January 2008

Linguistic Anthropology

Stanton Wortham
University of Pennsylvania, stanton.wortham@bc.edu

Linguistic Anthropology

Abstract

Linguistic anthropologists investigate how language use both presupposes and creates social relations in cultural context (Silverstein, 1985; Duranti, 1997; Agha, 2006). Theories and methods from linguistic anthropology have been productively applied in educational research for the past 40 years. This chapter describes key aspects of a linguistic anthropological approach, reviews research in which these have been used to study educational phenomena, and illustrates how researchers can analyze educational data from this perspective. Readers should also consult Chapter 28, "Language Socialization," by Kathleen Riley, later in this volume, for a discussion of linguistic anthropological research in the language socialization tradition.

The linguistic and paralinguistic signs that compose educational language use communicate both referential and relational messages. When educators and learners speak and write, they communicate not only about the subject matter they are learning but also about their affiliations with social groups both inside and outside the speech event. These affiliations, some of which are created in educational events and institutions themselves, can shape students' life trajectories and influence how they learn subject matter. For both theoretical and practical reasons, then, educational researchers need to understand how language use both creates and presupposes social relations during educational activities.

7 Linguistic Anthropology

STANTON WORTHAM

Linguistic anthropologists investigate how language use both presupposes and creates social relations in cultural context (Silverstein, 1985; Duranti, 1997; Agha, 2006). Theories and methods from linguistic anthropology have been productively applied in educational research for the past 40 years. This chapter describes key aspects of a linguistic anthropological approach, reviews research in which these have been used to study educational phenomena, and illustrates how researchers can analyze educational data from this perspective. Readers should also consult Chapter 28, Language Socialization, by Kathleen Riley, later in this volume, for a discussion of linguistic anthropological research in the language socialization tradition.

The linguistic and paralinguistic signs that compose educational language use communicate both referential and relational messages. When educators and learners speak and write, they communicate not only about the subject matter they are learning but also about their affiliations with social groups both inside and outside the speech event. These affiliations, some of which are created in educational events and institutions themselves, can shape students' life trajectories and influence how they learn subject matter. For both theoretical and practical reasons, then, educational researchers need to understand how language use both creates and presupposes social relations during educational activities.

Linguistic anthropology provides a useful set of tools for studying how educational language use reinforces and creates social relations (Wortham & Rymes, 2003). Linguistic anthropology is an interdisciplinary field – a recognized subdiscipline within American anthropology that also draws on linguistics (e.g., Eckert, 2000), qualitative sociology (e.g., Goffman, 1981; Mehan et al., 1996), cultural anthropology (e.g., Street, 2005), and European "linguistic ethnography" (e.g., Blommaert, 1999; Rampton, 2005). Linguistic anthropologists study how signs communicate referential and relational messages as they are used in social and cultural contexts. In doing so they draw on four key concepts, comprising what Silverstein (1985) has called the "total linguistic

fact" – that is, four aspects of language use that must be analyzed to understand how linguistic signs have meaning in practice – *form*, *use*, *ideology* and *domain*.

Linguistic anthropologists use linguists' accounts of phonological, grammatical and other systematically distributed categories of language *form*. Unlike formal linguists, however, linguistic anthropologists are not primarily interested in how linguistic signs have meaning apart from contexts of use. Instead, they study how such signs come to have both referential and relational meanings in social and cultural context (Hymes, 1964; Duranti, 1997). The meaning of any linguistic sign in *use* cannot be determined by decontextualized rules, whether linguistic or social. No matter how robust the relevant regularities, speakers and hearers can use signs in unexpected yet meaningful ways (Goffman, 1981; Silverstein, 1992). Linguistic anthropologists study how speech comes to have sometimes-unexpected meanings in local contexts. As important as local context is, however, the meaning of any linguistic sign cannot be understood without also attending to more widely circulating models of the social world. Linguistic anthropologists often construe these models as *ideologies* of language – models of linguistic features and the speakers who characteristically use them, which people draw on as they interpret the social relations signaled through language use (Silverstein, 1985; Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998). These ideologies are not evenly distributed across social space, but have a *domain* – the set of people who recognize the indexical link between a type of sign and the relevant ideology (Agha, 2006). Linguistic anthropologists study how models of language and social relations move from event to event, across time and across social space, and how such movement contributes to local and historical change in both language and society. This chapter describes how "linguistic anthropologists of education" – those who use a linguistic anthropological approach to study educational phenomena (Wortham & Rymes, 2003) – have applied the concepts of form, use, ideology, and domain in educational research.

