Gender, publication and citation in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology: The construction of a scholarly canon

BONNIE MCELHINNY, MARIJKE HOLS,
JEFF HOLTZKENER, SUSANNE UNGER,
AND CLAIRE HICKS

Department of Anthropology
University of Toronto
100 St. George Street, Room 1052
Toronto, ON M5S 3G3, Canada

ABSTRACT

Feminist scholars have begun to ask how existing conceptual schemes and organizational structures in academic disciplines have excluded women and feminist ideas, and to provide suggestions for transformation. One strand of this work has been the exploration of how canons of thought are constructed in such fields as economics, sociology, and sociocultural anthropology. This article begins such an investigation for sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology by reviewing how gender correlates with publication and citation over a 35-year period (1965–2000) in five key journals, and in 16 textbooks published in the 1990s. It describes some marked differences in the publication of works by women and on gender in the five journals, as well as some significant differences in the degree to which men and women cite the work of women. It also considers how the rate of publication of articles on sex, gender, and women is correlated with publication of female authors. It concludes with a discussion of the implications of this study for changing institutional practices in our field. (Gender, publication, citation, academic discourse, feminist theory, canons)*

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, feminist and critical analysts have directed their attention to the social milieu and social relations of knowledge production. The early stages of feminist thought in all fields have typically been associated with filling in the gaps: correcting sexist biases in the existing literature and creating new topics out of women's experiences (McElhinny 1997). However, as feminist work proceeds in a discipline, "feminists discover that many gaps were there for a reason, i.e. that existing paradigms systematically ignore or erase the significance of women's experiences and the organization of gender" (Stacey & Thorne 1993:168). The task of feminist scholars thus goes beyond simply adding discussions of

women to the available pool of knowledge; it also includes asking how existing conceptual schemes and organizational structures in our disciplines have excluded women and feminist ideas, and providing suggestions for transformation.

Recently feminist scholars in a number of different social scientific fields – sociocultural anthropology, economics, and sociology – have begun to explore how canons of thought are constructed (e.g. Spender 1981, Behar & Gordan 1995) and how theory becomes masculinized (Lutz 1995). A variety of recent works in anthropology (e.g. Amory 1997, Behar & Gordan 1995, Harrison 1995) have pointed out the processes of intellectual colonialism that lead to the suppression or marginalization of subaltern analysts. Since publishing is significant for getting jobs, tenure, grants, promotions, and awards, the politics of academic publication has been a key area of inquiry (Spender 1981, Ward & Grant 1985, Bakanic, McPhail & Simon 1987, Lutz 1990). Studies consider whether, when, and where women publish. Less frequently considered, but in our view of equal importance, is how women's writing is taken up – that is, how women's work is recognized, used, and cited by other scholars.

Thanks to Derrida 1988, 1991, citation is a notion much discussed in theory, but it remains little investigated in practice, and it has certainly received much less attention than publication (Lutz 1990).[1] Nevertheless, the practice of citation is central to academic writing because of what citations are perceived to signify. Generally, citations are seen as an objective measure of academic merit, a way by which scholars simply and rationally reflect appreciation of high-quality work (see Cozzens 1989:439 for a summary of this argument). Research on citations conducted by sociologists of science since the 1970s has shown that this perspective is oversimplified (Small 1978, Ferber 1986),[2] but many still suggest, though not without controversy, that citations remain significant for elevating the cited author's prestige and standing in the community (Cozzens 1989). Citation is one of the most important ways by which academics evaluate and critique the written work of others, and it is therefore crucial in the construction of a scholarly canon (Lutz 1990). Since research by different scholars indicates that most citations are inserted in scholarly works in order to agree with the person cited rather than to disagree (Small 1978, Lutz 1990, Cozzens 1989), citation is one way by which a work becomes widely celebrated as central, valuable, and important. In one of the most extensive studies of the way that gender shapes, and is shaped by, publication and citation rates, Lutz 1990 found that in sociocultural anthropology, even though women produce a substantial proportion of the work available for citation (a proportion commensurate with their presence in the field), the proportion of women authors cited is lower than would be expected on that basis. In addition, work written by men tends to be understood more frequently as theoretical, and thus as having wider implications for the field.

In this article, we present the results of a similar study that focuses on how gender correlates with publication over a 35-year period (1965–2000) in five journals in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology: *Anthropological*

Linguistics (AL), *Language in Society* (LS), *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* (JLA), *International Journal of Sociology of Language* (IJSL), and *Language Variation and Change* (LVC).[3] We also consider which journals are most likely to publish work on gender, and how this correlates with rates of publication of female authors. After looking at publication, we turn to two sources of information on the impact and reception of men and women's writings: citations of men and women in articles of roughly the same period, and in textbooks, a venue for canon-setting not considered by Lutz.

METHODS

We chose to study publication in refereed journals because they remain central to the calculation of scholarly worth in hiring, tenure, merit raises, and promotion decisions, as well as in grant and other competitions. They also are more regularly seen by a broad cross-section of those who identify themselves as sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists than are books and book chapters. We elected to analyze *Anthropological Linguistics*, *Language in Society*, *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, and *Language Variation and Change* for several reasons: they are generally understood to be among the most influential journals in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics; they represent a range of theoretical perspectives; they aim to attract international contributors; and they were launched at different times to respond to perceived inadequacies in the fora for publication then available.[4] Although these journals have an international reputation, and all aim to attract contributors from a variety of countries (though their success in this varies), the editors and, to a lesser extent, their editorial boards, as well as the bulk of the contributions, tend to reflect a North American orientation. Journals based in other locales (e.g. *Discourse and Society* or *Pragmatics*) might display different patterns.

We began by looking at how sex of authors correlated with rates of publication. We coded all articles in the first issue of each year. We looked only at research articles; book reviews, brief notes on previous publications, and other kinds of non-refereed publications were excluded. Where an article had more than one author, we counted all authors.[5] Where the gender of an author was unclear because the author's name was gender-neutral, because only initials were used, or because the author was from a culture whose naming conventions were not known to us, we consulted other scholars familiar with those naming conventions, wrote to the author, consulted membership lists (e.g. the American Anthropological Association membership directory), or tried to track down other publications by the same author in library databases such as the *Wilson Indexes* and *Anthropological Literature*. Our analysis is based only on those articles for which gender of author could be determined.

We also considered which journals were most likely to publish research on gender. Again, we only looked at research articles and lengthy review articles;

book reviews, brief notes on previous publications, and other kinds of non-refereed publications were excluded. An article was designated as being principally about gender if sex, gender, sexuality, women, or men was mentioned in the title, in the abstract, or in keywords accompanying the article.[6] Although gender as an analytic category was featured in other articles (on, say, language and power, or doctor-patient interactions), we included only those articles for which sex, gender, sexuality, women, or men was a principal theme.

For our analysis of citations, we coded citations of men and women in References, Works Cited, and Bibliography sections. Where authors cited multiple publications by a single author, we counted each publication separately. When authors cited publications with multiple authors, we counted each author separately.

The gender of gatekeepers

Earlier studies of publication in sociology and sociocultural anthropology suggested that women's participation in the publication process as editors correlates with the rates of publication of women and/or of feminist articles. For instance, Ward & Grant (1985:149–50) found a positive correlation between sociology journals that were edited by women and the publication of feminist articles on gender and sexuality, while Lutz 1990 found that *American Ethnologist*, the anthropology journal in her sample that had the highest proportion of female authors and that showed the largest increase in female authors over the decade studied, was the only journal to have at least one female editor. Editors serve as gatekeepers in a variety of different ways: in deciding whether or not to review a manuscript, which referees to send a manuscript to, and how to resolve the often contradictory recommendations contained in reviewers' reports (Bakanic et al. 1987:632).

We began, therefore, by looking at women's participation in the process of editing. To produce Table 1, we sampled at five-year intervals the number of men and women who were editors or members of an editorial board of the five journals.[7] Because these journals began publication at different times, we list the journals included in each year sampled. The category of editors includes editors, associate editors, book review editors, and in some cases assistant editors (where that position was held by a faculty member rather than, say, a graduate student at the editor's institution).[8]

For each year sampled, then, we have a snapshot of the gender of the editorial gatekeepers. Although it is noteworthy that AL had a female editor early on, in recent years, when the pool of senior women might be expected to be deepest and richest (given the number of women hired in the mid-1970s) and the number of editorial positions has increased, we see women occupying only one-quarter of these significant gatekeeping positions; moreover, all of these women were

TABLE 1. *Women as editors and editorial board members of five sociolinguistics journals, sampled at five-year intervals (1965–2000).*

	Editors		Editorial board	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
1965 (AL)	100	(1/1)	0	(0)
1970 (AL)	100	(1/1)	0	(0)
1975 (AL, LS)	25	(1/4)	14	(3/21)
1980 (AL, LS, IJSL)	17	(1/6)	15	(11/71)
1985 (AL, LS, IJSL)	29	(2/7)	15	(13/86)
1990 (AL, LS, IJSL, LVC)	7	(1/15)	30	(34/114)
1995 (AL, LS, IJSL, LVC, JLA)	27	(4/15)	35	(41/118)
2000 (AL, LS, IJSL, LVC, JLA)	27	(4/15)	33	(40/120)

associate editors rather than chief editors.[9] Editorial boards have become larger and perhaps more important since the founding of sociolinguistics journals in the mid-1960s, and women's participation in editorial boards, while fixed at approximately one-sixth through 1985, has shown a leap to about one-third in the past 15 years. Participation of women in editorial boards varies markedly, however, among the five journals (see Table 2). Indeed, the difference in the proportion of women editorial board members on different journals is increasingly significant over time.

