



Language, Gender, and Sexuality

Lal Zimman, Kira Hall

LAST MODIFIED: 28 JUNE 2016

DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199772810-0109

Introduction

Research on language, gender, and sexuality has been advanced by scholars working in a variety of areas in sociocultural linguistics, among them conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, discursive psychology, linguistic anthropology, sociophonetics, and variationist sociolinguistics. The relevance of gender to linguistic analysis was first noted in the early 20th century when descriptive linguists observed differences in female and male vocabularies and patterns of speaking in non-European languages. But it was not until the 1975 publication of Robin Lakoff's *Language and Woman's Place* (Lakoff 1975), originally published as a lead article in a 1973 issue of *Language in Society*, that disparate work on language and gender began to coalesce as a field of study. Research during this era of second-wave feminism focused on the everyday micro-discourse practices of women and men as instantiating hierarchical power relations, analyzing such phenomena as turn-taking, interruptions, and topic uptake. Fifteen years later, Deborah Tannen popularized a "two-cultures" approach to language and gender in *You Just Don't Understand: Men and Women in Conversation* (Tannen 1990), which shifted the source of gender differentiation away from patriarchy and onto language socialization in same-sex peer groups. Lakoff's and Tannen's models—which came to be called the "dominance" and "difference" models, respectively—set the foundation for contemporary work on language and gender. In the mid-1990s, the field was revitalized by what is often referenced as the "discursive turn" in social theory. New theoretical work in post-structuralist and multicultural feminism, including the view of gender as produced in discourse instead of predetermined by biological sex, inspired new involvement by language scholars across the fields of anthropology, communication, education, linguistics, psychology, sociology, and women's studies. The close analysis of gender in interaction demonstrated its intersectionality with other social categories, such as social class, race, ethnicity, age, and sexuality. Although work on language and sexuality preceded this development, this relationship too received renewed attention as scholars of language and gender came to recognize the heteronormativity that had implicitly shaped previous work in the field and began drawing on perspectives within the emergent field of queer theory. Gender and sexuality came to be seen as intimately connected in the language and gender literature, hence the field's eventual designation in many publication domains as *language, gender, and sexuality*. This annotated bibliography aims to bring together socially oriented linguistic scholarship on both gender and sexuality while also recognizing the independent trajectories of these traditions of research. Although the bibliography at times treats gender and sexuality as separate topics for purposes of clarity or emphasis, research in these traditions remains closely intertwined.

Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lakoff's groundbreaking study of "women's language" includes a range of observations about women's linguistic subjugation. Focusing on the expectations placed on women's language use, Lakoff uncovers women's linguistic double-bind: either speak "like a lady" and undermine one's interactional power, or bear the stigma of failing to adhere to gender norms.

Tannen, Deborah. 1990. *You just don't understand: Men and women in conversation*. New York: Ballantine.

Designed for a general audience, *You Just Don't Understand* combines reflections from Tannen's research as well as illustrative anecdotes to advance the argument that gendered discourse patterns are formed in childhood playgroups. Though controversial in the field, the book remains an extremely influential text on miscommunication between women and men.

General Overviews

Because the study of language, gender, and sexuality has attracted scholars from diverse disciplines, many of the field's most insightful overview articles introduce either specific topics of research, such as language and gender in workplace environments, or specific approaches or methods, such as conversation analysis. Many of these more streamlined overviews are cited later in this bibliography. Yet a number of cross-disciplinary reviews comprising research from a variety of topics and perspectives exist, among them Ehrlich and Meyerhoff 2014, a state-of-the-art introduction to the second edition of *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality* (published in first edition under the title *The Handbook of Language and Gender*). Other article overviews published since 2000 have addressed developments in the use of feminist and critical gender theory within different traditions of research in the field, among them Bucholtz 2014, Cameron 2005, and McElhinny 2014. The importance of the field's social constructionist approaches to gender and language is reflected in Ehrlich 2004, which also describes key developments in research on language and sexual violence. Overviews of research specifically focused on sexuality reflect diverging approaches to the field and include Kulick 2000, Bucholtz and Hall 2004, and Queen 2014, which offer contrasting perspectives on the usefulness of identity as an analytic category.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2014. The feminist foundations of language, gender, and sexuality research. In *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Edited by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 23–47. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bucholtz outlines how developments in the field of language, gender, and sexuality have been affected by developments in feminist theory. Her review describes influences from several feminist theoretical perspectives, among them liberal feminism, radical feminism, material feminism, multicultural feminism, postcolonial feminism, and queer theory.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 2004. Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research. *Language in Society* 33.4: 469–515.

This critical review of research in language and sexuality advances an analytic framework for identity as emergent in interaction. In contrast to calls for a purely desire-centered approach to language and sexuality, the authors argue that desire is forged through intersubjectively negotiated practices and ideologies.

Cameron, Deborah. 2005. Language, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. *Applied Linguistics* 26.4: 482–502.

Cameron outlines how sociolinguistic research on gender and sexuality has experienced a paradigmatic shift from a focus on binary difference to a focus on the diversity of identities and practices. The article discusses the theoretical foundations that have motivated this shift as well as its practical consequences with respect to empirical research.

Ehrlich, Susan. 2004. Language and gender. In *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Edited by Alan Davies and Catherine Elder, 304–327. Oxford: Blackwell.

This review, which draws on the author's research on language and sexual violence, traces the development of social constructionism in language and gender research. The section on "institutional coerciveness" argues for the continued importance of considering relations of power, as highlighted by research on sexism, sexual harassment, and sexual assault.

Ehrlich, Susan, and Miriam Meyerhoff. 2014. Introduction: Language, gender, and sexuality. In *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Edited by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 21–42. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

In the introduction to the thirty-two chapters that constitute the second edition of *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality*, Ehrlich and Meyerhoff provide a review of key themes and issues in the field. The introduction includes insightful discussions of performativity, queer linguistics, and globalization, among other subjects.

Kulick, Don. 2000. Gay and lesbian language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:243–285.

This review of research on gay and lesbian language forges a strong critique of identity-based research in language and sexuality and advocates a desire-centered approach in its place. The critique was viewed by some as polemical, yet it ultimately inspired renewed attention to both identity and desire.

McElhinny, Bonnie. 2014. *Theorizing gender in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology: Toward effective interventions in gender inequity*. In *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Edited by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 48–67. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

McElhinny examines assumptions guiding language and gender research with an eye to how this scholarship might inform feminist activism. She discusses three problematic assumptions: the collapsing of gender, sex, and sexuality; the understanding of gender as an attribute; and the view that gender is based in individuals rather than institutions.

Queen, Robin. 2014. *Language and sexual identity*. In *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Edited by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 203–219. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Queen revisits the identity-desire debate that has riddled the study of language and sexuality over the last decade and calls for more research that focuses on the two as intertwined. The chapter includes a useful review of what sociophonetic research has revealed about sexual identity as well as a commentary on “the special case of the lesbian.”

Textbooks

Over the last two decades, research on language, gender, and sexuality has increasingly moved beyond binary understandings of gender to treat gender identity as a complexly diverse product of discursive interaction. Although textbooks authored before the turn of the millennium by scholars such as Cameron, Coates, Graddol and Swann, and Romaine remain widely cited and used in the field, this section focuses on textbooks (or new editions of textbooks) published since 2000, which tend to emphasize performative and ideological aspects of gender and sexuality. These textbooks include Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2013, Goddard and Mean Patterson 2008, Litosseliti 2006, Mills and Mullany 2011, Talbot 2010, and Weatherall 2002. Holmes 2013, though not designed specifically as a textbook and now in its second edition, provides useful reviews of research more specifically focused on language, gender, and politeness. Cameron and Kulick 2003 is, to date, the only textbook focused centrally on the relationship between language and sexuality, although this topic also figures prominently in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2013.

Cameron, Deborah, and Don Kulick. 2003. *Language and sexuality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Cameron and Kulick have authored the only textbook dealing specifically with language and sexuality. Organized to mirror the authors' reader on the same topic (see *Anthologies and Edited Volumes: Language and Sexuality*), this book addresses themes in the field and argues for greater attention to the study of language and desire.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2013. *Language and gender*. 2d ed. New York: Cambridge.

This text, now in its second edition, introduces contemporary research and theory in the field of language, gender, and sexuality. Useful to both advanced and beginning students, the book is organized around linguistic themes that include semantic and metaphoric mappings of the world, politeness, gendered uses of sociolinguistic varieties, and style.

Goddard, Angela, and Lindsey Mean Patterson. 2008. *Language and gender*. 2d ed. London: Routledge.

This accessible introductory text in the Routledge Intertext series offers students hands-on practical experience in the textual analysis of language and gender. The book includes chapters on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, political correctness, and gendered speech styles.

Holmes, Janet. 2013. *Women, men, and politeness*. New York: Routledge.

Holmes' widely cited monograph, now in its second edition, uses data from New Zealand English to examine a range of verbal politeness strategies used by women and men in everyday discourse. The book includes extensive discussions of gendered differences in the use of interactional strategies, hedges and boosters, and compliments and apologies.

Litosseliti, Lia. 2006. *Gender and language: Theory and practice*. London: Hodder Education.

After summarizing deficit, dominance, and difference approaches to language and gender in an early chapter, this approachable introduction focuses on gender identity as a discursive construction. The book includes valuable chapters on gender and language in education, the media, and the workplace.

Mills, Sara, and Louise Mullany. 2011. *Language, gender, and feminism: Theory, methodology and practice*. New York: Routledge.

Authored by scholars in feminist stylistics and communication, Mills and Mullany's text examines contemporary research in language and gender from the standpoint of third-wave feminism. The book includes discussions of feminist discourse analysis alongside summaries of second- and third-wave feminism.

Talbot, Mary M. 2010. *Language and gender: An introduction*. 2d ed. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Talbot's accessible introduction to the field of language and gender, now in its second edition, includes chapters on conversation, public talk, and storytelling. A particularly strong chapter addresses consumerism and femininity in magazine texts, one of the author's primary areas of research.

Weatherall, Ann. 2002. *Gender, language, and discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Weatherall's introduction to the field examines contributions that discursive psychology has made to the study of language and gender. The book includes chapters on sexist language, verbal ability and voice, women's language, the discursive turn, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, and discourse and gender identity.

Anthologies and Edited Volumes

In contrast with the importance placed on peer-reviewed journal articles in some other subfields of linguistics, edited volumes have historically been the primary mode of dissemination of research on language, gender, and sexuality. Because a journal devoted to language, gender, and sexuality was not established until 2007 (see Journals), edited volumes have played a crucial role in the development of the field. These volumes provide unmatched grounds for exploration with new theoretical frameworks and analytic methods that often diverge from established (socio)linguistic perspectives.

Language and Gender

Coates and Pichler 2011 (the second edition of Coates' *Language and Gender: A Reader* [1998]) is among the most comprehensive readers in language and gender and incorporates many of the last decade's intellectual developments. Ehrlich, et al. 2014 (the second edition of Holmes and Meyerhoff's *The Handbook of Language and Gender* [Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003]), part of the Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics series, offers a number of authoritative review articles on an array of topics in the study of language, gender, and sexuality, serving as an important resource in the field. Cameron 1998 offers a collection of influential publications connected by their attention to feminist issues in language use, including classic texts from interdisciplinary sources. Hall and Bucholtz 1995, Bergvall, et al. 1996, and Bucholtz, et al. 1999 have been particularly important in establishing third-wave feminist theoretical orientations to language and gender studies, including attention to performativity, intersectionality, and the ways that discourse produces the subject (rather than vice

versa). Though the field of language and gender has a global presence, Okamoto and Smith 2004 is one of the few collections to focus exclusively on issues of language and gender in Japan. Tannen 1993, known for bringing complexity to the analysis of discourse in interaction, includes a set of now classic articles by widely cited scholars in the field. Prominent collections of language and gender research annotated elsewhere in this bibliography include Bucholtz 2004 (cited under Language, Gender, and Power: Foundational Texts), Lanehart 2009 (cited under Language, Gender, and Race), Lazar 2007 (cited under Language, Gender, and Power: Current Approaches), McElhinny 2007 (cited under Language, Gender, and Globalization), Tannen 1996 (cited under Language, Gender, and Socialization), and Wodak 1997 (cited under Language, Gender, and Power: Current Approaches). Many of the collections cited under Anthologies and Edited Volumes: Language and Sexuality also contain substantial discussions of gender.

Bergvall, Victoria L., Janet Bing, and Alice Freed, eds. 1996. *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice*. London: Longman.

The eleven chapters that constitute Bergvall, Bing, and Freed's edited volume seek to challenge dichotomous understandings of women's and men's language practices. Topics range from date rape proceedings at a college-level tribunal to gendered discourse practices of "third sex" *hijras* in India.

Bucholtz, Mary, A. C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton, eds. 1999. *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*. New York: Oxford.

This volume focuses on the discursive construction of gendered identities, with twenty chapters that center on a diverse range of communities and cultural contexts. The book is divided into four sections, which treat identity as everyday invention, as driven by ideological processes, as involving creative ingenuity, and as ongoing improvisation.

Cameron, Deborah, ed. 1998. *The feminist critique of language: A reader*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron's reader takes an interdisciplinary approach to language and feminism, covering issues in women's voices and silences, gendered language use in literary contexts, debates over sexist and nonsexist discourse, and major sociolinguistic approaches to language and gender.

Coates, Jennifer, and Pia Pichler, eds. 2011. *Language and gender: A reader*. 2d ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Coates and Pichler have revised Coates's first edition of this reader to include recent work by prominent scholars in the field. The book is organized into sections on linguistic gender differences, conversational practice, power in mixed-gender talk, same-gender talk, women in the public sphere, language and sexuality, and contemporary theoretical debates.

Ehrlich, Susan, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes. 2014. *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ehrlich, Meyerhoff, and Holmes's second edition is an authoritative guide on the state of language, gender, and sexuality research. The chapters contribute comprehensive reviews and original research situated in various areas of study within the field. Sections examine theory and history, methods, identities, ideologies, cross-cultural perspectives, and institutions.

Hall, Kira, and Mary Bucholtz, eds. 1995. *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*. New York: Routledge.

Gender Articulated marks twenty years since *Language and Woman's Place* (Lakoff 1975, cited under Introduction), taking the anniversary as an opportunity to reassess the contributions of Lakoff's classic text. The book's sections reflect this goal by focusing on hegemony and gendered power, agentive linguistic appropriation, and the emergence of the self through gendered language use.

