

Standard Dialect Ideology in Bangladesh: A Field Study

Sheikh Mehedi Hasan, Ph.D. in English
Adilur Rahaman, M.A. in English

=====

Abstract

Standard dialect ideology (hereafter SD ideology) as a significant concept in linguistic anthropology affects linguistic behavior and belief system of speakers of a speech community. In addition, SD ideology appears to fetishize ‘standard’ variety and stigmatize ‘non-standard’ variety of a language. In this study, we attempt to explore the symptoms of SD ideology in the linguistic behavior of Bangla speakers in Bangladesh. Field data suggest that SD ideology exists in the psyche of Bangla speakers in distinctive forms and seems to manifest itself differently in rural and urban areas of Bangladesh.

Key words: Standard Dialect Ideology, Bangla speakers in Bangladesh, dialectal distinctions, rural and urban differences.

1.0 Introduction

Issues pertaining to *standard language ideology* are generally addressed by linguistic anthropologists and sociolinguists. It has become an object of study since the assumptions of SD ideology seem to discriminate and stigmatize a large number of speakers in a society. Moreover, SD ideology appears to create a binary between ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ variety by situating standard variety at the center of a particular language. In the process of this binary function, speech of ‘non-standard variety’ becomes stigmatized. Besides, power-relations seem to play a significant role in distributing standard language and SD ideology in society. In Bangladesh, the manifestations of standard language ideology can be traced in interactions between speakers of Bangla, in opinion and judgment about ‘other’ speakers, and in making decisions about learning different varieties of the Bangla language.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Mechanism that Constructs SD Ideology in Society

Milroy (2001) indicates that the process of standardization of language leads to the formulation of standard language ideology, defining standardization as an imposition of uniformity upon a group of entity (p. 531). In his words: “Standardization consists of the imposition of uniformity upon a class of objects” (2001, p. 531). Standardization involves the process of modifying objects to generate similar patterns by removing distinctive features from them. Thus, as Milroy claims (2001, p. 531), objects (in this case language) become invariant which were originally variant or different. In particular, uniformity or invariance thus becomes a defining feature of standard language.

Milroy (2001, p. 532) elaborates upon the fact that ‘prestige’ is a social category that defines standard language. In other words, a standardized language carries high social prestige. This feature or characteristic of standard language is predicated on value judgment. Milroy clarifies that a standard language is prestigious, not because it is uniform, but powerful groups ascribe prestige to a particular variety of a language. However, he points out that ‘prestige’ is not a property of language—it is a social phenomenon that is systematically associated with language. Milroy (2001, p. 534) notes that the existence of standard variety depends on the process of identifying and stigmatizing non-standard varieties. He mentions that the dichotomy between ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ language is ideological.

Milroy (2001, p. 535) further discusses the consequences of standardization, pointing out that the consciousness of ‘correctness’ emerges as an outcome of standardization. In standard language cultures, through common sense speakers of a language can differentiate between ‘correct’ and ‘incorrect’ forms of the language. In Milroy’s words (2001, p. 535): “It is taken for granted as common sense that some forms are right and wrong, and this is so even when there is disagreement as to which is which”. He (2001, pp. 535-536) argues that the linguistic/grammatical explanation for the correctness or legitimacy of linguistic forms is ‘post hoc rationalization’. To establish this argument, he provides an example of an incorrect sentence in English. He notes that prescriptive grammarians would claim through their argument of post hoc rationalization that the sentence ‘I seen it’ is wrong because “seen is participle, not the past tense”. Thus, intra-linguistic justification about the correctness of linguistic form is ideological. A linguistic form historically evolves through interactions or

through deliberate intervention of language academies and at one point that form begins to represent itself as natural, logical and legitimate to stigmatize ‘illegitimate other’ forms.

