



# MASTERARBEIT | MASTER'S THESIS

Titel | Title

“I’ve fucking had it”: Swearing, Humor, and Voicing in subversive women’s talk as indices of political identity

verfasst von | submitted by  
Jakob Edlinger BA BSc

angestrebter akademischer Grad | in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts (MA)

Wien | Vienna, 2025

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt | Degree  
programme code as it appears on the  
student record sheet:

UA 066 812

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt | Degree  
programme as it appears on the student  
record sheet:

Masterstudium English Language and Linguistics

Betreut von | Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Ute Smit

## **Acknowledgments**

If I look back, I am lost and yet I find myself having to do just that to acknowledge all the help I have received along the way.

Above all, I am indebted to Ute Smit, who could not have been more supportive and encouraging, and provided valuable feedback at every turn, while being the Miranda Priestly to my Andy Sachs in the best way possible. I would also like to thank Pia Pichler whose seminar inspired this thesis.

Furthermore, I am immensely grateful to my mother and the literal moon for painstakingly proofreading this creation, as well as Sarah Wirnsperger and Yara Csillag for bearing the brunt of my thesis-induced insanity onsite. I would also like to express my gratitude to Michelle van de Bilt and Philipp Trojan for having our jointly organized student conference serve as a trial run for a number of thesis presentations, including my own. Special thanks go to my father and my sister whose pragmatic attitude and support made this endeavor possible. Thank you, also, to Selina Rebhandl for advice on some last-minute formatting dilemmas and to all my friends and colleagues at the department who witnessed my increasing exasperation over the last year and yet never once stopped being cordial.

## **Zusammenfassung**

Ein vom Geschlecht abhängiger Sprechstil spezifisch für Frauen ist ein umstrittenes Thema in der Linguistik und wurde maßgeblich von Robin Lakoff (1975/2004) beeinflusst. Sie präsentiert eine Liste mit Merkmalen von Women's Language (WL), die Elemente wie "women don't use off-color or indelicate expressions" („Frauen verwenden keine unangebrachten oder taktlosen Ausdrücke“), „women have no sense of humor“ („Frauen haben keinen Sinn für Humor“) und „women speak in italics“ („Frauen sprechen in Kursive“) beinhaltet (Robin Lakoff, 1975/2004: 80-81).

Dieses Projekt untersucht zwei politisch progressive Podcast-Moderatorinnen und deren Gesprächspartner\*innen, acht Dragkünstler\*innen, die Normen bezüglich WL umgehen. Besonders Schimpfwörter, Humor und Stimme werden als „enregistered forms“ (Silverstein, 2022) verwendet und sind ein Index für eine spezifische politische Persona – eine progressive, linke Identität. Das Untersuchen der Intersektion von Geschlecht und politischer Identität, ein oft übersehener Einfluss auf linguistische Variation (Hall-Lew & Eyndhoven, 2025: 33), ist besonders im Kontext des Südens der Vereinigten Staaten nach den Wahlen in 2024 sinnvoll – ein Ort, an dem Geschlecht ein politisiertes Thema ist.

Eine Kombination aus Konversationsanalyse und kritischer Diskursanalyse wurden angewendet, um Schimpfwörter, Humor, Stimme und die Diskurse, die in den Interaktionen produziert werden, näher zu erforschen. All diese Aspekte werden verwendet, um die Eigengruppe auf- und gleichzeitig die Fremdgruppe abzuwerten. Meine Erkenntnisse deuten an, dass Wiederaneignung nicht nur in der Verwendung von Schimpfwörtern eine Rolle spielt, sondern auch in den Diskursen, die durch Humor und Stimme entstehen. Obwohl die wiederangeeigneten Diskurse sehr vereinfachend wirken, können sie dennoch als Rebellion gegen eine rechtsextreme und konservative Regierung gelesen werden.

## **Abstract**

A gendered speech style specific to women has always been a contested topic in linguistics and was heavily influenced by Robin Lakoff (1975/2004). She provides a comprehensive list of features of Women's Language (WL) including elements like "women don't use off-color or indelicate expressions", "women have no sense of humor", and "women speak in italics" (Robin Lakoff, 1975/2004: 80-81).

This project investigates two progressive female podcast hosts from Oklahoma City and their eight drag artist guests, who flaunt the norms around WL. Especially swearing, humor and voicing are used as enregistered forms (Silverstein, 2022) in a way that indexes a specific political persona – a progressive, leftist one. Investigating the intersection of gender and political identity, an often-ignored influence on linguistic variation (Hall-Lew & Eyndhoven, 2025: 33), is especially fruitful in the context of Southern states in the US in the wake of the 2024 election, where gender is highly politicized.

A combination of Conversation Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis were employed to examine swearing, humor, and voicing, as well as the discourses created in interaction. All of these features are used to establish simultaneous in-group cohesion and out-group denigration. My findings indicate that reappropriation is apparent not only in the subjects' use of slurs but also in the discourses they invoke during humorous and voiced interactions. While the reappropriated discourses employed to denigrate the out-group are overly simplistic, they can be viewed as resistance against a far-right conservative government.

## Transcription Key

{...}	non-verbal information
...{laughing}	paralinguistic information qualifying underlined utterance
[...]	beginning/end of simultaneous speech
(xxx)	inaudible material
(.....)	doubt about accuracy of transcription
'.....'	speaker quotes others
<b>bold print</b>	speaker emphasis
>...<	faster speed of utterance
<...>	slower speed of utterance
-	incomplete word or utterance
/	rising intonation for statements
\	falling intonation
:	lengthened sound
=	latching on
(.)	micropause
(1); (2)	timed pauses (longer than one second)
/.../	phonetic transcription

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Identity and Language.....	2
2.1. Indexicality and Enregisterment.....	2
2.2. Political identity .....	5
2.2.1. Political indexicality.....	5
2.2.2. Political identity .....	6
2.2.3. Political Identity and gender .....	8
3. Gender.....	9
3.1. Women’s talk and Women’s Language .....	10
3.2. Swearing.....	14
3.2.1. Functions of swearing .....	14
3.2.2. “Women don’t use off-color or indelicate expressions” .....	18
3.3. Humor.....	21
3.3.1. “Women have no sense of humor” .....	25
3.4. Humor and swearing in combination: disparagement humor .....	27
3.5. Voicing .....	29
3.5.1. The role of voice in constructed speech.....	30
3.5.2. “Women speak in italics” .....	33
4. Data & Methodology .....	35
4.1. Podcast specifics .....	35
4.2. Method .....	37
4.3. Analytical Tools .....	39
4.3.1. Conversation Analysis.....	39
4.3.2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).....	41
5. Analysis.....	42
5.1. Overt mentions of political affiliation.....	43
5.2. Overt admissions of support.....	49
5.3. Swearing.....	54
5.4. Humor.....	60
5.4.1. Smart discourse .....	60
5.4.2. Sexualizing the Republicans .....	63
5.4.3. Discourses about religion .....	68
5.4.4. Priests as molesters.....	71
5.5. Voicing .....	75
5.6. The reappropriation of discourses .....	80
5.6.1. Smart discourse .....	80
5.6.2. Sexualization & Molester discourse.....	83
5.6.3. Bodily autonomy .....	86
6. Discussion.....	87
6.1. How are swearing, humor, and voicing leveraged in these interactions to enhance speakers’ political identity?.....	87
6.2. How do the discourses invoked by these three features aid in constructing a particular political identity?.....	87

6.3.	In what way does the status of these three features as aspects of women’s language contribute to the construction of political identity?.....	88
6.4.	Are there any marked differences in register between the hosts and their guests and how does this affect constructions of political identity? .....	88
6.5.	Limitations .....	89
7.	Conclusion .....	89
8.	References.....	91
9.	Appendix – Transcribed Data .....	99

## 1. Introduction

A gendered speech style specific to women has always been a contested topic in linguistics: it was mentioned only offhandedly as aberrant linguistic behavior until the 1970s when it gained more traction as a research topic. More recently, linguistics has moved away from binary and hegemonic concepts but gendered norms, even ones that only pertain to speech, are still pervasive in everyday life. These social norms concerning how women are supposed to speak can (and should) be violated and flaunted, the effects of which can be interpreted in numerous ways. This project investigates white progressive women in a conservative U.S. American state and drag queens who engage with women's talk in a way that establishes a specific political persona – a progressive, leftist person.

Politics and gender jointly constrain speech behavior. Despite not usually being considered when investigating linguistic variation, Hall-Lew & van Eyndhoven (2025: 333; 346) point to the correlation of political identity with demographic categories, like age, gender, and race: according to Silverstein's (2022) indexical order, political meanings are mapped on to these more commonly studied social factors. Nonetheless, political identity is often a better fit than gender or race in accounting for patterns of linguistic variation (Hall-Lew & van Eyndhoven, 2025: 334). In this regard, Hall-Lew and van Eyndhoven (2025: 346) focus on stance-taking and differing stances on specific issues as indicative of political identity and thus linguistic variation, whereas my conception focuses on group dynamics. My focus also differs in regard to target group: while the majority of linguistic inquiry into politics, such as political discourse analysis, concentrates on politicians, my focus are laypeople.

That politics and gender are entangled beyond just linguistic features, especially in an American context, has been evidenced by major political developments in recent years. As Freed (2020: 10) points out, "matters have materially deteriorated for women in the United States," referencing the Violence Against Women Act, the renewal of which had been ignored for several years. Freed (2020: 10) also mentioned the diminishing abortion rights in the US, which conversely took a turn for the even worse two years after Freed's publication with the overruling of *Roe v. Wade* by the Republican majority Supreme Court. These transgressions against women's rights were also accompanied by an anti-LGBTQ+ sentiment in the US, the most overt of which took the form of legislation to ban drag performances (Squirrel & Davey, 2023: 5). It seems any transcendent gender performances do not serve a far-right government whose goal is, amongst others, to reaffirm traditional conceptions of gender (Warwick et al.,

2024: 475-476). To end her review, Freed (2020: 15) summarizes: “[t]his chapter has chronicled the gloomy reality that women, women’s behaviour, and women’s language are still under attack.” The aim of my project is to show that women, or at least the two women who host the *I’ve Had It* podcast and their drag artist guests, use behaviors and notions around women’s language to launch counterattacks.

The first chapter is dedicated to indexicality, enregisterment and how these concepts relate to a political identity. Next, I will delve into language and gender, discussing Lakoff’s concept of Women’s Language (WL) by concentrating on three key aspects, swearing, humor and voicing. Then, I introduce the data set and detail my method, which is mainly CA-informed CDA. An analysis of the data according to the three main categories swearing, humor and voicing follows, emphasizing how these seemingly gendered rubrics contribute to the establishment of a political identity. Finally, I will discuss the discourses that emerge in the data in depth and conclude.

## **2. Identity and Language**

### **2.1. Indexicality and Enregisterment**

In order to more closely examine the possible implications features of women’s talk may have in terms of how speakers position themselves in terms of political identity, I will use the closely interrelated frameworks of indexicality and enregisterment.

An index is a linguistic form that can express or point to a social meaning in addition to a form’s denotational meaning (Ochs, 1993: 338). Enregisterment, in turn, describes the process by which a form, or a constellation of forms termed “repertoire”, becomes a recognizable indicator of such a social meaning (Agha, 2003: 231). For instance, the choice of a speaker to utter ‘divine’ when describing a delicious meal could be said to index a female identity by virtue of being an aspect of women’s language (WL), the enregistered forms of which were listed by Lakoff and will be the subject of the following chapter. Strongly enregistered forms are called “shibboleth” by Silverstein (2003: 212), who seems to be uniquely fond of that term and uses it even in his latest posthumous publication (Silverstein, 2022: 135) interchangeably with ‘enregistered forms’, in a move that has not been copied by other scholars to refer to markers of identity. Identity in Ochs’ conception (1996: 410) subsumes all kinds of social roles a person may fill, including organizational ranks, relationships, interactional roles, as well as group memberships. Eckert (2008: 456), in contrast, uses the term ‘persona style,’ which

denotes features of speech that have strong associations with social stereotypes. However, the relationship between an index and its social meaning is not always a straightforward one, because the social identities that are referenced are highly dependent on contextual norms and expectations, as well as the context specific to the speaker (Barrett, 2016: 10). For example, a gay man might use ‘divine’ as described above to signal gayness. This speaker specific context pertains to demographic information, like gender and sexuality, but goes further to include situational context, speaker relations, and assumptions (Barrett, 2016: 11). All these social meanings that can be linked to specific forms constitute what Agha (2003: 242) calls “metapragmatic stereotypes” which in turn can be identified with specific societal sub-groups.

Like most form-meaning units, one index may express multiple social meanings (Eckert, 2008: 454). All social meanings indexed by a particular form that are ideologically related constitute its indexical field (Eckert, 2008: 454), hence both the readings of ‘divine’ as an index for WL and gayness are part of the word’s indexical field. This field however, is far from static and with each reactivation may take on new meanings (Eckert, 2008: 454). This lack of constancy is especially noteworthy to Eckert (2024: 66) who keeps stressing the ephemeral nature of social meanings, which shift much more easily than denotations. This is especially true when it comes to slang terms which might point to membership of a niche societal sub-group in one decade and enter common parlance in another.

In an attempt to capture the complexity of ever-changing indexical associations, Silverstein (2003) coined the concept of “indexical order”. He distinguishes ‘n order indices’, later often called first order indices, which are pragmatic indications about the relationships between speakers, from ‘n+1’ or second order indices (Silverstein, 2003: 227). This second order then encompasses ideologically charged aspects, like specific group memberships or location specific features, in short, everything that goes beyond the interaction at hand (Silverstein, 2003: 227). These orders of indexicality are an attempt of relating the micro-social, for example specific speech situations, to the macro-social, meaning the organization of society in groups according to a hierarchy that comes with ideologies (Silverstein, 2003: 193), as well as social categories and group memberships that are bestowed by institutions (Silverstein, 2022: 131). Silverstein’s (2003: 212-213) main argument is that there is always a more abstract order of indexicality lurking in the background, that may cause the first order of indexical relationship to take on meanings of a higher order. For instance, a woman using politeness strategies can in certain situations be seen as her simply indicating the type of the relationship between her and

her interlocutor (first order) and at the same time also indexing her identity as woman (second order indexicality) to fulfill the hegemonic stereotype that “women are more polite than men”. Eckert’s interpretation of Silverstein’s indexical order has the first order be an accent that indicates a certain place, while higher order indexicality would depend on established attitudes toward that accent (Eckert, 2019: 754).

Indexicality, by virtue of its changeability and social contingency is also highly linked with performance. As Eckert (2019: 752) points out, “communicating certain things performatively can be more economical, more strategic, more believable, and more deniably intentional”. Such performances are in turn volatile, as their interpretation depends on the worldview and beliefs of each individual involved and can never be fixed or monosemous (Johnstone, 2016: 638). This same volatility is also the reason why Eckert (2019: 753) prefers the term “persona” over “identity” because it lacks the implication of a stable self and because it does not invoke a certain group membership. The latter is more explicitly investigated in Agha’s work (2007: 233), who, while concentrating on group-based registers, maintains that speakers’ perception of their own identity fluctuates with time and over different social interactions. However, Agha’s (2003) earlier work on enregisterment comes with a degree of stasis which is why Eckert (2008: 456) settles on the term ‘speech styles’ for what Agha calls ‘enregistered’ speech. ‘Style’, however, lacks the notions of social construction and joint negotiation of meaning, both of which are built into enregisterment. In addition, even Eckert (2024: 69) acknowledges that enregisterment is useful due to its focus on the process of a word coming to be associated with a particular social group, not a finished product.

Agha’s reason for championing enregisterment bears similarity to Silverstein’s connection of the micro- and macro-social, with Agha pointing out that examining register use in interaction is the only way to make sense of changes in register on a macro level (Agha, 2005: 38). His somewhat rigid conception of register organization consists of three categories, namely social domain, social range, and repertoire characteristics (Agha, 2005: 47). The social domain subsumes speakers that are able to wield the register and those able to recognize it to some extent, while the social range specifies in which social settings the register is appropriate and what relationships and speaker stereotypes are implied by its use (Agha, 2005: 47). The repertoire characteristics define the actual forms used as part of a register in terms of number, as well as what kind of linguistic and non-linguistic forms are used in the first place and what grammatical categories the linguistic forms entail (Agha, 2005: 47). Similarly, Barrett and Hall

(2024: 132) introduced the “indexical inventory” to talk about the individual’s associations between form and social meaning, as opposed to the abstract register’s characteristics in Agha’s (2005) theory. This knowledge to connect indices to a given social identity is also highly speaker-contingent, as it has to be inferred through subjective experiences and may in itself indicate a particular group membership (Barrett & Hall, 2024: 132). Further, this knowledge subsumes the pragmatic functions of a form, and beyond that “norms, preferences, and expectations regarding the distribution of this [pragmatic] work vis-a-vis particular social identities of speakers, referents, and addressees” (Ochs, 1993: 342). The dissemination of such indexicality associations takes the form of repeated use and social exchange and involves role alignment (Agha, 2003: 244): any interlocutor may align or disalign with the forms and their associations they receive, for instance a certain accent, and thus choose to change their own utterances to conform to these norms or not (Agha, 2005: 244).

## **2.2. Political identity**

### **2.2.1. Political indexicality**

Hall-Lew and van Eyndhoven (2025: 333-334) stress the importance of political identity as an important factor in terms of linguistic behavior. Historically, it has often been overlooked as a moderator of linguistic variation, despite being a seemingly more reliable indicator of sociolinguistic behavior than other, more established social identities (Hall-Lew & van Eyndhoven, 2025: 333-334). One of the first and most successful applications of indexicality on political identity, was Hall-Lew et al.’s (2010) inquiry into the pronunciation of the *a* in ‘Iraq’. They postulated that Republicans favor the more Americanized /æ/ while Democrats prefer what is dubbed “the foreign” /a:/ due to its association with Spanish and French loanwords, as well as British accents (Hall-Lew et al., 2010: 94). After investigating debate on increasing the number of American troops in Iraq in the House of Representatives in February 2007 using recordings televised on CSPAN, the U.S. American television channel broadcasting the proceedings of the national government, they identified 107 Republicans and 152 Democrats who mentioned Iraq at least thrice (Hall-Lew et al., 2010: 94-95). 85% of the 259 speakers were consistent in their usage of either pronunciation (Hall-Lew et al., 2010: 94-95). In their conception, political identity is constituted by party affiliation, the speaker’s stance at the debate, as well as recent voting behavior (Hall-Lew et al., 2010: 95). Hall-Lew et al.’s (2010: 96-98) findings indicate that Republicans are more likely to use /æ/ than Democrats, an assertion that remains true even when using other identities, like gender, ethnicity, age, or

region, as control variables. In a study that followed Hall-Lew et al.'s (2010) footsteps, Blas-Arroyo (2021) similarly focused on how phonetic variation indexes political identity. He investigated word final /l/ and word final and intervocalic /d/, using data from speeches by 16 politicians between 2007-2017, with half of the subjects being left-leaning, the other half right (Blas-Arroyo, 2021: 418). In spite of the lack of straightforward connection between variation and political leaning overall, Blas-Arroyo (2021: 436) found that nationalist politicians are consistently using more vernacular forms than other politicians.

While Hall-Lew et al. (2010) are very clear on how to operationalize political identity, they spend very little time on theoretical implications, jumping straight to the societal ones: they question both the role of political affiliation alongside the more classically investigated identities in sociolinguistic inquiry, like gender, class and race while at the same time emphasizing how political identity is more changeable than its peers (Hall-Lew et al., 2010: 98). In their discussion they also mention the group-based dynamics of a political identity for the first time and, crucially, how the political identity of a non-politician might differ from people in public office (Hall-Lew et al., 2010: 98-99). Blas-Arroyo (2021: 423) is even more unconcerned about theoretical or social considerations, simply taking party affiliation as sole marker of political ideology without considering political identity outside of a professional context, leaving the political identity of laypeople by the wayside. Blas-Arroyo's (2021: 437) concerns are purely linguistic: he points out that political indexicality should not be constrained to phonetic features but also consider grammar and lexis.

In sum, linguistic works in political identity so far have had a very limited scope and are defined by a lack of elaborate theoretical foundation for what political identity means beyond self-identification and attitudes toward politicized issues. For this reason, I will now go into more detail about identity in general, as well as provide a quick overview of how I conceptualize political identity.

### **2.2.2. Political identity**

In Ochs' (1996: 410) conception, identity in a social sense includes institutional ranks, group-based labels, like gender and class, relationships, and interactional roles. This definition is largely identical to the one presented by Buchholtz and Hall (2005: 592), who simply group these components differently with "macro-level demographic categories" encompassing labels like gender and class, while institutional ranks might be counted toward "local ethnographically

specific cultural positions”. Crucially, the interactional components of identity remain their own category for Buchholtz and Hall (2005: 594), and they define the construction of identity in interaction on four levels: (1) the use of linguistic forms with ideological connections to a certain group (i.e. use of a register), (2) speaker roles and attitudes, (3) presuppositions and implicatures, and (4) overt self-identification and self-labelling. While this implies that identity construction is a very intentional process, Buchholtz and Hall (2005: 606) also point out more unconscious processes that contribute to the fluid nature of identity in interaction, like self-identification out of habit, or identity as the product of negotiation, which also relies on the interlocutor’s perceptions. The latter is especially important, because it stresses the intersubjective components of identity which also involve the establishment of group-based relations by stressing either the similarity or difference with members of certain groups (Buchholtz & Hall, 2005: 598).

Political identity in particular, even on the most overt level, relies on such group dynamics. The most straightforward approach to determine a speaker’s political identity is their self-reported party identification which is defined as an “affective attachment to one’s preferred political party” (Dalton, 2021: 5). While there is a lot of debate about what exactly that means, some of the more accepted theories posit that an individual’s political self-identification, especially in the context of the U.S. American liberal-conservative divide, is derived from their attitude toward groups that symbolize liberalism or conservatism rather than stemming from ideology or attitudes toward specific issues (Zschirnt, 2011: 687). For instance, Goren (2005: 892), analyzing National Election Survey data, found that party identity constrained individuals’ belief systems in regard to moral tolerance, limited government, and equal opportunity. In turn, respondents’ value system did not affect party affiliation but had minor influence on attitudes toward policies (Goren, 2005: 892). Goren (2005: 881) thus frames identification with relevant social groups, like born-again Christians as a reference group for Republicanism, along with party effect as the two key components of political identity. While political identity, as discussed so far, relies on positive feelings toward one’s preferred party, attitudes toward opposing parties are also important in terms of negative identification (Dalton, 2021: 14). Zschirnt (2011: 686) points out that, historically, negative identification was more productive for conservatives, while liberals were more likely to rely on identification with liberal groups they evaluate positively. However, analyzing data from the National Election Studies from 1988 to 2008, Zschirnt (2011: 695) finds that conservatism has since taken over the dominant role: despite attitudes toward liberal groups yielding comparable results,

individuals' self-identification correlates slightly stronger with their positive or negative attitudes toward conservative groups. Examples for the most salient conservative reference groups are the military, big business, Christian fundamentalists, and non-controversial groups which for Zschirnt (2011: 697-698) are white people and the middle class, while the most significant liberal reference groups are feminists, environmental activists, unions, and “controversial groups” like immigrants and gay people.

So far, the discussion of political identity has adhered to a very strict Democrat-Republican dichotomy, as these are the only relevant political parties in the US. However, different groups with divergent political stances and attitudes toward key groups are part of the two main parties. In a survey investigating these attitudes and stances among 10221 adults, administered by the Pew Research Center, they identified four sub-groups per major political party (Pew, 2021: 4). Democrats consist of Progressive Left, Establishment Liberals, Democratic Mainstays, and Outsider Left (Pew, 2021: 6). While the first groups are ordered from most to least liberal in their attitudes, the Outsider Left, while mostly liberal, gained its position due to its lack of loyalty toward the Democratic Party (Pew, 2021: 6). The Republican sub-groups, ordered from most to least conservative, are Faith and Flag Conservatives, Committed Conservatives, Populist Right, and Ambivalent Right (Pew, 2021: 6). This survey also gave rise to the political typology quiz, through which survey-takers are assigned to one of the identified 8 sub-groups as well as a single non-partisan category: Stressed Sideliners (Pew, 2021: 6).

### **2.2.3. Political Identity and gender**

With feminists and fundamental Christians being two of the most salient reference groups in opposite corners of the political playing field, it seems uncontroversial to say that politics and gender are inextricably entangled. Hall-Lew and van Eyndhoven, (2025: 346), for instance, point out that political affiliation often correlates with other social factors, like gender, race, and religion. Moreover, Barnes and Cassese (2016: 10) point out that, in a U.S. American setting, women tend to identify to a larger degree with Democrats while men are more likely to be Republican. However, this overlap with gender, despite being superficially apparent, does not always take a straightforward form because it intersects with all the other social identities. For instance, in the 2016 US elections, 54% of all women voted Democrat (*2016 Election Results*, 2024). When intersected with race, it becomes clear that 52% of white women voted for Trump (*2016 Election Results*, 2024). One even more significant factor is religion with 79% of white evangelical women voting Republican (Cassese, 2020: 169). The 2024 elections which

led to Trump's second term had very similar numbers, with 53% women overall voting for Kamala Harris, while 53% of white women voted for Trump; evangelical Christian women were once again more conservative with 80% of them voting Republican (*2024 Exit Poll Results*, 2024). These results indicate the validity of Cassese's (2020: 172) main argument that religious identification as well as race have a visible impact on voting behavior, and that viewing gender as sole contributor to political identity is insufficient and misleading. Even overtly political identities lack a linear relation to gender, as Cameron and Shaw (2020: 148) found no clear pattern linking the gender of a politician to a particular speech style. Overall, it seems that the issue of only focusing on gender as a determinant of political identity diminishes the differences between women and undercuts the fact that gender intersects with a myriad of other social identities, chief amongst them race and religiosity.

### **3. Gender**

Language and gender, like any other discipline that uses gender as an analytical category, has been restructured by Judith Butler's (1990) application of J. L. Austin's (1975) terminology of performative speech acts. This led to a shift in perspective from viewing gender as an essential category to viewing it as a performance. This frame of reference works especially well in conjunction with indexicality, because gender is signaled "through a series of citations involving repetitions of signs, or culturally meaningful behaviors, which are recognized as markers of gender" (Barrett, 2017: 8). These citations, however, have no biological basis, and are simply references to culturally and individually established gender performances that are based on societal norms of masculinity and femininity (Barrett, 2017: 9). In short, gender is always context-based and partly created interactionally. Since the indexical repertoire for gender performances is incredibly vast and varied, however, it would be reductive to speak of it only in terms of masculine and feminine, when, in fact, individuals can position themselves in complex constellations outside of this linear continuum (Barrett, 2017: 9). It is also important to keep in mind that these indices as linguistic forms have multiple meanings (see Tannen, 1993) and might point to other markers of identity such as a race and class, or work entirely differently outside of a U.S. American context. The present chapter, however, focuses on linguistic forms that are stereotypically seen as indices of femininity, specifically ones which I argue are also readable as indices for political identity. For this purpose, I will first discuss the concept of "Women's Language" (WL) and then go into more detail about humor, swearing, and voicing.

### 3.1. Women's talk and Women's Language

Women's talk has numerous definitions, with Cameron (1997/2011: 252) broadly summarizing it as "rapport talk", a tool for solidarity reinforcement rather than information exchange. For Coates (1989/2011: 202-215) women's talk is characterized by joint topic development, gossiping, and features of collaborative simultaneous speech. One of the most influential scholars of women's talk, Robin Lakoff, even provided a comprehensive list of features (Lakoff, 1975/2004: 79-81):

- Specific lexical items ('mauve')
- Meaningless particles ('oh dear', 'goodness') instead of swearing (e.g. 'shit' is not available to women)
- Women-only adjectives ('adorable', 'charming', 'sweet', 'lovely', 'divine')
- Tag questions and increase of politeness strategies
- Hedging
- Intensifier 'so'
- Hypercorrect grammar
- Superpolite forms: women do not use off-color or indelicate expressions
- Women have no sense of humor
- Women speak in italics

Lakoff's writing can be described as one of the more misunderstood and misinterpreted texts in language and gender research, a field that it helped establish. Some researchers took it to be a sociolinguistic observation of women's speech behavior when, in fact, it merely highlighted characteristics of "ideological expectations of women's speech" (Buchholtz, 2004: 32). The fact that Lakoff's broader research context was generative semantics, a field in which introspection, and not empiricism, was the standard, eluded them (Buchholtz & Hall, 1995: 4). While her inquiry was not a sociolinguistic one at the time, she was still a sociolinguistic trailblazer because of her "willingness to examine multiple linguistic levels" (Buchholtz & Hall, 1995: 4). More recently, however, Lakoff frames her own research interest as having moved on from how women speak in a more sociolinguistic direction: how women's speech is perceived, especially in public and political contexts (Lakoff, 2021: 90). This shift in interest also helps further recontextualize her seminal work on women's language; viewed as tokens that symbolize expectations of how women should speak in order to be perceived in a favorable

light, her list of features turns from a reductive, binarist set of rules to a useful list of categories to investigate gender norms in American English.

While Lakoff's musings mostly concerned women, she also included other groups of people in the normative features she described: for instance, a man is who uses the word 'mauve' was classified as either homosexual or making fun of a woman (Lakoff, 1975/2004: 43). It is important to note that neither women nor gay men are monolithic, with many communities rejecting mimicking what is considered women's language – in fact there is no empirical evidence to support that something like a gendered speech style actually exists (Shaw, 2020: 62). However, for some subcultures this form of speech is an important linguistic resource (Barrett, 2017: 227). Drag queens, in particular, are a highly influential group of people who utilize and flaunt such speech-related social norms in ways that denaturalize the gender binary. As Barrett (2017: 35) points out:

Although the white-woman style is based on stereotypes of hegemonically feminine ways of speaking, the use of feminine speech among AADQs [African American drag queens] regularly involves forms of indexical disjuncture that question normative assumptions about gender, race, and class.

Similar to this white-woman style mentioned by Barrett (2017), women's language as a concept is especially useful if it is taken not as 'real' representation of how women speak, which for a group encompassing half of humanity is impossible, but rather as U.S. American social norms determining what linguistic behavior is considered acceptable for women.

Lakoff's own view of women's language as a norm, as well as a deviation from the norm at the same time, becomes more clear in her recent work:

We expect women to talk a certain way, which is only partly damaging; but we also expect it of women that they will behave a certain way, and thereby we impose a value judgment, either that it's good for a woman to talk traditional women's language because it fits the stereotype, which is by definition good because it does not force us to readjust our perception of reality; or it's bad for women to speak women's language because it deviates from the norm, and the norm for society as a whole is viewed as a good thing to adhere to, and any deviation is to be criticized. And both linguistically and otherwise, when we say that a certain form of behavior is 'acceptable' for a woman, we tend to be prescribing - both for the woman, that she act this way to indicate she 'knows her place,' and for a man, that he not act this way, to show he knows his. (Lakoff, 2015: 82)

Two underlying assumptions emerge out of this statement that have been subject to criticism for decades and make it difficult to apply her approach to a 2020s context: Lakoff adopts a

prototype view of gendered language and assumes that there is a tangible contrast that marks the difference between men's and women's language.

The prototypical speaker in Lakoff's text is unsurprising when considered from the generative semantics angle of her research, since like introspection, it was an established part of the way research was done at the time. Moreover, prototypical speakers as a concept still play a large role in inquiries into linguistic norms albeit approached in a critical and very context-specific way (Calder, 2020: 430). Overall, however, there is no denying that prototypical speakers are an outdated aspect of linguistic research and cannot be uncritically reproduced in an age of largely empirical linguistics. As Tannen (1993: 165) makes clear, "a particular example of discourse can [not] be taken to represent how discourse works for all speakers." Nevertheless, such a prototype approach to language seems to be productive for non-linguists but incidentally only when it comes to women. In the wake of Brett Kavanaugh's sexual assault allegations in September 2018, both Cameron (2018) and Freed (2020: 14) reported being approached by journalists to discuss Christine Blasey Ford's speech patterns and how typical they were for women. Incidentally, no one seemed to be interested in Kavanaugh's speech and its implications for men's language.

The difference approach, also called the two-cultures approach, that can be seen as underlying Lakoff's work, prescribes that men and women are socialized in separate subcultures (Coates & Pichler, 2011: 483), and it does not allow for the immense amount of variation within these groups. For instance, Lakoff (2015: 85) reaffirms the existence of women's language with the stipulation "if by that we mean that in a particular context, women and men may not express the same thing in the same way." One of the most salient examples for the difference approach is the assertion that overlapping speech is competitive when used by men, but collaborative when used by women. This stereotype lost significance when findings continued to indicate that both men and women make use of interruptions and cooperative simultaneous speech with similar frequencies (James & Clarke, 1993: 268). Overall, the difference approach necessitates that women and men consistently align with their respective gendered culture and excludes the possibility of individual behavior. Another flaw of this forced opposition between gendered speech styles is that it frames men's language as the unmarked, standard type and renders women's language deficient in some way (Coates & Pichler, 2011: 483). This prompted a number of attempts to "fix" women's speech behavior, i.e. by adopting "male" features, as after O'Barr and Atkins' (1980/2011) contribution that prompted a shift from gendered language to

powerful and powerless language. This was called the dominance approach which also had problematic aspects because gender and dominance interact in various ways and cannot be straightforward analogues. Variants of this debate are still extant, often in connection with uptalk in performances of femininity and how this question-like intonation signals insecurity (Cameron, 2018).