The number of gatekeepers who were women is roughly comparable to those found in sociology. Ward & Grant (1985:150) found in 1974–1983 that women constituted anywhere from 11% to 37% of the gatekeepers of a particular sociological journal. For the same time period, sociolinguistics journals display about the same range. More recently, both JLA and LS have had roughly equal numbers of men and women on their editorial boards, while LS has even had a majority of women on its editorial board. Although LS has slowly and steadily increased the number of women on the editorial board since its founding in the mid-1970s, AL had no women on its editorial board until the 1990s. To be sure, an editorial board was constructed for that journal later than for IJSL and LS, but even then no women were included at first, at a time when both those other journals did include women. The percentage of women on the IJSL editorial board has increased slightly from 10% to 14% in recent years. This editorial board does, however, include representatives from the largest number of countries. Other journals (LS and perhaps LVC) began with more international boards, and have slowly become more North American-dominated. In the section below, we will consider whether the gender composition of gatekeepers correlates with the gender of published authors.

TABLE 2. *Women's participation in the editorial boards of five sociolinguistics journals (1965–2000).*

	AL % (N)	IJSL % (N)	JLA % (N)	LS % (N)	LVC % (N)
1975	–	–	–	14% (3/21)	–
1980	–	10% (5/50)	–	29% (6/21)	–
1985	0% (0/13)	10% (5/50)	–	35% (8/23)	–
1990	18% (2/11)	10% (5/48)	53% (9/17)	50% (13/26)	42% (5/12)
1995	15% (2/13)	14% (7/51)	53% (9/17)	69% (18/26)	45% (5/11)
2000	13% (2/16)	14% (7/49)	45% (9/20)	70% (16/23)	50% (6/12)

N = Total number of editorial board members

Author's gender and publication in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology

In her study of publishing in American sociocultural anthropology, Lutz (1990:612) found that the publication rates of women approximated the number of women in the field. Approximately 30% of the articles published in the journals she studied were written by women, and approximately 30% of the people in the field were women. Because of the international and interdisciplinary constituency of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, we have no straightforward way of determining the percentage of women in the field. The membership list for the Society for Linguistic Anthropology, a subunit of the American Anthropology Association, has 639 people whose gender we were able to identify, of whom 47% are women. However, the members of the SLA represent only a fraction of practicing sociolinguists. The overall proportion of publications in sociolinguistic and linguistic anthropology by women authors is also about one-third (33% of 527 articles); however, this figure masks marked differences among journals in the publication of articles by women (see Table 3).[10]

JLA, LS, and LVC tend to publish women and men in approximately equal numbers. None of the sociocultural journals sampled by Lutz 1990 approached such parity. AL and IJSL publish works authored by women at significantly lower rates than the other journals. This may be due to differences in rates of submission of articles by women, differences in degree of acceptance of articles by women, or some combination of these (see Lutz 1990). AL has shown little change over time, with about one-fifth of its authors being women, while for most of IJSL's history about one-third of its authors have been women.[11]

Two of the journals studied here have had a woman as chief editor (Judith Irvine was editor of JLA in the late 1990s; Florence Voegelin was editor of AL in 1959–1981 and co-editor with Martha Kendall in 1982–1988), but no clear pattern exists of correlation between having a woman as chief editor and publishing

TABLE 3. *Women authors in five journals, 1965–1995 (in percentages).*

	AL % (N)	IJSL % (N)	JLA % (N)	LS % (N)	LVC % (N)
1965–70	22 (22)				
1971–75	19 (21)			16 (32)	
1976–80	19 (21)	7 (28)		58 (31)	
1981–85	19 (31)	31 (48)		43 (23)	
1986–90	16 (38)	36 (22)		58 (31)	58 (17)
1991–95	23 (39)	36 (36)	48 (27)	44 (25)	46 (35)
Overall	21 (172)	28 (134)	48 (27)	44 (142)	50 (52)

a large number of female authors. Indeed, AL has one of the lowest publication rates for female authors. However, there is a correlation between percentage of women on the editorial board and percentage of women published. Those journals with the largest number of women on the editorial boards (LS, JLA, LVC) also have the strongest records for publishing female authors; those journals with the fewest women on editorial boards (AL, IJSL) have the weakest records for publishing female authors.

*Publication of articles on gender in sociolinguistics
and linguistic anthropology*

Many scholars have argued that inadequacies in social science scholarship about gender and women are directly linked to the inequitable status of women within a profession (see Ward & Grant 1985 for a review). Such inadequacies can include the omission and under-representation of women as subjects for research; a concentration on male-dominated sectors of social life; the use of paradigms, theories, and methods that more faithfully portray men's experiences than women's; and the use of men and male lifestyles as norms against which social phenomena are interpreted (Ward & Grant 1985:140). Feminist sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists have increasingly asked questions about how fundamental analytic concepts must be revalued when women and gender are taken seriously. For instance, the definitions of "hypercorrection" (Cameron & Coates 1988), "standard" and "vernacular" language (Morgan 1999), and "speech community" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992, Holmes 1999), and even theories about the way language constructs social identity (Ochs 1992), have all been reexamined and revised by feminist sociolinguists.

There has, however, been less attention in our field than in other fields to the ways that inadequacies in scholarship correlate with status of women in the field. We therefore chose to explore the correlations between publication of women

TABLE 4. *Authors of articles on gender in five journals, 1965–2000.*

	AL % (N)	IJSL % (N)	JLA % (N)	LS % (N)	LVC % (N)	Total
Women	83% (15)	69% (43)	67% (4)	79% (26)	70% (14)	73% (102)
Men	17% (3)	21% (13)	17% (1)	18% (6)	25% (5)	20% (28)
Unknown	0	10% (6)	17% (1)	3% (1)	5% (1)	6% (9)
Total	18	62	6	33	20	139

authors and publication of research on gender, defined here as research on sex, gender, sexuality, women, or men.[12] We investigated the extent to which articles about gender were published in the different journals, assuming that many such articles would be "feminist" – which we define broadly here to mean critiques of the inequitable or negative treatment or position of women and implicit recommendations for change – while recognizing that some articles on those topics would not reflect that orientation. It is perhaps not surprising to find that the majority of articles on gender continue to be published by women (see Table 4), though men do contribute nearly one-quarter of the articles on these topics.

Because most feminist research continues to be done by women, we might expect that the journals that include the greatest number of women authors are most likely to publish work on gender. Indeed, two (LS, LVC) of the three journals that publish men and women in roughly equal numbers also publish more articles on gender, while the two journals (AL, IJSL) that publish fewer women also publish fewer articles on gender (Table 5).[13] JLA stands out in having a large percentage of publications by women but a relatively low percentage of articles on gender.

Still, what is most striking about our findings is the low rate of publication of articles on gender in the field. Only 5% of the articles published in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology in the past 35 years are primarily about gender (Table 5).[14]

The significance of our findings can be best highlighted by comparing them with the findings of a similar study in a related discipline, sociology. Unlike anthropology, history, and literary criticism, sociology is not understood as a discipline in which feminism has led to a significant reconceptualization of existing frameworks. Indeed, two feminist sociologists (Stacey & Thorne 1993) have spent some time considering what explains the "missing feminist revolution" in sociology, with *revolution* defined as both the transformation of existing conceptual frameworks and the acceptance of those transformations by others in the field. Yet we will see that even in sociology, feminist thought has had a much more significant impact than in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology.

TABLE 5. *Articles on gender in five sociolinguistics journals, 1965–2000.*

	AL % (N)	IJSL % (N)	JLA % (N)	LS % (N)	LVC % (N)	Total
1965–70	0.6% (1/151)					0.6% (1/151)
1971–75	2% (3/157)			4% (1/26)		2% (4/183)
1976–80	1% (2/156)	11% (10/89)		13% (3/23)		6% (15/268)
1981–85	2% (3/126)	2% (4/224)		5% (1/21)		2% (8/371)
1986–90	4% (4/101)	2% (5/222)		5% (1/20)	12% (3/26)	4% (13/369)
1990–95	5% (2/44)	5% (12/226)	9% (4/44)	18% (4/22)	12% (9/73)	8% (31/409)
1996–00	1% (1/73)	7% (18/253)	3% (1/36)	22% (16/74)	6% (4/64)	8% (40/500)
Total	2% (16/808)	5% (49/1014)	6% (5/80)[15]	14% (26/186)	10% (16/163)	5% (112/2251)

Ward & Grant 1985 surveyed articles published in ten major sociology journals in the period 1974–1983. They considered the effects of women's participation as editors and board members on publication of feminist articles, publication of women authors, and the nature and kind of articles published on gender. In that period, they found that 19% of articles published in those ten journals in sociology (705 of 3,674) were articles on gender (1985:144). By contrast, in approximately the same period (1976–1985), only 4% of the articles (26 of 639) published in the five sociolinguistic journals considered here were on gender. Although Ward & Grant found the percentage of articles on gender increasing steadily over time (1985:146), we find no such pattern. The sociology journal with the lowest rate of publication of articles on gender (13%) outstrips the highest rate (9%) for a sociolinguistic journal publishing in the same period, while the sociology journals with the highest rate (31%) far exceed the highest rate of any of the journals analyzed here, for any period (1985:147).

