is based on ideologies.

2.2. Role of Education

It has been argued that educational institutions are key players in the (re)production of such language ideologies (Bernstein, 2000; Collins, 1999; Mehan, 1996; Mertz, 1998; Silverstein, 1996). Educational systems, as mentioned in the introduction, have been accredited with playing a vital role in the legitimization of certain forms of expression and the devaluing of others as slang or ungram-

matical. Not only do these institutions often control the resources and establish the norm, but they also restrict access to them. As such, institutions, such as the site of this research, and their affiliated “language guardians” (Milroy, 1985) and “ideology brokers” (Mehan, 1996) should be examined for their decisive role in the struggle for legitimization and authority. This study, therefore, not only looks at one site that might support or refute this argument, but it also seeks to discern what ideologies about standard language are being introduced and perpetuated in educational institutions, and how they are being (re)produced.

3. Data Collection

The program examined here is part of a larger organization that includes a number of other adult educational programs, such as GED classes and vocational training courses. In this program, African American adults, ranging in age from eighteen to fifty-three, train and are assisted in gaining employment in the hospitality industry. There are three classes in this division: housekeeping, culinary arts, and front desk. It is the latter that I focus on. This sixteen-week long class is free, and a majority of the students who attend are out of work but are interested in customer service, or what the industry calls a “front of the house position.”

The corpus of data for this study consists of audio recordings of classroom activities and participant interviews in the lunchroom and in the classroom during breaks. From these audio recordings, I selected three interactions for this analysis. I chose these particular pieces because they are decidedly “typical” of reoccurring discussions or events.

4. Analysis

The interactional pieces I present in this analysis all evidence the prevailing language ideologies participants draw upon in their interactions with the expectations of Standard English in the workplace. The first two pieces come from classroom discussions facilitated by the instructor. The last piece comes from a discussion I participated in with students in the lunchroom. What will be made salient in all of these segments are the patterns of indexicals that line up to presuppose certain underlying assumptions about language use and certain language users.

4.1. “It’s not ya know professional”

This first piece comes from the first group of students I observed. This segment of discourse is a discussion that followed a mock job interview between an instructor, Mr. James, and an 18-year-old student, Lori. Mr. James role-played as the mock interviewer, and Lori participated as the interviewee. The practice interview ends with Mr. James asking Lori if she has any questions for him about the hotel or the position. Lori asks about educational benefits for hotel employees. After she asks her question, there is a lengthy pause. She repeats the question, in the same form, but begins to clarify the content. Mr. James interrupts, acknowledging the question, but not yet answering. Lori again repeats the question in the same code, at which point Mr. James answers. The interview ends moments later, and Mr. James asks the class for comments.

The discussion that follows the mock interview, presented below, focuses primarily on Lori’s linguistic choices during the interview. At one point, Mr. James attempts to move the conversation to the *content* of Lori’s responses, but the students continue to focus on the forms of her utterances.

(1) Segment 1

1. James: any any questions beside that
2. Lori: yes I’d like to know do y’all go any ed educational benefits for y’all’s
3. employees? (3) do y’all offer like employee /?/ ||
4. James: ||I got
your question I got
5. your question
6. (laughter from the class)
7. Lori: /?/ so all y’all got it?
8. James: uh we do offer uh reimbursement for uh educational courses after six
9. months on the job you have to go take the class you have to pay for it
10. and we reimburse you for it /?/ (.) is that it?
11. Lori: yep
12. James: all right thank you very much
13. (applause from class)