Both Lakoff's prototype view of the speaker and the latent difference approach of her work feeds into Freed's (2020: 3) critique of the introspective approach as a whole, in which she points out how little attention early researchers of gender and language paid to details of the individual interlocutors and the context of the interactions. Instead, they focused mainly on an introspective approach to make sweeping statements about men and women, which is apparent in the longer quote by Lakoff above. What is missing from a lot of these early approaches, as Barrett and Hall (2024: 130) point out, is "indexical variation, the highly variable and deeply contextualized array of relations between form and meaning that are cultivated within social groups across time and space". Already in the 1990s, the context of interactions began to gain importance, as can be seen with Tannen (1993: 183) who stresses the importance of idiosyncratic speech styles, the interaction of individuals, and constraints caused by the text, relations, and institutions. Overall, the approaches of the last 20 years have focused more on such individual and intersectional aspects, like sexuality, race, and class, along with interactions in specific contexts (Freed, 2020: 4). Moreover, the methods have shifted and using a more discourse analytic approach has become the norm. Incidentally, Freed (2020: 5) maintains that Lakoff's focus on linguistic features, mostly in the form of specific lexical items, is not enough to productively talk about gender issues and misogyny in language (Freed, 2020: 5). Sexist ideas and attitudes cannot be combatted with lexical reforms, as with a statement like "women talk too much" even exposing its overt sexism does not make it disappear (Freed, 2020: 5). Discursive approaches can at least critically investigate such ideas and normative thinking and document the pervasiveness of misogyny in language (Freed, 2020: 10). Other axioms that can be analyzed through a discourse analytic lens and that govern the linguistic behavior of the ideal woman as discussed by Lakoff (1975/2004: 80-81) are "women don't use off-color or indelicate expressions", "women have no sense of humor", and "women speak in italics".

I will go into more detail about three aspects mentioned by Lakoff (1975/2004), namely women's reticence when it comes to swearing, their lack of humor, and particular gendered

ways of voice modulation. In order to investigate these two norms in detail, both swearing and humor will be examined as scholarly concepts in general, after which will follow an investigation of gender-specific research. Humor and swearing are closely interlinked, as will become clear throughout the next few pages.

### **3.2. Swearing**

The concept of ‘swearing’ is called by many names in the extant literature. When bad, taboo, strong, offensive, or foul language, as well as profanities and obscenities, expletives, curse words, and indecent or obscene speech is invoked, most researchers as well as lay people mean the use of words that are considered inappropriate, have a strong negative connotation as well as a strong emotional charge (cf. Stapleton, 2022; 2010; Jay, 2018). Some of these near synonyms have functional meaning differences, like profanities, which are religion-based swear words, and obscenities, which mostly rely on bodily functions (Jay, 2005; McEnery & Xiao, 2004). Stapleton (2010: 290) more granularly distinguishes obscenities into sexual swear words, like *fuck* or *prick*, from scatological ones, like *shit* and *piss*.

The most used anglophone obscenities are *fuck* and *shit* (Jay, 2005) but there are of course regional variants. Jay (2005: 65) notes that the American sample of swear words in particular is a manageable set of historically relatively constant words that also include profanities like *god*, *damn*, and *hell*, as well as a third category he calls “socially offensive words” like *bitch*, *bastard* and racial slurs, which are subsumed under ‘ancestry’-based swear words by Stapleton (2020). Overall, such categorizations of swear words based on their semantic roots are some of the most commonly found units of analysis (see Stapleton, 2022; 2010; Jay, 2018).

#### **3.2.1. Functions of swearing**

Another fruitful branch of research into swearing involves categorization based on the function of both individual words and swearing as an activity. Uttering swear words is often linked to the psychoanalytic concept of tension release (cf. Jay, 2005; Stapleton 2010; Stapleton et al., 2022), which is closely linked to an emotional usage of swear words. Jay (2005: 63), for instance, maintains that the main reason of swearing is to express anger or frustration. Stapleton (2022: 30) dubs this emotional expression “annoyance swearing” and asserts that it usually has a negative charge. However, she refuses to name just one main function of swearing and instead includes three more nuanced interpersonal functions of swearing: verbal emphasis and humorous expression, identity work, as well as solidarity and social cohesion (Stapleton, 2010:

289). In her later work, these three categories are broadly referred to as “social swearing”, which most often has a positive charge and contrasts with annoyance swearing (Stapleton, 2022: 3).

While annoyance swearing as an emotional expression is most often linked to anger, which can lead to insulting and threatening speech, it can convey a range of emotions in certain contexts (Stapleton, 2010: 294). As an example, Stapleton (2010: 294) cites “Shit! I don’t believe you!” which can be argued to signify dismay, sadness, surprise or even happiness depending on its co-text. Hence, instead of approaching swearing as an index of a single emotion, it is more actionable to view instances of swearing as intensifying signs of the current emotional state of the speaker (Stapleton, 2010: 294).

The humor and emphasis aspect of social swearing is often linked to their inherent shock value as verbal manifestations of social taboo (Stapleton, 2010: 295). However, Stapleton (2010: 300) also notes an increasing social acceptability of cursing, which in her eyes is leading to a loss of shock value, though she makes no note of how this would affect the use of swearing for humoristic and emphatic purposes. In her later work, the applications of swear words for humor or emphasis appear under the label ‘rhetorical or stylistic functions of swearing,’ because in such cases swearing is used to alter the credibility of the speaker and the impact of their message (Stapleton et al., 2022: 8). Arguably, this analytic category could be split into three separate sub-categories, as to shock, to humor, and to emphasize an utterance could be viewed as separate functions if speaker intentions and goals are fully integrated as a distinguishing factor. What all three instances have in common is that they once again can be viewed as intensifiers of the intended function: swear words make utterances more shocking, more funny and/or add emphasis.

When it comes to the social identity aspect of social swearing, Stapleton (2010) distinguishes between social bonding and doing identity work, despite both of them being closely linked. She defines the function of social bonding as being reliant on slang, where swear words are part of the daily vernacular, which facilitates feelings of closeness and cohesion in an in-group (Stapleton, 2010: 291, 296). In Stapleton et al. (2022: 8), this function is dubbed conversational swearing which is used to manage social interactions and relations. In turn, her explanation of identity construction and swearing also hinges on in-group out-group dynamics, as in Stapleton’s (2010: 299) view the choice to use swear words presumes that interlocutors are part of the in-group; while the decision not to swear identifies interlocutors as belonging to the out-

group. This function also subsumes managing and presenting impressions of the self to others (Stapleton et al., 2022: 8). Overall, swearing as identity work involves interactional negotiation as well as the opportunity to perform multiple versions of identities, especially in terms of gender (Stapleton, 2010: 299).

Another aspect that critically contributes to the use of swearing as an identity index is its social acceptability. Due to its strong connection with verbal abuse and insults (Stapleton, 2022: 7) swearing is still often socially sanctioned, despite changing public sentiment toward swearing and laxer censorship rules in modern media. As Jay (2005: 71) points out, profane exclamations like ‘god’ or ‘hell’ are routinely printed in modern media, despite being prohibited just 100 years ago. Modern sanctions can take the form of official consequences, like censorship or fines, and unofficial ones, like social disapproval (Stapleton et al., 2022: 2). While such sanctions seem outdated, they are still extremely pervasive, especially on social media platforms that use algorithmic censorship like YouTube, TikTok and Instagram (Calhoun & Fawcett, 2023: 5). This leads to speakers avoiding using swear words in order to save face and maintain their social image which in turn enables other speakers who wish to signal a nonchalance toward social norms to use swearing as a powerful identity index (Stapleton, 2010: 291). Moreover, especially the self-censorship of TikTok users in order to follow community guidelines has given rise to completely new linguistic forms (Calhoun & Fawcett, 2023: 22), which can also function as strong social indexes due to their specifically signaling TikTok usage.

An additional phenomenon incorporating swear words and identity work, the usage of which has expanded in online communities, is the reappropriation or reclamation of slurs. This practice is characterized by slur usage among in-group members that lacks the derogatory component (Hess, 2020: 98). For instance, two gay men might affectionately call each other *faggot* or *fag* without causing offense (Hess, 2020: 98), while the same lexical items uttered by a straight person would be interpreted as highly offensive. Pavone (2024: 349) mentions four distinct purposes of slur reclamation, namely enhancing in-group solidarity, overt self-labelling, expressing pride and annulling the derogatory component of the slur. This reversal of derogatory meaning is an affective reappraisal, as speakers seek to reframe connotational meanings rather than denotational ones (Pavone, 2024: 359). Hess (202, 103) further stresses the importance of in-group membership for acts of reappropriation to be successful, as out-group members might be perceived to perpetuate established derogatory meanings.

While the functions discussed so far mainly centered on the speakers and what they want to accomplish, it is also important to go beyond speaker intention and look at interlocutor evaluations to achieve a holistic view of the indexical potential of swear words. For instance, Stapleton (2020) analyzed comments on newspaper articles about Stephen Fry cursing while hosting the BAFTA awards. To gain a range of politically diverse contributions, her sample included 94 comments from the leftist Guardian, 35 from the neutral Independent, and 200 from the right Daily Mail (Stapleton, 2020: 386). She found that commenters associated his swearing with negative intelligence, maturity, age, the working class, humor, control of behavior and general disrespectfulness; specifically, swearing indexes young age, low social class and low intelligence (Stapleton, 2020: 386-387). Incidentally, despite Fry's usage being identified as being mostly social swearing, the effect it seemed to have on the commenters was negative. Stapleton argues that this can be explained by his swearing being judged to be inauthentic and thus unsuccessful (Stapleton, 2020: 391) but it is important to also consider the context of her data. The formality of an award show likely evokes expectations of formal language in the audience. Additionally, since the bulk of her comments came from a conservative newspaper, the negative attitude toward Stephen Fry, a famous Labour supporter, is less surprising. As Jay (2005: 73) states, conservatism is strongly linked to religiosity which in turn is connected with a negative attitude toward swearing. Moreover, since the comments were collected on the internet, they are subject to the contextual influences of computer-mediated communication (CMC) on swearing.

Swearing functions differently in CMC because of the apparent lack of bodily involvement and direct consequences. The anonymity and missing physical presence of (some) online interactions can be seen as main factors contributing to the ubiquity of swearing in digital spaces (Jay, 2018: 110). Jane (2014: 558), for instance, points out that "issuing graphic rape and death threats has become a standard discursive move online". In order to refer to the especially vicious instances of swearing in CMC, Jane (2014) coined the term "e-bile", which was later adopted and more broadly defined by Jay (2018: 109-110) as a wide range of pejorative activities including personal and group attacks, as well as ranting, trolling, justified hostility, and name-calling. E-bile, in this conception, mainly works as a term for text-based social media, or comments online. While a lot of the more recently popular social platforms, like Instagram and TikTok, lack the immediate anonymity (in some cases) by virtue of being image and video-based platforms, the comment sections on these apps are then as now hospitable in terms of extreme language use. Overall, social platforms teeter the line of

respecting the freedom to write offensive words and respecting the freedom to not be exposed to offensive words, which leads them to employ algorithms that usually seem to favor the latter (as discussed in more detail by Calhoun & Fawcett, 2023). However, Jay (2018: 122) maintains that in an U.S. American setting, this nuanced issue with the First Amendment predates the internet and has gone on for many decades and is not unique to social media.

It is also important to point out that the functions of swearing are far from straightforward and as evidenced by the differences of swearing in CMC, extremely context dependent. Jay (2005: 63), for example, notes that swearing is moderated by factors like gender, social class, and religiosity. In addition, personality and group membership are contributing factors (Jay, 2018: 108). Similarly, Stapleton (2010: 289) stresses the importance of contextual information, which to her are social status, expectations and norms, as well as the level of formality. In fact it is Stapleton's (2010: 300) main point that the function of swearing is extremely variable and context-specific.

### **3.2.2. “Women don't use off-color or indelicate expressions”**

One of the most salient contextual determinants of swearing is gender. While the search for gendered speech styles is a futile one, the gender binary is a productive norm that is still pervasive (Stapleton, 2003: 22), even in 2025. Swearing, in particular, is subject to many norms and has been strongly associated with masculinity and overt sexual references; through this strong connection with sexuality, women, who historically had to repress their sexuality to a far greater degree than men, have long been excluded from swearing as an acceptable activity (Jay, 2005: 76). Axiomatic statements like Lakoff's “women do not curse” are only applicable to a subset of women, as swearing is very strongly linked to working class and black women in the US (Jay, 2005: 78), though it has to be noted that Lakoff was aware of her work only addressing her own, white and educated, cohort. Stapleton (2003: 22) also attributed women's greater class consciousness to their reticence in terms of swearing.

This strong connection between swearing and masculinity, according to Stapleton (2010: 293), is also what makes it so appealing for women to do identity work in terms of “negotiating gender boundaries and presenting contextualized versions of femininity.” The latter refers especially to gender performances that transgress gender but can still be considered appropriate in certain contexts (Stapleton, 2010: 293). At the same time, for a woman who swears, the social consequences, in terms of judgements about her character, are far greater than the ones

for men (Stapleton, 2003: 22). However, because femininity is not linked to swearing in the same way masculinity is, women who use swear words index more complex gender identities that are often strongly linked to group identities (Stapleton, 2010: 299-300).

Despite the futility of such approaches, gender differences in swearing pertaining to frequency and use of swear words are often pointed out and broadly studied. For instance, Jay (2005: 82) points out that “women curse less than men, generally speaking”. Gauthier & Guille (2017: 137) in turn summarize broadly that women have been found not to necessarily use swear words less often, but to use different swear words in different contexts. In order to gain insight into actual gender differences as reported by researchers I will summarize five of the more influential pieces of scholarship:

First of all, Bayard and Krishnayya (2001: 2) recorded twelve participants in New Zealand, six of which lived in an all-female apartment and six of which lived in an all-male apartment. They found that men have a higher usage of swear words but reduce it more drastically in more structured conversations (Bayard & Krishnayya, 2001: 8). The formality of a given conversation was determined by whether the ‘-ing’ was realized as /in/ or /iŋ/ and, overall, the more structured a conversation was, the fewer swear words were produced (Bayard & Krishnayya, 2001: 12). Overall, men also used ‘stronger’ swear words (Bayard & Krishnayya, 2001: 8), though the classification of swear word strength is extremely context-bound in general, and in Bayard and Krishnayya’s study is entirely based on the subjective judgement of the researchers. They also identified all of the established functions of swearing, like emphasis, annoyance, humorous uses, and actual insulting with the note that women also adopted swear words in order to signal solidarity which had only been considered a male activity (Bayard & Krishnayya, 2001: 11). The only context, in which women used more swear words than men, was in humorous interaction (Bayard & Krishnayya, 2001: 13). It is important to note that the sample size of Bayard and Krishnayya (2001) is extremely small, and their data collection is further complicated by the fact that Krishnayya was part of the all-male apartment. While their study and its implications are noteworthy for that particular group and maybe white New Zealander culture on a slightly more general level, it is questionable if it allows for the all-encompassing statements they make.

Secondly, in a study that uses interviews and a communities of practice framework to investigate swearing in a group of Irish undergraduate drinking buddies, Stapleton (2003) also makes gender-encompassing statements about the use of swear words. For instance, 12 out of

15 women reported using swear words to show intimacy or trust, while none of the men discussed this (Stapleton, 2003: 28). In terms of solidarity, Stapleton (2003: 29) highlights swear words used for humor and storytelling as central for both self-identification and in-group cohesion, while being equally salient for men and women. Furthermore, Stapleton (2003: 29) argues that because of the societal constraints on women's swearing, they mostly swear in private conversations which in turn gives swearing an intimate association.

Thirdly, Gauthier and Guille (2017: 138) conducted a corpus analysis of Twitter concentrating on British tweets collected between 7 April and 2 July 2015. While British tweets are not readily comparable to American speakers, due to the strong influence of culture on swear words, Gauthier and Guille (2017) is one of the only large-scale social media inquiries into swearing. One of their findings that asserts a gender difference is that women most commonly used *bitch* in a self-referential way, whereas men used it in a more insulting way (Gauthier & Guille, 2017: 153). However, they conclude that there are no significant gender differences for most swear words and that even the difference in usage of those swearwords is not significant; in sum, "both genders actually use swearwords in a way that is more similar than different" (Gauthier & Guille, 2017: 155).

Fourth, McEnery and Xiao (2004: 236) conducted a large scale study of the word *fuck* using both the spoken and the written section of the British National Corpus (BNC). While their findings of spoken English only account for 10% of the total data and lack a date of creation (McEnery & Xiao, 2004: 236, 256), McEnery and Xiao (2004: 240) conclude that men and women significantly differed in the frequency of the use of *fuck* and *fucking*. The same is not true for *fucks*, *fucked* or *fucker(s)*, where no statistical significance could be found (McEnery & Xiao, 2004: 240). Overall, "[f]or both males and females, the rank and proportion of different word forms show a very similar distribution pattern [...]. While the proportions of the different word forms may vary slightly by gender, this variation is not statistically significant" (McEnery & Xiao, 2004: 241).

Finally, Jane (2014: 559) summarized her autoethnographic research using a large number of direct messages she had collected from 1998 to 2012 and contrasted her findings with e-bile directed toward men. She concludes that female internet users receive mostly insults based on their appearance or threats of rape or other violent acts (Jane, 2014: 559). Insults towards men, in contrast, have mostly to do with their penis size, their aberrant masculinity and/or the

appearance of the women who surround them and only very rarely their own appearance (Jane, 2014: 565).

In sum, smaller scale qualitative approaches like Banyard and Krishnaya (2001) and Stapleton (2003) tend to find differences in the actual usage of swear words based on gender, whereas larger scale quantitative approaches using corpora like McEnery and Xiao (2004) and Gauthier & Guille (2017) tend to find no significant differences in that regard. Hence, the clear-cut gender difference implied by “women don’t use off-color or indelicate expressions” seems to be overstated, while the actual difference between men and women’s usage of swear words in speech interactions seems to be contingent on setting and mode. A more straightforward gender difference, however, can be found in the insults and swear directed at men and women.

The societal double-standards and norms around swear words seem especially influential when it comes to judgements about speakers who swear. For instance, Christie (2013: 165) analyzed discourse about celebrities swearing in public. The critiques of a male football star mainly focused on his swearing in the wrong context, i.e. in front of a camera, as opposed to the swearing itself. This implies that there are contexts in which it would have been socially acceptable for him to swear, like in a private setting (Christie, 2013: 166). In contrast, women who swear, like Sandi Toksvig and Gwyneth Paltrow, were criticized by the British press for swearing incorrectly and thus being inauthentic (Christie, 2013: 167). Christie (2013: 167) attributes this difference to the existence of discourses that legitimate swearing when it is done by men and the fact that there do not exist similar discourses for women swearing. This is supported by an earlier finding of Stapleton (2003: 27), as 14 out of 15 men participating in her study agreed with the statement that certain words are more acceptable for men than for women, while only 3 out of 15 women assented to that statement.

### **3.3. Humor**

Humor takes many forms and thus has many associated theories that try to explain it in different ways. Employing an operationalized approach to humor, I will follow researchers like Attardo (2015), who define humor according to how it can be recognized: humor is manifest in interactions when there are (1) paralinguistic indications of it, like laughing and smiling, (2) semantic or pragmatic indications which point to incongruity and/or (3) any metalinguistic indications by the speakers. This closely follows Attardo’s (2015) triangulation method in which “any given instance of humor is given an evaluation based on all the available evidence,

both theoretical and circumstantial” (Attardo, 2015: 182). While this does not focus on a more metaphysical ‘sense of humor’ as Davis (2008: 545) suggests, which to her provides a more holistic view of humor as it goes beyond single instances of humor to investigate a rather constant ability, it is those very instances I am interested in and how humor is used in interaction to construct identities. It is also important to point out that while the distinction between jokes and humor is fuzzy (Davis, 2008: 546; Schnurr, 2010: 310) with some researcher conflating the two (e.g. Bing, 2007; Attardo, 2015), in my conception that emerges out of Davis (2008) and Günther (2002), jokes are single, specific instances of humor. This following chapter will concentrate on theoretical considerations of humor, like its many binary categorizations, the multi-dimensionality of humor, the role of laughter and how humor is used for identity work.

There are as many typologies of humor as there are researchers – an observation already made by Davis (2008: 543), who asserts “humor theories tell us more about the theoreticians’ own perspective on life and their attitudes toward other humans than they do about humor itself”. What emerges from various different scholars are consistently binary conceptions of humor. One of these binaries involves looking at humor in interaction through a lens of its social function as an identity enhancer: Holmes and Marra (2002: 1687) distinguish between contestive and supportive humor, concepts also known as affiliative and disaffiliative humor (Attardo, 2015: 173). Contestive humor poses a challenge to what has previously been said or signals disagreement, while supportive humor, as a marker of agreement or elaboration of previous statements, does the opposite (Holmes & Marra, 2002: 1687). The functions of these two kinds of humor are summarized to be a way of showing resistance by challenging a speaker and as solidarity enhancement within a group while affirming existing power relations, respectively (Schnurr, 2010: 307); two processes which are powerful tools for constructing group identities. Zekavat (2017: 53), for instance, maintains that this aspect of inclusion and exclusion contributes to humor’s immense relevance for identity construction. In a similar vein, Kutz-Flamenbaum (2014: 295) utilizes a similar framework that focuses on an in-group-out-group dynamic, distinguishing internal and external humor based on the group membership of the humoristic subject. A joke about a member of the speaker’s group would be considered internal humor, which if successful should have affiliative consequences, whereas a joke about a different group, depending on the group membership of the audience, could be disaffiliative or affiliative (Kutz-Flamenbaum, 2014: 295). Davies (2017: 482) notes the multifunctional aspect of this kind of humorous, group-based identity work, which enables speakers to alienate

out-group members and enhance in-group solidarity with a single utterance. In regard to solidarity, Schnurr (2010: 316) also points out how important the relationship between speakers is as a moderator of humor; in close relationships humor can have objectively adversarial and challenging content but still be used affiliatively, while acquaintances would rather use humor that is self-denigrating. Kutz-Flamenbaum (2014: 295) formulates a specific kind of group-based humor used by social movements showcasing the inextricability of humor and politics. She mainly concentrates on public displays of humor with performative aspects, citing the performances by various social movements, like the “Raging Grannies” or “Billionaires for Bush,” as well as protest signs as examples (Kutz-Flamenbaum, 2014: 297). This framework is one of the more contemporary ones that also take into account social media and stress the performative aspect of humor. As a performance, humor is a vessel expressing socio-political commentary and various emotional states while simultaneously functioning as an attention-catcher for a potential audience (Kutz-Flamenbaum, 2014: 302).

Another instance of a bipartite theoretical framework, Attardo (2015: 170) distinguishes between canned jokes and conversational humor, which amounts to a rough distinction between scripted and non-scripted humor. He defines jokes as ritualized small portions of narrative that end in punch lines (Attardo, 2015: 172). The narrative aspect of Attardo’s definition is especially relevant when it comes to identity work, as jocular narratives are one way for speakers to represent identities, both their own and other people’s (Zekavat, 2017: 51). In contrast, conversational joking involves spontaneity and improvisation, albeit occasionally also includes the recycling of canned jokes (Attardo, 2015: 172). Hence, when it comes to humor even such a straight-forward-seeming binary as scripted and non-scripted is difficult to distinguish. The fact that Attardo often conflates jokes and humor is a practice admonished by Davis (2008: 545-546) who criticizes this trend in humor research and herself focuses on more elevated forms of humor, equating it with wisdom far surpassing a mere joking. Going beyond the level of jokes, Chovanec and Tsakona (2018: 9) define interactional humor as a term that encompasses established concepts like conversational humor and humor in interaction, two terms that are interchangeably used to refer to humor employed in spoken conversation. In addition, however, they envision interactional humor as a concept to include multimodal considerations, highlight the joint negotiation aspect of humorous interactions, and go beyond merely looking at linguistic features; they especially stress technology- and computer-mediated communication. Their conception of interactional humor makes the same rough distinction between scripted and spontaneous humoristic productions that can be found in Attardo (2015).

Their only stipulation is that there must be some sort of sequence to the humor, which for them would even be true for a stand-up comedian's monologue as it includes an audience (Chovanec & Tsakona, 2018: 10).

What can already be seen with Attardo's (2015) fuzzy borders of scripted and non-scripted humor and becomes clear with Chovanec and Tsakona's (2018) multimodal approach, is that humor is too complicated to be explained binarily. As Attardo (2015: 180) himself points out "[t]he issue is further complicated by factors such as familiarity, the formality of the situation, and the presence of an audience, which all affect the type and quantity of humor". He especially highlights the influence of close friendships on humor, which renders jokes an insufficient analytical category as humor in such a context tends to involve multiple turns of humorous co-construction (Attardo 2015: 180). This same multifunctionality is commented on by Davies (2017: 482) who concludes that interactional co-construction and multimodality are essential to all kinds of humor while also acknowledging humor's link to sociocultural factors of identity like gender, age, ethnicity, and class. Multimodal aspects of humor are also taken up by Chovanec and Tsakona (2018: 9) who point to CMC as a mediator of humor, be it in written form in comment sections or audiovisual material, which also recontextualizes humor as a publicly constructed and examined phenomenon. The overall complexity is also celebrated by Davis (2008: 563) who asserts that humor has an unequivocally strong and positive effect in all interactions. Davies (2017: 482), in contrast, stresses the ambiguity of humor even in its consequences, which renders it both a tool of resistance by calling norms into question, and of oppression by reproducing and enhancing them.

Attempting to capture this multidimensionality, Chovanec and Tsakona (2018) expand on Attardo's triangulation method and name five central factors for the identification and analysis of humor: the first is framing devices or contextualization cues of humorous interactions which include gestures, pitch, intonation, facial expressions, explicit statements and even code-switching (Chovanec & Tsakona, 2018: 3-4). These framing devices, which Attardo conceptualizes as "keying in" (2015: 181), can be used by recipients as well as instigators of humor. Chovanec and Tsakona (2018: 4) distinguish this use from reactions, their second category, which are used verbally or non-verbally on part of the audience to signal comprehension, reciprocation and/or evaluation. While laughter is subsumed in the 'reaction' section of Chovanec and Tsakona's (2018) conception, it alone is not enough to mark an instance as humorous, as laughter in itself is just as complex as humor. Laughter may be a

visceral reaction to something humorous, but it can also be a conscious and calculated move. Overall, laughter and humor are not sufficiently strong collocates to warrant adjacency-pair status (Schnurr, 2010: 308-309; Attardo, 2015: 170). Another important factor pointed out by Chovanec and Tsakona (2018: 6) are genres that include humor. The fourth category of Chovanec and Tsakona's (2018: 4-5) frame of analysis are cultural and societal identities, like gender and political affiliation, as having an influence on what is perceived as humorous by speakers. The functions of humor and its social consequences are the final lens presented by Chovanec and Tsakona (2018: 5-6), their prime example being in-group cohesion and out-group alienation akin to affiliative and disaffiliative humor as already discussed.

### **3.3.1. "Women have no sense of humor"**

As gender is one of the sociocultural identities foregrounded by Chovanec and Tsakona (2018: 4-5) as having relevance when it comes to analyzing humor, we now return to Lakoff's (1975/2004: 80) point "women have no sense of humor". This stereotype of women being humorless has been reproduced by many scholars for much of the remaining 20<sup>th</sup> century (Bing, 2004: 338; Coates, 2016: 166). A different school of thought, incidentally in line with the difference approach, argued that women do not lack a sense of humor, they simply have their own conception of humor that differs from men. For instance, summing up findings from the 1990s, Davis (2008: 558) states that women's humor stemmed from a caring concern for everyone and depended on a cooperative attitude to bring everyone together and make them feel good. More recently, this rather reductive point of view has been re-examined and scholars, like Coates (2016: 206), maintain that women actually practice humor quite frequently. Schnurr (2010: 316-17), further stresses that, despite the existence of gender stereotypes in regard to usage of humor, focusing on comparing gender differences might be less fruitful than investigating the interlinking relationship between humor and gender by more nuanced means that consider intersectional implications. Overall, actual research of the early 2000s has shown that women do in fact joke a lot and seem to joke for the purpose of in-group cohesion.

One of the most popular works supporting Coates' (2016) assertion that women frequently use humor, is Günther's (2002) exploration of the conversational sub-corpus of the British National Corpus (BNC) in which she merges quantitative methods and CA. Günther (2002: 134) analyzed 200 instances of humor based on laughter either preceding or succeeding an utterance. While this focus on laughter as a marker is, of course, a reductive view on humor, Günther's work yielded some interesting results. Although both men and women made similar amounts

of canned jokes, in all other categories, like puns and telling funny stories, women outperformed men when it came to quantity (Günther, 2002: 210). This is especially true for same-sex interactions and also pertains to the frequency of laughter (Günther, 2002: 180).

Overall, research that specifically foregrounded women as instigators of humor has emphasized the solidarity enhancement function. Holmes and Marra (2002), for instance, adopted a community of practice approach to investigate humor across nine different companies. They used the database of the Victoria University of Wellington Language in the Workplace Project (LWP), to which 350 individuals from several organizations based in Wellington contributed (Holmes & Marra, 2002: 1690-1691). In general, their findings mirror what has already been discussed in terms of humor as collaboration and co-construction that may express resistance or aggression but is also an important resource of maintaining close relationships (Holmes & Marra 2002: 1704). A similar function of humor has been found by Bing (2007). She defines 'rude jokes' as humor that explicitly features taboo content and, incidentally, also contributes to solidarity-building and establishing a cohesive group among feminists while simultaneously challenging gender norms (Bing 2007: 359). Bing (2007: 338) focuses on sexual jokes in same-sex groups and contends with the stereotype that women cannot be creators or disseminators of sexual humor. She stresses the same double standard that was also pointed out by Lakoff in regard to WL as a whole: if women participate in sexual humor they signal sexual availability and even lecherousness. If they do not, they are perceived as lacking humor (Bing, 2007: 343). Bing's (2007) findings similarly mirror the in-group cohesion aspect of humor as well as its role in resisting social norms. She points out that sexual jokes told by liberated women, as a stark contrast to traditional, sexist sexual humor, enhances in-group cohesion among feminists while also showcasing that normative structures established in such traditional jokes can be subverted (Bing, 2007: 359). One further function of such jokes is the introduction of taboo topics, like rape, that might not lend themselves to a serious discussion (Bing, 2007: 357).

In sum, while gender has been adopted as an important factor among ethnicity and class in intersectional and multimodal analyses of humor (see Zekavat, 2017; Attardo, 2015; Chovanec & Tsakona, 2018) it seems to have lost importance as a singular focus in research focus in the 2010s, where other social identities, like political identity, have become more popular.

### **3.4. Humor and swearing in combination: disparagement humor**

As Bing's (2007) research on sexual jokes exemplifies, humor and swearing often go hand in hand. Even Stapleton's (2002: 28) seminal work on swearing establishes humor as one of its main functions, with 13 of 15 participants mentioning swearing while telling stories "to get a laugh." Another concept that relates humor and swearing is Shaw's 'adversarial language' that she observed in the political context of the House of Commons (Shaw, 2020: 62). This type of language use is defined by the absence of politeness and face-saving strategies and the practice of personal attacks, hyperbolic descriptions; and the reliance on in-group out-group contrasts often strengthened by personal pronouns (Shaw, 2020: 72).

One possible function of adversarial language is the scrutiny of a political opponent, holding them accountable (Shaw, 2020: 249). The humoristic aspect comes with interlocutors' responses to adversarial language, as the receiving end of adversarial language often respond with laughter in an attempt to frame attacks as ridiculous and non-serious (Shaw, 2020: 80). This view of humor as a political tool is far from novel, Kutz-Flamenbaum (2014: 295-296) even calling both domains "inextricably linked", despite political humor requiring a considerable amount of nuance and sensitivity in order to be effective. The most common and best studied variety of a blend of humor and swearing that shares the political context with Shaw's adversarial language is disparagement humor. This type of humor constitutes not only a denigration of a specific target out-group but also an elevation of the speaker in-group (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 283). Furthermore, based on the target group mocked by disparagement humor, it can also be said to index either a conservative or liberal political affiliation (Rice & Ford, 2023: 598). This political identity aspect also contributes to the effectiveness of disparagement humor as it can only be effective if hearers of the joke do not identify with the person being disparaged and instead align themselves with the humorist (Zekavat, 2017: 54).

Disparagement humor is often explained according to one of the following three historical psychological concepts: relief, incongruity, superiority. The psychoanalytic concept of relief, which was already mentioned in the chapter on swear words (further underlining their strong link with humor), refers to the release of emotional tension, especially in terms of aggression (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 286). Incongruity theories, in turn, frame humor as the fusion of two ideas that do not belong together which in turn enable novel interpretation and a subversion of expectations (Kutz-Flamenbaum, 2014: 296); the challenge of the norm is also why Kutz-

Flamenbaum (2014: 296) sees this theory as indispensable when discussing humor in a political context. Finally, superiority theories claim that humor is especially effective when used to enhance the self-esteem of the social in-group by ridiculing the out-group (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 290-291).

However, Ferguson and Ford (2008: 299) assert that social identity theories might be more fruitful than established approaches based on superiority theory, as they place less emphasis on self-esteem and individual triumph and instead concentrate on identity work. While both are valid frameworks for approaching humor, one more focused on group dynamics has more relevance for this project. Specifically, identity work in inter-group settings that specifically focuses on group membership and social identities, as opposed to personal identities which emerge in interpersonal settings (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 296-297). Such inter-group settings are further framed as competitions for social recognition which is achieved by social comparison; the competition's goal is always to be seen as superior to a certain group and disparagement humor is employed in order to achieve it (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 296-297). In addition, disparagement humor is often wielded as a reaction to social threats: "if majority groups feel threatened by the social advances of racial minorities, they might communicate ethnic jokes that portray the minorities as incompetent" (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 298). The enjoyment of such jokes, then, hinges on the enhancement of the in-group by comparing themselves favorably to an out-group as well as the salience of the social group that is being enhanced (Ferguson & Ford, 2008: 299-301).