Ward & Grant also found a positive correlation between the use of qualitative methods and the publication of work on gender, in that the journals that printed the most qualitative work were more likely to print articles on gender than journals that printed more quantitative work. We do not arrive at a comparable finding: LVC, one of the journals with the highest percentage of articles on gender since its founding, is devoted to quantitative sociolinguistic studies. However, it is important to consider not only number but also kinds of article published on gender. Ward & Grant divide articles on gender into three categories – additions, modifications, and recasts – which they see as progressively more radical challenges to the discipline: (i) ADDITIONS address the omission or under-representation of women by replicating studies done with male-only samples and/or those studies that talk about sex differences; (ii) MODIFICATIONS refine or revise concepts to include previously neglected social domains in which women are actors; and (iii) RECASTS put forth new theoretical models to include women's lives. In their analysis, they found that the first two kinds of articles were most prevalent, accounting for about 45% of all articles on gender in the period examined

(1985:146). The most radical kinds of disciplinary transformations, recasts, appeared only about 10% of the time.

Almost all of the articles appearing in LVC are what Stacey & Thorne call "sex as a variable" studies, and thus fit into the category of additions as studies that talk about sex difference. Feminist critics have raised serious questions about such articles, noting that such work often reifies sex differences and suggests that they are immutable parts of men and women, and that it unreflectingly assumes that gender is the property of individuals rather than a principle of social organization (cf. Eichler 1980, Eckert 1989, Stacey & Thorne 1993, McElhinny 2003). Such work often begins by assuming that there are sex/gender differences and then proceeds by asking what those differences are, rather than asking if, when, and where there are sex/gender differences, and what difference (if any) those distinctions make. Publication of results that report uncritically on sex differences tends to ESSENTIALIZE them; that is, it reifies differences and understands them as categorical (Scott 1990:144). This contrast may be understood as rooted in biological difference (cf. sociobiology), or as rooted in sociological differences – for example, in models of gender development that place significant weight on early childhood experiences that are understood as gender-segregated (e.g. Tannen 1990). Essentialist portraits have been challenged because they fail to take into sufficient account the ways that other aspects of social identity interact with gender, because a focus on constructed differences between entities ignores differences within entities (Butler 1990:4, Scott 1990:137) and because "absolutist characterizations of difference end up always enforcing normative rules" (Scott 1990:145).[15] It is telling that work which reports on a LACK of sex difference is less likely to be published in journals (Hyde 1990).

A large number of the articles appearing in IJSL are analyses of sexist language and considerations of the effects of nonsexist language planning. Many of these articles, too, can best be understood as "addition" or, at most, "modification" articles. Most of them seem to draw upon the traditional rhetoric of research as objective and to argue that their approach arrives at even more objective findings than earlier, less gender-sensitive work. Though some writers on language and gender have developed more deep-seated epistemological critiques (Cameron 1992), few sociolinguists or linguistic anthropologists working on gender have written "recast" articles, or adopted the "standpoint" approach to feminism, which has been widely described in feminist theory (Alcoff 1988, Collins 1990, Hartstock 1983, Harding 1991, Jaggar 1983). Standpoint feminists argue that investigations of the viewpoints of marginalized groups lead to distinctive forms of knowledge. Standpoint feminism falls within a long leftist tradition of considering the unique epistemologies offered by oppressed groups:

> The intellectual history of feminist standpoint theory is conventionally traced to Hegel's reflections on what can be known about the master/slave relationship from the standpoint of the slave's life versus that of the master's life and

to the way Marx, Engels and Lukacs subsequently developed this insight into the 'standpoint of the proletariat' from which have been produced Marxist theories of how class society operates. In the 1970s, several feminist thinkers independently began reflecting on how the Marxist analysis could be transformed to explain how the structural relationship between women and men had consequences for the production of knowledge. (Harding 1993:53–4)

A feminist standpoint epistemology calls for acknowledgment that all human beliefs, including scientific ones, are socially situated, and it tries to offer an account of which social situations tend to generate the most objective knowledge claims. Instead of adopting a standpoint approach that clearly considers how knowledge and forms of knowledge production are linked to different positions of power, most of the work on language and gender published in academic journals has instead adopted (or has been forced to adopt) a "science-as-usual" stance.

The ways in which gender articles are published is also significant. Ward & Grant (1985:152) found that even the least radical kinds of articles on gender tend to be concentrated in special issues, where they might be overlooked by parts of the usual sociological readership.[16] Some evidence for this lies in the fact that gender articles were not later cited where they seemed to be relevant, even in publications in the same journal. In addition, works would appear in later issues of the same journal with precisely the same flaws described in those articles. There is evidence for a similar pattern in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. More than half (28) of the articles on gender that we found in IJSL were concentrated in three special issues: "American minority women in sociolinguistic perspective" (1978), "Language, sex and society" (1994), and "Women's language in various parts of the world" (1998). The total number of articles on gender for LS is boosted in 1999 by a special issue on "Communities of practice" with special attention to implications for feminist theories and methods. Though such special issues remain an important resource for scholars, as well as an important avenue for editors to explore in finding ways to showcase work on gender, if the insights offered in such articles do not systematically enter into analyses that also consider ethnicity, nationalism, culture, or class, then they can represent only a modest achievement.

Stacey & Thorne argue that "feminist transformation of a discipline may be facilitated, or impeded, by the traditional subject matter of a given field of inquiry, by the traditional subject matter of a given field of inquiry, by its underlying epistemologies, and by the status and nature of theory within each discipline, and within feminist thought" (1993:169). They point out that feminist thought has made most headway in disciplines where interpretivist understandings prevail over positivist ones: anthropology, literature, and history vs. sociology, psychology, political science, economics, and linguistics. Alessandro Duranti writes that linguistic anthropology is characterized by a sharp tension between positivist and interpretivist points of view. On the one hand, he notes that the idea that

transcription is theory is a widely accepted one in the discipline, and that it is one which requires a commitment to the idea that what we hear and transcribe reflects a set of choices, ideologies and theories about what constitutes relevant data. On the other hand,

> even the most dialogically oriented anthropological linguists hide somewhere inside a positivist homunculus, a little heir of Durkheim and Bloomfield, who believes that there are "facts" (speeches, words, sounds, and silences) and that science is done by finding appropriate – that is, communal and debatable – ways of representing those facts.... The order that can be reconstructed, inferred, and predicted on the basis of studying and analyzing transcripts becomes a source of confidence that often makes linguistic anthropologists – and their colleagues in related, partly overlapping fields – less tentative in their analysis, though not always daring in their conclusions. (Duranti 1994:40)

Because interpretive approaches are more reflexive about the circumstances in which knowledge is developed, they are more open to questions about the effects of the social and political circumstances in which knowledge is created and received – including the effects of the gender of researcher, audience, or those studied or written about – rather than understanding the production of knowledge as abstract, universal, and objective, unrelated to particular standpoints or positions (Stacey & Thorne 1993:177).

A related tension in sociolinguistic study, also pointed out by Duranti, is that between a focus on the formal-aesthetic dimensions of symbolic resources like language, and the historical, social, and moral implications of the uses of those resources. Though founding work in sociolinguistics has challenged the very distinction between *langue* and *parole* (Hymes 1974), much sociolinguistic work continues to be uninformed by social theory (for recent arguments along these lines, see Woolard 1985, Cameron 1990, Kulick 2000, McElhinny 2003), with the result that the analysis of linguistic forms, broadly defined, is often more detailed than the considerations of their social implications, including the implications of a focus on formal analysis to the exclusion of social analysis. Feminist insights suffer here, alongside insights derived from other forms of social theory, such as Marxist thought, queer theory, anti-racist scholarship, or postcolonial theory.

Gender and citation in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology

Although the process of journal refereeing means that the evaluation of submitted work is to some extent gender-blind, at least in regard to authors, citation of published work is not. When we considered a sample of 94 journal issues from five journals, with a total of 16,766 citations, we found a striking imbalance between the rate at which women cite women and the rate at which men cite women. Since the great majority of all scholars have been male, we would not expect parity in citation, especially in a field like anthropology in which scholars

310 *Language in Society* **32**:3 (2003)

TABLE 6. *Total rates of women cited in five sociolinguistics journals.*

	By women % (N)	By men % (N)	Overall % (N)
AL (33 yrs 1965–99)	29.8 (283)	15.8 (523)	19 (806)
IJSL (21 yrs 1978–99)	34.1 (458)	18.4 (393)	24.4 (851)
JLA (8 yrs 1991–98)	33.8 (392)	23.4 (187)	29.5 (579)
LS (21 yrs 1976–99)	39.2 (787)	26 (587)	32.2 (1374)
LVC (11 yrs 1989–99)	34.9 (543)	34.2 (423)	34.6 (966)
Total	35 (2463)	21.7 (2113)	27.3 (4576)

tend to cite a significant proportion of works from earlier decades.[17] Nonetheless, if this were the only factor affecting citation rates, we would still expect men and women to cite women at equivalent rates. This is not the case. In total, 27.3% of the total are citations of women. Women cite women 35.1% of the time, while men cite women only 21.5% of the time. This pattern of citation is, on the whole, similar to that found in economics (Ferber 1986) and in sociocultural anthropology (Lutz 1990), although the actual rate at which women are cited in our study is somewhat higher. This difference may be due to the fact that the studies examine different fields, but it also is probably linked to our use of a more recent sample. Table 6 shows the percentages on a journal-by-journal basis.

