This is the accepted version of the following article Language and ideology, which has been published in final form in *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach 85 (2020), 69-91*

Author: Kinga Koźmińska

LANGUAGE AND IDEOLOGY

Introduction

Language is 'an omnipresent and all-purpose meaning-making system' (McConnell-Ginet 2011, 6). Across social sciences and humanities, scholars have also been stressing that similar to language, "[g]ender, sex, and sexuality are cen-tral to individual experience and social life" (McConnell-Ginet 2011, 6). Not sur-prisingly then, the discussions about the relationship between gender, sexuality and language have been continuously at the core of social-scientific debates. In this contribution, I show that in order to understand this relationship, the attention has to be given to the role of ideology in meaning-making processes and the dynamic interplay of imagined and actual language use.

As early as 1977, Raymond Williams wrote that 'the definition of language is always, implicitly or explicitly, a definition of human beings in the world (21). In theoretical linguistics, the focus has, however, rarely been put on political and so-cial aspects of language (Cameron 2006a). Despite this tendency, the review pre-sented in this article provides evidence that ideas about language can impact linguistic structure (Silverstein 1985). At the same time, I propose that linguistic detail also participates in the creation of social meaning at various levels of lin-guistic structure. A focus on the dynamic character of meaning-making processes allows me to demonstrate that gender and sexuality mutually (re)produce one an-other thanks to the multidimensional and ideological character of linguistic signs.

The main goal of the contribution is to review existing academic works on the topic. I will begin by situating gender and sexuality within the debates on the relationship between ideology and language. I will then look at language and sociocultural practices and ideas associated with the biological classification into women/men, *gender*, and sexual practices and eroticism, *sexuality* (McConnell-Ginet 2011; Queen 2007). Next, I will review the literature on language ideologies to demonstrate what we already know about language ideologies from existing sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropological literature in various sociocultural contexts and how they impact such systems of social organization as ethnicity, class or gender. My primary goal is, however, to examine the role of language ideologies in mediating and infusing linguistic and social structures. I will do so by providing an overview of the current state of knowledge and trends in the studies of sociolinguistic differences and how they are shaped and shape our ideas about language use. I will then proceed to the discussion of language and ideology in the context of gender and sexuality research. This will enable me to show the complexity of the total (socio)linguistic fact (Silverstein 1985) and to describe how different systems of social organization dynamically intersect with one another. Following Bucholtz and Hall (2016) and Milani (2017), I will also posit that future sociolinguistic studies of gender and sexuality should incorporate other semiotic, corporeal and material elements of human and non-human aspects of life into their analyses.

Ideology – historical background

The concept of ideology has been studied across social sciences and humanities not only in relation to gender and sexuality research. Important discussions were also held outside of language studies. Historically, the term ideology was intro-duced to the English language from French (*idéologie*) in the late 18th century as "the philosophy of mind" (Taylor 1796) or 'the science of ideas' (Taylor 1797), a term used in linguistic theory in the following century. At the same time, in the 19th century, ideology and ideologists were also often equated with democratic and socialist policies and revolutionaries or even fanatical theorists respectively (Williams 1976).

The pejorative sense of the word was also echoed in Marx and Engels' *The German Ideology*. Here, the focus was on the question of how the material aspects of life shape ideas. Putting the real nature of historical processes over abstractions, they proposed to link ideas to classes. They argued that dominant ideas should al-ways be seen as the result of dominant material relationships. Marx and Engels posited that ideology was produced when people failed to acknowledge this relationship. As they famously claimed, 'ideology is a process accomplished by the so-called thinker consciously indeed but with a false consciousness' (1893).

In addition to ideology as illusion, Marx also defined ideology in more neutral terms arguing for ideological forms to be linked to changes in the economic conditions of production, a process in which people become conscious of the conflicting relationship between material interests and changing conditions in economic production. Such an understanding of ideology spread equally widely across social scientific debates. In line with this school of thought, it was often argued that classes develop systems of ideas suitable for their living conditions, which they then perceive as appropriate. Other ideologies are seen as expressions of the interests of other specific groups and classes, but incompatible with the general human interest. The discussion about the definition of ideology and its role for society has continued till the present day. Social scientists disagree whether ideology should be seen in purely conceptual terms. Advocates of this view see it as equivalent to mental phenomena (Woolard 1998) with some linking it explicitly to conscious-ness, as in J. B. Thompson's definition of ideology as "part of consciousness which can be said" (1984, 85). Opponents of this view argue, however, that ideo-logy has little to do with consciousness and define it as "the lived relation between men and their world" (Althusser 1969, 233). Here, ideology is often linked to practices of signification (Eagleton 1991; Bourdieu 1977). What remains contentious is also the degree to which ideology is seen as a coherent system and the degree to which power and potential for distortion are acknowledged (Woolard 1998).

As shown in this article, these discussions have also turned out to be crucial for understanding of femininity and masculinity as well as language. Importantly, a group of social scientists have included the role of processes of signification in the definition of ideology. Following Cameron (2006, 142), it could be argued that "for most scholars there is at least implicitly a close connection between ideology and language". From a linguistic point of view, language is, however, often insufficiently theorized by social theorists. Even when the role of language is taken into account (e.g., Anderson 1983), such theories are criticized by lin-guists not to "acknowledge the complexity revealed by linguistic research" (Cameron 2006a, 142). It is, therefore, crucial to review existing research fo-cusing on language ideologies, a concept that will help to understand the role of language for the study of ideas, including those surrounding gender and sexuality, since, as will be shown, ideologies of language "are not only about language" (Woolard / Schieffelin 1994, 55). They are rather tightly linked to such systems of social organization as gender, ethnicity or class.

Language ideologies

The term *language ideology* was coined as an answer to the lack of consideration for the role of language in the conceptualization of ideology in most social scienti-fic debates. It was also a bridge between anthropological interest in the study of the relationship between language and thought, on the one hand, and the dominant interest in linguistics in the study of abstract "inner-logic of the system of signs itself" (Volosinov 1973), on the other. Researchers focusing on the study of language ideology do not only look at language as a system of categorization – as previously propagated by Boas and other anthropologists. Neither do they neglect the social embedding of language in cultural contexts – as suggested in the work of such structuralist linguists as Bloomfield or transformational-generativists as Chomsky. In contrast to these approaches to the study of language, they do not

disregard ideology as secondary and false (Woolard 1992). Instead, since the 1970s they have been arguing for the importance of looking at people's ideas about language in connection to the dynamics of socially situated language use.
In order to do so, they have conceptualized language in yet another way arguing for the inherently ideological character of linguistic signs (Volosinov 1973). In this body of research, it has often been emphasised that in order to understand the relationship between ideas and sociolinguistic variation and their role in processes of linguistic and social change, scholars have to look at [t]he total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language, [which] is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms, contextualized to situations of interested human use and mediated by the fact of cultural ideology (Silverstein 1985: 220).

