

18 A Marked Man: The Contexts of Gender and Ethnicity

SARA TRECHTER

1 Introduction

As many chapters in this volume illustrate, the field of language and gender has expanded significantly in recent years to consider the relevance of ethnicity, sexual preference, and to a lesser extent class, to the construction of spoken and signed gendered identities (Hall and Bucholtz 1995; Livia and Hall 1997a; Bucholtz et al. 1999). In not-so-distant-past studies, the ethnic background of research participants was without question assumed because it was “unmarked” – White – and conclusions about gender and language based on research participants from this single ethnic background were often generalized to reflect on women and men as a whole. Because of ground-breaking work critiquing the lack of ethnic voices in relation to matrix languages and dialects and a growing body of work in languages outside the Euro-American context, this situation has begun to change (see this volume and this chapter for citations).

Nevertheless, if one glances at the titles of work in gender and language, it is still common for studies considering ethnicity and gender to prominently feature the non-matrix language name or a non-White ethnic label in their title (“Good Guys and ‘Bad’ Girls: Identity Construction by Latina and Latino Student Writers”; “No Woman No Cry: Claiming African American Women’s Place”). Ethnicity is foregrounded most often when it is non-White. Imagine changing some titles that just specify “women” to what they truly consider – White women, such as “White Women’s Identities at Work.” The field of gender and language still treats ethnicity as “marked” through the construction of oppositional pairs that oppose non-White to White, dialect to standard, non-English gender to English, non-matrix language speakers to matrix within a society. Thus, we might suppose that any contribution on gender and ethnicity will discuss research on each of the marked members of these oppositions and how they have added to a more highly diversified field of data, much as research in gender variation has taken us beyond essentialist definitions of “male” and “female.”

These two aspects of language and gender research have not developed apace. Researchers have complicated the notion of binary gender by pointing out its interactional and contextually constructed nature (see Bergvall, Bing, and Freed 1996; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992), interconnectedness and ideological associations with sexual preference (Livia and Hall 1997b), and its indexical rather than isomorphic nature (Ochs 1992). Except for some recent exceptions, there has not been an extensive engagement with redefining linguistic ethnicity in the field of language and gender. This may partially be because there is still a great deal of work to be done toward making the field of language and gender more attentive to issues of ethnicity and to the diverse voices of gender before the constructional nature of ethnicity can be dealt with in detail. A recent, important contribution to gender and ethnicity research is one that examines how gender is constructed intra-ethnically and interactionally within an in-group (Morgan 1999). A focus on interactional sequences in single-sex or cross-sex interactions emphasizes both the strategies for gendering that are available and interactive differences between men and women (Goodwin, this volume; 1999). Yet in such ethnic studies, there is some risk in assuming the gender (or ethnic) identity of participants as obvious or given as we look to their interactional strategies in constructing such identities (Urciuoli 1995; Kulick 2000). In effect, the available data on gender, language, and ethnicity has moved at a slower rate than our attempts to theorize it has. In practice, the mutually constructive properties of gendered/ethnic identity are complex and difficult to balance within any one study, especially when constrained by markedness relations with society's matrix language. As a focus, this chapter balances the importance of studies that demonstrate the role of ethnicity in the construction of linguistically gendered identities with those that emphasize the ways ethnicity itself gets gendered in both practice and ideology.

A great deal of gender and ethnicity research has addressed past stereotyping and attempted to create a more accurate and complete picture of ethnically gendered language in groups that have been neglected in the mainstream of gender and language research. The first section of this chapter considers how such work has changed the field of our inquiry. Without the continuation of these efforts, gender and language research will continue with a rather skewed focus, where the unmarked focus will be women who just happen to be Anglo and middle-class. In so far as sociolinguistic research is in constant danger of losing the complexity of either gender or ethnicity when demonstrating the relevance of one to a specific interactional context, the second focus of this chapter examines recent work that addresses two central questions: (1) how do gender and ethnicity mutually construct each other in negotiated discourse, and (2) how do some features of gender or ethnicity become iconic – ideologically part of a community as easily recognizable and interpretable features that are then taken as natural? Finally, a central assumption of this chapter is that even when gender and language research does not address ethnicity (i.e. it is assumed), the ethnicity of both the researched and the researcher should become highly marked. In fact, it probably is already

quite salient in the interpretation of those readers whose ethnicity is most often deemed worth commenting on in an academic context. Thus, the conclusion of this chapter is a proposal, re-emphasizing the gender and language researcher's responsibilities toward changing the field of research rather than merely plowing in new directions. Geneva Smitherman remarked explicitly on this obligation when advocating the use of African American English Vernacular in public and even corporate contexts:

So many of us who came in in the 60s on the struggles of Black people . . . got these degrees. We joined the mainstream. We should have been changing the course of that stream because the stream is polluted. (*Oprah Winfrey Show*, 1987)

Rather than assuming that the work we do merely describes the lamentable nature of fields and streams, as researchers we both effect and reflect that nature, and therefore have obligations to advocate and empower others in our work (Cameron et al. 1992). To the extent that gender and ethnicity research reflects and promulgates dominant social norms, activist researchers should, without inordinate reflexiveness or self-indulgence, attempt to direct such reflections productively. Language and gender research has not just studied "women's language," but has emphasized a political agenda that encourages the redefinition of men's language as "marked" (see Black and Coward 1981). The conclusion of this chapter therefore argues for similar work in the field of gender and ethnicity. Drawing on feminist perspectives as well as work by hooks (1992), Dyer (1997), and Ignatiev and Garvey (1996), I examine and propose strategies to make a man, a White man, as marked as any of the rest of us.