Form and use

The basic question facing both participants in and analysts of verbal interaction is: What does a given sign or utterance communicate about the events being described and enacted (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970; Silverstein, 1992; Erickson, 2004)? From a linguistic anthropological perspective, we cannot answer this question unless we attend to form, use, ideology, and domain. As I discuss these four aspects across the next several sections, I will refer to an example taken from my own work in American high school classrooms. I offer brief analyses of these data both to exemplify my conceptual sketch of linguistic anthropology and to illustrate a methodological approach often taken by linguistic anthropologists. Space limitations prevent an adequate description of either the data or the methodological approach. See Wortham (2004, 2006) for the former and Wortham (2001; Wortham & Locher, 1996) for the latter.

These data come from a ninth grade combined English and history class-room in an urban American school. The following example concerns a student whom I call Tyisha. This example occurred in January, at an important time for the emergence of Tyisha's social identity in this classroom. She had begun the academic year, in both the teachers' and other students' estimation, as one of the good students in the class. In November and December, however, the teachers began to identify her as disruptive, as more concerned with pushing her own opinions than with contributing to class discussion. On January 18, the class was discussing Aristotle's *Politics* and exploring his definition of "courage." In the following passage Tyisha offers herself as an example, and this discussion becomes an important turning point in teachers' and students' emerging identification of Tyisha as disruptive. ("TYI" stands for Tyisha, "T/B" for Mrs Bailey, one of the teachers, and "FST" for an unidentified female student. Transcription conventions are in the appendix.)

	TYI:	okay, I(hhh)- I had a <u>friend</u>. and she was like,
		sneaking out with a <u>boy</u>, and she lied and said that she was
		going with her <u>friends</u>. (hh) a(h)nd she told <u>me</u>, if my
270		mother call, to tell her she was at the <u>zoo</u> with her friend
		<u>Sta</u>cey. now that took her <u>cour</u>age to te(h)ll me.
	FST:	(hhh) [
	TYI:	[and it took c(hh)oura(h)ge for <u>me</u> to tell her
		<u>mo</u>ther that.
275	**FST**:	mhm
	T/B:	did it take courage for[her to tell her mother tha[t?
	FST:	[no [I
		don't think so

Throughout the chapter, I will use this example to illustrate a linguistic anthropological approach to educational processes. Further excerpts from subsequent class discussion of this example appear below. Note for the moment that Tyisha's example puts both cognitive and interactional issues into play. After Tyisha gives this example, teachers and students might ask: Does the example illuminate Aristotle and relate it to students' own lives? Does the fact that Tyisha lied to her friend's mother make her morally suspect and/or less promising as a student?

Linguistic anthropologists attend to linguistic *form*. For many decades, however, linguistic anthropologists have moved away from a linguistic emphasis on referential meaning and decontextualized regularities to a more ethnographic emphasis on appropriate communication in cultural contexts (Gumperz, 1982; Hymes, 1964). Early work on education described students from non-mainstream language communities employing norms of appropriate communication from their home communities, and showed how mainstream educators often misinterpreted this language use as "uneducated" (Cazden, John, & Hymes, 1972). This research attended systematically to linguistic form, but it did so in order to understand how linguistic patterns interconnect with

local cultural models of social relationships and appropriate demeanor, and the emergent organization of speech events. Contemporary linguistic anthropology of education continues to offer systematic analyses of various linguistic patterns, ranging from studies of phonological variation across groups (e.g., Eckert, 2000; Bucholtz, 2001; Stocker, 2003) to studies of grammatical and lexical patterns that distinguish dialects and registers (e.g., Jaffe, 1999; Kiesling, 2001), in order to illuminate the cultural significance of language in use.

In Tyisha's example, participants and analysts need to know certain things about syntax and semantics in order to understand what is being communicated. For instance, Tyisha's example represents her friend's speech. Like all languages, English provides grammatical categories used to represent speech. In line 268, Tyisha uses the metapragmatic verb "lie," as well as the verb "say." These verbs come from a specific paradigmatic set, and they distribute in regular ways. Tyisha also quotes her friend's speech, from lines 269–271, using a blended version of quoted speech, in which some of the deictics ("my" in line 269) shift to the perspective of the quoted speaker, as in direct quoted speech, while others remain from the perspective of the quoting speaker ("she" and "her" at line 270). This variant of "indirect freestyle" (Banfield, 1982; Lee, 1997) allows a speaker to move what Jakobson (1957/1971) calls the "narrated event" closer to the "event of speaking," thus heightening the immediacy of the example.

