

Christina Higgins

## Chapter 14

### Afterword

Locating discourse and ideology

#### 1 Preamble

As a North American scholar who specializes in discourse analysis and socio-linguistics, I appreciate the invitation by Simo Määttä and Marika Hall to reflect on this collection of contemporary scholarship that examines the relationships between discourse and ideology. As this volume makes clear, there are some rather long-standing traditions for the study of discourse and ideology that are tied to geography, language, and intellectual lineage. Like all theoretical concepts, discourse and ideology have situated historical ontologies and epistemologies that are challenging to decipher to any newcomer who grapples with them. In reading the volume, my own experience as a U.S.-trained scholar makes it starkly clear how situated and perspectival this research can be in terms of one's academic socialization, geographic location, and disciplinary orientation. Thus, I feel it is important to locate myself metadiscursively in order to comment on the volume as a whole. I am certain that a reflection by a scholar located in France or Brazil or Kenya would have a rather different take, and in taking a reflexive approach here, I encourage other scholars who take part in the commentary genre to more often address their positionality as they do this kind of intellectual work. In some scholarly traditions, the discursive label that might be affixed to this reflexivity is “self-indulgence”, or “navel-gazing”, but I favor the more optimistic label of “situated reflexivity” instead. In a time when scholars are invited to recognize the over-representation of intellectual knowledge produced by scholars in WEIRD (western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic) contexts (Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan 2010; Clancy and Davis 2019) as produced by academics who are mostly located in the global north, I find it especially important to reveal more about our dispositions, identities, and genealogies as scholars.

I come to this reflection chapter as a white, female, U.S.-born scholar of multilingualism in the field of applied linguistics. My conceptualization of applied linguistics is that it refers to language research that has relevance for real-world contexts. In my own scholarly work, I investigate a range of social questions about multilingualism by studying discourse, most often as it takes place in naturally-occurring conversations. Initially, I focused my research on multilingualism in Tanzania and then turned to concentrate on discourse in Hawai'i, where

I currently reside. These two contexts are embedded in post-colonial discourses and ideologies regarding language, politics, culture, and economic relations. In my scholarly circles, I have encountered the investigation of ideology mainly through studies of language ideology, whereas research on discourse has largely been tied to the study of language use in the form of spoken interaction, and to a lesser degree, the production and reception of written texts. My intellectual training and scholarship drew attention to what the editors in this volume refer to as “functional” approaches to discourse, as outlined by sociolinguists such as John Gumperz and Jan Blommaert, whose interests in contextualization and language ideologies have encouraged me to explore the links between language use and the ideologies attached to languages in multilingual practices. I was also partly influenced by ethnomethodology and conversation analysis and the insistence on emically-grounded interpretations of data, as evidenced in conversation and interaction. In my work, I have studied workplace conversation, public health communication, and beliefs about marginalized languages by drawing on an eclectic approach comprised of ethnography, social theory, and microlevel discourse analysis. My academic socialization encouraged an emphasis on language use as the first realm to investigate, followed by attention to the larger sets of beliefs, cultural practices, and institutional norms that shape the language use. From my observations, this emphasis still holds true today in most North American academic contexts where language and linguistics are a central disciplinary focus, at least in terms of how new scholars are trained and socialized into the field of discourse studies. The same is true for how discourse and its links to ideology is represented in contemporary textbooks, which tend to foreground discourse in the form of talk and text before linking it to ideological discussions (e.g., Paltridge 2012; Jones 2012). In my training and continued experience, scholarly examination of ideology and deep discussions of foundational scholars associated with this term are often found in other disciplinary homes outside of applied linguistics, such as literature, sociology, education, and political science.

Based on my experiences in “the field”, exposure to foundational texts on ideology and discourse from philosophical and theoretical traditions are uncommon unless undertaken by individuals. Early on, I was usually only exposed to the seminal works of major scholars such as Foucault, Bourdieu, and Bakhtin through secondary reading and in small, self-governed reading groups in graduate school and beyond. I strived to analyze the microlevel of language with reference to social theory, often drawn from these critical and/or post-structuralist theorists who wrote about the nature of language, power, and social life. Oftentimes, discussions of discourse invoked Bourdieu’s writings about distinction, cultural capital and habitus, Foucault’s treatment of subjectivity, knowledge and power, and Bakhtin’s work on legitimacy, heteroglossia and double-voicing.