By now, various definitions of language ideologies have been proposed with some attributing neutral and some critical value to the term (Woolard / Schieffelin 1994). Scholars also disagree about the role of people's 'awareness and the em-bedded role of language ideologies in the social and cultural systems. In 1990, Rumsey defined language ideology as "shared bodies of common-sense notions about the nature of language in the world" (Woolard / Schieffelin 1994, 346). Such a neutral definition of language ideology was criticized by some as in-sufficient as it did not reflect the complexity of language as defined by Silverstein above (Kroskrity 2004). Other scholars working with the concept have argued for a more dynamic understanding of language ideology which would allow to see both social and linguistic diversity as forces shaping cultural and linguistic change (Kroskrity 2004). Here, the most widely spread definitions include Silverstein's "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (Silverstein 1979, 193). In a similar manner, Errington (2001, 110) defines it as "the situated, partial and in-terested character of conceptions and uses of language". Irvine further argues that the phenomenon can only be properly studied if we look at patterns of linguistic structure, use and ideology together as forming "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests" (Irvine 1989, 255). Scholars working in this tradition posit that these conceptualizations of language structure and use can be both "explicitly articulated or embodied in communicative practice" (Kroskrity 2004, 496). They should then not be seen as a fixed belief system located in individual minds, but rather an ever-changing social construct that can only be understood through an examination of "texts and practices in which languages are represented" as well as in the ways they are "spoken and written about" (Cameron 2006b, 448).

Given the existence of various definitions of language ideologies, following Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) and Eagleton (1991), this chapter does not aim to

promote any particular interpretation of the term. Rather its goal is to review what common themes and characteristics of language ideologies have been shared and identified so far. This allows me to show how gender and sexuality are embedded in wider systems of social organization that constantly cross-cut one another (Le-von / Mendes 2016) and what role linguistic detail plays in this dynamic process of meaning-making. Based on studies in sociolinguistics, language contact and multilingualism, and identity and group formation, following Woolard and Schieffelin (1994), Ahearn (2012), etc., I argue that language ideologies are con-ceptual, socially experiential, power-inflected and characterized by various levels of awareness. They are also multiple, "partial, interest-laden, contestable and contested" (Woolard 1998, 10), which I explain in more detail below.

As most researchers agree on the social origins of thought and representation, language ideologies are most often seen as grounded in social experience. Given the fact that thought relies on "roots in or responsiveness to the experience of a particular social position" (Woolard 1998, 10), they are multiple as Kroskrity reminds us that "social experience is never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale" (Kroskrity 2004, 503). In the partitioned social space, individuals are guided by different socio-political, economic and other interests that are nego-tiated, propagated or made legitimate in, by and through language. This is clearly seen in research examining the relationship between language and nation. This research has shown that ideas about language have shaped contemporary under-standings of socio-cultural divisions, ethnic/national (Ramaswamy 1997; Eisenlohr 2007) and gender (Cameron 2006b; Queen 2007) identity as well as the definition of language itself.

The development of the modern nation-state has been traced to the propagation of the 18th century European romanticist idea of language as natural and "independent of individual voluntary acts and therefore not the creation of any self-conscious human will or intervention" (Gal 1998, 324), an idea which was echoed by the works of many scientists of language. Hence, "named languages such as English" have been shown to be "ideological constructions" (Blommaert / Ramp-ton 2011, 4), rather than "bounded, pure and composed of structured sounds, grammar and vocabulary designed for referring to things" (Blommaert / Rampton 2011, 4). Thanks to the work in this area, it is also clear now that these construc-tions are always embedded in particular social relations and discourses on language as imaginations of language itself have been shown to participate in the creation of social differentiation. Such is seen in Urla's (1993) study of Basque nationalism, where despite the fact that many nationals do not speak the Basque language, the conceptualisation of Basque as a national language is a decisive fac-tor for the understanding of the Basque nation. The multiplicity of language ideologies and the fact that they are guided by disparate, often conflicting individual and group interests are most visible upon

reviewing studies of the struggles over linguistic resources. These are clearly seen in political discussions surrounding the institutional status of minority languages as in debates about the Corsican language described in Jaffe (1999). Importantly, they are also noticeable in debates about linguistic features in relation to gender as in feminist debates against traditional propagation of *he* as a generic pronoun in English (Silverstein 1985). In this case, efforts of American feminists, who took an active stance against the Standard English grammatical rule, allowed for change in the grammar in recent decades making both genders represented in the standard register. Language ideologies are then not homogeneous cultural templates (Woolard / Schieffelin 1994). On the contrary, research shows that they are both culturally specific and characterised by internal variation with dominant, residual and emergent (Williams 1976) ideas circulating among members of various sociocultural groups. Cameron's (2006) discussion of gendered speech has also shown how the way women and men speak varies across different periods and cultures. Hence, it has to be borne in mind that these ideas are specific to a particular time and place and can change over time.

Multiple studies of multilingual communities also reveal that different mem-bers of the same community may value the same linguistic resources in various ways. Ideas about linguistic conduct can vary among generations when, for example, adult transnational migrants from East and South Asia in the UK perceive English as the 'they-code' giving preference to ethnic languages in family interactions, while their UK-born offspring see it as the 'we-code' to be treated as their primary mode of communication (Gumperz 1982; Zhu Hua 2017). The differences in evaluations of linguistic resources have also been shown to be sometimes differently assessed by speakers with different gender identity as in Hill's (1998) study of Mexicano-Spanish contact in Mexico. In this project, for example, women expressed less positive views than men towards the resurgent use of Nahuatl honorific and politeness forms in their community as they associated these features with times when women had a less advanced social position.

Such multiple understandings of different ways of communicating described in linguistic anthropological research also point to the importance of looking at power dynamics in the studied communities and the historical processes through which some groups make their ideologies hegemonic in a given sociocultural con-text (Blommaert 1999). Most scholars emphasise language ideologies' potential for conflict and contention (Gal 1992). Following the Gramscian (1971) under-standing of hegemony, they agree that even the widely naturalized dominant ideologies are a result of struggle and response to alternative forms of opposition. This is also noticeable in language and gender research. As described in more de-tail below, masculine ways of speaking have traditionally been treated as a norm in heteronormative sociocultural systems and a benchmark against which other

ways of speaking have been measured. Hence, it is also commonly acknowledged that some groups may have 'total social authority' over other groups by imposing ruling ideas on them as well as "by winning and shaping consent so that the power of the dominant groups appears both legitimate and natural" (Hall 1977).

In addition, examinations of ideas about linguistic (in)correctness in various contexts have revealed how individuals and groups rationalize their linguistic be-haviour in relation to "other areas of cultural discourse such as nature of persons, of power, and of desirable moral order" (Gal 1995, 171). Projects on standard lan-guages (e.g., Milroy / Milory 1985; Silverstein 1996) elucidate how through histo-rically propagated attitudes and prescriptive practices speakers come to evaluate particular linguistic forms and ways of speaking as correct and superior. Standard varieties are usually perceived as better than regional, urban or class varieties (Milroy / Milroy 1985). They also often serve as symbols of national unity as in Polish society (Duszak 2002), where such an understanding has been propagated by standardization processes and Polish purists from the 16th century onwards (Walczak 1995; Duszak 2002).