From the beginning, linguistic anthropology of education has moved beyond a study of form to emphasize the study of language in *use*. Hymes (1972) argues that speech can have multiple functions and that educational researchers must examine how utterances come to serve particular functions in context. Instead of presenting speakers as following decontextualized linguistic and pragmatic rules, Gumperz (1982) and Hymes (1972) describe speakers drawing on diverse resources and creating novel responses in context. Erickson and Shultz (1982) provide an extended study of creative language use, in which they explore the "socially and culturally organized improvisation" that occurs in conversations between academic counselors and students from non-mainstream backgrounds. Erickson and Shultz do not argue simply that non-mainstream students and mainstream counselors experience a "mismatch" of discursive styles, resulting in counselors' misjudgments about students. They show how counselors and students use various resources to create, override, resist, and defuse such mismatches. Non-mainstream students are often disadvantaged by their non-standard habits of speaking and by mainstream counselors' assumptions about these "deficits," but such disadvantage does not happen simply through a clash of monolithic styles. Erickson and Shultz find that "situationally emergent identity" explains more about the outcome of a "gatekeeping" encounter than demographically fixed identity, and they show how speakers use linguistic and cultural resources in context both to reproduce and to overcome disadvantage.

The general point here, as described systematically by Silverstein (1992), is that signs indicate social relations only in context. When a speaker uses a less

formal term, for instance – say, "lawyer" or "ambulance-chaser" instead of "attorney" – this can indicate that the speaker is poorly educated or unrefined, but it can also signal solidarity or humor. Tokens of such a sign only come to have determinate meaning when hearers understand them against the background of relevant context. "Context," however, potentially includes an enormous number of sometimes contradictory pieces of information. When I said "ambulance-chaser" just now, were you aware of the fact that I had recently been victimized by an unscrupulous lawyer, or the fact that I am organizing a movement to rescue our government from the legal-lobbyist complex, or the fact that I know you are married to one? Any or all of these (perhaps hypothetical) aspects of the context could have been made salient by earlier interaction, or they could be facts we know about each other. Depending on which features of the context are salient at the moment of utterance, participants will interpret the sign differently. This is what Silverstein calls "contextualization," the fact that signs come to have meaning only as they and co-occuring signs index aspects of the context. Cultural knowledge is crucial to interpreting the relational meaning of utterances, but we can only interpret that meaning by examining how utterances get contextualized in use. Instead of establishing a list of cultural beliefs, styles or rules that allegedly suffice to determine meaning, linguistic anthropologists study how speakers select from among many potentially relevant beliefs, styles, and rules, and sometimes ignore or change them, in actual events of language use.

Contemporary work in the linguistic anthropology of education has shown how attention to language use in this sense can illuminate educational processes. Rampton (2005), for instance, describes language "crossing" in urban, multiethnic groups of adolescents. Crossing is the use of words or other linguistic features from other languages in the course of an utterance. Rampton studies the use of Panjabi, Carribean Creole, and Stylized Asian English by white, South Asian, and Carribean youth in the UK. He does not argue simply that minority languages are devalued and used to stigmatize non-mainstream youth, nor that such youth use their home languages to resist such discrimination. Both of these processes, among others, do occur, but Rampton studies how these and other functions are accomplished in practice. The use of terms from a minority language does not have one or two fixed meanings – like stigma or resistance – because particular uses involve contestation, teasing, resistance, irony, and other stances. Like Erickson (2004; Erickson & Shultz, 1982), Rampton is deeply concerned about how the cultural politics of difference can disadvantage minority youth, and he describes the larger social and political forces regimenting language, identity, and politics in the UK. But he does not reduce disadvantage to predictable forms of identity politics, in which signs of identity routinely signal negative stereotypes. He shows instead how youth use language to navigate among the conflicting forms of solidarity and identity available to them in multiethnic Britain.

