New directions in the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender

Aneta Pavlenko and Ingrid Piller[1]

1. Introduction

Recently, several researchers have pointed to the ever-growing gap between the study of second language acquisition (SLA) and bilingualism and the study of language and gender (Burton, Dyson, and Ardener 1994; Ehrlich 1997; Pavlenko 2001; Woolard 1997). The goal of the present chapter is to write second language learning (SLL) and multilingualism into the theory of language and gender and to adopt recent developments in the field of language and gender for the study of multilingualism and SLL.

In order to argue for a reconceptualization of any area of research, it is necessary to pinpoint the problems with the existing framework. Thus, we will first challenge essentialist assumptions underlying many earlier treatments of bilingualism, SLA, and gender, which present 'men' and 'women' as undifferentiated groups. Subsequently, we will outline a poststructuralist theoretical framework for the study of multilingualism, SLL, and gender, and discuss four promising research directions which can significantly contribute to our understanding of the field. In doing so, we will focus on ways in which gender as a system of social relations and discursive practices mediates the learning and use of additional languages, and on ways in which gender relations and performances may be transformed in the process of second language socialization.

2. Essentialist approaches to the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender

The relationship between language and gender emerged as a separate field of inquiry in the 1970s, prompted by feminist concerns about the connections between sex, power, and language. The controversy sparked off by Lakoff's (1975) *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 relation-

ships between gender and linguistic practices. Almost immediately researchers looked at the relationship between multilingualism, SLL, and gender, suggesting that this, too, may be a promising area of inquiry (Gal 1978; Schlieben-Lange 1977; Solé 1978). Lakoff (1975: 47) underscored how important it is for language teachers "to realize that social context is relevant in learning to speak a second language fluently", and warned them to pay close attention to ways in which language practices and performances may be gendered. Gal (1978) demonstrated that not only language practices but also motivation and agency in learning the second language may be gendered and that in some cases this learning may be more advantageous for one group – young Hungarian women in her study – than for others. Unfortunately, for more than fifteen years Gal's (1978) work was rarely followed up, if at all. It was not until Burton, Dyson, and Ardener (1994) published a volume entitled *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use* that conversation on multilingualism, SLL, and gender resumed. In what follows, we will discuss three paradigms in which research on multilingualism, SLL, and gender was conducted between 1975 and the early 1990s. All three originated in the field of language and gender and focused on differences between women's and men's language, attempting to explain them through a generalized feature of gender identities or relations: deficit, difference, or dominance.

In the *deficit* framework, theorized in Ardener (1975) and exemplified in Lakoff (1975), women are presented as inferior language users and oftentimes as 'the muted group'. Lakoff (1975) suggested that women speak a 'powerless language' – uncertain, weak, excessively polite – and rely on hedges, tag questions, emphatic stress, and hypercorrect grammar. She also claimed that this language is forced on them as the price of social approval for being appropriately 'feminine'. In the study of multilingualism, this approach translated into the *linguistic lag* hypothesis, the view of minority women as less bilingual than men, and, thus, lagging linguistically behind them (see, for example, Stevens 1986). The deficit framework has been severely criticized in the field 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, and O'Leary 1988; Holmes 1990; O'Barr and Atkins 1980). With regard to bilingual women, Borker (1980), Gal (1991), and Spedding (1994) argued 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 the 'unequal encounters' with white middle-class male anthropologists, linguists, and ethnographers.

Another way to view Lakoff's (1975) work is in terms of the *dominance* paradigm which sees male dominance and female oppression as the key factors in linguistic interaction, suggesting that speech differences uncovered by researchers stem from institutionalized patriarchy. Theorized in Lakoff (1975), Thorne and Henley (1975), and Spender (1980), this approach found support in studies which demonstrated that in cross-sex conversations men dominate and/or interrupt women (West and Zimmerman 1983; Zimmerman and West 1975) or simply don't listen, leaving women to do the conversational 'shitwork' (Fishman 1983). In the study of multilingualism, the dominance approach offered an alternative interpretation of women's greater monolingualism, portraying them as linguistically oppressed by men (Burton 1994). In their theoretical critiques of the dominance model, feminist linguists pointed out that while this approach does acknowledge the importance of power relations, it fails to recognize the 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 and McConnell-Ginet 1992). As a result, the model oversimplifies patriarchy and gender relations, portraying 'women-as-a-group' as dominated by 'men-as-a-group' and obfuscating the fact that hegemonic masculinities often oppress both women and other men (who do not or cannot conform) and that hegemonic femininities also participate in oppressive practices. In language contact situations, the interaction is further complicated by historical and social complexities of the relationship between majority and minority language groups. In addition, it was also shown that the proponents of the model ignored the ambiguity of linguistic strategies and failed to systematically investigate the links between linguistic practices and production of and resistance to hegemony (James and Clarke 1993; Tannen 1993). In the study of multilingualism, several researchers challenged the portrayal of women as less bilingual than men, pointing out that at times women are not only more bilingual but also the initiators of language shift (Constantinidou 1994; Gal 1978; Holmes 1993; McDonald 1994; Schlieben-Lange 1977; Solé 1978)

A closer look at linguistic practices was taken in the *sex differences* approach, assumed in variationist sociolinguistics. This approach focused on correlating particular linguistic variables with the sex of the speaker, whereby sex was seen as one of several attributes, such as class, age, or race, determining an individual's relation to linguistic variation, in particular, phonological patterns and orientation towards standard grammar. The best-known claim in this paradigm is that women tend to use more standard and/or prestigious linguistic forms and registers (Labov 1966, 1972; Trudgill 1972, 1974). In the study of multilingualism, this approach strove to explain instances of language shift

spearheaded by women as caused by women's preference for more prestigious languages and/or varieties. In the field of SLA, it led researchers to posit that female learners generally do better than males (Ellis 1994) and to explain their achievement through more positive attitudes and better use of learning strategies (Oxford 1993, 1994). Feminist critics take issue with variationist sociolinguistics research both from theoretical and empirical standpoints. With regard to theory, they enumerate the inherent problems in measuring women's linguistic behavior against that of men, and argue against the speculative nature of 'female superiority' claims. They point out that no independent evidence supports these claims and suggest that the social meanings of linguistic variables cannot be defined on the basis of identities of those who use them most frequently (Cameron and Coates 1988; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Holmes 1992). Other scholars provide evidence that the claims are not borne out in cross-linguistic studies, in particular in Arabic-speaking countries (Haeri 1996; James 1996). In the study of bilingualism and SLA, the 'female superiority' claim finds no support either: in some contexts male learners outperform female ones (Polanyi 1995), and in others men are found to be more bilingual than women (Harvey 1994; Hill 1987; Holmes 1993; Spedding 1994; Stevens 1986).