2 Revealing Ethnic Gender

The evolution of the field of language and gender has a great deal in common with language, gender, and ethnicity in that critical approaches in both have responded to the refusal to "see" the complexity or sometimes even the presence of the Other. Cameron (1985), for instance, critiques the work of Labov (1972b) in New York and Trudgill (1974) as predefining a core social world as male-dominated. Because women's socio-economic status in these studies was partially determined by their father's or husband's occupations, their linguistic gender could also only be viewed within a power dynamic where male behaviors were defined as core and females' as deviant. Likewise, in viewing the social world in terms of sex, rather than in terms of interaction, community contact, and gendered social action, nuanced behaviors that were outside of the centrally defined prototype were lost (Eckert 1989). In a similar vein, Foster (1995) and Morgan (1999) call for a renewal in the field of African American Vernacular English (AAVE) that recognizes the voices and interactions of

women as central and the work of African American women scholars in this field as valid. Morgan proposes that sociolinguistic work that types competitive genres in AAVE such as “playing the dozens” as particular to juvenile, male, culture obscures the gender complexity of the field and ignores women’s voices and genres. She cites Labov’s (1972a) work as also excluding other “deviant” genders such as boys who were considered “lame” because of their sexual preference or non-stereotypical behaviors. By giving examples of women’s “reading,” a genre used by both African American male and female speakers, Morgan demonstrates that the inclusion of women’s voices in the analysis of AAVE leads to a more explanatory and socially grounded account. Like the dozens, reading is a public performance, where (often) women denounce the actions and attitudes of the hearer to her/his face in what is often an extended monologue. Both types of performance test the ability of the addressee to save face and be publicly cool. Along with Goodwin’s (1990, 1999) analysis of AAVE-speaking girls’ and boys’ games and “he-said-she-said” interactions in Philadelphia, these analyses stress the importance of maintaining public face, confronting what others may have said behind one’s back, and preserving a public cool. Without the additions of the interactional resources and analysis of how these are taken up by women, or with an analysis of these genres as only competitive boy talk, the complex connections between these genres and historical oppression of African Americans as well as construction of community values would be lost. The addition of women’s voices to the study of ethnicity is vital.

Likewise, Galindo and Gonzales (1999: 4) argue that hitherto there has been no far-reaching insider account of Chicana language in the research on gender and ethnicity, and though outsider accounts are important, they cannot recount the “lived experience” of women who live with the crossing of borders, an excellent metaphor for both gender and ethnicity (see Anzaldúa 1987). There are two ways that this border-crossing becomes particularly relevant for the study of gender and ethnicity. First, women in ethnic communities are sometimes the mediators between traditional culture and language, preserving older forms, and the matrix language culture. Gonzales (1999) focuses on women in New Mexico who must cross between the borders of the local community of Córdoba and the larger Chicano- and English-speaking community, and are therefore cultural and linguistic innovators, maintaining their Spanish through strong local networks, but switching code to accommodate to outsiders. The role of ethnic women as “cultural brokers” in such situations is arguably related to their economic role in the community. For instance, Hill (1987) connects the fact that older Mexicano-speaking women were not as likely to speak Spanish but to maintain their Mexicano with their employment patterns. Where men were more likely to leave for a time to work in a Spanish-speaking urban center, women’s cottage industry production affected their language choices. Even though women’s ways of speaking were often devalued by the community at large, they were also envied by some young men who had shifted to Spanish. Conversely, young Gullah women from the Sea Islands of the Eastern US

coast were more likely to speak a dialect nearer to Standard English because of their service work in the mainland industry (Nichols 1983). Finally, Medicine (1987) argues that Lakhota-speaking women maintain the language through their role as socializers of children, but are cultural brokers because of their bilingual skills (see also Goldstein 1995 on gender and bilingualism).

Ethnic women's borderland linguistic fluency does not just apply to mediating between languages; it also concerns gender borders. Much of the work on Latinas and Chicanas in the gender and language literature has purposefully sought to debunk gender stereotypes of Latinas as submissive followers (Orellana 1999). Galindo (1999), in particular, argues that Chicanas are often stereotyped from within their culture and by outsiders who regard Chicanas as pure, chaste, and conservative speakers. Slang vocabularies such as *pachuco* or *caló* in this tradition are associated with big-city male gang members, the lower classes, or prison inmates. Galindo offers examples of Texas women who choose to use such "rough" vocabulary and pronunciation to defy gender stereotypes and traditional gender expectations for Chicanas. Likewise, Zentella (1998: 641) examines an ideology constructing a distinction between "the Spanish/poor/non-white female identity . . . subordinate to an English/rich/white male identity," and the conflict between this ideology and the Madonna ideology which equates Spanish with country and motherhood. To the extent that Puertorriqueñas are responsible for passing on their *mother* language, while ensuring their own advancement and their children's success in English-speaking schools in America, they are in a double bind. Zentella maintains that they are switching to English at phenomenal rates.

Such work demonstrates the need for more studies that explore the linguistic behavior and choices of ethnic women, especially in how they view their linguistic choices as constructing a powerful, gendered, ethnic voice for themselves despite expectations from the matrix culture and gender expectations within their own community (see Mendoza-Denton 1999a for a summary). Inasmuch as heritage language and ideologies equating heritage language with ethnic membership are connected to women's available linguistic choices, studies which demonstrate women's place in the maintenance and evolution of heritage language, and how this gendered expectation comes into being, are vital to understanding how ethnicity, linguistic gendered ethnicity, is constructed within a predefined community.

3 Conflicting Styles

Although such representations allude to the multiple pressures of borderland gender, they do so primarily at the level of an overarching community ideology. They also demonstrate, however, that the ideologies of gender and ethnicity and the accompanying interactional behavior are not straightforward or necessarily standardized within such a "community." Drawing more heavily on the

methodologies of Conversation Analysis and ethnography, Goodwin (this volume; 1999) consequently sees identities and, in particular, moral development as continually emerging from interactional contexts such as complex games rather than as static, predefined positions from which language emerges. Although the girls in her studies are both “markedly” ethnic – primarily Mexican and Central American children in Los Angeles, who speak Spanish – and gendered, her work primarily demonstrates how different aspects of identity emerge in situations of play and conflict. Ethnicities and genders are consequently performative acts brought into being within particular contexts, rather than contained in traditional binaries of male/not male and White/non-White. In such a complex field of performance, it is not simple to pinpoint exactly how gender and ethnicity are mutually constructed or even that a particular linguistic behavior is necessarily “ethnic.” The values of particular linguistic behaviors are multiple: in performance and uptake, they transform throughout an interchange. Goodwin consequently (1999: 402) notes: “Much more work is required to sort out the effects of ethnicity, age and social class on norms of speaking.” Nevertheless, by paying close attention to performative data, the linguistic detail of how “community” membership is regulated emerges in the face of different personal styles.

