DISSERTATIONES SOCIOLOGICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

5

KADRI KOREINIK

Language ideologies in the contemporary Estonian public discourse: With a focus on South Estonian

Institute of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Tartu, Estonia

This dissertation has been accepted for the commencement of the degree Doctor of Philosophy (in Sociology) on 19.05.2011, by the Doctoral Committee of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Education, University of Tartu.

Supervisor: Veronika Kalmus, Professor
                University of Tartu

Opponent: Nico Carpentier, PhD
                Senior lecturer, Loughborough University
                Hoofddocent, Vrije Universiteit, Brussels

Commencement: 29.08.2011

The publication of this dissertation is granted by the University of Tartu.

CONTENTS

2

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This dissertation draws upon original research publications, which are listed in chronological order and are referred to inside the text in Roman numerals.

I   Koreinik, Kadri. (2011). Language ideologies and identity-building in the public discourse of South Estonian. Riho Grünthal & Magdolna Kovács (eds.). *Ethnic and Linguistic Context of Identity: Finno-Ugric Minorities. Uralica Helsingiensia* 5. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 247–266.

II Koreinik, Kadri. (2011). Agency Lost in the Discourse of Language Endangerment: Nominalization in Discourse about South Estonian. *Estonian Papers in Applied Linguistics* 7, 77–94.

III Koreinik, Kadri. (2011). Public discourse of (de)legitimation: the case of South Estonian language. *Journal of Baltic Studies* 42 (2), 239–261.

The articles are (re)produced with kind permission from the respective publishers, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (**I**), Eesti Rakenduslingvistika Ühing (**II**), and Taylor and Francis (**III**).

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Studies I–III The research papers are objects of single authorship, where the author is solely responsible for defining the research problems, conducting research, interpreting results and drawing conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to all the researchers whose interest lies in the field of language and discourse studies, an interdisciplinary world where different approaches meet and build on each other, a recent development and an uneasy endeavour which brings together linguists and social scientists and all researchers who are eager to study and explain an exciting (human) phenomenon – language. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Veronika Kalmus, my classmate in sociology, who began supporting me in the middle of my doctoral studies, to Professor Karl Pajusalu, who has believed in me for many years and, finally, to Dr. Kara D. Brown, a friend and a champion of language education policy studies on another continent, whose constructive questions have guided me throughout my thinking and writing. Furthermore, I am much obliged to conversations with Dr. Evar Saar, a researcher of topo-onomastics, for his insightful ideas on socio-historically situated language, to Dr. Sulev Iva for his passionate views on language maintenance, and to other colleagues from the Võru Institute, the Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, and the Institute of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Tartu, who tolerated my long quest. I am also grateful to my colleagues at ELDIA[1], a multidisciplinary research project which brings together linguists, law researchers and social scientists from eight European universities, and where Fenno-Ugric speech communities are internationally given the greatest academic consideration. Finally, I owe a lot to my two daughters, my son and my husband, who have had to share my attention with the doctoral project over these many years.

---

[1] For more details see http://www.eldia-project.org/.

INTRODUCTION

Language is exciting to study: people produce and reproduce language to make meanings of the outside world. While its meanings and descriptions come from the human mind and can be true or not, the world where languages exist and are produced cannot be both true and not true (Rorty 1999 [1989]). Thus, "one of the major sources and objects of power and inequality is symbolic and revolves around the use and abuse of language and discourse" (Blommaert 2001: 13). Nevertheless, language – "a species-unique format for cognitive representation" (Tomasello 2003: 13) – is used to describe the world and, paradoxically, (a) language(s) in it. This dissertation deals with how languages and linguistic practices are discursively positioned to understand language change within the Estonian linguistic market.

Given the impact linguistic and critical turns have had on human and social sciences (Rorty 1999 [1989]), Fairclough 1989), especially on language studies, any representation of language is considered to be an ideological enterprise. For example, in English, and likely in most other languages, "language" has several meanings. Language can be seen as a human representation system, an abstract external identity, a set of actual or potential sentences, the possession of a community or an individual, the knowledge in the mind of an individual, and a form of action (for an outline review, see Cook 2010). Although, the essence of language does not depend on how it is conceptualised, the practice of language does. Therefore, language change at the societal level can also be explained by ideas about language. To put it briefly, people are unequally positioned within social contexts, having different levels of power over and access to meaning-making (Martin & Rose 2003). As a result, languages are hierarchically situated in the world: prestige and power are diversely allocated among coexisting speech varieties (from vehicular to vernacular, from standardised to non-standardised languages) in multilingual contexts (Dorian 2002).

Since the nineteenth century, the accommodation of linguistic diversity has been problematic in the Western world due to modernisation, growing economic and social integration, and the introduction of mass media and the welfare state (Dunbar 2010). Nevertheless, despite some homogenisation of linguistic practices, here and there considerable linguistic diversity has been maintained.

In Estonia, as in other post-colonial settings, linguistic diversity has been affected by changing language hierarchies. The past vehicular languages German and Russian, as well as Estonian vernaculars, have given up their positions to global English and standard Estonian, respectively (cf. **Study III**). Two major language communities, Estonian- and Russian-speakers, are, according to popular belief, considered to be linguistically homogeneous. However, South Estonian neighbourhoods contain residual spaces where the techniques of nationhood, such as linguistic uniformity, are either weak or contested (Appadurai 2005 [1996]: 190). South Estonian (SE) varieties, which, according to

dialectology, have been linguistically and geographically the most distant from standard Estonian, have withstood the homogenising effects of standardisation, migration and the mainstream media best, but have faced a rapid language shift to standard Estonian (see **Studies I** and **III**). This ongoing language change may have been facilitated by dominant language ideologies which position SE varieties (and likely all other non-standard and unprivileged varieties or languages) as being less important than standard Estonian. Beyond the empowerment of the hierarchical view of languages, the meanings that are made and mediated for (a) language, and how it is experienced and represented build "shared bodies of common-sense notions about the nature of language in the world" (Rumsey 1990: 346). Indeed, those shared representations can reveal how language is experienced, and this in turn may explain some future language change (**Study II**). Language ideologies should not be dismissed as ignorant and prejudiced nonsense; there are complex and non-arbitrary links between beliefs about language and other beliefs (Cameron 2006). Therefore, both public and academic discourses merit examination.

Beyond academic circles, power and language have been central issues for collective action since the last quarter of the 20th century (Meluzzi 1996). Similarly, South Estonian (language) activists have begun negotiating dominant (linguistic) representations (Kansui 1999, Jääts 2000, Brown 2006) which seem to be more politically consequential than (scientific) facts about the language (Cameron 2006). Those rather conservative heritage movements, full of hope for pluralisation, but also for a utopian restoration of the pre-Soviet occupation lifestyle[2], emerged in the late 1980s with the fading Soviet regime. Since the restoration of Estonian independence, activists have received some institutional support for language maintenance. For example, a state research and development institute to promote SE varieties was founded in 1995 (**Study III**) and a local newspaper in 2000. Still, some activists believe that SE varieties cannot survive without legal recognition. While they may have had the desire for legalisation for years, activity started only in the mid-2000s, when the first proposals were made to the draft of the Language Act, and a second time at the end of the decade, when the Act was re-drafted. Meanwhile, pro and contra arguments regarding legal recognition, as well as other concerns, e.g. language change and loss, and national security, have been expressed in Estonian print media. Public discourse on SE varieties has focused on two major topics: (de)legitimation and language endangerment (of both Estonian and SE); moreover, it is linked to other discourses of power and resistance, and it exemplifies the ideology of standard variety. This discourse, however marginal it may seem, especially when compared to Estonian-Russian majority-minority discourses in Estonia, clearly reveals hegemonic language ideologies in Estonia. Thus, it provides a rare opportunity to study language ideology in a situation where domi-

---

2   From a conversation with Dr. Evar Saar, who has studied vernacular use in local media and observed the efforts of language activists.

nant linguistic representations are being challenged by some activists of numerically small communities of practice, i.e. Võru-speakers and Setos[3]. Both communities, while othered, avoid being labelled as minority groups[4]. Moreover, this illustrates

> the fact that certain discourse forms only become visible and accessible at particular times and under particular conditions is in itself an important phenomenon, which tells us a lot about our societies and ourselves, and which necessarily situates particular discourses in the wider sociopolitical environment in which they occur (Blommaert 2001: 28).

The focus of this doctoral thesis is on linguistic representations and language ideologies which exist in the Estonian society in the early years of the third millennium. First, I aim to outline language ideologies – shared ideas which lead to the construction of the idea that some languages and linguistic practices are of greater worth than others and to a positioning of them hierarchically – as discursively (re)produced in Estonia. Then, I will describe how dominant representations are challenged, and finally I will interpret language ideologies within the discursive context and speculate a bit on the consequences that such a challenge might have for both the South Estonian speech communities and other Estonian speakers. I have concentrated on media discourse and left semi-public and private discourses for future study. Public written discourse is where the discourses of resourceful social institutions, including academic discourses, government and education (Martin & Rose 2003) meet in interdiscursivity, i.e. by linking between different discursive formations, types or practices[5]. This should be stated clearly: discursive practice is just another social practice in which language ideologies are (re)produced (van Dijk 1998).

The theoretical, social and discursive context of research is introduced in the first chapter. Firstly, key concepts – language and power, ideology and legitimation – are presented and discussed. Secondly, previous research on language ideologies is outlined. Then, an overview of different aspects of the Estonian context – research on nation- and standard-building, collective action and other academic discourses – is presented. Other linguistic exchanges in the Estonian linguistic marketplace are addressed only briefly, and the main focus is on SE

---

[3] Instead of the standard Estonian exonym *setu(d),* the endonym *seto(d),* "Setos", and the autoglossonym *seto kiil,* "Seto language", are used.

[4] At this point, it is appropriate to recall that "…minorities and majorities are recent historical inventions, essentially tied up with ideas about nation, populations, representation and enumeration which are no more than a few centuries old. They are also today *universal* ideas, since the techniques of counting, classification, and political participation that underlie the ideas of majority and minority are everywhere associated with the modern nation-state" (Appadurai 2006: 49-50).

[5] Fairclough (1992) also differentiates between manifest (e.g. negation, presupposition and irony) and constitutive (e.g. discursive links within a text and between genres) interdiscursivity.

issues. Therefore, a short note on SE media is also included. After the contextualisation of the focus of this dissertation, research questions are presented.

The second chapter explores methodological choices, in particular Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and the context for the selection of a data corpus. Corpus-building plays a decisive role in the study of media discourse in majority-minority settings. Therefore, although discourse on the topic of SE has been rather marginal within the Estonian discursive space, I have outlined the principles of selection of media channels and texts.

Empirically, the dissertation draws on three research papers. In the first paper (**Study I**), I present and elaborate on discursively represented language ideologies which have been employed in identity construction or membership-building by both observers and speakers of SE. Languages, identities and memberships are understood as discursively (re)produced. In studying referential and other discursive strategies employed in identity-building efforts, I offer further explanations and interpretations of language ideologies.

Study II focuses on agency in the discourse of language endangerment. Study II primarily refers to the public discourse of (de)legitimation, including the competing claims on South Estonian in 2004–2005. CDA has been used in the analysis of representation of agency (cf. van Leeuwen 1995, 1996). Nominalisations employed in the discourse of language endangerment reproduce the code image of language, the representation of language without speakers.

Study III concentrates on conflicting language ideologies embedded in argumentation, which both support the (de)legitimation of SE and reveal linguistic representations generally accepted in Estonia.

The main results, drawn from the studies (**Study I–III**) listed above, are highlighted in the third chapter, and are interpreted and discussed in the fourth. The dissertation ends with a short chapter of conclusions, where the main results are presented.

1. THEORETICAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS

1.1. Language and power

Many critical accounts of language, including discourse studies, depart from Gramscian "historicist" linguistics. According to Gramsci (1971:451), without "a critical and historicist conception of language", academic and social practices can lead to erroneous results. He adapts Pareto's (1963) metaphoricality of language by placing the meanings of language in the past[6], where the meanings cannot by removed (cf. Salamini 1981). Nevertheless, Gramsci (1971:452) recognises some transformation and dialectics:

> Language is transformed with the transformation of the whole civilization, through the acquisition of culture by new classes and through the hegemony exercised by one national language over others, etc., and what it does is precisely to absorb in metaphorical form the words of previous civilizations and cultures.

Language is a social (i.e. collective) and political phenomenon, which helps to build some social unity. This unity is often in the interests of hegemonic classes and, "every time the question of language surfaces in one way or another", there is a reorganisation of cultural hegemony in the process (Gramsci 1985: 183–4). Hegemony is Gramsci's central concept in understanding "the very unity existing in a concrete social formation" (Laclau & Mouffe 1985:7). Moreover, he acknowledges the political nature of standard-building when differentiating grammars: immanent (spontaneous) and normative grammar; the latter, being political, facilitates homogenisation, but "always presupposes a 'choice', a cultural orientation, and is therefore always an act of national-cultural politics" (Gramsci 1985: 182).

For Foucault, unlike Gramsci, power is not only negative, repressive and juridical, but also positive, productive and technical (Foucault 1980: 119–121). The state is not the sole source of power; it can operate only on the basis of existing power relations, and transforming power relations means re-codifying them (ibid.). Furthermore, Foucault holds that truth, being a set of rules for splitting the true and the false, cannot exist outside power. Every society has its regime of truth, i.e. modes of discourses which are acknowledged and serve as truth. Truth is centred within a scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it; its production is controlled by some political and economic apparatuses, such as universities and media (ibid.).

---

[6] The metaphoricality of language is most explicitly revealed in Pareto's (1963) theory of residues, e.g. group persistence and derivations, such as verbal proofs. While residues are the observable (constant) manifestations of human sentiments and instincts, derivations are transformable, "the intellectual systems of justification with which individuals camouflage their passions or give an appearance of rationality to propositions or acts which have none" (Aron 1967: 101).

Foucault does not provide a clear definition of discourse. The definition is far from the common use and can be written as follows: discourses are not entities of sequences of signs; discourses are practices which result from the regularities of a particular discursive formation and "form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault 1972: 49). Nevertheless, Foucault's anti-structuralist focus is not on the model of language and signs, but on the relations of power (cf. Foucault 1980). Foucaultian method is genealogy, which is

> "a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects etc., without having to make reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history" (Foucault 1980: 117).

