

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this chapter, the writer concludes the result of the study and gives some suggestions for further research that can be made based on this study.

5.1 Conclusion

After going through some analysis of the e-mail messages written by both male and female participant in “Yahoo” discussion groups, finally, the study comes to the following conclusion:

1. Men and women do write differently; although not to the same extent, when responding to e-mail postings from same- and cross-gender participants in “Yahoo” Discussion Groups. This can be seen in the frequency of the language features found in their E-mail responses. Therefore, the language features use when writing to male netpals may differ from those of female ones.
2. Comparing to women, men do not completely use different language style when communicating with other men than women in the discussion groups.
3. Men are more likely to state opinion, aggressive/sarcastic expressions, and share personal experience with other men than women in the

groups. These are associated with men's social stereotypes as being aggressive and more interested in presenting their personal point of view to solve problems in the discussion groups. However, men use more supportive expressions, asking questions, provide personal information, and suggestion when writing to other women in order to match the language style of their female netpals.

4. Men continue to state more opinion when communicating with other women. This implies that men want to dominate and present an 'authoritative' contribution to the discussion in order to maintain social standing.
5. Women do write differently when responding to e-mail postings from other women than men.
6. In the area of same-gender communication, women use a lot more references to emotion, provide more personal information, opinion, suggestion, and supportive expressions. These results imply that women use language to establish closeness as a basis of friendships and that women place a high value on consideration for the wants and needs of others. While in cross-gender communication, women tend to use more opinion, aggressive/sarcastic expressions, and ask more questions in order to fit the situation and be easily accepted in the group. They also use questions to stimulate conversations.

These six conclusions are the result of this study concerning with the different language style use by men and women in responding to e-mail postings in “Yahoo” discussion groups.

5.2 Suggestions

The writer realizes that there are some weaknesses in the study; therefore, for the next researchers, there are some suggestions to give to improve researchers in the same field with the one being discussed in this thesis. The writer of this study suggests that through these findings the future researchers who deal with Sociolinguistics field and especially with the topic of language, gender and online communication can include wider scope either on the subject or the area of analysis.

The point of discussion in this research is the language features used in E-mail discussion groups. It would be a step forward if there is another research which discusses the language used in other forms of online communication, such as instant messaging, chat rooms, or message boards.

In addition, concerning the limited references on the subject, the writer also would like to suggest the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University to provide more books on gender and online communication in order to make the future researchers be able to conduct further studies more easily.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, A., and Bruce, M. 1993. The Expert Systems Debate: A Gender Perspective in *E. Green, J. Owen, and D. Pain (eds.) Gendered by Design?* (pp. 81-94). Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis.
- Arliss, Laurie P. 1991. *Gender Communication*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Bilous, F. R., and Krauss, R.M. 1988. *Dominance and Accommodation in the Conversational Behaviours of Same- and Mixed-Gender Dyads*. *Language and Communication*, 8, pp. 183-194.
- Bonvillain, Nancy. 1999. *Language, Culture, and Communication*. [On-line]. Available: <http://logos.uoregon.edu/explore>.
- Cameron, Deborah. 1992. *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Chaika, Elaine. 1994. *Language: The Social Mirror*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Coates, Jennifer. 1986. *Women, Men, and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language*. London: Longman.
- _____. 1993. *Women, Men, and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language, 2nd ed.* London: Longman.
- Collis, B. 1985. *Sex Differences in Secondary School Students' Attitude Toward Computers*. *The Computing Teacher*, 12, pp. 33-36.
- Coupland, N., Coupland, J., Giles, H., and Henwood, K. 1988. *Accommodating the Elderly: Invoking and Extending a Theory*. *Language in Society*, 17, 1-41.
- Coupland, N., Coupland, J., and Giles, H. 1991. *Language, Society, and the Elderly*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Cummings, J. N., Butler, B., and Kraut, R. 2001. *The Quality of Online Relationships*. *Communications of the ACM*.
- Dharma, R. 1999. *A Comparative Study on the Politeness Strategies in Giving Advises Employed by Male and Female Consultants in "Dari Hati ke Hati" Column of Femina Magazine*. Unpublished S1 Thesis. Surabaya: Widya Mandala Catholic University.

- Dimona, L., and Herndon, C. 1994. *Women's Sourcebook*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Doyle, J. A. 1985. *Sex and Gender: The Human Experience*. Dubuque, Iowa: C. Brown Publishers.
- Duck, S., and Wright, P. H. 1993. *Re-examining Gender Differences in Friendships: A Close Look at Two Kinds of Data*. *Sex Roles*, 28, pp. 709-727.
- Fetler, M. 1985. *Sex Differences on the California Statewide Assessment of Computer Literacy*. *Sex Roles*, 13, pp. 181-191.
- Fisher, G. 1984. *The Social Effects of Computers in Education*. *Electronic Learning*, pp. 26-28.
- Fitzpatrick, M., Mulac, A., and Dindia, K. 1995. *Gender-Preferential Language Use in Spouse and Stranger Interaction*. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 14, pp. 18-39.
- Forsyth, A.S., and Lancy, D.F. 1989. *Girls and Microcomputers: A Hopeful Finding Regarding Software*. *Computers in the Schools*, 6, pp. 51-59.
- Graddol, D., and Swann, J. 1989. *Gender Voices*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Hannah, A., and Murachver, T. 1999. *Gender and Conversational Style as Predictors of Conversational Behaviour*. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 18, pp. 153-174.
- Henwood, F. 1993. Establishing Gender Perspectives on Information Technology: Problems, Issues, and Opportunities in *E. Green, J. Owen, and D. Pain (eds.) Gendered by Design? (pp. 31-52)*. Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis.
- Herring, S. 1994. *Gender Differences in Computer-Mediated Communication: Bringing Familiar Baggage to the New Frontier*. Miami: American Library Association Annual Convention Keynote Talk. June 27, 1994. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.cpsr.org/gender/herring.txt>.
- Holmes, J. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. United States of America: London Publishing.
- Jones, P.K. 1987. *The Relative Effectiveness of Computer-Assisted Remediation with Male and Female Students*. *Technical Horizons in Education*, 14, pp. 61-63.