According to Milroy (2001, pp. 547-551), SD ideology is established through the process of codification such as writing grammar books and dictionaries (Milroy, 2001, p. 547). There is an impact of codification on popular mind. When a nation-state codifies and standardizes a language, common people tend to believe that authoritative accounts or descriptions of a language are the only legitimate forms, disregarding the correctness of other varieties of a language. Milroy (2001, p. 548) asserts that historical linguistics is also responsible for describing non-codified form as ‘incorrect’. Milroy (2001, p. 548) cites Wyld who believes that standard language is correct and representative of a particular language because standard form has a long history of existence, which is documented and endorsed by authority whereas non-standardized varieties do not have any history.

Wyld (in Milroy, 2001, p. 548) also denies the existence of urban dialects by claiming that urban dialects do not “have independent histories of their own”. Nevertheless, Victorian linguists accept the existence of regional or rural dialects as they might be a valuable source of linguistic data to reconstruct [standard dialect of] a language.

Marsh (1865 in Milroy, 2001, p. 550), a linguist of 19th Century, differentiates between legitimate and illegitimate change of language. According to Marsh (1865 in Milroy, 2001, p. 550), legitimate changes are internal and natural change of a language whereas illegitimate changes are ‘corruption’ that occur due to extraneous factors.

Milroy (2001, p. 550) suggests that linguists could not provide any explicit criteria for differentiating between natural change and illegitimate change (corruption) of a language (2001, p. 548). Nevertheless, some linguists defined urban dialects as vulgar that contaminate the purity of a language. In such cases, history functions as a determining factor to define the legitimacy of a language. However, Milroy claims that history cannot be an effective and useful criterion to legitimize a form. He argues that historically “the house is building” is correct and “the house is being built is incorrect”; but in late 1850s, “the house is building” became an incorrect or illegitimate form.

In her article “Accent, Standard Language Ideology, and Discriminatory Pretext in the Courts”, Lippi-Green (1994) uses the term ‘SL ideology’ to indicate standard language ideology. Lippi-Green explores various dimensions of SL ideology and identifies the mechanics exploited to propagate SL ideology. SL ideology, as Lippi-Green (1994, p. 164) mentions, might manifest itself when an interlocutor evaluates a speaker, when social stereotyping is constructed on the basis of language, or when someone is discriminated on the basis of linguistic differences. By citing McArthur (1992 in Lippi-Green, 1994, p. 16) she describes the assumptions of L2 ideology about accent such as accent is “adenoidal, barbarous, broad, cute, distinct, educated, flat, foreign, funny, guttural, harsh, heavy, lilting, nasal, posh, provincial, quaint, rough, rustic, sing-song, strong, and uneducated”. She claims that in English speaking countries the term ‘accent’ is used to discriminate people as social ‘other’. Lippi-Green (2001, p. 166) defines SD ideology as a belief which claims that there is an ideal and homogenous system of speaking; in addition, the ‘correct’ model of speech is taken from written form. Lippi-Green (1994, pp. 166-167) argues that the powerful blocs of society create, propagate and disseminate central assumptions of SL ideology as ‘common sense’, and common people uncritically subscribe to that ideology. She further argues that educational system, news media and entertainment industry are useful apparatuses to spread SL ideology in the US. With regard to educational system, students are taught that there is a ‘correct’ way of speaking and ‘incorrect’ way of speaking, and only grammar books and ‘proper’ authority can provide them with information about correct usage of language (Lippi-Green, 1994, p. 167). Media, especially newspapers, as Lippi-Green (1994, p. 169) mentions, also promotes SL ideology. She (1994, p. 170) comments that in an standard language culture, people fail to recognize that variation in spoken language is systematic and regular/structured. In addition, the concept of ‘national standard’ is an *idealization* and *abstraction* which does not exist in reality; it simply hides the real nature of spoken language.

