

Languages of Change: Sociolinguistics and Redefining the Normative Language of Social
Inequality

Kevin Kempe
University of Calgary

*Kevin Kempe is an undergraduate student at the University of Calgary, in Calgary, Canada.
This paper was prepared for the World Youth Leaders Forum 2012: Towards a World Without
Poverty and Inequality, at Shaw College of the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Abstract

Rhetorics of gender, race and sexuality that today constitute literature and public empowerment discourses globally, are often the derivatives of historical languages of oppression. The intrinsic ability of language to permeate cultures and social processes earmarks contextual understandings of accepted social interactions, hierarchies and prejudices. This paper will use a sociolinguistic approach to contextualise the need for redefining oppressive language in order to address perpetual social inequalities around the world. I will examine the gendered nature of words within languages, the subconscious acceptance of historical linguistic designations, and the perpetuation of negative connotations and word associations. Case studies of language and gender, language and race, and language and sexuality in North America and Africa are used to demonstrate the profound implications of varying sociolinguistic customs and histories. From this evidence I will present the effects of language in socially constructed spaces as opportunities for remedial action in education, policy and public awareness; thereby ensuring the ability to create positive, non-gendered, non-heteronormative, and non-racial definitions and meanings for words and concepts that have repressive historical legacies. I will then suggest ways to promote intentional awareness and a conscious reconstruction of sociolinguistic interactions that will allow individuals, governments and societies to focus on the practical challenges that have been created by languages of oppression, and reconstitute a basis for equality and prosperity.

Keywords: sociolinguistics, language, race, gender, sexuality, normative, policy, action, equality

Introduction

Talking about identity.

We all like to think that we are able to freely choose who we are, the work that we do, and the people that we interact with. We believe that we can think, feel and describe without inhibition; the truth however, is that we are limited by a set of words, phrases and concepts that have been historically constructed and continue to evolve to fit modern social, cultural and political circumstances. The people that we interact with are often limited to those that we share common bonds with, are members of the same social class, or have the same physical, cultural or political identities as we do. The challenge in creating these identities is that we are often unable to see that the people who we chose to interact with, are the ones set out for us by the language of the world around us, and the influence of sociolinguistics on defining normative relationships.

It is when we go against these normative social values and create alternative individual or collective identities that we most often experience the negative effects of social inequality (Djité, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Not only will there be changes in the opportunities available, but also in the way that people look, speak and interact with each other. Sociolinguistic theory provides us with the tools to analyse the interactions of people and people, people and their environments, and people and the social and cultural elements of their surroundings (Chambers, 1995; Downes, 1998; Fasold, 1984). Most particularly, we are able to witness the cleavage of societies along the lines of social strata and class divisions, accompanied in part by the variability of their lexicons and language.

Word usage and term 'correctness' create stereotypes and reinforce or justify the use of derogatory and prejudiced actions towards members of certain social strata (Myhill, 2004). The

structure of a society and the extent to which a normative language is standardized is most noticeably determined by the common use of the lexicon of the highest social class (Myhill, 2004). Significant research across varying fields has produced results indicating that the nature of this normalizing process, in accordance to the powers and politics of a society leaves an abundance of room to cleave and reinforce social inequality (Aitchison, 1981; Cleary and Lund, 1993; Djité, 2008; Milroy and Milroy, 1985; Holtgraves, 2002).

The institutionalization and socialization of language processes and correctness permits arbitrary authorities to levy social and class structures against individuals and communities in order to force their subordination (Brenzinger, 2009; Hill, 2008; Myhill, 2004). Both of these actions contribute to the internalization of external identities, causing individuals and identities to take on the relevant political, social and economic structures; including class, employment, and participation in public activity; and to be limited by the nature of the language used to describe them (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). These cases are evident when we look at the languages of white racism (Hill, 2008) and black communities (Alim, 2003; Ibrahim, 2003; Johnson, 2004), the overt and subconscious subordination of women in gendered speech (Rudwick and Shange, 2006; Smith, 1985; Tannen, 1993), and the silencing of sexual minorities, leading to the creation and globalization of 'queer language' or 'queer linguistics' (Barrett, 2001; Jackson, 2004; McConnell-Ginet, 2011; Motschenbacher, 2011).