Ideas about the standard variety are, therefore, most often linked to the highly-valued qualities within a particular culture (Silverstein 1996). As an example may serve here Silverstein (1996), where the ideology of Standard American English was shown to associate the standard variety with such qualities as clarity, truthful-ness and precision. As a result, standard varieties usually become norms against which other varieties are evaluated. It could be argued that these uniform varieties have historically been linked to aesthetics which have allowed speakers to rationalise and justify human actions that eradicate subordinate language varieties (Hobsbwam 1990). Consequently, other varieties are not associated with linguis-tic differences. Rather, they are categorised as linguistically inferior and become a proxy for linguistic discrimination (Lippi-Green 1997). This often has to do with the fact that standard varieties usually propagate ideas of groups of affluent speakers from dominant social strata and allow them to maintain their privileged position. Research has shown that varieties commonly associated with lower so-cial classes or ethnic minorities are naturalized and hierarchized to be typical of lower social positions. Standard varieties are commodified and become the only means to achieve full access to social privilege in capitalist economies (Kroskrity 2004).

Importantly, language ideologies including ideologies of the standard may be displayed with varying degrees of awareness. Kroskrity offers "a correlational relationship between high levels of discursive consciousness and active, salient contestation of ideologies and, by contrast, the correlation of practical conscious-ness with relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized, and definitively dominant ideologies" (Kroskrity 2004, 505). Researchers demonstrate that people's con-sciousness of their actions (Kroskrity 1998) and access to ideological sites, that is

“institutional sites of social practice as both object and modality of ideological expression” (Silverstein 1998, 136), vary. As a result, the levels of awareness of language ideologies can be different among members of the same community. The relationship between awareness and institutional sites is not straightforward, but rather “multi-sited” (Philips 2000) with the same language ideologies often being associated with more than one site.

Such socially mediated awareness is also influenced by speakers’ ability to identify linguistic and discursive phenomena. Research has shown that individual and group’ efforts to maintain languages in their pure/‘correct’ or feminine/mas-culine forms can have not always predictable results precisely due to different levels of understanding of linguistic strategies and norms. Some levels of lin-guistic structure have been shown to be more often targeted by linguistic purists. For example, purists and other advocates of language conservatism frequently focus on lexicon, rather than on other levels of linguistic structure. This was ob-served in Hill’s (1985) study of Nahuatl-Spanish contact, where linguistic purists, in this case older male factory workers advocating for the use of Nahuatl, mocked younger generations of men in the Malinche Volcano region in Mexico for their use of Spanish words in Nahuatl. At the same time, Hill demonstrated that the older men’s own linguistic awareness was limited largely to lexicon: they were unaware of the strong influence of Spanish on the grammar of their own language. Similarly, in his study of the Arizona Tewa community, Kroskrity (1998) de-monstrated that despite the fact that the three linguistic codes used in the commu-nity, Tewa, Hopi and American, were kept separate, the purism was limited most-ly to the level of lexicon. Similarly to Hill (1985), Kroskrity described grammatical diffusion, e.g. a grammatical borrowing of an evidential form from Hopi into Tewa.

It is, therefore, crucial for identity and group formation and as shown later, for gender and sexuality studies to notice that the local ideologies of language can result in various linguistic outcomes. As described above, one level of linguistic structure can serve as a way to perform separate identities, with languages being treated as separate entities (Kroskrity 1998). In other cases, the very mixing of languages can be celebrated as a new form of identity as in the case of the Puerto Rican community in New York City, where highly valued codeswitching allowed speakers to express a bilingual identity (Zentella 1997). It is therefore important to look at folk theories of language in order to understand complex processes of rationalizing language use as a step to allow change in both linguistic and social structures (Silverstein 1985).

Linguistic signs, indexicality and the mediating role of language ideology

In order to explain the mediating role of language ideologies in processes of linguistic and social change and identity and group formation, I now review how linguistic signs are linked to "such apparently diverse categories as morality, emotions, aesthetics, authenticity, epistemology, identity, nationhood, development or tradition" (Gal 1998, 323). This enables me to provide an overview of basic concepts necessary to understand the linguistic constitution of gender and sexuality as embedded in larger social processes.

In the body of research on language ideology, it is the indexical mutability (Silverstein 2003; Eckert 2012) of linguistic signs that makes it possible to link linguistic signs to various aspects of the changing sociocultural experience, including to one's gender identity and sexuality. By now, sociolinguists have shown that linguistic signs at various levels of linguistic structure – lexical, syntactic or phonological – act as indexes/indices (Pierce's 1931-58). This means that similar-ly to smoke indexing fire, linguistic signs used in interactional events point to something other than their referents. They do not simply reflect reality, but also "retract[] another reality" (Volosinov 1973). As a result, speakers use linguistic signs in micro contexts linking them to macro-sociological categories in ordinal, integral degrees of the indexical order (Silverstein 2003, 193). As signs are used by various people in multiple situations, their meanings are not fixed and stable, but can vary among different speakers of the same language. The linguistic signs are therefore part of social semiotic systems "capable of expressing the full range of a community's social concerns" (Eckert 2012, 94).

In studies of linguistic variation, the indexical property of language was ob-served as early as 1963, when William Labov conducted a correlational study of phonetic variants used by speakers of English living in an island of Martha's Vineyard in the United States. He observed that in contrast to other inhabitants of the island and the state more broadly, the local fishermen participated in the re-versal of the trend affecting one of the features of the local way of speaking (lowering part of the nucleus of the diphthongs in their speech). Feeling threatened by the tourist industry, Labov argued, the fishermen used the phonetic variant to project a local identity of an islander.

Following a series of large-scale correlational projects, which demonstrated a close relationship between linguistic signs and sociocultural structure, it was widely noticed that the meaning of linguistic differences was assumed to be a fixed and "incidental fallout from social space" (Eckert 2012). The indexical linkage of linguistic signs to sociocultural experience, observed in more recent studies, can be, therefore, attributed to the shift in assumptions of sociolinguistic studies of language variation and change. Moving away from studies based on static categories towards ethnographic studies of linguistic practices and locally

grounded categories, it is now most often argued that the contextually situated use of language allows speakers to position themselves within the sociocultural landscape (Silverstein 2003).