More recent studies indicate that political identity, more than gender, influences what kind of disparagement humor people employ and, sometimes, what kind they enjoy. Buie et al. (2022) and Rice and Ford (2022), for instance, conducted similar experiments around American participant reactions to three memes, one of them immigrant-disparaging, another religion-disparaging, and a Florida-disparaging one they deemed neutral. They notably did not find any gender effects, but relatively strong effects concerning political affiliation. While Rice and Ford (2022: 587) investigated if people inferred a speaker's political affiliation based on the jokes they tell, Buie et al. (2022) concentrated on participants' judgement of offensiveness. In Rice and Ford's (2023: 587) experiment, 202 participants were shown one of the three memes framed as a Facebook post; they were further asked to specify what political affiliation the poster is likely to have and how this affected their sympathy toward the poster. Rice and Ford (2023: 597-598) found that the poster was judged to be more liberal when the meme was

religion-disparaging which caused liberal participants to like him more, whereas an immigrant-disparaging meme indicated a conservative poster, which in turn led conservative participants to report higher sympathy values. These results indicate that the type of disparagement humor employed, i.e. the subject of the joke, signaled group-membership and, by virtue of the sympathy evaluating, functioned as affiliative or disaffiliative humor. Furthermore, Buie et al. (2022: 1399) conducted two experiments, in the first of which 325 participants evaluated the three memes. In the second experiment, 152 participants participated in a role-play task that involved either two religious jokes or two jokes about vulnerable social groups (Buie et al., 2022: 1403). Their findings indicate that conservatives are more offended by humor that violates moral foundations like social order and sacredness, while liberals judge violations of the social justice and compassion to be more offensive (Buie et al., 2022: 1403, 1406). However, only experiment 1 showed that political identity influenced the perception of funniness, with the more offensive memes also being judged as less funny (Buie et al., 2022: 1402-1403). The same effect was not found in the role-play experiment, ostensibly due to specific differences between the jokes of the first experiment and the second, like ease of comprehension and level of incongruous and surprising content (Buie et al., 2022: 1406). Conservatives overall reported lower values of offensiveness, ostensibly due to their greater cavalier humor beliefs, which means they are more likely to approach all humor in a non-critical and non-serious way (Buie et al., 2022: 1407). While Buie et al. (2022: 1408) argue that view of morality plays a large role in humor enjoyment they also allow for the dual affiliative/disaffiliative function of disparagement humor to contribute, because it enhances the in-group and devalues the out-group.

### **3.5. Voicing**

When it comes to linguistic inquiry into voice as an index, Bakhtin's (1981, 1984) work is inescapable. While he was a literary scholar, some concepts he coined, like heteroglossia and double-voicing, as well as his approach to parody have become an invaluable resource for linguists (see Tannen, 2007; Günthner, 2008; Podesva & Callier, 2015; Pichler, 2023). However, as Pichler (2023: 73) points out, there are some difficulties applying these predominantly literary concepts to actual, real-life speech situations – not least because of the highly complex classification system he employs and the fact that his assertions about literary language are accompanied by observations about “ordinary speech of everyday life” (Bakhtin, 1984: 194). It seems that the difference between spoken and written modes, which necessitate

entirely different resources and perspectives sometimes elude Bakhtin and scholars who base their research on his. Especially in the context of reported speech which is the subject of the following section, it is important to point out the inherent difference between the spoken mode, which is ephemeral and relies on humanity's most fickle capability, memory, and the written mode, which exists outside of the human brain and can be fixed and revisited without the text changing forms. Despite this lack of distinction, Bakhtin's work not only heavily influenced investigations into voice in a metaphorical sense, i.e. the opinions and discourse uttered by one person, but also, to a lesser degree, voice in a literal sense, i.e. phonological and phonetic approaches.

In the following section, I will consider the literal and metaphorical voice, focusing on voice in constructed speech and then, on a phonological level, I will discuss a higher than normal register, namely falsetto, and its uses.

### **3.5.1. The role of voice in constructed speech**

One of Bakhtin's most fundamental concepts is heteroglossia, which on the one hand describes the presence of many different "voices", meaning styles, languages, or registers, within a language (Bakhtin, 1981: 67), and, on the other hand, also stands for a general property of utterance meaning that defies a single true, context-independent and correct interpretation (Bakhtin, 1981: 428). The latter is often also referred to as polyphony (Tannen, 2007: 103). In addition, when applying heteroglossia in his literary approach, Bakhtin calls its incorporation in novels "another speech in another's language" (Bakhtin, 1981: 324), which he classifies as double-voicing, since this speech reflects the meaning and intentions, and thus the voices, of both the character who is speaking and the author. He also allows that double-voicing transcends the literary sphere because human speech substantially revolves around what other people say, which is often reproduced in various degrees of veracity (Bakhtin, 1981: 337).

These linguistic implications of double voicing, as well as more complicated literary aspects of Bakhtin's (1981, 1984) elaborate classification system were taken up by Agha (2005) in an attempt to tackle enregisterment and everyday talk. Agha (2005: 38) argues that the linguistic activity of a single person cannot yield sufficient information to make statements about registers. At the same time, he maintains that understanding registers on the whole necessitates investigating individual speakers, and thus voices, in interaction (Agha, 2005: 38). Agha (2005: 47) solves this seeming conundrum by asserting that token uses of registers need not always be

consistent with the greater stereotypic associations of the register, which he dubs “a kind of folk assumption of contextual invariance”, harkening back to Bakhtin’s heteroglossia. Moreover, Agha (2005: 38) defines everyday instances of registers as speakers using voices to position themselves in a certain way: these “enregistered voices” in Agha’s conception are themselves indexed via speech and constitute personae and social types. Furthermore, enregistered voices, like registers themselves, have a social domain, the groups of people with the knowledge to understand and perform this voice, and a social range, the set of different character types that can be performed with this voice (Agha, 2005: 39-40). In order to make apparent that a voice is being used, the speaker/author employs voicing contrasts, which are any linguistic signs to distinguish the instance of voice from its co-text (Agha, 2005: 40). The acknowledgment of this voicing contrast is the first step of Agha’s (2005: 45) typification of voices, called “contrastive individuation”, followed by either “social characterization” if a social type is invoked or “biographic identification” if the voice points to an actual person.

While Agha’s (2005) concept of enregistered voices is a useful adaptation of Bakhtin’s (1981) work, it shares two of its downsides, namely the lack of a clear distinction between written and spoken language, as well as an over-reliance on written text to make explanatory statements that concerns all modes of language. The latter is most readily apparent in Agha’s (2005: 43) usage on the distinction between direct and indirect speech, with free indirect speech, a purely literary device which represents a character’s voice through the narrator, featuring prominently in his discussion. In contrast, Tannen (2007: 102) points out that distinguishing between indirect and direct speech in actual speech situations can prove to be difficult both in terms of grammar (Tannen, 2007: 118) and in terms of the truth value, or the accuracy of the conveyed information of the report (Tannen, 2007: 107). This truth claim inherent to reported speech is often used to frame the quoted words as independent of the speaker, despite speakers often altering the words to fit their perspectives and achieving their communicative goals (Günthner, 1999: 11). Instead, Tannen (2007: 103) prefers the term “constructed dialogue” to highlight the act of creation in everyday talk. But even as a critic of the missing distinction between written and spoken discourse in Bakhtin’s work (see Tannen, 2007: 105), Tannen (2007: 112) finds a way to connect her concept to a more literary field by highlighting the constructedness of reported speech and likening it to drama: she stresses the collaborative aspects of constructed dialogue, with the speaker infusing the voice with their evaluations and the actively involved audience making sense of this performance by accessing their own knowledge (Tannen, 2007: 132). These dramas involve characters that are animated by various voices. Similar to Agha

(2005), Tannen (2007: 112) points out how these voices or characters can represent people or social types, not just specific individuals, though she calls instances in which an entire social group is invoked by a voice “choral dialogue”.

One of the ways in which speakers who stray from the path of direct report by strategically employing selective memory invoke the voice of a social type or individual is the “malicious and deliberately parodic distortion of another's word, slander” (Bakhtin, 1981: 339). This can be achieved by exaggerating intonational patterns and misrepresenting or reframing the context of the original speech (Bakhtin, 1981: 340). Overall, Bakhtin stresses the many guises of parody, from merely imitating lexical habits to mocking principles and character traits, all in the service of the parody to itself or some more benign goal (Bakhtin 1984: 194). One of these goals, as put by Günthner (2008: 436) who utilizes Bakhtin’s writings in her analysis of reported speech, is the strengthening of group cohesion by establishing a common identity that relies on the parodied party the in-group wants to be distanced from. By portraying such parodic voices that function as negative social types, speakers identify themselves by performing who they are not (Günthner, 2008: 435). In turn Günthner (2008: 410-20) finds that such displays of a negative social type are a way of encouraging listeners to align themselves with their opinions and assessments, thus contributing to group cohesion. To achieve such an effect, Günthner (2008: 433) stresses the use of linguistic heterogeneity, like accents or dialects, as well as code-switching, word-choice, prosody, and voice quality. Tannen (2007: 122), too, goes into more detail than Agha (2005) when it comes to which (para-)linguistic signs are used to perform voice, by also mentioning quality of voice, prosody, rhythm and intonation as tools in the construction of such characters or social types. Günthner (1999), however, follows in the footsteps of Tannen, Agha and Bakhtin and blends spoken and written modes, by extending these principles of spoken language to the oral production of written texts: this again is not merely a transmission of meaning but infused with the performer’s assessment of the written work (Günthner, 1999: 16). In other words, it is the literal voice that indexes the metaphorical sense of voice.

Overall, Bakhtin (1981, 1984) and Agha (2005) make little distinction between the written and spoken mode and even scholars who are focused on the spoken mode cannot help but include aspects of written language in their conceptions (Tannen, 2007; Günthner, 1999). In the actual speech interactions most relevant to my inquiry, the literal voice, for example falsetto as

discussed in the following chapter, is one of the hallmark signs employed to signal the markedness of voices in the more metaphorical sense.

### 3.5.2. “Women speak in italics”

Voice quality is also a well-researched topic and the Bakhtinian influence is, some would say thankfully, less apparent when investigating slightly more phonetic aspects of voice. Investigating voice quality and prosody in speech interactions, Günthner (1999: 21) found the following functions specifically in constructed speech contexts: signaling constructed speech, animating social types, and signaling the performed voice’s opinions as well as the speaker’s opinion on the quoted text. Speakers modify their voice quality in many speech situations for a number of other reasons, for instance, as an index of their identity, to share information on their emotional state, or to signal uniqueness (Podesva & Callier, 2015: 173).

More broadly, Podesva (2007: 479-480) points out how distinct voice qualities can indicate different social groups and cites falsetto as one of the most salient variables. Stross (2013: 142), who extensively investigated this phenomenon, defines falsetto as “the vocal register above the normal (or modal) one, and involves vibration of the vocal cord edges, resulting in a high-pitched sound with a relative lack of overtones”. Falsetto often co-occurs with creaky voice, sometimes called vocal fry, a deep glottal voice quality that “sounds much like an old hinge needing oil” (Sicoli, 2010: 523). Podesva (2007: 487) notes that creaky voice with its deeper pitch often enhances the effect of the much higher falsetto but also notes that they are not necessarily actively employed to do identity work; there are three inherent factors that cause falsetto and creaky voice, namely the elasticity of the vocal cords, the endings of utterances, and the production of glottal phones.

Moreover, Sicoli (2010: 522, 528) points out that voice qualities, like falsetto or creaky voice, are seldom considered the primary indices of registers and simply taken to be incidental by-products to the seemingly more salient morphological and lexical signs. However, in his investigation of voice quality in the indigenous Mesoamerican language Lachixío, Sicoli (2010: 530) found that higher pitch indicated a show of respect, while lower pitches consistently signaled authority. This dichotomy mirrors the often-assumed gendered aspect of higher pitches being associated with women and lower pitches being associated with men; an assertion that is supported by Stross’ research (2013: 148), who claims that 96% of American speakers were able to correctly identify the gender of a person of whom they only heard the

voice. However, Sicoli (2010: 548) rejects the notion that a high pitch is language universal and entirely based on underlying biology but rather stresses that it can take on different sociocultural meanings dependent on the context. Further he points out that “we should focus on the processes of enregisterment through which voice qualities come to take on social functions” (Sicoli, 2010: 548). Podesva and Callier (2015: 174) in turn point to the rich variety of voice quality across social groups and individual speakers for the purpose of identity construction, which further complicates language universal statements, or even biological arguments. To this point, Stross (2013: 146) points out that pitch is not a fixed entity, citing the common occurrence of women with deep voices in contexts where deep voices are valued, and men with higher voices in opposite environments. Overall, voice quality, especially pitch variations like falsetto, are a useful resource in terms of gender identity. One of the main points of Podesva and Callier (2015: 179) is that voice quality functions as an index of gender, but they claim that what is being indexed is not a vague gender identity but rather a specific gendered social type. Beyond gender, voice quality is a multifunctional index that serves multiple purposes and can also be used to intersectionally establish class and ethnicity types at the same time as gendered ones (Podesva & Callier, 2015: 182-183).

While falsetto certainly indexes gender, Stross (2013: 142-144) further identifies nine intertranslatable functions of falsetto that are based on observational knowledge and not, as Sicoli (2010) and Podesva (2007) maintain, based on cultural knowledge. He considers this list, the product of ethnographic accounts and observational logic, to be largely comprehensive and language universal, stating that most cases of falsetto are instances of either subordinacy, mutual respect, emotional arousal, imitation, mockery, salience, distance communication, identity concealment or location concealment (Stross, 2013: 142-144). The most relevant of these functions for my purposes is the mocking or parodic use of falsetto, which also comes with a gendered undercurrent. Stross (2013: 154) traces back this use of falsetto to its role in “baby talk”, which is the voice employed by caregivers to address small children. While he stresses that baby talk is not intended to be mocking its context renders it an index for a need for vulnerability, nurture, naivety, and general helplessness (Stross, 2013: 154). Addressing an adult with such a voice, hence, can also index the speaker’s assessment of their interlocutor possessing any of these characteristics.

## 4. Data & Methodology

### 4.1. Podcast specifics

I have chosen a podcast as my data because it takes the form of naturally occurring non-scripted language available in the public domain. At the same time, podcasts can be seen not just as a case study but as “window(s) to a wider milieu” (Lundström & Lundström, 2021: 290), which is especially useful for investigating enregisterment and further group-based speech features that have been discussed so far. While podcasts are indicative of trends, or even political leaning, within a larger group, they are no replacement for actual political activism on the Left because they are mostly based on websites that frame listeners as consumers and lack direct engagement (Jelfs, 2021: 257). However, mere exposure to subversive humor, which permeates the data chosen for this project, has been found to have a tangible political impact by increasing the tendency toward collective action in listeners that describe themselves as less feminist (Riquelme et al., 2021: 10).

When considering only mode, podcasts resemble radio shows, with Jarret (2009: 119) pointing out that many podcast formats are copied from established radio shows. However, the two audio-based media also differ in several key points. Firstly, the agency of the audience plays a larger role with podcasts. As opposed to simply pressing the on-button which is the case with radios, listening to a podcast involves a sequence of choices. As Funk and Speakman (2022: 1415) highlight, listening to a podcast involves choosing not only a specific episode of a certain podcast, but also a web browser or an app, of which there are several popular options, and beyond that the listening device also has to be selected, as phones, tablets and computers are able to play podcasts. In order to help potential listeners make this choice, podcasts episodes often feature catchy titles and short descriptions, which Funk and Speakman (2022: 1415) call the “most outward-facing content on any podcast”. However, with the emergence of TikTok and the rising popularity of short form videos on Instagram and YouTube as well, short clips of podcasts are also used for promotional purposes. Furthermore, these clips are arguably more outward-facing as they target people on different platforms that are not necessarily interested in podcasts.

Jarrett (2009: 117) sees the participatory features of podcasts in the hosts, who are in contrast to radio announcers, not trained speakers or part of an institution but are enabled by online services available to everyone to take on the role of host. Jarrett (2009: 123-124) further points

out the liminal role of broadcast talk in podcasting, which may lack the institutionalized features of radio shows, like addressing the audience throughout, that mark it as overtly produced for a listening audience. While radio talk is often framed as a conversation between host and listener (Jarrett, 2009: 122), podcasting talk may exhibit more features of mundane talk, like a conversation between friends that just happens to be overheard by the listeners (Jarrett, 2009: 125). However, this distinction between radio and podcasting talk is tenuous, as both exist on various level of formality, ranging from productions by established media institutions to friends recording their casual conversations.

The majority of research into podcast specific discourses about U.S. American politics focuses on conservative podcasts specifically, to the point where Funk and Speakman (2022: 1417) only talk about “mainstream and conservative” podcasts. In this sense it is also unclear what exactly is expressed by “mainstream”, as with the increasing societal shift toward the right of the political spectrum across the Western world over the last decade, mainstream cannot possibly be meant as a synonym for liberal or even leftist. Funk and Speakman (2022: 1529) also point out that “scholarship on self-described and ideologically progressive news media is relatively limited.”

In order to approach this research project as holistically as possible and provide some ethnographic information, I will borrow elements from Lundström and Lundström’s (2021) podcast ethnography. This method is divided into three main steps, namely exploring, engaging, and examining (Lundström & Lundström, 2021: 290-294). The first step encompasses gathering basic information like the identity of the speakers, the schedule, the episode length, as well as clarifying why this particular podcast was chosen as a subject of research (Lundström & Lundström, 2021: 291). Engaging with the podcast, then, means to listen and record under what circumstances one listens and what implements are used to play the podcast (Lundström & Lundström, 2021: 292-293). Finally, examining the podcast subsumes three questions “Why is the podcast produced?”, “How do the speakers interact?”, and “What themes are being treated?” (Lundström & Lundström, 2021: 294). While the main focus of my research responds to the latter two questions of ‘examine’, I will use the remaining steps of Lundström and Lundström’s (2021) framework to provide an in-depth overview of both “I’ve Had It” and my engagement with it.

Since humor, swearing and voicing are among the most salient features in the podcast *I’ve Had It*, first published on 18 October 2022, this is the data I have chosen to focus on. The podcast

is largely non-scripted, and while it includes some more planned segments, like games or specific talking points, spontaneous speech abounds. The hosts, interior designer Jennifer Welch and attorney Angie “Pumps” Sullivan, are two middle-aged women living in Oklahoma. Two notable members of their staff are Kiley and Richard, the production assistants. While both hosts are wealthy white women, they use their platform to promote progressive political views in a red state: they oppose the recent abortion bans and routinely interview drag queens who, in the wake of American anti-trans legislation, have often been painted as scapegoats. All episodes chosen feature a famous drag queen, namely Delta Work, Trixie Mattel, Katya Zamolodchikova, Bianca del Rio, Ginger Minj, Symone, Gigi Good, and Detox Icunt.

Utilizing the backlog, I listened to all episodes released between October 2022, when the podcast was first released and 25 July 2024, providing me with ample contextual information about established dynamics between the hosts. While the podcast still releases episodes twice a week in addition to a new, initially bi-weekly, podcast that focuses on American political news and currently releases new episodes twice a day, I have not been consuming the more recent episodes. “I’ve Had It” currently figures at 278 episodes, which range from 30 minutes to 1 hour and 15 minutes in length, with early episodes usually being around 45 minutes long, whereas more recent ones often surpass the one-hour mark.

The question “Why is the podcast produced?” has two possible answers. First, Jenny and Pumps starred in an interior design reality show in 2017 called “Sweet Home Oklahoma” that ended after one season. Further, they recently published a book which indicates that attaining fame and amassing wealth played a role in the podcast’s inception. However, they also use their platform to promote leftist ideas and hold Republicans accountable. Notable guests included prominent Democrats like presidential candidate Kamala Harris and popular leftist politician Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez.

## **4.2. Method**

This project was guided by these four research questions:

- How are humor, swearing and voicing leveraged in these interactions to enhance speakers’ political identity?
- How do the discourses invoked by these three features aid in constructing a particular political identity?

- In what way does the status of these three features as aspects of women’s language contribute to the construction of political identity?
- Are there any marked differences in register between the hosts and their guests and how does this affect constructions of political identity?

Overall, I chose eight episodes, published between June 2023 and February 2024, that feature a drag artist guest. In order to further specify my data, I specifically selected instances of political talk to transcribe resulting in 21 longer sequences (for a complete list see appendix). The decision to label an interaction as overtly political was most often facilitated by mention of a prominent Republican or Democrat party member, or by invoking politicized discourses, like transgender rights in the US. Out of these 21 sequences, I selected 41 Extracts (see Table 1) ranging from to illustrate arguments, counting the swear words used as well as marking humorous turns and instances of parodistic voicing and the themes and discourses that were invoked. My guiding principles were:

1. Using the features of women’s talk as a set of operationalized norms to investigate if the speakers adhere/deviate from them.
2. Concentrating on their use of disparagement humor, swear words and voicing to look at in-group-out-group dynamic that is created linking back to political identity.
3. Ultimately using indexicality connecting this to enregisterment i.e. the process of an overarching “democrat register”, a leftist sub-group of democrats forming that saliently incorporates the three features.

**Table 1**  
*List of Extracts*

Extract Number	Title	Episode Number	Timestamp
1	Petty shit	3	33:48-34:13
2	Liberal joy	4	06:14-07:39
3	Centrist anguish	4	07:40-09:13
4	Political typology quiz	7	06:58-07:48
5	Leftist idiots	8	12:24-13:00
6	Oklahoma City	1	12:16-12:36
7	Oklahoma as a red state	2	42:16-43:31
8	Post-Delta drag discussion	1	35:30-36:44
9	Swearing in Oklahoma	2	14:23-15:06
10	Fucking hypocrites	6	45:29-45:34
11	Drag queens as scapegoats	2	26:50-27:05
12	Taking away unlimited mimosas from a faggot	4	17:02-17:20

13	Petty salty bitches	3	33:55-33:59
14	Open casket funerals	2	31:24-31:33
15	Mitch McConnell	4	52:42-52:57
16	Mike Huckabee	6	48:16-48:49
17	Small-dicked men	4	16:04-16:15
18	Mike Pence, Piers Morgan, Ronald Reagan	1	32:56-33:31
19	Tricks and maneuvers	2	15:15-15:48
20	The patriotic things	6	45:10-45:33
21	Lauren Boebert #1	4	43:56-45:06
22	Megachurches	2	32:28-32:50
23	Church or The Wiggles?	3	38:25-38:56
24	Organized religion	4	46:58-47:15
25	Drag queens and priests	2	26:25-26:36
26	Number one killer of children	2	27:20-27:57
27	Catholic priests	4	15:35-15:54
28	Catholic lawsuit	4	46:06-46:16
29	Catholic architecture	3	38:11-38:26
30	Indoctrination in schools	5	29:53-31:04
31	Lauren Boebert #2	4	45:07-45:31
32	Gay hairdressers	4	16:32-17:02
33	Bobby does my hair	5	26:36-27:36
34	Go to hell	5	22:42-23:32
35	Smart... and good-looking	7	07:16-07:35
36	Joel Osteen	2	02:43-2:57
37	Stupid people making stupid laws	3	34:15-34:52
38	Right-wing indoctrination	3	35:42-36:29
39	Gigi is a better person	7	46:01-47:21
40	Vatican hookers	3	37:27-37:56
41	The individually wrapped Viagra commercial	8	10:08-10:41

---

### 4.3. Analytical Tools

In order to answer the research questions, I will employ both Conversation Analysis, leaning on Cameron (2001) and Clayman and Loeb (2017), and Critical Discourse Analysis with reference to Fairclough (2023), and Fairclough and Fairclough (2012). This combination will help me investigate the formal features and interactive strategies, as well as the norms that inform these interactions.

#### 4.3.1. Conversation Analysis

While investigating the intersection of politics and language via Conversation Analysis (CA) approaches is certainly not new, with both discourses about politics and overtly political discourse being the subject of a number of CA studies (Clayman & Loeb, 2017: 276), one dimension I am interested in is still underexplored: the interactional co-construction of a

shared, relationship-enhancing political identity in direct interactional encounters. A CA approach is particularly useful for this endeavor because it can be applied to a micro-level, like lexical choices and prosodic characteristics of utterances, as well as on a broader level, like the norms and customs governing turn-taking in a conversation (Clayman & Loeb, 2017: 277-78). Moreover, the unique focus of CA on turn-taking and interactional practices like topic selection, render it an especially prolific tool to investigate who gets to speak and for how long. In the context of this project, this last aspect also determines who gets the opportunity to do identity work and to what extent.

The first of the two major drawbacks of CA is its basis in the assumption that there can only be one speaker at a time, which has been shown to be inaccurate time and time again (Coates, 2011; Cameron, 2011). However, this does not diminish the method's ability to also analyze simultaneous speech, so this is of lesser importance for my purposes. The more controversial disadvantage of using CA is its strict speaker-orientation, meaning its analytic focus is 'emic' and based only on notions that speakers make relevant during the interaction that is studied (Clayman & Loeb, 2017: 279). Cameron (2002: 87) calls this approach "data-centered", though she restricts it to 'pure' CA, as it discourages the incorporation of information from outside the talk sequence into the analysis. Especially the feminist branch of CA found this to be an obstacle as gender identities are often not directly invoked but still contribute crucial information to the understanding conversations. Thus, Tennent and Weatherall (2021: 259) assert that conversation analysts ought to concentrate on identities deemed important by speakers and then show how they are wielded for meaning-making in interaction.

Especially power structures like gender often work on a more subliminal level that is rarely openly talked about, with gender often being a contributing factor in conversations in which it is not overtly invoked (for an in-depth discussion of this issue see Cameron, 2005). This should not diminish the importance of CA; it is important because interactional constraints (i.e. topic selection and turn management, etc.) that can be uncovered using CA influence to what degree individual speakers can contribute to the interaction. Nonetheless, in order to supplement the extremely 'emic' approach of CA for a holistic perspective and to escape the strict focus on the immediate co-text and the refusal to acknowledge the broader context, I will also make use of discourse analytic approaches.

#### 4.3.2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

While there are many forms of discourse analysis, my main approach will involve some elements of multimodal discourse analysis (MDA) but mostly revolve around Fairclough's (2023) critical discourse analysis (CDA). Multimodal discourse analysis (Kress & Bezemer, 2023) is relevant for my purposes as I will also consider gestures and facial expressions as extralinguistic signs in my analysis. However, my transcription style will not be following the established multimodal pattern, because for my purposes a stave transcript and its potential for accurately capturing simultaneous speech is more important than the extremely detailed and time-consuming process of transcribing multimodally.

CDA is both a method and a theory at once (Fairclough, 2023: 15). As a tool to investigate ideologies and identities that might not be overtly acknowledged, CDA evaluates and describes existing realities and compares them to value systems and material, political, and cultural standards while at the same time trying to explain these realities (Fairclough, 2023: 11). Overall, CDA is concerned with the structures of social practices and the strategies of social agents that manifest in text (Fairclough, 2023: 13).

Fairclough (2023) allows for three senses of discourse, namely knowledge construction from a specific social point of view, language connected to a specific social milieu, and, most generally, "meaning making as an element of the social process", which he prefers call 'semiosis' not discourse (Fairclough, 2023: 13). Pichler (2023) similarly conceptualizes discourse as "ideology, approaching different types of discourses as different ways of speaking, thinking, perceiving, and representing, informed by [other] ideologies or belief systems, and reflecting, affecting as well as constituting social and cultural practices and identities" (Pichler, 2023: 57). Established discourses, in this view, function as positioning tools for speakers, who can present themselves as closely connected to certain identities and, at the same time, far apart from others (Pichler, 2023: 58). Discourses that emerge in a particular field may be recontextualized or appropriated by another group for their own purposes and they may always be 'operationalized' (Fairclough, 2023: 14). In Fairclough's (2023: 14) conception, operationalization means practically applying the discourse by way of physical materialization, for instance in architecture, inculcation, which means speakers taking on new identities, or enactment, which gives rise to novel interaction practices. Fairclough's (2023: 14) example for these processes comes from the domain of business, in which a 'new public management'

discourse may impact office layouts and new leadership identities and change interactions between employee and employer.

Fairclough (2023: 15-16) also talks of CDA in four stages, the first of which requires focusing on a social wrong with a trans-disciplinary theoretical basis. The second involves identifying hindrances that prevent the social wrong to be ameliorated and consists of analyzing social meanings and its interrelation with linguistic practice, selecting appropriate texts for linguistic analysis (Fairclough, 2023: 16). Stage 3, then, necessitates musing whether the social wrong in question is needed to maintain order and the last stage encompasses finding a way of ending the social wrong (Fairclough, 2023: 17). Instead of focusing on the negative, i.e. a social wrong in the form of right-wing ideology, I focus on how leftists deal with and discuss right wing ideology and how this is used to enhance their own identities as leftists.

## 5. Analysis

Political identity is of great importance to the hosts, Jenny and Pumps. While their podcast was conceived as a vehicle to complain about things in their lives, hence the title “I’ve Had It”, and they often discuss more mundane matters, political topics are continuously revisited. Jenny topicalizes this in Extract 1, which is a good introductory excerpt because, despite its shortness, it showcases a lot of analytical categories that will be revisited in the coming chapter.

Extract 1: Petty shit

(146)

Katya [go on]

Pumps

Jenny okay [I re-] I read some articles about you and you have- there’s we like to talk- we like to talk about all this petty shit because

(147)

Katya {oo}

Jenny we’re petty salty bitches there’s no question about it but we also have

(148)

Jenny a side where we really take (.) you know our politics very seriously

(149)

Katya [right]

Jenny and we see them as moral issues and not necessarily poli[tical] and you

(150)

Jenny had a really good statement that you made about all of these morons that are obsessed with drag queens right now

Extract 1 makes apparent that the hosts openly engage with politics, make ample use of swear words, and engage in simultaneous in-group enhancement and out-group denigration. Further, in Jenny's open admission of taking politics seriously in stave 149, she can be read as reappropriating a conservative discourse by foregrounding the "moral issues", with classic understandings of morality in a religious sense usually playing a larger role for Republicans than for Democrats in their evaluations (Buie et al., 2022: 1407). Reappropriation is also involved in Jenny's use of "bitches" in stave 147. While this is usually an offensive term used to insult women, Jenny uses it to describe herself, thus disabling its pejorative content. Simultaneously, this use of *bitches* as well as calling topics of discussion "petty shit" (stave 146) is humorous due to it subverting the expectation that upper middle class white women "don't use off-color or indelicate expressions" (Lakoff, 1975/2004: 80). Finally, in stave 150, Jenny refers to anti-LGBTQ lawmakers, many of whom called for a drag ban, as "these morons", which not only invokes a discourse linking Republicans to a lack of intelligence but broadly denigrates the entire group while at the same time creating the implicature that the speakers involved are an intelligent in-group that exists in contrast to the moronic out-group.

This analytic chapter will roughly follow the same sequencing. First, the focus will be on mentions of political identity and attitudes towards political causes and groups. Then, an overview of the swear words invoked will be given. Further, the instances of humor and sequences of voicing will be analyzed. Finally, the discourses that are established throughout the data will be the subject of discussion.

### **5.1. Overt mentions of political affiliation**

In this first section, the focus of analysis is on mentions of political identity both to demonstrate the speaker orientation toward this topic and to highlight that even a seemingly straightforward identity like political affiliation can be contested and necessitates continuous negotiation. The four instances of interaction demonstrating this all take place in the introductory segments of their respective podcast episodes, in which the hosts, Jenny and Pumps, react to comments and reviews by (purported) listeners read aloud by Kiley, the production assistant, like in Extract 2.



(220)  
Pumps podcast= [dirty word]  
Jenny =I love how they throw that out like it's [a insult]  
Kiley =not one time=

(221)  
Pumps it's like thank you for noticing  
Jenny that you were liberal

In Extract 2, discussed in an episode from October 2023, Jenny and Pumps are called “skanks” (stave 208) and identified as liberals. Their reaction to the insult showcases their unconventional attitude toward swearwords. While most people would be more offended at being called *skank*, a classic misogynist slur evoking a lack of hygiene and sex work, Pumps and Jenny are not only amused but seem to display overwhelmingly positive feelings about this lexical choice. Both vocalize their appreciation in staves 214 and 216, respectively, and Pumps voices her excitement about hearing a slur that seems uncommon and slightly out of fashion to her. In contrast, they appear to be more offended by the reviewer not knowing that they are liberal. Pumps states that the commenter “obviously doesn’t listen to the podcast” (staves 219-220) which implies that listening to the podcast ought to sufficiently demonstrate their political identities to such a degree that it renders any questioning or second-guessing redundant. Moreover, Jenny points out that *liberal* is almost used like an insult, which it often is in right-wing circles - not just as a stand-alone pejorative but as part of a blend with the word ‘retard’ to create ‘libtard’ (Olson & LaPoe, 2017: 128). Being more offended by political identifiers continues immediately after with the reading of the next review in Extract 3.

Extract 3: Centrist anguish

(222)  
Pumps [okay]  
Jenny [kay]  
Kiley let's see if you think this one's better it's by niffy D it's a review on

(223)  
Pumps okay okay  
Kiley apple (.) four stars the two hosts are great together unmatched chemistry great storytellers and senses of humor I would argue that politically this podcast is more centrist slash liberal than left so if

(224)  
Pumps {@@@}  
Kiley you're right of that you'll probably get (.) butthurt (.) but if you're

(225)  
Kiley left of that you'll probably cringe\ it's a bit Mean Girls and perimenopause

(226)  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Kiley (.) great listen if you have thicker skin but the

(227)  
Kiley internalized misogyny is sometimes coming from inside the house (.) the feel good comedy can often come across as mean

Pumps hhh I [like it]  
 Jenny [I just-] I have a

(228)  
 Pumps {@@@@@@} I thought you were gonna  
 Jenny problem with them calling us centrist

(229)  
 Pumps say that the misogyny comes from withinside the house (.) the centrist/

(230)  
 Pumps that's [your issue/] =no I'm not a centrist  
 Jenny [the centrist] I'm not a fucking centrist=

(231)  
 Pumps either but (.) she must be wa:y left-leaning (.) which I'm all for it  
 Jenny as

(232)  
 Pumps yeah [it's kind of-]  
 Jenny centrist/ [but of all the] comments and all the criticism that we've

(233)  
 Jenny received (.) that one just kind of sits with me a little bit a fucking

(234)  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} I thought  
 Jenny centrist/ what like a John McCain centrist/ (.) fuck off

(235)  
 Pumps it was- I thought it was a great review (.) all in all I thought it was

(236)  
 Pumps well written (.) I liked it=  
 Jenny =I'm kind of butthurt about being called a

(237)  
 Pumps {@@}
 Jenny centrist so you know{laughing} what that means (.) I've got

(238)  
 Jenny to go on a fucking liberal progressive tirade we gotta get Bernie

(239)  
 Pumps {@@@@@@} [right now] {@@@@@@}  
 Jenny Sanders on this podcast  
 Kiley [uh I'm] on it

In Extract 3, even Pumps is surprised about Jenny's strong reaction to being called a centrist. She asserts that she thought the allegation of them displaying internalized misogyny has prompted her response, which Jenny seemingly does not deem worth reacting to. Jenny, instead, voices rejection of the political label, self-disclosing that this comment has affected her emotionally (staves 233 & 236) and she justifies her stance by pointing out how much hate and criticism they regularly face from right-wing reviewers and commenters. This is also the first instance within the data that makes apparent the relativism of these political terms. While the reviewer identifies the hosts as liberal and/or centrist, actively disavowing their status as leftist, this centrist label has a different meaning for Jenny, whose point of reference is Republican centrist John McCain. It seems, however, that this "wa:y left-leaning" (stave 231)

reviewer is talking about the mainstream Democratic Party, which by European standards would be classified as center-right. Jenny, in a further attempt to distance herself from the allegation of being centrist, states outright that they ought to get Bernie Sanders, the politician considered the most leftist, for an interview. This suggestion creates the implicature that their choice of podcast guests directly indicates their political identity. At the same time this utterance complicates the matter of political terms further by introducing *progressive*. On the micro-level of U.S. American Democrat politics, *leftist* and *progressive* are often interchangeable, while *liberal* points to the more centrist party mainstream, as it is used by the reviewer in Extract 3. Incidentally, Jenny and Pumps do not seem offended by being called *liberal*, despite its semantic overlap with *centrist*, likely because on an even grander scale of bipartisan U.S. American politics, the term stands in a contrast to conservatism and subsumes establishment liberals and progressive leftist (Pew, 2021: 6) which might be more relevant to them in interactions with conservative hate commenters than the particular shadings of Democrat. This is noteworthy because among leftists, it is these particular shadings that gain importance, with Jelfs (2021: 254) calling this phenomenon the “characteristic performative disambiguation of contemporary left culture from that of liberalism.” Since they are dealing with a listener who seems “way left-leaning” (stave 231), Jenny’s anguish seems less surprising.

