

# Contents

<i>List of Tables and Figures</i>	viii
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	ix
1 Current Research Methodologies in Gender and Language Study: Key Issues <i>Jane Sunderland and Lia Litosseliti</i>	1
<b>Part 1 Sociolinguistics and Ethnography</b>	
2 Sociolinguistic and Ethnographic Approaches to Language and Gender <i>Joan Swann and Janet Maybin</i>	21
3 Reconstructing the Sex Dichotomy in Language and Gender Research: Some Advantages of Using Correlational Sociolinguistics <i>Anna Kristina Hultgren</i>	29
4 Negotiating Methodologies: Making Language and Gender Relevant in the Professional Workplace <i>Louise Mullany</i>	43
5 Gender, Ethnicity and Religion in Spontaneous Talk and Ethnographic-Style Interviews: Balancing Perspectives of Researcher and Researched <i>Pia Pichler</i>	56
<b>Part 2 Corpus Linguistics</b>	
6 'Eligible' Bachelors and 'Frustrated' Spinsters: Corpus Linguistics, Gender and Language <i>Paul Baker</i>	73
7 Perpetuating Difference? Corpus Linguistics and the Gendering of Reported Dialogue <i>Kate Harrington</i>	85
8 The English Vocabulary of Girls and Boys: Evidence from a Quantitative Study <i>Rosa M<sup>a</sup> Jiménez Catalán and Julieta Ojeda Alba</i>	103

### **Part 3 Conversation Analysis**

- 9 Conversation Analysis: Technical Matters for Gender Research 119  
*Celia Kitzinger*
- 10 Categories, Actions and Sequences: Formulating Gender in Talk-in-Interaction 139  
*Elizabeth Stokoe*

### **Part 4 Discursive Psychology**

- 11 Discursive Psychology and the Study of Gender: A Contested Space 161  
*Nigel Edley and Margaret Wetherell*
- 12 Discursive 'Embodied' Identities of 'Half' Girls in Japan: A Multi-Perspectival Approach 174  
*Laurel D. Kamada*

### **Part 5 Critical Discourse Analysis**

- 13 Controversial Issues in Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis 193  
*Ruth Wodak*
- 14 CEOs and 'Working Gals': The Textual Representation and Cognitive Conceptualisation of Businesswomen in Different Discourse Communities 211  
*Veronika Koller*
- 15 Harnessing a Critical Discourse Analysis of Gender in Television Fiction 227  
*Konstantia Kosetzi*

### **Part 6 Feminist Post-Structuralist Discourse Analysis**

- 16 Feminist Post-Structuralist Discourse Analysis – A New Theoretical and Methodological Approach? 243  
*Judith Baxter*
- 17 Interwoven and Competing Gendered Discourses in a Pre-School EFL Lesson 256  
*Harold Andrés Castañeda-Peña*

## Part 7 Queer Theory

18	The Contributions of Queer Theory to Gender and Language Research <i>Helen Sauntson</i>	271
19	Queering Gay Men's English <i>William L. Leap</i>	283
	<i>References</i>	297
	<i>Index</i>	326

# 1

## Current Research Methodologies in Gender and Language Study: Key Issues

*Jane Sunderland and Lia Litosseliti*

Gender and language, best seen as a topic or field, is investigated *through* an increasing range and diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches. To explore this characteristic of the field, the editors of this book<sup>1</sup> organised a British Association of Applied Linguistics/Cambridge University Press Seminar entitled 'Theoretical and Methodological Approaches to Gender and Language Study', which took place at Birmingham University, UK, in November 2005. We planned both the Seminar and this book with a very broad notion of 'approach' in mind, but as something chosen in a principled way, which then has implications for, and is manifested methodologically in, the researcher's choice of research questions, data, data selection/collection/generation, analysis and interpretation. *Approach*, then, spans theory and research practice.

In the recent *Handbook of Language and Gender* (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 2003), the contributors draw on ethnography, grammatical analyses, discourse-based analyses, 'discourse-historical' critical discourse analysis, conversation analysis, linguistic anthropology, text analysis, discursive psychology and 'pragmatic eclecticism'. This diversity is testimony to the richness of the highly interdisciplinary gender and language field. Few of the contributors, however, address approach explicitly. Three exceptions are Susan Philips, Jack Sidnell and Joan Swann. Philips claims that discourse analysis '*allows for empirical documentation of the production of gender ideologies, and can reveal in detail how these ideologies are grounded and ordered in discourse*' (2003: 272; our italics). Sidnell notes that by '*wedding the close analysis of talk-in-interaction with ethnography, it is possible to examine the manner in which the settings of everyday life, and the relevance of them to the participants' gender, are constructed and managed through practices of talk-in-interaction*' (2003: 345; our italics). Claims about what an approach *allows for, can reveal and makes possible* suggest that there are also certain things particular approaches cannot do, are less well-equipped to do, or can do together (see below). And Swann's 'pragmatic

eclecticism' explicitly acknowledges 'the possibilities and limitations of all methodological choices' (2003: 630).

Despite this reticence in the *Handbook*, approach is *important*: as gender and language researchers, we need to be alert to the risk of becoming entrenched in our approaches, or taking them for granted. In publications, we need to declare our interest in the research – not only 'which questions are asked or not asked' but also 'which methods of analysis are followed and why' (Litosseliti, 2006a: 151). Accordingly, *Gender and Language Research Methodologies* has *approach* as its organising principle.

\* \* \*

Historically, there has always been diversity of approach within language and gender study, even before today's theoretical complexities. Otto Jespersen (1922) can retrospectively be seen as using 'native speaker intuition' in his chapter 'The woman'. Mary Haas (1944), in her anthropological study of women's and men's speech in Koasati, a Native American language, followed a more empirical approach; this anthropological tradition has shaped present-day ethnographies. Gender and language use was later addressed, more substantially, by variationist sociolinguistics, with gender – or, rather, biological sex – having the status of an independent variable (Labov, 1990, 1966; Cheshire, 1982; Milroy, 1980; Gal, 1978; Trudgill, 1972).

The 'parallel' strand of work, gender as part of linguistic code (e.g., Corbett, 1991) was, in the 1970s and 1980s, addressed from a critical (if at times rather determinist) feminist perspective with a focus on (non-)sexist language (Spender, 1980); more recently, this has been documented as feminist-inspired language change (e.g., Hellinger and Bußmann, 2001; Pauwels, 1998). A major early player in the 'sexist language' debate (and in gender and language study more generally) was Robin Lakoff. Her monograph *Language and Woman's Place* (1975) is now routinely acknowledged as valiant and productive, if flawed (being a pioneer carries a price). Lakoff's own methodological approach was the Chomskyan one of native speaker intuition, or 'introspection', which she took pains to document ('I have examined my own speech, and that of my acquaintances, and have used my own intuitions in analysing it' (1975: 4)) and defend:

any procedure is at some point introspective: the gatherer must analyze his [sic!] data, after all. Then, one necessarily selects a subgroup of the population to work with: is the educated, white, middle-class group that the writer of the book identifies with less worthy of study than any other? And finally, there is the purely pragmatic issue: random conversation must go on for quite some time, and the recorder must be exceedingly

lucky anyway, in order to produce evidence of any particular hypothesis, for example, that there is sexism in language...

(1975: 4–5)

Lakoff is right about ‘any procedure [being] at some point introspective’, or at least subjective – a point made also by feminist and critical linguists, that is, *no* approach is, can or even should be objective. However, her other arguments are more problematic. Of course we can investigate the talk of ‘educated, white, middle-class’ women – as long as we do not pretend that they are more widely representative. And, though sexist language may indeed be absent on a given stretch of tape, this is less true of gender tendencies in language use, actually Lakoff’s greater area of concern.

‘Introspection’ was not taken up in subsequent gender and language study, giving way to different forms of empiricism,<sup>2</sup> with a focus on small-scale social interactions. These studies sometimes went under the name of ‘Conversation analysis’ (see Stokoe, this volume) or ‘Interactional sociolinguistics’. Feminist-informed work included projects on interruption (West and Zimmerman, 1983; Zimmerman and West, 1975), verbosity, questions and back-channelling (Fishman, 1983). Like their sociolinguistic variationist predecessors, these studies were essentially comparative (men *vis á vis* women, i.e., focusing on gender *differences*). Social constructionism and *discourse* were still in the very early stages of development.<sup>3</sup>

The theoretical approach to gender in much of this work was based on the critical, feminist notion of ‘male dominance’ – of men, over women, through language. ‘Dominance’ was a child of its (political) time – the Women’s Liberation Movement of the 1970s was in full swing. ‘Dominance’ did not, however, fit a well-established variationist paradigm, and soon took second place to the much less critical ‘(cultural) difference’ approach. Cameron writes:

The gradual ascendancy of difference over dominance was almost inevitable given the ideology of twentieth-century linguistics, especially its anthropological and sociological variants. Difference, and not inequality, is what the framework of structural linguistics is designed to deal with.