My interest in multilingual practices in East Africa led me to deeply engage with Bakhtin (1981, 1984) early in my career, as his writings about multivocality were a rich resource for making sense of how people used English, Swahili, and other languages in their everyday lives in ways that were not well explained by existing dominant analytical frameworks about multilingualism. Throughout my career, I have felt the most comfortable in my analysis of discourse/ideology by starting with a careful examination of discourse using the tools of interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, and narrative analysis. I have always strived to make sense of discourse data with reference to social theory, and to make connections between what Gee (2004) would refer to as the small “d” discourses of interaction and the big “D” Discourses of practice, schemas, and common senses that circulate, shape, and are shaped by the discourses being examined. Nonetheless, I don’t think I’m alone in noting a difficulty in sometimes fully grasping much of the dense scholarship produced by these social theorists writing about the nature of language, discourse, and ideology.

## 2 Themes in this collection

Now that I have made what I consider to be important caveats regarding my own positionality on discourse and ideology, I attempt to comment on some of the themes and contributions in this collection of chapters. This is indeed a timely book. At this moment in which the global COVID-19 pandemic lingers on, we are all surrounded by texts and communication practices that show how discourse and ideology operate. Of course, ideological debates about public health, vaccines, and personal freedom are not the only discursively and ideologically divisive issues of the day. A glance at the headlines in mainstream news sources in the U.S. points to an alarming example: “Texas school administrator told teachers to include Holocaust books with ‘opposing’ views when explaining new state law”. The article notes that after the story went viral, the superintendent of the Texas school district apologized, and publicly stated, “there are not two sides of the Holocaust”, noting that the teaching of “historical facts” does not require multiple perspectives. Still, when teaching “current events”, teachers in Texas are now required to offer readings and perspectives from “opposing viewpoints” (Kilgough 2021). This news item emerged as a result of new legislation in Texas and elsewhere in the U.S. that has restricted how teachers engage with their students in teaching and learning about racism, due to a backlash in some communities towards the use of anti-racist books and curriculum in schools. More broadly, the legislation can be understood as a counter-discourse to social movements in the

U.S. that have shined a light on police brutality towards Black and Brown people. This example illustrates how the discursive construction of history as “facts” and current events as requiring “opposing viewpoints” is interlinked with ideological debates around racism in the U.S. It also draws attention to the role of white Americans in responding to social movements that encourage critical awareness of race and power relations in both historical and contemporary contexts.

Similarly, this edited volume engages in the examination of discourse and ideology in a range of contexts where divisive rhetoric on race, belonging, liberty, gender, societal change, and nationality are often in the foreground. Several chapters attend to the role of discourse in perpetuating and disrupting national ideologies that negatively portray immigrants in Spain and Belgium (Lázaro Gutiérrez and Tejero González, Verschueren), and another explores discourse and subjectivity among Tunisians who defy authoritarian regimes in their own country through social protest discourses and performances (Guellouz). National identity and resistance are also examined with attention to parochial and patrimonial mindsets in an examination of discourses resisting multiculturalism and the #metoo movement in France (Louar). In today’s world, these discourses are easy to find in most contexts, as ideologies of “the nation” in relation to ethnolinguistic identities and cultural dispositions are increasingly articulated and contested through discourse in public spaces.

Beyond these divisive rhetorical practices on polarizing ideologies, the book also pays attention to ideological concerns that are more centrally about language in terms of linguistic practices and language ideologies, yet which are also entangled with nationhood, identity, and power relations. Here, the authors tackle the role of language subordination vis-à-vis standardized language varieties in the francophone minority region of Acadia in Eastern Canada (Vernet), the role of ideologies about audience and histories of indexicalities in translation into Finnish (Mäntynen and Kalliokoski), the practice of “licensing” through English, whereby Nordic speakers of English engage in frequent pragmatic borrowing of English, thereby tapping into its ideological framings and indices (Peterson), and a corpus analysis of the terms “discourse” and “ideology” in English-medium academic texts as a means to understand how these terms are constructed through their semantic collocations (Diaz and Hall).

