Integrating Intersectionality in Language, Gender, and Sexuality Research

Erez Levon*
Department of Linguistics, Queen Mary University of London

Abstract

In this paper, I argue for the need to integrate intersectionality theory more fully in language, gender, and sexuality research. I outline the basic principles of what an intersectional approach to identity and identity-linked speech entails, focusing particularly on the belief that an adequate description of lived experience, and hence social practice, requires us to consider the ways in which multiple systems of social categorization (e.g., gender and sexuality, race/ethnicity, social class, and place) intersect with one another in dynamic and mutually constitutive ways. I review research on the linguistic perception and production of gender and sexuality that has adopted an intersectional perspective to date and argue that while certain aspects of the theory have long had a foothold in work in this area, the field's engagement with the full ramifications of intersectionality as an analytical framework has been partial. I conclude with suggestions about how to anchor a more comprehensive approach to intersectionality in sociolinguistic research.

1. Introduction: The Inadequacy of Isolated Categories in Sociolinguistic Analysis

Sociolinguistic research over the past 20 years has been characterized by an increasingly sophisticated use of social theory and, as a result, the development of a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between individuals, society, and observed patterns of language variation and change (see, e.g., Carter 2013). Many (though certainly not all) of the theoretical innovations in this regard first appeared in work devoted to the study of language, gender, and sexuality before spreading to other areas of sociolinguistic inquiry (Queen 2014), including the argument that language variation can be a form of strategic social practice (Eckert 1989a,1989b; Eckert and McConnell–Ginet 1992; Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999), that such practice is made possible by virtue of an already existing network of ideological links between linguistic forms and social meanings (Gal 1978; Ochs 1992; Barrett 1997), and that it is through engaging in this type of semiotic maneuvering that speakers materialize relevant presentations of self in interaction (Livia and Hall 1997; Cameron and Kulick 2003, 2005; Bucholtz and Hall 2004, 2005). In this paper, I discuss another more recent theoretical innovation that was first introduced to sociolinguistics in research on language, gender, and sexuality: *intersectionality theory*, or the belief that no one category (e.g., 'woman' or 'lesbian') is sufficient to account for individual experience or behavior. I describe how the adoption by an increasing number of language, gender, and sexuality researchers of an intersectionality perspective – a perspective that was itself originally developed in the 1980s by Black feminist scholars and others working on the sociology of gender and ethnic divisions (e.g., hooks 1981; Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1983) – has begun to allow work in this area to provide a more robust account of socially meaningful variation. I argue, moreover, that, like the innovations that came before it, an intersectionality approach stands to have broad ramifications for sociolinguistic theory more generally, well beyond the confines of research focusing specifically on gender and sexuality where it emerged.

As Carter (2013) notes, one of the principal benefits of sociolinguistics' engagement with contemporary social theorizing has been the ability to overcome a false dichotomy between 'structure' and 'agency' in our analyses. What this means is that we do not have to view linguistic practice *either* as a reflex of pre-determined social categories and forces *or* as resulting from the autonomous actions of individuals behaving solely in accordance with their own beliefs and desires. Rather, we can model the ways in which socially meaningful uses of language are the product of what Coupland (2007: 82) terms 'constrained freedom', determined by *both* the various predispositions about language and social life to which we have been socialized (i.e., our 'speech community norms') *and* the agentive choices we make about how to negotiate these normative expectations (e.g., Bourdieu 1979, 1991; Bell 2001; Coupland 2007; Levon 2009; see also Levon and Mendes, forthcoming). Yet despite this, our analyses have tended to remain relatively beholden to explanations grounded in unitary categories of lived experience (Trechter 2003; Morgan 2004, 2007; Lanehart 2009). Thus, while we have developed sophisticated accounts of how particular linguistic forms come to take on gendered meanings, for example, and of how those meanings are then recruited by speakers in interaction, we have been somewhat less attentive to the fact that those gendered meanings are also simultaneously classed, raced, and region- and age-specific (not to mention a host of other such 'specificities') and that when recruiting these forms in talk speakers draw on all of these underlying social connotations together. In other words, I suggest that the analysis of social meaning in much of sociolinguistics has been largely compartmentalized to date, separated into distinct foci of gender/sexuality, race/ethnicity, class, region, etc. While perhaps a useful heuristic early on, this analytical separation has ultimately become detrimental to the further development of the field since it obscures the ways in which different categories of experience (like 'gender' and 'ethnicity') inform and constitute one another (for a somewhat similar argument with regard to race/ethnicity, see Becker 2014; Blake 2014). It is this compartmentalization that intersectionality theory allows us to address by providing us with a framework for understanding the totality of inter-locking social forces that underlie linguistic practice.

In making these claims, I do not mean to imply that sociolinguistic research has been totally uninterested in the question of intersecting social categories. As I mentioned above, a number of language, gender, and sexuality researchers have already adopted an intersectional approach, and certain aspects of intersectionality theory have had a foothold in language and gender studies for some time (see, e.g., discussion in Mallinson 2009). Therefore, what I am arguing for is a fuller and more sustained engagement with intersectionality theoretic principles throughout the field. I should also note that my comments in this regard are focused primarily on work in the variationist paradigm, since research grounded in linguistic anthropological and (critical) discourse analytic perspectives has tended to be more amenable to intersectional considerations (e.g., Leap and Boellstorff 2004; McElhinny 2007; Mendoza-Denton 2008; Bucholtz 2011; Milani 2013, 2014). Finally, it is also important to distinguish between *intersections*, as I use the term here, and the concept of *interactions* as it is normally understood in (quantitative) sociolinguistics (e.g., Labov 1972; Trudgill 1974). To that end, and to help clarify my arguments more generally, I turn in the next section to a definition of intersectionality and a brief outline of intersectionality theory. In Section 3, I review a number of studies on the linguistic production and perception of gender and sexuality that have engaged with aspects of intersectionality in their analyses. I conclude in Section 4 with suggestions for how to integrate a more comprehensive approach to intersectionality in our research going forward, and I illustrate these proposals with a discussion of recent work that has been conducted on language and sexuality.

