

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Reviewed in this chapter are some theories of sociolinguistics (2.1), language variation (2.2), genderlect (2.3), word choice in genderlect (2.4), taboo language in genderlect (2.5), and men and women interaction (2.5). Hopefully, these theories help construct better understanding of how male and female become different regarding the language they use both in utterances as well as in written forms.

2.1 Sociolinguistics

As a branch of linguistics, sociolinguistics discusses language use in social context. Spolsky (1998:3) stated that sociolinguistics is the field that studies the relation between language and society, i.e. between the uses of language and the social structures in which the users of language live. Therefore, sociolinguistics can't be separated from any social context in any society. Put it further, Spolsky defined sociolinguistics as the relation of both language and society where the use of language is influenced by the social structure of the language users. Quite similar to Spolsky's definition Hudson (1980:1) simply stated that sociolinguistics is the study of language in society.

Other linguist, Fairlough (1989:1), said that sociolinguistics is mainly dealing with language in its social context. Furthermore, Trudgill (2003:123) assumes that sociolinguistics is a term to describe all areas of the study of the relationship between language and society other than those which are purely social scientific in their objectives, such as ethnomethodology – a term to describe all areas of the study of relationship between language and society. Trudgill acclaimed that ethnomethodology has one of which objectives is social scientific.

In addition, sociolinguistics in Downes's view (1984:9) is a branch of linguistics which studies just those properties of language and languages which require reference to social, including contextual, factors in their explanation.

When language is used in social context related to the users, there will arise some variations as it is known that societies as the language users will create language based on the context.

2.2 Language Variation

Variation of language is created by the users (society). This creation is based on social context such as producing many words or registers to use in communication. Other than that language variation is also observed in relation to gender, i.e. there is language variation between male and female speakers. Wood quoted by Sapiro (1986:271) found that whereas men describe things in more objective terms ("he is about 6 feet and 1 inch tall"), women use more interpretive language ("he looks very worried about something"). From Wood's argument in Sapiro, it can be inferred that men use more clear or straight forward to what they are going to say or comment on something, whereas women tend to use assumption or interpreted words to express something. As in the example above when men comment on somebody's height, they say "he is about 6 feet and 1 inch tall", where it does not need a deep interpretation in understanding it. Unlike men, women comment on something by saying "he looks very worried about something", where it needs further interpretation in what something really is.

Sapiro (1986:271) also quoted Eakins and Eakins in describing about language variation in male and female to clarify gender differences in language

use. From Eakins and Eakins statement it can be assumed that in language use men use more words when they describe objects or something unlike women that they don't use more words in describing the object they want to describe.

In addition, Milroy and Milroy (1998:55) clarify that variation according to gender appears to be universal and, in terms of style, the tendency appears (in Western societies at least) to be always in the same direction. Female tends toward the careful end of continuum and male toward the casual end. According to Milroy and Milroy when talking about language variation related to gender, it will be common that male in easy way tends to use the casual end rather than women the careful end.

Further, language variation in gender may vary in pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. From these variations, Jespersen in Coates (1986:31) draws some differences in pronunciation uttered by men and women for examples respectively: soft is pronounced [sɔ:ft] and [sɔft]. Considering the example, it is clear that one word may have two pronunciations as it is pronounced by male and female. 'Soft' for example is pronounced [sɔ:ft] by male and [sɔft] by female.

Next, language variation in male and female is on vocabulary. Lakoff in Coates (1986:18) singles out "empty" adjectives like *divine*, *charming*, *cute* ... as a typical of what she calls 'women' language. In addition, based on Jespersen in Coates (1986:19) 'vastly' and 'so' are also marked as having 'something internally feminine about it' and mostly used by women eventhough men can use it too. For examples of this 'ladies usage' are observed in expressions such as: vastly obliged or vastly offended; vastly glad or vastly sorry; large objects are vastly great, small ones are vastly little. The examples of 'so' are as follows: 'It is

so lovely!'; 'He is so charming!'; 'Thank you so much!'; 'I'm so glad you've come. Jespersen's explanation for this sex-preferential usage is that women much more often than men break off without having thought out what they are going to say.