As one can see, the rates are even close to equitable only for LVC; in the remaining journals, men cite women approximately two-thirds as often as women cite women. The lowest rates, as well as the largest overall gap, are for AL. The journals that tend to publish fewer women (AL and IJSL) also tend to have fewer women cited overall. This is true even if we compare only the citations in articles written by men.

When these data are broken down by decade (Table 7), we can see that the rates of citations are not stable. The change over the past two decades is significant.[18] While the rate at which women are cited clearly increased in the period 1990–1999 over 1980–1989, for the three journals that spanned more than 20 years, another interesting pattern is evident here. The rate of women cited by women increases across these two periods somewhat more dramatically than the rate of women cited by men. Since women have higher rates of publication for the period 1990–1999, their citation of women can thus account for a significant proportion of the overall increase of women being cited over these two decades. As a result, the gap between rates of citation of women by women and by men has actually widened over the last two decades, even though the overall rates are higher for the more recent decade.[19]

Scholars often cite themselves, sometimes profusely, and so we considered what impact this might have on our results. For LVC, AL, and IJSL, we looked at

TABLE 7. *Citation of women authors in five sociolinguistics journals, by decade.*

	1980–1989			1990–1999		
	By women % (N)	By men % (N)	Overall %	By women % (N)	By men % (N)	Overall %
AL	23.3 (53)	15 (212)	16.1	30.6 (133)	18.4 (208)	21.8
IJSL	27.2 (135)	17.6 (202)	20.5	38.6 (315)	21.3 (183)	29.7
JLA				33.7 (396)	23.4 (187)	29.5
LS	31.7 (206)	25.4 (225)	28	43.4 (464)	27.8 (328)	33.6
LVC				35.5 (525)	34.6 (422)	35.1
Total	28.7 (394)	18.5 (639)	21.4	36.9 (1829)	25.6 (1328)	31.1

the practice of self-citation. Examining a total of 127 journal articles, we found that, on average, self-citations make up 6.5% of citations in articles written by female authors and 8.0% citations in those written by men. This difference is significant only at the 10% level (chi-square = 2.87, p = .0902).[20] That men are more likely to cite themselves than women is not, therefore, a full explanation of why women are cited less often than men. Clearly, as Lutz 1990 also found, the differences between men and women in their citation of women is not an artifact of self-citation.

CANON CONSTRUCTION IN TEXTBOOKS

Although there is a burgeoning academic literature on the ways in which publication and citation are linked to gender in articles in refereed journals, the role of textbooks in the construction of a scholarly canon has been examined remarkably infrequently. Even Lutz's (1990) comprehensive survey of different forums for the presentation of research in anthropology does not consider the role of textbooks. Nonetheless, as Thomas Kuhn argues, "Close historical investigation of a given speciality at a given time discloses a set of recurrent and quasistandard illustrations of various theories in their conceptual, observational, and instrumental applications. These are the community's paradigms, revealed in its textbooks, lectures and laboratory exercises. By studying them and by practicing with them, the members of the corresponding community learn their trade" (1970:43). Kuhn's comments focus on instruction, and the lack of attention given to textbooks as publications may perhaps be linked to the frequent devaluation of teaching as opposed to research in the assessment of academic work. Junior scholars are often advised not to consider writing textbooks, not only because they may not have the breadth of vision that a senior scholar may have, but also because a textbook, though time-consuming to write, may not be counted as a research

publication during consideration for tenure. The prestige that is attached to writing a textbook depends in part on its audience.

Although all textbooks, by virtue of the material that is covered in them, present a distinctive take on what is central in a given field at a given moment, textbooks written for upper-level undergraduates and graduate students may be more likely to provide a critical overview of the field and to identify important gaps and emerging trends in ways that try to shape future scholarship. Nonetheless, textbooks that are written primarily for undergraduates also shape widespread perceptions about what kinds of social problems and scholarly questions are central, and therefore their importance should not be dismissed. Future practitioners in the field also get their first, and for some most lasting, impression of what constitutes the field when they are undergraduates.

We surveyed 16 textbooks in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology that were published, or published in new editions, in the 1990s. An informal survey of linguistic anthropologists conducted on an e-mail list and later published in *Anthropology News* (the newsletter of the American Anthropology Association) identified seven of these books – those by Agar, Bonvillain, Duranti, Foley, Palmer, Salzmann, and Wardhaugh – as the ones most commonly used by linguistic anthropologists (Dunn & Wilce 1999:64).[21] We added to the list several others that are directed more toward sociolinguists, as well as several books that also have a linguistic anthropological focus but were omitted from the informal survey.

Although women published approximately one-third of the articles in the five academic journals in the 1990s, only about one-fifth (3/16, or 19%) of these textbook authors are female. All of the female authors have written textbooks directed primarily to undergraduates.[22] The textbooks that are most likely to shape the direction of scholarship in the field, those directed to graduate students, have all been written by men.

As Table 8 shows, the frequency with which works written by female and male authors are cited in these textbooks varies dramatically: Bonvillain's and Holmes's textbooks cite women approximately half the time, while Hanks cites one woman for every nine men cited.[23] Female authors were among the most frequent citers of other female authors (chi-square 139.7, p = .000, significant at 1% level).

The topics that authors choose to survey clearly influence the number of women cited. This is perhaps most clearly evident in the differences in citation rates of women in Fasold's two sociolinguistic volumes. Fasold 1984, *Sociolinguistics of society*, devotes a considerable amount of space to language planning, a field in which we found relatively few women cited, while Fasold 1990, *The sociolinguistics of language*, contains a chapter on "Language and sex." The first volume cites women 19% of the time, while the second volume cites them 34% of the time.

Eight of the books listed here – Bonvillain, Chambers, Fasold 1990, Foley, Holmes, Macaulay, Romaine, and Wardhaugh – include at least one chapter on language and gender. Two female authors, Bonvillain and Holmes, include two

TABLE 8. *Citations of female authors in 16 textbooks in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology.*

Textbook	Women cited	N	Audience for textbook
Holmes 1992	49%	301	UG
Bonvillain 2000	46%	448	UG
Fasold 1990	34%	652	UG/G
Romaine 1994	32%	186	UG
Duranti 1997	30%	822	UG/G
Chambers 1995	30%	354	UG/G
Foley 1997	26%	833	UG/G
Macaulay 1994	26%	184	UG
Hudson 1996	25%	305	UG/G
Wardhaugh 1992	24%	484	UG
Spolsky 1998	24%	62	UG
Salzmann 1993	21%	414	UG
Palmer 1996	21%	413	UG/G
Fasold 1984	19%	420	UG/G
Agar 1994	17%	135	POP/UG
Hanks 1996	12%	239	UG/G

N = total authors cited by a given textbook author
UG = undergraduate; G = graduate; POP = popular audience

chapters each on language and gender. Seven of the eight authors who include chapters on language and gender are the most frequent citers of women. Duranti's textbook, although it does not include a chapter on gender, also is one of the most frequent citers of women, perhaps because his book includes a rich number of references to works in the literature on language socialization, an area in which the majority of contributions has been made by women scholars.[24]

In addition to thinking about how the inclusion of fields in which women have predominated (like language socialization and gender studies) shapes citation, it is important to ask which fields have been male-dominated, or which are relatively balanced. Hanks's book does not attempt a full-scale survey of current work in sociolinguistics/linguistic anthropology; it focuses on work shaped by semiotics and practice theory and undertakes a genealogy of that work. The citation of a number of works in continental European philosophy leads to an extraordinarily low citation of women in this field, even though the field of linguistic anthropology is currently approximately 50% women. Agar's book devotes considerable time to the strengths and weaknesses of cognitive anthropology. Palmer's focus on ethnosemantics as central to linguistic anthropology also leads to a low rate of citation of women. Because the tone of the book is quite personal (it is structured, in part, as an introduction to the field through the prism of Agar's own intellectual biography), many of the citations are quite explicitly to people in

314

TABLE 9. *The 12 authors most frequently cited in 12 textbooks on linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics.*

Author's name	Number of textbooks in which author is one of five most frequently cited authors
Bickerton	2
Chomsky	2
Duranti	2
Fishman	3
Gumperz	3
Haugen	2
Hymes	5
Labov	7
John Milroy	2
Lesley Milroy	4
Romaine	3
Trudgill	7

Agar's own personal network where, it seemed to us, men were more heavily represented. Indeed, one of the most striking findings to us as we reviewed these textbooks was how little overlap there was among the textbooks in the topics covered and/or authors cited. This is evident in the authors most frequently cited in this set of textbooks (see Table 9).[25]

It is not, however, topic alone that shapes the numbers of women and men cited, since the citation of women by different authors can vary even when those authors are discussing the same topic. Six of the textbook authors – Bonvillain, Fasold, Holmes, Macaulay, Romaine, and Salzmann – devoted a chapter to a topic roughly characterized as language and variation in regional and social dialects. These chapters on language variation did NOT necessarily cover the same material. What is significant here is what material, and which scholars, each author believes must be included in such a chapter. Most authors cited women one-quarter of the time, but Bonvillain cited them one-third of the time. Bonvillain differs from the other authors in that she (like Morgan 1999) defines vernacular language broadly enough to include work on discourse, and thus to include many studies of African American women's discourse genres. She cites Rickford's (1997) comments about the ways in which African American women have been erased from the urban landscape by researchers' focus on male-centered activities and male sexual exploits, and she draws on work by Michele Foster and Linda Nelson to present alternative perspectives.