Demonstrating Jenny’s continuous effort to assert her identity as a leftist, Extract 4 was taken from an episode posted two months after the previous two Extracts. Jenny and Pumps, once again in the introductory segment of the podcast, have taken a political typology quiz, a survey determining their political identity, and discuss their results.

Extract 4: Political Typology Quiz

(504)  
 Kiley first off I think (.) we should shoutout to our listeners because we

(505)  
 Pumps oh yeah/  
 Kiley posted (.) the political typology quiz (.) that proved you were not

(506)  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny oh yeah yeah right  
 Kiley a centrist (.) nor was Pumps (.) a little bit less (.) and so everyone

(507)  
 Pumps =I love [that]  
 Kiley took it everyone’s progressive left= [not] one centrist in our

(508)  
 Pumps I love [that] >they are smart<  
 Jenny =you know what/ (.) [our-] our followers are smart (.) our

Kiley followers=  
(509)  
Jenny listeners are smart (.) they're locked in they are (.) positive smart  
(510)  
Pumps [=and good-looking] I have  
Jenny and cynical [=and good-looking]  
Kiley and good-looking= gorgeous  
(511)  
Pumps noticed [that] at the (.) uh live shows [everybody's] smart and  
Jenny [yeah] [that was-]  
(512)  
Pumps attractive  
Jenny I think that's great we flipped the script they comment they  
(513)  
Pumps right  
Jenny call me a centrist and then we say well what the fuck are you/ (.) you  
(514)  
Pumps [there's  
Jenny take the quiz  
Kiley that person was a faith and flag conservative [that left  
(515)  
Pumps no doubt] (.) no doubt at all=  
Jenny =yeah  
Kiley that comment

Extract 4 reveals that the allegation of being a centrist has weighed heavy on Jenny who still seems bitter about the comment from Extract 3. She voices her continuous disdain for that review by questioning that reviewer's political affiliation. Her negative attitude toward that commenter is supported by Kiley employing a political label as an insult in turn, namely calling that person a Faith and Flag conservative. Pumps, who does not seem invested in this negotiation of political identity to the same degree, is nonetheless supportive of Jenny. This is evidenced by the collaborative simultaneous speech in staves 514-515, which expresses her agreement with Kiley's statement. Furthermore, on a discourse level, the description of their listeners as not only intelligent but good-looking invokes the religious discourse connecting moral righteousness with physical beauty (Cielontko & Zámečník, 2023: 21). This particular discourse will continue to be a theme in the data when it comes to disparagement humor, with the hosts associating a lack of comeliness with their political opponents in a large number of the humorous turns to come.

The final overt mention of political identity also serves as a conclusion to Jenny's negotiation and continued assertion of herself as a leftist. Extract 5 was taken from an episode posted in January 2024.



Extract 6: Oklahoma City

(2)  
Jenny Delta how are you/  
Delta hi: I'm great >wait< where are you where are you in

(3)  
Jenny we're in Oklahoma City  
Delta the world/ Oklahoma City/ oh  
Pumps we- Oklahoma sits on

(4)  
Jenny {laughter} listen Del[ta-]  
Delta =Texas (.) okay [sounds] like a lot of drag  
Pumps top of Texas= {laughter}

(5)  
Jenny we're here to fight the good fight  
Delta bans to me that's all I'm hear-  
Pumps >that's

(6)  
Jenny alright (.) [and] we're here here fighting the good fight  
Delta >I know you are- [I know you are<]  
Pumps right<

In Extract 6, Jenny and Pumps face a challenge by Delta whose comment about drag bans (staves 4-5) implies that the location of both hosts being in proximity to Texas influences their political identity. Whether this implication was intentional or not, Jenny immediately affirms her support by saying “we’re here to fight the good fight” (stave 5). This, in turn, prompts both Pumps and Delta to support Jenny’s statement. While Pumps merely corroborates the veracity of Jenny’s utterance, Delta says “I know you are” (stave 6) twice in quick succession which not only confirms Jenny’s statement but reframes Delta’s initial challenge as a humorous comment or even a test. This test is reminiscent of a long tradition of drag queen verbal behavior, namely teasing in order to establish group cohesion and to probe whether the teased party is equipped to withstand teasing (Murray, 1979; McKinnon, 2017). Delta’s behavior here, however, differs slightly in that she is not only checking how Jenny and Pumps cope with someone poking fun at their hometown. In addition, she is asserting how these out-group members, two Southern straight white women, deal with an indirect accusation of supporting drag bans and thus Republican policies. Jenny’s follow-up that they are “fighting the good fight” (stave 6) and Delta’s acceptance and support of this statement renders the test a successful one. Ultimately, Delta’s admission of knowing both hosts and their stances establishes a closer connection and an in-group dynamic between them.

While Pumps inhabits her usual supportive albeit passive conversational role in Extract 6, there is a multimodal aspect to her political identity in this exchange. Despite her not actively defending herself during Delta’s test, she is wearing a T-shirt that states ‘PROUD ALLY’

underneath a rainbow, overtly signaling her allyship to the LGBTQIA+ community. The same allyship is actively vocalized by Jenny in Extract 7.

Extract 7: Oklahoma as a Red State

(132)  
Jenny well Trixie Mattel this has been a long time coming and I have loved

(109)  
Jenny every moment=  
Pumps =every second= =and I want you to know that we- even though

(133)  
Jenny we live in a red state we are not and we are huge allies of your community hhh. and we totally support your agenda of spreading love

(134)  
Trixie {chuckle}  
Jenny peace and happiness to adult-only shows across the United States and

(135)  
Trixie thank you so much for having  
Jenny we cannot thank you enough for joining us

(136)  
Trixie me I really feel like you guys are me and Katya's like parallel like I don't know our tethers [your tethers]  
Pumps [biggest compliment] ever=  
Jenny =totally the biggest

(137)  
Trixie [of course]  
Jenny compliment well thank you so much for coming on=  
Pumps =thank you [you're a

(138)  
Trixie I'll see y'all in Oklahoma{country accent}  
Pumps blast] see ya [see y'all]  
Jenny [bye]

(139)  
Pumps oh my gosh that was the biggest treat ever=  
Jenny =I mean Trixie= =the best= =I

(140)  
Pumps =love=  
Jenny love Trixie= =I love drag queens= =everything about them= =I know I wish

(141)  
Pumps [every day]  
Jenny we could have drag queens on like (.) [once a month] I know they're so

(142)  
Pumps =it really is like even if you- if I came and I was kinda like u:h  
Jenny fun=

(143)  
Pumps tired it's rainy outside >da-da-da< you just- I feel energized I'm

(144)  
Pumps ready to go=  
Jenny =it's drag queen energy= =it is- drag queen energy is the best

(145) 43:31  
Pumps (.) ever=  
Jenny =it is the best energy ever and I love Trixie

In Extract 7, Jenny puts into words that they are “huge allies” to Trixie (stave 133). Another similarity to the previous Extract 6. is the invocation of place. Jenny feels the need to bring up that their beliefs exist despite their location in a red state (stave 133) and Trixie humorously alludes to their location by imitating a Southern drawl in stave 138. Trixie’s foregrounding of place, however, does not constitute a challenge or test along the lines of Delta’s utterance. Rather, Trixie seems to use the accent as a way of enhancing her relationship with her interlocutors by accommodating to and reciprocating their accent. In order to further set her apart from the red state she inhabits, Jenny goes on to voice her support for Trixie’s “agenda”, by which she appropriates the very common conservative discourse of a surreptitious “gay agenda” (Alvarado & Churchill, 2020: 352). What exactly this notorious gay agenda is, remains unclear but is often connected to accusations of pedophilia and strongly linked with the ‘save our children’-discourse (Williams, 2018: 250). The ‘save-our children discourse’ played a large role in U.S. American politics in the late 1970s, when Anita Bryant became the spokesperson of an eponymous organization advocating against an anti-discrimination law that would have protected homosexual workers in Florida (Williams, 2018: 251). Their main thesis was that any laws favoring gay people endangered “our” children, as they were potential targets of an imagined recruitment effort as part of the gay agenda (Williams, 2018: 251). However, by identifying Trixie’s agenda as “spreading love peace and happiness to adult-only shows across the United States” (stave 133), it becomes clear that Jenny’s conception of the gay agenda differs significantly from what is implied by conservatives raving about it. Jenny even forestalls the ‘save our children’-discourse by underlining that Trixie’s shows only admit adults (stave 133).

Another possibly surprising aspect of the interaction in Extract 7 that further supports the positive attitude Jenny and Pumps have toward drag queens is their reaction to Trixie’s comment in staves 135 and 136. On her turn, Trixie comments how alike Jenny and Pumps as a duo are to herself and Katya, another drag queen and longtime collaborator of Trixie’s. Not only does she speak of them as parallels, but her figurative use of tether highlights the strong connection she feels to the hosts. As a reaction, Jenny and Pumps hyperbolically and enthusiastically vocalize how this is “the biggest compliment ever” (staves 136 and 137). This comparison to female impersonators might not be looked upon favorably by everyone, considering that insults like *virago* and *shrew* are based on ascribing masculine properties to women and are mostly used pejoratively (Oxford English Dictionary, 2025a, 2025b). Trixie’s comment in contrast does not seem to carry any gendered connotations and merely appears to

indicate that Katya and Trixie similarly complain about mostly mundane topics on their podcast. Considering the immense financial success and recognition Katya and Trixie have received, especially in the niche of LGBTQIA+ entertainers, then renders the seemingly hyperbolic utterance “biggest compliment ever” more sincere.

The final portion of identity work in Extract 7 takes place after Trixie exits the interview. Jenny and Pumps take this opportunity to debrief and talk about their guest, which only initially takes the form of Jenny professing her affection for Trixie as a person (stave 139-140). The very next utterance is a declaration of love for the entirety of drag queens. Especially Pumps uses a lot of hyperbolic elements, like completing Jenny’s sentence about having drag queens as guests with “every day” which contrasts with Jenny’s more realistic “once a month” (stave 141). Another example for her using hyperbole is found in stave 145, when she states that drag queen energy “is the best energy ever” before she returns to focus on Trixie as an individual. A similar post-interview discussion happens in their first ever podcast episode featuring a drag queen in Extract 8.

Extract 8: Post-Delta drag discussion

(24) *Jenny and Pumps are discussing their guest after Delta has left*

Jenny love (.) [love] her she is [fantastic]

Pumps [love] [here’s the] deal (.) the people who bitch

(25)

Pumps about drag queens and drag shows they’ve never been because if you’ve been to a drag show or you’ve met a drag queen you realized it’s like the

(26)

Pumps happiest place on earth (.) it’s so much fun it’s fantastic interaction

Jenny totally

(27)

Pumps it’s stimulating it’s engaging like you cannot- it’s physically impossible to have a

(28)

Pumps bad time (.) [at a drag show]

Jenny >here’s the [deal< (.) it] says far more about the drag queen

(29)

Jenny haters (.) than it does about drag queens because we’re supposed to be

Pumps oh agree

(30)

Jenny a country that values the First Amendment and freedom (.) part of that

Pumps right

(31)

Jenny is freedom of expression hhh. and any person should be able to express themselves in a democratic society freely and without judgement love who they want dress

(32)

Jenny how they want lip sync to whatever they want it doesn’t fucking

Pumps right

(33)  
 Jenny matter I think anybody who has outspoken against drag queens is putting a red flag right  
 Pumps

(34)  
 Jenny there {mimes planting a red flag into her own skull} one thousand  
 Pumps that they're fucked up

(35)  
 Jenny percent love Delta Work I mean  
 Pumps yes no she was absolutely delightful

(36)  
 Jenny absolutely love Delta [Work (.) we've] got to get our asses to a drag  
 Pumps [she's hilarious]

The interaction in Extract 3 follows a similar structure: Jenny commences by saying she loves Delta, which is followed by a jump in conversation toward the topic of drag queens in general, which then turns into discussing people who do not like drag queens. This phrasing clearly delineates the out-group, namely Republicans, with a political angle being foregrounded by Jenny mentioning the First Amendment, which secures free speech (stave 30). Towards the end of the Extract, the focus of conversation once again falls back to Delta as an individual and is then once again used to transition to drag in a more general sense. This time, however, it includes a more practical call to action with stave 36 seeing Jenny commit herself to going to a drag show. The description of people who display an anti-drag sentiment in staves 28-34 that separates the two instances of Delta being talked about, will be subject of a later section analyzing description of the out-group as a way of constructing in-group identity in its own right.

### 5.3. Swearing

Swearing for the purposes of this chapter will be discussed in terms of the habitual practice of using swear words and the speakers' orientation toward that topic, the swear words as lexical items, as well as specific practices that involve swearing, like gay insulting, slur reclamation, and e-bile. Overall, swearing has two main functions for Jenny, Pumps, and their guests, namely denigrating the Republican out-group while building solidarity within the in-group present. Further, the very practice of swearing seems to be integral to how Jenny and Pumps view themselves and their identity as Southern leftists. In Extract 9, they overtly mention their own associations with swearing, while simultaneously denigrating a specific group who refuses to swear.

Extract 9: Swearing in Oklahoma

(52)  
Pumps our Oklahoma [brethren]  
Jenny [and here's] the thing I mean people that sit around and

(53)  
Jenny get butthurt about cussing=  
Pumps =I don't believe it= =get over it it's just

(54)  
Jenny such bullshit by the Bible thumpers that act like "oh they use the word

(55)  
Jenny fuck or they use the word shit" [but all of these] egregious human  
Pumps ["I'm so offended"]

(56)  
Jenny rights violations they don't give a shit about (.) so they can all fuck

(57)  
Jenny off  
Pumps at first I thought it was gonna m- my mother had wri- I thought my

(58)  
Pumps mother might be her (.) with the cussing cause no one hates the cussing  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(59)  
Pumps more than-  
Jenny it's just a- such a- well and also the studies have shown (.)  
and this you can google this listener this is true studies have shown that  
cussing is a sign of intelligence google it put it in the permanent record  
take it to the bank

Not only does Jenny make ample use of several swear words in Extract 9, but she also tells the conservatives to “fuck off” (stave 56-57). This indicates that not only does the topic of swearing serve to deepen Jenny and Pumps’ relationship as they collaborate on the topic throughout the Extract, with Pumps signaling her agreement in staves 53 and 55 and Jenny laughing at Pumps’ humorous contribution in stave 58, it also serves as a way to other the conservative out-group, expose their hypocrisies (stave 55-56), and insult their intellect. This discourse about intelligence is especially noteworthy because it plays a large role in several of the conversational snippets that were selected. While in this instance they do not overtly say that all conservatives are stupid, they strongly associate a lack of swear word usage to religiosity, which in turn is often used interchangeably with the Republican label throughout the data. Stave 59, then, forms the culmination of the smart discourse in this Extract, with Jenny presenting herself as educated, as she vaguely cites studies that ostensibly demonstrate that people who swear are more intelligent than those that do not. The implicature of this sequence in light of the co-text in the passage is clearly that the conservative out-group has an inferior intellect which stands in contrast to the swearing in-group’s mental acuity.

This discourse, however, is not the only strategy employed for othering in Extract 9, with voicing and the actual use of swear words, not the mere discussion of swearing, serving the same purpose. The voicing becomes especially apparent in staves 54 and 55 when Jenny starts with an impersonation of a “Bible-thumper”. Jenny uses the discourse marker *act like* to introduce the short instance of constructed speech which is then delivered in an audibly higher register with a higher degree of aspiration than her casual speaking voice. Pumps, in turn, employs similar voicing – a higher than normal register with audible aspiration - in her overlap in staff 55. This style of voice also reappears in multiple Extracts and bears a striking resemblance to “fundy baby voice” (Cameron 2024). While Jenny and Pumps parody the out-group using this voice, portraying them as ignorant of actual problems and superficial by virtue of being easily offended by swear words, they also use those swear words to denigrate conservatives further. Their attitude toward cussing is labeled as “bullshit” (staff 54) and Jenny tells them to “fuck off” (staff 56-57). These swear words continue to serve a purpose beyond merely insulting conservatives. Linking back to the discourse about intelligence in staff 59, Jenny’s ample swear word usage further enhances her own identity as an intellectual. The group identity is also often enhanced by jointly using swear words, as is evident in Extract 10.

Extract 10: Fucking hypocrites

(450)  
 Symone [fucking] (.) hypocrites  
 Jenny for the team to say (.) look at these fucking [hypocrites]  
 Pumps [hypocrites]

In this sequence, all three speakers overlap collaboratively, while jokingly discussing Symone’s potential involvement with Republican Mike Pence, with Pumps finishing Jenny’s utterance and Symone reiterating Jenny’s words to signal her agreement. All speakers support the statement and signal a willingness to utilize swear words themselves, which effectively denigrates the out-group as “fucking hypocrites”, whereas the in-group establishes solidarity via communal swear word usage.

The majority of swear words throughout the data share the referent of “fucking hypocrites” in staff 450. Especially words like *idiot*, *dumb*, *stupid*, or *crazy*, all denoting a lack of mental prowess, are exclusively used to refer to either specific Republican personalities or to conservatives as a group. *Idiot* occurs for the first time in staff 51 (see appendix), where Jenny uses it to refer to a commenter who complained about their use of swear words. The word then reappears in staff 271 (see appendix), when Bianca calls Lauren Boebert an idiot. The adjective *dumb* also only occurs twice, both times in predicative constructions to denote

conservative ideas (stave 468) and religiously motivated behavior (stave 180). *Stupid* is used for the same purpose, namely modifying conservative ideas (152) and religiously motivated behavior (stave 179) but, in contrast, proves much more popular with 12 occurrences. Especially noteworthy regarding frequency of use is Katya, who used the word five times in a sequence discussing her puzzlement with conservative lawmakers (staves 152-162). This insult is also used to establish rapport with the speakers present, which is apparent in Pumps' interaction with Katya. She reiterates one of Katya's statements to signal her agreement: "I think it's more stupid than sad too" (stave 162). A similar collaborative usage of *crazy* can be seen in stave 179, where Pumps uses it to both summarize and affirm Jenny's contribution, as she is complaining about the futility of the Catholic church's stance against masturbation. The use of *crazy* throughout the data mirrors *stupid* and *dumb*, with all eleven instances referring to either conservatives as people or their practices (see Appendix; staves 88, 179, 191, 192, 258, 298, 386, 396, 541, 571); this also applies to the one instance of *insane* (stave 493)

The only popular swear word of the scatological variety was *shit* with 20 occurrences total. Jenny in particular seems the fondest of this word as she is responsible for 15 instances. Her most favored realizations are *shit* as a noun and the compound *bullshit*. Incidentally the verbal form of *shit* never occurs but *shit* as a noun is part of two lexical phrases, *give a shit* and *go to shit*, which occur thrice. *Shittalking* as a gerund is uttered twice by Jenny, once in stave 8 "we're here to do some shittalking" and once in stave 334 "it's time to do some world class shittalking". These metalinguistic announcements reinforce the importance swearing has for Jenny and how integral of an activity swearing is to build group cohesion in this podcast.

The most often used swear word was unsurprisingly *fuck* with 81 total occurrences. The most often realized form of the lemma was *fucking* as an intensifier which occurs 45 times. Verbal uses of *fuck* account for 26 instances, including lexical phrases like *fuck off* and *fuck up*. The remaining 10 uses of *fuck* were nominal including forms like *motherfucker*, *fuckery* and the gerund *fucking*. Jenny was once again the most proactive swearer producing 34 versions of *fuck*, which aligns with her role in the podcast. She is the more verbose of the hosts and responsible for topic selection in most instances. Pumps, in contrast, accounts for only 7 uses, trailing after Bianca with 20 and Symone with 11 realizations, despite both only having guest status. Overall, Pumps is more supportive and less dominant than Jenny, which is also reflected in her swear words usage.

Two notable swearing practices employed in the utterances by the drag queen guests are gay insulting and the reappropriation of slurs. The former is present in Extract 11 and uttered by Trixie as she defends drag queens from Republican anti-drag rhetoric in an underhanded way.

Extract 11: Drag queens as scapegoats

(93)

Trixie because I- drag is not as um (.) thought out I work with drag queens

(94)

Trixie these are unintelligent whores they're not masterminds there's

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(95)

Trixie nothing behind the curtain like it's just some guy (.)

Trixie's labeling of drag queens as "unintelligent whores" (stave 94) not only inverts the discourse about intelligence otherwise present in the swear word usage by switching referents from the out-group to the in-group, it also constitutes a playful defense. In order to portray drag queens as harmless "guys" (stave 95) in contrast to the Republican construct of the predatory, malicious drag queen, Trixie diminished their intelligence and refers to them collectively by a sexual insult. While on the surface this constitutes an insult, it also has a supportive reading beyond the defense against Republican discourses. The insult serves as a kind of inoculation against harassment from the out-group by teaching the offended party to cope with insults coming from the in-group. Thus, this instance can be viewed as a lesson in dealing with insults for Trixie's fellow drag queens. Jenny's and Pump's laughter following the insult supports a more positive reading of the insult. A second instance of gay insulting in Extract 12 further incorporates the reclamation of a slur.

Extract 12: Taking away mimosas from a faggot

(256)

Bianca =well let's just be real for a minute first and foremost you know it's getting dirty now because you see they're saying oh drag queens like children yeah that's problematic then they're like we want to ban drag brunches now the gays are really upset because you know what unlimited

(257)

Bianca mimosas from a faggot (.) that is problematic honey (.) you're fucking

Pumps {@@}

Jenny {@@}

While *faggot* is one of the most offensive slurs to use against gay men, Bianca's use is multi-layered. On one level, it constitutes a homophobic insult. Gay men are presented as shallow and only caring about trivial matters like brunch. Further, the mention of mimosas, a classic brunch drink consisting of sparkling wine and orange juice, contributes to foregrounding the femininity of gay men. This latter aspect does seem to support Whorten's (2025) findings in



and Pumps identify as shittalking individuals, they are also recognizably present online with both their full names and appearances and day jobs being available online. A mechanism similar to the driving force behind e-bile seems to enhance their swear word usage nonetheless: they lack direct interaction with Republicans during their podcast episodes which most likely causes them to be more uninhibited in their insults, in addition to only being surrounded by their highly supportive in-group. Catharsis might also play a large role in their unencumbered swearing as in Oklahoma, they are outnumbered by Republicans. Thus, encounters with their out-group are likely common experiences in their daily life that lead to contempt and frustration, with their podcast being an outlet for relief.

## 5.4. Humor

Humor has two main applications in the data: aligning with in-group members while simultaneously disparaging out-group members. The humorous turns in the data can be ordered based on the discourses that are invoked. The three discourses relevant throughout the data are the ‘smart discourse’, discourses about religion, and a discourse that frames priests as child molesters.

### 5.4.1. Smart discourse

While the ‘smart discourse’ that effectively links the in-group with intelligence and the out-group with stupidity is heavily apparent in the participants’ use of swear words, it is more surreptitious and indirect in their humoristic turns. One of these covert invocations of the ‘smart discourse’ can be found in Extract 14, in which Jenny, Pumps and Trixie discuss open casket funerals.

Extract 14: Open casket funerals

(119)  
 Jenny [I think-] I think it's corpse abuse why

(120)  
 Jenny aren't the Republicans onto that (.) why don't they leave the fucking  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(121)  
 Jenny drag queens and alone and get onto these people that are dressing up

(122)  
 Trixie =no kidding  
 Jenny dead people and putting them in boxes it's fucking weird=

After discussing the tradition of open casket funerals in the Southern United States, Jenny labels this practice “corpse abuse” (stave 119). She goes on to wonder why the Republicans



on to Jenny’s hyperbolic comments, not only to signal her agreement, but to heighten the humor of the interaction. To this purpose, she deduces that McConnell’s physical appearance necessitates him suffering from halitosis. Since bad breath is extremely unpleasant, an appearance matching that phenomenon has to be equally as displeasing to the eye. In effect, this short interaction sees Jenny elaborating on the smart discourse indirectly, which then, through collaboration with Bianca is linked with a discourse about ugliness. A similar but even more surreptitious insult to physical appearance can be seen in Extract 16, during an interaction, in which Symone is talking about Mike Huckabee.

Extract 16: Mike Huckabee

(459)  
Symone of the Huckabee l- I remember in sixth grade th- the father- Huckabee

(460)  
Symone father was (.) what is it called/ a governor/ (.) the one they(vote) to  
Pumps yeah  
Jenny yes

(461)  
Symone say okay yeah (.) a governor and he made us do- (.) girl this is the ultimate  
hypocrisy he- we had to do those fucking like you had to be outside for like  
a thirty minutes or an hour in- in school/ you know like you had recess which  
you had like an active hour{miming quotation marks} (.) if you- if you wanna  
know why the irony of that is look it

(462)  
Symone up but um just look up the name (.) [but um we] had that but I- (.)  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} I [can guess]

The insulting utterances appear in stave 461, with Symone calling Mike Huckabee’s engagement for increased physical activity in school curricula as “the ultimate hypocrisy”. She further points out that to understand the irony she is pointing to, one simply has to look up the name Mike Huckabee. That this utterance constitutes an underhanded insult, is underlined by Pumps’ reaction, which not only supplies laughter but verbal support with the collaboratively overlapping “I can guess” (stave 462). The implication is that Mike Huckabee’s appearance is in complete opposition with physical fitness. Incidentally, the former governor of Arkansas used to be obese until around 2006, when Symone would have been in sixth grade, when he was prompted by his own weight loss to promote public policies around exercise (Leibovich 2006). Another instance of disparaging the physical form of Republicans, albeit not concerning a surplus of weight but rather a diminutive physicality, can be found in Extract 17.

Extract 17: Small-dicked men

(246)  
Pumps [right]  
Jenny [no]body wants to talk about that because guns as everybody knows are

(247)  
 Bianca {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}
   
 Jenny also {makes extending motion with hands} penile extenders for the

(248)  
 Pumps =right=
   
 Jenny small-dicked men that run the country= =so they don't wanna deal

In this exchange, Jenny critiques how Republicans approach firearms and the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution, noting that these weapons are merely “penile extenders for the small-dicked men that run the country” (staves 247-248). The humor in this sequence lies in the taboo of introducing the topic of genitals and the incongruity of doing so in a seemingly unrelated discussion of the right to bear arms. Thus, Jenny frames the Republican pro-gun stance as an act of overcompensation. The out-group denigration is actively enhanced by Pumps who latches on to assent in stave 248, while Bianca is more focused on the humor, responding with laughter at hearing “penile extender” (stave 247). In addition, this sequence contradicts Bing’s (2007: 349) assertion that women do not generally joke about dicks and are more interested in privileges afforded to its owners rather than the appendage itself. More evidence that Jenny and Pumps do want to focus on the appendage itself can be drawn from Extract 41, detailing the hosts’ reaction to a Viagra commercial, to which we will return in the broad discussion of discourses invoked in the next chapter.

#### 5.4.2. Sexualizing the Republicans

One of the jocular interactions that illustrates the dual function of humor in the data can be found in Extract 18, in which Jenny prompts Delta to play ‘Fuck, Marry, Kill’, one of the pre-planned segments that are part of the show. In this segment, Jenny provides three celebrity names, in this case Mike Pence, Piers Morgan, and Ronald Reagan, and Delta must decide which of the titular verbs to assign to each personage.

Extract 18: Mike Pence, Piers Morgan, Ronald Reagan

(15)  
 Delta would be who I would marry um I- uh oh god Piers Morg- I mean there’s- something tells me that u:m- that Mike Pence h- he might be a wild ride so (xxxxxx) Piers Morgan is just gr- he looks gross he acts  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(16)  
 Delta gross I know he smells like Aqua Velva (.) get outta here gone murdered  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(17)  
 Delta (.) with Caitlin Jenner  
 Jenny I- I love the slap and tickle with Mike Pence  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@} I do

(18)  
Jenny [I- s-] I think you're right something's going  
Pumps too thinking he's a [wild ride]

(19)  
Jenny on there yeah  
Delta yeah

While Extract 18 also features the disparagement of Piers Morgan, whose alleged usage of Aqua Velva (stave 16), a cheap aftershave in a plastic bottle, implies tastelessness beyond the overt assertion of his grossness, the main humoristic content in this interaction is the assertion that Mike Pence is sexually adventurous. This is supported by Jenny and Pumps laughing out loud as a reaction and their subsequent collaboration. Their laughter likely derives from the incongruity of this allegation of lasciviousness with the well-known conservatism about the former vice-president, who never dines or has one-on-one meetings with women who are not his wife (Filipovic, 2017; Khazan, 2017; Parker, 2017). Jenny and Pumps' reaction to Delta's joke initially only takes the form of laughing but only two turns later, in stave 18, both verbally support the statement, with Pumps reiterating Delta's words and Jenny's overt 'I think you're right'. Moreover, Jenny's "something's going on there" (staves 18-19) underlines the surreptitious nature of Mike Pence's alleged lascivious behavior, which creates a discourse of outwardly repressed conservatives being sexually adventurous behind closed doors. Both these collaborative strategies are meant to build rapport and strengthen the in-group solidarity.

The interaction in Extract 19 similarly showcases out-group denigration, as Jenny and Pumps discuss a conservative commenter, named Wejo, who complained about Jenny and Pumps' ample use of swear words.

Extract 19: Tricks and maneuvers

(61)  
Jenny Wejo I bet she is just I-

(62)  
Jenny I mean I bet missionary sex two to three times in her life (.) you know  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(63)  
Jenny I mean this is a person that is just wound up like a [cheap clock]  
Pumps [I don't know] you

(64)  
Pumps know they say the more wound up you are the (.) uh naughtier you are

(65)  
Pumps in the bed[room] =I don't know I've always heard that  
Jenny [who] says that= I think

(66)  
Jenny that's bullshit [I mean maybe but] I-  
Pumps well I don't- I don't have any [personal knowledge]

(67)  
Jenny I mean I think that whoever wrote that I- I doubt she's doing all sorts

(68)  
Jenny of tricks and maneuvers in the bedroom I'm just going to take a wild  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(69)  
Jenny stab and say she's not some wonderful lay {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Pumps okay{laughing}

In stave 62, Jenny links this commenter's negative attitude towards swearwords to a lack of sexual stimulation, which initially garners a laugh from Pumps who eventually carefully challenges this assertion starting in stave 63. Pumps utilizes the same discourse that was developed in Extract 18, which connects extremely repressed conservatives with surreptitious, lascivious behaviors. However, by framing it with "they say" (stave 64), Pumps already distances herself from her own analysis, ostensibly anticipating being challenged in turn by Jenny. Jenny indeed questions Pumps' contribution in staves 64 to 66, going so far as to calling Pumps' initial statement "bullshit" (stave 66). This prompts Pumps to further defend herself by once again distancing her "personal knowledge" (stave 66) from her initial assertion, framing it again as an outside opinion. While this interaction almost has the structure of a debate with Jenny, the more dominant interlocutor, repeatedly discrediting Pumps, Jenny herself breaks the tension by joking about the commenter's sexual prowess, with the humorous content lying once again in the disparity between repressed conservatives and a sexually adventurous lifestyle. This time, however, in contrast with Extract 18, Jenny expresses her doubt that a person such as the conservative commenter could offer any "tricks or maneuvers in the bedroom". By framing such skills as inaccessible to conservatives, not only does this contradict the discourse established in Extract 18, it also frames sexual prowess as something desirable and linked to open-minded individuals not a secretive characteristic of conservatives.

A similar positive reframing of sexual acts can be found in Extract 20, in which Jenny once again engages the guest, Symone, in a formulaic gamified segment called 'Would you Rather'. Jenny asks Symone to choose between having sex with Mike Pence and eating a mayonnaise sandwich with extra mayonnaise while walking through an airport with bare feet. Symone then muses about the first option:

Extract 20: A patriotic thing  
(445)  
Symone like I'm gonna get some hate and that's fine but he's gonna get more-  
Pumps  
right  
(446)





dumpster” (stave 274), however, Bianca not only heightens the publicness of the location but also the surreptitious nature of the act, hidden behind a dumpster. While sex on the streets in proximity to garbage may be called classless behavior, the imperative “have some class” further underlines as just how inappropriate Bianca classifies Boebert’s behavior, not even reaching the decency of people who have sex on parking lots behind dumpsters in Bianca’s eyes. All these instances of subversive humor seem to be successful, as far as eliciting laughter from her interlocutors is concerned (staves 267, 272, and 274).