14. James: any any comments
15. Jackie: yeah um she did goo:d but um the *speech* like you did used some words
16. /?/ *y'all got any*||
17. Lori: ||no I really don't do like when I'm interviewing with
18. [wIf] somebody else
19. Jackie: but this is where we're supPOSE to use
20. James: this is this is and||
21. Lori: ||I don't but I'm just say'n I hear voices ya know how
22. ya hear voices like other people talk'n and mess up my **concentration**
23. James: right and I understand that that's ya know I I but there's still a need to
24. make sure we perfect our diction make sure we ya know uh all right
25. we'll go on so diction
26. Denise: I was think'n of mak'n a comment on /?/ you have to also try to catch
27. that person's attention you know like when she was she *wasn't*
28. *professional about her diction* and everything and she kinda like lost /?/
29. me as far as concentrat'n I couldn't concentrate on a lot of things
30. because of like *y'all and you got and this and that*
31. James: did you take this seriously I don't think you did
32. Lori: no I couldn't take it seriously
33. James: why not
34. Dorothy: Mr. [James] uh
35. James: what's up
36. Dorothy: /?/
37. James: *slang?*
38. Denise: yeah what's that word they use to describe
39. Sandra: *Ebonics*
40. Denise: yeah yeah *Ebonics*
41. (some laughter in class)
42. Denise: yeah and you're talk'n ya know and *it's not ya know professional*

43. because I don't I don't think it's front desk
44. James: I'm just look'n at your reaction I'm just look'n at
45. Lori: no I don't talk like this if I was an employee I would be at the front desk
46. I wouldn't talk like this
47. Denise: I was wrong and I apologize for the way I said it but the employer will
48. look at her the same way and they want you to be able to speak they
49. don't I mean I I might not be front desk material but they want a
50. certain type of person like Mr. [James] says ya know ya have to be
51. energetic ya have to you're on stage at all times
52. you ||have to be an actor||
53. Lori: ||a:n' I know that ||it's just [jIs] be'n in a classroom be'n in a
54. classroom an' be'n in an interview is two different||
55. Denise: ||no||
56. Lori: ||total-
ly YES it is
57. Sandra: but not at this time we have /?/
58. James: we'll have we'll have this discussion after class if you want

As this interaction unfolds, a number of indexical patterns emerge, patterns that suggest what professional language sounds like (italics), where it is to be spoken (underscore), and the performative nature of sounding professional (bold). I will start with the issue of unprofessional language. While the majority of the interview is not shown, even in this small piece, the way Mr. James responds to Lori's question (line 3) seems marked and draws attention to that moment. His first response is no response. He then gives a rather informal confirmation, which is followed by laughter from the class, before answering (line 8).

The meaning of the laughter only becomes clear when the students respond to Lori's performance in the interview. In Jackie's first comment, she draws our attention to particular forms by quoting Lori's speech (lines 15 and 16). Denise, in her turn, does the same

thing (line 30). Dorothy offers a token. Mr. James picks up the utterance, “slang” (line 33) and receives confirmation from Dorothy in line 34. Then Sandra offers “Ebonics” (line 39), and Denise says, “It’s not, ya know, professional” (line 42). All of these tokens line up to suggest what professional language looks like, or better yet, what it does NOT look like. “Unprofessional” is tied to Ebonics (note the “yeah yeah” agreement), which is tied to slang, which relates back to the particular forms identified by both Dorothy and Jackie. This emergent pattern of indexicals presupposes a shared belief among the participants about what comprises unprofessional language.

Another salient ideology within this piece concerns professional environment. There are two parts to this: What constitutes a professional environment, and does the classroom and mock interview have what it takes to be considered one? Lori is explicit and states that the interview in the classroom does not count, only outside interviews (lines 17, 53, and 54). Others overtly disagree. For instance, Jackie says, “This is where we’re supposed to use” (line 19). In this interaction, the token “professional” is connected to a particular place (front desk) (line 43), a position (employee) (line 45), and an activity (interview) (lines 17 and 54). All of these line up to presuppose where professional language should take place.

