



Demographics, Religion: When religious identity shapes linguistic patterns

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Language and Linguistics Compass</i> |
| Manuscript ID: | Draft |
| Wiley - Manuscript type: | Article |
| Keywords: | Sociolinguistics, Discourse Analysis & Language Policy < Compass Section, Bilingualism < Sociolinguistics < - Subjects, Dialects < Sociolinguistics < - Subjects, Intercultural Communication < Sociolinguistics < - Subjects, Language Variation and Change < Sociolinguistics < - Subjects |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

To appear in
Yaeger-Dror and Cieri (eds) special double issue.
of Language and Linguistic Compass--Sociolinguistics.

Review

Religion as a sociolinguistic variable ¹

Abstract

When considering variables that are rarely coded for in sociolinguistic studies, we discovered that general demographic studies [e.g., the census, Pew Research studies] have only recently realized that the question sets provided for demographic information rarely permit coding of religion, or when they do, provide only coarse grained coding; yet recent studies in sociolinguistics and social anthropology have demonstrated that fine grained distinctions in religious identification are necessary to account for sociolinguistic variation. This paper reviews the information from both sociolinguistic studies and demographic studies which should be considered when developing a protocol for analysis of speech variation. The paper also points out that the variation is often due to network effects from the ‘community of practice’, but at least some of the variation can be traced to ideological positions or choice of referee, both of which appear to influence language use.

1. Introduction

A recent issue of *IJSL*, edited by Mukherjee (2013) explores the interaction between language use and religious choices. The introduction states that there are two ‘fundamental realities’ which tie language to religion:

- “It is through the various forms of language that the living vitality of a community’s religious beliefs is passed down from generation to generation.” (Mukherjee 2013: 1)
- Both language and religion are social constructs “conceived as ideologically saturated . . . as a world view, even as concrete opinion, insuring a minimum of mutual understanding in all spheres of ideological life.” (Bakhtin 1981: 271).

¹ Many thanks to the NSF for their support of the workshop (Grant #1144480), which provided the opportunity for sociolinguists to develop a more robust set of standards for metadata. This paper was written within a framework proposed by Christopher Cieri of the LDC. I would like to thank all those who have discussed the contents with me as the paper was being prepared: Bob Bayley, David Bowie, Christopher Cieri, Corky Feagin, Lauren Hall-Lew, Uri Horesh, Catherine Miller, Rich Steiner, Ben Tucker, Keith Walters and Michael Wreblowski... for their willingness to provide input from their own research which bears on the topic of this paper, as well as for many fruitful discussions of both theoretical and technical material discussed here. I would also like to thank the attendees at the LSA Satellite Workshop funded by the NSF which goaded me to expand on this theme. My thanks as well as to those who have put up with me as I took this side trip into research protocol and metadata for archival storage...

Those points being accepted, it seems appropriate to consider the extent to which religious affiliation influences linguistic choices. Moreover, over the last few years many studies have shown the extent to which speakers' linguistic choices are influenced by the social groups they belong to, with religious groups being one of the overlapping possible communities of practice. As a result, there are 5 main purposes for the present paper. We hope this paper will convince you that each of the following factors has an independent possible influence on language choices, and should therefore be considered as a possible source of variation in a linguistic study.

- a) Religion should be considered consistently, rather than subsumed as one aspect of 'ethnicity' which a researcher might presume can be ignored if it isn't obvious that it is relevant in a given instance. Even if redundant within a given study, and therefore not actually analyzed in a given study, the information should be retrievable.
- b) Multiple religious designations should be permitted for those whose parents are from two different religious groups, those whose significant-others belong to some 'other' group, and those who have changed affiliation during their lifetime
- b') Speakers should be allowed to designate for themselves which of a possible multiple set of designations they affiliate with most strongly – and which other groups they also affiliate with.
- c) The set of choices for 'religion' should be fine-grained
- d) A speaker's expressed degree of ideological commitment to a given sect should also been shown to influence linguistic choices.
- e) Who the interviewer is, where the interview is carried out, and how the questions are posed are all likely to influence the answers given to all demographic questions, and to questions of religious identity quite as much as other self-identifiers. Thus how to phrase the questions, and who should present them, should be determined in advance, and specified in the protocol to ensure the comparability of responses.

It is obvious from the preceding list that the options proposed for coding of 'religion' will be more extensive and detailed than many previous studies have assumed.

2. 'Ethnicity' and 'religion' are not synonymous, and 'religion' cannot be subsumed under 'ethnicity'

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

It appears that what has often in the past been labeled ‘ethnicity’ could be better regarded as at least three **independent variables** (Yaeger-Dror/Cieri 2014), which – at least initially – should all be considered separately:

- **Race²** – While this paper will be devoted to the Religious aspect of ‘ethnic’ identity, Racial Identity has to remain in the mix, as many previous studies have shown: Dubois and Horvath (1999), Fix (2014), Blake and Wong & Hall-Lew (in this issue), as well as Prewitt (2013a,b) reinforce the conclusions of such earlier studies.

In addition, we should not conflate:

- **Linguistic heritage** – as in the papers by Wong & Hall-Lew and Bayley in this issue.
- **Regional heritage** – as in the papers in this issue by Wong & Hall-Lew, Bayley and Blake, where studies have considered religion and regional heritage separately they have shown that each is independently variable. Of course, it is a mistake for researchers to assume a strong interdependence between religion and linguistic or regional heritage (e.g., Pandharipande 2006; Hary/Wein 2013: 87, Kulkarni-Joshi 2013, forthcoming).

- **Religious heritage and present religious adherence**

It is tempting to simplify the complexity of speakers’ identities (say, Lebanese and Christian or Jewish instead of Muslim, or Cantonese and Baptist instead of, say, Confucian or Buddhist) much less permit a nuanced sense of identity where parents’ heritage groups differ, or where the heritage group, and the present beliefs are no longer the same.

In addition, while racial heritage and regional heritage have been foci for sociolinguistic coding for many years until recently religion was [generally] ignored, or was conflated with other variables. For example, the Lower East Side study of NYC (Labov 1966/2006) was concerned with speakers who had come from various countries, and “Jews”, who were coded as a uniform group of speakers, although their parents may have come from several linguistic, regional, and doctrinal backgrounds. At the time, it was a great innovation to conceptualize religion as a potential sociolinguistic variable; inevitably, nowadays we find that the metadata for religion AND other factors previously treated as ethnicities need to be more nuanced.

² After duly considering more linguistically appropriate ‘titles’ for this variable, we found that since none of them was perfect, we would settle for mnemonics over accuracy; thus, the three ‘r’s..and an L..