2.2 Components of SD Ideology

Milroy (2001, pp. 536-537) analyzes the components of standard dialect ideology in society. He notes that when people differentiate between ‘correct’ and ‘incorrect’ linguistic forms they believe that their judgment is based on linguistic theories. Those who believe in SD ideology do not understand that they are prejudiced and their attitude is discriminatory. Sometimes they acknowledge that their own speech is ‘incorrect’ and they need guidance from superior authority to improve their speech. Milroy (2001, p. 537) identifies the

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:10 October 2014

Sheikh Mehedi Hasan, Ph.D. in English and Adilur Rahaman, M.A. in English
Standard Dialect Ideology in Bangladesh: A Field Study

following components of SD ideology. First, SD ideology assumes that correct linguistic forms (pronunciation, rules, norms, meanings) have to be learned from grammar books or from schools. Second, the canonical form or correct variety inherits from ancestral grammarians or linguists; common people do not have any contribution to enrichment of a standard variety of language (Milroy, 2001, p. 537). The third feature of standard dialect ideology is the belief that if the canonical variety is distorted, the language might face the threat of extinction. Hence, the correct or canonical form has to be protected. The fourth component (Milroy, 2001, p. 539) of SD ideology indicates that language, for common people, does not mean all varieties of a language; language for them means the reified variety or standard variety of a language. Fifth, non-standard varieties are deviations from the standard variety. Sixth, SD ideology stigmatizes non-standard variety (Milroy, 2001, p. 551).

2.3 Is SD ideology false consciousness?

Milroy (2001) does not explicitly dispel arguments pertaining to standard dialect ideology. Instead, he historicizes the genealogy of language as a system and offers a comparative analysis of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ variety to clarify the point that standard dialect is one of the varieties of a particular linguistic system. He (2001, pp. 539-543) observes that many languages of the world are not standardized and in the case of non-standardized languages, nobody would find the existence of a static and fixed prestige variety. This phenomenon implies that standardization is not a ‘natural’ process, but rather, an artificially constructed sociolinguistic condition. He indicates that some dominant languages of the world such as English or French seem to be responsible for constructing standard language ideology (2001, p. 542). In Milroy’s words (2001, p. 542): “English has developed over time higher and higher levels of standardization in the various phases of this process, and, within the culture, there has been greater and greater acceptance of the ideology of standardization”.

Through a comparative analysis of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ language, Milroy (2001, p. 543) claims that standard dialect is an idealized variety that exists in speakers’ mind, but it is not completely applied in interactions. Similarly, a non-standard variety might have an ‘ideal’ form that is used in communication. This fact cannot ascribe superiority or uniqueness to standard variety because uniformity can be imposed upon any variety of a particular language. Milroy (2001, pp. 543-545) argues that methodology of linguistics is

responsible for the construction of SD ideology. He maintains that linguists chiefly study standard language cultures and the conception about right and wrong also comes from ideological assumptions or presuppositions of the linguists. For instance, grammaticality or correctness of an utterance, as some linguists believe, depends on the use of a particular form in literary texts; ‘correctness’ or ‘grammaticality’, as Milroy argues, is not predicated on the systematic recurrence of a particular form. For instance, the expression “the eggs is cracked” systematically recurs in one variety of English (Milroy, 2001, p. 545). But this expression is excluded from the corpus of correct form, because this form (plural NP followed by singular auxiliary marker) is not used in literature. Milroy (2001, p. 544) notes that SD ideology assumes that languages are ‘fixed’ and ‘stable’ entities. In practice, Milroy asserts, language changes constantly and it is not homogenous.