- Kirk, D. 1992. *Gender Issues in Information Technology as Found in Schools*. Educational Technology, 32, pp. 28-31.
- Kothari, C.R. 1990. *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern.
- Lakoff, R. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lever, J. 1978. *Sex Differences in the Complexity of Children's Play and Games*. American Sociological Review, 43, pp. 471-483.
- Levin, T., and Gordon, C. 1989. *Effect of Gender and Computer Experience on Attitudes Toward Computers*. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 5, pp. 69-88.
- McMillan, James H. 1992. *Educational Research*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Meunier, L. 1996. *Gender Differences in Computer Use*. [On-line]. Available: <http://hhobel.phl.univie.ac.at/mii/gpmc.dir9606/msg00013.html>.
- Montgomery, M. 1995. *An Introduction to Language and Society*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Mulac, A., and Bradac, J.J. 1995. Women's Style in Problem Solving Interactions: Powerless or Simply Feminine? in *P.J. Kalbfleisch and M.J. Cody (eds.) Gender, Power, and Communication in Human Relationships* (pp. 83-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mulac, A., Wiemann, J.M., Widenmann, S.J., and Gibson, T.W. 1988. *Male / Female Language Differences and Effects in Same-sex and Mixed-sex Dyads: The Gender-Linked Language Effect*. *Communication Monographs*, 55, pp. 315-335.
- Murray, F. 1993. A Separate Reality: Science Technology and Masculinity in *E. Green, J. Owen, and D. Pain (eds.) Gendered by Design?* (pp. 64-80). Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis.
- Pew Internet and American Life Project. 2000a. *Tracking Online Life: How Women Use the Internet to Cultivate Relationships with Family and Friends*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.pewinternet.org/reports>.
- Preisler, B. 1987. *The Tentative Female*. English Today, 12, pp. 29-30.
- Rafaeli, S., and Sudweeks, F. 1993. *ProjectH Codebook*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.arch.usyd.edu.au/~fay/projecth.html>.

- Reid, E. 1991. *Electropolis: Communication and Community on Internet Relay Chat*. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.crl.com/~emr/electropolis.html>.
- Riggs, C., and Sparrow, J. 1994. *Gender, Diversity and Working Styles*. Women in Management Review (9:1), pp. 9-16.
- Rosetti, P. 1997. Gender Differences in E-mail Communication. [On-line]. Available: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Rosetti-GenderDif.html> or <http://mypage.direct.ca/p/prosett/online.html>.
- Sanders, J. S. 1985. *Making the Computer Network*. The Computing Teacher, 12, pp. 23-27.
- Sapir, E. 1949. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harvest.
- Savicki, V., Lingenfelter, D., and Kelley, M. 1996. *Gender Language Style and Group Composition in Internet Discussion Groups*. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, Vol. 2 (No. 3). [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ascuse.org/jcmc/vol2/issue3/savicki.html#subjects>.
- Shea, V. 1994. *Net Etiquette*. San Fransisco: Albions Books.
- Spence, J.T., and Buckner, C.E. 2000. *Instrumental and Expressive Traits, Trait Stereotypes, and Sexist Attitudes: What Do They Signify?* Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24, pp. 44-62.
- Sproull, L., and Kiesler, S. 1986. *Reducing Social Context Cues: E-mail in Organizational Communication*. Management Science, 32, pp. 1492-1512.
- Tannen, D. 1990. *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- _____. 1995. *The Power of Talk: Who Gets Heard and Why*. Article from Harvard Business Review, September, Vol. 73 (No. 5), pp. 138-148.
- Teeler, D., and Gray, P. 2000. *How to Use the Internet in ELT*. England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Thomson, R., Murachver, T., and Green, J. 2001. *Where is Gender in Gendered Language?* Journal of Psychological Science, Vol. 12 (No. 2), pp. 171-175. [Online]. Available: http://www.psychologicalscience.org/members/journal_issues/ps/PSCI1226.pdf.
- Thomson, R., and Murachver, T.(in press). *Predicting Gender from Electronic Discourse*. British Journal of Social Psychology.

- Trias, Jennifer V. 1997. *Democracy or Difference: A Literature Review of Gender Differences in Online Communication*. [On-line]. Available: <http://nimbus.temple.edu/jvaughn/papers/litrev.htm>.
- Trudgill, P. 1984. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Great Britain: Cox and Nyman, Ltd.
- Twenge, J.M. 1997. *Changes in Masculine and Feminine Traits Across Time: A Meta-Analysis*. *Sex Roles*, 36, pp. 305-327.
- Walther, J. B. 1996. *Computer-Mediated Communication: Impersonal, Inter-Personal, and Hyper Personal Interaction*. *Communication Research*, 23 (1), pp. 3-43.
- We, Gladys. 1993. *Cross-Gender Communication in Cyberspace*. [On-line]. Available: http://cpsr.org/cpsr/gender/we_cross_gender.
- Wright, P. H., and Scanlon, M. B. 1991. *Gender Role Orientations and Friendship: Some Attenuation but Gender Differences Abound*. *Sex Roles*, 24, pp. 551-566.
- Yelloushan, K. 1989. *Social Barriers Hindering Successful Entry of Females into Technology Oriented Fields*. *Educational Technology*, 29, pp. 44-46.