

ARTICLE

## Linguistic Strategies and Conversation Style of Men and Women in Transactional Conversation at Tourism Objects

Ni Wayan Kasni <sup>\*</sup> , I Wayan Budiarta 

Department of English Literature, Faculty of Letters, Univeristas Warmadewa, Denpasar, Bali 80239, Indonesia

### ABSTRACT

This research aims to investigate the linguistic strategies and conversation style used by men and women in transactional tourism objects and to analyze the contribution of men's and women's language to tourism sustainability. This research employs a qualitative approach. The study employs content analysis proposed by Krippendorff to systematically examine recorded conversations between male and female participants. Coates' theory guides the analysis to interpret male language features, such as minimal responses and direct commands, and Lakoff's theory explores female speech characteristics, including politeness and hedges. The results show that men predominantly use direct language and minimal responses to assert control and transaction efficiency. At the same time, women employ more polite forms and indirect language to foster rapport and maintain a courteous interaction. Both male and female sellers use questions and compliments strategically, with men focusing on gathering information for clear transactions and women fostering connection. These varied communication styles enhance the tourist experience, encouraging repeat visits and promoting positive word-of-mouth, which is crucial for sustaining tourism destinations in the long term. The study concludes that these gendered communication styles significantly impact tourism sustainability by influencing customer satisfaction and repeat business. Men's directness supports efficient transactions, while women's politeness enhances customer relations, contributing to a positive tourism experience and long-term sustainability.

**Keywords:** Linguistic Strategies; Conversational Style; Transactional Conversation

#### \*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Ni Wayan Kasni, Department of English Literature, Faculty of Letters, Univeristas Warmadewa, Denpasar, Bali 80239, Indonesia; Email: wayankasni@gmail.com

#### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23 November 2024 | Revised: 12 January 2025 | Accepted: 15 January 2025 | Published Online: 19 February 2025  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i2.8168>

#### CITATION

Kasni, N.W., Budiarta, I.W., 2025. Linguistic Strategies and Conversation Style of Men and Women in Transactional Conversation at Tourism Objects. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(2): 797–812. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i2.8168>

#### COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Language and gender are interconnected, with women's and men's language influencing interactions between women and men<sup>[1, 2]</sup>, affecting vocabulary use, word choice, and emotional differences in spoken language<sup>[3]</sup>, and influencing text representation<sup>[4]</sup>. Therefore, men and women may use different languages<sup>[5]</sup>.

Gender influences conversational language usage<sup>[6-9]</sup>. This means that language and gender relationships in conversations vary between males and females<sup>[10]</sup>. Both men and women have different speech patterns<sup>[11]</sup>, styles<sup>[12-14]</sup> and behaviour<sup>[15]</sup> in conversational. However, not all of them follow typical patterns of conversation<sup>[16]</sup>. Therefore, the conversation between men and women needs to be learnt in different contexts, conditions, times, and communication types. Men and women communicate differently in daily life<sup>[17, 18]</sup>. Many studies reveal the different linguistic features of men and women in conversation. Men and women have differences in lexicon and phonology use<sup>[19]</sup>, vocabulary, grammar, and styles in conversation<sup>[12, 17, 20]</sup>.

Men speakers used more interruptions<sup>[21]</sup>, hard and high-hedges and boosters<sup>[22]</sup>, argued more and engaged in more competitive discourse styles in verbal interactions<sup>[23]</sup>, spoke more abstractly<sup>[24]</sup>, interrupted more in conversations<sup>[25]</sup>, more vocalized pauses<sup>[26]</sup>, more direct and non-standard speech<sup>[27]</sup>, more direct and non-standard<sup>[27]</sup>, more refer to object properties and impersonal topics<sup>[28]</sup>, and prefer a direct, dominant, and non-conventional conversational style than women.

Women use more dependent clauses<sup>[29]</sup>, first-person pronouns, fewer third-person references, and interrupt each other<sup>[21]</sup>, more likely to use accepted standards and high prestige usages<sup>[30]</sup>, use more polite language and the style is conversational<sup>[12]</sup>, use soft and low-hedges and boosters<sup>[22]</sup>, frequently use hedges<sup>[31]</sup>, use minimal listener responses and speaker allocation devices<sup>[23]</sup>, speak more concretely<sup>[24]</sup>, use more tag questions<sup>[32]</sup>, show silence more often<sup>[25]</sup>, use more justifiers, intensifiers, and agreement in conversations<sup>[26]</sup>, more supportive, polite, and expressive speech<sup>[27]</sup>, use more words related to psychological and social processes<sup>[28]</sup>, use more standard forms in communication<sup>[33]</sup>, more verbally<sup>[34]</sup>, and prefer a reserved, tactful, and polite style than men.

In both verbal and nonverbal communication, men and

women communicate differently<sup>[35, 36]</sup> based on context, condition, time, and communication type<sup>[37, 38]</sup>. In certain ages, interaction partners, and activity types, women are slightly more talkative and use more affiliative speech than men, while men use more assertive speech<sup>[39]</sup>. Men tend to be more verbose and directive at home, while women are more supportive, polite, and expressive<sup>[40]</sup>. In public speeches, male speakers use specific types of linguistic, psychological, cognitive, and social words more frequently than females<sup>[41]</sup>. In academic essays, women use more adjectives, intensifiers, and words, while men use more empty adjectives and linking adverbials<sup>[42]</sup>. In everyday interactions, women do more conversational than men<sup>[43]</sup>. In formal face-to-face conversations, women prefer avoiding direct disagreement and maintaining social rapport, while men seem less professional speakers and less cooperative<sup>[44]</sup>. In peer-directed educational discussions, women use more epistolary communication, while men use expository communication styles in initial posts<sup>[45]</sup>. In televised interviews, women use simpler, more self-referential language, while men use less common language and larger words, highlighting their passive, third-person, depersonalized speech<sup>[46]</sup>. In online collaborative learning, women are more effective and cohesive communicators than men.

Apart from context, condition, time, and communication type, linguistic features used between men and women are also different based on the culture, as in Pakistani<sup>[47]</sup>, Jordanian<sup>[48]</sup>, Sri Lanka<sup>[49]</sup>, Malaysia<sup>[50]</sup>, Minangkabau<sup>[51]</sup>, Banjar<sup>[52]</sup>, Russia<sup>[53]</sup>, Japan<sup>[54]</sup>, Malioboro<sup>[55]</sup>, and Iran<sup>[56]</sup>. The linguistic features of men and women are also different in different settings, such as in Instagram<sup>[57]</sup>, in university settings<sup>[58, 59]</sup>, in television talk shows<sup>[47, 60]</sup>, in interview videos<sup>[61]</sup>, in advertisements<sup>[62]</sup>, and police station<sup>[63]</sup>. However, men and women also have similarities in linguistic features, especially in compliments, and support each other's statements when discussing<sup>[64]</sup>.