2.4 Indexicality and SD ideology

Irvine and Gal (2000, p. 37) in “Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation” records that *Indexicality* refers to the notion that linguistic features (e.g. pronunciation, vocabulary, syntax etc.) mirror the images of people and their culture. In short, speech represents identity and common behavioral patterns of a person or a group. In addition, linguistic behavior is believed to be inseparable from a speech community’s moral, emotional, psychological or economic properties. However, Silverstein (1998) categorizes *indexicality* into two types: *first-order indexicality* and *second-order indexicality* (p. 128). According to Silverstein, *first-order indexicality* refers to the notion that linguistic system is affected by socio-demographic ideology (structure of ideas) such as kinship, ethnicity, gender etc. (p. 129). In particular, the value system (latent functions) of a society produces distinctive linguistic forms (manifest system). For instance, T/V pronominal system in French language evolved from the unequal power relations between people in French society (Silverstein, 2000, p. 132). Similarly, Japanese affinal taboo index resulted from social ideology regarding relationship between mother-in-law and son-in-law/daughter-in-law. To be specific, son-in-law/daughter-in-law avoids certain lexical items in front of mother-in-law (“Indexicality,” n.d.). Silverstein (2000, p. 129) argues that linguists sometimes obfuscate the *first-order-indexicality* by claiming that structural regularities of a particular language is *natural*. This argument of Silverstein suggests that ideas about correct/incorrect forms of language emerge from the process of naturalizing linguistic regularities and alienating *second-order indexicality* (latent, i.e. value system, for instance) from *first-order indexicality*

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:10 October 2014

Sheikh Mehedi Hasan, Ph.D. in English and Adilur Rahaman, M.A. in English
Standard Dialect Ideology in Bangladesh: A Field Study

(i.e. linguistic forms). On the other hand, *second-order indexicality* refers to the notion that language encodes speakers' socio-economic or personal characteristics.

The notion of indexicality and SD ideology are interconnected. SD ideology represents the standardized variety of a language as the only correct/legitimate variety of the language. In this process, speakers of non-standardized variety are generally indexed as the speakers of incorrect/illegitimate variety of a language. In addition, these speakers are forced to carry the stigma associated with a non-standardized variety. In other words, first-order indexical (linguistic properties of a standardized variety) activates second-order indexical (its sociological value/prestige) and influences human behavior, i.e. speakers of standard variety are treated with honor; likewise, the linguistic properties (e.g. lexis, phonological system) of a non-standardized variety also reveals its second-order indexical (i.e. its stigma) and leads to discrimination of the speakers. This drama of indexical association appears to be created by SD ideology (see section 2.1).

3.0 Methodology

In this study, we have adopted ethnographic-interpretive model of qualitative research. We have collected field data from January 2011 to December 2013 through ethnographic observation, participant observation, and informal conversation both in rural and urban areas. We selected participants and conversational events randomly for this study. In addition, we took extensive field notes—sometimes in front of the participants and sometimes surreptitiously, and recorded conversations in certain cases. In this study, we have adopted deconstructive approach to interpret the field data. Precisely, principles of deconstructive analysis include: (a) exploration of multiple meaning of texts; (b) identification of absences in texts; and (c) exploration of self-contradiction(s) in texts (Barry, 2002, pp. 61-79). Therefore, we have attempted to explore multiple meanings of the responses of the participants/conversational events, analyze the unconscious (absences) of responses/conversational events, and unravel the self-contradiction in the responses/conversational events. It is to note that in this study six cases are considered to investigate SD ideology.

4.0 Findings and Analysis

In this section, pseudonyms are used to denote participants. In an informal conversation (in an urban setting), Tripti, (about 25 years old) reveals her beliefs about standard Bangla. During the conversation, she informs that she has sent her son (3 years old) to an English medium daycare school because her son might pick up regional dialects from their housemaids. In other words, Tripti wants to protect her son from the influence of non-standard variety of Bangla. When asked about the ‘problems’ of regional dialect or non-standardized variety of Bangla, she did not answer explicitly, nor did she identify any problems; she simply smiles which might imply (from the discourse) the prestigious and privileged status of standard dialect in society. Since regional dialect is considered the language of the housemaids, she must not allow her son to learn the lower-class variety of the language.

To analyze the conversation, we engage two concepts of linguistic anthropology: *first-order indexicality* and *second-order indexicality*.