1
2
3 Geertz (1973: 87-125) and Gumperz & Wilson (1971) were two of the early proponents of
4 coding for religious/cultural distinctions as well as for regional and linguistic distinctions. So
5 many studies have come out in the last 20 years to support this point that only the most
6 superficial review of their findings is possible here. However, the interested reader will find
7 ample evidence in the publications discussed in the following sections.
8
9
10
11

12 **3. Multiple Religious Identities (Affiliations)**

14 The main focus in this section will be on evidence of religious affiliation – specifically,
15 ambiguous or multiple affiliations within the US—but with evidence from linguistic studies
16 elsewhere which demonstrate the importance of such affiliation(s) to linguistic variation. Our
17 understanding of religion in the United States has changed over the last generation: Bengston, et
18 al (2013) document that only 43% of grandparents now share a religion with their grandchildren,
19 and that while there is a ‘rise of the nones’ [those who profess no religion] there is no sense of
20 community within that group. The Pew Foundation (2008) provided a careful study of religious
21 commitment in the US. They show that even members of minority racial or regional-heritage
22 communities cannot be assumed to share a single religious community affiliation. The Pew study
23 found that “more than one-quarter of American adults (28%) have left the faith in which they
24 were raised in favor of another religion - or no religion at all. If change in affiliation from one
25 type of Protestantism to another is included, 44% of adults have either switched religious
26 affiliation, moved from being unaffiliated with any religion to being affiliated with a particular
27 faith, or dropped any connection to a specific religious tradition altogether.” Moreover, “among
28 people who are married, nearly four-in-ten (37%) are married to a spouse with a different
29 religious affiliation. ...Hindus and Mormons are the most likely to be married to someone of the
30 same religion (90% and 83%, respectively).” Thus, in the US we must assume that interviewees
31 may be coded for multiple religions -- the one(s) they were raised in, as well as the one(s) they
32 profess at the time of recording. A single coding option is even less likely to be sufficient in
33 some other parts of the world: While it is well known that Japanese- Chinese- or Korean-
34 ancestry speakers have a greater tendency to religious syncretism (e.g., Goh 2009), as do many
35 Latin cultures (e.g., Marzal 1996; Hill 2001; Corr 2003; Uzendowski 2003; Capone 2010;
36 Koechert & Pfler 2013), the Pew study implies that such syncretism is increasing in the US,
37 making casual reliance on single coding for religion obsolete in the US as well. Not surprisingly,
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

syncretism and language or dialect code switching are likely to go hand in hand (e.g., Koechert & Pfler 2013).

A point made by Walters (p.c.) that bears repeating here is that the nature of religious identity varies from culture to culture: While it is now common for speakers to have multiple religious affiliations, in the Middle East or Africa, religion is a more salient variable both culturally and linguistically (Walters 2007; Germanos & Miller forthcoming). The extent to which this is also the case in Europe varies by country, is in flux in recent years, and is worthy of sociolinguistic (as well as anthropological) inquiry. Certainly Milroy's work (1980ff) demonstrates that language variation may follow sectarian lines. Vajita's work in Alsace (2013), Kulkarni-Joshi's in India (2013), and Kaiser's in the US (2013) have shown that religious identity may be independently correlated with language choice as well as language attitudes.

In order to permit results to be compared an accurate assessment of speakers' religious affiliation, it is clear that all interviewers should provide the same choices to be specified in the protocol.

We also draw the conclusion that given the independence of these different strands of family heritage and belief, the metadata for 'ethnicity' should permit independent analysis of all possible 'ethnic' factors—race, regional heritage, linguistic heritage, religious heritage. If one religious code suffices for a given speaker, that implies that s/he self-identifies as the same religion that both parents and spouse also identify with, and that s/he was raised in that faith; the coding system should permit, for that study, that extra variables can be supplied redundantly at a later time. The ideal study should allow for possible multiple religious affiliations for the subject, his/her parents and life partners: In this way, we may discover that the linguistic evidence reveals the importance of only one specific religious affiliation [say, the earliest], but it is more likely that just as individual histories differ, so do personal language choices.

In actuality, informally, we already permit redundancies which can be expanded on in later studies: To choose a very different feature: if the metadata permit the researcher to code for speakers' means of income, a study could subsequently interpolate a hypothetical linguistic marketplace rating (Sankoff & Laberge 1978), and perhaps educational level, for such a job; however, it is inevitable that such assumptions would prove wrong a certain percentage of the time.

1
2
3 Similarly, we are not necessarily advocating allocating separate coding slots for each of the
4 factors above in an initial study. If for example in a mythical version of LES described in
5 SSENYC, all of the "Italians" were children of immigrants and Catholic, and all of the "Jews"
6 were Russian immigrants, it would be reasonable to reduce the dimensionality of the coding to a
7 single ethnicity label for each so that "Italian" becomes an abbreviation for a string of features
8 unique to that group.³ However, somewhere in the protocol and discussion, the researcher
9 should always be clear enough so that future studies can make use of the data. For example, in
10 the early Montreal French Study (Sankoff & Sankoff 1973; Thibault & Vincent 1990), all the
11 Francophones sampled are local, L1 French-speaking Catholics, religion and heritage could later
12 be inserted to permit the corpus to be merged with a larger multi-group corpus which includes,
13 say, the local anglophone speakers. Subsequent studies, like those of Boberg (2005, 2011),
14 would then be able to share an enlarged database, which includes the earlier Montreal studies. To
15 choose another American example: Most studies of US Hispanic communities assume that all
16 speakers are Catholic, but recent studies like the Pew Research Center's (2014) or Münch's
17 (forthcoming) demonstrate that this is no longer the case. The problem is not only the range of
18 metadata initially encoded, but whether sufficient information is retrievable in a way that will
19 permit future research comparisons.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **4. The need for finer-grained coding for religion**

34
35 Even a coarse-grained religious model has been shown to be useful in sociolinguistic studies
36 which have coded for religion: e.g., Jewish, Christian and Muslim (Blanc 1964), Catholic and
37 Protestant (Milroy 1980), Christian and Muslim (Walters 2006, 2007), Jewish and Muslim
38 (Amara 2005; Chetrit 2007). Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo (1990) showed the extent to which church
39 affiliation in the Solomon Islands influences language choice, and showed that the importance of
40 religious choice is not only an effect of the audience design/ accommodation, but of strategic
41 power-related choices discussed by Bourdieu (1991).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Mukherjee (2013b) appears to emphasize cases where the lack of linguistic unity entails splitting
49 of a single religious identity into smaller linguistic units, with a given macro-religious identity
50 insufficient for maintaining a coherent sense of social identity.
51
52
53

54
55
56 ³ As a reviewer stated: "If a study insists on a single religious affiliation, it not only fails to store useful
57 metadata, but also fails to consider the same in the analysis which suffers as a result: ... Provided that the
58 fieldworker had confirmed the consistency of this relationship, why not indicate that in the metadata?"
59
60

1
2
3 A Pew study (2008) of religious affiliation in the US supports his claim. “Even smaller religions
4 in the U.S. reflect considerable internal diversity. For instance, most Jews identify with one of
5 three major groups: Reform, Conservative or Orthodox Judaism; but in a more recent study (Pew
6 2013), they found that three choices were insufficient. Similarly, more than half of Buddhists
7 belong to one of three major groups within Buddhism: Zen, Theravada or Tibetan Buddhism.⁴
8 US Muslims affiliate primarily with one of two major groups: Sunni and Shia. If we notice the
9 wide variation in dress codes in some of these communities, it becomes obvious that even in the
10 US finer-grained distinctions will be needed for these ‘minority’ religious communities as well
11 as for, say, Christians.