This argument of whether the mock interview “counts” is an interesting one, as the mock interview only fulfills one of the characteristics associated with the token “professional.” It may be that the other students agree that the classroom is not a professional environment, but believe that when the mock interview takes place, it becomes a simulated one, and thus the use of professional language is expected when this activity takes place. However, since “this” in line 19 of Jackie’s statement could be referring to the classroom in general or the activity of mock interviews, a longer stretch of data would be needed to make any such assertions.

Another category that emerges in this interaction is that of performance. In Lori’s rebuttal to her classmates’ criticisms, she talks about her inability to “concentrate” as the reason she used the forms in question. What seems to be presupposed is the unnaturalness of this professional language. Denise picks up the token of “concentration,” but uses it to refer to her own inability to concentrate on Lori’s per-

formance (line 26). Since Denise and Lori share a similar linguistic background and conversed regularly outside of class, Denise’s difficulty in concentrating on what Lori was saying may be attributable to a mismatch between Lori’s language choices and Denise’s expectations. Later this notion of concentration is connected to other aspects of performance—being on stage, being an actor, and being a certain type of person (lines 50-52). By this point, interestingly, Denise shifts to talking about “they,” the employers and what they want. She removes herself as the possible authority with the deprecating “I might not be front desk material.” She also quotes Mr. James as an authority on how Lori needs to be, which avoids a commitment to this particular ideology.

In just this one piece of data, multiple patterns of indexicals are emergent concerning what a person in the kind of position the students are seeking *sounds* like. The ideologies that seem to be circulating include the notion that non-standard English does not belong in the workplace setting. It marks the speaker as a certain type of person, one that employers do not want. Therefore, in order to get a job, applicants need to take on another persona, speak another way.

4.2. “It’s a *tha* it’s not a *fah*”

In this next piece, similar manifestations of the above-mentioned categories of professional environment, unprofessional language, and the performance of professionalism are presented. Here, in this classroom discussion, the instructor, Ms. Taylor, distinguishes between how she speaks at home and how she speaks, or attempts to speak, in a professional environment. She is explicit about what she feels is necessary pronunciation-wise in an interview and elicits examples of how people say things “wrong.” She uses words like “neglect” and explains how certain words are supposed to be pronounced. She also talks about taking a deep breath and remembering what she is supposed to do, which seems to tie in with the performative nature of being professional.

(2) Segment 2

1. Taylor: when I’m home|| ||beCAUSE I’m home but ya know I wouldn’t go on
2. Paula: ||yes||
3. Taylor: an interview an’ a ya know I just [jIs] think about

4. Anna: ||what I say **take a**||
 5. Taylor: ||get'n a job at /?/||
 5. Taylor: **deep breath** [brEf] a:n **remember** that there are *different letters in the alphabet that I neglect to use* when I'm not in a professional environment when I'm IN a professional environment I know that (.) I *have to pronounce thaT* I have to let that 't' at the end of the word
9. Zahara: I know I get [gIt] in trouble too 'cause of that
 10. Taylor: which *word that* (.) *people say wrong* all the time
 11. Kate: ||ain't ||
 12. Natalia: ||skrimp|| skrimp
 13. Kate: ain't
 14. Taylor: ||skrimp ||
 15. Natalia: ||an stremf||
 16. Marnie: ||what? ||
 17. Taylor: ||shrimp||
 18. Natalia: ||you know|| what it is? skrimp stremf
 19. Taylor: ||Uh-huh ||
 20. Natalia: strength they say ||stremf||
 21. Taylor: ||stremf|| strength
 22. Natalia: no stremf
 23. Taylor: they say stremf
 24. Janette: like if it's a 't' 'h' they turn the 't' 'h' into an f
 25. Taylor: it's a tha it's not a fah

As in the first segment, a number of indexicals line up to presuppose what professional language sounds like (*italics*). In this piece, neglecting letters (line 6) links with “I have to pronounce thaT” (line 8), which is tied to words people “say wrong all the time” (line 10), which is tied to “it’s a tha it’s not a fah” (line 25). All of these presuppose that there is a belief that a correct way of speaking exists. Even more, the contributions of the students concerning what “people say wrong,” both what they offer and the fact that they offer anything at all, supports the notion that there is a degree of sharedness of this ideology among the participants.