2. Intersectionality Theory

Intersectionality theory has been described as the 'most important theoretical contribution that women's studies has made' (McCall 2005: 1771) – it is a concept that has become a 'buzzword'

across the humanities and social sciences for how to understand and theorize individual experiences and the larger social structures within which those experiences are located (Davis 2008). This by no means implies that intersectionality is a unified social theory. There are numerous debates about the framework's key concepts, including discussions of how best to conceptualize intersections themselves and how to methodologically implement intersectional analyses (McCall 2005; Phoenix 2006; Yuval-Davis 2006; Hancock 2007; Weldon 2008; Choo and Ferree 2010). For purposes of the current discussion, I abstract away from some of this theoretical complexity and focus on the basic principles that all forms of intersectional analysis share.

At its core, intersectionality theory asserts that both our own, inner understandings of self and the kinds of access, opportunity and treatment we receive are the product of multiple and intersecting systems of social classification. This basic premise emerged in reaction to the perceived exclusionary and homogenizing tendencies of much second-wave feminist theorizing, which, while it purported to represent a collective 'woman's' perspective, principally reflected the preoccupations and experiences of White, middle-class, heterosexual women (Zack 2007; Ferree 2011). The notion that race, class, and national origin can combine with gender to produce a variety of different 'standpoints' (Collins 1990) thus began to gain currency in a number of fields (e.g., Davis 1981; hooks 1981; Hull, Scott, and Smith 1982; Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1983, 1992; Bryan, Dadzie, and Scafe 1985; James 1986). The term 'intersectionality' was itself coined by Crenshaw (1989), a legal theorist, in a discussion of the inadequacy of non-discrimination protections available to Black women. In her work, Crenshaw describes how Black women may occasionally suffer discrimination in ways analogous to all Black individuals and hence be protected by legislation that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race. In other cases, Black women may suffer discrimination in ways analogous to other women and hence be protected by legislation that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex. But, crucially, Crenshaw argues that in certain instances, Black women experience discrimination as *Black women*, not as the additive effects of discrimination based on race and gender but as a specific instantiation of an irreducible intersection of the two categories together. According to Crenshaw, it is this kind of intersectional experience that anti-discrimination law is ill-equipped to handle. Though originally focused on principles of legal doctrine, Crenshaw's arguments in this regard helped to highlight intersectionality as a general and unavoidable fact of life, one which scholars have been trying to construct adequate models of ever since.

We can distill from the literature three basic underlying tenets of an intersectionality theoretic approach. The first tenet reflects Crenshaw's original insight and maintains that *lived experience* is ultimately intersectional in nature. If it is the goal of our research to understand how social forces inform and constrain observed practice, then it is incumbent upon us to place this intersectional complexity at the heart of our analyses. In practice, this is achieved by working to identify the multiplicity of categories, ideologies, and forces that undergird any observed social phenomenon, or as Matsuda (1991: 1189) puts it 'asking the other question':

> When I see something that looks racist, I ask, "Where is the patriarchy in this?" When I see something that looks sexist, I ask, "Where is the heterosexism in this?" When I see something that looks homophobic, I ask, "Where are the class interests in this?"

A deceptively simple method on the surface (Davis 2008), the very fact of asking 'other questions' like these forces us to go beyond the analysis of categories in isolation and instead to consider how those categories intersect with equally important others.

The second tenet of intersectionality theory is that intersections are *dynamic*, and emerge in specific social, historical, and interactional configurations. This means that it is not possible to describe a stable or universal condition indicated by the intersection of gender and race, for

example, but rather that we must attend to the ways in which different social histories, interpersonal motivations, and local ideological expectations shape the imbrication of categories of experience in real-world empirical encounters. Methodologically, the principle of dynamism pushes us to adopt a process-centered approach to intersectionality, one in which we explore how practices (be they institutional or individual) contribute to the racializing and gendering, for instance, of specific individuals, activities, and representations (Staunaes 2003). The importance of dynamism has led some scholars to argue that 'intersectionality' itself is too static a metaphor for the process described and to propose alternative terms, such as social dynamics (Cooper 2004), axes of difference (Yuval-Davis 2006), and assemblages (Puar 2007). Despite these proposals, however, the term intersectionality has been largely retained since it intuitively captures the crux of the framework (Yuval-Davis 2011).

The final tenet of intersectionality theory is that these (dynamic) categories not only intersect but also *mutually constitute* one another (e.g., Choo and Ferree 2010). In certain respects, this is the boldest (and most contentious) aspect of the framework (cf. Crenshaw 2011) since it asserts that intersections are not to be viewed as 'crossroads' of two or more discrete and already existing categories but rather that intersections are themselves formative of the categories in question. In other words, mutual constitution maintains that constructs such as class, race, and gender do not exist as entities unto themselves. Instead, they crucially depend for their meaning on their relationship to the other categories with which they intersect. Thus, there is no 'gender effect' to be discovered and analyzed; there is only the effect of gender in relation to class, race, etc. This is an admittedly strong formulation of mutual constitution, and many scholars have argued for the need to adopt an 'intersections-plus' model (Weldon 2008), where we recognize the existence of unitary 'main effects' of categories in addition to the effects of their intersections (e.g., Walby 2009; Choo and Ferree 2010; Yuval-Davis 2011). Yet even with the retention of the main effects, the concept of mutual constitution remains one of the principal innovations of intersectionality theory since it forces us to go beyond an analysis of *interacting* categories and to look instead at *intersecting* ones (Shields 2008). The difference between an interaction and an intersection is that in the case of the former, there is a necessary assumption of independence between the categories in question. So while we can enter both gender and social class, for example, as predictors in a quantitative model, we are required to assume that each of these factors can (at least in theory) have an independent effect on whatever dependent variable we investigate. And though in our quantitative analyses, we may find evidence of a significant interaction between factors, the interaction only serves to pinpoint places where the two factors mutually effect the outcome of the dependent variable, and say nothing (and indeed cannot say anything) about how the factors themselves are inter-dependent on one another. In short then, the concept of mutual constitution pushes the envelope of intersectionality further and asks us to identify not only how a gendered act, for example, may also be raced or classed but also how gender as a system of social organization is itself ultimately articulated in race- or class-based terms.

