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Abstract: Language is communication practice mediated by linguistic system. The fields of linguistics anthropology and sociolinguistics offer a platform upon which communication practices can be broadly defined in a manner that allows a space for discourse on language and gender. This requires paralinguistic and pragmatic considerations that tap from integration of the social locus of linguistic practice and linguistic system as deployed by the category and group under consideration. This is in acknowledgment of the fact that neither language nor social world comes ready made and neither it is static. It is nurtured and maintained under mutual day to day activities. This article therefore discusses how language is to establish and maintain gender order and gender categorization and gender discourse. The discussion will show how dominant gender ideologies are reinforced in day to day talk and communication discourses and the perceived or perpetrated gender ideologies inherent in the communications.
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Introduction

The idea that men and women use language differently is a conventional wisdom that appear everywhere. Recent research, though, suggests that the most important variable is not the sex of the person but what and how he / she uses the language. This paper is intended to discuss how language is used to establish and maintain gender order within society.

The Definition of Gender

In the general sense, the notions “sex” and “gender” are perceived to be synonymous and in some studies they are used interchangeably. The definition of sex and gender in Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (1995) is as follows:

sex: (excluding other meanings) 1- The two sexes are the two groups, male and female, into which people and animals are divided according to the function of they have in producing young. 2- The sex of a person or animal is their characteristics of being either a male or female.

gender: 1- A person’s gender is the fact that they are male or female. 2- You can refer to all male and female people as a particular gender. 3- In grammar, the gender of a noun, pronoun or adjective is whether it is masculine, feminine or neuter.

The dictionary definitions mentioned above do not give a clear distinction between the two terms. However, especially postmodernist scholars believe that gender is a completely different notion and is not a biological fact at all. According to Butler (1990), there are brute facts of biology and gender is a phenomenon which is brought into being when it is performed. In her own words, “Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a ‘natural’ kind.
of being” (Butler, 1990, p.32). Gender is therefore not something you acquire once and for all at an early stage of life, but an ongoing accomplishment produced by your repeated actions (Cameron, 2004). As the authors indicated, one’s gender is not equivalent to his/her sex; though, most of the time, building on the biological base he/she has from birth, he/she constructs it through his/her life with the experiences which take place first in the family then in society. One’s social context and culture he/she lives in shapes his/her gender identity accompanied with unique individual experiences. As a consequence, every society has a distinct gender identity and any individual living in them may or may not comply with the presumed gender identity.

In this study, the term gender is used following this conceptualization of gender which is composed of culturally constructed male identity and female identity, not the biological differences between males and females.

Gender and Language Overview

As the rise in the number of publications in recent years indicates, language and gender is a growing area of study among researchers. Block (2002) states that in two survey articles, Jane Sunderland (2000) and Aneta Pavlenko and Ingrid Piller (2002) cite over twenty collections of articles which were published during the period 1991-2001, and over 10 monographs devoted to this topic. Among the outstanding studies we may mention the research studies such as the relationship between gender and language or discourse (Goddard & Patterson, 2000; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002); the special concerns and issues of immigrant women (Frye, 1999; Goldstein, 1995, 2001; Kouritzin, 2000; Norton, 2000; Rivera, 1999); and women’s needs and voices in EFL situations (Lin et al.; Mcdihill, 1997, 2001; Saft & Ohara, 2004).

Though there are no existing journals devoted solely to language and gender, journals such as Gender and Education, Discourse and Society and TESOL Quarterly have been publishing increasingly more articles that focus on gender and language interrelation. In addition, there has been an increase in the number of conferences held on the concepts of language and gender, like the International Gender and Language Association Conference that was held at Lancaster University in April, 2002 and a close look of applied linguistics and language teaching conferences shows that there are progressively more colloquia and individual papers that focus on language and gender (Block, 2002).

From the two studies cited above, Sunderland’s article has an English language bias, centering as it does around four key countries-Australia, Canada, the UK and the US. Nevertheless, Aneta Pavlenko, Adrian Blackledge, Ingrid Piller and Marya Teutsch-Dwyer’s (2002) edited collection, Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender, is a move in the direction of including greater diversity (Block, 2002), in terms of contexts and languages by examining other contexts and a wide variety of languages other than English.