He (2003) and Rymes (2001) also attend closely to creativity and indeterminacy in particular speech events. Like Rampton, they first describe habitual

patterns of language use which serve as background against which creative uses happen. He (2003) shows how Chinese heritage language teachers often use predictable three-part "moralized directives" in order to control disruptive behavior. Rymes (2001) describes typical "dropping out" and "dropping in" autobiographical stories, through which alternative school students construct senses of self and reject or embrace formal education. But He and Rymes go on to show how educators and learners use and sometimes ransform these habitual patterns as they construct particular stances in context. He (2003) shows how the Chinese heritage language teacher's authority waxes and wanes during a lesson, as she uses moralized directives in various ways and as students react to these uses. Rymes (2001) shows how students from the alternative school reproduce, contest, and ridicule typical dropping out and dropping in stories. Sometimes they even contest the distinction between students who have embraced and rejected school, thereby positioning themselves in unpredictable ways with respect to linguistic, ethnic, and economic stereotypes. This work shows that, in order to study the social relations established through education, we must attend to both predictable and unexpected ways that marginalized and mainstream speakers talk in and about school.

Tyisha's example and the subsequent classroom discussion, like all discourse, contain many indexical signs through which speakers both draw on and reformulate widely circulating stereotypes. Tyisha's example gives teachers and students an opportunity to explore Aristotle's definition of courage, by discussing whether Tyisha's lying to her friend's mother was in fact courageous. But the example also presents both her friend and herself as flouting parents' moral injunctions against lying and illicit dating. This positions Tyisha against adults like the teacher. In fact, Tyisha skillfully constructs the example to create interactional problems for the teachers. Because the example involves immoral behavior (at least from an adult's point of view), if Tyisha's behavior was in fact courageous then the teachers would have to acknowledge her courage while condemning her behavior. Tyisha thus both adopts and revels in an oppositional identity, as an adolescent who helped her friend get away with illicit dates and who also manages to talk about this in an academic discussion – perhaps even in such a way that her oppositional behavior could be classified as courageous.

As the classroom discussion continues, the teachers try to convince Tyisha and other students that her behavior was not courageous, that it would instead have been courageous to tell her friend's mother the truth. Tyisha acknowledges that this latter alternative would have been courageous, but she insists that lying to her friend's mother also required courage. ("T/S" is Mr Smith, one of the two teachers running the discussion).

> **TYI**: if I lyin'- If I'm sittin' here lying in another person
>   mother face, that took courag(h)e. [and if I'm
> **T/S**:   [why?

315	**TYI**:	telling her, be<u>cause</u> you don't-
	FST	lies.
	T/S	have you never <u>lied</u> to your mother?
	FST:	hnuh
	TYI:	no- not- not to no one <u>else</u>'s momma, <u>no</u>.
320	**T/S**:	have you ever <u>lied</u> to a <u>tea</u>cher who is a mother?
	FST:	uh(hhh)
	TYI:	that's <u>different</u>.
	FST:	aw <u>man</u>.
	STS:	[2 seconds of laughter]
325	**TYI**:	that's <u>very</u> different um- I mean that's <u>different</u>. I'm
		always over there visiting this <u>friend</u> and her mother, might
		have had trus- trust in me and I come over and tell her this
		big, <u>bold</u> faced lie.

At line 320 Mr Smith cites "a teacher who is a mother." This clearly indexes the other teacher, Mrs Bailey, who, as everyone in the room knows, has an adolescent daughter herself. Mr Smith's question highlights the interactional tension that Tyisha's example raises. Tyisha acts proud of the fact that she lied to her friend's mother, even though Mrs Bailey and other adults would identify with the friend's mother and consider this wrong. Mr Smith thus seems to be pointing out that Tyisha opposes Mrs Bailey and people like her. In use, then, the discussion of Tyisha's example has positioned her not only as a potentially unethical adolescent but also as opposed to one of the teachers who is sitting right there in the room (and who is probably at that moment worrying about her own daughter's friends doing the same thing to her).

Tyisha revels in this oppositional identity, as illustrated in the sequence of increasingly colorful metapragmatic verbs that she uses to describe her lie. She started by using the verb "tell" to describe what she said to her friend's mother (at line 270). In segments not presented here (see Wortham, 2004, 2006), Mr Smith reframed it as a "lie" at line 288, and opposed such lying to "telling the truth" (line 298). Another student spiced up the characterization: "so you gonna sit there and lie to her face" (line 297). Tyisha herself embraces this characterization at lines 312–313: "I'm sitting here lying in another person mother face." And she ends up with: "her mother might have had trust in me and I come over and tell her this big bold-faced lie" (lines 326–328). Far from euphemizing what she did, Tyisha embraces the oppositional character of her action and proudly flaunts social norms. This clearly opposes her to Mrs Bailey.