The differences in language features in communication styles between men and women can improve business deals and management<sup>[65]</sup>. For tourism, gender differences significantly impact the design of marketing communications<sup>[66, 67]</sup>. Men sellers tend to use more talk<sup>[68]</sup>. Women sellers and buyers have higher speech levels and are more active and clever in speaking<sup>[69]</sup>; women sellers use tact, agreement, and modesty to communicate with buyers<sup>[70]</sup>,

use more nurturing language and behavior<sup>[71]</sup>, and use more interruption<sup>[68]</sup>.

The research problem concerns understanding the distinct language features and communication styles between men and women in various conversational contexts, especially in transactional conversations. Although men and women exhibit different speech patterns, styles, and linguistic behaviors, these differences may vary based on context, condition, and type of communication. Existing research has shown that men and women use different vocabulary, sentence structures, and conversational tactics, yet little is known about how these differences manifest specifically in transactional conversations. Additionally, the role of gender-based language use in shaping professional interactions, particularly in sectors like tourism, where communication plays a crucial role in sustainability, remains underexplored. Understanding these linguistic differences could provide valuable insights into how communication contributes to the evolving roles of men and women in this industry. Therefore, the research problem formulated into:

- (1) What are men's linguistic strategies and conversation styles in transactional at tourist attractions?
- (2) What are the linguistic strategies and conversation styles used by women in transactional at tourist attractions?
- (3) Does language depict the changing roles men and women play in contributing to tourism sustainability?

## 2. Theoretical Basis

The syntactic differentiation between males and females concerns directive speech. Men often use directive phrases such as "Do this now," while women are more indirect, saying, "Why don't we do this for a while?" Women are taught to be more ladylike and speak gracefully, softly, and less forcefully.

In communication, women are active participants. While women ask questions to facilitate the flow of conversation, men compete to express their views and are eager to dominate the conversation. When it comes to linguistics, women speak softer, are more polite, and more feminine. Women also seem more thoughtful and put more effort into the conversation than men. Men's speeches, however, are more forceful and convincing. These factors are evident

because women are emotional while men are more rational in their characteristics. Socially, men are dominant, and women are subordinate. These differences are often reflected in communication. Lakoff introduced women's language to distinguish men's and women's different speech<sup>[72]</sup>. This theory has served as a basis for much research on the subject. Further, Lakoff's published work gave so many ideas to linguists to use to understand even more language and gender through a bigger lens or perspectives, which are the deficit approach, dominance approach, and difference approach.

According to<sup>[73]</sup>, the deficit approach explains that female language is inferior to men's. Thus, it concerns women's language deficiency, which lies in using hyperbole expressions in conversation, less command of syntax, and less vocabulary. Thus, women's language is believed to "be non-innovative. Moreover, the dominance approach further describes women's language, which elaborates that women are subordinate to men. In other words, women are dominated during interaction, thus making the women's language an oppressed one.

Meanwhile, the different approach believes that men and women belong to different subcultures. It resulted from women's resistance to being labeled as the powerless group. This time, women are allowed to claim that they are distinct from men, thus claiming to air their voices and express the ideas of love, family, and human experiences<sup>[74]</sup>.

## 3. Methods

### 3.1. Setting

This study is a field research project conducted in Tenganan Pegringsingan, Manggis District, Karangasem Regency, Bali<sup>[75]</sup>. This location is a well-known destination recognized by domestic and international visitors. Tenganan Pegringsingan is one of the Bali Aga villages (inhabited by the indigenous people of Bali) that has preserved its cultural heritage. As a tourist village, the local community leverages its unique cultural expertise, such as traditional dance, carving, writing on lontar (palm leaves), weaving textiles, and more. Additionally, the villagers showcase and sell their creative works in front of their homes. It allows visiting tourists to purchase these items while enjoying the beauty of other attractions in the village.

In addition, the data collection for this research was

conducted in Penglipuran Village, located in Bangli District, Bangli Regency, Bali. Penglipuran Village is a tourism village renowned for its cultural and traditional attractions, the Heroes Monument, forested areas, bamboo groves, and well-preserved architectural heritage passed down through generations. This village was named the “Best Tourism Village” by the UN Tourism Organization in 2023. Penglipuran Village is also recognized as an environmentally friendly village, having received an accolade as one of the cleanest villages in the world by UNESCO. As a tourism destination with natural beauty, the local community often offers additional attractions, such as local creative products, to visitors, contributing to the economic growth of the Penglipuran community. Thus, tourist activities in the village not only involve enjoying its scenic beauty but also supporting local small and medium enterprises (SMEs) through the purchase of various souvenirs.

### 3.2. Data Collection

The research data were collected through observation. All data were obtained from conversations between sellers and buyers, which the researcher recorded. In addition, the researcher also took notes on each interaction between sellers and buyers that occurred directly in the tourist area.

### 3.3. Data Analysis

The recorded data were analyzed using qualitative techniques. The recordings were transcribed and organized into conversational formats. Each conversation was numbered to distinguish interactions between male and female participants. This analytical technique enabled the researcher to organize the linguistic features of sellers and buyers. Once processed, the data were interpreted and presented in a descriptive narrative.

This research employs a qualitative approach to explore the nuances of language use in transactional conversations. The content analysis method, guided by Krippendorff’s theory<sup>[76]</sup>, systematically analyzes the linguistic patterns found in the interactions between sellers and buyers at the Tenganan Pegringsingan tourism object in Bali. Data is collected through observation, focusing on recorded conversa-

tions involving male and female participants. The analysis of these conversations is gender-specific: Coates’ theory is applied to interpret the language used by men, highlighting aspects of male conversational styles<sup>[74]</sup>, while Lakoff’s theory is employed to examine the language patterns of female speakers, emphasizing the features that characterize women’s speech<sup>[72]</sup>. The results of this analysis are then presented in a descriptive format, allowing for a clear and detailed depiction of the linguistic differences and similarities in the transactional conversations based on gender.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Linguistic Strategies and Conversation Style of Men in Transactional at Tourist Attractions

Men have six language features: minimal responses, commands and directives, swearing and taboo language, compliments, themes, and questions<sup>[74]</sup>. The conversation exhibits several of the language features outlined by Coates. Men mostly use minimal responses or backchanneling language features. Men tend to use this language feature to assert the dominance of the conversation. The conversation has clear, minimal responses that can be found at turn 01, 03, 06, 30, 32, 50, 58, and 77. The commands and directives men use with their friends or people to be close to each other. The conversation’s use of commands and directives can be found at turns 01, 08, 12, 30, 49, 51, and 69. Men often use the questions to gain information<sup>[74]</sup>. These language features in the conversation can be found at turns 10, 14, 34, 51, 53, 58, and 69. In conversations, men often use compliments to show appreciation for each other based on skill and possessions. The complement in the conversation can be found at turns 51 and 65. Another language feature is the theme, as Coates<sup>[74]</sup> stated that men sometimes talk about current issues and topics that interest men. However, in the conversation, the theme cannot be found clearly. Moreover, swearing and taboo language are more often used by men than women to express emotion. In the transactional conversation, the swearing and taboo language feature cannot be found to maintain a formal and respectful tone.