Language variation in gender or male and female is also observed on grammar. In this context Jespersen in Coates (1986:25) talks about the concepts of parataxis and hypotaxis. He explains that parataxis is the term used to describe a sequence of clauses where there are no links at all. The clauses are simply juxtaposed: CLAUSE, CLAUSE (e.g. *I got up, I went to work*). Similar to this but not always included in term of parataxis, is co-ordination, where clauses are linked by co-ordination conjunctions (*and, but, etc.*): CLAUSE and CLAUSE (e.g. *I got up and I went to work*). Then, hypotaxis is the term used to describe a sequence of clauses where the links are subordinating conjunctions (*after, when, because, etc.*): after CLAUSE, CLAUSE or CLAUSE after CLAUSE (e.g. *After I got up, I went to work* or *I went to work after I got up*). Jespersen (1986:26) claimed that women's syntax seems different in spoken and written language. Written language (in particular, printed material) was produced by men on their written syntax but he was more likely to have judged women syntax on the basis of their spoken language. The differences of men and women in using parataxis and hypotaxis are as follows.

	Parataxis	Hypotaxis
<i>Typically found in:</i>	Anglo-Saxon prose Speech	Renaissance and post-Renaissance prose Writing
<i>Supposed to be typical of:</i>	Restricted code Women's language	Elaborated code Men's language

In Spolsky's view (1998:33) language variety is a third set of variations concerning the special variety (or **register**) which is marked by a special vocabulary (technical terminology) associated with a profession or occupation or other defined social group and forming part of its **jargon** or in-group variety. Another Spolsky's statement about language variety, i.e. dialects, styles, and registers as mentioned before are ways of labeling language variety or kinds of language varieties.

Concerning language varieties in gender, Spolsky (1998:36) clearly stated that it was ethnographers who first draw attention to distinguish between male and female varieties of language, often which clear differences occur in vocabulary. Supporting Spolsky's statement the term language variety or variety of language is defined by Hudson (1980:24) as *a set of linguistic items with similar social distribution*. Based on this definition Hudson clarifies that any varieties of languages are examples of varieties. These are English, French, London English, the English of football commentaries, the language used by the member of a particular long-house in the north-west Amazon, and/or the language or language used by a particular person.

The previous statements are strengthened by Sapir quoted by Milroy and Milroy in *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (1997:47) when he remarks "everyone knows that language is variable." Sapir further states that variability in language is within everyone's experience of using and listening to language, and most people show some degree of interest in it.

Still in the same case of language variety, Ferguson and Gumperz in Niken (2006:8) view that:

Language variety is anybody of human speech patterns which is sufficiently homogeneous to be analyzed by available techniques of synchronic description which has a sufficiently large repertory of elements and their arrangements or processes with broad enough semantic scope to function in all normal contexts of communication.

From this point of view it can be said that language variety deals with any one of human speech patterns which is sufficiently homogeneous that can be analyzed by available techniques of synchronic description.

In another part of Milroy's and Milroy's (1998:48) research in varieties and variation they stated that:

Language variation in time forms the subject matter of historical linguistics. The main advances in recent years, however, have been in the more obviously "human" dimension of variation, that is, in *social* variation in language. Afterward, they clarify some phonological terms. They argued that phoneticians frequently point out that no two utterances of the same word by same speaker are exactly alike. One of these structured aspects of phonetic/phonological is labeled *assimilation*. For example, in phrase such as *a bacon and eggs* in British English, the final /n/ of "bacon" may be assimilated to the place of articulation of the preceding /k/ are realized as velar rather than alveolar nasal.

According to Milroy and Milroy that language variation have been in the more obviously human dimension of variation in language. Then, phoneticians frequently point out that no two utterances of one speaker are exactly alike. For

example in ‘a bacon and eggs’ British pronounce the final /n/ of bacon may be assimilated of the preceding /k/.

Therefore, it is totally clear that those variations may arise in both male and female pronunciation, the so called genderlect.

2.2.1 Genderlect

Language varieties related to the definition above can occur in every group of people, including male and female group the so called gender. A variety or lect which is specific to or particularly associated with either male or female speakers is termed genderlect in Trudgill’s view (2003:54). This term is in most usages misleading, in that it suggests that there may be communities where male and female speakers use radically different varieties. In fact, while there are some more-or-less gender-specific usages in many if not most languages, these range from the use of a small number of words, phrase or conversational devices in some languages to particular vowels, consonants or grammatical endings in others. Most differences between male and female speech are quantitatively-revealed tendencies rather than absolute difference.

Concerning gender Lakoff argued that men and women are born in differentiations, one of those is in language. They are, in communication, distinctive within the use of English language. Lakoff in Coates singles out “empty” adjectives like *divine*, *charming*, *cute*... as a typical of what she calls ‘women’ language (Coates, 1986:18) where they always use them when they admire something referring to men, fashion, etc.

To have more case in term of male and female lect differentiation, consider Lakoff 's observation below.

Consider (A) 'Oh dear, you've the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.' (B) 'Shit, you've the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.' Here it is safe to predict that people would classify the first sentence as a part of "women's language" whereas the second as "men's language" (Coates, 1986:21).