Mendoza-Denton (1999b) provides further nuances to our understanding of Latina intra-group ethnicity. It is complicated by both class and urban versus rural associations, and the fact that linguistic actions contain multiple meanings. In high school girl intra-group conversations about class and ethnic affiliations, the stances that participants take do not always involve neat correlations of discourse markers with conversational effect; the same discourse marker may show oppositional co-construction or a collaborative denial (see Modan 1994 for similar strategies among ethnic Jewish women). By utilizing conversations in which the teenagers argue about and explore their allegiance to different identities, Mendoza-Denton is able to compare the girls’ stances concerning their own ethnic affiliations, while exploring the concomitant linguistic behaviors that serve to include or exclude. The girls’ ideological profession of affiliation or allegiance to the Mexican Rural Class is not matched by their Mexican Urban Middle Class interactional style, and a speaker with Mexican Rural Class style has difficulty gaining and maintaining the floor.

That participants within any given community of practice will not always have similar styles, especially as they cross back and forth between borders displaying multiple allegiances, is central to the study of how ethnicity and gender are mutually constructed. As people use different voices to perform multiple identities, they may both invoke and challenge the prototypical categories associated with those identities. Hall (1995) and Barrett (1999) investigate such switching between voices as people utilize their performance for linguistic and material capital. The sex workers in Hall (1995) invent and “call on” the voices of ethnic (White Southern, Latino/a, African American) gender stereotypes, often catering to their clients’ desires. African American Texas drag queens engage in abrupt shifts into and out of White women’s “speech”

(Barrett 1999); this is middle-class, and “refined,” exhibiting many of the stereotypical vocabulary and pronunciation characteristics for women’s speech, such as empty adjectives like “adorable” or “marvelous,” hypercorrect pronunciation, and “dynamic” intonation (cf. Lakoff 1975). In crossing such borders, the drag queens inadvertently make the connections between stereotypical gender and ethnicity more explicit. To be really “woman-like,” the drag queens invoke a voice that is “White.” As people create different identities in such overt performances, the question remains whether the voices that such performers use are their “real” identities – those which form a stable sense of self (see also Weatherall and Gallois, this volume). Of course, such a question could be asked for any performance – if participants are bringing different voices to bear, then to what extent does the performance necessarily construct gender and ethnic identity? If identity is interactionally constructed, for instance in children’s games (Goodwin, this volume) or the workplace (Holmes and Stubbe, this volume), then the validity of heritage ethnic categorizations such as African American, Latino/a, White, Panjabi, is questionable.

This latter question has been addressed in some detail by Walters (1996) as well as Anzaldúa (1991: 250), who defend identity categories against a perceived onslaught of performative umbrella analyses of identity. In effect, they argue that the practice of focusing on “performance” or interactional construction of identity prematurely effaces social categorization and a politically motivated conception of community. With the erasure of ethnicity, the non-White voice is assimilated into White, and the lesbian, female voice is subsumed into a queer, unmarked, therefore male, perspective. The very social categorization that enables discrimination may ultimately be the political rallying point for the formation of a community of practice to resist historically rooted dominance. To the extent that performative analyses deal with individuals’ use of multiple voices, gender and ethnicity researchers are in a double bind. The work summarized above both emphasizes the need to address a lack of ethnic (usually considered to be non-White) women’s voices in gender and language research, but also seeks to reveal the complexity of voices within an established category. Those researchers who have focused on the interactional construction of identity apparently also feel obligated to address the lack of diversity in the gender and language tradition by categorizing participants first by gender and ethnic background. Work that addresses a lack of women’s or ethnic voices in the gender and language literature assumes a priori both the gendered and ethnic identity of its subject by asking the question, “How do women and girls who identify as X speak or sign?” And if identity is not defined a priori through a common social construct such as Chicana, African American, Jew, or White, it may be through a particular kind of linguistic performance: those who speak Spanish, those who signify, and so on. This kind of definition is tautological: linguists simultaneously try to define the practices of a linguistic community while maintaining that the community as an entity is defined by its practice (Urciuoli 1995; Trechter 2000; Kulick 2000).

An approach which focuses on the emergent identity of participant(s) in a community of practice need not be in conflict with one that recognizes historically enforced social categories as sites of resistance and identity formation, nor should we be forced to abandon any study of linguistic communities or the social aspects of semiosis because participants in interactions draw on multiple voices. The relationship between gender and ethnicity *should* emphasize different definitions of linguistic communities as they come into prominence, especially considering the specific political goals of the researched and researcher: a community of *practice* (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992), an *imagined* community (Anderson 1991; Queen 1997), one of *contact* “that placed at its center the operation of language *across* lines of social differentiation . . . that focused on modes and zones of contact between dominant and dominated groups” (Pratt 1987: 60; Barrett 1997), or even a *speech* community, defined by “participation in a set of shared norms . . . observed in overt types of evaluative behavior” (Labov 1972b: 120–1). Recognizing that ethnic, community, and gender identities are fluid social constructs in practice, which index and draw on semiotic resources while simultaneously creatively constructing new resources through contextual interaction, is difficult to capture. Yet both historically grounded and performative meanings of community as well as linguistic judgments about such constructions explain why gender and ethnicity are neither static nor singular. Different definitions of “community” (identity-based, interaction-based, community-based) are also highlighted as they emerge from interaction.

4 Use and Construction of Models

Given an available repertoire and some notion of what choices of expression are associated with a particular projection of identity in a given context, a speaker can project multiple gender and ethnic affiliations. Myers-Scotton (1998) proposes a Markedness Model in which participants in speech events perform as rational actors who have in mind specific sets of rights and obligations (RO), and which therefore provides a heuristic for how participants might choose possible moves within an interaction. For a specific interaction type, a speaker would often be aware of the language, dialect, or genre (linguistic features) that index an unmarked RO set. A speaker usually chooses an unmarked move, but may sometimes opt to build a new interactional norm by choosing a marked feature. For instance, the African American drag queen performances may shift from indexing stereotypic White woman speech to that of an African American man for shock humor in a performance as a marked shift (Barrett 1998).

