Loudermilk, B., Gutierrez, E., & Corina, D. Submitted. What are you talkin' about? Perception of sociolinguistic variation: Evidence from event-related potentials

Luck, S. 2005. *An introduction to the event-related potential technique.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Maye, J., Aslin, R. N., & Tanenhaus, M. K. 2008. The weckud wetch of the wast: Lexical adaptation to a novel accent. *Cognitive Science* 32: 543–62.

Niedzielski, N. A. 1999. The effect of social information on the perception of sociolinguistic variables. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18: 62–85.

Osterhout, L., & Holcomb, P. 1992. Event-related potentials elicited by syntactic anomaly. *Journal of Memory and Language* 31: 785–806.

Pantos, A. 2010. *Measuring implicit and explicit attitudes toward foreign-accented speech.* Ph.D. dissertation. Rice University.

Plichta, B., & Preston, D. R. 2005. The /ay/s have it: The perception of /ay/ as a North-South stereotype in US English. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 243–85.

Plichta, B., & Rakerd, B. 2010. Perceptions of /a/ fronting across two Michigan dialects. In D. R. Preston & N. A. Niedzielski (eds.), *A reader in sociophonetics*, 223–40. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Preston, D. R. 1993. Folk dialectology. In D. R. Preston (ed.), *American dialect research*, 333–77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rickford, J. R. 1999. *African American Vernacular English: Features, evolution, educational implications.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Squires, L. M. 2011. *Sociolinguistic priming and the perception of agreement variation: Testing predictions of exemplar-theoretic grammar.* Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan.

Staum Casasanto, L. 2008. *Experimental investigation of sociolinguistic knowledge.* Ph.D. dissertation. Stanford University.

Strand, E. A., & Johnson, K. 1996. Gradient and visual speaker normalization in the perception of fricatives. In D. Gibbon (ed.), *Natural language processing and speech technology*, 14–26. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sumner, M., & Samuel, A. G. 2005. Perception and representation of regular variation: The case of final /t/. *Journal of Memory and Language* 52: 322–38.

Sumner, M., & Samuel, A. G. 2009. The effect of experience on the perception and representation of dialect variants. *Journal of Memory and Language* 60: 487–501.

Tanenhaus, M. K., & Brown-Schmidt, S. 2008. Language processing in the natural world. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 363(1493): 1105–122.

Thomas, E. 2002. Sociophonetic applications of speech perception experiments. *American Speech* 77: 115–47.

Trudgill, P. 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wald, B., & Shopen, T. 1985. A researcher's guide to the sociolinguistic variable (ING). In V. P. Clark, P. A. Eschholz, & A. G. Rosa (eds.), *Language: Introductory readings*, 4th ed., 515–541. New York: St. Martin's Press.

CHAPTER 8

INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES

CHRISTINE MALLINSON AND TYLER KENDALL

HISTORIOGRAPHERS often have narrated sociolinguistics as an interdisciplinary field that originated at the intersection of sociology, anthropology, and linguistics (Fishman 1997; Lévi-Strauss 1963; Shuy 2003). Sociolinguistics holds broad appeal for other linguists and scholars from other fields interested in exploring the language, individual, culture, and society interface. Interest in variation and cognition has also increased across diverse approaches to the study of language and linguistic theory, reflecting greater convergence with sociolinguistics.

Still, some sociolinguists suggest the need for further interdisciplinary engagement. One rationale is that doing so will help us better understand "the structure of language" (Chambers 2003: 11). Another position is that learning about other theoretical frameworks, methodologies, and analytic strategies will advance our modeling of relationships among social, linguistic, and cultural factors (Williams 1992; Woolard 1985). A third take is that sociolinguistics should become more interdisciplinary in order to more fully contribute to social theory, as broadly relevant to social science and the humanities (Coupland 2001: 6–8; Hambye & Siroux 2009: 133–134; Woolard 1985).

Regardless of the position taken, the concept of "doing interdisciplinarity" raises complicating questions. To what extent is sociolinguistics a hybrid discipline? How should theories from other disciplines inform sociolinguistic theory and research design? How can sociolinguists avoid selectively choosing and naively importing theoretical elements from other fields, without considering their

underlying assumptions (Coupland 2001; Fishman 1991; Horvath 1998; Woolard, 1985)? As Wardhaugh (2006: 11) cautions, "mixing" other disciplines with linguistics by attempting to relate concepts and findings from each will not yield a "worthwhile sociolinguistics." Paradigms from other disciplines do not always have "added-value" for sociolinguistics (Hambye & Siroux 2009: 135) and/or may require careful theoretical and methodological calibrating (Mallinson & Dodsworth 2009).

Finally, the term "interdisciplinarity" implies a two-way exchange and a process of cultivating engagement (Carlin 2002). How might sociolinguistics not only benefit from incorporating concepts, theories, and methods from other disciplines but also lend insight into the complexities of language and society, with the goal of mutual advancement? To that end, in this chapter we review interdisciplinary literature that speaks to the topics, techniques, and extent to which sociolinguists, other linguists, and other scholars have converged. We focus on three sites of inquiry: (1) language, computation, and the mind; (2) language, identity, and culture; and (3) language and social stratification. We do not consider these sites mutually exclusive or collectively exhaustive however, as research on these topics overlaps and intersects, and other scholars might well uncover different themes. We leave consideration of many omitted but important areas (e.g., literary analysis, translation, media studies) to the reader.

We find narrating interdisciplinary approaches to sociolinguistics vis-à-vis these three thematic areas to be a useful tool, organizationally and intellectually. Taylor (2010) advocates that scholars from different disciplines combat academic separation and specialization by converging to work within "emerging zones" of inquiry organized around broad topics, such as "language," in order to analyze common problems. Drawing upon this model, within the topic "language," our three themes constitute fecund zones of inquiry within which to explore language and its interdisciplinary relationship to social, cultural, psychological, and cognitive structures and processes.

