▌ **Main Articles** ▌

Bilingualism, gender, and ideology*

Aneta Pavlenko

Temple University

Abstract

The purpose of the present paper is to theorize the relationship between bilingualism and gender within a feminist poststructuralist framework. I suggest that all language contact phenomena, including bilingualism, acquire different meanings in different contexts and can be linked to gender only indirectly. In some contexts, where bilingual skills are highly valued, they may become a means for one group to dominate the other, while in others bilingualism and cultural mediation are constructed as "servile" occupations and assigned to the less powerful group. Depending on gender relations in minority and majority communities, the values and benefits of monolingualism and bilingualism may be different for men and women. In some situations, knowledge of the majority language would be useful to everyone in the community, in others, the majority language is more useful for men than for women, and yet in others, it is women who profit most by shifting to the majority language. In sum, it is argued that it is not the essential nature of femininity or masculinity that defines the patterns of bilingualism, language maintenance or language shift, but rather the nature of gender, social, and economic relations, and ideologies of language and gender that mediate these relations.

Key words

bilingualism

gender

ideology

1. Introduction

Recently, several researchers pointed to the ever-growing gap between the study of bilingualism and the study of language and gender (Burton, Dyson, & Ardener, 1994; Ehrlich, 1997; Woolard, 1997). While the body of empirical research, conducted at the intersection of the two fields, is slowly growing, to date little attempt has been made to theorize the relationship between bilingualism and gender and to point out how both fields can benefit from bridging the gap. The goal of the present paper is to offer a theoretical account of the role of gender in various language contact phenomena, as well as in second language learning. On the one hand, this account will be situated within a feminist poststructuralist framework, currently espoused by many in the field of language and gender (Cameron, 1992, 1997; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Gal, 1991; Hall & Bucholtz, 1995; Romaine, 1999a; Talbot, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1987). On the other, it will be placed

Address for correspondence

CITE Department, College of Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, U.S.A.;
e-mail: <apavlenk@ astro.ocis.temple.edu>.

within poststructuralist approaches to bilingualism, which examine the role of ideologies, identities and power relations in language contact situations and in second language learning (Auer, 1998; Blackledge, 1999; Errington, 1998; Heller, 1999; Kulick, 1992, 1998; Lantolf, 1996; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 1997; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 1998a; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Rampton, 1995, 1997; Romaine, 1999b; Siegal, 1996; Spitulnik, 1998a,b; Woolard, 1998a,b).

In order to argue for a reconceptualization of any area of research, it is necessary to pinpoint the problems with the existing framework. Thus, I will first challenge essentialist assumptions underlying many current treatments of bilingualism and gender, which present "men" and "women" as undifferentiated groups and posit that women by definition occupy subordinate positions in society. Then, I will discuss feminist and poststructuralist assumptions which inform contemporary research on language and gender on the one hand, and bilingualism and second language acquisition (SLA) on the other, using them to create a comprehensive theoretical framework for the study of bilingualism, gender, and ideology. Subsequently, I will present a gendered account of a number of language contact phenomena, including differential bilingualism, language maintenance, language shift, and second language learning.

1.1 Essentialist approaches to gender in the study of bilingualism

Although interest in the issues of language and gender goes back at least a hundred years (West, Lazar, & Kramarae, 1997), it was not until the 1970s that language and gender emerged as a separate field of inquiry. The controversy sparked by Lakoff's (1975) book *Language and Woman's Place* and by Thorne and Henley's (1975) anthology *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance* stimulated unparalleled interest on the part of sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists in relationships between gender and linguistic practices. Most of the studies conducted between 1975 and the early 1990s focused on differences between women's and men's language and attempted to explain them through a generalized feature of gender identities or relations: *deficit, difference,* or *dominance.* All three frameworks found reflection in the studies that attempted to investigate the relationship between gender and multilingual practices.

Lakoff (1975) suggested that women speak a "powerless language" — uncertain, weak, and excessively polite, relying on hedges, tag questions, emphatic stress and hyper-correct grammar — and that this language is forced on them as the price of social approval for being appropriately "feminine." This approach became known as the *deficit* framework, in which women are presented as inferior language users. In the study of bi- and multi-lingualism, this approach usually translates into the *linguistic lag* hypothesis, the view of minority women as less bilingual than men, and, thus, lagging linguistically behind them (e.g., Stevens, 1986). The deficit approach was severely criticized in the study of language and gender for assuming a male-as-norm language standard and thus problematizing women, for treating women as an undifferentiated group, and for postulating a one-to-one mapping between linguistic phenomena and their meaning (Cameron, McAlinden, & O'Leary, 1988; Holmes, 1984, 1990; O'Barr & Atkins, 1980). With regard to bilingual women, Borker (1980), Gal (1991), and Spedding (1994) pointed out that at times it is the ethnographic practice that renders women mute and monolingual and that the findings of the earlier studies may not adequately represent reality: some women may prefer to hide the

extent of their bilingualism in "unequal encounters" with white middle-class male anthropologists, linguists, and ethnographers. Spedding (1994) provided evidence that women bilingual in Aymara and Spanish use their linguistic competence strategically: to limit the impact of their institutional encounters with Spanish-speaking officials, they often pretend to have minimal knowledge of Spanish. Harvey (1994), Hill (1987), Loftin (1996), and Spedding (1994), also pointed to the fact that in many communities in South America, local practices and ideologies deny women's bilingualism, presenting them as ignorant monolingual indigenous women. Thus, in Hill's (1987) study many Mexicano-Spanish bilingual women were introduced by their husbands as not knowing any Spanish. In Loftin's (1996) study Quichua-Spanish bilingual women were forced to present themselves during a public event as monolingual speakers of Quichua, whether they were proficient in the language or not.

To account for these oppressive practices, an alternative interpretation of women's greater monolingualism was offered by the *dominance* model which portrayed women as "the muted group," linguistically oppressed by men (e.g., Burton, 1994). Several researchers challenged this portrayal, pointing out that very often women are linguistic innovators and at times even initiators of language shift (Constantinidou, 1994; Gal, 1978, 1979; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977; Solé, 1978). Feminist linguists, in their critiques of the dominance model, pointed out that this approach fails to recognize social, historical, and political situatedness of power, the effects of which are mediated not only by gender, but also by class, race, ethnicity, and sexuality (Cameron, 1992; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992). In language contact situations, the interaction is further complicated by historical and social complexities of the relationship between dominant and subordinate languages.

The third approach to the study of bilingualism and gender is the *difference* paradigm, which focuses on correlating particular linguistic variables with the sex of the speaker. This paradigm often underlies research in variationist sociolinguistics; its best-known claim is that women often use more standard and/or prestigious forms of language (Labov, 1966; Trudgill, 1972, 1974). In the study of bilingualism this approach strove to explain instances of language shift spearheaded by women (Constantinidou, 1994; Gal, 1978, 1979; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977; Solé, 1978) as caused by women's preference for more prestigious languages and/or varieties. Feminist critics take issue with variationist sociolinguistics as well, starting once again with the biased male-as-norm view and pointing out that whatever women do, be it greater use of standard forms or innovative linguistic variants, their behavior is measured against male and somehow always interpreted as prestige oriented (Cameron & Coates, 1988; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Gal, 1992; James, 1996). The claim was not borne out in cross-cultural research either: in particular, research in Arabic speaking countries demonstrated that men used more standard variants than women of the same social class (Bakir, 1986; Haeri, 1996; James, 1996; Khan, 1991). Haeri (1996) presents a persuasive argument against universal association of high or classical language forms in diglossic situations with power and prestige. Her study of the use of Arabic in Amman demonstrates that well educated men use more salient features of classical Arabic than less educated ones; in contrast, highly educated women use salient variants of the local urban Arabic standard, associated with modernity, progress, and change in the status quo. In the study of bilingualism, the view of women as cultural brokers

clashed with research that found greater incidence of bilingualism among minority and immigrant men than women (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Holmes, 1993a; Spedding, 1994; Stevens, 1986).

Most importantly, whatever explanation was offered for purported gender differences in language contact, the emphasis was on women and on how they fare with regard to men, which continued to problematize women as a group. The contradictory nature of findings on women's lesser or greater degree of bilingualism did not allow for any easy explanation whereby one trend can be conceptualized as the pattern and the other as the exception. An alternative to choosing one of the two possible trends is to look for a different set of generalizations. Opting for the latter, I will first outline feminist and poststructuralist approaches to the study of bilingualism and SLA and the study of language and gender, and then present the implications of these approaches for the study of bilingualism, gender, and ideology.

2. Feminist and poststructuralist approaches to the study of bilingualism, SLA, language and gender

More than 15 years ago, Romaine (1984) pointed out that inadequate social theory leads to inadequate sociolinguistic explanation. In the last decade, many researchers in the field of language and gender have attempted to incorporate social theory into their research and in the process embraced feminist and poststructuralist approaches to language and gender (Cameron, 1992; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Gal, 1991; Hall & Bucholtz, 1995; Romaine, 1999a; Talbot, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Similarly, many researchers in the fields of SLA and bilingualism have explored the implications of poststructuralist approaches for the study of multilingual practices (Auer, 1998; Errington, 1998; Heller, 1999; Kulick, 1992, 1998; Lantolf, 1996; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 1997; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 1998a; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Rampton, 1995, 1997; Romaine, 1999b; Siegal, 1996; Woolard, 1998a,b). As there is no universally accepted definition of either approach, in the present paper these terms will be used as follows. While the terms poststructuralism and postmodernism serve as an umbrella for a variety of theoretical approaches, I see all of these approaches as having a common focus on language as the locus of social organization, power, and individual consciousness. Similarly, feminism also embraces a variety of movements, all of which have a common core in challenging the dominant patriarchy and improving life conditions of the oppressed groups. *Feminist poststructuralism*, outlined by Cameron (1992, 1997) and Weedon (1987), is, therefore, understood here as an attempt to investigate and to theorize the role of language in construction and reproduction of gender relations, and the role of gender dynamics in language use and change.

2.1 Poststructuralist approaches to the study of bilingualism and SLA

More than 25 years ago, Hymes (1974) argued for the need to study apparently dissimilar linguistic processes such as bilingualism, creolization, linguistic nationalism, pidginization, and standardization, as interrelated "within the history of European expansion and the emergence of a world history" (p. 80). In the last quarter of the 20th century, anthropological approaches to language contact phenomena incorporated European social theory

and broadened the focus of inquiry from purely linguistic processes to issues of political economy, power, and domination, establishing crucial links between these processes and language contact outcomes (Gal, 1978, 1979,1989; Kulick, 1992, 1998; Rampton, 1995; for an in-depth review see Romaine, 1995). Nearly two decades later, Norton Peirce's (1995) study of second language learning investment of immigrant women marked the beginning of the poststructuralist inquiry in the study of SLA. It was soon followed by theoretical treatments which attempted to reconceptualize SLA within the postmodernist framework (Lantolf, 1996; Norton, 1997; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Rampton, 1997) and by studies which applied poststructuralist approaches to second language learning in naturalistic and formal contexts (McKay & Wong, 1996; Pavlenko, 1998a,b; Siegal, 1996). While it is impossible to review all the work that has been done within the poststructuralist framework in either field, below I will sketch five assumptions, common to all poststructuralist inquiry in bilingualism and SLA and critical for our discussion of gendered linguistic practices.