Rampton (1991, 1995) examines how switches between unmarked norms for speech events operate in inter-ethnic language crossing among urban youth. He primarily focuses on the ideology behind the unmarked uses of SAE (Stylized

Asian English) – used to disrespect; Caribbean Creole – used to demonstrate urban vitality and dissent; and Panjabi – associated with local networks. In particular, agonistic Panjabi words were especially prevalent in inter-ethnic interactions among younger boys and were highly associated with the activity of tag games. Panjabi was thus an unmarked choice for agonistic boys' play. As the boys grew older, however, Panjabi use decreased in inter-ethnic interactions, and White girls were not often recorded using Panjabi words unless they were discussing *bhangra* (a popular music extending beyond the local interaction networks) or had Panjabi boyfriends. Additionally, Rampton argues that the crossing among urban, ethnic linguistic varieties dissociates one variety from a natural marker of ethnicity so that ethnicity is interactionally negotiated. He does not discuss crossing as a possible marker for gender – White girls were not recorded speaking Panjabi, even though they do claim to use some Panjabi words.

Such work that traces inter-ethnic crossing demonstrates more than how speakers make choices about which variety to use for an appropriate context. It demonstrates the performative change or historical development of an ethnic variety as a preferential gender variety for the playful expression of conflict or teasing, as well as its association with age-related and historically sedimented genres. The political and social resistance associated with Caribbean Creole or African American dialects, Rampton theorizes, springs from political and social resistance movements of the 1960s and therefore is more likely to be adapted to function in the cool urban youth culture as a less local language of dissent. Thus, for gender (see discussions of Barrett and Hall in section 3 above) or ethnic "crossing" to be possible, interactional participants draw on, as well as create, gendered and ethnic interactional norms. Gender crossing is consequently ethnic, as in White women's speech being the most "female," and ethnic crossing is apparently gendered, as researchers associate it primarily with male behaviors (Bucholtz 1999; Hewitt 1986; Kiesling 2001).

Because the interactional obviously draws on and creates new historical linguistic norms, how such notions become naturalized or "denaturalized" (as in the case of Rampton's new ethnicities) becomes of primary importance, especially if our desire is to disrupt and resist such processes. Obviously, such work calling attention to the socially constructive nature of ethnicity and gender is not new to the social sciences and can be traced from Boas in the early twentieth century to Butler (1993). However, Irvine and Gal (2000) and Irvine (2001) theorize how *linguistic* differentiation gets constructed as a typical semiotic process in culture. They identify three semiotic processes through which people create ideologies of *linguistic* difference: *iconization*, *fractal recursivity*, and *erasure*. *Iconization* is a process by which linguistic features that normally index stances, genres, or dialect become so strongly associated with a social group that they are thought to be inherent or essential characteristics of that group (for a discussion of indexicality see Kiesling, this volume). Even those group members who do not frequently use the linguistic features in question are associated with them by default. Through *fractal recursivity* the linguistic relationship

between form and social meaning that is salient from one level of interaction or context is projected into new areas or levels of discourse as speakers draw on salient resources to create shifting “identities” or communities. In other words, form(s) including pronunciation, word choice, phrases, dialect, or even a particular language associated iconically with one group may be utilized by both in- and out-group members, sometimes projecting new meanings. Such projection can have the effect, however, of further stabilizing the iconic connection between linguistic form and social group identity through repetition and expansion of the form into multiple contexts, despite some potential of destabilizing the original iconic form.¹ Finally, the ideological process of *erasure* effectually removes some groups and social behaviors from vision and sight. They become subsumed under the totalizing and dominant ideology. In effect, they become *unmarked* (see Bucholtz 2001; Trechter and Bucholtz 2001 for further discussion). Erasure may be perpetuated on a number of different levels both as it occurs within the interactional norms of a community and as that community is viewed by outsiders. Together these ideological processes serve to equate social identity with linguistic form.

Multiple-level erasure has often occurred in accounts of the phonological or morphological gender indicators in several Native American languages. Lakhota, a Siouan language, currently spoken by about 12,000 people in the northern middle-west of the United States, has often been characterized by academic researchers and native speakers alike as possessing a series of sentence-final particles which indicate illocutionary force and gender of the speaker. These are usually reported by native speakers through the citation of one or two iconic forms: men say *lo* and women say *le*; men say *yo*, and women say *ye*. To some extent it is difficult to tell how much native speakers have been influenced by academic researchers in creating such a neat complementary distribution of forms in their claims about Lakhota. They typically volunteer the iconic sayings above, but the others are most likely from elicitation in the context of textual interpretation or production. In some sense, through further representation the academic community has taken this iconization and potentially the erasure of women’s voices to new levels (see Trechter 2000 for a detailed discussion). Table 18.1 represents data from Rood and Taylor (1997) and from what native speakers have told me about their language.²

Table 18.1 Lakhota clitics, by gender and speech act

Illocutionary/affective force	Man	Woman
Formal question	hūwo	hūwe (obsolete)
Imperative	yo	ye _a
Opinion/emphasis	lo	le (archaic), ye _a
Emphatic statement		kʃto
Entreaty	ye _e	na
Surprise/opinion	wā	mā

I have found that by examining a variety of Lakhota speech acts, genres, and conversations that, of course, in interaction this neat table of "separate but equal" behavior for men and women breaks down. This is because men and women engage in different discourse genres which index their gender, use some of the same particles pretty regularly, and because some forms are dying out (Trechter 2000). Women tend to use *kfto* more often, and men use *wā* more often than women. However, there are three forms that are used almost exclusively by men (*lo*, *yo*, and *hūwo*) and two that are used exclusively by women (*na*, *mā*). By "exclusive" use here, I mean that to use the forms that are exclusive is to give a clearly gendered flavor to one's voice. Thus, men using the exclusively women's particles are considered to be acting in a womanly manner or maternally, and women who use the men's particles are "tom-boys." The particles *lo* and *yo* have in fact become highly salient to speakers, and it is only in conjunction with these that the "women's" forms are defined as appropriate to women's use at all. It is considered "natural" or an essential quality for men to use *lo* and *yo* (*hūwo* as a rhetorical question indicator is a bit more rare), and though some speakers acknowledge that some boys in situations of limited linguistic access have difficulty nowadays picking up the male forms, others have told me that boys do this naturally without correction. In this sense, certain of the gender deictics in Lakhota that point to the gender of the speaker have gone beyond indexical relationships and become *iconic*.