- 01 Man 1: *nggih nanti titiang atur niki, yening dewa aji ten, biar titiang atur niki 8 juta*  
‘Yes, I’ll give you this, if Dewa Aji doesn’t agree, let me give you this 8 million’
- 02 Man 2: *ini sebenarnya ane mantuk ngeraganin agak suci*  
‘This is actually what gives it a rather sacred spirit’
- 03 Man 1: *nggih*  
‘Yes’
- ... ..
- 06 Man 2: *nggih tiang kan ndak tau, yen bapak kan tau*  
‘Yes, you know more better than me’
- 07 Man 1: *tapi sekarang dapet sane becik, masak tiang ngatur dewa aji sane melog-melog*  
‘But now I get a good one, how can I lie to Dewa Aji’

The minimal responses are used to show attention and often assert dominance in the conversation. The word *nggih* ‘yes’ at turn 01, 03, 06 is used by both men multiple times to keep the conversation flowing and to confirm understanding. The command and directive usage is subtle in this conversation. The man uses directive language at turn 01, *biar titiang atur niki 8 juta* ‘let me give you this 8 million’. This statement is direct and clear, showing the seller’s control over the transaction details. There is an implicit command in how the

seller proposes the deal, demonstrating assertiveness in the negotiation.

Moreover, the compliments in Coates’ theory are often used by men to acknowledge skills or possessions. However, in this conversation, there are no direct compliments. The closest instance is at turn 07, discusses the quality of the product *dapet sane becik* ‘I get a good one,’ but this is more of a self-promotion of the product rather than a compliment to the buyer.

- 08 Man: *mau pake yang ini*  
‘I want to wear this one’
- 09 Woman: *oh sewa?*  
‘oh rent?’
- 10 Man: *berapa yang sewa?*  
‘How much the price for rent?’
- 11 Woman: *ada yang 75.000 ada yang 50.000*  
‘some are 75,000 rupiah and some are 50,000 rupiah’
- 12 Man: *pake ukuran segini*  
‘this size please’
- 13 Woman: *iya ada*  
‘sure, here you are’
- 14 Man: *boleh dibawa keliling?*  
‘Can it be carried around?’
- ... ..
- 30 Man: *oh iya boleh itu*  
‘Okay, that one  
*ini dinaikin kah atau dilipet?*  
‘shall I lift it or fold it?’
- 31 Woman: *guhung*  
‘roll’
- 32 Man: *disini nggak apa apa?*  
‘Is it okay here?’
- 33 Woman: *ga apa apa*  
‘It’s okay’
- 34 Man: ... ..  
*funksinya apa ini pak kalo selendang ini?*  
‘What is the function of this scarf?’

The man uses minimal responses such as *oh iya boleh itu* ‘okay, that one’ at turn 30 and *disini nggak apa apa?* ‘Is it okay here?’ at turn 32. These brief responses help him control the conversation, aligning with Coates’ observation that men use minimal responses to assert dominance in a conversation.

The man frequently uses commands and directives, such as *mau pake yang ini* ‘I want to wear this one’ at turn 08, *pake ukuran segini* ‘this size please’ at turn 12, and *ini dinaikin kah atau dilipet?* ‘shall I lift it or fold it?’ at turn

30. These are direct, straightforward instructions typical of male communication that prioritizes clarity and efficiency.

The man also asks several questions, such as *berapa yang sewa?* ‘How much is the rent price?’ at turn 10, *boleh dibawa keliling?* ‘Can it be carried around?’ at turn 14, and *funksinya apa ini pak kalo selendang ini?* ‘What is the function of this scarf?’ at turn 34. These questions are used to gather information, which aligns with Coates’ theory that men use questions to obtain information rather than to maintain the conversation flow or for politeness.

- 49 Man 1: *beli 3 ya 100.000, boleh?*  
‘Can I get 100.000 rupiah for three durian?’
- 50 Man 2: *boleh boleh*  
‘Certainly’
- 51 Man 1: *kupas ya, um.. manis, enak*  
‘Can you open it? Um... sweet and delicious’  
*udah lama jualan itu dik?*  
‘How long have you been selling it?’
- 52 Man 2: *udah*  
‘Pretty long’
- 53 Man 1: *akhir musim masih duren kalo ini?*  
‘By the end of the season is it still durian’s?’
- 54 Man 2: *gak musim*  
‘No’
- 58 Man 2: ...  
*iya, kan pas musim*  
‘Yes, it’s on the season’  
*gak bawa pulang lagi?*  
‘you don’t want to take it home?’
- 65 Man 1: ...  
*nah.. Itu bisa, keras sekali..., biasanya tidak sekeras itu, tapi enak durennya matengnya pas*  
‘Well... you can do that, very hard..., usually not that hard, but it’s delicious because it’s wellcooked’

Minimal responses are evident in the conversation, particularly from man two as a seller. He frequently uses short responses like *boleh boleh* ‘certainly’ at turn 50 and *iya* ‘yes’ at turn 58. These minimal responses acknowledge the buyer’s requests and questions without interrupting the flow of the conversation. The seller’s brief responses can be seen as a way to keep the interaction efficient. It aligns with Coates’ idea that men use minimal responses to maintain control and focus the conversation on the task.

The buyer uses directives in the conversation, particularly when he says, *beli 3 ya 100.000, boleh?* ‘can I get

100.000 rupiahs for three durians?’ at turn 49 and *kupas ya* ‘can you open it?’ at turn 51. These statements are direct, characteristic of the command and directive style that Coates describes as typical in male speech. The buyer clearly states his intentions and expectations, common in male communication, where clarity and efficiency are prioritized.

The Buyer indirectly compliments the product when he says, *manis, enak* ‘sweet and delicious’ at turn 51 and *enak durennya mateng nya pas* ‘it’s delicious because it’s well cooked’ at turn 65. These compliments reflect the buyer’s appreciation of the seller’s product, which aligns with Coates’

observation that men often use compliments to acknowledge skills or possessions. The compliment here is centered on the quality of the durian, a key aspect of the transaction.