The *gender differences* or 'two-cultures' approach, introduced by Maltz and Borker (1982) and developed and popularized by Tannen (1990), shifted the focus from linguistic features to male and female styles in cross-gender communication. The merit of this approach is in discussing male styles on a par with female ones, as opposed to considering male behavior as a norm: no explicit judgments are passed about the comparative value of either style. Stemming from work on cross-cultural miscommunication, the two-cultures view suggests that men and women constitute different cultures (learned mainly in single-sex preadolescent peer groups), and as a result, cannot always communicate successfully. Women are said to focus on rapport and affective functions of conversation, while men focus on report and informational aspects, often seeing conversations as status contests. This approach was transferred to the study of SLA by Gass and Varonis (1986), who suggested that men interact to produce more output, while women interact to obtain more input. Pica et al. (1991) found that the gender of the learner played no role in native/non-native speaker (NS/NNS) interaction but the gender of the interlocutor did: female NSs were shown to ask more helpful questions and to negotiate meaning more consistently than male NSs. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the interaction with a female NS may lead to better results in SLL than interaction with a male NS (see Teutsch-Dwyer's chapter for a critical evaluation of this thesis).

While Tannen's (1990) book was extremely popular with the general public, quickly becoming an international bestseller, in academia her arguments

were heavily criticized. Feminist linguists identified several problems with the 'two-cultures' approach, the first of which was the oversimplification of the assumption of separate cultures. "Girls and boys, women and men ... live together in shared linguistic worlds, be it in the family, in schoolrooms, in the streets, in colleges, in jobs; they are probably spending more time in mixed-sex contexts than in single-sex contexts, and, above all, they are not victims of constant misunderstandings," stated Trömel-Plötz (1991: 490) in her scathing review of Tannen's (1990) book. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) pointed out that to assume lack of knowledge of the interactional norms of the 'other culture' is to ignore individuals' agency in making interactional choices and to presuppose that in any given context individuals choose only possibilities judged typical for their gendered subculture. Later research convincingly demonstrated that both men and women can be involved in both rapport and report talk, depending on the activity they are engaged in and the community of practice they are associated with (see Cameron 1997a). In the field of SLA, Günthner (1992) demonstrated that NS/NNS status may override any possible gender effects in cross-cultural communication.

In sum, critical analyses of the deficit, dominance, and difference paradigms, conducted in the early 1990s, demonstrated that all three undertheorized gender and language and, as a result, were grounded in problematic universalizing assumptions, speaking of 'women' and 'men' in ways that obscure heterogeneity across and within cultures (Cameron 1992; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Gal 1991; Trömel-Plötz 1991). These analyses demonstrated that the studies in all three paradigms focused on and problematized women, thus normalizing the status of men's language as unmarked and ungendered. Several researchers also pointed out that the designs of the studies from which these models were derived have not systematically identified or sought out participants representing the diversity of men's and women's experience. Most importantly, feminist linguists argued for the reevaluation of the categories of 'language' and 'gender', and for the need to move beyond static oppositions such as 'difference and dominance', to the study of how gender and hegemony are produced in discourse in a variety of contexts (Cameron 1992, 1996, 1997b, 1998; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Gal 1991; West and Zimmerman 1987).

3. Feminist poststructuralist approaches to the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender

In the last decade, many researchers have embraced feminist poststructuralist approaches to the study of language and gender (Cameron 1992, 1996, 1997b, 1998) and to the study of second language learning and multilingualism (Peirce 1995; Norton 2000). In this section, we will attempt to demonstrate how these fields can be brought together in the poststructuralist paradigm and provide definitions of the key terms that will be used throughout the chapter.

While the terms 'poststructuralism' and 'critical inquiry' serve as an umbrella for a variety of theoretical approaches, in the present chapter we will use the terms interchangeably, emphasizing similarities which they share. Similarly, we see various feminist movements as having a common aim of challenging the dominant patriarchy and improving life conditions of oppressed groups. Thus, for us, *feminist poststructuralism*, outlined by Cameron (1992, 1997b) and Weedon (1987), is an approach which strives to theorize and to investigate the role of language in the production of gender relations, and the role of gender dynamics in language learning and use. Of particular importance to us is the poststructuralist focus on *language* as the locus of social organization, power, and individual consciousness, and as a form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1991). *Learning*, in turn, is seen here as socialization, or a situated process of participation in particular communities of practice, which may entail the negotiation of ways of being a person in that context (Wenger 1998).

Our view of gender will also differ significantly from that espoused in earlier research. Contemporary theorists of gender present a convincing argument 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; Crawford 1995; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Nicholson 1994; West and Fenstermaker 1995). Conceiving of gender as composed of separate masculinities and femininities also prevents us from addressing issues of power and inequality. Consequently, we will approach *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: 176). If gender is viewed as a social, historical, and cultural 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 as well as over time within a culture (for a comprehensive discussion of diverse meanings of gender see Bonvillain 1995). Moreover, anthropological evidence indicates that not all so-

cieties 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 and 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).

This view of gender as a system of social relations and discursive practices has important implications for both the 'gender' and the 'language' parts of language and gender research. With language seen as a collection of heterogeneous discourses, individual linguistic strategies can no longer be directly linked to gender and cease to be the main focus of research. Instead, the locus of study shifts 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; Kulick 1998; Ochs 1992; Talbot 1998; West and Zimmerman 1987). Therefore, with gender seen as a system of social relations and discursive practices, the goal of the study of language and gender becomes twofold: on the one hand, to study ways in which gender is constructed and negotiated in multiple discourses, and, on the other, to investigate the effects of gender on individuals' access to linguistic resources and possibilities of expression.

Finally, it is not only the locus of study that has shifted with time, but also the primary unit where research is conducted. 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 directly address the mediating role of activity and practice in the relationship between language and society. A pioneering 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 and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). *Communities of practice* are defined in this work 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 and McConnell-Ginet 1999: 185). They can be small or large, formal or informal, and embrace a variety of settings, such as a factory floor (Goldstein's chapter), an English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) classroom (McMahill's chapter), or even a married couple (Piller's chapter). Communities of practice present a very useful framework for future research on multilingualism, second language learning, and gender, as they allow us to focus on the learning process, to examine ways in which gender me-

diates access to various practices, and to theorize the gender-based marginalization of particular community members.

In short, we believe that the feminist poststructuralist view of the relationship between language and gender allows us to view the processes of learning and use of additional languages in a new light. In the present chapter we outline four areas which we see as most promising in terms of the current and future study of the relationship between gender and additional language learning and use: (1) the study of gendered access to linguistic resources, (2) the study of gendered agency, motivation, and investment in second language learning and language shift, (3) the study of gender performance in multilingual contexts, and (4) the study of ways in which critical and feminist pedagogy may transform contemporary educational practices. Clearly, these areas are not entirely new, as can be seen in the amount of research conducted in each, as well as in the fact that we can trace some research strands back to the 1960s (Ervin-Tripp 1967) and 1970s (Gal 1978; Schlieben-Lange 1977; Solé 1978). At the same time, these diverse attempts to investigate the links between multilingualism, SLL, and gender have not yet been brought together and theorized in a way offered in the present chapter (see also Pavlenko 2001). Consequently, we see the main contribution of our chapter as attracting attention to this new field of research, explicating the theoretical framework in which the research has been conducted, demonstrating what has been established to date, and outlining ways in which the field can move forward.

4. New directions in the study of multilingualism, second language learning, and gender

4.1. Gendered access to linguistic resources in multilingual contexts

One of the key findings in the field is that gender as a system of social relations and discursive practices structures differential opportunities for access to linguistic resources. Numerous studies demonstrate that in some minority and immigrant communities, where second language skills are highly valued and associated with social and economic benefits, men have privileged access to this symbolic capital, 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 1993; Kouritzin 2000; Loftin 1996; Losey

1995; Spedding 1994; Stevens 1986; Swigart 1992; see also chapters by Blackledge, Ehrlich, Goldstein, Heller, and Teutsch-Dwyer).