Iconization of these forms, as Irvine and Gal (2000) assert, seems to have come from their repeated association with certain speech events. As these markers became an increasingly salient part of their speech the participants in these events were considered to "naturally" speak in a certain way. In fact, in a vast collection of multi-genred text collected by native speaker and linguist Ella Deloria in the 1920s and 1930s and in the conversational data in my own fieldwork, *lo* "m. assertion" as a gender and assertion particle is considerably higher in frequency than any other gender particle. It occurred thousands of times. Its supposed female counterpart, *le* "f. assertion," was very rare, and it is now obsolescent, and *kfto* "emphatic," often associated with women and especially the genre of gossip, was used only forty times. The largest concentration of men using male assertion particles is found in the conversations of men speaking publicly.

In a speech transcribed by Ella Deloria in the 1930s (example (1)), a group of men who do not know each other well are jokingly and agonistically talking about political speeches. There are nine uses of *lo* in a text that is only eleven lines long. I reproduce the text in full because it illustrates the good humor but polite distancing evoked with the use of *lo*, its association with public speaking, and assertion of opinion in public. There is a tendency for the men to end their turn with an assertion particle after they make their point. The interactions between B and C (an insistent and slightly critical participant) contain more masculine assertions as the two men negotiate the perceived proper length of a good political speech and whether the old guard have been thrust aside or have given up their power willingly. Potentially, every sentence could

end with *lo*, but there is an especial increase of use in line 9 as the younger man (speaker B) reflects personally and gives his opinion on larger public concerns of the Lakhotá people. When speaker C authoritatively continues this reflection combining personal and public matters, he also ends his opinions with *lo*.³

(1): *Comments around the inauguration*

- 1 A: hūhū hi! T^hakoza, ficaya ukoyakix'āpe **lō!**
 2 B: Tók^hel hé?
 3 A: óx, le pcelyéla ūkóyakaksāu kī he wak^hé kī. Tuwá wóyute wāzī ot^há c^hāke c^ha c^hīfká ogná iyáta iyéyī nā yawásteftē yat^hī nā iyók^hpiyexcī napcī nā ak^hé ocápa yūk^hā c^hīfká-inūpa kī ak^hé wóyute-wafte ū hé etāhā ogná él aúpi nā kák^hel ihá icáxtake kī hé^hegna kíciqluzāu kī iyéc^hel ūkókyakix'āpe **lō!**
 4 B: Hā, éyaf t^hūkajila, c^hī waná líla t^héhā-yāk^hapi c^háké hé^hamū?. T^hiyók^hatī nā oyāk-ŷice éyaf líla wóglakau kī ótapi ec^hiyatāhā ofílya?. Niyés wanáx'ū yāke kī t^hawát'elc^hiyapifni nā hé^hamū we **lō!**
 5 A: Hūhí, nijnálaŷ onáx'ū-awaftec^hilake ū. ímnyexcī iyáyikte séce ū!
 6 B: Wā, t^hūkajila, tk^háf henála slolwáya c^ha ep^hé séca **wā!**
 7 A: ox, tuwá ak^hákšá!
 8 C: K^hola, kahāskeyala s'e iyáyeŷni, ehāni. Takúku mahétuya ilúkcā nā yuhá ináyažī-iteke ŷā owehāhāpi ecé ec^hānu nā ílotake **lō.**
 9 B: Hā, Wā, itéŷniyā oiyokŷice?. Táku éyaf iyúha oíhāke yuk^hā keyápi k'ū wicá^hape **lō.** Lé āpétu kī Lak^hóta wic^haxca wakíc^hūza-ūpi k'ū wic^hákicigluzapi nā k^hoškálaka wic^hák'upi yūk^hā kítāla s'e iyōmayake **lō.** Heū eháf áwicak^heya-iwayikte kī omáyat^hake **lō.**
 10 C: Tó, eyá c^hī hé^hetu?. Waná Lak^hólwichox'ā-t^hanila k'ū hé^heyá-inažī s'elél. éyaf hākéyela ec^hél ehé **lō,** t^hakoza, hé wic^hákicigluzapi ehé k'ū hé hé^hetuŷni?. Iyec^hika xeyáp inážipe **lō.**
 11 B: Hā, hāk'u. ic^hé?

- 1 A: Well, of all things! Grandson, that was no way to treat us **m!**
 2 B: What do you mean by that?
 3 A: What you did to us was exactly like what happens to a man who has taken a spoonful of the best tasting food, and chewed it with ecstasy, and then swallowed it most agreeably, and again opened his mouth for more; but this time, the second spoonful of the same fine food is brought to his lips, and the instant it touches his lips, it is immediately withdrawn, leaving him wanting more **m.**
 4 B: Yes, perhaps, grandfather, but you know the audience had already been sitting there quite a while. The room was warm, and the seats uncomfortable, but there were so many speakers which made it bad. It was only out of consideration for you listeners that I did as I did **m.**
 5 A: Oh, and you are the only one I really like to hear, too. I thought you would talk so satisfyingly!
 6 B: But grandfather, there's just a chance that that was all I knew to say **m.surprise!**
 7 A: Impossible!
 8 C: My friend, why didn't you speak a little longer? It was obvious you had various worthwhile ideas which you had thought up and kept in mind, but all you did was "wise-crack" and then you sat down **m.**

- 9 B: Yes, I guess so; but really, don't you know, it was a sorrowful occasion. They are right who say that everything must end sometime **m**. On this day, the leadership of the Dakota has been taken away from the old men and given over to the young, and it affected my spirit, the very least bit **m**. On that account, I couldn't talk really seriously. It stuck in my throat **m**.
- 10 C: Of course, well, you are right. It seems that the old Dakota ways are really and truly at an end. But grandchild, you got only part of it right **m**. To say the leadership was wrested from the old men is not to put it accurately. Of their own accord, the old men have stepped aside **m**.
- 11 B: Yes, really; isn't it so? (Deloria 1937?: 212–20)

Authoritative male opinions often contain the use of *lo* even when not in cases of overt public opinion-making, but I would argue that the frequency of *lo* in these contexts makes this particular genre a prototype for its use. Women who must make speeches and offer opinions in public contexts tell me they do use *lo*, but that this in no way means that they are gay (a common interpretation). They know that the iconic use would mean that they would be expected to act like men (have desire for women) because they are using the male particle, but they are merely using the particle in its authoritative context (Trechter 2000). They do so in professions that may have formerly been male-dominated.