Language versus linguistics.

A sociolinguistic approach to problems of language and interaction target the aspects of social problems that give people a common basis to understanding and communicating with each

other (Chambers, 1995; Fasold, 1984). The origins and uses of initial language implementation have as great of an effect on social problems and inequality as do the perceptions around, and stereotyping resulting from the linguistic (i.e. tonal, phonetic, semantic, etc.) variations of genders, races or sexualities (Fasold, 1984; Myhill, 2004; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

Although much of the relevant theoretical research done on language in society has more to do with language groups and minority languages (Adegbija, 1994; Chambers 1995; Downes, 1998; Fasold, 1984; Heller, 2008; Ruanni Tupas, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), this paper deals to a greater extent with the role that semantics and lexical choice play in determining levels of social inequality.

The varied degrees to which language can be used to attack and isolate an individual or a collective identity come from the extent of that language's embedded nature in historical social inequality. There must be a common, or minimally affirmed belief in the power and subjectivity of a word or locution in order for it's definition to hold meaning (Chambers, 1995; Downes, 1998). As noted by Apostolidou: "Insult is not unilateral. It incorporates, reflects, and produces conditions of exclusion and intolerance; it incubates social investments made on "othering"; it serves the appeasement of social tensions; it alleviates the vivid representation of awkwardness" (2010:43).

In this way, discursive violence and the power of an insult is to subordinate not only the targeted population, but by connotation all those people who are associated with some of the words held within (Apostolidou, 2010; Downes, 1998; McElhinny, 1999; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). In the case of a homosexual male being called an "accomplished girl" (Apostolidou, 2010:47), this not only carries connotation for the male because of the derogatory way in which

the term is used, but also suggests that there is something negative about being an ‘accomplished girl’, even for a woman. This is to say that it is not only a matter of how language perpetuates existing social inequality, but how that inequality is used as the basis for limiting the development of both language and human capacity in the future (Apostolidou, 2010). It is from this basis that we construct the ideal norms and values of social relations and interpersonal interactions that lead to the socialization of identity and the normalizing of certain gender, race and sexuality hierarchies.

Sticks and Stones

Sex and gender.

Male-female language relationships are reflective of social conceptions of masculinity and femininity, derived through various social, cultural and political processes that impart a certain expectation of thought and action upon each sex. These engineered forms of identity are reflected in levels of politeness, perceived aggression and positivity of language (Tannen, 1993). The ways in which language has been constructed to create dichotomies and bifurcations undoubtedly facilitates the categorization and identification of characteristics, however it also attempts to solidify the fluid nature of social language (Smith, 1985). One of, if not the most obvious accepted dichotomy, until recently, was that between the male and the female. The discussion on sex and gender, their relevant biophysical and social constructs and the ways in which they can be shaped, determined and altered, all contribute to the ways in which historical legacies can remain host to negative consequences for many years.

Lawson (1992) and Smith (1985) argue that because communication resources themselves are products of male culture, men have been able to successfully prevent women from actively participating in the creating and development of language; leading to a misrepresentation of lexical variation and meaning. The normalized structure of male-word dominated languages or “He” languages has caused non-gendered objects, places and things to be associated as male (Smith, 1985). Here we are able to witness the extent to which language structure is both a contributor to, and construct of social norms (Chambers, 1995; Downes, 1998; Smith, 1985). These patterns are reflected in social customs such as conventional word order in North American naming schemes and lists that arbitrarily consider men first: the use of ‘husband and wife’, not ‘wife and husband’ in marriage ceremonies demonstrate the subconscious social stratification that leads to inequality (Smith, 1985).

