A DISTINCTIVE ANALYSIS OF SOCIOLINGUISTIC IN COMMUNICATION BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

Shafa Tiara Pangestika Agusty[1]
Dion Tira Erlangga[2]
English Literature
English Education

diontiraerlangga@gmail.com

Abstract

Observations of the differences between the way males and females speak were long restricted to grammatical features, such as the differences between masculine and feminine in morphology in many languages. However, in the 1970s women researchers started looking at how a linguistic code transmitted sexist values and bias. Lakoff's work (1975) is an example of this; she raised questions such as: Do women have a more restricted vocabulary than men? Do they use more adjectives? Are their sentences incomplete? Do they use more 'superficial' words? Consequently, researchers started to investigate empirically both bias in the language and the differential usage of the code by men and women. This paper will analyze a short recorded sample of natural conversation (see Appendix 1) in order to discuss if the following claims can be supported by research: a) women talk more/less than men; b) women break the 'rules' of turn-taking less than men c) women use more standard forms than men. Results in the analysis showed that there does not seem to be a distinguishable difference with respect to the usage of language by men and women potentially due to the establishment of an informal atmosphere during the recorded sample and to a sense of solidarity among participants, which enabled them to make use of the code to maintain conversation.

Key words: Analysis, communication, differentiate, sociolinguistic

INTRODUCTION

The gender pattern which is explained in the section on sociolinguistic patterns describes phonological differences in female and male speech behaviour with respect to the overall frequency of using certain phonological variants (Pranoto & Afrilita, 2019), (Suprayogi, Samanik, et al., 2021). These differences have also been referred to as typical sex-graded variation (Kuswoyo & Siregar, 2019), (Kardiansyah, 2019). Studies in language and gender, however, have a less restricted focus as they are more generally concerned with gender-based variation as concerns specific female and male ways of speaking (Abidin et al., 2022), (Puspita & Pranoto, 2021) (i.e. conversational styles and connected discourse features: structuring conversation; lexical differences) (Afrianto & Gulö, 2019), (Amelia et al., 2022), (Fakhrurozi & Adrian, 2021). The term 'genderlect' is used to refer to the communicative style associated with a particular gender (Qodriani & Kardiansyah, 2018), (Gulö & Nainggolan, 2021). Men and women use language differently (Budiman et al., 2021), (Samanik & Lianasari, 2018). Differences in the choice of vocabulary, grammatical

patterns, prosodic means are distinct enough to speak of male and female speech styles (Kuswoyo et al., 2022), (Adelina & Suprayogi, 2020), (Puspita & Amelia, 2020). The existence of the two speech styles is the linguistic reflection of social relations (Maskar et al., 2022): until recently men have exercised more power in society and the tendency is still rather strong (Candra & Qodriani, 2019). Men's verbal behaviour is more aggressive as it is supposed to demonstrate a position of dominance (Oktaviani & Mandasari, 2019), (Aminatun et al., 2021). Women were assigned a submissive role both in the workplace and at home (Gulö, 2019), which accounts for more co-operative and less aggressive female speech strategies (Mertania & Amelia, 2020).

Sociolinguistic research says about female-male differences (Suprayogi, Pranoto, et al., 2021). Women, it turns out, are not the embarrassing little sister in the story of language change (Wahyudin, 2018), (Rahmania & Mandasari, 2021). Instead, they are the early adopters and the leading edge of innovation (Yulianti & Sulistiyawati, 2020). Matthew J. Gordon, a sociolinguist at the University of Missouri, says, "One of the strongest tendencies is for women to take the lead when language changes spread in a community (Samanik, 2021), (Qodriani & Wijana, 2020). There are exceptions, but most studies have found that women are in the forefront of change; they use the innovative forms at higher rates than do men (Gulö et al., 2021), (Kardiansyah & Salam, 2020). Of course another way of stating this is to say that men lag behind when changes are active in a community (Kasih et al., 2022), (Ahmad et al., 2020)." So, if one gender has to be cast as the vocal underachiever, it is almost certainly men (Mandasari & Aminatun, 2019). Linguists have identified various speech tendencies that distinguish men and women (Kardiansyah & Qodriani, 2018), (Maulana & Suprayogi, 2022). And these two in particular stand out. Women are, first off, are more innovative, more inclined to pick up on and adopt changes that are occurring more broadly in pronunciation (Fithratullah, 2021), (Mandasari & Wahyudin, 2021). And, secondly, they are more correct in their speech—meaning women are more aware of what is considered correct and prestigious in pronunciation, and they're more likely to apply that knowledge (Hutauruk & Puspita, 2020), (Yulianti & Sulistiyawati, 2021). The opposite is true as well: Men tend to be more conservative, that is, more slow to pick up on sound changes going on around them, and they tend to be more casual in their speech (Fithratullah, 2019).