Fractal recursivity occurs when this gender indicator is used in other contexts. Even though *lo* suggests an authoritative stance, when males are not acting particularly authoritatively, they may feel constrained to use it as the pressures of iconization and recursivity act as semiotic forces. Deloria (*ca.* 1937: 306) notes such an instance as a man (example (2)) speaks to her of his experiences in *Wokiksikuye K'eya* 'Some Memories.'

When the ending *lo* is used simply as a closing to a statement by a man who isn't trying to be authoritative, he sometimes "swallows" it instead of accenting it for emphasis. This informant does so constantly, except where he is quoting.

Unlike the speakers in example (1), this particular man was relating stories about himself where he was truly frightened but kept his calm, or where he appeared weak or silly to himself and others, but ultimately proved his strength of character. In the introduction and conclusion to his story, his use of *lo* reflects a narrative frame of a differently-authoritative self as it is "swallowed."

(2): *Introduction to "Some Memories"*

Oglálata t^hoká wahí k'úhā wóixa wā́zígzi awák^hip^ha k'éyaf iyúhaxcí wóixaŋni.ʔ Woyuŋ'iyaye nakū slolwáye **lo**. Yúk^hã wā́zi lec^hetū.

"When I first came among the Oglala, laughable experiences were mine but not everything was funny. I also knew fear **m**. And one such time was as follows." (Deloria *ca.* 1937: 306)

(3): *Conclusion to "Some Memories"*

maya-ap^haʒeʒe ekawīgapi kī lec^hel wic^hūt'etaha wakpapte **lo**.

"I had just come through, escaping death just as one might turn about just at the very rim of a cliff **m**." (ibid.: 309)

This man's constrained use of *lo* in his introduction to his stories and in the conclusion in example (3) illustrates that he is under some pressure to display masculinity. Not all men do this. Because men are now constrained to use *lo* in a variety of discourse contexts, even when not speaking authoritatively or publicly, iconization and recursion for this form is rampant. Although the original meanings of authority and public opinion are still apparent through a thorough examination of discourse contexts, it has become an indicator of maleness rather than only one of stance, affect, or discourse context.

Erasure in the context of gendered discourse particles in Lakshota should by now be obvious. *Le*, the phonologically similar and iconically female assertive counterpart of *lo*, has become obsolescent. *Le* as a form was associated both with opinion and also with maternal care-giving. Although I have heard males use the form in a care-giving context (see Trechter, forthcoming, for a detailed analysis), it has not been refracted in numerous contexts. The form *kfto* "emphatic" which is currently becoming the iconic counterpart of *lo* (see Rood and Taylor 1997) also does not seem to be a good candidate for broad recursive spread because it is often associated with the genre of gossip. It is perhaps the negative associations of some forms that marks them for a type of erasure even in cultures where the balance between men's and women's cultural activities and rights and semiotic resources is highly emphasized ("men say *x*; women say *y*").

5 Conclusion

Such a model of linguistic and semiotic differentiation is important to the treatment of language, gender, and ethnicity for three reasons: (1) it demonstrates how through iconization we establish categories of ethnic and gendered linguistic forms; (2) it demonstrates how and why gender are often mutual constructions as people draw on different voices for self and other representation; and (3) why certain populations, behaviors, genders, and ethnicities are continually effaced despite attempts to call attention to their presence. The academic study of language and gender is also a type of cultural community. As we examine the construction of linguistic differentiation, however, we as a community of practice are potentially susceptible to the same constructive ideological processes we are examining: iconization, recursivity, and erasure. Interestingly, the process of erasure has permeated not just the folk conceptualizations of language, gender, and ethnicity, but in reviewing this chapter, it is apparent that such erasure continues to be an unconscious process in current gender and ethnicity research. Recognizing previous erasure among academics of ethnic women's voices and styles – even those which are iconic within ethnic communities, Morgan, Galindo and Gonzales, and others make them more audible in gender and ethnic research. Goodwin and Mendoza-Denton draw our attention to hitherto unobserved competitiveness and stylistic

differences in intra-group interactions among girls of different ethnicities, focusing on actual interaction, whereas Anzaldúa notes the possible erasure of ethnicity if performative theory is overly emphasized. Though much current work attends to current iconization of ethnic and gender language and subsequent recursivity through double-voiced uses (Barrett 1999; Hall 1995), there is still some danger of promulgating the practice of erasure at the academic, research level. In examining the process of recursivity and the liminal language or border crossings among urban and White youth, and the consequent creation of “new ethnicities” (Rampton 1995) or the appropriation of ethnic language in fraternities (Kiesling 2001), Morgan’s critique of Labov’s (1972a) work on ethnic vernacular springs to mind. The appropriation by trendy youth of ethnic varieties appears largely to be male practice. The question is whether ethnic appropriation by Whites is a male-gendered practice, or whether by unconsciously focusing attention primarily on boys and young men’s appropriations, through repetition, the presence and practice of girls and women are erased.

In a variety of ways, language and gender researchers have sought to examine the connections between interactional work and the formation of ideology about gender and ethnicity while working to include greater diversity of gender and ethnic voices. Yet the complex semiotic processes associated with erasure cannot be addressed by only emphasizing alternative practices and voices that hitherto have been ignored. In the tradition of gender and language, Black and Coward (1981) early on encouraged a turning of the tables. Rather than only focusing on “women’s language” to counteract men’s historical hegemony and resulting erasure of women’s voices, an important step to upsetting the hegemonic balance was men’s recognition of themselves as also living within gendered subjectivities (see Johnson and Meinhof 1997). Similar challenges have been put forth by researchers in ethnic studies and the growing field of Whiteness studies (hooks 1992; Dyer 1997; Ignatiev and Garvey 1996), going so far as to claim that the objective of Whiteness studies is ultimately to eradicate such an ethnic category, partially through the realization of its hegemonic and destructive nature.