The most central critique of social scientists' apolitical treatment of language comes from Bourdieu. For Bourdieu (1991), language, which is infinitely generative and originative and can thus bring into existence collectively recognised representations, is a tool of power. Thus linguistic exchanges are "also relations of symbolic power in which the power relations between speakers or their respective groups are actualized" (ibid. p. 37). Power, in this case, relies on symbolic capital, which may be of whatever quality – physical, economic, cultural or social – that is recognisable by social agents and that is now mostly objectified, codified, delegated, warranted and bureaucratised by the state (Bourdieu 2003). The holder of the monopoly of legitimate symbolic violence most often possesses the power over the instituted taxonomies or categories. Such agents may range from ordinary individuals to authorised professionals, as political not linguistic capacities of (legitimate) meaning-making are unequally distributed among individuals of different age, gender, ethnicity, and class (Martin & Rose 2003), as is access to media (Blommaert 2005). Furthermore, the production of objectified representations, including legislative taxonomies, is a field of cultural or ideological production, where agents, including social scientists, struggle over classification (Bourdieu 1991). In the linguistic market, there is not an exchange between languages but between discourses of production and reception. Bourdieu supports Foucault in acknowledging the role of academics in the (re)production of discourses.

Along with the above-mentioned theorists, there are other (deconstructionist) thinkers who have influenced discourse studies and who have applied the concept of power, which deals with its symbolic aspects and the ideological control of suppressed groups. Discourse studies vary in their methodological consummation (e.g. Laclau & Mouffe 1985), but many authors focus on the analysis of the role of ideology in the discursive reproduction of power and domination, as well as legitimation, which is the key ideological function of discourse (van Dijk 1998).

4

1.2. Ideology and its legitimating function

There have been limitations in the application of the concept of ideology to empirical research. Past academic discourse has contributed greatly to the common negative understanding of ideology, to its mostly erroneous, biased, deceptive and hidden ways, sometimes referred to as false consciousness[7], and its otherness. Otherness is exemplified by Foucault (1980: 118), for whom ideology "always stands in virtual opposition to something else which is supposed to count as truth" and the main problem lies in "how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false".

There have been a number of attempts at, and calls for, a more neutral approach, a "non-evaluative conception of ideology" (e.g. Mannheim 1953; Geertz 1973). For example, Geertz looks at ideology as a cultural system and argues for the sociology of meaning, i.e. the study of symbolic action, socially determined vehicles of conception. Nevertheless, he believes in the social function of science as understanding and criticising ideologies.

Although more positive, and thus broader, concepts of ideology were introduced later in the twentieth century, the conceptual vagueness of ideology has remained another major obstacle in its empirical analysis (van Dijk 1998). Van Dijk (ibid.) formulates a framework of a multidisciplinary theory of ideology, which includes the components of ideology, and its links to other social representations, values, social structures and groups (and their interests). He also tries to explain how it is acquired, used and changed, and how it is reproduced and expressed. Van Dijk, with his ideological preferences lying in the triangle of cognition, society and discourse, breaks out of the disciplines of philosophy, sociology and political science, which have been dominant in the study of ideology so far. Besides dominant groups ideology is a key analytical level in the understanding of (new) social movements. Ideology has two essential functions for collective action: an integrative and a strategic function. The former articulates its interests and demands and reformulates its values and norms, whereas the latter is mostly about legitimation and the enforcement of interests, and is used to seek inside and outside consensus (Meluzzi 1996).

Legitimation is also a form of collective action which seeks to justify itself (van Dijk 1998). The concept of legitimation departs from Weber's thinking (2002 [1904, 1921–22]), according to which, beyond pure material, affective or value-rational foundations, every act of domination seeks to induce and maintain a belief in legitimacy. Today, the most widespread form of legitimacy is the belief in legality. However, the legitimacy of domination can be understood as a possibility as long as it is considered and treated as such. In general, Weber (2002 [1904, 1921–22]) holds that domination plays a far greater role in influencing social relations and cultural phenomena than is apparent *prima*

---

[7] First mentioned by Engels in his letter to Franz Mehring (cf. Marx & Engels 1977), this concept is generally attributed to Marxian thought.

facie. For example, the domination which takes place in a school shapes an orthodox form of speech and writing (ibid. 90). In the Habermasian discursive model of public space, unconstrained dialogue is the central premise of democratic legitimacy. While unconstrained dialogue requires a reasoning public, Habermas (2001: 235) admits that the audience has split into a minority of specialists, reasoning in the non-public sphere, and the majority of consumers, receiving in the public sphere. In the context of this study of the (de)legitimation of non-standard language, it is also worth considering that, for Habermas, the legitimacy of tradition in modernity rests on the meanings of the present, not the ways of the past (cf. Benhabib 1993).

While language and discourse have obviously become central in the study of ideology, two broad traditions can be distinguished in the research on ideology and practice (Philips 1992). Most authors discussed above (e.g. Foucault 1980 and Bourdieu 1991), and numerous others (e.g. Fowler et al 1979[8], Kress & Hodge 1979 and Bakhtin 1981) are a part of the tradition in which ideology is conceptualised as rooted in practice and discourse. In another tradition, which will be presented in the next chapter, ideology is separated from behaviour, but their connection is considered important. Both traditions have offered some of the greatest scholarly attention to the power issues embedded in language.

The second tradition can mostly be found in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, where the language ideological debates lie (e.g. Blommaert 1999). (Early) sociolinguists, influenced by Wittgenstein's (2005) [1967] philosophy and interested in "language in use", challenged Chomskyan linguistics, which concentrated on idealised speakers (Wodak et al. 2011). Instead, the founders of sociolinguistics were concerned with diglossia (Ferguson 1959), societal bilingualism and minorities, i.e. language sociological issues (e.g. Fishman 1991), language variation and change (e.g. Labov 2001), and the ethnography of speaking (Hymes 1962), as well as the question of whose meanings are legitimated in the context of socialisation (Bernstein 1971)[9]. Bernstein's work has also inspired the theory of critical linguistics and social semiotics (Ivinson 2011).

---

[8] For example, Fowler & Kress (1979:186) argue for critical linguistics: "if linguistic meaning is inseparable from ideology, and both depend on social structure, then linguistic analysis ought to be a powerful tool for the study of ideological processes which mediate relationships of power and control".

[9] A few of Ferguson's (1959), Fishman's (1991), and Labov's (2001) concepts and ideas are also used in the present thesis. The first author is referred to later in this article and the latter two in Study III.

1.3. Research on language ideologies

Language ideologies as a field of research has its roots in North American linguistic anthropology (Johnson & Milani 2009; e.g. Silverstein 1979, Woolard 1992, Woolard & Schieffelin 1994 and Kroskrity 2000). Linguistic anthropologists have attempted, above all, to explore what consequences the ideologies of linguistic differentiation have for language change (Irvine & Gal 2000). Furthermore they have sought to understand how different actions are authorised on the basis of linguistic difference. In general, for anthropologists, both speakers and scholars of speech bear responsibility for the ignoring of linguistic variation and "guided by simplifying language ideologies, speakers construct languages more often by reifying their linguistic homogeneity than by confronting their internal variation" (Kroskrity 2000: 24).

Another promising focus on language ideologies is to look more closely at "*social mechanisms* through which particular ideas or beliefs about linguistic practices are produced, circulated and/or challenged through meaning-making activities under particular conditions" (Johnson & Milani 2009: 4). While not fully discarding cognitive models, this approach builds extensively on how language ideologies are mediated (Milani & Johnson 2008, Moschonas & Spitzmüller 2009), how languages are situated via media discourse (Blackledge 2005). Although messages are not equated with power, this approach analyses various voices and contexts of media discourse (Johnson & Milani 2009). For example, not long ago, only expert, privileged or hegemonic voices were mediated; today, new media have also opened up discursive spaces to less privileged and more dominated voices in late-modern societies (ibid.). Although languages are equally capable of meaning-making, but unequally socially ranked, there are no unconstrained spaces or dialogues for claiming legitimacy in language issues (ibid., cf. Habermas 2001). Nevertheless, in spite of different emphases, both approaches aim to reveal

> how linguistic phenomena are invested with meanings and values through the production, reproduction and/or contestation of conventional indexical ties between (i) perceived or presumed features, genres, styles or varieties of language and (ii) broader cultural representations of their purported speakers in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, aesthetics, morality (Johnson & Milani 2009: 4; cf. Irvine & Gal 2000 and Gal 2006).

In recent years, several claims have been made for launching language studies. For example, Reagan (2004: 56) supports Fairclough's critical language awareness that uses constructivist epistemology to reject the positivist objectification of language. Moreover, in such rethinking, languages and metalanguages are treated as invented and "these inventions have had very real and material effects, determining how languages have been understood, how language policies have been constructed, how education has been pursued, how people have come to identify with particular linguistic labels" (Makoni &

Pennycook 2005:140). In this enterprise, the potential of incorporating linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics and other fields into CDA seems promising (Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000). Beyond discursive studies, social theorists have even been invited to reconsider social action as textually negotiated meaning (Martin & Rose 2003). The concept of language ideology involves an inter-disciplinary promise: "ideologies of language are significant for social as well as linguistic analysis because they are not only about language" (Woolard & Schieffelin 1994: 55).

In this dissertation, different bits of knowledge are synthesised. My study is informed by theories which link power and discourse, seeking the empirical manifestations of power and resistance in public discourse. Therefore, from linguistic anthropology, I have borrowed the overall interest in language ideology as producing language change; my research methodology is informed by CDA and critical linguistics. Furthermore, discourse studies are of fundamental importance here, as the spoken and written word is not just the spoken and written word but also a form of social practice, action or behaviour which occurs among the common phenomena investigated by social scientists.

In the next chapter, I provide a description of social and discursive contexts for Estonian nation- and standard-building, considering that "languages and nations as being co-constructed dialectically are imagined into being dialecti-cally" (Makoni & Pennycook 2005: 140), and for SE language activism as a sort of resistance.

1.4. Estonian contexts

1.4.1. Research on nation- and standard-building

In this chapter different accounts of nation- and standard-building[10] are pre-sented. First, two major Estonian authors of 19th century nationalism are revisited. Then, studies of contemporary nation-building, especially those pointing out its discursive aspects, are outlined. While many Estonian scholars of nationalism depart from the work of their foreign counterparts, these coun-terparts are given attention when their views help to clarify interdiscursivity and thus contribute to the debate. Finally, the development of standard Estonian is focused upon.

In his reassessment of earlier periods of Estonian nationalism in the light of new writings, Raun (2003) finds Hobsbawm's (1990)[11] and Gellner's (1996)[12]

---

[10] In constructing national identity, nation-building is "the process whereby inhabitants of a state's territory come to be loyal citizens of that state" (Bloom 1990: 55). Similarly, standard-building is conceptualised as the process whereby speakers of speech varieties accept the single standard language.

[11] After attributing to Germans the role of setting up the Baltic nation-states, Hobsbawm (1990:165, 170) characterises the nationalist movements of the late twentieth century as negative and divisive, rejecting modern modes of political organisation as reactions of

claims of Estonian nationalism being created without national demand or out of nothing to be inaccurate. Instead, he argues that the most salient aspects of Estonian national identity were linguistic, cultural and mythic, "whereas history, religion and the state were much less significant" (Raun 2003: 140). Among other, but less important, components and factors, he lists Estonians' traditional social homogeneity, which encouraged the myth of consanguinity, the failure of cultural Russification, the stimulating effect of the Baltic German opposition on Estonian cultural nationalism and the role of the voluntary association movement, which requires further investigation. He regards the romanticist Jakob Hurt as "the most systematic ideologist of Estonian nationalism in the 1860s and the 1870s", and believes that Hurt was "setting the tone on this issue for later ideologists, who continued to emphasize the cultural component in ensuing decades" (ibid. 137–140). Despite the fact that Hurt came from southern Estonia, he fully accepted a single Estonian standard. Raun (2003) draws on Henricus de Lettis in stating that dialectal fragmentation did not hinder *Estones* in communication with each other.

Another prominent scholar of Estonian nation-building, Jansen (2004, 2007), in her attempt to examine both the contacts and differences between Estonians and Baltic Germans, positions the cultures of Estonians, Baltic Germans and Russians in a zero-sum game, in a zone of convergence. While Baltic German mentality, backwardness of estate society, and emerging public spheres deepened the differences, Russian, while culturally threatening, was often seen as beneficial for social advancement in the 1880s. In this context, Jansen also points to the mother tongue as one of the main factors in shaping the Estonian ethnic body. Moreover, Estonian ethno-linguistic communion was boosted by the romantic cult of Estonian, which was initiated at the turn of the 19th century by Estophiles – people of non-Estonian decent, above all Baltic Germans, who were compassionate to Estonia and its culture – and flourished beginning in the mid-1800s in written Estonian and public speeches (Jansen 2007: 456).

Piirimäe (2009) has outlined the state-of-the-art studies of nineteenth century Estonian nationalism, with their philosophical, ideological, symbolic, social and political aspects. After analysing the works of all the leading researchers, with a few exceptions, of Estonian nationalism, she points out a number of promising topics and research programmes. For example, further research could apply the methods of context and discourse analysis to the study of ideological aspects of nationalism or "specify the different reactions of different social groups to this policy and the government's attempts to legitimise it" (Piirimäe 2009: 189).

Although the study of nationalism and nation-building has been somewhat fragmented, there are a number of authors who have called attention to dis-

---

weakness and fear. For him, Estonia is an example of "small linguistic communities vulnerable to quite modest demographic changes".

[12] When Gellner (1996) argues for a modernist explanation of nations, he gives the example of the Estonians at the beginning of the 19th century, who were merely a category without ethnic consciousness or an ethnonym.

cursive aspects of ethno-political issues or nation-building (e.g. Ruutsoo 2002, Kalmus 2002, 2003, Kõuts & Tammpuu 2002, Pettai 2004, 2010, Petersoo & Tamm 2008 and Pääbo 2011).

Ruutsoo's (2002) interests lie in understanding the main discursive conflicts of Estonian post-imperial nation-building. While the comparative legal-normative and political approaches which he observes are deficient, they dominated the previous research on Estonian nation-building. There is, however, a need to study legitimate utterances, interpretations of practices, what is articulated and what is left out. The debate on nation-building has been framed by the ideologies of liberalism and republicanism, which were embedded in the diverging discourses of the civil society and nation-state.

The latest critical account of nation-building is found in Pääbo (2011). He focuses on the comparison of a reproduced and mediated top-down (hegemonic?) collective memory of the political elite and its master narratives of history within post-imperial space, where he analysed Estonian history textbooks, along with textbooks in Georgian, Russian and Ukrainian. The Estonian narrative of origin is built on Estonians' immobility of settlement and the emerging but failed statehood before the 13th-century colonisation, which leads to the projection of Estonian continuity back into times immemorial. Pääbo also outlines the main elements of Estonians' identity: 1) the Estonian language, whose key role, but also its endangerment is narrated, 2) education, including Estonians' high level of literacy, 3) Estonians' traditional culture and rural lifestyle, 4) Estonians as a secular, maritime, peaceful and democratic nation, 5) the homogeneity of Estonians, and 6) the chronotope of Estonia, which overlaps with its territory on the border of Western culture (ibid.). The character of the Estonian narrative towards Russia and Russians has explicit and implicit exclusive elements. For example, former historical accounts of Slavic influences on the Estonian culture are discursively challenged. Four outlined schematic narrative templates[13] employ glorifying elements in describing the gaining of national independence and victimising ones in describing the losing of independence (for narrative organisation, see Wertsch 2008). As for significant others, the Russian negative image is mainly constructed via security threats, threats to the culture and the language, repression, exploitation and political antagonisms.