THREE SITES OF INTERDISCIPLINARY INQUIRY

Language, Computation, and the Mind

Sociolinguistic understandings of language have recently become more central to general linguistic theorizing. Variation in language is also increasingly of interest for what it tells us about general properties of human cognition, and these intersections have generated greater contact between sociolinguistics and the cognitive sciences.

Probabilistic, usage-based, and exemplar-based models of language (Bod, Hay, & Jannedy 2003; Bybee 2001; Goldinger 1998; Johnson 1997; Pierrehumbert

2001) are centrally concerned with variation and often attend to the role of social information in language processing. Exemplar models, which posit that speaker-hearers store "exemplars" in memory and use these exemplars for comprehension and language production, are rooted in the understanding that experience influences speaker-hearers' linguistic systems. In phonological terms, these approaches acknowledge that "exact phonetic targets and patterns of variation must accordingly be learned during the course of language acquisition" and propose "that mental representations of phonological targets and patterns are gradually built up through experience with speech" (Pierrehumbert 2001: 137). There are clear overlaps with sociolinguistics. Pierrehumbert (2006) describes the variable rule paradigm of early variationist sociolinguistics as a precursor to current exemplar theories and notes that "acquisition appears to depend on social information" (527). Areas in syntax also show interest in variation and probabilitistics (Bresnan & Ford 2010). Sociolinguistics offers data and methods to assess the extent to which (social) orientation filters experience (Foulkes & Docherty 2006; Ochs & Schieffelin 1995).

Psycholinguistics and the psychology of language are, like sociolinguistics, often focused on understanding variation in language. One key difference, however, is their orientation to what that variation means. Sociolinguists are typically interested in language variation because of its extralinguistic meanings and its ability to indicate and express social differences. Psycholinguists see variation as symptomatic of processing and as an indicator of cognitive activity in the process of speech production, as well as a central problem to be addressed in theories of speech perception. Yet, much psycholinguistic and psychological research, for example, on accommodation and convergence, asks questions directly of interest to and influential upon sociolinguistic work (Giles, N. Coupland, & J. Coupland 1991). Other work, for instance, on personality including extroversion and introversion (Eysenck 1967; Pennebaker & King 1999), has not as directly influenced sociolinguistics. Meanwhile, these areas could likely benefit from sociolinguistic insights about individual, cultural, and social difference and sociolinguistic norms.

Sociolinguists, (social) psychologists, and psycholinguists also often differ methodologically. Sociolinguists generally obtain language data from real-world interactions, often complemented with ethnographic insight, while psycholinguists often utilize highly controlled experimental settings. Psycholinguists typically focus on perception and representation, while sociolinguists often focus on production. Yet, recent work in both areas has blurred these lines by investigating, for example, the relationship between speech production and perception and the role of local, nonlocal, and stereotype norms in perception (Clopper & Pisoni 2004; Evans & Iverson 2007; Hay, Warren, & Drager, 2006; Johnson 2006; Kendall & Fridland 2012; Kraljic, Brennan, & Samuel 2008; Niedzielski 1999; Strand & Johnson 1996).

Sumner & Samuel (2009), for instance, examined how listeners' own dialect experience affects spoken word recognition. Through several experiments

with *r*-ful and *r*-less speakers from New York City and *r*-ful speakers from non-*r*-less regions (outside of NYC), they found significant differences in perceptual processing not only between non-New Yorkers and New Yorkers but also, in a long-term form priming task, between the two NYC groups, despite both groups receiving similar daily exposures to the same *r*-less variants. These results indicate that experience has consequences for language processing, and in some cases productive experience is also implicated in form processing and in differences in the underlying representation of linguistic forms. The authors further suggest that dialects should be considered not only in terms of speakers' productions but also their perceptions and representations; sociolinguists might benefit from this perspective.

With increasing knowledge about the brain and mind, sociolinguistic insights will be important for future research on language processing. In fact, neurolinguistic work has begun addressing questions at this interface. Perrachione, Chiao, and Wong (2010) examined listeners' abilities to recognize voices in samples spoken by African Americans and European Americans. The authors suggest that an own-race bias in the identification of voices appears to result from "asymmetric exposure to culturally-acquired features of spoken dialect" (52). Their interest in a cognitive model of auditory person perception builds explicitly on sociolinguistic research, such as Purnell, Idsardi, and Baugh (1999) and Thomas and Reaser (2004). These connections will certainly increase: as Kristiansen and Dirven (2008) write, "Cognitive Linguistics itself will inescapably benefit from turning its attention towards variational and interactionist linguistics" (3); in turn, sociolinguists should reach out to these areas.

Computational modeling is another promising mode of inquiry into the social processes behind language variation and change. Modeling work on areas such as sound change has existed in some form for several decades (Liljencrants & Lindblom 1972); however, recent work has begun to incorporate sociolinguistic concepts into the models (Nettle 1999) and address specific sociolinguistic research questions. For example, Baxter, Blythe, Croft, and McKane (2009) use a computational model to assess Trudgill's (2004) claims about the origins and development of New Zealand English. Baxter and colleagues argue "one cannot be certain that an intuitively plausible model actually works without a precise quantitative model" (290). Recent interest in treating language as a complex (adaptive) system—that is, where properties emerge in the system that do not appear to be properties of the individual entities in the system (Altmann, Pierrehumbert, & Motter 2009; Ellis & Larsen-Freeman 2009)—represents yet another new avenue for relating sociolinguistic work to mathematics, physics, and computation (Kretzschmar 2009).

Social network analysis (SNA; Wasserman & Faust 1994) also naturally overlaps with sociolinguistic inquiry. SNA has been incorporated into sociolinguistic research to some extent (most famously by the Milroys in their work on Belfast English; cf. Milroy 1980), but network-based approaches remain underutilized in sociolinguistic theory and methodology. SNA provides an analytic

framework for quantitatively analyzing social relationships, particularly from a computational perspective; for instance, Fagyal et al. (2010) use social networks to computationally model the spread of innovations in speech communities. There is also room to expand the use of SNA in less computational areas (Dodsworth 2005).