Together, these three principles make intersectionality theory a powerful framework for the analysis of identity-linked practice. And while it is true that it can be challenging to implement intersectionality fully in behavioral research (Shields 2008; Choo and Ferree 2010), I have argued previously (Levon 2011) that recent developments in so-called 'third wave' sociolinguistic theorizing – particularly the belief that the social meanings of variable forms are underspecified and only emerge when recruited by speakers in the context of interactionally relevant styles (e.g., Eckert 2008, 2012) – make variationist sociolinguistics well-suited for doing so. In the remainder of this paper, I review some of the research by language, gender, and sexuality scholars that has engaged with intersectionality theory to date before turning to suggestions about how to anchor intersectionality theoretic principles more fully in our analyses.

3. Approaching Intersectionality in Language, Gender, and Sexuality Research

From very early on, certain strands of research on language, gender, and sexuality argued against the belief that gender or sexuality as a category has a uniform effect on language use. Milroy (1980), for example, describes how changes in the vowel system of Belfast in the 1970s were driven by the intersection of gender, ethnicity (Catholic versus Protestant), and occupation-linked social networks. Similarly, Nichols (1978) documents how the use of different morphosyntactic features among Black women in coastal South Carolina is constrained by the women's geographic location and the kinds of social and economic opportunities available to them in these places. This finding leads Nichols to argue that the key factor in accounting for the women's uses of language is not so much their gender *per se* as it is the roles and opportunities that their gender affords them in their local communities (for a similar argument in a different ethnographic context, see Gal 1978). Eckert's (1989a,1989b) classic study of jocks and burnouts in a Detroit-area high school makes very much the same point, demonstrating how gender intersects with local, class-linked affiliations to determine the social and interactional goals that speakers have, and the types of language they use to achieve them.

Building on this foundational work, and taking advantage of the possibilities afforded by more socially nuanced theories of variation (e.g., Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992; Livia and Hall 1997), research in language, gender, and sexuality began to focus more explicitly on the interrelations between gender/sexuality and other relevant categorizations. The most extensive body of research in this area has been on the intersection of gender and race/ethnicity, though the majority of work on this topic has not been specifically variationist in nature. Nevertheless, a number of key studies have identified specific linguistic features and strategies that speakers use to position themselves at the junction of different gendered and racial/ethnic positions, including Barrett's (1995, 1997) research on appropriation and language play among African American drag queens; Morgan's (1996, 2004, 2007) work on African American women's speech practices; Bucholtz's (1999, 2001, 2011) discussions of gender and Whiteness; Pichler's (2008, 2009) ethnography of a group of young Bangladeshi girls in London; and Davis' (2014) recent analysis of gender, sexuality, and 'indigenousness' among two-spirit Native Americans. From a quantitative perspective, the most sustained engagement with language at the intersection of gender and ethnicity can be found in Mendoza-Denton's (e.g., 2008, 2011) long-term examination of language use among Latina gang members in Northern California. In this body of work, Mendoza-Denton has carefully documented how the girls she studies vary a number of linguistic features (in conjunction with other social practices) to construct and position gendered articulations of self that are themselves grounded in the girls' ethnic, classed, and gang-based affiliations (see also Fought 1999). Finally, work on the intersection of gender/sexuality and ethnicity has also begun to emerge in perception research. In a recent study, Pharao and colleagues (2014) discuss how the identification of a voice as sounding 'gay' in Danish depends on its perceived ethnicity, such that non-White-sounding voices are never perceived as 'gay' even when they contain the same sexuality-linked linguistic features as White-sounding voices.

Closely related to work on ethnicity is research that has explored the intersection of gender/sexuality and socio-political imaginings of place, and particularly the nation. Once again, there is far more work on this topic in linguistic anthropology than in (quantitative) sociolinguistics, including Kulick's (1993) work on language and gender among the Gapun in Papua New Guinea and his later work on Brazilian *travesti* (Kulick 1998); Besnier's (2002, 2003, 2004) analyses of *leiti* in Tonga; Inoue's (2002, 2006) historical genealogy of Japanese women's language; and Boellstorff's (2004, 2005) discussion of gays and lesbians in Indonesia. Nevertheless, there are a number of studies in this area from within sociolinguistics that deserve

mention. Wong (2005, 2008a, 2008b; Wong and Zhang 2000) has written extensively on the politics of labeling practices among lesbians and gays in Hong Kong, where he argues that the use of terms such as *tongzhi* emerges from a particular articulation of gender, power, and the politics of sexuality in the region. Similarly, my work on language and sexuality in Israel (Levon 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014a) demonstrates how lesbian and gay Israelis use patterns of prosodic and lexical variation to position themselves in relation to differing conceptualizations of Zionism and Israeli nationalism. Linguistic positionings of self in relation to different national and supranational ideologies is also the focus of Zhang's (2005, 2007, 2008) research on gender, 'cosmopolitanism' and phonological variation in Beijing. On a sub-national level, a recent study by Podesva and Van Hofwegen (forthcoming) investigates /s/ variation among lesbian and gay speakers in rural Shasta County in Northern California. In that paper, they describe how local ideologies of what it means to be 'country' (Hall-Lew and Stephens 2012) lead lesbian and gay speakers in the area to avoid gender non-normative practices, including the acoustic fronting of /s/. Finally, there is a small but growing body of work on the perception of sexuality in different national and cultural contexts, including in Puerto Rico (Mack 2010), Hawaii (Drager 2011), the Southern US (Mann 2012), and Hungary (Rácz and Schepácz 2013; Rácz and Papp forthcoming), among other locations.

Along with race/ethnicity and place, a third major intersection with gender and sexuality that has been explored in the literature is social class. Moore (2004, 2010) and Moore and Podesva (2009), for example, describe how girls in a high school in Bolton (in the north of England) selectively recruit both class- and gender-linked variants (e.g., non-standard subject–verb agreement and tag questions) so as to position themselves within different communities of practice. Moore's arguments in this regard are reminiscent of Eckert's (e.g., 1989a) discussion of the jock and burnout girls (mentioned above) as well as Kiesling's (1998) claims about how men in fraternities in the US draw on stereotypes of working-class speech to create hegemonically masculine presentations of self. Mallinson (2006) and Mallinson and Childs (2007) likewise discuss how two communities of Black women in rural Appalachia draw on different elements of African American English and Southern American English to differentiate themselves from one another along both class-based and religious lines. In her work on Glasgow, Stuart-Smith (2007) makes the converse claim, arguing that young working-class women produce more 'masculine' articulations of /s/ so as to display their working-class status and so distance themselves from their middle-class counterparts (see also Levon and Holmes-Elliott 2013). Hall's (2005, 2009) research on language use among *hijras*, *kotis*, and *boys* in India also highlights how the variable use of gendered linguistic forms and strategies enables speakers to divide themselves into separate groups in what are essentially class-based ways.