(1995a: 35)

‘(Cultural) difference’ saw variation in the talk of women and men as the result of their being members, from an early age, of different ‘linguistic sub-cultures’ (Gumperz, 1982; Maltz and Borker, 1980). This suggested that gendered talk needed to be understood via study of single- as well as mixed-sex groups, which prompted investigation and positive re-evaluation of women’s talk (e.g., Tannen, 1990; Coates, 1989), and, later, investigation of men’s talk (e.g., Coates, 2003; Johnson and Meinhof, 1997). Such work highlighted the importance of examining conversational style in context, particularly speakers’ own ‘speech communities’.

The '(male) dominance' and '(cultural) difference' approaches had much in common. Both *compared* women and men, as members of two social groups. The common focus was very much private talk, small groups, and the *who* and *how* of communication. Work on public talk, on *what* was said, and on written texts was relatively rare.

This changed with the advent of social constructionism. Hitherto, the impetus behind much gender and language study had been either to uncover inequality in mixed-sex talk (given a feminist mandate to show how language use systematically disadvantaged women), or to celebrate the strengths of all-women talk. The underlying (unstated) assumption had tended to be that language use was somehow a reflection of gender. Social constructionism, however, entailed the very different notion of language use as *constructing* gender.

As regards gender itself, 'dominance' and 'difference' studies tended to see gender as sets of 'differential tendencies' between women and men, boys and girls (i.e., the *who* (speaker sex) and *how* of talk). And 'differential tendencies' is still the current 'popular' understanding of gender. Social constructionism, broadly defined, however, sees gender as:

- the active/interactive/negotiated construction of gender, including self-positioning
- linguistic dealings *with* (individual/groups of) women, men, boys and girls, e.g., how they are addressed, what is said *to* them
- what is said and written *about* gender differential tendencies, similarities and diversity, including what is said and written *about* (individual/groups of) women, men, boys and girls

Social constructionist perspectives thus de-emphasise gendered speakers (and writers) as agents, focusing rather on *what* is communicated *by, to* and *about* women, men, boys and girls.

The post-structuralist thinking associated with social constructionism allowed gender, *inter alia*, to be seen as not fixed but something interpreted – hence *talked and written about* (as well as enacted). Accordingly, any gender differentiation constructed *in* talk or writing may be more significant socially than any stylistic or interactional 'differential tendencies' in language use (see Kroløkke and Sørensen, 2006: 106; Cameron, 1997b).

Most gender and language study today broadly encompasses social constructionist meanings of *gender* together with a nuanced version of 'differential tendencies'. Its (post-structuralist) concerns are (see Cameron, 2005a, b):

- diversity (e.g., class, ethnicity, and their interaction with gender; multiple masculinities/femininities; differences among 'women' and among 'men')
- gender being 'performed' (see below) in an ongoing way, allowing for *agency*; performance being achieved partly through language (which is

therefore *constitutive*); power being ‘done’ rather than something speakers ‘have’

- ‘local’ or ‘contingent’ explanations for gendered language patterns and the importance of specific contexts (see below).

Post-structuralism in its different forms has over the last 25 years turned much gender and language study – and much social scientific thinking – on its head. The associated notion of *performativity* (Butler, 1990), which has its roots in linguistics and language philosophy, allows gender to be seen as performed in part through the ‘embodied reiteration’ of particular linguistic acts. *Performance*, however, has other origins (e.g., Goffman, 1974) and is used more widely in the gender and language field. We now read frequently about gender being *performed*, but also *constructed*, *accomplished*, *achieved*, *enacted* and *effected*.

‘Local’ or in-context explanations for gendered language patterns have increasingly been theorised in terms of *Communities of Practice* (CofPs) (Lave and Wenger, 1991): groups of people ‘who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour’, when ‘ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short, practices – emerge’ (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992: 464). We participate in multiple CofPs, for example as members of a family, students in a classroom, employees in a workplace, members of a political party or other group. Gender identities (see Benwell and Stokoe, 2006; Litosseliti and Sunderland, 2002) are arguably produced, reproduced and contested through such participation, in particular through *differentially* gendered engagement (see Holmes and Meyerhoff, 1999, for a discussion). The CofP notion allows us to ‘distinguish between speakers’ assumed gendered behaviour and the range of identities available in the gendered communities that speakers inhabit’ (Litosseliti, 2006a: 66). For instance, co-operative interactional patterns are not ‘natural’ to (or even socially predictable in) women, but rather reflect and are shaped by the gendered CofPs in which women participate (see Ostermann, 2003, for an example).

## About this book

The book is organised in seven sections, representing an important selection of the current major methodological approaches to gender and language study. Each section includes a chapter laying out the foundations of an approach, followed by an illustrative chapter or chapters. Emphasised is the approach itself – its rationale and implementation, with empirical studies acting in an illustrative capacity. Our seven approaches are (1) sociolinguistics and ethnography, (2) corpus linguistics, (3) conversation analysis (CA), (4) discursive psychology, (5) critical discourse analysis (CDA), (6) feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (FPDA) and (7) queer theory. These may

be combined in current research practice in interesting and productive ways. Some (but not all) may act in the service of others. Needless to say, these seven approaches do not constitute a comprehensive (or neat) typology.

### **Part 1 Sociolinguistics and ethnography**

Sociolinguistics has a long history and a wide scope. Now much broader than its original variationist paradigm, sociolinguistics is no longer concerned only with large-scale surveys, comparisons and unproblematised notions of gender. Many modern approaches to gender and language can now thus be described as sociolinguistic. Some pre-feminist 'gender differences' work carried out within this variationist paradigm (see Labov, 1966, and Trudgill, 1972), produced findings of relevance to the later feminist project. The importance of situating gender in context was shown by Susan Gal (1978) in her study of gender and bilingualism in Oberwart (on the Austrian-Hungarian border). Similarly, social context in the form of social network was key to Lesley Milroy's 1980 finding that a group of women in one Belfast community produced more particular vernacular forms than did their husbands (in contrast to Labov and Trudgill's findings).

These 'landmark' sociolinguistic studies are discussed by **Joan Swann** and **Janet Maybin** in Chapter 2. In an overview of sociolinguistic approaches to gender and language, they trace the movement away from broadly quantitative variationist approaches towards more local, contextualised, qualitative explorations of gender as intersecting with other social identities, including race, class and sexuality, and note the emergence of Communities of Practice approaches.

The subsequent chapters in Part 1, by **Anna Kristina Hultgren**, **Louise Mullany** and **Pia Pichler**, illustrate different sociolinguistic methodologies – correlational sociolinguistics, ethnographic/interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic ethnography, respectively. In Chapter 3, Hultgren evaluates contemporary quantitative investigations of sex differences in language use, emphasising the benefits of combining quantitative (correlational) and qualitative (ethnographic) approaches, and using her research on call centres to highlight the strengths of correlational methodologies. Mullany, in Chapter 4, explores the use of a qualitative paradigm – interactional sociolinguistics – in workplace contexts. In Chapter 5, Pichler looks at the use of linguistic ethnography and the ethnographic principle of engaging participants in the research process, and considers what can be gained from enabling participants to provide an 'insider' perspective on linguistic data.

### **Part 2 Corpus linguistics**

Dealing with frequencies and probabilities in its analyses of corpora of up to several million words, corpus linguistics is ideally placed to investigate whether a particular word or phrase is used more by men or women. It thus has the potential to make claims which other approaches cannot. Corpus

linguistics however can also show how women and men are differentially constructed, or 'positioned', in the way they refer to themselves or are referenced by others. Janet Holmes and Robert Sigley (2002), for example, used corpora to look at the use of *girl/boy* in a New Zealand workplace.

Corpus linguistics faces a particular challenge in the current *qualitative* gender and language climate. However, the textual environment in corpus studies can be wide and diverse. Secondly, frequencies do not determine interpretations – and corpus linguistics has been used to identify and interpret contesting gendered discourses (e.g., Baker, 2005). Thirdly, corpus linguistics can support and complement small-scale qualitative studies. Swann includes corpus linguistics in her discussion of 'pragmatic eclecticism', referring to 'the use of quantitative (e.g., corpus-based) approaches to complete an analysis of more contextualised examples' (2003: 630).

In the first chapter, **Paul Baker** gives an overview of the potential of corpus methodologies and argues against the idea that a corpus approach sacrifices depth for breadth. In an analysis of the terms *bachelor* and *spinster* in the British National Corpus, he shows in Chapter 6 that while the former collocates with positive words such as *eligible* and the latter is constructed as unattractive and lonely, the corpus also reveals a conflicting *feminist* discourse surrounding spinsters.

The following two chapters show the benefits of researchers constructing their own corpora. **Kate Harrington** shows in Chapter 7 how combining quantitative corpus techniques with qualitative analysis facilitates an understanding of how and why reported dialogue use appears to be gendered. Using a corpus of conversational talk, she demonstrates how transparency ensures that individual variation is not hidden by a generalised use of statistics that may exaggerate gender differentiation. With their own corpus of learner English, in Chapter 8 **Rosa Jiménez Catalán** and **Julieta Ojeda Alba** explore the written English of Spanish primary school girls and boys.