A closer look at the historical development of the gender concept in language studies will reveal that the perspectives and the philosophies underlying the research have changed over time. Research on language and gender and theoretical shifts in the field result from real-world changes brought about by political movements and therefore represent not only differences in academic perspectives on gender and language, but also changes across time in how gender
and language are perceived to work in the world (Cameron, 2004). According to Cameron (1995), "a crude historical-typological account of feminist linguistic approaches since 1973 would probably distinguish between three models of language and gender (p. 33): the deficit model, the cultural difference model and the dominance model.

**Deficit Model**

In the deficit model, females are seen as disadvantaged speakers and communicators, particularly in the professional world, due to their upbringing and socialization as females (Block, 2002). The deficit theory is well-reflected in Lakoff's (1973) work on language and women's place. In these studies, the speech of men is accepted as the norm while the women's speech is perceived to be deficient. In her analysis of verbal hygiene, Cameron (1995) points out the pressure imposed on female members of the society to monitor both the men's and their own language and clean up their faulty language production accordingly.

Though being followed by different models, it is interesting to find recent studies making use of the deficit model. Career orientation recommendations are the typical lay public face of the framework. The book by Ellig and Morin entitled What Every Successful Woman Knows (2001) makes a good example of this fact. The aim of the book is to provide professional women with effective strategies that will let them to get ahead in the male-dominated business world (Block, 2002). In the section of communication strategies, the advice given to women who feel inferior among men dominated society is as follows: The lesson for successful women seeking the breakthrough to power? Grab the magic marker, move right up to the flipchart, and say what you have to say. Don't wait for acceptance... and don't wait, much less ask, for permission to speak. Just say it (Ellig & Morin, 2001, p.109). Here, it is clearly seen that women need to change their language and alter to a male tone in order to achieve something.

The necessity of this imitation is reflected by the authors with the following wordswomen have been trained since childhood to be less direct... Young girls were traditionally taught to believe that they would get more through coyness than through directness. Women simply gather and process information differently from men. In fact, they approach the whole process of communication in a different way (Ellig & Morin, 2001, p.110). The authors very clearly adhere to the deficit model, showing women as deficient members of the world of business which needs confident and assertive players. According to the authors, men acquire these abilities in a natural way early in their lives and if women want to challenge men and become successful in the world of business, they have to adopt, or even imitate the characteristics of men in communication. Block (2002) states that the view of gender is essentialized in that it is about having certain characteristics which are determined by the environment and which are stable throughout one's lifetime. It is also imminently conservative in that it requires that women follow modes of behavior laid down by men, as opposed to challenging them (p. 51-52).

**Dominance Model**

In the mid 1970s, the dominance framework was adopted by most researchers and they linked negative evaluations of women's language to their social domination by men.
Cultural Difference Model

With the turn of the 1980s, the difference framework (dual culture model) was raised as an alternative to the dominance model. According to the cultural difference model, men and women belong to separate but equal cultures which predate the development of individuals who are socialized into them (Block, 2002). That is, girls and boys are socialized into different ways of relating to one another in their predominately same-sex interactions and, thus, acquire different communicative styles within the community they live (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). Unlike the deficit model, the cultural difference model does not perceive the differences negatively. It adopts the socially liberal position that men and women are different but equal: women’s speech and communication styles are not inferior to men’s; rather the relationship between the two are problematic at least in part because of culture clash (Block, 2002). This model assumes that, if communication breaks down between men and women, it’s caused by misinterpreting the other party’s form of interaction (Tannen, 1993, 1996), not because of the men’s dominating power in the communication between men and women. What is needed to enhance an intact communication for individuals is to learn how to be bi-cultural and thoroughly understand the opposite gender’s understanding. In this era, besides bringing the two genders on the same grounds, the difference model valued the positive aspects of women’s unique communicative styles. SLA studies specifically focused on gender differences in conversational style, quantity of talk and learning styles and strategies (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004).
Post-structuralism and De-essentializing Gender

Like everything in the life is influenced and changed by real life events like political instabilities and differing perspectives, there has been a move in language and gender away from a stable and conservative concept of gender to a more detailed and unstable one. All of these post-structuralist approaches to gender advocate the belief that “gender is a social phenomenon; it is about doing as opposed to having or being; it is the outcome of engagement, in particular, social practices as opposed to preceding and causing such engagement; and it is in many contexts across different contexts (Block, 2002, p. 54). Davis and Skilton-Sylvestor (2004) too recite the claims of numerous scholars (e.g., Cameron, 1990; Holmes, 1991; Freed, 1995) who believe that gender behaviors are neither predictable nor universal.