Similarly, the underlying assumptions concerning where people

need to speak “correctly” (underscore) and the performative nature of professional language (**bold**) emerge through patterns of indexicals. Specifically, the “where” becomes salient as Ms. Taylor’s contrasts “home” (line 1) with “interview” (line 3) and professional environment (lines 6 and 7). At the same time, the performative nature of professional language is emergent as a category. The indexicals “taking a deep breath” (lines 3-5) and “remember” (line 5) emerge as a pattern that continues to suggest that the participants are presupposing certain attitudes or beliefs about the use of particular language structures.

4.3. “It’s broken English”

This last piece comes from a lunchroom discussion I participated in with some of the students who were in Ms. Taylor’s classroom during the last discussion. I introduced the topic of language varieties by mentioning to the 6 students at the table that I noticed a lot of class time was dedicated to talking about professionalism and language. The students responded by talking about the need for a “Standard English Only” rule for the program.

(3) Segment 3

1. Rochel: and **after a while while it gets hard** I thought I could do that ya know?
 2. Tamara: right
 3. Rochel: I’m like okay at [Possibilities Inn] I can *talk ghetto* you *speak Ebonics*
 4. or whatever and then ya know if I have an interview I can go **back to speaking the way I speak** it doesn’t work like that ‘cause **I caught myself** SEveral times speaking *Ebonics* where I should not have been
 7. ||like that
 8. Sara: ||*Ebonics* is more so like um *private language* ain’t it? I mean *instead of*
 9. *saying is you’ll say are* I mean isn’t it like that?
 10. Rochel: No it’s *broken language* it’s *broken English*
 11. Anna: *Ebonics is broken English* like ||it’s not it’s *not necessarily bad* or ||or
 12. Rochel: ||*broken English*

street street English||

- 13. Anna: ya know it's just improper
- 14. Rochel: it's improper

This segment includes a number of the same indexicals seen earlier, as well as the introduction of a few new ones relating to the pre-supposed categories of how people should speak and where. Concerning what professional and unprofessional language sounds like (*italics*), in this piece, “ghetto” (line 3) links to “Ebonics” (line 3), which links to “private language” (line 8), which links to “broken language” (line 10), “broken English” (lines 10-12), “street English” (line 12), and “just improper” (lines 13-14). While there seems to be discord concerning how bad non-standard English is, even Anna, who offers a mitigator to all the criticism, “it’s not necessarily bad” (line 11), seems to share the assumption that it is damaged and unacceptable.

In looking at how students identify professional environments (*underscore*), here a student names the program as a place where non-standard English can be spoken (line 3). As was discussed earlier, while students seem to be in agreement that there are places where the students should speak professionally (line 6), a number disagree that the program is one. In other words, the conflict among these participants is resonant of the conflict made salient in other pieces of data, suggesting an interesting place for further investigation.

What also makes this piece particularly interesting is that it makes salient the performative nature of non-standard English as opposed to Standard English for some students (*bold*). Rochel speaks Standard English as a first variety and indicates in this interaction that she switches codes for the program. “I can go back to speaking the way I speak,” she explains (line 4-5). In other words, regardless of which variety is the student’s first language, there seems to be an underlying belief that speakers do need to change how they speak for the environment, and it is not a natural thing to do and can cause problems.