(1) *Language, or rather discourses within it, is not merely a tool for communication, but the main site of world and identity construction.*

The shift from modernism and structuralism toward postmodernist and poststructuralist approaches is often described as the move from "language" to "discourse." While the term "language" assumes a chain of signs without a subject, produced and seen from an "objective" position or from nowhere in particular, "discourse" as "practices which form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault, 1972, p. 49) involves human beings as agents operating in specific contexts, and, thus, brings back the relativist view of the world. Most importantly, in contrast to the universalist positivistic and abstract notion of "language" as grammar, postmodernist "discourse" is heavily vested with meaning; discourses are ideologies which serve to reproduce, maintain or challenge existing power and knowledge structures.

The implications of this approach are particularly important for multilingual contexts. As Le Page and Tabouret-Keller(1985) suggested, for multilingual speakers in linguistically diverse societies, each act of speaking or silence becomes an "act of identity." The view of identity as constructed in and through discourse informs two main approaches to poststructuralist inquiry in bilingualism and SLA. One group of researchers analyzes language ideologies underlying representations of languages and ethnicities in discourse, unmasking racist underpinnings of particular scientific, media, and educational discourses that discriminate against minority and non-native speakers (e.g., Lippi-Green, 1997). Another group examines construction and performance of identities in different languages (and discourses) of particular bilinguals and second language learners (Auer, 1998; Koven, 1998; Rampton, 1995), focusing specifically on how ideologies of language and power which give meaning to particular subject positions may influence language contact and language learning outcomes (McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 1997; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 1998a,b; Siegal, 1996).

(2) *Language ideologies play the central role in linguistic practices, mediating between social structures and forms of talk.*

In her discussion of the role of language ideology in sociolinguistic investigation of multilingual practices, Woolard (1998a) points out that researchers in bilingualism have

been ahead of their time in recognizing the social, political, and linguistic implications of language ideologies. At the same time, the guise under which these ideologies were investigated was often sociopsychological; as a result, ideologies were treated as relatively stable language attitudes linked to equally stable ethnic and cultural identities. Poststructuralist work recast the notion of attitude as ideology foregrounding its socially derived and dynamic nature, and insisting that political and economic events influence language contact outcomes through the interpretive ideological filter (Woolard, 1998a). Studies which investigate the workings of ideology in privileging one language variety over the other in multilingual contexts range from the examination of language choice in the Zambian media (Spitulnik, 1998a) to discussion of American Indian language education programs (Collins, 1998) to analysis of devaluation of minority literacies by the British school system (Blackledge, 1999). Other studies examine ways in which predominant language ideologies influence language maintenance, death, and shift (Errington, 1998; Kulick, 1992, 1998; McDonald, 1994). Yet another strand of contemporary scholarship is devoted to the critique of the native/non-native speaker and majority/minority dichotomies, predicated on the cornerstone of modern linguistic theory, assumption of monolingualism as the main linguistic condition (Heller, 1999; Lippi-Green, 1997; Romaine, 1995; Woolard, 1998a). Lippi-Green's (1997) work, for instance, demonstrates real world consequences of the dichotomy which creates fruitful conditions for job and other forms of discrimination against speakers of particular language varieties and speakers with "accents" that others claim difficult or impossible to comprehend. In short, the study of the functioning of language ideologies indicates that linguistic practices acquire different meanings in different contexts. As pointed out by Romaine (1995) and Heller (1999), even the notion of a linguistic minority only makes sense within an ideological framework of nationalism in which the majority language is central to construction of the nation and all other languages are defined as minority in relation to the nation-state.

(3) *Language is a form of symbolic capital.*

One of the key ways in which language ideologies function is by attributing differential values to different languages and practices. Many poststructuralist linguists agree with Bourdieu's (1991) definition of linguistic practices as a form of symbolic capital, whereby existence of more and less valued language varieties contributes to creation of a linguistic marketplace, where linguistic capital can be converted into economic and social capital. The value of a particular linguistic variety derives from its ability to provide access to more prestigious forms of education, desired positions in the workforce or social mobility ladder. Bourdieu's theory of language as symbolic capital finds support in various studies of language contact, in particular, studies of language shift, discussed in detail in Section 3, which demonstrate that in contexts where men in minority communities have land ownership or secure job positions, the shift to the second language may be spearheaded by women who benefit economically from entering the industrial laborforce and socially from appropriating new gender roles and new subject positions (Gal, 1978, 1979; McDonald, 1994; Nichols, 1980, 1983; Schlieben-Lange, 1977).

(4) *Bilinguals' identities are constructed in and by language, whereby different monolingual and bilingual speech communities may offer a different range of available subject positions.*

The importance of the notion of identity, in particular, ethnic identity, for under-standing language contact phenomena was recognized relatively early in the study of bilingualism. At the same time, early approaches to identity suffered from an objectivist slant, whereby identities were viewed as stable and unchangeable. In contrast, poststructuralist scholarship views language use in multilingual contexts as "acts of identity" (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985) and identities themselves as multiple, dynamic and subject to change. It is posited that identities are constructed by and in discourse, very often developing through the process of linguistic bricolage from "contradictory and frequently fragmentary pieces of discourse, repertoires, and accounting systems available to individuals to make sense of their position" (Wetherell, 1997, p. 150). Thus, bicultural bilinguals may perform different identities in their two languages, or find linguistic means to construct identities unique to bilingual contexts. The first option is well illustrated in a recent study by Koven (1998) which demonstrates that Portuguese-French bilinguals, children of Portuguese peasants, perform very different identities in their two languages. In Portuguese, which they have learned from their parents and village relatives, they come across as rural, provincial Portuguese villagers, immigrants to France, while in French they are identified as young urban Parisians. With regard to the second option, recent research on bilingual conversation exposed the "myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems" (Gardner-Chloros, 1995), demonstrating that at times bi- and multilingual contexts provide unique means for construction of new and plural identities (Auer, 1998; Errington, 1998; Rampton, 1995; Spitulnik, 1998b; Woolard, 1998b).

(5) *Identity and agency are important factors in deciding outcomes of second language learning.*

Ideologies of language and power also construct more and less prestigious and desirable linguistic identities. As a consequence, poststructuralist scholarship in SLA portrays second language learning outcomes as influenced by the range of identities available in the L2 which the learners may choose or refuse to perform (Pavlenko, 1998a,b; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Polanyi, 1995; Siegal, 1996). This work emphasizes that, on the one hand, adults are agents who strive to decide for themselves which linguistic and cultural targets to approximate, and that at the same time their agency is coconstructed with those around them: some environments may be supportive of assimilation attempts, while others may reject any such attempts on the part of minority or immigrant L2 learners and users (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000). Thus, at times, L2 users may attempt to assimilate to the L2 community and/or negotiate new identities in terms of the discourses available in that community (Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 1998a,b; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000). At other times, they may limit their L2 learning to the basic proficiency level refusing to modify their behavior and reconstruct their identities (Polanyi, 1995; Siegal, 1996; Teutsch-Dwyer, 1998). In other contexts they may opt for constructing new and mixed linguistic identites (McKay & Wong, 1996; Rampton, 1995). And yet in others their attempts to participate in the target language society may be rejected by L2 speakers (Lippi-Green, 1997).

2.2 Feminist poststructuralist approaches to the study of language and gender

Similarly to the discussion above, the focus of the present section is on nine assumptions, critical to the feminist poststructuralist view of language and gender. Interrelated and

interlocked, these assumptions delineate current conceptualizations of gender, language, and the relationship between them, presenting us with analytical tools that will help to understand, investigate, and theorize this relationship in bi- and multilingual contexts.

(1) *Rather than an individual property, gender is a system of social relations.*

Contemporary theorists of gender present a convincing case for why gender cannot be fully understood as an individual attribute: femininities relate to masculinities and all are connected to other social categories (Cameron, 1992; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Nicholson, 1994; West & Fenstermaker, 1995). Conceiving of gender as composed of separate masculinities and femininities also prevents us from addressing issues of power and inequality. Consequently, current approaches view gender not as a set of traits, a variable or a role, but as a product of social doings, "a system of culturally constructed relations of power, produced and reproduced in interaction between and among men and women" (Gal, 1991, p. 176).

This view has important implications for the "language" part of language and gender research. To begin with, individual linguistic strategies are no longer straightforwardly linked to gender and cease to be the sole focus of research. Instead, the goal of the study of language and gender becomes twofold: On the one hand, to study gender as a system of social relations constructed and negotiated in discourse through naming, representation, and interaction practices, and, on the other, to investigate effects of gender as a system of social relations on individuals' access to linguistic resources and possibilities of expression.

(2) *The meaning of gender is socially and culturally constructed and, as a result, differs across cultures.*

If gender is viewed as a social construct, then it comes as no surprise that normative masculinities and femininities, as well as beliefs and ideas about relations between the sexes, may vary across cultures. Anthropological evidence also indicates that not all societies limit the view of gender to the binary opposition. While in Western societies intersexed infants have to undergo surgery so that the male/female dichotomy can be medically enforced (Bing & Bergvall, 1996), other cultures allow for a "third" or "fourth" gender, such as neither man/nor woman *hijra* in India (Nanda, 1990) or half man/half woman *berdache* or *two-spirit* in Native American tribes (Lang, 1997).

(3) *The meaning of gender is embodied in gender ideologies which are multiple, dynamic and subject to change.*

In the early years, the study of language and gender focused on men's and women's linguistic strategies. At present, the locus of the study has shifted to ideologies of language and gender, which embody speakers' normative conceptions of gender identities, gender relations, and gender-appropriate uses of language, and are produced, reproduced, challenged and negotiated in talk and other forms of discourse (Bergvall, 1999; Gal, 1991, 1992; Kulick, 1992, 1998; Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 1985; Talbot, 1998). Current research demonstrates that in many societies around the world gender is not just a system of social relations but a hierarchy, whereby maleness is more valued than femaleness; this system of social ranking is, in turn, crucially linked to other prestige systems (Ortner & Whitehead, 1981). As a result, in many communities women's ways of speaking are considered inferior and

less valued than men's linguistic behaviors (Gal, 1991; Keenan Ochs, 1974; Kulick, 1992, 1998; Sherzer, 1987). The everyday functioning of ideologies of language and gender is very subtle and mediated by social meanings: thus, highly valued linguistic behaviors and styles are not specifically male, more typically they are associated with the public sphere or genres, to which men happen to have exclusive or predominant access; in contrast, female genres or speech styles are associated with the private sphere and viewed as marked and less valuable. Consequently, female communicative norms typically clash with community norms for a good speaker (be it an eloquent orator, with a direct style, or an indirect speaker, or a speaker who avoids showing verbal fluency in public). Once this perspective is internalized, it informs the behavior of the majority of members of a particular community determining whose speech style is seen as normative, whose version of the communication situation prevails, whose language is seen as deviant, who is required to interpret the meaning of the other and, ultimately, who gets to talk (Henley & Kramarae, 1991).

(4) *The construct of gender does not operate in isolation; it is inextricably linked to other aspects of social identity and social relations such as class, race, ethnicity, culture, sexuality, age, and economic status.*

In a ground-breaking article *The whole woman*: *sex and gender differences in variation*, Eckert (1989) pointed out that "gender is not enough" and that "the whole woman," or "man" for that matter, belongs to a certain age group, class, has an ethnic identity, and so forth. Several studies demonstrated that any conclusions about gendered styles, based on the study of white middle-class Americans, are easily rendered invalid by the study of communication in other ethnic and class communities (Bing & Bergvall, 1996; Freed, 1996; Houston, 1994; Morgan, 1991; Riessman, 1987). In doing so, they made it visible that the portrayal of men and women as homogenous and "seamless" categories is based on ethnocentric assumptions and, as a result, has "coercive and regulatory consequences" (Butler, 1990, p. 4). Even if we limit our discussion of gender to the binary opposition of female/male, it is clear that neither is a homogeneous group and that within each category some identities are more powerful than others. Gender is not even foregrounded in every interaction: The differences found are predicated on a number of factors, which include but are not limited to race, class, ethnicity, geographic region, culture, economic and social status, occupation, sexuality, religious affiliation, (dis)ability and age.