Both men use questions to gather information and clarify details. The buyer questions such as *udah lama jualan itu dik?* ‘How long have you been selling it?’ at turn 51 and *akhir musim masih duren kalo ini?* ‘by the end of the

season, is it still durian’s?’ at turn 53. These questions help the buyer gain more information about the product and the seller’s experience. Similarly, the seller asks, *gak bawa pulang lagi?* ‘you don’t want to take it home?’ at turn 58, aimed at understanding the buyer’s needs. Using questions to gather information and clarify points is a key feature of male communication, as highlighted by Coates.

- ...
- 69 Man: *gak boleh kurang?*  
‘Can I bargain?’  
*kalo saya langsung beli berarti saya tinggal bayar berapa ya?*  
‘If I want to buy it now, how much is it?’
- ...
- 77 Man: *gak apa-apa deh*  
‘It’s okay’

The man uses minimal responses, *gak apa-apa deh* ‘It’s okay’ at turn 77 toward the end of the conversation. This phrase indicates his acceptance of the situation. It serves to wrap up the discussion, aligning with Coates’ observation that men use minimal responses to assert control over the conversation.

The male speaker’s use of direct language, such as *gak boleh kurang?* ‘Can I bargain?’ at turn 69 reflects Coates’ idea that men often use commands or directives. This direct inquiry shows his assertiveness in trying to negotiate the price. The male speaker uses questions to gather information, such as *kalo saya langsung beli berarti saya tinggal bayar berapa ya?* ‘If I want to buy it now, how much is it?’ at turn 69. It aligns with Coates’ idea that men ask questions to obtain specific information.

#### 4.2. Linguistic Strategies and Conversation Style of Women in Transactional at Tourist Attractions

The language features women use in conversation differ from those used by men. The language features include lexical hedges or filters, tag questions, rising intonation on declarative and empty adjectives, precise color terms, intensifies, hypercorrect grammar, super-polite forms, avoidance of strong swear words, and emphatic stress<sup>[72]</sup>. The transactional conversation between the two women reflects several

of Lakoff’s language features. Most of the women, the seller, use hedges at the turn 80, 82, 83, 84, 104, 113, 115, 121, 168, 199, and polite forms to maintain a courteous and customer-friendly interaction and be more cooperative. Tag questions are used when women lack information and use a tag question to be corrected by the hearer.

Some of the women, as the buyer, use tag questions to negotiate prices at turn 101, 156, and 202, demonstrating a less assertive and more cooperative communication style. The grammar used by both women is polite and formal, found at turn 89 and 91, which aligns with Lakoff’s observation of hypercorrect grammar. Consistent use of polite forms aligns with Lakoff’s observation that women tend to use super-polite language. Super-polite forms maintain respect and friendliness in the conversation at the turn 80, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 119, 120, 128, 129, 195, 199, and 203. A woman in the transactional conversation uses an intensifier at the turn of 95. Intensives are used where the pourer will insist on absolute superlatives, with strong emphasis, which seems more characteristic of women’s language than men’s. Both women avoid strong language, contributing to a polite and effective exchange. The interaction is characterized by politeness and indirectness, especially when negotiating the price. However, the transactional conversation lacks rising intonation on declarative, empty adjectives, precise color terms, and significant emphatic stress.

- 78 Woman 1: *nike becik nike*  
‘That one is good’  
...
- 80 Woman 1: *ni kudaan niki buk nggih?*  
‘How much is this ma’am?’  
...
- 82 Woman 1: *oh niki medaging selendang*  
‘Oh... with a scarf’
- 83 Woman 2: *nggih anggo megarus niki*  
‘Yes, just for profit’  
*nggih ambil ampun cingak-cingak*  
‘Take it, have a look’
- 84 Woman 1: *niki nggih niki buk*  
‘This ma’am’
- 85 Woman 2: *bukak bukak buk, cingak cingak motifnya*  
‘Open it ma’am, look at the motif’  
...

Lexical hedges or fillers are not explicitly present in this short conversation. However, phrases like *oh* at turn 82 and *nggih* ‘yes’ at turn 80, 83, and 84 could serve as softeners or polite acknowledgments, indicating agreement or a mild surprise. The use of *oh* at turn 82 by woman 1 when she discovers the scarf included with the item can be seen as a soft way of acknowledging new information without showing strong emotion or disagreement.

The buyer’s use of *becik* ‘good’ at turn 78 is an adjective, but it does not fully qualify as an empty adjective according to Lakoff’s definition. *Becik* directly describes the perceived quality of the item, making it a meaningful descriptor rather than an adjective used purely for emotional

or social purposes.

Both women use polite and formal grammar, which aligns with Lakoff’s observation of hypercorrect grammar. Phrases like *nggih* ‘yes’ and *buk* ‘ma’am’ at turns 80, 84, and 85 reflect a formal and respectful tone that is consistent throughout the interaction. Super-polite forms are evident throughout the conversation, particularly with the seller repeating the *nggih* ‘yes’. This term and *buk* ‘ma’am’ show respect and politeness. The seller’s language is consistently polite and accommodating, such as when she says *nggih ambil ampun cingak-cingak*, ‘Yes, take it, have a look’ at turn 83.

- 87 Woman 1: *itu biasanya 25.000, tak kasi 20.000 dah*  
‘It usually 25.000 rupiah, but I’ll give you 20.000 rupiah’  
...
- 89 Woman 1: *saking napi bu?*  
‘Where are you from, ma’am?’
- 90 Woman 2: *tiang badung, tuban. Rame mangkin nggih?*  
‘I’m from Badung, Tuban. Are there many visitors?’
- 91 Woman 1: *nggih, astungkara rame*  
‘Yes, I hope there will be lots of visitors’

The phrase *Rame mangkin nggih?* The woman’s question, ‘Are there many visitors?’ at turn 90, indicates rising intonation on a declarative. It turns a statement into a question, reflecting a polite inquiry rather than a direct or

confrontational question.

The grammar used by both women is consistent with Lakoff’s observation of hypercorrect grammar. The speech is polite and formal, especially in the use of *nggih* ‘yes’ at



turn 91 and *bu'ma'am*' at turn 89, which show respect and adherence to social norms.

Super-polite forms are evident in the conversation. The woman's offer to reduce the price *tak kasi 20.000 dah* 'I will give you 20,000 rupiah' at turn 87 and her inquiry about

the buyer's origin *saking napi bu?* 'Where are you from, ma'am?' at turn 89, show politeness and a desire to establish a friendly rapport. The woman's response, including *nggih* 'yes' at turn 90, reflects a similarly polite and respectful tone.