Just like previous instances of this humorous discourse linking Republicans with sexuality, it is meant to showcase the hypocrisy of their policies and attitudes. Jenny overtly topicalizes this in staves 275-277, where she points out that Boebert had previously spoken out against drag shows but she herself chooses to display sexual behavior as part of the audience of a musical where children were also present (O’Connell, 2023). This hypocrisy is previously commented on by Bianca, who focuses on the Democratic partner of Boebert, who seems to offer drag shows at the establishment he owns (stave 269). Overall, Boebert’s behavior confirms the discourses around conservatives and sexuality that were previously developed by the podcast hosts. What distinguishes this sequence from its forerunners is Bianca’s heavy usage of denigrating swear words for Lauren Boebert and Republicans at large. In this regard, Bianca is very explicit by calling Boebert a “tool” (stave 266) and a “fucking idiot” (stave 271). These swear words enhance the discourse that links Republican politicians with stupidity.

### 5.4.3. Discourses about religion

Next to Republicans sexuality, their intelligence and their corporeal presence, their religion is another topic that is invoked throughout the humorous sections of their podcast. While there are discussions about organized religion throughout the US in the data, with jokes about megachurches and Catholicism, the bulk of humoristic turns establishes a discourse that connects religious institutions to child abuse. The first joke to ridicule megachurches is uttered by Trixie in Extract 22.

Extract 22: Megachurches

(126)  
 Trixie these- these basically big box like superstores masquerading as non-  
 Pumps {laughing}

(127)  
 Trixie profits (.) give me a- like give me a break the level of tax break et  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(128)  
 Trixie cetera for the- like give me a break hhh. I mean Jan Crouch used to fly  
 (129)  
 Trixie her dogs private= =she wasn't even on the- she wasn't even on the  
 Pumps =yeah=  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(130)  
 Trixie plane (.) she'd fly the dogs [private]  
 Pumps [lots of] private jets in the megachurches  
 Jenny right

The two instances of humor in Extract 22 target megachurches and the associated televangelists, who are often depicted as the agents of megachurches. The first denigration takes the form of a comparison between megachurches and “big box like superstores” (stave 126). This likening of a profane grocery store built to enable mass consumption foregrounds the capitalism involved in megachurches, while downplaying the spiritual aspects that should be inherent in a church. Moreover, drawing attention to a megachurch’s legal status as a non-profit organization, and mentioning the tax breaks that accompany this status, lay the groundwork for Trixie’s denigration of religious scammers. Trixie transitions to talking about Jan Crouch (stave 128), whose financial scandals were widely publicized, although she is not technically affiliated with a megachurch and instead used a religious broadcasting channel to exploit viewers for personal gain (Sforza, 2012). Thus, invoking Jan Crouch frames megachurches as religious scams. Overall, Trixie uses this discourse to humorously highlight the hypocrisy of conservative religious institutions in the United States.

The megachurch denigration in Extract 23 follows a similar pattern, both disparaging the practice as a whole, as well as a famous televangelist.

Extract 23: Church or The Wiggles?

(198)  
 Katya [don't love that] [no{laughing}]  
 Pumps [not so great]  
 Jenny [no the] Catholics the architecture A plus the stained

(199)  
 Katya yeah oh yeah [gorgeous] ooh (.) F {claps}  
 Pumps {@@@}  
 Jenny glass A plus (.) [the- the] megachurches F [you totally find] the

(200)  
 Katya br- br- {crossing out motion with hands} [amphitheater]  
 Jenny architecture is terrible [awful]

(201)  
 Katya [uh uh] [you're going- you're going to ch]urch or  
 Jenny [it is] absolutely tragic archi[tecture I don't know how people-]

(202)  
 Katya or you're going to see The Wiggles [it's like xxxx] yeah fuck Joel  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(203)

Katya Osteen I've had it with that motherfucker [oh my god]

Pumps o:[:h the] worst

Jenny [same] same

The first joke in Extract 23 is Jenny grading the architecture of Christian denominations in stave 198-199. The main function of her turn is to denigrate megachurches in particular, by distinguishing them from other Christian movements, like Catholicism that, according to her, seem to have at least made some tangible cultural impact. The fact that only the stained-glass windows are what is remarkable about the Catholic Church constitutes a condemnation of religiosity by itself, with megachurches not even reaching this level of esteem. Most megachurches are Evangelical Protestant, thus more relevant in Jenny's US context, and even Catholic congregations that meet the size requirement, 1800 to 2000 attendees, are most often not counted as megachurches (Hunt, 2020: 1). While Pumps supports this contribution with laughter, Katya uses Jenny's introduction of megachurches to elaborate on the topic, actively agreeing with her assessment, calling megachurch buildings tragic and making fun of these venues. The humorous comparison in stave 202 that likens megachurches to concerts by the Wiggles, a children's music group, encapsulates two insults. First, it questions the validity of megachurches as spiritual ventures by comparing it with a profane event for a mass audience, like a concert. The second insult covertly connects megachurches to the smart discourse: by stating that a children's music group bears resemblance to a megachurch, the congregation is implied to have the mental capacity of children. Jenny and Pumps acknowledge Katya's joke with laughter which then leads to the final denigration in this sequence. Katya's exclamation "fuck Joel Osteen" (staves 202-203) seems more serious than the several humorous turns it succeeds but is nonetheless supported by Pumps who agrees that this televangelist and megachurch-affiliate is the worst, while Jenny proclaims that she shares the sentiment by repeating "same" twice (stave 203). Moving away from megachurches but staying in a religious realm, a similar joke to Katya's "Wiggles" comment (stave 202), linking the fields of pop music and religiosity, is made by Bianca in Extract 24.

Extract 24: Organized religion

(298)

Bianca I agree organized religion is crazy which is why I'm not a fan of Taylor

(299)

Bianca Swift I mean that is an organized religion those people that worship

Pumps {@@@@@@}

(300)  
 Bianca that girl I'm just like whatever it's a whole new church it's a whole new  
 thing if it works for you great but don't try to sell me and try to

(301)  
 Bianca lure me into it because it ain't for me (.) it ain't for me  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny yeah

Bianca's joke about Taylor Swift's followers resembling organized religion (staves 298-299) contributes to the same discourse that links megachurches with mass consumption that was used by Trixie in Extract 22 and Katya in Extract 23. While in previous instances this discourse delegitimized the spiritual position of megachurches in contrast to more conventional religious institutions, Bianca voices her disdain for all organized religions and distances herself from it by saying "it ain't for me" (stave 301). The humor of her comparison is acknowledged by Pumps in stave 299 and consists mainly of the incongruity between a massively popular secular pop singer and religious worship.

#### 5.4.4. Priests as molesters

A more specific church-related discourse that permeates the data links priests with child abuse. This connection refers to church employees in a more general sense in two instances, and Catholic priests specifically, in three of the following Extracts, starting with Extract 25.

Extract 25: Drag queens and priests

(88)  
 Trixie crazy and the only place (.) where men put on dresses and fuck children

(89)  
 Trixie is church I love drag I'm  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@} ohh{laughing}  
 Jenny you're exactly right Trixie

Trixie's joke in stave 88 largely relies on shock value. She puts extant revelations about the clergy and their connection to child abuse scandals (see Denney 2023; Raine & Kent 2019) in explicit taboo terms. Further, Trixie points to the overlap of religious institutions and drag, equating the elaborate garments of preachers to dresses worn by drag queens, and in the same breath frames the church as the only threat for children. Pumps responds with supportive laughter and Jenny voices her strong support in stave 89. The fact that Jenny has similar feelings as Trixie becomes clear in Extract 26.

Extract 26: Number one killer of children

(97)  
 Jenny attacking of drag queens is the biggest low hanging fruit (.) that  
 Pumps right

(98)  
 Jenny they could grab onto and it's also (.) like right now the number one  
 Trixie {deep sigh}

(99)  
 Jenny killer (.) o:f children in the United States are guns (.) the number  
 Trixie yeah

(100)  
 Jenny one molester of children are these religious institutions and so- but by all  
 means let's talk about men (.) that re:ally (.) probably the majority are not  
 huge lovers of children Pumps and I both

(101)  
 Jenny fucking [hate kids] and s- we have five between us (.) so it's not  
 Pumps [hate kids] {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(102)  
 Jenny [like] you know{laughing}  
 Trixie [girl] {@@@@@@@@} shout out to the kids listening shout out to

(103)  
 Jenny shout out to the kids >shout out to the kids< okay  
 Pumps right  
 Trixie the kids

While the joke Jenny makes does not directly implicate priests as molesters, this is the content of the more serious section of Jenny's turn (staves 99-100), preceding the humorous comment. Instead of denigrating the out-group, the joke teasingly denigrates the in-group and signals Jenny's alignment of opinion with drag queens: "probably the majority are not huge lovers of kids" (stave 100). This introductory phrase, then leads both Jenny and Pumps to voice their hatred for kids. The humor lies in the unexpected and ostensibly shocking revelation that they dislike their own children. Trixie even seems slightly taken aback by the joke but then laughs and points to the possibility of Pumps' and Jenny's children listening to their podcast (stave 102). Overall, Jenny's joke constitutes an inversion of stereotypical expectations about gender. Women are supposed to be nurturing and child friendly not openly voicing their dislike for both children in general and their own. Moreover, it frames drag queens and the hosts as part of the in-group who hates kids in opposition to religious institutions who like children too much and in the wrong way. Further the entire Republican discourse of drag queens as dangerous moral corrupters that should not interact with children is ridiculed and pales in comparison to what Jenny identifies as the real threats to children, namely loose gun control legislation and pedophilic members of religious institutions.

Two strikingly similar points, namely hatred of children and allegations of pedophilia for religious institution, are also voiced by Bianca in Extract 27.

Extract 27: Catholic priests

(240) *Bianca complains about climate change until she changes the topic*  
Bianca I don't care what happens I'm a drag queen I'm not even allowed to be  
Pumps {@@@}  
Jenny {@@@}

(241)  
Bianca around children and let's just talk about that for a minute I don't like  
fuckin- children are the worst I often say I'm not a fan of

(242)  
Bianca children I'm not a Catholic priest leave me alone (.) go to the church  
Pumps {@@@}  
Jenny {@@@}

(243)  
Bianca talk to the- clean that house before you try to clean ours=  
Pumps {silently chuckling}  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@} =no it is-

Bianca's joke in Extract 27 is similarly dependent on shock value. In an utterance that echoes the previous sentiments, Bianca points out that she is not allowed near kids referencing the much-discussed Republican drag bans (see Squirrel & Davey, 2023). In reaction, she voices her own dislike of children and then her humorous turn commences. Bianca, who is also a successful comedian, starts with the phrase "I often say" (stave 241) which marks the forthcoming statement as humorous, performative utterance, likely part of Bianca's stand-up routine. The actual humorous content identifies an affinity for children with Catholicism and simultaneously distances Bianca's identity from that group of people as she explicitly states, "I'm not a Catholic priest" (stave 242). Jenny and Pumps react to her statement with ample laughter to signal both their support and acknowledging the humor of her statement. Bianca's final statement in the Extract "clean that house before you try to clean ours" echoes the stance Jenny expressed in (the previous) Extract 26, effectively summarizing that there are more serious issues at hand and the focus on drag queens serves mainly as a distraction. This, however, was only Bianca's first joke linking Catholicism to child abuse. The second can be found in Extract 28.

Extract 28: Catholic lawsuit

(287)  
Bianca (.) and sending children to the church (.) gi:rl I don't know if you  
Pumps agree

(288)  
Bianca know this but I have a lawsuit against the Catholic church because when

(289)  
Bianca I was an altar boy nobody fucked me and I'm furious about it  
Pumps {@@@}  
Jenny {@@@}

In her second joke denigrating the Catholic church, the humor once again stems from incongruity and shock value. Similar to her first joke, Bianca opens her humorous turn with a conversational discourse marker that, within the context of her being a stand-up comedian, signals an incoming joke “I don’t know if you know this” (staves 288-289). The jest that follows presents a true anecdote of Bianca’s life with a provocative point. The incongruity lies in the lawsuit not being about sexual abuse but its absence. Bianca alleges wanting to be sexually abused by a priest as a child and laments not having had the experience, subverting the expectations of the listeners. The implicature created by this joke is that expecting to be sexually abused as a child is a reasonable expectation to have. While Bianca also portrays herself as lascivious in this instance, the Catholic clergy remain the clear perpetrators. Pumps and Jenny support her joke with laughter.

The final instance of Catholic denigration is voiced by Katya in Extract 29.

Extract 29: Catholic architecture

(195)  
 Katya thing I will give to the Catholics is that they did um Saint Peter’s  
  
 (196)  
 Katya basilica is off the- off the hook [they preserved]  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@} the architec[ture is A plus]  
  
 (197)  
 Katya art the architecture and the art is fabulous [the] kid fucking not-  
 Jenny [it-]  
  
 (198)  
 Katya [don’t love that] [no{laughing}]  
 Pumps [not so great]  
 Jenny [no the] Catholics

The interaction in Extract 29 precedes and informs the conversation about megachurches in Extract 23. Similarly to Jenny’s comment in the context of Extract 23, the only area in which Katya can muster a compliment for the Catholic church is architecture, with “Saint Peter’s basilica [being] off the hook” (stave 195-196). This in itself stands as a condemnation of Catholic beliefs and doctrine which seem to not even be worth mentioning to Katya. The condemnation is taken a step further with Katya voicing her disdain for the child sexual abuse (stave 197). The stark contrast and conversational tone of the interaction that so far only involved discussing pleasant topics like architecture render her rather extreme statement humorous. The other striking incongruity in this exchange are the hedged utterances “not so great” and “don’t love that”, which would be more appropriate for discussing unpleasant weather instead of condemning child rape. However, it is this very incongruity in tone that adds

to the humor of Katya’s contribution, who cannot help laughing at her own and Pumps’ mild disapproval. In spite of the exaggeratedly casual tone, the collaborative overlap in stave 198 still signals disagreement with the practices of the religious which continues to be perceived as the out-group.

### 5.5. Voicing

In contrast to the more straightforward examples of disparagement humor described so far, the humor described in the five Extracts that follow lies in the parodistic use of voice used to establish the outgroup. This parodying of the out-group has the same effect of more conventional disparagement humor, namely denigrating the out-group while establishing in-group solidarity. This parodistic voicing is markedly different to the normal conversational speaking voice of the speakers and is recognizable by voicing contrast and discourse markers. Since the voice quality of the parodied constructed speech sections is consistently high in pitch and has saliently aspirated elements, I am referring to this style as “fundy baby voice” as it matches the descriptors detailed in Cameron (2024). This moniker stands for fundamentalist baby voice, indicating the religious fundamentalism of the speaker and the high pitch of the voice. Incidentally, it only refers to a recognizable, enregistered voice used by women, most often conservative politicians, and is used to shame their speech behavior (Cameron, 2024). Further, all five instances of voicing effects in constructed speech involve the detailed characterization of the subject of parody in the immediate co-text. In four of these cases this subject is an entire social group, meaning the voicing functions as choral dialogue, as first exemplified in Extract 30.

Extract 30: Indoctrination in schools

(393)

Ginger no

Jenny media hhh but it’s starting to seep out everywhere hhh and these people they’re so mad at like- I’m like you really want to pick on a transgendered kid/ do you not think that kid’s having a hard enough time/ navigating school/ to have fucking Vicky and Brenda at the school board screaming pulling her hair out by the root does that make you feel good does it make you feel like a good Christian to pick on the transgendered kid and it’s just mindboggling (.) how these <people of faith> that should be <fighting this fight> are the **persecutors** (.) they are the **oppressors** and we live- I mean you’re- you’re from the South you know th- that these type of people (.) we live around it but here’s the part where it gets covert hhh is where you have people in polite society you know in the white suburbs or or in the white- nice white neighborhoods hhh that (.) say racist things under their breath (.) and then they say things like (.) well I wanna make sure that my kids aren’t getting indoctrinated in school with all this <gender identity stuff>{fundy baby voice} and they say these things and that’s the covert whispers that is getting to where this thing is catching on like a

(394)  
 Ginger =absolutely hhh well and I've even noticed it like my- my  
 Jenny wildfire=

In Extract 30, Jenny's short stretch of voicing during her long uninterrupted turn is marked by a different voice quality than the surrounding utterances. It is perceptibly lower in volume, slightly higher in pitch and characterized by a larger degree of aspiration. Most of her turn is dedicated to defining the group she is about to animate with her use of voicing, starting with "these people they're so mad" (stave 393). She goes on to cite two members of this group with the generic names "Vicky" and "Brenda", and then gives the entire group a label, namely "people of faith" (stave 393). Members of this out-group are actively characterized as being oppressors and prosecutors (stave 393), as well as depicted as being irrationally emotional, by virtue of pulling their hair out. In contrast to her condemnation of people of faith, Jenny sympathizes with transgender children saying they are "having a hard enough time" (stave 393). The section of fundy baby voice that follows the discourse marker "they say things like" (stave 393) is used to equate even more innocuous-seeming behavior, like calmly alleging that discussions about gender constitute indoctrination, with the irrational behavior detailed before. In fact, Jenny points out that these covert admissions are even more dangerous and by delivering the irrational discourse in the calm fundy baby voice, it helped this highly problematic discourse gain some social acceptability. In a similar way to more overt instances of humor, Jenny's parodistic use of the fundy baby voice is met with support from her interlocutors, with Ginger first giving affirmation and then elaborating on Jenny's contribution. The support of her interlocutors is also important in Extract 31.

Extract 31: Lauren Boebert

(278)  
 Bianca [uh huh]  
 Pumps can't [stand her]  
 Jenny I've had it with her (.) [but all the] shit she's doing right now all

(279)  
 Bianca [as you should]  
 Jenny this hypocrisy hhh I just want to keep making notes so [when I run into]

(280)  
 Jenny all these Bible study Christians that are like oh I don't have a problem with gays{soft voice} I want to be like you think you're so pro kid (.) and you think that you're okay with gays but then you go and vote (.) one way and you're voting for morons just like this (.)

The discussion of Lauren Boebert's sexual exploits during a musical theatre show in Extract 31 is marked by the agreement of opinion among the speakers. This assent is signaled by Bianca's backchanneling and Pumps' reiteration of Jenny's sentiment in stave 278. Bianca

further supports Jenny in stave 279, in which she affirms Jenny’s figurative desire to keep track of Boebert’s misdeeds. In contrast to these displays of in-group solidarity, the out-group is clearly defined as “these Bible study Christians” while the impending parodistic use of voicing as a choral dialogue is marked by the discourse marker *like*. The announced constructed speech in stave 280 is characterized by a markedly higher pitch than Jenny’s surrounding talk, albeit lacking some of the more aspirated elements of her other voiced performances. Content-wise, the constructed speech highlights Jenny’s perceived hypocrisy of conservatives who outwardly project being open toward select minority groups, while their political engagement signals the opposite. She continues by foregrounding the connection between Christians and Republicans, notably stressing voting behavior as indication of political identity. In Extract 32, Jenny uses the same voice again but introduces a new discourse.

Extract 32: Gay hairdressers

(253)  
 Bianca tell me  
 Jenny and let me tell you what I’ve had it with the most (.) this is what

(254)  
 Jenny really chaps my fucking hide are the women that look like Pumps and me and when they’re in certain social circles oh no I have a gay friend or my hairdresser’s gay{high-pitched voice} but when they go to vote (.)

(255)  
 Bianca [uh huh]  
 Jenny [they] vote an entirely different way and I think the gays should ban the straights that do this from all services {gesturing a cross motion} all entertainment {gesturing a cross motion} that the gays do they need to ban these duplicitous straight people because I’ve had it with them=

Extract 32 begins with the establishment of the to-be parodied group, which Jenny sets up to be “women that look like Pumps and me” (stave 254). While on a superficial level this simile might indicate a deeper connection between the hosts and white, blonde middle-aged women, the constructed speech in stave 254 suggests otherwise. Here, Jenny echoes her sentiment of Extract 31 by criticizing the hypocritical statements of conservative women purporting to support gay rights but simultaneously voting for a political party whose goal is to abolish those very rights. Further, by suggesting that gay creatives “ban these duplicitous straight people” (stave 255) from their shows, Jenny aligns herself with gay people and thus with Bianca, a gay man when out of drag, rather than the parodied straight women that resemble her. Her support of gay rights, however, is complicated by the actual content of the voiced parody section: while the “gay friend” (stave 254) mirrors the function of “I don’t have a problem with gays” (stave 280) in Extract 31, the novel addition is the discourse of the hairdresser as the stereotypical occupation for a gay man. While this discourse can perpetuate harmful stereotypes that may

lead to flamboyant gay men being perceived as less competent than masculine ones (Fingerhut & Peplau, 2006: 274), Jenny’s usage is not overtly malicious. Most likely, the setting of a hair salon is a plausible way for Jenny to imagine conservative women encountering gay people. A similar invocation of gay hairdressers can be found in Extract 33.

Extract 33: Bobby does my hair

(375)  
 Ginger turns out to be (.) nothing=  
 Pumps = [right]  
 Jenny = [well] and I think I read somewhere I don’t

(376)  
 Jenny know if this was in your emails to us or if it was an article when I was googling that you talked about and >I think this is really interesting< (.) **overt** (.) attacks on the LGBTQ community hhh and **covert** (.) attacks (.) and there are both like the Republican party in Texas recently put into their platform that uh homosexuals- it was an abnormal (.) **lifestyle choice** and that is in (.) the (.) **Republican** (.) **party** (.) **platform** that is an (.) overt attack in (.) documents hhh and you still have people that probably live in very urban areas that could sit in this conversation with us that say oh no I’m a- I’m a Texas Republican but you know Bobby over here does my hair and I’ve loved him for

(377)  
 Ginger uh huh  
 Jenny years{dainty voice} and you’re just like (.) well are you loving Bobby/

(378)  
 Jenny are you/ when you go vote and you vote for that type of hateful (.) platform that says this is an **abnormal** (.) lifestyle choice like is that

Extract 33 similarly lacks a religious aspect, as Jenny is now fully focused on the political angle. As the preceding Extracts already showed, voting as mentioned in stave 378 is one of the most salient factors of political identity for Jenny. She also uses overt labels to define the parodied group several times in stave 376, with the political label of the parodied party being part of the voiced utterance: “I’m a Texas Republican”. The constructed speech is marked by “people [...] that say” with the voicing again being characterized by a higher pitch, and slightly more aspiration than in Jenny’s casual speaking voice. Overall, this instance of voicing repeats the same pattern that all previous instances of Jenny’s parodistic fundy baby voice share: exposing hypocrisy in the out-group while eliciting the support of her immediate listeners. Further, the gay hairdresser stereotype is once again mentioned in stave 376. One of the more interesting and less formulaic instances of parodistic voicing, however, is found in Extract 34.

Extract 34: Go to hell

(344)  
 Ginger just as much of a sinner as I am bitch=  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny =well and you know what it is

(345)  
 Jenny Pumps will remember this we want a- went on a girls' trip hhh to Santa Fe New Mexico and there was this gal and she was a big bible thumper hhh but of course she was against you know healthcare for

(346)  
 Ginger uh huh  
 Jenny poor people (.) she was against gay people and she gets kind of

(347)  
 Jenny schnoekered (.) and she's like so you don't go to church Jennifer{accusatory voice} and I'm like no I don't I'm an atheist and she starts just screaming in my face you're going to go to hell you're going to burn in hell{strained voice} and I was just like god it seems

(348)  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@  
 Jenny like your Christianity really gives you a sense of serenity (.) I mean

(349)  
 Ginger {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} [yes]  
 Pumps @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@  
 Jenny she was such a bitch she was such a [total] shortsighted bitch I still

(350)  
 Jenny cannot stand her to this day I think what a phony fake person and I see these hypocrites on display every single day and I'm incapable of being friends with them

Extract 34 once again foregrounds the religiosity of the parodied person with her political identity being heavily implied to be Republican, as she is said to be against healthcare for poor and against gay people (staves 345-346). The two instances of constructed speech are marked by “she’s like” (stave 347) and “screaming in my face” (stave 347). Jenny’s voicing differs across both instances: the first voiced section just encompasses a slightly higher pitch paired with slight shoulder movements to signal an air of mocking mimicry. The second parodistic piece, imitating this devout albeit hostile woman screaming, is characterized by a deeper, hoarse voice. The contrast between both voiced impersonations enables the reading that the sweet, higher voice might just be an act, while the hateful, strained voice then exposes the speaker’s actual persona, which is supported by Jenny’s elaboration in stave 350. Jenny’s own line in the constructed dialogue “no I don’t I’m an atheist” (stave 347) is perceptibly deeper than the parodies and projects nonchalance. Like the previous voiced parodies, Extract 34 is an example of ridiculing conservatives for their hypocrisy, which is highlighted by Jenny’s comment about serenity. This joke in stave 348, which is followed by Bianca’s and Pumps’ laughter in stave 349, implies that the purpose of religion if engaged with correctly is to provide peace of mind. Since the “total shortsighted bitch” (stave 349) is unable to display this calmness of mind, her co-opting of Christian belief for hatred is implied to be a wrong application of belief that stands in contrast with the image the parodied speaker likely wants to project.

## 5.6. The reappropriation of discourses

The discourses established using humorous statements warrant further discussion, especially since the reappropriation of discourses was apparent throughout. The smart discourse, the ‘sexualizing the Republicans’ discourse and the ‘priests as molesters’ discourse all constitute inversions of established conservative discourses, with one new example that distorts right-wing discourses around women’s bodily autonomy underlining the prevalence of the reclamation of discourses by Jenny and Pumps.

### 5.6.1. Smart discourse

The smart discourse, used in humorous exchanges to insult, is also present in sincere, non-humorous exchanges, like the discussion of the political typology quiz in Extract 35, which overtly links the physical beauty and intelligence discourses.

Extract 35: Our listeners are smart ... and good-looking

(508)  
Pumps I love [that] >they are  
smart<  
Jenny =you know what/ (.) [our-] our followers are smart (.) our  
Kiley followers=  
(509)  
Jenny listeners are smart (.) they’re locked in they are (.) positive smart  
(510)  
Pumps [=and good-looking] I have  
Jenny and cynical [=and good-looking]  
Kiley and good-looking= gorgeous  
(511)  
Pumps noticed [that] at the (.) uh live shows [everybody’s] smart and  
Jenny [yeah] [that was-]  
(512)  
Pumps attractive

As becomes apparent in Extract 35, the hosts and Kiley are establishing a discourse about the in-group, listeners of the podcast, that stands in direct opposition to the discourse about the out-group. During the short, very collaborative, exchange, they call their followers smart four times and compliment their physical appearance a cumulative five times by using the adjectives “good-looking,” “gorgeous” and “attractive.” While this interaction involves some comedic hyperbole as there is a playful angle to the overwhelming praise, they do not seem to be fully joking, because that would likely be read as an insult by their audience. Overall, this conversation establishes that physical beauty and being smart are strongly linked.

What exactly is meant by *smart* can be gleaned from Extract 36, in which Jenny discusses Joel Osteen (who was already topic of discussion in Extract 23):

Extract 36: Joel Osteen

(41) 2:45 -3:03  
Jenny some people think they have a purpose like maybe that Joel Osteen  
Pumps right

(42)  
Jenny and he thinks his purpose (.) is you know spreading the gospel or whatever  
but smart people like you and me: know that his purpose is to rake in billions  
of dollars

In Extract 36, Jenny utters the words “smart people like you and me”, which instantly creates a defined in-group consisting of Jenny and Pumps with the likely inclusion of their listeners as they are, like their guests, assumed to share their view. Jenny’s version of smartness includes a sense of honesty and self-reflection, which Joel Osteen seemingly lacks by being unable to know his true purpose. Effectively, this excludes the hypocritical religious conservatives, who in Jenny’s portrayals rarely appear forthright about their goals or views, from being smart. By connecting this exclusion to these religious conservatives’ refusal to swear, an activity which for Jenny and Pumps is also linked to intelligence (see Extract 9), Jenny implies their stupidity. Further, Jenny overtly points toward Joel Osteen’s hypocrisy in regard to his motives, spreading the gospel versus money, which means that smartness for Jenny also has to do with political savvy as she uses her own to unearth conservative hypocrisies. The fact that the religious and political out-group cannot possibly be said to be smart is overtly stated in Extract 37 by Katya:

Extract 37: Stupid people making stupid laws

(152)  
Jenny stupid people making stupid laws about drag queens and I think that is

(153)  
Katya yeah I mean I just- it- it’s truly puzzling and I think  
Pumps [well said]  
Jenny so [simply put]

(154)  
Katya like there’s this uh such a- such a bizarre combination of- of

(155)  
Katya stupidity and um ambition with these people [y’know] like they’re so  
Pumps [ye:s]  
Jenny [yeah]

(156)  
Katya fucking stupid but they’re so fucking motivated (.) that for like a  
Pumps [right]  
Jenny [totally]

(157)  
Katya liberal person it's kind of hard to understand {@@@} I always  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(158)  
Katya equated stupidity or ignorance with like (.) inaction [laziness right]  
Pumps [right]  
Jenny laziness [right]

(159)  
Katya (.) but these people are fully motivated by the bible{Southern accent}  
Pumps right {@@@@@}  
Jenny yeah

In Extract 37, Katya talks about initially connecting stupidity with laziness, ignorance and inaction but having to reassess her standpoint after witnessing the ambition of Bible thumpers. Despite their drive, however, they remain stupid, an adjective that features five times in one form or another in this short exchange to describe the Biblically motivated. While this contrasts well with the previous assertions of the in-group intelligence, there are competing discourses about intelligence for different purposes throughout the data. For instance, Trixie's and Bianca's playful in-group insulting intentionally paints drag queens as shallow to counteract Republican discourses about drag queens being evil masterminds. Incidentally, in all of Jenny's and Pumps' interactions in the selected data, Republican or religious conservatives are never portrayed in a way that implied intelligence even in a conniving, negative way.

Overall, while this discourse that intentionally overstates the in-group's intelligence and beautiful appearance is clearly playful to contrast the Republicans who have been well established to be both stupid and ugly, it might yet have a more sinister edge. It paints beauty as a hallmark of moral righteousness with ugliness being a physical manifestation of corruption. Incidentally, conflating appearance and character has theological roots, as Cielontko and Zámečník (2023: 16) cite several historical Protestant discourses linking ugliness not just with demonic forces but with a "defective human character". Cielontko and Zámečník (2023: 17-18) further explicate how this discourse used as a propagandistic tool was wielded by Nazis against Jews. While Jenny and Pumps' reappropriated use of the discourse cannot be compared with National Socialist propaganda in the slightest, it makes clear that this playful discourse that they are treating like a joke can be extremely dangerous if taken to the extreme. Harnessing this discourse as a genocidal weapon further necessitates vast political supremacy, which neither Jenny, Pumps nor the Democratic party have in the current state of affairs. Thus, this reappropriated discourse takes on the form of rebellion, becoming a tool of resistance against oppressive conservatives who are continuously stripping marginalized groups of their rights.

### 5.6.2. Sexualization & Molester discourse

The ‘Sexualizing the Republicans’ discourse that also closely connects to the ‘priests as molesters’-discourse is likewise the subject of serious conversations and reflections. The interaction in Extract 38, for instance, involves speculation about how religious indoctrination leads to sexual repression and thus the alleged rich sexual lives of conservatives.

Extract 38: Right-wing indoctrination

- (170)  
Katya the- the- the absolutely bloodthirsty capitalism I understand (.) the  
Pumps {nods}  
Jenny right
- (171)  
Katya not wanting to think about a hundred years from now and focus on making  
profits today I understand but the women’s bodies thing/ the mor- the the  
sexuality morality
- (172)  
Katya thing/ (.) I [don’t] why  
Jenny [I’ll tell] you why (.) cause- okay so I wasn’t raised
- (173)  
Jenny with religion at all so I was zero indoctrinated my parents were
- (174)  
Katya okay  
Jenny atheists okay but I lived and grew up in the Bible Belt a:nd these
- (175)  
Jenny people that are raised and indoctrinated- that’s where the indoctrination is  
they’re indoctrinated in this right wing form of christianity and the number  
one thing that they shame is sex because
- (176)  
Katya right  
Jenny it’s the one thing they can’t control (.) it’s a control thing because
- (177)  
Jenny the one thing that religion picked (.) to shame is the one thing that  
Katya true  
Jenny we’re genetically encoded to do

Extract 38 commences with Katya wondering about the strict rules about sexuality Republicans seem so attached to, while their capitalist and anti-environmentalist stances lead to no bafflement (Staves 170-171). Jenny, in response, contributes with her understanding of religious indoctrination that uses shame as a lever to manipulate sex framed as a primitive urge, as that is the only means by which to exert control over their congregations. Similar musings that seek to justify the latent lasciviousness of Republicans the hosts keep mentioning can be found in Extract 39.

Extract 39: Gigi is a better person

(537)  
Gigi yeah  
Jenny such a double exploitation because (.) <I was as shocked as shit> when I found out how many quote on quote straight men{airquotes} frequent

(538)  
Gigi uh huh  
Jenny (.) Grindr (.) gay bars and these other apps that are (.) at church (.)

(539)  
Jenny a:nd you know trot out- you know they're probably the type of guys that

(540)  
Gigi [yes] [oh my go:d  
Pumps [right]  
Jenny do those family photos with the AR-15s you know [fucked] up [with the

(541)  
Gigi ye:s] [a hundred percent]  
Pumps [crazy ass people]  
Jenny kids got em] you know they're probably doin some

(542)  
Gigi [they] a:re (.) and it- and- and at a  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny butt stuff I mean you just know [it] {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(543)  
Gigi certain point it's like I think the initia:l reaction especially from within the community is to is- is kind of (.) hatred and disgust towards that but I feel really bad for these (.) men because uh clearly

(544)  
Gigi they have a life (.) that is so repressed [and] you know their beliefs  
Jenny [yeah]

(545)  
Gigi have been just like pummeled into them week after week month after month year after year\ and now it's- it's really led to: (.) it- it's almost been forced out of them like they have to- they have to get this off their- out of their system in order to feel like they are of sound

(546)  
Gigi mind and >I don't know< I just feel bad for them= [it's like  
Pumps =[you're] a [better  
Jenny =[hhh I-]

(547)  
Gigi god]  
Pumps per]son than me [because] I think they're a bunch of hypocrites=  
Jenny [I-] =I see

Extract 39 sees Jenny discussing the out-group, which in this instance is clearly defined as conservatives who are secretly using gay dating sites like Grindr while also attending church. This religious group is linked to the Republican party not just by virtue of their religiosity but with a mention of AR-15 ownership, which functions as a symbol of the lax gun control legislation favored by Republicans. Jenny's joke about butt stuff that follows to her own and Pumps' amusement (stave 542), incidentally, does not seem to be successfully humorous for Gigi. She, instead, launches into a more heartfelt self-disclosure kind of turn, sharing her own

feelings (stave 543). However, their differing views do not engender hostility, as Gigi's listening behavior is marked by supportive backchanneling, which occurs 5 times during Jenny's turn from staves 537-541. Pumps even admits that Gigi is a better person than her because she herself thinks these conservatives are hypocrites. Gigi's more compassionate theory on the sexual hypocrisy and repression marked by the unique combination of homophobia and homosexual desire, is indoctrination as a child, whether it be via literal or figurative pummeling (stave 545).