12 Notice also that Pew’s ‘major groups’ are not intended to be exhaustive, but indicative of the fact
13 that the coarse-grained set of choices generally incorporated into the metadata (such as Jewish,
14 Christian, Muslim) is unlikely to be ideal, even within the US, and even within one urban area.⁵
15 As a consequence, we may assume that when speakers choose a macro-level religion, the online
16 questionnaire [or the interviewer] could offer more fine-grained options. The survey
17 demonstrates as well that interviewees from [say] Latino families, cannot be assumed to conform
18 to their heritage religion, with only 55% of Latinos now considering themselves Catholic (Pew
19 2014); there is a reasonable likelihood that even populations that have been traditionally assumed
20 to share a single religious community affiliation can no longer be assumed to do so (Pew 2008),
21 and it may well be that a community of practice for the newly religious is as tight knit as more
22 long term multiplex communities.

23 Even finer distinctions have been found to be critical for an understanding of language choice
24 among Hindus (Kulkarni-Joshi 2013, forthcoming), Muslims (Mukherjee 2013; Joseph 2004;
25 Alam & Stuart-Smith 2013; Eakin & Roth 2013), Jews (Levon 2006, Benor 2010), as well as
26 Christians (Baker and Bowie 2009, Childs and Mallinson 2007, Milroy 1980).

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 ⁴ Note that “more than half” is far from an exhaustive list of choices for even those who self identify as
53 Buddhist in the US.

54 ⁵ Hary and Wein (2013:fn 11), provides an interesting folk-framework showing that coarse grained
55 frames are not limited to the Western world: “The dichotomy, in Kerala is not necessarily between the
56 various religious communities, but rather between /ambalakkar/ ‘those who go to temples’ [various sects
57 of Hindus, Buddhists, Jains-my] and /pallikkar/ ‘those who go to prayer-shrines’ [Jews, Muslims,
58 Christians-my]”.

To further complicate the picture: several recent studies have emphasized the importance of degree of affiliation within a religion and the resultant splintering of a single religious group into finer-grained communal affiliation, and will be discussed in the next section.

Conversely, the work of Wagner (2012, 2014) reveals the extent to which even in a single South Philadelphia parochial [Catholic] girl's high school cohort, the girls' use of English demonstrates the extent to which language is used to distinguish their self-defined Irish or Italian regional heritage, despite the fact that none of the girls is first generation, and that many of them actually share both Irish and Italian ancestry; she found that the girls' accent varied relative to the regional identity of the grandparent they choose to affiliate with during their high school years (Wagner 2014), rather than their religious affiliation, which is shared with (nearly) all their classmates.

Similarly, Weinreich (1980), Prince (1988), Fader (2007), and Zuckerman (2014), among many others, have demonstrated the extent to which Yiddish speakers from different religious sects, or from different locales, dress and speak quite differently. Blanc (1968) and Yaeger-Dror (1988, 1993), and Lefkowitz (2004) among others, have demonstrated that Israeli Jews from different regional communities have quite different phonologies as well.

In short, not only the religious distinctions themselves need to be fine-grained, but even in one fairly close-knit community, like the high school studied by Wagner, 'religion' cannot stand in for THE 'ethnic' variable, but must be supplemented by other heritage factors.

These studies demonstrate that a finer grained set of distinctions may be called for than has previously been the case when 'religion' is coded, and future research should permit a finer set of coding distinctions than has been available until now.

5. Not just religion but degree of ideological commitment to a given sect is often relevant to sociolinguistic variation, and should be considered separately.

A further complication arises in studies which have shown that religious ideology may have an independent influence on speech. That is, certain studies have shown that degree of 'orthodoxy' of speakers' affiliation with their religion also impacts on their use of language:

Childs/Mallinson (2007) found that the speech of two groups of African American women from a small community in Appalachia could be distinguished from each other by whether the women were religious or not, although they all attended the same church. Like Milroy (1980), they

1
2
3 presented this as a result of social network rather than of religious commitment or ideology,
4 although it was understood that it was the more religious women whose speech was most
5 strongly influenced by the dominant norm.
6
7

8
9 Baker & Bowie (2009, Bowie & Baker-Smemoe forthcoming) similarly demonstrate the extent
10 to which varying degrees of religious commitment are documentable from Utah Mormon
11 speakers' choice of specific sociophonetic variables.
12

13
14 Spolsky & Walters (1985) first noted the extent to which the phonology of Hebrew used for
15 liturgical purposes reflects a speaker's religious affiliation -- both the degree of religious
16 commitment, and the 'community of practice' within that religious community. Poll (1981),
17 Isaacs (1999), and Assouline (2010, refs) among others demonstrate the extent to which ultra
18 orthodox Jewish speakers of Yiddish vary their phonology of both Yiddish and Hebrew – not, as
19 in the study by Prince (1988), to demonstrate affiliation with their audience, but to demonstrate
20 their affiliation with a 'referee'⁶ community's degree of religious observance (Bell & Gibson
21 2011). Avineri's work documents that nonreligious users of Yiddish also adapt their dialect to
22 foreground their religious (dis)affiliation (ref).
23
24

25
26 Similarly, Levon (2006) showed sociophonetic variation reflects a speaker's degree of Jewish
27 religious commitment importance as well, ~~while Benor (2010, 2011, 2013)~~. Benor (2011, 2013)
28 finds that the Yiddish lexical infiltration of English used by 'newly' orthodox-affiliated Jewish
29 speakers is as indicative of their community affiliation as is their choice of attire, and differs
30 systematically from the use of Yiddish and Hebrew loans by those who have been religious all
31 their lives.
32
33

34
35 All these studies show that religion -- and even degree of religious affiliation, or length of
36 attachment to a specific religious community -- should be separately coded from linguistic, racial
37 and regional heritage.
38
39

40
41 In Israel, Sfardi speakers' retention of more *sprachbund* affiliated phonology (Blanc 1968;
42 Yaeger 1988)⁷ may be heard as evidence for a given socioeconomic class (Gafter forthcoming),
43
44

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁶ Here the focus is on Bell's (2001) contrast between adapting your speech to who you are speaking to, which he refers to as 'audience design', and adapting your speech to some role model, or shared understanding of a specific community's speech, which he refers to as 'referee design'.