It is, thus, now commonly argued that linguistic signs do not carry fixed meanings. As the concerns expressed through linguistic practices change in time and place, speakers appropriate and re-inscribe linguistic signs with new meanings within an indexical field of all potential meanings in a non-linear manner (Eckert 2008). Since, as it is also argued, the signs are multi-dimensional (Coupland 1985), they are continuously being imbued with cultural meanings. Their meanings are embedded in local contexts characterised by particular "kinds of people liv[ing] there and [their] activities, beliefs and practices" (Eckert 2008, 462). Hence, in this body of research, speakers' use of linguistic features is not seen as a result of their orientation towards an assigned place in socioeconomic hierarchy, but rather the meaning is created through stylistic practice. The speakers participate in the process of bricolage (Levi-Strauss 1966) where they appropriate and recombine clusters of linguistic features to create social meaning. These clusters form speaking styles that allow speakers "as agents in social space, [to] negotiate their positions and goals within a system of distinctions and possibilities" (Irvine 2001, 23-24). As Eckert (2012, 98) puts it, these styles are "at [their] foundation ideological, and the stylistic form of propositions is very much a part of their meaning". In this way, it is argued, ideology operates within language itself. The mediating role of language ideologies is enabled by three universal semiotic processes: iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure (Irvine / Gal 2000). Through iconization, linguistic signs (and styles) are transformed and linked to "the social images" (Irvine / Gal 2000, 37), to the "bodily hexis that is imagined to be the source of socially marked linguistic forms or practices" (Bucholtz / Hall 2016, 178). As a result, linguistic features and language varieties are seen as dis-playing the nature/essence of social groups. Rather than being historical conventions, they are essentialized as universal and timeless (Hebdige 1979). Kozminska (2016) demonstrates this in the case of Polish-English contact in South-East England, where speakers of Polish oriented towards Poland and the Polish diaspora link the ability to speak Standard Polish to being 'really' Polish. As these essences operate within a system of oppositions, the oppositions them-selves, "salient at some level of relationship", may then be projected "onto some other level. For example, intragroup oppositions might be projected outward onto intergroup relations, or vice versa" (Irvine / Gal 2000, 38). As a result, through such fractal recursivity, "subtle forms of distinctiveness" are linked "with broader contrasts and oppositions" (Irvine 2001, 33), reproducing further meaningful distinctions within sociocultural space. In the Polish-English situation, this results in Poland-oriented speakers becoming hypercorrect when speaking Polish, which

for some, makes them more representative of the Polish diaspora in the UK than other speakers. As speakers do not pay attention to other, less representative ways of speaking, in this case, the new ways of speaking Polish characterised by selected English phonetic features, and people speaking them are often ignored and erased.

In this school of thought, styles with their constitutive features emerge from repeatedly taken stances in interaction (Kiesling 1998). Some of them then be-come widely recognized, that is, enregistered, and associated with particular stereotypes and groups of speakers. In other words, they can form cultural models of action that link diverse behavioral signs to enactable effects, including images or persona, interpersonal relationship and type of conduct (Agha 2007: 145).

Knowledge of registers becomes emblematic of one's identity. Researchers argue that in this historical process of enregisterment (Johnstone 2016) of linguistic signs and ways of speaking, some enregistered styles are promoted more widely through various institutional actions, e.g. Standard Polish norms are propagated through schooling. As speakers are socialized in various ways with different access to institutional sites, their evaluations of linguistic signs and styles vary and depend on socially mediated proficiency and awareness (Agha 2007). They are also contingent upon power dynamics in a given context and speakers' position within relevant hierarchies.

Ideologically mediated signs have been observed at all levels of linguistic structure: phonological, morphosyntactic, lexical. Many of the projects in the sociolinguistic tradition focused on phonological variation, both segmental and suprasegmental (e.g., Eckert 2000; Levon 2014; Podesva 2007; Zhang 2005). Many also pointed to the importance of gender and sexuality for linguistic differentiation. In line with current trends, studies of linguistic practices of ado-lescents such as Eckert (2000) elucidated how speakers use phonetic variants in various ways to express local ideologies. In this case, through their ways of speaking, adolescents expressed school-oriented jock or school-alienated burnout identities in a high school in Detroit, USA. Eckert demonstrated that based on their understanding of the use of vowels widely used in Detroit's city centre and typical of the ongoing Northern City Vowel Shift in the United States, the girls were leading older changes such as fronting of (a), with girls expressing burnout identities specifically leading also the linguistic innovation in the use of newer features such as backing of (e) and (uh). Similarly, in China, Zhang (2005) ob-served that a group belonging to the new class of yuppies working in foreign-owned companies presented themselves as cosmopolitan by combining a supra-segmental feature characteristic of Hong Kong and Taiwan, i.e. full tones, with local Beijing interdental /z/ and rhotacized finals, the latter used differently by the

two genders. Their peers in state-owned companies were found not to use the full tone at all.

Such ideologically mediated differences in linguistic behaviour have also been observed at other levels of linguistic structure. Once again, studies of adolescents' linguistic practices have informed our understanding of linguistic and social changes, where new experiences with a changing world often have been shown to be (re)produced in and through youth's language use. At the morphosyntactic level, for example, Cheshire (1982) observed that male teenagers in Reading, England, used linguistic forms differently. Those adhering to the vernacular sub-culture, in this case those who valued criminal activities or trouble and less skilled jobs, were found to use more non-standard syntactic forms, e.g. multiple negation, *was* with plural subjects or 3rd person singular subject with present tense suffix. In Kerswill's study of London youth in Hackney and Havering, two boroughs with different socioeconomic and ethnic compositions, lexical items were also found to be differently used by speakers with different ethnic backgrounds. The youth in Hackney and Havering used e.g. the "you get me" pragmatic marker more often than the youth in Havering, with non-Anglo speakers leading the trend. More broadly, almost exclusively, non-Anglo speakers, with a high proportion of speakers with a family history of Afro-Caribbean migration, were found to be using such lexical items as *blood*, *man* or *bruv*. The trends in lexical differences seemed to be ethnicity, and not place-related. This stands in sharp contrast to vocalic variation, where the distinction was between inner and outer city (Kerswill 2013, 28).

Sociolinguistic focus on style-shifting also shows that members belonging to the same gender category may exhibit similar frequencies of the same features, but their strategic implementation of the features may differ in line with differences in the understanding of the world. This is visible in Sharma and Rampton's (2015) study of Punjabi-English speaking younger and older Asian men in South-all, London. As the socio-political realms in which these two generations of speakers have lived have changed, the indexical value of the variants characteristic of Punjabi English have also changed. For older men, who maintained ties with India and experienced hostile attitudes towards their community in Britain, Punjabi phonetic features in English such as retracted and retroflex /t/ were shown to mark "ethnic positionings in moment-to-moment interactions" (Sharma / Rampton 2015, 25). Having less contact with the Indian subcontinent than the older men and "inhabit[ing] a less politicized, yet recognizably ethnic British identity" (Sharma / Rampton 2015, 25), the younger men were shown to use the variants in a lower range of discourse contexts than older men.