- 94 Woman 1: ...  
*5.000 beli dua ya?*  
 'Can I get 5.000 rupiah for each item?'  
 95 Woman 2: *5.000 beli dua, baang ndak? Ya kasi dah*  
 '5.000 rupiah for each item? Okay take it'

The phrase *ya kasi dah* 'Okay, take it' used by the woman at turn 95 could be seen as an intensifier. Although not strongly emphatic, the casual *kasi dah* adds a slight emphasis, signaling agreement or acceptance, though it is subtle. The conversation contains elements of politeness, particu-

larly in the way both women negotiate the price. The woman said *ya?* at the end of her offer, *5.000 beli dua ya?* At turn 94, the statement is polite and less demanding. Other woman's response, *ya kasi dah* 'Okay, take it' at turn 95, also reflects a polite and accommodating tone.

- 101 Woman 2: ...  
*15.000 ya*  
 'can I get 15,000 rupiah?'  
 104 Woman 1: ...  
*30.000 pas ya*  
 '30,000 rupiah fix price'  
 113 Woman 2: ...  
*ini 35.000 ya?*  
 'Can I get 35,000 rupiah for this item?'  
 115 Woman 2: ...  
*35.000 ya?*  
 'Can I get 35,000 rupiah for this?'  
 119 Woman 2: ...  
*ini 3 40.000 dah, terima kasih*  
 '40,000 rupiah for 3 items, thank you'  
 120 Woman 1: *terima kasih kembali kak*  
 'Thank you'

The woman says *ya* frequently, especially at the end of sentences like *30.000 pas ya* '30,000 rupiah fix price' at turn 104. Although *ya* is often used to soften the statement and invite agreement, it also acts as a filler, making the conversation less direct and more tentative. Another woman also uses *ya* to negotiate prices, such as *35.000 ya?* 'Can I get 35,000 rupiah for this item?' at turn 113, 115, which serves as a hedge.

The woman also frequently uses tag questions during negotiations, such as, '*15.000 ya?* 'or 'Can I get 15,000

rupiahs?' at turn 101. This usage is aligned with Lakoff's observation that women use tag questions to soften statements and seek confirmation or agreement.

Politeness is maintained throughout the conversation. The woman ends the transaction with *terima kasih kembali kak* 'Thank you' at turn 120 and *terima kasih* 'thank you' at turn 119. These super-polite forms are consistent with Lakoff's theory that women tend to use polite expressions more often.

- 121 Woman 1: *pas ya nak ya*  
‘just right’  
...
- 128 Woman 2: *makasi ya nak ya*  
‘thank you, son’
- 129 Woman 1: *iya makasi*  
‘yes, thank you’  
...
- 156 Woman 2: *kan gak apa-apa ini ambil ini ya?*  
‘it’s okay to take this, aren’t we?’  
...
- 168 Woman 2: *iya gak apa*  
‘It’s okay’  
...
- 195 Woman 1: *iya makasi ya kak*  
‘yes, thank you ms’  
...

The word *ya* is frequently used by both women throughout the conversation, such as in *pas ya nak ya* ‘just right’ at turn 121 and *iya gak apa* ‘yes, it’s okay’ at turn 168. This serves as a filler, making their speech softer and less direct, which aligns with Lakoff’s observation that women use lexical hedges to soften their statements.

Tag questions appear when Woman 2 says, *kan gak apa-apa ini ambil ini ya?* ‘it’s okay to take this, isn’t it?’ at

turn 156. This use of a tag question seeks confirmation and is less assertive, reflecting the pattern Lakoff identified.

Politeness is maintained throughout the interaction, with phrases like *makasi ya nak ya* ‘thank you, son’ at turn 128 and *iya makasi* ‘yes, thank you’ at turn 129, 195 used frequently. These super-polite forms reflect Lakoff’s idea that women tend to use polite expressions more often in conversation.

- ...
- 199 Woman 1: *nggih-nggih 10.000*  
‘okay, 10,000 rupiah’  
...
- 202 Woman 2: *kan ampun samian dados bu nggih?*  
‘everything is done ma’am?’
- 203 Woman 1: *nggih ampun, suksma bu*  
‘done, thank you ma’am’  
...

The phrase *nggih-nggih* ‘okay, okay’ used by the woman at turn 199 functions as a hedge, softening the transaction and showing politeness. This aligns with Lakoff’s idea that women often use fillers or hedges to make their conversation less direct and more tentative.

The question of the woman, *kan ampun samian dados bu nggih?* ‘everything is done ma’am?’ at turn 202, can be considered a form of a tag question. She seeks confirmation,

reflecting a less assertive and more cooperative communication style typical of women’s speech per Lakoff’s theory.

Politeness is evident throughout the conversation, especially in phrases like *nggih-nggih* ‘okay, okay’ at turn 199 and *suksma bu* ‘thank you, ma’am’ at turn 203. These forms indicate a respectful and considerate tone, which aligns with Lakoff’s observation that women often use super-polite forms in their speech.

### 4.3. Contribution of Men and Women Language to Tourism Sustainability

Seller and buyer conversations involve various language features to bargain, persuade, greet, explain, undertake, confirm, and affirm<sup>[77]</sup> when transacting at tourist attractions. These language features contribute to tourism sustainability when the buyer starts to buy something in the transactional conversation. Language use in these seller-buyer interactions plays a crucial role in the experience of tourists, potentially affecting their satisfaction and willingness to return<sup>[78]</sup>.

03 Man 1: *nggih*  
'yes'

201 Woman 1: *ae*  
'yes'

Both men and women use minimal responses to keep conversations flowing. In the conversations, men frequently use minimal responses like *nggih* 'yes.' These brief acknowledgments serve to confirm understanding and keep the conversation moving forward. In male communication, these responses can assert control and show dominance in the interaction, contributing to efficient transactions, which are key in maintaining a smooth business environment in tourism. Women also use minimal responses, but these often carry a more polite tone to maintain harmony and rapport, as seen in the conversation. This polite interaction fosters positive relationships, which is crucial for repeat business and long-term sustainability in tourism.

08 Man: *mau pake yang ini*  
'I want to wear this one'

95 Woman 2: *5.000 beli dua, baang ndak? Ya kasi dah*  
'5.000 rupiah for each item? Okay take it'

Men often use direct language to express commands or requests, such as in conversation at the turn 08 *mau pake yang ini*, 'I want to wear this one.' This straightforward approach emphasizes clarity and efficiency, which can help in quick decision-making during transactions. Women also use directives, which are often softened by politeness or in-

69 Man: ...  
*kalo saya langsung beli berarti saya tinggal bayar berapa ya?*  
'If I want to buy it now, how much is it?'