Sociolinguistics also has close connections to corpus linguistics, with both focusing on empirical approaches to language in use (Kretzschmar 2009). But generally speaking, large-scale, spoken language corpora suitable for addressing complex sociolinguistic questions remain rare, and most sociolinguistic work is still conducted on language samples gathered via sociolinguistic field methods (Kendall 2011). Recently, research within and outside sociolinguistics has focused on generating "unconventional" corpora (Beal, Corrigan, & Moisl 2007; Kendall & Van Herk 2011). Other work seeks to make standard corpora more relevant for sociolinguistic research (Anderson 2008; Romaine 2008). Projects like the Origins of New Zealand English (ONZE; Gordon, Maclagan, & Hay 2007) and the Sociolinguistic Archive and Analysis Project (SLAAP; Kendall 2008) represent further connections between sociolinguistics and corpus linguistics. It seems likely that work across these related fields will continue to converge.

Language, Identity, and Culture

Questions of the nature of the "self," the dynamics of interpersonal interaction, and the formation of identity and culture are central to many disciplines, and an examination of language is often essential to this work. As cultural theorist and sociologist Stuart Hall notes, since discursive practice is the practice of making meaning, and "since all social practices entail meaning, all practices have a discursive aspect. So discourse enters into the influences of all social practices" (Hall 1996: 201–02). Fields within and outside linguistics have taken up the study of language, identity, and culture. Although each field formulates its own terms and theoretical stances, with varying degrees of overlap, there is a general perspective that language helps constitute and/or is constituted by identity, positionality, and social organization. Language is not considered a neutral, autonomous object that simply documents and transmits already-existing realities, nor is identity taken to be a stable, internal feature of an individual person; rather, it is a practice and resource that shapes and manifests social processes. These arguments take different forms across fields, as authors imbue them with distinct nuances, apply them to answer diverse questions, and employ various methodologies, including ethnography, interviews, linguistic mapping, and textual analysis.

The degree of interaction between scholars from these assorted fields varies, but there are some common cross-disciplinary theoretical influences. From anthropology, linguistic anthropology, linguistics, and sociolinguistics, Boas

(1966), Sapir (1949), and Whorf (1956) helped initiate a shift from the view of language as a mirror of mental processes to the suggestion that language conditions thought by constraining possible "types of observations and evaluations." Gumperz (1968) proposed the notion of "speech communities," and Hymes (1964) formulated an "ethnography of communication." These concepts helped shape the view of language as a shared practice in which individuals acquire a "repertoire of speech acts," and, through its acquisition and use, construct identity. Additionally, Labov (1966) highlighted linguistic variation within and between communities and its correlation with social stratification.

Drawing on cross-cultural examples, anthropologist Geertz (1973) argued that meaning is "stored in symbols," and that symbol systems have power to order experience. He defined culture as "webs of significance" that humankind spins and argues that anthropology is an "interpretive" science that seeks to explicate and construe meaning in social expression (5). Sociocultural psychologist Vygotsky (1986) contended that cognition and consciousness are formed through social interaction, mediated by language. From literary criticism and semiotics, Bakhtin (1981) investigated language as social practice and social force. He put forth the concepts of heteroglossia and intertextuality, arguing that all language is dialogic in nature, that all texts are in communication with one another, and that they embody and help generate competing forces within society.

Philosopher and sociologist Michel Foucault (1980) questioned "bodies of knowledge," the semiotic systems, discourses, practices, and institutionalized procedures by which we reify and reproduce our collective beliefs and attitudes, and the forces of power and control operating within these symbolic and social structures. From sociology, Bourdieu (1991) argued that acts of language generate, legitimize, and reproduce social resources, distinctions, and structures and that power is enacted and contested in the "linguistic field." From feminist theory, Butler (2006) suggests that identity is "a normative ideal rather than a descriptive feature of experience" (23). She argues that language and other symbolic acts shape identity through continual performance that "congeals" into identity, although dominant cultural constructions of identity can also be disrupted.

From these common points of ancestry, current explorations of language, identity, and culture have branched into many directions. Theories related to conceptual metaphor formulate language as central to cultural opinions and practices. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Lakoff (1993) argued that "root metaphors" permeate our thinking, structure our reasoning, and organize our cultural conceptual systems. Cultural psychologists Miller, Fung, and Koven (2007) discuss how narrative practices co-create identity and culture, particularly in early childhood and late adulthood: "at both ends of the life course narrative serves as a medium of both socialization . . . and innovation and transformation" (596).

Gee (1996) and other New Literacy Studies theorists take a sociocultural approach to literacy and culture, contending that meaning is culturally

negotiated and that language should be considered in terms of its use in discursive practices. According to Gee (1996), "Discourses . . . are accepted as instantiations of particular identities (or 'types of people') by specific groups. . . . They are, thus, always and everywhere social" (3). The study of new literacies also explores multimodal linguistic, discursive, and symbolic practices in relation to new technological contexts and analyzes the influence of these practices on meaning construction, identity, interaction, and culture (Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear, & Leu 2008).

Scholarship from communication studies and intercultural communication also investigates language and culture as mutually constitutive. As Scollon and Scollon (2003) commented, the field of intercultural communication has moved beyond simple comparisons between cultures or individuals to explore "the co-constructive aspects of communication" (543)—or, as Philipsen (2002) noted, "the role of communication as a resource in managing discursively the individual-communal dialectic" (53). Micro- and macro-level approaches explore how "dimensions of cultural variability" (such as "power distance") may affect communication across cultures (Gudykunst & Lee 2002), and social identity is highlighted as a major influence on verbal and nonverbal accommodation practices by speakers of different groups.

Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz (1982) argued that the symbolic, discursive practices of society are terrains wherein gender, race/ethnicity, and class are "communicatively produced." Drawing on extensive field-based research, Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985) view language as an "act of identity" used to construct social divisions and alliances (p. 16; see also Tabouret-Keller 1997). As Bucholtz and Hall further discuss, within linguistic anthropology language is highlighted as a primary symbolic resource for (re)producing identity via the "culturally specific subject positions that speakers enact through language" (2004: 369); accordingly, they define identity as a "product of situated social action" and a "cultural effect" (376). Abundant research from linguistic anthropological perspectives investigates race, ethnicity, ideology, identity, and language (Bailey 2002; Kiesling & Paulston 2005; Scollon & Scollon 2001; Spears 1999).

From critical discourse studies, the intersection of language, race/ethnicity, ideology, and identity is also a central focus. For Fairclough (1989), power is enacted through discourse, and van Dijk (2008) argues that discourse produces, maintains, directs, and challenges power in society. Wodak and Reisigl (2003) further state that "racism, as both social practice and ideology, manifests itself discursively" (372). Much research reveals how racism emerges in culturally specific discursive contexts; some exemplars include Bonilla-Silva's (2006) sociological study of "colorblind" racism, Hill's (2008) sociolinguistic investigation of racist discourse, and Santa Ana's (1999) analysis of racist metaphors in discourses about immigration. There are also numerous studies of language, race, and ethnic identity (cf. Fishman 2001), although Anthias (2002) argues that the concept of "identity" has lost much of its heuristic utility. Instead, she advocates employing the concept of narratives of location and positionality

and demonstrates this approach by examining articulations of race and ethnicity in narratives by British-born youth of Greek Cypriot background. Finally, documentary linguistics and endangered language research also overlap with sociolinguistics in their orientation to community-based field research, culture and identity-related concerns, and naturally occurring talk (Stanford & Preston 2009).

Regarding gender, extensive research on language, culture, and identity has sought to uncover "the logic of the encoding of sex differences in languages," to analyze the "oppressive implications of ordinary speech," to explain miscommunication between men and women, to explore how "gender is constructed and interacts with other identities," and to investigate "the role of language in helping establish gender identity [as] part of a broader range of processes through which membership in particular groups is activated, imposed, and sometimes contested through the use of linguistic forms...that activate stances" (Duranti 2009: 30–31). Other work explores how language is used to reproduce, naturalize, and contest gender ideologies, drawing from many disciplinary perspectives, including quantitative and qualitative traditions within sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 2003; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 2005), cultural theory (Anzaldúa 1987), queer theory (Kulick 2005), social cognition and discursive psychology (Weatherall & Gallois 2005), textual analysis (Livia 2005), and communication studies (Thimm, Koch, & Schey 2005). Critical discourse, narrative, metaphor, and rhetorical analysis have been used to examine other gendered dimensions of processes of meaning making, such as gender bias in cell biology (Beldecos et al. 1988) and factory farm industry language used to conceal violence (Glenn 2004).

Another large body of literature has examined language, literacy, socialization, identity, and ideology. Scollon and Scollon (1981) argued that language practices and discourse patterns reflect culturally specific worldviews and "ways of knowing" and that altering one's discourse patterns may alter one's identity; for instance, Heath (1983) investigated literacy events in three communities in relation to larger sociocultural patterns and processes of socialization. Norton (1997) explored the ownership of English internationally, relating it to questions of language learning, teaching, and identity. Mithun (2004), Fill (2007), and Maffi and Woodley (2008) stressed linguistic diversity as a source of cultural heritage, a conceptual resource, and a link to biodiversity and ecological sustainability. Porter (2005) argued that invisible identity subtexts are at work in cultural discourses about sustainability.

Language and Social Stratification

In sociology, "social stratification" generally refers to the hierarchical arrangement of groups within a society and attendant processes of social inequality (Savage 2005: 250). Language is often central in considerations of prestige,

status, power, and inequality, whether viewed from sociology, anthropology, or sociolinguistics. Languages and dialects are typically situated along continuums of social power and prestige (Giles 1991), which are undergirded by language ideologies—aesthetic/moral judgments about language that are often tied to sociopolitical and socioeconomic interests (Kroskrity 2004: 502–03). As sites of conflict between the norms of the elite and non-elite, standard language ideologies both contribute to and result from social stratification.

Standard language ideologies often emerge in language policies, in language planning endeavors, and in situations of language contact and endangerment (Haugen 1985; Myers-Scotton 1993; Nettle & Romaine 2002; Wright 2004). Ideologies also surround different language varieties. Within the United Kingdom, for instance, "Received Pronunciation" generally has "overt prestige" (Giles 1970). Nonstandard varieties of any language are often stigmatized, though they may have "covert prestige" (Labov 1966; Preston 1998). Speakers may, however, resist prestige labels and hold language attitudes that differ from those of the elite (Heller 2003; Rickford 1986). Speakers also variously respond to the growth of powerful languages, such as English (Crystal 2003), as seen in studies of the Jambun Aboriginal community (Schmidt 1985), the Solomon Islands (Jourdan 2008), and the Chinese Tyneside community in the United Kingdom (Li 1994).

Language use is intimately tied to the rights and privileges that social systems afford, particularly with respect to education. In rural and/or developing areas of the world, education remains limited for many women and girls (Kristof & WuDunn 2009), especially those who speak indigenous languages (Tiano 1987). In the early history of the United States, tests of "literacy" disproportionately disqualified African Americans from voting (Feagin 2000), and education was used to disrupt cultural continuity among Native Americans (Cantoni 2007). Teachers may also, consciously or not, judge students who speak nonstandard varieties as being less intelligent or unruly (Charity Hudley & Mallinson 2011; Ferguson 2001; Seligman, Tucker, & Lambert 1972). In the US context, students who speak nonstandard varieties of English score systematically lower on standardized assessments (Charity, Scarborough, & Griffin 2004). Psychologists, linguists, educational researchers, and sociologists find these differences are due to a range of social, linguistic, and economic factors often related to test design and test preparation (Charity Hudley & Mallinson 2011; Feagin 2000; Garrett 2009).