Okamoto, Shigeko, and Janet S. Shibamoto Smith. 2004. *Japanese language, gender, and ideology: Cultural models and real people*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

The chapters in Shigeko and Smith's collection challenge traditional and popular representations of language, gender, and sexuality in Japan—including the ideology of “Japanese women's language”—by focusing on everyday linguistic practices in a diversity of contexts.

Tannen, Deborah, ed. 1993. *Gender and conversational interaction*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Edited by one of the field's most established language and gender scholars, Tannen's collection contains twelve chapters on gender-related patterns in interaction that are now considered classics in the field. The volume showcases early interactional work of scholars like Eckert, Johnstone, Goodwin, Brown, Sheldon, and Edelsky, as well as Tannen.

Language and Sexuality

Anthologies have also played a significant role in the development of language and sexuality studies. This begins with volumes like Leap 1995 and Livia and Hall 1997, which ushered in a new age of queer linguistics. Recent developments in language and sexuality studies have been furthered through compilations like Campbell-Kibler, et al. 2002; McIlvenny 2002; and Canakis, et al. 2010—each of which advances the field by taking on innovative theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches, and communities of study. Cameron and Kulick 2006 is one of the few readers that includes classic and more recent articles on the study of language and sexuality. One theme of Cameron and Kulick's volume that is also reflected in Harvey and Shalom 1997 is attention to the role of the erotic and theories of desire in shaping language use. Zimman, et al. 2014 examines a number of binaries that structure the gendered and sexual lives of speakers in diverse contexts and sociocultural environments. Prominent collections on language and sexuality annotated elsewhere in this bibliography include Leap and Boellstorff 2003 (cited under Language, Gender, and Globalization) and Motschenbacher and Stegu 2013 (under Queer Discourse).

Cameron, Deborah, and Don Kulick. 2006. *The language and sexuality reader*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron and Kulick's reader, which is organized to complement their textbook (Cameron and Kulick 2003, cited under Textbooks), is divided into sections on early treatments of gay slang and argot, debates over the notion of gay language, contemporary work on the performance of sexuality and maintenance of heteronormativity, and research on the language of desire.

Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn, Robert J. Podesva, Sarah J. Roberts, and Andrew Wong, eds. 2002. *Language and sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

This volume is divided into two sections: “Contesting Meaning in Theory,” which includes essays on the future of queer linguistics and the role of queer theory in language and sexuality studies, and “Contesting Meaning in Practice,” which offers analytical chapters that provide empirical grounding for these theoretical questions.

Canakis, Costas, Venetia Kantsa, and Kostas Yiannakopoulos, eds. 2010. *Language and sexuality (through and) beyond gender*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Articles in this collection examine issues of language and sexuality in contemporary Greece. The book's chapters discuss identity and desire as mutually constituted in discourse, addressing language issues in children's storytelling, lifestyle magazines, hostess bars, online personals, and the historical development of *lesbos* to *lesbian*.

Harvey, Keith, and Celia Shalom, eds. 1997. *Language and desire: Encoding sex, romance, and intimacy*. New York: Routledge.

This collection analyzes the use of language in expressions of romantic and sexual desire. Divided into three sections titled “Words,” “Narratives,” and “Voices,” the book examines discourse domains that include popular romance fiction, the teen novel, personal ads, and flirtatious phone calls.

Leap, William, ed. 1995. *Beyond the lavender lexicon: Authenticity, imagination, and appropriation in lesbian and gay languages*. New York: Routledge.

Leap’s volume was among the first anthologies to focus on language and sexuality in communities marginalized for their sexual practices. The book aims to go beyond older studies that focused on slang and other lexical items by considering discursive, grammatical, and phonological features employed in the negotiation of sexuality.

Livia, Anna, and Kira Hall, eds. 1997. *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Queerly Phrased is the product of the first major wave of scholarship in language, gender, and sexuality to be influenced by the introduction of queer theory in the 1990s (see Queer Discourse). The book includes contributions on an array of linguistic and cultural contexts and analytical frameworks.

McIlvenny, Paul, ed. 2002. *Talking gender and sexuality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

This collection of papers explores how discursive psychology and conversation analysis can illuminate performative perspectives on gender and sexuality. The volume includes articles by Speer, Kitzinger, Stokoe, Potter, and McIlvenny, among others, and discusses contexts ranging from elderly couples in Finland to adolescents in Dar es Salaam to disembodied computer-mediated interactants.

Zimman, Lal, Jenny Davis, and Joshua Raclaw. 2014. *Queer excursions: Retheorizing binaries in language, gender, and sexuality*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

The articles in this volume offer reconsiderations of familiar binaries, such as female versus male and heterosexual versus homosexual, as well as introduce less often discussed binary structures, like sex versus gender, LGBTQ versus transgender, and assimilative gay politics versus radical queer politics. The editors advocate a retheorization of binary relations that recognizes speakers’ own orientations to the dichotomies that inform their lives.

Ethnographies

An area of strength in language, gender, and sexuality research that has extended in influence to other areas of sociocultural linguistics is the use of ethnography. As a method closely associated with the discipline of anthropology, ethnography has become especially prominent in work conducted by linguistic anthropologists. But variationist sociolinguists have likewise found that the contextualized long-term analysis of linguistic as well as sociocultural practices in specific communities can illuminate the complexities of social meaning. This section annotates book-length publications that use ethnography as a central method. The first section includes ethnographies focused on Language and Gender, and the second section covers Language and Sexuality.

Language and Gender

Goodwin, Zentella, and Eckert are often cited as key figures for establishing the importance of ethnographic methods to the field of language and gender. Goodwin 1990 combines ethnographic methods with conversation analysis to study talk and social organization among African American girls in Philadelphia. Goodwin’s approach reveals quite different linguistic practices and meanings than those described in previous studies that use more traditional sociolinguistic methods. Zentella 1997, a now classic account of bilingual practices in a New York Puerto Rican community, combines ethnography with micro-discursive analysis to illustrate how gender, among other factors, plays a dynamic role in practices of code switching. Solidifying the importance of ethnography for variationist sociolinguistic analyses,

Eckert 2000 combines quantitative and ethnographic methods to analyze the adolescent social categories of “jocks” and “burnouts” in a Detroit high school. Other influential ethnographies in this vein that include attention to gender are Bucholtz 2011, a study of diverse identities of “white kids” in a Bay Area high school; Mendoza-Denton 2008, a study of Latina gang members in northern California; and Pujolar 2001, a discussion of the *Ramblers* and the *Trepas*, two groups of adolescents in Barcelona. Inoue 2006 offers a theoretically sophisticated account of the development of Japanese women’s language that unites historical and ethnographic accounts. Jacobs-Huey 2006 explores the intersections of gender and race as revealed through African American women’s hair care, and it remains one of the few texts to advocate for multi-sited linguistic ethnography.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. *White kids: Language, race, and styles of youth identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Bucholtz’s accessible ethnography, based on fieldwork conducted in a multiracial urban California high school, analyzes gender as one of many aspects of identity that emerge in the language practices of diverse groups of “white kids,” including hip-hop fans, nerds, and preppies.

Eckert, Penelope. 2000. *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Eckert presents findings from her ethnographic investigation of gender, social class, and categorization at a Detroit high school as she outlines her practice-based approach to sociolinguistic variation. Eckert has discussed the adolescent categories of “jocks” and “burnouts” in several publications, but this is her first book-length monograph to combine ethnography with variationist sociolinguistics.

Goodwin, Marjorie H. 1990. *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among black children*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.

Informed by conversation analysis, Goodwin’s influential book investigates everyday interactions among African American children in Philadelphia. Her analysis challenges universalizing claims about girls valuing egalitarian relationships and boys valuing hierarchy, as the children she observes make use of a mixture of interactional strategies.

Inoue, Miyako. 2006. *Vicarious language: Gender and linguistic modernity in Japan*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Inoue’s theoretically rich discussion analyzes the development of Japanese “women’s language” as a sociocultural construct tied to national and capitalist modernity. Although the book primarily discusses events that occurred at the turn of the 20th century, Inoue also draws from ethnographic fieldwork on everyday language practices in a Tokyo corporation.

Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. 2006. *From the kitchen to the parlor: Language and becoming in African American women’s hair care*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Jacobs-Huey’s book is based on a multi-sited ethnographic study of African American women’s hair care practices. The author addresses the politics and linguistics of African American women’s hair from a number of angles, with special attention to the process through which women learn to position themselves discursively as cosmetologists.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mendoza-Denton’s ethnographic study of Latina high school students in California highlights the importance of communities of practice in shaping linguistic variation. Even as the speakers in her study shared similar gendered and ethno-racial identities, it is their participation in different gangs (Nortefa and Surefa) that best explains their sociolinguistic styles.

Pujolar, Joan. 2001. *Gender, heteroglossia, and power: A sociolinguistic study of youth culture*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pujolar's ethnographic study of youth culture in Barcelona examines the linguistic production of gender within two differently situated social groups, the Ramblers and the Trepas. The author analyzes the groups' language styles along with their divergent uses of Catalan and Spanish.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 1997. *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zentella's ethnography analyzes micro-discursive moves within a New York Puerto Rican community alongside the macro-social processes of symbolic domination that structure everyday life. Her work portrays code switching as a complexly agentive phenomenon that can be used as a resource to express multiple and shifting identities and that is influenced by a wide range of factors, among them gender.

Language and Sexuality

Linguists working more specifically on sexuality have also made extensive use of ethnographic methods, although the appearance of book-length ethnographies is a comparatively recent development. Leap's influential analysis of what he calls Gay Men's English (in Leap 1996) utilizes the ethnographic method of participant observation and the author's own experience as a gay man to analyze patterns of discourse in Washington, DC's gay community. Though not specifically designed as an ethnography, Leap's text motivated contextualized investigations into the language patterns of diverse groups associated with sexual and gender alterity. Barrett 2016 provides an updated perspective on gay men in the United States twenty years later by emphasizing the variable ways in which gay identities are negotiated. Other recent monographs on language and sexual identity move beyond the US context, among them Gaudio 2009 on the Nigerian 'yan daudu, Abe 2010 on Japanese sexual minorities, Levon 2010 on lesbians and gays in Israel, and Jones 2012 on a British lesbian community. Scholars have also begun to introduce ethnographic accounts of language and sexuality as practiced in diverse heterosexual communities, such as Pichler 2009, a linguistic ethnography of heterosexuality as constructed in the talk of British adolescent girls.

Abe, Hideko. 2010. *Queer Japanese: Gender and sexual identities through linguistic practices*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Abe's ethnography, based on ten years of fieldwork in Tokyo, provides a portrait of Japanese sexual minorities through their language practices. The author analyzes several domains of language use throughout the text, such as magazine advice columns, bars, television, seminars, text messaging, and private homes.

Barrett, Rusty. 2016. *From drag queens to leathermen: Language, gender, and gay male subcultures*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Barrett's book provides a wide-ranging analysis of gay male subcultures, including drag queens, bears, circuit boys, and leathermen. Drawing on multi-sited ethnographic research, Barrett analyzes varied discursive domains to highlight the heterogeneity of a category that is often homogenized, even within the field of language and sexuality.

Gaudio, Rudolf P. 2009. *Allah made us: Sexual outlaws in an Islamic African city*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gaudio presents an ethnographic account of Hausa-speaking Nigerian 'yan daudu, or men who "act like women" and maintain intimate relationships with men. Despite strictly enforced religious prohibitions against homosexuality, 'yan daudu are able to engage with stigmatized social positionalities through a range of semiotic practices, such as indirect speech genres.

Jones, Lucy. 2012. *Dyke/girl: Language and identities in a lesbian group*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones bases her analysis of lesbian discourse, identity, and social categorization on ethnographic fieldwork conducted with a lesbian women's hiking group in the north of England. Jones's book, which remains one of the few publications to focus specifically on language in a lesbian community, serves to highlight important intersections between gender and sexuality.

Leap, William L. 1996. *Word's out: Gay Men's English*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota.

Leap theorizes a set of linguistic practices he calls Gay Men's English, a set of strategies for establishing community in homophobic cultural contexts. Drawing from participant-observation in several locales, Leap analyzes cooperative conversational practices, management of the line between public and private discourses, and narratives of gay adolescence and AIDS.

Levon, Erez. 2010. *Language and the politics of sexuality: Lesbians and gays in Israel*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Levon's study of lesbians and gays in Israel highlights the intersections of linguistic practice, sexuality, and politics. Particularly innovative is a chapter on prosody, which situates lesbian and gay speakers' deployment of more or less gender-normative pitch practices in relation to their orientations to different spheres of political activism.

Pichler, Pia. 2009. *Talking young femininities*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Drawing from ethnographic fieldwork among three groups of British adolescent girls, Pichler analyzes interactions that take place in an elite public school, London's East End, and the British Bangladeshi community. The book describes how members of these communities jointly construct "young femininities" in their talk about dating, sex, and marriage.

Bibliographies

Several bibliographies have been published in the area of language, gender, and sexuality, many of which include research from interdisciplinary sources. Motschenbacher 2012 is a highly comprehensive book-length bibliography that covers language, gender, and sexuality research published from 2000 to 2011. Other bibliographies have a narrower scope. Ward 2006 is an online bibliography on LGBTQ language that has been maintained for a number of years, though it has not been updated since 2006. Sunderland, et al. 2002 deals with language, gender, and genre, while Teaching Language and Gender present commentary and resources for teaching language and gender. Flood 2008 provides a bibliography focused on masculinities generally, including one page that focuses on men's language use.

Chan, Marjorie. 1997. *Chinese Language and Gender On-line Bibliography*.

Initially created in 1997 and updated several times, Chan's online biography includes citations for research on language and gender in Chinese linguistics as well as general linguistics. The bibliography also includes a section that cites potentially relevant nonlinguistic research on Chinese women.

Flood, Michael. 2008. *Men's Language. The Men's Bibliography: A Comprehensive Bibliography of Writing on Men, Masculinities, Gender, and Sexualities*, 19th ed.

Flood's brief bibliography on linguistic dimensions of masculinity is divided into a section that deals specifically with men's language use and another that serves as a more general discussion of language and gender research in which men's language is in some way addressed.

Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2012. *An interdisciplinary bibliography on language, gender, and sexuality (2000–2011)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Motschenbacher's book-length bibliography on language, gender, and sexuality is highly comprehensive. Several thousand entries are included, covering interdisciplinary research published between 2000 and 2011.