The remaining chapters are case studies on the relationship between discourse and ideology by applied linguists, social work researchers, healthcare researchers, discourse analysts, literary scholars, and translation specialists who examine ideologies about social practices in state institutional contexts. Of course, these are also bound up in ideologies of the nation-state and its role and responsibilities to all residents, as these contributions examine the discourses emerging from contexts where migrant and low-income families struggle within

state systems. Lutman-White and Angouri analyze focus group conversations and interviews among social workers and managers in England to show how they articulate the ideologies of child protection social work and its associated moral order in their talk. They examine how the institutional support for families has changed in recent years, leading to the emergence of a dominant discourse that centers on child-protection, rather than helping families stay together or providing families with the resources they need to succeed. Lázaro Gutiérrez and Tejero González report on work they have done in a healthcare training setting in Spain, where they analyze discourses of Spanish healthcare staff made about migrants in the context of training about diversity and intercultural healthcare. In analyzing written comments made in online forums, the authors explore how the staff express ideologies about migrants with regard to discourses that posit us/them boundaries, which articulate insurmountable cultural differences, and which position language as a barrier to healthcare.

As a scholar who uses discourse analytical frameworks alongside social theory, I am always intrigued by how other scholars frame their studies in terms of theory and method, and how they ground their findings. The volume begins with a series of chapters that shows the continued linkage of discourse/ideology studies with French scholarly traditions, and with the French language. Määttä provides a succinct overview of the relations between ideology and discourse in French scholarship, which in turn nicely segues to the next set of chapters. His chapter provides a needed history of these terms as a prelude to the volume as a whole. Next, Vernet's study of language diversity in Acadia, a French-speaking region of Canada, examines language ideology through the ways that contact languages like Chiac are both discursively valorized and subordinated with reference to standardized French in the same institutional spaces at a university. Vernet's analysis departs from French discourse analysis traditions by employing ethnographic methods. He illustrates how the syllabi and teachers' discussion about language standards proscribing Acadian varieties of French were the discursive sites where rules and conditions about language were located. The next two chapters return to French discourse analytic traditions by examining ideological practices in relation to subjectivity, power, liberation, and performance. Here, the authors do not explicitly discuss their research methods, but rather provide rich examples to unpack with reference to the theoretical relationship between ideology, discourse, and transformative social meanings. Guellouz examines discourse and performativity in Tunisia by taking on the challenging subject matter of immolation as transformative, performative act. The role of discourse as language use is arguably minimal here, whereas the discussion of the nature of discourse and its material effects on subjectivities is extensive. In her analysis, she describes how an immolation done in protest of the Tunisian government and the utter-

ance *dégage* ('leave') created new sets of subjectivities by offering new discursive materialities. The analyst's interpretation is the main resource here. Through the discursive effects of repeating *dégage*, she argues that ideologies of protest enter into public space, thereby changing the space through discourse. Similarly, Louar's study of language troubles in France that examine Macron's rhetoric denying multiculturalism and public discourse on the irrelevance of the #metoo movement is focused on the theoretical arguments and illustrations of concepts. In both chapters, the analysis of the meanings of these discourses are presented without recourse to perspectives apart from the authors'. This is of course a normative style of research for this genre of scholarship on discourse and ideology, but it is notable for its distinction with the rest of the contributions in the book.

In other cases, methods are briefly explained with the goal of getting to the question of the nature of discourse and ideology more directly. This is the case with Verschueren, who draws attention to the importance of examining the rhetorical nature of discourses of the "new normal" in newspapers in Belgium as sites where ideologies about immigration, integration, and secularism are produced and formed into an "anti-multiculturalism" discourse. Similarly, Lázaro Gutiérrez and Tejero González briefly describe a large corpus of texts produced through healthcare worker training, but few details are provided regarding the content analysis that is mentioned before illustrating key aspects of ideologies and attitudes towards serving migrants in the healthcare context.

Other chapters point to methods that are used in the service of examining discourse and ideology which indicate a more empirical bent, including interactional sociolinguistics (Lutman-White and Angouri), ethnography (Mäntynen and Kalliokoski; Vernet), survey methods (Peterson) and corpus linguistics (Diaz and Hall). This shows that discourse and ideology can benefit from methods that explore the contextualized nature of discourse with reference to its "brought about" and "brought along" contexts (Giddens 1976), for they acknowledge that the context and form in which discourses are articulated are central to understanding their ideological expression. These chapters all stand in great contrast with the methods of the French discourse chapters that come early in the book as they point to an interest in researching discourse and ideology in a systematic, grounded manner. This raises the question of whether there is a shared set of epistemological approaches to the study of discourse, or even if current approaches to discourse studies are so methodologically disparate that they might merit different disciplinary identities, rather than different schools of thought or sub-disciplinary traditions.