⁷ That is, retention of features which are consistent with the phonology of the local region, as described in Chambers and Trudgill (1980): in this case, the Sfardi speakers are more likely to retain pharyngeal

1
2
3 but also of retention of their religious-identity, and commitment to a particular religious practices
4 and a specific degree of observance which differ consistently from that of the local dominant
5 norm (Blanc 1968; Smooha 1987; Ben-Rafael, pc; Ben-Rafael & Sharot 2008).
6
7

8
9 Johnson-Weiner (1998) found that sense of affiliation within the Anabaptist communities in the
10 US and Canada influences linguistic choices. Raith (1992) and Keiser (2012, this volume)
11 demonstrate the extent to which Mennonite speakers whose forebears came to the US from one
12 small area in Germany vary their use of language to demonstrate their degree of affiliation with
13 one or another degree of Mennonite orthodoxy. In their studies it is obvious that the linguistic
14 choices are not just referee designed, but are ideologically meaningful to the speakers; that is,
15 their religious philosophy helps formulate their decisions about the relatively humble religious
16 expression of linguistic ‘choices’.
17
18

19
20 Alam and Stuart-Smith (2013, in press) show that in the UK as well, Muslim Pakistani-Glasgow
21 girls who are more observant speak differently from their Muslim classmates; in this case, the
22 **less** religiously observant speakers’ English more closely reflects the dominant norm, while the
23 more observant speakers are more likely to display their affinity with the religious community by
24 singling out a specific nonlocal variant of a feature. In this case, we might infer that it is not
25 ideology but ‘referee design’ which causes the easily calibrated difference in the girls’ consonant
26 system. Samant (2010) found that in the US, just as in Glasgow, Muslim community members
27 who are more religious are less likely to adopt local sociophonetic features. Abu Alhidja (2013,
28 pc) showed the extent to which even the internet text choices made by Arabic speakers can
29 reflect their degree of religious commitment; she suggests that these choices are not merely
30 referee designed, but reflect ideological commitment.
31
32

33
34 In short, it appears that not only community of practice is relevant to the analysis of religion and
35 language choice, but consideration of the contrast between audience and referee design, and
36 some concomitant consideration of the community’s understanding of social characteristics
37 appropriate for a religious person, whether in Appalachia, in the Anabaptist community, or
38 elsewhere.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 consonants, and anterior. rhotic position, while Ashkenazi speakers are more likely to lose pharyngeal
57 consonants, and shift to a dorsal-rhotic position.
58
59
60

6. Practical questions: WHO asks a question, and the way you ask a question are likely to influence the answer you get.

Another issue is the importance of the question-situation to a speaker's choice of religious designation: When speakers have been asked their religion, it is likely that however coarse-grained the set of choices offered, speakers will generally provide an answer consistent with that degree of generality, and with their perception of the questioner's understanding of the speaker's religion(s).⁸ A protocol for inquiring about religion might therefore permit the interviewer (or the computer questionnaire) to prompt a participant by asking for a finer-grained coding option than the one initially provided; in fact, a neutral computer-survey questionnaire may ultimately permit a greater degree of detail than a non-ingroup interviewer.

As already hinted, the phrasing of the questions to speakers should be consistent across speakers, to maximize the likelihood that the answers will be comparable, and the question itself should be retained so future researchers know what has been coded: Are speakers being asked to say what their birth-family religion was, how they were raised [What religion were you raised as?], or how they self-identify today [Do you feel that you are a member of any religious community? what religion do you consider yourself as belonging to?] Somewhere in the protocol, and in the archival notes it should be made clear exactly what the questions were, and how they were administered, so future researchers know what has been coded, and how to replicate the situation if they choose.

Unfortunately, even the initial study organizers may forget how questions were posed, although we know that speakers' claimed identities are influenced by the questions posed. Thus a researcher is often permitted ONE 'factor group' slot, but the speaker may have as many as six relevant 'ethnic' identities, and his or her sense of (relative) affiliation with these groups may vary even within one interaction (Eckert 2012; Hall-Lew/Yaeger-Dror 2014).

Another practical issue not discussed in most of these studies, but relevant to all the metadata discussion in this issue, is...when do we want to present our questionnaire? Given that raising a specific issue can influence speech and perception, providing a questionnaire in the same session as the conversation to be taped increases the likelihood that linguistic features relevant to the

⁸ This is not only consistent with our understanding of the observer's paradox, but with the CA notion first encapsulated by Sacks' dictum 'don't tell people something they already know', and first discussed at length in Schegloff (1968).

1
2
3 questions raised will be somewhat more likely to occur. For that reason, it may be worthwhile to
4 provide a basic questionnaire on a separate occasion from the main interview itself, as is often
5 the rule at LDC. Conversely, the protocol may routinize the elicitation of varying attitudes by
6 juxtaposing speakers with both ingroup and outgroup interviewers, following in the footsteps of
7 Rickford and MacNair-Knox (1994), or the work of social psychologists (e.g., Giles 1977).

8 Protocol decisions as to whether to elicit specific intergroup attitudes or to neutralize them
9 should be consciously and consistently made before the study begins, and the information should
10 be recoverable both by the initial researcher, and by the archive system.

11 Conversely, just as other articles in this special issue have discussed the importance of the social
12 situation (Eckert, Rickford, Tagliamonte refs), this factor is also important in the discussion of
13 religious affiliation. Speakers are most likely to adapt the degree of linguistic affiliation to a
14 specific group to the social situation within which the conversation takes place. If speakers from
15 the same ingroup are the primary participants they are more likely to demonstrate their ingroup
16 bonafides than the same speakers interacting with outgroup members or with an outgroup
17 interviewer. They are more likely to demonstrate their ingroup bonafides in a setting where
18 religion is relevant, than in a setting where it is irrelevant.

19 **7. Other practical issues**

20 It may well be that in many communities in the US there is little variation caused by religious
21 community affiliation, while in others there is extreme variation which can be traced to religious
22 ingroup identification. We can refer to this as the Hinton and Pollock (1990) effect: The ‘myth’
23 of African American uniformity (Wolfram 2007; Blake, this issue) was only recognized after
24 research in the Midwest demonstrated that local African American speakers were rful: Had
25 Hinton and Pollock not coded for race, we would not know that race is not as uniformly relevant
26 to rhoticity as had been assumed by previous sociolinguistic analysts. However, there is no way
27 to know the importance of a given variable unless the variable has been coded for consistently
28 and accurately.