Based on Lakoff's observation above women don't use rough or indelicate word because women can be called the euphemism expert. They use more polite words as shown in the first sentence.

2.2.2 Word Choice

As the previous paragraph gives the explanation and the phenomenom of genderlect or male and female variation, this section is to discuss about word choice. Word choice is word chosen based on human gender, male and female. Uchida also affirms in Mizokami's journal (2003:107) that a look at any transcribed text could tell us whether an utterance is made by a male or female without listening to the voice. In addition, he clarifies the dominant discourse in Japanese sociolinguistics would assert that the utterance such as the following are typically men's language.

(1) A: *Gohan tabeta?* (=Have you eaten (lunch)?)

B: *Un, ie de kuttekit.* (=Yeah I had at home.)

(2) *Ah, ketsu ni ase kaita.* (=Oh, my bottom is sweaty.)

(3) *Omae, damattore!* (=You, shut up!)

So, without listening to the speaker, we can directly differ men or women language because of the way and choice of word that make it sense of them.

Mizokami quoted some researcher reports that men interrupt more often than women. Then, he argued that women use mechanical definitions to identify interruption. To support this quotation, Mizokami (2003:151) quoted West and Zimmerman example in men's stating their interruption. The examples are as follows.

Female: So uh you really can't B__ch when you've got all those on the same day (4.2) but I uh asked my physics professor if I couldn't change that.

Male : Don't touch that.

Female: What?

Male : I've got everything just how I want in that notebook. You'll screw it up leafin' through it like that.

So, it can be inferred that men interrupt more than women do; when they interrupt they use the direct sentence or choice of word, whereas women use more mechanical, interpreted, and assumption word to express interruption.

Lakoff in Sapiro (1986:270) argued that in many senses there are fairly distinct female and male dialect within the English language. From Lakoff's argument it is assumed that men and women are born in differentiation, judging from language side. They are, in communication, fairly distinct within the English language. Lakoff as quoted by Coates (1986:18) stated that he singled out "empty" adjectives like *divine*, *charming*, *cute*... as a typical of what she calls 'women' language.

In *addition*, according to Jespersen in Coates (1986:19) 'vastly' and 'so' are also claimed as having 'something eternally feminine about it' and mostly used by women eventhough men can use it too. The example of 'so' can be observed in the following sentence: 'It is *so*

lovely!'; 'He is so charming!'; 'Thank you so much!'; 'I'm so glad you've come'. When women find something good they will say 'it is so lovely' and then if they look at a handsome guy they will say 'he is so charming', but sometimes they will use it in another condition too.

Jespersen's explanation for this sex-preferential usage is that women much more often than men break off without having thought out what they are going to say. It can be inferred then that women always break off their sentence or talking in communication, never end up their desire, meaning that they don't speak out loud what they are going to say.

In the same case as Jespersen, Lakoff (1986:19) in Coates also has a section on the intensifier *so*. She asserts that that '*so*' is more frequent in women's than men's language, though certainly men can use it. In addition, Lakoff in Mizokami (2003:145) explains that these (so, divine, vastly) characteristics of 'women language' are a result of linguistic subordination: a woman must learn to speak 'women language' to avoid being criticized as unfeminine by society.

The explanation above clearly support what Sapiro (1986:270) affirms that women and men use slightly different vocabularies. He further states that because of the different experiences women and men have and the different training they receive, they use the different specialized vocabularies.

It is now clear that word choice of both male and female can be differentiated and will be analyzed in the research to find out the answer of the statement of the problem in the research data. Uchida statement is used

as the main theory to find out words choice used by male and female. Then, West and Zimmerman example are used too where the example are not found in Uchida. Another theory or views are the supporting theory that strengthen Uchida's and West and Zimmerman's view.

2.2.3 Taboos in Genderlect

Taboo language is variety language commonly used by men which is now used by women too. It becomes taboo related to the women's stereotypes or men's in some languages. They have their own language, and it makes sense that language appropriateness must be used by women. Unlike men, women are more ladylike in everything referring to language. According to Trudgill (2003:133) taboo language has to do with words and expressions which are supposed not to be used, and which are shocking, offensive, blasphemous or indecent when they are used. 'Swear words' are common examples of words which are subject to linguistic taboo.

'A wistling sailor, a crowning hen and a swearing woman all three ought to go to H_ _l together'.