Marginalized groups also may resist educational and linguistic inequality; consider, for example, Chinese women's *Nushu* script (Liu 1997) and the coded language used by enslaved Africans brought to North America (Smitherman 1986: 48). Qualitative research from education, anthropology, linguistics, and sociology further reveals how students use linguistic performances and identity practices to express, reflect, and challenge their educational and occupational trajectories, especially those that are imposed upon them (Bettie 2003; Carter 2005; Eckert 1989; Ferguson 2001; Willis 1977).

Language ideologies are also implicated in workplace discrimination, as revealed in matched-guise studies with workers' resumes, for example, or in interview and survey-based studies of reactions by employers to workers who speak nonstandard varieties of a given language—such as, in the US context, African American English (S. L. Terrell & F. Terrell 1983) and Southern American English (Grogger 2011). Accent also can play a role in job and housing discrimination, revealed by sociolinguistic and social psychological interview, survey, and experimental studies (Baugh 2007; Lippi-Green 1997; Purnell et al. 1999). Housing discrimination affects residential segregation (Massey & Lundy 2001), a key sociological mechanism in the perpetuation of high rates of poverty, unemployment, crime, and constrained access to education for residents in the United States (Labov 2008).

Language can also affect access to health systems. Immigrants with limited language proficiency may be less likely to seek and/or receive quality care (Angel & Angel 2006; Morales, Lara, Kington, Valdez, & Escarce 2002), and doctor/patient miscommunication issues disproportionately affect racial and ethnic minorities and/or women. Research in medicine, sociology, public policy, and other fields has recently called for additional training for health providers in order to improve communication skills (Freimuth & Quinn 2004; Rao, Anderson, Inui, & Frankel 2007).

In socially stratified societies, the dynamics of social location are often linguistically constructed as well. Sociological and social psychological studies reveal that individuals routinely categorize others based on social attributes (e.g., race, gender), which can lead to stereotypes that may be used to justify discrimination (Ridgeway & Erickson 2000). Research from conversation and discourse analysis further reveals that stereotypes are often perpetuated by everyday discourse (Holtgraves 2010: 1386): for example, with respect to race and ethnicity (Bonilla-Silva 2006; Hill 2008), gender (Schulz 1975; Sutton 1995), sexual orientation (Pascoe 2007), and social class (Mallinson & Brewster 2005). Language also figures prominently in how speakers display and negotiate power through honorifics, tag questions, turn-taking, interruption, and other features (Brown & Levinson 1987; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 2003).

Hierarchies of social stratification may also be reflected in the distribution of socially sensitive linguistic forms (Cedergren 1973; Labov 1966; Trudgill 1974). Quantitative sociolinguistic studies, which aim to derive sociologically informed models for language variation and change, generally use surveys and interviews to gather and statistically analyze data on individuals' speech patterns and their education levels, occupations, income, and so on. Early and subsequent sociolinguistic research indicates that linguistic evidence of social stratification is often transparent as well as nuanced (Mallinson 2010). Speakers may also use language to contest their real or perceived social locations. Although individuals with high social status typically use the most prestigious and the least stigmatized

linguistic forms, speakers with lower status occasionally use more standard forms than expected, due to "linguistic insecurity" (Labov 1966). Speakers may also engage in hypercorrection out of a desire to use standard forms (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2006).

CONCLUSION

We have intended to help bridge gaps in disciplinary knowledge by reviewing interdisciplinary scholarship from three key zones of inquiry related to language: language, computation, and the mind; language, culture, and identity; and language and social stratification. Abundant scholarship from a variety of related fields conceptualizes language, identity, and culture as inextricably intertwined and mutually constitutive. Empirical investigations reveal how social, cultural, stylistic, ideological, and linguistic dimensions interact to produce and reproduce each other anew within specific contexts, often in relation to culturally specific subject positions. Interdisciplinary scholarship on the theme of language and social stratification reveals language to be closely implicated in the construction of identity and values and in the dynamics of allegiance and exclusion. Contributions to the study of language and social stratification have explored the power and prestige of languages and language varieties, tracked the linguistic, educational, occupational, legal, and health-related effects of social hierarchies, and revealed language to be of many intersecting symbols and practices used by speakers to construct social boundaries. Finally, the literature on language, computation, and the mind reveals that sociolinguistic interests overlap with many diverse fields. Recent years have seen variation in language and probabilistic approaches move from the periphery to the center of many linguistic and cognitive interests. Sociolinguistics can expect to continue to integrate and align with these interests through continuing advancements in technology, mathematical and computational methods, databases of available data, and knowledge of cognition.

Despite overlaps in interdisciplinary approaches to areas of sociolinguistic inquiry, the insights from various disciplines exploring similar questions must be routinely and effectively shared with researchers in other fields for interdisciplinarity to be sustained. All too often these bridges are not consistently established; Duranti (2009) bemoans "incipient separatism" growing even between the closely aligned fields of linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics (5). As we have discussed, sociolinguists have much to borrow and gain from other fields. In return for borrowing, we also have essential insight to lend to interdisciplinary inquiry on language as a key mechanism in social, cultural, psychological, and cognitive processes.

References

....

Altmann, E., Pierrehumbert, J. B., & Motter, A. 2009. Beyond word frequency: Bursts, lulls, and scaling in the temporal distributions of words. *PLoS ONE* 4: e7678.

Anderson, W. 2008. Corpus linguistics in the UK: Resources for sociolinguistic research. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2: 352–71.

Angel, J. L., & Angel, R. J. 2006. Minority group status and healthful aging: Social structure still matters. *American Journal of Public Health* 96(7): 1152–159.