29 **8. Possible theoretical ‘fallout’ from more careful coding of religious community identity**

30 As discussed by Eckert (2008, 2012), we know that linguistic variation reflects - demonstrates
31 [or ‘indexes’] - speakers’ sense of multiple communal identities, or the relative strength of the
32 REGIONAL and RELIGIOUS (or other) identities for given speakers. We also know that even
33 within a single interaction one identity can be foregrounded at the expense of others: Becker
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (forthcoming) demonstrates the extent to which a NYC-bred, African American professional
4 woman favors sociophonetic variables related to one or another of these identities at different
5 points in a single interaction she had with a new resident in her neighborhood (Becker
6 LgComm); Podesva shows how California gay professionals favor features which reflect their
7 multiple identities in different social settings (Podesva 2011). Mukherjee notes in passing the
8 fact that while Pakistan was ‘created’ with the understanding that the religious identity of Indian
9 speakers was the most salient aspect of social identity, the 1971 fission of Pakistan provides
10 evidence of the countervailing importance of regional/linguistic identity as critical aspects of
11 speakers’ identity.
12

13
14 Eckert (2008, 2012) refers to this nuanced adaptation of features to even momentary situational
15 variables as ‘bricolage’, and the interaction among multiple ethnic identities provides a rich
16 environment for such manipulation of multiple identity markers (Hall-Lew & Yaeger-Dror 2014;
17 Becker 2014). We can presume not only that speakers vary their production of regionally and
18 other (religiously, socioeconomically, vocationally, or gender-related) indexical features, but that
19 the researcher should attempt to adequately code for features which could be relevant to a
20 speaker’s presentation of self, and insure that any information which is gathered should be
21 adequately preserved in the metadata. Documenting of situational features is discussed at greater
22 length in the articles by Eckert, Rickford and Tagliamonte in this volume.
23

24
25 And yet we should allow the data to dictate the extent to which linguistic choices are made from
26 ‘addressee design’ or other ‘audience design’ factors, whether the adoption of specific features
27 reflects a more targeted ‘referee design’ for the community, or whether they reflect strong
28 ideological commitment to a specific linguistic mode of expression:
29

30
31 Yaeger-Dror (1993, 1994) showed that Israeli singers’ use of (r) reflected not their religion,
32 which they shared with their entire audience, but with the regional heritage of their audience
33 which favored the song style of the segment: this in itself might not be surprising, given earlier
34 studies by Trudgill (1986) and Prince (1988), but reflects the fact that religion is only one of the
35 many identities of relevance to a speaker. On the other hand, Ben Rafael and Sharot (2008, pc)
36 find that it is the more religious members of the Sfardi community who are most likely to retain
37 alveolar /r/ in conversational situations: Like Alam and Stuart-Smith’s Pakistani girls, it does
38 not appear to be an ideological choice, but one which is dictated by ‘referee design’.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
Assouline's article demonstrates the extent to which even within an isolated cohesive religious community, and even in religious lectures, dialect features demonstrate that the lecturers retain an alternate linguistic identity based on having originally belonged to different regional Hassidic communities, despite the fact that (as Giles showed in several publications) speakers are much less likely to emphasize a regional/linguistic identity if they cannot go back to the region where the language or dialect is spoken.

14
15
16
17
18
19
Further study of accurately coded communities, will hopefully permit us to distinguish not just the importance of one or another demographic variable to individuals' sense of identity, but the purpose it serves within the community.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
As we have seen, older studies often equated religious and regional identity. Although that may well have been a viable decision at that time, recent studies have shown that it is no longer possible. Conversely, many of the papers cited here demonstrate the extent to which speakers' linguistic choices reflect not just their social network, 'community of practice' or 'audience', but also the relative strength of their ideological commitment to a specific 'referee' group, and are 'chosen' to reflect their ideological commitment to a specific set of religious (or nonreligious) ideals. These studies have shown that linguistic variation correlates with

32
33
the country of emigration

34
35
the L1 and dialect of the speaker (and speaker's forebears)

36
37
the region of origin

38
39
the religion of the speaker (and forebears)

40
41
the degree of commitment towards the religion

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
These facts suggest it's wisest to begin with the assumption of independence among all these factors, to consider all of these factors, unless /until they are proven redundant. Certainly, the evidence is now strong enough to suggest that whatever the motivation for the differentiation of dialect relative to a 'religion' factor, whenever possible we should try to consider both a speaker's religious community affiliation(s) and the speaker's [relative] commitment to a specific religious (or other) ideology.

52 53 References

54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Abd-el-Jawad, Hassan 2006. Why do minority languages persist? The case of Circassian in Jordan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9 (1). 51–74.