While most of the authors do not discuss their methodology in detail, Miller's chapter is a standout as a reflexive enterprise that considers how scholars' data collection in the form of interview questions asked and analytical tools tend to be

at odds with their epistemological alignments with the non-essentialist nature of discourse and ideology. Her chapter acknowledges the mismatch between approaching data with an intent to code and categorize while foregrounding the performative and fluid nature of discursive practices as they relate to identity. She takes a critical eye to her own research, noting how she focused on certain features of participants in her studies in order to answer research questions that she crafted with attention to the participants' linguistic and newcomer status. Miller's chapter is a reminder about the importance of reflexivity in discourse research. Research is itself part of the discursive process, whereby researchers engage in the disciplining of discourse and do so from their (relatively) powerful positions in society as intellectuals with access to certain forms of cultural capital.

### 3 The nature of discourse and ideology

So, what is the nature of discourse and ideology, as identified in this volume? Most contributors identify a strongly intertwined relationship between the two concepts. Collectively, the authors identify discourse as the use of language as articulated in social practices, whereas ideology refers to beliefs, mental models, and sense-making practices that are shared by a group or society. Van Dijk's chapter is important here, as it reiterates his view of discourse as a vehicle for ideology, a meaning that is expressed similarly in most chapters. For him, mental models are at the interface of societal beliefs and individuals' discourse practices, and these mental models are mediated by context, such as the professional or personal identities of the speakers and their relations with others. In this way, Lutman-White and Angouri's chapter shows how a certain moral order about child welfare is part of the shared social cognition of social workers as they articulate their sense-making in focus groups and interviews. While a discourse of family preservation is a possible mental model that could be a dominant discourse in their ideological positioning, the social workers' discourse is marked by more attention to the risks that children are exposed to, and hence, a discourse of child protection emerges as the dominant narrative that they share, and as a rationale for the institutional practice of separating children from their parents. This narrative is simultaneously shaped by the social workers' institutional realities, which the authors argue have made it more likely for low-income parents to struggle to meet their children's needs without support due to austerity cuts.

Verschueren's chapter draws our attention to the ways in which discourses that are aligned with arguably regressive ideologies emerge in places we might least expect, such as progressive or "left" media houses. His discussion of an

anti-discourse in Belgium toward multiculturalism shows how ideologies about immigration and societal diversity have been rearticulated in political discourse by “mainstream” national leaders in Europe and in texts such as newspaper editorials. He analyzes an editorial in a liberal newspaper that expounds upon the development of Arabic schools in Brussels, pointing out that they will offer an alternative site for learning language to Koranic schools, which are portrayed as problematic due to their association with orthodoxy and the constraints they put on girls in terms of wearing headscarves. Through the editorial, a common sense is presented in which certain forms of language maintenance are recommended as long as they are highly secular. The text produces an anti-discourse toward religious practices and a utopic discourse toward secular societies, which are imagined to be populated by groups who have superficial ethnolinguistic differences and a shared common core of the same values. In analyzing this text, Verschueren shows us how discourses about multiculturalism which strive to be frank and supportive of some aspects of diversity are in fact part of the spread of increasingly exclusionary ideologies about diversity.

Finally, Mäntynen and Kalliokoski’s chapter on the ideological debates in translation offers some vivid examples of how mental models are not always shared, and how that gap is made visible in discourse. They describe an editor’s recommendation for the word *tavara* (‘goods’) in Finnish as the better choice for translating English *commodity* instead of a translator’s choice, a compound of *hyödyke* and *tuotantotekijä* (‘production’ + ‘factor’). According to the editor, Finnish academic convention informs this choice due to Marxist associations with this word and the definition of *commodity* as ‘*tavara*’ in Marxist thinking. This indexicality was not as relevant from the translator’s point of view, however. This shows the ties between discourse and ideology in the act of translating, and reveals the gaps in mental models and also the natural histories of discourse for certain discourse-ideological links.