As a result of this understanding, studies began shifting from perceiving gender as an individual and generalizable concept to perceiving gender as a social construction within specific cultural and situational contexts (Davis & Skilton-Sylvestor, 2004). Second language research, therefore, shifted from the positivistic conceptualization of gender as an individual variable to a constructivist view of gender as social relations operating within complex systems has led to richer understandings of the relations between gender and language learning across societies, communities, and classrooms (Norton & Pavlenko, 2004). Taking a post-structuralist stance to gender also means “understanding that gender cannot be studied in isolation from other traditional sociological variables such as ethnicity, social class and nationality -variables that cluster together to form an individual's self identity at a given point in time” (Block, 2002, p. 54), and that gendered activity is an outcome of “communities of practice”:

During the course of our lives, people move into, out of, and through communities of Practice continually transforming identities, understandings, and worldviews. Progressing through the life span brings ever-changing kinds of participation and nonparticipation, contexts for “belonging” and not belonging” in communities. A single individual participates in a variety of communities of practice at any given time, and over time: the family, a friendship group, an athletic team, a church group. These groups may be all-female or all-male; they may be dominated by women or men; they may offer different forms of participation to men and women; they may be organized on the presumption that all members want (or will want) heterosexual love relations. Whatever the nature of one’s participation into communities of practice, one’s experience of gender emerges in participation as a gendered community member with others in a variety of communities of practice (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1995, p.469).

Accepting that gender is a practiced attainment, gender should no more be studied as natural sex differences, yet it should be studied as contextualized social, psychological and linguistic behavior.

Current State of Gender and Language Interaction

In spite of the changing research philosophies and practices, traditional gender perspectives, the superiority of female language learners being the first, persist among TESOL educators (Sunderland, 2000). SLA research and practice still continue to hold the belief that gender differences can be
refined, and are uniform across language learning contexts (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). For instance, a number of researchers (i.e., Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Ellis, 1994; Oxford, 1993) continue to assume female superiority in language development. Many other scholars concluded their research studies with the claim that females have an advantage over males in language acquisition both in L1 and L2. However, the biological and dualistic conceptions of gender that underlie much (past) work in SLA exaggerate and overgeneralize differences between males and females, and ignore the social, cultural, and situational forces that shape gender categories, relations, and learner outcomes (Ehrlich, 1997).

Most assumptions about who uses which forms have little to do with gender. However, the number of scholars that still keep the same track is not small. "The persistence of essentializing, and dichotomizing gender research, despite theoretical critiques and evidence to the contrary, is most likely due to scholars' underlying ontological and epistemological positions" (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004, p. 384). Theorists like Freed (1995) and Kitetu and Sunderland (2002) state, the theory of language in the western world focused basically on adult, middle class and white populations which have dominated SLA literature are biased in failing to represent other social and cultural contexts. Yet many researchers and theorists are gradually moving away from traditional frameworks towards richer understandings of the relationships between gender and language learning across societies, communities and classrooms (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). Non-Western SLA scholars (e.g., Canagarajah 1999; Lin et al, 2004) along with those interested in immigrant, refugee, indigenous and K–12 populations (e.g., Duff, 2002; Duff, Wong, & Early, 2002; Harklau, 1994; McKay & Wong, 1996; Valdés, 1998) are criticizing studies that ignore situated values and practices and change their perspectives and turn to investigate traditionally ignored aspects (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004).

Social relationships in gender theorizing and research has become more evident in recent years as Connell (2002) suggests: The key is to move from a focus on difference to a focus on relations. Gender is, above all, a matter of the social relations within which groups and individuals act... Gender must be understood as a social structure. It is not an expression of biology, not a fixed category in human life or character. It is a pattern in our social arrangements and in everyday activities or practices which these arrangements govern (p. 9). Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (in Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004) argue that research on language and gender should:

• explain how social practices relate to linguistic structures and systems
• describe the social construction of gender categories
• examine how gender relations and privilege are constructed
• consider theories and approaches from other communities of scholarly practice, especially those specifically concerned with gender
• focus on the particular rather than (over) generalize. (p.387)

They also specifically call for research that takes into account the complexity of the intersection of identity, power relations and linguistic practices. Therefore, the recognition of the complex nature of language and gender requires language studies conducted within authentic communicative contexts and increased cooperation among linguists, sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, philosophers,
communication specialists, educators and feminists (Freed, 1995).