Recent studies show that immigrant and minority women's access to education in majority languages may be significantly constrained by language and gender ideologies and practices of both majority and minority communities. To begin with, women's status as housekeepers and mothers, in conjunction with the lack of governmentally funded daycare, may result in complete immobility. In some contexts, their status as financially dependent on the breadwinner males may also bar them from government-funded English-as-a-second-language (ESL) classes (Kouritzin 2000). However, as Kouritzin (2000) insightfully points out, it is overly simplistic to equate access with availability: lives of immigrant and minority women may be complicated not only by gendered and systemic inequalities but also by cultural conflicts. Even in contexts where classes, professional training, and other linguistic resources are available, access problems may arise. The availability of daycare solutions did not appear to help an Indian woman in Kouritzin's (2000) study, as her husband was adamant that only family should care for the children. Similarly, lack of family responsibilities did not help young Portuguese women in Goldstein's (1995) study: they couldn't take ESL classes because being in the same classroom with male strangers was considered inappropriate in their community. Thus, even the best of solutions, such as evening and weekend classes and externally funded daycare, do not help women who are culturally required to be home with their children and to prioritize their roles as housekeepers, mothers, wives, caretakers, and 'guardians of the home language'. Blackledge's chapter convincingly shows that the majority society also constrains women's access to linguistic resources: positioning Bengali mothers as illiterate, the school in Birmingham does not provide them with bilingual books which would have simultaneously helped them to improve their own English and to assist the English literacy learning of their children.

Moreover, as demonstrated by Heller (1999) and Losey (1995), even when immigrant and minority women do access the classroom, they may get significantly less classroom interaction time than either minority men or majority men and women. Losey's (1995) study of classroom participation patterns of American and Mexican-American students in a community college classroom persuasively demonstrated that Mexican-American women were doubly marginalized in the class, both as ethnic minority members and as women, and thus prevented from taking their turns, expressing themselves, and interacting in the target language. Similarly, Heller (1999) shows that older immigrant girls are the ones who are alienated most in a French-language high school in Toronto, Ontario, and have least access to its linguistic resources, in particular, English.

In contrast, middle-class white boys have the best chance to become bilingual in the way envisaged by the school (see also Heller's chapter).

Another discursive space where access to linguistic resources may be gendered is the workplace. While many researchers attribute minority and immigrant men's greater bilingualism to their role as breadwinners (see, for example, Stevens 1986), Holmes (1993) and Goldstein (1995, and this volume) argue that participation in the workforce alone does not guarantee access to the majority language: in many cases, gatekeeping practices may prevent women from learning and using the second language even when they are working. Holmes (1993) shows that while immigrant men in Australia and New Zealand are more often employed where English is required, immigrant women oftentimes work in places where they use their native language. Goldstein's (1995, and this volume) investigation of linguistic practices in a Canadian factory demonstrates that the unspoken rules of this workplace prevent immigrant Portuguese women from using English by positing Portuguese as a solidarity code. Since all the co-workers are either native speakers of Portuguese or at least proficient L2 users (in the 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 prohibits the use of English, positioning it as a secret language that some may not understand. The researcher points out that while this practice ensures solidarity and cooperation on the factory floor, it may also keep the women from social and economic advancement, enjoyed by Portuguese men, more fluent in English. A similar link between education and the workforce is made in 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. The researcher shows that women in this community have less access to education than men and speak less Spanish; as a result, they cannot join the industrial labor force, for which the use of Spanish is crucial, and have limited opportunities to practice whatever Spanish they know.

Studies conducted in indigenous communities in South America paint a very complex picture of ways in which ideologies of language and gender conspire in restricting indigenous women's access to Spanish (Harvey 1994; Hill 1987; Loftin 1996; Spedding 1994). The researchers suggest that the images of ideal masculinity, constructed by local 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: 60). In contrast, the images of ideal femininity place women firmly inside the community, making them the transmitters of the home language, and of cultural, ethnic, and religious traditions. In doing so, these ideologies obfuscate the fact that the 'guardian' role is predicated upon

lesser bilingualism and is not highly valued. Moreover, it is argued that local ideologies construct indigenous women as more Indian than the men, both in their looks and in their speech. This Indianness, in turn, positions women simultaneously as 'guardians of the home language' and as backward members of the community. 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 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: 202). Harvey (1994) shows that women in Ocongate, Peru, clearly recognize that their inability to use Spanish has negative implications for their social position. However, their attempts to use Spanish are met with negative attitudes from the men in the community and their performance is subject to ridicule and insults, in which they are portrayed as trying to pass themselves off as better and more educated than they are in reality. Similar situations are depicted in studies which look at minority language communities in Africa, India, and South America, and at immigrant communities in Australia, New Zealand, and the US (Harvey 1994; Hill 1987; Holmes 1993; Stevens 1986; Swigart 1992; Zentella 1987).

Interestingly, it is not only disadvantaged immigrant and minority women who may be denied access to linguistic resources or allowed limited access only, but also middle- and upper-middle class Western females, who temporarily live abroad as students or expatriates and temporary workers. Several studies conducted with Americans studying abroad suggest that some contexts in Russia, Japan, or Spain also provide unequal opportunities for male and female learners to participate in informal interactions (Polanyi 1995; Siegal 1996; Talburt and Stewart 1999). Pichette (2000) interviewed a number of male and female Westerners living in Japan comparing contexts in which they use the language and their linguistic achievements. She concluded that white Western men have many more chances to participate in informal interactions – and, as a result, acquire the language in a wider range of contexts – than Western women. The men spend a lot of time in the local *izakaya* (Japanese pub) where they can 'pick up' the language from the regular customers; they also practice the language with their Japanese girlfriends. In contrast, Western women do not as often form relationships with Japanese men, and are discouraged from

going to pubs and bars alone as their attempts to strike up a conversation may be misinterpreted by the locals. Gender, in conjunction with race, also appears to have limited the interactional opportunities of Misheila, an African-American student on a study abroad trip to Spain (Talburt and Stewart 1999). During the trip, Misheila had found herself consistently singled out and sexually harassed by Spanish males. This sexual harassment, whether real or perceived, provoked a negative reaction in her toward Spanish and its speakers, and curtailed any future investment in learning Spanish. In contrast, the men in Polanyi's (1995) study conducted in Russia and in Pichette's (2000) study conducted in Japan explicitly stated that they had enjoyed their opportunity to be different and visible as it brought them a lot of attention, in particular from local women.

At the same time, we would like to emphasize that women are not always positioned at a double disadvantage as L2 learners. In certain contexts, ideologies of language and gender may conspire against men in achievement of success in second language learning. Thus, Günthner (1992) demonstrated that while Chinese women in her study kept asking native speakers of German for help and assistance in their learning of German, 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 women coming to the US as immigrants or international students have a greater chance of forming relationships with American men and, as a result, have more opportunities to be engaged in meaningful interactions in the target language; consequently, they may achieve higher proficiency than their male peers. At the same time, a high amount of interaction does not necessarily lead to higher proficiency: Teutsch-Dwyer's chapter clearly shows that linguistic accommodations made by the American girlfriend and the English-speaking co-workers of an immigrant Polish man slowed down his acquisition of English.