This evolving set of metapragmatic verbs illustrates how a linguistic anthropologist of education can use grammatical categories to help uncover the emerging social identity of a student like Tyisha. Tyisha's use of more and more highly presupposing verbs, together with her example of illicit adolescent behavior, opposes her to the teachers. This contributes to the shift in her local classroom identity, from "good student" toward "disruptive student"

(see Wortham, 2006). Only by attending to language in use, to the indexical signaling accomplished by discussion of Tyisha's example, can we uncover how Tyisha and the teachers do this relational work.

Power and Ideology

Erickson and Shultz (1982), He (2003), Rampton (2005), and Rymes (2001) all attend both to the unpredictable character of local interactions and to the larger social regularities that provide resources for such interaction. Other linguistic anthropologists of education attend less to the creative potential of language in use, focusing instead on the power relations bound up with language and education. Before moving on to the concept of language *ideology*, I will briefly review several studies that show how linguistic anthropologists have attended to questions of *power*.

Heller (1999) and Blommaert (1999) both describe language planning and education within multilingual nation states. They acknowledge the unexpected meanings that can emerge in particular events, but they do not focus on creativity within discursive interactions. Instead, they provide more detailed accounts of how state and institutional language policies can differentially position diverse populations. Heller studies how French Canadians' arguments for ethnic and linguistic legitimacy have shifted over the past few decades – from proclaiming the authenticity of their culture and asserting their rights as a minority group to emphasizing the benefit of French as an international language. This shift in models of "Frenchness" has changed the value of French Canadians themselves, with bilinguals valued more than monolinguals and Standard French valued more than vernaculars. Heller explores how this shift plays out in a French language high school in Anglophone Ontario. Blommaert (1999) describes how the Tanzanian state has used language planning for nation building. He traces the attempt to make a common nation out of a multilingual society by establishing Swahili as the index of a homogeneous Tanzania and as the primary language of education. In the process, language planners create "symbolic hierarchies" between languages and language varieties. Blommaert shows how institutions like schools (and the media, science, etc.) do this work.

Collins and Blot (2003) describe how literacy practices are embedded in global processes, like colonialism and neo-liberalism, and institutionally anchored power relations. They analyze interdependencies between local literacies and larger sociohistorical movements, describing the hegemony of the literate standard and arguing against the common assumption that schooled literacy will provide intellectual and economic salvation in all cases. Like Collins and Blot, Eckert (2000) argues for a "practice" approach to language and power. Using arguments similar to those offered by Rampton (2005), Silverstein (1992), and others who work on language in use, Eckert argues that apparently stable macrosocial categories are more variable than most theories of power assume

– "masculinity," "heterosexuality," "sluttiness," and other social categories are constructed in practice. Eckert does not abandon macrosociological variables, but she explores how they are deployed in unexpected ways. She describes the divergent phonological patterns of peer groups at a suburban high school, revealing complex relations among students' social positions and their habitual phonology.

As linguistic anthropologists have moved toward practice-based accounts that attend both to language in use and to power relations, many have used the concept of language *ideology* (Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998). Silverstein (1985) describes an ideology as a metapragmatic model of language and social relations that regiments particular uses. Because of indeterminacy about what a sign might mean in context, speakers and hearers must draw on models of linguistic forms and the speakers who typically use them. When one such model becomes salient, from among the many that might be relevant to interpreting the meaning of a given utterance, it "regiments" the values of indexical signs. When I called lawyers "ambulance-chasers," for instance – and you were unsure whether I was upset about a recent legal experience, crusading to overhaul the legal-lobbyist system, or insulting you and your spouse – you needed to know more about the relevant context to know what my utterance meant. Each of these models (aggrieved victim of legal misconduct seeking sympathy, political crusader seeking a convert, aggressive interlocutor) might frame the event we were engaged in, and in doing so fix the indexical value of "ambulance-chaser" (and neighboring signs). As Silverstein (1992) argues, any account of the social meanings of language use must describe such models and explain how they become salient in practice, as configurations of indexical signs come to mutually presuppose one model as most relevant.

Many linguistic anthropologists have noted that such models, often called "language ideologies," systematically associate types of speech with socially located types of speakers. Language ideology has become an important concept, allowing linguistic anthropologists to explore relations between the emergent meanings of signs in use, socially circulating ideologies, and broader social structures. Language ideology has also been important for the linguistic anthropology of education, because schools are important sites for learning (and legitimating) associations between types of speakers ("educated," "authoritative," "at-risk," etc.) and types of language use.