The focus of feminist-critical and poststructuralist scholars on the effects of power relations contributed a lot to gender and language education. Research on power relations can reveal real or perceived strategic appeals to differences and document ways in which gender differences are constructed in interaction. According to many scholars, “analysis of power and identity dynamics can create conscious awareness of these dynamics and help teachers move toward curricular and pedagogical choices that transform unjust practices” (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004, p.387). This, in turn, can help the educators conduct their instruction under the light of relevant research.

**Gender and First Language Acquisition**

General acceptance about children’s way of learning their mother tongue is quite straightforward; it is natural and without striking a blow. There is always difference in talent when children study other knowledge, for example, some children are good at mathematics, while others have a talent for physics. However, there is little difference in mother tongue acquisition. Although children’s living environments differ in thousands of ways and experiences in physics and intelligence are totally different, these differences don’t influence their acquisition of mother tongue at all. Five or six-year-olds, regardless of their gender, have the same language ability roughly despite their different language environments. It’s easy for children to learn their mother tongue and acquire language ability unconsciously (Li & Bu, 2006).

However, there are also several studies of first language acquisition (Douglas, 1964; Morris, 1966 etc.) that have shown girls to be better learners than boys. Trudgill (1974) showed that women used the prestige variants more frequently than men and related this phenomenon to female social insecurity. Differences between male and female L1 learners appear more in studies conducted in bilingual settings; and such studies favor female learners in acquiring the languages they are exposed to. In a study of Punjabi migrant children in England, Agnihotri (1979) showed that girls assimilated the prestige variants faster than the boys; they were also better at resisting the stigmatised variants. Satyanath (1982) too found that Kannadiga women in Delhi showed a higher percentage of assimilation of linguistic features associated with Hindi and also a higher degree of usage than men. He found that younger women assimilated the host society’s language and culture maximally. Unlike Trudgill (1974), who holds social insecurity to be responsible for greater use of prestige variants, Satyanath attributes it to the sociocultural aspects of the Kannadiga community which provides women a greater opportunity of interaction with the host society and this seems to be the underlying reason in female learners outscoring their counterparts.

**Gender and Second Language Acquisition (SLA)**

SLA, which is a subarea of applied linguistics, has become a genuine field of research for the last three decades. Previously, the research of gender and SLA basically focused on the topics valued in the area of SLA; nevertheless, with the change of perspectives it started to investigate the teachers and the learners more. In the previous period, only such studies that were based on positivist or postpositivist assumptions were respected by many scholars. As (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004) states, real science meant only experimental or quasiexperimental design,
surveys, and postpositivist qualitative studies to such scholars; and assuming only this hierarchy as the real track to follow neglects the wide range of contributions made through other paradigms (including gender) and excludes research participants' diverse experiences, "thereby creating conditions for inaccurate, inequitable and discriminatory outcomes" (p.388).

Such a hierarchy of predetermined research approaches, topics and participants, also, has the potential to cause discriminatory results against the teachers (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004). Lin et al. (2004) explains the way that educators face "systematic, institutional suppression of research and teaching on minority and diversity issues" (p.497). They state that "senior staff identified research by minority scholars on marginalized groups—as opposed to the adult, middle-class, and white populations that have dominated SLA literature—as 'repetitive' and 'trivial'" (p.497).

Even though some significant SLA theorists (i.e. Long, 1998; Gass, 2000) believe that SLA researchers began to ask the right questions, investigating these questions in a scientific way and accumulating results that allow them to further refine and make adjustments to existing theories, if we look closer how questions are related to gender have been explored, we cannot say that it is definitely the case (Block, 2002). As Jiménez-Catalán (2000) utters, individual differences such as age, aptitude, learning style and motivation are very-well focused on in most SLA research studies, but gender is often ignored. Besides, as Ehrlich (1997) and Sunderland (2000) points out, even in studies where gender was included into research, it was perceived in an oversimplified way.