- 1
2
3
4 **Abu-Elhij'a, Dua'a** 2013. Variation in Representation of Arabic Consonants and Grammatical
5 Variables in Facebook. (M.A thesis, University of Haifa, 2011). Lap Lambert Academic
6 Publishing, Germany.
7
8
9 Abu-Haidar, Farida (1991) Christian Arabic of Baghdad. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
10
11 Al-Khatib, Mahmoud A. / Alzoubi, A. / Abdulaziz, A. 2009. The impact of sect-affiliation on
12 dialect and cultural maintenance among the Druze of Jordan: An exploratory study. *Glossa* 4.
13 186–219.
14
15
16 Al-Khatib, Mahmoud A. 2001. Language shift among the Armenians of Jordan. *The*
17 *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 152. 153–177.
18
19 Al-Khatib, M. and M. N. Al-Ali 2010. Language and Cultural Shift Among the Kurds of Jordan.
20 *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 23. 7–36. ([http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2010/Al-](http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2010/Al-Khatib_Al-Ali_netti.pdf)
21 [Khatib_Al-Ali_netti.pdf](http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2010/Al-Khatib_Al-Ali_netti.pdf))
22
23
24
25 Al-Wer, Enam / de Jong, Rudolf (eds.). 2009. [Arabic Dialectology: In Honour of Clive Holes on](#)
26 [the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday](#). Leiden: Brill.
27
28
29 Alam, Farhana / Stuart-Smith, Jane. 2013, in press. Identity, ethnicity, and fine phonetic detail:
30 an acoustic phonetic analysis of syllable-initial /t/ in Glaswegian girls of Pakistani heritage.
31 In Marianne Hundt and Devyani Sharma (eds), *English in the Indian Diaspora (Varieties of*
32 *English Around the World)*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
33
34
35
36 Amara, Muhammed 2005. Language, migration and urbanization: The case of Bethlehem.
37 *Linguistics* 43(5). 883–901.
38
39
40 Assouline, Dalit 2010. The emergence of two first person plural pronouns in Haredi Jerusalemite
41 Yiddish. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 22.1-22. [dalitassouline@gmail.com]
42
43
44 Assouline, Dalit forthcoming.
45
46 Ayalon, ? Eli Ben Rafael, S. Sharot 1986. The costs and benefits of ethnic identity. *BJS* 37. 550-
47 565.
48
49
50 Baker, W. / Bowie, D. 2009. Religious affiliation as a correlate of linguistic behavior. *PWPL* 15
51 (Article 2) URL: <repository.upenn.edu/pwpl>.
52
53
54 Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich & Michael Holquist (eds.). 1981. *The dialogic imagination: four*
55 *essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bayley, Robert (this issue) Demographic Categories in Sociolinguistic Studies of U.S. Latino
4 Communities.
5
6
7 Becker, Kara 2014. Linguistic repertoire and ethnic identity in New York City. *Language and*
8 *Communication* 35. 43-54.
9
10
11 Behnstedt, Peter 1989. Christlich-Aleppinische Texte. *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 20.
12 43–96.
13
14
15 Bell, Allan 2001. Back in style: reworking audience design. In Eckert/Rickford (eds) *Style and*
16 *Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp 139-169.
17
18
19 Bell, Allan & Andrew Gibson 2011. Staging language: An introduction to the sociolinguistics of
20 performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15. 555-572.
21
22
23 Ben Rafael, Eliezer / Sharot, S. 2008. [Ethnicity, Religion and Class in Israeli Society](#).
24 Cambridge: CUP.
25
26 Bengtson, V., Norrella Putney and Susan Harris 2013. *Families and Faith*. Oxford: Oxford
27 University Press.
28
29
30 Benmamoun, Elabbas, Mushira Eid & John McCarthy (eds.), 1998 *Perspectives on Arabic*
31 *Linguistics XI: Papers from the Eleventh Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics*.
32 Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
33
34
35 Benor, Sarah 2011. The Changing Role of Yiddish in the Linguistic Repertoire of American
36 Jews. Paper delivered at nwav40, Georgetown U, Oct, 2011.
37
38
39 Benor, Sarah Bunin. 2010. Ethnolinguistic repertoire: Shifting the analytic focus in language and
40 ethnicity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14. 159–183.
41
42
43 Benor, S. (ed.) 2011. *Jewish Languages in the Age of the Internet*. Special issue of *Language and*
44 *Communications* 31/2.
45
46
47 Blanc, Haim 1964. *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*. (Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs, X).
48 Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
49
50
51 Blanc, H. 1968. The Israeli koiné as an emergent national standard. *Language Problems of*
52 *Developing Nations*, ed. by Fishman, J., C. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta, 237-257. Wiley, NY.
53
54
55 Boberg, Charles. 2005. The Canadian Shift in Montreal. *Language Variation and Change* 17(2).
56 133-154.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Boberg, Charles 2011. Ethnic isolation as a factor in the diversity of Montreal English.
4 Presented at NWAV40, Georgetown University. October, 2011.
5
6
7 Bourhis, Richard Y., Geneviève Barrette, Shaha El-Geledi 2009. Acculturation orientations and
8 social relations between immigrant and host community members in California. *Journal of*
9 *Cross-Cultural Psychology* 40. 443-467.
10
11
12 Bowie, David 2012. Religion: Elicitation and metadata. In NSF sponsored workshop, Coding for
13 Sociolinguistic Archive Preparation. Portland, Oregon. **URL:**
14 http://projects ldc.upenn.edu/NSF_Coding_Workshop_LSA/Bowie.pdf
15
16
17 Bowie, David and Wendy Baker-Smemoe, forthcoming. Linguistic behavior and religious
18 activity. *Language and Communication*.
19
20
21 Burrige & Enninger (eds) 1992. *Diachronic Studies on the Languages of the Anabaptists*.
22 Bochum: Brockmeyer.
23
24
25 Capone, Stefania. 2010. *Searching for Africa in Brazil: Power and Tradition in Candomblé*.
26 Durham, Duke University Press.
27
28
29 Corr, Rachel. 2003. *The Catholic Church, Ritual and Power in Salasaca. Millennial Ecuador:*
30 *Critical Essays on Cultural Transformations and Social Dynamics*, ed. By Norman E.
31 Whitten, 102-128. Iowa City: Iowa University Press.
32
33
34 Chetrit, J., 2007. Diglossie, hybridation et diversité intra-linguistique: études socio-pragmatiques
35 sur les langues juives, le judéo-arabe et le judéo-berbère. Peeters, Louvain.
36
37
38 Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge
39 University Press.
40
41
42 Coupland, Nikolas. 2010. The authentic speaker and the speech community. *Language and*
43 *Identities*, ed by Carmen Llamas and Dominic Watt, 99–112. Edinburgh, U.K.: Edinburgh
44 University Press.
45
46
47 Diab, Rula 2009. Lebanese university students' perceptions of ethnic, national, and linguistic
48 identity and their preferences for foreign language learning in Lebanon. *The Linguistics*
49 *Journal*, Sept. 2009 Special Edition, 101-120.
50
51
52 Dubois, S. & B. Horvath (2000) When the music changes, you change too *LVC* 11. 287-313.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 [Eakin](#), Hugh and [Alisa Roth](#) 2013. [Syria's Refugees: The Catastrophe](#). New York Review of