The indexical relationship between linguistic signs and local ideologies has

also been established in both monolingual and multilingual contexts, where gen-der and sexuality have also often played an important role for linguistic and cultural conduct. Many researchers have linked linguistic choices in language contact situations to speakers' conceptualisations of their social world (e.g., Harris 2006) arguing for multilingual speakers to be negotiating community norms at the level of language drawing on multiple cultural frameworks (Agha 2009). Multilingual speakers have also been found to make use of different realizations of the same linguistic form depending on their sociocultural positioning and experiences of engagement with structures of class, ethnicity, and gender. As an example may serve Mendoza-Denton's study of Latin American teenage girl gangs in Cali-fornia, where English-speaking and Americanized Norteñas and the Mexican or Latin American-oriented Spanish-speaking Sureñas were found to make different use of semiotic devices, including phonetic variants. They differently realized /ɪ/ in English in discourse-marking pronominal expressions, TH-pro. The linguistic difference allowed the girls to project the North-South opposition onto language, USA and Mexico, class and race. Importantly, these linguistic signs co-occur with other "embodied phenomena" (Bucholtz / Hall 2016, 184), which are "not simply a supplement to language but a basic element of communication". Hence, gesture, gaze, and other forms of human physicality and bodily movements have been shown to be meaningful (Haviland 1993) with a potential to create social difference (Goodwin / Alim 2010). Moreover, ethnographically-informed studies have shown that material objects as well as other semiotic codes such as clothing (Mendoza-Denton 2008; Nakassis 2016) participate in the meaning-making processes alongside linguistic detail. Hence, the studied linguistic signs never operate in a vacuum, but are rather embedded in an entanglement of material and other socioculturally meaningful re-sources.

Language, Gender and Sexuality

As noted above, scholars working in multiple sociocultural scenarios have studied different ways in which members of groups and communities pick and choose socially meaningful linguistic resources from pre-constrained systems and the ways in which these clusters of features come to be associated with particular qualities of speakers. As demonstrated in the discussion above, gender and sexuality have often intersected with other categories. In the remainder of the chapter, I will therefore focus on these two categories and how they have come to be understood as produced and reproduced by ideologically-mediated linguistic detail. I will underline the dynamic character of the processes in which these categories inflect other systems of social organizations. I will begin, however, by situating the current trends of viewing gender and sexuality

as non-static and contested within a wider sociohistorical context.

Historically, language or particular linguistic phenomena have been linked to ideas about what it means to be a woman and what it means to be a man (Cameron 2006b), with many listing 'natural' features of women's and men's speech (e.g., Jespersen 1922). Some 40 years ago, as a response to academic and non-academic debates describing linguistic features as naturally 'feminine'/'masculine' and frequently conflating the notions of sex/gender/sexuality, an interdisciplinary field of inquiry emerged. Ranging from feminist and queer linguistics to laboratory phonology studies (Levon / Mendes 2014), scholars working in this area have tried to capture how conventional understandings of linguistic phenomena be-come associated with being a woman/man and how gender and sexuality in-fluence language use in actuality rather than in unsubstantiated accounts. Over the years, the language, gender, and sexuality research has demonstrated that it is in fact the concept of ideology that can help understand this connection. Scholars in this tradition examine how different ways of communicating between men and women or speakers with different sexual orientation can help us better understand the ideological character of language.

Perhaps the earliest evidence supporting the ideological character of gender differences in language use and debunking the existence of a natural link between speech and being a woman/man comes from the feminist tradition. As Cameron (2014, 281) points out, from the beginning of the movement in 19th century, when women's public speech was perceived as unnatural and indecent, feminists have continuously been questioning meanings "embedded in representations of language" which linked particular types of speech to inherent qualities of being a woman. Feminists have argued that a common insistence on clear-cut and stable differences in communicating between women and men was in line with the idea of the natural order (Cameron 2006b, 2014), where biological differences are supposed to be represented in speech.

Some scholars have argued that there are distinctly male and female ways of speaking. This line of argumentation is not only popular among adherents of biologism, who have talked about women's language or gay speak as separate and characterised by particular linguistic features. In early feminist linguistics, the notion of feminine talk was discussed thanks to such publications as Lakoff's seminal work *Language and Women's Place* (1975). In this essay, Lakoff listed particular features of language, e.g. tag questions, evaluative adjectives, and linked them to the notion of femininity. She explicitly noted that these features were typical of white women from privileged social strata. However, many have iconized this type of speech to be indexical of all women. Originally, Lakoff argued that these features were used by women as a result of ways in which they were socialized and treated in unequal and male-dominated society. She claimed that the linguistic features used by women reflected their subordinate position,

which was a result of power dynamics in the patriarchal system. The study relied on Lakoff's own observations about "cultural expectations that have come to in-fluence their [the features'] use" (Bucholtz / Hall 1995). In line with trends at the time, the distinction between women and men was largely understood in binary terms.
Similarly, in that period, in queer linguistics, although questioning the uniformity of gender categories of woman/man, it was argued that the way gay speakers spoke formed a different type of language. Leap described it as Gay English (1996), while Smyth et al. (2003) talked about "the gay male voice". In line with main tendencies, these early feminist and queer linguistic projects relied on the assumption that language reflected speakers' assigned position in socioeconomic structure. In these studies, it was argued that power was the key factor for shaping linguistic behaviour (Levon / Mendes 2014).
Other projects complicated the picture and questioned the universality of the claims made in these studies by providing seemingly contradictory evidence regarding the speech of members of the same gender category. In sociolinguistic studies of variation, women were observed to be more likely to use prestige forms than men, while at the same time also leading linguistic innovation (Labov 2001). The innovative use of linguistic variables by women was observed in a series of more locally-oriented and ethnographically informed projects e.g. in Gal's (1979) study of linguistic choices of German-Hungarian bilinguals in Oberwart, Austria, where a shift towards German was linked to the local political economy and women's preference for a non-agricultural and more 'modern' way of life.
However, it was only after the emergence of queer theory (Butler 1990, 1993) and the introduction of the notion of performativity into linguistic studies that these seemingly contradictory tendencies could be more fully accounted for. The indexically mutable character of linguistic signs embedded in local ideologies also started being acknowledged. Rather than assuming the existence of a community of women or lesbians/gays that could be defined by a shared identity (Levon / Mendes 2014), it was argued that speakers perform identity by drawing on socio-culturally meaningful linguistic and other semiotic resources. Linguistic forms were interpreted as ways to "express[] or mean[] something about gendered properties of the circumstances of language production" (McConnell-Ginet 1988), with the relationship between language and gender being non-exclusive (Ochs 1992).
The same expressions and linguistic strategies commonly associated with gender identity were shown to be linked to other social relations and stance (Brown 1980). They have also been shown to be used by both genders. For example, one of the features commonly associated with men, the use of swearwords, was observed in the speech of women in various sociocultural contexts. In his study of Tok Pisin, Kulick (1993) described *kros*, a local speech genre in Papua New 84 Kinga Koźmińska

Guinea as a long monologue full of abusive language performed by women. Similarly, McElhinny (1995) reported that contradictory to common beliefs about women's infrequent use of swearwords, policewomen in New York used them with high frequency to project 'toughness', which in this community was seen as masculine. Studies of drag queens (Barrett 1995, 1997) and sex workers (Hall 1995) helped further problematize how speakers strategically use linguistic fea-tures associated with a particular category of race or gender for self-presentation. In light of these advancements, it was claimed that similar to other types of iden-tity, gender identity should therefore be seen as constituted by a variety of features, each of which is not necessarily or exclusively associated with either female or male. It is their combination and existential association with particular sets of stances and values that eventually produces one's gender identity (Duranti 1997: 211).

Such a shift in assumptions, in line with the general shift in sociolinguistics, allowed to move away from analysing mostly 'feminine' ways of speaking and communicating. It was argued that 'representations may be analyzed as part of a society's apparatus for maintaining gender distinctions and hierarchies' (Cameron 2014, 285). It also became apparent that masculinity should not be seen as an invisible norm (Cameron 2014) against which femininity was assessed. Rather, different ways of performing masculinity and naturalization of hegemonic hetero-sexual masculinity should also be considered. Here, Kiesling's (2005) study of a group of young American men in a fraternity house in the United States made visible that stance-taking in interactional events helps establish different forms of masculinity in discourse. He demonstrated that the use of an address term *dude* enabled the men to index 'cool solidarity' at the same time negotiating between discourses on young masculinity, hegemonic heterosexuality, solidarity, and non-conformity.

An understanding of the relationship between language, gender and sexuality was further enhanced when scholars advocated for sexuality to encompass not only conscious sexual identity claims, but also a series of "recognized and re-pressed" (Levon / Mendes 2014) identifications expressed by individual speakers that go beyond their conscious control (Cameron / Kulick 2003, 2005). It was argued that a focus on identifications could help account for the conflicting linguistic behaviour observed in previous studies. It also enables us to see that gender and sexual identities themselves are not static, but rather emerge in interaction (Levon / Mendes 2014). They are achieved by combining particular, context-dependent features, where the same form may create different social meaning. This was observed in Podesva's (2006, 2007) study, where a gay speaker was observed to be using the same linguistic form, falsetto voice indexing "expressiveness", to construct different personas: a diva at parties with friends, a

caring doctor at a medical clinic.
This way scholars no longer ask what characterizes feminine/masculine speech as a separate form of language use typical of all women and men. Rather, they have begun to see them as particular types of registers that speakers can draw on when creating their personas and identities. The study of linguistic forms or clusters allows us to see what effects these features might produce, how they are perceived and when they become important tools for identity construction (McConnell-Ginet 2013). It is acknowledged that the types of registers described in popular discourse and academic scholarship such as Lakoff's and Leap's projects provide "a powerful symbolic 'meaning resource' for 'stylistic agents' to draw on" (Cameron 2000, 123). The move towards emergentist (Levon / Mendes 2014) properties of identities, however, draws attention to the fact that different dimensions of identity inflect one another (McConnell-Ginet 2011). As a result, as shown before, the same gender category can be experienced and linguistically expressed in different ways depending on one's sexuality, ethnicity, class, age, etc. This approach has allowed scholars to expand their analytical focus beyond the speech of white women in privileged positions. A more varied range of ex-periences including those from subordinate positions (Bucholtz et al. 1999), other racial, ethnic or class backgrounds, has now been studied.
These studies have also demonstrated that language is not the only semiotic code that allows to perform gender/sexual identity. Equally important are other semiotic codes such as makeup or clothes (Eckert 2000; Mendoza-Denton 2008). Milani (2017, 417) also argues that similarly to linguistic and other semiotic signs, corporeal and material aspects of meaning making such as its spatial dimension allow to achieve particular meanings in which "sexual identities, desires and practices" are produced and contested. Even the images of the body can participate in the process of semiosis representing sexual citizenship (Milani 2015), which points to the close relationship between discursive practices and materiality of the human and non-human life.
Scholars investigating language issues in relation to gender and sexuality are often reminded, therefore, that language is always part of a social framework (Irvine 2001), which includes other non-linguistic activities and goals (McConnell-Ginet 2013). In order to have a full picture of how individuals opt in and out (Blommaert / Rampton 2011) of their various categories and when the categories become important for meaning-making, today's researchers look at the interplay of local and global discourses on language, gender and sexuality. The emphasis is put simultaneously on localized communities of practice (Lave / Wenger 1990), to which individuals belong in local contexts, and imagined communities (Ander-son 1983), which shape broader ideas about what it means to be a woman/man and what counts as "normal" in terms of human "physicality, sexuality, emotions and intimate relationships" (Cameron 2014, 294).

Future directions and Slavonic languages

As language remains the locus of ideas and practices in which gender and sexua-lity emerge, sociolinguists see it as the primary object of analysis. The discussion above demonstrates, however, that other non-linguistic and material dimensions also influence the way we form our ideas about cultural conduct, also in relation to gender and sexuality. As a next step, we therefore have to more explicitly link the knowledge about the role of language for identity and group formation processes to other biological, material or technological dimensions of gender and sexuality. As Bucholtz / Hall (2016, 184) remind us, "the body offers certain affordances that shape the trajectory of semiosis", where agency is "produced through a network of entities" both human and nonhuman, semiotic and material. Further work on embodied sociolinguistic action, motion and bodily experience will better explain the indexical character of linguistic signs and how they come to mean what they do.

Moreover, as objects and technologies participate in meaning-making pro-cesses, sociolinguists looking at the relationship between language and ideology cannot dismiss them from their analyses. As various scholars argue (e.g., Bucholtz / Hall 2016, Varis 2014,), the reality can no longer be divided into off-line/online where speakers interact in separate domains. Instead, following Bucholtz / Hall (2016), it should be stressed that new technologies and media co-create human capabilities (Keating 2005), where the relationship between virtual and physical aspects of the human body, with its gender and sexuality, remain embedded in cultural discourses, potentially changing our sense of self. Therefore, future studies of language and ideology as well as gender and sexuality must account for multidimensionality of signs used in contemporary processes of semiosis. Projects examining embodied sociolinguistic actions (Bucholtz / Hall 2016), perhaps with a greater use of multimodal analysis in the studies of gender and sexuality (Milani 2017), will help to expand our understanding of how global and local flows of people and languages in the globalized world produce, re-produce and reconfigure experiences of sociocultural categories at individual and community levels.

In the light of the current developments and future directions in language, gender and sexuality research, a review of Slavonic gender and queer linguistics as well as a call for new studies on language ideologies and linguistic practices in these languages could not be more urgent. With much attention paid to the relationship between the grammatical category of gender and the sex of the referent, the language, gender and sexuality research in such countries as Poland has largely neglected "gender-based social issues and language" (Kielkowska-Ja-nowiak / Pawelczyk 2014), together with a potentially ideological character of linguistic changes in the region. Linguists working on Slavonic languages have

also rarely looked at the relationship between linguistic and other semiotic signs as well material, technological and corporeal aspects of life.
The focus on actual linguistic practices observed in everyday life, rather than collected by means of questionnaire methods, would, therefore, help understand how styles, be them in local call-centres in Poland (Kielkowska-Janowiak / Pa-welczyk 2008) or in transnational contexts of Polish-speaking migrants in South East England (Kozminska 2016), are linked to materially shaped and technologi-cally mediated ideas about what counts as "normal" in a particular locality. It would also further our understanding of the ways in which the linguistic practices and ideas about femininity/masculinity are related to the transformations from state socialism to market economies in Eastern Europe more broadly (Gal / Kligman 2001) and in which the ongoing changes in public/private domains influence women's and sexual minorities' visibility in Slavonic languages.