### Part 3 Conversation analysis

Conversation analysis (CA), developing out of ethnomethodology and linguistics, is concerned with the sequential organisation of naturally-occurring talk (everyday conversations or institutional talk), and with the accomplishment of social action in talk. As such, it is 'well-positioned to consider the constructed nature of gender in talk' (Krolokke and Sørensen, 2006: 49). In its microanalysis of talk-in-interaction, CA empirically identifies recurrent, structural characteristics – namely patterns such as turn-taking, interruptions and repairs. CA aims to:

take singular sequences of conversation and tear them apart in such a way as to find rules, techniques, procedures, methods, maxims... that can be used to generate the orderly features we find in the conversations we examine. The point is, then, to come back to the singular things we

observe in a singular sequence, with some rules that handle those singular features, and also, necessarily, handle lots of other events.

(Sacks, 1984: 413)

Some early (1970s) work on gender and conversational interaction (e.g., Fishman, 1983) drew upon CA (problematically, given the prior identification of gender as a variable) to reveal male dominance in everyday conversation (see also Kitzinger, and Stokoe, this volume). However, in analysing gender only when speakers explicitly orient to it, and rejecting 'prior variables' or analyst agendas such as gender and feminism, orthodox CA can be seen as problematic for feminist and gender study (there has been a long-running debate about claims for gender in a localised stretch of talk (e.g., Schegloff, 1998, 1997; Wetherell, 1998; and see p. 12)). In the late 1990s, CA was reclaimed by and for gender and language study (e.g., Speer, 2005; Stokoe and Smithson, 2001; Kitzinger, 2000 and this volume).

**Celia Kitzinger** introduces CA in Chapter 9 and explores its relevance and value for feminist research on gender and sexuality as well as for the broader issues of power and oppression in everyday interaction. She focuses on 'interruption', of concern to gender and language researchers and conversation analysts alike. Kitzinger argues that CA offers a 'systematic and contextually sensitive analytic method grounded in co-interactants' *own* practices and actions' (p. 136) that can help us understand where and how gender is achieved in the ordinary practices of talk.

**Elizabeth Stokoe** then demonstrates in Chapter 10 how the topic of 'gender' can be studied via its categorial reference and sequential organisation in talk-in-interaction – for example, by looking at the way members' categories (such as *girls/women*, *fellas/men*, *secretary*) are put to use in the same kinds of sequential environments, doing the same kinds of actions. Stokoe suggests that this allows us to see 'how everyday notions of gender are taken up, reformulated, repaired, or resisted, in turns of talk that accomplish conversational action' (p. 139). She concludes with a discussion of the theoretical upshot of analysing gender from an ethnomethodological/CA perspective, particularly in relation to social constructionism.

#### **Part 4 Discursive psychology**

'Discursive psychology' originated with Edwards and Potter (1992; see also 2001), who were concerned to unpack and critique social, developmental and cognitive psychology (both topics and methods). This challenge to mainstream psychology entailed a radical shift – from seeing psychological states as being *behind* talk, to their being deployed and handled *in* talk.

Since the mid-1990s, discursive psychology has taken two different directions (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006; McIlvenny, 2002), the original branch maintaining its focus on the study of psychological phenomena as constructed, attended to and organised in talk as social action (e.g., Edwards,

2005; Potter and Hepburn, 2007). However, its increasingly close relationship to CA led to the emergence of a new branch: ‘critical discursive psychology’ (cf. Edley and Wetherell, 1999), which is more closely related to post-structuralism and critical discourse analysis, drawing both on the Foucauldian notion of *discourses*, and the comparable notion of *interpretative repertoires* (Edley, 2001; Potter and Wetherell, 1987).

In Chapter 11, **Nigel Edley** and **Margaret Wetherell** identify a particular challenge for discursive psychology, that is, to fruitfully combine analytical principles from both branches – in the face of critics who maintain that macro-analysis of discourse patterns works at the expense of micro-analysis of the interactional context of talk (Wooffitt, 2005). They claim that an expanded and integrative discursive psychology that assumes a broad understanding of constructionism and aims to work across both the micro and the macro would in principle combine a focus on ‘how speakers construct (and use) gender categories and how they are constructed – as gendered beings – by those very categories’ (p. 166).

A related synthetic approach is taken by **Laurel Kamada** in Chapter 12, who examines how six Japanese-Caucasian girls in Japan construct and combine their multi-ethnic and gendered ‘embodied’ identities, within and across a range of discourses. In framing her work within the integrative trajectory of discursive psychology, as well as incorporating analytic tools from Feminist Post-Structuralist Discourse Analysis (FPDA), Kamada’s ‘multi-perspective’ approach sheds light on the discursive work involved in the girls’ negotiation of gendered and ethnic identities, and on their sense of their ‘lived-body-selves’ – how they speak together, and enact the ‘body work’ of friendship.

## Part 5 Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

Discourse analysis grew out of an awareness of the importance of language *beyond the sentence*, and of context. When discourse analysis becomes *critical* discourse analysis is debatable. CDA *per se* has very particular epistemological roots – including critical linguistics, with its Marxist underpinnings, and critical theory of the Frankfurt School. Kroløkke and Sørensen pay tribute to Norman Fairclough for seeing critical theory as a theory of *discourse*: ‘one may say that Fairclough combined discourse theory with sociolinguistics and created CDA’ (2006: 52). CDA also identifies and analyses the workings of (often gendered) *discourses*, ways of seeing or representing the world which ‘systematically form the objects of which they speak’ (Fairclough, 2003; Foucault, 1972: 49), that is, are constitutive of social structures.

There is not just one, monolithic CDA (see Wodak and Meyer, 2001), but several, which together constitute a ‘programme’ (Weiss and Wodak, 2003). All CDA shares a focus on ideology and power (and its contestation), and goals of working towards progressive social change, challenging assumptions and, more recently, opening up new possibilities through different

readings of linguistic, discursive and social products and processes (i.e., texts, and the production and consumption of texts; Fairclough, 1992). All CDA considers both discursive and non-discursive practices, and assumes a dialectical relationship between discourse and the social, that is, that discourse shapes but is also shaped by some form of material reality (a position rejected by post-structuralist writers).

Though there have been studies of gender using CDA (see Kosetzi, this volume), CDA has been accused of downplaying both gender concerns and feminist approaches to language study (e.g., Cameron, 1998b). One question is whether CDA's conventional focus on social class, hierarchy and power relations, and on the 'dominant' and 'dominated', enables it to deal fully with gender. Some gender and language analysts self-identify as CDA analysts; others do not, though their work may well be feminist (hence 'critical') (see also Wodak, 1997; Kotthoff and Wodak, 1997). And there is now a collection devoted to 'feminist critical discourse analysis' – Michelle Lazar's *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power, and Ideology in Discourse* (2005) (see also Walsh, 2001).

The CDA section starts with Chapter 13 by **Ruth Wodak**, who discusses feminist CDA and illustrates its combination with her 'discourse-historical' approach to CDA with a case study of migrant identities – one crucial principle of CDA being a focus on a problem and not on a linguistic unit *per se*. The analysis is both macro and micro, addressing the all-important (different levels of) context. **Veronika Koller** then shows in Chapter 14 how CDA can combine with cognitive semantics through a study of the representation of businesswomen in a business magazine and a lesbian magazine, and also engages with notions of discursive psychology. Chapter 15, by **Konstantia Kosetzi**, applies Faircloughian CDA to Greek TV fictional texts, and considers the special challenges of fiction for CDA.

## **Part 6 Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (FPDA)**

With roots in post-structuralism and feminism, and sharing some similarities with both CDA and CA, *feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis* (FPDA) (Baxter, 2002a, b, 2003) also 'responds' to both (it is informed by broad social issues *and* includes very detailed analysis of talk). Important here is the post-structuralist notion of 'positioning' (of oneself and others, in discourse); individuals can also (as in CDA and 'critical' discursive psychology) be seen as *multiply* positioned. Having a degree of *agency*, manifested in different linguistic forms, they have the potential not only to *recognise* how and through which discourses they are being 'positioned', but also to *take up* particular subject positions, and to *resist* positionings. FPDA thus rejects the notion of individuals being 'at the mercy of these competing discourses' (Baxter, 2003: 31). A degree of agency does not entail, however, what Baxter describes as a 'liberal-humanist conception of the free individual

in control of their destiny': the range of possible subject positions for women remains limited.

Discourses are important to FPDA (as well as to CDA). Often 'competing', they are what shifting/fluctuating power relations are 'constantly negotiated through' (Baxter, 2002b: 831). And shifts in power are a key concern of FPDA, which accordingly allows for dynamism in all exchanges. A woman may be (simultaneously) positioned as powerful within one discourse and powerless within another (e.g., as an employee but as someone whose labour is essential). FPDA is also about encouraging textual interplay (between different, related texts within a very specific social context) for its own sake, so that the possibility of new meanings, richer understandings and alternative insights into gender identities may emerge.