These phenomena are not uniquely North American; they exist in varying ways across the globe. Current trends in the utilization of African languages echo the ways in which culture and customary social practices perpetuate the unequal effects of language on women and other minority groups (Heller, 2009; Rudwick & Shange, 2006). The use of the “language of respect” known as *isiHlonipho* in several language groups in Southern Africa provides a comparative structure for harnessing language and redefining cultural norms to empower minority groups and resist historical oppression (Brenzinger, 2009; Rudwick & Shange, 2006). Differentiating norms in *isiHlonipho* for female amaZulu and amaXhosa indicate that although the general concept of respect and politeness is maintained between the cultures, *isiHlonipho* itself does not denote female subordination, the cultural practices that attempt to justify its uses do.

For this reason, the nature of the language distinction has been seen by many to be a system of categorical oppression of women by men in language, social, political and literary means. The ties of language to culture, and the difficulty in differentiating the two leads to a cyclic reinforcement, as one is a justification for the others' oppression (Rudwick & Shange, 2006). AmaXhosa women, under the subordinating influence of *isiHlonipho* would rest in the lower limits of cultural hierarchy and be expected to maintain what Skutnabb-Kangas calls "vertical identities" (2000:155). Through descriptors and definitions, the conceptualization of male-female relationships causes the subordinate to always be compared to the higher social role, identified according to what it lacks in physical and cultural comparison, often on the basis of relationships and emotions (McConnell-Ginet, 2011; McElhinney, 2002 ; Smith, 1985).

Race and ethnicity.

Often it is not just the words used that have implications for the glorification and stigmatization of social strata or class structures but the language and its geographical and historical origins as well (Ruanni Tupas, 2000). Race and ethnicity are often tied to language as the variability of language and diversity of language groups around the world opens room for discussion on the identifying features of people, and the desire for common characteristics through the process of globalization. Without an ability to communicate, the process of globalization would be neither efficient nor nearly as beneficial; therefore we often witness the migration of language with people and products. There are resulting implications for native languages when a foreign dialect is brought through trade and commerce; this often leading to

the death or genocide of smaller language groups by international language structures such as English.

For some people English is seen as a negative entity, irrelevant to local culture and more or less a form of neocolonialism (Heller, 2008; Ruanni Tupas, 2000). This continued form of colonialism exists in the introduction of words and phrases of subordination that had not existed, in form or in context, in local languages prior to the introduction of English (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). The legacy linguistic colonization is the ability to continue to subordinate people among different ethnic or linguistic groups, leading to the forced assimilation or adaptation of a language on an international scale. This has brought the world closer together and has brought about fights for nationalism and resistance through local histories and cultures. The perpetuation of white dominance in South Africa, and foreign dominance in both ex-colonies and non-colonies with English-speaking nations, insists on the adaptability of local language, and the expectation of the simultaneous morphing of lexicon and meaning (Ibrahim, 2003; Phaswana, 2003; Ruanni Tupas, 2000). The introduction of English as a dominant language across borders causes the same forms of stigmatization and prejudice on a national scale that it creates in a class-based hierarchy of social divisions.

The existence of a common language across cultures and across borders provides the platform for ethnic and cultural tension as government policy, media and educational curriculae are being printed in a largely incomprehensible manner. Individuals and communities are forced to either assimilate or integrate into the dominant sociolinguistic discourse, that of English, in order to obtain economic and political rights (Fasold, 1984; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). The assists the government to enact policies of racism into legislation via a system of mutual

unintelligibility. Skutnabb-Kangas outlines the subtle and not so subtle intonations of racism in current legislation in order to demonstrate how specific ethnic groups in Canada and South Africa could legally become nothing other than *Indians, Honorary Whites* or *Colored people* (2000:161 - Info Box 3.5). These pieces of legislation reflect a rationalization and linear process in determining the extent to which a language should contribute to both a nation and nationalism; based on the degree of social control desires and the limited policies of inclusion (Fasold, 1984; Heller, 2008; Hill, 2008).

Sexuality and heteronormativity.