(5) *Gender is constructed and negotiated in discourse; thus, language plays an active role in production and reproduction of gender asymmetries.*

Gender asymmetries are reproduced in language through ideologies of language and gender which assign particular values to various social identities, practices, phenomena, and events. Recent scholarship indicates that discourses—public and private, written and oral, individual and institutional—are the key sites of construction and negotiation of powerful and powerless gender identities. Thus, "preferred" and powerful masculinities in the North American context are heterosexual white middle-class ones, while minority and/or gay identities are relatively powerless and invisible outside of specific contexts (Kiesling, 1997). In contrast, as demonstrated in Tannen's (1994) discussion of female politicians and other professionals, any attempts at construction of "powerful" femininities may bring repercussions rather than rewards.

(6) *While gender is a discursive accomplishment, rather than being directly related to gender, language indexes gender; thus, linguistic manifestations of gender may differ across communities of practice.*

In recent years, the field has come to recognize that the relationship between gender and language is neither direct nor unilinear, and that most linguistic behaviors and practices index gender indirectly, mediated by ideologies of language and gender (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Gal, 1991; Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 1985). The majority of linguists have also acknowledged that there are no linguistic behaviors, styles, or practices that can be universally associated with a particular gender group (for a dissenting opinion, see Chambers, 1992, 1995; Holmes, 1993b). A useful distinction between two types of gender indexicals is proposed by Silverstein (1985): categorical/overt and statistical/covert. The categorical/overt linguistic practices index directly the gender of the speaker, listener, or both, independent of the context of the conversation. Among such forms are forms of address, kinship terms, third person pronouns, past tense markers in French or Russian, systematic gender indexing of the speaker in an American Indian language Koasati (Haas, 1944) or the use of different dialects in an Aboriginal Australian language Yanyuwa (Bradley, 1998). The second type of indices, statistical or covert indexicals — such as directness or politeness — do not directly point to but are typically associated with speakers of a particular gender group. Since only "few features of language directly and exclusively index gender" (Ochs, 1992, p. 340), it is the latter group that has long been the focus of attention of the field of language and gender. To date, linguistic indexing of gender has been attested in prosody, phonology, syntax, morphology, lexicon, communicative styles, narrative styles, strategic uses of silence, access to and use of discursive genres (Freed, 1995; Gal, 1991, 1992; Philips, Steele, & Tanz, 1987; for an up-to-date review, see Günthner, 1996). Most importantly, unlike overt indexing, the discursive and social practice of covert indexing can be fully understood only in context and through an analysis of ideologies of language and gender.

(7) *Interpretation of the meaning of particular linguistic strategies is context-dependent.*

In their arguments against essentialist approaches to language and gender, several researchers pointed out that the social meaning of linguistic forms and discourse strategies can never be taken as natural, transparent, and unambiguously associated with a particular gender group (Cameron, McAlinden, & O'Leary, 1988; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992; Gal, 1991, 1992; Holmes, 1984, 1990; Tannen, 1993). Tannen (1993), in particular, argued that the evidence typically offered for men's dominance in conversation, such as amount of silence or frequency of interruptions, is ambiguous, since linguistic forms and strategies have multiple functions and may be used differently by different individuals. For instance, interruptions, previously treated as an indication of conversational dominance (West & Zimmerman, 1983), may equally well be used as a solidarity strategy by speakers with "high involvement" style (James & Clarke, 1993; Tannen, 1993). These and similar discussions suggested that the meaning of linguistic forms must always be examined, interpreted, and evaluated within specific institutional, historic, and cultural contexts.

(8) *Power, itself a social and cultural construct, is the main intervening variable that allows us to understand the interaction between language and gender.*

Currently, researchers no longer aim at figuring out who wields power by counting the

number of interruptions, raised topics, or by measuring the length of silences in conversational interaction. Instead, they examine who defines meaning and imposes interpretation, who controls particular genres and discourses and how this control is transformed into and by culturally salient ideologies of gender and language. In the present paper, power is viewed as symbolic domination, and, following Van Dijk (1997), defined as a continuum whereby symbolic power resources include status, expertise, control over linguistic, economic and political resources and access to them. Depending on the context of a particular study, power relations can play out in a number of ways, all of which link individuals with social structures.

(9) *Institutional settings and communities of practice are the key sites of the interaction between language and gender.*

Early research on language and gender focused on interpersonal encounters and on speech communities, defined by Gumperz (1972) as a group of speakers who share rules and norms for the use of language. Lately, the latter notion had been found wanting as it did not address directly the mediating role of activity and practice in the relationship between language and society. A seminal article by Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) *Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice* shifted the locus of research to a more concrete site of *communities of practice* (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), which are defined as groups "whose joint engagement in some activity or enterprise is sufficiently intensive to give rise over time to a repertoire of shared practices" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1999, p. 185). The communities can be small or large, formal or informal: a theater group, a family, a secretarial pool, a sports team, or an academic discipline. The process of becoming a member of a particular community involves learning and initial peripheral participation, which is followed by legitimate participation as a core member (some individuals may be marginalized or may choose to remain peripheral members). Most importantly, negotiation of membership involves gaining control of the appropriate discourse or discourses. Considering that individuals typically negotiate multiple memberships (family, workplace, educational setting, church, neighborhood, sports club, etc.), the concrete focus on activity and practice allows the researchers to look in-depth at how ideologies, power, gender, and other aspects of social identity interact across a variety of communities, without privileging gender-based accounts (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1999; Ehrlich, 1999; Freed, 1999; Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999).

3. New perspectives on the relationship between bilingualism and gender

Below, I will argue that poststructuralist approaches offer a productive and appealing way to frame the study of gender in the field of bilingualism. In that I agree with a recent analysis offered by Ehrlich (1997) of the study of gender in the field of SLA. At the same time, while her analysis focuses on how gender as a social practice shapes outcomes of language contact and second language learning, my approach foregrounds the meanings attributed to linguistic practices and language contact phenomena by ideologies of language and gender. I postulate that all linguistic practices and language phenomena, even monolingualism and bilingualism per se, can only be rendered meaningful in context, and only in this way can be linked to gender; no generalization of the kind "women do this, men do that" can

adequately reflect the complexity of interactions in multilingual communities. In what follows, I will first pinpoint various ways in which gender could be indexed by multilingual practices. Then, I will focus on three language contact phenomena—differential bilingualism, language maintenance and language shift—and demonstrate how viewing gender as a system of social relations and linguistic indexing as mediated by ideologies of language and gender allows us to theorize gendered patterns in language contact.

3.1 Gender indexing in bi- and multilingual communities

In addition to a variety of ways of indexing gender possible in monolingual contexts, in multilingual communities gender can be indexed by language use, language choice, language maintenance, language shift, and codeswitching. Just like in monolingual communities, there are two possibilities for gender indexing in multilingual ones: overt and covert. The first overt possibility for gender indexing is language itself. Similarly to the Australian Aboriginal community of Yanyuwa where men speak one dialect and women speak another (Bradley, 1998), in some multilingual communities, marked by exogamy, the two genders may differ in language backgrounds. This pattern is best exemplified by multilingual communities in the Vaupes region of the Northwestern Amazon where a relatively small population speaks more than 16, very often mutually unintelligible, languages (Jackson, 1974, 1983; Sorensen, 1972). While all the inhabitants of the area are multilingual, residence is patrilocal and the rule of exogamy requires that all inmarrying women in a settlement (usually a longhouse) be from other tribes, that is, language groups. Men's language is an official language of a longhouse, in addition all longhouse members would be fluent in two or three other languages and in the lingua franca of the area, Tucano. Thus, every child's parents are speakers of two different languages, but it is the father's language that is predominantly used in the longhouse, has higher prestige, and defines the child's linguistic and tribal identity.

Patterns of difference can also be found in the use of a second language. One example of such overt gender indexing is discussed by Salzmann (1993, p. 183) who notes that in North Africa, Arabs who speak French as a second language exhibit gender differences in pronunciation of the French 'r': in men's speech it is an apical consonant, in women's speech it is a uvular consonant. At present, North African men would like to approach the contemporary French norm, which is the uvular 'r', but they are prevented from doing so by the rigid convention by which uvular 'r's are characteristic of women's speech.

Most cases of gender indexing in bi- and multilingual practices should, however, be considered as covert indexing, mediated by ideologies of language, gender, and power, so that particular languages or ways of using them are perceived as predominantly feminine or masculine. Thus, in many language contact communities, the dominant language, perceived as a power code, is associated with masculinity, and the minority language with domestic values and femininity (Harvey, 1994; Loftin, 1996; Simon, 1996). In other communities, the minority language is viewed as a solidarity code and is associated with masculinity (Hill, 1987; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977) or with femininity (Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994; Spedding, 1994). An especially interesting case of divergent ideologies of language and gender is described by McDonald (1994) whose research in Brittany indicates that for the peasants in the village of Kerguz, Breton is associated with masculinity and French with femininity. This language use has its correlates in social space: Breton is the language used in all-male company, in the fields

and in bars, while French is used during tea parties in farmhouse parlor sets. This division became particularly visible during a New Year party, attended by the researcher, where the whole village had gathered together in the evening:

> …the women sit together at one end of the long table with their sweet cakes and sweet wine and speak predominantly in French, and the men pack together at the other end in a haze of cigarette smoke, eating cheap *pâté* and drinking hard liquor, playing dominoes or cards, and speaking predominantly in Breton. (McDonald, 1994, p. 94)

The local view is challenged by the militant Breton movement which equates French with oppression and Breton with liberation. Some participants of this nationalist movement have settled in the area, and proceeded to encourage the women to speak Breton and to pass it on to their children. A similar situation is described by Schlieben-Lange (1977) with regard to the use of Provençal in Southern France:

> Men continue to speak the language at work, in the cafes and while playing "boule," while women generally deny that they even speak Provençal and forbid the men to introduce Provençal into family conversations.

In their insightful review of codeswitching and gender, Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998) indicate that, while there exists no direct relationship between the two, different meanings that codeswitching practice acquires in different contexts may mediate its relationship to gender. The framework adopted in the present paper leads me to suggest that in contexts where the majority language is valued more, through association with power, people with more access to that language, often men, will exhibit higher degrees of codeswitching and loan-word use in the minority language. In contrast, when the local language is more valued, through association with solidarity, codeswitching may be restricted and one group of speakers may insist on implementing linguistic purism in the minority language. Thus in Dakar, men are found to speak a codeswitched variety, Urban Wolof (Swigart, 1992), while in Mexico their speech is considered to be a "cleaner" version of the local language Mexicano than that spoken by women (Hill, 1987).

The importance of considering class and ethnicity in discussion of ideologies of language and gender is underscored by Pujolar (1997) in a study of bilingual Spanish-Catalan male talk in working class Catalonia. Focusing on the meaning and performance of masculinity, the researcher demonstrated that working-class Catalan men perform masculinity through verbal duelling in Catalan (very often involving homosexuality), while more urban sons of Spanish-speaking parents mock their ways, using silly Catalan voices to present unmasculine individuals.