In addition to the overall numbers of women and men cited in these textbooks, we also were interested in which authors were most frequently cited. For 12 textbooks, we identified the five authors most frequently cited.[26] In some cases,

the number was slightly larger than five if several authors were tied for fifth in number of works cited. This resulted in a list of 52 authors. Fourteen, or slightly more than 25%, of these authors were women.[27] Remarkably, no single author is among the most frequently cited authors in all these textbooks. Only 12 of these are among the top five cited authors for more than one textbook (Table 9). Two of these (Lesley Milroy and Suzanne Romaine) are women. Those who are most widely cited across a range of textbooks include Labov, Trudgill, and Hymes (see Figueroa 1994 for a work that argues that Hymes, Labov, and Gumperz are three of the leading sociolinguistic theorists and metatheorists, and Murray 1983 for one arguing that Gumperz and Hymes, among others, were both organizational and intellectual leaders in establishing the ethnography of speaking).

This finding should be interpreted with caution. It does not mean that these authors are not cited in the other textbooks (many are), but rather that they are not among the most frequently cited authors in those books. Frequency of citation is only one measure of influence. For instance, Brown & Gilman's famous paper on pronouns was cited in most of the textbooks, but this pair produced fewer publications than, say, Labov or Gumperz. One paper that is widely cited across different schools of thought in a field is arguably as central as one author who is cited multiple times in the context of only some schools of thought in a field. Authors who were frequently cited by textbook authors could have been seen as central to the field, or they could simply be well known to the author, as is evident in the high degree of self-citation among textbook authors, as well as citation of frequent co-authors and colleagues at the same university. This reflects the dual functions of textbooks: describing the field and also directing it.

C O N C L U S I O N : I M P L I C A T I O N S , A P P L I C A T I O N S ,
F U R T H E R R E S E A R C H

In their study of the publication of feminist work in sociology, Ward & Grant (1985:153) point out that professional newsletters have often been the sole publication in which one can find information on the status of women in a profession. They caution that, if newsletters remain the major outlet for such discussions, some scholars may conceptualize the gender issue as an administrative or management problem only, and not one with implications for the tenor, quality, and direction of scholarly research (see also Harding 1986). Such discussions also allow scholars to separate considerations of the status of women in the field from the nature of scholarship in the field. We need to use the sophisticated tools available to us as sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists to consider how different voices, as well as different theoretical perspectives, get heard within our profession and also within other institutions. Such work is of a piece with the reflexive turn in anthropology, which considers the contexts and politics of ethnographic fieldwork and writing (see, e.g. Clifford & Marcus 1986, Rosaldo 1993, Behar & Gordan 1995, Gupta & Ferguson 1997).

Susan Gal, in a comprehensive review of research on language and gender, has pointed out:

> [S]ocietal institutions are not neutral contexts for talk. They are organized to define, demonstrate, and enforce the legitimacy and authority of linguistic strategies used by one gender – or men of one class or ethnic group – while denying the power of others. Forms that diverge are devalued by the dominant ideologies. . . . [B]y authorizing some linguistic practices and not others, the institution appears to demonstrate the inferiority of those who use unauthorized forms and often inculcates in them feelings of worthlessness. (1991:188–89)

In this article, we have begun an examination of the academy as a social institution by considering how gender correlates with publication and citation in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. In this conclusion, we consider some of the implications of this work, and the questions it raises for further research.

Our work suggests the importance of considering both sociological and epistemological factors to discover whether and how a discipline welcomes women and work on gender, feminism, and women. Feminist transformations of knowledge are affected by factors like the demographic composition of a discipline and its internal organization, as well as by a discipline's traditional subject matter and underlying epistemologies (see also Stacey & Thorne 1993). The number of women serving as gatekeepers correlates with publication rates of women. This suggests the importance of recruiting women into not only this subfield but also other, related subfields, as well as the importance of recruiting women into gatekeeping positions.

This project begins to show some of the ways that scholars and works of scholarship become central in the field, and the fact that these processes are shaped by gender, but we believe there is much more work to be done on why and how this occurs, as well as on the question of what may attract significant numbers of women to certain topics and significant numbers of men to others, and what may repel them from other topics. As with other work in language and gender, the richest picture will be obtained by using other methodologies alongside quantitative methods (see Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992). A more ethnographic account of how different journals operate would be helpful. Editorial structures differ among the journals (with IJSL's being perhaps most different from the others), and this can be significant, but so can editors' decisions about how proactive to be in soliciting work, and their ideas about which issues are or should be central to the field. Certainly the boundary between solicited and submitted articles can be much more ambiguous than it is often taken to be in, for instance, search and tenure committee discussions. How decisions are made about which manuscripts should be sent out for review, as well as which reviewers to send them to, are relevant here as well.[28] In addition, a qualitative analysis of in-text citations would allow us to gain a more nuanced understanding of how women's and men's work is valued and used (for examples of such analysis for other ends, see Gilbert 1977, Small 1978, Moravcsik

1988, Cozzens 1989). Here, we offer one example of what such qualitative analysis might yield, in the hope of promoting such research.

We were struck, as we combed through Foley's (1997) rich and helpful introduction to anthropological linguistics, by the way that some decisions about how to organize the book had gendered implications. Foley's textbook is structured around the debate between universalist and relativist approaches to social life and to linguistic analysis. The 21-chapter book includes at its core five chapters that review arguments and evidence for innate constraints on mind, and five chapters that review arguments and evidence for cultural and linguistic constraints on mind. These chapters are followed by nine chapters that are rich reviews of research on certain topics in linguistic anthropology, such as politeness, gender, language socialization, and genre. The keystone chapter in the book is Chapter 10, "Linguistic relativity and the Boasian tradition," which reviews the contributions of Boas, Sapir, and Whorf to Americanist anthropology, with particular attention to implications of their work for linguistic anthropology. This chapter also highlights current research that carries on in this tradition, including detailed analyses of the work of John Lucy and Michael Silverstein. Indeed, the work of these two scholars is construed as important enough to merit separate subheadings in the chapter ("Neo-Whorfianism: The empirical studies of Lucy" and "Silverstein's reformulation"), each of which appears in the book's table of contents. The only other scholars singled out for similar textual distinction are Plato, Kant, Saussure, Lévi-Strauss, Berlin, Lounsbury, Boas, Sapir, and Whorf. The work of these two scholars is thus placed at the center of an anthropological canon. Because of its relationship to the debate construed as the central debate for linguistic anthropology, their work is also construed as crucially theoretical. And these are two scholars who are white and male, and centrally placed at a key institution for graduate training in anthropology in the United States, the University of Chicago. There is, however, at least one other corpus of work that has been crucially linked to the critical elaboration of Whorf's work, and it is not featured in this chapter nor in other chapters on empirical studies of relativism. This is work on language socialization, which is treated as one of the "topics in" linguistic anthropology. Yet two of the key scholars in this tradition, Elinor Ochs and Bambi Schieffelin, have repeatedly emphasized the way this work is connected to, and contributes to, the Whorfian tradition (see e.g. Schieffelin & Ochs 1986, Ochs 1996). That their work is featured in the textbook and lavishly cited certainly marks its importance. These are not marginalized scholars. Nonetheless, their work, by virtue of its placement within the structure of the text, is construed for student readers as less theoretically central than that of Lucy and Silverstein.

This exemplifies a general point made by Lutz: "Theory has acquired a gender insofar as it is more frequently associated with male writing, with women's writing more often seen as description, data, case, personal, or, as in the case of feminism, 'merely' setting the record straight" (1995:251). The point, as Renato Rosaldo eloquently emphasizes, is that "in the humanities, social sciences and

legal studies, canonical lists of classics pose problems not because of what they include (the books are good), but because of what they exclude (other good books). . . . The vision for change strives for greater inclusion, not an inversion of previous forms of exclusion" (1993:xviii). Certainly a more comprehensive analysis of the ways that theory gains a gender and a race within linguistic anthropology would require finding and examining the books and articles that are not cited at all, or that are cited critically, and considering how one might structure interpretations of the history and current practice of the field in more inclusive ways. Exemplary in this regard is Marcyliena Morgan's argument (2002:86) for the need to give the work of the African-American sociolinguist Claudia Mitchell-Kernan more respect and attention than it received when it originally appeared.