Inclusion is perhaps the most fundamental aspect of a well-functioning society. Inclusion can vary from socio-economic inclusion, to political inclusion, to physical or spacial inclusion; all of which can be brought together through the use of inclusive language. The impacts of inclusive language are greater than keeping a person involved and welcomed into an institution or community; inclusive language positively contributes to cohesion and simultaneously limits the ability of language to be used to cleave social differences through normative structures (Chambers, 1985; Jackson, 2004). In Canada, the British Columbia *Safe Schools Act* legislates against the effects of heteronormativity and the exclusion of sexual minorities in the education system. Although the new legislation mandates inclusivity and non-heteronormativity and heteroconformation there are heavy implications to be found in a gap between policy and procedure (McGregor, 2008). McGregor's (2008) research showed public schools to be regular forums for heteronormative interaction while in a sexualized context. for normative language and experience in a sexualized environment. This research however, was not a reactionary, not

precautionary study done following several court cases regarding sexual harassment on the basis of sexuality or sexual orientation.

Due to the extent of which heteronormativity is engrained in, and accepted as a part of daily life, it often requires a biased, external recognition through a negative social impact to identify the cause of normative language structures and to have them addressed in policy. There is a rising need for a continual process of historical and contextual analysis in order to set out social and political impetus for non-heteronormative change (Downes, 1998; McConnell-Ginet, 2011; McElhinny, 1999). This change would be required to infiltrate bifurcated systems that create assumptive language that limits the categorization of an individual beyond homo/heterosexual.

Several cases have been documented in North America and Africa that witness the creation of homosexual or queer subcultures that include their own vernaculars and linguistics, in order to subvert or implode the heteronormative structures of their social surroundings (Barrett, 2001; Jackson, 2004; Leap, 2004; McConnell-Ginet, 2011; Peña, 2004). By subverting the pre-determined social standards, homosexual men from Miami to Cape Town have the opportunity to redefine customary domicile family relations, but family structures, linguistic assumptions, and even the definition of 'gay' (Peña, 2004). In Miami, Cuban gay men are creating community and positive space through a bond of homosexuality and the relationships of being social outcasts. The strive to encompass derogatory terms - personalizing and internalizing their meanings in order to limit the external repercussions available to be honed in on by discriminators. Black gay vernacular challenges popular conception and causes people to have to change the ways in which they view or passively accept conventional social roles (Alim, 2003; Peña, 2004). By utilizing

the stereotypical roles of heteronormative social categories and becoming the black gay men of those positions, they are able to “resist monolithic notions of blackness and gayness and provide space for community-building and sexual agency” (Johnson, 2004:252).

But Names Will Never Hurt Me

Social cause and social action.

Languages of oppression have taken on many forms over the centuries, have permeated cultures, institutions and individual, leaving the marks and legacies of tarnish reputations, dishearten communities and heaves of social inequality (Brenzinger, 2009; Hill, 2004; Ibrahim, 2003; Fasold, 1984; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Although sociolinguistics has been the tell-tale accomplice to allowing the existence of racism, gender-based biases and heteronormativity through it’s coupling of language and social relations; it is also the first stepping stone to reinventing and redefining the structures of oppression that have build and reinforced social inequality over the years (Holtgraves, 2002). The first step to reorienting language patterns is recognizing the causal relationships and circumstances that have allowed for or helped to constructed the structure of normative language. We must look at the semantic, orthographic, tonal, and lexical patterns expressed by members of a community to evaluate the degree to which sociolinguistic inequality has been internalized and then more forward to rebuilding language and education curriculum for schools, communities and governments (Holtgraves, 2002; Myhill, 2004). A belief in something is often enough to give it meaning, so by locating local, known methods of public engagement, we can leverage community development as a platform for informed learning and redevelopment (McGregor, 2008).