Studies in the area of language and gender often make use of two models or paradigms - that of dominance and that of difference. The first is associated with Dale Spender (1980), Pamela Fishman (1980), Don Zimmerman and Candace West (1975), while the second is associated with Deborah Tannen (1984). Dominance can be attributed to the fact that in mixed-sex. Conversations, men are more likely to interrupt than women. It uses a fairly old study of a small sample of conversations, recorded by Don Zimmerman and Candace West at the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California in 1975. The subjects of the recording were white, middle class and under 35. Zimmerman and West produce in evidence 31 segments of conversation. They report that in 11 conversations between men and women, men used 46 interruptions, but women only two.

Research Question

Do men and women speak differently in the process of communication?

Aim And Objectives of The Study

This project aims at a sociolinguistic study of the effect of gender on language use among students. It seeks to achieve the following specific objectives:

To identify the differences in the speech patterns of male and female

Significance Of The Study

This study is very significant because it would bring to limelight the terms and expressions used by male and female student of the environment. Since it focuses on the issue of language and gender, it would serve as a source of information and discovery to those who do not understand how gender consideration influences.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature, Trudgill (1972) found a kind of sex differentiation for speakers of urban British English. His study demonstrated that "women informants"... use forms associated with the prestige standard more frequently than men". His study also discovered that male speakers place a high value on working class nonstandard speech. He offers several possible reasons for the finding that women are more likely to use forms considered correct: (1) The subordinate position of women in English and American societies makes it "more

necessary for women to secure their social status linguistically"; and (2) while men can be rated socially on what they do, women may be rated primarily on how they appear – so their speech is more important. As for American literature, research has not shown a noticeable difference in terms of the usage of standard forms by men and women. The difference theory was also summarized in Tannen's book, you just don't understand (1990) in an article in which she represents male and female language use in a series of six contrasts:

• Status vs. support

This claims that men grow up in a world in which conversation is competitive - they seek to achieve the upper hand or to prevent others from dominating them. For women, however, talking is often a way to gain confirmation and support for their ideas. Men see the world as a place where people try to gain status and keep it. Women see the world as "a network of connections seeking support and consensus".

• Independence vs. intimacy

In general, women often think in terms of closeness and support, and struggle to preserve intimacy. Men, concerned with status, tend to focus more on independence. These traits can lead women and men to starkly different views of the same situation

• Advice vs. understanding

Deborah Tannen claims that, to many men a complaint is a challenge to find a solution:

• Information vs. feelings

Culturally and historically speaking, men's concerns were seen as more important than those of women, but today this situation may be reversed so that the giving of information and brevity of speech are considered of less value than sharing of emotions and elaboration.

• Orders vs. proposals

It is claimed that women often suggest that people do things in indirect ways - "let's", "why don't we?" or "wouldn't it be good, if we...?" Men may use, and prefer to hear, a direct imperative.

• Conflict vs. compromise

This situation can be clearly observed in work-situations where a management decision seems unattractive - men will often resist it vocally, while women may appear to accede, but complain subsequently. In fact, this is a broad generalization - and for every one of Deborah Tannen's oppositions, we will know of men and women who are exceptions to the norm.

METHOD

The main focus of attention of this study is on the use of English language among male and female students. Hence, the sources of the data are 400 level students of the Department of English and Literary Studies. Forty (40) students (20 males and 20 females) were selected at random for this study. For the collection of data, participant's observation the,use of questionnaire and audio recording were the main techniques employed. The respondents were asked questions at different places and periods within the department and their responses were recorded.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This method of analysis in this study is based on Lakoff's (1975) levels of analysis. She identified a number of linguistic features which she claimed were used more often by women than men and which in her opinion express uncertainty and lack of confidence. The features to be considered using Lakoff's analysis for this study are: lexical hedges, tag-question, verbosity, adjectives, intensifier, hyper-correct words etc. Each data collected has been discussed under the relevant topics above as appropriate. Below is a sample analysis.

DATA	RESPONDENT	PERCENTAGE
AGREE	26	65
DISAGREE	8	20
NOT SURE	0	0
NO RESPONSE	6	15
TOTAL	40	100

From the above, it would be seen that 65% of the respondents agreed that maleand female use different speech patterns and six respondents did not answer this question. This study set out to demonstrate that the inherent differences in male and female use of language, that is, the sex exclusive and sex preferential markers. This study has examined the language use among male and female in my environment. From the study carried out, it can be said that male and female use different speech patterns. These differences in the speech pattern of male and female results in miscommunication and misinterpretation in the process of interaction. While the most obvious function of language is to communicate information language also contributes to at least two other equally important, but less often recognised, function; to establish and maintain social relationships and to express and create the social identity of the speaker.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that in our society and others like it, there are male and female differences in their use of language. They do not use completely different forms but different quantities or frequencies of the same form. In a society where gender plays a major role language also has a key role to perform in the contribution of that role. Differences in the gender roles, identities of men and women, hierarchical nature of gender relations and the dominance of men constitute the factors that contribute to the differences in language use. Gender differentiation does not exist in vacuum: it interacts in a complex way with other kinds of social differentiation. But language and gender are developed through participation in everyday social practice. In other words, language and gender are inextricably linked.