In sum, we can see that unequal gender relations may mediate access to linguistic resources and structure differential interactional opportunities for male and female L2 users of different ages, class, and ethnic backgrounds. Sexual harassment in particular emerges as an important gatekeeping practice which may complicate women's access to the target language community and inhibit their language learning (Ehrlich 1997, this volume; Goldstein 1995, this volume; Polanyi 1995; Siegal 1996; Talburt and Stewart 1999). We see this feminist understanding of ways in which ideologies and identities, in particular gender identities, mediate access to linguistic resources as critical both for theoretical treatments of language contact and language learning outcomes in the fields of bilingualism and SLA, and for practical attempts to devise new peda-

gogical approaches to language teaching, and new language and education policies and curricula.

4.2. Gendered agency in second language learning and use

Another important finding in the study of multilingualism, SLL, and gender is the intrinsic relationship between gender and agency – i.e., individual decisions and actions – in the process of L2 learning and use. While many SLA theories view L2 learners as passive vessels for input and output, poststructuralist approaches portray them as agents in charge of their own learning (Pavlenko, 2001). This view implies that in some cases L2 users may decide to learn the second, or any additional, language only to a certain extent, which allows them to be proficient, but without the consequences of losing the old and adopting the new ways of being in the world. In other contexts, their L2 learning may be accompanied by a full transition to the new linguistic community and L1 loss. And yet in others they may resist the language that positions them unfavorably. Moreover, an individual's choice is only part of the story in the poststructuralist framework which sees agencies as co-constructed and learning options as predicated on language ideologies and power structures within a particular society.

Gender as a system of social relations and discursive practices emerges as one of the key factors that in certain contexts may influence the decision-making process, and, as a result, the outcomes of second language learning and language shift (see chapters by McMahill, Pavlenko, and Teutsch-Dwyer). To begin with, differences in gender relations between particular speech communities may motivate individuals – oftentimes women – to learn a second language which will ensure them a higher, more respectable social and economic status (Gal 1978; McDonald 1994). Gal's (1978) pioneering study of the 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 subservient 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 not in their native Hungarian villages. Similar findings are reported by Swigart (1992), who shows that while a large majority of women in Dakar, Senegal, 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. Close attention paid to multiple aspects of

identity in both studies suggests that linguistic innovation may be restricted to a particular group of women who are best able to take advantage of social change in progress – often, these may be younger and better educated women (Gal 1978; Holmes 1993; Kobayashi 2000; Swigart 1992).

Another way in which women were found to initiate language shift is by deciding not to transmit the primary language of the community to their children (Constantinidou 1994; Mascarenhas-Keyes 1994; McDonald 1994; Schlieben-Lange 1977). 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: 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 in other domains, these women were in the process of redefining themselves: Gaelic symbolized the bond with their fishing past from which they wanted to break loose.

Several studies indicate that nowadays learning English in particular is seen by many women around the globe as a way of liberating themselves from the confines of patriarchy (Kobayashi 2000; Matsui 1995; Solé 1978; McMahill's and Pavlenko's chapters). Solé (1978) documents a greater tendency to use English – at times exclusively – among Mexican-American college women, striving to escape the confines of traditional Mexican culture. Kobayashi's (2000) survey of 555 high school students in Japan provides evidence that female Japanese students are significantly more positive toward – and more interested in – learning English, training for English-language related professions, and traveling to English-speaking countries, than their male peers. It is not surprising then, that in 1998, according to the Japanese Ministry of Education, 67% of foreign language majors among the university students were female, with English being the most popular and socially expected choice for women as a major and as an occupational choice (Kobayashi 2000). The researcher explains these trends by pointing to the marginalized status of young women in mainstream Japanese society and to ways in which the media discourses of language and gender legitimize female career choices linked to English. One cannot help but notice that this steering of women toward career choices in the language professions – which tend to be lower-paid and more marginal than most other professional careers – is very much in line with the

traditional patriarchal distribution of career options. McMahill's chapter in the present volume takes a different approach to the same phenomenon, suggesting that the links perceived between feminism and English allow female Japanese learners in a feminist EFL class to use English as a language of empowerment. Similarly, an analysis of personal narratives of second language learners in Pavlenko's chapter shows that some immigrant and minority women learn English in order to escape gender relations and gendered linguistic practices of their cultures, perceived by them as hierarchical and demeaning.

It is important to point out here that women are not always the ones prompted to shift allegiances by unequal gender relations. Fortune (1998) tells about a young man who grew up in Brazil speaking Karaja, an indigenous language where the use of certain morphological and lexical forms is sex-exclusive. The young man's parents did not correct his use of women's forms in speech when he was growing up; as a result, his linguistic behavior was considered inappropriate by the wider Karaja community and he was ridiculed as a 'misfit'. Becoming bilingual was a liberating experience for this man, as Portuguese provided a new and much more respectable linguistic and gender identity for him. Herbert (1992, cited in James 1996: 104) 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 would improve their economic and social status. The changing nature of gender relations and the meaning of bilingualism is underscored by Aikio (1992), who discusses the Sámi community in Finland, where women historically enjoyed a comparatively high social and economic status and freedom to travel, while 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 Sámi women attempted to protect themselves from the dominant culture by refusing to learn Finnish. Once the traditional social and economic status began to change during – and as a result of – World War II, Sámi women followed Sámi men in their shift to Finnish.

It is equally important to indicate that gender as a system of social relations and discursive practices may not only prompt second language learning and language shift but may also elicit resistance to learning a language which invalidates individuals' gender subjectivities and replaces them with other ones, seen as problematic. A particularly poignant case 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 and sexuality in terms of spirituality rather than biology, were not easily understood by members of the majority community, many 'berdache' Native

Americans had no choice but to identify themselves as gays and lesbians. In doing so, they acquired identities which could be read in Western terms, but, at the same time, moved from highly respectable identities to highly problematized ones (Lang 1997; Medicine 1997). While these Native Americans had no choice but to learn English, Pavlenko's chapter presents a number of cases in which learners choose to abandon – or at least limit – their attempts to learn and use the second language which positions them unacceptably in terms of gender.

In sum, we can see that paying attention to gender enhances our understanding of agency that may lead to investment in L2 learning or resistance to it. The studies discussed above convincingly demonstrate that it is not the essential nature of femininity or masculinity that defines the patterns of language shift or linguistic trajectories of particular individuals, but rather the nature of gendered social and economic relations, and ideologies of language and gender that mediate these relations. We also believe that much more work remains to be done in this area, in particular, with regard to gendered choices prompted by legitimization of particular sexual identities. An intriguing glimpse into ways in which sexuality may influence linguistic and cultural transitions is offered in Cant's (1997) collection of testimonies of gays and lesbians who migrated either from a rural area to a metropolitan one or from a country where homosexuality is illegal to a more tolerant one. While second language learning was not a factor in some transitions, switching speech communities was critical for Nacho, who left Franco's Spain for London, and for Anna, who left London's Chinese community for the city's multicultural lesbian scene.