The striking imbalance between the rate at which women cite women and the rate at which men cite women is another question that deserves further attention.[29] One explanation for this finding could be that, within the subfield of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, certain topic areas attract larger numbers of men or women. For instance, work on language planning, ethnosemantics, and color terminology seems to attract large numbers of men, while work on language and gender, language socialization, and language revitalization seem to attract large numbers of women. The differential rates of citation could, therefore, be linked to the topics of inquiry that people are investigating. As we were developing a coding system, we initially tried to code for topic of inquiry and to consider its correlation with the gender of the author. We discovered, however, that there was an enormous amount of variability in intercoder judgments on what the topic of an article was. Resolving this methodological difficulty would be one challenge for conducting further research along this line.[30] Ferber 1986 did, however, control for topic in a study of gender and citation rates in economics, and she still found a striking imbalance in citation, similar to what we describe here. She suggests that the social networks in which scholars moved (whatever their field of inquiry) were not wholly gender-equitable, and that scholars tended to cite those in their network more often than those outside it. The effects of social networks on citation are, then, a second possible explanation for the differential rates at which men and women cite women. How certain authors become cited more often than others is a topic that can be studied with sociolinguistic methods that consider who is positioned within social networks in ways that allow them to disseminate knowledge, even though such methods have thus far been linked mostly to the dissemination of phonological change rather than knowledge about such dissemination (Milroy 1980, Eckert 2000).[31]

Yet a third explanation for the way in which gender correlates with citation patterns will be necessary if citations are governed not only by topic or network. One possibility is that people tend to evaluate members of their own sex more favorably than they do those of the opposite sex (see Ferber 1986 for a summary of such research, and for some suggestions on how it might shape citation patterns).[32] A variant of this is the idea that work attributed to women is evaluated

less favorably than work attributed to men, regardless of the gender of the evaluator (see Friend, Kalin & Giles 1979 for a review of relevant research). Whatever the explanation for the difference in citation patterns, it has clear implications for which kinds of work are treated as central, or theoretical, in a field, and how one might revise such a canon. Rosaldo, describing the implications of increasingly diverse classrooms for the organization of curriculum, points out: "One crucial ingredient involves affirmative action for course readings (and for works cited in publications). Teachers find new ways to seek out pertinent works of high quality by people of color, women, gays, and lesbians" (1993:xiii).

Social networks may be more influential for different publication forums. The publication of articles in journals may be the most gender-blind, while the publication of articles in edited volumes may be least gender-blind, because of the ways editors work through their own scholarly networks to solicit contributions.[33] Furthermore, a scholar's stature is often assumed to be enhanced by publishing books or articles in journals that are not specifically targeted to members of the subfields of linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, but also to larger audiences (all anthropologists, all linguists, scholars in women's studies). We have not investigated publication and citation practices in books and flagship journals (e.g. *Language*, *American Anthropologist*, *American Ethnologist*, *Annual Review of Anthropology*), but the questions of which forums are most significant for developing stature in the field, and how publication in different forums is correlated with gender, remain rich areas for further investigation. Certainly, a focus on journal articles alone does not give a full sense of the impact and visibility of feminist work within linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics. Though the number of monographs on language and gender remains small, some of these have been highly visible (e.g. Lakoff 1975, Goodwin 1990, Tannen 1990). A more common outlet for publications in language and gender are anthologies (e.g. Bing, Bergvall & Freed 1996, Benor, Rose, Sharma, Sweetland & Zhang 2002, Hall & Bucholtz 1995, McConnell-Ginet, Borker & Furman 1980). Certainly these books and book chapters have had a far from negligible impact. Nonetheless, journal articles continue to have more value at crucial gatekeeping moments in academics' careers (hiring, tenure, promotion, grant competitions), and our analysis suggests that feminist work is under-represented in linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistic journals, when compared to the amount of feminist work found in related fields like sociology. It is even possible to see the publication of anthologies as an attempt to create alternative publication venues for work that may receive an uncertain reception elsewhere. In this vein, we note that recent work on language and sexuality has also appeared largely in edited collections rather than journals (for more details, see Queen 2002).

Given the enormous amount of variability we witnessed in textbooks' determination of which works and scholars were central to the field, we believe that our study, like many others, suggests that citation cannot simply be seen as an objective measure of the quality of the work cited. One's ability to be cited is

linked to a variety of factors, including institutional location,[34] whether one's work is seen as bridging different fields of inquiry, whether one's work is seen as "theoretical" (a determination which in and of itself is shaped by gender, as well as ethnicity and nationality; see Christian 1987, O'Rand 1989, Lutz 1995), and also, perhaps, sheer innovativeness. Our group splits on whether frequent citation can ever be seen as a useful measure of the quality of a work; we agree, however, that citation may, in some complex way, indicate the impact of a given work on a community of practitioners (see Hamermesh, Johnson & Weisbrod 1982 for an analysis of citation that conflates objective worth and impact).

We believe that the determination of scholarly talent, like other forms of talent, will always be embedded within social relations (see Kingsbury 1988 for a study of the production of Western art music in which he finds that the distribution of "talent" in a conservatory followed predictable lines of power and alliance rather than measurable aesthetic criteria). Furthermore, we agree that statistics on citation should not be used in tenure or promotion decisions precisely because of their complex relationship to scholarly productivity and worth. In the short run, as other studies are conducted, we suggest that editors might consider annually publishing statistics that reveal the ways submissions and publications are linked to gender, nationality, and other social distinctions significant in our field. We also recommend that all authors carefully review their own citation patterns and, where they display marked gender disparities, ask themselves why this is the case, and if it is desirable and feasible to change their practice.[35]

Finally, we should note that an analysis of citations cannot account for any unacknowledged impact that feminist work may have had on sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. Certainly, feminist work laid some of the foundations for the new studies of language and sexuality, a fact acknowledged by many – but not all – who are beginning to work in this field. Moreover, certain authors who are adamantly opposed to some feminist insights may have developed their arguments in unacknowledged opposition to such work. We hope that this article will encourage scholars in the field to think more widely about the question of how the impact of feminist thought can be discerned. We continue to think, however, that it is problematic if feminist work is not explicitly acknowledged by other scholars, and we hope that investigations into the impact of feminist work will ultimately lead to such acknowledgment.

In conclusion, this research suggests how far language and gender studies have come in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology – and how far they have yet to go. Although we are encouraged by the recent appearance of a range of textbooks on language and gender, and rumors of others in the works, and although half of the textbooks we surveyed included at least one chapter on language and gender, no textbook in sociolinguistics has yet placed the study of gender – or feminist methods – at the center of the field. Some authors place variationist sociolinguistics at the center because of the implications it offered for formal linguistics. Others accord a central place to Boas, Sapir, and Whorf, and

those scholars working on questions related to the question of universalism vs. relativism. In addition, our field lags considerably behind other, closely related fields in the publication of articles on gender. We look forward to the textbooks and courses and papers that will help explain why and how certain domains of inquiry get understood as central and theoretical, and to those that consider what it might mean to place the study of gender and feminism, and other aspects of social identity and political practice, at the center of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology.

NOTES

*An earlier version of this article was presented at the First Annual IGALA (International Gender and Language Association) conference at Stanford in May 2000, and published in the proceedings of that conference. We'd like to thank the audience there for their enthusiastic reception of this piece, and especially Mary Bucholtz, Norma Mendoza-Denton, Hank Rogers, and Jane Sunderland for their detailed comments. We also appreciate the logistical, statistical, and scholarly help that Regna Darnell, Joshua Fishman, Moez Hababou, Yuko Hirodo, Warren Olivo, Abigail Sone, Paulette Stockard and Sara Trechter offered as we were completing this article. Stephen Murray and another reviewer who remains anonymous offered detailed, constructive comments that we found helpful in making our final revisions. Sandro Duranti provided key perspectives as a former editor and writer of an influential textbook, and Nancy Dorian provided thoughtful and detailed comments on the complex editorial structure of IJSL and on the role of gender and scholarship in language revitalization efforts. Finally, we wish to thank Jane Hill for her support of this article.

[1] Although Derrida is primarily concerned with signature, his analysis applies equally well to citation. Derrida 1988, 1991 argues that in order for a signature to count as a signature, it has to be repeatable and it has to enter into a structure called "iterability" (to both repeat and change). Guillory 1990 draws on Derrida's concept of iterability in an analysis of how canon formation in literature and the use of citations in literary journals (and texts) constructs a form of cultural capital that reproduces the existing social order within universities, in ways relevant to this study.

[2] For instance, citation may be used to lend weight to a text (Small 1989:440). Furthermore, for at least some disciplines there is often little overlap between papers identified as "the best" and those papers that are cited most often. More "theory" papers fall into the former category, while more "method" papers fall into the latter in the field of chemistry, for example (Cozzens 1989:442).

[3] Although publication of IJSL began in 1974, our coding begins in 1978.

[4] The journals were founded in the following years: *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1959; *Language in Society*, 1972; *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 1991; *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 1974; and *Language Variation and Change*, 1989.

[5] Compare Lutz 1990, who counted only the first author of multiple-author articles. In sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, unlike other fields, it is unusual to find articles authored by more than two people. To count only the first author, then, seemed to us to omit an author who was often better understood as a joint author than as a second author. Worth pursuing is the question of who tends to appear in multiple-authored publications, who tends to be first author, and who tends to give graduate students recognition in terms of authorship vs., say, acknowledgment or payment as a research assistant, and exactly how multiple authorship affects merit pay increases or promotion.

[6] This coding strategy will miss some articles that are influenced by feminist work but are not directly about sex, gender, sexuality, women, or men (for more discussion of this point, see our concluding section). It has the advantage, however, of ensuring intercoder reliability.