Finally, another prominent area in the field has been research on the intersection of gender, sex, and sexuality themselves. This issue has been central to much of the work in sociolinguistic perception, where scholars have investigated how language cues different gradations of the combination of gender and sexuality (e.g., Smyth, Jacobs, and Rogers 2003; Munson et al. 2006; Munson 2007; Mack and Munson 2012). There has been less research in this regard on the production side of things (Levon 2011), though Zimman's (2013, 2014a, 2014b) work on language variation among transmen is a notable exception. In a series of studies using ethnographic, variationist, and discourse analytic methods, Zimman details how categories of gender, sex, and sexuality come together for his participants in empirically distinct ways, and he traces the specific phonetic, prosodic, and textual strategies through which the transmen he studies take up and embody a variety of different masculine selves.

Though selective, the preceding review provides a flavor of the types of engagement with intersectionality theory we find in the language, gender, and sexuality literature (for more extensive reviews of work in this field beyond my specific focus on intersectionality, see Queen 2013, 2014). We see that scholars have investigated the relationship between language and

gender/sexuality in a variety of social, national, and cultural contexts and have been sensitive to how different aspects of social life (such as ethnicity and social class) can constrain and inform how people experience gender and sexuality. Despite this, I nevertheless argue that the field's engagement with intersectionality theory has been partial at best and that we have yet to fully embrace the implications of intersectionality as an analytical framework. In nearly all of the studies reviewed above, the approach to intersectionality that is adopted is one of 'content specialization' (Choo and Ferree 2010), or what McCall (2005) terms 'intra-categorical' intersectionality, whereby broader categorizations like 'woman' are rejected in favor of more specific articulations (e.g., Latina woman or working-class Latina woman). In other words, studies in the field of language, gender, and sexuality have tended to investigate the intersection of gender/sexuality and other categories by examining points of contacts between individual levels of the categories in question. So, gender and race, for example, are examined via a consideration of Black women's practice, or sexuality and region via an analysis of the language used by rural gay men. This type of intra-categorical approach is central to what intersectionality is about, and it serves a crucial theoretical, empirical, and political role is bringing to light a variety of lived experiences that would otherwise be obscured (Crenshaw 1989, 1991; Morgan 2004). But, this is not the entirety of what intersectionality has to offer. Though an intra-categorical approach succeeds in responding to the first principle of intersectionality described above (i.e., the need to examine the intersectional reality of lived experience), it risks paying less attention to the two remaining principles: the dynamic and mutually constitutive nature of intersections themselves (Davis 2008; Choo and Ferree 2010). I therefore suggest that the way to take intersectionality forward in language, gender, and sexuality research is to move beyond a solely intra-categorical approach and to turn our attention to dynamism and mutual constitution as equally important components of the theory.

Before describing what I have in mind in a bit more detail in the next section, I should reiterate that my comments about the state of intersectionality within the field are a generalization and that there are a number of studies that have integrated a more comprehensive understanding of the theory in their analyses (e.g., Mallinson 2006; Mendoza-Denton 2008; Bucholtz 2009). I nevertheless maintain that, on the whole, the critique still applies and particularly with respect to research on language and gender/sexuality within the variationist paradigm. I note, moreover, that my arguments echo recent comments by Eckert (2014) on the use of binary divisions when coding for gender and sexuality in quantitative research. There, Eckert describes the danger of 'fractal recursivity', or 'nesting the terms of the binary within each side of the binary', in language and gender studies, since 'fractals offer a magnification of the ideology that maintains the binary rather than a glimpse at the broader dynamics that constitute gender' (2014: 530). What Eckert is saying is that an intra-categorical approach (i.e., fractal recursivity) does not give us access to the ways in which categories themselves are constituted. Thus, though she does not cast it in these terms, Eckert essentially makes a very similar point to the one that I make here, and argues for a broader integration of intersectionality theoretic principles in our research.

4. Intersectional Sociolinguistics: Future Directions

I propose that we can achieve the goal of integrating intersectionality more fully by combining a focus on marginalized lived experiences with a sustained examination of the ways that linguistic practices linked to one category are used to constitute another. What I mean by this is that we need to go beyond an investigation of solely 'gendered' or 'sexual' features to also include an analysis of features normally associated with other social systems (e.g., race/ethnicity, social class, and place) and of how those features are recruited in the construction and perception of different

sexual and gendered positionings. I illustrate what this kind of approach entails with two brief examples, one drawn from work on perception and the other from a study of strategic stylistic production.

Campbell-Kibler (2011) considers how reactions to the ING variable in the US, a feature that is normally evaluated in terms of region, social class, and overt prestige (Campbell-Kibler 2007), intersects with perceptions of /s/-fronting, a variable that has been argued to index gay sexuality in men's voices (e.g., Munson 2007). As we would expect, Campbell-Kibler finds that listeners rate recordings of men using the velar [iŋ] variant as sounding more 'competent' than recordings with the alveolar [ɪn] form. Likewise, listeners also rate men producing fronter articulations of /s/ as sounding 'gayer' than recordings of those same men producing backer versions. In addition, Campbell-Kibler identifies a general negative correlation between perceptions of gayness and perceptions of competence in her sample, such that voices judged as sounding 'gayer' are, on average, also judged as sounding less 'competent'. But an interesting thing happens when listeners evaluate recordings that contain both /s/-fronting and the velar [iŋ] variant. In these cases, Campbell-Kibler discovers that some listeners rate the speaker as sounding both 'gay' and 'competent'. In other words, the general trend of judging gay-sounding voices as lacking in competence (and competent-sounding voices as not being 'gay') disappears for certain listeners when the two features are presented together. Campbell-Kibler interprets this pattern to indicate that the listeners in question are basing their evaluation on stereotypical representations of a particular type of man: the highly educated/competent gay man. In doing so, the listeners reject the more widespread correlation between competence and heterosexual masculinity and instead allow for the perceptual possibility of a man who is both gay and competent. This finding is interesting for the current discussion because it demonstrates how listeners use the evaluation of language on one dimension (perceived competence) to help constitute their evaluation of another (perceived sexuality). The point is that Campbell-Kibler does not find that [iŋ] is an index of gay male sexuality (or at least not directly). Rather, she finds that [iŋ] is an index of 'competence' and that, for certain listeners, sounding competent helps to constitute what it means to sound gay (see Levon 2014b for a similar investigation in a different context and Munson et al. 2006 for a discussion of other traits that may contribute to the perception of male sexuality).