89 Woman 1: *saking napi bu?*  
'Where are you from, ma'am?'

directness. As in the conversation at turn 95 *ya kasi dah* 'Okay, take it,' the woman uses a softener *ya* to make the directive less forceful. This approach can make the interaction more pleasant, encouraging customer satisfaction and loyalty. Both woman and man as seller use subtle directives to assert control over the transaction details like in *biar titiang atur niki 8 juta* 'let me give you this 8 million'. It shows the seller's influence in the negotiation process and helps steer the conversation towards a favorable outcome for them.

51 Man 1: *kupas ya, um.. manis, enak*  
'Can you open it? Um... sweet and delicious'

Men occasionally use indirect compliments or self-promotion to highlight the quality of their products, as seen in the conversation at turn 51 *manis, enak* 'sweet and delicious.' This positively influences the buyer's perception and enhances the likelihood of a sale, which is beneficial for sustaining business in the tourism sector. Compliments are less frequent in women's speech in the conversation. However, when used, they are typically indirect and embedded in the conversation, subtly encouraging the buyer without appearing overly assertive. This strategy subtly influences the buyer's perception of the product's value.

Women frequently use polite forms and hypercorrect grammar, as seen in conversations 05 and 06. These strategies help to create a respectful and courteous environment, which is critical in a service-oriented industry like tourism. Politeness can lead to higher customer satisfaction and a better reputation for the tourism object, thus supporting long-term sustainability. While men also use politeness strategies, they often combine these with a more direct communication style. This blend can effectively ensure that transactions are smooth and respectful, balancing efficiency with customer relations. The use of polite language helps maintain a respectful tone in the conversation. It is particularly important in a tourism setting, where the buyer's positive experience can lead to repeat business and good reviews, contributing to the long-term sustainability of the tourism object.

Both men and women use questions to gather information, but the intent behind the questions differs. Men tend to ask questions to gather specific information, which helps them make informed decisions during transactions. This is seen in the conversation at turn 69 *kalo saya langsung beli berarti saya tinggal bayar berapa ya?* ‘If I want to buy it now, how much is it?’. It leads to clearer, more transparent transactions, enhancing trust between buyers and sellers. Women also ask questions, but often, these serve to maintain the conversation or show interest, which helps build rapport. As in conversation 06 turn 89 *saking napa bu?* ‘Where are you from, ma’am?’ the question is more about establishing a connection than simply gathering information. It helps create a welcoming atmosphere, which is essential for sustainable tourism.

## 5. Conclusions

In conclusion, men and women employ distinct language features in transactional conversations that significantly contribute to tourism sustainability. Men use direct and efficient language, such as minimal responses and straightforward commands, facilitating quick decision-making and smooth transactions. These features help maintain control and clarity in business exchanges, enhancing customer trust and satisfaction. This finding confirms that male characters prioritize logic and influence their communication style<sup>[79]</sup>. On the other hand, women emphasize politeness and rapport-building through minimal responses, softened directives, and hypercorrect grammar, fostering positive relationships and creating a welcoming atmosphere for tourists. Both male and female sellers use questions and compliments strategically, with men focusing on gathering information for clear transactions and women fostering connection. These varied communication styles enhance the tourist experience, encouraging repeat visits and promoting positive word-of-mouth, which is crucial for sustaining tourism destinations in the long term.

## Author Contributions

Conceptualization, N.W.K. and I.W.B.; methodology, N.W.K. and I.W.B.; formal analysis, N.W.K. and I.W.B.; investigation, N.W.K.; data curation, N.W.K. and I.W.B.; writing—original draft preparation, N.W.K. and I.W.B.; writ-

ing—review and editing, N.W.K. and I.W.B.; funding acquisition, N.W.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## Funding

This research received no external funding.

## Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

## Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

## Data Availability Statement

All data in this research obtained from interview. Then, researchers do not use the third side’s data.

## Acknowledgments

The researcher extends gratitude to the Rector of Warmadewa University for providing financial support and granting permission to conduct this field research. Additionally, sincere thanks are given to all parties involved in this study.

## Conflicts of Interest

We stated that there is no conflict of interest.

## References

- [1] Holmes, J., 1997. Women, Language and Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 1(2), 195–223. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00012>
- [2] Talbot MM. 1999. *Language and gender: An introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. pp. xi, 257
- [3] Kristy, I.M., 2022. Differences in language conversation use by gender. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Sains Dan Humaniora*. 6(2), 248–253. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23887/jppsh.v6i2.43639>
- [4] Jones, L., 2016. Language and gender identities. In: Preece, S. (ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity*, 1st ed. Taylor and Francis: London, UK. pp. 210–224.
- [5] Yaş, E., 2022. *Dilbilimsel ve toplumdilbilimsel*