Finally, as argued for below, gender indexing may also be performed through gendered patterns in bilingual competence, language shift, maintenance, and transmission.

3.2 Differential bilingualism

Research studies discussed above suggest that patterns of language proficiency, language shift, maintenance, and transmission may be gendered in some multilingual contexts. I suggest that the key to understanding of such patterns is in the acknowledgment of differential — and shifting — values of bilingualism and monolingualism. In some contexts, bilingual or second language (L2) skills are highly valued as a form of symbolic capital (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Spedding, 1994), while in others bilingualism and "cultural

mediation" are constructed as "servile" occupations and the monolingual group may be praised for remaining "untainted" (Adachi, 1998; Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994; Medicine, 1987; Troy, 1987). In addition, depending on the gender relations in majority and minority communities, the values and benefits of monolingualism and bilingualism may be different for men and women of particular generations, ethnicities, and socio-educational backgrounds. The focus of this section will, therefore, be on explaining gendered patterns of bilingualism in a variety of multilingual communities through the access to, as well as the values and meanings of language practices, mediated by ideologies of language and gender.

Research indicates that in some minority communities men have a privileged access to symbolic capital associated with the knowledge of a second language (power, prestige, social and economic benefits), while women are prevented from learning and using the language by a number of gatekeeping practices, which restrict women's mobility, access to majority language education and the workplace (Goldstein, 1995; Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Holmes, 1993a; Loftin, 1996; Spedding, 1994; Stevens, 1986; Swigart, 1992). Moreover, while many researchers attribute minority and immigrant men's greater bilingualism to their role of breadwinners (e.g., Stevens, 1986), Holmes (1993a) and Goldstein (1995) argue that participation in the workforce alone does not guarantee access to the majority language for women: in many cases, gatekeeping practices may prevent women from learning and using the second language even when they are working. Holmes (1993a) shows that while immigrant men in Australia and New Zealand are more often employed where English is required, immigrant women often work in places where they use their native language. Goldstein's (1995) investigation of linguistic practices in a Canadian factory demonstrated that the unspoken rules of this workplace prevented immigrant Portuguese women from using English by positing Portuguese as a solidarity code. Since all the coworkers are either native speakers of Portuguese or at least proficient L2 users (in case of the speakers of Spanish and Italian), there is no need for English, and many women on the line do not speak or understand it well. Thus, tradition requires that no one use English, to prevent its use as a secret language that some may not understand. Goldstein (1995) points out that while this practice ensures solidarity and cooperation on the factory floor, it may also keep the women in question from social and economic advancement, enjoyed by Portuguese men, more fluent in English. She emphasizes that gender relations in the immigrant Portuguese community also limit women's access to educational opportunities by preventing them from attending ESL classes as it is considered unacceptable for them to be in the same classroom with male strangers.

In her comprehensive review on gender and language maintenance in multilingual communities, Holmes (1993a) qualifies the finding of immigrant men's greater bilingualism by bringing in a generational factor. She suggests that in immigrant communities in Australia and New Zealand, only first generation men are more bilingual than women; second generation women, engaged in language maintenance, may be more bilingual than men who spearhead language shift. The situation appears to be markedly different in some indigenous communities in South America where ideologies of language and gender may conspire in constructing generation after generation of Andean women as somehow more Indian than the men, both in their looks, in particular, dress, and in their speech (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Loftin, 1996; Spedding, 1994). In all of the communities in question

women are described by men as not knowing any or at least as "lagging" linguistically behind in Spanish. Hill's (1987) study of the use of Spanish and Mexicano (Nahuatl), an indigenous language of Mexico, in rural communities in the region of the Malinche Volcano, demonstrates that having less access to education than men, women speak less Spanish and, as a result, have no access to the industrial labor-force, for which the use of Spanish is crucial. Harvey's (1994) study of Quechua-Spanish bilingualism similarly demonstrates that in Ocongate, Peru, men use Spanish more than women and are considered significantly better speakers of it. The ideology of language in this community presents an ideal speaker as a fluent bilingual with competence in a formal register of Spanish, characterized by long and complex utterances, with multiple clauses and qualifications. Typically, this register is used by men in public meetings; women do not use this register, and, as a result, prefer to remain silent or not attend the meetings at all. Harvey (1994) emphasizes that women clearly recognize that their inability to use Spanish has negative implications for their social position; at the same time, their attempts to use Spanish are met with an equally negative attitude: their performance is subject to criticism, ridicule and insult, whereby they are portrayed as trying to pass themselves as better and more educated than they are in reality. As a consequence many younger women have a good passive understanding of Spanish but are afraid or ashamed to speak it in public.

These and other studies underscore the importance of examination of gatekeeping practices which may prevent women from becoming fluent bilinguals. A good example of such an investigation into particular mechanisms of double oppression is a study of Quichua-Spanish bilingualism in the Otavalo area by Loftin (1996). Language ideologies in this community place Spanish as the language of the government and "high culture," associating it with literacy, formality, and power. Quichua is perceived as disorderly, rural, backward, but nevertheless an important index of an indigenous ethnic identity. During a local festival, local officials expressed the belief that women have difficulty expressing themselves in Spanish and are able to better express themselves and their "women's knowledge" in Quichua; thus, Quichua was chosen as the main language in the festival events, including the beauty contest. These beliefs were voiced and carried out by the officials despite an explicit request from one of the beauty contest participants to speak Spanish; her inferior knowledge of Quichua ultimately cost her the victory. This study demonstrates particularly well how choices of language may be made *for* women — in order to ostensibly reflect their needs, but in reality to constrain their language behavior.

In other contexts, where bilingualism is associated with inequality and social disadvantage, ideologies of language and gender may conspire to put more pressure to be bilingual on the less powerful group, often women. Examples of such attitudes can be found in colonial situations, where Aboriginal women (Troy, 1987) and American Indian women (Medicine, 1987) were assigned by their men the "servile" role of "cultural brokers" in charge of contacts with the colonists. Medicine (1987) traced the origins of this role to early reservation times when women were often sent to get the rations and recruited to work in the houses of missionaries and other agents of change. She notes that not only the American Indian men assigned these roles to women, but also that the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the U.S. recruited young women for mediation purposes. Troy (1987) investigated the development of contact languages in New South Wales, finding that, contrary to previous suggestions, Aboriginal women were the catalysts in the process. She discussed several

contexts in which local gender relations positioned women as mediators between the colonists and the Aborigins: the sexual context, in which Aboriginal females were the companions of male colonists; the social context, in which Aboriginal females were sent to collect supplies of food and other goods; the educational context, in which female Aboriginal children became the locus of the colonists' "education" and "civilization" efforts, often in the role of domestic servants and companions to female colonists; and, finally, the religious context, in which missionaries targeted women as more receptive to Christianity. Documenting these contact contexts allowed Troy (1987) to argue that in early settlements Aboriginal women were the principal participants in the daily interactions that promoted the development of contact languages, while Aborginal men communicated directly with the missionaries and the colonists in very limited contexts.

An example of a multilingual community where different values are assigned to men's and women's languages, regardless of what the particular languages are, is the previously discussed area of Northwestern Amazon where everyone is multilingual but the official language of any longhouse is men's language (Jackson, 1974, 1983; Sorensen, 1972). Women in this situation find themselves at a double disadvantage: to begin with, their primary language is not the official language of the longhouse, and, while they raise the children bilingually, they primarily use the husband's language when talking to them. In addition, women in a particular longhouse do not necessarily share a language of easy communication (although some may be from their own tribe), and thus have to use the official language of the longhouse or the lingua franca Tucano. Jackson (1983, pp. 186– 187) points out that the costs of language exogamy are much higher for women than for men and that the new wives' "stranger" status, which often results in emotional stress, is a predominant theme in Tucanoan culture. To underscore the importance of considering local gender, social, and economic relations, I can contrast this pattern with that of Sud Yungas, Bolivia, described by Spedding (1994), where females are crucial to local economy and thus stay in place, while males come from elsewhere and are known as "sons-in-law of Takipata." As a result, women are considered to be more genuine members of the indigenous community: they index this status by using Aymara as insiders' language.

The contrast above emphasizes the importance of resisting convenient generalizations of gendered patterns and of considering gender relations in a particular community together with local ideologies of language and gender. Close attention to local contexts has great potential for making the analysis of the interaction between bilingualism and gender more nuanced and more complex. Thus, while in contexts where women are an oppressed group they may be rendered more or less bilingual, depending on the attitudes toward bilingualism, in other contexts where they enjoy more independence, they can initiate language shift or remain monolingual by choice, as a strategy of resistance to a particular language, for political, social or economic reasons. This argument is made by Chinchaladze and Dragadze (1994) with regard to Georgian women in the former Soviet Union. While the predominant language ideology in Georgia was that of nationalism which treated Russian as the language of the oppressor, Georgian men were implicated in the local economy which required at least some knowledge of Russian. In contrast, women, especially in the rural areas, could afford to remain monolingual, and thus were praised for "remaining untainted by Russification" (Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994, p. 83). Adachi (1998) describes a similar situation in Kubo, a Japanese community in Brazil: while men have to learn basic

Portuguese in order to conduct social and business transactions, the majority language has no currency inside the community and women remain monolingual. A diachronic perspective on maintenance and shift is presented in Aikio (1992) who discusses the Sámi community in Finland, where women historically enjoyed a very high social and economic status and freedom to travel. Finnish women were perceived by them as economically disadvantaged, dependent on their husbands and forced to stay in one spot. As a consequence, up until World War II and ensuing change of economic and gender relations in the community, Sámi women attempted to protect themselves from the dominant culture by refusing to learn Finnish. Similar findings were reported by Herbert (1992, cited in James, 1996, p. 104) with regard to Thonga women in South Africa. While all Thonga have a low status in the dominant Zulu culture, Thonga women are considered to be much more respected and powerful in their own community than Zulu women in theirs. As a consequence, even though both sexes are equally exposed to Zulu, Thonga women deliberately speak it much less than men do, as a form a resistance to the loss of respect and power.

In sum, while it is clear that in many cases minority and immigrant women are doubly oppressed, it appears impossible to conclude that men — or, for that matter, women — as a group will always be more — or less — bilingual in language contact situations. In contexts where gender relations are hierarchical, the more privileged group, typically men, may appropriate the language practices of value, either becoming bilingual (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Holmes, 1993a; Spedding, 1994) or remaining monolingual (Medicine, 1987; Troy, 1987). In contexts where gender relations are relatively equal, valued language practices may be taken up by all (Mascarenhas-Keyes, 1994), while devalued language practices may be taken up by the group more invested in the market place relations (Adachi, 1998; Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994). Finally, it is also possible that language practices may have a different value for different language groups; this difference may also result in gendered bilingualism, whereby one group chooses to shift to the second language and the other to remain more or less monolingual (Aikio, 1992; Constantinidou, 1994; Gal, 1978, 1979; Herbert, 1992; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977). Thus, the key to understanding and explaining gendered patterns in differential bilingualism lies, above all, in the meanings assigned to particular linguistic practices, which — together with ideologies that mediate them — may change from generation to generation.