Just as there is a demonstrated need for inclusive language in policy development regarding educational institutions and heteronormativity, the need for inclusive action and policy development is demonstrated with regards to gender mainstreaming and non-gender-bifurcated social structures (Tannen, 1993). It is not as easy as taking away the male dominance or social elitism, sociolinguistic development and social reconstruction is about working from the bottom up. Women need to therefore not only use words as a means of empowerment, but ensure that they are internalizing and adjusting definitions to fit what is current and relevant, but has been left out due to a lack of female perspective in language development (Smith, 1985)

The historic nature of many terms that are given or assigned to particular members of a culture are controversial in that they are often derogatory and undesirable in connotation, but also act as the necessary social lubricant to allow a subculture to exist in society. They give people a way to identify, question and rouse curiosity about the collective as an other, but also as a source of comfort should they self-identify with the language used (Apostolidou, 2010). These processes of social reconstruction and social action for redevelopment are fragile in that, if tipped to far in the opposite direction, they risk the fate of altering the direction in which social inequality was, but never reaching the desired outcome of social **equality**.

Reconstructing histories.

Much the same as legal processes can be used to perpetuate social inequality, they can act as the main stance against oppression and act as the foundation for justice, reconciliation and development. The ability to harness an identity comes from the individual, and the desire to

make a permanent change in the social relations, language structures and systems of oppression must remain in the individual even when the form of action moves from the individual to the community, or the nation to the state. Legislation and legislative communication must act as an ultimate authority where it has reasonable ethical consideration backed by informed public support. Education and policy development both have a need for institutional and social advocacy; the empowering of legislators and citizens to conduct and redistribute meaning through a right, its recognition, and then its regulation and assurance (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

I would not encourage individuals or communities to forget their pasts, to disengage from their histories or to ignore their yesterdays, but rather to internalize the lessons of those who lived before and to mobilise their injustices as reason to fight for equality. Words and languages of oppression should not be silenced, but should become the basis of education and understanding, they must be utilized as an instructional tool to teach the differences of normative language and inclusion; to educate on the imbalances of social hierarchies, gender stereotyping, racism and heteronormativity (Downes, 1998; McConnell-Ginet, 2011, Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

“... [T]he whole idea of having just one language is to the benefit of those elites who in this way could secure for themselves the ‘profit of distinction’ for possessing the linguistic capital of proficiency in the one language, and prevent many others from acquiring it altogether, or from acquiring the right variant” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000:249)

This is simply what we must prevent, in order to secure ourselves a better chance at achieving complete social equality in the long run. Thought and speech guide our action, so when we are limited to the thoughts and words included in another person’s language, we are

limited to the ways that they desire for us to act. We must become fully aware of the situations in which our language guides us, that we might be able to talk our way out of or into any situation, regardless of age, class, race, gender or sexuality.

Conclusion

Language remains the most important aspect of intercultural and transcultural communication. It also guides the intergenerational and transgenerational production and reproduction of knowledge, norms and values (Downes, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). The legacies of histories can be found in the sociolinguistic structures and language patterns of individuals, communities and nations. The social strata, class structures, gender roles and stereotypes of domesticity are reflected in the language and patterns of social interaction that are derived from the experience of yesterday (McConnell-Ginet, 2011). We are faced daily with the strength of the inequality and oppression of days gone by, each memory a result of a word, a concept, a piece of legislation that permitted, forced or guides the actions of a social being. We can not take language away from interaction if we desire to fully grasp the realm of political, social, economic and cultural dynamism. The ways in which language and people change open areas for improvement, bring about hope for an equal tomorrow and challenge the present to look towards a brighter future. It may be that a day will come when we no longer talk about sex or gender, race or ethnicity, sexuality or normative behavior, because the indifference in which we should treat socially constructed hierarchies will be no more; Identities will come from within and we will have the chance to define and redefine, time and time again, the relevant meanings of all things in an every changing world.