In contrast to historians and political scientists, the linguists Raag (1999, 2010) and Laanekask (2004) have shed more light on the politics of language, its ideological and discursive aspects. In the examination of standard-building, Raag (1999) refers to Saareste (2006) [1952] when emphasising multiple and clear linguistic differences between North and South Estonian. The two written languages were developed within the Lutheran doctrine of disseminating the Scriptures to people in the vernacular, while "the seventeenth-century publi-

---

[13] "Period of Light vs. Period of Darkness", „Persistent Move towards Independence", "Interregnum as Historical Moment for Independence", and "Heroic Survival" (Pääbo 2011).

cations in South Estonian on the whole seem to be closer to vernacular usage than North Estonian printed matter" (Raag 1999: 22). In the making of a standard variety, he points to competitive northern and southern clerics, who aimed at the publication of a complete translation of the Bible, and other oppositions when it came to the unification of the written languages at the beginning of the 1800s and later, when language innovations were introduced. As a result of the wish of intellectuals to lessen regional variation and to agree on common standards and establish linguistic conferences in 1908–1911, a normative standard Estonian dictionary was published at the time of the establishment of Estonian statehood, in 1918. A couple of decades later, the Soviet occupation in 1944 affected both the status- and corpus-planning of Estonian. Post-war corpus-planning focused largely on aligning the norms of correct and common language usage. Raag (1999: 34–35) concludes:

> in spite of the existence of certain prescriptive attitudes and the implicit pressure toward uniformity in language usage exerted by grammars, vocabularies, and prestigious books such as the Bible, people of earlier times obviously felt quite free to write very much as they wanted, largely without any pronounced concern about consistency or being stigmatized because of it.

In his recent paper, Raag (2010) addresses Võru regionalism as a reaction to centralism and Estonian linguistic authoritarianism. Since 1905, when Modern Standard Estonian emerged, authoritarian tendencies, he argues, have been manifested. He compares the inter-war attitudes of two influential reformers of the Estonian language, Johannes Aavik and Johannes Voldemar Veski, and their not so widely known contemporaries, who opposed deliberate intervention into the evolution of Estonian. He lists seven publications of dictionaries of correct usage of Estonian since 1918 and the emergence of a new language professional, the linguistic "pre-corrector", and describes the examples of stigmatisation (of South Estonian users) and "treatment of dialectical errors" as indicators of linguistic authoritarianism (Raag 2010: 137). The post-Soviet Estonian regionalist aspirations are described as linguistic[14] and cultural but not restorationist. Raag (2010: 150) arrives at the recognition that "regionalism helps to neutralize the authoritarian tradition in Estonian language planning and promotes the peaceful coexistence of local language and the standard language".

Laanekask (2004) concentrates on a range of extralinguistic phenomena in the development of the Estonian literary language. She assigns importance in the recession of the South Estonian literary language to a negative cost-benefit ratio due to a smaller readership, the smallness and one-sidedness of the corpus, limited codification, the societal need for a unitary means of communication in

---

[14] Raag (2010) also provides an overview of the standardisation of the Võru dialect, its graphisation, codification and implementation.

the context of modernization, a winning nationalist ideology and the development of a new ethnic identity, whose main pillar was the single standard, and other subjective factors. Nevertheless, even in the changed circumstances at the beginning of the twentieth century, the literary standard, she admits, remained too diverse, which was caused by the two existing codified languages, the growing number of literati with a vernacular background, South Estonian features blended into the common language and political dissensions among language planners (Laanekask 2004: 410).

Finally, some ideological aspects of language planning have been discussed by Hennoste (1999, 2003). It should be mentioned that his former overview of language developments in Estonia has caused heated discussions (which merit a future critical analysis) among linguists. According to Hennoste (2003), the abrogation of the hierarchy of normative language, and its dialects and other marginal variants in post-colonialist thinking are underpinned by an understanding that all language use is the use of sub-languages and all sub-languages are marginal vis-à-vis an illusory standard.

In conclusion, researchers of Estonian nationalism and nation-building, in contrast to scholars of standard-building, often ignore the heterogeneity within "natural discontinuities", i.e. distinct (national) languages, and misjudge the consensual making of standard Estonian. Such ignorance and misjudgement certainly does not lessen "the significance of a non-issue" (Blommaert & Verschueren 1992: 357)[15]. The study of the latter on the level of linguistic representations also provides a chance to revise everyday Estonian nation-building, which is intimately linked to its standard-building.

1.4.2. Other academic discourses on South Estonian and its varieties: studies of language variation

The study of language variation, as opposed to some historicist accounts of nationalism and related language planning of linguistic homogeneity, is literally the study of heterogeneity, but dialectologists, in contrast to sociolinguists, usually do not touch upon social matters, e.g. the unequal distribution of power and prestige. While language planners and other linguists claimed the superiority of standard Estonian over other varieties during the Soviet period, dialectologists kept investigating linguistic variation (cf. Raag 2010).

South Estonian varieties have offered a rich resource for dialectological investigation for some 150 years (Wiedemann 2002 [1864], Saareste 2006 [1952], and Pajusalu 1996). There has also been a decade of sociolinguistic research on South Estonian (Org et al. 1994, Pajusalu et al. 1999 and Mets

---

[15] Joseph (2004: 124) finds similar problems in Anderson's (1991) [1983] work, where his "constructionist approach to nationalism is purchased at the price of an essentialist outlook on languages. It seems a bargain to the sociologist or political scientist, to whom it brings explanatory simplicity not to mention ease".

2010). Traditional dialectology describes linguistic variation, the distribution of linguistic forms in a geographical space; sociolinguistics analyses variation and language use, along with social aspects. Perceptual dialectology, in turn, integrates socio- and geo-linguistic analyses and maps the perceptual differences and similarities of speech (Preston 1989). All of these research traditions deal with the drawing of boundaries: the first applies the concept of the isogloss, the second focuses on how language varies socially and the third on how linguistic variation is perceived by speech communities. Language borders drawn by observers or speakers never match (Iannàccaro & Dell'Aquila 2001), and language naming practices are never neutral; both are motivated by, or contribute to, group representation (Léglise & Migge 2006).

Early dialectological treatments of the Balto-Finnic languages do not mention South Estonian or its varieties as (a) discrete language(s) (Pajusalu 1996). The notion of Võru Estonian (German: *werroestnische*) was introduced by Wiedemann (2002 [1864]). He holds that the Võru dialect should be considered from the distinct position of the Tallinn dialect. Moreover, according to Wiedemann, inhabitants of south-eastern Estonia are bi-dialectual from early childhood and regard the Tallinn dialect as a comprehensible foreign language. Hurt's (1886) treatment of Tartu, Võru, and Mulgi as three distinct South Estonian dialects is shared by most modern Estonian dialectologists (see Pajusalu 2003). Setu was first considered a discrete South Estonian variety by Finnish linguists (Kettunen 1917, and Ojansuu 1919, as referred to in Koreinik & Pajusalu 2007). When discussing historical linguistic branching in the 20th century, a number of linguists state that modern South Estonian developed from either an ancient South Estonian tribal language or a language contact North Estonian had with neighbouring languages or tribes (Kettunen 1940, Saareste 1952, Sammallahti 1977, Viitso 1985, and Kallio 2007, as referred to in Iva 2007). Although, North and South Estonian share many proto-Ugric features, linguistic differences from the standard built on North Estonian are often stressed (e.g. Saareste (2006) [1952]; Pajusalu 2003). Although, there has been no special research on intelligibility, the South Estonian variety of Võru is seen as unintelligible to most Estonian speakers (Ehala 2007).

Parbus (1966) pioneered the view of the usage of South Estonian varieties as an example of diglossia[16]. Today, however, instead of being described by diglossic arrangements, the use of South Estonian varieties has been characterised as bilingualism[17] (Mets 2010). However, there are a number of phe-

---

[16] Diglossia is "the quintessential example of linguistic variation where linguistic realization as opposed to linguistic acquisition – (…), the use of H [the variety of high prestige] or L [the variety of low prestige] – is a function solely of social context, and not of the social identity of the speaker. In diglossia, it is context, not class, or other group membership, that controls use" (Hudson 2002: 6). Charles A. Ferguson's (1959) original contribution drew on four prototypical cases (Arabic, Greek, Haitian and Swiss German).

[17] While individual bilingualism is individual linguistic versatility (Hudson 2002), "societal bilingualism refers to the functional distribution of languages or language varieties across a

nomena indicating a language shift: large in-group differences in the language use of younger speakers (Org et al. 1994), and its usage by "only adults beyond child-bearing age" (Fishman 1991, as quoted in Ehala 2006). The South Estonian variety of Võru is often described as a peripheral (Ehala 2004), less valued (Ehala & Niglas 2007), and less prestigious language in Estonian society (Koreinik 2007). The recent sociolinguistic analysis of social networks has suggested that dialectal fragmentation converges in a levelled and simplified language use, but two varieties – Võru and Estonian – are still differentiated based on conversational situation (cf. code-switching) (Mets 2010).

As for linguistic differentiation within south-eastern Estonia, Koreinik & Pajusalu (2007) have mapped language-naming practices in south-eastern Estonia, where there are no visible alternatives for *võru kiil* "the Võru language" as a "language or dialect different from the standard Estonian spoken in one's neighbourhood", with its expansion into the neighbouring South Estonian (SE) speech communities. Still, multiple peripheral naming practices occur and some perceived borders between speech communities appear. The limited use of the neologism *võro-seto kiil*, introduced by language professionals, may also indicate some resistance to the standardisation of SE and the strength of the linguistic identity of respective speech communities.

1.4.3. Research on language and ethnic activism within the discourses of collective action

In this chapter, I have extensively drawn on Melucci's (1996) constructivist approach to collective action, and his analysis of new social movements within the context of the information society (see also Polletta & Jasper 2001). The discourses of multiculturalism, in which I also include those of multilingualism, enjoy growing scholarly and public interest because they are about how society is constructed and shaped by information (Meluzzi 1996). Those discourses "are never only academic, but increasingly political" and multiculturalism "can constitute a goal and a political objective for highly innovative cultural movements, but also, equally likely, a banner for a new rhetoric open to manipulation" (ibid. 160–161).

When the 1980s and the 1990s witnessed the revival of ethnic and cultural conflicts activated by the collapse of the Soviet empire, the objectives for an ethnic movement were the same as elsewhere: to protect its culture or to re-establish its vitality (Meluzzi 1996). The defence of linguistic diversity has often been one of the main arguments in language preservationist discourses (Muehlmann 2008). The new rights to be achieved were both "to be different" and "to control a specific life-space" (Meluzzi 1996: 156).

---

given population, usually along ethnic lines and often reflecting past migrations" (Wodak et al. (2011:6). The bilingualism which Mets (2010) is talking about is the bilingualism of communities of practice and it does not refer to the whole south-eastern Estonian population.

A similar agenda was in place in the collective action of South Estonian intellectuals. Both the Seto Movement and the Võru Movement date back to the national awakening and the accompanying preservationist heritage movement of the late 1980s (cf. Kansui 1999, Jääts 2000). Since then, Setos have been involved in the demarcation of their territory and identity more actively than ever before. The Estonian-Russian border debate seems to have strengthened the identity of the Setos (Jääts 2000 and Saar 2003). Setos are also seen "as ethnographic raw material that both Estonian and Russian nationalists have attempted to claim" (Jääts 2000: 651). The Seto movement had two differently prioritized political aims: the restoration of the integrity of the Setos' habitat within the Republic of Estonia and the maintenance of their culture (Eichenbaum 1998). Furthermore, Jääts (2000) has isolated some radical thinking in the Seto movement. Apart from considering Setos a separate ethnos, radicals hold the view that Seto is a separate language. Likewise, the intellectuals of the Võru Movement adhere to diverging views: a radical one, claiming that the Võru-speakers are a distinct Fenno-Ugric ethnic minority, and a moderate one, supporting ideas of a Võru regional language and a Võru sub-ethnicity (Kansui 1999). The activists have, inspired by post-colonialist thought (cf. Hennoste 2003) and backed by the academic discourse of linguistics, advanced the idea of South Estonian as a discrete Finnic language (Ehala 2007).

Meluzzi (1996) differentiates three types of ethno-nationalist struggles: an interstate conflict, the regulation of mutual relationships within ethnic pluralism, and groups claiming autonomy from a rather homogeneous national state. The case of the Setos can be placed in the latter category, but with some reservations. The idea of cultural autonomy has been discussed from time to time, but apart from the Estonian-Russian border issue (Saar 2003), which can be defined as a territorial conflict (Jääts 2000), control over the geographical area has not been seriously demanded. Rather, Seto activists' interest seems to lie in the cultural rebirth of Setos, and language preservationist ideas have not been the most central part of their agenda. Võru regionalism has discursively positioned itself within the cultural enrichment paradigm (cf. Brown 2006, **Study III**). Despite a few individual activists having voiced rather radical ideas, both movements generally expressed "the need for independent identification outside the control and standardization of the dominant culture" (Meluzzi 1996: 155). Moreover, activists, in their effort to maintain their traditional identity, culture and language, may contribute to new hegemonic practices and essentialising definitions (cf. Annist 2009, 2010). For example, Annist (2009), drawing on Appadurai (2005) [1996])[18] points out that the establishment of Seto

---

[18] In his major work, Appadurai (2005 [1996]: 3–4) explores the effect of electronic mediation and mass migration on the work of imagination: "neither images nor viewers fit into circuits or audiences that are easily bound within local, national, or regional spaces". Imagination, one of his central concepts, has become another everyday (social) practice. It can bring about agency: "imagination is today a staging ground for action, and not only for escape" (ibid. 7).

cultural hegemony by institutionalised project-based funding is another example of "locality building", which also has colonising effects. State funding favours elites at the regional, national and international levels, and this excludes alternative and hybrid versions of local culture. At the same time, ethnic groups are engaged in the imaginative construction and mobilisation of differences; they resist the efforts of nation-states to place their ethnic diversities into fixed and closed sets of cultural categories (Appadurai 2005 [1996]).

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

To conclude, most existing academic accounts either seem to consider the issue of SE unimportant, and thus academically unappealing to analyse, or do not address symbolic aspects of power in the linguistic market. Indeed, SE varieties are spoken on the Estonian periphery; their academic treatment is also peripheral. Most attention is given to SE varieties within the framework of sociolinguistic and language policy and planning. However, both research on historical nationalism and contemporary nation-building would benefit from a critical study of allegedly consensual standard-building.