Jaffe (1999) traces the policies and practices involved in the recent revitalization of Corsican. She describes one ideology that values French as the language of logic and civilization, another that values Corsican as the language of nationalism and pride, and a third that embraces multiple languages and multiple identities. Her analyses show how schools are a central site for the struggle among these ideologies – with some trying to maintain the centrality of French in the curriculum, some favoring Corsican language revitalization and the displacement of French, and others wanting some Corsican in the schools but resisting a new "standard" Corsican as the official language

of schooling. Kiesling (2001) uses "language ideology" to understand peer relations and ethnic stereotypes among white middle-class fraternity brothers, exploring how racially linked features of their speech both serve local inter-actional functions and reproduce social hierarchies. He describes fraternity brothers asserting their intellectual or economic superiority over each other by marking interlocutors as metaphorically "black." But he also shows how they assert physical prowess over each other by themselves speaking like black men, thus inhabiting a stereotype of physical masculinity. The fraternity brothers use and reinforce ideologies of Black English Vernacular speakers as less rational, economically distressed, and physically imposing.

Stocker (2003) describes a monolingual Spanish-speaking group in Costa Rica that is believed to speak a stigmatized dialect – despite the fact that their language is not linguistically distinguishable from their neighbors' – because they live on an artificially bounded "reservation" and are perceived as "indigenous." She shows how high school language instruction reinforces this ideology. Berkely (2001) describes Mayan speakers going to school to learn how to write "authentic" local stories in their language. He shows how this brought two ideologies into conflict – a literate ideology that valued the authority of the (young, female) teacher and treated literacy as an "auto-nomous" skill (Street, 2005), and a local ideology that presented older men as empowered to tell stories on behalf of others. Berkely shows how the teacher and the elders creatively navigated this conflict, with older men telling stories that younger people learned to write down.

With respect to Tyisha's example, I have already mentioned various lan-guage ideologies that became relevant to interpreting the social implications of the discussion. Students and teachers have at least two different models available to understand an adolescent who lies about illicit dates: an imma-ture, rebellious, unethical person who should be disciplined and grow up; and a heroic person who resists the illegitimate authority of adults and helps adolescents to be autonomous. The teachers try to establish that Tyisha's behavior fits the former model, while Tyisha tries to evoke the latter and win fellow students to her side. As we have seen in the section on language use, such models always get adjusted or modified in context, as participants use them for various interactional purposes and tailor them to the situation. Nonetheless, participants cannot understand what signs mean in context without attending to the more widely circulating models or ideologies that provide a starting point for local interactional work.

Domain and Trajectory

Work on language ideology shows how language in use both shapes and is shaped by more widely circulating social models and power relations. We must be careful, however, not to cast this as a simple two-part model – sometimes called the "micro-macro dialectic" – in which events create

structures and structures are created in events. In fact, there are many scales of social organization relevant to understanding language in use (cf. Wortham, 2006). In their study of "untracking" as an educational reform, Mehan et al. (1996) move beyond a simple combination of local events and larger social patterns. They explore various realms that influence "at-risk" students' school success – ranging from the student him- or herself, to parents, family, the classroom, the school, peer groups, the community, as well as national educational policy and broader socioeconomic constraints. Instead of describing "micro" and "macro," Mehan and his colleagues describe how resources from many different spatial and temporal scales combine to facilitate or impede students' academic success. They give a more complex account of how "intelligence" and "educational success" are constructed in practice, describing how various resources work together to facilitate a given student's path.

Agha (2006; Agha & Wortham, 2005) describes the diverse spatial and temporal scales that allow language to signal social relations. Any model that associates linguistic features with an identifiable type of speaker has what he calls a *domain*. Models are used and recognized only by a subset of any linguistic community, and this subset changes as the model moves across time and space. There is no one "macro" set of models or ideologies, universal to a group. Instead, there are models that circulate densely in communities ranging from pairs, to local groups, to groups at various spatial and temporal scales all the way up to global language communities. The task is not to relate micro to macro, but to describe the various relevant resources – likely drawn from several different spatial and temporal scales – that facilitate a phenomenon of interest, and to describe the "intertextual" links across events through which models move as they are used to characterize people (Agha & Wortham, 2005; Wortham, 2006).