One aspect of *first-order indexicality* (i.e. linguistic features) in this case is that the woman herself used an urban-dialect with us (perhaps considering the formality of the context). Though she wants her son to speak only in standard dialect, she herself is multidialectal. During the conversation, suddenly she received a phone call from her mother and switched to her *Barisali* variety of Bangla. After attending the phone call, she switched to an urban dialect to communicate with us. We have referred to the *first-order indexical* of this conversation because it has an implication for SD ideology. However, the implication of this *first-order indexical* cannot be analyzed without referring to the *second-order indexical* which indicates Tripti’s social, familial, and economic background as well as her aspirations and ambitions in life. Tripti, a middle class M.A. graduate, works in an English medium school. As she desires to educate her son well, she has sent him to an English medium school. From the conversation, several dimensions of standard dialect ideology is revealed: first, Tripti relates SD to ‘prestige’ and a ‘sign’ of belongingness to educated class; in contrast, she stigmatizes regional varieties of Bangla as these are spoken by, according to her, “lower class people such as housemaids”. Thus, in this case the concept “indexical” comes into play. However, at one point of the conversation, she appears self-contradictory. She herself is multidialectal—that is, she knows standard Bangla, *Barisali* variety of Bangla, and an urban dialect; but she wants her son to be monodialectal. She seems to believe that if her son learns other dialects/varieties, it would relate her son’s status to certain undesirable communities of

society. In particular, *Barisali* dialect would link her son to Barisali people or uneducated/lower class group (*second-order indexical*). In order to avoid the implication of *second-order indexical*, Tripti is concerned about creating a reified identity of her son who would belong only to educated or upper class. . Thus, Tripti's son is systematically alienated from different non-standardized varieties of Bangla.

In another instance (data collected in an urban setting), Meghla (about 28 years old) from Tangail, expressed her desire to teach only standard Bangla to her son. When asked about the reason for choosing exclusively SD Bangla, instead of choosing both standard Bangla and *Tangaili* variety of Bangla (her own regional dialect), Meghla remarks that standard Bangla is essential to communicate with 'other' people. She affirms: "In order to communicate with *people*, it is essential to learn standard Bangla". Apparently, Meghla's attitude toward standard Bangla seems unproblematic since none can deny that in a multidialectal communicative setting, standard or uniform dialect might be an option. But in this case the implied meaning of 'people' is different. By 'people', Meghla means educated and upper class people. She seems to be worried about the fact that her son would be discriminated if he speaks *Tangaili* variety in an educated-elite-class setting. This worry is not arbitrary and it reflects 'prestige', acceptability, and sign-exchange value of standard dialect of Bangla language.

However, with regard to Meghla's attitude toward standard dialect, the following questions can be raised: a) why does Meghla alienate her son from *Tangaili* variety?; b) why does she avoid choosing both *Standard variety* and *Tangaili variety* for her son? The answer to question *a*, as her statement infers, is that she equates the use of *Tangaili variety* with impolite behavior. To Meghla, the use of standard variety reflects 'politeness'.

To elaborate upon this point we would like to refer to the following incident. Once Meghla brought her son with her and we observed that she talked to her son in standard Bangla. With regard to question *b*, we would like to offer the following interpretation. Meghla, a middle class woman, brought up in a semi-urban district in Bangladesh, desires a position in upward socio-economic (class) mobility. Her desire is reflected in her effort to teach her son standard Bangla. She might or might not attain economic/material resources to become an upper-middle class woman, but at least indexically (second-order) she intends to

represent herself and her son as members of educated elite class of society. Another point is that perhaps, Meghla resents her own socio-economic or linguistic background where she was not taught standard Bangla which could indexically represent her as a middle-class-elite woman. Therefore, she consciously distances herself from *Tangaili variety* of Bangla. By teaching her son standard Bangla from the early age, and by distancing him from a regional variety of Bangla, Meghla, perhaps, aspires to construct her son's identity as 'pure' middle-class elite.