5 Books, Oct 10. (URL: [http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/oct/10/syrias-refugees-](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/oct/10/syrias-refugees-catastrophe/)
6 [catastrophe/](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/oct/10/syrias-refugees-catastrophe/))
7
8
9 Eckert, Penelope. 2008. Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12. 453–
10 476.
11
12 Eckert, P. 2012. Three waves of variation study. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41. 87–100.
13
14 Fader, A. 2007. Reclaiming sacred sparks: linguistic syncretism and gendered language shift
15 among Hasidic Jews in New York. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17/1. 1–22.
16
17 Fishman, J. / García, O. (eds) 2012. *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford
18 University Press.
19
20 Fought, Carmen. 2006. *Language and Ethnicity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
21
22 Freeouf, Peter Frank. 1989. Religion and dialect: Catholic and Lutheran dialects in the German
23 of Dubois County, Indiana. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University doctoral dissertation.
24
25 Funderburg, Lise & Martin Schoeller (2013) The changing face of America. *National*
26 *Geographic* 83-119. (URL, downloaded 11/28,
27 <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2013/10/changing-faces/funderburg-text#>;
28 <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2013/10/changing-faces/schoeller-photography>)
29
30
31
32
33
34 Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures*. NYC: Basic Books.
35
36 Germanos, M-A / Miller, C. forthcoming. Is religious affiliation a key factor of language
37 variation in Arabic-speaking countries? *Language and Communication*.
38
39 Giles, H. 1977. (Ed.) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
40
41 Goh, Daniel. 2009. (ed) *Religious Syncretism and Everyday Religiosity in Asia*. Special issue of
42 *Asian Journal of Social Science* 37.
43
44
45
46 Gumperz, John and Robin Wilson. 1971. Convergence and Creolization: A Case from the Indo-
47 Aryan/Dravidian Border in India. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, ed by D.
48 Hymes, 153-169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
49
50
51
52 Habib, Ranya 2010a. Rural Migration and Language Variation in Hims, Syria. *SKY23*. 61-99.
53 (http://www.linguistics.fi/julkaisut/SKY2010/Habib_netti.pdf)
54
55
56 ____ 2010b. Towards determining social class in Arabic-speaking communities and implications
57 for linguistic variation. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 4(1). 175–200.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hachimi, Atiqa 2001. Shifting sands: Language and gender in Moroccan Arabic. *Gender across*
4 *Languages (IMPACT Studies in Language and Society 9, Volume I)*, ed. by Marlis Hellinger
5 & Hadumod Bussmann, 27–51. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
6
7
8
9 Hall-Lew, L. / Malcah Yaeger-Dror 2014. Introduction to the special issue on New Directions in
10 the Analysis of Ethnic Variation in Language. *Language and Communications* 35. 1-8.
11
12
13 Hartman-Keiser, S. 2012. *Pennsylvania German in the American Midwest*. PADS #96 Raleigh:
14 Duke University Press.
15
16 Hary, B and M. Wein. *Religiolinguistics IJSL* 220. 85-108.
17
18 Hill, Jane. 2001. Syncretism. *Key terms in language and culture*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti,
19 241–243. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
20
21
22 Hinton, Linette, and Karen Pollock. 2000. Regional variation in the phonological characteristics
23 of African American Vernacular English. *World Englishes* 19. 59-71.
24
25
26 Holes, Clive 1986. The social motivation for convergence in three Arabic dialects. *IJSL* 61:33-
27 51.
28
29
30 Isaacs, Miriam 1999. Yiddish and Hebrew in Haredi Israel. *IJSL* 138. 101-121
31
32 Jahangiri, N and R. Hudson 1982. Patterns of variation in Tehrani Persian. *Sociolinguistic*
33 *Variation in Speech Communities*, ed. by S. Romaine, 49-64. London: Blackwell.
34
35
36 Johnson-Weiner, Karen 1998. Community identity and language change in North American
37 Anabaptist communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2. 375-94.
38
39
40 Joseph, J. 2004. *Language and Identity*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. [in Lebanon]
41
42 Kaplan, K. and N. Stadler, eds (forthcoming) *Haredi Society: from survival to establishment*.
43 Van Leer: Jerusalem. [In Hebrew]
44
45
46 Kerswill, Paul. 2012. Language variation I – Social factors: class and ethnicity. *Language: a*
47 *Student Handbook on Key Topics and Theories*, ed. by Dan Clayton, 23-43. London: English
48 and Media Centre.
49
50
51 Kerswill, Paul. 2013, *fc*. Identity, ethnicity and place: the construction of youth language in
52 London Space in language and linguistics: geographical, interactional, and cognitive
53 perspectives (Series: *linguae & litterae*). ed. by Peter Auer, Martin Hilpert, Anja Stukenbrock
54 & Benedikt Szmrecsanyi. Berlin: de Gruyter.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Kerswill, P., E. Torgersen & S. Fox. 2008. Reversing ‘drift’: Innovation and diffusion in the London diphthong system. *LVC* 20. 451-91.
- Kerswill, Paul & Kevin Watson. 2013. *Phonological considerations in sociophonetics. Research Methods in Sociolinguistics*, ed by Janet Holmes & Kirk Hazen, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Koehert, Andreas and Barbara Pfeiler 2013. Maintenance of Kaqchikel ritual speech in the confraternities of San Juan Sacatepéquez, Guatemala. *IJSL* 220. 127-149.
- Kulkarni-Joshi, S. 2013. *Methodological Issues in Investigating Sociolinguistic Identity. Alternative Voices: (Re)searching Language, Culture and Identity* ed by Imtiaz Hasnain, Sangeeta Bagga-Gupta & Shailendra Mohan, 74-88.... Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Labov, William 1966/2006. *The Social Stratification of English in NYC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, Wm. 2001/2004. *Principles of Linguistic Change. Vols II-III*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lefkowitz, Daniel. 2004. *Words and Stones: Language and the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levon, E. 2006. Mosaic identity and style: Phonological variation among Reform American Jews *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10. 185-205.
- Lieberson, Stanley 1992. The enumeration of ethnic and racial groups in the census: Some devilish principles. *Challenges of measuring an ethnic world*, ed by J. Charest & R. Brown. US Govt Printing Office: Washington.
- Lieberson, Stanley 1993. The enumeration of ethnic and racial groups in the census. *Challenges of Measuring an Ethnic World*. US Govt & Statistics Canada. Pp.23-34.
- Mallinson & B. Childs 2007. *Communities of Practice in Sociolinguistic Description: Analyzing Language and Identity Practices among Black Women in Appalachia*. *Gender and Language* 1.
- Marzal, Manuel. 1996. *The Religion of the Andean Quechua in Southern Peru. The Indian Face of God in Latin America*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books.