Anthias, F. 2002. Where do I belong? *Ethnicities* 2: 491–514.

Anzaldúa, G. 1987. *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Bailey, B. H. 2002. *Language, race, and negotiation of identity: A study of Dominican Americans*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baugh, J. 2007. Linguistic contributions to the advancement of racial justice within and beyond the African diaspora. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1: 331–49.

Baxter, G., Blythe, R., Croft, W., & McKane, J. 2009. Modeling language change: An evaluation of Trudgill's theory of the emergence of New Zealand English. *Language Variation and Change* 21: 257–96.

Beal, J., Corrigan, K., & Moisl, H. 2007. Taming digital voices and texts: Models and methods for handling unconventional synchronic corpora. In J. Beal, K. Corrigan, & H. Moisl (eds.), *Creating and digitizing language corpora*, vol. 1 1–16. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Beldecos, A., Bailey, S., Gilbert, S., Hicks, K., Kenschaft, L., Niemczyk, N., Rosenberg, R., et al. 1988. The importance of feminist critique for contemporary cell biology. *Hypatia* 3(1): 61–76.

Bettie, J. 2003. *Women without class: Girls, race, and identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boas, F. 1966. *Race, language and culture*. New York: Free Press.

Bod, R., Hay, J., & Jannedy, S. (eds.). 2003. *Probabilistic linguistics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. 2006. *Racism without racists*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bresnan, J., & Ford, M. 2010. Predicting syntax: Processing dative constructions in American and Australian varieties of English. *Language* 86: 168–213.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. 2004. Language and identity. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 369–94. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Butler, J. 2006. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Bybee, J. 2001. *Phonology and language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cantoni, G. (ed.). 2007. *Stabilizing indigenous languages*. Flagstaff, AZ: Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University. Retrieved from http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/SIL/.

Carlin, A. 2002. Bibliographic boundaries and forgotten canons. In S. Herbrechter (ed.), *Cultural studies: Interdisciplinarity and translation, Critical studies*, vol. 20, 113–130. New York: Rodopi.

Carter, P. 2005. *Keepin' it real: School success beyond Black and White*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cedergren, H. J. 1973. The interplay of social and linguistic factors in Panama. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

Chambers, J. K. 2003. *Sociolinguistic theory: Linguistic variation and its social significance*, 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Charity Hudley, A. H., & Mallinson, C. 2011. *Understanding English language variation in U.S. schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Charity, A., Scarborough, H. S., & Griffin, D. M. 2004. Familiarity with school English in African American children and its relation to early reading achievement. *Child Development* 75(5): 1340–356.

Clopper, C., & Pisoni, D. 2004. Effects of talker variability on perceptual learning of dialects. *Language and Speech* 47: 207–38.

Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C ., & Leu, D. J. (eds.). 2008. *Handbook of research on new literacies*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coupland, N. 2001. Introduction: Sociolinguistic theory and social theory. In N. Coupland, S. Sarangi, & C. N. Candlin (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and social theory*, 1–26. New York: Longman.

Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dodsworth, R. 2005. Attribute networking: A technique for modeling social perceptions. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9: 225–53.

Duranti, A. (ed.). 2009. *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Eckert, P. 1989. *Jocks and burnouts: Social categories and identity in the high school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. 2003. *Language and gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, N., & Larsen-Freeman, D. 2009. *Language as a complex adaptive system*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Evans, B., & Iverson, P. 2007. Plasticity in vowel perception and production: A study of accent change in young adults. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 121: 3814–26.

Eysenck, H. 1967. *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Fagyal, Z., Swarup, S., Escobar, A. M., Gasser, L., & Lakkaraju, K. 2010. Centers and peripheries: Network roles in language change. *Lingua* 120(8): 2061–79.

Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and power*. New York: Longman.

Feagin, J. R. 2000. *Racist America: Roots, current realities, and future reparations*. New York: Routledge.

Ferguson, A. A. 2001. *Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fill, A. 2007. Language contact, culture and ecology. In M. Hellinger & A. Pauwels (eds.), *Handbook of language and communication: Diversity and change*, 177–207. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fishman, J. A. 1991. Putting the 'socio' back into the sociolinguistic enterprise. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 92: 127–38.

Fishman, J. A. 1997. Bloomington, summer of 1964: The birth of American sociolinguistics. In C. Paulston & G. R. Tucker (eds.), *The early days of sociolinguistics: Memories and reflections*, 87–95. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Fishman, J. A. 2001. *Handbook of language and ethnic identity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977.* (C. Gordon, ed., C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Foulkes, P., & Docherty, G. 2006. The social life of phonetics and phonology. *Journal of Phonetics* 34: 409–38.

Freimuth, V. S., & Quinn, S. C. 2004. The contributions of health communication to eliminating health disparities. *American Journal of Public Health* 94(12): 2053–055.

Garrett, A. J. 2009. The role of picture perception in children's performance on a picture vocabulary test. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

Gee, J. 1996. *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses,* 2nd ed. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Geertz, C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays.* New York: Basic Books.

Giles, H. 1970. Evaluative reactions to accents. *Educational Review* 22(3): 211–27.

Giles, H. 1991. *Language: Contexts and consequences.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. 1991. Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics*, 1–68. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Glenn, C. B. 2004. Constructing consumables and consent: A critical analysis of factory farm industry discourse. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 28(1): 63–81.

Goldinger, S. D. 1998. Echoes of echoes? An episodic theory of lexical access. *Psychological Review* 105: 251–78.

Gordon, E., Maclagan, M., & Hay, J. 2007. The ONZE corpus. In J. Beal, K. Corrigan, & H. Moisl (eds), *Creating and digitizing language corpora,* vol. 2, 82–104. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Grogger, J. 2011. Speech patterns and racial wage inequality. *Journal of Human Resources* 46(1):1–25.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Lee, C. M. 2002. Cross-cultural communication theories. In W. B. Gudykunst & B. Mody (eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication,* 2nd ed., 25–50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gumperz, J. J. (ed.). 1968. The speech community. In *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, 381–86. New York: Macmillan.