In both Tripti's and Meghla's case, some common features of SD ideology are reflected. In both instances, SD is consciously linked with middle-class or upper-class-educated elite community and regional variety of Bangla is stigmatized. Tripti alienates her son from *Barisali variety*, since *Barisali variety* is the language of housemaids or lower class people (as the responses of the participant indicate). Likewise, Meghla distances her son from *Tangail variety* since this *variety* does not reflect upper middle class-elite identity. For both the participants, standard dialect is a symbolic capital or an apparatus for upward socio-economic mobility. But it is too complex to determine whether they can gain economic resources if they themselves use standard Bangla and teach standard Bangla to their son. The condition of linguistic marketplace of Bangladesh suggests that standard Bangla is capable of creating an illusion about the socio-economic class of a person. Perhaps, Tripti and Meghla are aware of this illusive power of standard Bangla.

In another instance (in a rural setting), it appears that intelligence of a child is not recognized due to the influence of standard dialect ideology. In this case, we documented data through ethnographic observation from a village of Tangail. Akash, a child of 5 years old, is a competent speaker of *Tangail variety* of Bangla. He can spontaneously talk about his surroundings and knows the names of local animals and plants. He is also capable of using language as a tool for expressing emotion. Most importantly, he can continue speaking for a long time without any inhibition. He does not seem to need any linguistic support from anyone else. One person from Tangail, instead of admiring him, comments: "The little boy speaks well; but he should learn *shuddho* [standard] Bangla". This remark about the child's linguistic capability seems to demonstrate that linguistic fluency or competence in a regional variety is not valued. In addition, it seems that SD ideology did not allow the person in this case to recognize the capacity of the child to link himself with the external world through his

regional dialect. However, parents of the child never showed any concern about teaching standard spoken Bangla to their child.

From the observation, it seems that regional variety is organically connected to their emotional life. The child seems to deliberately and consciously imitate her mothers' accent and expression. In his context, standard Bangla is simply *reified* and *idealized* variety which does not have any function or usefulness in such settings. At least, the parents of Akash cannot be identified as a stakeholder or promoter of standard spoken Bangla.

Why does SD ideology fail to recruit the parents in this case? Are they indifferent, unlike Tripti and Meghla, to their son's education or upward socio-economic mobility? One possible answer to these questions is that parents of Akash are concerned about his education but they do not associate speaking standard Bangla as an essential aspect of education. They also do not equate upper-middle class identity with a particular variety of language. In Akash's village, affluent and non-affluent people appear to speak the same variety of Bangla language. Through the analysis of this rural context, it can be deduced that people in urban areas tend to link standard Bangla with upper-middle-class-elite identity.

In addition, standard Bangla gained prestige in *urban areas* since urban areas contain multiple dialects. In the competition, standard Bangla wins, since it has codified materials such as grammar books or literature, and it has licensed propagators/spokespersons to speak of its 'inherent aesthetic beauty'.

Another data on SD ideology (in a rural setting) has been extracted from a comment about *Behula*, a serial of 'Zee Bangla' TV channel of Kolkata. Rahul, a religious counselor and a regular viewer of *Behula* comments that the language of the characters in *Behula* is sweet-sounding and correct. He also laments over the *incorrect* and *harsh* spoken variety of Bangla in Bangladesh. In his view, Kolkata's Bangla is the only 'correct' Bangla. As we observed him when he was watching *Behula*, it seemed that he listened to every utterance with love and reverence. His countenance reflected admiration for the 'sweet-sounded' pronunciation of Kolkata's Bangla. Rahul also remarks that different non-standard varieties of Bangla in Bangladesh have contaminated the beauty of Bangla language.