3.3 Language maintenance

A phenomenon closely related to differential bilingualism is that of language maintenance and transmission. A common view of language maintenance presents it as a collective decision by a community to continue using a minority language or languages it has traditionally used (Fasold, 1984, p. 213). Recent research qualified this view suggesting that the meaning and extent of language maintenance are determined in context, and different groups within the community may have different attitudes toward it (Romaine, 1995; Swigart, 1992). From the perspective adopted in this paper, language maintenance may alternatively be used as a resistance strategy to the mainstream language and culture or as an oppressive gatekeeping practice, in which case the group, assigned to maintain the minority language and transmit it to children, may enjoy less access to the majority one. As a resistance strategy, maintenance of the minority language may be alternatively adopted by men (McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977) or by women (Adachi, 1998; Aikio, 1992;

Blackledge, 1999; Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994; Herbert, 1992). As a gatekeeping practice, the role of "guardians of the home language" may be enforced and not taken up by choice (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Medicine, 1987; Swigart, 1992; Zentella, 1987). Interestingly, in the latter case, it is always women who are positioned in this role, whether they aspire to it or not (later on, in the discussion of language shift, I will point to situations in which women refuse this role and choose to transmit the majority language instead).

Harvey (1994) underscores the role of ideologies of language and gender in the enforcement of the "guardian of the home language" role. In many South American contexts, the images of masculinity, constructed by these ideologies, attach high value to bilingualism and thus present men as skillful "mediators between the inside world of kinship and community and the outside world of finance and knowledge" (Harvey, 1994, p. 60). In contrast, the images of ideal femininity place women firmly inside the community, making them the transmitters of the home language, cultural, ethnic, and religious traditions, obfuscating the fact that this role is predicated upon lesser bilingualism and is not highly valued. Consequently, women internalize this role and attempt to live up to it, often subscribing to the ideology of linguistic purism, as evidenced in the case of older Dakarois women, who are positioned and position themselves as preservers of traditional culture and who, accordingly, downplay any knowledge of French and avoid codeswitching and loanword use when speaking Wolof (Swigart, 1992). In an attempt to explain the origins of women's linguistic oppression, Cameron (1992) suggests that in some communities men may be threatened by women's becoming bilingual. She points to the paradoxical situation in which many immigrant and minority men find themselves with regard to assimilation: while beneficial socially and economically, it may also undermine one's way of life, values, beliefs and ultimately ethnic and cultural identity. Positioning women in charge of language maintenance may become a way out:

> In a male-dominated society, men can resolve this problem [of assimilation] by taking the rewards of cultural change for themselves while requiring the community's women to be living symbols of tradition. (Cameron, 1992, p. 202)

This situation is illustrated in studies which look at minority language communities in Africa, India, and South America, and at immigrant communities in Australia, England, New Zealand, and the U.S. (Blackledge, 1999; Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Holmes, 1993a; Simon, 1996; Stevens, 1986; Swigart, 1992; Zentella, 1987). A particularly striking example of enforced language maintenance as "women's work" is offered in a recent study by Simon (1996). The researcher investigated education and literacy practices which provide the gender basis for minority language maintenance in the Indian community of Banaras. She found that, since more than 60% of Banarsi females never attend school or leave after primary school, they are not recognized by the society and do not recognize themselves as good Hindi speakers. The 1991 census of literacy in the area indicated that there are three times as many literate males as females. Thus, women are confined to being maintainers and transmitters of Banarsi Bhojpuri, which is often seen as the language of women. As pointed out by Simon (1996), this situation of stability is grounded in pervasively low female literacy. The ways in which women's role in transmission of minority language and literacy is devalued by the majority society are discussed by Blackledge (1999). The author demonstrates that school authorities in Birmingham, U.K., do not view Bangladeshi women's Bengali literacy as an important resource. Instead, the

schools demand that the women contribute to their children's English literacy learning, and when they are unable to do so, deem the women "illiterate."

In short, we can see that the meaning of language maintenance and the gendered patterns associated with it are determined by context: it may alternatively be interpreted as a strategy of resistance or as a gatekeeping practice, and may be associated with women or men. In contrast, language transmission appears to be exclusively "women's work." Imposed on women in communities which strive to preserve the native language, the role of "guardians of the home language" at times may limit women's access to the symbolic capital of the majority language.

3.4 Language shift

Language shift, or a minority community's adoption of the new language, often through transitional bilingualism, is another important phenomenon in the study of bilingualism. The literature often links women directly to language shift, as in the following discussion by Paulston:

> Language shift frequently begins with women (granted access and incentive)…The most common explanation is that women who are in a subordinate position in society are sensitive to issues of power, but there really exists no generally accepted explanation. (Paulston, 1994, p. 13)

I argue that the portrayal of women as key linguistic innovators is highly misleading. This focus on women implies that numerous situations where language shift is initiated by men are either obscured or normalized; either case highlights women — rather than gender relations — as a problem. In order to reconcile the two gendered patterns and a nongendered pattern in language shift, we need to take a more nuanced approach that will consider the meanings assigned to the languages in question in a particular community. We also need to acknowledge that like all other phenomena, language shift cannot be uniformly linked to a particular gender group, but is rather grounded in gender, social, and economic relations in the minority and the majority communities. A particularly persuasive argument in this regard is made by Aikio (1992) who demonstrated that as long as they had a high status in the local community, Sámi women in Finland resisted the more prestigious Finnish to a greater degree than men. Once the traditional social and economic status began to change during — and as a result of — World War II, Sámi women shifted to Finnish.

Gal (1978, 1979) and Nichols (1980, 1983) suggested that in some cases where women in the minority community have a lower status than men, employment and marriage opportunities in the majority community may allow them to engage in language shift in resistance to unequal gender relations. Gal's (1978, 1979) pioneering study of a bilingual Austrian-Hungarian peasant community of Oberwart demonstrated that women in this community spearheaded language shift from Hungarian to German escaping the peasant life hierarchy in which they were kept in secondary positions. Motivated by a symbolic link between German and a newly available worker status, the young women chose both jobs and prospective mates in industrial urban centers where German was spoken, and, as a result, peasant Hungarian-speaking men "couldn't get wives." Similar findings are reported by Swigart (1992) who shows that while a large majority of women in Dakar works on preserving and transmitting Wolof, there is a small but visible group of younger women who

identify with Western culture, wear Western clothes, and refuse to speak Wolof, using exclusively French. Thus, linguistic innovation and language shift may be restricted to a particular group of women who are best able to take advantage of social change in progress (Gal, 1978, 1979; Holmes, 1993a; Nichols, 1980,1983; Swigart, 1992). It is also important to emphasize that exogamy, as a way to initiate language shift and to improve one's social status, is not confined to women. Holmes (1993a) notes that Dutch, German, Hungarian, and Greek immigrant men in Australia tend to marry outside their own group more often than women. It is equally important to indicate that women are not always the ones prompted to shift allegiances by unequal gender relations. Herbert (1992) shows that among the Thonga people in South Africa, where women have higher prestige and more power than in the dominant Zulu culture, men lead the shift to Zulu, since assimilation to Zulu language and culture will improve their economic and social status.

Another way in which women were found to initiate language shift is deciding not to transmit the primary language of the community to their children (Constantinidou, 1994; Mascarenhas-Keyes, 1994; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977). Romaine states that at times minority women get blamed for "killing" languages by not speaking them, yet for them these languages "became symbolic of a despised female identity and thus were tainted with the stigma of conquest by more powerful people and their languages" (1999a, p. 181). Schlieben-Lange (1977) and McDonald (1994) describe, respectively, Provençal and Breton mothers who in the 1960s and the 1970s started speaking French to their children. French for them was associated with modernity, urbanity, refinement, and higher social status, while Provençal and Breton "smelled of cow-shit" (McDonald, 1994, p. 103). The dominant society encouraged the shift, forbidding and punishing the use of local languages in school settings. Similarly, Constantinidou (1994) documents the death of East Sutherland Gaelic, prompted by the fact that in the 1930s women stopped transmitting the language to their children. Constantinidou (1994) suggests that, motivated by the death of the fishing industry and opening employment opportunities, these women were in the process of redefining themselves: Gaelic symbolized the bond with their fishing past from which they wanted to break loose. Finally, in a diachronic investigation of language use on the Goa island, Mascarenhas-Keyes (1994) spans several centuries demonstrating that at all times women in this community played an important role in the marginalization of the local language Konkani and the shift to the use of Portuguese and/or English. The concept of "progressive motherhood" in this community involved fostering fluency in the two Western languages which were linked to higher social status and economic benefits. Thus, while men in this community deployed their second language skills primarily through employment, women, formally as teachers, and informally as progressive mothers, facilitated the transition to monolingualism in Portuguese or English.

The complex relationship between ideology, gender, and language shift is illustrated in Kulick's (1992, 1998) study of verbal genres in Gapun, Papua New Guinea. Women in the village of Gapun are associated with the performance of a public genre, *kros*, a dramatic display of anger, characterized by loud shouting, vulgarity, and explicit accusations of wrongdoing, typically performed in Taiap, the local vernacular. In contrast, a typical male public genre, *men's house talk*, is an oratory in Tok Pisin, the national language, and focuses on downplaying conflict and stressing the consensus in the village. Not surprisingly, women in Gapun are considered to be quarrelsome and antisocial troublemakers, while men

position themselves as sociable, generous, and temperate. Consequently, Taiap came to be associated with negatively valued aspects of life, such as affective excess, irresponsibility, and dangerous knowledge, and Tok Pisin came to symbolize modernity, Christianity, education, and economic success. The differential positioning of men and women vis-a-vis different languages and their value is evoked by Kulick (1992, 1998) as the primary reason for current language shift from Taiap to Tok Pisin in Gapun.

In short, we can see that it is not the essential nature of femininity or masculinity that defines the patterns of bilingualism and language shift in a particular speech community, but rather the nature of gender, social and economic relations, and ideologies of language and gender that mediate these relations. Therefore, in order to understand language shift as a— possibly— gendered phenomenon, it is important to consider what kind of circumstances may facilitate or prevent language shift and how these circumstances differ across communities. I suggest that the key factors are gender, age, generation, class, race, social and economic relations in the local community, employment and educational opportunities in the majority community, as well as desirability of certain members of the group as friends and marriage partners for members of the majority community (clearly related to the previously listed factors). In the case of equal opportunities for both groups, women, according to James (1996, p.103) may be more willing to take the leap as "in some working-class and rural peasant communities, women may have good reason to feel less loyalty to the traditional culture and lifestyle of the community than men do." The view of language shift as grounded in local contexts also helps to explain gendered patterns of a shift away from the majority or standard language, such as found in the rural Belizean Creole community where women's increased participation in local administration entailed a greater usage of the Creole vernacular by them (Escure, 1991). This localized view helps us to understand why and how in certain bi- and multilingual communities men and women of different ages, classes, ethnicities, and generations may have differential access to, different attitudes toward, and different incentives for using a particular language or a particular variety of it.

3.5 Double bind of bilingual women

While the discussion above attempted a balanced portrayal of a number of multilingual communities, where men's and women's ways of using languages may differ, it is critical to emphasize that ideologies of language and gender tend to devalue women's linguistic practices and not men's. Salzmann (1993) demonstrates that Arabic women's use of the uvular 'r' in their French prevents men from switching from apicals to the uvulars, even though it would bring them closer to the standard: the fact that women have adopted this standard lowers its prestige. Kulick's (1992, 1998) work illuminates how this process takes place through an imposition of a particular devalued genre on women (whose husbands often expect and even ask them to perform *kros*) and subsequent linkage of this genre to women's irrationality and then to the "womanly" nature of the language in which it is performed. At times, it appears that women have difficulty appropriating the positive symbolic meaning of whatever language they speak: in the case of the Andean women, both ignorance of Spanish and ability to speak Spanish can count against them (Harvey, 1994).

Analyzing the studies above, we can see very similar ideologies at play in diverse contexts, all of which attempt to devalue both women's first and second language competence. In case of the first or minority language, it is the language per se that may be

positioned as backwards and deemed "women's language" (Kulick, 1992, 1998; Loftin, 1996; Simon, 1996) or it is the women's competence in it that may be undermined in the community (Hill, 1987). The majority community may also contribute to the devaluation process by negating the value of minority languages and literacies (Blackledge, 1999). In the case of the second or majority language, two ideological approaches may be simultaneously at play: one focuses on the positive portrayal of women as "guardians of the home language" and the other on denying or downgrading women's use of the second language. Positive portrayals of women present ideal femininity as inextricably linked to the knowledge, maintenance, and transmission of the minority language, or even to resistance to the majority language (Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994; Harvey, 1994; Swigart, 1992). These portrayals link the use of the native language to insider's status, cooperation, and solidarity (Goldstein, 1995; Spedding, 1994). Negative portrayals paint women as ridiculous, incompetent, or pretentious L2 users, leading them to deny or downplay their knowledge of the second language (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Loftin, 1996; Simon, 1996; Spedding, 1994; Swigart, 1992). At times, local ideologies of language and gender portray women who lead language shift as "language killers" (Constantinidou, 1994; Romaine, 1999a). While men's practices can also be devalued, they are not devalued in the same way, nor with the same social and economic consequences. Even though in McDonald's (1994) and Schlieben-Lange's (1977) studies male adherence to the local language is looked down upon by women, as Gal (1978) pointed out, in peasant communities, men as farmers and landowners are in a more beneficial position economically than their wives who aspire to more modern and urban lifestyles symbolized by the second language.

In other words, no matter what language choice minority and immigrant women make, in many communities— although not all— they are in a double bind, "damned as conservative if they maintain their ethnic language, damned as traitors if they learn English too well" (Holmes, 1993a, p. 167). Hill's (1987) study demonstrates that in the Mexicano community women's speech appears to be constrained within a narrow range of possibilities, whereas men are able to use the full range of code variation. On the one hand, women use fewer Spanish loan words and more Mexicano noun-incorporating verbs; on the other, they transfer Spanish stress patterns to Mexicano at a greater rate than men do. As a result, men are viewed as better speakers of both Spanish and Mexicano, even though by linguistic measures many women are better speakers of Mexicano.

Holmes (1993a) suggests that second generation immigrant women are often more bilingual than men (who presumably shifted toward the majority language), feeling the need to both use the majority language and maintain the minority one. This greater bilingualism is one way in which they attempt to resist the "double bind." Another way to overturn the negative judgments is to promote a change of the meaning of bilingualism and to turn what has started as a "servile role," into an empowering condition. Medicine (1987) argues that in many Native American communities men both downplay and envy women's fluency in English: on the one hand, this ability is taken as a sign of assimilation and abandonment of traditional values, on the other, it is vested with power not held by male leaders. Similarly, Troy (1987) contends that Aboriginal women's early role in language contact allowed them to increasingly take on community leadership roles traditionally performed by men. Finally, it is important to emphasize that in some communities women have enough independence to define their own meanings and values: they may decide that a particular language, which

men may still be clinging to, is holding them back and move away from it (Constantinidou, 1994; Gal, 1978, 1979; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977).

4. New perspectives on the relationship between second language learning and gender

To conclude this review, I will discuss second language learning by individuals and the ways in which it can be affected by gender relations. Seeing gender as a socially and culturally constructed system, subject to negotiation and transformation, and second language learning as directly affected by identity politics, posits new questions for the study of SLA. How can differences in gender relations affect linguistic transitions? What are the ways of indexing and performing gender in different speech communities and can they be appropriated by adults? What are the implications of assuming new gendered subjectivities in the target culture?

To begin with, as I have argued in the discussion of language shift, differences in gender relations between particular speech communities may motivate individuals to learn a second language which will ensure a higher, more respectable social status. Sóle (1978) documents a greater tendency to use English — often exclusively — among Mexican-American college women, striving to escape the confines of the patriarchal Mexican culture. My own analysis of personal narratives of second language learners (Pavlenko, 1998a,b) provides evidence that some Japanese and Polish women learn English in order to escape gender relations and gendered linguistic practices typical for their own cultures and perceived by them as hierarchical and demeaning. Similarly, McMahill's (1997) investigation of feminist ESL classes in Japan suggests that for many Japanese students the concepts of English and feminism are closely related, which renders their learning and using of English empowering. This type of second language learning as resistance is not limited to women. Fortune (1998) tells about a young Karaja man who grew up in Brazil and whose parents did not correct his use of women's forms of speech when he was growing up. As a result, his linguistic behavior was termed inappropriate by the Karaja community and he was ridiculed as a "misfit." Becoming a bilingual was a liberating experience for this man, as Portuguese provided a new and much more respectable linguistic and gender identity for him.

The power of language to name individuals or to leave them nameless can also explain the frustrations experienced by L2 users who are forced into learning and using the L2 but whose L1 gendered subjectivities cannot be coherently produced and understood in the second language. A particularly vivid example is an outcome of a widespread shift from Native American languages to English for those previously categorized as berdache or two-spirit. Since these subjectivities, which treat gender in terms of spirituality rather than biology, were not easily understood by members of the majority community, many Native Americans had no choice but to identify themselves as gays and lesbians. In doing so, they appropriated identities which could be read in Western terms, and, at the same time, moved from highly respected identities to highly problematized ones (Lang, 1997; Medicine, 1997). In other cases the shift is not as visible, nevertheless linguistic and cultural differences in performance and meanings of a variety of gendered subjectivities, from a spouse to a parent, have important implications for the individuals who attempt cross-linguistic and cross-cultural transitions. Piller's (1999) interviews with 13 German-American couples indicate

that having a second language, particularly a prestigious one, like English or German, in one's native country is an exceptional and coveted skill. In contrast, being a non-native speaker among the natives is often perceived as a deficiency. It so happened that of the 13 couples interviewed, in 12 cases it was the female partners who migrated to the husband's native country, thus, carrying the burden of assimilation and acculturation. Thus, it is not surprising that while all informants praise the advantages of cross-cultural relationships, only females also mention the costs of acquiring a new language and culture, not unlike the women in the Northwestern Amazon (Jackson, 1983).

Finally, in some contexts gendered discursive practices may prevent learners from successfully interacting in and learning the second language. Heller's (1999) ethnographic study focuses on discourses on language and gender operating in a French-language school in Ontario, Canada. She demonstrates that these discourses, produced mainly by males, ensure that academically successful middle-class males become bilingual in the way envisaged by school, while older female immigrants have the most difficulty gaining access to English. Class is an important aspect in this language and gender interaction: since ideologies of language and gender marginalize working-class speakers of vernacular Canadian French, working-class males often stop speaking French altogether and working-class females are silenced by linguistic insecurity. The critical role of ideologies of language and gender in this process is emphasized in Siegal's (1996) investigation of Western women learning Japanese in Japan. The researcher found that many of these women resisted dominant gender ideologies, encoded, in their opinion, in Japanese "women's language," even though at times their resistance came at a price of not "having an authentic voice" in their second language and not being perceived as fully fluent and proficient. Polanyi's (1995) insightful analysis of the diaries of American students in the Living Abroad Program in Russia clarifies the fact that male students benefitted significantly more from this program and got much higher test scores than the women upon return to the U.S. She found that American men and women in Russia participated in different types of gendered interactions: while men were coveted by Russian women and were involved in positive interactions, women were sexually harassed by Russian men and were often involved in negative interactions, which, in turn, led them to avoid any interactions at all. Talburt and Stewart's (1999) discussion of a Spanish immersion experience of an African-American female student demonstrates that a gendered position in an L2 culture may be further complicated by race. These and other studies target sexual harassment as a gatekeeping practice complicating women's access to the L2 community and, as a result, inhibiting language learning (Ehrlich, 1997; Goldstein, 1995; Polanyi, 1995; Siegal, 1996; Talburt & Stewart, 1999).

This discussion of differential access to discursive practices attempts to focus on the role of gender in interaction without essentializing masculinities and femininities. While many researchers, myself included, emphasize that women as L2 learners are often at a double disadvantage, I would like to qualify this statement and add that in certain contexts — where race, culture, and ethnicity come into play — men may have less access to the target linguistic community than women. Thus, Günthner (1992) demonstrated that interacting with German counselors in China, Chinese women did not hesitate to ask for help and assistance in their learning of German, while Chinese men were resigned to solving their problems by themselves, as revealing their communicative deficits would have

been face-threatening to them. Similarly, Moon (2000) found that Asian females coming to the U.S. as immigrants or international students have a greater chance of forming relationships with American males and, as a result, have more opportunities to be engaged in meaningful interactions in the target language; consequently, they may become better learners and speakers of English than their male counterparts. In contrast, Teutsch-Dwyer (1998) demonstrates that accomodations made by the American girlfriend and English-speaking coworkers of an immigrant Polish male slowed down his language acquisition.

In sum, the construct of gender has multiple uses for SLA theory and practice. The improved understanding of gendered learning and resistance, the insights into the functioning of the gatekeeping practices are invaluable in the explanation of language learning outcomes (Heller, 1999; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 1997; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 1998a,b; Polanyi, 1995; Siegal, 1996; Teutsch-Dwyer, 1998) and in attempts to devise new pedagogical approaches for foreign and second language classrooms (Goldstein, 1995; McMahill, 1997). I also suggest that communities of practice present a very useful framework not only for future investigations of language contact but also for research on second language learning and gender, as they focus on the process of apprenticeship in becoming a member of a particular community. This learning process could be examined from different vantage points: as gender socialization, as acquisition of sociolinguistic competence, and as gaining control of the appropriate discourse or discourses (Holmes & Meyerhoff, 1999). It would be informative to see what gendered positions are offered and taken up — or resisted — by the new members, and to examine how they learn to perform appropriate gender identities. The distinction between peripheral (often temporarily) and marginalized members of a particular community of practice becomes critical in understanding the working of local hegemonic discourses of language and gender, as it will allow us to see which members are allowed to move to the core and engage in legitimate participation and which are marginalized and remain on the periphery.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, I hope to have demonstrated the importance of forging new links between the fields of bilingualism and SLA, and language and gender. The theoretical framework I have presented foregrounds ideologies of language and gender in explanation of language contact and second language learning processes and outcomes. This framework posits that in certain contexts language contact outcomes can be explained by differences in gender relations in the majority and the minority communities and by meanings assigned by ideologies of language and gender to specific linguistic resources and practices. Thus, in some situations, the knowledge of the majority language may be valued by everyone in the community, in others, the majority language is more valuable for men than for women, and yet in others, it is women who may profit most by shifting to the majority language. Similarly, the same language contact phenomena may be viewed as strategies of resistance or as oppressive practices. As strategies of resistance, linguistic practices may be taken up by either men (McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977) or women (Aikio, 1992; Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994; Herbert, 1992). In contrast, when linguistic practices become strategies of oppression and gatekeeping, they are usually used against women — by men as well as by women who internalized them — through ideologies of language and

gender that link a particular phenomenon to femininity in positive or negative ways. Thus, language maintenance, accompanied by the task of language transmission, may appear as a gatekeeping strategy that limits women's access to the symbolic capital of the majority language (Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Simon, 1996; Spedding, 1994; Swigart, 1992). Throughout my discussion, I have identified a number of oppressive practices that may prevent women from learning or using a second language: restricted access to educational and employment opportunities, restricted access to public genres, sexual harassment, as well as restricted mobility and financial dependence. Several ideological approaches were shown to mediate these practices: devaluation of a minority language as "women's language," downgrading of women's competence in the minority language and literacy, ridiculization of women's performance in the majority language, and positive portrayal of women as "guardians of the home language" (Blackledge, 1999; Chinchaladze & Dragadze, 1994; Goldstein, 1995; Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Loftin, 1996; Romaine, 1999a; Simon, 1996; Spedding, 1994; Swigart, 1992).

This discussion makes it particularly clear that future studies in the field need to be grounded in local relations rather than in universalizing assumptions about gender. Statements about gender relations in a particular community should be made only on the basis of empirical investigations, as often neighboring communities may espouse very different ideologies of language and gender. This point has been forcefully made by Sherzer (1987) who compared two South American Indian groups, the Chilean Araucanians and the Kuna of Panama. While in both societies men control and perform most political and ritual activities, Kuna women are also involved in public and everyday genres in significant ways, and their contributions are, for the most part, appreciated; in contrast, the Araucanian women are forced into silence and excluded from many discursive practices. Similarly, Spedding (1994) showed that, unlike in other multilingual communities in South America, in the Sud Yungas province in Bolivia, women and men have equal opportunities to learn Spanish (even though they ultimately make different choices with regard to language use). Finally, Aikio (1992) and Herbert (1992) demonstrated that while gender relations may differ in majority and minority communities, the ones espoused in the majority community may actually afford less status to women.

Two types of questions—macro and micro—need to be explored in future investigations of the interaction between bilingualism, gender, and ideology. With regard to societal level of linguistic interaction, among the many questions are the following: What—possibly conflicting—gender ideologies and discourses are at work in a particular society? How are they reflected in language ideologies and linguistic practices? What are the power relations and how do they define access to particular linguistic resources? What discourses of resistance are available to the members of particular communities and how do they make use of them? Are gender ideologies currently in the process of change and, if so, how is this change reflected in linguistic practices? As demonstrated in the discussion above, answers to these questions can be found in a variety of ways, ranging from the analysis of historic documents, surveys, and statistics (Aikio, 1992; Constantinidou, 1994; Holmes, 1993a; Mascarenhas-Keyes, 1994; Medicine, 1987; Troy, 1987) to the analysis of institutional practices of the majority community with regard to minority and immigrant languages (Blackledge, 1999; Heller, 1999; Loftin, 1996; McDonald, 1994; Schlieben-Lange, 1977).

To acknowledge the fact that language, gender and power interaction is best studied on a local level, researchers may then ask what ideologies of gender and language are at work in a particular community of practice and how do they relate to the ideologies of the society at large? With regard to gender, how do different gender, age, class, and race groups participate in the local economy and how is this participation mediated linguistically? With regard to language, what are the values of languages and language varieties used in the community and how is gender reflected in these beliefs? What are the attitudes toward various language contact phenomena, from language maintenance to codeswitching? Who has access and who controls particular discourses? How are gatekeeping practices instituted in the community? What are the possibilities for resistance to the predominant hierarchy and how do different groups of speakers engage in this resistance? As demonstrated in the paper, the answers to these questions can be found in in-depth analyses of social activities and linguistic practices of a particular community, which include but are not limited to marriage practices (Gal, 1978, 1979; Jackson, 1974, 1983; Sorensen, 1972), language transmission practices (Constantinidou, 1994; Harvey, 1994; Hill, 1987; Kulick, 1992, 1998; McDonald, 1994; Spedding, 1994), educational practices (Blackledge, 1999; Heller, 1999; McKay & Wong, 1996; McMahill, 1997), workplace practices (Gal, 1978, 1979; Goldstein, 1995) and a variety of communal activites (Harvey, 1994; McDonald, 1994; Spedding, 1994).

Shifting the focus of attention to individuals, we need to know what are the communities of practice/linguistic markets in which particular bilinguals participate? How are these communities positioned with regard to society? Which communities are easier accessed and by whom? Who gets silenced in particular encounters, when and why? And, finally, if the individuals in question are engaged in cross-cultural transitions, how were they positioned by the dominant ideologies of language and gender in their first language communities of practice? Currently espoused approaches to these questions range from analysis of multilingual and second language interactions and speech samples (Günthner, 1992; Pujolar, 1997; Siegal, 1996; Teutsch-Dwyer, 1998) to analysis of second language learning narratives, elicited through oral interviews and diaries (Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko, 1998a,b; Polanyi, 1995).

I suggest that only when these and many other related questions are answered for a number of postcolonial, minority, and immigrant communities, as well as for individuals in cross-cultural marriages and cross-linguistic transitions, will we be able to paint a sufficiently comprehensive picture of the relationship between bilingualism, gender, and ideology.

References

ADACHI, N. (1998). Gender roles, women's speech, and ethnic and community boundaries in a Japanese-Brazilian commune. In S. Wertheim, A. Bailey & M. Corston-Oliver (Eds.), *Engendering communication. Proceedings from the Fifth Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April, 1998* (pp. 1–12). Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Women and Language Group.

AIKIO, M. (1992). Are women innovators in the shift to a second language: A case study of Reindeer Sámi women and men. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **94**, 43–61.

AUER, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Codeswitching in conversation. Language, interaction, and identity.* London/New York: Routledge.

BAKIR, M. (1986). Sex differences in the approximation to Standard Arabic: A case study. *Anthropological Linguistics*, **28**, 3–9.

BERGVALL, V. (1999). Toward a comprehensive theory of language and gender. *Language in Society*, **28**, 273–293.

BING, J., & BERGVALL, V. (1996). The question of questions: Beyond binary thinking. In V. Bergvall, J. Bing & A. Freed (Eds.), *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice* (pp. 1–30). London/New York: Longman.

BLACKLEDGE, A. (1999). Language, literacy and social justice: The experiences of Bangladeshi women in Birmingham, U.K. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, **20**, 179–193.

BORKER, R. (1980). Anthropology: Social and cultural perspectives. In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker & N. Furman (Eds.), *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 26–44). New York: Praeger.

BOURDIEU, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

BRADLEY, J. (1998). Yanyuwa: "Men speak one way, women speak another." In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 13–20). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

BURTON, P. (1994). Women and second language use: An introduction. In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 1–29). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

BURTON, P., DYSON, K., & ARDENER, S. (Eds.). (1994). *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use.* Oxford/Providence: Berg.

BUTLER, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity.* New York: Routledge.

CAMERON, D. (1992). *Feminism and linguistic theory.* Second ed. London: McMillan.

CAMERON, D. (1997). Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: Questions of sex and gender. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse* (pp. 21–36). London: Sage.

CAMERON, D., & COATES, J. (1988). Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex* (pp. 13–26). London/New York: Longman.

CAMERON, D., McALINDEN, F., & O'LEARY, K. (1988). Lakoff in context: The social and linguistic functions of tag questions. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex* (pp. 74–93). London/New York: Longman.

CHAMBERS, J. (1992). Linguistic correlates of language and sex. *English World-Wide*, **13**, 173–218.

CHAMBERS, J. (1995). *Sociolinguistic theory: Linguistic variation and its social significance.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

CHESHIRE, J., & GARDNER-CHLOROS, P. (1998). Codeswitching and the sociolinguistic gender pattern. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **129**, 5–34.

CHINCHALADZE, N., & DRAGADZE, T. (1994). Women and second-language knowledge in rural Soviet Georgia: An outline. In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 80–84). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

COLLINS, J. (1998). Our ideologies and theirs. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 256–270). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CONSTANTINIDOU, E. (1994). The "death" of East Sutherland Gaelic: Death by women? In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 111–127). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

ECKERT, P. (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change*, **1**, 245–268.

ECKERT, P., & McCONNELL- GINET, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, **21**, 461–490.

ECKERT, P., & McCONNELL- GINET, S. (1999). New generalizations and explanations in language and gender research. *Language in Society*, **28**, 185–201.

EHRLICH, S. (1997). Gender as social practice: Implications for second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, **19**, 421–446.

EHRLICH, S. (1999). Communities of Practice, gender, and the representation of sexual assault. *Language in Society*, **28**, 239–256.

ERRINGTON, J. (1998). *Shifting languages. Interaction and identity in Javanese Indonesia.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

ESCURE, G. (1991). Gender roles and linguistic variation in the Belizean Creole community. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), *English around the world. Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 595–608). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

FASOLD, R. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

FREED, A. (1995). Language and gender. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, **15**, 3–22.

FREED, A. (1996). Language and gender research in an experimental setting. In V. Bergvall, J. Bing & A. Freed (Eds.), *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice* (pp. 54–76). London/New York: Longman.

FREED, A. (1999). Communities of practice and pregnant women: Is there a connection? *Language in Society*, **28**, 257–272.

FORTUNE, G. (1998). *Sex-exclusive differentiation in the Karaja language of Bananal island, Central Brazil.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Lancaster University, U.K.

FOUCAULT, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge.* London: Tavistock.

GAL, S. (1978). Peasant men can't get wives: Language and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society*, **7**, 1–17.

GAL, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.

GAL, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, **18**, 345–367.

GAL, S. (1991). Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. In M. di Leonardo (Ed.), *Gender at the crossroads of knowledge* (pp. 175–203). Berkeley: University of California Press.

GAL, S. (1992). Language, gender, and power: An anthropological view. In K. Hall, M. Bucholtz & B. Moonwomon (Eds.), *Locating power. Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference* (pp. 153–161). Berkeley, CA: University of California.

GARDNER -CHLOROS, P. (1995). Codeswitching in community, regional and national repertoires: The myth of discreteness of linguistic systems. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages* (pp. 68–89). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

GOLDSTEIN, T. (1995). "Nobody is talking bad": Creating community and claiming power on the production lines. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated. Language and the socially constructed self* (pp. 375–400). New York/London: Routledge.

GUMPERZ, J. (1972). Introduction. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 1–25). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

GÜNTHNER, S. (1992). The construction of gendered discourse in Chinese-German interactions. *Discourse and Society*, **3**, 167–191.

GÜNTHNER, S. (1996). Male-female speaking practices across cultures. In M. Hellinger & U. Ammon (Eds.), *Contrastive sociolinguistics* (pp. 447–473). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

HAAS, M. (1944). Men's and women's speech in Koasati. *Language*, **20**, 142–149.

HAERI, N. (1996). *The sociolinguistic market of Cairo: Gender, class, and education*. London: Kegan Paul.

HALL, K., & BUCHOLTZ, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Gender articulated. Language and the socially constructed self*. New York/London: Routledge.

HARVEY, P. (1994). The presence and absence of speech in the communication of gender. In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 44–64). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

HELLER, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London/New York: Longman.

HENLEY, N., & KRAMARAE, C. (1991). Gender, power, and miscommunication. In N. Coupland, H. Giles & J. Wiemann (Eds.), *Miscommunication and problematic talk* (pp. 18–43). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

HERBERT, R. (1992). *Language, gender, and ethnicity: Explaining language shift in Thongaland*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Los Angeles, CA.

HILL, J. (1987). Women's speech in modern Mexicano. In S. Philips, S. Steele & C. Tanz (Eds.), *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective* (pp. 121–160). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

HOLMES, J. (1984). Hedging your bets and sitting on the fence: Some evidence for hedges as support structures. *Te Reo*, **27**, 47–62.

HOLMES, J. (1990). Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech. *Language and Communication*, **10**, 185–205.

HOLMES, J. (1993a). Immigrant women and language maintenance in Australia and New Zealand. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, **3**, 159–179.

HOLMES, J. (1993b). Women's talk: The question of sociolinguistic universals. *Australian Journal of Communication*, **20**, 125–149.

HOLMES, J., & MEYERHOFF, M. (1999). The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society*, **28**, 173–183.

HOUSTON, M. (1994). When black women talk with white women: Why dialogs are difficult. In A. Gonzalez, M. Houston & V. Cher (Eds.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (pp. 133–139). Roxbury Publishing Company.

HYMES, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

JACKSON, J. (1974). Language identity of the Colombian Vaupes Indians. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 50–65). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

JACKSON, J. (1983). *The fish people. Linguistic exogamy and Tukanoan identity in Northwestern Amazonia*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

JAMES, D. (1996). Women, men and prestige speech forms: A critical review. In V. Bergvall, J. Bing & A. Freed (Eds.), *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice* (pp. 98–125). London/New York: Longman.

JAMES, D., & CLARKE, S. (1993). Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender in conversational interaction* (pp. 231–280). New York: Oxford University Press.

KEENAN OCHS, E. (1974). Norm-makers, norm-breakers: Uses of speech by men and women in a Malagasy community. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 125–143). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

KHAN, F. (1991). Final consonant cluster simplification in a variety of Indian English. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), *English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 288–298). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

KIESLING, S. (1997). Power and language of men. In S. Johnson & U. Meinhof (Eds.), *Language and masculinity* (pp. 65–85). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

KOVEN, M. (1998). Two languages in the self/the self in two languages: French-Portuguese bilinguals' verbal enactments and experiences of self in narrative discourse. *Ethos, 26*, 410–455.

KULICK, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

KULICK, D. (1998). Anger, gender, language shift, and the politics of revelation in a Papua New Guinean village. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 87–102). New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LABOV, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City.* Washington, DC: Center of Applied Linguistics.

LAKOFF, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place.* Harper and Row Publishers.

LANG, S. (1997). Various kinds of two-spirit people: Gender variance and homosexuality in Native American communities. In S. Jacobs, W. Thomas & S. Lang (Eds.), *Two-spirit people: Native American gender identity, sexuality, and spirituality* (pp. 100–118). Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

LANTOLF, J. (1996). SLA Theory Building: "Letting All the Flowers Bloom!" *Language Learning, 46*, 713–749.

LAVE, J., & WENGER, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Le PAGE, R., & TABOURET-KELLER, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

LIPPI-GREEN, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States.* New York/London: Routledge.

LOFTIN, J. (1996). "Women's knowledge" and language choice at the Fourth Cultural Congress in Otavalo, Ecuador. In N. Warner, J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, M. Oliver, S. Wertheim & M. Chen (Eds.), *Gender and belief systems. Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 19–21, 1996* (pp. 447–454). Berkeley, CA: University of California.

MASCARENHAS-KEYES, S. (1994). Language and diaspora: The use of Portuguese, English and Konkani by Catholic Goan women. In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 149–166). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

McDONALD, M. (1994). Women and linguistic innovation in Brittany. In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 85–110). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

McKAY, S., & WONG, S. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, **66**, 577–608.

McMAHILL, C. (1997). Communities of resistance: A case study of two feminist English classes in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, **31**, 612–622.

MEDICINE, B. (1987). The role of American Indian women in cultural continuity and transition. In J. Penfield (Ed.), *Women and language in transition* (pp. 159–166). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

MEDICINE, B. (1997). Changing Native American roles in an urban context *and* changing Native American sex roles in an urban context. In S. Jacobs, W. Thomas & S. Lang (Eds.), *Two-spirit people: Native American gender identity, sexuality, and spirituality* (pp. 145–155). Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

MORGAN, M. (1991). Indirectness and interpretation in African American women's discourse. *Pragmatics*, **1**, 421–452.

MOON, S. (2000). Ideologies of language and gender among Korean ESL students and South African ESL students: Shaping language learning processes. *Temple University Japan Working Papers in Applied Linguistics. Gender Issues in Language Education*, **17**, 148–163.

NANDA, S. (1990). *Neither man nor woman: The hijras of India.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

NICHOLS, P. (1980). Women in their speech communities. In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker & N. Fuhrman (Eds.), *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 140–149). New York: Praeger.

NICHOLS, P. (1983). Linguistic options and choices for black women in the rural South. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender, and society* (pp. 54–68). Newbury House.

NICHOLSON, L. (1994). Interpreting gender. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, **20**, 79–105.

NORTON PEIRCE, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, **29**, 9–31.

NORTON, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, **31**, 409–429.

O'BARR, W., & ATKINS, B. (1980). "Women's language" or "powerless language"? In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker & N. Furman (Eds.), *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 93–110). New York: Praeger.

OCHS, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 335–358). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

ORTNER, S., & WHITEHEAD, H. (1981). Introduction: Accounting for sexual meanings. In S. Ortner & H. Whitehead (Eds.), *Sexual meanings: The cultural construction of gender and sexuality* (pp. 1–27). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

PAULSTON, C. (1994). *Linguistic minorities in multilingual settings. Implications for language policies.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

PAVLENKO, A. (1998a). Second language learning by adults: Testimonies of bilingual writers. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, **9**, 3–19.

PAVLENKO, A. (1998b). Transformation of gender in second language learning. In S. Wertheim, A. Bailey & M. Corston-Oliver (Eds.), *Engendering communication. Proceedings from the Fifth Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April, 1998* (pp. 439–448). Berkeley, CA: University of California.

PAVLENKO, A., & LANTOLF, J. (2000). Second language learning as participation and the (re)construction of selves. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning: Recent advances* (pp. 155–177). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PHILIPS, S., STEELE, S., & TANZ, C. (Eds.). (1987). *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective.* Cambridge, U.K. : Cambridge University Press.

PILLER, I. (1999). "Something tattooed on my forehead": Gendered performances and perceptions of linguistic and national identity," In U. Pasero & F. Braun (Eds.), *Wahrnehmung und Herstellung von Geschlecht— Perceiving and Performing Gender* (pp. 117–126). Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

POLANYI, L. (1995). Language learning and living abroad: Stories from the field. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 271–291). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

PUJOLAR, J. (1997). Masculinities in a multilingual setting. In S. Johnson & U. Meinhof (Eds.), *Language and masculinity* (pp. 86–106). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

RAMPTON, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents.* London/New York: Longman.

RAMPTON, B. (1997). Second language research in late modernity: A response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, **81**, 329–333.

RIESSMAN, C. (1987). When gender is not enough: Women interviewing women. *Gender and Society*, **1**, 172–207.

ROMAINE, S. (1984). The status of sociological models and categories in explaining linguistic variation. *Linguistische Berichte*, **90**, 25–38.

ROMAINE, S. (1995). *Bilingualism.* Second Edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

ROMAINE, S. (1999a). *Communicating gender.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

ROMAINE, S. (1999b). Early bilingual development: From elite to folk. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and migration* (pp. 61–73). Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

SALZMANN, Z. (1993). *Language, culture, and society. An introduction to linguistic anthropology.* Boulder, CO: Westerview Press.

SCHLIEBEN - LANGE, B. (1977). The language situation in southern France. *Linguistics*, **19**, 101–108.

SHERZER, J. (1987). A diversity of voices: Men's and women's speech in ethnographic perspective. In S. Philips, S. Steele & C. Tanz (Eds.), *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective* (pp. 95–120). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

SIEGAL, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, **17**, 356–382.

SILVERSTEIN, M. (1985). Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In E. Mertz & R. Parmentier (Eds.), *Semiotic mediation: Sociocultural and psychological perspectives* (pp. 219–259). New York: Academic Press.

SIMON, B. (1996). Gender, language, and literacy in Banaras, India. In N. Warner, J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, M. Oliver, S. Wertheim & M. Chen (Eds.), *Gender and belief systems. Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 19–21, 1996* (pp. 679–687). Berkeley, CA: University of California.

SOLE, Y. (1978). Sociocultural and sociopsychological factors in differential language retentiveness by sex. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **17**, 29–44.

SORENSEN, A. (1972). Multilingualism in the Northwestern Amazon. In S. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 78–93). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

SPEDDING, A. (1994). Open Castilian, Closed Aymara? Bilingual women in the Yungas of La Paz (Bolivia). In P. Burton, K. Dyson & S. Ardener (Eds.), *Bilingual women. Anthropological approaches to second-language use* (pp. 31–43). Oxford/Providence: Berg.

SPITULNIK, D. (1998a). Mediating unity and diversity: The production of language ideologies in Zambian broadcasting. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 163–188). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

SPITULNIK, D. (1998b). The language of the city: Town Bemba as urban hybridity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, **8**, 30–59.

STEVENS, G. (1986). Sex differences in language shift in the United States. *Sociology and Social Research*, **71**, 31–34.

SWIGART, L. (1992). Women and language choice in Dakar: A case of unconscious innovation. *Women and Language*, **15**, 11–20.

TALBOT, M. (1998). *Language and gender: An introduction*. Polity Press.

TALBURT, S., & STEWART, M. (1999). What's the subject of study abroad: Race, gender, and "living culture." *The Modern Language Journal*, **83**, 163–177.

TANNEN, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 165–188). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TANNEN, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5. Women and men in the workplace: Language, sex and power*. New York: William Morrow.

TEUTSCH-DWYER, M. (1998). Male identity and second language acquisition. In S. Wertheim, A. Bailey & M. Corston-Oliver (Eds.), *Engendering communication. Proceedings from the Fifth Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April, 1998* (pp. 565–575). Berkeley, CA: University of California.

THORNE, B., & HENLEY, N. (1975). *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

TROY, J. (1987). The role of Aboriginal women in the development of contact languages in New South Wales: From the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century. In A. Pauwels (Ed.), *Women and language in Australian and New Zealand society* (pp. 155–169). Sydney: Australian Professional Publications.

TRUDGILL, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society*, **1**, 179–195.

TRUDGILL, P. (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Van DIJK, T. (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction. Volume 2. Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 1–37). London: Sage.

WEEDON, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

WENGER, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

WEST, C., & FENSTERMAKER, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender and Society*, **9**, 8–37.

WEST, C., LAZAR, M., & KRAMARAE, C. (1997). Gender in discourse. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction. Volume 2. Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 119–143). London: Sage.

WEST, C., & ZIMMERMAN, D. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender, and society* (pp. 102–117). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

WEST, C., & ZIMMERMAN, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, **1**, 125–151.

WETHERELL, M. (1997). Linguistic repertoires and literary criticism: New directions for a social psychology of gender. In M. Gergen & S. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender* (pp. 149–167). New York/London: Routledge.

WOOLARD, K. (1997). Between friends: Gender, peer group structure, and bilingualism in urban Catalonia. *Language in Society*, **26**, 533–560.

WOOLARD, K. (1998a). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–47). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WOOLARD, K. (1998b). Simultaneity and bivalency as strategies in bilingualism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, **8**, 3–29.

ZENTELLA, A. (1987). Language and female identity in the Puerto Rican community. In J. Penfield (Ed.), *Women and language in transition* (pp. 159–166). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.