References

- Adegbija, E. (1996). Language Attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Sociolinguistic Overview. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*. DOI: **1-85359-239-0**
- Alexander, N. (2009). The Impact of the Hegemony of English on Access to and Quality of Education with Special Reference to South Africa. In W. Harbert, S. McConnell-Ginet, A. Miller & J. Whitman. (Eds.) *Language and Poverty*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Alim, H. S. (2003). "We are the streets": African American Language and the strategic construction of a street conscious identity. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. F. Ball, & A. K. Spears. *Black Linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Apostolidou, A. (2010). Inscribing Gendered and National ANxieties on Instiulting Language: Linguistic Depictions of Greek Male Homosexuality. In C. Canakis, V. Kantsa, & K. Yannakopoulos. (Eds.) *Language and Sexuality (through and) beyond Gender*. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Brenzinger, M. (2009). Language Diversity and Poverty in Africa. In W. Harbert, S. McConnell-Ginet, A. Miller & J. Whitman. (Eds.) *Language and Poverty*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Chambers, J. K. (1995). *Sociolinguistic Theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Djité, P. G. (2008). *The Sociolinguistics of Development in Africa*. North York, Ontario: Multilingual Matters.
- Downes, W. (1998). *Language and Society: Second Edition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Heller, M. (2009). Colonialism and re-imaging minority language management. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 4, 103-106. DOI: 10.1080/17447140802691724
- Hill, J. H. (2008). *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell
- Holtgraves, T. M. (2002). *Language as Social Action: Social psychology and language use*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Ibrahim, A. E. K. M. (2003). "Whassup, homeboy?" Joining the African Diaspora: Black English as a symbolic site of identification and language learning. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. F. Ball, & A. K. Spears. *Black Linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, P.A. (2004). Gay Adaptation, Tom-Dee Resistance, and Kathy Indifference: Thailand's Gender/Sex Minorities and the Episodic Allure of Queer English. In W. L. Leap & T Boellstorff. (Eds.) *Speaking in Queer Tongues: Globalization and Gay Language*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Johnson, E. P. (2004). Mother Knows Best: Black Gay Vernacular and Transgressive Domestic Space. In W. L. Leap & T Boellstorff. (Eds.) *Speaking in Queer Tongues: Globalization and Gay Language*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Lawson, B. (1992). Nobody Knows Our Plight: Moral Discourse, Slavery, and Social Progress. *Social Theory and Practice*, 18.

- Leap, W. L. (2004). Language, Belonging and (Homo)Sexual Citizenship in Cape Town, South Africa. In W. L. Leap & T Boellstorff. (Eds.) *Speaking in Queer Tongues: Globalization and Gay Language*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. (2011). *Gender, Sexuality, and Meaning*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- McElhinney, B. (2002). Language, Sexuality and Political Economy. In K. Campbell-Kibler, R. Posed, S. Roberts & A. Wong. (Eds.) *Language and Sexuality: Contesting Meaning in Theory and Practice*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications
- McGregor, C. (2008). Norming and <Re>Forming: Challenging Heteronormativity in Educational Policy Discourses. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 82. <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/articles/mcgregor.html>
- Motschenbacher, H. (2011). Taking Queer Linguistic further: sociolinguistics and critical heteronormativity research. *International Journal of Social Language*, 212, 149-179. DOI: 10.1515/IJSL.2011.050
- Myhill, J. (2004). A parameterized view of the concept of 'correctness'. *Multilingua*, 23, 389-416. DOI: 01678507/2004/0230389
- Pashwana, N. (2003). Contradiction or affirmation? The South African language policy and the South African national government. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. F. Ball, & A. K. Spears. *Black Linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York, New York: Routledge.

- Pena, S. (2004). Pajaration and Transculturation: Language and Meaning in Miami's Cuban American Gay Worlds. In W. L. Leap & T Boellstorff. (Eds.) *Speaking in Queer Tongues: Globalization and Gay Language*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Ruanni Tupas, T. (2000). Global politics and the Englishes of the world. In J. Cotterill & A. Ife. (Eds.) *Language Across Borders*. (pp. 81-98). British Association for Applied Linguistics.
- Rudwick, S. & Shange, M. (2006). Sociolinguistic oppression or expression of 'Zuluness'? 'IsiHlonipho' among isiZulu-speaking females. *Souther African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 24, 473-482 DOI: 1607-3614
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education - or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- Smith, P. M. (1985). *Language, The Sexes and Society*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Tannen, D. (1993). *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.