REFERENCES

Abidin, Z., Amelia, D., & Aguss, R. M. (2022). *PELATIHAN GOOGLE APPS UNTUK MENAMBAH KEAHLIAN TEKNOLOGI INFORMASI BAGI GURU SMK PGRI 1 LIMAU*. *3*(1), 43–48.

Adelina, C., & Suprayogi, S. (2020). Contrastive Analysis of English and Indonesian Idioms of Human Body. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 20–27.

Afrianto, A., & Gulö, I. (2019). Revisiting English competence at hotel. *Teknosastik*, *17*(1), 35–39.

Ahmad, I., Borman, R. I., Fakhrurozi, J., & Caksana, G. G. (2020). Software Development Dengan Extreme Programming (XP) Pada Aplikasi Deteksi Kemiripan Judul Skripsi Berbasis Android. *INOVTEK Polbeng-Seri Informatika*, *5*(2), 297–307.

Amelia, D., Afrianto, A., Samanik, S., Suprayogi, S., Pranoto, B. E., & Gulo, I. (2022). Improving Publlic Speaking Ability through Speech. *Journal of Social Sciences and Technology for Community Service (JSSTCS)*, *3*(2), 322.

https://doi.org/10.33365/jsstcs.v3i2.2231

Aminatun, D., Muliyah, P., & Haryanti, H. (2021). the Effect of Using Dictogloss on Students' Listening Comprehension Achievement. *JURNAL PAJAR (Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran)*, *5*(2), 262–269. https://doi.org/10.33578/pjr.v5i2.8246

Budiman, A., Pranoto, B. E., & Gus, A. (2021). *Pendampingan Dan Pelatihan Pengelolaan Website SMS Negeri 1 Semaka Tanggamus*. *2*(2), 150–159.

Candra, L. K., & Qodriani, L. U. (2019). An Analysis of Code Switching in Leila S. Chudori's For Nadira. *Teknosastik*, *16*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v16i1.128

Fakhrurozi, J., & Adrian, Q. J. (2021). Kajian Dan Praktik Ekranisasi Cerpen Perempuan di Rumah Panggung ke Film Pendek Angkon. *Deiksis: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, *8*(1), 31–40.

Fithratullah, M. (2019). Globalization and Culture Hybridity; The Commodification on Korean Music and its Successful World Expansion. *Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*(2018), 00013. https://doi.org/10.29037/digitalpress.42264

Fithratullah, M. (2021). Representation of Korean Values Sustainability in American Remake Movies. *Teknosastik*, *19*(1), 60. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v19i1.874

Gulö, I. (2019). Predicates of Indonesian and English Simple Sentences. *Teknosastik*, *15*(2), 76–80.

Gulö, I., & Nainggolan, T. (2021). The Functions of Nias Personal Pronouns. *The 1st International Conference on Language Linguistic Literature and Education (ICLLLE)*.

Gulö, I., Setiawan, D. B., Prameswari, S. R., & Putri, S. R. (2021). MENINGKATKAN KEPERCAYAAN DIRI ANAK-ANAK PANTI ASUHAN DALAM BERBICARA BAHASA INGGRIS. *Adimas: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, *5*(1), 23–28.

Hutauruk, M., & Puspita, D. (2020). A METAPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS: A STUDY OF PRAGMATIC FAILURE FOUND IN INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(2), 62–69.

Kardiansyah, M. Y. (2019). English Drama in the Late of VictoriaKardiansyah, M. Y. (2019). English Drama in the Late of Victorian Period (1880-1901): Realism in Drama Genre Revival. Teknosastik, 15(2), 64–68.n Period (1880-1901): Realism in Drama Genre Revival. *Teknosastik*, *15*(2), 64–68.

Kardiansyah, M. Y., & Qodriani, L. U. (2018). ENGLISH EXTRACURRICULAR AND ITS ROLE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS'ENGLISH SPEAKING ABILITY. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, *4*(1), 60–69.

Kardiansyah, M. Y., & Salam, A. (2020). The Translator's Strategy as a Cultural Mediator in Translating Indonesian Novel into English. *4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2020)*, 413–418.