4.3. Gendered discursive interactions in multilingual contexts

Another promising direction for future research is the study of gender and discursive interactions in multilingual contexts. Above we discussed ways in which gender may mediate access to interactional opportunities in the second language. In the present section, we will pay close attention to ways in which the presence of more than one language simultaneously multiplies and constrains possibilities for gendered self-expression. We see five main areas in which investigation of multilingual contexts may enhance the understanding of the relationship between language and gender: (1) investigation of the discursive construction of gendered subjectivities in language contact situations, which illuminates clashes in ideologies of language and gender (see Heller's chapter); (2) examination of the use of multiple languages in indexing and performing gender (see Ohara's chapter); (3) study of transformations of gender

performances in linguistic transitions (see Ohara's and Pavlenko's chapters), (4) inquiry into ways in which gender, ethnic, and national identities, NS/NNS status, language proficiency, and the degree of acculturation interact in multilingual contexts (see Piller's chapter), and (5) consideration of ways in which affect and affiliation are implicated in multilingual contexts (see Piller's and Teutsch-Dwyer's chapters).

With regard to the first area of research, multilingual and multicultural contexts present a fertile site for investigation of the discursive construction of gendered subjectivities in public and private discourses. While multiple ideologies of language and gender also clash in seemingly homogeneous monolingual environments, the clashes are especially visible and severe when two or more clearly delineated linguistic, ethnic, and cultural communities are involved. For instance, in a study that compared the discursive construction of German and Turkish women in essays of German students, Räthzel (1997) found that both groups of women were portrayed as subordinated to men. At the same time, German women were seen as subordinating themselves actively, while Turkish women were depicted as "victims of men, of their nature (they are often pregnant) and of ideologies (honour)" (Räthzel 1997: 67). Blackledge's chapter further elaborates on discursive constructions of minority women by the majority society demonstrating how the British school system views Bengali women as illiterate because their literacy is in Bengali and not English. At times, minority communities conspire with the majority culture in oppressive practices. A pioneering study by Ledgerwood (1990) identifies storytelling as an important gender policing resource in a Cambodian immigrant community in the US. Transition to a society with less rigid and more equal gender roles resulted in a loss of social order in the Cambodian community, as Khmer women are entering the workforce, becoming mobile, literate, educated, and able to control cash from both public assistance and wages. Understanding that American laws can protect them against abusive marriages, and that job opportunities and financial assistance are available to help them end unsatisfactory marriages, some women have less interest in family and community matters and engage in dating or having affairs instead. While not all Khmer women participate in these changes, the very possibility of the choices – threatening to Khmer patriarchal social order – led to the creation of a new genre of stories about improper women: (1) improper wives who consider themselves equal to men and, thus, are sexually promiscuous; (2) improper daughters, who are involved in premarital sexual behavior and/or run away from home; (3) improper widows and orphans who are considered unguarded and at greater risk of sexual promiscuity. Performed as 'urban legends' by older men and women, these stories are always told as true and serve as a warning to

disobedient women, since any kind of deviation in these stories always results in serious consequences such as illness or death.

Like other types of identity, gender identities are not only constructed *by* discourse, but also accomplished *in* discourse. In recent years, the field of language and gender 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 through ideologies of language and gender (Gal 1991; Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Ochs 1992). A useful distinction between two types of gender indexicals is proposed by Silverstein (1985): categorical/ overt and statistical/covert. Overt linguistic practices index the gender of the speaker, listener, or both directly, independent of the context of the conversation. 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: 340), it is the latter group that has long been the focus of attention in 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, and access to and use of discursive genres (Bonvillain 1995; Freed 1995; Gal 1991; Ohara, this volume; Philips, Steele and Tanz 1987; Romaine 1999; Yokoyama 1999; for a comprehensive review, see Günthner 1996). The study of multilingualism and SLL indicates that in multilingual contexts gender can additionally be indexed by language use, language choice, language maintenance, language shift, and code-switching.

Most cases of gender indexing in bi- and multilingual communities constitute covert indexing, mediated by ideologies of language, gender, and power, so that particular languages or ways of using them are positioned 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). 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 (Spedding 1994). In their review of research on code-switching and gender, Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998), who are writing from a gender-differences perspective, indicate that, while there exists no direct relationship between the two, different meanings that code-switching practices acquire in different contexts may mediate their relationship to gender. The framework adopted in the present chapter leads us to suggest that in contexts where the majority language is more valued, through association with power, people with more access to that language, oftentimes

men, will exhibit higher degrees of code-switching and loan-word use in the minority language. In contrast, when the local language is more valued, through association with solidarity, code-switching 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 code-switched 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).

A related and quite intriguing area of investigation is research that links differences in gender performances between different communities to transformation of these performances in linguistic transitions. To date, however, very little research has been conducted in this area. More than three decades ago, Ervin-Tripp's (1967) study of Japanese women living in the US suggested that some bilingual women may perform drastically different gendered selves depending on the context, interlocutor, and the language of the interaction. Her insights were not built upon until recently, when researchers started looking again at possibilities of self-expression afforded to individuals by different languages. While Ohara's chapter discusses transformations of pitch in the speech of women who are bilingual in English and Japanese, McMahill's and Pavlenko's chapters talk about ways in which some languages may be seen as more advantageous than others for free self-expression. Pavlenko's chapter also discusses transformations in discursive performances of gender experienced by individuals in the process of linguistic transition. A recent study by Pujolar (1997) reminds us that ideologies of language and gender differ also within multilingual communities based on a number of factors, such as class, ethnicity, or sexuality. In his work, Pujolar (1997) found that men in Catalonia, bilingual in Spanish and Catalan, construct masculinity in different ways: while working-class Catalan men perform masculinity through verbal dueling in Catalan (oftentimes involving insults related to alleged homosexuality), more urban sons of Spanish-speaking parents mock their ways, using silly voices in Catalan to present unmasculine individuals.

Poststructuralist inquiry into multilingualism, SLL, and gender, also brings a new dimension into investigations of intercultural communication and miscommunication. To begin with, it is suggested that individual and institutional interactions in multilingual contexts cannot afford to ignore ways in which power can be differentially distributed based on gender, social status, the native/non-native speaker status, the speakers' degree of proficiency in the more prestigious language, or the degree of acculturation to the majority culture (Günthner 1992; Singh and Lele 1990). The interplay between status, gender, and power in conversational interaction is well illustrated in Günth-

ner's (1992) study of conversational conflicts between German counselors and Chinese students in a Chinese university, where German counselors attempt to give Chinese students a more realistic perspective on their future stay in Germany. The researcher found that in four conversations, conducted in German, Chinese women hardly contradicted their German interlocutors and gave up their own positions, while Chinese men were willing to handle disagreement and remained argumentative all the way through. At the same time, the female German counselors employed highly assertive discursive strategies, due to their high status as counselors and as native speakers of German.