### 3.1 Discourse as a site for social change?

A question that this book raises is whether and to what degree this examination of discourse and ideology can be tied to applied or more public take-up of these discussions. As a scholar with an interest in applied linguistics and citizen sociolinguistics (e.g., Svendsen 2018), I often wonder how the analysis of discourse might be put to use in different ways, either in more public circulation, as in the case of sharing some of these insights with wider audiences through popular press houses, or in the case of participatory research involving institutions and stakeholders who are enmeshed in discourses and ideologies and who might

benefit from a reflective approach to this. It is of course already a lot of work to analyze discourse and its relationship to ideology, and scholars have long made important contributions through describing how social and ideological shifts have taken place in and through discourse (e.g., Fairclough, Cortese, and Ardizzone 2007). Nonetheless, after we have a clear understanding of how discourse and ideology are working together, I find it very important to ask: What real-world purposes can this analysis serve?

The chapters here that explore institutional practices in particular raise the question of what studies of discourse and ideology might be helpful for and who might benefit. Lázaro Gutiérrez and Tejero González offer a clear context in which the analysis of ideologies towards migrants could lead to useful knowledge about how the Spanish healthcare system is doing in terms of serving the public. For them, discourse is a site not only for identifying ideologies but also potentially for social change. While employee training might be a challenging context in which to radically reshape prejudicial ideologies and dispositions toward migrant patients, their findings invite consideration of what other sites might be well suited for discussions of these discourses. It seems likely that nursing and medical education would be likely suspects, in addition to workplace training for healthcare administrators. One can imagine a critical pedagogy of sorts in which the discourses from the online forums are used to invite discussion about the positioning of migrants in Spanish society and to develop a metadiscursive literacy about the discourses healthcare workers encounter in these contexts.

Lutman-White and Angouri's study on discourses of social workers offers another study with implications for professional practices and state policies regarding child protection and social work. Their analysis of discourses that favor child protection, and which seem to offer rationales for removing children from their families, reveal the power of the state institutions' increasingly austere levels of support for impoverished families. The result is that social workers' ways of talking about their work articulates a common sense in alignment with these forms of welfare. The question that arises here is, how might this be applied or put to use? Would the practice of social work involving children be informed for the better through some kind of metadiscursive awareness of these discourses/ideologies? Could metadiscourse about social work be a site for any level of professional transformation and change, even in a highly neoliberal state?

Another contribution that encourages consideration of the more applied role of discourse is Vernet's study on language ideologies in Acadia, which invites reflection on the apparent "linguistic schizophrenia" (Kachru 1977) in a university context where Acadian and Chiac are legitimized yet disallowed in the French-language institutional spaces of higher education, since mainstream/standardized French is preferred. It is possible to imagine events inviting public discussion of

these circumstances among academics and the community alike to see what a metadiscourse about this might lead to. While the prescribed linguistic norms may persist, it would be interesting to see how explicitly addressing these practices might open up spaces for further legitimating “vernacular” languages. The practice of requiring students from this region to take two French courses as part of their studies is reminiscent of a prior language policy at my workplace, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, where many local students speak Pidgin (Hawai‘i Creole). These students were required to take Speech courses from the 1930s through the 1970s in order to “correct” their Pidgin and replace it with English; if students failed to eradicate Pidgin from their spoken language, they were dismissed from the university (Tamura 1996). This policy ended when the ideologies of language rights and civil rights began circulating in Hawai‘i, alongside the Hawaiian Renaissance, a movement that strived to revitalize the Hawaiian language and cultural practices such as hula that were once banned by missionaries. Performative and discursive practices tied to ethnic identity, local pride, and sovereignty helped to displace deficit discourses tied to Pidgin speakers and to Pidgin, which in turn led to institutional change: the Speech courses were no longer a gatekeeping device for higher education. I am curious if events that encourage more honest and open discussion of language ideologies in Acadia might speed up the process of linguistic awareness and even lead to institutional change.

Other contexts in this edited volume have more applied implications for professional practices, particularly in professional work in language and linguistics. Miller’s chapter argues for scholars to make reflexivity an intrinsic part of their work in applied linguistics as they go about selecting and analyzing discourse data. In my view, this is especially important in the acts of socializing students into the field in our classrooms, at conferences, and in our textbooks. In addition, Mäntynen and Kalliokoski’s chapter draws attention to the ideological complexity underlying the difficult work of translation. Again, metadiscursive dialogues about this complexity are necessary, not only in the professional work of translation, but in all language-related work. In my own work on multilingual practices, for example, I have often struggled to effectively gloss transcripts to convey all of the meanings that are embedded. My choices for translation are always partial, and the limitations of publishing conventions often make detailed explanations about these choices difficult to manage. My graduate students also regularly experience this challenge when translating from languages like Korean, Japanese, and Mandarin into English, but we do not have any translation scholars to get guidance from for such projects on a regular basis. Accessible guidance on translation in discourse-related work that shows how to manage the ideological-discursive relationship would surely be very welcome among a wide audience of language scholars (cf. Blommaert 2006).

