

The Influence of Gender Identity on Lexical Choice and Laypersons' Perception of Gender
and Language in Dutch

MA Thesis Linguistics

Thesis supervisor: Mr Drs Tony Foster

Second Reader: Dr Dick Smakman

1 July 2016

Kim Sandra van der Heijden

S1287559

k.s.van.der.heijden@umail.leidenuniv.nl

Table of contents

List of tables	3
Abstract	4
Chapter 1: Introduction	5
1.1 Introduction to social indexicality	5
1.2 Introduction to gender	6
1.3 Introduction to language differences in gender	9
1.3.1 History of gender research	9
1.3.2 Language differences in gender	10
Chapter 2: Methodology	13
2.1 Overview	13
2.2 Methods of research	13
2.3 Procedure	15
2.3.1 The data	15
2.3.2 Own analysis	17
2.3.3 Analysis by laypersons	21
Chapter 3: Results	23
3.1 Overview	23
3.2 Results	23
3.2.1 Own analysis	23
3.2.2 Analysis by laypersons	32
Chapter 4: Discussion	36
4.1 Overview	36
4.2 Discussion	36

4.2.1 Discussion about own analysis	36
4.2.2 Discussion about analysis by laypersons	39
Chapter 5: Conclusion	41
5.1 Conclusion	41
5.2 Application of the results	43
Bibliography	45
Appendix	48

List of tables

Table 1: <i>Mean scores and standard deviations of the results of the analysis based on previous research</i>	25
Table 2a: <i>Mean scores of the most frequently used –lijk words by women</i>	27
Table 2b: <i>Mean scores of the most frequently used –lijk words by men</i>	27
Table 3a: <i>Mean scores of the most frequently used words by women</i>	29
Table 3b: <i>Mean scores of the most frequently used words by men</i>	29
Table 4: <i>Mean scores and standard deviations of the results of the analysis based on stereotypes</i>	30
Table 5: <i>Information about the speakers and their conversations</i>	48
Table 6: <i>Information about the participants and the answers they gave in the survey</i>	60

Abstract

This thesis studies the current differences in lexical choice in male and female speech in Dutch in order to find out which Dutch language features are indicative of the gender of a speaker and which Dutch language features laypersons associate with a certain gender. While the field of language variation due to gender has increased in popularity, there is still little research available about the differences between male and female speech in languages other than English. This thesis was written in order to add to this currently underrepresented subject within the field of language variation due to gender. Furthermore, this thesis also focuses on the subject of lexicality, which is a subject that is often overlooked in favour of other parts of language variation, such as the variation in the use of certain language acts, the variation in voice and the frequency of interruptions. Social indexicality and previous studies about the differences between male and female speech are discussed in this thesis, before the methodology is explained. The data used in this thesis consist of fifty transcribed conversations from Dutch television programmes such as *Van de Kaart*, and these data were scrutinized for the presence of various gendered language features, such as the use of negation or locatives. Furthermore, twenty-five participants were asked to read three transcriptions and to indicate what they thought the gender of the speaker was. While the data showed that all analysed language features are used by both men and women, there is often a difference in the frequency of use, which means the feature is either feminine or masculine. For example, the use of negation is more frequent in female speech, while men use more quantities. Laypersons, on the other hand, determined the gender of speakers both through contextual clues and the lexical choices made by the speakers.

Keywords: gender, gender differences, language variation

Chapter 1: Introduction

The differences and similarities between men and women have been a fascination for people for a long time. In the last hundred years, more people have started to examine the differences in the speech produced by men and women. While the first studies about the topic of language variation due to gender were mostly based on stereotypes and anecdotes, various social influences, such as the feminist movement, have made research in this field more scientific and have created more interest in the subject of language variation due to gender (Brouwer, Gerritsen, De Haan, & Van der Post, 1979, p. 10). However, while many studies have been conducted about the topic of gender and language variation in English, there are few studies that show gendered language variation in languages other than English. Most studies also focus solely on the researchers' ideas and findings about gender and language and ignore the opinions of laypersons, while laypersons can give us valuable information about how certain language variations are perceived. Furthermore, the subject of variation in lexical choice is often overlooked in favour of other types of language variation. In this thesis, I will examine the current differences in male and female language, with a focus on lexicality, in the Dutch language in order to find out which Dutch language features are indicative of the gender of the speaker and which Dutch language features laypersons associate with men and women.

In the following section, the topics of social indexicality and gender will be discussed, before previous studies on the topic of language variation due to gender are examined.

1.1 Introduction to social indexicality

People use indexes on a daily basis in order to convey and receive information and to understand the world around them. A commonly given example of an index is smoke indicating that something is on fire. The smoke gives a person enough information in order to

react, for example, by fleeing the site or calling the fire department, without ever seeing the fire itself. This thesis will focus on a variation of indexicality, namely, social indexicality. This term means that certain features of a person, especially his or her speech, are understood as pointing to a certain identity (Agha, 2007, p. 14). For example, the intonation and pitch of someone's voice are indexes of the speaker's race (Anderson, 2008, p. 125). Social indexicality allows people to receive and react to information about the speaker's identity that is not explicitly stated, such as the speaker's race, gender and age. Social indexicality is not flawless, since indexes can often only be understood when the speaker and listener share a similar background. For example, one's accent can be a sign that indicates which country the speaker is from. However, in order to conclude that someone's accent means that he or she is from Germany, the listener has to know what a German accent sounds like and associate this accent with people from that country. Similarly, various cultures have different indexes that point towards someone's gender. This thesis will analyse which lexical choices are indexes of a certain gender.

It has to be noted that many of the social indexes discussed in this thesis consist of non-exclusive relations between the signifier and the signified (Ochs, 1992, p. 340). This non-exclusivity means that, while a feature might be socially linked to a certain gender and is mainly used by people of that gender, people of the other gender do use the feature as well.

1.2 Introduction to gender

The terms *sex* and *gender* are often used interchangeably, especially by laypersons, but the term *gender* will be used consistently in this thesis. While someone's sex is strictly biological and based on their reproductive organs and their chromosomes, gender is mental and is decided on by an individual based on biological and social influences (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 10). Since gender and its perception are heavily influenced by culture, I would like to specify that this thesis focuses on gender in the Western world,

specifically in the Netherlands. Gender is oftentimes a big part of one's identity (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 10) and influences many parts of one's life, such as clothing choices, language, behaviour and perception of the world. This section will discuss how gender identity can be formed and influenced and cause differences between men and women.

While teenagers and adults do tend to adopt certain gendered acts in later stages of life, a person's gender identity is influenced from a young age. Starting as children, people begin to pick up gender acts and gender indexicality from adults by copying adults' actions and receiving responses to this behaviour, and by being treated a certain way by adults (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 19). Eckert and McConnell-Ginet give the example that children might imitate the way adults of their gender walk and girls sometimes paint their faces in order to copy their mothers' make-up (2003, p. 10). One of the features that is often seen as a gender index is the pitch of a person's voice. Although no biological reason can be found for the change in a child's pitch, most children change it around the age of four (Eckert & McConnell, 2003, p. 18). There are two possible reasons for this change in pitch, namely, either the children imitate the pitch of adults of the same gender or children mimic the pitch that adults use when they talk to children of a certain gender. In both cases, the children unconsciously change a previous habit because of the input they receive.