Sunderland, Jane, Ren-Feng Duann, Paul Baker, and the Gender and Language Research Group. 2002. *Gender and Genre Bibliography*. 2d ed. Lancaster, UK: Centre for the Study of Language in Social Life.

The bibliography compiled by Sunderland and colleagues focuses on language and gender in the context of genre. Sections are divided by generic theme, which includes topics like academic discourse, children's literature, dictionaries, graffiti, magazines, and many others.

Sunderland, Jane, and Joan Swann. *Teaching Language and Gender*. Southampton, UK: Univ. of Southampton.

This bibliography compiled by Sunderland and Swann focuses on texts useful for teaching language and gender, accompanied by thorough comments in addition to the references themselves.

Syllabi on the Web for Women- and Gender-Related Courses: *Language and Linguistics*.

This collection of online syllabi, last updated in 2006, includes a substantial section on language and linguistics, featuring approximately fifteen syllabi by prominent language and gender researchers and teachers.

Ward, Gregory. 2006. *Studies on LGBTQ Language: A Partial Bibliography*. Northwestern Univ.

Ward has for many years maintained access to a webpage containing his bibliography on LGBTQ language practices, which includes conference papers (e.g. from the Lavender Languages and Linguistics conference) as well as published work. It contains works produced prior to 2007.

Journals

Although many academic journals deal with linguistic practice and many others are concerned with gender, *Gender & Language* is the first major journal to focus on the intersections of these areas. Accordingly, it has become a key publishing site for the study of language, gender, and sexuality. *Women and Language* has also been a longstanding venue for publishing research on gender and communication. More recently, the *Journal of Language and Sexuality* was founded in order to provide a forum in which sexuality is centered, furthering the theorization of this area of study.

***Gender & Language*. 2007–.**

Since 2007, Equinox has published *Gender & Language*, the first journal that emphasizes this area of study. Edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Tommaso Milani, the journal is affiliated with the International Gender and Language Association and publishes research from a range of theoretical and methodological perspectives.

***Journal of Language and Sexuality*. 2012–.**

The *Journal of Language and Sexuality* was founded in 2012 by William Leap and Heiko Motschenbacher to provide a forum for research on language and sexuality, which is often subsumed under the study of language and gender.

***Women and Language*. 1976–.**

Women and Language is a longstanding interdisciplinary research periodical positioned in the field of communication that provides a feminist forum focused on language and gender issues. Edited by Patty Sotirin and published by the Humanities Department at Michigan Technological University, the journal is affiliated with the Organization of Communication, Language, and Gender (OSCLG).

Early Texts in Language and Gender

The relationship between language and gender first appeared in the linguistic canon through early-20th-century anthropological accounts of non-Western cultural contexts. In descriptions of women's and men's speech in non-Indo-European languages—for example, Chamberlain 1912, an account of Caraya; Sapir 1949, an analysis of Yana; and Flannery 1946, a report on Gros Ventre—authors perceived linguistic differences between the sexes to be so extreme that they often categorized their speaking styles as separate languages, a perspective critiqued in Trechter 1999 as “linguistic exoticism.” Women's language use in these early studies is often framed as a deviation from the masculine linguistic norm, which purportedly reflects the fundamental inequality between the sexes in “primitive” cultures. As Hall 2014 argues, the assumed impermeability of the division between women's and men's languages for members of these cultures is evident in the stigma attached to those who deviate from the linguistic expectations for members of their sex. Furfey 1944 provided an example of this trend by focusing on the stigmatization of “effeminate” men who talk more like women than men. Jespersen 1922 attributed the supposed stark differences between women's and men's languages in non-Western cultures to the strict sex-based division of labor they maintain. By contrast, Jespersen argued, modern Western languages show only “lingering effects” (p. 219) of a prior era in which women and men were socially segregated. In his view, all that remains are small gender differences in pronunciation that are “more or less isolated instances, without any deeper significance” (p. 209). Jespersen hinted at greater linguistic equality in the years to come, foreshadowed by the feminists of his era, who, he claimed, adopted the speech patterns typical of men. Gender differences among speakers of Western languages, in contrast to speakers of non-Western languages, were thus presented as a matter of individual choice rather than sociocultural determination. This comparative perspective set into motion the now contested distinction between *gender exclusive* languages and *gender preferential* languages, with the former term suggesting grammatical prohibition and the latter statistical tendency.

Chamberlain, Alexander F. 1912. Women's languages. *American Anthropologist* 14:579–581.

Chamberlain provides a brief discussion of theories that might account for the purportedly rigid gender differences among speakers of the Brazilian language Caraya, ultimately identifying the gendered division of labor as the best explanation. He also considers exceptions to the trend: certain men who use pronunciations expected of women.

Flannery, Regina. 1946. Men's and women's speech in Gros Ventre. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 12:133–135.

Flannery's analysis of gender differences among speakers of Gros Ventre provides an interesting perspective on the stigma of deviation from gender norms. Speculating on the “shame” of insufficiently masculine boys, Flannery argues that the strictures of sex-exclusive speech make children afraid to speak Gros Ventre, thereby facilitating language shift.

Furfey, Paul Hanly. 1944. Men's and women's language. *American Catholic Sociological Review* 5:218–223.

Furfey's discussion of gender differentiation in non-European languages situates these practices as a sign of men's domination over women in such cultures—and, by extension, masculine men's domination over effeminate men. This framing allows Furfey to describe European cultures as free from gender hierarchy.

Haas, Mary R. 1944. Men's and women's speech in Koasati. *Language* 20:142–149.

Haas defines gender-based differences in the phonology of Koasati, a Muskogean language of the southern United States. Younger speakers are shifting away from these distinctions, which do not exist in all Muskogean languages, but Haas argues that languages in this family historically maintained widespread gender differentiation. Reprinted in 1964 in *Language in Culture and Society*, edited by Dell Hymes (New York: Harper & Row), pp. 228–233.

Hall, Kira. 2014. Exceptional speakers: Contested and problematized gender identities. In *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Edited by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 48–67. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

In a historical review of language and gender literature, Hall documents shifts in the conceptualization of linguistic deviance, uncovering the crucial role that non-normative speakers have played in the theorization of the field.

Jespersen, Otto. 1922. The woman. In *Language: Its nature, development, and origin*. By Otto Jespersen, 237–254. London: Allen and Unwin.

Jespersen provides the classic text on language and “the woman.” He distinguishes what he calls “primitive” cultures, which maintain strict gender differentiation in speech, from “civilized” Western cultures, in which language use reflects individual choice. Yet Jespersen acknowledges important exceptions to his generalization, ultimately problematizing his own division. Reprinted in *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader*, edited by Deborah Tannen (New York: Routledge, 1998), pp. 201–220.

Sapir, Edward. 1949. Male and female forms of speech in Yana. In *Selected writings of Edward Sapir*. Edited by David Mandelbaum, 206–212. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Sapir’s discussion of gender forms in Yana is intended to focus on the psychology underlying linguistic gender differences. While he begins by taking care not to prioritize either women’s or men’s language forms as more basic, he ultimately concludes that women’s forms must be derived from the unmarked male standard.

Trechter, Sara. 1999. Contextualizing the exotic few. In *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*. Edited by Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton, 101–122. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Trechter critically examines the exotification of languages described as gender-exclusive (i.e., having linguistic forms used exclusively by women and others used exclusively by men). The construction of such cultures as maintaining oppressive systems of gender-based language control, Trechter argues, serves to frame dominant Western cultures as linguistically egalitarian by contrast.

Language, Gender, and Power

Since the politically charged publication of Lakoff’s feminist text *Language and Woman’s Place* (Lakoff 1975, cited under Introduction) in the 1970s, the field of language and gender has been centrally concerned with the subject of power. Scholars within linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, and socially oriented discourse analysis have embraced a diversity of perspectives in feminist and social theory to examine how language reflects, structures, and informs social hierarchy.

Foundational Texts

With the feminist movements of the 1970s, the concept of power became a central issue to research in language and gender. This is evident in Lakoff 1975 (*Language and Woman’s Place*, cited under Introduction), which is often described as the inaugural publication of the field as it is known today. Lakoff draws attention to the ways language reflects inequality between women and men through practices like the generic use of the masculine pronoun. Her emphasis on linguistic asymmetries was extended in numerous works, among them Bodine 1975, McConnell-Ginet 1978, and Spender 1980. However, Lakoff is most famous for her description of “women’s language” as involving hyper-politeness, verbal hedges (*sort of, maybe, a little*), question intonation in declarative contexts, emphatics (*so, really*), “empty” adjectives (*divine, cute*), and lexical items related to women’s work (*chartreuse*). For Lakoff, these forms are reflective of the conversational insecurity experienced by women in a man’s world, where they must do extra linguistic work to have their voices heard. Though often mistaken as an empirical claim on how women speak, Lakoff’s discussion was in fact calling attention to the linguistic double-bind women face: either “speak like a lady” and give up any claims on intellect or self-confidence, or take on an air of authority and risk being stigmatized as overly masculine. Scholars working within the paradigm of conversation analysis subsequently found gender-based differences through analyses of conversation—for example, research on cross-gender conversational maintenance in Fishman 1978 or the study of interruption patterns in Zimmerman and West 1975—and thus began to locate the naturalization of gender hierarchy in the everyday “doing” of gender, in the terms of West and Zimmerman 1987. At the same time, Other linguists began to challenge the notion that gender *per se* is driving these linguistic differences. For instance, O’Barr and Atkins 1980 found that courtroom expert witnesses are perceived as lacking authority when they use a preponderance of Lakoff’s features, regardless of the individual witness’s gender. Returning to the insights of

Language and Woman's Place, Bucholtz 2004 provides an annotated reprint of Lakoff's original 1975 text with commentaries from leading language and gender scholars.

Bodine, Anne. 1975. Androcentrism in prescriptive grammar: Singular "they," sex-indefinite "he," and "he or she." *Language in Society* 4:129–146.

As part of the literature aiming to uncover how gender inequality is maintained linguistically, Bodine focuses on grammatical prescriptions that promote the generic masculine (e.g., *he* vs. *he or she*). Challenging the supposedly arbitrary status of *man* as the unmarked norm, Bodine uncovers the overtly misogynistic history of this practice.

Bucholtz, Mary, ed. 2004. *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Bucholtz's reissue of Lakoff's influential 1975 *Language and Woman's Place* includes previously unpublished annotations on the text by Lakoff herself. The collection additionally features twenty-five commentaries on Lakoff's pioneering contribution by scholars who have been influenced by her work.

Fishman, Pamela. 1978. Interaction: The work women do. *Social Problems* 25:397–406.

Fishman's classic text famously posits that women do most of the interactional "shitwork" in cross-gender conversations. Driven by analysis of heterosexual couples' interactions in the home, she argues that women contribute greater effort toward the maintenance of conversational momentum, while men have greater say over the direction of the talk.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 1978. Intonation in a man's world. *Signs* 3.3: 541–559.

McConnell-Ginet analyzes the role of intonation, or patterns in pitch usage, in the negotiation of gender hierarchies during spoken communication. In addition to identifying intonational patterns associated with women and men, she highlights the ways that women's use of intonation is stigmatized for deviating from the masculine norm.

O'Barr, William, and Bowman Atkins. 1980. "Women's language" or "powerless language"? In *Women and languages in literature and society*. Edited by Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman, 93–110. New York: Praeger.

O'Barr and Atkins's influential study of courtroom discourse draws on Lakoff's notion of "women's language." By focusing on the ways that this language variety is used by various social groups in contexts of powerlessness, these authors emphasize power as the common variable driving gendered linguistic subordination.

Spender, Dale. 1980. *Man made language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

In a book with far-reaching influence in the field of gender studies, Spender provides a broad overview of linguistic mechanisms of male dominance, ranging from grammatical conventions to conversational silencing to the exclusion of women's participation in language produced in the public sphere.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. Doing gender. *Gender & Society* 1.2: 125–151.

West and Zimmerman's highly influential paper provides a framework for understanding gender as an interactional accomplishment (something one "does") rather than a biological or psychological state (something one "is"). By identifying the mundane ways gender difference is constructed, West and Zimmerman highlight the insidious naturalization of gendered power dynamics.

Zimmerman, Don, and Candace West. 1975. Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Edited by Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henly, 105–129. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Zimmerman and West draw on the tools of conversation analysis to examine the turn-taking practices of women and men in conversations with one another. Highlighting interruptions, silence, and the control of conversational content, the authors connect men's dominance in interactional speech to their macro-sociological status and power over women.

Gender Asymmetries in Language Structure

Any bibliography of the field of language and gender would be incomplete without an entry on gender asymmetries in language structure, a classic arena of scholarship for the theorization of gender, hierarchy, and power. Early research in this area, informed by second-wave feminism and the concept of patriarchy, proposed that a sex-based hierarchy is built into grammatical and semantic systems in the world's languages. Scholars have argued that forms such as the generic masculine reflect and privilege a male perspective and thus perpetuate everyday sexism. Although Lakoff 1975 (cited under Introduction) and Spender 1980 (cited under Foundational Texts) are often cited as foundational in this regard, voluminous scholarship exists on this topic, particularly with respect to grammatical and semantic asymmetries in the English language. Miller and Swift 1976, one of the earliest texts on this subject, outlines "sexual prejudice" in naming practices, semantic polarizations, and religious language. Frank and Treichler 1989, a landmark text on language and sexism, focuses on biased language in professional writing and provides guidelines for the use of nondiscriminatory language. Penelope 1990 utilizes the concept of patriarchy to argue that women and minorities must take action against the "man-made language" that perpetuates oppression. Much research in this area responds to a dominant view still perpetuated in mainstream linguistics that these kinds of asymmetries are arbitrary by-products of language-internal change and are thus unrelated to social life. Bodine 1975 (cited under Foundational Texts) challenges this view by illustrating how political movements are responsible for current prescriptions surrounding the use of the generic masculine in English, while Pauwels 1998 documents the successes of feminist language reform around the world. Silverstein 1985, representing early perspectives on gendered asymmetries in linguistic anthropology, reminds readers that the study of gender systems in language and culture requires attention to ideology and usage as well as structure. This three-pronged view came to characterize work on linguistic gender as scholars moved to a model of gender as performative in the 1990s. Cameron 1995, for instance, discusses language reform as a kind of "verbal hygiene," theorizing the role of varied sociopolitical movements in calling attention to language as a social phenomenon. Livia 2001 (cited under Queer Discourse) reviews a broad corpus of written texts in English and French that problematize linguistic gender, devoting special attention to genres of feminist-influenced fiction that creatively avoid masculine generics. McConnell-Ginet 2011 brings together semantic and social perspectives on language to illuminate topics ranging from pronoun usage to identity labeling. Finally, chapters appearing in Hellinger, Bussmann, and Motschenbacher 2001–2015 outline creative as well as presupposed uses of linguistic gender across diverse languages. This four-volume reference work provides useful systematic descriptions of grammatical, lexical, referential, and social gender in thirty of the world's languages.