Part 4 is introduced, appropriately, by FPDA's originator, **Judith Baxter**. Baxter in Chapter 16 carefully compares FPDA and CDA, identifying commonalities (including 'the discursive construction of subjectivity' (p. 245)) and teasing out differences. FPDA, she claims, may *supplement* CDA by focusing on those instances of power which may be too fleeting or unusually manifested for conventional CDA to deal with. **Harold Andrés Castañeda Peña** in Chapter 17 documents his own FPDA study of Colombian pre-school children in a lesson on English personal pronouns. His analyses show how these children 'live between and within shifting versions of masculinities and femininities' (p. 268).

## Part 7 Queer theory

A key principle of queer theory is the destabilising of what appears 'natural' and stable. Queer theory takes 'normality' as its primary object of investigation and works to continually problematise taken-for-granted, socially sanctioned notions of gender and heteronormativity (see also Sunderland, 2006; and Bucholtz, 1999b).

*Queer* refers to that which is not aligned with any particular identity and resists categorisation; *queer theory* is post-structuralist in that it sees gender and sexualities as performed – through repeated, 'citational' discursive acts (e.g., Butler, 1990). Butler's significant work on performativity provides a theoretical framework in which gender and sexual (and other) identities are *brought into being* by a series of such acts.

In Chapter 18, **Helen Sauntson** reviews key principles and developments in queer theory which are particularly relevant to gender, sexuality and language. She also identifies tensions, most notably the problem of retaining a commitment to a political and emancipatory agenda while, at the same time, resisting notions of 'identity' as fixed, stable and inevitable. Sauntson focuses upon Bucholtz and Hall's (2004) 'tactics of intersubjectivity' analytical framework, which offers a methodology influenced by both queer and feminist theories. **William Leap**, in Chapter 19, focuses on different discursive constructions of gay masculinity, using an oral narrative of a gay man

in South Africa. Leap explores how masculine gender/sexual identities are produced in relation to particular material conditions. He considers the value of 'not naming the subject' (e.g., as *woman*) for queer theory, and gender and language study alike.

\* \* \*

Our claim is that gender and language study can only *benefit* from access to this range of approaches,<sup>4</sup> as 'each [method], in its own way, helps uncover the gender issues at stake in communication' (Kroløkke and Sørensen, 2006: 47). Rather than asking which is the most appropriate approach for gender and language study, we argue that more productive is the 'value-adding' question of 'What is each approach *particularly well-equipped* to achieve? What are its *affordances*?' – as well as 'What are its limitations?'

When it comes to identifying an approach for a given research project, some may decide on a topic of interest, research questions and data – and then on the approach. However, this is to see approach as a *tool*. Rather, we see an approach as *conceptual*, with theoretical and epistemological underpinnings as well as *methodological* ones. Some see conversation analysis as inadequate for understanding human social interaction in general, and gendered interaction in particular; others feel similarly about critical discourse analysis. Ontological considerations (Mason, 2002), including those of researcher affiliation and commitment to a particular approach (to which the researcher is then 'accountable'), may thus also influence the choice of approach. If you self-identify ontologically and epistemologically as a discursive psychologist, for example, then your chosen data will probably be a recording and transcript of naturally-occurring or elicited talk. If you see yourself as a *critical* discursive psychologist, your analysis may focus on *discourses* (whereas if you are a discursive psychologist who aligns herself with conversation analysis, it almost certainly will not).

Approach, therefore, is not simply a matter of 'what works best' or even 'goodness of fit'. The extended debate in *Discourse and Society* over the definition of 'context' and the (in)appropriacy of CA for (feminist) gender and language study (initiated by Schegloff (1997) and Wetherell (1998)) has included defences of CA by feminist scholars of gender and language, including Stokoe and Smithson (2001), Kitzinger (2000), Speer (1999) and Stokoe (1998). The debate has hinged on the question of when gender is, or can be claimed to be, relevant to a given stretch of talk. To illustrate: a critical discourse analyst who uses her knowledge of society and gender relations to identify gender as relevant may be challenged by a conversation analyst who sees no evidence of its consequentiality, that is, when *participants* manifestly 'orient' to gender (the classical CA 'warrant' for claiming that gender is 'relevant').

## Combining approaches

These days it is not uncommon to use more than one approach for a piece of research, a 'deliberate recombination of methods' (Kroløkke and Sørensen, 2006: 61). Indeed, this is precisely what research students are frequently encouraged to do, perhaps to demonstrate their methodological contribution to the field. Combining approaches is in principle feasible, as Holmes and Meyerhoff exemplify in the *Handbook of Language and Gender*:

Meyerhoff...demonstrates, in her discussion of *sore* in Bislama, that variationist approaches are not inconsistent with detailed ethnographic sociolinguistic description, and a social constructionist focus on the emergent nature of gender.

(2003: 12)

But can Approach A always go with Approach B, in a pick-and-mix sort of way? Might some approaches be particularly compatible and others incompatible? Must some always serve or supplement others? And can a researcher achieve accountability to more than one method?

Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis is (at least on the surface) relatively straightforward here. Baxter emphasises that FPDA is a 'supplementary' approach: it looks at 'the continuously fluctuating ways in which speakers, within any discursive context, are positioned as powerful or powerless by competing social and institutional discourses' which is 'an aspect of spoken interaction perhaps overlooked by CA and CDA' (2003: 44).

Of course, conversation analysts and critical discourse analysts may wish to contest Baxter's premise that they may overlook fluctuating positionings. And neither CA nor CDA are static entities. Baxter's real point is, however, the desirability of 'supplementarity' (Derrida, 1976) more widely:

to convey the built-in dependencies and oppositions of any one theoretical paradigm with any other. In other words, each theoretical approach should be seen as both necessary to and *yet simultaneously threatening* to the identities of the others.

(2003: 43, our italics; see also Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999)

This representational 'nexus' of approaches constitutes a reminder of the epistemological complexity, organic nature and, indeed, dynamism of the modern research endeavour, as well as its potential tensions. It also points to the need for researcher reflexivity (see below) – already characteristic of critical research.

Critical discourse analysis has conventionally been 'served' by textual analysis, often using argumentation theory, Halliday's systemic-functional grammar (2004), van Leeuwen's critical notions of social actors/action

(e.g., 1996) and, more recently, ethnography (e.g., Wodak, 1996). The discursive-historical (Wodak), socio-cognitive (van Dijk), and different Faircloughian (e.g., 1995a,b, 2001b) branches of CDA draw on different grammars as they see fit. And imaginative and flexible CDA studies do indeed also draw on conversation analysis, discursive psychology, corpus linguistics, pragmatics or sociolinguistics, as well as FPDA. However, supplementarity is not automatically a theoretically valid way forward – a relationship may not be reciprocal. Whereas CDA might draw on CA, for example, it is harder to imagine the reverse (neither CA nor the CA branch of discursive psychology entertains the notion of *discourses*). And, given their different intellectual roots, FPDA and CDA are not comfortably compatible, so whereas a CDA practitioner who sees discourse as working *dialectically* (i.e., shaped by as well as shaping material events), might be willing for FPDA to *supplement* it, she might reject CDA ‘serving’ FPDA given the latter’s anti-materialist stance.

### **‘Warrants’ for gender, approaches to gender and notions of gender**

Questions that all approaches to gender and language study have to address are: what counts as gender? how is it to be theorised? with what ‘warrant’ can the analyst claim that gender is relevant in a stretch of talk or written text? We have already seen the classical CA warrant of ‘participants’ orientations as evident in the text’ (see Swann, 2002: 49). But what constitutes an ‘orientation’? Schegloff’s (1997) famous example is a speaker’s ironic use of ‘Ladies last’ when passing butter at a dinner table: that is, a feature *made visible or audible* in an interaction. However, Kitzinger (2000) contests this, observing that to wait for an explicit ‘gender orientation’ would be ‘unbearably limiting’ (see also Stokoe and Smithson, 2001).

Swann (2002: 50–8) identifies six other ‘warrants’ for gender, as follows:

*Quantitative and/or general patterns (derived from correlational studies of language use, large (computerised) corpora or other systematic comparison between the language of different social groups).* In large-scale variationist sociolinguistic studies and corpus linguistics, quantitative procedures may establish statistical significance of the relationship between gender and another variable – but not causality, or even whether gender is the real issue.

*Indirect reliance on quantitative/general patterns.* Small-scale, ‘interactional sociolinguistic’ studies may draw on previous, larger scale studies, and either then map their findings and claims onto them, or contest previously identified general patterns (or their interpretations, or methodology).

*Speakers’/participants’ solicited interpretations.* This warrant, irrelevant to CA and unacceptable to the CA branch of discursive psychology, is relevant

to its critical branch, data for which is characteristically, intentionally, interview transcripts. Solicited interpretations are also important in ethnographic approaches and, often, CDA. Such data requires an epistemological position not only that non-naturally-occurring data constitutes *good* data but also an acceptance that solicited interpretations constitute reported understandings (not 'mined facts'). While understandings may bear little relation to 'facts', they are *nevertheless* interesting in their own right. Use of solicited interpretations also entails taking on board co-construction, that is, that interviewees' responses will be tailored to the questioner (as in any 'conversation').

*Analysts' theoretical positions.* While CA espouses the ideal of *minimising* the analyst's theoretical position, and proponents would claim that CA (being concerned with *speakers'* orientations) can come close to this, all interpretations are arguably *influenced* by analysts' theoretical positions – on both gender and language. Some approaches are, however, particularly explicit about this. The position of FPDA is self-evident, and critical discourse analysts often put their cards on the table from the start. Doing this, however, risks accusations of tailoring interpretation to the theory, and CDA has been a target of critique here (e.g., Widdowson, 1995; but see response by Wodak, 2006).

*Analysts' intuitions.* As we saw earlier, Lakoff (1975) vigorously – but problematically – justified her reliance on introspection. However, analysts' intuitions play a role in most linguistic (and other) research, including the attribution of meanings or functions to utterances (Swann, 2002, see p. 58) – and intuitions are not unrelated to informed insights and, indeed, theoretical positions (see above).

*Speakers are female, male (or whatever).* This last, 'atheoretical' warrant is characteristic of past gender and language study, and of current popular discourse (e.g., a piece of behaviour is attributed to gender ('that's a man thing') when there is no basis for this). Clearly, because members of a social group do X, this does not in itself make X explicable by that group membership: it needs to be established whether gender (say) is *relevant* to analysis of the data in question or whether it is more important that the individuals concerned are, say, (in some sense) powerless (cf. O'Barr and Atkins, 1980) or members of a certain CofP or social network (e.g., Milroy, 1980). Arguably, however, elements of this warrant remain in most language and gender research (see Stokoe, this volume), and Swann herself comments: 'Despite the current emphasis on context and performativity, I do not think language and gender researchers actually do dispense with gender as an *a priori* explanatory category – and probably they cannot' (2002: 60).

Table 1.1 overleaf suggests a relationship between these seven warrants, the approaches illustrated (or referred to) in this book, and notions of gender (see p. 4).

Table 1.1 Relationships between ‘warrants’ and approaches to, and notions of, gender

	Warrants for gender (from Swann, 2002)	Possible associated approach(es)	Notions of gender
1	Quantitative and/or general patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale variationist sociolinguistic studies</li> <li>• Corpus linguistics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘differential tendencies’ between women and men, boys and girls (as regards language use)</li> </ul>
2	Indirect reliance on quantitative/general patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small-scale, ‘interactional sociolinguistic’ work which draws on and maps findings onto claims of larger-scale studies</li> </ul>	
3	Participants’ orientations as evident in the text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conversation Analysis (CA)</li> <li>• Feminist Poststructuralist Discourse Analysis (FPDA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• linguistic dealings <i>with</i> (individual, and groups of) women, men, boys and girls, e.g. how they are addressed, what is said <i>to</i> them and what they say <i>about</i> gender</li> </ul>
4	Speakers’/Participants’ solicited interpretations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discursive psychology</li> <li>• FPDA</li> <li>• CDA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is said and written about gender differences/tendencies, similarities and diversity</li> </ul>
5	Analysts’ theoretical positions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDA</li> <li>• FPDA</li> <li>• Queer Theory (at least)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• potentially any</li> </ul>
6	Analysts’ intuitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introspection</li> </ul>	
7	Speakers are female, male (or whatever)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Popular discourse (mainly)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘differential tendencies’ between women and men, boys and girls (as regards language use)</li> </ul>

## Interpretation and feminism

The current emphasis on qualitative methodologies across the social sciences, moving away from *positivistic* paradigms of research towards more *interpretative* (e.g., discourse analysis, ethnography) and *critical* ones, has helped illuminate the fluidity and complexity of (gendered) meaning. However, all gender and language researchers, including those working within a qualitative paradigm (see Hultgren, this volume), need to explore a range of interpretations. This raises the question of the role of the analyst and her theoretical and political alignments (see also p. 12).

Given that CDA explicitly goes beyond the text to identify relationships between language and wider social and political workings, CDA analysts routinely engage with and acknowledge their role in the research process (which includes drawing on their own critical/feminist interpretative insights, perhaps as members of the relevant community). Such reflexivity is also key to FPDA and critical discursive psychology. In contrast, interpretation in conventional CA is very differently based on the sequential intersubjectivity constructed between *participants* as they display their understanding of prior and subsequent actions (but see Stokoe, and Kitzinger, this volume).

So what of the role of feminism? Starting with what is now called the 'Second Wave' of the Women's (Liberation) Movement, blossoming in the 1970s, feminism has influenced gender and language work considerably (work culminating in the new *Gender and Language* journal in 2007). Feminism has influenced specific perspectives and epistemological approaches (the '(male) dominance' approach prevalent in the 1970s; feminist critical discourse analysis (Lazar, 2005); Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (Baxter, 2002a, b, 2003); feminist conversation analysis (Kitzinger, 2000; Speer, 1999)), but *most* gender and language study can be described as broadly feminist, in its questioning of androcentrism and 'objective' or 'universal' truths, and in its commitment to the promotion of progressive gender relations.

Litosseliti summarises three key principles of feminist research as:

1. Characterized by self-reflection, self-reflexivity, even conscious partiality.
2. Done by researchers who 'locate themselves within, rather than outside the research topic and the participants'.
3. 'Informed by feminist politics'.

(2006a: 151–2)

The first point refutes the idea that facts can be divorced from values or that impartiality is possible. Such reflexivity facilitates the monitoring of feminist work, in part to ensure that it does not inadvertently perpetuate rather than subvert the inequalities it tries to address. The second pertains to research on (sometime) marginal or oppressed individuals and groups, and power relations between researcher and those researched: scholarship 'which does not transform those it studies into objects but preserves in its analytic procedures the presence of the subject as actor and experiencer' (Smith, 1981: 1). The possibility of participants' perspectives actually taking *precedence* over those of an 'expert' researcher is much debated (see Sarangi and Roberts 1999; deFrancisco, 1997; Cameron et al., 1992). That, in reality, the researcher's perspective will typically prevail within (feminist) academic publishing is an irony acknowledged by, *inter alia*, FPDA (Baxter, 2003).

The third point, feminist research as *informed by* feminist politics, extends to *empowerment* (see De Francisco, 1997), that is, *contributing* to feminist

politics (see also Sunderland, 2004). Feminist linguistics accordingly, explicitly, 'aims to draw connections between gender-related linguistic phenomena and gender inequality or discrimination' (Litosseliti, 2006a: 152). We acknowledge that it is, however, harder to facilitate empowerment, than to identify and demystify areas of gender inequality.

This book lacks the scope to discuss feminism but we stress that its meaning is not self-evident. FPDA, for example, because it rejects absolutes (including absolute power), and, indeed, 'grand narratives', rejects any feminism which is omnirelevant or entails a ubiquity of powerlessness and disadvantage for women (women *may* be powerless and disadvantaged, but this depends on time, place and other contextual features). As regards any feminism/approach relationship, we need to distinguish between theory and *application* (see Gill, 1995): discourse analysis, say, can be used in the interests of misogyny as well as feminism.

The necessity to resist categorical thinking and 'grand narratives', and at the same time maintain a broad political and progressive perspective (see Cameron, 2006; Litosseliti, 2006b; Philips, 2003), was emphasised by several contributors at the fourth International Gender and Language Association conference (2006). The current diversity of gender and language methodological approaches, and indeed – perhaps in particular – the creative tensions between them, are to be welcomed in the facilitation of this. We hope this book will encourage both debate and innovative, creative feminist practice here.

## Notes

- 1 With Carmen Caldas-Coulthard.
- 2 In contrast, many related disciplines, including gender, cultural and media studies, do *not* rely on empiricism (see Bucholtz, 1999b).
- 3 Although West and Zimmerman (1983) anticipated what was to come with their notion of 'doing' power and gender in face-to-face interaction.
- 4 One omission from our approaches is Pragmatics. Deborah Cameron (1998a, 2005b), proposes a 'Pragmatic turn' for discourse analysis, informed by relevance theory, i.e., conversational participants infer meaning from what is relevant *to them*, including a set of background assumptions. This gets round the dilemma of the analyst either looking at what participants may or may not be explicitly orienting to (as in CA), or being accused of imposing her own interpretations on the data.

# Index

- Advertising/advertisements 179, 181, 220, 229
- Agency 4, 10, 31, 67–8, 77, 147, 152, 172, 176, 184, 247, 274, 293
- Agent 4, 38–9, 41
- Approaches (*see* individual entries)
- Appropriation 273
- Bachelor 7, 78–81, 83
- Baker, P. 7, 31, 73–84
- Bakhtin, M. 229–30, 234, 245, 247, 250, 254
- Barrett, R. 23, 26
- Baxter, J. 10–11, 13, 17, 30, 46, 54, 174–7, 243–55, 257, 264, 273, 278
- Benwell, B. 5, 8, 150, 232
- Besnier, N. 25, 32, 57
- Biber, D. 74, 78
- Billig, M. 30, 36, 120, 162, 163, 172, 174, 239, 251, 255
- Binaries 29–33, 38–9, 41, 89, 246–7, 255–7, 264–6, 274, 293
- Bisexual 59, 209, 228, 230, 234, 274, 279, 295
- Bourdieu, P. 37–8, 50, 68, 199, 203–4, 244
- Boys 4, 7, 16, 36, 60–1, 78, 103–5, 107–15, 127, 140, 163, 167, 260, 262–7, 280
- British National Corpus (BNC) 7, 75, 78, 81, 83, 87
- Bucholtz, M. 11, 18, 156, 228, 271–2, 274, 277–82, 286
- Burkitt, I. 165
- Butler, J. 5, 11, 23, 41, 46, 162, 194, 245, 271–8, 285, 289
- Buttny, R. 85, 156
- Button, G. 156–7
- Caldas-Coulthard, C. 228, 245–6
- Call centres 6, 27, 38
- Cameron, D. 3–4, 10, 17–18, 22–3, 29, 34, 38–41, 43, 45, 51–2, 100, 121, 228, 245, 257, 271, 274–5, 282, 285
- Chouliaraki, L. 13, 227–8, 230, 238
- Children (*see also* girls; boys) 11, 103–15, 174–90, 229, 236, 253, 256–68
- Cicourel, L. 73, 211
- Classroom interaction 57, 253, 256
- Coates, J. 3, 23, 29, 51, 91, 112–13, 121, 140, 187, 194, 275–6, 285
- Cognitive biases 76
- Cognitive discourse analysis 214
- Cognitive critical discourse analysis, 211–12, 216
- Socio-cognitive discourse analysis 214
- Collocate/collocation 7, 77–81, 217
- Combining Approaches 5–7, 9–10, 13–14, 21, 25, 27–8, 30, 37, 46, 48–52, 56–7, 59, 68–9, 75–6, 101, 166–7, 174–5, 189, 195–200, 211, 217, 224, 244, 253, 278
- Communicative Strategies 48
- Communities of Practice 5–6, 27, 51, 246, 279
- Competitive talk 22–3, 140
- Concordance 79–82
- Constructionism 155–6
- Social constructionism 3–4, 8–9, 33, 155–6, 164–6
- Conversation Analysis 3, 5, 7–8, 12, 14, 17, 27, 31, 36–7, 64, 119–57, 161, 163–4, 174–6, 189, 211–12, 243
- Co-operative talk 5, 22–3, 131–6, 268
- Coulter, J. 166, 212, 214
- Corpus linguistics 5, 6–7, 14, 31, 71–115, 211
- Correlational sociolinguistics 6, 27, 29–42, 46
- Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (*see also* Feminist critical discourse analysis; Cognitive critical discourse analysis) 1, 5, 9–17, 27, 46, 77, 193–239, 243–51, 254–5, 273, 279
- Cultural materialism 246

- Deconstruction 179, 246  
 Deficit theory 29, 178–80  
 DeFrancisco, V. 17, 121  
 Denial 33, 151–4, 177, 231–2, 237  
 Derrida, J. 13, 245, 249  
 Difference (*see also* gender differences; sex differences) 3–4, 6, 16, 21–4, 26–7, 29–42, 44, 61, 73, 75–6, 78, 83, 85–101, 103, 106–15, 121, 123–4, 135–6, 139–47, 155, 161–2, 179, 182, 201, 218, 220–2, 237, 262–4, 266–7, 279–80, 283, 290, 295  
 Discourses 11, 60, 76–8, 162–3, 170–3, 176, 194, 231, 248–9, 250–2, 256  
 Anti-gay discourses 291  
 and Cognition 116, 211–12, 224  
 Discourse prosody 77, 81–2  
 ‘Discourses of belonging’ 201  
 Ethnic discourses 176–7, 189  
 Gendered discourses 7, 9, 51–2, 76, 78, 83, 194, 229–31, 234, 239, 253, 256–68  
 Resistant discourses 76, 81, 249  
 ‘Turn to discourse’ 162–3  
 Discourse analysis (*see also* Critical discourse analysis; (Socio-) Cognitive (critical) discourse analysis; Feminist critical discourse analysis; Feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis) 1, 5, 9, 16, 18, 25, 30, 34, 36, 74, 76, 120, 161, 175–6, 205, 208, 211, 223, 228, 236, 243–6, 250, 254–5, 295  
 Discursive psychology 1, 5, 8–10, 12, 14, 16–17, 27, 31, 41, 62–3, 120, 156, 161–90, 212–14, 244, 246, 252, 255  
 Dominance (male) theory 3–4, 8, 17, 30, 37, 51, 121, 135, 140  
 Eckert, P. 5, 27, 30–3, 40–1, 57  
 Edley, N. 9, 41, 161–76, 189–90  
 Educational contexts 76, 103–15, 140, 177, 256–68, 281  
 Edwards, D. 8, 143, 148, 152–3, 155–7, 163–5, 174, 212–13  
 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) 103–15, 253, 256–68  
 Epistemic construction 156, 165–6  
 Essed, P. 203, 209  
 Essentialism 33, 40–1, 52, 61, 73, 155–6, 166, 212, 246, 275–6  
 Anti-essentialism 33, 41, 156  
 ‘Strategic essentialism’ 40, 275, 284  
 Ethnicity 28, 31, 33, 56–69, 148, 174–5, 177–84, 189, 194, 197, 205, 208, 246, 252–3  
 Ethnography (*see also* Linguistic ethnography) 1–2, 6, 13–16, 21–8, 31, 43–69, 210, 238, 247, 251, 253–4  
 Ethnography of communication 25  
 Feminist ethnography 249  
 Ethnomethodology 7, 41, 156, 162  
 Fairclough, N. 9–10, 13–14, 77, 215–16, 227–34, 236, 238–9, 246, 248–9  
 Femininity 4, 11, 32, 51, 66, 69, 76, 100, 155, 162, 188, 190, 228, 256–57, 263, 265–8, 276, Discourse of femininity 181, 265  
 Feminisation of public discourse in workplaces 11  
 ‘Fun femininity’ 184–9  
 Hegemonic femininities 76, 275–6  
 Stereotypical femininity 220  
 ‘Unbounded femininity’ discourse 265–6  
 Feminism 2–4, 6–8, 10–12, 16–18, 27, 37–9, 42, 45, 62, 81, 120–1, 156, 171, 175–6, 179, 193–6, 198–9, 221, 223, 228–9, 235–6, 245, 255, 271–3, 277–8, 282  
 Lesbian feminist/m 221, 272–3  
 Feminist conversation analysis 17  
 Feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA) 10, 17, 193–210, 228, 245  
 Feminist research/ers 8, 17–18, 38, 120–1, 193–4, 196, 199, 210  
 Feminist ethnography 249  
 Feminist Poststructuralist discourse analysis (FPDA) 5, 9–11, 13–18, 27, 31, 46, 174–6, 187, 189, 243–68, 273, 278–9  
 Feminist Sociolinguistics (*see also* Feminism and Feminist research/ers) 44, 46  
 Fiction 10, 83, 104, 227–39, 255, 288–9  
 Fishman, P. 3, 8, 22, 30, 121