[7] If a person serves on two different editorial boards, she or he has been counted twice in Table 1. We've only counted editors and editorial board members for whom we could verify gender.

[8] These tables only count editors with some enduring role at the journals, and not guest editors of single issues, though determining the gender of these editors would also be of interest. It would be particularly important for a more nuanced picture of the role of gender and publication for IJSL. Currently, the make-up of five of the six annual issues of IJSL is determined by the respective issue editors, who serve as guest editors, while the one annual "singles" issues is typically edited by an

associate editor. Our thanks to Joshua Fishman and Nancy Dorian for insights into the complex editorial structure at IJSL. The need for more detailed, ethnographic accounts of how journals work is further considered in our conclusion.

[9] The recent appointments of Jane Hill as editor of LS and of Mary Bucholtz and Elizabeth Keating as co-editors of JLA begin to buck this trend.

[10] Although application of a chi-square test suggests that the differences in the proportions of women authors among the five journals are not significant for any of these periods, the sample size here is quite small and so statistical analyses are not reliable.

[11] It is important to note here that AL experienced a significant change in format in the period analyzed. From 1965 to 1979, the journal was data-oriented. Many papers were methodological, and results were intended for the international language archive. From 1980 on, the journal focused more on social uses of language.

[12] See Queen 2002 for a comprehensive account of recent publications on language and sexuality.

[13] Note that the number of authors is not equivalent to the number of articles because some articles have more than one author.

[14] The total of articles on gender for JLA does not include the 1999 "Lexicon" issue, which included 76 entries, one of which was on gender, by a woman.

[15] For more on critiques of essentialism in sociolinguistics, see McElhinny 1996.

[16] Ward & Grant (1985:152) also found that the most radical suggestions for disciplinary transformation tended to be ignored. They were not even cited to be criticized, but instead were simply not cited in later articles in the same journal.

[17] Garfield 1984 suggests that anthropology, in contrast to the hard sciences, has a much longer citation half-life; that is, anthropologists cite older articles more than, say, chemists do.

[18] Data from the period 1980–1989 is excluded for JLA and LVC because there were not enough data available for these journals during that period to provide an accurate sample.

[19] One might argue that some of the most frequently cited male scholars might be cited critically, and that such citations do not lead to increased recognition or stature in a field. Although we did not conduct a qualitative analysis of how citations were done in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, studies of other fields agree that authors most often cite scholars whose findings agree with their own rather than those with whom they disagree (Small 1978, Lutz 1990, Cozzens 1989). Further, Garfield 1984 reports that work which is not perceived as scholarly, or scholarly enough, is often not cited at all, rather than being cited critically. A recent instance of this in sociolinguistics is in a widely read debate over the strengths and weaknesses of conversation analysis and critical discourse analysis (see Billig 1999, Kitzinger 2000, Schegloff 1997, 1998, 1999, Wetherell 1998). Schegloff critiques a certain style of feminist sociolinguistic analysis yet does not cite any instances of this. Billig describes this omission of citations as "tactful," a word suggesting that the scholarly work so critiqued is embarrassing, perhaps not even scholarly. Kitzinger, in turn, points out that Billig fails to cite feminist scholars whose views align with his own, and indeed whose work has been devoted to careful investigation of issues that she (and Schegloff) believe Billig treats casually and even sloppily. Throughout this debate, the work of feminist scholars is made invisible by not being cited. Even in the instances where authors are cited critically, then, this does not necessarily involve a lack of recognition, but rather marks one's work as central to the field, and as thus worth critiquing.

[20] In response to one reviewer's request, we include the following brief introduction to statistical analysis. P, or the observed significance level, is the chance of getting a test statistic as extreme as or more extreme than the observed one. The chance is computed on the basis that the null hypothesis is right. The smaller this chance is, the stronger the evidence against the null hypothesis. A p of 1 in 100 says that only one investigator in 100 would get a test statistic as extreme as, or more extreme than, that one. The question of how small p has to get before one rejects the null hypothesis is a matter of statistical convention. There is no sharp dividing line between probable and improbable results. Many statisticians draw lines at 5% and 1%. If p is less than 5%, the result is "statistically significant"; if p is less than 1%, the result is "highly significant." For further information on the interpretation of statistics, we refer interested readers to Freedman, Pisani, Purves & Adhikari 1991.

[21] The survey also included readers in linguistic anthropology. Which articles are selected for inclusion in such readers would also be one sign of the corpus that is constituted as the canon in a field.

[22] A variety of criteria distinguished textbooks primarily directed toward undergraduates and those directed toward graduate students or others (we are all, after all, learners). These included presence or absence of extensive in-text citations, inclusion of simple essay topics or exercises, amount of pre-

vious knowledge assumed, complexity of information presented, and introductions describing intended audiences. In addition, although any textbook provides a distinctive take on a field of inquiry, some textbooks simply provide summaries of the existing literature, while others explicitly mark gaps and absences and attempt to suggest directions the field should take. Finally, e-mail lists and other informal discussions suggest how various books have been used by linguistic anthropologists and sociolinguists.

[23] In counting all citations, we often found ourselves citing works written outside the field of sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, from such fields as cognitive science, philosophy, or feminist or anti-racist or Marxist social theory. Citation of these works too helps determine what is central, or theoretical (these are not necessarily the same thing), in a given field. When we examined which works were most frequently cited, however, we found that they tend to be almost exclusively articles in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology proper.

[24] Not every textbook, of course, needs to include a chapter on language and gender. It has been suggested to us, for instance, that a chapter on language and gender would be out of place in a textbook that focuses on methods. Our hope is that any author of a textbook, of whatever format or topic, might stop to consider the implications of gender or feminist perspectives. For instance, a textbook might include a consideration of the ways that feminist perspectives have shaped debates about methods. In a recent book which he explicitly notes is NOT a textbook, and yet which is starting to be read and used as one, Michael Herzfeld describes an innovative approach to a survey of (sociocultural) anthropology:

> Gone from the surface are such familiar old warhorses as kinship, ethnicity, and religion. But they are still emphatically present in the text – indeed, they pervade virtually all the chapters in one way or another. The history of a discipline is not so easily dismissed; nor are its central preoccupations so trivial. Rather, they have become part of its own peculiar "common sense." At the same time, we can contribute most usefully to an understanding of the troubled world around us – and ethnicity, for example, is very much one of its "troubles" – by challenging the categorical certainty that leads people to assume that these topics are intellectually unproblematic. (2001:xii)

Gender, like ethnicity and culture, can be problematic when assumed – or ignored. Ultimately, we believe gender will be fully integrated into the field only when it is addressed in precisely these same ways.

[25] It was also painfully evident to us as we were undertaking the sometimes tedious and certainly time-consuming task of trying to identify the gender of authors cited. Since some textbooks cited authors with their full name, and others cited them with first initials only, we would try to use information on gender in the former to identify gender in the latter. We were able to clear remarkably few unidentified authors in this way.

[26] Agar and Bonvillain were excluded. Agar's citations take the form of a bibliographic essay, while Bonvillain includes a "Works cited" list at the end of each chapter. These practices made the most frequently cited authors difficult to count in these books. Salzmann was coded too late to be included in this tally. We chose not simply to count total number of citations across all publications, because some textbook authors cite only minimally while others cite extensively, and these different citation styles would have skewed the overall picture in favor of those who cite extensively. Because we are interested in gender of authors, we focused on which authors are cited most frequently, and not on which publications are cited most frequently (related questions, of course).

[27] The 14 women who showed up on this list of 52 were Penny Brown, Penelope Eckert, Janet Holmes, Lesley Milroy, Elinor Ochs, Shana Poplack, Suzanne Romaine, Joan Rubin, Michelle Rosaldo, Gillian Sankoff, Bambi Schieffelin, Catherine Snow, Deborah Tannen, and Candace West.

[28] Thanks to Nancy Dorian, Sandro Duranti, and Joshua Fishman for some rich insights into the role of editing different journals.

[29] The effect of seniority level of different scholars would also be worth investigating.

[30] One possibility might include studying those journals (e.g. *Language in Society*) that ask authors themselves to supply keywords, and using those keywords rather than coder-supplied ones.

[31] Murray 1983, 1998 draws on the study of another textual feature of academic publication, acknowledgments, to consider the effects of social networks on the formation of theory groups in American sociolinguistics. His study could provide a rich foundation for work similarly interested in networks and citation analysis, but more attentive to issues of gender than his study is.

[32] Our study of citation patterns in textbooks suggests the ways that both these explanations (the gendering of topics of inquiry and the gendering of scholarly networks) may in fact shape citation patterns.

[33] Other arenas in which scholarly work is disseminated and recognized also deserve attention. These would include giving papers at conferences, giving plenary talks at conferences, receiving major research grants, and receiving major research awards. See Lutz 1990 for further ideas, as well as an investigation of the significance of some of these for sociocultural anthropology.

[34] Those training graduate students get cited more, those editing journals can ensure that their own work is cited in papers reviewed, and those seen as founding a field of inquiry are cited more often.

[35] In this article, we cite 77 female authors and 49 male authors.

TEXTBOOKS SURVEYED

Agar, Michael (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow.