Although it may seem that there are already many studies done on gender and language about White folk, few of these engage with the topic by considering participants’ *Whiteness* to be ethnic or this ethnicity to be part of their linguistic gender construction, leaving it unconsidered as an unmarked norm. A shift toward recognizing or marking White ethnicity in gender and language studies is not only important for complicating our view of ethnicity in the political realm; it is also a responsible research move. For in much of the research interactions described in this chapter, in the local network of interactions, Whiteness is not always the unmarked norm, though it may be taken up in that way by our academic community. For instance, Hartigan (1999), Modan (2001), and Trechter (2001) argue that in many locales – Detroit, Washington, DC, Pine Ridge Indian reservation, respectively – “whiteness” is clearly marked. Hillbillies living in predominantly African American neighborhoods in Detroit,

for example, are ethnically marked in their local network because of their Whiteness, and also in the larger American context because of their obviously deviant non-middle-class White ethnicity. Bucholtz (2001: 96) argues that nerd speech, by being a hyperstandard White variety (non-appropriative of de-racialized African American English), “undermines the racial project of whiteness as a normative and unmarked construct.” In effect, focusing the lens of gender and ethnicity in one direction only leads us to miss how the ideological and interactional processes of linguistic differentiation, erasure, and discrimination operate.

Because sociolinguistic variables of gender and ethnicity are not consistently regarded in the same light within a community, “authentic” indicators, though salient, do not always become iconic representations for a community. For instance, Besnier (this volume) discusses how the most salient marker of identity for the *fakaleiti* in Tonga is not always their linguistic orientation toward English and modernization, but their vocal pitch and ways of speaking. Moreover, gender and ethnicity are often constructed in terms of each other, enabling erasure along the axis of either. For instance, “authentic” male ethnic language may be quite different from women’s, but both are not always treated as equally ethnic by researchers or within a community. Schilling-Estes (1998) notes that speakers of Ocracoke English considered the most authentic ethnic speech (though she does not refer to it in racial terms) to be located in the speech of White men who have historical connections to traditional maritime occupations and who “play poker”.⁴ These men had exaggeratedly raised /ay/ and did not actually possess another typical feature of Ocracoke Island speech (fronted /aw/) to the degree of many other speakers, yet they were most often mentioned as “real” examples of the dialect by people on the island. She concludes that women and gay Ocracokan men who use fronted /aw/ and a less exaggerated pronunciation of /ay/ also have a strong sense of Ocracoke (ethnic) identity. Nevertheless, *erasure* takes place along a gendered axis within this community, because the speech of the poker players is held up as authentic and because the other common pronunciation feature is not analyzed as an identification marker. Ethnicity becomes *de facto* male as it is indexed by a poker-playing, maritime community of practice. Another common kind of erasure takes place at the level of language and gender research. As the focus in Schilling-Estes’s study is the gendering of language and how community membership is linguistically and ideologically realized through gender, the construction of presumably White ethnicity is largely obscured.

The linguistic study of gender and ethnicity may have come a long way since the early 1970s, especially as notions of gender and ethnicity have been firmly rooted in social interaction and ideological promulgation, and more work on a greater diversity of voices is slowly being published. The workings of cultures (or models of them) are, however, not absolutes. One objective in reflecting on the processes of linguistic differentiation in culture is to destabilize the process and to effectively counteract the hegemonic force of erasure. Increased attention to how such erasure is accomplished at different levels

of construction, both folk and in the academy, is now possible. However, there is still a great deal of work to be done in providing adequate data from a variety of languages, dialects, and ethnic perspectives. This chapter is a call to step up the work in both of these areas.

NOTES

I would like to thank the editors of this volume for their excellent comments, patience, and support, and Mary Bucholtz for her encouragement as well as thought-provoking discussions with me concerning markedness and Whiteness.

- 1 This “double effect” of recursivity has been one of the recurrent criticisms of drag queen speech that draws on stereotypic features of women’s language: that it fails to destabilize the connection between the stereotype of women’s speech and women, and in some interpretations actually reinforces it.
- 2 ye_a and ye_e are pronounced the same, but trigger and undergo different morphophonemic processes. They are

homophonous but definitely different morphemes (see Trechter, forthcoming).

- 3 For reasons of length, I omit the interlinear gloss of the original and only provide a running translation with the relevant gender particles highlighted and translated with *m*. (male assertion), *m.surprise*, etc. Lakhota transcription is in the International Phonetic Alphabet, with /c/ indicating an alveopalatal affricate.
- 4 One cannot be sure that these men are White in Schilling-Estes (1998). It is common practice not to mention race when research participants are White or easily subsumed into that category.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict 1991: *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria 1987: *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria 1991: To(o) queer the writer – Loca, escritora y chicana. In Betsy Warland (ed.) *Writings by Dykes, Queers, and Lesbians*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, pp. 249–63.
- Barrett, Rusty 1997: The “homo-genius” speech community. In Anna Livia and Kira Hall (eds) *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 181–201.
- Barrett, Rusty 1998: Markedness and styleswitching in performances by African American drag queens. In Carol Myers-Scotton (ed.) *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 139–61.

- Barrett, Rusty 1999: Indexing polyphonous identity in the speech of African American drag queens. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 313–31.
- Bergvall, Victoria, Bing, Janet, and Freed, Alice (eds) 1996: *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. New York: Longman.
- Black, Maria and Coward, Rosalind 1981: Linguistic, social and sexual relations: A review of Dale Spender's *Man Made Language*. Reprinted in Deborah Cameron (ed.) *The Feminist Critique of Language*. London: Routledge, pp. 111–33.
- Bucholtz, Mary 1999: You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 443–60.
- Bucholtz, Mary 2001: The whiteness of nerds: Superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 84–100.
- Bucholtz, Mary, Liang, Anita C., and Sutton, Laurel A. (eds) 1999: *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, Judith 1993: *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge.
- Cameron, Deborah 1985: *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Cameron, Deborah, Frazer, Elizabeth, Harvey, Penelope, Rampton, Ben, and Richardson, Kay (eds) 1992: *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Deloria, Ella 1937?: Dakota Ethnographic and Conversational Texts. MS 30 (x8a.7). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Deloria, Ella ca. 1937: Dakota Autobiographies. Bosas Collection, MS 30 (x8a.6). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Dyer, Richard 1997: *White*. New York: Routledge.
- Eckert, Penelope 1989: The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1: 245–67.
- Eckert, Penelope and McConnell-Ginet, Sally 1992: Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 461–90.
- Foster, Michèle 1995: Are you with me?: Power and solidarity in the discourse of African American women. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (eds) *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge, pp. 329–50.
- Galindo, Leticia 1999: Caló and taboo language use among Chicanas: A description of linguistic appropriation and innovation. In Leticia Galindo and María Dolores Gonzales (eds) *Speaking Chicana: Voice, Power and Identity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 175–93.
- Galindo, D. Leticia and Gonzalez, María Dolores (eds) 1999: *Speaking Chicana: Voice, Power and Identity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Gaudio, Rudi 2001: White men do it too: Racialized (homo)sexualities in postcolonial Hausaland. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 36–51.
- Goldstein, Tara 1995: "Nobody is talking bad": Creating community and claiming power on the production lines. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (eds) *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge, pp. 375–400.