- Foucault, M. 9, 165, 244–8, 272  
 Franklin, S. 194, 209  
 Freed, A. 41, 44, 136  
 Friendship groups 9, 22, 28, 34, 58–9,  
 68, 85–6, 88–9, 99, 121, 127–8,  
 132–3, 143, 149–50, 174–90, 194,  
 244, 253, 280, 287, 292
- Gal, S. 2, 6, 24–5, 45  
 Garfinkel, H. 156, 162  
 Gay/Gay men/masculinity 11, 23, 100,  
 217, 221, 233, 271–4, 276, 279–96  
 Gaze 142, 188, 203, 204–5, 259,  
 265–6, 290  
 Gender categories 9, 44, 147, 150–4,  
 157, 166, 174–6  
 Gender dichotomy 29–42, 94,  
 195, 197  
 Gender differences 3, 6, 16, 22, 24, 30,  
 35, 42, 44, 75–6, 78, 83, 96, 99, 110,  
 112–13, 121, 123–4, 135–6, 139–40,  
 237, 262–3, 266–7  
 Gender similarities 4, 16, 22, 35, 40,  
 51, 76, 83, 92, 96–7, 101, 103, 106,  
 111–14  
 Gender stereotypes 33, 38–40, 44, 52,  
 76, 81–2, 86, 100–1, 144, 199, 203,  
 209, 233, 235, 252  
 Gesture 83, 142, 147, 258, 268  
 Gill, R. 18, 163  
 Girls 4, 7–9, 16, 28, 36, 56–69, 78,  
 103–14, 120, 140, 143–4, 154, 171,  
 174–7, 180–90, 198, 207, 218–20,  
 224, 245, 247, 250, 252–3, 255, 263,  
 266–7, 279  
 Goffman, E. 5, 60, 232, 238  
 Goodwin, M. 120, 267  
 Gossip 239  
 Gough, B. 100, 163
- Hall, K. 11, 23, 26, 32, 271–5, 277–82,  
 286  
 Halliday, M. A. K. 13, 213, 215, 217  
 Hammersley, M. 30, 42, 56–7, 59, 62,  
 68–9  
*Handbook of Language and Gender* (2003)  
 1, 13, 23, 33, 38, 41, 44–6, 155–6,  
 209  
 Hedges 22, 41, 91, 140  
 Hegemonic masculinity 220, 276
- Hegemony 163–4, 197  
 Heritage, J. 119, 127, 136, 144, 148,  
 156, 164, 173, 216  
 Hester, S. 148, 157  
 Heteronormativity 11, 121, 281  
 Heterosexism 120  
 Heterosexuality (Compulsory  
 heterosexuality) 233, 272–4,  
 276–7, 281–2  
 ‘Hierarchies of constraint’ 275–6  
 Hollway, W. 162, 170–1, 176,  
 234, 237  
 Holmes, J. 1, 5, 7, 13, 22–3, 26–7,  
 29–31, 33, 38, 41, 44–6, 54, 78, 85,  
 99, 100, 112, 155–6, 209  
 Homophobia 281–2, 284, 286  
 Homosexuality (*see also* Gay men;  
 Lesbian/ism; Queer theories) 194,  
 247, 276–7, 280–2, 287, 289–94  
 Humour (*see also* Jokes, Teasing) 99,  
 229–30  
 Hymes, D. 25
- Identities/identity 5, 11, 13, 23, 26,  
 32–3, 59, 60–1, 64, 67, 76–7, 99–101,  
 143–4, 147, 156–7, 162, 165, 175–6,  
 180, 196–7, 200–1, 210, 214, 246,  
 253, 264, 272–3, 275, 277–82, 281,  
 283, 285–7, 294, 296  
 British Asian 60, 67  
 Class 283  
 Embodied 174–90  
 Ethnic 9, 176, 189, 245, 283  
 Female 33, 208, 248  
 Feminine/feminities 100, 161  
 Gender/gendered 5, 9, 11, 27, 31, 34,  
 46, 112, 155, 162, 163, 176,  
 189–90, 194, 197, 200, 220, 225,  
 253, 264, 267, 273, 278–9, 282–3,  
 286, 289, 293  
 Institutional 48, 54  
 Male 113, 171–2  
 Masculine/masculinities 12, 100,  
 161, 163, 167  
 Men 264  
 Migrant 10, 198, 200–1, 208, 210  
 Multiple 66, 99, 193–5  
 Religious 61  
 Researcher 48, 52  
 Restricted 100

- Identities/identity – *continued*  
 Sexuality/sexual (including gay, lesbian, homosexual and heterosexual) 27, 76, 187, 272–3, 275, 278–82, 284, 292, 294, 296  
 Social 6, 45, 85, 99, 101, 195, 215, 275, 281, 287  
 Speaker 27, 35  
 Subcultural 27  
 Women 99, 100, 264  
 ‘Ideological dilemmas’ 163, 173, 175, 188–9, 239  
 Institutional discourse 13, 247, 252  
 Institutional talk 7, 119  
 Interactional sociolinguistics 3, 6, 14, 16, 21, 25, 28, 43, 49, 255  
 Interdiscursivity 196, 217, 230–1, 234–5, 239, 248  
 International Corpus of English 75  
 Internet 179, 280  
 Interruptions (*see also* Overlapping talk; Turn-taking) 3, 7–8, 22, 37, 120–36, 140, 184, 258, 260  
 Intertextuality/intertextual analysis 196, 207, 216–17, 221, 224, 231–2, 234–5, 251, 253, 262–3, 265–6, 268  
 Interviews 15, 27, 38, 49–52, 73, 151–3, 155, 167, 172–3, 177, 180, 221, 224, 254, 286–7  
 Ethnographic-(style) interviews 24, 28, 43, 56–70  
 James, D. 140, 287  
 Jefferson, G. 64, 119–20, 122–3, 126, 136, 143–4, 156, 157, 173  
 Jespersen, O. 2, 112  
 Jiménez Catalán, R. 7, 31, 76, 87, 103–15  
 Johnstone, B. 85–6, 89, 95  
 Jokes 188  
 Kaitanidi, M. 236, 239  
 Kamada, L. 9, 161, 163, 174–90, 244, 252, 253, 255  
 Keenan, E. 24  
 Kitzinger, C. 8, 12, 14, 17, 36, 41, 119–38, 140, 142, 148, 157, 161, 164, 216  
 Koller, V. 10, 46, 206, 209, 211–26, 230, 251  
 Kosetzi, K. 10, 209, 227–39  
 Kress, G. 229, 233–4  
 Kristeva, J. 234  
 Krzyżanowski, M. 200–2, 205, 209–10  
 Kulick, D. 32, 57, 271, 274–5, 282, 284  
 L2 76, 105  
 L2 productive vocabulary 103, 112, 114  
 Labov, W. 2, 6, 22, 30, 203  
 Lakoff, G. 206, 214–15  
 Lakoff, R. 2–3, 15, 22, 29, 41, 52, 112–13, 120, 136  
 Language Learners/ing (*see also* English as a Foreign Language) 103, 105, 257, 264  
*Language and Woman’s Place* (1975) 2–3, 15, 22, 29, 38, 41, 113, 136  
 Lazar, M. 10, 17, 193, 195–7, 209, 228, 231–4, 245, 247  
 Leap, W. 11–12, 273, 275, 277, 283–96  
 Learner Corpus Research 103–15  
 Lerner, G. 136  
 Lesbian/ism (*see also* Feminism; Lesbian feminism) 121, 194, 217, 220–4, 271–4, 276–7, 281–2  
 as Discourse prosody 83  
 Lesbian magazines 10, 218, 220–4  
 Lexical priming 76–7  
 Linguistic Ethnography 6, 25, 28, 49, 56  
 Litosseliti, L. 2, 5, 17–18, 23, 30, 34, 46, 54, 113, 209, 227–8, 232–4, 237  
 Livia, A. 271–8  
 Magazines (*see also* Lesbian magazines) 10, 211–24, 239  
 Masculinity 4, 11–12, 32, 51, 91, 99–100, 155, 161–3, 167, 219–20, 228, 247, 256–7, 263, 265, 267–8, 276, 282, 285, 288–9, 291, 294–5  
 ‘Bounded masculinity’ discourse 265–6  
 Female masculinity 276  
 Gay masculinity 11–12, 285, 287, 290  
 Generic masculine 224  
 Hegemonic masculinities 76, 163, 220, 275–6  
 Heterosexual masculinity 272, 291  
 Stereotypical masculinity 51, 101  
 Maybin, J. 2, 21–9, 33, 43, 46, 59, 187