As discussed, at a young age, children adopt gendered acts by copying adults or because they are influenced by being treated a certain way by adults. Researchers discovered differences in treatment and perception of boys and girls when they presented participants with a newborn baby (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 17). When the participants thought a baby was female, her cries were said to be pitiful and she was treated with gentle hands. However, when participants were shown the same baby, but were told he was a boy, the participants said the child's cries were angry and the child was handled playfully. This behaviour by caregivers can change children's behaviour drastically, as was proven in a day

care experiment. Researchers noticed that the caregivers tended to give female toddlers attention when the girls babbled and talked, while boys were given attention when they screamed and whined (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 18). When the researchers returned nine to eleven months later, the female toddlers were observed to be more talkative than the boys and the boys exhibited more aggressive behaviour by screaming and demanding attention. The way the caregivers had treated them had impacted the children in such a way that the toddlers had adjusted their daily behaviours in order to receive more attention. In short, the differences in treatment of boys and girls have the power to change the behaviour that the children exhibit.

Furthermore, children are talked to in different ways, depending on their gender, which is said to be the cause of girls using more diminutives and emotive words, such as *sad*, while prohibitives are often used while talking to boys (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 17). Coincidentally, these aforementioned actions and speech patterns that people adopt during their childhood are also what men and women are stereotypically known for. For example, women are said to be overly talkative and emotional, while men are seen as more aggressive and more likely to demand something instead of discussing the situation (Tannen, 1990, p. 153). These studies and others seem to suggest that the differences in treatment of boys and girls can result in habitual differences in behaviour and language and these differences might be the cause for gender differences and language variation due to gender at a later age.

While children seem to receive frequent input that helps them to develop their gender identity, with time, these children become active agents in forming their gender identity. When people become aware of the impact of language, they can actively use linguistic variation in order to draw attention to a part of their identity, such as their gender (Meyerhoff, 2011, p. 242). In this instance, this actively chosen linguistic feature becomes part of his or

her gender identity. For example, a man who wants to appear masculine would deliberately use linguistic features that he sees as being indexes of masculinity, such as swearing. In short, the language and behaviour that is presented because of one's gender identity seems to be influenced by both unconscious changes due to outside influences and deliberate decisions made by the person in question.

Tannen explains that these differences in gender lead to men and women communicating in different ways (1990, pp. 42-43). For example, women are more likely to communicate in ways that create positive, close bonds with others, while men are more likely to communicate in ways that reinforce the hierarchy within their community. Tannen goes as far as to state that communication between men and women can be seen as cross-cultural speech, since the backgrounds of the men and women differ so much that misunderstandings are easy to arise, especially in close relationships (1990, p. 42).

1.3 Introduction to language differences in gender

1.3.1 History of gender research

Gender research has changed its focus from claiming there are biological reasons for gender differences to arguing that gender differences are caused by social influences. The first forays into gender research mostly involved discussing female inferiority in linguistic matters, which the researchers argued is caused by women's biology (Brouwer, Gerritsen, De Haan, & Van der Post, 1979, p. 10). This method of thinking lost popularity around 1960, after which the current trend emerged where gender differences are seen as a consequence of social influences. Many of the studies that were conducted in the first stages of gender research were later deemed unreliable, because of their stereotypical or androcentric nature and because these researchers often used their own experiences as argumentation in their work instead of doing methodological research (Weatherall, 2002, p. 37). Unfortunately, many of the

stereotypical features of both men and women that were discussed in these studies are oftentimes still seen as truth because of the hall of mirrors phenomenon (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 81). This phenomenon refers to a situation where a stereotype is seen as true, despite a lack of valid argumentation, because it is known that researchers have conducted studies about it and because people want to believe the stereotype to be true. An example of one such stereotype is the belief that women are more talkative than men. This belief is still common among laypersons, although it has been proven that men dominate regular oral conversations (Gefen & Ridings, 2005, p. 78), work-related meetings (Kendall & Tannen, 1997, p. 83), and even online conversations (Gefen & Ridings, 2005, p. 79).

1.3.2 Language differences in gender

Researchers such as Tannen and Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons state that communication between men and women can be classified as cross-cultural communication, because of certain differences in childhood, treatment and experiences between men and women (1990, p. 42, 2006, p. 122). However, despite the fact that these researchers view men and women as belonging to two different cultures, in the Netherlands, men and women do speak a mutually intelligible language with no exclusively male or female features.

One of the most obvious gender differences is the standard voice used by each gender. Multiple studies have shown that a layperson is able to detect someone's gender by only listening to the pitch of the speaker's voice (Weatherall, 2002, p. 49). Intonation is seen as an indication of gender as well, since women tend to change their pitch more frequently than men do, which is associated with showing emotion (McConnell-Ginet, 1978, p. 552). These two features are recognizable enough that whenever a man mocks a woman or wishes to be perceived as more feminine, he raises his pitch and rapidly changes it throughout his speech instead of changing his vocabulary, syntax or other language features (McConnell-Ginet, 1978, p. 549).

Another language related gender difference is the fact that certain speech acts are more commonly performed or more commonly accepted by one of the genders. One of these speech acts is boasting, which is seen as natural for men, but is less frequently used in public by women. Generally, boasting is seen as stating that the speaker is better than the audience, which is a prime way to establish an hierarchy for men, while women tend to recoil from boasting, since it does not promote bonding and is seen as unladylike (Tannen, 1990, pp. 218-219). Apologizing, on the other hand, is generally recoiled from by men, since it involves a potential loss of face, while women embrace it (Tannen, 1990, p. 232). That is not to say that women never boast or that men never apologize.

While these are certainly gender differences that are related to language, this thesis focuses on the gender related differences in lexical choice. On the sentence level, men are said to use more elliptical sentences, while women often speak in more complete sentences (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557). Possibly because of this, or because of a tendency to use more filler words (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557), women use longer sentences than men do (Mulac & Lundell, 1986, p. 89). Women also favour modal constructions (McMillan, Clifton, McGrath, & Gale, 1977, p. 551), while men are more inclined to use directives (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557).

Various studies describe a strong association between women and polite or insecure constructions in language, such as hedging and the use of tag questions (Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 213). However, multiple researchers protest the notion that women use more tag questions than men and either state that there is no clear difference between the genders or that men use more tag questions (Weatherall, 2002, pp. 60-61, Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557). While women are associated with politeness and insecurity, men are associated with being informative. This is reflected in men's language through their more frequent use of words denoting location and quantities

(Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 213, Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557).

A considerable part of our daily conversations have to do with emotion. Women are stereotypically associated with emotions and studies have shown that this is reflected in their language through their more frequent use of emotive words, especially those concerning positive emotions (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557). Curiously enough, women also use more negations than men do. Men, on the other hand, use more words that show their judgement about a situation, such as *good* or *bad* and they also show their emotions in their more colourful and frequent manner of swearing (Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 213). Emotions are often expressed in adverbs and studies show that women are more likely to use intensifiers before adverbs in English (Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557), as well as in Dutch (Brouwer, Gerritsen, De Haan, & Van der Post, 1979, p. 110). Unfortunately, research into gender differences in Dutch is infrequent, but it is known that men and women use different words that end in *-lijk* (Keune, 2013, p. 65). Men are inclined to use *tamelijk*, *onmiddellijk* and *ongelofelijk*, while women prefer *dadelijk*, *verschrikkelijk* and *vriendelijk*. Women also use less productive affixes in Dutch, such as *-ster* and *ver-*. In the next chapter, the language features that will be analysed will be announced and the methodology will be discussed.