Podesva (2011) provides another example of how gay male sexuality can be constituted via linguistic variables that are recruited from a different system of social categorization. For Podesva, this other category is region, specifically features associated with the California Vowel Shift (CVS). Four components of the CVS are considered: BOOT-fronting, BOAT-fronting, BAN-raising, and BAT-backing. Podesva examines these features in the speech of Regan, a 31-year-old gay Asian American man in San Francisco. Regan's speech is sampled in three contexts: at a 'boys night out' with other gay male friends in the Castro district of San Francisco; at dinner with Regan's close friend Anthony; and in a meeting with Regan's supervisor at work. Podesva finds a consistent pattern of variation across these three contexts. During the 'boys night out', Regan displays the most advanced realizations of the CVS features, with significantly fronted BOOT and BOAT, raised BAN, and backed BAT. In the meeting with his supervisor, in contrast, Regan's vowels are the most conservative; BOOT and BOAT are further back, BAN is not raised, and BAT sits well front of the BOT vowel. Finally, at dinner with his friend, Regan produces intermediate realizations of all four vowels – they are significantly more CVS-shifted than in the meeting with his supervisor but significantly less so than during the 'boys night out'. In analyzing this pattern, Podesva argues that we must consider the ways in which CVS features have become enregistered (Agha 2007) as indices of the 'fun', 'laidback', and 'carefree' personalities stereotypical of Californians. Despite the fact that the use of CVS features in Regan's speech tracks the general 'gayness' of the contexts (where more advanced CVS features are used

the more explicitly 'gay' the contexts get), Podesva maintains that establishing a link between these features and the indexation of a 'monolithic notion of gay identity is far too large a leap to make' (2011: 42). Instead, Podesva claims that the connection between the CVS and sexuality is grounded in Regan's drawing on the enregistered meanings of these features (e.g., 'fun' and 'laidback') to help him constitute a 'gay partier' persona in certain settings. In other words, Regan does not use the CVS to index his sexuality directly. Rather, the CVS (in combination with other relevant features, such as pitch and intonation) allows Regan to construct a 'gay partier' persona that is itself constituted by its intersection with ideologies of what it means to be 'Californian'.

Though not explicitly framed in terms of intersectionality theory by the author, Podesva's (2011) arguments, like those of Campbell-Kibler (2011), illustrate the kind of analytical focus on dynamism and mutual constitution that I am advocating for here. In both studies, the authors consider how linguistic features that are not directly related to gender or sexuality come to be used in the production and perception of sexual selves. By doing so, the studies are able to investigate how the relevant sexualities themselves are constituted by other categories at particular social and interactional moments – how there currently exists in the US a gay male persona that is defined, at least in part, by his 'competence' and a different gay male persona defined by his 'carefree' and 'laidback' nature. In short, the examples I give here allow us to understand not only *how* sexual personae are linguistically materialized (i.e., in terms of which linguistics features are used) but also *why* those variables participate in their emergence in the ways that they do.[1] And though both of the examples I give involve gay male sexuality, I believe that the analytical approach that they illustrate can (and should) be applied much more broadly.

This is not to say that the approach I am outlining should necessarily apply to all sociolinguistic research. I take it as a given that integrating intersectionality theory is part of a larger project of investigating the relationship between language and identity (however defined), and thus, my comments are directed to those for whom this is an analytical goal. Yet for those scholars who are interested in identity-linked speech, I am arguing that we need to take a more expansive approach to 'asking the other question' (Matsuda 1991) – that it is not enough to ask how a particular linguistic practice may be raced or classed, for example, in addition to be gendered, but that we also need to ask why the raced and classed meanings of certain forms make them available for the constitution of gender. In other words, I think we need to go beyond assuming that an African American English (AAE) feature, for example, will always (or only) be doing something that is race/ethnicity related, or that a 'country' feature will always (or only) be doing something related to place. We also need to be asking how speakers may use AAE or 'country' to enact gender and sexuality and consider what that use can tell us about the relationship between race/ethnicity or place and gender/sexuality more broadly. It is, therefore, not coincidental that the studies I use to illustrate the key concepts of dynamism and mutual constitution are both grounded in a third-wave approach to language variation. As I have argued previously (Levon 2011), a third-wave conceptualization of social meaning as indexically under-specified is what opens up an analytical space for intersectional analysis to proceed. Intersectional analysis itself then entails working to trace the links between the different elements of a variant's indexical field so as to understand how the different stances and social categories associated with a feature come to mutually constitute one another.[2]

Ultimately, I am arguing that language, gender, and sexuality scholars need to take race, class, and a host of other relevant categories seriously. I suggest that the way we should do this is not by simply adding these other categories into the empirical mix but instead by centering our analyses on the social, historical, ideological, and linguistic *relationships* between these categories and the different lived articulations of gender and sexuality we study. I believe that only once we have broadened our focus in this way will we be able to say that we have fully integrated intersectionality theory in language, gender, and sexuality research.

Acknowledgement

Special thanks to Renée Blake, Deborah Cameron, Kathryn Campbell-Kibler, Penelope Eckert, and Christine Mallinson for discussions of the ideas presented here. Thanks too to Phillip Carter and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. I, of course, am alone responsible for any errors or shortcomings.