Rogers (2003) applies this approach to trace an individual student's trajectory across two years, as the student and her family negotiate with authorities about whether she is "disabled." Rogers shows how both institutionalized and local models facilitate the transformation of this student from "low achieving" to "disabled," and she follows the intertextual links among official texts, conferences, tests, family conversations, and other events that helped constitute this student's trajectory. Wortham (2006) traces the emergence of individual students' social identities across an academic year in one ninth grade classroom. This analysis tracks the development of classroom-specific models that identify different types of "student" one might be in this classroom, showing the distinctive gendered models that emerge across several months. These local models both draw on and transform more widely circulating models, and they are used in sometimes-unexpected ways in particular classroom events. The analysis shows how two students' identities emerge as speakers transform widely circulating models of race and gender into local models of appropriate and inappropriate studenthood, and as they contest these identities in particular interactions.

Crucial to this analysis is the local, classroom-specific domain within which models of identity emerge and become recognizable. The local model of Tyisha – as a disruptive force in class discussion, as someone who should be cast out from the group of teachers and students who contribute productively to discussion, and as a student who is thus "unpromising" – would not be immediately recognized by people outside the classroom, although it is constructed using resources from models of identity that have broader domains. "Macro" and "micro" thus do not suffice to analyze this example, because we must attend to intermediate domains like the one including only teachers and students in this classroom.

As the discussion of Tyisha's example ends, she has failed in her attempt to enlist other students. She skillfully embedded a defense of illicit adolescent behavior within an academic discussion of Aristotle. But she did not get other students to take her side and identify themselves as adolescents who will not accept the authority of adults like the teachers. ("LIN" is Linda, pseudonym for another student in the class.)

	LIN:	I don't think that's <u>cou</u>rage to go and steal a <u>can</u>dy bar
385		[because <u>cou</u>rage- right
	MST:	[it's stupid
	LIN:	cause courage, the virtue of courage, what we read
		of courage was to <u>do</u> something- something <u>good</u>, not to
		do <u>some</u>thing and go and do <u>some</u>thing [evil.
390	TYI:	[that's <u>not</u>
		true
	FST:	[yeah that's
		right
	TYI:	<u>cou</u>rage is not just doing something <u>good</u>.
395		[students talking at once]
	TYI:	if I go[shoot you in the <u>head</u>
	T/B:	[shhhhhh
		[students arguing]
	T/B:	ahh, if we <u>can</u>- if we <u>can</u> talk about courage as being
400		something good, the virtue of <u>cou</u>rage, and go back to that
		definition, and I know you <u>nev</u>er bought into <u>it</u>, but the rest
		of us <u>seem</u> to be, using this as a definition, so <u>there</u>fore,
		we'd ask you to kind of go a<u>long</u> with it.
	FST:	okay.
405	T/B:	the idea of <u>cou</u>rage, was not just doing things you're
		a<u>fraid</u> to do, but doing things <u>that</u>- overcoming your fear
		for a <u>good</u> reason. <u>Lin</u>da?
	LIN:	I was saying what Tyisha said, if you go shoot
		somebody in the <u>head</u>, you gonna call that courage? or you
410		is gonna call that <u>stupid</u>?

The other students side with the teachers here, opposing Tyisha's argument and calling her behavior "stupid." At lines 399–403 Mrs Bailey also uses a

clear opposition between "us" (the teachers and students other than Tyisha, who are trying to have a productive discussion of Aristotle) and "you" (Tyisha, who is disrupting their discussion), and she makes clear that Tyisha is outside the core group of cooperative students.

In Wortham (2006), I show how, in addition to the concept of domain, we need the concept of "trajectory" (Dreier, 2000) to analyze what happens to Tyisha across the year. Instead of analyzing language ideologies as if they occurred in stable form across a homogeneous group, we must explore their domains and describe how they move across both local and global scales. Similarly, instead of assuming that individuals are identified in stable ways, we must explore how their identities emerge and change across a trajectory of events in which these identities solidify and re-form.

Conclusions

Linguistic anthropologists of education study language form, in use, as organized by ideologies, as those ideologies move across social domains and come to identify individuals. A linguistic anthropological approach is thus characterized by its refusal to adopt simple accounts of educational processes and institutions. Instead of studying either the referential or the social functions of language, linguistic anthropologists study how speakers deploy both grammatical categories and social indexicals to accomplish reference, social identification, and other functions. Instead of emphasizing either institutions and power relations or events in which social relations are constructed – or a simple combination of the two – linguistic anthropological approaches show how both "macro" and "micro" are abstracted from a continuum of potentially relevant resources that together constrain and facilitate the functions of speech. By attending to form, use, ideology, and domain, linguistic anthropologists provide a more complex picture of educational language use.