Chapter 2: Methodology

2.1 Overview

First of all, in this chapter, I will discuss the methods of research that are common in the field of language variation due to gender, followed by the methodology used in this current study. In order to determine what vocabulary is indicative of which gender, I have chosen to combine two methods of research. The data used in this thesis consists of fifty transcribed conversations that were shown on Dutch television. With these data, two studies have been conducted, namely, I have analysed the data myself and asked twenty-five laypersons to choose which gender they thought the speakers have, based on the transcriptions they read. By combining these two methods, I was able to discover which parts of vocabulary are typical of which gender and what laypersons think is an indication of gender in speech. Please note that whenever the phrase *female features* or *male features* is used, it is used to indicate that the discussed language feature is primarily used by that gender and associated with that gender and the phrase does not mean that the language feature is exclusively used by that gender.

2.2 Methods of research

As aforementioned, research into gender differences in language has changed, especially since 1960 and since the influx of feminist research into the topic. Before that time, personal experiences were often presented as facts, which lead to many stereotypes being accepted as truth. After this time, it became more common to do research, either by studying written texts or by interviewing groups of people.

Nowadays, there are three main methods for researching gender differences in language. Firstly, there is still a small group of writers whose research consists of their personal experiences, as the work of the researchers before 1960 did. Often, these researchers

do supplement their own experiences with those of others and with studies done by other researchers. Deborah Tannen (1990) is one of the researchers who still presents her findings this way. This type of research is possibly less reliable, since many of the claims have not been studied deeply, but this kind of study is often relatable to laypersons and makes the topic of linguistics approachable for new students and the general population.

Another method to find the differences in male and female language is to use transcriptions, texts and results from other studies to draw new conclusions or to find the mean of all studies. Examples of this are the studies “Gender differences in verbal ability: a meta-analysis” by Hyde and Linn (1988), and “Gender differences in language use: an analysis of 14,000 text samples” by Newman, Groom, Handelman and Pennebaker (2008). An advantage of this kind of study is the great sample size and the ability to draw from a group of experienced researchers. Unfortunately, since the data has already been used in other studies, the researchers are rarely able to present new insights into male and female language.

The third and most common method is to collect samples of written or spoken language from both genders and analyse the received data without including one’s own experiences and without using studies from other researchers. Researchers who made use of these method were Gefen and Ridings (2005), who collected data with a survey, Argamon, Koppel, Fine and Shimoni (2003), who used a written corpus and McMillan, Clifton, McGrath and Gale (1977), who videotaped people and transcribed the conversations. My study will follow this last method of research and will be based on transcriptions from televised conversations.

2.3 Procedure

2.3.1 The data

The data consist of transcriptions from various conversations from Dutch television programmes. The conversations were taken from the television programmes *Van de Kaart*, *De Bloemenstal* and *Hello Goodbye*. In *Van de Kaart*, the presenter rings the doorbell of a random house and asks if she is allowed to enter the speaker's home. A conversation starts naturally at that moment. In the two other programmes, speakers are approached at the airport or at a flower stall at the market and are asked to participate in the television programme. The speaker might be asked to give a snippet of an anecdote, in order to make it possible for the presenter to judge if the speaker is interesting enough to appear on television. When the anecdote is deemed worthy, the speaker is approached by the camera crew and the conversation begins. The speakers in these three programmes have little to no time to prepare themselves before they are asked to talk. They do not have time to actively change their pattern of speech or word choices, which makes these conversations close to natural speech. Furthermore, these television programmes were made to share the stories told by the speakers with the audience. Therefore, the speakers get enough time and space to tell their story and provide enough data for the study. While presenters do interrupt in order to clarify something, to add to the story or to ask something, the speaker is able to tell his or her story without the subject being changed by the conversation partner. This motivates the speaker to keep talking and it makes the speaker feel at ease, which brings out more natural speech. The presenters also focus on one speaker and pay less attention to the bystanders. Lastly, these television programmes contained many speakers that suited the criteria listed below.

In order to collect data, fifty conversations from Dutch television programmes from the last year were selected and transcribed. The conversations were chosen based on the gender and age of the speakers, their ability in Dutch and the length of the conversation. For

this study, twenty-five men and twenty-five women were selected who were above the age of forty, spoke Dutch without a foreign accent and were in a conversation for two to five minutes. The aforementioned limitations were established since implementing these limitations eliminates multiple variables from the data. Since there are many variables that affect someone's natural speech and language choices, eliminating these variables will ensure that the speakers have similar linguistic backgrounds, which makes seeing gendered patterns in their speech easier. In order for a speaker to be selected for this research, the race, age and gender of the speaker had to be clear based on contextual clues, such as the voice of the speaker, how he or she referred to himself or herself or his or her general appearance. A list of information about the participants can be found in part A of the appendix.

The age limit was established to ensure variation in language due to age was minimal. The decision was made to use Dutch speakers who speak the language without a foreign accent, since speaking with a foreign accent could mean that a speaker has a different native language or has grown up in linguistic circumstances that are severely different from the childhood of the other speakers. In order to exclude these variables from the study, those who did not speak Dutch or spoke Dutch with a foreign accent were excluded from the study. Lastly, all conversations were between two minutes and five minutes long to ensure the samples were long enough to analyse and to ensure that each speaker would provide roughly the same amount of data.

The conversations were transcribed and included the vocabulary used by both the speaker and the presenter of the television programme. The speech of the presenter of the program was recorded to be able to present a complete picture to the participants of the survey and to enable myself to see the speaker's speech in context. Certain features of speech, such as intonation, interruption or use of filler sounds, such as *uhm*, were not recorded.

2.3.2 Own Analysis

The first part of the study consisted of my own analysis of the data. Firstly, it was determined which language features would prove valuable to look at. The analysed features can be organized in three categories, namely, those features that were studied in previous research, the most frequently used words, and language features that have become stereotypical for a certain gender. Most of the studies and their results that were discussed in section 1.3.2 “Language differences in gender” only show results that are applicable to English. In this thesis, a few of the features discussed in that section will be examined in order to find out if the results found in these aforementioned studies also apply to the Dutch language. Secondly, it was determined what the most frequently used words are for both men and women. Lastly, the language features that are the subject of the more popular stereotypes about male and female language were examined to see if the stereotypes were true. These three categories will now be discussed in more detail.

Based on the studies discussed in section 1.3.2, this thesis analysed sentence length, modal constructions, tag questions, locatives, quantities, emotion, negation, the use of words ending in *-lijk* and adverb intensifiers. The masculine or feminine feature was extracted from the data by hand and converted into a percentage of the total number of words used by the speaker in his or her conversation. For each gender, the mean of these percentages was calculated and the means of men and women were compared to find out which gender uses the feature more often, on average. Furthermore, for some of the features, the sample standard deviation was calculated as well. This method was used in all three categories, unless stated otherwise.

The first analysed feature was the sentence length and, according to Mulac and Lundell, women consistently use longer sentences (1986, p. 89). The number of words per sentence was counted and an average was calculated for both the men and the women. A

preference for modal constructions is also mainly ascribed to women (McMillan, Clifton, McGrath, & Gale, 1997, p. 552). Modality can be expressed either through verbs or through adverbs. In Dutch, the verbs that convey modality are *blijken, lijken, schijnen, heten, denken, voorkomen, toeschijnen, kunnen, moeten, hoeven, mogen, willen* and *zullen* and a great number of adverbs that convey modality exist in the Dutch language (Haeseryn, Romijn, Geerts, De Rooij, & Van den Toorn, 1997). A complete list of modal adverbs can be found in part B of the appendix. This method of analysing modality is modelled after the study done by McMillan, Clifton, McGrath and Gale (1977, p. 548), who included both the verbs and adverbs that denote modality in their study.

There is still a great amount of debate about whether tag questions are mainly indicative of female speech or of male speech in English (Weatherall, 2002, pp. 60-61, Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, pp. 556-557, Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 213). In this thesis, it was tested whether tag questions are used more frequently by men or women in Dutch. While the traditional English tag questions, such as *can they?* and *doesn't he?* do not have a direct Dutch equivalent, the Dutch phrases *toch?* and *hè?* are frequently used in the same manner (Haeseryn, Romijn, Geerts, De Rooij, & Van den Toorn, 1997). Another feature of speech that was analysed in this thesis is the tendency to use locatives. The original study by Gleser, Gottschalk and John uses the term "place or spatial relations" instead, and names *towards, Canada* and *here* as examples (1959, p. 183). These researchers state that locatives are more frequently used by men. A list of Dutch locatives can be found in part C of the appendix and includes words such as *naar, naast* and *daar*. The same study by Gleser, Gottschalk and John (1959) researched terms denoting quantity and they found that men use more quantities in their speech than women do. Examples of quantity that were given in the study are *quart, many* and *large* (Gleser, Gottschalk and John, 1959, p. 183). While the Dutch list of quantities is infinite, a few of the most common Dutch quantities

are *veel* and *geen*.

Another language feature that was studied is the use of emotion in language, which is a quality that is primarily ascribed to women. While this part of the study can be broad and include, for example, judgement words and swear words, the original study only searched in their data for “any reference to emotion or feeling” (Mulac, Bradac, & Gibbons, 2006, p. 148). I was careful to solely include emotions or feelings in my study. Negation is another language feature that is ascribed to women, defined by the same study by Mulac, Bradac, & Gibbons as “a statement of what something is not” (2006, pp. 139, 147). In Dutch, there are a few words that can convey this meaning, namely *geen*, *niet*, *nooit*, *niemand*, *nergens*, *niets* and the more casual *niks* (Taalunie, 2007a).

There is a great diversity in Dutch words that end in *-lijk*, which was studied by Keune (2013), and I have analysed which words ending in *-lijk* were present in the data of this study. Lastly, the use of adverb intensifiers was analysed in this thesis. The original study was done by Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons, who defined *adverb intensifiers* by giving the examples *very*, *really* and *quite* (2006, p. 148). While in some definitions the term *adverb intensifiers* may include phrases that reduce intensity, such as *a bit*, this thesis will follow the definition of the original study and only analyse the adverb intensifiers that strengthen the meaning of the word. Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons described adverb intensifiers as being a primarily female language trait (2006, p. 136).

In order to determine which five words were used most frequently by each gender, the program “WordSmith Tools” was used (Scott, 2016). Frequency lists were made using the “WordList” feature of the program. The Wordlist feature shows how many times each word is found in the conversation and calculates what percentage this type is of the total number of words produced by the speaker. For each gender, the average percentage of each word was calculated and lists of the ten most frequent words for men and women was constructed.

The last category of analysed language features consists of four stereotypes. Firstly, the stereotype exists that men use the word *I* (“ik”) more than women do (Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 214). To test this stereotype, WordSmith Tools was used to calculate the percentages of speech that each person dedicated to the word *ik*. The other first person pronouns, namely, *we*, *wij*, *mij*, *me* and *ons*, were analysed as well, in order to present a complete picture of the use of first person pronouns by both genders. Another common stereotype is that women apologize more frequently than men do (Schumann & Ross, 2010, p. 1649). While it is more common to apologize in English, since the phrase *I am sorry* is also used as a method of showing sympathy instead of showing guilt or regret (Tannen, 1990, pp. 231-232), other languages also associate apologizing with women. Words that convey apology in Dutch are *sorry* and *excuses*. Similarly, women are associated with the use of diminutives. In Dutch, the suffixes used to make a diminutive are *-je*, *-kje*, *-pje*, *-tje* and *-etje* (Haeseryn, Romijn, Geerts, De Rooij, & Van den Toorn, 1997). The diminutives were extracted from the data, except those diminutives that have no clear alternative, such as *een beetje*.

Lastly, Brouwer, Gerritsen, De Haan and Van der Post describe in their book a Dutch stereotype that was popular around 1910 (1979, p. 115). In that time, the stereotype existed that women use conjunctions less frequently than men do and instead, merge different sentences without any extra words or phrases to indicate such a change. This stereotype existed since it was believed that women were not intelligent enough to use more complex sentence constructions. If a woman did use conjunctions, she was believed to use coordinating conjunctions, while men used subordinate conjunctions (Brouwer, Gerritsen, De Haan, & Van der Post, 1979, p. 116). Both kinds of conjunctions were studied in this thesis. A complete list of the Dutch subordinating and coordinating conjunctions can be found in part D of the appendix.

2.3.3 Analysis by laypersons

In order to determine what language features laypersons view as being inherently male or female, a group of participants was asked to read three transcriptions and determine the gender of the speakers. Twenty-five people of different ages, genders and backgrounds who spoke Dutch were approached and asked to partake in a survey. These participants were recruited using social media and personal connections. The participants could click a link that would take them to a survey on Typeform (Muñoz & Okuniev, 2012, free version), which is a service that allows users to make surveys. The participants were asked to state their gender, age and if Dutch is their native language. They were also asked to confirm that I was allowed to use the answers they gave for my thesis. After this, they were presented with three partial transcriptions and were asked to determine whether the speaker was a man or woman and to state why they thought so. The complete survey can be found in part E of the appendix. Transcriptions of the conversations of participants 5, 26 and 46 were chosen for this survey. Participant 5 is male and makes frequent use of quantities, locations and the word *ik* in his conversation, which are features that were shown to be masculine by previous research. His sentences are moderately long and he uses few emotions and diminutives. The subject of his conversation is the model village and train set he has set up in his house, which is a subject that can be seen as inherently male. Participant 26 is female and uses short sentences, diminutives, tag questions and makes little use of locatives, quantities and the word *ik*, which are features that are indicative of female speech, according to the studies discussed in section 1.3.2. Participant 26 talks about her divorce and the help she has had during this time, which can be seen as inherently female. The third speaker, participant 46 is male and uses locatives and quantities, but also uses language features that are branded as feminine, such as emotional words, negation and adverb intensifiers. This conversation was chosen to test if participants would think the speaker is female, based on the feminine features of his language or if there

are other features in participant 46's speech that laypersons would interpret as being masculine. The subject of this conversation is not inherently masculine or feminine, as the speaker talks about a journey that his father has made. The survey's results were gathered and analysed to see if there are any consistent patterns in how the participants judge whether a speaker is male or female. By combining my own analysis of the data with the analysis of laypersons, this thesis can present a broad picture of gender in the Dutch language. The results of this method will be presented in the next chapter.

Chapter 3: Results

3.1 Overview

In this chapter, the results of the analysis and the survey will be presented and discussed. Each analysed feature will be briefly summarized and the results from the analysis will be shown. The results will be compared to the results of previous studies whenever possible.

3.2 Results

3.2.1 Own analysis

As aforementioned, the collected data were examined on sentence length, modal constructions, tag questions, locatives, quantities, emotion, negation, the use of words ending in *-lijk* and adverb intensifiers, in order to test if the results of the discussed studies also apply to the Dutch language.

In a research by Mulac and Lundell, the average sentence length of men and women was studied (1986, p. 89). As can be seen in table 1, the analysis of our data shows that men have a higher average sentence length. The difference in sentence length between the two genders is remarkably small, namely, on average, men only speak 0.01 word more per sentence than women do. This outcome of the data clashes with the picture brought forth in the study by Mulac and Lundell (1986), since these researchers emphasized that women use considerably more words per sentence than men do.

Modal constructions are a frequent occurrence in Dutch, both as verbs and adverbs. McMillan, Clifton, McGrath and Gale stated that women are more likely than men to use modal constructions (1977, p. 552). As can be seen in table 1, that outcome is consistent with the Dutch results. Our data also showed that men and women have different tendencies when it comes to the choice of using a verb or adverb to express modality. Both men and women

prefer to use a modal verb, but women are more likely than men to use modal adverbs, as shown in table 1. Women use 60.2 percent modal verbs and 39.6 percent modal adverbs, while men use 74.1 percent modal verbs and 25.9 percent modal adverbs. This clashes with the results of a study by Newman, Groom, Handelman and Pennebaker, who stated that women would use modal auxiliary verbs more frequently than men (2008, p. 213).

While both laypersons and researchers often associate the use of tag questions with insecurity and with women, there is debate about whether or not women actually use more tag questions than men do (Weatherall, 2002, pp. 60-61, Pennebaker, Mehl, & Niederhoffer, 2003, p. 557, Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 213). Analysis of the data collected in this thesis showed that the association does apply in the Dutch language. 0.57 percent of female speech consisted of tag questions, while only 0.45 percent of male speech does, as can be seen in table 1. This corresponds to women using a tag questions every 176 words, while men use a tag question every 223 words. This result correlates with multiple studies, such as those by Lakoff (2004, pp. 47-48) and McMillan, Clifton, McGrath and Gale (1977, p. 551). The fact that the use of tag questions is not common in Dutch is also reflected in the data, since 32 percent of the women and 44 percent of the men did not use any tag questions in their conversations.

A study by Gleser, Gottschalk and John determined that men are more informative in their speech, which expresses itself in an abundance of locatives and quantities in male speech that exceeds the frequency at which women use locatives and quantities (1959, p. 187). The data collected in this thesis confirm that this statement holds true for Dutch as well. As shown in table 1, male speech consists of 2.68 percent locatives and 2.27 percent quantities, while female speech is 2.50 percent locatives and 2.02 percent quantities. While some people do not use quantities in their conversations at all, the locatives are always present and often in abundance. The speech of one speaker, a female, even contained 5.91 percent locatives,

including vague locatives, such as *daar* (“there”) and specific references to places, such as *in Amsterdam* (“in Amsterdam”) and *in de auto* (“in the car”).

Table 1: Mean scores and standard deviations of the results of the analysis based on previous research

Categories	Female M	SD	Male M	SD
Sentence Length	6.84	1.97	6.85	1.95
Modal Construction	2.92	1.31	2.22	1.02
Verb	1.76	0.89	1.65	0.88
Adverb	1.16	0.86	0.58	0.43
Tag Question	0.57	0.72	0.45	0.71
Locative	2.50	1.23	2.68	1.28
Quantity	2.02	1.28	2.27	0.92
Emotion	0.50	0.61	0.40	0.53
Positive	0.35	0.47	0.24	0.43
Negative	0.14	0.23	0.15	0.26
Neutral	0.01	0.07	-	-
Negation	3.28	1.90	2.46	1.62
“Nee”	1.38	1.49	0.91	0.91
- <i>lijk</i> words	1.20	0.71	0.97	0.60
Adverb Intensifier	1.52	0.85	1.20	0.76

Women are associated with emotions and feelings, both through laypersons’ stereotypes and studies by experts (Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons, 2006, p. 125). This is true in Dutch as well, since our data point to women’s language consisting of 0.50 percent emotions, while male speech consist of 0.40 percent emotions, as shown in table 1. These percentages also point towards the Dutch people using few emotions in their speech. Women use a word denoting an emotion every 200 words, while men use one emotional word every 250 words. Our data also showed that men and women have different preferences for which kind of emotions they use in their speech. While both genders prefer using positive emotions in their speech, such as *blij* (“happy”) and *gelukkig* (“happy”, “content”), men are more likely than women to use words and phrases denoting negative emotions, such as *eenzaam zijn* (“to be lonely”) and *triest* (“sad”). The distribution of positive and negative emotions in the speech of

both genders can also be found in table 1. While the men solely used positive or negative emotions in their speech, one of the women used a phrase that cannot be seen as either positive or negative, namely *dubbel voelen*, which loosely translates to “feeling a positive emotion and a negative emotion at the same time”. This neutral emotion is also represented in table 1.

Opposing the stereotype that women are often more agreeable and nice than men are, Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons discovered that women use more negation than men do (2006, pp. 125, 131). Our analysis shows that this is also the case in Dutch, as can be seen in table 1. Often, the negation used is the word *nee* (“no”). When using a negation, women use *nee* 42.01 percent of the time and men use *nee* 37.18 percent of the time.

As shown in table 1, our data show that Dutch spoken by men consists of 0.97 percent *-lijk* words, while women’s speech is 1.20 percent *-lijk* words. Keune researched which *-lijk* words are most common for men and women and concluded that the word *tamelijk* (“fairly”) is almost exclusively used by men, while the word *dadelijk* (“soon”) is almost exclusively used by women (2013, p. 28). This was not followed by the speakers in this thesis. Lists of the ten most frequently used words ending in *-lijk* can be found in tables 2a and 2b. It is striking how many of the *-lijk* words are frequently used by both genders. Thirteen of the *-lijk* words are used by both men and women and the four most frequently used *-lijk* words are identical for the two genders. Remarkable is that the third most frequent word for both men and women, *tuurlijk*, is an abbreviation of the second most frequent word for men and women, which is *natuurlijk* (“of course”). If the abbreviation was not used instead of the complete word, *natuurlijk* would have been the most frequent *-lijk* word in female speech. Women also use three different *-lijk* words to express that something is horrible, namely *verschrikkelijk*, *vreselijk* and *afschuwelijk*, two of which are among the ten most frequently used *-lijk* words for women.

Table 2a: *Mean scores of the most frequently used –lijk words by women*

Female Ranking	<i>-lijk</i> word	M	Also used by other gender
1	Eigenlijk	0.362	Yes
2	Natuurlijk	0.282	Yes
3	Tuurlijk	0.087	Yes
4	Moelijk	0.077	Yes
5	Uiteindelijk	0.052	Yes
6	Verschrikkelijk	0.042	No
7	Vreselijk	0.039	Yes
8	Dadelijk	0.028	Yes
9	Behoorlijk	0.026	Yes
10	Eerlijk	0.025	Yes

Table 2b: *Mean scores of the most frequently used –lijk words by men*

Male Ranking	<i>-lijk</i> word	M	Also used by other gender
1	Eigenlijk	0.315	Yes
2	Natuurlijk	0.207	Yes
3	Tuurlijk	0.074	Yes
4	Moelijk	0.062	Yes
5	Redelijk	0.050	No
6	Uiteindelijk	0.040	Yes
7	Fatsoenlijk	0.038	No
8	Heerlijk	0.030	Yes
9	Vermoedelijk	0.024	No
10	Makkelijk	0.012	Yes

Adverb intensifiers are frequently associated with women in the study by Mulac, Bradac and Gibbons (2006, pp. 125, 136). As table 1 shows, a tendency of women to use this kind of word was also noticed in this thesis, since female speech consists of 1.52 percent adverb intensifiers. However, despite being associated with femininity, adverb intensifiers are also used by all but three men. Male speech consists of 1.20 percent adverb intensifier.

In short, the results found in the Dutch conversations that were used as data are often consistent with the results of the studies discussed in section 1.3.2 “Language differences in gender”. Women’s speech contains more modal constructions, tag questions, emotions,

negations and adverb intensifiers, while men use more locatives and quantities. Only the average sentence length of male and female speech and the *-lijk* words used by men and women did not mimic the results of previous studies. While Mulac and Lundell stated that women use more words per sentence (1986, p. 89), our collected data show that men use slightly more words per sentence. Many of the words discovered by Keune in her study were not found in these everyday conversations that were used as data (2013, p. 28). Instead, men and women used many of the same *-lijk* words.

The results concerning the features in the second category, namely, the most frequently used words, can be found in tables 3a and 3b. As can be seen in these tables, there is little variation due to gender in this part of the vocabulary. The lists are near identical, apart from *je* and *is*, which are swapped, and numbers 9 and 10 are different for the two lists. The most frequent word in the speech of both genders is *ja* (“yes”). Since the data consist of conversations between strangers, this was to be expected, since the speakers would want to come across as agreeable and nice. Women use *ja* more frequently than men do, namely, their speech consists for 6.45 percent of the word, while male speech consists of 5.13 percent *ja*. Furthermore, the three articles are present in this list, namely *het* (“the”), *de* (“the”) and *een* (“a(n)”). Since there are no alternatives to these words and they are present in most cases where a noun is used in a sentence, these words are used frequently. Two of the most frequent conjunctions are also found in these lists. Men use *en* (“and”) frequently, while women use *en* and *maar* (“but”) frequently, which will be discussed later on in this chapter. Another interesting word is *dat*, which can be used in two positions in the sentence, namely, *dat* can be used to refer to a genderless object, similar to the English pronoun *it*, as well as serve as a subordinating conjunction. The fact that *dat* has more than one application might be the reason for its high frequency.

Table 3a: *Mean scores of the most frequently used words by women*

Female Ranking	Word	M
1	Ja	6.45
2	Ik	3.95
3	En	2.93
4	Het	2.34
5	Een	2.11
6	Je	2.11
7	Dat	2.07
8	Is	1.79
9	Maar	1.51
10	De	1.47

Table 3b: *Mean scores of the most frequently used words by men*

Male Ranking	Word	M
1	Ja	5.13
2	Ik	4.29
3	En	2.96
4	Het	2.67
5	Een	2.51
6	Is	2.27
7	Dat	2.15
8	Je	2.02
9	De	1.86
10	Die	1.29

The last category of the analysis consists of stereotypes. One of these stereotypes is that men use *I* more often than women do, since repeated use of *I* is seen as an indication of selfishness or individualism (Newman, Groom, Handelman, & Pennebaker, 2008, p. 214).

The Dutch equivalent to *I* is “ik” and according to the data, men do indeed use *ik* more often than women do. Male speech consists of 4.29 percent *ik* while female speech is only 3.95 percent *ik*. This result is not in agreement with the result found by Mehl and Pennebaker (2003, p. 865). These researchers claim that women are more likely to use first person singular pronouns. However, our data show that women are more likely than men to use the

first person plural pronouns *ons* (“us”) and *we* (casual form of *wij*), and the first person pronoun *mij* (“me”). Men use *me* (casual form of *mij*) and *wij* (“we”) more than women do, although men still prefer the use of *we* above *wij*. The use of the pronouns *we* and *me* is associated with informality. Surprisingly, neither of the genders adheres to solely using the informal or formal constructions, but instead, people of both genders mix these constructions in their speech. All results concerning these pronouns can be found in table 4.

Table 4: *Mean scores and standard deviations of the results of the analysis based on stereotypes*

Categories	Female M	SD	Male M	SD
Use of “ik”	3.95	2.04	4.29	2.55
Use of “mij”	0.33	0.46	0.22	0.41
Use of “me”	0.21	0.29	0.30	0.47
Use of “wij”	0.07	0.17	0.13	0.20
Use of “we”	0.78	0.78	0.74	0.73
Use of “ons”	0.10	0.19	0.05	0.12
Apologies	0.05	0.14	0.01	0.06
Diminutives	0.65	0.63	0.68	0.46
Conjunctions	6.19	1.57	5.94	1.71
Coordinating	5.23	1.48	4.85	1.54
Subordinating	0.95	0.71	1.09	0.58

Apologizing is seen as a feminine trait and is an example of an insecurity construction. Also in this set of data, apologizing was more present in female speech than in male speech, as is shown in table 4. However, apologizing is a rare construction in both men and women in the collected data. Only 16 percent of the women and 4 percent of the men used an apology. An apology was given for one of four reasons: One woman apologized for the way she spoke, one woman apologized for confusing the presenter, one woman apologized for accidentally touching the presenter and lastly, one man and one woman apologized for crying during an emotional conversation.

The use of diminutives is another language trait that is associated with women.

Diminutives are seen as a trivial language feature with little use beyond indicating that something is either small or cute. However, the data show that men use more diminutives than women do, despite the complete lack of association between men and diminutives. As table 4 shows, male speech consists of 0.68 percent diminutives, while female speech consists of 0.65 percent, which is small difference of 0.03 percent in the use of diminutives by the genders. While five of the women did not use any diminutives, only two of the men refrained from using them. The two speakers who used diminutives most frequently are both women, who used words such as *berichtje* (“short message”), *computertje* (cute form of *computer*) and *fotootjes* (“small pictures” or a cute way to refer to pictures).

Finally, the stereotype existed in the Netherlands that women are incapable of using conjunctions correctly, especially the subordinating conjunctions. This led to the belief that women use few conjunctions and if they use them, that women use coordinating conjunctions, since these conjunctions are deemed to be easier to use. Our data show that overall, women use more conjunctions than men do. As shown in table 4, women’s speech contains 6.19 percent conjunctions, while men’s speech contains 5.94 percent conjunctions. Women do use more coordinating conjunctions than men, while men use more subordinating conjunctions than women do, as table 4 shows. Overall, both genders prefer the use of coordinating conjunctions above subordinating conjunctions, especially the words *maar*, *dus* and *en* (“but”, “so”, “and”).

In short, some stereotypes have a root of truth. Men do indeed use more first person singular pronouns, while women have the tendency to apologize and to use coordinating conjunctions. However, these stereotypes that have a basis of truth do exaggerate the rate at which the gender uses the construction. They often state that one gender uses the construction frequently, at a rate of multiple times each minute, while the other uses it rarely. In practice, the construction is often used by both genders, but one of the genders uses the construction

slightly more often. Other stereotypes that were tested in this thesis were proven to be false. In reality, men use more diminutives than women do and women do use conjunctions often.

3.2.2 Analysis by laypersons

Twenty-five participants were recruited and asked to complete a survey, which contained three transcriptions of conversations that were used as data in this thesis. As aforementioned, the speaker in the first conversation was a man and his speech contained many of the features that are discussed above in section 3.2.1 and were marked as typical of male speech. The second conversation contained a female speaker and many typically feminine features were found in this text. The third conversation was held by a man and contained a neutral subject and primarily feminine features of language. The complete survey can be found in part E of the appendix. A list of the participants' answers can be found in part F of the appendix. To clarify, the participants are the people who partook in the survey, while the speakers are the people whose conversations were transcribed. Ten of the twenty-five participants correctly identified the genders of the speakers. A bigger group of eleven participants identified the two first speakers correctly, but identified the last speaker as female. Overall, all but one participant identified the first speaker correctly, all but two identified the second speaker correctly, while twelve people were unable to identify the last speaker correctly.

Despite the fact that the survey asked the participants which word choices by the speakers they used to identify the speakers' genders, many participants stated that, while some word choices did seem masculine or feminine to them, they identified the speakers based on circumstantial evidence. Some of the participants admitted that they identified the speakers by the subject of their text, although the participants were warned that clear identifications of gender in the conversation could be manipulated. Twelve of the twenty-five participants stated in their answer that they identified the first speaker as male (partly)

because of his interest in model trains and model village and his former job in horticulture.

The second speaker was identified as a woman by a few of the participants because she was buying flowers. The length or complexity of the answers was also an important factor in identifying a speaker's gender. The first speaker was identified as male, because he was short in his answers, while speakers 2 and 3 were said to be female, because they gave a comprehensive answer to short questions. The third speaker was also seen as female because of the specific information he gave about his father's situation. The participants associated long answers and an abundance of information with women, possibly because women are stereotyped to be overly chatty. Men, on the other hand, are associated with being short in their answer and possibly disinterested in sharing information with others.

Another factor that helped the participants identify gender is whether the speaker comes across as emotional. The third speaker was identified as male by one participant and by another as female based on the participants' different interpretations of the conversation. The participant who identified speaker 3 as male stated that she thought the speaker had an insensitive way of speaking about his father's troubles, while the other participant stated that the speaker was able to sympathize with his father's motives for doing charity work abroad and that she associated the ability to sympathize with women. A participant who identified the second speaker as female also stated that the subject of problems after a divorce seemed like a topic that could solely be discussed between two women.

Most of the participants also stated that certain lexical choices helped them to identify the speaker as a certain gender. One of the features that participants associated with a gender is stuttering or making mistakes in language. Speaker 3 tries to say that his father had a job laying flooring, by uttering the following sentence: *Hij is, hij heeft altijd vloer leggen gedaan* ("he is, he has always done laying floors"). This wording of this sentence is unusual and can be seen as incorrect. Three different participants gave this sentence as an example of why they

thought the speaker is a woman. Some of the participants pointed towards the stumbling beginning of the sentence (*hij is, hij heeft*), while others were more concerned about the mistake at the end (*always done laying floors*).

Nine of the twenty-five participants identified the first or third speaker as male by his use of the subordinating conjunction *dus* (“so”). *Dus* is an eye-catching feature of the third speaker’s conversation, since he repeatedly ends his sentences with the word, as to indicate that he has finished what he wishes to say. Also the repetition of the coordinating conjunction *en* (“and”) is ascribed to men. The association between men and conjunctions falls in line with the stereotype discussed in section 2.3.2. The participants also saw the quantities in the speech of speaker 1 as an indication of masculinity. The participants mentioned the phrases *een maand* (“a month”) and *honderd vierkante meter* (“one hundred square meters”) as being masculine. This also follows the results found in our data as discussed above, as men tend to use more quantities than women do. The participants linked the word *ik* (“I”) with male speech as well, which is an association that was also found in our own analysis of the data. Various participants also saw the word *ja* (“yes”) as a male trait. The first speaker uses the word *ja* often to start his answer with and multiple times even uses *ja* twice in succession to emphasize his point. Only one participant associated *ja* with women. The first speaker also used the particular phrase *[dat] kan je wel stellen* (similar in meaning to the phrase *you can say that again*), which a participant associated with male speech. The third speaker uses the phrase *een speciale uitdaging* (“a special challenge”). Two participants state this phrase as a reason to identify the speaker as a man, while two other participants use this as a reason to say he is a woman. This is possibly due to the fact that the word *uitdaging* (“challenge”) is associated with being strong and daring, which are stereotypically male traits, while the use of the word *speciale* (“special”) is a stereotypically feminine trait.

Participants found it relatively easy to identify the second speaker as female. Fifteen of

the twenty-five participants cited the word *vriendinnetje* (cute word for “female friend”) as a sign of female speech. Also the words *lief* (“sweet”, “nice”) and *klatsen* (“to chat”) were seen as inherently female. Furthermore, the use of the adjective *bijzonder* (“special”) was seen as feminine. This is possibly since adjectives are inherently seen as feminine. This is further emphasized by the fact that one of the participants identified speaker 1 as male, based on his lack of adjectives. Also the use of adverb intensifiers, such as in the phrases *helemaal alleen* (“completely alone”) and *heel belangrijk* (“very important”), helped the participants to identify a speaker as female. This follows our own analysis of the data, which shows that adverb intensifiers were used more frequently by women.

In short, many of the participants were able to correctly identify the speaker when the subject matter was something that could stereotypically belong to a gender and when the speaker had an abundance of features in their speech that fit his or her gender. However, when a speaker had both typically female and male language features in his or her speech, the participants were hesitant to identify the person as a certain gender. While the participants did look at word choice, many also mentioned relying on the feel of the conversation, the subject matter or actions by the speaker that can be ascribed to a certain gender stereotypes. The next chapter will examine the implications of all the results discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 4: Discussion

4.1 Overview

This chapter will discuss the results further, starting with the differences between the results found in the studies that were discussed in section 1.3.2 “Language differences in gender” and the results found in this current thesis, followed by a discussion about laypersons’ perception of male and female language.

4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 Discussion about own analysis

As discussed in the previous chapter, male features in the Dutch language are the use of locatives and quantities, a high average sentence length, the use of *ik*, the use of diminutives and the use of subordinating conjunctions. Most of these results correspond to the results found in previous studies or the stereotype that was examined, except for the features of sentence length and the use of diminutives.

The theory suggests that women have a higher average sentence length than men do (Mulac & Lundell, 1986, p. 89). However, as was stated in the last chapter, our data show that male speech contains a higher average sentence length. A reason for this disagreement in results can be found in the differences in the methodology of the two studies. While this thesis is based on data that was collected by transcribing conversations between strangers, Mulac and Lundell prompted their speakers to monologue about pictures that they saw (1986, p. 85). Whether a speaker is required to hold a monologue or hold a conversation changes the linguistic response of the speaker. The speakers in Mulac and Lundell’s study (1986), who held a monologue, had ample time to formulate their thoughts and they were not interrupted during their monologue. However, the speakers in the data used in this thesis were in a conversation and therefore, socially obliged to answer in a timely fashion. These speakers

were also often interrupted by the presenter or bystanders for various reasons, such as wanting to add information or to ask another question. Whether or not a speaker had had time to formulate his or her thoughts or was interrupted while voicing his or her thoughts will have had an impact on the average sentence length of a speaker. As stated by McMillan, Clifton, McGrath and Gale, female speech is interrupted more often than male speech is (1977, p. 553), which leads to the conclusion that women are more often forced to break off their sentences due to being interrupted and start a new one, leading to a higher number of sentences with the same number of words per conversation. This leads to a lower number of words per sentence, which is the case in the data used in this thesis. In short, the results found in both Mulac and Lundell's study (1986) and the results found in this thesis are valid, but they are valid in different situations. Women have a higher sentence length on average only when the speakers are allowed to monologue. However, as discovered in this current study, men have a higher average sentence length than women when they are in conversation with strangers and can be interrupted.