In this instance, standard dialect ideology reflects itself in the enunciation of *sweet-soundedness* of Kolkata's Bangla and in his belief about the stigmatized status of Bangladeshi Bangla. This data about Rahul has been derived from the same setting where Akash and his family live. A significant aspect of this data indicates that it is not a standardized variety of Bangla which sounds sweet to his ear, but rather, it is Kolkata's Bangla which is sweet-sounding. In this case, a religious preacher, living in a small village of Bangladesh, is affected by the standard dialect ideology, not of a nation-state, but of another speech community of Bangla language. From this case, it seems that there might be multiple 'standards' in the psyche of people. It is to note that Rahul appears to use regional variety of Bangla in communication with local people and tries to use standard Bangla (though it does not sound like Kolkata's Bangla) while delivering sermons in formal settings. It seems irrelevant to problematize his linguistic behavior, but SD ideology comes into play when he stigmatizes regional varieties of Bangla by taking Kolkata's Bangla as a reference point.

Another instance of SD ideology (in an urban setting) reflects itself through the self-contradictory behavior of a speaker of Bangla. In this case, Saiful, a middle class male speaker of Bangla (about 24 years old) expresses his disgust and annoyance at the use of standard Bangla by Limon. In an informal conversation, Saiful defines the practices of speaking standard Bangla as a negative characteristic of Limon whom he dislikes. He angrily remarks: *haramjada abar shantipuri bhashay kotha koy* ["That bastard speaks in *Shantipuri* Bangla"]. In this case, *Shantipuri* Bangla (see Sekhor, 2011) or standard Bangla fails to indexically categorize Limon as a polite-educated person. In addition, his use of *Shantipuri* Bangla or Standard Bangla becomes stigmatized. In other words, Saiful is informed of some negative characteristics or moral flaws of Limon. Perhaps, Saiful believes that someone with negative qualities is not supposed to use standard spoken Bangla, since standard Bangla seems to be generally propagated as *bhodroloki bhasha* [language of elite person]. It may be seen that Limon (who is disliked by Saiful) uses standard Bangla to represent himself as a member of *bhodroloki society*.

In another *adda* situation (informal conversation in an urban setting), Saiful and Foyzal (both are about 24 years old and corporate employees) assert that people speaking regional dialect should not be discriminated. They further remark that regional dialect is a

marker of a person's identity, and variations in speech of a language should be respected. However, at one point in the *adda*, both Saiful and Foysal start to mimic their acquaintances who speak regional dialect in formal public places. This suggests that their *conscious* mind believes that regional dialect should not be discriminated; but their *unconscious* is occupied by standard dialect ideology. Or, at least, they do not expect people to use regional dialect in urban formal public places. In this case, regional dialect is stigmatized only at formal places; but its use is normal at home. Therefore, it seems that they converted syntactic, lexical and phonological features of regional dialect into subject of fun. In the *adda*, the mimicry continued for at least 10 minutes until they were interrupted to change the topic.

5.0 Conclusion

In short, this study has made an attempt to reveal multiple dimensions of the application of SD ideology in Bangladesh. The study suggests that some speakers of Bangla believe that standard dialect is associated with upper class identity. In addition, this study indicates that some speakers of Bangla tend to avoid non-standard or regional variety, not because non-standard variety is incorrect, but it sounds impolite to them. Apart from this, language behavior of some speakers of regional variety at rural areas appears to deny the association between language, class and education. On the contrary, multidialectal linguistic marketplace of urban areas tends to nurture oppressive and anti-people standard dialect ideology.

References

- Barry, P. (2002). *Beginning Theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory*. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Indexicality. (n.d.). Retrieved March 10, 2013, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indexicality>
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity, (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 35-84.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1994). Accent, Standard language Ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Language in Society*, 23, 163-198.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language Ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 5(4), 530-555.
- Sekhar, S. (2011). *Bhaasaar praan bhaasaar bitarka*. Dhaka: Bivas.

Silverstein, M. (1998). The uses and utility of ideology: A commentary. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: OUP.

Sheikh Mehedi Hasan, Ph.D. in English

Assistant Professor
Department of English
Southeast University
Banani, Dhaka-1213
Bangladesh
mehedi_08@hotmail.com

Adilur Rahaman, M.A. in English

Adjunct Faculty
Department of English
Southeast University
Banani, Dhaka-1213
Bangladesh
adilr.1987@gmail.com