NOTE

Appendix: Transcription Conventions

-       abrupt breaks or stops
?   rising intonation

.   falling intonation
–   (underline) stress
[indicates simultaneous talk by two speakers, with one utterance represented on
         top of the other and the moment of overlap marked by left brackets
[. . .] transcriber comment
,   pause or breath without marked intonation
(hh)   laughter breaking into words while speaking

REFERENCES

Agha, Asif (2006). *Language and Social Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Agha, Asif, & Wortham, Stanton (eds.) (2005). *Discourse across Speech-Events: Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity in Social Life*. Special issue of the *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1).

Banfield, Ann (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Berkley, Anthony (2001). Respecting Maya language revitalization. *Linguistics and Education*, 12, 345–366.

Blommaert, Jan (1999). *State Ideology and Language in Tanzania*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Bucholtz, Mary (2001). The whiteness of nerds: Superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 11, 84100.

Cazden, Courtney, John, Vera, & Hymes, Dell (eds.) (1972). *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, James & Blot, Richard (2003). *Literacy and Literacies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dreier, O. (2000). Psychotherapy in clients' trajectories across contexts. In C. Mattingly & L. Garro (eds.), *Narrative and the Cultural Construction of Illness and Healing* (pp. 237–258). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, Penelope (2000). *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Erickson, Frederick (2004). *Talk and Social Theory: Ecologies of Speaking and Listening in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Erickson, Frederick, & Schultz, Jeffrey (1982). *Counselor as Gatekeeper: Social Interaction in Interviews*. New York: Academic Press.

Garfinkel, Howard & Sacks, Harvey (1970). On formal structure of practical actions. In J. McKinney & A. Tiryakian (eds.), *Theoretical Sociology* (pp. 338–366). New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Goffman, Erving (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gumperz, John (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

He, Agnes (2003). Linguistic anthropology and language education. In Stanton Wortham & Betsy Rymes (eds.), *Linguistic Anthropology of Education* (pp. 93–119). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Heller, Monica (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hymes, Dell (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), 1–34.

Hymes, Dell (1972). Introduction. In Courtney Cazden, Vera John, & Dell Hymes (eds.), *Functions of Language in the Classroom* (pp. xi–lvii). New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Jakobson, Roman (1957/1971). Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. In R. Jakobson, *Selected Writings* (vol. 2, pp. 130–147). The Hague: Mouton.

Kiesling, Scott (2001). Stances of whiteness and hegemony in fraternity men's discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 11, 101–115.

Lee, Benjamin (1997). *Talking Heads: Language, Metalanguage, and the Semiotics of Subjectivity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mehan, Hugh, Villanueva, Irene, Hubbard, Lea, & Lintz, Angela (1996). *Constructing School Success: The Consequences of Untracking Low Achieving Students*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rampton, Ben (2005). *Crossing* (2nd edn.). Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.

Rogers, Rebecca (2003). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices: Power in and out of Print*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rymes, Betsy (2001). *Conversational Borderlands: Language and Identity in an Alternative Urban High School*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schieffelin, Bambi, Woolard, Kathryn, & Kroskrity, Paul (eds.) (1998). *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, Michael (1985). On the pragmatic "poetry" of prose. In D. Schiffrin (ed.), *Meaning, Form and Use in Context* (pp. 181–199). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Silverstein, Michael (1992). The indeterminacy of contextualization: When is enough enough? In Aldo DiLuzio & Peter Auer (eds.), *The Contextualization of Language* (pp. 550–75). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Stocker, Karen (2003). Ellos se comen las eses/heces. In Stanton Wortham & Betsy Rymes (eds.), *Linguistic Anthropology of Education* (pp. 185–211). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Street, Brian (ed.) (2005). *Literacies across Educational Contexts: Mediating Learning and Teaching*. Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Wortham, Stanton (2001). *Narratives in Action: A Strategy for Eesearch and Analysis*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Wortham, Stanton (2004). From good student to outcast: The emergence of a classroom identity. *Ethos*, 32, 164–187.

Wortham, Stanton (2006). *Learning Identity: The Mediation of Social Identity through Academic Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wortham, Stanton & Locher, Michael (1996). Voicing on the news. *Text*, 16, 557–585.

Wortham, Stanton & Rymes, Betsy (eds.) (2003). *Linguistic Anthropology of Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger.