

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Language plays an important role in shaping the social scene and constructing social identities and this can be seen particularly in the area of gender—the socially constructed differences of behavior and belief considered appropriate to the two sexes. For many of us, most of the time, language seems just a neutral tool for expressing ideas and conveying information. In the domain of gender, however, as in other important areas of social life, careful analysis can reveal that language sometimes operates to disguise distinctions, sometimes to reinforce them and sometimes also actively to produce them.

Sexist language is any language that expresses such stereotyped attitudes and expectations, or that assumes the inherent superiority of one sex over the other. In other words, sexist language can be understood as a language that is used to create, constitute, promote, and exploit an unfair or irrelevant distinction between sexes.

In a need for leading to a language that treats both sexes equally or so called 'equality in language', the writer has compiled some guidelines of non-sexist language from various sources. Some reliable institutions that deal primarily with language matter such as American Philosophical Association (APA), Linguistic Society of America (LSA) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) have issued their own version of guidelines of non-

sexist language. In addition, the writer also found a book entitled “The McGraw – Hill College Workbook” written by John C. Bean which discusses briefly and effectively some guidelines of non-sexist use of language. Each version of guideline offers its own weakness and strength. It then encourages the writer to combine those guidelines so that one elaborate version of guidelines of nonsexist language can be formulated. The purpose of combining those guidelines is for picking out the best part of each so every version of guideline of non-sexist language acts as a complement for one another.

Related to presentation and analysis of the data that the writer has carried out, the writer then obtained some points of conclusion in this study. Firstly, most indicators of sexist language are the appearance of generic term ‘man’ and generic pronouns ‘he’, ‘his’ and ‘him’ throughout contexts of language use. At this point, the writer has compiled some suggestions and hints to overcome this matter. These hints will probably be very helpful to eliminate sexist sense within sentences.

Secondly, the data that the writer has gathered are the real evidence that language do put sexes at the unequal position. English language does not merely alienate women. Men also accept the same treatment but the proportion of the alienation is much more obvious on the behalf of women. From the previous discussion, we realize that women are viewed as an oppressed group, while men are seen as the dominant one.

The last point, the writer would like to take a general conclusion that English—a language now used in many varieties in the British Isles, the United

States, and most Commonwealth countries, and often internationally—do denotes sexism within it. The conscious choice by all of us to use the nonsexist language will greatly assist in the creation of a more open and equitable environment in the world.

Here, the writer also provides some points of suggestion tied up to the application of the alternatives of non-sexist language already presented. The first is about the alternatives of non-sexist language that the writer offered deal mostly with the use of generic pronouns that refer strictly to general contexts of language use in which the intended meaning is supposed to include all human being regardless sex. This carries meaning that we are still permitted to use gender-specific pronouns only to identify a specific gender or specific person. In this case, it is indeed still possible to use personal pronouns only in relation with certain kind of sex in particular.

Secondly, the alternatives presented in previous discussion also deal with the matter of recasting one sentence in different words with similar meaning. It is possible to recast the sentence in different style by using plural nouns and pronouns only if they don't change the meaning of the sentence. We may still restructure the sentence in another style of composition as long as it doesn't change the essential meaning of the sentence itself.

In the third point, the writer would like to pay attention to terms that are casually used in daily speech and that can be considered sexist such as terms of address and occupations. In the data analysis, the writer compiled non-sexist forms of the terms. It is not an easy task to get accustomed to new forms of non-

sexist language since people might have been used to the sexist versions but by gradual adjustment hopefully we will be able to make these terms familiar in the future.

The fourth point of suggestion is about the real practice of non-sexist language which is much more flexible in spoken language than in written language. Some people in English speaking countries are even free to make their own decision to choose plural form 'they' as antecedent when the subject used is indefinite pronoun such as in a sentence '*Each student should submit their assignments by Monday*'; another example of this matter can be taken from literary work of George Bernard Shaw, which said that 'It's enough to drive *anyone* out of *their* senses' and of George Elliot's which said that 'I shouldn't like to punish *anyone*, even if *they* had done me wrong'. At present, we heard this frequently in many informal occasions except in conversation among some people who still identify themselves as linguistically conservative over the disagreement in number between a subject and its antecedent. Somehow we have to admit that this usage is still far more acceptable in spoken rather than in written language.

Finally, the guidelines of non-sexist language that the writer has combined may hopefully give some positive contribution to the equality in all areas of our lives especially in our language. Even somehow, not most people agree on these conventions but at least the guidelines have opened our new horizon of something that we did not aware before.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Melli Josa