References

Agha, A. 2009. What do Bilinguals do? A Commentary, in: Reyes, A. / Lo, A. (eds.), *Beyond Yellow English: Toward a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America*, Oxford, 1-11 [Oxford Scholarship Online].
Agha, A. 2007. *Language and Social Relations*, Cambridge.
Ahearn, L. 2012. *Living Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*, Oxford.
Althusser, L. 1969 *For Marx.* London.
Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London.
Barrett, R. 1997. The 'homo-genius' speech community, in: Hall, K. / Livia, A. (eds.), *Queerly phrased: Language, gender and sexuality*. New York, 181-232.
Barrett, R. 1995. Supermodels of the world unite! Political economy and the lan-guage of performance among African-American drag queens, in: Leap, W. (ed.), *Beyond the Lavender Lexicon: Authenticity, Imagination and Appropriation in Gay and Lesbian Languages*,New York, 207-226.
Blommaert, J. 1999. The Debate is Open, in: Blommaert, J. (ed.), *Language Ideo-logical Debates*, Berlin, 1-38.
Blommaert, J. / Rampton, B. 2011. Language and Superdiversity, *Diversities* 13(2), 1-21.
Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge.
Brown, P. 1980. How and why are women more polite: some evidence from a Mayan community, in: McConnell-Ginet, S. / Borker, R. / Furman, N. (eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society*, New York, 111-149.
Bucholtz, M. / Hall, K. 2016. Embodied Sociolinguistics, in: Coupland, N. (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates*, Cambridge, 173-197. 88 Kinga Koźmińska

Bucholtz, M. / Hall, K. 1995. Introduction: Twenty years after *Language and wo-man's place*, in: Hall, K. / Bucholtz, M. (eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, New York, 1-24.
Butler, J. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York / London.
Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York / London.
Cameron, D. 2014. Gender and Language Ideologies, in: Ehrlich, S. / Meyerhoff, M. / Holmes, J. (eds.), *The Handbook of Language, Gender and Sexuality*, Mal-den, 281-296.
Cameron, D. 2006a. Ideology and language, *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2), 141-152.
Cameron, D. 2006b. Gender and Language Ideologies, in: Holmes, J. / Meyerhoff, M. (eds.), *Language and Gender*, Oxford, 447-467.
Cameron, D. 2000. Styling the worker: Gender and the commodification of language in the global service economy, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(3), 323-347.
Cameron, D. / Kulick, D. 2005. Identity Crisis?, *Language & Communication* 25(2), 107-125.
Cameron, D. 2003. *Language and sexuality*, Cambridge.
Cheshire, J. 1982. *Variation in an English Dialect*, Cambridge.
Coupland, N. 1985. 'Hark, Hark, Hark': Social Motivations for Phonological Style-Shifting, *Language and Communication*, 153-171.
Duranti, A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge.
Duszak, A. 2002. *Us and Others. Social Identities Across Languages, Discourses and Cultures*, Amsterdam.
Eagleton, T. 1991. *Ideology: An Introduction*, London.
Eckert, P. 2012. Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation, *The Annual Review of Anthropology* 41, 87-100.
Eckert, P. 2008. Variation and the indexical field, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12, 453-476.
Eckert, P. 2000. *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*, Oxford.
Eisenlohr, P. 2007. *Little India: Diaspora, Time and Ethnolinguistic Belonging in Hindu Mauritius*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
Errington, J. 2001. Ideology, in: Duranti, A. (ed.), *Key Terms in Language and Cul-ture*, Malden, 110-112.
Gal, S. 1998. Multiplicity and Contention among Language Ideologies: A Commen-tary, in: Schieffelin, B. / Woolard, K. / Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Language Ideologies*, Oxford, 317-332.
Gal, S. 1995. Language, Gender and Power: An Anthropological Review, in: Hall, K. / Bucholtz, B. (eds.), *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Con-structed Self*, London, 169-182.
Gal, S. 1992. Multiplicity and Contention among Ideologies, *Pragmatics* 2, 445-450.
Gal, S. 1978. Peasant Men can't Get Wives: Language Change and Sex Roles in a Bilingual Community, *Language in Society* 7(1), 1-16.
Gal, S. / Kligman, G. 2000. *The Politics of Gender After Socialism*, Princeton, NJ. Language and Ideology 89

Goodwin, M. / Alim, H. S. 2010. “Whatever (neck roll, eye roll, teeth suck)”: The situated coproduction of social categories and identities through stancetaking and transmodal stylization, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 20(1), 179-194.
Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York.
Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*, Cambridge.
Hall, K. 1995. Lip service on the fantasy line, in: Hall, K. / Bucholtz, M. (eds.), *Gen-der articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, New York / London, 183-216.
Hall, S. 1977. Culture, Media and the Ideological Effect, in: Curran, J. et al. (eds.), *Mass Communication and Society*, Beverly Hills, 315-348.
Harris, R. 2006. *New Ethnicities and Language use*, Basingstoke.
Haviland, J. 1993. Anchoring, iconicity, and orientation in Guugu Yimithirr pointing gestures, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 3, 3-45.
Hebdige, D. 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, London.
Hill, J. 1998. Today There Is no Respect: Nostalgia, Respect, and Oppositional Dis-course in Mexicano (Nahuatl) Language Ideology, in: Schieffelin, B. / Woolard, K. / Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Language Ideologies*, New York, 68-86.
Hill, J. 1985. The Grammar of Consciousness and the Consciousness of Grammar, *American Ethnologist* 12(4), 725-737.
Hobsbawm, E. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, New York.
Irvine, J. 2001. ‘Style’ as Distinctiveness: The Culture and Ideology of Linguistic Differentiation, in: Eckert, P. / Rickford, J. (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge, 21-43.
Irvine, J. 1989. When Talk Isn’t Cheap: Language and Political Economy, *American Ethnologist* 16, 248-267.
Irvine, J. / Gal, S. 2000. Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation, in: Kros-krity, P. (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities*, Santa Fe, 35-84.
Jaffe, A. 1999. *Ideologies in Action: Language Politics on Corsica*, Berlin.
Jespersen, O. 1922. The Woman. Reproduced, in: Cameron, D. (ed.), *The Feminist Critique of Language*, London, 201-220.
Johnstone, B. 2016. Enregisterment: How linguistic items become linked with ways of speaking, *Language and Linguistics Compass* 10, 632-643.
Keating, E. 2005. Homo prostheticus: Problematizing the notions of activity and computer-mediated interaction, *Discourse Studies* 7(4-5), 527-545.
Kerswill, P. 2011. *Identity, ethnicity and place: the construction of youth language in London*, http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/75329 [11/202018].
Kiełkiewicz-Janowiak, A. / Pawelczyk, J. 2014. Language and Gender Research in Poland: An Overview, in: Ehrlich, S. / Meyerhoff, M. / Holmes, J. (eds.), *The Handbook of Language, Gender and Sexuality*, Malden, 355-377.
Kiełkiewicz-Janowiak, A. / Pawelczyk, J. 2008. Gender Stereotypes and Globalised Customer Service Communication in Poland, in: Santaemilia, J. / Bou, P. (eds.), *Gender and Sexual Identities in Transition: International Perspectives*, New-castle upon Tyne, 76-100.
Kiesling, S. 2005. Homosocial Desire in Men’s Talk: Balancing and Recreating Cul-tural Discourses of Masculinity, *Language in Society* 34(5), 695-727. 90 Kinga Koźmińska