1.4.4. A short note on SE in minority and majority media

The newspaper *"Tarto maa rahwa Näddali-Leht",* published in 1806, is an eminent example of the past of Estonian journalism and, in terms of the legitimation of South Estonian, demonstrates the consistency of its literary standard. Today, after two centuries, there are plenty of media (platforms) available for those South Estonian speakers who choose to follow minority media. Until the mid-1990s, the South Estonian variety of Võru was used in all journalistic genres (Saar 2005). Since 2000, a Võru-language newspaper, "Uma Leht" ("[Our] Own Paper"), has been published every other week, with a circulation of 10,000 copies, as well as being available online. It is read either regularly or occasionally by three-fourths of the adult residents of the language area (Saar Poll 2005). As a result of the state's cultural policy, the newspaper is supported by public funding and distributed by direct mail to promote the language. With this newspaper being an entirely Võru-language channel, other (local) print media have almost stopped using Võru (Saar 2005). Naturally, there are exceptions: for example, sporadic texts in Võru have been published by the well-known (South Estonian) non-conformist columnist and writer Jaan Kaplinski, in national print media and in the blogosphere. With the help of state funding, the Võru-language versions of the Estonian children's magazine "Täheke" ("Little Star") have been published since 2005. In another South Estonian variety, Seto, in 1995 a bilingual newspaper (some texts are available in Seto, some in standard Estonian) was first published. In addition, the magazine "Peko Helü" ("Peko's Voice") (2006) (re-)introduces mainly Seto immaterial (a popular calendar and folklore) and material culture (arts and crafts). Also, short radio news programmes and TV episodes in South Estonian varieties are aired on

7

National Public Service Broadcasting. Both varieties are used in blogging and in social media to a limited extent.

Although there has been no extensive analysis of media content in South Estonian, one of above-mentioned newspapers, "Uma Leht", has been described as an example of an alternative medium (Koreinik 2005). Alternative media, whose content is not fiercely antagonistic, but rather an alternative to hegemonic policies and priorities, are oriented towards specific communities and are horizontally structured (Carpentier et al. 2003). A very preliminary observation has revealed several developments, which require further analysis. For example, in addition to some spectacularization of SE speech communities, media hybridisation (e.g. print-radio and web-print) and linkages to majority media can also be found in SE minority media.

* * *

While focusing exclusively on discursive practices, this dissertation is also a part of the tradition of sociolinguistics in its attempt to provide further explanation of "who speaks where, in what way, why and with what kind of impact, and how do these aspects of context shape the linguistic resources available to speakers" (Wodak et al. 2011: 2). In other words, the question is how linguistic practices, which are linked to representations of the world, no matter how and by whom those representations are voiced, may change. For example, some of the hegemonic representations which are considered in this dissertation are iconic representations of language and the essentialist concept of discrete languages (Irvine & Gal 2000, and Makoni & Pennycook 2005) which are connected to nation- and standard-building processes. While there have been some discussions of language hierarchies (Hennoste 2003) and the unequal treatment of speakers and their languages in Estonia (Vihalemm 1999, Brown 2006, Rouillard 2009 and Tender 2010), language ideologies have not received enough empirical study. My dissertation (**Study I–III**) aims to start to fill this gap through an empirical investigation of language ideologies, by combining different approaches. I am seeking to answer the following research questions:

> **What explicit oppositions exist in the discourses of the (de)legitimation of South Estonian and language endangerment? How are the in-group and the out-group constructed? (Study I–III)**

> **What discursive strategies are employed to (de)legitimate South Estonian as a language? What arguments are voiced for the political inclusion or exclusion of South Estonian? How are the proponents' and the opponents' legitimacy maintained? (Study I–III)**

> **How are language and speakers' agency represented? (Study II)**

These narrower research questions help to address the main research question:

> **What language ideologies exist in contemporary Estonian society? (Study I–III)**

2. METHODOLOGY: METHODS AND DATA CORPUS

2.1. Critical Discourse Analysis

Most discourse studies depart theoretically from the Foucaultian approach to discourse as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault 1972: 49). Different perspectives of discourse analyses take into account, to varying extents, the immediate text and its further contexts, intertextual and interdiscursive links, the archaeology of organisations and institutional frames (Wodak 2008). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been called "a programmatic development" (Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000), or "a shared perspective" (van Dijk 1993), which has been developed by a growing network of scholars and which has an interest in linking language with power. Being more than merely descriptive, CDA, as with any critical science, should ask questions about ideology, responsibility and interests (van Dijk 1986, as quoted in Wodak 2001).

Due to interdisciplinary interests in discourse analysis, different meanings have been attached and methods applied to its core concepts, making them rather vague. Therefore, it is crucial to outline some of the concepts for the current research. First, I have borrowed the concept of *text* from Halliday and Hasan (1976: 2), who have defined it as both a product and a process, "a unit not of form but of meaning". Language is functional, i.e. "that is doing some job in some context, as opposed to isolated words and sentences" (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 10). Textual linguistics outlines a number of standards of textuality, including intentionality[19], informativity[20], situationality[21] and intertextuality[22], which function as constitutive principles of textual communication (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). *Discourse*, being one of the central concepts, is conceptualised as a social action or practice of making meanings (van Dijk 1998, and Martin & Rose 2003). CDA permits the analysis of the linguistic and semiotic sides of social processes:

Discursive practices may have major ideological effects: that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities

---

[19] "Intentionality" is a user-centred notion, "concerning the text producer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the **producer's** intentions, e.g. to distribute knowledge or to attain a GOAL specified in a PLAN. (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 7)

[20] "Informativity" "concerns the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/uncertain" (ibid. 9).

[21] "Situationality" "concerns the factors which make a text RELEVANT to a SITUATION of occurrence" (ibid. 9).

[22] "Intertextuality" "concerns the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts" (ibid. 10).

through the ways in which they represent things and position people (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 258)

The most problematic concept in CDA seems to be *context* (e.g. Schegloff 1997). The selection of contexts, instead of being an object of investigation, is said to be determined by the researcher, and a great deal of contextualisation is involved *a priori* (Blommaert 2001). Following the critique, van Dijk (2006: 163) proposes that contexts should be "subjective participant interpretations, constructions or definitions of such aspects of the social environment" which are not, unlike their consequences, observable. Blommaert (2001: 28) suggests that discourse should be used as a social object whose linguistic characteristics "are conditioned and determined by circumstances that are far beyond the grasp of the speaker or user, but are social, political, cultural and historical". I have tried to avoid *a priori* contextualisation by providing Estonian contexts of nation- and standard-building, and other relevant discourses, and by explaining the social situatedness of my research (see also **Study I** and **III**).

Nevertheless, CDA has been applied to the study of different social problems, including the construction of nationalist (e.g. Wodak et al. 2009 [1999]), racist (e.g. van Dijk 1991) or ethnic discourses (e.g. Kalmus 2003), language ideologies (Blackledge 2005), planning (e.g. Georgiou 2010) and politics (e.g. Milani & Johnson 2008). Encouraged by such a large number of applications, in **Studies I** and **III**, first I studied different discursive strategies which have materialised in negotiating a hierarchical positioning of languages. Next, I studied how text producers have made choices of lexicogrammar: how processes (actions) are nominalised and participants (actors) are excluded (cf. van Leeuwen 2008). This part of the analysis draws on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), according to which language is "a network of systems, or interrelated sets of options for making meaning" (Halliday 1994:15, see also Martin & Rose 2003). In **Study II**, however, I looked beyond text linguistic analyses of content and constitution of language. Instead, the research paper is focused on lexicogrammar (*nominalisation*), together with some contextual aspects of text, e.g. intertextuality and intentionality (cf. Wodak 2008).

Finally, as I have attempted to analyse media *texts,* the broad principles of text selection are presented in the next chapter.

2.2. Data corpus

First, I will focus on the general principles of corpus-building, which is of direct relevance for each of my research papers (**Study I–III**). Then I will describe the population of texts and the sample. There are a couple of choices to be made when analysing media or public discourse: whether to prefer quantitative or qualitative analysis and which platform to choose from the media landscape. As the size of the population of texts was not known beforehand and the corpus appeared to be rather limited and homogeneous at the end, qualitative analysis of a few texts seemed adequate (cf. Martin & Rose 2003).

Apart from being intensely used, having public attention and political influence, print media also have a number of practical (e.g. they are permanent and unchanging; there is no need for transcription) and substantive (e.g. they reflect the social mainstream, and are disseminated to large audiences within the hybridisation between print and the Web) advantages over other media, as far as social, including discourse, studies are concerned (Mautner 2008).

Another important selection had to be made between Estonian and SE media. When a discourse concerns minorities and the media they are exposed to, media language is of great importance, as speakers' preferences in media consumption are also indicative of their choice of languages and linguistic environments (Moring 2007). Given that even some official languages have problems with reaching functional completeness in media, most minority languages also have difficulty reaching this completeness (ibid). With the increasing media presence, dependence and consumption since late modernity (cf. mediatisation),[23] practices of media use have also become crucial for language maintenance. In the case of asymmetric bilingualism, the minority often follows both minority and majority media, but the majority has no need for, habit of using or access to (i.e. due to language barriers, intelligibility) minority media. Therefore, while minority media enable the minority to create an alternative public sphere, to empower the community, and to promote their language and culture, mainstream media play an important role for the minority's participation: expressing their identity, negotiating their interests, promoting their life-styles and traditions, and challenging stereotypes about them (Silverstein & Georgiou 2005, and McGonagle 2006). Nevertheless, in general, instead of supporting mother-tongue transmission, the media likely interfere in it within minority-majority contexts (Moring & Dunbar 2008). Moreover, mainstream media tend to misrepresent minorities, undermine their identities and have an overall assimilating effect (ibid.). Therefore, since I decided to study linguistic representations in Estonia, the majority media – all-Estonian dailies, weeklies and cultural magazines – are of particular interest in this dissertation.

In Estonia, the general trend in print media consumption is towards the ageing of the newspaper readership, with occasional reading among younger generations (Vihalemm 2006). Quality newspapers are read by elite groups (Vihalemm & Kõuts 2004). While the media behaviour of ethnic Estonians and Estonian Russians (a traditional Estonian majority-minority divide) and their integration processes have been monitored and studied for decades now (Vihalemm 2001, 2008), the analyses of media behaviour, contents and discourse for (South) Estonian varieties are limited to a few unpublished (under-)graduate

---

[23] Mediatisation has a number of meanings. For Habermas (1989: 305), the mediatisation of the life-world means its dependency on increasingly complex and formally organised domains of action (e.g. the economy or the state administration). On the other hand, it may refer to a concept used in media studies, e.g. to "the metaprocess by which everyday practices and social relations are increasingly shaped by mediating technologies and media organizations" (Livingstone 2009: 4).

8

works and papers (e.g. Saar 1996, Harju 1999, and Afanasjev, unpublished manuscript). There was a final thesis on the vernacular use in a number of county and local newspapers (Saar 1996), but apart from an undergraduate thesis (Harju 1999), there is no recent analysis on the consumption of (majority) media in south-eastern Estonia. It can be concluded that, due to a lack of interest, a detailed study of media behaviour in south-eastern Estonia, where SE varieties are spoken, is virtually non-existent.

With the restoration of Estonian independence and regionalist collective action in the 1990s (Kansui 1999, Jääts 2000, Raag 2010), the number of published media texts discussing South Estonian varieties seemed to be bigger than ever, although the total number of texts is unknown. My focus is on two discourses: language endangerment and (de)legitimation of SE. While sporadic concerns over the loss of SE have appeared more or less explicitly in most media texts on SE since the end of the 1980s, with the foundation of the state research and development organisation for the preservation and promotion of the Võru variety of SE in 1995 (see also **Study I** and **III**), those concerns became somewhat institutionalised. Along with proposals to the Language Act made by SE language activists, the greatest number of articles debating legal recognition of SE, and thus its ultimate legitimation, has been published since the mid-2000s. Between 1995 and 2008, the number of media texts on SE totalled over a thousand. The sample includes texts from the all-Estonian dailies "Eesti Päevaleht" and "Postimees", the south-eastern Estonian county papers "Võrumaa Teataja" and "Koit", the weeklies "Maaleht" (targeted to rural residents) and "Sirp" (targeted to intellectuals) and the literary magazine "Vikerkaar". However, it excludes other county newspapers from outside south-eastern Estonia (see **Study I**) and the all-Estonian weekly tabloid "Õhtuleht", whose news values lie mostly in entertainment and topics of human interest (cf. Harcup & O'Neill 2001). The sample includes 17 texts focusing on language endangerment (1995–2008, **Study I** and **II**) and six texts debating (de)legitimation (2004–2005, **Study III**). The texts that extracts are taken from are referred to inside the body text of **Study I** and in the appendices of **Study II–III**

3. FINDINGS

Human experience is transformed into meaning by the grammar of a natural language (Halliday 2004). The same holds true for how language is experienced: meanings are produced in discursive practices. Discursive practices which are used to rank languages and linguistic practices in Estonian society are summarised in this chapter. The findings are grouped following the research questions, which I address in order from less to more general ones.

3.1. Beyond intergroup polarisation: multiple oppositions, multiple interests?

Majority-minority settings are often analysed in terms of in-group ("us") and out-group ("them"), while (group) identity is ascribed by the distribution of power, recourses, capacities etc. In fact, identity mediates between positionality in the social-structural system and the habitus of embodied disposition to action (Lemke 2008: 21). In the case of a speech community, the latter, i.e. interactional experience, highlights practices which make majority and minority groups far more diverse than expected. Thus, more or less explicit intergroup but also intragroup polarisation was expected in the public discourse on South Estonian (**Study I–III**) and, as a matter of fact, multiple oppositions occurred. *Referential strategies*, e.g. the use of the personal pronouns "we" and "they", which indicate memberships of an ideological nature (van Dijk 2006), demonstrate the clear boundary discursively maintained between Estonian and SE speakers, but also differences among SE speakers: between speakers and language activists. Activists are represented by collective nouns, as being assimilated into a group; SE speakers are referred to as "they" by both in- and out-group language professionals. In addition to the different language capacities of Estonian and SE speakers, another level of intergroup polarisation is obviously based not on capacities but on opportunities and desire (cf. Grin 2003): language professionals (e.g. activists, planners and educators) vs. others.

Furthermore, in the discourse of (de)legitimation (**Study III**), the negative agency of the opponents of SE legitimation is repeatedly emphasised. The proponents of SE legitimation are accused of opportunism in the enforcement of another standard for their own interests, thus jeopardising Estonian, while its opponents are blamed for ignoring visible sociolinguistic phenomena and thus paying no attention to actual linguistic diversity. In the *predicational strategies* (**Study I**), *negative other-presentation* is explicit: mainly negative qualities are ascribed to activist SE speakers by Estonian language and media professionals (e.g. journalists and columnists). SE speakers' collective identity is built by different voices via the narratives of regional identity (**Study I**; cf. Paasi 2003). *Positive self-presentation* is not explicit and is realised mainly in *rationalisations* (**Study I–III**).