Cameron, Deborah. 1995. *Verbal hygiene*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

This influential book discusses and theorizes a range of attempts to regulate the English language, including the regulation of style by academic editors, the teaching of grammar in schools, movements for "politically correct" language, and self-help advice given to women on how to speak more effectively.

Frank, Francine Wattman, and Paula A. Treichler. 1989. *Language, gender, and professional writing*. New York: Modern Language Association.

This early book on language and sexism provides a strong argument for the need to eliminate "biased language." The book offers guidelines on how to use nonsexist language without sacrificing the "clarity and grace" necessary for professional writing.

Hellinger, Marlis, Hadumod Bussmann, and Heiko Motschenbacher, eds. 2001–2015. *Gender across languages*. 4 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

This four-volume reference work contains rich bibliographical material on various categories of gender in thirty of the world's languages. Chapters address structural properties of language relating to gender; the place of gender in systems of agreement, pronominalization, and word-formation; empirical evidence of gender-based variation; and relationships between grammatical and social gender.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 2011. *Gender, sexuality, and meaning: Linguistic practice and politics*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

This collection of new and previously published work by McConnell-Ginet, a leading semanticist in the field of language and gender, views speakers as active participants in processes of semantic change. The book includes chapters on sexist language reform as well as definitional struggles regarding the word "queer."

Miller, Casey, and Kate Swift. 1976. *Words and women*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

This early book on language and sexism provides details of sexual prejudice across varied domains of the English language, including naming practices, address terminology, semantic systems, and religious language. The authors are interested in exposing the "unconscious messages" of sexism that are transmitted through language use.

Pauwels, Anne. 1998. *Women changing language*. London: Longman.

This book examines initiatives by feminist groups around the world to change sex-bias in language. In contrast with some publications inspired by second-wave feminism, this text positions women as active "meaning-makers" instead of passive recipients of linguistic asymmetries.

Penelope, Julia. 1990. *Speaking freely: Unlearning the lies of the fathers' tongues*. New York: Pergamon.

Penelope's book, informed by second-wave feminist perspectives on patriarchy, examines the racist and sexist underpinnings of the English language. The author holds that societal problems of sexism and racism can be resolved only if speakers change their speech patterns and "unlearn" assumptions regarding gender that have become sedimented in language.

Silverstein, Michael. 1985. Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In *Semiotic mediation: Sociocultural and psychological perspectives*. Edited by Elizabeth Mertz and Richard J. Parmentier, 219–259. New York: Academic Press.

Silverstein argues that much of the research on linguistic gender has problematically focused on referential instead of indexical meaning. He calls for a more comprehensive analysis that examines the intersection of linguistic structure, language use, and reflective ideology.

Current Approaches

Power has maintained an important role in the study of language and gender for several decades, but its theorization has shifted considerably as scholars incorporate into their work a changing landscape of feminist viewpoints. The decoupling of "women's language" from women that began after the publication of Lakoff 1975 (cited under Introduction) became central to research in the 1990s. For example, Gal 1991 invoked new theoretical perspectives on language ideology in order to demonstrate that power is produced and resisted through the strategic appropriation of ideologically saturated discursive forms. This shift is in part due to social theorists like Michel Foucault, who challenged previous models that conceptualize power relations as the exertion of force by institutions or individuals over unwilling subordinates. As an instigator of the discursive turn in social theory, Foucault viewed power as a product of discourse rather than its precursor, an idea taken up by Judith Butler and integral to the development of "feminist linguistics" as described in Cameron 1997. Wodak 1997, which includes Cameron's article, is a central early text in the application of diverse feminist perspectives to language and power, highlighting critical discourse analysis in particular. For Foucault, power in Western cultural contexts works largely through self-government, where it is depoliticized by an ethics of individual responsibility. Inoue 2007 focuses on the linguistic governmentality of neoliberalism, whereby individuals must take personal responsibility for their language use, erasing the power dynamics in which that

language exists. The key idea behind Foucault's *governmentality* is that social subjects participate in their own regulation, making it unnecessary for governing institutions to exert their power overtly. The linguistic double-bind described by Lakoff is instructive here: women are not forced to use "women's language," but rather internalize their subordination as an effect of that discourse. Much current language and gender research focuses on language as a material reality that enables and facilitates hierarchical practices in late capitalism (see Language, Gender, and Political Economy). Scholars often employ frameworks associated with specific subfields in sociocultural linguistics, as exemplified by the emergent platforms of feminist conversation analysis presented by Speer 2005 and Kitzinger and Frith 1999, feminist critical discourse analysis as discussed by Lazar 2007, and the feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis that is the focus of Baxter 2008.

Baxter, Judith. 2008. Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis: A new theoretical and methodological approach? In *Gender and language research methodologies*. Edited by Kate Harrington, Lia Litosseliti, Helen Sauntson, and Jane Sunderland, 243–255. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baxter defines the field of feminist post-structuralist discourse (FPSD) analysis, distinguishing it from related schools like (feminist) critical discourse analysis and (feminist) conversation analysis. FPSD is unique, according to Baxter, because of its attention to the plurality and ambiguity of discursive meaning and the omnipresence of gendered power dynamics in talk-in-interaction.

Cameron, Deborah. 1997. Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: Questions of sex and gender. In *Gender and discourse*. Edited by Ruth Wodak, 21–36. London: SAGE.

Cameron delineates key points of divergence in feminist research on language, providing one of the first discussions of performativity as an important concept for the field. Despite a shared critical perspective on gender differentiation and hierarchy, feminist scholars have differed in their theorization of power, its role in the construction of gender, and the processes through which language creates and/or reflects reality.

Gal, Susan. 1991. Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. In *Gender at the crossroads of knowledge: Toward a new anthropology of gender*. Edited by Micaela DiLeonardo, 175–203. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

This landmark publication draws on contemporary theorizations of social power and language ideology to reconceptualize women's speech and silence in the context of symbolic domination. Rather than treating silence as a mark of powerlessness and speech of power, Gal emphasizes the different communicative possibilities afforded to women and men both culturally and institutionally.

Inoue, Miyako. 2007. Language and gender in an age of neoliberalism. *Gender & Language* 1.1: 79–91.

Centered on an analysis of language and gender in a Tokyo corporation, this article explores the significance of neoliberal governmentality in shaping gendered linguistic practices. Specifically, Inoue shows how the individualistic subjectivity that neoliberalism enables has the effect of obscuring processes of power and inequality that extend beyond the individual.

Kitzinger, Celia, and Hannah Frith. 1999. Just say no? The use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse & Society* 10.3: 293–316.

This paper exemplifies the usefulness of conversation analysis for exposing the workings of power. Taking on the discourses that demand women "just say no" to indicate lack of sexual consent, the authors underscore the general conversational preference to hedge refusals, casting doubt on some men's claims to confusion or ambiguity regarding women's consent.

Lazar, Michelle M. 2007. *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lazar's edited volume features nine chapters situated in the field of feminist critical discourse analysis. Taken from an array of cultural milieus, these contributions all focus on situating everyday language use in the larger-scale sociopolitical discourses through which power hierarchies are maintained.

Speer, Susan. 2005. *Gender talk: Feminism, discourse and conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Speer provides an overview of feminist approaches to discourse and conversation analysis that draws on the fields of feminist linguistics, discursive psychology, and ethnomethodology. Despite the historical tensions between feminist linguistics and conversation analysis, Speer highlights the potential to bring these fields together in mutually instructive ways.

Wodak, Ruth, ed. 1997. *Gender and discourse*. London: SAGE.

Edited by a leading scholar in critical discourse analysis, Wodak's collection introduces central debates in feminist linguistics and what they mean for the analysis of gender in discourse. The book's emphasis on gender as both socially constructed and context-sensitive is advanced by scholars from Europe, the United States, and Australia.

Language, Gender, and Socialization

As in feminist-influenced research across the social sciences, gender socialization is a central issue in the field of language and gender. When gender is conceptualized as socially constructed, socialization practices become key to explaining how gender differentiation emerges. Ochs and Schieffelin 1984 was one of the first sources to bring attention to language socialization, challenging Chomsky's universal model of language acquisition by arguing that socializing practices influence child language acquisition. This early research led to a deeper theorization of language as indexical of gender. Ochs 1992, for instance, contrasts caretaker-child interaction in American middle-class households with what takes place in traditional Samoan communities to argue that these practices are importantly linked to women's prestige in society more generally. Likewise, studies of children's language use—particularly in Western cultural contexts—contributed to the development of one of the major theoretical models in the early years of language and gender: the “two-cultures” model, which frames cross-gender communication as cross-cultural communication. Maltz and Borker 1982 is the seminal text in this framework. The authors outline the conversational differences that characterize girls' and boys' gender-exclusive social networks as based in intimacy and hierarchy, respectively. The connection between gender difference in childhood and the linguistic practices of adults is most clearly advanced by Tannen, who argues in Tannen 1990 (cited under Introduction) and Tannen 1996 that the different cultures of girls and boys lead to different communicative patterns among women and men. This observation is also integral to Maccoby 1998, which advances a widely cited psychological theory regarding the reproduction of gender. Critics of Tannen, like Troemel-Ploetz 1991, charge that the two-cultures framework depoliticizes gender by making women's and men's communication a matter of value-free misunderstanding, divorced from broader power structures. However, Sheldon 1997 and others have highlighted the connections between childhood language socialization and gender-based power. Another criticism of early two-cultures research focuses on its narrow scope of applicability. Tannen's observations about white middle-class American girls and boys was challenged by research investigating the variability of children's social and linguistic practices. Goodwin 1990 (cited under Ethnographies: Language and Gender) shows that African American girls engage in both cooperation and competition to manage the social order of their peer groups. Recent research on gendered language socialization recognizes that socialization continues beyond childhood language acquisition. Jacobs-Huey 2006 (under Ethnographies: Language and Gender) highlights intersections of gender and race in the language socialization of African American cosmetologists-in-training, while Leap 1999 considers the socialization experiences of adolescents negotiating the stigma of same-sex desire. Yet the distinctiveness of socializing processes in children should also be recognized, as Kulick and Schiefflin 2004 points out in a review of language socialization research that argues for a deeper consideration of subjectivity and desire.

Kulick, Don, and Bambi B. Schiefflin. 2004. Language socialization. In *A companion to linguistic anthropology*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti, 349–368. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kulick and Schiefflin, linguistic anthropologists who have written extensively about language, socialization, and gender in non-Western cultures, join forces to discuss the importance of considering subjectivity and desire in research on language socialization.

Leap, William 1999. Language, socialization, and silence in gay adolescence. In *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*. Edited by Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton, 259–272. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Leap focuses on the ways socialization shapes gay identity and language practices for adolescents who have little or no direct access to a gay community. Drawing on narratives from gay men, Leap highlights the ways gay adolescents internalize the social demand that they remain silent about their desires.

Maccoby, Eleanor. 1998. *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Maccoby, a prominent psychologist of gender, reviews psychological, linguistic, and anthropological research on gender to theorize its reproduction across generations. As suggested by the title, a two-cultures model of gender is essential to this account, which locates the reproduction of gender within an “explanatory web” of biology, society, and cognition.

Maltz, Daniel N., and Ruth A. Borker. 1982. A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In *Language and social identity*. Edited by John J. Gumperz, 196–216. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

In this chapter, Maltz and Borker describe their highly influential argument that communication between the genders can be understood as cross-cultural communication. They focus on single-sex friendship groups among children, and how the different types of relationships pursued by girls and boys lead to different approaches to communication.

Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. In *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. Edited by Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 335–358. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

This highly influential article argues that broad identity categories like “woman” or “man” are seldom directly linked to linguistic form; rather, they are constituted from stances that speakers take up in conversation. Ochs suggests that differing stance-taking practices among caretakers in the United States and Samoa account for the lower prestige of women in US society.

Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1984. Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implication. In *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion*. Edited by Richard A. Shweder and Robert A. Levine, 276–322. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Comparing the practices of caregivers in the United States, Samoa, and Papua New Guinea, Ochs and Schieffelin question the assumption that adults necessarily engage in linguistic accommodation to children. Instead, the acquisition process reflects culture-specific notions of hierarchy and socially appropriate language use.

Sheldon, Amy. 1997. Talking power: girls, gender enculturation and discourse. In *Gender and discourse*. Edited by Ruth Wodak, 225–244. London: SAGE.

Moving away from the notion that girls prefer to maintain social harmony and avoid conflict, Sheldon highlights the ways that young girls develop complex ways of negotiating dissent. The author problematizes broad generalizations about how boys and girls interact, instead advocating for close analysis of discourse in its interactional contexts.

Tannen, Deborah. 1996. *Gender and discourse*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

This collection republishes six of Tannen’s highly influential articles on language and gender, many of which take a two-cultures approach to the analysis of gendered discourse. Topics addressed include power and solidarity, conversational interruptions, physical alignment and topical cohesion, female-male styles as comparable to “ethnic styles,” and talk at work.

Troemel-Ploetz, Senta. 1991. *Selling the apolitical. Discourse & Society* 2.4: 489–502.

Serving as a response to the two-cultures model's framing of miscommunication between genders as a matter of symmetrical cross-cultural difference, this critical essay presents a strong critique of the framework's apolitical account gender relations. Troemel-Ploetz argues that gender inequality must be part of any account of gender difference. Reprinted in 2011 in *Language and gender: A reader*, 2d ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell), pp. 518–528.

Practice-Based Approaches to Language and Gender

In recent decades, the field of language, gender, and sexuality has increasingly been defined by its orientation to the construction of gendered and sexual subjectivity through everyday social and linguistic practices. This section of the bibliography identifies three major theoretical approaches to sociolinguistic practice: performativity, ethnomethodology, and the community of practice. Each of these schools of thought shares considerable overlap with the others, but they also differ in their goals, assumptions, and disciplinary histories. Nevertheless, scholars of language and gender have often combined more than one of these frameworks, frequently also drawing upon ethnographic methods to ground their observations about everyday practices of gender.