Finally, recent studies also follow up on Eckert and McConnell-Ginet's (1992) contention that the emphasis on economic and social power should not obfuscate other aspects of gender relations such as affiliation and affect. This trend finds reflections in the study of language use and language choice in cross-cultural couples (Heller and Lévy 1992; Piller's chapter) and investigations of bilingualism, gender, and friendship (Hruska 2000; Willett 1995; Woolard 1997). Piller's chapter provides a detailed discussion of various factors which contribute to language choice and language use in cross-cultural couples' communication. Other recent studies look at ways in which gendered peer networks may impact both language use and language learning outcomes. Woolard's (1997) ethnographic case study of high school students in the Barcelona area indicates that gendered friendship practices can affect the use of the bilingual repertoire. The researcher shows that being more solidary and cohesive than the boys' groups, girls' friendship circles favor ethnic and linguistic homogeneity and set stronger constraints on linguistic behavior. In contrast, boys' peer groups can be ethnically mixed and linguistically diverse, with Catalan and Castilian boys mixing more freely than Catalan and Castilian girls. As a result, boys and girls profit differently from the patterns of language use imposed on them by their gendered peer networks: girls' friendships and language behavior may have greater consequences for the social identities they are able to project. Similar gendered patterns in affiliation and language practices were documented in Hruska's (2000) and Willett's (1995) studies of young ESL learners. Willett's (1995) study of four 7-year old ESL children in a mainstream classroom showed that the combined effects of differences in gendered peer cultures and the seating arrangements – which were designed to keep the boys apart but allowed the girls to sit together – favored the three female learners. The friendship between three ESL girls allowed them to collaborate and support each other, thus earning a high status in the girls' subculture and the status of 'good learners' in the eyes of the teacher. In contrast, the working-class Mexican-American boy, Xavier, did not get any help from his female seatmates and was not allowed to get out of his seat to get help from his male

bilingual friends. As a result, he had to rely on adults for help, thus acquiring the status of a needy child, unable to work independently.

In sum, we can see that multilingual and multicultural contexts offer multiple opportunities for researchers interested in the relationship between language and gender. These settings offer a productive site for investigation of the interaction between diverse constructions of gender, sexuality, and privilege which may co-exist – or clash – with each other. They also provide us with a unique opportunity to examine ways in which gendered performances may be transformed in the process of second language socialization. Finally, these contexts offer unparalleled insights not only into the relationship between language, gender, and power, but also into the links between language, gender, and the dynamics of sexual attraction and affiliation.

4.4. Critical and feminist pedagogy

Given the fact that many of the studies in the field are concerned with the mediated relationship between language and social justice, it is clear that mere critical analyses are not enough and that practical outcomes of research in the new field of multilingualism, SLL, and gender are most desirable. Over the years, numerous researchers have engaged in projects that aimed to investigate how critical and feminist pedagogies can contribute to learners' enrichment and empowerment (Casanave and Yamashiro 1996; McGregor, 1998; Peirce 1995; Norton 2000; Papatzikou Cochran 1996; Schenke 1996; Vandrick 1995, 1999a; Yamashiro 2000). Four key topics have been explored in this research: (1) gendered access to educational opportunities (see Blackledge's and Heller's chapters); (2) the gendered nature of classroom interaction (see Heller's chapter); (3) gender representation in teaching materials (see Kramsch and von Hoene's chapter); and (4) development of feminist approaches to language pedagogy (see McMahill's chapter).

Considering that readers may be more familiar with this line of research and practice, we will be brief in our review (for a comprehensive review of the issues of language and gender in second and foreign language education, see Sunderland 2000). In particular, we will omit discussion of the first two topics since they have already been dealt with in sections 4.1 and 4.3, which discuss ways in which gender may mediate access to educational opportunities and patterns of classroom interaction, oftentimes doubly discriminating against immigrant and minority women. In section 4.3, we also presented Willett's (1995) study which shows that in some contexts gendered peer networks may work to the advantage of female learners. Similarly, McMahill's chapter discusses a

unique type of class which combines the learning of English with a feminist agenda and targets an almost exclusively female audience. Together, studies investigating ways in which gender mediates access to and interaction in educational contexts suggest that more attention needs to be paid to locally constructed relations of power which are predicated not only on gender, but also on age, ethnicity, sexuality, class, and linguistic and cultural background. At the same time, feminist educators warn us that this complex approach should not distract attention from the fact that female learners are still disadvantaged in the majority of contexts (Vandrick 1999b).

The third topic, gender representation in language teaching materials, has been for a long time a focus of attention in the fields of applied linguistics (AL) and teaching English-as-a-second/foreign-language (TESL/TEFL). In particular, content analyses of ESL textbooks, published in the 1970s and early 1980s, revealed that many texts stereotyped male and female roles and excluded women from the narrative through omission of females in texts and illustrations, firstness of males in any pair of categories, privileging of males in occupational visibility, and the use of masculine generics such as 'he', 'man', or 'mankind' (Hartman and Judd 1978; Porreca 1984; Sunderland 1992). While the situation has been steadily improving in ESL, recent textbook analyses of EFL textbooks published in Japan (McGregor 1998), Japanese textbooks published in Japan and the US (Siegal and Okamoto 1996), and Russian textbooks published in the US (Shardakova 2000) reveal that many second and foreign language textbooks continue to portray stereotypical gender roles with men occupying higher social positions and women more subordinate roles. Siegal and Okamoto (1996) in particular found that textbooks aimed at teaching Japanese to American students present highly stereotypical linguistic 'norms' based on hegemonic ideologies of class, language, and gender. Kramsch and von Hoene's chapter expands on this theme, insightfully analyzing ways in which discourses of gender and travel interlink in contemporary German textbooks. Together, these studies suggest that there is still a lot to accomplish in order for classroom language teaching materials, in particular textbooks, to fairly represent gender relations and practices and to reflect the gendered nature of linguistic exchanges. The inclusion of sexual harassment issues in the curriculum is particularly important in order to enable female learners to use the language skillfully to protect themselves from potential attacks and to avoid misunderstandings. For instance, in a Spanish classroom, some discussions may deal with multiple meanings of *piropos*, Spanish male complements, which are at times perceived as sexual harassment by American women (Talburt and Stewart 1999).

Finally and most importantly, we believe that the appearance of feminist approaches to language pedagogy (Casanave and Yamashiro 1996; McGregor,

1998; Peirce 1995; Norton 2000; Papatzikou Cochran 1996; Schenke 1996; Vandrick, 1995, 1999a; Yamashiro 2000; see also chapters by Kramsch and von Hoene and McMahill), concerned with empowering the students through discussions of gender, sexuality, and the teaching of non-sexist language, signals the beginnings of a steady movement toward equality and social justice in educational contexts.

5. Conclusions

To conclude, we hope to have demonstrated the importance of forging new links between the fields of multilingualism, SLL, and language and gender. We have argued that the field of language and gender will benefit from considering multilingual contexts, which can provide a unique perspective on the effects of gender as a system of social relations and discursive practices on individuals' access to linguistic resources. Multilingual contexts also offer an unparalleled opportunity to explore construction and negotiation of gender in discourse through examination of gender indexing in multilingual communities, individual gender performances in two or more languages, and the interplay between gender and the NS/NNS status in the construction of authority.

We have also argued that the fields of bilingualism and SLA will similarly benefit from incorporating gender among other social factors that influence multiple language learning and use. We suggested a theoretical framework which foregrounds ideologies of language and gender in the explanation of language contact and SLL processes and outcomes. This framework posits that in certain contexts language contact and language learning outcomes can be explained by the difference in gender relations in majority and minority communities and the meaning assigned by ideologies of language and gender to specific linguistic resources and practices. Thus, in the study of SLA this framework will allow the field to investigate how differences in the meaning and performance of gender could motivate L2 learning.

Two types of questions, macro and micro, need to be explored in future investigations of the interaction between multilingualism, gender, and ideology. With regard to the 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?