Furthermore, polarisation between activist SE speakers and Estonian language professionals was also observable in *discursive positions* (**Study III**). Paradoxically, proponents of SE legitimation, who are also activist speakers of the minority language, position themselves similarly to the *established majority* (cf. Kalmus 2003) and not as a minority demanding minority rights in majority media. Instead of claiming linguistic rights, cultural enrichment is voiced by activist speakers of SE. In this way they do not compromise the dominating ideology of the standard language. Paradoxically, their arguments for a new essentialised language contribute to furthering the political arrangement of the language and its varieties. Those language and media professionals who oppose SE legitimation discursively position themselves (and other Estonian–speakers) as an *endangered majority* (cf. Kalmus 2003). Both ideological groups of language professionals are key contributors to the discourse of language endangerment, where the agency of speakers is downgraded. Language professionals' voices shape how language policy can be interpreted: speakers do not have active agency in language change and cannot reverse the language shift (cf. Fishman 1991). Finally, as the agentless representation of (South) Estonian may discursively produce alienated speakers, another, less explicit, polarisation appears: between speakers and language professionals in general. All of the above-mentioned oppositions also bring up the issue of interests, some of which have and some of which have not been explicitly set forth. For example, language professionals, as with representatives of other professions who provide expert service to solve objective or subjective human problems, may use public space to make claims of jurisdiction; besides concerns over their native languages, their interests may lie in a full-time activity of diagnosis, treatment and inference (Abbott 1988). Thus their interest in and concerns over language differ significantly from those of speakers.

3.2. Discursive struggle over a legitimate language

The public discourse on South Estonian is an example of the discursive struggle over what is considered a legitimate language (cf. Bourdieu 1991). In its *argumentation strategies*, both concerns over redistribution of scarce resources and fragile national security and concerns over language loss are expressed. While this discourse is an arena for jurisdictional claims for language professionals (**Study I–III**) who are more or less explicitly seeking to legitimate their group interests, the discourse of (de)legitimation also features the spectrum of language ideologies embedded in Estonian society, i.e. how economically or socially unequal placement of language varieties is legitimated in Estonia. The most informative for unmasking (de)legitimation was the analysis of argumentative strategies (**Study III**).

In the case of legitimating SE, authorisation legitimation was primarily realized via *comparisons* or *references to legitimate others*. *Rationalisations*

were made by *explanations* and *definitions*, which were expected, as the proponents of SE legitimation are trying to introduce new vocabulary to convince their audiences and opponents (**Study I, III**). The definition of dialect refers to the dominating ideology of linguistic purism, which has been characteristic of past linguistic representations (Hennoste 1999), but which may still have importance in the de-legitimisation of varieties and colloquial speech. Raag (1999) places Estonian purism in the xenophobic/ethnographic/archaising category (Thomas 1991, as referred to in Raag 1999). Purist representations are also voiced in the case of SE varieties. The ideology of purism needs further inquiry in public discourse.

As for the delegitimation of SE, *authorisation* and *rationalisation legitimation* were common. Authorisation involved references made to (1) *people*, e.g. that speakers have already adopted the modernist formula of language-and-its-varieties (including dialects) and accommodated to diglossia, (2) *history*, e.g. the accounts of a thirteenth century chronicler on the unity of Estonian tribes, (3) *legitimate others*, e.g. neighbouring EU entrants or multilingual states, examples of both allegedly separatist aspirations and successful accommodation of linguistic diversity. As for rationalisation, the opponents of SE legitimation are engaged in *result legitimation* by demonstrating that as long as Estonian varieties keep functioning for the enrichment of monolithic standard Estonian (**Study II–III**), the preservation of dialects (cf. language maintenance) should be tolerated. Another example of rationalisation is the employment of *causal schemas towards future*, which make references to possible impending costs of language maintenance and to unwanted outcomes, e.g. the Russian threat (**Study II–III**).

The *topos* of threat is repeatedly employed in the discourse on SE and can be highlighted as the most common argument in (de)legitimation. Legitimating SE is associated with threats from Russia and the EU, which may lead to unwanted outcomes in the power relations between Estonia(n) and Russia(n) and therefore undermine the security of Estonia. Thus, the discursive (re)production of threat is the justification for the exclusion of SE varieties from the category of legitimate language (**Study II–III**).

3.3. Alienated speakers, essentialised languages?

Another finding which links public discourse to academic discourse and mechanisms of truth embedded in scientific discourses (cf. Foucault 1980) is the representation which constructs alienated speakers and essentialised languages. Academic discourse can mean at least two things: academic discourse in general, and the still dominating approach of the "idealised speaker" and "language as a symbol" in Estonian academic discourse. In the discourse of language endangerment, speakers are represented as having no agency in real and unwanted or imagined language change (**Study II**). Alienated speakers may

9

interpret language issues as being left under the control of authorised language professionals. The agentless representation of language is reproduced by the *nominalisations* employed (**Study II**). The use of nominalisations describing abstract matters is common to and accepted in academic discourse. Both deactivation and deagentialisation indicate that both Estonian and SE are primarily experienced as the symbols or icons of (ethnic) groups (cf. Irvine & Gal 2000, and del Valle 2000) and less as languaging, which refers to speakers' everyday use of different registers and their role as active (re)producers of language (cf. Becker 1991). The discourse of language endangerment and (de)legitimation of SE are about distinct and discrete languages, iconically linked to ethnoses, ethnic groups and speech communities; this obscures and draws borders within everyday languaging. While the proponents make claims for SE language varieties to be legitimated and legalised, they argue for another authorized category of language, but do not disinvent or deconstruct languages in general. Therefore, this dissertation also attempts to increase (critical language) awareness of speakers' alienation and essentialised languages that contribute to the disinvention of languages, a strategy to subordinate languages to their speakers rather than supporting the hegemony of language over speakers (Makoni & Pennycook 2005).

DISCUSSION

Following the language shift to standard Estonian, SE language activists engaged in an eleventh-hour negotiation of the legitimacy of SE varieties. The resulting media debate on language recognition and discourses of (de-)legitimisation and language endangerment have provided an opportunity to study linguistic representations and language ideologies existing in contemporary Estonian society. As language ideologies construct some language varieties as more valuable and useful than others, "in many parts of the world more than two speech varieties coexist in a single multilingual area, and prestige and power are allocated among them in terms of complex regional, social and economic hierarchies" (Dorian 2002: 64). Language ideologies, rather than linguistic facts, can be more telling as far as language change is concerned.

All of my research papers (**Study I–III**) are focused on language ideologies, ones that are challenged and ones that are challenging. I have concentrated on written media discourse, which can be a public space for any (de)legitimation. Despite explicit polarisations and diverging discursive strategies, opposing voices, i.e. the proponents of SE legitimation and their opponents, reinforce rather similar representations: both reproduce essentialist, iconic and sometimes purist representations of Estonian and South Estonian. Without disinventing languages and acknowledging speakers' agency in languaging, a possible SE standard variety which the proponents argue for steps into the same flow of essentialism. Nevertheless, as the advocates of disinvention of languages suggest, language planners have to consider different alternatives, not solutions, which may vary; in some cases essentialising mother tongues, while in other cases questioning essentialist representations would be preferred (Makoni & Pennycook 2005). Furthermore, iconisation links both Estonian and South Estonian varieties to the imagined ethnos or, in the case of South Estonian, to another "social magic", imagined regional identity. Iconisation of Estonian is not challenged; however, building another collective identity, a regional one, is occasionally questioned by the opponents of SE recognition. While being accused of separatist aspirations, the proponents, instead of claiming linguistic human rights, adhere to the cultural enrichment agenda.

There are a couple of more observations which I would like to draw attention to, as they were not (sufficiently) covered in the research papers. First, although intergroup polarisation produces a plurality of voices and diverging (linguistic) representations, it is rather difficult to judge whose voice is dominating by depending on only a couple of qualitative studies. However, voices which explicitly emphasised opponents' negative agency, and were thus likely engaged in manipulation, are seen as corresponding to the dominant political voices (van Dijk 2006), which preserve the status quo. Therefore, the centrality of the *topos* of threat in the public discourse on SE makes it a manipulative discourse of language endangerment, where agendas are hidden. Furthermore, intergroup polarisation also demonstrates another opposition in the attitudes and

interests of an ethnolinguistic group, which Gal (2006: 21) has referred to: "the language attitudes of language specialists, intellectuals, media workers come to be at odds with the preferences of other minority speakers". While SE language activists can be seen as (unauthorized) professionals who attempt to legitimate a language variety and whose interests lie within this language only, bi-dialectual SE speakers have other choices to make and identities to maintain beyond daily languaging. The discourse of language endangerment and SE (de)legitimation are where identities are constructed. It also manifests identity politics at the national and local levels: speakers' desire to be included and fear of being included in or excluded from an ethnos are manipulated (cf. Lemke 2008; Voss 2006).

Secondly, the discourse of endangerment of Estonian has obvious parallels with three other discourses: the post-Cold-War security discourse, the globalisation discourse (cf. Gould 2006), and the academic discourse. The first refers to problems originating from outsiders (e.g. migrants) and the second to the growing global competition between nation-states. In Estonia, arguments voiced by the opponents of SE legal recognition and legitimation include both references to danger coming from late Russian-speaking migrants and doubts about the competitiveness of Estonia(n) in the global (linguistic) market. The interdiscursivity between public and academic discourses is explicit but equally important is what is missing: arguments from mainstream research on Estonian nation- and standard-building are brought into the media debate, but constructivist accounts are absent. While the developments of sociolinguistics, anthropology, discourse and media studies have contributed to the advancement of language studies, public discourse on SE does not include these.

Finally, I would like to propose a modest policy recommendation, though it may seem like breaking through an open door. Given the agentless representation of language, instead of normative aspects of language, Estonian language policy makers should turn their attention to its generative aspects. Speakers' active roles and languaging should be acknowledged and welcomed in education, research, business and elsewhere. Unfortunately, language ideological debate is not just another social magic which brings into existence what was named within a discourse (cf. Blommaert 1999). The materiality of this discourse is obvious, as languages and speakers are unequally ranked. The ideology of standard language seems to also be one of the most powerful ideologies in the case of Estonia (cf. Milroy 2001). While other argumentative strategies diverge, language professionals seem to agree on one issue: standard Estonian meets modern societal demands and SE can survive only with the help of a recognised written standard. The legitimacy of standard Estonian is maintained in a manner similar to the Gramscian epoch: political unification necessitates linguistic standardisation.

Besides having value on its own, the analysis of linguistic representations in public discourse is complementary to research on the (discourses of) Estonian nation- and standard-building. As the media have turned into the site of politics

(e.g. Castells 2000), the discourse of language endangerment should be given increased attention in future analyses of the politics of language and identity. Although this dissertation has demonstrated some interdiscursivity, further research should inquire into semi-public and private discourses on the subject. Overall, this study on language ideologies in Estonian is only a beginning.

10

CONCLUSION(S)

What explicit oppositions exist in the discourses of the (de)legitimation of South Estonian and language endangerment?
There are multiple oppositions represented in the discourses of the (de)legitimation of South Estonian and language endangerment: on the one hand, between Estonian and SE speakers and, on the other hand, between SE activists and SE speakers. (**Study I–III**)

How are the in-group and the out-group constructed?
The in-group is constructed by personal nouns; the out-group is constructed by collective nouns. Regional narratives and comparisons are used for SE speakers; negative other-presentation is employed for SE language activists. (**Study I–III**)

What discursive strategies are employed to (de)legitimate South Estonian as a language?
The macro strategies of perpetuation (by the opponents) and transformation (by the proponents) are utilised to (de)legitimate SE varieties as a language or languages. Referential strategies within those macro strategies can also be seen as a part of identity politics. Opponents' and proponents' argumentative strategies include both authorisation (e.g. by reference to or comparison with legitimate others, such as European states and languages, both better and worse off in accommodating linguistic diversity) and rationalisation (by defining a regional language, a dialect or a standard language, and by result legitimation, where the result is the social functionality of standard Estonian). (**Study I**, **III**)

What arguments are voiced for the political inclusion or exclusion of South Estonian? Delegitimation strategies include the *topoi* of threat, which form the main argument and make the discourse of (de)legitimation simultaneously a discourse of language endangerment. While the threat is usually associated with migrants, the discourse employs zero-sum arguments and parallels the Estonian-Russian majority-minority discourse. Other main arguments include cultural enrichment, and language diversity and its loss, which are employed by proponents, but also the costs of another (standard) language voiced by opponents. (**Study I–III**)

How are the proponents' and the opponents' legitimacy maintained? The opponents' legitimacy is maintained by the representation of the proponents' negative agency. This move makes the discourse manipulative, as far as the opponents are concerned. (**Study I–III**)

How are language and speakers' agency represented?
Language is represented without speakers; the speakers' agency is backgrounded or hidden. Such a representation contributes to the further alienation of speakers, the generative aspects of language and everyday languaging, and may also mask language professionals' interest. The public discourse of language endangerment may have become a public arena for claims of jurisdiction for language professionals. (**Study II**) Both the opponents and the proponents reinforce essentialist representations of language and argue for standardisation, though for different standard varieties. (**Study I–III**)

What language ideologies exist in contemporary Estonian society?
The use of deactivation and deagentialisation indicates that language is primarily experienced as a symbol of the (ethnic) group and less as a cultural institution of languaging. This iconisation and manipulation of threats (to national security and integrity) and concerns (over language loss) are used when different Estonian language practices and varieties are positioned and legitimated and legislative taxonomies are authorised. Assumptions of a zero-sum game, imaginatively expressed toward Russian and other languages, are present in the discourses. (**Study II–III**) Given this situation, hegemonic discourses favour the Estonian linguistic culture of monoglossy. (**Study II**)

REFERENCES

Abbott, Andrew. (1988). *The System of Professions: Essay on the Division of Expert Labour*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Afanasjev, Vahur. (unpublished manuscript) *Võru eurovisioonidiskursuse analüüs*. Tartu Ülikool. Sotsiaalteaduskond. Meedia ja kommunikatsiooni osakond.

Anderson, Benedict. (1991) [1983]. Imagined *Communities*. London: Verso.

Annist, Aet. (2010). Heterotoopiast hegemooniaks: võim ja kultuur Setomaal. In Helen Sooväli-Sepping & Linda Kaljundi (eds.). *Maastik ja mälu. Eesti pärandiloome arengujooni*. Tallinn: Tallinna ülikooli kirjastus, x–x. [forthcoming]

Annist, Aet. (2009). Outsourcing culture: Establishing heritage hegemony by funding cultural life in South Eastern Estonia. *Lietuvos etnologija. Socialines antropologija i etnologija studios* 9, 117–138.