Performativity

The intellectual history of performativity reaches back to J. L. Austin, whose theory of the performative utterance challenged incumbent philosophical notions about the truth value of statements (see Austin 1975, first published 1962). Austin identified a distinctive type of utterance, dubbed the *performative*, which cannot be described as true or false but rather achieves truth through being uttered—a classic example being an officiant's proclamation "I now pronounce you husband and wife." Importantly, Austin ultimately concluded that all utterances are performative because they act to inform, claim, or enact a discursive accomplishment. In the foundational years of queer theory, Butler 1990 proposed the notion of "performativity" as a framework for understanding gender and its subversion. With special attention to drag performances, Butler argues that gender is not a precultural truth but is rather brought into being through social and discursive action. This theory of gender performativity undermines the naturalization of heteronormative gender by pointing to drag's ability to highlight the work involved in feminine or masculine self-presentation. Just as Austin argued that all utterances are performative, Butler maintains that all gender is performed, not just that of drag performers and others who deviate from cultural norms. Rather than being an imitation of normative femininity, drag constitutes a double mimesis—a copy of a copy. Performativity gained visibility in language and gender research through texts such as Cameron 1997 (cited under Language and Masculinity) and Cameron 1997 (under Language, Gender, and Power: Current Approaches). It also served a crucial role in the birth of queer theory and queer linguistics. Livia and Hall 1997 introduces a foundational volume in the latter field, in which the authors draw attention to the linguistic genealogy of performativity to uncover the ways contextual specificity both produces and is produced by gendered linguistic practice. The theorization of performativity has been furthered by developments like Kulick's analysis of the word "no" (Kulick 2003). Kulick argues that sexual refusals produce a dual indexicality that at once denies desire and performatively constitutes the speaking context as one of sexual persuasion, creating the very sexual roles the speaker overtly disavows. Milani 2014 brings performativity to bear on "sexed signs" in his critique of scholarship in the burgeoning field of "linguistic landscapes" for ignoring gender and sexuality. Milani argues that place is also performative in that gendered and sexed signs produce particular kinds of public spaces. Recognizing the significance of discourse for theories of performativity, Speer and Potter 2002 and McIlvenny 2002 emphasize the benefits of bringing an empirical perspective on discourse together with post-structuralist ideas about performative acts.

Austin, J. L. 1975. *How to do things with words*. 2d ed. Edited by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Austin's posthumously published lectures on the performative delineate this class of utterance, identify its differences from the constative (an utterance with a truth value), and explain the conditions under which performatives can be realized (termed *felicity conditions*), before finally concluding that all utterances are in some sense performative. First published 1962.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Butler's classic text sets out a performative theory of gender. Though the text deals broadly with the constitution of gendered subjectivity, her emphasis on the role of language and other forms of signification in this process makes the text highly relevant and influential for scholars of language and gender.

Kulick, Don. 2003. No. *Language & communication* 23.1: 139–151.

Kulick draws attention to what he calls the “dual performativity” of *no*. While the word functions discursively as a bald-faced refusal, he is particularly interested in the way that it performatively constitutes certain kinds of sexual subjectivities and contexts in which sexual persuasion is at once produced and refused.

Livia, Anna, and Kira Hall. 1997. “It’s a girl!” Bringing performativity back to linguistics. In *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality*. Edited by Anna Livia and Kira Hall, 3–18. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Livia and Hall highlight the insights of queer theory for researchers concerned with language, gender, and sexuality, with particular emphasis on performativity. Emphasizing the linguistic origins of post-structuralist approaches to performativity, the editors advance a union of linguistic and post-structuralist perspectives as the organizing principle behind *Queerly Phrased*.

McIlvenny, Paul. 2002. Critical reflections on performativity and the “un/doing” of gender and sexuality in talk. In *Talking gender and sexuality*. Edited by Paul McIlvenny, 111–149. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McIlvenny's treatment focuses on connections between performativity and the notion of “doing” gender established in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis. One focus of the chapter is how analyzing interaction can highlight possibilities for “undoing” or refusing to do gender in ways that subvert the reiteration of normative practices.

Milani, Tommaso. 2014. Sexed signs: Queering the scenery. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 228:201–225.

Milani critiques the linguistic landscape literature for ignoring gender and sexuality in its focus on multilingualism. His analysis of “banal sexed signs” in retail spaces at Dulles Airport and a central street in Stockholm illustrates that gender and sexuality are essential to the production, understanding, and negotiation of public space.

Speer, Susan A., and Jonathan Potter. 2002. From performatives to practices: Judith Butler, discursive psychology and the management of heterosexist talk. In *Talking gender and sexuality*. Edited by Paul McIlvenny, 151–181. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Speer and Potter bring Butler's approach to performativity and hate speech together with discursive psychologists' interest in the interactional accomplishment of sexuality. In contrast with Butler's attention to abstract notions of discourse and power, the authors argue that her theorization of heterosexism can be enhanced through grounding in everyday talk.

Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis

Among the earliest approaches to language and gender that emphasize social practice is ethnomethodology and its linguistic offshoot, conversation analysis (CA). The section on Language, Gender, and Power describes a key contribution from this school of thought: West and Zimmerman 1987 (cited under Foundational Texts) frames gender as something one *does* rather than something one *is*.

Ethnomethodologists look to the properties of an interaction in order to understand how social categories like gender are brought into being, and CA focuses on talk-in-interaction to understand how interlocutors perform interactional and social action. Conversation analysts are committed to identifying the aspects of intersubjectivity that are relevant to speakers, determined by textual evidence, rather than assuming gender's relevance even when interactants do not overtly orient to it. One of the originators of CA, Emanuel Schegloff, focuses on the potential relevance of gender to interaction in Schegloff 1997. He cautions discourse analysts not to impose their theoretical interests (e.g., in gender) on conversational data unless there is clear evidence that the interactants are making gender relevant through their talk.

Schegloff is highly critical of critical discourse analysis and describes the assumption that social categories like gender are omnirelevant as “theoretical imperialism.” A number of challenges to Schegloff’s perspective have been put forth by feminist scholars, among them one of Schegloff’s original collaborators, Gail Jefferson, who argues in Jefferson 2004 for the importance of cultural stereotypes for the interpretation of gender’s relevance in talk-in-interaction. Sources like Weatherall 2000 and Stokoe and Smithson 2001 point out that practitioners of CA often rely on contextual information in order to interpret conversational exchanges, yet this type of contextualization is often left unanalyzed. Stokoe and Smithson 2001 provides one of the most thorough critical reviews of CA and gender, with the authors questioning analysts’ authority to identify the points at which gender becomes relevant in interaction. Eglin 2002 questions the practice of relying on even the most direct indexes of gender (e.g., the word *women*) as incontrovertible evidence that gender is interactionally salient, while Kitzinger 2005 examines the still largely unexplored territory of sexuality’s relevance in interaction. The development of feminist CA, which Kitzinger 2000 describes in depth, reflects the strong interest in redeeming CA’s empirical rigor and analytic insight as a framework for analyzing language and gender while also mitigating its potential weaknesses. Wetherell 1999 offers a slightly different perspective through a focus on CA’s compatibility with post-structuralist social theory.

Eglin, Peter. 2002. Members’ gendering work: “Women,” “feminists,” and membership categorization analysis. *Discourse & Society* 13.6: 819–825.

Eglin’s article makes use of membership categorization analysis (MCA), which takes an ethnomethodological approach to social subjects’ own understanding of the cultural categories with which they are engaged. He highlights the potential ambiguity of categories like *woman* in the context of anti- and pro-feminist discursive practices.

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. A note on laughter in “male-female” interaction. *Discourse Studies* 6.1: 117–133.

Jefferson investigates the hypothesis that women are more likely to join men’s laughter than vice versa. While a quantitative analysis shows no significant difference in women’s and men’s frequency of laughter uptake, Jefferson argues that gender is relevant because of the socio-ideological context in which interactions take place.

Kitzinger, Celia. 2000. Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & Psychology* 10.2: 163–193.

Kitzinger introduces a special issue of *Feminism & Psychology* that emphasizes the fundamental compatibility of CA and research on language, gender, and sexuality. Taking on some of the critiques offered by other authors in this section, this special issue focuses on the ways conversational interactants orient toward gender and sexuality.

Kitzinger, Celia. 2005. “Speaking as a heterosexual”: (How) does sexuality matter for talk-in-interaction? *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38.3: 221–265.

This paper employs conversation analysis in order to reveal the everyday naturalization of heterosexuality. Looking at moves that are rendered invisible as part of routine talk-in-interaction, Kitzinger identifies resources for producing oneself and one’s interlocutors as heterosexual (e.g., the introduction of referents through connection with heteronormative roles like *husband* and *wife*).

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society* 8.2: 165–187.

In a widely discussed critique of critical discourse analysis, Schegloff discusses two conversational sequences: an interaction in which gender was not directly referenced by speakers, and another in which a speaker overtly orients to gender. Schegloff argues that analysts should not assume that gender is relevant without analytical “warrant.”

Stokoe, Elizabeth, and Janet Smithson. 2001. Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society* 12.2: 217–244.

The authors offer an in-depth critical review of conversation analysis and its compatibility with feminist research on gender. Stokoe and Smithson situate CA as a useful tool for analyzing the discursive negotiation of gender, but also question a number of unstated assumptions concerning interpretation and the notion of speaker “orientation.”

Weatherall, Ann. 2000. Gender relevance in talk-in-interaction and discourse. *Discourse & Society* 11.2: 286–288.

In response to Schegloff 1997, Weatherall problematizes the notion that conversation analysts can maintain empirical objectivity by analyzing only what appears in a transcript. Invoking feminist critiques of science, she argues that all analysts are influenced by their own subjectivity, and that attempts at objective analysis deny this reality.

Wetherell, Margaret. 1999. Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society* 9.3: 387–412.

Wetherell brings together conversation analysis and post-structuralist approaches to discourse to analyze talk about sexual experiences in a group of young white middle-class men. Strengths and flaws are identified for both frameworks, leading Wetherell to argue for a blended approach that overcomes CA’s insistence on a unitary interpretation of “relevance.”

Community of Practice

First introduced by Lave and Wenger 1991 without explicit attention to gender, the community of practice (CoP) has been an important theoretical influence on language and gender. Inspired by Bourdieu 1977, the CoP as taken up in language and gender research provides a means of conceptualizing gender as grounded in habitual interaction rather than macrolevel demographic categories. CoPs are formed around the shared activities that bring people together: pursuing political action, participating in classroom education, engaging in commerce, or practicing a religion, for example. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992 provides a foundational introduction to this framework for the study of language and gender, urging researchers to situate their linguistic work in locally salient practices rather than making generalizing claims about the speech of women or men as a whole. This call inspired heightened interest in ethnographic methodology, as more researchers began to conduct their work within specific CoPs in order to understand the local indexicalities of language forms and usage. The enthusiasm with which the CoP was taken up is reflected in a special issue of *Language in Society* published in 1999 (Volume 28, Issue 2), which features examples of how language and gender is articulated in a selection of CoPs. The volume’s widely cited introduction, Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999, outlines the distinguishing role of this theoretical model in language and gender research. Bucholtz 1999 describes one CoP in a California high school, in which self-identified female nerds disengage from normative femininity as part of their broader disalignment from the notion of *coolness*. Meyerhoff 1999 argues that the speech community framework is better suited to describe gender differences in apology rituals in Vanuatu because the patterns Meyerhoff identifies hold for women and men who lack a shared CoP. Davies 2005 provides a more overt challenge to the community of practice as a tool for sociolinguistics, arguing that a few key problems demand attention: the difficulty of identifying a joint venture in many communities that sociolinguists might study, the lack of clarity about how localized practices can be linked up with macrolevel social processes, and the challenge of defining legitimate community membership. The issue of the *Journal of Sociolinguistics* in which Davies’ article appears also includes response commentaries from Eckert and Wenger, Gee, and Meyerhoff. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 2007 revisits the CoP and argues that more work is needed that compares practices across different communities and that shows how local practices work in relation to larger-scale institutions and other sites of power.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Bourdieu’s sociological discussion of language as a form of symbolic capital has been highly influential in fields concerned with language and society, among them language, gender, and sexuality. Bourdieu’s theory of practice, outlined in this text, likewise inspired the development of the popular “community of practice” model.

Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. “Why be normal?”: Language and identity practices in a community of nerd girls. *Language in Society* 28.2: 203–223.

Bucholtz's study of self-identified teenage nerds illustrates the usefulness of the community of practice for the study of language and gender because of its ability to contextualize both alignments and disalignments from normative gender expressions with respect to the everyday social practices in which community members are engaged.

Davies, Bathan. 2005. Communities of practice: Legitimacy not choice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9.4: 557–581.

Davies argues that sociolinguists—whose goals and assumptions may differ from the sociologists of learning who originated the CoP framework—should attend more closely to the negotiation of belonging in communities of practice. Specifically, Davies draws on Eckert's data from Belten High to demonstrate that a CoP's own power hierarchy determines access to membership.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1992. Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:461–490.

This foundational article introduces the community of practice as a framework for theorizing language and gender. Challenging the “difference” and “dominance” paradigms, the authors argue that the linguistic negotiation of gender is grounded in speakers' everyday practices rather than their membership in macrolevel gender categories.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2007. Putting communities of practice in their place. *Gender & Language* 1.1: 27–37.

Fifteen years after their initial call, Eckert and McConnell-Ginet reflect on the popularity of the community of practice model. While lauding the upsurge in attention to local context, the authors maintain that CoP studies should not lose sight of the macrolevel ideologies and imagined communities to which CoP members orient.

Holmes, Janet, and Miriam Meyerhoff. 1999. The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28.2: 173–183.

Holmes and Meyerhoff's introduction to the 1999 *Language in Society* special issue on the community of practice approach distinguishes the CoP framework from other frameworks prominently used in sociolinguistics, including the speech community, social network theory, social identity theory, and social constructionism.

Lave, Jean, and Étienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate and peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Lave and Wenger introduce the community of practice as a way of situating learning in its social and interactional context. The community of practice is defined by shared engagement in some activity by a group of people who may occupy more or less central or peripheral positions within that network.