Short Biography

Erez Levon is a Senior Lecturer in Linguistics at Queen Mary University of London. His work uses quantitative, qualitative, and experimental methods to examine patterns of socially meaningful variation in language. He primarily focuses on the relationship between language and gender/sexuality and the ways in which gender and sexuality intersect with other social categorizations (particularly nation and social class). He is the author of *Language and the politics of sexuality: Lesbians and gays in Israel* (Palgrave, 2010) and the co-editor of *Language, sexuality and power: Studies in intersectional sociolinguistics* (OUP, 2015).

Notes

* Correspondence address: Erez Levon, Department of Linguistics, Queen Mary University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK. E-mail: e.levon@qmul.ac.uk

[1] A reviewer points out that the argument I am making here about features being recruited for the construction and presentation of sexual selves resonates in important ways with the literature on characterological figures in linguistic anthropology (e.g., Agha 2007; Bucholtz 2009; Johnstone 2013). That research suggests that linguistic features take on meaning in the context of broader ideologies about relevant social personae and that what listeners attend to in language are not disembodied identity categories but the indexation of known character types. This view is wholly consistent with the approach I advocate for here, though I would argue that what is needed to operationalize a focus on characterological figures is a method for teasing apart how those figures are constituted in the first place. In other words, while I agree that personae are the ideological vehicles through which beliefs about language circulate, I maintain that intersectionality helps us to look underneath the surface of personae to see their component parts and thus better understand how and why particular linguistic features come to be associated with these person types.

[2] Though I do not focus on it here, an important part of tracing the links between a variant's different social meanings is an analysis of the power relations that enable and/or constrain the formation of these links to begin with. A focus on the power relations involved in different intersectional configurations is also a central component an intersectionality theoretic approach. For more details on this point, see Levon and Mendes (forthcoming).

Works Cited

Agha, Asif. 2007. *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anthias, Floya, and Nira Yuval-Davis. 1983. Contextualizing feminism: gender, ethnic and class divisions. *Feminist Review* 15(1) 62–75.

——. 1992. *Racialized boundaries: race, nation, gender, color and class and the anti-racist struggle*. London: Routledge.

Barrett, Rusty. 1995. Supermodels of the World, Unite!: political economy and the language of performance among African American Drag Queens. *Beyond the lavender lexicon*, ed. by William Leap, 207–26. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

——. 1997. The "homo-genius" speech community. *Queerly phrased*, ed. by Anna Livia and Kira Hall, 181–201. New York: Oxford University Press.

Becker, Kara. 2014. Linguistic repertoire and ethnic identity in New York City. *Language & Communication* 35(1) 43–54.

Bell, Allan. 2001. Back in style: reworking audience design. *Style and sociolinguistic variation*, ed. by Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford, 139–69. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Besnier, Niko. 2002. Transgenderism, locality and the Miss Galaxy beauty pageant in Tonga. *American Ethnologist* 29(3) 534–66.

——. 2003. Crossing genders, mixing languages: the linguistic construction of transgenderism in Tonga. *Handbook of language and gender*, Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 279–301. Oxford: Blackwell.

——. 2004. The social production of abjection: desire and silencing among transgender Tongans. *Social Anthropology* 12(3) 301–23.

Blake, Renée. 2014. African American and Black as demographic codes. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8(11) 548–63.

Boellstorff, Tom. 2004. "Authentic, of course!": gay langauge in Indonesia and cultures of belonging. *Globalization and gay language*, ed. by William Leap and Tom Boellstorff, 181–201. Urbana: Univeristy of Illinois Press.

——. 2005. *The Gay archipelago: sexuality and the nation in Indonesia*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *Distinction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

——. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryan, Beverly, Stella Dadzie, and Suzanne Scafe. 1985. *Heart of the race: Black women's lives in Britain*. London: Virago.

Bucholtz, Mary. 1999. "You da man": narrating the racial other in the production of white masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4) 443–60.

——. 2001. The whiteness of nerds: superstandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11(1) 84–100.

——. 2009. From stance to style: gender, interaction and indexicality in Mexican immigrant youth slang. *Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives*, ed. by Alexandra Jaffe, 146–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 2011. *White kids: language, race and styles of youth identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary, and Kira Hall. 2004. Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research. *Language in Society* 33(4) 469–515.

——. 2005. Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4–5) 585–614.

Cameron, Deborah, and Don Kulick. 2003. *Language and sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 2005. Identity crisis? *Language and Communication* 25(2) 107–25.

Campbell-Kibler, Kathryn. 2007. Accent, (ING) and the social logic of listener perceptions. *American Speech* 82(1) 32–64.

——. 2011. Intersecting variables and perceived sexual orientation in men. *American Speech* 86(1) 52–68.

Carter, Phillip. 2013. Poststructuralist theory and sociolinguistis: mapping the linguistic turn in social theory. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 7(11) 580–96.

Choo, Hae Yeon, and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: a critical analysis of inclusions, interactions and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28(2) 129–49.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black feminist thought*. New York: Routledge.

Cooper, Davina. 2004. *Challenging diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989. 139–68.

——. 1991. Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6) 1241–99.

——. 2011. Postscript. *Framing intersectionality: debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies*, ed. by Helma Lutz, Maria Teresa Herrera Vivar and Linda Supik, 221–33. London: Ashgate Publishing.

Davis, Angela Yvonne. 1981. *Women, race and class*. New York: Random House.

Davis, Kathy. 2008. Intersectionality as buzzword: a sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory* 9(1) 67–85.

Davis, Jenny. 2014. "More than just 'gay' Indians": intersecting articulations of Two-Spirit gender, sexuality and indigenousness. *Queer Excursions: retheorizing binaries in language, gender and sexuality*, ed. by Lal Zimman, Jenny Davis and Joshua Raclaw, 62–80. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drager, Katie. 2011. Style and perceived sexuality. Paper presented at News Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 40. Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

Eckert, Penelope. 1989a. *Jocks and burnouts: social categories and identity in the high school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

——. 1989b. The whole woman : sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1(3) 245–67.

——. 2008. Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4) 453–76.

——. 2012. Three waves of variation study: the emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41(1) 87–100.

——. 2014. The problem with binaries: coding for gender and sexuality. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8(11) 529–35.

Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 1992. Think practically and look locally: language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21(1) 461–90.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2011. The discursive politics of feminist intersectionality. *Framing intersectionality: debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies*, ed. by Helma Lutz, Maria Teresa Herrera Vivar and Linda Supik, 55–65. London: Ashgate Publishing.

Fought, Carmen. 1999. A majority sound change in a minority community: /u/-fronting in Chicano English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(1) 5–23.

Gal, Susan. 1978. Peasant men can't get wives: language change and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society* 7(1) 1–16.

Hall, Kira. 2005. Intertextual sexuality: parodies of class, identity and desire in liminal Delhi. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1) 125–44.

——. 2009. Boys' talk: Hindi, moustaches, and masculinity in New Delhi. *Gender and spoken interaction*, ed. by Pia Pichler and Eva Eppler, 139–62. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall-Lew, Lauren, and Nola Stephens. 2012. Country talk. *Journal of English Linguistics* 40(3) 256–80.

Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics* 5(1) 63–79.

Holmes, Janet, and Miriam Meyerhoff. 1999. The community of practice: theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28(2): 173–83.

hooks, bell. 1981. *ain't i am woman? black women and feminism*. boston: south end press.

Hull, Gloria, Patricia Scott, and Barbara Smith. 1982. *All the women are white, all the black are men, but some of us are brave: Black women's studies*. New York: Feminist Press.

Inoue, Miyako. 2002. Gender, language and modernity: toward an effective history of Japanese women's language. *American Ethnologist* 29(2) 392–422.

——. 2006. *Vicarious language: gender and linguistic modernity in Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

James, Selma. 1986. *Sex, race and class*. London: Centerpress.

Johnstone, Baraba. 2013. *Speaking Pittsburghese: the story of a dialect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kiesling, Scott. 1998. Men's identities and sociolinguistic variation: the case of fraternity men. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2(1) 69–99.

Kulick, Don. 1993. Speaking as a woman: structure and gender in domestic arguments in a New Guinea village. *Cultural Anthropology* 8(4) 510–41.

——. 1998. *Travesti: sex, gender and culture among Brazilian transgendered prostitutes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lanehart, Sonja. 2009. Diversity and intersectionality. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 53. 1–7.

Leap, William and Tom Boellstorff (eds). 2004. *Speaking in queer tongues: globalization and gay language*. Urbana-Champagne: University of Illinois Press.

Levon, Erez. 2009. Dimensions of style: context, politics and motivation in gay Israeli speech. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(1) 29–58.

——. 2010. *Language and the politics of sexuality: lesbians and gays in Israel*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

——. 2011. Teasing apart to bring together: gender and sexuality in variationist research. *American Speech* 86(1) 69–84.

——. 2012. The voice of others: identity, alterity and gender normativity among gay men in Israel. *Language in Society* 41(2) 187–211.

——. 2014a. The politics of prosody: language, sexuality and national belonging in Israel. *Queer Excursions: retheorizing binaries in language, gender and sexuality*, ed. by Lal Zimman, Jenny Davis and Joshua Raclaw, 101–28. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 2014b. Categories, stereotypes and the linguistic perception of sexuality. *Language in Society* 43(5) 539–66.

Levon, Erez, and Sophie Holmes-Elliott. 2013. East end boys and west end girls: /s/-fronting in Southeast England. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 19(2) 111–20.

Levon, Erez, and Ronald Beline Mendes. forthcoming. Introduction: locating sexuality in language. *Language, sexuality and power: studies in intersectional sociolinguistics*, ed. by Erez Levon and Ronald Beline Mendes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Livia, Anna, and Kira Hall. 1997. "It's a girl!": bringing performativity back to linguistics. *Queerly phrased*, ed. by Anna Livia and Kira Hall, 3–20. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mack, Sara. 2010. A sociophonetic analysis of perception of sexual orientation in Puerto Rican Spanish. *Laboratory Phonology* 1(1) 41–63.

Mack, Sara, and Benjamin Munson. 2012. The influence of /s/ quality on ratings of men's sexual orientation: explicit and implicit measures of the "gay lisp" stereotype. *Journal of Phonetics* 40(1) 198–212.

Mallinson, Christine. 2006. The dynamic construction of race, class and gender through linguistic practice among women in a Black Appalachian community. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.

——. 2009. Sociolinguistics and sociology: current directions, future partnerships. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3(4) 1034–51.

Mallinson, Christine, and Becky Childs. 2007. Communities of practice in sociolinguistic description: analyzing language and identity practices among black women in Appalachia. *Gender and Language* 1(2) 173–206.

Mann, Stephen. 2012. Speaker attitude as a predictive factor in listener perception of gay men's speech. *Journal of Language and Sexuality* 1(2) 205–29.

Matsuda, Mari. 1991. Beside my sister, facing the enemy: legal theory out of coalition. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6) 1183–92.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs* 30(3) 1771–800.

McElhinny, Bonnie (ed.). 2007. *Words, worlds and material girls: language, gender, globalisation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2008. *Homegirls: language and cultural practice among Latina youth gangs*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——. 2011. The semiotic hitchhiker's guide to creaky voice: circulation and gendered hardcore in a Chicana/o gang persona. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21(2) 261–80.

Milani, Tommaso. 2013. Are "queers" really "queer"? Language, identity and same-sex desire in a South African online community. *Discourse & Society* 24(5) 615–33.

Milani, Tommaso (ed.). 2014. *Language and masculinity: performances, intersections, dislocations*. London: Routledge.

Milroy, Leslie. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Moore, Emma. 2004. Sociolinguistic style: a multidimensional resource for shared identity creation. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/La revue canadienne de la linguistique* 49(3–4) 375–96.

——. 2010. The interaction between social category and social practice: explaining was/were variation. *Language Variation and Change* 22(3) 347–71.

Moore, Emma, and Robert Podesva. 2009. Style, indexicality, and the social meaning of tag questions. *Language in Society* 38(4) 447–85.

Morgan, Marcyliena. 1996. Conversational signifying: grammar and indirectness among African American women. *Interaction and grammar*, ed. by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel Schegloff and Sandra Thompson, 405–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 2004. "I'm every woman": Black women's (dis)placement in women's language study. *Langauge and women's place: text and commentaries*, ed. by Mary Bucholtz, 252–9. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 2007. When and where we enter: social context and desire in women's discourse. *Gender and Language* 1(1) 119–29.