Kozminska, K. 2016. *Language and identity in a transnational context: A sociopho-netic study of the Polish of a group of migrants living in the UK*, Oxford [PhD thesis].
Kroskrity, P. 2004. Language Ideologies, in: Duranti, A. (ed.), *A Companion to Lin-guistic Anthropology*, Malden, 496-517.
Kroskrity, P. 1998. Arizona Tewa Kiva Speech as a Manifestation of a Dominant Language Ideology, in: Schieffelin, B. / Woolard, K. / Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Lan-guage Ideologies*, New York, 103-122.
Kulick, D. 1993. Speaking as a Woman: Structure and Gender in Domestic Argu-ments in a New Guinea Village, *Cultural Anthropology* 8(4), 510-541.
Labov, W. 2001. *Principles of Linguistic change.* Vol. II: Social Factors, Oxford.
Lakoff, R. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*, New York.
Leap, W. 1996. *Word's out: Gay men's English*, Minneapolis.
Levi-Strauss, C. 1966. *The Savage Mind*, Chicago.
Levon, E. 2014. *High Rising Terminals in London: Gender, Ethnicity and Interactio-nal Meaning*, Chicago.
Levon, E. / Mendes, R. 2016. *Studies in intersectional sociolinguistics: Language, Sexuality and Power*, Oxford.
Lippi-Green, R. 1997. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimina-tion in the United States*, London.
Marx, K. / Engels, F. 1893. *Marx-Engels Correspondence. Engels to Franz Mehring*, London.
McConnell-Ginet, S. 2011. *Gender, Sexuality and Meaning: Linguistic Practice and Politics*, Oxford.
McConnell-Ginet, S.1988. Language and Gender, in: Newmeyer, F. (ed.), *Linguis-tics: The Cambridge Survey, vol.4: Language: The socio-cultural Context*, Cam-bridge, 75-99.
McElhinny, B. 1995. Challenging Hegemonic Masculinities: Female and Male Po-lice Officers Handling Domestic Violence, in: Hall, K. / Bucholtz, M. (eds.), *Gen-der Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, New York, 217-243.
Mendoza-Denton, N. 2008. *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practice among Latina Youth Gangs*, Oxford.
Milani, T. 2017. Language and Sexuality, in: Garcia, O. / Flores, N. / Spotti, M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Society*, Oxford, 1-23.
Milani, T. 2015. Sexual citizenship: Discourses, spaces, and bodies at Joburg Pride 2012, *Journal of Language and Politics* 14(3), 431-454.
Milroy, J. / Milroy, L. 1985. *Authority in Language*, London.
Nakassis, C. 2016. *Doing Style: Youth and Mass Mediation in South India*, Chicago.
Ochs, E. 1992. Indexing gender, in: Duranti, A. / Goodwin, C. (eds.), *Rethinking context*, Cambridge, 335-358.
Peirce, C. 1931-1958. *The collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce (8 vols.)*, Cambridge.
Philips, S. U. 2000. Constructing a Tongan Nation-state through Language Ideology in the Courtroom, in: Kroskrity, P. (ed.), *Regimes of Language*, Santa Fe, 229-257.
Podesva, R. 2007. Phonation Type as a Stylistic Variable: The use of Falsetto in Constructing a Persona, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(4), 478-504. Language and Ideology 91

Podesva, R. 2006. Intonational Variation and Social Meaning: Categorical and Pho-netic Aspects, *Working Papers in Linguistics* 12(2), 189-202.
Ramaswamy, S. 1997. *Passions of the Tongue: Language Devotion in Tamil India, 1891-1970*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
Rumsey, A. 1990. Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology, *American Anthropolo-gy* 92(2), 346-361.
Queen, R. 2007. Sociolinguistic Horizons: Language and Sexuality, *Language and Linguistic Compass* 1(4), 314-330.
Smyth, R. / Jacobs, G. / Rogers, H. 2003. Male voices and perceived sexual orienta-tion: An experimental and theoretical approach, *Language in Society* 32(3), 329-350.
Sharma, D. 2011. Style Repertoire and Social Change in British Asian English, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15(4), 464-492.
Sharma, D. / Rampton, B. 2015. Lectal Focusing in Interaction: A New Methodology for the Study of Style Variation, *Journal of English Linguistics* 43(1), 3-35.
Silverstein, M. 2003. Indexical Order and the Dialectics of Sociolinguistic Life, *Language and Communication* 23, 193-229.
Silverstein, M. 1998. The Uses and Utility of Ideology: A Commentary, in: Schieffelin, B. / Woolard, K. / Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, Oxford, 123-148.
Silverstein, M. 1996. Monoglot Standard in America, in: Brenneis, D. / Macaulay, R. (eds.), *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, Boulder, 284-306.
Silverstein, M. 1985. Language and the Culture of Gender: At the Intersection of Structure, Usage, and ideology, in: Mertz, E. / Parmentier, R. (eds.), *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*, Orlando, 219-259.
Silverstein, M. 1979. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology, in: Clyne, P. / Hanks, W. / Hofbauer, C. (eds.), *The Elements*, Chicago, 193-248.
Thompson, J. B. 1984. *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*, Cambridge.
Urla, J. 1993. Cultural Politics in an Age of Statistics: Numbers, Nations and the Making of Basque Identity, *American Ethnologist* 20(4), 818-843.
Varis, P. 2014. Digital Ethnography, *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 104.
Volosinov, V. N. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, New York.
Walczak, B. 1995. Norma językowa wobec elementów obcego pochodzenia, in: Pisarek, W. / Zgółkowa, H. (eds.), *Kultura języka dziś*, Poznań, 120-133.
Williams, R. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford.
Williams, R. 1976. *Keywords*, London.
Woolard, K. 1998. Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry, in: Schiefflin, B. / Woolard, K. / Kroskrity, P. (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, Oxford, 3-51.
Woolard, K. 1992. Language Ideology: Issues and Approaches, *International Prag-matics Association* 2(3), 235-249.
Woolard, K. / Schieffelin, B. 1994. Language ideology, *Annual Review of Anthropo-logy* 23, 55-82.
Zentella, A. 1997. *Growing Up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Oxford.
Zhang, Q. 2005. A Chinese Yuppie in Beijing: Phonological Variation and the Con-struction of a New Professional Identity, *Language in Society* 34(3), 431-466.
Zhu, H. 2019. *Exploring Intercultural Communication*, New York.