- perspektiften cinsiyet [Gender from the linguistic and sociolinguistic perspective]. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edeb Araştırmaları Derg.* 28(June), 469–482. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1132588>
- [6] Budiwati, T.R., 2004. Language use between men and women. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature.* 4(2), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v4i2.137>
- [7] Dunn, L.L., 1996. Gender and conversational interaction. *Language and Speech.* 39(1), 95–97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383099603900106>
- [8] Deviana, F., Wahyono, D., 2024. Social inequality on women in Khaled Hosseini’s “A Thousand Splendid Suns” novel. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature.* 3(2), 75–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.3.2.2024.75-88>
- [9] Putra, I.M.A.W., Juniartha, I.W., 2023. Liberal feminism depicted by Wanda through the dialogue in Dr. Strange in the multiverse of madness movie. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature.* 2(2), 53–64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.2.2.2023.53-64>
- [10] Kipers, P.S., 1987. Gender and topic. *Language in Society.* 16(4), 543–557. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500000373>
- [11] Hannah, A., Murachver, T., 2007. Gender preferential responses to speech. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology.* 26(3), 274–290. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X06303457>
- [12] Baker, P.A., 2021. Discourse and gender. In: Hyland, K., Paltridge, B., Wong, L. (eds.). *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed. Bloomsbury Publishing: London, UK. pp. 181–192.
- [13] Duha, E., Mono, U., Perangin-Angin, A., 2022. Communication style in Indonesia’s television series: My nerd girl. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature.* 1(1), 1–8. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.1.1.2022.1-8>
- [14] Oktira, H.D., Mono, U., Perangin-Angin, A.B., 2022. Different perspective of understanding between Indonesian and Malaysian in communication style. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature.* 1(1), 21–28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.1.1.2022.21-28>
- [15] Pillon, A., Degauquier, C., Duquesne, F., 1992. Males’ and females’ conversational behavior in cross-sex dyads: From gender differences to gender similarities. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research.* 21(3), 147–172. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01068070>
- [16] Ridgeway, C.L., Tannen, D., 1996. Talking from 9 to 5: How women’s and men’s conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work. *Contemporary Sociology.* 25(3), 398. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2077494>
- [17] Jiang, G., 2023. Analysis on daily communication differences between males and females. *Communications in Humanities Research.* 5(1), 442–446. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7064/5/20230357>
- [18] MacIntyre, P.D., 2019. Anxiety/uncertainty management and communication accommodation in women’s brief dyadic conversations with a stranger: An idiodynamic approach. *SAGE Open.* 9(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019861482>
- [19] Alhabuobi, T., 2021. Variation in language use across gender. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies.* 11(2), 129–134. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1102.03>
- [20] Bi, Q., 2010. Characteristics of the language of women in English. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* 1(3), 219–221. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.3.219-221>
- [21] Hirschman, L., 1994. Female–male differences in conversational interaction. *Language in Society.* 23(3), 427–442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500018054>
- [22] Holmes, J., 1995. *Women, Men and Politeness*, 1st ed. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 43.
- [23] Watts, R.J., 1994. Male vs female discourse strategies: Tabling conversational topics. In: Brünner, G., Graefen, G. (eds.). *Texte und Diskurse.* Springer Fachmedien: Wiesbaden, Germany. pp. 218–237. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-11619-6\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-11619-6_10)
- [24] Joshi, P.D., Wakslak, C.J., Appel, G., et al., 2020. Gender differences in communicative abstraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 118(3), 417–435. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000177>
- [25] Dewi, K.T., 2019. The linguistic strategies differences between men and women post graduate students of English education program of Undiksha Singaraja. *Yavana Bhasha: Journal of English Language Education.* 2(2), 70. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25078/yb.v2i2.1028>
- [26] Turner, L.H., Dindia, K., Pearson, J.C., 1995. An investigation of female/male verbal behaviors in same-sex and mixed-sex conversations. *Communication Reports.* 8(2), 86–96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08934219509367614>
- [27] Behbahani, H.K., Gholami, M., 2018. A sociolinguistic exploration of the difference between male speech and that of female speech. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Scientific Research.* 1(7), 11–21. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31426/ijamsr.2018.1.7.712>
- [28] Newman, M.L., Groom, C.J., Handelman, L.D., et al., 2008. Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Process.* 45(3), 211–236. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530802073712>
- [29] Hancock, A.B., Rubin, B.A., 2014. Influence of communication partner’s gender on language. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology.* 34(1), 46–64. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X14533197>

- [30] Adams, J.N., 1984. Female speech in Latin comedy. *Antichthon*. 18, 43–77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066477400003142>
- [31] Muthia, R.D., Hidayat, N.D., Alek, A., 2021. Conversational strategies used by women speakers in same-sex communication: A research on Noor Tagouri podcast. *Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*. 9(1), 12–29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v9i1.1735>
- [32] Sharif, N.A.M., Saffarudin, S., Aziz, A.A.A., et al., 2023. The differences in linguistic forms used by men and women. *Proceedings of International Conference of Research on Language Education (I-RoLE 2023)*; 13-14 March, 2023; Noble Resort Hotel Melaka, Malaysia. pp. 512–520. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15405/epes.23097.46>
- [33] Santika, R.S., Pahira, S.H., Prahitaningtyas, S., 2023. Rethinking language and gender research. *OPSearch American Journal of Open Research*. 2(10), 719–723. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58811/opsearch.v2i10.79>
- [34] Pasaribu, O.L., 2018. Language variations between women and men at SMP Muhammadiyah 3 Medan academic years 2017/2018. In: Zulfadhli, R.S., Pramesti, U.D., Adek, M., et al. (eds.). *Proceedings of the International Conference on Language, Literature, and Education (ICLLE 2018)*; July 19-20, 2018; Padang, Indonesia. pp. 121–124. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2991/iclle-18.2018.19>
- [35] Bouhout, N., 2019. Two uses of gender in conversation: A membership categorization analysis. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*. 4(2), 193–206. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v4i2.271>
- [36] Dewi, N.M.C.S., Pratiwi, D.P.E., Suastini, N.W., 2022. The verbal and non-verbal signs of “For Women by Women: IDÔLE Lancôme” advertisement. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature*. 1(2), 84–93. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.1.2.2022.84-93>
- [37] Bagaskoro, G., 2022. Gender specific features of language use on Joe Biden’s and Kamala Harris’s speeches. *RADIANT: Journal of Applied, Social, and Education Studies*. 3(1), 41–50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52187/rdt.v3i1.96>
- [38] Thorne, B., Tannen, D., 1994. Gender and conversational interaction. *Contemporary Sociology*. 23(4), 597–599. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2076432>
- [39] Leaper, C., Smith, T.E., 2004. A meta-analytic review of gender variations in children’s language use: Talkativeness, affiliative speech, and assertive speech. *Developmental Psychology*. 40(6), 993–1027. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.6.993>
- [40] Haas, A., 1979. Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*. 86(3), 616–626. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.616>
- [41] Hossain, M.Z., Samin, A.M., 2022. Analysis of Male and Female Speakers’ Word Choices in Public Speeches. *Computation and Language*, 11(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.06366>
- [42] Koç, D.K., 2021. Gender and language: A sociolinguistic analysis of second language writing. In: Hanci-Azizoğlu, E.B., Kavakli, N. (eds.). *Futuristic and Linguistic Perspectives on Teaching Writing to Second Language Students*. IGI Global: New York, US. pp. 161–177. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-6508-7>
- [43] Fishman, P.M., 1978. Interaction: The work women do. *Social Problems*. 25(4), 397–406. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/800492>
- [44] Al-Ali, H., 2019. A critical study of Arab males and females interactional styles in formal face-to-face conversations when using English as a second language. *English Language, Literature & Culture*. 4(1), 1-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ellc.20190401.11>
- [45] Gibbs, W.J., 2009. An exploratory analysis of communication in peer-directed educational discourse. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*. 21(2), 110–127. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-009-9017-4>
- [46] Brownlow, S., Rosamond, J.A., Parker, J.A., 2003. Gender-linked linguistic behavior in television interviews. *Sex Roles*. 49(3–4), 121–132. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024404812972>
- [47] Kanwal, R., Khan, F.R., Baloch, S.M., 2017. Comparative study of linguistic features in gender communication in Pakistani television talk show. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*. 6(2), 54–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.23.2017.62.54.62>
- [48] Al-Harahsheh, A.M.A., 2014. Language and gender differences in Jordanian spoken Arabic: a sociolinguistics perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 4(5), 872–882. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.5.872-882>
- [49] Gunarathne, N., 2023. A psychological study of non-verbal communication differences between men and women in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science*. XII(V), 09–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2023.12502>
- [50] Subon, F., 2013. Gender differences in the use of linguistic forms in the speech of men and women in the Malaysian context. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 13(3), 67–79. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33193/JALHSS.85.2022.753>
- [51] Yanti, Y., 2021. Gender and communication: Some features of women’s speech. *Journal of Cultura and Lingua*. 2(1), 33–38. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.37301/cu\\_lingua.v2i1.69](https://doi.org/10.37301/cu_lingua.v2i1.69)
- [52] Jumainah, J., Krismanti, N., Lestary, A.A., 2023. Banjarese women’s language features: A gen-