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 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 code-switching? 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?

Shifting the focus of attention to individuals, we need to know what are the communities of practice/linguistic markets in which particular bi- and multilinguals 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? Only when these and many other related questions are answered for a number of postcolonial, minority, and migrant 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 multilingualism, SLL, and gender.

Note

1. Parts of this chapter appear in Pavlenko, A. (2001) Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. *The International Journal of Bilingualism* 5, 2.

References

Aikio, Marjut
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.

Ardener, Edwin
1975 The problem of women revisited. In Ardener, Shirley (ed.), *Perceiving Women*. London: Malaby/Dent.

Bergvall, Victoria
1999 Toward a comprehensive theory of language and gender. *Language in Society* 28, 2, 273–293.

Bing, Janet and Victoria Bergvall
1996 The question of questions: Beyond binary thinking. In Bergvall, Victoria, Janet Bing, and Alice Freed (eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Longman, 1–30.

Bonvillain, Nancy
1995 *Women and Men: Cultural Constructs of Gender*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Borker, Ruth
1980 Anthropology: Social and cultural perspectives. In McConnell-Ginet, Sally, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman (eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. New York: Praeger, 26–44.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1991 *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Burton, Pauline
1994 Women and second-language use: An introduction. In Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.), *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use*. Oxford/Providence: Berg, 1–29.

Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.)
1994 *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use*. Oxford/Providence: Berg.

Cameron, Deborah
1992 *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. Second ed. London: Macmillan.

1996 The language-gender interface: Challenging co-optation. In Bergvall, Victoria, Janet Bing, and Alice Freed (eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Longman, 31–53.

1997a Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In Johnson, Sally and Ulrike Meinhof (eds.), *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 47–64.

1997b Theoretical debates in feminist linguistics: Questions of sex and gender. In Wodak, Ruth (ed.), *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, 21–36.

1998 Gender, language and discourse: A review essay. *Signs* 23, 4, 945–973.

Cameron, Deborah and Jennifer Coates

1988 Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences. In Coates, Jennifer and Deborah Cameron (eds.), *Women in their Speech Communities: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. London/New York: Longman, 13–26.

Cameron, Deborah, Fiona McAlinden, and Kathy O'Leary

1988 Lakoff in context: The social and linguistic functions of tag questions. In Coates, Jennifer and Deborah Cameron (eds.), *Women in their Speech Communities: New Perspectives on Language and Sex*. London: Longman, 74–93.

Cant, Robert (ed.)

1997 *Invented Identities? Lesbians and Gays Talk about Migration*. London: Cassell.

Casanave, Christine Pearson and Amy Yamashiro (eds.)

1996 Gender issues in language education (Special issue). *Keio University Shonan Fujisawa Campus Journal*.

Cheshire, Jenny and Penelope Gardner-Chloros

1998 Code-switching and the sociolinguistic gender pattern. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 129, 5–34.

Constantinidou, Evi

1994 The 'death' of East Sutherland Gaelic: Death by women? In Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.), *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use*. Oxford/Providence: Berg, 111–127.

Crawford, Mary

1995 *Talking Difference: On Gender and Language*. London: Sage.

Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnell-Ginet
1992 Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21, 461–490.
1999 New generalizations and explanations in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28, 2, 185–201.

Ehrlich, Susan
1997 Gender as social practice: Implications for second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19, 421–446.

Ellis, Rod
1994 *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan
1967 An Issei learns English. *The Journal of Social Issues* 23, 78–90.

Fishman, Pamela
1983 Interaction: The work women do. In Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarae, and Nancy Henley (eds.), *Language, Gender, and Society.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 89–102.

Freed, Alice
1995 Language and gender. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 15, 3–22.

Fortune, Gretchen
1998 *Sex-exclusive differentiation in the Karaja language of Bananal island, Central Brazil.* Ph.D. dissertation, Lancaster University.

Gal, Susan
1978 Peasant men can't get wives: Language and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society* 7, 1, 1–17.
1991 Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. In Di Leonardo, Micaela (ed.), *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 175–203.

Gass, Susan and Evangeline Varonis
1986 Sex differences in NS/NNS interactions. In Day, Richard (ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 327–351.

Goldstein, Tara
1995 "Nobody is talking bad": Creating community and claiming power on the production lines. In Hall, Kira and Mary Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender Articu-*

lated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self. New York/London: Routledge, 375–400.

Gumperz, John
1972 Introduction. In Gumperz, John and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1–25.

Günthner, Susanne
1992 The construction of gendered discourse in Chinese-German interactions. *Discourse and Society* 3, 167–191.
1996 Male-female speaking practices across cultures. In Hellinger, Marlies and Ulrich Ammon (eds.), *Contrastive Sociolinguistics.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 447–473.

Haeri, Niloofar
1996 *The Sociolinguistic Market of Cairo: Gender, Class, and Education.* London: Kegan Paul.

Hartman, Pat and Elliott Judd
1978 Sexism and TESOL materials. *TESOL Quarterly* 12, 4, 383–393.

Harvey, Penelope
1994 The presence and absence of speech in the communication of gender. In Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.), *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use.* Oxford/Providence: Berg, 44–64.

Heller, Monica
1999 *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography.* London/New York: Longman.

Heller, Monica and Laurette Lévy
1992 Mixed marriages: Life on the linguistic frontier. *Multilingua* 11, 1, 11–43.

Herbert, Robert
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, Jane
1987 Women's speech in modern Mexicano. In Philips, Susan, Susan Steele, and Christine Tanz (eds.), *Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 121–160.

Holmes, Janet
1990 Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech. *Language and Communication* 10, 3, 185–205.
1992 *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
1993 Immigrant women and language maintenance in Australia and New Zealand. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3, 2, 159–179.

Hruska, Barbara
2000 Bilingualism, gender, and friendship: Constructing second language learners in an English dominant kindergarten. Paper presented at the Annual AAAL Conference, March 2000, Vancouver, Canada.

James, Deborah
1996 Women, men and prestige speech forms: a critical review. In Bergvall, Victoria, Janet Bing, and Alice Freed (eds.), *Rethinking Language and Gender Research: Theory and Practice*. London/New York: Longman, 98–125.

James, Deborah and Sandra Clarke
1993 Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. In Tannen, Deborah (ed.), *Gender in Conversational Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 231–280.

Kobayashi, Yoko
2000 Young Japanese women's perceptions about English study. Paper presented at the Annual TESOL Conference, March 2000, Vancouver, Canada.

Kouritzin, Sandra
2000 Immigrant mothers redefine access to ESL classes: Contradiction and ambivalence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21, 1, 14–32.

Kulick, Don
1998 Anger, gender, language shift, and the politics of revelation in a Papua New Guinean village. In Schieffelin, Bambi, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 87–102.

Labov, William
1966 *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center of Applied Linguistics.
1972 *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lakoff, Robin
1975 *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper and Row Publishers.

Lang, Sabine
1997 Various kinds of two-Spirit people: Gender variance and homosexuality in Native American communities. In Jacobs, Sue-Ellen, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang (eds.), *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 100–118.

Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger
1991 *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledgerwood, Judy
1990 *Changing Khmer Conceptions of Gender: Women, Stories, and the Social Order*. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

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

Losey, Kay
1995 Gender and ethnicity as factors in the development of verbal skills in bilingual Mexican American women. *TESOL Quarterly* 4, 635–661.