(American Proverb)

The proverb above explains that woman is the same as a wistling sailor and a crowning hen when she swears where it is not expected by the societies. When they use swear word societies expect them to go H_ _l, that they must not appear around societies while using it, including women that use taboo. Coates (1986:19) argued that oaths, exclamations, and taboo words are anything which could come under the general heading

'vulgar language'. Concerning the vulgar language, it is more frequently used by men than women. Since everything related to women are more ladylike, then, it is very taboo for women to use the vulgar words.

Again, consider Lakoff 's observation in Coates (1986:21) below.

(A) 'Oh dear, you've the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.'

(B) 'Shit, you've the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.'

It is safe to predict that people would classify that the first sentence as a part of "women's language", the second as "men's language."

So, women don't use rough or indelicate word because women are called the euphemism expert. They tend to use more polite words as shown in the first sentence. Similar to Trudgill, Coates (1986:35) states that taboo operates in all societies, proscribing certain forces of behavior, linguistic behavior. He takes an example in British society today. Topics of conversation such as excretion or sexual activity are taboo in most context. That taboo languages are shocking, offensive, blasphemous or indecent is very contrast to women stereotypes that they are full of softness in thought. Women always use the non-stronger expletive than men. Those indecent words are more related to men.

When discussing taboo language, below is Orton's statement as quoted by Giliéron in Coates (1986: 42):

In this country men speak vernacular more frequently, more consistently, and more genuinely than women.

Regarding the argument above, Chesier selects swearing as one of the measures to be included in Vernacular culture index (Coates, 1986:109). From Chesier's view it can be assumed that swearing or taboo

languages are part of vernacular. Further, Jespersen in Coates (1986:108) claimed that women have an instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expressions and preference for refined and (in certain spheres) veiled and indirect expression. Unlikely, in his preface to the *Dictionary of American Slang*, Flexner in Coates (1986:108) claims that most American slang is created and used by males. In line with this, Lakoff in Coates (1986:108) also claims that men use stronger expletives (*damn, shit*) than women (*oh dear, goodness*), but her evidence is purely impressionistic. Based on the three arguments above it can be concluded that women have an instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expression; that they (women) also have indirect expression to express the taboo words. Additionally, Lakoff claims that men use stronger expletives such as *damn or shit* than women, and that the latter use the word like *oh dear or goodness* on the other hand. Lakoff evidence is purely impressionistic.

Talking about taboo language men remark to limit and curb techniques of women speech (*loc.cit.277*). Delivering taboo language, based on Sapir, is also connected to the term techniques in communication.

2.3 The Men and Women Interaction

Both men and women are different, and therefore it is influencing them in interaction to each other. Women's linguistic behavior is often characterised (*Sich*) as being concerned with co-operation (more positively polite than men) and avoidance of conflict (more negatively polite than men) (Mills, 2003:203). Then,

Mills (2003:165) quoting Lakoff and Spender argued that women's language style was further characterized by the use of elements such as hedges, tentativeness, tag-questions which seemed to these theorists to signal indirectness, mitigation, diffidence, and hesitation. In contrast to this, male speech was characterised as direct, forceful, and confident, using features such as direct, unmitigated statements and interruption.

Politeness itself is generally considered a civilizing force which mitigates the aggression of strangers and familiars towards one another and ideologically this civilizing move is often associated with femininity. Masculinity, on the other hand, is stereotypically associated with directness and aggression (Mills, 2003:204). The characterized between male and female above apply to their goals of communication or their utterances. According to Lancker in Jay (2009:155), he stated that reason for using or not using taboo words depend on the conversational goals of the speaker. Swearing is like using the horn, which can be used to signify a number of emotions (e.g., anger, frustration, joy, surprise). Our control over swearing ranges from the spontaneous forms (e.g., habitual epithets), over which we seem to have little control, to the reflective forms (e.g., new obscene joke), where we take time to think about what to say. That's why every people goals of conversational related to Lancker is different, (e.g., fuck and shit) between male and female will have the difference goals of uttering those words such as anger, frustration, joy, surprise, etc. may be male goals are showing joy but female to show anger.

Similarly, Jay (2009:155) argues that besides literal or denotative uses (*We fucked*), the primary use of swearing is for emotional connotation, which occurs in

the form of epithets or as insults directed toward others. Epithets are offensive emotional outbursts of single words or phrases used to express the speaker's frustration, anger, or surprise (*Holy shit! Fuck me!*). He further argued that insulting form of taboo word use include name calling and put downs (*asshole, bitch*) and cursing or wishing harm on someone (e.g. *fuck off, eat shit and die*). He added that positive social outcomes are achieved by using taboo words in jokes and humor, social commentary, sex talk, storytelling, in-group slang, and self-deprecation or ironic sarcasm in order to promote social harmony or cohesion.