Violence experienced in childhood is also invoked by Katya in Extract 40, whose turn about child sexual assault in the Catholic Church serves as a link to the priests as molesters discourse.

Extract 40: Vatican hookers

(185)  
 Katya whatever whatever and we all know that priests I mean [d- d-]  
 Pumps [are the] worst

(186)  
 Katya [all the-] are the worst offenders{high-pitched} I have a friend in  
 Pumps [offenders]

(187)  
 Katya Italy who's like you would- you would die if you knew about the hooker

(188)  
 Katya activity at the Vatican like you have [no li- you have no idea]  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}[and it's probably both]

(189)  
 Katya [it's all men] it's all men [it's all men]  
 Pumps right  
 Jenny both genders I mean you know [it's probably] [but here's the deal]

(190)  
 Katya well they're yeah- they're  
 Pumps yeah  
 Jenny that's better than the fucking kids

(191)  
 Katya fucking kids at the Vatican too [you know they're] nasty and crazy [it  
 Pumps [it's just so sad] [crazy]

Katya portrays priests not only as the worst offenders of child sexual assault but focuses on Catholicism by mentioning the high prostitute activity in the Vatican. Like in Extract 19, despite highly collaborative conversational strategies, with Pumps completing Katya's utterance in stave 185, there is a slight humorous disconnect between the hosts and Katya. As the hosts laugh after Katya's turn in stave 188, she is more serious and keeps elaborating on the topic, eventually linking the covert promiscuity of the conservatives to child sexual assault, contributing to the priests as molesters discourse.

Incidentally, this discourse of sexual indulgence and perversion directly mirrors conservative discourse about gay people, with the molester discourse that alleges pedophilia reappropriating especially homophobic Republican talking points (Blain, 2005: 38). These narratives of gay men, trans people and drag queens as child predators are based on disinformation (Marwick et al., 2024: 460). The goal of these conservative discourses and the current moral panic around drag queens never was to present facts but to “justif[y] bigoted and authoritarian legislation, attempting to instate rigid adherence to gender norms completely at odds with the reality of modern life” (Marwick et al., 2024: 476). Therein also lies the difference between the Republican discourse and such allegations against members of the church. The established discourse of priests as molesters is backed by physical data to a certain extent (Denney, 2023; Raine & Kent, 2019), which is unavailable for the Republican version of the discourse as it simply does not exist.

### 5.6.3. Bodily autonomy

The reappropriation being a constant in the discourses covered so far is no coincidence but instead might be an overt goal of Jenny and Pumps. This is indicated in Extract 41, in which they discuss a Viagra advert.

Extract 41: The individually wrapped Viagra commercial

- (582)  
Pumps no one even wants to consider how a woman would feel if she’s forced to carry a pregnancy that A could kill her B the child’s not viable or C she’s just not ready in her life hhh nobody’s interested in all that
- (583)  
Pumps (.) we wanna regulate all that I wanna get inside those scrotums like  
Jenny no
- (584)  
Pumps we’re inside the uterus: and I think that we’d have a lot of change I think the balance would shift if we all decided (.) you know what/ if you knock somebody up we’re going to give you a (.) vasectomy hhh and
- (585)  
Pumps you have no control over it=  
Jenny =you wanna jump in that scrotum=  
= I wanna jump
- (586)  
Pumps in that scrotum=  
Jenny =you wanna get in that scrotum=  
=I wanna get in that

This Extract is taken from an exchange that started with Jenny complaining about an advert about individually wrapped Viagra pills and comparing it to women’s reproductive autonomy (staves 553-581; see appendix). Jenny and Pumps then elaborate on abortion rights and how they are governed by the Supreme Court but men get to have lengthy advertisements. They

also point out that there does not seem to be comparable stigma in regard to Viagra as there is regarding Plan B or female contraception. Extract 41, then commences with Pumps voicing her interest in the active reversal of these circumstances, which also encompasses the discourses around that topic. This is made overt by her saying to “get inside those scrotums like they are inside the uterus” (stave 583-584). What also emerges from this interaction further underlines that collaborative humorous strategies, like the continuous repetition of the phrase “I wanna jump in that scrotum” in staves 585-586, accompany even more serious discussions. This humorous line in particular approaches the perversity of Donald Trump’s famous “grab them by the pussy” comment. Thus, Pumps – who, while by no means timid, is the most reticent speaker in the selected data – reappropriates this deeply misogynist way of discussing women and uses it to talk in the same way about men. Hence, binary gender still is very relevant for Pumps as a resource. Like their application of the smart discourse, Pumps’ lack of political power enables a reading of this deeply offensive and derogatory way of speaking about men as an act of rebellion rather than emanating the same oppressive force of Trump’s statement.

## **6. Discussion**

In order to summarize my findings and discuss their implications, I will now revisit the research questions that were presented as part of the Methodology section.

### **6.1. How are swearing, humor, and voicing leveraged in these interactions to enhance speakers’ political identity?**

Two things all three analytical categories have in common are simultaneous in-group enhancement and out-group denigration. Using Zschirnt’s (2011: 687). conception of political identity as depending on attitudes toward reference groups, this constitutes a direct act of identity construction. Swearing as a practice is characterized by the overt denigration of conservatives while the act of using swear words establishes solidarity. Humor and voicing work in slightly more subtle ways to denigrate the out-group by implicature and insinuation but were occasionally used to launch overt attacks.

### **6.2. How do the discourses invoked by these three features aid in constructing a particular political identity?**

The use of discourses is marked by reappropriation. Jenny, Pumps, and their guests employ conservative, repressive discourses against Republicans. Similar to their use of swearing,

humor, and voicing, this act of denigrating the political out-group leads to in-group solidarity via the co-development of these discourses, signaling agreement, and affirming each others' beliefs.

### **6.3. In what way does the status of these three features as aspects of women's language contribute to the construction of political identity?**

Jenny and Pumps' speech behavior subverts the norms recorded by Lakoff (1975/2004): they swear, they joke, they parody overtly feminine voices. Their non-compliance to WL distances them from the out-group, who are not only characterized by their refusal to use swear words but also depend on traditional stereotypes of femininity. Their refusal to bow to oppressive stereotypes divorces them from being perceived as religious and complacent in spite of their appearance (see Extract 32). This denial of norms also plays an important role in their self-perception. For instance, they perceive swearing as a marker of intelligence and even political moral purity.

### **6.4. Are there any marked differences in register between the hosts and their guests and how does this affect constructions of political identity?**

The majority of drag artists guests are also avid users of swear words and seem to share the hosts' sense of humor. On an observable level, they laugh at the same things and heighten each other's humoristic turns. Only one guest noticeably did not seem to share this register, or did so to a lesser extent, namely Gigi. As was briefly covered in the discussion of Extract 39, she does not laugh at the mention of "butt stuff" (stave 542), which Jenny and Pumps find wildly amusing. Moreover, in the sequence she features in, Gigi never swears. This contrast coincides with a difference in attitude toward the out-group, with Gigi approaching closeted, conservative men with compassion, where Jenny and Pumps call them hypocrites (see Extract 39). Despite this difference in their progressive political identities, Gigi and the hosts disagree amicably, and their interaction is characterized by highly collaborative strategies, like backchanneling and joint topic development similar to the hosts' conversations with the other drag artists. This indicates that there are multiple valid ways of constructing a leftist political persona and no one true register to perfectly index one political identity.

## **6.5. Limitations**

The approaches I utilized were not without their limitations, in fact, the reliance of CA and CDA on the analyst's knowledge make them above all limited. Furthermore, while the data spans eight months, each recording takes up an hour of the subjects' day at most, meaning the representativity of the data for the overall speech behavior of each speaker is questionable. Beyond that, I was very selective with the data, choosing only overtly political sequences, which disregards political identity on a more covert level. Moreover, while the data is naturally occurring and takes the form of casual conversation, the added context of podcasting adds a layer of performance to even mundane habits. The hosts swearing, for instance, might be intentionally frequent for them to profit off the attention-drawing shock value of uttering taboo words and not represent "authentic" speech behavior of Democrats.

## **7. Conclusion**

In conclusion, swearing, humor and voicing, all strongly overlapping phenomena in the data, were used for several purposes. The most notable are in-group enhancement by building solidarity and fostering agreement, and the simultaneous out-group denigration by insulting said out-group, as well as portraying them as mentally inept, emotionally volatile, morally corrupt, and hypocritical. Swearing emerged as a particularly notable practice, as it is widely disapproved of by conservative Republicans and is thus considered uniquely smart and Democratic by the two hosts.

Common discourses established in the data were the smart discourse, which connects outward appearance and intelligence, the 'sexualizing the Republicans' discourse, and discourses about religion. The smart discourse equates intelligence with physical beauty in the in-group, while linking stupidity with ugliness in the out-group. The sexualizing the Republicans discourse alleges that conservatives preach water but drink wine sexually speaking and the discourses about religion denigrate megachurches while portraying priests as molesters to invalidate the church as a spiritual institution.

Overall, reappropriation seems to be a common theme that is both found in the swearing behavior, which included reclaiming slurs, and in the discourses that are invoked, which revolve around the reclamation of certain discourses, like the smart discourse and the sexualizing discourse. While some discourses, like the smart discourse have tyrannical origins and applications, their being used by Jenny and Pumps instead works as resistance and rebellion

against oppressive conservative forces. A specific discourse regarding reproductive rights further points to this reappropriation being intentional to some extent on the part of the hosts.

To fill the gaps left by this project, either a quantitative survey or a large-scale analysis of public speech data would be necessary. The survey ought to target the speech behavior of Democrats in regard to humor, swearing and voicing and would ideally be followed by qualitative interviews on a smaller scale. The analysis of speech data would encompass finding public figures who are aligned with the Democratic party, albeit not actual politicians, and sampling clips of them speaking casually in similar contexts. In the next analytic step this data could be coded to account for humoristic turns, swearing and voicing, which might enable statements on an actual Democrat register that would be more founded than ones based on the present research. Finally, while this project provided insight into the in-group enhancing activities of leftist Democrats, it would be interesting to see what a similar demographic of Republicans would discuss, which discourses they would produce, and what conversational strategies they employ. It would also be relevant to compare a range of different genders across political affiliation to gain insight into whether conservatives exhibit more stereotypical gendered speech behavior than more liberal groups. Furthermore, a more focused linguistic inquiry into fundy baby voice as an enregistered voice is necessary.

Word count 35.896-5.995 Extracts) = 29.901

## 8. References

### Primary Sources

- I've Had It Podcast. (2023a, June 8). *Is It Still Mansplaining if You're in Drag? With Delta Work* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6IHlfDKGzil>
- I've Had It Podcast. (2023b, July 27). *Death is a Total Racket with Trixie Mattel* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AWmTVJ7VHCg>
- I've Had It Podcast. (2023c, September 26). *Stupid Straight People Stuff with Katya* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JGLjEOX3m3E>
- I've Had It Podcast. (2023d, October 17). *Different Strokes with Bianca Del Rio* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8XhtBZm4peY>
- I've Had It Podcast. (2023e, November 21). *A Gaytheist with Ginger Minj* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XkVNGyw0GHk>
- I've Had It Podcast. (2023f, December 5). *An ATM Machine of Great Ideas with Symone* [Video]. Youtube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kvho\\_VrHVCE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kvho_VrHVCE)
- I've Had It Podcast. (2023g, December 14). *Live Laugh Love with Gigi Goode* [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KgOgOwzrhHQ>
- I've Had It Podcast. (2024, January 23). *Fiercifying the Suburbs with Detox* [Video]. Youtube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1N9xMo\\_Hv\\_I](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1N9xMo_Hv_I)

### Secondary Sources

- 2016 election results: Exit polls. (2024, November 23). CNN. <http://2016.elections.cnn.com/election/2016/results/exit-polls>
- Agha, A. (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, 23, 231–173.
- Agha, A. (2005). Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 38–59. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2005.15.1.38>
- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618284>
- Alvarado, C., & Churchill, L. (2020). Radical gay agenda. In J. Pierceson (Ed.), *LGBTQ Americans in the U.S. political system: An encyclopedia of activists, voters, candidates, and officeholders* (p. 351; Vol. 2). ABC-CLIO. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798400678561>
- Attardo, S. (2015). Humor and laughter. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 167–188). Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194>
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Barnes, T. D., & Cassese, E. C. (2016). American party women: A look at the gender gap within parties. *Political Research Quarterly*, 70(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912916675738>

- Barrett, R. (1999). Indexing polyphonous identity in the speech of African American drag queens. In M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, & L. A. Sutton (Eds.), *Reinventing identities: The gendered self in discourse* (pp. 313–331). Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195126297.003.0017>
- Barrett, R. (2017). *From drag queens to leathermen: Language, gender, and gay male subcultures*. Oxford Univ. Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195390179.001.0001>
- Barrett, R., Cramer, J., & McGowan, K. B. (2022). Place-based variation in the American context. In *English with an accent* (3rd ed.). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003332886-5>
- Barrett, R., & Hall, K. (2024). Sexuality discourses: Indexical misrecognition and the politics of sex. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 53(Volume 53, 2024), 127–146.  
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-052721-092531>
- Bayard, D., & Krishnayya, S. (2001). Gender, expletive use, and context: Male and female expletive use in structured and unstructured conversation among New Zealand university students. *Women and Language*, 24(1), 1–15.
- Bing, J. (2007). Liberated jokes: Sexual humor in all-female groups. *HUMOR*, 20(4), 337–366. <https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMOR.2007.017>
- Blain, M. (2005). The politics of victimage: Power and subjection in a US anti-gay campaign. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(1), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900500052168>
- Blas-Arroyo, J. L. (2021). Indexing political identity in the Catalanian procés: A sociophonetic approach. *Language in Society*, 50(3), 411–440.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740452000072X>
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (1995). Introduction: Twenty years after Language and Woman’s Place. In K. Hall & M. Bucholtz (Eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*. (pp. 1–22). Routledge.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>
- Buie, H. S., Ford, T. E., Olah, A. R., Argüello, C., & Mendiburo-Seguel, A. (2022). Where’s your sense of humor? Political identity moderates evaluations of disparagement humor. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 25(5), 1395–1411.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430221998792>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203824979>
- Calder, J. (2020). Language, gender and sexuality in 2019: Interrogating normativities in the field. *Gender and Language*, 14(4), 429–454. <https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.18634>
- Calhoun, K., & Fawcett, A. (2023). “They edited out her nip nops”: Linguistic innovation as textual censorship avoidance on TikTok. *Language@Internet*, 21, 1–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.14434/li.v21.37371>
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Sage.
- Cameron, D. (2005). *Relativity and its discontents: Language, gender and pragmatics*. 2(3), 321–334. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2005.2.3.321>

- Cameron, D. (1997/2011). Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In *Language and Gender: A reader* (2nd ed., pp. 250–262). Wiley Blackwell.
- Cameron, D. (2018, October 11). Language and the brotherhood of men. *Language: A Feminist Guide*. <https://debuk.wordpress.com/2018/10/11/language-and-the-brotherhood-of-men/>
- Cameron, D. (2024, March 14). Fundy baby voice-shaming. *Language: A Feminist Guide*. <https://debuk.wordpress.com/2024/03/14/fundy-baby-voice-shaming/>
- Cameron, D., & Shaw, S. (2020). Constructing women's "different voice." In *Journal of Language and Politics* (Vol. 19, Issue 1, pp. 144–159). John Benjamins.
- Cassese, E. C. (2020). Straying from the flock? A look at how Americans' gender and religious identities cross-pressure partisanship. *Political Research Quarterly*, 73(1), 169–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912919889681>
- Chovanec, J., & Tsakona, V. (2018). Investigating the dynamics of humor: Towards a theory of interactional humor. In V. Tsakona & J. Chovanec (Eds.), *The Dynamics of Interactional Humor: Creating and negotiating humor in everyday encounters* (pp. 1–26). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/thr.7.01cho>
- Christie, C. (2013). The relevance of taboo language: An analysis of the indexical values of swearwords. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58, 152–169.
- Cielontko, D., & Zámečník, J. (2023). When you do not fit in: Ugliness as a theological problem. *AUC THEOLOGICA*, 12(2), 9–26.
- Clayman, S. E., & Loeb, L. (2017). Conversation analysis and the study of language and politics. In R. Wodak & B. Forchtner (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics* (pp. 276–290). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315183718-21>
- Coates, J. (1989/2011). Gossip revisited: Language in all-female groups. In J. Coates & P. Pichler (Eds.), *Language and gender: A reader* (2nd ed., pp. 199–223). Blackwell.
- Coates, J., & Pichler, P. (Eds.). (2011). *Language and gender: A reader*. (Second edition.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Coates, J. (2016). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315645612>
- Dalton, R. J. (2021). Party identification and its implications. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.72>
- Davies, C. E. (2017). Sociolinguistic approaches to humor. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Humor*. Routledge.
- Davis, D. (2008). Communication and humor. In V. Raskin (Ed.), *The Primer of Humor Research* (pp. 543–568). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198492.543>
- Denney, A. S. (2023). Child sex abusers in Protestant Christian churches: An offender typology. *Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice & Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.21428/88de04a1.000ff84d>
- Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 453–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00374.x>

- Eckert, P. (2019). The limits of meaning: Social indexicality, variation, and the cline of interiority. *Language*, 95(4), 751–776.
- Eckert, P. (2024). Social meaning. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 50(1–2), 63–70.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2024-2004>
- Exit poll results 2024 | CNN Politics*. (2024, December 13). CNN.  
<https://www.cnn.com/election/2024/exit-polls>
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2023). Critical discourse analysis. In *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 11–22). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244>
- Ferguson, M. A., & Ford, T. E. (2008). *Disparagement humor: A theoretical and empirical review of psychoanalytic, superiority, and social identity theories*. 21(3), 283–312.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMOR.2008.014>
- Filipovic, J. (2017, March 30). Mike pence’s dining “standard” reveals so much about what he thinks of women. *Cosmopolitan*.  
<https://www.cosmopolitan.com/politics/a9209120/mike-pence-dinner-alone-women/>
- Fingerhut, A. W., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). The impact of social roles on stereotypes of gay men. *Sex Roles*, 55(3), 273–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9080-5>
- Freed, A. F. (2020). Women, language and public discourse: Five decades of sexism and scrutiny. In *Innovations and Challenges: Women, Language and Sexism*. Routledge.
- Freed, A. F. (2021). The politics of difference in twenty-first century America: Women, men and language. *Gender and Language*, 15(1), 104–110.  
<https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.19527>
- Funk, M., & Speakman, B. (2022). Centrist language, camouflaged ideology: Assembled text-based content on mainstream and ideological news podcasts. *Journalism Studies*, 23(11), 1415–1433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2022.2094820>
- Gauthier, M., & Guille, A. (2017). Gender and age differences in swearing: A corpus study of Twitter. In K. Beers Fägersten & K. Stapleton (Eds.), *Advances in Swearing Research: New languages and new contexts* (pp. 137–156). John Benjamins Publishing Company.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.282.07gau>
- Goren, P. (2005). Party identification and core political values. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(4), 881–896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2005.00161.x>
- Günther, U. (2002). *What’s in a laugh? Humour, jokes and laughter in the conversational corpus of the BNC* [Doctoral thesis, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg].  
<https://freidok.uni-freiburg.de/data/735>
- Günthner, S. (1999). Polyphony and the ‘layering of voices’ in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31(5), 685–708. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00093-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00093-9)
- Günthner, S. (2008). Chapter 14. The construction of otherness in reported dialogues as a resource for identity work. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity* (pp. 419–444). De Gruyter Mouton.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198508.3.419>

- Hall-Lew, L., Coppock, E., & Starr, R. L. (2010). Indexing political persuasion: Variation in the Iraq vowels. *American Speech*, 85(1), 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-2010-004>
- Hall-Lew, L., & van Eyndhoven, S. (2025). Linguistic variation and political identity. In C. Cieri, L. Hall-Lew, K. Drager, & M. Yaeger-Dror (Eds.), *Dimensions of Linguistic Variation* (pp. 332–349). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197533499.003.0018>
- Hess, L. (2020). Practices of slur use. *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, 97(1), 86–105. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18756735-09701006>
- Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2002). Having a laugh at work: How humour contributes to workplace culture. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12), 1683–1710. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00032-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00032-2)
- Hunt, S. (2020). Introduction: The megachurch phenomenon. In S. Hunt (Ed.), *Handbook of Megachurches* (pp. 1–20). Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004412927\\_002](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004412927_002)
- James, D., & Clarke, S. (1993). Women, men, and interruption: A critical review. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 231–280). Oxford Univ. Press.
- Jane, E. A. (2014). ‘Back to the kitchen, cunt’: Speaking the unspeakable about online misogyny. *Continuum*, 28(4), 558–570. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2014.924479>
- Jarrett, K. (2009). Private talk in the public sphere: Podcasting as broadcast talk. *Communication, Politics & Culture*, 42(2), 116–135.
- Jay, T. (2005). American women: Their cursing habits and religiosity. In A. Jule (Ed.), *Gender and the language of religion* (pp. 63–84). Palgrave Macmillan UK. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523494\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523494_5)
- Jay, T. (2018). Swearing, moral order, and online communication. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 6(1), 107–126.
- Jelfs, T. (2021). Will the revolution be podcast?: Marxism and the culture of “millennial socialism” in the United States. In *Marxism and America* (pp. 241–263). Manchester University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526149770.00017>
- Johnstone, B. (2016). Enregisterment: How linguistic items become linked with ways of speaking. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 10(11), 632–643. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12210>
- Jones, T. M. (2011). Saving rhetorical children: Sexuality education discourses from conservative to post-modern. *Sex Education*, 11(4), 369–387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2011.595229>
- Khazan, O. (2017, March 30). How Pence’s Dudely Dinners Hurt Women. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/pences-gender-segregated-dinners/521286/>
- Kress, G., & Bezemer, J. (2023). Multimodal discourse analysis. In *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 139–155). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244>
- Kutz-Flamenbaum, R. V. (2014). Humor and social movements. *Sociology Compass*, 8(3), 294–304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12138>

- Lakoff, R. (1975/2004). Language and woman's place. In B. Mary (Ed.), *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries* (pp. 39–102). Oxford Univ. Press.
- Lakoff, R. (2015). 6. You say what you are: Acceptability and Gender-related Language. In S. Greenbaum (Ed.), *Acceptability in Language* (pp. 73–86). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110806656-007>
- Lakoff, R. T. (2021). The politics of misogyny and the misogyny of politics. *Gender and Language*, 15(1), 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.19525>
- Leibovich, M. (2006, January 17). *Fire in the Belly*. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/01/16/AR2006011601380.html>
- Lundström, M., & Lundström, T. P. (2021). Podcast ethnography. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 24(3), 289–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1778221>
- Marwick, A., Smith, J., Basnight, B., Boyles, D., Donnelly, M., Kaczynski, S., Ringel, E., Whitmarsh, S., & Yabase, C. (2024). Child-sacrificing drag queens: Historical antecedents in disinformative narratives supporting the drag queen story hour moral panic. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 47(4), 459–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2024.2396288>
- McEnery, A., & Xiao, Z. (2004). Swearing in modern British English: The case of fuck in the BNC. *Language and Literature*, 13(3), 235–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947004044873>
- McKinnon, S. (2017). Building a thick skin for each other: The use of 'reading' as an interactional practice of mock impoliteness in drag queen backstage talk. *Journal of Language and Sexuality*, 6(1), 90–127.
- Murray, S. O. (1979). The Art of Gay Insulting. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 21(5), 211–223.
- O'Barr, W., & Atkins, B. (1980/2011). 'Women's language' or 'powerless language'? In J. Coates & P. Pichler (Eds.), *Language and Gender. A Reader* (pp. 451–460). Blackwell.
- Ochs, E. (1993). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 335–358). Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connell, O. (2023, November 20). What happened at Lauren Boebert's infamous night at a Beetlejuice show? *The Independent*. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/lauren-boebert-theater-beetlejuice-denver-b2448089.html>
- Olson, C. S. C., & LaPoe, V. (2017). "Feminazis," "libtards," "snowflakes," and "racists": Trolling and the Spiral of Silence effect in women, LGBTQIA communities, and disability populations before and after the 2016 election. *The Journal of Public Interest Communications*, 1(2), 116–116. <https://doi.org/10.32473/jpic.v1.i2.p116>
- Parker, A. (2017, March 28). Karen Pence is the vice president's 'prayer warrior,' gut check and shield. *The Washington Post*. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/karen-pence-is-the-vice-presidents-prayer-warrior-gut-check-and-shield/2017/03/28/3d7a26ce-0a01-11e7-8884-96e6a6713f4b\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/karen-pence-is-the-vice-presidents-prayer-warrior-gut-check-and-shield/2017/03/28/3d7a26ce-0a01-11e7-8884-96e6a6713f4b_story.html)

- Pavone, L. (2024). Slur reclamation, irony, and resilience. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 20(2), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2024-0029>
- Pichler, P. (2023). ‘I’ve got a daughter now man it’s clean man’: Heteroglossic and intersectional constructions of fatherhood in the spontaneous talk of a group of young southeast London men. *Language in Society*, 52(1), 51–78. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404521000646>
- Podesva, R. J. (2007). Phonation type as a stylistic variable: The use of falsetto in constructing a persona. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(4), 478–504. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00334.x>
- Podesva, R. J., & Callier, P. (2015). Voice quality and identity. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 173–194. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000270>
- Raine, S., & Kent, S. A. (2019). The grooming of children for sexual abuse in religious settings: Unique characteristics and select case studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 48, 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2019.08.017>
- Rice, W. E., & Ford, T. E. (2023). From humor to political dispositions: Effect of disparagement humor on perceptions of political identity. *HUMOR*, 36(4), 587–605. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2023-0082>
- Riquelme, A. R., Carretero-Dios, H., Megías, J. L., & Romero-Sánchez, M. (2021). Joking for gender equality: Subversive humor against sexism motivates collective action in men and women with weaker feminist identity. *Sex Roles*, 84(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01154-w>
- Schnurr, S. (2010). Humor. In M. A. Locher & S. L. Graham (Eds.), *Interpersonal pragmatics* (pp. 307–328). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214338.2.307>
- Sforza, T. (2012, February 23). Suit: ‘Cover-ups of sexual and criminal scandals’ at TBN. *Orange County Register*. <https://www.ocregister.com/2012/02/23/suit-cover-ups-of-sexual-and-criminal-scandals-at-tbn/>
- Shaw, S. (2020). *Women, Language and Politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139946636>
- Sicoli, M. A. (2010). Shifting voices with participant roles: Voice qualities and speech registers in Mesoamerica. *Language in Society*, 39(4), 521–553.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3), 193–229. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(03\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00013-2)
- Silverstein, M. (2022). *Language in Culture: Lectures on the Social Semiotics of Language*. Cambridge University Press; Cambridge Core. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009198813>
- Squirrel, T., & Davey, J. (2023). *A year of hate: Understanding threats and harassment targeting drag shows and the LGBTQ+ community*. Institute for Strategic Dialogue. <https://www.isdglobal.org/isd-publications/a-year-of-hate-understanding-threats-and-harassment-targeting-drag-shows-and-the-lgbtq-community/>
- Stapleton, K. (2010). Swearing. In M. A. Locher & S. L. Graham (Eds.), *Interpersonal Pragmatics* (pp. 289–306). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214338.2.289>
- Stapleton, K. (2020). Swearing and perceptions of the speaker: A discursive approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 170, 381–395.

- Stapleton, K. (2003). Gender and Swearing: A Community Practice. *Women and Language*, 26(2), 22–33.
- Stapleton, K., Beers Fägersten, K., Stephens, R., & Loveday, C. (2022). The power of swearing: What we know and what we don't. *Lingua*, 277, 103406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2022.103406>
- Stross, B. (2013). Falsetto voice and observational logic: Motivated meanings. *Language in Society*, 42(2), 139–162. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740451300002X>
- Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction* (pp. 165–188). Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (Ed.). (2007). “Oh talking voice that is so sweet”: Constructing dialogue in conversation. In *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed., pp. 102–132). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618987.005>
- Tennent, E., & Weatherall, A. (2021). Feminist conversation analysis: Examining violence against women. In J. Angouri & J. Baxter (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315514857>
- Tinsley, M. (2022). ‘The opposite of nationalism’? Rethinking patriotism in US political discourse. *Identities*, 29(6), 807–826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2021.2004739>
- Williams, H. H. (2018). From family values to religious freedom: Conservative discourse and the politics of gay rights. *New Political Science*, 40(2), 246–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2018.1449064>
- Worthen, M. (2023). *Interrogating the use of LGBTQ slurs: Still smearing the queer?* Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003290506>
- Worthen, M. G. F. (2025). I’m queer but you’re a fag: Queer men’s cishnormativity, perceptions of masculinity, and their use of the “fag/faggot” slur using norm-centered stigma theory. *Sexuality & Culture*, 29(1), 38–61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-024-10283-3>
- Zekavat, M. (2017). *Satire, humor and the construction of identities*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/thr.6>
- Zschirnt, S. (2011). The origins & meaning of liberal/conservative self-identifications revisited. *Political Behavior*, 33(4), 685–701. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-010-9145-6>

## 9. Appendix – Transcribed Data

### I've Had it Transcripts

Episode	#	Sequence Title	Time	Page
1. Is It Still Mansplaining if You're in Drag? with Delta Work Timeline	1	Oklahoma	11:57-12:56	2
	2	Mike Pence, Piers Morgan, Ronald Reagan	32:33-34:17	3
	3	Post-Delta drag discussion	35:30-36:55	5
2. Death is a Total Racket with Trixie Mattel	4	Joel Osteen	02:45 - 03:03	8
	5	Swearing in Oklahoma	13:38-15:51	8
	6	Drag queens as scapegoats	24:29 - 27:57	11
	7	Open casket funerals	30:10-31:43	15
	8	Megachurches	32:22-32:52	18
	9	Oklahoma as a red state	42:24-43:31	19
3. Stupid Straight People Stuff with Katya	10	Right-wing indoctrination	33:48-38:56	23
4. Different Strokes with Bianca Del Rio	11	Centrist or Liberal?	06:18-09:16	32
	12	Catholic priests & "those" straight people	15:36-17:44	37
	13	Lauren Boebert	43:46-47:15	41
	14	Closeted lawmakers	49:38 - 53:10	47
5. A Gaytheist with Ginger Minj	15	Ginger's and Jenny's experiences with religious hate	20:55-37:16	52
6. An ATM Machine of Great Ideas with Symone	16	Mike Pence	43:51-46:00	69
	17	Sarah Huckabee Sanders	48:08-53:27	73
7. Live Laugh Love with Gigi Goode	18	Political Typology Quiz	06:58-07:48	82
	19	Floodgate	43:23-47:41	84
8. Fiercifying the Suburbs with Detox	20	Individually wrapped Viagra commercial	07:16-11:08	90
	21	Leftist idiots	12:24-13:00	95

**Is It Still Mansplaining if You're in Drag? with Delta Work Timeline**

Sequence 1: Oklahoma

(1) 11:57-12:56

Jenny well listen up listener we have a big day (.) I mean it's a big day it is Pride month a:nd we have an on brand guest and we're **so** excited to welcome to I've Had It (.) Delta Work (.) the host of the very hit podcast Very Delta (.)

(2)

Jenny Delta how are you/

Delta hi: I'm great >wait< where are you where are you in

(3)

Delta the world/

Oklahoma City/ oh

Jenny we're in Oklahoma City

Pumps

we- Oklahoma sits on

(4)

Jenny {laughter} listen Delta-

Delta =Texas (.) okay sounds like a lot of drag

Pumps top of Texas= {laughter}

(5)

Jenny we're here to fight the good fight

Delta bans to me that's all I'm hear-

Pumps

>that's

(6)

Jenny alright (.) [and] we're here here fighting the good fight

Delta >I know you are- [I know you are<]

Pumps right<

(7)

Jenny but listen we digress we're not here to be postive Delta

Delta right right {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Pumps

{@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(8)

Jenny we're here to [do-] we're here to do some shit talkin (.) okay/

Delta {@@@@@@@@} [at] all

(9)

Jenny that's what this is about it is time to air the (.) **pettiest** of

(10)

12:56

Jenny grievances= =and I'm saying the pettier the better

Pumps

=that's right=

{@@@@@@@@}

---

Sequence 2: Mike Pence, Piers Morgan, Ronald Reagan

(11) 32:33-34:17 *Pumps is setting up a game of fuck marry kill*

Pumps okay what about- I hate to do this to you Mik- Mike Pence (.)