Munson, Benjamin. 2007. The acoustic correlates of perceived masculinity, perceived femininity, and perceived sexual orientation. *Language and Speech* 50(1) 125–42.

Munson, Benjamin, Elizabeth C. McDonald, Nancy L. DeBoe, and Aubrey R. White. 2006. The acoustic and perceptual bases of judgments of women and men's sexual orientation from read speech. *Journal of Phonetics* 34(2) 202–40.

Nichols, Patricia. 1978. Black women in the rural South: conservative and innovative. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 17(1) 45–54.

Ochs, Elinor. 1992. Indexing gender. *Rethinking context: language as an interactive phenomenon*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 335–58. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pharao, Nicolai, Marie Maegaard, Janus Møller, and Tore Kristiansen. 2014. Indexical meanings of [s+] among Copenhagen youth: social perception of a phonetic variant in different prosodic contexts. *Langauge in Society* 43(1) 1–31.

Phoenix, Ann. 2006. Editorial: intersectionality. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3) 187–92.

Pichler, Pia. 2008. Gender, ethnicity and religion in spontaneous talk and ethnographic-style interviews: balancing the perspectives of researcher and researched. *Gender and language research methodologies*, ed. by Kate Harrington, Lia Litosseliti, Helen Saunston and Jane Sunderland, 56–70. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

——. 2009. *Talking young femininities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Podesva, Robert. 2011. The California vowel shift and gay identity. *American Speech* 86(1) 32–51.

Podesva, Robert, and Janneke Van Hofwegen. forthcoming. /s/exuality in small-town California: gender normativity and the acoustic realization of /s/. *Language, sexuality and power: studies in intersectional sociolinguistics*, ed. by Erez Levon and Ronald Beline Mendes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Puar, Jasbir. 2007. *Terrorist assemblages: homonationalism in queer times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Queen, Robin. 2013. Gender, sex, sexuality and sexual identities. *The handbook of language variation and change*, ed. by J. K. Chambers and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 2nd edition, 368–87. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

——. 2014. Language and sexual identities. *The handbook of language, gender and sexuality*, ed. by Susan Ehrlich, Miriam Meyerhoff and Janet Holmes, 2nd edition, 203–19. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rácz, Péter, and Viktória Papp. forthcoming. Percepts of Hungarian pitch-shifted male speech. *Language, sexuality and power: studies in intersectional sociolinguistics*, ed. by Erez Levon and Ronald Beline Mendes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rácz, Péter, and András Schepácz. 2013. The perception of high frequency sibilants in Hungarian male speech. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 60(4) 457–68.

Shields, Stephanie. 2008. Gender: an intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles* 59(5–6) 301–11.

Smyth, Ron, Greg Jacobs, and Henry Rogers. 2003. Male voices and perceived sexual orientation: an experimental and theoretical approach. *Language in Society* 32(3) 329–50.

Staunaes, Nora. 2003. Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 11(2) 101–10.

Stuart-Smith, Jane. 2007. Empirical evidence for gendered speech production: /s/ in Glaswegian. *Laboratory Phonology 9: phonology and phonetics*, ed. by Jennifer Cole and Jose Hualde, 65–86. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Trechter, Sara. 2003. A marked man: the contexts of gender and ethnicity. *The handbook of language and gender*, ed. by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 423–43. Oxford: Blackwell.

Trudgill, Peter. 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walby, Sylvia. 2009. *Globalization and inequalities: complexity and contested modernities*. London: Sage.

Weldon, Laurel. 2008. Intersectionality. *Politics, gender and concepts: theory and methodology*, ed. by Gary Goertz and Amy Mazur, 193–218. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wong, Andrew 2005. The reappropriation of tongzhi. *Language in Society* 34(5) 763–93.

——. 2008a. The trouble with tongzhi: the politics of labeling among gay and lesbian Hongkongers. *Pragmatics* 18(2) 277–301.

——. 2008b. On the actuation of semantic change: the case of tongzhi. *Language Sciences* 30(4) 423–49.

——. forthcoming. How does oppression work: insights from Hong Kong lesbians' labeling practices. *Language, sexuality and power: studies in intersectional sociolinguistics*, ed. by Erez Levon and Ronald Beline Mendes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wong, Andrew, and Qing Zhang. 2000. The linguistic construction of the tongzhi community. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 10(2) 248–78.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3) 193–210.

——. 2011. Beyond the recognition and re-distribution dichotomy: intersectionality and stratification. *Framing intersectionality: debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies*, ed. by Helma Lutz, Maria Teresa Herrera Vivar and Linda Supik, 155–69. London: Ashgate Publishing.

Zack, Naomi. 2007. Can Third Wave feminism be inclusive? Intersectionality, its problems and new directions. *The Blackwell guide to feminist philosophy*, ed. by Linda Martin Alcoff and Eva Feder Kittay, 193–207. Oxford: Blackwell.

Zhang, Qing. 2005. A Chinese yuppie in Beijing: phonological variation and the construction of a new professional identity. *Language in Society* 34(3) 431–66.

——. 2007. Cosmopolitanism and linguistic capital in China: language, gender and the transition to a globalized market economy in Beijing. *Words, worlds and material girls*, ed. by Bonnie McElhinny, 403–22. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——. 2008. Rhotacization and the "Beijing Smooth Operator": the social meaning of a linguistic variable. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(2) 201–22.

Zimman, Lal. 2013. Hegemonic masculinity and the variability of gay-sounding speech. *Journal of Language and Sexuality* 2(1) 1–39.

——. 2014a. The discursive construction of sex: remaking and reclaiming the gendered body in talk about genitals among trans men. *Queer Excursions: retheorizing binaries in language, gender and sexuality*, ed. by Lal Zimman, Jenny Davis and Joshua Raclaw, 13–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 2014b. Transmasculinity and the voice: diverse masculinities through phonetic bricolage. *Language and masculinity: performances, intersections, dislocations*, ed. by Tommaso Milani. London: Routledge.