Appadurai, Arjun. (2006). Fear of small numbers. An Essay on the Geography of Anger. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. (2005) [1996]. *Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization.* Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Aron, Raymond. (1967). *Main Currents in Sociological Thought: Durkheim, Pareto, Weber. Vol. 2*. New York: Basic Books.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas.

Beaugrande, Robert-Alain de & Dressler, Wolfgang. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.

Becker, A. L. (1991). A short essay on languaging. In Frederick Steier (ed.). *Research and Reflexivity*. London: Sage, 35–41.

Benhabib, Seyla. (1993). Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jürgen Habermas. In Graig Calhoun (ed.). *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 73–98.

Bernstein, Basil. (1971). *Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 1: Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge.

Blackledge, Adrian. (2005). *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World.* Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Blommaert, Jan. (2001). Context is/as Critique. *Critique of Anthropology* 21(1), 13–32.

Blommaert, Jan. (2005). Discourse. A Critical Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan. (1999). The debate is open. In Jan Blommaert (ed.). *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–38.

Blommaert, Jan. & Bulcaen, Chris. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29, 447–66.

Blommaert, Jan & Verschueren, Jef. (1992). The Role of Language in European Nationalist Ideologies. *Pragmatics* 2(3), 355–75.

Bloom, William. (1990). *Personal identity, national identity and international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (2003). *Praktilised põhjused. Teoteooriast*. Tallinn: Tänapäev.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, Kara D. (2006). *Learning the Language. International, National & Local Dimensions of Regional-Language Education in Estonia*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. UMI Dissertation Services.

Cameron, Deborah. (2006). Ideology and language. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2), 141–152.

Carpentier, Nico, Lie, Rico & Servaes, Jan. (2003). Community Media: Muting the Democratic Media Discourse?. *Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* 17(1), 51–68.

Castells, Manuel. (2000). Materials for an Explanatory Theory of the Network Society. *British Journal of Sociology 51* (1), 5–24.

Cook, Vivian. (2010). Prolegomena to Second Language Learning. In Paul Seedhouse, Steve Walsh & Christopher Jenks (eds.). *Conceptualising 'Learning' in Applied Linguistics*. Palgrave Macmillan, 6–22.

del Valle, José (2000). Monoglossic policies for a heteroglossic culture: misinterpreted multilingualism in modern Galicia. *Language and communication* 20 (2), 105–132.

Dorian, Nancy C. (2002). Diglossia and the simplification of linguistic space. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157 (1), 63–69.

Dunbar, Robert. (2010). *Accommodating linguistic diversity: Exploring the role of different linguistic regimes from a legal and sociolinguistic perspective*. [PowerPoint Presentation made at ELDIA workshop and symposium in Võru, South-Eastern Estonia, October 5–6, 2010]. Retrieved from a file.

Eichenbaum, Külli. (1998). (ed.). *Ku kavvas Setomaalõ seto rahvast jakkus? Publications of Võro Institute 2*.

Ehala, Martin. (2007). Sustainability of double ethnic identity in majority-minority settings: The case of Estonian and Võro. In Roger Blokland & Cornelius Hasselblatt (eds.). *Language and Identity in the Finno-Ugric World. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium at the University of Groningen, May 17–19, 2006.* Maastricht: Shaker, 44–54.

Ehala, Martin (2006). Keelevahetuse pööramisvõimalusi võru keelealal. In Helen Koks & Jan Rahman (eds.). *Mitmekeelsus ja keelevahetus läänemeresoome piirkonnas. Publications of Võro Institute 18*, 11–26.

Ehala, Martin (2004). Keelehoid ja mitmikidentiteet. In Karl Pajusalu & Jan Rahman (eds.). *Keel ja identiteet. Publications of Võro Institute 16*, 11–22.

Ehala, Martin & Niglas, Katrin. (2007). Empirical Evaluation of a Mathematical Model of Ethnolinguistic Vitality: the Case of Võro. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6, 427–444.

Fairclough, Norman. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. (1992). Discourse and Text: Linguistic Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 3(2), 193–217.

Fairclough, Norman & Wodak, Ruth (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Teun van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Sage Publications Ltd., 258–284.

Feldman, Merje. (2001). European Integration and the Discourse of National Identity in Estonia. *National Identities* 3(1), 5–21.

Ferguson, Charles A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word* 15, 325–340.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Foucault, Michel. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. (ed. Colin Gordon). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

11

Fowler, Roger & Kress, Gunther. (1979). Critical linguistics. In Roger Fowler, Bob Hodge, Gunther Kress & Tony Trew. (eds.). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Gal, Susan. (2006). Migration, Minorities and Multilingualism: Language Ideologies in Europe. In Clare Mar-Molinero & Patrick Stevenson (eds.). *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 13–27.

Geertz, Clifford. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books, A Division of HarperCollins Publishers.

Gellner, Ernest. (1996). Ernest Gellner's reply: 'Do nations have navels?' *Nations and Nationalism* 2(3), 366–70.

Georgiou, Vasiliki. (2010). Competing discourses in the debate on place names in Cyprus: Issues of (symbolic) inclusion/exclusion in orthographic choices. *Journal of Language and Politics* 9(1), 140–164.

Gould, Robert. (2006). The European paradox: Swiss discourses of identity between dependence and xenophobia. In Clare Mar-Molinero & Patrick Stevenson (eds.). *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 162–176.

Gramsci, Antonio. (1985). *Selections from cultural writings*. David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, trans. William Boelhower. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith (eds. and trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Grin, François. (2003). *Language Policy Evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Habermas, Jürgen. (2001). *Avalikkuse struktuurimuutus*. Tallinn: Kunst.

Habermas, Jürgen. (1989). *The Theory of Communicative Action. Volume* 2. Oxford: Polity Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). Writing science: literacy and discursive power (1993). In Jonathan J. Webster (ed.). *The Language of Science. Volume 5 in the Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday*. London, New York: Continuum, 199–225.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to functional grammar. 2nd edition*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, Ruqaiya. (1985). *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harcup, Tony & O'Neill, Deidre. (2001). What Is News? Galtung and Ruge revisited. *Journalism Studies* 2(2), 261–280.

Harju, Ülle. (1999). *Meediakasutus Kagu-Eestis. Bakalaureusetöö*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool. Sotsiaalteaduskond. Ajakirjandusosakond.

Hennoste, Tiit. (2003). Postkolonialism ja Eesti. In Tiit Hennoste. *Eurooplaseks saamine. Kõrvalkäija altkulmupilk. Artikleid ja arvamusi 1986–2003*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 303–314.

Hennoste, Tiit. (1999). Eesti keele arengud: totalitaariast polüloogiasse. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 2, 88–96.

Hobsbawm, Eric. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, Alan. (2002). Outline of a theory of diglossia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 157, 1–48.

Hurt, Jakob. (1886). *Die estnischen Nomina auf -ne purum*. Helsinki.

Hymes, Dell. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. In Thomas Gladwin & William C. Sturtevant (eds.). *Anthropology and Human Behavior*. Washington, DC: The Anthropological Society of Washington, 13–35.

Iannàccaro, Gabriele & Dell'Aquila, Vittorio. (2001). Mapping languages from inside: notes on perceptual dialectology. *Social and Cultural Geography* 2 (3), 265–280.

Irvine, Judith T. & Gal, Susan. (2000). Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.). *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Santa Fe, New Mexico, School of American Research Press, Oxford, James Currey, 35–83.

Iva, Sulev. (2007). *Võru kirjakeele sõnamuutmissüsteem*. Dissertationes Philologiae Estonicae Universitatis Tartuensis 20. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Ivinson, Gabrielle. (2011). Bernstein: Codes and Social Class. In Ruth Wodak, Johnstone, Barbara & Kerswill, Paul (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: Sage Publications Ltd., 40–56.

Jansen, Ea. (2007). *Eestlane muutuvas ajas. Seisusühiskonnast kodanikuühiskonda*. Tartu: Kirjastus Eesti Ajalooarhiiv.

Jansen, Ea. (2004). *Vaateid eesti rahvusluse sünniaegadesse*. Tartu: Ilmamaa.

Johnson, Sally & Milani, Tommaso M. (eds.) (2009). *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Joseph, John E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. Palgrave: Macmillan.

Jääts, Indrek. (2000). Ethnic identity of the Setus and the Estonian–Russian border dispute. *Nationalities papers* 28 (4), 651–670.

Kalmus, Veronika. (2003). "Is Interethnic Integration Possible in Estonia?" Ethno-Political Discourse of Two Ethnic Groups. *Discourse & Society* 14 (6), 667–697.

Kalmus, Veronika. (2002). Ethno-political Discourse in Estonian School Textbooks. In Marju Lauristin & Mati Heidmets (eds.). *The Challenge of the Russian Minority. Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 256–276.

Kansui, Akiko. (1999). *Tiiki syugi undou ni okeru gengo to tisiki zin – Esutonia nanbu Voru tihou no zirei kara*. PhD Dissertation, unpublished English summary. Osaka: Sougou Kenkyuu Daigakuin Daigaku.

Koreinik, Kadri. (2005). The Paper for a Speech Community – How It Relates to the Community Media Model. In Olga Haurinen & Helena Sulkala (eds.). *Tutkielmia vähemmistökielistä Jäämereltä Liivinrantaan. Vähemmistökielten tutkimus- ja koulutusverkoston raportti IV*. Acta Universitatis Ouluensis. Humaniora B 66., 62–70.

Koreinik, Kadri. (2007). *Võro. The Võro language in education in Estonia. Regional Dossiers Series*. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.

Koreinik, Kadri & Pajusalu, Karl (2007). Language naming practices and linguistic identity in South-Eastern Estonia. In Cornelius Hasselblatt & Roger Blokland (eds.). *Language and Identity in the Finno-Ugric World*. Maastricht: Shaker, 192–204.

Kress, Gunther & Hodge, Robert. (1979). *Language as ideology*. Routledge.

Kroskrity, Paul V. (ed.) (2000). *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: SAR.

Kõuts, Ragne & Tammpuu, Piia. (2002). Changing Media Discourse on Minority Issues: From Ignorance towards Recognition. In Marju Lauristin & Mati Heidmets (eds.). *The Challenge of the Russian Minority. Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia.* Tartu: Tartu University Press, 306–316.

Laanekask, Heli. (2004). *Eesti kirjakeele kujunemine ja kujundamine 16.–19. sajandil.* Dissertationes philologiae Estonicae Universitas Tartuensis 14. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Labov, William. (2001). *Principles of Linguistic* Change. *Vol. 2: Social Factors*. Malden, MA, USA, Oxford, UK, Blackwell Publishers.

Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London, New York: Verso.

Léglise, Isabelle & Migge, Bettina. (2006). Language-naming practices, ideologies, and linguistic practices: Towards a comprehensive description of language varieties. *Language in Society* 35, 313–339.

Lemke, Jay L. (2008). Identity, Developments and Desire: Critical Questions. In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard & Rick Iedema (eds.). *Identity Trouble. Critical Discourse and Contested Idenities.* Basingstoke: Palggrave Macmillan.

Livingstone, Sonia. (2009). On the Mediation of Everthing: ICA Presidental Address 2008. *Journal of Communication* 59, 1–18.

Makoni, Sinfree & Alastair Pennycook. (2005). Disinventing and (Re)Constituting Languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal* 2(3), 137–56.

Mannheim, Karl. (1953). *Ideology and utopia*. New York: Harcourt.

Martin, J.R.; Rose, David. (2003). *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*. London: Continuum.

Marx, Karl & Engels, Friedrich. (1977). *Valitud kirjad*. Tallinn: "Eesti Raamat".

Mautner, Gerlinde. (2008). Analyzing Newspapers, Magazines and Other Print Media. In Ruth Wodak & Michał Krzyżanowski (eds.). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Science*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 30–53.

McGonagle, Tarlach (2006) *Committee of Experts on Issues Relating to the Protection of National Minorities (DH-MIN), Comments on the draft report on* 'Access of National Minorities to the Media: New Challenges, DH-MIN(2006)016, Council of Europe, at http://www.coe.int/t/e/human_rights/minorities/ 4._INTERGOVERN-MENTAL_COOPERATION_(DH-MIN)/2._Documents/DH_MIN_Working-Documents_eng.asp#TopOfPage

Melucci, Alberto. (1996). *Challenging Codes. Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mets, Mari. (2010). *Suhtlusvõrgustikud reaalajas: võru kõnekeele varieerumine kahes Võrumaa külas*. Dissertationes Philologicae Estonicae Universitatis Tartuensis 25.

Milani, Tommaso M. & Johnson, Sally. (2008). Language politics and legitimation crisis in Sweden. A Habermasian approach. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 32 (1), 1–22.

Milroy, James. (2001). Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5 (4), 530–55.

Moring, Tom. (2007). Functional Completeness in Minority Language Media. In Mike Cormack & Niamh Hourigan (eds.). *Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 17–33.

Moring, Tom & Dunbar, Robert. (2008). *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the media. Regional or Minority Languages*, No. 6. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Moschonas, Spiros & Spitzmüller, Jürgen. (2009). Prescriptivism in and about the media: a comparative analysis of corrective practices in Greece and Germany. In Sally Johnson & Tommaso M. Milani (eds.) (2009). *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse*. London: Continuum.

Muehlmann, Shaylih. (2007). Defending diversity: Staking out a common global interest? In Alexandre Duchéne & Monica Heller (eds.). *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London, New York: Continuum, 14–34.

Org, Ervin, Reimann, Nele, Uind, Katrin, Velsker, Eva & Pajusalu, Karl. (1994). Vastseliina Sute küla elanike murdepruugist ja keelehoiakutest. *Keel ja Kirjandus* 4, 203–209.

Paasi, Anssi. (2003). Region and place: regional identity in question. *Progress in Human Geography* 27 (4), 475–485.

Pajusalu, Karl. (2003). Estonian dialects. In Mati Erelt (ed.). *Estonian Language. Linguistica Uralica. Supplementary Series* 1, 231–272.

Pajusalu, Karl. (1996). *Multiple Linguistic Contacts in South Estonian: Variation of Verb Inflection in Karksi*. Turku: Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics of the University of Turku.

Pajusalu, Karl, Velsker, Eva & Org, Ervin. (1999). On Recent Changes in South Estonian: Dynamics in the Formation of the Inessive. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 139, 87–103.

Parbus, Ülo. (1966). Kirjakeelest, sirdekeelest ja murdekeelest. *Emakeele Seltsi Aastaraamat* 12. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat, 3–15.

Pareto, Vilfredo. (1963). *The Mind and Society: A Treatise on General Sociology*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Petersoo, Pille. (2007). Reconsidering Otherness: Constructing Estonian Identity. *Nations and Nationalism* 13 (1), 117–133.