Gumperz, J. J. (ed.). 1982. *Language and social identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, S. 1996. The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, & K. Thompson (eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies*, 118–227. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Hambye, P., & Siroux, J. 2009. Approaching language as a social practice: Reflections on some implications for the analysis of language. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 3(2): 131–47.

Haugen, E. 1985. The language of imperialism: Unity or pluralism? In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (eds.), *Language of inequality*, 3–17. New York: Mouton.

Hay, J., Warren, P., & Drager, K. 2006. Factors influencing speech perception in the context of a merger-in-progress. *Journal of Phonetics* 34: 458–84.

Heath, S. B. 1983. *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. 2003. Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 473–92.

Hill, J. H. 2008. *The everyday language of White racism.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (eds.). 2005. *The handbook of language and gender.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Holtgraves, T. 2010. Social psychology and language: Words, utterances, and conversations. In *The handbook of social psychology*, 5th ed., vol. 2, 1386–422. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Horvath, B. 1998. Some 'fractious energy.' *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2(3): 446–56.

Hymes, D. H. 1964. Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (eds.), *The ethnography of communication*, 1–34. Washington, DC: American Anthropologist.

Johnson, K. 1997. Speech perception without speaker normalization: An exemplar model. In K. Johnson & J. W. Mullennix (eds.), *Talker variability in speech processing*, 145–65. San Diego: Academic Press.

Johnson, K. 2006. Resonance in an exemplar-based lexicon: The emergence of social identity and phonology. *Journal of Phonetics* 34: 485–99.

Jourdan, C. 2008. Language repertoires and the middle class in urban Solomon Islands. In G. Sankoff, M. Meyerhoff, & N. Nagy (eds.), *Social lives in language— sociolinguistics and multilingual speech communities: Celebrating the work of Gillian Sankoff*, 43–67. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kendall, T. 2008. On the history and future of sociolinguistic data. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2: 332–51.

Kendall, T. 2011. Corpora from a sociolinguistic perspective (Corpora sob uma perspectiva sociolinguística). In S. Th. Gries (ed.), *Corpus studies: Future directions*, special issue of *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada* 11(2): 361–89.

Kendall, T. & Fridland, V. 2012. Variation in perception and production of mid front vowels in the U.S. Southern Vowel Shift. *Journal of Phonetics* 40(2): 289–306.

Kendall, T. & Van Herk, G. (eds.). 2011. Corpus linguistics and sociolinguistic inquiry. Special issue of *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 7(1).

Kiesling, S. F., & Paulston, C. B. (eds.). 2005. *Intercultural discourse and communication: The essential readings.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kraljic, T., Brennan, S.E., & Samuel, A. G. 2008. Accommodating variation: Dialects, idiolects, and speech processing. *Cognition* 107: 51–81.

Kretzschmar, W. 2009. *The linguistics of speech.* Cambridge University Press.

Kristiansen, G., & Dirven, R. 2008. Introduction: Cognitive linguistics: Rationale, methods and scope. In G. Kristiansen & R. Dirven (eds.), *Cognitive sociolinguistics*, 1–20. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kristof, N. D., & WuDunn, S. 2009. *Half the sky: Turning oppression into opportunity for women worldwide.* New York: Knopf.

Kroskrity, P. V. 2004. Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 496–517. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kulick, D. 2005. Language and desire. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The handbook of language and gender*, 119–41. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Labov, W. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. 2008. Unendangered dialects, endangered people. In K. King, N. Schilling-Estes, L. W. Fogle, J. J. Lou, & B. Soukup (eds.), *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties*, 219–38. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lakoff, G. 1993. The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 2nd ed., 202–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. 1985. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1963. *Structural anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.

Li, W. 1994. *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Liljencrants, J. & Lindblom, B. 1972. Numerical simulation of vowel quality systems: The role of perceptual contrast. *Language* 48: 839–62.

Lippi-Green, R. 1997. *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.

Liu, F. 1997. *Nuzi (female script), Nushu (female literature), Nuge (female songs) and peasant women's de-silencing of themselves, Jiangyong County, Hunan Province, China*. Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University.

Livia, A. 2005. "One man in two is a woman": Linguistic approaches to gender in literary texts. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The handbook of language and gender*, 142–58. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Maffi, L., & Woodley, E. 2008. *Biodiversity: Culture* (No. GEO 4). Global Environment Outlook: Environment for Development, 182–85. Nairobi: UNEP.

Mallinson, C. 2010. Social stratification. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone, & P. Kerswill (eds.), *The Sage handbook of sociolinguistics*, 87–99. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mallinson, C., & Brewster, Z. W. 2005. 'Blacks and bubbas': Stereotypes, ideology, and categorization processes in restaurant servers' discourse. *Discourse & Society* 16: 787–807.

Mallinson, C., & Dodsworth, R. 2009. Revisiting the need for new approaches to social class in variationist sociolinguistics. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 3: 253–78.

Massey, D. S., & Lundy, G. 2001. Use of Black English and racial discrimination in urban housing markets: New methods and findings. *Urban Affairs Review* 36(4): 452–69.

Miller, P. J., Fung, H., & Koven, M. 2007. Narrative reverberations: How participation in narrative practices co-creates persons and cultures. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology*, 595–614. New York: Guilford Press.

Milroy, L. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mithun, M. 2004. The value of linguistic diversity: Viewing other worlds through North American Indian languages. In A. Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology*, 121–40. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Morales, L. S., Lara, M., Kington, R. S., Valdez, R. O., & Escarce, J. J. 2002. Socioeconomic, cultural, and behavioral factors affecting Hispanic health outcomes. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved* 13(4): 477–503.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. Elite closure as a powerful language strategy: The African case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 103(1): 149–64.