Delta

just do it

okay

(12)

Pumps Piers Morgan (.) Ronald Reagan

Delta

y'know j- just growing up and just

(13)

Delta knowing Ronald Reagan from my <childhood> uh and not knowing until I became like

a teenager like what- what a monster he was I would say I would have to have-

marry that person just off of the knowledge of who I thought he was a cowboy

who became (.) president and like you know I know

(14)

Delta differently about that (.) but I'm going with that memory (.) that

Pumps

right

Jenny 'kay  
Delta would be who I would marry um I- uh oh god Piers Morg- I mean there's- something  
tells me that u:m- that Mike Pence h- he might be

(15)  
Delta a wild ride so (xxxxxx) Piers Morgan is just gr- he looks gross he acts  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(16)  
Delta gross I know he smells like Aqua Velva (.) get outta here gone murdered  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(17)  
Delta (.) with Caitlin Jenner  
Jenny I- I love the slap and tickle with Mike Pence  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@} I  
do

(18)  
Jenny [I- s-] I think you're right something's going  
Pumps too thinking he's a wild ride

(19)  
Jenny on there. yeah  
Delta yeah yeah I think- I also feel like he's the type of

(20)  
Delta person if he was around like maybe only Democrats he'd be like

(21)  
Delta I'm a Democrat (.) I'm a Democrat it's goo:d I don't know I remember  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(22)  
Delta like gosh when you f- mention these political figures I can remember a time when  
people were- used to say like I'm a Republican because I own a business and  
because I own this business I'm thinking like uh financially and there used to  
be- I feel like there used to be a time where we were under the impression  
that you could be uh a little mo:re progressive in your party or a little  
mo:re r:estrained in your party and like there's just- it's so weird that  
that's not a

(23)  
Delta 34:17  
Delta thing really like it's- we've been- it's been polarized  
Pumps right right agree  
Jenny yeah totally

---

Sequence 3: Post-Delta drag discussion  
(24) 35:30-36:55 Jenny and Pumps are discussing their guest after Delta has left  
Jenny love (.) [love] her she is [fantastic]  
Pumps [love] [here's the] deal (.) the people who bitch

(25)  
Pumps about drag queens and drag shows they've never been because if you've been to a  
drag show or you've met a drag queen you relaized it's like the

(26)  
Pumps happiest place on earth (.) it's so much fun it's fantastic interaction  
Jenny totally

(27)  
Pumps it's stimulating it's engaging like you cannot- it's physically impossible to  
have a

(28)

Pumps bad time (.) [at a drag show]  
 Jenny >here's the [deal< (.) it] says far more about the drag queen

(29)  
 Jenny haters (.) than it does about drag queens because we're supposed to be  
 Pumps oh agree

(30)  
 Jenny a country that values the First Amendment and freedom (.) part of that  
 Pumps right

(31)  
 Jenny is freedom of expression hhh. and any person should be able to express  
 themselves in a democratic society freely and without judgement love who they  
 want dress

(32)  
 Jenny how they want lip sync to whatever they want it doesn't fucking  
 Pumps right

(33)  
 Jenny matter I think anybody who has outspoken against drag queens is putting a red  
 flag right

(34)  
 Jenny there {mimes planting a red flag into her own skull} one thousand  
 Pumps that they're fucked up

(35)  
 Jenny percent love Delta Work I  
 mean  
 Pumps yes no she was absolutely delightful

(36)  
 Jenny absolutely **love** Delta [Work (.) we've] got to get our asses to a drag  
 Pumps [she's hilarious]

(37)  
 Jenny show  
 Pumps hhhh I know we were supposed to go next weekend and I can't go

(38)  
 Pumps because of the Luke stuff but we're gonna get one on the docket  
 Jenny on the

(39)  
 Jenny docket you hear that um that's what lawyers say that's what they call a

(40)  
 Jenny 36:55  
 Pumps calendar the docket  
 on- on the calendar

**Death is a Total Racket with Trixie Mattel**

Sequence 4: Joel Osteen

(41) 2:45 -3:03

Jenny some people think they have a purpose like maybe that Joel Osteen  
Pumps right

(42)

Jenny and he thinks his purpose (.) is you know spreading the gospel or whatever but  
smart people like you and me: know that his purpose is to rake in billions of  
dollars

(43)

Jenny tax free [so there's a lot- there's] a lot of purpose fraud going on  
Pumps [racket racket racket]

(44)

Jenny as well=  
Pumps =I agree one hundred percent

---

Sequence 5: Swearing in Oklahoma

(45) 13:38-15:51 reading reviews

Kiley okay this person i:s named Wejo and it's titled pottymouth "don't talk about  
Oklahoma with your dirty mouth I know you're trying to

(46)

Kiley be **cool** and **with it** but surely{chuckling} your vocabulary allows you to  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(47)

Kiley speak in such a way that **we** who live in Oklahoma can respect and be

(48)

Kiley proud that you represent us=  
Pumps =first of all we don't represent all of

(49)

Pumps Oklahoma thank you very much  
Jenny so by her logic (.) anybody from the state

(50)

Jenny of Oklahoma is not allowed to cuss (.) and we all must be homogenous and behave  
the same way (.) a:nd by her logic podcasters are elected

(51)

Jenny representatives I mean what an (.) **idiot**  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@} yeah I just that's

(52)

Pumps our Oklahoma [brethren]  
Jenny [and here's] the thing I mean people that sit around and

(53)

Jenny get butthurt about cussing=  
Pumps =I don't believe it=

(54)

Jenny such bullshit by the Bible thumpers that act like "oh they use the word

(55)

Jenny fuck or they use the word shit" [but all of these] **egregious** human  
Pumps ["I'm so offended"]

(56)

Jenny rights violations they don't give a shit about (.) so they can all fuck

(57)  
 Jenny off  
 Pumps at first I thought it was gonna m- my mother had wri- I thought my

(58)  
 Pumps mother might be her (.) with the cussing cause no one hates the cussing  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(59)  
 Pumps more than-  
 Jenny it's just a- such a- well and also the studies have shown (.) and this  
 you can google this listener this is true studies have shown that cussing is a  
 sign of intelligence google it put it in the permanent record take it to the  
 bank Richard what's

(60)  
 Jenny going on/  
 Rich I think you guys represent Oklahoma very well  
 Pumps tha:nk you Richard

(61)  
 Jenny Richard you're so sweet= Wejo I bet she is just I  
 Rich =so keep rocking ladies=

(62)  
 Jenny I mean I bet missionary sex two to three times in her life (.) you know  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(63)  
 Jenny I mean this is a person that is just wound up like a [cheap clock]  
 Pumps [I don't know] you

(64)  
 Pumps know they say the more wound up you are the (.) uh naughtier you are

(65)  
 Pumps in the bed[room] =I don't know I've always heard that  
 Jenny [who] says that= I think

(66)  
 Jenny that's bullshit [I mean maybe but] I-  
 Pumps well I don't- I don't have any [personal knowledge]

(67)  
 Jenny I mean I think that whoever wrote that I- I doubt she's doing all sorts

(68)  
 Jenny of tricks and maneuvers in the bedroom I'm just going to take a wild  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(69)  
 Jenny stab and say she's not some wonderful lay {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
 Pumps okay{laughing}

---

Sequence 6: drag queens as scapegoats  
 (70) 24:29 - 27:57  
 Jenny you know back in the early nineties and- or let me say mid nineties when I  
 really went to drag shows frequently the host was Ginger Lamar at Angles in  
 Oklahoma City I believe she is dead now R.I.P. Ginger but it was on Sunday  
 nights and the whole club was full of I would say half gay people and the  
 other half straight

(71)  
 Jenny people men and women= =so I'm wondering with all of this like  
 Pumps =right=

(72)  
 Jenny hysteria over the killer drag queens or whatever that the right wing is

(73)  
 Jenny just going- Fox News is fucking hyperventilating about has the  
 Trixie girl

(74)  
 Jenny attendance of heterosexuals decreased at all increased I haven't been to a drag  
 show in- in a while Pumps and I are going to go to a drag brunch soon but um  
 have you seen a change in that because back in the day nobody gave a shit  
 about drag queens and everybody straight men

(75)  
 Jenny included **loved** it=  
 Pumps =well everybody that goes to a drag show fucking loves

(76)  
 Pumps it  
 Jenny yes  
 Trixie hhh. we're all just there to have fun and you know what's

(77)  
 Trixie heartbreaking about all this is is this art form that I've dedicated my

(78)  
 Trixie life to (.) is being used to as like a scapegoat right= =it's the  
 Pumps =right=

(79)  
 Trixie same thing with like women's bodies [or abortion] it's not that these  
 Pumps [right]  
 Jenny [right]

(80)  
 Trixie people care it's that they look at a big rubric of topics and they go

(81)  
 Trixie which one will actually get these people to vote [which one is the]  
 Pumps [right=]  
 Jenny [=exactly]

(82)  
 Trixie scariest which one can be inflated and distorted the most extreme way and (.)  
 there is nothing underhanded about drag we don't- all the drag queens don't  
 get together over like a map and talk about how we're gonna you know b- b-  
 abduct

(83)  
 Trixie children like= =it's all so made up in fact I'm just gonna say it  
 Jenny =right=

(84)  
 Trixie I got into drag not because I wanted to fraternize with fucking

(85)  
 Trixie children so for somebody like me and when you google drag  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
 Pumps right{high-pitched}

(86)  
 Trixie queen guess whose picture comes up/ {raises hand} and they use my  
 Pumps yes

(87)

Trixie to put on like Fox News [and stuff and put it in like-] it's really  
 Jenny [oh shit=]  
 Pumps [=oh shi:t]

(88)

Trixie crazy and the only place (.) where men put on dresses and fuck children

(89)

Trixie is church I love drag I'm  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@} ohh{laughing}  
 Jenny you're exactly right Trixie

(90)

Trixie gonna say it y'all can record it forever and tell everyone (.) drag's

(91)

Trixie not that cool (.) [or important (.) drag is not-] drag- drag is not  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} [I love it]

(92)

Trixie worth the air time of the news of politicians of taxpayer money (.)  
 Jenny right right right right  
 Pumps right

(93)

Trixie because I- drag is not as um (.) thought out I work with drag queens

(94)

Trixie these are unintelligent whores they're not masterminds there's  
 Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(95)

Trixie nothing behind the curtain like it's just some guy (.) or you know whoever women  
 whoever in an outfit singing a little song so that you have something to drink  
 wine and watch like it's that elevated and that

(96)

Trixie is it [there's nothing-] right  
 Pumps [it's so fun] like you said it's not poli[tical at all]  
 Jenny [hhh. I think] the

(97)

Jenny attacking of drag queens is the biggest low hanging fruit (.) that  
 Pumps right

(98)

Jenny they could grab onto and it's also (.) like right now the number one  
 Trixie {deep sigh}

(99)

Jenny killer (.) o:f children in the United States are guns (.) the number  
 Trixie yeah

(100)

Jenny one **molester** of children are these religious institutions and so- but by all  
 means let's talk about men (.) that re:ally (.) probably the majority are not  
 huge lovers of children pumps and I both

(101)

Jenny fucking [hate kids] and s- we have five between us (.) so it's not  
 Pumps [hate kids] {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(102)

Jenny [like] you know{laughing}

Trixie [girl] {@@@@@@@@} shout out to the kids listening shout out to  
 (103)  
 Trixie the kids  
 Pumps right  
 Jenny shout out to the kids >shout out to the kids< okay

---

Sequence 7: open casket funerals  
 (104) 30:10-31:43  
 Trixie are y'all doing open casket [cremation what's the deal]=  
 Pumps [<fuck no:>]  
 Jenny =cremation=

(105)  
 Trixie yeah open casket traumatized **traumatized**  
 Pumps =cremation (.) all day long oh  
 (.)

(106)  
 Trixie {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} totally traumatized=  
 Pumps  
 Jenny =open casket are so traumatizing I remember when my

(107)  
 Jenny grandmother died I was sixteen years old and I went to the funeral and

(108)  
 Trixie [legs open]  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny there she is like (.) dead [in the casket] and we're- {@@@@@@@@} we're

(109)  
 Jenny all looking at her and I touched her because I like felt really close to her and  
 I touched her hand and it's like you know our body

(110)  
 Pumps [so cold]  
 Jenny temperature is [ninety eight] degrees which is really hot and I touched her and  
 she was so cold hhh. I'll just never forget it and I don't

(111)  
 Pumps yeah [I don't- I don't like it]  
 Jenny understand the whole (.) [open casket thing] we gotta burn it uh eh you

(112)  
 Pumps [do whatever]  
 Jenny know spread the ashes [everybody needs] to move on down the road but

(113)  
 Jenny dressing up a dead person like a doll and putting them in a box and opening it  
 is fucking weird and I'm so glad you brought this to our attention because I  
 fucking had it

(114)

Trixie I've had it with the open casket funerals it's traumatizing  
Pumps [yeah me too{softly}]  
Jenny [with that]

(115)

Trixie it actually I think is- if you want to respect the memory of someone  
Jenny [trauma-]

(116)

Trixie and you want to preserve the memories you have of someone avoid that

(117)

Trixie casket do not go up there do not look at it=  
Pumps agree =yeah if I go to funerals

(118)

Pumps and they start doing the whole (.) line to the casket I just g- get in

(119)

Pumps my line and go the other way [like I'm out]  
Jenny [I think-] I think it's corpse abuse why

(120)

Jenny aren't the Republicans onto that (.) why don't they leave the fucking  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(121)

Jenny drag queens and alone and get onto these people that are dressing up

(122)

Trixie =no kidding  
Jenny dead people and putting them in boxes it's fucking weird=

(123)

Trixie so [weird I uh-] [I know]  
Pumps [and expensive] [total racket] =it is  
Jenny a [total] racket [uh death is] a total racket=

(124) 31:43

Trixie girl it's the impulse isle at like Trader Joe's

---

Sequence 8: Megachurches

(125) 32:22-32:52

Trixie =oh gi:rl had it come on  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny okay so had it or hit it (.) megachurches/= {@@@@@@@@@@}

(126)

Trixie these- these basically big box like superstores masquerading as non-  
Pumps {laughing}

(127)

Trixie profits (.) give me a- like give me a break the level of tax break et  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(128)

Trixie cetera for the- like give me a break hhh. I mean Jan Crouch used to fly

(129)

Trixie her dogs private =she wasn't even on the- she wasn't even on the  
Pumps =yeah=  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(130)

Trixie plane (.) she'd fly the dogs private  
Pumps [lots of] private jets in the megachurches  
Jenny right

(131)

32:52  
Trixie and they love it  
Pumps (.) [lots]  
Jenny [lots] lots-

---

Sequence 9: Oklahoma as a Red State

(132)

42:24-43:31  
Jenny well Trixie Mattel this has been a long time coming and I have loved

(109)

Jenny every moment= =and I want you to know that we- even though  
Pumps =every second=

(133)

Jenny we live in a red state we are not and we are huge allies of your community hhh.  
and we totally support your agenda of spreading love

(134)

Trixie {chuckle}  
Jenny peace and happiness to adult-only shows across the United States and

(135)

Trixie thank you so much for having  
Jenny we cannot thank you enough for joining us  
Trixie me I really feel like you guys are me and Katya's like parallel like I

(136)  
 Trixie don't know our tethers [your tethers]  
 Pumps [biggest compliment] ever=  
 Jenny =totally the biggest

(137)  
 Trixie [of course]  
 Jenny compliment well thank you so much for coming on=  
 Pumps =thank you [you're a

(138)  
 Trixie I'll see y'all in Oklahoma{country accent}  
 Pumps blast] see ya [see y'all]  
 Jenny [bye]

(139)  
 Pumps oh my gosh that was the biggest treat ever= =the best=  
 Jenny =I mean Trixie=. =I

(140)  
 Jenny love Trixie= =I love drag queens= =I know I wish  
 Pumps =love= =everything about them=

(141)  
 Pumps [every day]  
 Jenny we could have drag queens on like (.) [once a month] I know they're so

(142)  
 Pumps =it really is like even if you- if I came and I was kinda like u:h  
 Jenny fun=

(143)  
 Pumps tired it's rainy outside >da-da-da< you just- I feel energized I'm

(144)  
 Pumps ready to go= =it is- drag queen energy is the best  
 Jenny =it'S drag queen energy=

(145) 43:31  
 Pumps (.) ever=  
 Jenny =it is the best energy ever and I love Trixie



(157)  
Katya liberal person it's kind of hard to understand {@@@} I always  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(158)  
Katya equated stupidity or ignorance with like (.) inaction [**laziness** right]  
Pumps [right]  
Jenny laziness [right]

(159)  
Katya (.) but these people are **fully** motivated by the bible{southern accent}  
Pumps right {@@@@@}  
Jenny yeah

(160)  
Katya or whatever and- but never having read a damn page um and even then  
Jenny yeah

(161)  
Katya it's like okay okay whatever it's just- it's true- it's really- it's shocking  
and it's um- I guess it's not shocking but um it's uh it's sad and it's stupid  
I think it's

(162)  
Katya more stupid than sad (.) [um]  
Pumps I [think] it's more stupid than sad too=  
Jenny =I think

(163)  
Jenny it's like you have- they- they want to unify:- they don't wanna talk

(164)  
Katya right [sure]  
Jenny about guns because that's a multi billion dollar industry they [don't]

(165)  
Jenny wanna talk about the environment and the fact that we just had the

(166)  
Katya [right]  
Jenny hottest summer ever and next year will [pro]bably be even hotter

(167)

Katya [yeah] [yeah]  
 Jenny because there's bill[ions] of dollars behind fossil fuels and [they]

(168)  
 Jenny don't wanna talk about you know certain- they don't wanna talk about (.) women's bodies because by God we're supposed to sm- we live in an

(169)  
 Katya .hhh now (.) that's where I don't understand so like  
 Pumps =right  
 Jenny abortion ban state\=

(170)  
 Katya the- the- the absolutely bloodthirsty capitalism I understand (.) the  
 Pumps {nods}  
 Jenny right

(171)  
 Katya not wanting to think about a hundred years from now and focus on making profitss  
 today I understand but the women's bodies thing/ the mor- the the sexuality  
 morality

(172)  
 Katya thing/ (.) I [don't] why  
 Jenny [I'll tell] you why (.) cause- okay so I wasn't raised

(173)  
 Jenny with religion at all so I was zero indoctrinated my parents were

(174)  
 Katya okay  
 Jenny atheists okay but I lived and grew up in the Bible Belt a:nd these

(175)  
 Jenny people that are raised and indoctrinated- that's where the indoctrination is  
 they're indoctrinated in this right wing form of christianity and the number  
 one thing that they shame is sex because

(176)  
 Katya right  
 Jenny it's the one thing they can't control (.) it's a control thing because

(177)  
 Jenny the one thing that religion picked (.) to shame is the one thing that  
 Katya true

Jenny we're genetically encoded to do like I had a friend whose kids went to a  
(178)  
Jenny bible thumper private school and the told the kids at the school if you  
masturbate- told teenage boys this if you masturbate that is from the  
(179)  
Katya yeah [oh yeah]  
Pumps [it's crazy]  
Jenny devil how fucking stupid is that [to tell a teenage boy] not to beat  
(180)  
Katya yeah or I mean (.) yeah I grew up Catholic and you know it's  
Pumps [such a normal thing]  
Jenny off I mean (.) [so dumb]  
(181)  
Katya funny as my main I've had it I was gonna write the pope {@@@}  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
(182)  
Katya because{laughing} because because for us- just for the reason you're uh you just  
described as that Catholicism in particular they- they turn  
(183)  
Katya you against your body\= =like you know they- they turn you- to be  
Pumps =right  
Jenny right=  
(184)  
Katya to be naked is to be ashamed and it's (.) **locked up** and talk about  
indoctrination\ they are- I mean they have a chokehold on the you know uh  
turning people against themselves and making them ashamed of them  
(185)  
Katya whatever whatever and we all know that priests I mean [d- d-]  
Pumps [are the] worst  
(186)  
Katya [all the-] are the worst offenders{high-pitched} I have a friend in  
Pumps [offenders]  
(187)  
Katya Italy who's like you would- you would die if you knew about the hooker



Katya [don't love that] [no{laughing}]  
Pumps [not so great]  
Jenny [no the] Catholics the architecture A plus the stained

(199)  
Katya yeah oh yeah [gorgeous] ooh (.) F {claps}  
Pumps {@@@@}  
Jenny glass A plus (.) [the- the] megachurches F [you totally find] the

(200)  
Katya br- br- {crossing out motion with hands} [ampitheater]  
Jenny architecture is terrible [awful]

(201)  
Katya [uh uh] [you're going- you're going to ch]urch or  
Jenny [it is] absolutely tragic archi[tecture I don't know how people-]

(202)  
Katya or you're going to see the Wiggles [it's like xxxx] yeah fuck Joel  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(203)  
Katya Osteen I've had it with that motherfucker [oh my god]  
Pumps o:[h the] worst  
Jenny [same] same

**Different Strokes with Bianca Del Rio**

Sequence 11: Centrist or Liberal?

(204) 06:18-09:16

Pumps oh [good]

Kiley I've got a- (.) a really good hate comment [on] instagram for you guys=

(205)

Pumps =okay= =okay=

Kiley =and it's by Paulie Anna Farms= =and she writes I had no idea

(206)

Pumps {@@}

Kiley that these two vey thirsty aged hags (.) were complete liberals making

(207)

Pumps {@@@@} [I wasn't]

Kiley fun of the merchandise at Walmart (.) no [one even-] no one even knows

(208)

Pumps {@@@

Jenny {@@@

Kiley who you two are and I'm completely unfollowing you two noboy skanks

(209)

Pumps @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} nobody **skanks** (.) I haven't heard skank in a minute=

Jenny @@@@}

(210)

Jenny =I love that it's nobody knows who you are but I'm also going to

(211)

Pumps {@@@@@}

Jenny unfollow you which means Paulie Anna you knew **exactly** who we were (.)

(212)

Jenny furthermore the merchandise deserved ridicule because bad ideas deserve

(213)

Jenny ridicule hhh. and number two: um it's a pretty good takedown (.) [I]

Kiley it [is]

(214)

Pumps =hhh [I thought it

Jenny mean I like it= [the skank was

Kiley =I thought the last little skank was just [the cherry on

(215)

Pumps was just-] I th- think it was just an average takedown until the skank  
Jenny good]  
Kiley top]

(216)

Pumps I have to say I like the skank that's where it g- that's where it

(217)

Pumps hooked me= [other than] that it's just name calling  
Jenny =yeah I like the skank [a lot]

(218)

Pumps which is normal (.) nothing super nuanced about that=  
Jenny right =hhh what didn't

(219)

Pumps =she obviously doesn't listen to the  
Jenny know that we were liberal=  
Kiley =yeah=

(220)

Pumps podcast=  
[dirty word]  
Jenny =I love how they throw that out like it's [a insult]  
Kiley =not one time=

(221)

Pumps it's like thank you for noticing  
Jenny that you were liberal  
Kiley right let's see

(222)

Pumps okay  
Jenny kay  
Kiley if you think this one's better it's by nifty D it's a review on

(223)

Pumps okay okay  
Kiley apple (.) four stars the two hosts are great together unmatched chemistry  
great storytellers and senses of humor I would argue that politically this  
podcast is more centrist slash liberal than left so if

(224)

Pumps {@@@}

Kiley you're right of that you'll probably get (.) butthurt (.) but if your

(225)

Kiley left of that you'll probably cringe\ it's a bit Mean Girls and Perry

(226)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Kiley Menopause (.) great listen if you have thicker skin but the

(227)

Kiley internalized misogyny is sometimes coming from inside the house (.) the

Pumps hhh I [like it]

Jenny [I just-] I have a

Kiley feel good comedy can often come across as mean

(228)

Pumps {@@@@@@} I thought you were gonna

Jenny problem with them calling us **centrist**

(229)

Pumps say that the misogyny comes from withinside the house (.) the centrist/

(230)

Pumps that's [your issue/] =no I'm not a centrist

Jenny [the centrist] I'm not a fucking centrist=

(231)

Pumps either but (.) she must be wa:y left-leaning (.) which I'm all for it

Jenny as

(232)

Pumps yeah [it's kind of-]

Jenny centrist/ [but of all the] comments and all the criticism that we've

(233)

Jenny received (.) that one just kind of sits with me a little bit a fucking

(234)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} I thought

Jenny centrist/ what like a John McCain centrist/ (.) fuck off

(235)

Pumps it was- I thought it was a great review (.) all in all I thought it was

(236)

Pumps well written (.) I liked it=

Jenny =I'm kind of butthurt about being called a

(237)

Pumps {@@}

Jenny centrist so you know{laughing} what that means (.) I've got

(238)

Jenny to go on a fucking liberal progressive tirade we gotta get Bernie

(239)

Pumps {@@@@@@} [right now] {@@@@@@}

Jenny Sanders on this podcast

Kiley [uh I'm] on it

Sequence 12: Catholic priests & "those" straight people

(240) 15:36-17:44 (Bianca complains about climate change until she brings this up)

Bianca I don't care what happens I'm a drag queen I'm not even allowed to be

Pumps {@@}

Jenny {@@}

(241)

Bianca around children and let's just talk about that for a minute I don't like fuckin- children are the **worst** I often say I'm not a fan of

(242)

Bianca children I'm not a Catholic priest leave me alone (.) go to the **church**

Pumps {@@}

Jenny {@@}

(243)

Bianca talk to the- **clean** that house before you try to clean **ours**=

Pumps {silently chuckling}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@} =no it is-

(244)

Jenny it is one thousand percent the truth and here's all of that is all of

(245)

Bianca uh huh

Jenny that is a ruse because (.) all of these kids are getting shot in school

(246)

Pumps [right]

Jenny [no]body wants to **talk** about **that** because guns as everybody knows are

(247)

Bianca {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny also {makes extending motion with hands} **penile extenders** for the

(248)

Pumps =right=

Jenny small-dicked men that run the country= =so they don't wanna deal

(249)

Jenny with that **size** problem that they have so hmm what can we do here let's

(250)

Bianca right

Jenny go browbeat drag queens and I mean I- that is such just bullshit to me

(251)

Bianca  
yeah

Pumps yeah

Jenny but is such a <small group of people> but then they start beating drum

(252)

Jenny and then they go to Bible study and then they get all thes epeople in

(253)

Bianca tell me

Jenny and let me tell you what I've had it with the most (.) this is what

(254)

Jenny really chaps my fucking hide are the women that look like Pumps and me and when they're in certain social circles oh no I have a gay friend or my hairdresser's gay{high-pitched voice} but when they go to vote (.)

(255)

Bianca [uh huh]

Jenny [they] vote an **entirely different way** and I think the gays should **ban** the straights that do this from all services {gesturing a cross motion} all entertainment {gesturing a cross motion} that the gays do they need to ban these **duplicitous** straight people because I've had it with them=

(256)



Bianca    and jerks somebody off I mean what the fuck (.) like a Democrat and  
Jenny        {oo}

(268)

Bianca    then w- and then we found out the guy is a Democrat who owns a bar

(269)

Bianca    where there's drag shows (.) and this cunt is complaining about wuh  
Pumps   right

(270)

Bianca    wuh wuh wuh wuh what- what- stop electing people (.) stop electing  
Pumps   agree

(271)

Bianca    stupid fucking people to start with I mean she is a fucking idiot and I don't  
              understand vaping in the theatre first of all calling Beetlejuice

(272)

Bianca    you know (.) artistic first of all that's xxxx to see that like who/  
Pumps   {oo}

Jenny   {oo}

(273)

Bianca    go jerking somebody off in the theater everybody knows you do that in  
Pumps   yeah

(274)

Bianca    the parking lot next to a dumpster xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx have some class  
Pumps   {oooooooooooooooooooooooooooo}

Jenny   {oooooooooooooooooooooooooooo}

(275)

Bianca    you [cunts really]  
Jenny        [but you know] (.) she's the one who- her quote was children need to

(276)

Pumps   =right=  
Jenny        go to church not to drag shows= =and then here she is in a movie

(277)

Jenny        theater where we know people- Americans get shot in movie theaters and she is  
              giving somebody a handjob and yet she thinks she is this big

Bianca   ha  
Jenny        moral leader on what's best for children and here's the thing about her

(278)  
 Bianca [uh huh]  
 Pumps can't [stand her]  
 Jenny I've had it with her (.) [but all the] shit she's doing right now all

(279)  
 Bianca [as you should]  
 Jenny this hypocrisy I just want to keep making notes so [when I run into]

(280)  
 Jenny all these Bible study Christians that are like oh I don't have a problem with gays{soft voice} I want to be like you think you're so pro kid (.) and you think that you're okay with gays but then you go and vote one way and you're voting for morons just like this (.) and by the ways I want to know who and what your husband's beating off to all the time for you to

(281)  
 Pumps {@@@@@}  
 Jenny internalize all this stuff all the time I want your husband's Google

(282)  
 Bianca now that that's serious but th- the tricky thing  
 Pumps {@@@@@@@}  
 Jenny search history

(283)  
 Bianca about this too or- or the funny thing about it is just the fact that she is- y'know complaining that she's Christian and that everybody

(284)  
 Bianca should live this way (.) isn't she like a grandmother at like thirty  
 Pumps right

(285)  
 Bianca something years old/ [like her xxx year] old son is having sex with  
 Pumps [=yes]  
 Jenny [thirty six=]

(286)  
 Bianca someone else (.) out of wedlock and now they're pregnant like girl get outta here clean your own fucking house before you tell us how to live

(287)  
 Bianca (.) and sending children to the church (.) gi:rl I don't know if you

Pumps agree

(288)

Bianca know this but I have a lawsuit against the Catholic church because when

(289)

Bianca I was an altar boy nobody fucked me and I'm furious about it

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(290)

Bianca {shaking head} horrible (.) even the priests were like no she talks

Pumps {@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@}

(291)

Bianca too much nah I'm good [when the xxx says] not my thing it's

Pumps {@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@} hhh the [last place-]

(292)

Bianca really sad

Jenny the last place I would send my sons to would be some sort of

(293)

Bianca ooh{acting spooked} [yeah]

Jenny Jesus camp or some youth ministry church thing (.) [plus] I'm really

(294)

Jenny suspect of **anybody** who's like this cool hip youth pastor of the mega

(295)

Bianca oh

Jenny church that you know wears True Religion jeans and wants to hang out

(296)

Bianca wait not the

Jenny with all the teens I think that's a fucking red flag city

(297)

Bianca True Religion jeans (.) wooo hoo hoo hoo spooked you got it yes I

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(298)

Bianca agree organized religion is crazy which is why I'm not a fan of Taylor

(299)

Bianca Swift I mean that is an organized religion those people that worship

Pumps {@@@@@@}

(300)

Bianca that girl I'm just like whatever it's a whole new church it's a whole new thing  
if it works for you great but don't try to sell me and try to

(301)

Bianca lure me into it because it ain't for me (.) it ain't for me

Pumps {@@@@@@@}

Jenny yeah

---

Sequence 14: closeted lawmakers

(302) 49:38 - 53:10

Bianca hhh I've had it I've

Jenny okay (.) had it or hit it closeted (.) lawmakers

(303)

Bianca had it because it- it- it's the- it's the- it's the **hypocrisy** that gets

Pumps uh huh

(304)

Bianca me you know and it's the insanity or this life that they try to paint or what  
about the lawmaker now that was just bribed with bars of

(305)

Bianca gold and they saying (.) not guilty ho:w/ do you claim to be not guilty

Pumps yes

(306)

Bianca with hundreds of thousands of dollars in- in jacket pockets and his excuse was  
oh it's because I'm from Cuba and I'm worried that it might turn over into  
Cuba a communist country so I need the cash in case I need to flee (.) what  
kind of psychology and fuckery is this just own up to it my issue with  
lawmakers in general I fucking hate all of them and I recently had a moment  
where Mitch McConnell

(307)

Bianca (.) the troll of all trolls (.) there was a fabulous meme- oh this is

Pumps uh huh

(308)



Jenny did to the Supreme Court and how much power he wielded he is the

(318)

Bianca agree

Pumps yeah

Jenny walking embodiment of everything that is wrong with old white men in

(319)

Jenny America (.) and he has hurt with his policies so many people that he

(320)

Bianca [progress just progress] yeah

Pumps [progress]

Jenny claims to care about [and he does] his Christianity] bullshit his care

(321)

Bianca yeah

Jenny for other people is bullshit (.) all he has done has lined the pockets

(322)

Jenny of people like the Koch brothers and I think what he has done to the

(323)

Pumps yeah

Jenny Supreme Court it is a horribly rotten institution now and it all is- starts and ends with Mitch McConnell (.) fuck him and **he** is the one

(324)

Pumps [right]

Jenny that's choosing to put himself out [there] he can retire at any time (.) if I was having mini strokes while giving I've Had It podcast and everybody was making fun of me online I would have a choice at that point to either continue giving mini strokes or to resign/ so this is a choice because you know what America is all about freedom (.) and

(325)

Bianca ugh

Jenny he has the freedom to have mini on TV and I mean (.) if you're going to

(326)

Jenny be nine hundred seventy five and in public office that's just the risk

(327)

Bianca [that comes with it] =I agree (.) and let's

Jenny you take but [fuck Mitch McConnell] fuck him=

(328)

Bianca just on top of that he looks like his breath stinks let's just say it

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(329)

Bianca let's just say it =halitosis bitch halitosis like you

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@} chronic halitosis=

(330)

Bianca just say what you have for lunch I already smell it we know we know he

Pumps {@@@}

Jenny yeah

(331)

Bianca is a rotted human being [not a fan]

Pumps [uh huh] (.) [rotten] from the inside out

Jenny [yeah (.) [totally] [terrible]

**A Gaytheist with Ginger Minj**

Sequence 15: Ginger's and Jenny's experiences with religious hate

(332) 20:55-37:16

Ginger {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Pumps {@@@@}

Jenny well Ginger (.) this is enough of the positivity (.) that's where this

(333)

Jenny train is gonna end alright (.) we feel good ra ra sis boom ba it's time

(334)

Ginger [let's do it]

Jenny to bitch it's time to do some [world class] shittalking tell us what

(335)

Ginger hhh I have had it with- well a lot of things um

Jenny you've had it with

(336)

Ginger particularly{laughing} most recently I have had it with all of like the

(337)

Ginger negativity towards drag (.) which I feel is kind of a double-edged

Pumps yes

(338)

Ginger sword like there's the one half of it where I'm like how dare you (.) we have been around for centuries we have been the ones at the forefront of a lot of these fights (.) you know it was a drag queen who threw the first brick at Stonewall it was drag queens who kind of rallied the community against AIDS and started all the fundraising and the awareness outreach for all of that there's always drag queens at the forefront of especially LGBTQIA+ issues (.) a:nd no:w you want to like turn it all around and look to us and be like you're wrong and what you do is disgusting and filthy hhh and then on the other side of that it's kind of a compliment that we've now made it become so

(339)

Ginger **mainstream** [that] we're suddenly a threat after centuries of what we've

Jenny [right]

(340)

Ginger been doing (.) hhh so I mean I have had it honestly with that the

Jenny right

(341)

Ginger people that message me every single day going you're a sinner and you're going to **burn** in **hell** I'm like okay (.) uh read the Bible you

(342)

Ginger read the bible **Vicky**{higher voice} youre the one that is wearing (.)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(343)

Ginger plastic fucking earrings w-{} with mixed fabrics on your body you're

Pumps {}

(344)

Ginger just as much of a sinner as I am bitch=

Pumps {@@@@@@@@}

Jenny =well and you know what it is

(345)

Jenny with people like that hhh they are so punitive and so cruel I'll never forget this Pumps will remember this we want a- went on a girl's trip hhh to Santa Fe New Mexico and there was this gal and she was a big bible thumper hhh but of course she was against you know healthcare for

(346)

Ginger uh huh

Jenny poor people (.) she was against gay people and she gets kind of

(347)

Jenny schnoekered (.) and she's like so you don't got to church Jennifer{accusatory voice} and I'm like no I don't I'm an atheist and she starts just screaming in my face you're going to go to hell you're going to burn in hell{strained voice} and I was just like god it seems

(348)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny like your christianity really gives you a sense of serenity (.) I mean

(349)

Ginger {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} [yes]

Pumps @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@

Jenny she was such a **bitch** she was such a [total] shortsighted bitch I still

(350)

Jenny cannot stand her to this day I think what a phony fake person and I see these hypocrites on display **every single day** and I'm incapable of being

(351)

Ginger well and the the worst part of it is I don't have to  
Jenny friends with them

(352)

Ginger be friends with them because I'm related to most of them and that is  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny {@@@@@@@@@@}

(353)

Ginger the- that is the environment I grew up in (.) and like the funniest  
Pumps {@@}

(354)

Ginger thing was 8(.) um during Covid- during lockdown my aunt Glenda Fay and

(355)

Ginger her name is Glenda Fay not Glinda so please do not call her Glinda  
Jenny {@@}

(356)

Ginger or she'll have a meltdown um she was staying with us at our house and  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@}

(357)

Ginger I was getting ready to get back to Allstar season six so I was watching as much  
drag race as possible we were watching UK season two and this whole  
conversation pops up about non-binary and genderfluid and all that and Glenda  
Fay goes now what the hell does that mean/{slightly southern accent} and  
before I could pipe up and say anything because you know automatically like-  
like my hackles go up and I'm like {hissing} ready to attack and my mom goes  
(.) well you know Glenda it's kind a like Josh (.) where (.) he never- like  
some days he feels (.) more masculine and some days he feels more feminine and  
it's just kind of being able to express on the outside how you feel on the  
inside that way you know you kind of give everybody clues as to how you're p-  
like particularly feeling that day (.) broke it down for her in this way and

(358)

Ginger I'm ust watching this going this is my mother/ like my mother the-  
Pumps right

(359)

Ginger every time I tried to come out to her for years would go >no no no no it's just  
a phase it's just a phase< (.) she had come around so far that she was fully  
like listening and understanding and my aunt Glenda just stares at her and

goes oh okay and I'm like so it's not that difficult for you people to grasp and- and understand like the concept

(360)

Ginger is not that foreign

Pumps that's neat that your mom was- did that (.)