- 1
2
3 Meechan, Marjory Ellen. 1999. The Mormon drawl: Religious ethnicity and phonological
4 variation in southern Alberta. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Ottawa,
5 Ottawa, Ontario.
6
7
8
9 Miller, Catherine, Enam Al-Wer, Dominique Caubet & Janet C.E. Watson (eds.) 2007 Arabic in
10 the City: Issues in Dialect Contact and Variation. London: Routledge.
11
12 Milroy, L. 1980. Language and Social Networks. Oxford: Blackwell.
13
14 Münch, Christian forthcoming. Language, Faith and Identity: Multilingual practices of Latino
15 immigrants in New York City Churches.
16
17
18 Mukherjee, Sipra (ed.) 2013a. Reading Language and Religion Together. IJSL 220.
19
20 Mukherjee, Sipra 2013b. Reading Language and Religion Together. Introduction IJSL 220. 1-6.
21
22 Pandharipande, R. 2006. Ideology, authority, and language choice: Language of religion in South
23 Asia. Explorations on the Sociology of Language and Religion, ed by Tope Omoniyi and
24 Joshua A. Fishman Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
25
26
27 Pew 2008. U.S. Religious Landscape Survey. Religious Affiliation: Diverse and Dynamic.
28 (URL: <http://religions.pewforum.org/pdf/report-religious-landscape-study-full.pdf>)
29
30
31 Pew 2011. Eliciting religious affiliation: [http://religions.pewforum.org/pdf/report-religious-](http://religions.pewforum.org/pdf/report-religious-landscape-study-full.pdf)
32 [landscape-study-full.pdf](http://religions.pewforum.org/pdf/report-religious-landscape-study-full.pdf) – cited in Bowie 2011. URL: <http://www.pewforum.org/>
33
34
35 Pew 2013. A portrait of Jewish Americans. (URL:
36 <http://www.pewforum.org/2013/10/01/jewish-american-beliefs-attitudes-culture-survey/>)
37
38
39 Pew 2014. Religious switching among Hispanics. [http://www.pewresearch.org/key-data-](http://www.pewresearch.org/key-data-points/u-s-catholics-key-data-from-pew-research/)
40 [points/u-s-catholics-key-data-from-pew-research/](http://www.pewresearch.org/key-data-points/u-s-catholics-key-data-from-pew-research/)
41
42
43 Podesva, R.J. 2011. Salience and the social meaning of declarative contours: Three case studies
44 of gay professionals. *Journal of English Linguistics* 39(3). 233–264.
45
46
47 Poll, S. 1981. The Role of Yiddish in American Ultra-Orthodox and Hassidic Communities.
48 Never Say Die!: A Thousand Years of Yiddish in Jewish Life and Letters, ed by Joshua Fishman,
49 197-218. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
50
51
52 Prince, E. 1988. Accommodation theory and dialect shift. *Language & Communication* 8. 307-
53 320.
54
55
56 Prewitt, Kenneth 2013a. Fix the Census' Archaic Racial Categories. *New York Times* op
57 ed(August 21, 2013)
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 _____ 2013b. What Is Your Race? The Census and Our Flawed Effort to Classify Americans.
4 Princeton University Press: Princeton
5
6
7 Raith, Joachim. 1992. Dialect Mixing and/or Code Convergence: Pennsylvania German?
8 Diachronic Studies on the Languages of the Anabaptists, ed. by Burrige & Enninger,
9 152-165. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
10
11
12 Rickford, John and Faye McNair-Knox. 1994. Addressee- and topic-influenced style shift: A
13 quantitative sociolinguistic study. Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register, ed by
14 Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan, 235-276. New York: Oxford University Press.
15
16
17 Rosen, Nicole & Crystal Skriver, forthcoming. Linguistic patterning of Latter-Day Saints in
18 Southern Alberta, Canada. Language and Communications.
19
20
21 Samant, Sai. 2010. Arab Americans and sound change in southeastern Michigan. English Today
22 26. 27–33.
23
24
25 Sankoff, D. and Gillian Sankoff 1973. Sample survey methods and computer-assisted analysis in
26 the study of grammatical variation. Canadian Languages in their Social Context, ed. by
27 Regna Darnell, 7-64. Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research.
28
29
30 Sankoff, D. and S. Laberge. 1978. The linguistic market and the statistical explanation of
31 variability. Linguistic Variation: Models & Methods, ed. by D. Sankoff, 239-250. NY:
32 Academic Press.
33
34
35 Sawyer, John F. A. & J. M. Y. Simpson (eds.). 2001. Concise encyclopedia of language and
36 religion. Amsterdam, New York: Elsevier.
37
38
39 Sharma, Devyani 2011. Style repertoire and social change in British Asian English Journal of
40 Sociolinguistics 15. 464–492
41
42
43 Schegloff, E. 1972. Formulating place. Studies in Social Interaction, ed. by D. N. Sudnow, 75-
44 119. New York: MacMillan.
45
46
47 Smooha, Sammy 1987. Jewish and Arab ethnocentrism in Israel. Ethnic and Racial Studies 10.
48 1-26.
49
50
51 Spolsky, B. & Walters, J. 1985. Jewish styles of worship: A conversational analysis.
52 International Journal of the Sociology of Language 56. 51-65.
53
54
55 Thibault, Pierrette / Vincent, Diane 1990. Un Corpus de Français Parlé. Montreal: Recherches
56 Sociolinguistiques, 1.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Trudgill, P. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 5
6 Uzendoski, Michael. 2003. Purgatory, Protestantism, and Peonage: Napo Runa Evangelicals and
7 the Domestication of the Masculine Will. *Millennial Ecuador: Critical Essays on Cultural*
8 *Transformations and Social Dynamics*, ed. by Norman E. Whitten, 129-153. Iowa City: Iowa
9 University Press.
- 10
11
12 Vajta, K. 2013. Linguistic, religious and national loyalties in Alsace. *IJSL* 220. 109-125.
- 13
14 Verkuyten, Maykel / Thijs, Jochem. 2010. Ethnic Minority Labeling, Multiculturalism, and the
15 Attitude of Majority Group Members. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 29. 467–
16 477.
- 17
18
19 Wagner, Suzanne 2013. We act like girls and we don't act like men: Ethnicity and local language
20 change in a Philadelphia high school. *Language in Society* 42(4).
- 21
22
23 Wagner, Suzanne Evans 2012. Real-time evidence for age-grad(ing) in late adolescence. *LVC*
24 24.179-202.
- 25
26
27 Wagner, Suzanne 2014. Linguistic correlates of Irish-American and Italian-American ethnicity in
28 high school and beyond. *Language and Communication* 35. 75-87.
- 29
30
31 Walters, K. 2006. Communal dialects. In *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*,
32 Leiden: Brill. Vol. I, pp. 442-448.
- 33
34
35 Walters, K. 2007. Attitudes. In....
- 36
37
38 Walters, K. 2011. Education for Jewish girls in 19th- and early 20th-century Tunis and the
39 spread of French in Tunisia. In Emily Gottreich and Daniel Schroeter (Eds.), *Jewish culture*
40 *and society in North Africa* (pp. 257-281). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- 41
42
43 Watson-Gegeo, Karen & David W. Gegeo 1990. Social identity, church affiliation and language
44 change in kwara'ae. *Papers in Pragmatics* 4. 150-182.
- 45
46
47 Wein, Martin J. 2009. *Chosen Peoples, Holy Tongues: religion, language, nationalism and*
48 *politics in Bohemia and Moravia in the seventeenth to twentieth Centuries*. *Past and Present*
49 202. 37–81.
- 50
51
52 Weinreich, Max 1980. *A History of the Yiddish Language*. Chicago: UChicago Press.
- 53
54
55 Yaeger-Dror 1988. The influence of changing group vitality on convergence toward a dominant
56 linguistic norm. *Language & Communication* 8. 285-305.
- 57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Yaeger-Dror, M. (ed) forthcoming. Religious choice, religious commitment, and linguistic
4 variation. Focus issue of Language and Communication.
5

6
7 Yaeger-Dror, M. and Christopher Cieri 2013. Prolegomenon for Analysis of Dialect Coding
8 Conventions for Data Sharing. Methods in Proceedings of Methods in Dialectology XIV.
9 Papers from the Fourteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, 2011, ed.
10 by A. Barysevich, A. D’Arcy, and D. Heap, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
11
12

13
14 Zuckermann, Ghil’ad (ed) 2014. Special issue: Jewish Language Contact. International Journal
15 of the Sociology of Language. Issue 226.
16
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review