Meyerhoff, Miriam. 1999. Sorry in the Pacific: Defining communities, defining practices. *Language in Society* 28.2: 225–238.

Meyerhoff analyzes the use of *sore* “sorry” among speakers of Bismala, a creole spoken in Vanuatu. Women's tendency to use *sore* more often than men, Meyerhoff argues, is better explained by women's shared membership in a common speech community rather than shared participation in a particular community of practice.

Gender and Sociolinguistic Variation

From the inception of modern sociolinguistics, gender (or “sex”) has been an important social variable in explanations for linguistic variation. Romaine 2003 reviews one of the most significant trends in the literature, which emerged in early studies of sociolinguistic variation in

English: the tendency for women to make greater use of variants seen as “standard,” perhaps due to different orientations to linguistic prestige. The discovery of this connection between gender- and class-based variation drove variationists to postulate that women and men play distinctive roles in language change. Labov 1990 argues that women are responsible for language change from “above” (toward more standard speech), whereas men lead language change from “below” (toward more vernacular speech). Milroy 1980 likewise connects gender differences with standardness in a social network-based analysis of Belfast English, but attributes them to differences in network density. With the rise of the Community of Practice model, large-scale generalizations regarding the speech of women and men has been to an extent displaced by localized understandings of gendered language in specific communities. Eckert’s ethnography of a suburban Detroit high school, discussed in Eckert 1989 and Eckert 2000 (cited under Ethnographies: Language and Gender), is among the most influential studies of this sort. Students at the school spoke in ways that reflected not only their gender, but also their participation in one of the two major communities of practice within the school: jocks and burnouts. Eckert also emphasizes power dynamics that force women to define their worth through the accumulation of symbolic capital (in contrast with the political and material capital amassed by men). Mallinson and Childs 2007 similarly draws on the community of practice framework to explain the finding that a group of African American women with similar demographic characteristics made use of phonological and morphosyntactic variables in ways that had more to do with religious community membership than gender. With the destabilization of the link between femininity and standardness has come greater sensitivity to the way speakers mobilize resources to accomplish social work, as Johnstone 1999 describes in an account of Texas women’s deployment of the features of southern American English. In Eckert 2012, the author characterizes what she terms the “third wave” of variation research, which views language change as emerging from the active stylistic practices of speakers who are invested in the creation of social meaning. Podesva 2013 provides a strong example of third-wave variationist research, in which identities are treated as performatively realized and quantitative results are not treated as self-explanatory but as situated in discursive context.

Eckert, Penelope. 1989. The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1:245–267.

Eckert discusses the role of gender in her study of the Northern Cities Vowel Shift at a Detroit high school. To account for girls’ greater use of both the most and least “standard” variables, she highlights the way gendered power dynamics cause women to depend on symbolic resources for self-making.

Eckert, Penelope. 2012. Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:87–100.

This discussion of “third wave” variationist literature reviews newer work in gender and sexuality that views variation as emerging not from the structural positions of speakers caught up in systems of production, but from the active stylistic practices of speakers invested in the creation of social meaning.

Johnstone, Barbara. 1999. Uses of southern-sounding speech by contemporary Texas women. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3.4: 505–522.

Johnstone’s investigation of southern American English in the speech of Texas women treats regional variation as a resource for negotiating interaction and relationships rather than a sociohistorical process in which women play a homogenous role. Southern-sounding speech, then, is not the cause but the effect of particular sociolinguistic practices.

Labov, William. 1990. The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. *Language Variation and Change* 2.2: 205–254.

In this article, Labov considers the relationship between gender and class in driving language change, with a focus on dialectal variation in Philadelphia. He identifies an interaction between these social categories wherein working-class men resist changes led by women, creating different gendered patterns for working- and middle-class speakers.

Mallinson, Christine, and Becky Childs. 2007. Communities of practice in sociolinguistic description: Analyzing language and identity practices among black women in Appalachia. *Gender & Language* 1.2: 173–206.

The authors analyze the speech of eight middle-aged and older African American women in an Appalachian community, finding considerable variation in several variables associated with African American English. Rather than assuming the primacy of gender and racial identity categories, the authors underscore the significance of social practice and sociolinguistic ideologies.

Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Milroy's study of Belfast English focuses on the role of social networks in shaping sociolinguistic variation, which serve as a mediating factor between language and gender. That is, differing degrees of vernacularity are correlated not with gender directly, but with a speaker's degree of connectedness with others in the community.

Podesva, Robert J. 2013. Gender and the social meaning of non-modal phonation types. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 37.1: 427–448.

Podesva provides a third-wave variationist account of phonation (a subset of voice qualities) across a stratified sample of Washington, DC, residents. The complex findings on the distribution of marked voice qualities—such as creaky, breathy, and falsetto phonation—are situated through analysis of the discursive contexts in which they appear.

Romaine, Suzanne. 2003. Variation in language and gender. In *The handbook of language and gender*. Edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 98–118. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Romaine's chapter provides a comprehensive review of explanations offered to explain gender differences in sociolinguistic variation. She grounds her discussion of standardness with respect to the relationship between gender and class and the potential for language to promote inequality even in the face of increasing equity in realms like employment.

Language, Gender, and Race

Like second-wave feminism more generally, early research in language and gender was largely based on the practices of college-educated middle-class white women. Indeed, Lakoff's concept of "women's language" was later discussed in Barrett 1999 (cited under Queer Discourse) as the model for a "white women's style" performed by African American drag queens, suggesting that the register is ideologically associated with middle-class whiteness. Barrett's work is part of a broader movement in the 1990s to extend the language and gender canon to include speakers from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds—a shift influenced by the spread of multicultural feminism across the academy. With African American Vernacular English already well-established as a research subject in sociolinguistics, some of the field's most important challenges to the erasure of persons of color have focused on African American women's practices, among them Jacobs-Huey 2006 (cited under Ethnographies: Language and Gender), Lanehart 2009, Mitchell-Kernan 1971, Morgan 1999, and Troutman 2001. Much contemporary work on language, gender, and race acknowledges the central role of language in both maintaining and transforming racial identities and relations. Since the turn of the millennium, scholars have increasingly considered how race intersects with categories like class, sexuality, community, generation, and nation, exemplified by Chun 2004, an analysis of the use of "Mock Asian" language by Korean American comedian Margaret Cho, as well as Davis 2014, a study of language, gender, sexuality, and indigeneity among Two-Spirit Native Americans. Research on the language practices of Latina/o communities in the United States has likewise made more sophisticated the field's understanding of ethnoracial identity and its place in systems of marginalization, among them Zentella 1997, an analysis of bilingualism among different generations of New York Puerto Ricans, and Mendoza-Denton 2008, a study of contrastive semiotic styles adopted by Norteña and Sureña gang members in California (both cited under Ethnographies: Language and Gender). Bucholtz 2011 (also under Ethnographies: Language and Gender) directs attention to whiteness as a racialized category in the author's study of teenage styles in a multiracial high school. Trechter 2014, drawing from ethnographic research among Native American speakers of Lakhóta, provides a cautionary review of how assumptions about gender and ethnicity may guide our research practices and findings. In a highly reflexive piece, Gaudio 2011 discusses how the ethnographic encounter—in this case involving a white gay male academic and men who have sex with men in Nigeria—may inadvertently serve to reify racially distinct sexualities within the power-laden context of postcolonialism.

Chun, Elaine. 2004. Ideologies of legitimate mockery: Margaret Cho's revoicings of Mock Asian. *Pragmatics* 14.2–3: 263–289.

Chun discusses contexts for potentially legitimate use of Mock Asian. Her analysis of Margaret Cho's comedy routines suggests that the use of this variety, while recirculating Asian stereotypes, can also be read as a subversive critique of mainstream racist ideologies, given Cho's positioning as an "authentic" second-generation Korean American.

Davis, Jenny L. 2014. More than just "gay Indians": Intersecting articulations of Two-Spirit gender, sexuality, and indigenusness. In *Queer Excursions: Rethorizing Binaries in Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. Edited by Lal Zimman, Jenny Davis, and Joshua Raclaw, 62–80. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Davis's article is one of the few to address links between language, gender, sexuality, and indigenusness through its focus on a Rocky Mountain Two-Spirit community. Her analysis uncovers a multiplicity of localized binaries that influence Two-Spirit displays of identity along with broader binaries that govern indigenus and LGBT discourses.

Gaudio, Rudolf P. 2011. White men do it too: Racialized (homo)sexualities in postcolonial Hausaland. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11.1: 36–51.

Gaudio analyzes a discussion that took place in an ethnographic encounter between himself and Nigerian men who have sex with men. Through a reflexive analysis of his own positionality as a gay European American man, Gaudio demonstrates the historical and interactional contingencies of blackness, whiteness, Hausaness, and other racial, religious, and sexual categories.

Lanehart, Sonja L., ed. 2009. *African American women's language: Discourse, education, and identity*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Lanehart's collection includes seventeen chapters on aspects of African American women's language that range from hip-hop feminism to intonation, the discourse marker *girl*, and "church lady talk." The book is divided into sections that reflect core areas of contemporary research on African American English and gender: language and identity; discourse, grammar, and variation; film and literature; and performance and community.

Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia. 1971. *Language and behavior in a black urban community*. Monographs of the Language-Behavior Research Laboratory 2. Berkeley: Univ. of California.

Mitchell-Kernan's dissertation on African American women's discourse practices in West Oakland, subsequently published by UC Berkeley's Language-Behavior Research Laboratory, is widely recognized as a pioneering text in the study of African American women's language, particularly for its use of ethnographic methods and its analysis of conversational *signifying*, or indirect communication.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1999. No woman no cry: Claiming African American women's place. In *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*. Edited by Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton, 27–45. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Morgan discusses the marginalization of women in African American language research as she analyzes data from ethnographic research among black women in the United States and the English-speaking African diaspora. She focuses on three central interactional events that emerge across generations of speakers: he-said-she-said interactions, instigating, and conversational signifying.

Trechter, Sara. 2014. A marked man: The contexts of gender and ethnicity. In *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality*. 2d ed. Edited by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff, and Janet Holmes, 335–352. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Trechter reviews research on gender and ethnicity to illustrate their mutual construction in discourse. Drawing from discussions of the Lakhóta gender system in particular, Trechter demonstrates that researchers are also influenced by ideological processes such as iconicity and erasure, making a more reflexive accounting of gender and ethnicity imperative.

Troutman, Denise. 2001. African American women: Talking that talk. In *Sociocultural and historical contexts of African American English*. Edited by Sonja L. Lanehart, 211–237. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Troutman provides a useful overview of linguistic behaviors associated with African American women, both stereotypical and actual, discussing such areas as reported speech, cooperative speech, reading dialect, “culturally toned” diminutives, performance, *capping*, and *smart talk*.

Language, Gender, and Sexuality

Sexuality has been an important component of research on language and gender since its earliest days, particularly with respect to the ways heterosexuality structures interactions between women and men. It was not until the 1990s, however, that language and sexuality took hold as an independent arena of investigation. With the rise of queer theory in the academy more broadly, the study of language use in groups marginalized for their gendered and sexual practices was brought into the study of language, gender, and sexuality. *Queer linguistics* served as a critique of the assumed heterosexuality that was built into many of the early discussions of language and sexuality. Reflecting the post-structuralist discursive turn described in *Language, Gender, and Power: Current Approaches*, queer linguistics has often focused on the ways discourse can work to both produce and subvert hegemonic ideologies and practices. At the same time, sexuality has become an important part of sociolinguistic approaches to style, leading to a robust literature on the way sociolinguistic variation is mobilized as speakers navigate the complex relationship between gender and sexuality.

Queer Discourse

The influence of Performativity as a framework for understanding gender and sexuality is nowhere stronger than in the case of queer linguistics, which arose through volumes like Leap 1996 (cited under *Ethnographies: Language and Sexuality*) and Livia and Hall 1997 (under *Anthologies and Edited Volumes: Language and Sexuality*). The field questions the heterosexism and gender normativity that characterizes much of the research on “women” and “men.” Early linguistic research on gays and lesbians has been critiqued for an essentialized understanding of sexual identity, as discussed in a widely cited debate, exemplified by Kulick 2000 and Bucholtz and Hall 2004, over the place of identity and desire in language and sexuality studies (both under *General Overviews*). Yet works like Leap 1996 (under *Ethnographies: Language and Sexuality*) nevertheless had the effect of calling attention to—and ultimately disrupting—the ideological link between femininity, female bodies, and desire for men, on the one hand, and masculinity, male bodies, and desire for women, on the other. A new generation of scholars has recently revisited the concept of heteronormativity as a central theme in queer linguistics, as seen in Motschenbacher 2010 and in many contributions to Motschenbacher and Stegu 2013, a special issue on queer linguistics for *Discourse & Society*. The theme of heteronormativity has also become important within conversation analysis: scholarship like Land and Kitzinger 2005 has exposed the heterosexual assumptions that guide everyday conversation. As much of this research makes clear, queer linguistics encompasses more than the linguistic practices of gays and lesbians; indeed, it calls into question any clean division between gender and sexuality through an emphasis on the subversive potential of both erotic and gender-crossing practices. This potentiality is central to Livia 2001, an investigation of grammatical gender as a resource for identity work in French and English texts; Gaudio 2009 (under *Ethnographies: Language and Sexuality*), a discussion of linguistic indirectness and other subversive strategies used by Nigerian *yan daudu*; Hall 2005, a treatment of class and gender liminality in “*hijra*-acting” performances of transgender *kotis* in a New Delhi NGO; Besnier 2003, a study of transgender Tongans, or *leitis*, whose use of English reflects tensions between local and global linguistic practices; and Zimman 2014, an analysis of gendered embodiment as constructed in the discourse of transgender men. The question of what constitutes subversion is a complex matter, as elucidated by Barrett 1999, an analysis of African American drag queens’ shifting constructions of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Parodic performance, a critical ground for resignifying queer linguistic practices, reveals the performative nature of gender.

Barrett, Rusty. 1999. Indexing polyphonous identity in the speech of African American drag queens. In *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*. Edited by Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, and Laurel Sutton, 313–331. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Barrett’s treatment of style-shifting among African American drag queens provides a linguistic perspective on the question of the subversive potential of drag. In contrast to critics’ claims that drag performers aspire to normative white femininity, Barrett demonstrates how shifts between gendered and racialized positionalities allow for parody and ultimately subversion.