- der study. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures*. 6(2), 149–164. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.20527/jetall.v6i2.16232>
- [53] Konstantinovskaia, N., 2020. Russian and Japanese women's real language practices. In: Konstantinovskaia, N. (ed.). *The Language of Feminine Beauty in Russian and Japanese Societies*. Springer International Publishing: Cham, Switzerland. pp. 163–191. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41433-7\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41433-7_4)
- [54] Tanaka, L., Okano, K., Nakane, I., et al., 2021. Japanese women's speech through life-transitions (1989-2000): An analysis of youth language features. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*. 31(1), 119-143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jola.12302>
- [55] Setyawan, A.H., Binawan, H., Nugraeni, N., 2022. Politeness strategies used by pedicab drivers to foreign tourists in Malioboro Street. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*. 6(2), 535–544. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v6i2.6162>
- [56] Pakzadian, M., Tootkaboni, A.A., 2018. The role of gender in conversational dominance: A study of EFL learners. *Cogent Education*. 5(1), 1–17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1560602>
- [57] Al-Munawarah, A.L., 2023. Decoding language style utilized by men and women on instagram. *Elite: English and Literature Journal*. 10(1), 90–105. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24252/elite.v10i1.37478>
- [58] Wahyuningsih, S., 2018. Men and women differences in using language: A case study of students at Stai Kudus. *EduLite Journal of English Education Literature Culture*. 3(1), 79–90. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.3.1.79-90>
- [59] Ali, A., Nasreen, S., Wajdi, M.A., 2019. An observational study of verbal and nonverbal communication in female and male university students. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*. 19(1), 1–18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46568/pjgs.v19i1.72>
- [60] Apridaningrum, M.C.G., Angelina, P., 2019. Women's language features used by Sarah Sechan in her talk show. *ELTR Journal*. 3(2), 1–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v3i2.76>
- [61] Dewi, N.M.A.S.U., 2023. Women's language features on Bridgerton Cast Youtube interview by Netflix. *International Journal of Linguistics and Discourse Analytics*. 5(1), 86–96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52232/ijolida.v5i1.93>
- [62] Huy, M.X., Thu, A., 2023. A comparison study of linguistic features in English ads for men and women: A case study. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*. 3(7), 1452–1461. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/v03i7y2023-35>
- [63] Ahmad, S., Aziz, S., Ranra, B., 2023. Women and crime: A Sociolinguistic study of the use of language in the netflix series' unbelievable. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. 11(2), 2616–2623. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2023.1102.0560>
- [64] Dinata, A.E., Sukarini, N.W., Maharani, S.A.I., 2023. Men's and women's language features used in the conversation of the talk show "The Ellen Show." *ULIL ALBAB: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*. 2(6), 2474–2481. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56799/jim.v2i6.1637>
- [65] Baytosh, C.M., Kleiner, B.H., 1989. Effective business communication for women. *Women in Management Review*. 4(4), 16–20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649428910131986>
- [66] Brouwer, D., Gerritsen, M., De Haan, D., 1979. Speech differences between women and men on the wrong track? *Language in Society*. 8(1), 33–50. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005935>
- [67] Kim, D.Y., Lehto, X.Y., Morrison, A.M., 2007. Gender differences in online travel information search: Implications for marketing communications on the internet. *Tourism Management*. 28(2), 423–433. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.04.001>
- [68] Pulungan, D.H., Sumarsih, S., Santoso, D., 2018. The conversational styles by male and female sellers in business transactions at traditional market "Pasar Sentosa Baru" Medan. *Linguistik Terapan*. 14(1), 10–18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24114/lt.v14i1.8356>
- [69] Rusni, R., 2020. The speech acts of sellers and buyers in the Gelumbang Village Market, Gelumbang District, Muara Enim Regency. *Jurnal Pembahsi (Pembelajaran Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia)*. 10(1), 34–38. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31851/pembahsi.v10i1.4612>
- [70] Revita, I., Marwati, S., Ayumi, A., et al., 2020. Maxims of politeness performed by female sellers at traditional market in Sumatera Barat. *Journal Arbitrer*. 7(1), 8–15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.7.1.8-15.2020>
- [71] Sojka, J.Z., Tansuhaj, P., 1997. Exploring communication differences between women and men sales representatives in a relationship selling context. *Journal of Marketing Communications*. 3(4), 197–216. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/135272697345899>
- [72] Lakoff, R., 1973. Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*. 2(1), 45–79. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500000051>
- [73] Litosseliti, L., 2006. *Gender and Language Theory and Practice*. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 27.
- [74] Coates, J., 2015. *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. 3rd ed. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 1-245.
- [75] BPS Karangasem, 2024. *Kecamatan Manggis dalam Angka 2024 [Manggis in Figures 2024]*, Vol. 35. Karangasem: BPS Kabupaten Karangasem.
- [76] Krippendorff, K., 2004. *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*, 2nd ed. Sage Publication, Inc.: Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, Inc. pp. 81.
- [77] Emike, A.J., Oreoluwa, B.O., Dandiga, A.G., 2019. *Seller-buyer conversation: Investigating the dis-*

- course strategies. *Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*. 2(7), 142–151. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36348/sijll.2019.v02i07.001>
- [78] Promburom, T., 2022. Transformed gender relations in community-based tourism development: Performing gender in homestay tourism. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies*. 22(1), 155–73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14456/hasss.2022.15>
- [79] Khumairoh, T., Anugerahwati, M., 2021. Conversational style of male and female characters in game of thrones season 8. *JoLLA: Journal of Language, Literature, and Arts*. 1(5), 573–586. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17977/um064v1i52021p573-586>