4.4. Summary of Findings

In sum, three of the categories that seem to be presupposed by the indexical patterns in this discourse include that of professional environment, unprofessional language, and the performance of professionalism, as can be seen on this chart:

Professional Environment	Unprofessional Language	Performance of Professionalism
Front desk Employee Interview (outside of Classroom) Classroom (?)	Y'all, you got, y'all got any? Slang Ebonics It's not... professional	Concentration Energetic (?) On stage An actor
Go on an interview Get'n a job A professional environment	Neglect to use [Letters] I have to pronounce thaT Get in trouble... People say [words] wrong It's a tha it's not a fah	Take a deep breath Remember
An interview Where I shouldn't be [speaking Ebonics]	Talk ghetto Speak Ebonics Private language Instead...you'll say are Broken language Broken English Not necessarily bad Street English Just improper	After a while... it gets hard I can go back to speaking the way I speak I caught myself

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, by looking closely at how and what ideologies are explicitly and implicitly expressed by the students, staff, and representatives from the target industry, the local (re)production of socio-cultural attitudes concerning professionalism and their effect on the employment opportunities of the speakers may be better understood and addressed. I believe this is an area worth exploration and one that promises practical implications in not just the training of future employees, but also in their hiring processes.

While the findings of this study cannot speak directly to the students’ employment opportunities, I feel it is necessary to include here a brief account that, because it typifies the students’ experiences, continues to drive this study. After completing the program, in one class, out of the twenty-two students who interviewed for front desk positions at a newly opened luxury hotel, only one was offered a position, as a bellhop. The feedback from the human resource personnel was that, while the students seemed quite knowledgeable of the industry, they had poor communication skills. Needless to say, the students

were frustrated. They told me that the solution they felt should be to impose a “Standard English Only” rule in the program. Such a rule, they said, would alleviate the burden students take on of having to choose between fitting in with their peers or being accused of “acting white.” Having this choice was and continues to be a problem for the students. This solution again draws on the ideologies that are emergent in the pieces of data shown above. The students see a need to speak “right” (i.e. Standard English), to have an undebatable place to use Standard English, and to rehearse using Standard English. Needless to say, it is disconcerting that the imposed rule is seen as the only solution. As stated earlier, because of its very tangible implications, this is an area I will continue to explore.

Transcription Conventions

?	rising intonation
(#)	pause length in seconds
(.)	pause under 30 seconds
	overlap
/?/	inaudible utterance
:	elongated vowel
[]	psyedonym use or nonstandard English pronunciation
CAPS	stress

References

Baugh, J. 2000. *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic Pride and Racial Prejudice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bernstein. 2000. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Collins, J. 1996. Socialization to text: Structure and contradiction in schooled literacy. In *Natural Histories of Discourse*, M. Silverstein and G. Urban (eds.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collins, J. 1999. The Ebonics controversy in context: Literacies, subjectivities, and language ideologies in the United States. In *Language Ideological Debates*, Jan Blommaert (ed.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 201-234.

Grubb, W. N. 1997. *Learning to Work: Case for Reintegrating Job Training and Education*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lippi-Green, R. 1994. Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Language in Society* 23: 163-198.

Mehan, H. 1996. The construction of an LD student. In *Natural Histories of Discourse*, M. Silverstein and G. Urban (eds.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 253-276.

Mertz, E. 1998. Language ideologies and praxis in US law school classrooms. In

Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory, B. Schieffelin (ed.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Milroy, J. a. M., Lesley. 1985. *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Philips, S. 1998. Language ideologies in institutions of power: A commentary. In *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, Bambi Schieffelin (ed.) New York: Oxford University Press. 211-228.

Piatt, B. 1993. *Language on the Job: Balancing Business Needs and Employee Rights*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Silverstein, M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, W. H. Paul Clyne and Carol Hofbauer (eds.) Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 193-247.

Silverstein, M. 1992. The use and utility of language ideologies: Some reflections. *Pragmatics* 3, 2: 311-323.

Silverstein, M. 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In *Reflexive Language*, J. Lucy (ed.) New York: Cambridge University Press. 33-58.

Silverstein, M. and G. Urban. 1996. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

van Dijk, T. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publications.

Language and Education Division
 University of Pennsylvania
 Philadelphia, PA 19102
 sniad@dolphin.upenn.edu