Besnier, Niko. 2003. Crossing genders, mixing languages: The linguistic construction of transgenderism in Tonga. In *The handbook of language and gender*. Edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 279–301. Oxford: Blackwell.

Besnier analyzes English use among transgender Tongans known as *leitis*, who exploit the language's association with femininity, cosmopolitanism, and sophistication. Though limited linguistic proficiency keeps many Tongans from using English, *leitis*' reputation as "shameless" allows them to draw on this language to navigate tensions between local and global selfhood.

Hall, Kira. 2005. Intertextual sexuality: Parodies of class, identity, and desire in liminal Delhi. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15.1: 125–144.

Hall analyzes the discourse practices of Hindi-speaking *kotis* in urban India, a transgender group that performs parodies of the "third sex" *hijras*. The analysis illustrates the complex intersectionality of language, class, identity, and desire, with *kotis* distinguishing their sexuality as a preferable middle ground between upper-class gays and lower-class *hijras*.

Land, Victoria, and Celia Kitzinger. 2005. Speaking as a lesbian: Correcting the heterosexist presumption. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38.4: 371–416.

The authors employ conversation analysis to examine a set of telephone exchanges in which the sexuality of lesbian speakers becomes interactionally relevant. While lesbians' talk resembled the unmarked conversational practices of heterosexuals when their sexual orientation was known, various coming-out strategies were necessary to manage their interlocutors' assumption of heterosexuality.

Livia, Anna. 2001. *Pronoun envy: Literary uses of linguistic gender*. New York: Oxford.

Livia, a specialist in the application of linguistics to literary texts, explores creative uses of pronouns by feminist writers within a broad corpus of English and French texts. Bridging the gap between linguistic and literary analysis, Livia's text illustrates the crucial importance of grammatical gender to feminist and queer concerns.

Motschenbacher, Heiko. 2010. *Language, gender, and sexual identity: Poststructuralist perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Motschenbacher adopts a post-structuralist framework in this analysis of the discursive construction of heteronormativity and gender binarism. The book outlines a number of queer linguistic approaches to language, gender, and sexual identity while analyzing a range of empirical data taken from advertising, queer cinema, and everyday discourse.

Motschenbacher, Heiko, and Martin Stegu, eds. 2013. *Special Issue on Queer Linguistics. Discourse & Society* 24.5.

Editors Motschenbacher and Stegu frame this special issue on queer linguistics around the concept of heteronormativity. The field's leading and up-and-coming scholars analyze discursive constructions of heterosexuality alongside lesbian and gay sexuality, positioning their work with respect to developments in both queer theory and queer linguistics.

Zimman, Lal. 2014. The discursive construction of sex: Remaking and reclaiming the gendered body in talk about genitals among trans men. In *Queer excursions: Rethorizing binaries in language, gender, and sexuality*. Edited by Lal Zimman, Jenny Davis, and Joshua Raclaw, 13–34. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Zimman's analysis of talk about the body in an online transgender community highlights the discursive nature of biological sex. Through innovative combinations of canonically "female" and "male" genital terminology, members of this community challenge both scientific and popular understandings of sex as universal, natural, static, and binary.

Sexuality and Sociolinguistic Variation

The role of sociolinguistic variation in the negotiation of identity has taken on an important place within the field of language and sexuality, particularly since the beginning of the 21st century. The voice has been an important object of analysis in this literature, as shown by Munson and Babel 2007, a review of research on the production and perception of certain voices (especially men's voices) as belonging to gay speakers. However, the discussion provided by Campbell-Kibler 2011 on variation in the suffix *-ing* (e.g. *talking* versus *talkin'*), Wong 2005 on the lexical semantics of *tongzhi*, and Levon 2010 (cited under Ethnographies: Language and Sexuality) on several levels of sociolinguistic practice, from narrative to prosody underscores the importance of holistic styles over individual variables. Zimman 2013 extends the issue of stylistic context to an analysis of transgender men's perceived sexuality, which highlights the relationship between sexuality and gender normativity as hegemonic masculinity works to erase the diversity of subjugated masculinities. Recognizing the contextual basis of sociolinguistic style and problematizing static approaches to the "gay-sounding voice," Podesva 2007 focuses on the shifting use of falsetto voice quality in the speech of one gay man in three different social contexts. Many authors engaging with sexuality and sociolinguistic variation, then, maintain a sensitivity to politics, power, and normativity. Heterosexuality thus maintains an important place in this work, as exemplified by Eckert 2011, which examines the negotiation of dialectal variation in the vowels of preteens in California as they begin to engage with the heterosexual marketplace. What this type of analysis makes clear is that linguistic negotiations of sexuality are a tool not only for positioning interlocutors' overtly sexualized identities and desires, but also for constructing other forms of social subjectivity like age, ethnicity, and coolness (among innumerable other locally salient identities). Wong 2005 highlights the politics of lexical variation associated with sexuality in his analysis of the homophobic re-reappropriation of the term *tongzhi*, which renewed the social stigma of a term that had been recently reclaimed by gay activists. Corpus linguists' interest in collocational and phrasal patterns in written and spoken discourse has also assumed an important role in the quantitative analysis of sexuality, as in Baker 2008, an analysis of public discourses surrounding homosexuality.

Baker, Paul. 2008. *Public discourses of gay men*. New York: Routledge.

Baker applies quantitative methodologies of corpus linguistics to a variety of public texts on homosexuality, some authored by gay men and others not. His analysis uncovers divergent collocational and phrasal patterns in corpora ranging from the popular sitcom *Will and Grace* to debates in the UK House of Lords.

Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn. 2011. Intersecting variables and perceived sexual orientation in men. *American Speech* 86.1: 52–68.

Campbell-Kibler presents results of matched-guise experiments that investigated the relationship between the articulation of /s/ and the morphological variable (ING). She finds that perceptions of sexuality, gender normativity, and other characteristics depend on the interaction between these variables such that neither could be said to index gayness on its own.

Eckert, Penelope. 2011. Language and power in the preadolescent heterosexual market. *American Speech* 86.1: 85–97.

Eckert's approach to sexuality and variation highlights the role of regional dialectal features in preadolescents' construction of a heterosexual marketplace. In these contexts, heterosexuality becomes a framework not only for the construction of gender and sexuality but also for the negotiation of maturity and social status within the local community.

Munson, Benjamin, and Molly Babel. 2007. Loose lips and silver tongues, or, projecting sexual orientation through speech. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1.1: 1–34.

Munson and Babel review the literature on the perception of men's voices as gay-sounding. Echoing an argument made by Munson elsewhere, the paper highlights the indirect nature of indexicality such that gay identity can be indexed through selected combinations of phonetic traits associated with gender and/or other socially meaningful identities.

Podesva, Robert J. 2007. Phonation type as a stylistic variable: The use of falsetto in constructing a persona. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11.4: 478–504.

Podesva's widely cited case study of stylistic variation focuses on one gay man's use of falsetto voice quality in three different social contexts. To emphasize the contextual basis of identity work, Podesva employs the notion of *persona* to account for the speaker's variable use of features linked to sexuality.

Wong, Andrew. 2005. The reappropriation of *tongzhi*. *Language in Society* 34.5: 763–793.

Wong focuses on the shifting meaning of *tongzhi* “comrade,” a word used in the construction of Communist Chinese subjectivity. Even as *tongzhi* was appropriated by Hong Kong activists working to establish a gay community, the variable semantics and indexicality of the word allows for its further, homophobic resignification in media discourses.

Zimman, Lal. 2013. Hegemonic masculinity and the variability of gay-sounding speech: The perceived sexuality of transgender men. *Journal of Language and Sexuality* 2.1: 1–39.

Zimman focuses on the relationship between gender normativity and the perception of male voices as gay-sounding through an acoustic and perceptual comparison of the voices of female-to-male transgender speakers—who are often perceived as gay men after their gender role transition—alongside both gay- and straight-identified non-trans men.

Language and Masculinity

As in many other areas of study within the field of language and gender, the rise of language and masculinity studies in the 1990s also mirrored developments in gender studies. Research on language and gender formulated within difference-based frameworks included men's speech as part of their investigations of gendered linguistic practices, but this work tended to represent male speech patterns as monolithic and rarely made masculinity the object of analysis. Sattel 1976 offers one of the first studies specifically focused on men's language practices, which contextualizes what Sattel calls the “inexpressive male” in the female-male power dynamics that were at the center of feminist research on language in the 1970s. Much of the preliminary work in this area failed to challenge the framing of masculinity as an implicit gendered norm against which femininity is compared. Scholars of the new masculinity studies, many of whom are featured in Johnson and Meinhof's book, argue that gender dynamics can be fully illuminated only when we understand how men, as well as women, participate in the construction of gendered subjectivity. Also key in this literature is attention to power dynamics and social disparities among men as well as those between women and men. Much of the research on power hierarchies among men is framed by the notion of hegemonic masculinity, or the form of privileged masculinity that is most highly valued in a particular cultural context. This idea is used extensively in Coates 2003, which examines a variety of all-male conversations in the United Kingdom. Sexuality is a key element in regulating hegemonic masculinity, and several authors have investigated the mutual construction of masculinity and heterosexuality. Cameron 1997 and Kiesling 2005 are among those who have called attention to the ways young men collectively construct hegemonic masculinity through the discursive management of homosocial relationships, the policing of heterosexual desire, and the subordination of non-normatively masculine men. But sexuality is only one lens through which hegemonic masculinity is constructed. Studies focused on race, ethnicity, and class—among them Bucholtz 1999, Chun 2001, and Pujolar 2001 (cited under Ethnographies: Language and Gender)—have been particularly effective in demonstrating how the performance of masculinity varies across social groups and discursive contexts. A 2015 collection of articles on language and masculinity edited by Milani, who also edited a special issue of *Gender & Language* on the same subject in 2011, brings focus to processes of identification, desire, and intersectionality in the construction of both hegemonic and non-normative masculinities (see Milani 2014, cited under Practice-Based Approaches to Language and Gender: Performativity).

Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3.4: 443–460.

Through analysis of narratives in which the narrator gives voice to the “racial other,” Bucholtz explores the ways that white teenage boys construct their own masculinities in relation to imaginings of African American masculinities as physically powerful and hyper-aggressive, which they accomplish in part through the appropriation of African American English.

Cameron, Deborah. 1997. *Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity*. In *Language and masculinity*. Edited by Sally Johnson and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof, 47–64. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

This chapter is concerned with the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity among a group of college men as they gossip about the sexuality of another man. By associating this man with stigmatized forms of sexuality and gender—homosexuality and effeminacy—and distancing themselves from these positionalities, the speakers reinforce their own heteronormativity.

Chun, Elaine. 2001. *The construction of white, black, and Korean American identities through African American Vernacular English*. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11.1: 52–64.

Chun analyzes the use of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) by Korean American men as a tool that simultaneously reinforces and disrupts racial stereotypes about black and Korean identities. While Korean Americans' use of AAVE contests the ideological feminization of Asian men, it also reinforces racist ideologies about black hypermasculinity.

Coates, Jennifer. 2003. *Men talk: Stories in the making of masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

This book draws on a range of conversational data from the United Kingdom to illustrate how hegemonic masculinity structures men's talk at the turn of the millennium. Coates focuses on stories told by different groups of men in all-male conversations, among them garage mechanics, carpenters, and academics.

Johnson, Sally, and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof, eds. 1997. *Language and masculinity*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

A key contribution to language and masculinity studies, Johnson and Meinhof's volume includes chapters on a range of spoken and textual genres. Many of the book's contributions challenge the association between men and particular linguistic resources, such as competitive discursive styles, swearing, or avoidance of ideologically feminized forms of talk.

Kiesling, Scott Fabius. 2005. *Homosocial desire in men's talk: Balancing and re-creating cultural discourses of masculinity*. *Language in Society* 34.5: 695–726.

Kiesling addresses the way *homosociality*, or the social intimacies between members of the same gender, figure into the maintenance of normative masculinity. The importance of close platonic relationships, however, can at times run contrary to the maintenance of strict heterosexuality, which must be managed through interactional strategies like indirectness.

Milani, Tommaso M., ed. 2015. *Language and masculinities: Performances, intersections, dislocations*. New York: Routledge.

Milani's edited volume is the first explicitly devoted to language and masculinity since Johnson and Meinhof's book nearly twenty years before. The volume focuses on hegemonic forms of masculinity as well as the multiplicity of men's (and others') gender expressions across global contexts, including both more and less normative masculinities.

Sattel, Jack W. 1976. *The inexpressive male: Tragedy or sexual politics?* *Social Problems* 23.4: 469–477.

Sattel's classic text considers the association between masculinity and emotional inexpressivity as a product and tool of sexual politics. Rather than a value-neutral temperamental difference between women and men, the tendency for men to withhold emotionally is framed by Sattel as a means of maintaining a position of social dominance.

As outlined in Shankar and Cavanaugh 2012, the study of language and political economy arose within linguistic anthropology to investigate the material conditions of language use. Pioneering articles in this tradition extend and revise Bourdieu 1977 (cited under Community of Practice), forming an understanding of language as symbolic capital (see Practice-Based Approaches to Language and Gender) to account for the power-laden complexities of language choice in multilingual nation-states. As Susan Gal argues in an influential cross-cultural review of the relationship between speech and power (Gal 1991, under Language, Gender, and Power: Current Approaches), gender is of central importance to these discussions because women and men's discourse practices often acquire different values. A dramatic example comes from modern Japan: Inoue 2006 (under Ethnographies: Language and Gender) reveals the close bond between language, gender, and political economy by locating the origins of Japanese "women's language" in processes of nation-building. Women's language is thus never purely about gender, as Barrett 1995 also argues in an analysis of the use of a stereotyped women's language by African American drag queens. Barrett's early critique of Bourdieu's understanding of symbolic domination illustrates that these speakers use standard language in their performances not to acquiesce to white authority but to contest it. A strong tradition of research in language and political economy examines the linguistic commodification of women's voices in the workplace. In the particularly overt example of phone sex, Hall 1995 analyzes the selling of stereotyped women's language as a sexual commodity that is complexly imbricated in systems of power. But research on less exotic workplaces also illustrates the materiality of gendered language, such as Toerien and Kitzinger 2007 on emotional labor in a UK beauty salon, Holmes 2006 on the gendering of requests and refusals in New Zealand factories, Cameron 2000 on the valorization of feminine communicative styles in call centers in the United Kingdom, and Ostermann 2003 on the contrastive use of affiliative strategies at an all-female police station and feminist crisis intervention center in Brazil. Work on language and political economy is increasingly attentive to how gender materializes in the globalized service economy, including research by Piller and Takahashi 2010 on unequal access to linguistic capital in the gendered work of transnational migrants. The edited collection McElhinny 2007 (under Language, Gender, and Globalization) provides an important theorization of the political economy of language and gender within the context of globalization, showcasing contemporary work in linguistic and cultural anthropology.