Petersoo, Pille & Tamm, Marek (eds.). (2008). *Monumentaalne konflikt: mälu, poliitika ja identiteet tänapäeva Eestis*. Tallinn: Varrak.

Pettai, Vello. (2010). State Identity in Estonia Durng the 1990s: Inheriting and Inventing. In Baiba Metuzāle-Kangere (ed.). *Inheriting the 1990s. The Baltic Countries. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia 37*, 153–174.

Pettai, Vello. (2004). Narratives and Political Development in the Baltic States: History Revised and Improvised. *Ab Imperio* 1, 405–433.

Philips, Susan U. (1992). A Marx-influenced approach to ideology and language: comments. *Pragmatics* 2 (3), 377–385.

Piirimäe, Eva. (2009). Teoreetilisi perspektiive 19. sajandi eesti rahvusluse uurimiseks. In Tõnu Tannberg & Bradley Woodworth (eds.). *Vene impeerium ja Baltikum: venestus, rahvuslus ja moderniseerimine 19. sajandi teisel poolel ja 20. Sajandi alguses* I. Acta et Commentationes Archivi Historici Estoniae 16 (23), 167–191.

Polletta, Francesca & Jasper, James M. (2001). Collective Identity and Social Movements. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, 283–305.

Preston, Dennis. (1989). *Perceptual Dialectology. Nonlinguists' Views of Areal Linguistics*. Topics in Sociolinguistics. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

12

Pääbo, Heiko. (2010). *Potential of Collective Memory Based International Identity Conflicts in Post-Imperial Space*. Dissertationes Rerum Politicarum Universitas Tartuensis 3.

Raag, Raimo. (1999). One Plus One Equals One: the Forging of Standard Estonian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 139, 17–38.

Raag, Raimo. (2010). Regionalism in Language Policy: the Case of Võru. In Baiba Metuzāle-Kangere (ed.). *Inheriting the 1990s. The Baltic Countries*. *Studia Uralica Upsaliensia* 37, 131–152.

Raun, Toivo U. (2003). Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Estonian nationalism revisited. *Nations and Nationalism* 1, 129–147.

Reagan, Timothy. (2004). Objectification, Positivism and Language Studies: A Reconsideration. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 1(1), 41–60.

Rorty, Richard. (1999) [1989]. *Sattumuslikkus, iroonia ja solidaarsus*. Tallinn: Vagabund.

Rouillard, Rémy. (2009). Language loyalty in the Baltic: Russian artists and linguistic nationalism in Estonia. In Clare Mar-Molinero & Patrick Stevenson (eds.). *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 133–146.

Rumsey, Alan. (1990). Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American anthropologist* 92, 346–361.

Ruutsoo, Rein. (2002). Discursive Conflict and Estonian Post-Communist Nation-Building. In Marju Lauristin & Mati Heidmets (eds.). *The Challenge of the Russian Minority. Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia.* Tartu: Tartu University Press, 31–54.

Saar, Evar. (2005). Võron kielen käyttö vironkielisissä sanomalehdissä Etlä-Virossa. In Olga Haurinen & Helena Sulkala (eds.). *Tutkielmia vähemmistökielistä Jäämereltä Liivinrantaan. Vähemmistökielten tutkimus- ja koulutusverkoston raportti IV.* Acta Universitatis Ouluensis. Humaniora B 66, 98–102.

Saar, Evar. (2003). Setos – Eine südestnische Sprache und Kultur an der Estnisch-Russischen Grenze. In Wolfgang Brücher (ed.). *Grenzverschiebungen. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einem zeitlosen Phänomen*. Internationales Symposium des interdisziplinären Forschungsschwerpunktes „Grenzregionen und Interferenzräume" der Philosophischen Fakultäten der Universität des Saarlandes in Saarbrücken und Forbach 10.–12. Mai 2001. Röhrig Universitätsverlag, 103–118.

Saar, Evar. (1996). *Võru keele kasutamine kohalikes ajalehtedes (1986–1994). Lõputöö.* Tartu: Tartu ülikool. Ajakirjanduse õppetool.

Saareste, Andrus. (2006) [1952]. *Kaunis emakeel*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

Saar Poll (2005) = The study of the readership of Uma Leht.

Salamini, Leonardo. (1981). Gramsci and Marxist sociology of language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 32, 27–44.

Schegloff, Emanuel. (1997). Whose Text? Whose Context?, *Discourse & Society* 8(2), 165–87.

Silverstein, Michael. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks & Carol F. Hofbauer (eds.). *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 193–247.

Silverstone, Roger & Georgiou, Myria. (2005). Editorial Introduction: Media and Minorities in Multicultural Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31 (3), 433–441.

Tender, Tõnu. (2010). *Mitmekeelsus Eestis Euroopa Liidu mitmekeelsuse ideaali taustal*. Dissertationes de Mediis et Communicationibus Universitatis Tartuensis 9. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Tomasello, Michael. (2003). *Constructing a Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society* 17 (3), 359–383.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* London: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1993). Editor's foreword to Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4, 131–142.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1991). Racism and the Press. London & New York: Routledge.

van Leeuwen, Theo J. (1995). Representing social action. *Discourse and Society* 6 (1), 81–106.

van Leeuwen, Theo J. (1996). The representation of social actors. In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard, Malcolm Coulthard (eds.). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, 32–70.

van Leeuwen, Theo J. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vihalemm, Peeter (2008). The Infosphere and Media Use of Estonian Russians. In Mati Heidmets (ed.). *Estonian Human Development Report 2007*. Tallinn: Eesti Koostöökogu, 77–81.

Vihalemm, Peeter. (2006). Media Use in Estonia. Trends and Patterns. *Nordicom Review* 27(1), 17–29.

Vihalemm, Peeter. (2001). Development of Media Research in Estonia. *Nordicom Review* 22(2), 79–92.

Vihalemm, Peeter & Kõuts, Ragne. (2004). Trükisõna ja lugejaskond Eestis 1965–2004. In Peeter Vihalemm (ed.). *Meediasüsteem ja meediakasutus Eestis 1965–2004*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 61–90.

Vihalemm, Triin. (1999). Estonian Language Competence, Performance, and Beliefs on Acquisition among the Russian-Speaking Inhabitants of Estonia, 1989–1997. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 139, 69–85.

Voss, Christian. (2006). The Macedonian Standard Language: Tito-Yugoslav Experiment or Symbol of 'Great Macedonian' Ethnic Inclusion? In Clare Mar-Molinero & Patrick Stevenson (eds.). *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 118–132.

Weber, Max. (2002) [1904, 1921–22]. *Võimu ja religiooni sotsioloogiast*. Tallinn: Vagabund.

Wertsch, James. (2008). The Narrative Organization of Collective Memory. *Ethos* 36 (1), 120–135.

Wiedemann, Ferdinand Johann. (2002) [1864]. *Versuch ueber den werroestnischen Dialect*. (eds. Külli Habicht, Karl Pajusalu). Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Wittgenstein, Ludvig. (2005) [1967]. Filosoofilised uurimused. Tartu: Ilmamaa.

Wodak, Ruth. (2008). Discourse Studies – Important Concepts and Terms. In Ruth Wodak & Michał Krzyżanowski (eds.). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–29.

Wodak, Ruth. (2001). What CDA is about? In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1–13.

Wodak, Ruth, Johnstone, Barbara & Kerswill, Paul. (2011). Introduction. In Ruth Wodak, Ruth, Barbara Johnstone, & Paul Kerswill (eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: Sage Publications Ltd., 1–7.

Wodak, Ruth, de Cillia, Rudolf, Reisigl, Martin & Liebhart, Karin. (2009) [1999]. *The discursive construction of national identity*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics* 2(3), 235–249.

Woolard, Kathryn. A. & Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55–82.

SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

Keeleideoloogiad tänapäeva eesti avalikus diskursuses, fookusega lõunaeesti keelel

Keeleideoloogiad võimaldavad konstrueerida teatud keeli ja keelepruuke teistest väärtuslikumaks ning positsioneerida neid hierarhiliselt (Blackledge 2005). Võim on, mitte üksnes keeleideoloogiate tõttu, mitmekeelses keskkonnas alati ebaühtlaselt jaotunud (Dorian 2002). Keeleideoloogiad ühes teiste keeleväliste teguritega võivad keelelistest faktidest enamgi seletada keelemuutusi ja -vahetust (Cameron 2006). Homogeensena näiva eesti keele positsioon on keelehierarhiates minevikus korduvalt muutunud. See teeb Eesti ühiskonnast akadeemiliselt üsna huvipakkuva uurimisobjekti. Just allkeelte, nt kõnekeele, traditsiooniliste kohamurrete keeleregistrite tähenduse, väärtuse(tuse), (düs)funktsionaalsuse jms konstrueerimine võimaldab lähemalt vaadelda neid argumentatsioonivõtteid ja -strateegiaid, mida keele staatuses keelte puhul ei pruugi märgata. Käesolevas doktoritöös analüüsitakse domineerivaid ja teisi keeleideoloogiaid ning keelelisi representatsioone lõunaeesti keele avalikus diskursuses.

Alates 1980ndate lõpust on lõunaeesti keele aktivistid, nii radikaalsed kui ka mõõdukamad Võru liikumise (Kansui 1999), aga ka setude esindajad (Jääts 2000), püüdnud legitimeerida lõunaeesti kohamurdeid ja saavutada nende avalik tunnustamine lõunaeesti keelena (Ehala 2007). 2000ndate keskel ja lõpus on esitatud täidesaatvale võimule ettepanekud muuta keeleseadust. Kaasnenud legitiimsusnõuded trükimeedias koos esitatud poolt- ja vastuargumentidega kuuluvad diskursustesse, mida võib nimetada (de)legitimatsiooni- ja keele ohustatuse diskursusteks. Need pakuvad hea võimaluse uurida keelelisi representatsioone ja/või keeleideoloogiaid tänapäeva Eesti ühiskonnas.

Eesti ühiskonda on iseloomustatud keelelise rahvusluse (*linguistic nationalism*) (Rouillard 2009) ja keelelise autoritaarsuse (*linguistic authoritarianism*) (Raag 2010) mõiste abil ning kuni taasiseseisvumiseni kestnud totalitaarse keelesitutatsiooni kaudu (Hennoste 1999). Samas ei pööra enamik rahvusluse ajaloo käsitlusi rahvusluse ideoloogilistele aspektidele ja nende diskursiivsele konstrueerimisele märkimisväärset tähelepanu (Piirimäe 2009). Sotsiaalteadustes on rahvusloome diskursiivseid aspekte rohkem uuritud (vt nt Feldman 2001, Ruutsoo 2002, Petersoo 2007, Pääbo 2011). Standardiseerimise ideoloogilist mõju on vaadelnud põhja- ja lõunaeesti kirjakeele konkurentsis ka humanitaarid (nt Raag 1999, Laanekask 2004). Lõunaeesti keel on pälvinud akadeemilist tähelepanu ennekõike dialektoloogia (Wiedemann (2002) [1864], Saareste (2006) [1952], Pajusalu 1996, 2003) ja sotsiolingvistika (Org et al. 1994, Mets 2010) ning regionalismi käsitlustes (Jääts 2000, Raag 2010). Antropoloog Annist (2009) kasutab setu kultuuri hegemoonia mõistet institutsionaliseeritud projektipõhise rahastamise mõjude kirjeldamisel.

Nii keele kriitilised käsitlused kui ka diskursuseuuringud (*discourse studies*) lähtuvad Gramsci (1971, 1985) historitsistlikust keelekäsitlusest, mille järgi on

keel sotsiaalne ja poliitiline fenomen, mis võimaldab luua hegemooniliste klasside huvides poliitilist ühtsust. Keeleprobleemi esilekerkimine näitab teatud kultuurihegemoonilist ümberkorraldust. (Keele)standardiloome on poliitiline ja seega võimuküsimus. Foucault' (1980) jaoks ei saa tõde, mis eristab õiget valest, eksisteerida väljaspool võimu. Igal ühiskonnal on oma tõerežiim, diskursused, mida tunnustatakse ja seatakse tõena funktsioneerima. Tõde on koondunud teadusliku diskursuse ja seda loovate institutsioonide ümber. Sotsiaalteaduste apoliitilist keelekäsitlust on kritiseerinud ka Bourdieu (1991). Legitiimse sümboolse vägivalla monopoli hoidjal on võim institutsionaliseeritud taksonoomiate üle. Legislatiivseid taksonoomiaid toodetakse kultuurilise või ideoloogilise konstrueerimise väljal. Tähendusloome võime ei ole keeleline, vaid poliitiline, ja see on jaotunud ühiskonnas ebavõrdselt (Bourdieu 1991, Martin & Rose 2003). Need ja teised autorid on mõjutanud näiteks kriitilist diskursusanalüüsi (KDA), mis keskendub ideoloogia rollile võimu, domineerimise ja legitimeerimise diskursiivses taastootmises (van Dijk 1998). Varasemad ideoloogiakäsitlused on olnud suunatud selle kallutatud olemusele, lähtudes marksistlikust võltsteadvuse kontseptsioonist, ja rõhutanud selle teisesust (*otherness*). Van Dijk formuleerib uue, multidistsiplinaarse ideoloogiateooria, mis võimaldab erinevalt varasematest uurida ideoloogiaid ka empiiriliselt. Ideoloogia üks funktsioone on legitimatsioon. Diskursus on ideoloogia uurimise keskmes erinevate uurimisdistsipliinide jaoks. Lahknevused tulenevad lähenemisnurgast: neist ühe kohaselt on diskursus mis tahes sotsiaalne tegevus; teine vaatleb diskursust, seega ka ideoloogiat, näiteks keelelisest käitumisest lahus (vrd Philips 1992). Esimest pooldab KDA-st tõukuv keeleideoloogiate uurimise traditsioon (nt Blackledge 2005). Teist eelistavad keeleideoloogiate uurimise traditsiooni alustanud Põhja-Ameerika keeleantropoloogid (vt Johnson & Milani 2009; Woolard & Schieffelin 1994, Kroskrity 2000).