Nettle, D. 1999. Using social impact theory to simulate language change. *Lingua* 108: 95–117.

Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. 2002. *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Niedzielski, N. 1999. The effect of social information on the perception of sociolinguistic variables. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18: 62–85.

Norton, B. 1997. Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly* 31: 409–29.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. 1995. The impact of language socialization on grammatical development. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (eds.), *The handbook of child language*, 73–94. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Pascoe, C. J. 2007. *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pennebaker, J., & King, L. 1999. Linguistic styles: Language use as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77: 1296–312.

Perrachione, T. K., Chiao, J. & Wong, P. 2010. Asymmetric cultural effects on perceptual expertise underlie an own-race bias for voices. *Cognition* 114: 42–55.

Philipsen, G. 2002. Cultural communication. In W. B. Gudykunst & B. Mody (eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication*, 2nd ed., 51–67. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pierrehumbert, J. B. 2001. Exemplar dynamics: Word frequency, lenition and contrast. In J. Bybee & P. Hopper (eds.), *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, 137–57. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Pierrehumbert, J. B. 2006. The next toolkit. *Journal of Phonetics* 34(4): 516–30.

Porter, T. B. 2005. Identity subtexts in the discursive construction of sustainability. *Electronic Journal of Radical Organization Theory* 9(1): 1–13.

Preston, D. 1998. They speak really bad English down South and in New York City. In L. Bauer & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Language myths*, 103–12. New York: Penguin Books.

Purnell, T., Idsardi, W., & Baugh, J. 1999. Perceptual and phonetic experiments on American English dialect identification. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18(1): 10–30.

Rao, J. K., Anderson, L. A., Inui, T. S., & Frankel, R. M. 2007. Communication interventions make a difference in conversations between physicians and patients: A systematic review of the evidence. *Medical Care* 45(4): 340–49.

Rickford, J. R. 1986. The need for new approaches to social class analysis in sociolinguistics. *Language and Communication* 6(3): 215–21.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Erickson, K. G. 2000. Creating and spreading status beliefs. *American Journal of Sociology* 106(3): 579–615.

Romaine, S. 2008. Corpus linguistics and sociolinguistics. In A. Lüdeling & M. Kytö (eds.), *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook*, vol. 1, 96–111. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Santa Ana, O. 1999. 'Like an animal I was treated': Anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society* 10(2): 191–224.

Sapir, E. 1949. Language. In D. Mandelbaum (ed.), *Selected writing of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*, 7–32. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Savage, M. 2005. Class and stratification: Current problems and revival prospects. In C. J. Calhoun, C. Rojek, & B. S. Turner (eds.), *The Sage handbook of sociology*, 236–53. London: Sage Publications.

Schmidt, A. 1985. *Young people's Dyirbal: An example of language death from Australia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schulz, M. R. 1975. The semantic derogation of woman. In *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*, 64–75. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. 1981. *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. 2001. *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*, 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. 2003. Discourse and intercultural communication. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 538–47. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seligman, C., Tucker, G., & Lambert, W. 1972. The effects of speech style and other attributes on teachers' attitudes toward pupils. *Language in Society* 1: 131–42.

Shuy, R. W. 2003. A brief history of American sociolinguistics 1949–1989. In C. B. Paulston & G. R. Tucker (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings*, 4–16. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Smitherman, G. 1986. *Talkin and testifyin: The language of Black America*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Spears, A. K. (ed.). 1999. *Race and ideology: Language, symbolism, and popular culture*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Stanford, J. N., & Preston, D. R. 2009. The lure of a distant horizon: Variation in indigenous minority languages. In J. N. Stanford & D. R. Preston (eds.), *Variation in indigenous minority languages*, 1–20. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Strand, E. & Johnson, K. 1996. Gradient and visual speaker normalization in the perception of fricatives. In D. Gibbon (ed.), *Natural language processing and speech technology*, 14–26. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sumner, M. & Samuel, A. 2009. The effect of experience on the perception and representation of dialect variants. *Journal of Memory and Language* 60: 487–501.

Sutton, L. A. 1995. Bitches and skankly hobags: The place of women in contemporary slang. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, 279–96. New York: Routledge.

Tabouret-Keller, A. 1997. Language and identity. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics*, 315–26. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Taylor, M. C. 2010. *Crisis on campus*. New York: Knopf.

Terrell, S. L., & Terrell, F. 1983. Effects of speaking Black English upon employment opportunities. ASHA *(Journal of the American Speech and Hearing Association)* 25(6): 27–9.

Thimm, C., Koch, S. C., & Schey, S. 2005. Communicating gendered professional identity: Competence, cooperation, and conflict in the workplace. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The handbook of language and gender*, 528–49. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Thomas, E. R., & Reaser, J. 2004. Delimiting perceptual cues used for the ethnic labeling of African American and European American voices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 8: 54–87.

Tiano, S. 1987. Gender, work, and world capitalism: Third world women's role in world development. In B. Hess & M. M. Ferree (eds.), *Analyzing gender: A handbook of social science research*, 216–43. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Trudgill, P. 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Trudgill, P. 2004. *New-dialect formation: The inevitability of colonial Englishes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

van Dijk, T. A. 2008. *Discourse and power*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1986. *Thought and language*. Edited by A. Kozulin. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wardhaugh, R. 2006. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. 1994. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weatherall, A., & Gallois, C. 2005. Gender and identity: Representation and social action. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The handbook of language and gender*, 487–508. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Whorf, B. 1956. *Language, thought and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Edited by J. B. Carroll. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Williams, G. 1992. *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique*. New York: Routledge.

Willis, P. E. 1977. *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. Farnborough, UK: Saxon House.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. 2003. Discourse and racism. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 372–97. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wolfram, W., & Schilling-Estes, N. 2006. *American English: Dialects and variation*, 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Woolard, K. A. 1985. Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist* 12: 738–48.

Wright, S. 2004. *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.