## 4 Situating discourse and ideology on a broader scale

In closing, I return to the issue of location and the relevance of considering how situated the knowledge on discourse and ideology has been for research and thinking in sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, applied linguistics, critical discourse studies, and other language-related fields. Across the chapters, it is striking, though not surprising, that nearly all of the scholars are located in resource-rich locations in North America or Europe, and that almost all of the contexts of study focus on populations and language practices in these same contexts. Guellouz's paper on discourse and performativity in Tunisia is the only exception here. In most scholarship around the world, of course, this over-representation of the global north is normative, as the majority of academic publications are produced by scholars in these contexts, in English. Nonetheless, this raises the question of reflexivity with regard to the geographic locations of scholars and their exposure to different lines of intellectual discourses, and the possibilities of additional or other approaches to the theorization and study of ideology and discourse. In other words, what is this volume missing in terms of more geographically diverse approaches to discourse and ideology? This is a promising direction for future work, not only to deepen academic discussions of these weighty topics through diversity, but also to gauge how situated and constrained our frameworks for knowing might be.

In Hawai'i, ideology and discourse from a Native Hawaiian perspective, for example, would necessarily engage with concepts, authors, and intellectual lineages that have very little crossover with the references and constructs in this volume. Instead, concepts such as *mo'okū'auhau* ('genealogy') and *mo'olelo* ('history/story') would likely be used to probe into Hawaiian worldviews, histories, and discursive struggles, and writings by seminal Hawaiian scholars such as David Malo (Malo 1903) and Native Hawaiian methodologies (Oliveira and Wright 2015) would frame the scholarship. In other contexts, insights into discourse and ideology as framed by Southern theory (Connell 2020; Santos 2014) invite us to acknowledge the limitations of current knowledge and to expand the canon by looking at discourse and ideology from different vantage points. It challenges the universalist relevance of particular social theories by critiquing the dominance of western thought in intellectual debates and scholarship. Southern theory pluralizes epistemological approaches by inviting more ways of knowing into intellectual spaces from previously underrepresented regions and intellectuals. The study of discourse and ideology can certainly be enriched – and ultimately, perhaps, even existentially challenged – by more ways of knowing from different corners of the world.

## References

- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination*. Michael Holquist (ed.), Carol Emerson & Michael Holquist (transl.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1984. *Rabelais and his world*. Hélène Iswolsky (transl.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2006. How legitimate is my voice? A rejoinder. *Target* 18 (1). 63–76.
- Clancy, Kathryn B. & Jenny L. Davis. 2019. Soylent is people, and WEIRD is white: Biological anthropology, whiteness, and the limits of the WEIRD. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 48 (1). 169–186.
- Connell, Raewyn. 2020. *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman, Giuseppina Cortese & Patrizia Ardizzone (eds.). 2007. *Discourse and contemporary social change*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Gee, James P. 2004. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1976. *New rules of sociological method*. London: Hutchinson.
- Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine & Ara Norenzayan. 2010. Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature* 466 (7302). 29–29.
- Jones, Rodney. 2012. *Discourse analysis*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1977. Linguistic schizophrenia and language census: A note on the Indian situation. *Linguistics* 186. 17–32.
- Killough, Ashley. 2021. Texas school administrator told teachers to include Holocaust books with ‘opposing’ views when explaining new state law. <https://www.cnn.com/2021/10/15/us/texas-schools-books-holocaust-state-law/index.html> (accessed 15 October 2021).
- Malo, David. 1903. *Hawaiian antiquities (Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i)*, Vol. 2. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company.
- Oliveria, Katrina-Ann R. K. N. & Erin K. Wright (eds.). 2015. *Kanaka ‘Ōiwi methodologies: Mo‘olelo and metaphor*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Paltridge, Brian. 2012. *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Svendsen, Bente A. 2018. The dynamics of citizen sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 22 (2). 137–160.
- Tamura, Eileen H. 1996. Power, status, and Hawai‘i Creole English: An example of linguistic intolerance in American history. *Pacific Historical Review* 65 (3). 431–454.