Doktoritöö keskendub keeleideoloogiatele, nii neile, mida vastustatakse, kui ka neile, mis näivad vastustavat hegemoonilist diskursust. Kuna tekstipopulatsiooni suurus polnud ette teada ning tekstikorpus osutus piiratuks ja homogeenseks, on kasutatud kvalitatiivset lähenemist (vrd Martin & Rose 2003). Ehkki on olemas ka lõunaeestikeelne (trüki)meedia, on selles töös analüüsitud eestikeelset trükimeediat, kus legitiimsusnõudeid esitatakse ja lükatakse tagasi, sest lõunaeestikeelne meedia ei pruugi olla eesti ühiskeele kõnelejatele mõistetav ja kättesaadav. Valim koosneb 17 tekstist, mille keskmes on keele ohustatus, ja kuuest tekstist, mille fookuses on lõunaeesti keele (de)legitimatsioon. Meetodina on kasutatud KDA-d (nt van Dijk, 1998, Wodak et al. 2009 [1999]). Lõunaeesti keele diskursus on kinnistunud rahvusloome ja standardkeele kehtestamise diskursusesse. Hoolimata eksplitsiitsest polariseerumisest ja lahknevatest diskursiivsetest strateegiatest, tugevdavad nii lõunaeesti keele staatuse pooldajad kui ka selle vastased üsna sarnaseid keelelisi representatsioone: mõlemad taastoodavad eesti ja lõunaeesti keele olemuslikke (*essentialist*), harva ka puristlikke käsitlusi. Keelt ja/või keeli dekonstrueerimata ning keelekasutajate agentsust arvestamata (Makoni & Pennycook 2005) oleks

tunnustatud lõunaeesti keel ja võimalik keelestandard oma allkeelte suhtes eesti kirjakeele standardiga võrreldavas positsioonis. Ehkki keelestaatuse pooldajaid on süüdistatud separatismis, järgitakse pigem n-ö kultuurilise rikastamise agendat. Mõlemad pooled kasutavad mineviku- (eesti keele standardi loomine) ja tulevikusuunalisi põhjuslikke (hirm keelekao ees) skeeme.

Doktoritöö põhineb kolmel akadeemilises perioodikas avaldatud originaaluurimusel.

Esimese uurimuse keskmes on identiteedidiskursus ja -poliitika, identiteediloome ja keeleline identiteet, mida mõistetakse ennekõike kollektiivse identiteedina ning analüüsitakse KDA meetodite abil. KDA käsitleb keelt, identiteeti ja sotsiaalseid gruppe diskursiivselt konstrueerituna. Analüüsitakse diskursiivseid strateegiaid, eeskätt viitavaid või nimetavaid strateegiaid (*referential or nomination strategies*), mida kasutavad identiteediloomes nii lõunaeesti murrete uurijad-vaatlejad (välisgrupp) kui ka keelekogukond (sisegrupp). Viitavate strateegiate kasutamine näitab, et mõlema grupi diskursiivsetele praktikatele on iseloomulik nii grupisisene kui ka -väline polarisatsioon. Valdavalt nimetavate asesõnade abil konstrueeritakse meie- ja nendegrupp. Lõunaeesti keele aktivistid eristavad ennast keelekasutajatest, välisgrupi kolumnistid seevastu neist mõlemast. Predikatiivsetes strateegiates (*predicational strategies*) rakendatakse negatiivset teiseesitlemist (*negative other-presentation*). Peale nimetatud strateegiate rakendatakse veel autoriseerimist (*authorization*) võrdluse (*comparison*) ja legitiimsete teiste (*reference to legitimate others*) abil. Tulemused kinnitavad van Dijki (2006) seisukohta, mille järgi ei piisa identiteediloome seletamisel sotsiaalse grupi liikmesuse kindlakstegemisest. Tulemusi saab seletada näiteks sisegrupi (keeleaktivistid *versus* keelekogukond) lahknevate huvide, praktikate ja (keele)võimekusega (*linguistic capacities*). Samal ajal kui Lõuna-Eesti keelekogukonna n-ö tavaliikmed on ametis igapäevapraktikatega, on keeleaktivistide huvi keskmes keel.

Teises uurimuses on analüüsitud agentsuse (*agency*) representatsiooni avalikus diskursuses, mille võtmeteema on keel(t)e ohustatus, aga ka soovimatud keelemuutused, murrete kadu jms. Analüüsitakse, millised protsessid on nominaliseeritud ja milliseid teisi varjatud või taandatud agentsuse võtteid on diskursuses rakendatud. Kasutades KDA raamistikku, näitan, et materiaalsetes protsessides, mis esitavad keelemuutusi, -vahetust või -kadu, on toimija välja jäetud. Diskursiivsed praktikad, mis varjavad keelekasutaja agentsust ja koos sellega representeerivad puudulikult keele protsessilaadset (*languaging*) (vrd Becker 1991) ja ka generatiivset olemust, toetavad kaudselt Eesti monoglossilist keelelist kultuuri (vrd del Valle 2000). Keele ohustatuse avalikku diskursust toodavad ja taastoodavad keele- (keelekorraldajad, -aktivistid) ja meediaprofessionaalid (kolumnistid, ajakirjanikud). Keele ohustatuse diskursus on ka professionaliseerumise avalikuks areeniks, kus keeleprofessionaalid esitavad n-ö pädevusnõudeid (*jurisdictional claims*) (vrd Abbott 1988), millega taotlevad

avalikku heakskiitu, et erialaseid probleeme (sh keel ja keelemuutused) klassifitseerida, nende üle arutleda ja neid lahendada. Taandatud agentsus võib aga viidata keelekogukondade võõrandumisele oma keelest (vrd Halliday 2004).

Kolmas uurimus käsitleb lõunaeesti (de)legitimatsioonidiskursust. KDA abil analüüsitakse lõunaeesti keele staatuse pooldajate ja vastaste argumentatsiooni. Mõlemad pooled kasutavad mitmesuguseid strateegiad, nt viited autoriteetidele, legitiimsetele teistele, ajaloole (*authorization*), aga ka ratsionaliseerivaid argumente (*rationalization*), kuid lõunaeesti murdeid keelekategooriast välistavas diskursiivses praktikas kasutatakse negatiivset teiseesitlemist ja manipuleeritakse ohuga. Seega on lõunaeesti (de)legitimatsioonidiskursus ühtlasi keele ohustatuse diskursus, mis kulgeb paralleelselt eesti-vene enamus-vähemus(keele)diskursusega. Keeleturule (*marché linguistique*) on omistatud nullsumma-mängu-põhimõte. Mõlemad pooled taastoodavad keele essentsialistlikku tähendust ja käsitlust. Diskursuses eendub eesti keele sümboolne ja ikooniline tähendus (vrd Irvine & Gal 2000), mis töötab keelelise mitmekesisuse kui eesmärgi vastu. Oht, kulukus ja ajalooline järjepidevus on põhiargumendid, millega välistatakse lõunaeesti keelele keele staatuse andmine.

Töö kokkuvõttes pakutakse artiklites resümeeritule lisaks teisi tõlgendusi. Esiteks, kuna keelestaatuse oponendid manipuleerivad ohuga ja kasutavad teisi manipuleerivaid võtteid, nt negatiivset teiseesitlust, võib nende esitatud keeleideoloogiat pidada Eesti domineerivaks keeleideoloogiaks (vrd van Dijk 2006). Teiseks, etnolingvistilise grupi, sh Lõuna-Eesti keelekogukondade sisemine opositsioon võib lähtuda ka näiteks standardiseerimisest (vrd Gal 2006). Tuleb meeles pidada, et nagu migrantidele, kelle jaoks on uus meedia võimaldanud virtuaalsete naabruskondade tekke (Appadurai 2005 [1996]), on ennekõike vähemusgrupi privilegeeritumale osale kättesaadav uue meedia kaudu leviv informatsioon, sh mitmekeelsuse diskursus. Kolmandaks, lõunaeesti (de)legitimatsioonidiskursuses ja keele ohustatuse diskursuses torkab silma interdiskursiivsus külma sõja järgse julgeoleku ja globaalse diskursusega (vrd Gould 2006). Esimeses konstrueeritakse autsaidereid (nt migrante) ennekõike probleemide kaudu ja teine viitab üleilmsele konkurentsile rahvusriikide vahel. Eesti kontekstis tähendab see venekeelse vähemuse ja Eesti keelelise konkurentsivõime pidevat nimetamist. Vaadeldavas diskursuses peegeldub ka akadeemiline diskursus nii üldiselt kui ka selle distsiplinaarse uurimisseisuna. Eesti keele standardi legitiimsust põhjendatakse Gramsci epohhi vaimus: poliitiline ühtsus vajab keelelist standardiseerimist. Lisaks keeleideoloogiate uurimisele täiendab see doktoritöö rahvusluse ja rahvusloome (diskursuste) uurimist. Keele ohustatuse diskursusele tuleb pöörata suuremat tähelepanu ka keele- ja identiteedipoliitikate analüüsimisel. Rajades alles teed keeleideoloogiate uurimisele Eestis, võiks käesolev töö jätkuda poolavalike ja individuaalsete diskursuste uurimisega.

PUBLICATIONS

OTHER PUBLICATIONS ON
THE TOPIC OF THE PHD THESIS

Koreinik, Kadri. (2005). The Paper for a Speech Community – How It Relates to the Community Media Model. In Olga Haurinen & Helena Sulkala (eds.). (2005) *Tutkielmia vähemmistökielistä Jäämereltä Liivinrantaan. Vähemmistökielten tutkimus- ja koulutusverkoston raportti IV*. Acta Universitatis Ouluensis. Humaniora B 66, 62–70.

Koreinik, Kadri. (2007). *Võro. The Võro language in education in Estonia. Regional Dossiers Series*. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.

Koreinik, Kadri & Pajusalu, Karl (2007). Language naming practices and linguistic identity in South-Eastern Estonia. Hasselblatt, C.; Blokland, R. (eds.). *Language and Identity in the Finno-Ugric World*. Maastricht: Shaker, 192–204.

Eichenbaum, Külli & Koreinik, Kadri (2008). Kuis eläs mulgi, saarõ ja võro kiil? Kohakeelte seisundiuuring Mulgimaal, Saaremaal ja Võrumaal. Võru: Võro Instituut.

Koreinik, Kadri (forthcoming). Executive Summary of the Case-specific Report on the Seto language. ELDIA Working Papers. http://www.eldia-project.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=16&Itemid=70&lang=et

Koreinik, Kadri (forthcoming). Executive Summary of the Case-specific Report on the Võro language. *ELDIA Working Papers*. http://www.eldia-project.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&id=16&Itemid=70&lang=et

Koreinik, Kadri & Saar, Evar (forthcoming). On the maintenance of South Estonian varieties with a focus on institutions. *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Kadri Koreinik
Date of birth: 31 December 1970
                  Married, three children
Citizenship: Estonian
Address: Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, University of
                  Tartu, Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Estonia
Telephone: +372 5238337
E-mail: kadri.koreinik@ut.ee

Education
1991–1996   Undergraduate studies, Department of Sociology, University
             of Tartu
1997–1998   Graduate studies (MA in Economy and Society), Central
             European University
2001–2002   Diploma in Community Development, National University of
             Ireland, Galway
2000–2011   Graduate (doctoral) studies, Institute of Sociology and Social
             Policy, University of Tartu

Professional experience
2010–2012   Researcher, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics,
             University of Tartu
2004–2009   Researcher, Võru Institute
2007–2007   Freelance consultant, ECOTEC Research & Consulting Ltd.
2005–2006   Freelance consultant, WYG International
2002–2002   Coordinator, Rural Partnership Programme
1999–2007   Lector on contract, Institute of Sociology and Social Policy
1997–2002   Part-time researcher, Võru Institute
1996–1997   Media planner, Zavod advertising agency

Other courses and seminars
January 2011   ELDIA workshops for media discourse analysis, University of
                 Helsinki, Finland, and for textual analysis (Transcriber, ELAN
                 and systemic functional linguistics), University of Maribor,
                 Slovenia
October 2010   ELDIA workshop for legal analysis, Võru, Estonia
November 2006   5th Kastelli Symposium "Well-being and Health in the
                 Northern Focus", Oulu, Finland
August 2005   Oslo Summer School in Comparative Social Sciences 2005
February 2005   Seminar "Nordic-Baltic-Russian network of Finnic minorities
                 and regional languages", Eskilstuna, Sweden

July 1992	4th Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen, summer school in Cortona, Italy

Research interests

Language ideologies and extra-linguistic factors and representations which determine language behaviour, discourse, linguistic minorities, construction of membership/identity in speech communities in media, language maintenance, language shift and societal impacts of standard-building.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Nimi: Kadri Koreinik
Sünniaeg: 31. detsember 1970
                  abielus, kolm last
Kodakondsus: Eesti
Aadress: eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, Tartu ülikool, Ülikooli 18,
                  50090 Tartu, Estonia
Telefon: +372 5238337
E-post: kadri.koreinik@ut.ee

Haridus
1991–1996   bakalaureuseõpe, Tartu ülikooli sotsioloogia osakond
1997–1998   magistriõpe, Kesk-Euroopa Ülikool
2001–2002   diplomiõpe, National University of Ireland, Galway
2000–2011   doktoriõpe, Tartu ülikooli sotsioloogia ja sotsiaalpoliitika
              instituut

Teenistuskäik
2010–2012   spetsialist, Tartu ülikooli eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut
2004–2009   teadur, Võru instituut
2007–2007   vabakutseline konsultant, ECOTEC Research & Consulting
              Ltd.
2005–2006   vabakutseline konsultant, WYG International
2002–2002   koordinaator, Rural Partership Programme
1999–2007   lepinguline lektor, Tartu ülikooli sotsioloogia ja sotsiaal-
              poliitika instituut
1997–2002   teadur, Võru instituut
1996–1997   meediaplaneerija, reklaamiagentuur Zavod

Erialane enesetäiendus
jaanuar 2011   ELDIA meediadiskursusanalüüsi õpituba, Helsingi ülikool,
                  Soome
okotober 2010   ELDIA õigusanalüüsi õpituba ja sümpoosion, Võru, Estonia
november 2006   5th Kastelli sümpoosion "Wellbeing and Health in the Northern
                  Focus", Oulu, Soome
august 2005   Oslo Summer School in Comparative Social Sciences 2005
veebruar 2005   seminar "Nordic-Baltic-Russian network of Finnic minorities
                  and regional languages", Eskilstuna, Rootsi
juuli 1992   4th Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen poliitika-
                  teaduse suvekool, Cortona, Itaalia

Teadustöö põhisuunad

Keeleideoloogiad ja representatsioonid ning muud keelevälised tegurid, mis mõjutavad keelelist käitumist, diskursus, keelelised vähemused, keelekogu-kondade identiteediloome ja konstruktsioon meedias, keelehoole, keelevahetus, keele standardiseerimise sotsiaalne mõju.

DISSERTATIONES SOCIOLOGICAE
UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Veronika Kalmus**. School textbooks in the field of socialisation. Tartu, 2003, 206 p.
2. **Kairi Kõlves**. Estonians' and Russian minority's suicides and suicide risk factors: studies on aggregate and individual level. Tartu, 2004, 111 p.
3. **Kairi Kasearu.** Structural changes or individual preferences? A study of unmarried cohabitation in Estonia. Tartu, 2010, 126 p.
4. **Avo Trumm**. Poverty in the context of societal transitions in Estonia. Tartu, 2011, 215 p.