- Gonzales, María Dolores 1999: Crossing social and cultural borders: The road to language hybridity. In Letticia Galindo and María Dolores Gonzales (eds) *Speaking Chicana: Voice, Power and Identity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 13–38.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 1990: *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 1999: Constructing opposition within girls' games. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 388–409.
- Hall, Kira 1995: Lip service on the fantasy lines. In Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz (eds) *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge, pp. 183–216.
- Hall, Kira and Bucholtz, Mary 1995: *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*. New York: Routledge.
- Hartigan, John 1999: *Racial Situations: Class Predicaments of Whiteness in Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hewitt, Roger 1986: *White Talk Black Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, Jane 1987: Women's speech in modern Mexicano. In Susan Philips, Susan Steele, and Christine Tanz (eds) *Language, Gender and Sex in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 121–60.
- hooks, bell 1992: *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press.
- Ignatiev, Noel and Garvey, John (eds) 1996: *Race Traitor*. New York: Routledge.
- Irvine, Judith 2001: "Style" as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford (eds) *Stylistic Variation in Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21–43.
- Irvine, Judith and Gal, Susan 2000: Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul Kroskrity (ed.) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, pp. 35–84.
- Johnson, Sally and Meinhof, Ulrike Hanna (eds) 1997: *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kiesling, Scott 2001: Stances of whiteness and hegemony in fraternity men's discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 101–15.
- Kulick, Don 2000: Gay and lesbian language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29: 243–85.
- Labov, William 1972a: *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William 1972b: *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, Robin 1975: *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Livia, Anna and Hall, Kira (eds) 1997a: *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Livia, Anna and Hall, Kira 1997b: "It's a girl!": Bringing performativity back to linguistics. In Anna Livia and Kira Hall (eds) *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–18.
- Medicine, Beatrice 1987: The role of American Indian women in cultural continuity and transition. In Joyce Penfield (ed.) *Women and Language in*

- Transition*. New York: State University of New York Press, pp. 159–65.
- Mendoza-Denton, Norma 1999a: Sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology of US Latinos. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28: 375–95.
- Mendoza-Denton, Norma 1999b: Turn initial *no*: Collaborative opposition among Latina adolescents. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 273–92.
- Meyerhoff, Miriam 1996: Dealing with gender identity as a sociolinguistic variable. In Victoria Bergvall, Janet Bing, and Alice Freed (eds) *Rethinking Language and Gender Research*. New York: Longman, pp. 202–27.
- Modan, Gabriella 1994: Pulling apart is coming together: The use and meaning of opposition in the discourse of Jewish American women. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, Laurel Sutton, and Caitlin Hines (eds) *Cultural Performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California, pp. 501–8.
- Modan, Gabriella 2001: White, whole wheat, rye: Jews and ethnic construction in Washington, D.C. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 116–30.
- Morgan, Marcyliena 1999: No woman no cry: Claiming African American women's place. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 27–45.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol 1998: A theoretical introduction to the markedness model. In Carol Myers-Scotton (ed.) *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*. New York: Oxford, University Press, pp. 18–39.
- Nichols, Patricia 1983: Linguistic options and choices for Black women in the rural South. In Barrie Thorne, Cheris Kramarae, and Nancy Henley (eds) *Language, Gender and Society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 54–68.
- Ochs, Elinor 1992: Indexing gender. In Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin (eds) *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 335–58.
- Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich 1999: Good guys and bad girls: Identity construction by Latina and Latino student writers. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 64–82.
- Pratt, Mary Louise 1987: Linguistic utopias. In Nigel Fabb, Derek Attridge, Alan Durant, and Colin McCabe (eds) *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 48–66.
- Queen, Robin 1997: I don't speak spritch: Locating lesbian language. In Anna Livia and Kira Hall (eds) *Queerly Phrased: Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 233–56.
- Rampton, Ben 1991: Interracial Panjabi in a British adolescent peer group. *Language in Society* 20(3): 391–422.
- Rampton, Ben 1995: *Crossing: Language and Identity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rood, David and Taylor, Alan 1997: A Lakhota sketch. In William Sturtevant and Ives Goddard (eds)

- Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 17. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, pp. 440–82.
- Schilling-Estes, Natalie 1998: Reshaping economies, reshaping identities: Gender-based patterns of language variation in Ocracoke English. In Suzanne Wertheim, Ashlee C. Bailey, and Monica Corston-Oliver (eds) *Engendering Communication: Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California, pp. 509–20.
- Trechter, Sara 1999: Contextualizing the exotic few: Gender oppositions in Lakota. In Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton (eds) *Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 101–22.
- Trechter, Sara 2000: Review of *Queerly Phrased*. *Language* 76(2): 444–6.
- Trechter, Sara 2001: White between the lines: Ethnic positioning in Lakota discourse. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 22–35.
- Trechter, Sara forthcoming: *Gendered Voices in Lakota*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trechter, Sara and Bucholtz, Mary 2001: White noise: Bringing language into whiteness studies. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1): 3–21.
- Trudgill, Peter 1974: *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie 1995: Language and borders. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55–82.
- Walters, Suzanna 1996: From here to queer: Radical feminism, postmodernism, and the lesbian menace. *Signs* 21: 831–69.
- Zentella, Ana Celia 1998: Spanish Madonnas: U.S. Latinas and language loyalty. In Suzanne Wertheim, Ashlee Bailey, and Monica Corston-Oliver (eds) *Engendering Communication: Proceedings from the Fifth Berkeley Women and Language Conference*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California, pp. 637–52.