Research Studies Conducted on Gender in SLA

In his prominent work The Study of Second Language Acquisition, Rod Ellis (1994) devotes only a few pages to gender in a section entitled "sex", that is included in the section of "Social factors and second language acquisition". He shortly discusses the difference between the terms "sex" and "gender" and mentions the two principles Labov (1991) suggested:

1. In stable sociolinguistic stratification, men use a higher frequency of non-standard forms than women.

2. In the majority of linguistic changes, women use a higher frequency of the incoming forms than men (p.206-207).

Then he turns Labov's generalizations into an hypothesis that follows as "women might be better at L2 learning than men as they are likely to be more open to new linguistic forms in the L2 input and they will be more likely to rid themselves of interlanguage forms that deviate from target-language norms" (Ellis, 1994, p. 202).

Ellis then cites two studies, Burstall's (1975) research in England on primary school students of French and Boyle's (1987) research in Hong Kong on university students of English. Either of these studies reveals that female students were more successful than male students in the exams applied. However, Ellis does not reach conclusive results on these findings; he states that such generalizations might be misleading as Boyle's study also indicated higher achievement of male students in listening tests and the study by Bacon (1992) of university students of Spanish in the US found no such significant difference between boys and girls.
Achievement is not the only aspect that Ellis cites. He discusses attitudes towards language learning and learning strategies which are directly related to gender. About the attitudes issue, Ellis cites studies that resolve that both boys and girls can be more instrumentally motivated than the other group for the reasons that affect their instrumental motivations. Similarly, Ludwig (1983) found that male university students of German, French and Spanish in the US were more instrumentally motivated than female students, and according to Gardner and Lambert (1972)'s study, female students of L2 French in Canada were more motivated than the male students and also had more positive attitudes towards the speakers of the target language (Block, 2002). Bacon and Finnemann (1992) found that female university students of Spanish in the US were more instrumentally motivated than male students. About the learning strategies, Gass and Varonis's (1986) study of university students of English as a second language is cited to support the notion that "men use the opportunities to interact to produce more output, whereas women use it to obtain more input" (Ellis, 1994: 203 in Block, 2002). However, Teresa Pica et al.'s (1991) study of adult learners of English in the US indicated no significant differences in interaction strategies (Block, 2002).

According to Ellis’ review, there was nothing conclusive in studies of gender differences in SLA in achievement, attitudes and strategy use at that time. As a result, Ellis concluded the section about gender as follows: Sex is, of course, likely to interact with other variables in determining L2 proficiency. It will not always be the case, therefore, that females outperform males. Asian men in Britain generally attain higher levels of proficiency in L2 English than do Asian women for the simple reason that their jobs bring them into contact with the majority English speaking group, while women are often "enclosed" in the home. Sex interacts with such factors as age, ethnicity, and, in particular social class (Ellis, 1994, p. 204). Several other SLA texts published at about the same time (i.e. Cook, 1993; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Towell & Hawkins, 1994, Mitchell & Myles, 1998; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; and Gass & Selinker, 2001) reveal that gender is neither listed in the index nor discussed in anything but a passing manner by any of these authors (Block, 2002). Looking at articles published in specialized SLA and general applied linguistics journals, we find that gender in SLA has been dealt within two very distinct ways in research:

**Mainstream SLA Research and Gender**

In mainstream SLA, that is research exploring issues such as how interaction relates to SLA or the role of Universal Grammar in SLA or the role of general cognitive mechanisms in SLA, gender is usually perceived to be the synonym for biological sex, and despite being mentioned during the discussion of research methodology, it is seldom returned to during the data analysis stage (Block, 2002).

The research done by Mackey et al (2000) is fairly typical of research published in specialist SLA journals. It has a general interest in the potential contribution to SLA of interactional feedback provided by a more competent interlocutor to a less competent interlocutor in the course of a conversational interaction (Block, 2002). According to the authors, to investigate the relationship, it is first necessary to examine the extent to which such feedback is actually perceived as such by those to whom it is provided. One source of evidence of this influence is to be found in the exchanges themselves: the researchers examine a stretch of discourse and reach an agreement as to whether or not it contains an example of interactional
feedback and if it does, what type of interational feedback it is and, more importantly, the effect it has on the linguistic structure of the exchange (Block, 2002). Another source of evidence for the perception of interactional feedback as interactional feedback is to be found in post-task accounts of what happened provided by the learner. So as to investigate these issues, the researchers video recorded two groups of language students as they were on a spot-the-differences task. One of the groups consisted of 10 learners of English from diverse L1 backgrounds and the other had 7 American students of Italian. The students, then, were asked to generate stimulated recalls as they watched the records of their interactions. During these stimulated recalls, learners were asked to comment on those points in the activity when they were exposed to interactional feedback.