Maltz, Daniel and Ruth Borker
1982 A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In Gumperz, John (ed.), *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 196–206.

Mascarenhas-Keyes, Stella
1994 Language and diaspora: The use of Portuguese, English, and Konkani by Catholic Goan women. In Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.), *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use*. Oxford/ Providence: Berg, 149–166.

Matsui, Machiko
1995 Gender role perceptions of Japanese and Chinese female students in American universities. *Comparative Education Review* 39, 3, 356–378.

McDonald, Maryon
1994 Women and linguistic innovation in Brittany. In Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.), *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use*. Oxford/Providence: Berg, 85–110.

McGregor, Laura (ed.)
1998 Special issue: Gender issues in language teaching. *The Language Teacher* 22, 5.

Medicine, Beatrice
1997 Changing Native American roles in an urban context *and* changing Native American sex roles in an urban context. In Jacobs, Sue-Ellen, Wesley Thomas, and Sabine Lang (eds.), *Two-Spirit People: Native American Gender Identity, Sexuality, and Spirituality*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 145–155.

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

Nanda, Serena
1990 *Neither Man nor Woman: The Hijras of India*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Nicholson, Linda
1994 Interpreting gender. *Signs* 20, 1, 79–105.

Norton, Bonny
2000 *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity, and Educational Change*. London: Longman.

O'Barr, William and Bowman Atkins
1980 "Women's language" or "powerless language"? In McConnell-Ginet, Sally, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman (eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society*. New York: Praeger, 93–110.

Ochs, Elinor
1992 Indexing gender. In Duranti, Alessandro and Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335–358.

Oxford, Rebecca
1993 Gender differences in styles and strategies for language learning: What do they mean? Should we pay attention? In Alatis, James (ed.), *Strategic Interaction and Language Acquisition: Theory, Practice, and Research.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 541–557.
1994 La différence continue ... Gender differences in second/foreign language learning styles and strategies. In Sunderland, Jane (ed.), *Exploring Gender: Questions and Implications for English Language Education.* London: Prentice Hall, 140–147.

Papatzikou Cochran, Effie
1996 Gender and the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 30, 159–162.

Pavlenko, Aneta
2001 Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 2.

Peirce, Bonny Norton
1995 Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 1, 9–31.

Philips, Susan, Susan Steele, and Christine Tanz (eds.)
1987 *Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pica, Teresa, Lloyd Holliday, Nora Lewis, Dom Berducci, and Jeanne Newman
1991 Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13, 343–376.

Pichette, Mary Jo
2000 *The influence of gender on the acquisition of the Japanese language by white Western men and women living and working in Japan.* Unpublished manuscript, Temple University Japan.

Polanyi, Livia
1995 Language learning and living abroad: Stories from the field. In Freed, Barbara (ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 271–291.

Porreca, Karen
1984 Sexism in current ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly* 18, 4, 705–724.

Pujolar, Joan
1997 Masculinities in a multilingual setting. In Johnson, Sally and Ulrike Meinhof (eds.), *Language and Masculinity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 86–106.

Räthzel, Nora
1997 Gender and racism in discourse. In Wodak, Ruth (ed.), *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage, 57–80.

Romaine, Suzanne
1999 *Communicating Gender*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schenke, Arleen
1996 Not just a "social issue": Teaching feminist in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly* 30, 155–159.

Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte
1977 The language situation in Southern France. *Linguistics* 19, 101–108.

Shardakova, Marya
2000 *Identity construction in Russian textbooks*. Unpublished manuscript, Bryn Mawr College.

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

Siegal, Meryl and Shigeko Okamoto
1996 Imagined worlds: Language, gender, and socio-cultural "norms" in Japanese language textbooks. In Warner, N., J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, M. Oliver, S. Wertheim and M. Chen (eds.), *Gender and Belief Systems. Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 19–21, 1996*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, BWLG, 667–678.

Silverstein, Michael
1985 Language and the culture of gender: At the intersection of structure, usage, and ideology. In Mertz, Elizabeth and Parmentier, Richard (eds.), *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*. New York: Academic Press, 219–259.

Singh, Rajendra and Jayant Lele
1990 Language, power, and cross-sex communication strategies in Hindi and Indian English revisited. *Language in Society* 19, 541–546.

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

Spedding, Alison
1994 Open Castilian, closed Aymara? Bilingual women in the Yungas of La Paz (Bolivia). In Burton, Pauline, Ketaki Kushari Dyson, and Shirley Ardener (eds.), *Bilingual Women: Anthropological Approaches to Second-Language Use*. Oxford/ Providence: Berg, 30–43.

Spender, Dale
1980 *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stevens, Gillian
1986 Sex differences in language shift in the United States. *Sociology and Social Research* 71, 1, 31–34.

Sunderland, Jane
1992 Teaching materials and teaching/learning processes: Gender in the classroom. *Working Papers on Gender, Language, and Sexism* 2, 2, 15–26.
2000 Issues of language and gender in second and foreign language education. *Language Teaching* 33, 4, 203–223.

Swigart, Leigh
1992 Women and language choice in Dakar: A case of unconscious innovation. *Women and Language* 15, 1, 11–20.

Talbot, Mary
1998 *Language and Gender: An Introduction*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Talburt, Susan and Melissa Stewart
1999 What's the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and "living culture". *The Modern Language Journal* 83, 163–177.

Tannen, Deborah
1990 *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Morrow.
1993 The relativity of linguistic strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In Tannen, Deborah (ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 165–188.

Thorne, Barrie and Nancy Henley
1975 *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Trömel-Plötz, Senta
1991 Review essay: Selling the apolitical. *Discourse and Society* 2, 4, 489–502.

Trudgill, Peter
1972 Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1, 179–195.
1974 *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vandrick, Stephanie
1995 Teaching and practicing feminism in the University ESL class. *TESOL Journal* Spring, 4–6.
1999 a Who's afraid of critical feminist pedagogies? *TESOL Matters* 9, 2, 9.
1999 b The case for more research on female students in ESL/EFL classrooms. *TESOL Matters* 9, 2, 16.

Weedon, Chris
1987 *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Wenger, Etienne
1998 *Communities of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

West, Candace and Sarah Fenstermaker
1995 Doing difference. *Gender and Society* 9, 1, 8–37.

West, Candace and Don Zimmerman
1983 Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarae, and Nancy Henley (eds.), *Language, Gender, and Society.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 102–117.
1987 Doing gender. *Gender and Society* 1, 2, 125–151.

Willett, Jerri
1995 Becoming first graders in an L2: An ethnographic study of L2 socialization. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 3, 473–503.

Woolard, Kathryn
1997 Between friends: Gender, peer group structure, and bilingualism in urban Catalonia. *Language in Society* 26, 533–560.

Yamashiro, Amy (ed.)
2000 Gender issues in language education. *Temple University Japan Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* 17.

Yokoyama, Olga
1999 Russian genderlects and referential expressions. *Language in Society* 28, 3, 401–429.

Zentella, Ana Celia
1987 Language and female identity in the Puerto Rican community. In Penfield, J. (ed.), *Women and Language in Transition*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 159–166.

Zimmerman, Don and Candace West
1975 Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversations. In Thorne, Barrie and Nancy Henley (eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 105–129.