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**FORMAT**

Font: Calibri

Font size: 12 for the main body and 10 for footnotes
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Justification: left and right

**TITLE PAGE - centered**

**Title: Calibri 12 bold**

1 line

Name: Calibri 12 normal

1 line

Affiliation: *Calibri 12 italicized*
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**HEADINGS**

Number sections using *1., 2., 3.,* and subsections using *1.1, 1.2, 1.3,* a.s.o, as you deem appropriate. (Sub)section headings should be italicized. Leave a line after headings and begin flush right without indenting the first paragraph but only each subsequent one. E.g.,

*1. Introduction*

In this paper we shall attempt to show that…

**MAIN BODY**

All subsequent paragraphs must be indented (set tab at 1).

Quotations of more than 20-25 words should be avoided, if possible. However, if you cannot avoid them they should be indented (set tab at 1) and set apart from the main body of the text in smaller font (Calibri 11); a line should be left before and after the indented quotation, as in the example:

A detailed critique of queer linguistics is beyond the scope of this paper, but a couple of points should be made, and Hall does that eloquently:

From a political perspective, I am concerned that queer theory, by maintaining its analytic distinction between practice and identity, ignores the subjectivity of those it was initiated to defend. From a sociocultural linguistic perspective, I am concerned that this distinction leads to a static account of the indexical processes that give rise to social meaning. (Hall 2013: 640)

Hall’s second point relates to (linguistic and social) categorisation at large. This may be fuzzy (rather than Aristotelian; cf. Lakoff 1982, 1987; Taylor 2010) and dynamic (rather than static), but it is *inescapable*; and so are the indexical relations between categories themselves (which Bucholtz and Hall 2004, 2005 have attempted to capture).

**FOOTNOTES**

Notes should appear as footnotes, rather than endnotes, and they should be numbered consecutively as 1, 2, 3, etc. in Calibri size 10. Please leave a space after the footnote number before typing the footnote text.

**INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES**

**Examples**

Advocating sexuality as desire (Kulick 2000, 2003; Cameron 2005; Cameron & Kulick 2003, 2005, 2006) has worked as a catalyst for the field.

Recent research (Sauntson & Kyratzis 2007; Morrish & Leap 2007) has shown both concepts to be manifestly relevant to the study of language and sexuality, and intricately implicated in gendered self- and other-representation, given heteronormativity.

On the other hand, the ‘critical approach to heteronormativity’ emphatically advocated by queer linguistics can hardly be dissociated from issues of identity and desire in language, as heteronormativity specifically aims at policing their correlation vis-a-vis gender norms (Coates 2013: 536).

**EXAMPLES, TABLES, AND DIAGRAMS**

Examples, tables, and diagrams should be numbered consecutively using 1, 2, 3. Simple numbering will do for examples (i.e., without the word “Example” preceding the number). However, if you must use tables or/and diagrams, then you should write “Table 1” or “Diagram 1” etc., as appropriate.

**REFERENCES**

References should include all works cited (and be limited only to works cited). The second line of each entry should be indented (set tab at 0,5).
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