(361)

Ginger [yeah eh] =a very

Pumps especially after I read [the book] I mean she's come a long way=

(362)

Ginger long way which is why I was kinda like {gasps & clutches chest} in the

(363)

Ginger corner you know just clutching my pearls

Pumps yeah don't you think though

(364)

Pumps a lot of times when people are obsessively obsessed with something outside of their comfort zone (.) a lot of times it's to mask their own problems like you were saying in your family like (.) you've got the dau- the cousin that kidnaps kids the missing (.) I mean a lot of times go- just idle gossip and stuff is because you don't want to fix what's

(365)

Pumps going on in your own house so you want to pick on other people=

Jenny =but I

(366)

Jenny think this issue with um (.) LGBTIQIA+ is far more insidious than that=

(367)

Ginger [of course]

Pumps =oh no I agree in [this-] yeah

Jenny [I] think that [this is] rooted in religion and

(368)

Ginger yeah

Jenny people getting indoctrinated in their religion and that life is very

(369)

Jenny black and white and life there are only binary choices (.) and then out of all the things that they can pick on they pick on sex (.) being a

(370)  
Ginger =they try to prop up this  
Pumps right  
Jenny virgin until you're married (.) and the gays=

(371)  
Ginger one thing and be like this is it this is the target this is what we're

(372)  
Ginger all mad at (.) meanwhile everything over here in the corner has just  
Jenny right

(373)  
Ginger gone to shit and is just getting worse (.) but nobody pays attention  
Pumps [yeah]  
Jenny [right]

(374)  
Ginger because they're too hyperfocused on what the actual target is which

(375)  
Ginger turns out to be (.) nothing=  
Pumps =[right]  
Jenny =[well] and I think I read somewhere I don't

(376)  
Jenny know if this was in your emails to us or if it was an article when I was  
googling that you talked about and this is really interesting (.) overt (.)  
attacks on the LGBTQ community hhh and covert (.) attacks (.) and there are  
both like the Republican party in Texas recently put into their platform that  
uh homosexuals- it was an **abnormal** (.) **lifestyle choice** and that is **in (.) the**  
**(.) Republican (.) party (.) platform** that is an (.) overt attack in (.)  
documents hhh and you still have people that probably live in very urban areas  
that sit in this conversation with us that say oh no I'm a- I'm a Texas  
Republican but you know Bobby over here does my hair and I've loved him for

(377)  
Ginger uh huh  
Jenny years(dainty voice) and you're just like (.) well are you loving Bobby/

(378)  
Jenny are you/ when you go vote and you vote for that type of hateful platform that  
says this is an **abnormal** lifestyle choice like is that

(379)  
Ginger =yeah well I mean it's just

Jenny really where we are in twenty twenty three=

(380)

Ginger like you know the- the people who have like- had racism ingrained in them from the time that they were little: they stop and they'll look and like I literally went to school with girls that would look and be

(381)

Ginger like oh my god he's so attractive for a black guy (.) [or he's] one of

Pumps

right

Jenny

[oh yeah]

(382)

Ginger the good ones or you-{@} when my ex that I was with for eleven years he was African American and (.) I'll never forget the first time he went home with me I mean we had our own issues but hhh aside from that the first time I took him back to Leesburg with me: there were literally people that were like oh don't even consider yourself black around us you're- you're like a white person to us and I was like that is (.) so offensive because you're immediately letting this person know that you're just meeting typically you're beneath me but I'm going to overlook the fact that you happen to be (.) a person of color and give you my white card for the day and I fell like it happens a lot the- the same way recently with people of- of the LGBTQIA+ community you know it's like oh they're one of the good ones or you know Josh is a drag queen/ but he's not one of those drag queens\ like the- the- there's no

(383)

Ginger qualifying it (.) you're just a person at the end of the day and you

Jenny

right

(384)

Ginger should probably get to know that person before you start persecuting

(385)

Ginger them for anything else about them (.) selves you know like (.) drives me

Pumps

right

(386)

Ginger crazy

Pumps

[yeah]

Jenny

hhh [no] it really is it's really jarring to see how in my lifetime I'm forty nine how I saw gay rights like for a- for a um civil rights

(387)

Ginger

uh huh

Jenny movement it went rapid speed you had Will and Grace and then all of a

(388)

Jenny sudden it got in front of the Supreme Court and polish- politicians started publicly supporting I mean very recently in my adulthood no we

(389)

Pumps right

Jenny stand for gay marriage and then the Supreme Court passes it I remember

(390)

Jenny Obama was president they light up the White House with the rainbow flag

(391)

Ginger uh huh

Pumps yeah

Jenny lights on it and I was just like oh my god this is amazing (.) this is

(392)

Jenny so great and then I just feel like- like in the last three years or something like I don't **watch** Fox News or really **read** uh right-wing

(393)

Ginger no

Jenny media hhh but it's starting to seep out everywhere hhh and these people they're so **mad** at like- I'm like you really want to pick on a transgendered kid/ do you not think that kid's having a hard enough time/ navigating school/ to have fucking Vicky and Brenda at the school board screaming pulling her hair out by the root does that make you feel good does it make you feel like a good Christian to pick on the transgendered kid and it's just mindboggling (.) how these <people of faith> that should be <fighting this fight> are the persecutors (.) they are the oppressors and we live- I mean you're- you're from the South you know th- that these type of people (.) we live around it but here's the part where it gets covert is where you have people in polite society 8:9 you know in the white suburbs or or in the white- nice white neighborhoods that (.) say racist things under their breath and then they say things like (.) well I wanna make sure that my kids aren't getting indoctrinated in school with all this gender identity stuff{breathy voice} and they say these things and that's the covert whispers that is getting to where this thing is catching on like a

(394)

Ginger =absolutely hhh well and I've even noticed it like my- my

Jenny wildfire=

(395)

Ginger siste:r\ has been a uh special education fot he last (.) twenty-five years she comes home just like sobbing and in tears (.) because it's not quite covert anymore especially in Florida (.) especially dealing with um like race issues uh they- she was g- they allt he teachers were like gathered up in her school and told you have to give us a list of every book that you own whether it's in the school or not if it's in your posesseion we need to know what it i:s then we're going to tell you which ones you can keep and which ones you have to surrender (.) she was like >woah woah woah woah< like my sister's an avid book reader she's like (.) my- like my **whole collection** of **books** that I've had my entire life/ I have to list everything and they said yes you have to an- an- and she's like I'm not going to do it and the:n she's- her- her curriculum that she's had for years and years (.) about the Civil Rights Movement and Rosa Parks- she's not allowed to talk about Rosa

(396)

Ginger **Parks=** =in school anymore (.) she can't teach these  
Pumps =isn't that crazy=

(397)

Ginger lessons because it might make a white child feel bad  
Pumps hhh that's the

(398)

Pumps thing I mean people feeling uncomfortable about history I don't understand that (.) at all (.) you should feel uncomfortable if you don't want to learn about history (.) and correct course **that's** when

(399)

Ginger exactly  
Pumps you should feel bad [not] learning about what happened I- I- (.) I  
Jenny [right]

(400)

Pumps [just xxx] =it **is**=  
Jenny [well and] sometimes history (.) **is** uncomfortable= =I mean it- and

(401)

Jenny that's where the lesson is (.) I think that is the <biggest problem with white culture> and I think one thing Pumps and I are trying to do

(402)

Ginger yeah  
Jenny with this podcast hhh is laugh a lot and be petty (.) but also talk

(403)

Jenny about uncomfortable things (.) and (.) normalize talking about uncomfortable things because hhh as an adult you can walk and chew gum at the same fucking time (.) if- if our listeners can take one thing **away** from this it is if you're white (.) and you're heterosexual hhh you really started life on the ninety yard- ninety yard line of the 100 yard **dash** and just try to <step out> of the <indoctrinated world> in which you were **raised** (.) and have empathy for people's **plight** and what all they have to overcome because I didn't have to overcome being

(404)

Ginger uh huh

Pumps [right]

Jenny heterosexual hhh [and] I didn't have to overcome being white (.) there

(405)

Jenny were no obstacles put in my way for being a straight white woman (.)

(406)

Ginger hhh well and I also have to say like as bad as I have it and hem

Jenny **none**

(407)

Ginger have gotten it during all of this (.) I am also (.) a white man (.) at

(408)

Ginger the end of the day (.) so I don't even get it as bad as some of the

Jenny right

(409)

Ginger other drag queens that I know hhh and I know about doc- indoctrination

(410)

Ginger because I was indoctrinated by the church when I was growing up (.) I

Jenny right

(411)

Ginger had the same exact things and- (.) and everybody knew that I was

(412)

Ginger different my mother would call me <artistic> {miming quotation marks}

Jenny {@@@@@@}

(413)

Ginger which was just Southern slang for flaming homosexual (.) and- and my

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny

{@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(414)

Ginger dad would grab me by the nape of my hair when we would walk into church and he'd go sit in the corner twiddle your thumbs and don't say anything because if you embarrass me I'm gonna whoop your ass (.) and so my entire existence outside of my bedroom was just sitting down very quietly not saying anything being careful i- and mindful about the way that I **walked** if somebody asked me question I'f have to make sure I wasn't lisping too much when I answered them like it became very um (.) I mean it was abuse it was control it was all of these things (.) but it also became incredibly (.) uh false for me (.) so it felt like every time I had (.) like a communication with anybody who wasn't my immediate family (.) it was pretend it was a play it was an act (.) it's just super overwhelming sometimes to try to (.) **reconcile** the way that I was raised and those things that were literally beat into me

(415)

Ginger every day (.) with who I am and what I've become

Jenny

all of this pressure

(416)

Jenny is put on (.) uh the LGBTQIA+ community or the black and brown community all this pressure is put on them to be a certain way and to be quote unquote fixed {miming quotation marks} (.) and I think we need to flip the script those of us who have deeper thoughts hhh and see these issues as being gray and not black and white we need to flip. The

(417)

Ginger

yeah

Jenny

script and say hhh your church needs to be fixed (.) you need to fix

(418)

Jenny that (.) you need to quit teaching this to kids hhh you need to quit packaging up hate (.) and putting Jesus on the cover of it and then letting people trot that out and feel **justified** in treating people like shit (.) and making them feel like they're less than you and I think we (.) those of us that get this need to put the pressure back on them and say you need to clean your house because what you're teaching is hate and bigotry but wrapping it up hhh just like that girl told me oh you're going to hell{hoarse voice} I mean she's so mad that I was an atheist and it's like that's your big fucking problem/ that's your

(419)

Ginger

uh huh

Jenny

takeway in life/ and that's the one time I experienced I can't imagine

(420)

Ginger

yeah

Jenny (.) as a gay person what you experience fromt the religious right

(421)

Ginger

imagine being a gaytheist {@@@@} hhh you just check all the boxes of

Pumps

{@@}

Jenny

{@@}

(422)

Ginger

hate and you know I've used the- the religion against them as well and I was like j- by your own logical thinking (.) reading the same book that you have read that you are **quoting** from right now going by that

(423)

Ginger

book (.) you're the person that Jesus would not approve of (.) because

Jenny

exactly

(424)

Ginger

he never judged anybody he hung out with the sex workers a:n- and

(425)

Ginger

every- with the brown people and everybody that was different which PS

Jenny

right

(426)

Ginger

Jesus also would have been (.) [a brown] person

so all of

Ginger

{@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny

[brown]

{@@@@}right

(427)

Ginger

these things that you **hate** a- about everybody else are exactly what this figure that you have put all of your faith and trust and pixie

(428)

Ginger

dust **in** (.) **is**=

Jenny

=exactly

**An ATM Machine of Great Ideas with Symone**

Sequence 16: Mike Pence

(429) 43:51-46:00

Jenny would you rather (.) eat (.) a mayonnaise sandwich with extra

(430)

Symone {@@@@@@@} okay:

Jenny mayonnaise walking barefoot through the airport (.) or- (.) or fuck

(431)

Symone oh wo:::w wo::w [this is some mad- you] did me

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny Mike Pence {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} [I did you dirty Symone]

(432)

Symone **dirty** I mean oh my god

Pumps [she's] done it to me too

Jenny oh girl I mean [**dirty**] uh huh

(433)

Symone [I'd really-]

Jenny [barefoot-] barefoot mayonnaise sandwich while eating through- walking

(434)

Symone [walking] through o:::h

Jenny through the airport [eating] (.) mayonnaise sandwich with extra

(435)

Symone {@@@} do I get to keep

Jenny mayonnaise or you're fucking Mike Pence which one/

(436)

Symone the Mike Pence thing a secret or is it that like something that

(437)

Symone everyone's gonna know about (.) like it's a public scandal (.) because

Jenny u:::h

(438)

Symone that's actually kinda fun =you gotta

Pumps {@@@@@@@}

Jenny I got- I gotta go public with it=

(439)

Symone go public with it/ (2) oh my god that is **so** demented okay:

Pumps {@@@@@@@}

Jenny I know I know=

(440)  
Symone =You **are** demen[ted] a:::h (2) [y'know what/] I  
Pumps =she's demented=  
Jenny [I] am I am [what are you-]

(441)  
Symone I think I'm gonna {@@@@@@} this so fucked [up I think I'm gonna-]  
Jenny [you're fucking Mike] Pence

(442)  
Symone =I think I'm fucking Mike Pence (.) because let me tell you  
Pumps {@@@  
Jenny aren't you= {@@@}

(443)  
Symone something (.) that is history making= =[that] is history making  
Pumps @@ =[right]  
Jenny =it is=

(444)  
Symone that is- that [is-] that is all over the blgos mania (.) that is I feel  
Jenny [yes] yes

(445)  
Symone like I'm gonna get some hate and that's fine but he's gonna get more-  
Pumps right

(446)  
Symone that's gonna do more for society I feel like so (.) >I'm gonna take one

(447)  
Symone for the team< =[I'm selfless]  
Pumps [I was gonna say] you're selfless=  
Jenny [you know what] =[I think-] I think

(448)  
Symone abso[lutely]  
Pumps {@@@  
Jenny it's an act of patriotism (.) [that's] s what I think that would be (.)

(449)  
Symone [absolutely]

Jenny [I think that] would be one of e- a patriotic thing (.) to take one

(450)

Symone [fucking] (.) hypocrites

Jenny for the team to say (.) look at these **fucking** [hypocrites]

Pumps [hypocrites]

(451)

Symone uh huh

Jenny hhh that marginalize and pick on drag queens and trans kids because

(452)

Symone uh huh [he wasn-] well he

Jenny they think they're tough guys yeah yeah [I think]

(453)

Symone wa- {} I was a tough guy last night how about that (2) how about that

Pumps {}

Jenny {}

(454)

Symone yeah me and- yeah we were real tough (.) last night sis yeah I'm

Pumps {}

(455)

Symone taking one for the team I'm gonna be a [patriot] {}

Jenny [I like it] I like it (.)

(456)

Symone {}

Pumps that is exactly right

Jenny America don't say Symone never did anything for you

---

Sequence 17: Sarah Huckabee Sanders

(457) 48:08-53:27

Jenny okay last one (.) had it or hit it (.) Sarah (.) Huckabee (.) Sanders=

(458)

Symone =oh fucking had it (.) let me tell you something (.) we need to get rid

Pumps {}

Jenny {}

(459)

Symone of the Huckabee l- I remember in sixth grade th- the father- Huckabee

(460)

Symone father was (.) what is it called/ a governor/ (.) the one they(vote) to  
Pumps yeah  
Jenny yes

(461)

Symone say okay yeah (.) a governor and he made us do- (.) girl this is the ultimate  
hypocrisy he- we had to do those fucking like you had to be outside for like a  
thirty minutes or an hour in- in school/ you know like you had recess which  
you had like an active hour{miming quotation marks} (.) if you- if you wanna  
know why the irony of that is look it

(462)

Symone up but um just look up the name (.) [but um we] had that but I- (.)  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@} I [can guess]

(463)

Symone listen I cannot stand (.) when people are ignorant and it- it comes off her- she  
to me comes off as ignorant not necessarily not smart because I like- I do  
have to give her you know somewhat of intellect but I don't like ignorance and  
I feel like she's very ignorant I think people especially in Arkansas don't  
know no better so they think (.) oh and they thought oh she's a **woman** so we're  
**really** doing it we're really

(464)

Symone sticking it to him you know like (.) you know I was like we-re you know  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}ri:::ght  
Jenny right

(465)

Symone like we're putting in a woman that has all this vitriol and such it

(466)

Symone just feels like her spirit is hateful (.) [you know what I mean]  
Pumps yes =it is hateful]  
Jenny [it is=] it is

(467)

Symone [a:nd] I don't (.) like that because you know I can disagree with  
Jenny [hateful]

(468)

Symone someone hhh I can (.) you know think your ideas are fucking dumb but I don't  
hate people you know like I- you know I don't truly hate people and I feel  
like her spirit is hateful and I dn't like that for my stay I don't like that  
for people there who just want to exist hhh and be free and who happen to love

to live in Arkansas for all the perks that there are cause there are perks  
y'know there- there are some great things about living in Arkansas but you  
know people like that make it so difficult and so (.) just (.) hard (.) harder  
than it already is to live there so like you know I just I fucking had it I've  
had it a:nd (.) I think we as a people especially in the South need a lot more  
like (.) just (.) education and more (.) just love we just need more love and  
it's just hard it's sad a:nd it just makes me weary for (.) the-

(469)

Symone the pe- young people (.) and the people who are oth- who are other  
Pumps right

(470)

Symone you know (.) [it's just- it's] just hard and it- I hate it so I fucking  
Pumps uh [huh absolutely]

(471)

Symone had it [Sarah Huckabee Sanders (.) we had it]  
Jenny I've had [it] [had it with] her I've [had it  
Pumps [fucking had it with her too] [she's

(472)

Symone [she's] mean (.) [they're mean] [yeah]  
Pumps mean]  
Jenny with] her [dad] (.) they're [mean-spirited they] weaponized religion to

(473)

Symone [yes] [yes]  
Jenny [claim] moral superiority (.) [they] have no empathy for anybody-

(474)

Jenny anybody that doesn't fit exactly into (.) a white Anglo-Saxon

(475)

Symone [mold] yeah  
Pumps right  
Jenny protestant (.) [box] (.) a:nd it's just and it's just such- to me when

(476)

Symone [yeah]  
Jenny I see their- the way they think I think [god] what an antiquated

(477)

Symone [hateful (.) old]  
Jenny hateful [old way to think] and let me just say this (.) if by all these

(478)  
 Jenny religious Republican leaders in the south from Oklahoma Texas and and

(479)  
 Symone [ >straight across< ]  
 Jenny you go straight (.) [u:h east] hhh if their idea that being religious

(480)  
 Symone uh huh  
 Jenny and voting Republican were- was the best way they have had (.) super

(481)  
 Symone yeah  
 Jenny majorities in all of these states for decades hhh and these are the

(482)  
 Symone poorest [uneducated]  
 Pumps yeah  
 Jenny poorest (.) the most incarcerated the [highest crime] rates the lowest

(483)  
 Symone [infancy] mortality rate= [the list goes] on  
 Pumps yeah =yes  
 Jenny education (.) the most [poverty] all [this stuff]

(484)  
 Jenny all the bad stuff (.) all of it is concentrated right there in all of

(485)  
 Symone yeah  
 Jenny these blue states (.) that have a bigger population and pay more taxes

(486)  
 Symone y- yeah  
 Jenny have to fund all the fuckery that goes on in these states and I've

(487)  
 Symone I've had it= I fucking had it and you know what  
 Pumps =had it  
 Jenny fucking had it

(488)  
 Symone really got me actually >talked about this yesterday< uh (.) it'll- I'll never  
 forget when I- before I moved to uh Arkansas went to Louisiana to uh meet with

some of my college friends (.) and I'll never forget (.) driving through that state being like are y'all fucking kidding me like

(489)

Symone do y'all not- do y'all not see this like uh like it's so pver- it's so  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(490)

Symone poverty stricken and it's like y'll have been voting the same way for  
Jenny yeah

(491)

Symone god knows how long (.) since the fucking dawn of your state probably

(492)

Symone a:nd (.) y- nothing's changed like what's not clicking what's not  
Pumps yeah

(493)

Symone clicking you know what I mean it's just insane to me and it's sad

(494)

Symone because we as people deserve to have a good life (.) you deserve to  
Pumps right

(495)

Symone have a good life and you're uh already just born in shit and so they're don't  
and they don't really do anything to get you out of that shit

(496)

Symone they only just care about getting themselves and the people that look  
Pumps right

(497)

Symone like them and the people that are in their tax bracket out of that shit and they  
have no regard for you (.) whether you're white black whatever

(498)

Symone (.) poor [y'know] it's- they're all- they're all- you're all the same  
Jenny [right]

(499)

Symone to them you're all the same (.) so I just don't get how you don't get  
Pumps right

(500)

Symone get that but you know hey (.) maybe what do I know {@@@} I'm just- I'm  
Pumps {@@@@@}  
Jenny {@@@@@}

(501)

Symone just an award-winning drag queen what do I know {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Pumps {@@@}  
Jenny {@@@}

(502)

Symone what do I know {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}  
Jenny we know that you're and award winner otherwise you

(503)

Symone [I wouldn't be here]  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@} that's right  
Jenny wouldn't be [on our podcast]

**Live Laugh Love with Gigi Goode**

Sequence 18: Political Typology Quiz

(504) 06:58-07:48

Kiley first off I think (.) we should shoutout to our listeners because we

(505)

Pumps oh yeah/

Kiley posted (.) the political typology quiz (.) that proved you were not

(506)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@}

Jenny oh yeah yeah right

Kiley a centrist (.) nor was Pumps (.) a little bit less (.) and so everyone

(507)

Pumps =I **love** [that]

Kiley took it everyone's progressive left= [not] one centrist in our

(508)

Pumps I love [that] >they are smart<

Jenny =you know what/ (.) [our-] our followers are smart (.) our

Kiley followers=

(509)

Jenny listeners are smart (.) they're locked in they are (.) positive smart

(510)

Pumps [=and good-looking] I have

Jenny and cynical [=and good-looking]

Kiley and good-looking= gorgeous

(511)

Pumps noticed [that] at the (.) uh live shows [everybody's] smart and

Jenny [yeah] [that was-]

(512)

Pumps attractive

Jenny I think that's great we flipped the script they comment they

(513)

Pumps right

Jenny call me a centrist and then we say well what the fuck are you/ (.) you

(514)

Pumps [there's

Jenny take the quiz

Kiley that person was a faith and flag conservative [that left  
(515)  
Pumps no doubt] (.) no doubt at all=  
Jenny =yeah  
Kiley that com]ment

---

Sequence 19: Floodgate

(516) 43:23-47:41  
Gigi okay (.) let me open the floodgates to another thing since-  
Jenny let's do it

(517)  
Gigi since coming out as trans and- and living my life as woman fully the:- the  
dating pool has completely flipped around and now it's **so** like (.) a lot of  
the people prior to- to dating who I'm dating now like I would be on the **apps**  
and I would be on **Hinge** and I would be on **Raya** and I'd do all of that (.) and  
most of the people who: would slide in would be like (.) military soldier u:m  
like a lot of law enforcement a lot of live ve:ry uh I don't know just like  
that very stereotypical man's man type person a:nd it- it- it always seemed-  
oh and athletes so many

(518)  
Gigi athletes my god the athletes love the dolls (.) but it- it was always  
Pumps {@@@@@@@@}

(519)  
Gigi ve:ry like (.) uh no like et- I don't want to take you out on a date

(520)  
Gigi but please come over type thing (.) so I don't kn- it's like i- i- if  
Pumps o:h

(521)  
Gigi you're wondering what all of these u:h conservative men are doing behind closed  
doors I know so many trans women who have slept with so

(522)  
Gigi many different politicians (.) and it's just like such a common thing  
Pumps hhh yeah

(523)  
Gigi that I'm- I- of course I'm not surprised that these repressed homosexual young  
Mormon **men** are (.) trying to get their rocks off the

(524)  
Gigi night thy have to leave for **two years** (.) [right] two years/ my god  
Jenny [right] but

(525)  
Gigi [(xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)]  
Jenny [here's something] I wanna say that I think is such a shame (.) that

(526)  
Gigi uh huh  
Jenny (.) homosexuals and trans people and people in the gay community all

(527)  
Jenny LGBTQIA+ have to experience (.) that needs to be said (.) so you're

(528)  
Gigi uh huh  
Jenny used as (.) a polarizing (.) force in political discourse to: (.)

(529)  
Gigi yeah  
Jenny placate to the bible thumpers so they feel like hhh they can attach

(530)  
Jenny themselves to purity culture and misogyny and capitalism and all the things  
because the drag queens and the trans people that's what fucking

(531)  
Gigi [of course]  
Jenny up society hhh but the under[belly-] the underbelly of that is (.) a

(532)  
Jenny lot of these people and this is what surprised me when I would get on my  
friends' Grindr how many of these men (.) are married (.)

(533)  
Gigi uh huh uh huh yeah  
Pumps yeah  
Jenny heterosexually (.) with children (.) that want to go h:ave you know sex

(534)  
Gigi yeah  
Jenny with somebody in the community (.) and have naughty sex with somebody

(535)

Gigi uh huh{nodding}

Jenny in the community (.) then drive home to their wives go to their church

(536)

Gigi uh huh

Jenny on Sunday go vote for Donald Trump at the elections (.) and it's- it's

(537)

Gigi yeah

Jenny such a double exploitation because (.) <I was as shocked as shit> when I found out how many quote on quote straight men{airquotes} frequent

(538)

Gigi uh huh

Jenny (.) Grindr (.) gay bars and these other apps that are (.) at church (.)

(539)

Jenny a:nd you know trot out- you know they're probably the type of guys that

(540)

Gigi [yes [oh my go:d

Pumps [right]

Jenny do those family photos with the AR-15s you know [fucked] up [with the

(541)

Gigi ye:s] [a hundred percent]

Pumps [crazy ass people]

Jenny kids got em] you know they're probably doin some

(542)

Gigi [they] **a:re** (.) and it- and- and at a

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny butt stuff I mean you just know [it] {@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@}

(543)

Gigi certain point it's like I think the initia:l **reaction** especially from within the community is to is- is kind of (.) hatred and disgust towards that but I feel really bad for these (.) men because uh clearly

(544)

Gigi they have a life (.) that is so repressed [and] you know their beliefs

Jenny [yeah]

(545)

Gigi have been just like pummeled into them week after week month after month year after year\ and now it's- it's really led to: (.) it- it's almost been forced out of them like they have to- they have to get this off their- out of their system in order to fell like they are of sound

(546)

Gigi mind and >I don't know< I just feel bad for them= [it's like  
Pumps =[you're] a [better  
Jenny =[hhh I-]

(547)

Gigi god]  
Pumps per]son than me [because] I think they're a bunch of hypocrites=  
Jenny [I-] =I see

(548)

Gigi don't get me wrong (.) I have a lot of fuel and hatred  
Jenny your point-

(549)

Gigi towards these hypocrites but I can't help but feel (.) bad for the way  
Jenny yeah

(550)

Gigi they were raised like I'm sorry that you were raised by who you were

(551)

Gigi raised by  
Pumps =a better person=  
Jenny yeha and I think- I think that you're= =a better

(552)

Gigi {@@@@@@@@@@@@} oh that's sweet  
Pumps yeah  
Jenny person than we are Gigi {@@@@}I do

**Fiercifying the Suburbs with Detox**

Sequence 20: individually wrapped Viagra commercial

(553) 07:16-11:08

Jenny and then this commercial comes on and it's just trying to be this like

(554)

Jenny supe:r hip commercial and it's for (.) {checks notes} individually

(555)

Pumps {@@@@}

Jenny wrapped (.) generic viagra (.) and it's got this old boomer who's

(556)

Pumps yeah right

Jenny narrating the commerical (.) and it shows the individually wrapped (.)

(557)

Pumps oh okay

Jenny packages that kind of look like condoms (.) and the guy goes (.) and

(558)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny they're individually wrapped (.) I think it's pretty cool he says it

(559)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny just like that and it shows him he's this (.) goofy (.) dorky (.)

(560)

Jenny boomer okay (.) and then they show the box that it comes in and basically you can skirt the system and you don't have to go to your doctor (.) so not only is Viagra made to skirt the system of what your

(561)

Pumps right

Jenny natural hhh penis could do without medication (.) now there's a skirt

(562)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@}

Jenny within the skirt now you can got to this website and order this

(563)

Jenny it's so cool individually wrapped (.) Viagra{airquotes} hhh so as I'm sittin there watching that then I got to my (.) smartphone because I'm- the commercial and I thought that guy's an idiot this is a stupid

(564)

Pumps {@@@@@@@@@}

Jenny commercial hhh I can't believe I just watched this (.) so I go to my

(565)

Jenny phone and then I see that the Supreme Court (.) is gonna take a case

(566)

Pumps right

Jenny hhh regarding Plan B (.) which is **female** (.) **medication** hhh and I've

(567)

Jenny **had it** with the fact (.) that **men** hhh can have this skirt within a skirt of the system hhh for their beloved Viagra that's individually wrapped hhh and have some (.) dorky Boomer spokesman talk about how (.)

(568)

Pumps {@@@}

Jenny it's pretty cool{dorky boomer voice} and women when it comes to (.)

(569)

Jenny their reproductive rights a:nd what goes on between their legs hhh

(570)

Pumps oh absolutely

Jenny they're having to go to the Supreme Court (.) up against all these nuts

(571)

Pumps right

Jenny there that crazy Beer drinker the Handmaid all of them (.) so I have

(572)

Jenny **had** it with the: overt (.) disparity hhh tha:t (.) men can have these grandstanding showboating commercials about how to skirt the system (.)

(573)

Pumps {@@@@}

Jenny to get a hard on (.) longer and better than what their (.) penisses

(574)

Pumps right

Jenny could naturally do (.) and if there was commercial like that for Plan B

(575)

Jenny or for a female contraception there's still so much sexism in society that it would be deemed risqué or what are these slutty women doing hhh

(576)

Pumps =hhh it's so offensive it- we always talk  
Jenny and I just- I've had it that=

(577)

Pumps talk about (.) if they would put the money and power and **research** hhh (.)  
b:ehind curing cancer or: (.) hunger that they put into: erectile

(578)

Pumps dysfunction for men the world would be a better place=  
Jenny =no we've said it

(579)

Jenny this will be about the third or fourth time we've said it on this

(580)

Pumps =it **has**  
Jenny podcast hhh the science into the erection has been outstanding=

(581)

Pumps been= because it affects men= but  
Jenny =it has been outstanding =that's right

(582)

Pumps no one even wants to consider how a woman would feel if she's forced to carry a pregnancy that A could kill her B the child's not viable or C she's just not ready in her life hhh nobody's interested in all that

(583)

Pumps (.) we wanna regulate all that I wanna get inside those scrotums like  
Jenny no

(584)

Pumps we're inside the uterus: and I think that we'd have a lot of change I think the balance would shift if we all decided (.) you know what/ if you knock somebody up we're going to give you a (.) vasectomy hhh and

(585)

Pumps you have no control over it= = I wanna jump  
Jenny =you wanna jump in that scrotum=



(598)

Pumps

=I just wanna say thank you=

Jenny (.) I could not (.) **agree** (.) **more**=

=I say

(599)

Pumps

=we are leftists=

=right=

Jenny thank you we are leftist=

=we are idiots=

=I- I

(600)

Jenny

think twenty twenty-four hate comments are really looking up for us