Kasih, E. N. E. W., Suprayogi, S., Puspita, D., Oktavia, R. N., & Ardian, D. (2022). Speak up confidently: Pelatihan English Public Speaking bagi siswa-siswi English Club SMAN 1 Kotagajah. *Madaniya*, *3*(2), 313–321. https://madaniya.pustaka.my.id/journals/contents/article/view/189

Kuswoyo, H., Budiman, A., Pranoto, B. E., Rido, A., Dewi, C., Sodikin, S., & Mulia, M. R. (2022). Optimalisasi Pemanfaatan Google Apps untuk Peningkatan Kinerja Perangkat Desa Margosari, Kecamatan Metro Kibang, Lampung Timur. *Journal Of Human And Education (JAHE)*, *2*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.31004/jh.v2i2.47

Kuswoyo, H., & Siregar, R. A. (2019). Interpersonal metadiscourse markers as persuasive strategies in oral business presentation. *Lingua Cultura*, *13*(4), 297–304.

Mandasari, B., & Aminatun, D. (2019). STUDENTS'PERCEPTION ON THEIR PARTICIPATION: WHAT AFFECTS THEIR MOTIVATION TO TAKE PART IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES? *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied*

Linguistics, *8*(2), 214–225.

Mandasari, B., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2021). Flipped Classroom Learning Model: Implementation and Its Impact on EFL Learners' Satisfaction on Grammar Class. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, *8*(1), 150–158.

Maskar, S., Puspaningtyas, N. D., & Puspita, D. (2022). Linguistik Matematika: Suatu Pendekatan untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Non-Rutin Secara Matematis. *Mathema Journal E-Issn*, *4*(2), 118–126. www.oecd.org/pisa/,

Maulana, B., & Suprayogi, S. (2022). *Analysis of Sense Relations on Stars Song Lyric By*. *3*(1), 42–47.

Mertania, Y., & Amelia, D. (2020). Black Skin White Mask: Hybrid Identity of the Main Character as Depicted in Tagore's The Home and The World. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 7–12. https://doi.org/10.33365/llj.v1i1.233

Oktaviani, L., & Mandasari, B. (2019). Powtoon: Presenting SQ3R Implementation in Reading Class through A Web-Based Medium. *PROCEEDINGS UNIVERSITAS PAMULANG*, *1*(1).

Pranoto, B. E., & Afrilita, L. K. (2019). The organization of words in mental lexicon: evidence from word association test. *Teknosastik*, *16*(1), 26–33.

Puspita, D., & Amelia, D. (2020). TED-TALK: A SUPPLEMENT MATERIAL TO PROMOTE STUDENTS'AUTONOMY IN LISTENING. *ELTIN JOURNAL, Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, *8*(2), 91–102.

Puspita, D., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). The attitude of Japanese newspapers in narrating disaster events: Appraisal in critical discourse study. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(2), 796–817.

Qodriani, L. U., & Kardiansyah, M. Y. (2018). Exploring Culture in Indonesia English Textbook for Secondary Education. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia)*, *7*(1), 51–58.

Qodriani, L. U., & Wijana, I. D. P. (2020). Language Change in 'New-Normal'Classroom. *4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2020)*, 385–389.

Rahmania, A. H., & Mandasari, B. (2021). STUDENTS'PERCEPTION TOWARDS THE USE OF JOOX APPLICATION TO IMPROVE STUDENTS'PRONUNCIATION. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, *2*(1), 39–44.

Samanik, S. (2021). Imagery Analysis In Matsuoka's Cloud Of Sparrows. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 17–24.

Samanik, S., & Lianasari, F. (2018). Antimatter Technology: The Bridge between Science and Religion toward Universe Creation Theory Illustrated in Dan Brown's Angels and Demons. *Teknosastik*, *14*(2), 18. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v14i2.58

Suprayogi, S., Pranoto, B. E., Budiman, A., Maulana, B., & Swastika, G. B. (2021). Pengembangan Keterampilan Menulis Siswa SMAN 1 Semaka Melalui Web Sekolah. *Madaniya*, *2*(3), 283–294. https://doi.org/10.53696/27214834.92

Suprayogi, S., Samanik, S.-, Novanti, E. A., & Ardesis, Y.-. (2021). EFL Learner's Literary Competence Mapping through Reader-Response Writing Assessed using CCEA GCSE Mark Scheme. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, *21*(1), 1. http://journal.unika.ac.id/index.php/celt/article/view/2871

Wahyudin, A. Y. (2018). Maximizing Outlining Practice in Teaching Writing for EFL Secondary Students: A Research Perspective. *Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia*, 45.

Yulianti, T., & Sulistiyawati, A. (2020). The Blended Learning for Student's Character Building. *International Conference on Progressive Education (ICOPE 2019)*, 56–60.

Yulianti, T., & Sulistyawati, A. (2021). *Online Focus Group Discussion (OFGD) Model Design in Learning*.