At the beginning of the study Mackey et al. present a table containing "participant biodata" in the research methodology section. Here, they show three easily identifiable identities that these learners bring to the classroom "(in the case of the first group) and learning Italian (in the case of the second group): gender (column 2), L1 (column 3) and foreign exchange student (column 5)" (Block, 2002, p. 61). However, the authors only mention the gender of the participants under the column of "gender"; and in the rest of the article they do not make any explanations or point out any findings related to this factor.

As Gass (2000) suggests, even though they put "gender" in the biodata table, Mackey et al. do not go on to investigate further relations of gender as they do not think it is relevant to their research interests. "In this case, the researchers are interested in a focus on negotiation devices as determinants of behavior, as opposed to gender as either an influence on behavior or a part of identity enacted in the exchanges examined" (Block, 2002, p.63).

Social-Psychological Research and Gender

The concept of gender has been dealt with a significantly different approach in social-psychological research. However, most of the studies have traditionally over generalized the notions and the results found in the studies. Nevertheless, ... it is in research which is more sociolinguistically oriented (and as a result, at the fringes of mainstream SLA), where gender has been dealt with more robustly, as an aspect of identity inextricably interwoven with other aspects of identity such as nationality and ethnicity, and as an important factor in the process of SLA" (Block, 2002, p.60).

Talburt and Stewart's (1999) study is the first example where gender and identity issues were more important than SLA issues. In that study, the researcher focused on an African American university student on a five week study abroad program in Spain. The program combined language and culture classes with informal socializing. The subject of the study had a middle class background and had been raised in a white setting. She accepted that she had already experienced racism in her life in the United States, and she had an expectation of not encountering a similar racist discrimination in Spain. Nevertheless, at the end of her first week in her new setting, she stated that she was already disappointed to be in Spain. The reason why she was so disappointed was the comments of males in the streets of the city. As she walked by them, they made negative comments on her appearance and sexuality. The study indicated that the issues relating to socialization, ethnicity and gender are very
important in SLA research and further investigation of the concepts is necessary.

A relatively new research study was conducted by Hruska (2004), who investigated second language development among minority students while practicing as an ESL kindergarten teacher. The study was a year-long ethnographic study conducted in an English dominant kindergarten in the United States. The classroom was composed of 6 Spanish-bilingual English language learners and 17 native English speakers. The base for the study was a theoretical framework that views language as the site for constructing social meaning and negotiating power. According to Fairclough (1989), such theory provides the foundation for asking questions about the interaction which moves beyond a strictly linguistic focus. Data collection followed standard ethnographic procedures, including prolonged engagement, persistent observation and triangulation to ensure the credibility of interpretations. The researcher conducted one to three 20- to 45-minute observations daily and videotaped at least two observations per week. The study demonstrated how relationships and interaction mediated through local gender constructions support and constrained English language learners’ classroom participation. Based on these results, the author concludes that “local gender ideologies operating in second language (L2) learning contexts affect students’ access to the interactions that they need to develop a second language” (Hruska, 2004, p.459).

Consequently, gender cannot be perceived as a fixed independent variable which always results in generalizable outcomes.

In other words, her ethnographic study described how gender ideologies, gender constructions, and behaviors related to it intersected with bilingualism, ethnicity and friendships in ways that emphasized unequal power relations or shaped participation in classroom events, which, affected the students’ second language development (Davis & Skilton-Sylvester, 2004).

Conclusion

Language and gender involves interpreting the use of linguistics resources to accomplish social ends. It foregrounds aspects of interpretation, nature and role of gender ideology in thought processes and the consideration of analytic linkages between form (linguistics - structures) and their function from gender perspective.

Language and communication rather more to women than to men, women talk more than men, women are more verbally skill than women. Men’s goal in using language tend to be about getting things done, whereas women tend to be about making corrections to other people. Men talk about things and facts, whereas women talk more about people, relationships and feelings.
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