Barrett, Rusty. 1995. Supermodels of the world, unite! Political economy and the language of performance among African American drag queens. In *Beyond the lavender lexicon: Authenticity, imagination, and appropriation in lesbian and gay languages*. Edited by William Leap, 207–226. New York: Routledge.

Barrett's discourse analysis of performances by African American drag queens presents a challenge to Bourdieu's understanding of symbolic domination, which holds that the masses are complicit in their own domination. In this case, performers use standard language associated with a dominant authority as a form of resistance against that authority.

Cameron, Deborah. 2000. Styling the worker: Gender and the commodification of language in the globalized service economy. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.3: 323–347.

Cameron's article analyzes the linguistic and vocal "styling" prescribed for operators in UK telephone call centers, where service work is produced largely through language. She shows how the commodification of language in this globalized workplace problematically valorizes a feminized speech style associated with expressiveness, caring, empathy, and sincerity.

Hall, Kira. 1995. Lip service on the fantasy lines. In *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*. Edited by Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz, 183–216. New York: Routledge.

Hall interviews phone sex operators and finds that employees utilize the "women's language" of Lakoff 1975 (cited under Introduction). This finding both draws attention to women's language as a sexual commodity and complicates the characterization of such forms as powerless. The use of women's language by phone sex employees leads to economic and social power, even as it reaffirms sexist stereotypes.

Holmes, Janet. 2006. *Gendered talk at work: Constructing gender identity through workplace discourse*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Holmes explores the ways gender contributes to the meaning of interactions in a number of predominantly white-collar institutions in New Zealand. Her analysis of feminine and masculine interactional styles draws from an extensive database of interactional data collected over a period of seven years as well as supplemental interviews and focus groups.

Ostermann, Ana Christina. 2003. Communities of practice at work: Gender, facework, and the power of habitus at an all-female police station and a feminist crisis intervention center in Brazil. *Discourse & Society* 14:473–505.

Ostermann analyzes discourse strategies associated with two workplaces in Brazil: an all-female police station that deals with domestic violence cases and a feminist crisis intervention center. The analysis illustrates that it is not gender that produces interactional patterns in the workplace, but rather the communities of practice from which professionals are drawn.

Piller, Ingrid, and Kimie Takahashi. 2010. At the intersection of gender, language and transnationalism. In *The handbook of language and globalization*. Edited by Nikolas Coupland, 540–554. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Piller and Takahashi explore how patterns of transnational migration and associated English competencies impact particular groups of migrant women. They suggest that the evaluation of the work potential of migrant women as best suited to factories, homes, and the sex or tourism industries is importantly influenced by ideologies of language.

Shankar, Shalini, and Jillian R. Cavanaugh. 2012. Language and materiality in global capitalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:355–369.

Shalini and Cavanaugh review an emerging field of scholarship they call “language materiality.” While not focused specifically on gender, the review covers important ethnographic and theoretical work on linguistic objectification and practices of embodiment alongside language commodification in global capitalism.

Toerien, Merran, and Celia Kitzinger. 2007. Emotional labour in action: Navigating multiple involvements in the beauty salon. *Sociology* 41.4: 645–662.

Toerien and Kitzinger explore the production of emotional labor in work environments, focusing on an extended interaction between a client and a beauty therapist. They find that the beauty therapist prioritizes emotional labor over the immediate task of hair removal, suggesting its importance to this form of work.

Language, Gender, and Embodiment

The annotations in this section represent an emergent area of research in the study of language, gender, and sexuality: the embodied nature of language. Because scholars of language are traditionally concerned with the realm of the symbolic, increased attention to corporeality provides a significant reformulation of language as a means of communication. As outlined by Zimman and Hall 2009, two complementary perspectives have emerged as particularly strong trends in this literature, one emphasizing the body as a product of discourse and the other treating the body as a resource in linguistic practice. The first mode of analysis examines the discursive practices through which the body takes on social intelligibility: Zimman and Hall 2009 underscores the importance of this perspective for language and gender by analyzing trans people’s creative uses of body part terminology as a challenge to normative models of sex. Frith 2015 takes on the orgasm and similarly confronts the discursive naturalization of this bodily process and its gendered implications, while Ramanathan 2010 focuses on disability in order to reveal the importance of language in the negotiation of health as a form of embodied normativity. King 2015 also considers the body as a resource for discursive identity work in the case of an intersex activist, focusing on the ways the body serves to anchor cultural identities in corporeal experience. The second perspective from which the body has been integrated into research on language, gender, and sexuality is through the analysis of embodied gesture. The treatment of neck rolls, eye rolls, and instances of suck-teeth in Goodwin and Alim 2010 exemplifies the interactional salience of gesture as a means of constructing the intersecting macro-identities of gender, race, and class. Gordon and Labotka 2009 takes an experimental approach to gendered embodiment in which the authors quantify the space speakers occupy and the speed at which they move. Yet the use of canonical gestures is not the only way in which bodies themselves act as signifiers. For Jones 2008, the mere display of the body constitutes a critical element of online video-mediated erotic interactions between gay men. For Speer and Green 2007, the body provides legitimation for a psychiatrist’s assessment of his trans patient’s ability to “pass.” A great deal of work remains to be done in this new terrain of research in language, gender, and sexuality, but the texts sampled here highlight some of the ways that corporeality can be usefully integrated into understandings of social meaning.

Frith, Hannah. 2015. *Orgasmic bodies: The orgasm in contemporary Western culture*. Basingstoke, UK, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Frith's book is an accessible treatment of orgasm as an embodied experience that is often interpreted as purely biological. Frith shows how orgasms are constructed through everyday interaction by privileging certain bodies, acts, and experiences over others. Although her analysis is not strictly linguistic, the book's theoretical perspectives and language data are useful for sociocultural linguists.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness, and H. Samy Alim. 2010. "Whatever (neck roll, eye roll, teeth suck)": The situated coproduction of social categories and identities through stancetaking and transmodal stylization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20.1: 179–194.

This article highlights the importance of gestural stylization in the management of relationships in a group of preadolescent girls. By combining verbal resources associated with white "Valley girls" and gestures associated with working-class blackness, these speakers are able to negotiate both their immediate peer group and the broader constructs of gender, race, and class.

Gordon, Bryan, and Lori Labotka. 2009. Gendered gestures: An experimental approach to the linguistic embodiment of masculinities. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 53:62–71.

Gordon and Labotka's paper uses experimental methods to analyze the effect of ideologies about gender and sexuality on the production of gesture. Their results are complex and resist simplistic interpretations, but the study's research design and discussion provide fruitful directions for the development of research on gender, sexuality, and gesture.

Jones, Rodney H. 2008. The role of text in televideo cybersex. *Text and Talk* 28.4: 453–473.

Jones's investigation of computer-mediated sexual encounters (or "televideo cybersex") provides a rare glimpse into the language used in real-time sexual encounters. In this genre, textual elements function as support for the display and performance of erotic embodiment.

King, Brian W. 2015. Reclaiming masculinity in an account of lived intersex experience: Language, desire, and embodied knowledge. In *Language and masculinities: Performances, intersections, dislocations*. Edited by Tommaso Milani, 220–242. New York: Routledge.

This chapter deals with the complexity of the material body through analysis of one intersexed person's narratives of lived experience. While intersex embodiment has often been treated as a devastating challenge to the notion of biological sex, King demonstrates the importance of the gendered body in the construction of intersex subjectivity.

Ramanathan, Vaidehi. 2010. *Bodies and language: Health, ailments, disabilities*. Multilingual Matters.

Ramanathan's book provides deep engagement with language and the embodiment of health and disability. The first chapter is focused on breast cancer, providing the most overt contribution to language, gender, and sexuality, while the remaining chapters offer new directions and tools for the analysis of language and the gendered and sexualized body.

Speer, Susan A., and Richard Green. 2007. On passing: The interactional organization of appearance attributions in the psychiatric assessment of transsexual patients. In *Out in psychology: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer perspectives*. Edited by Victoria Clark and Elizabeth Peel, 335–368. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Speer and Green analyze interactions between a trans woman and a psychiatrist to explore how physical appearance is invoked to legitimize trans people's gender identities. Rather than treating "ability to pass" as a property of a particular trans person, the authors emphasize the co-constructed and power-laden nature of gender attribution.

Zimman, Lal, and Kira Hall. 2009. Language, embodiment, and the “third sex.” In *Language and identities*. Edited by Dominic Watt and Carmen Llamas, 166–178. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

The authors delineate two perspectives from which embodiment may be analyzed in language, gender, and sexuality studies. The role of discourse in producing biological sex is highlighted by an analysis of computer-mediated interaction among female-to-male transgender speakers, while the potential of gesture for the performance of gender alterity is demonstrated by an analysis of hand claps produced by Indian “*hijra* actors.”

Language, Gender, and Globalization

Scholars of language and gender have long been interested in movements of media, peoples, and markets across nation-state boundaries, even if they have only recently begun to frame these studies in terms of globalization. Gal 1978, an influential article on German-Hungarian bilingualism in the Austrian border town of Oberwart, found that young women were more likely than men to orient to the symbolic prestige of German, using it to signal their rejection of traditional Hungarian peasant values. Since this early publication, as global processes associated with late capitalism have come to affect even the most local of speech communities, scholars have increasingly considered the place of globalization in the production of social meaning. Pioneering collections in this broadly construed research area include McElhinny 2007, which explores how language contributes to the production of social difference in the context of political and economic global transformations, and Leap and Boellstorff 2003, which overviews the linguistic effects of the globalized gay rights movement. A new line of ethnographic research in this area investigates how English, a language of global prestige, emerges in postcolonial and globalizing environments as a complex resource for the production of sexual and gender modernity. Scholarship in this vein includes articles on the place of English in producing a cosmopolitan subjectivity, among them Besnier 2003 (cited under Queer Discourse) on the performances of transgender beauty pageant contestants and their audiences in Tonga. Piller and Takahashi 2006 illustrates how English is linked with desire in the second-language learning discourses of Japanese women. Pigg 2001 theorizes the communicative difficulties that can arise from the prioritization of English in global health situations, focusing on AIDS education in Nepal. Hall 2009 analyzes how class-based ideologies of English and Hindi are mapped onto global and local understandings of female masculinity in a New Delhi NGO. Leap 2010 reviews the place of English cross-culturally as indexical of a gay identity produced through global movements of economic and cultural capital. Of course, stances of modernity are produced through other languages as well. Zhang 2005 investigates how Chinese professional women in Beijing orient to a new “cosmopolitan” sociolinguistic variable in Mandarin based on the use of a full tone in place of a neutral one. Such research illustrates that linguistic forms and their associated meanings are always shifting as communities participate in the ever evolving and often competing processes of globalization and localization.

Gal, Susan. 1978. Peasant men can't get wives: Language and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society* 7.1: 1–17.

Gal's influential article on the code-switching practices of bilingual German-Hungarian women in an Austrian border town, whose preferred language works to enact their orientation away from traditional peasant values, suggests that women's speech practices are complexly tied to social position, strategic life choices, and the symbolic value of language.

Hall, Kira. 2009. Boys' talk: Hindi, moustaches, and masculinity in New Delhi. In *Gender and spoken interaction*. Edited by Pia Pichler and Eva Eppler, 139–162. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall addresses social class, globalization, and code-switching as she analyzes divergent indexicalities of English and Hindi among lesbians and transgender men in a New Delhi NGO. Bilingual transgender men resist the global prioritization of same-sex desire by using Hindi, which is for them ideologically allied with non-elite Indian masculinity.

Leap, William L. 2010. Globalization and gay language. In *The handbook of language and globalization*. Edited by Nikolas Coupland, 555–574. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Leap examines cases ranging from the Philippines to Indonesia where linguistic practices and discourses of same-sex desires and identities have been affected by global movements of economic and cultural capital. The article includes an insightful discussion of the

place of English as a language of sexual cosmopolitanism.

Leap, William L., and Tom Boellstorff, eds. 2003. *Speaking in queer tongues: Globalization and gay language*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

The ten chapters that constitute this collection, edited by two prominent anthropologists of sexuality, examine the global spread of lesbian and gay discourse patterns, vocabulary systems, rhetoric, and sexual images in diverse sociocultural, national, and linguistic contexts.

McElhinny, Bonnie, ed. 2007. *Words, worlds, and material girls: Language, gender, globalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

McElhinny's linguistic anthropological collection presents a changing landscape of language and gender in several national contexts as an effect of globalization. The volume's thirteen chapters, including an insightful introduction by McElhinny, use a variety of methodologies to examine domains such as schools, media, workplaces, the music industry, beauty pageants, and marriage.

Pigg, Stacy Leigh. 2001. Languages of sex and AIDS in Nepal: Notes on the social production of commensurability. *Cultural Anthropology* 16.4: 481–541.

Drawing from insights in both linguistic and medical anthropology, Pigg focuses on the example of AIDS awareness education in Nepal to illustrate how language ideologies about English and vernacular languages complexly inform the translation and communication of knowledge about AIDS.

Piller, Ingrid, and Kimie Takahashi. 2006. A passion for English: Desire and the language market. In *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression and representation*. Edited by Aneta Pavlenko, 59–83. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

In this study of Japanese learners of English in Australia, Piller and Takahashi illustrate the mediatized creation of a desire to learn English among Japanese women. The authors address an important but rarely discussed topic in second-language acquisition when they argue that romantic and sexual choices influence language-learning opportunities.

Zhang, Qing. 2005. A Chinese yuppie in Beijing: Phonological variation and the construction of a new professional identity. *Language in Society* 34:431–466.

Zhang conducts a quantitative analysis of the gendered use of four sociolinguistic variables by Chinese professionals in foreign and state-owned companies. She finds that female employees in foreign companies, often showcased in highly visible positions as symbolic capital, overwhelmingly favor nonlocal variants as part of an emergent cosmopolitan identity.

[back to top](#)