- Media (mass) 18, 77, 179–81, 195, 200, 222, 227–8, 230–1, 236, 238, 280
- McElhinny, B. 32, 45, 68, 277
- Membership categories 63, 120, 139, 148, 153, 199, 201
- Metaphors 67, 206, 211–24
- Methodological problems 52–5, 124, 201
- Methodologies (*see* individual entries)
- Meyerhoff, M. 1, 5, 13, 23, 33, 38, 41, 44–6, 155–6, 209
- Migrants 10, 195–6, 198–210
- Mills, S. 51, 195, 209, 231, 235
- Milroy, L. 2, 6, 15, 22, 24, 113
- Minimal responses 38, 64, 69
- Mullany, L. 6, 28, 30–1, 38, 43–55, 58
- Multiperspectivism/Multi-method approach (*see also* Combining approaches) 48–52, 174
- Multiplicity 246, 256, 267–8
- Multiple identities (*see* Identities)
- Murray, S. 124, 134, 291
- Narrative (*see* Story)
- Naturally occurring data 7, 12, 46, 56–70, 74, 77, 86–7, 119, 136, 155, 212, 233
- Non-naturally occurring data 15
- Nichols, P. 113
- Nicholson, L. 209, 276
- Ontological construction 156, 165
- Oppression 8, 17, 120, 136, 146–8, 272, 276, 293
- Overlapping talk (*see also* Interruptions; Turn-taking) 121–36, 171, 258, 261–2
- Part-of-speech tagging 74
- Performance 4–5, 22–3, 140, 142, 155, 161–2, 175, 187–8, 253, 256–7, 266–7, 274, 276, 295
- in EFL writing 105, 112
- Performativity 5, 11, 15, 76, 162, 177, 184–9, 194, 245–6, 253, 257, 273–5, 277
- Performative models/frames/paradigms 25, 27, 59, 273
- Performatively orientated tradition 27
- Pichler, P. 6, 28, 31, 43, 56–70
- Police interrogation 151–4, 157
- Politeness 136
- Political correctness 173, 219
- Politics in research 3, 11, 16–18, 24, 27, 32, 37, 40, 43, 45, 47, 49, 162, 174, 176–7, 193–4, 195, 197, 200, 207–10, 212, 221, 247, 254–5, 272–4, 276–8, 282, 288, 292–3, 295
- Pomerantz, A. 148, 150, 154
- Post-marxism 246
- Postmodernism 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 41, 66–7, 73, 163, 246
- Poststructuralism (*see also* FPDA) 4–5, 9–11, 25, 41, 68, 73, 161, 162, 165–6, 174–6, 211, 243, 245, 247–8, 250, 254, 262–3, 267
- Poststructuralist discourse analysis 161, 174–6, 245
- Potter, J. 8, 9, 156, 162–6, 174–5, 213–14, 224, 228, 233–4
- Power (social) 5, 8–11, 13, 17–18, 23, 25, 30, 35, 37–8, 45, 47, 51, 77, 83, 85, 120–1, 123, 135–6, 175, 194–6, 214, 218, 221–2, 227–8, 232–4, 238, 245–9, 251–3, 255, 262–6, 268, 272–3, 275–6, 279, 281, 287
- Disempowerment 182–4, 273
- Empowerment 17–18, 52, 179, 187, 189, 255–7, 267–8
- Powerlessness 11, 13, 15, 18, 22–3, 41, 175, 188, 238, 247–8, 252–3, 276, 289, 292
- Symbolic power 204, 233
- ‘Will to power’ 244, 247
- Pragmatics 14, 18, 122, 212, 281
- Procedural consequentiality 144
- Pronouns 11, 75, 206–7, 257–8, 260–1, 264–5
- Prosody 77, 81–2, 122, 142
- Psathas, G. 119, 148
- Public talk 4
- Qualitative methodology 6–7, 16, 21–3, 26–8, 30–1, 43, 46, 67, 73–4, 76, 87, 89, 91–2, 98, 100–1, 104–5, 120, 203, 208, 210, 216–18, 253, 257
- Quantification 27, 29–31, 35, 73
- Quantitative methodology (*see also* Corpus linguistics) 6–7, 14, 16, 21–3, 26–8, 30, 33, 35, 46, 73–115, 120, 162, 203, 208, 210, 216–18
- Queer theories 5, 11–12, 23, 271–96

- Racism 104, 233  
 Rape 82, 104  
 'Reality analysis' 154, 157  
 Repair 120, 136, 142–4  
 Reported dialogue 7, 85–102  
 Reported speech (*see also* Reported dialogue) 92  
 Rich, A. 272–3  
 Roberts, C. 17, 43, 45, 47, 51–2, 54, 58  
 Romaine, S. 40, 78, 85, 92
- Sacks, H. 8, 63–4, 119–20, 122–3, 136, 139, 143–4, 148, 150, 156  
 Sauntson, H. 11, 55, 271–83, 286, 293  
 Schegloff, E. 8, 12, 14, 36, 64, 119–20, 122–3, 127, 135–6, 143–4, 147–8, 175–6  
 Semantic prosody 77  
 Sex 29–42, 68, 121, 143, 162, 274  
   Binary 29, 31, 38–40  
   Biological sex as variable 2–4, 31–3, 36, 39, 74, 107–8, 111–12, 114, 193, 274  
   as Corpus token 78–82  
   Dichotomy 29–42, 195  
   Differences 6, 27, 33–4, 37, 39, 78, 107–8, 161–2, 111–13, 161–2  
   vs Gender 32–4  
   Mixed sex talk 3–4, 23, 61, 87, 120, 124, 140  
   Single sex talk 3, 75, 87, 124, 167  
   Telephone sex worker 23  
 Sexism (*see also* Heterosexism) 92, 120, 164, 228, 231–3  
   Sexist language 2–3  
 Sexual/ity/ies 6, 8, 11–12, 23, 27, 32, 34, 45, 52, 76, 120, 136, 148, 165, 167, 170–3, 188, 194, 205, 208, 221, 227, 231, 233, 236, 245, 253, 271–96  
 Simeonidou, C. 236  
 Social action 7–8, 40, 162, 165–6, 284  
 Social constructionism 3–4, 8, 13, 33, 64, 68, 140, 155–6, 164–6, 176, 233, 246, 253, 256  
 Social roles 99, 121, 214–17  
 Sociolinguistics 2–3, 6, 14, 21–70, 73, 112, 136, 139–40, 143–4, 279  
   Cognitive sociolinguistics 212  
   Correlational sociolinguistics 6, 9, 27, 29–42, 46  
   Ethnographic sociolinguistics 9, 13  
   Feminist sociolinguistics 44, 46  
   Interactional sociolinguistics 3, 6, 14, 16, 21, 25, 28, 43, 49, 255  
   Variationist sociolinguistics 14, 16, 29–30  
 South Africa 11, 285–90, 293, 296  
 Speech Act theory 162, 175  
 Speech community 3, 254  
 Speer, S. 8, 12, 17, 121, 157, 164–6, 189, 232, 233  
 Spender, D. 2  
 Spinster 7, 78–9, 81–3  
 Spivak, G. 40, 275, 284  
 Spontaneous conversational data (*see* Naturally occurring talk)  
 Standard language use 22–3, 113  
 Stokoe, E. 3, 5, 8, 12, 14–15, 17, 36, 63, 120–1, 139–57, 161, 164  
 Story (including story-telling and narrative) 63, 88, 95, 120, 125, 136, 143, 258, 260, 262, 286, 287–96  
   Coming out stories 291–3  
   Life story narrative 286–93  
 Stubbs, M. 76–8, 237  
 Subject positions 10–11, 64, 171–2, 197, 246, 248–9, 253, 262, 267, 268  
 Supplementary approaches (*see also* FPDA) 13, 238, 244, 253–5  
 Sunderland, J. 5, 11, 18, 23, 30, 34, 51, 57, 103, 177–8, 187, 209, 227–30, 234, 237, 239, 250, 257, 262–6  
 Symbolic Power 204, 233  
 Swann, J. 1, 6–7, 14–16, 21–30, 33, 40, 43, 46, 59, 73, 104, 257
- Taboo words 75  
 'Tactics of intersubjectivity' 11, 271, 278–82, 286  
 Tag questions 22, 41, 135–6, 140  
 Tagliamonte, S. 86  
 Talbot, M. 45, 228–9, 232, 235, 249, 257  
 Talk-in-interaction 1, 7–8, 119, 135, 139–57, 166, 171, 173, 251  
 Tannen, D. 3, 29–30, 51, 75, 85, 89, 121, 123  
 Taylor, P. 38  
 Teasing 60, 66–7, 184–5, 187–8, 253

## Topic

- Research 1, 8, 12, 17, 25, 43–4, 121, 135, 139, 148, 164, 166, 194
- Speech 7, 31, 34, 60, 87–9, 91–2, 94–5, 98–101, 104–5, 111–13, 135, 140, 142, 184, 202–4, 208, 210, 215, 217–18, 223–4, 257, 264, 289
- Transcription conventions/  
notation 69–70, 102, 126, 173, 190
- Transgender 25, 32, 274, 277, 295
- Turn-taking (*see also* Interruptions;  
Overlapping talk) 7–8, 37, 64, 69, 75, 120, 122–3, 125–36, 139–40, 142–3, 146–7, 148, 150, 152, 154, 162, 244, 251, 253, 258, 261–2, 264, 268, 296
- University tutorials 121, 140
- Van Dijk, T. 4, 205, 209, 212–13, 214, 218, 223–4, 227–8, 230, 239, 247
- van Leeuwen, T. 13, 216–17, 227–9, 233–4
- Variables (linguistic) 8, 21, 24, 31, 33, 39, 91, 108, 121, 136, 144, 193, 197, 208, 246
- Variationism 21–2, 30
  - Approaches 6, 13
  - Paradigm 3, 6
  - Sociolinguistics 2, 3, 14, 29–30, 41
- Vernacular forms 6, 22
- Visual analysis 231–4, 238
- Vocabulary 76, 103–15, 166, 283–4
- Walkerdine, V. 245, 263–4
- Warrants for gender 14–16, 26
- Weatherall, A. 36, 121
- West, C. 3, 18, 22, 30–1, 120–1, 123–5, 162, 232
- Wetherell, M. 8–9, 12, 36, 41, 62–4, 120, 161–76, 189, 228, 234
- Wodak, R. 9–10, 14–15, 46, 193–210, 214, 220, 228–31, 234, 238–9, 245–9
- Workplace 5–7, 28, 38, 43–55, 231, 235–6
- Zimmerman, D. 3, 18, 22, 30, 31, 120–1, 123–5, 162