Bonvillain, Nancy (2000). *Language, culture and communication: The meaning of messages*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Chambers, J. K. (1995). *Sociolinguistic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Duranti, Alessandro (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fasold, Ralph (1984). *Introduction to sociolinguistics*. Vol. 1, *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

———— (1990). *Introduction to sociolinguistics*. Vol. 2, *Sociolinguistics of language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Foley, William (1997). *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hanks, William (1996). *Language and communicative practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Holmes, Janet (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Hudson, R. A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macaulay, Ronald (1994). *The social art: Language and its uses*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, Gary (1996). *Toward a theory of cultural linguistics*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Romaine, Suzanne (1994). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Salzmann, Zdenek (1993). *Language, culture and society: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. Boulder: Westview.

Spolsky, Bernard (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wardhaugh, Ronald (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

REFERENCES

Alcoff, Linda (1988). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminism. *Signs* 13:405.

Amory, Deborah (1997). African studies as American institution. In Akhil Gupta & James Ferguson (eds.), *Anthropological locations*, 102–17. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bakanic, Von; McPhail, Clark; & Simon, Rita (1987). The manuscript review and decision-making process. *American Sociological Review* 52:631–42.

Behar, Ruth, & Gordan, Deborah (eds.) (1995). *Women writing culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benor, Sarah; Rose, Mary; Sharma, Deyvani; Sweetland, Julie; & Qing Zhang (2002). *Gendered practices in language*. Stanford: CSLI.

Billig, Michael (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis. *Discourse and Society* 10:543–58.

Bing, Janet; Bergvall, Victoria; & Freed, Alice (1996). *Language and Gender Research: Theory and Method*. London: Longman.

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

Cameron, Deborah (1990). Demythologizing sociolinguistics: Why language does not reflect society. In J. E. Joseph & T. J. Taylor (eds.), *Ideologies of language*, 79–93. London: Routledge.

325

——— (1992). *Feminism and linguistic theory*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan.

———, & Coates, Jennifer (1988). Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences. In Deborah Cameron (ed.), *Women in their speech communities*, 13–26. London: Longman.

Christian, Barbara (1987). The race for theory. *Cultural Critique* 6:51–63.

Clifford, James, & Marcus, George (eds.) (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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

Cozzens, Susan (1989). What do citations count? The rhetoric-first model. *Scientometrics* 15:437–47.

Derrida, Jacques (1988). *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwest University Press.

——— (1991). Signature event context. In Peggy Kamif (ed.), *A Derrida reader: Between the blinds*, 80–111. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dunn, Cynthia, & Wilce, Jim (1999). Textbooks for language and culture. *Anthropology News*, 40(9):64.

Duranti, Alessandro (1994). *From grammar to politics: Linguistic anthropology in a Samoan village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eckert, Penelope (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1:245–68.

——— (2000). *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

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

Eichler, M. (1980). *The double standard: A feminist critique of social science*. New York: St. Martin's.

Ferber, Marianne (1986). Citations: Are they an objective measure of scholarly merit? *Signs* 11:381–89.

Figueroa, Esther (1994). *Sociolinguistic metatheory*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Freedman, David; Pisani, Robert; Purves, Roger; & Adhikari, Ani (1991). *Statistics*. 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton.

Friend, Penelope; Kalin, Rudolf; & Giles, Howard (1979). Sex bias in the evaluation of journal articles: Sexism in England. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 18:77–78.

Gal, Susan (1991). Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender. In Micaela di Leonardo (ed.), *Gender at the crossroads of knowledge: Feminist anthropology in the postmodern era*, 175–203. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Garfield, Eugene (1984). Anthropology journals: What they cite and what cites them. *Current Anthropology* 25:514–28.

Gilbert, G. Nigel (1977). Referencing as persuasion. *Social Studies of Science* 7:113–22.

Goodwin, Marjorie Harness (1990). *He-said-she-said: Talk as social organization among Black children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Guillory, John (1993). *Cultural capital: The problem of literary canon formation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gupta, Akhil, & Ferguson, James (1997). Discipline and practice: 'The field' as site, method and location in anthropology. In Akhil Gupta & James Ferguson (eds.), *Anthropological locations*, 1–46. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hamermesh, Daniel; Johnson, George; & Weisbrod, Burton (1982). Scholarship, citations and salaries: Economic rewards in economics. *Southern Economic Journal* 49:472–81.

Hall, Kira, & Bucholtz, Mary (1995). *Gender articulated*. New York: Routledge.

Harding, Sandra (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

——— (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

——— (1993). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: "What is strong objectivity?" In Linda Alcoff & Elizabeth Potter (eds.), *Feminist epistemologies*, 49–82. New York: Routledge.

Harrison, Faye (1995). The persistent power of "race" in the cultural and political economy of racism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:47–74.

Hartsock, Nancy (1983). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In Sandra Harding & Merrill Hintikka (eds.), *Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology and the philosophy of science*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Herzfeld, Michael (2001). *Anthropology: Theoretical practice in culture and society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holmes, Janet (ed.) (1999). Special issue: Communities of practice in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28(2).

Hyde, Janet Shibley (1990). How large are cognitive gender differences? In Joyce McCarl Nielsen (ed.), *Feminist research methods: Exemplary readings in the social sciences*, 207–23. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Hymes, Dell (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jaggar, Alison (1983). *Feminist politics and human nature*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Kingsbury, Henry (1988). *Music, talent and performance: A conservatory cultural system*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kitzinger, Celia (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism and Psychology* 10:163–93.

Kuhn, Thomas (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kulick, Don (2000). Gay and lesbian language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:243–85.

Lakoff, Robin (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lutz, Catherine (1990). The erasure of women's writing in sociocultural anthropology. *American Ethnologist* 17:611–25.

——— (1995). The gender of theory. In Behar & Gordan, 249–66.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally; Borker, Ruth; & Furman, Nelly (1980). *Women and language in literature and society*. New York: Praeger.

McElhinny, Bonnie (1996). Strategic essentialism in sociolinguistic studies of gender. In Natasha Warner et al. (eds.), *Gender and belief systems: Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Conference on Women and Language*, 469–80. Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California, Berkeley.

——— (1997). Ideologies of public and private language in sociolinguistics. In Ruth Wodak (ed.), *Gender and discourse*, 106–39. London: Sage.

——— (2003). Theorizing gender in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. In Janet Holmes & Miriam Meyerhoff (eds.), *The language and gender handbook*, 21–42. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Milroy, Lesley (1980). *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Moravcsik, Michael (1988). Citation context classification of a citation classic concerning citation context classification. *Social Studies of Science* 18:515–21.

Morgan, Marcyliena (1999). No woman, no cry: Claiming African American women's place. In Mary Bucholtz et al. (eds.), *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse*, 7–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——— (2002). *Language, discourse and power in African American culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, Stephen (1983). *Group formation in social science*. Carbondale and Edmonton: Linguistic Research.

——— (1998). *American sociolinguistics: Theorists and theory groups*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ochs, Elinor (1992). Indexing gender. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking context*, 335–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——— (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In John Gumperz & Stephen Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, 407–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Rand, Angela (1989). Scientific thought style and the construction of gender inequality. In Jean O'Barr (ed.), *Women and a new academy: Gender and cultural contexts*, 103–21. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Queen, Robin (2002). A matter of interpretation: The 'future' of 'queer linguistics.' In Kathryn Campbell-Kibler et al. (eds.), *Language and sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice*, 69–86. Stanford: CSLI.

Rickford, John (1997). Unequal partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American speech community. *Language in Society* 26:161–98.

Rosaldo, Michelle (1974). Women, culture and society: A theoretical overview. In Michelle Rosaldo & Louise Lamphere (eds.), *Woman, culture and society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

——— (1980). The use and abuse of anthropology: Reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding. *Signs* 5:389–417.

Rosaldo, Renato (1993). *Culture and truth: The remarking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society* 8:165–87.

——— (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse and Society* 9:413–16.

——— (1999). 'Schegloff's texts' as 'Billig's data': A critical reply. *Discourse and Society* 10:558–72.

Schieffelin, Bambi, & Ochs, Elinor (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:163–91.

Scott, Joan (1986). Gender: A useful category of historical analysis. *American Historical Review* 91(5):1055–75.

———— (1988). American women historians, 1884–1984. In her *Gender and the politics of history*, 178–98. New York: Columbia University Press.

———— (1990). Deconstructing equality-vs.-difference; or, The uses of post-structuralist theory for feminism. In Marianne Hirsch & Evelyn Fox Keller (eds.), *Conflicts in Feminism*, 134–48. New York: Routledge.

Small, Henry (1978). Cited documents as concept symbols. *Social Studies of Science* 8:327–40.

Spender, Dale (1981). The gatekeepers: A feminist critique of academic publishing. In Helen Roberts (ed.), *Doing feminist research*, 186–202. London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Stacey, Judith, & Thorne, Barrie (1993). The missing feminist revolution in sociology. In Linda Kauffman (ed.), *American feminist thought at century's end*, 167–88. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Tannen, Deborah (1990). *You just don't understand*. New York: Ballantine.

Ward, Kathryn, & Grant, Linda (1985). The feminist critique and a decade of published research in sociology journals. *Sociological Quarterly* 26:139–57.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society* 9:387–412.

Woolard, Kathryn (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: Towards an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist* 12:738–48.