Popular stereotyping suggests that women use more diminutives than men do, as was discussed in section 3.2.1. However, this present study found that men use more diminutives than women do, despite the fact that only women are associated with the use of diminutives through stereotypes. This disparity between the stereotype and reality can be explained by the various types of diminutives and their social meanings. Diminutives can be used either to indicate that something is small or short, such as *een bosje bloemen* ("a small bunch of flowers") or *eventjes* ("a short while"), or to introduce a dainty or cute element to one's speech, such as *restaurantje* (cute form of "restaurant") or *datejes* (cute form of "date"). While the first type of diminutive is used liberally by both genders, the second type is seen as strictly feminine. Since this second type of diminutive carries a strong association with a gender, the use of this type becomes marked in the minds of the speakers. Men are also

socially discouraged from using this second type of diminutive for the fear of being called “feminine” or “gay”. Since women are the only ones using the marked type of diminutive, the use of diminutives in their speech is noticed more frequently, which leads to the stereotype of women using an abundance of diminutives.

Little variation could be found in the genders’ choice of *-lijk* words and the most frequently used words by men and women. One of the reasons that the *-lijk* words listed in tables 3a and 3b are the most frequently used is that all words in the lists of most frequent *-lijk* words can be used in any conversation, no matter the subject. For example, a speaker is less likely to use the word *huwelijk* (“marriage”) in a conversation than the word *natuurlijk* (“of course”), since the subject of marriage does not come up every day, but the phrase *of course* can occur in conversations about every topic. Additional to this, the listed *-lijk* words do not carry a connotation of being overly feminine or masculine, which enables both genders to use the words without social repercussions. Since there are no clear alternatives to the listed *-lijk* words that still end in *-lijk*, especially no gendered variations, both men and women tend to use the same *-lijk* words.

Similar reasoning is found behind the similarity between the most frequent words of men and women. These lists are nearly identical, since there are few alternatives to the use of these words. Many words, such as the articles *het*, *de* and *een* (“the”, “the” and “a(n)”), the first person personal pronoun *ik* (“I”) and the verb *is* (“is”) cannot be replaced by any other word and are necessary in nearly every sentence. Because of the combination of these words being both without alternatives and unavoidable in speech, there is little variation in these lists of most frequent words, which are shown in tables 3a and 3b.

Women, as discussed in the previous chapter, are more likely than men are to use modal constructions, tag questions, emotional words, negation, adverb intensifiers, apologetic phrases and conjunctions, especially coordinating conjunctions. Most of the results

correspond to those of the previous studies as discussed in chapter 1 and the stereotypes they are based on, except for the results concerning the conjunctions.

Our data show that women use more conjunctions than men do, which contradicts the old stereotype that women do not use conjunctions frequently (Brouwer, Gerritsen, De Haan, & Van der Post, 1979, p. 115). This stereotype has fallen out of favour for various reasons. The stereotype was based on the belief that women are less intelligent than men and less capable of using language correctly, which is a belief that has become less prominent through the years. Also the women themselves have changed since 1900, when the stereotype was born. Since 1900, women have become more educated and are often just as involved in society as men are, which means they receive more language input and especially more variation in language input than they would in the year 1900. Nowadays, it is unthinkable that an adult Dutch woman would not know how to use conjunctions, which quickly destroys the presence of this stereotype.

4.2.2 Discussion about analysis by laypersons

It has become clear that laypersons rely on various language features when they attempt to identify a speaker as a certain gender. Lexical choice seems to be one of the less popular methods for identifying someone's gender. Many of the participants partly relied on the topic of the conversation or language features such as the length of answers, the perceived emotional state of the speaker and other features that are not related to linguistics to mark someone as a certain gender. Participants often fall back on stereotypes in order to match a speaker with a gender. Long, complex sentences were associated with women, since women are said to be chatty, conversations containing emotions were marked as female speech, because men are said to have an inability to express emotions, phrases referencing strength were attributed to men, since men are viewed as the strong ones, while adverb intensifiers were ascribed to women, since women are both said to have a tendency to exaggerate and a

preference for adjectives. The question is whether the participants learned which words and phrases are common for both genders through social interaction or whether the participants learned the stereotypes and applied those to their task in the survey.

The most interesting speaker in the survey is the speaker in the third conversation. The subject of the conversation was neutral and the conversation contained both masculine and feminine language components, which were identified as such by the results found in this thesis (see section 3.2) and the studies discussed in section 1.3.2. Because of these features of the conversation, it was more difficult for the participants to use the subject matter or obvious stereotypes to identify the speaker as a certain gender. It was clearly a confusing conversation for most of the participants since the group of participants was almost evenly split between marking the speaker as female and marking the speaker as male. This indicates that it is indeed difficult for people to identify a speaker solely on his or her vocabulary. Contextual information, such as the looks or voice of the person, is crucial in identifying which gender a person has.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

The main questions in this thesis were which Dutch language features are indicative of male and female language and which Dutch language features laypersons associate with men and women. Especially the gendered variation in lexical choice was discussed in this thesis.

The topic of social indexicality was discussed in the first chapter, followed by the development of gender identity and the features that could influence this identity. After exploring previous studies conducted on the topic of the linguistic indexes of men and women, a method was devised that would provide the answers to these aforementioned questions. The methodology that was used contains two methods, namely, one where the gathered data were analysed by me and one where the gathered data were analysed by laypersons. Eventually, the results found with these methods show that men use more locatives, quantities, diminutives, subordinating conjunctions and use the word *ik* more often and they have a higher average sentence length, while women use more modal constructions, tag questions, emotional words, negation, adverbs intensifiers, apologies and conjunctions. This means these linguistic features are accurate indexes for gender. Laypersons tend to look more at contextual signs of gender instead of vocabulary that is indicative of a gender. Laypersons associate men with certain topics, insensitivity, brief answers and the use of locatives, quantities and the words *ja* (“yes”), *ik* (“I”) and *dus* (“so”). On the other hand, laypersons associate women with other topics of conversation, a focus on emotions, elaborate answers, mistakes in language and the use of diminutives, adjectives and adverb intensifiers.

Overall, the purpose of this thesis was to present the reader with an overview of previous studies about language variation due to gender, to find out which effects gender can have on one’s use of certain Dutch language features and the Dutch lexicon in this current time and to examine laypersons’ perception of what language features are male or female. My

belief is that the results found in this thesis give a satisfactory answer to these questions.

It should be noted that the results were based on data that consisted of conversations between strangers. When certain variables in this situation are changed, the results found in this thesis may not apply. This was mentioned in chapter 4 as well, as the difference in methodology between this thesis and the study by Mulac and Lundell (1986) caused the results of these studies to differ. A limitation to the research presented in this thesis is the small sample size in the feature “apologies”. While most of the analysed features were found in the conversations of the vast majority of speakers, only five of the fifty participants used an apology in their conversation. There are several possible reasons for the low sample size in this category. First of all, the low sample size could be related to the speakers. For example, women’s speech might have adjusted to the male standard in this instance, since there are various negative connotations linked to frequent apologies. Frequent apologies are often seen as a sign of weakness and emphasize the fact that the speaker has made a mistake. Secondly, the sample size might have been low due to the situation surrounding the conversations used in the data. Since people only apologize when they feel the situation necessitates it, apologies are rare and only occur when something atypical happens, such as the speaker crying or accidentally hitting his or her conversation partner. While other studies, such as Schumann and Ross’ (2010, p. 1649), do agree with the result found in this thesis, which is that women apologize more often than men do, further research is needed to say with certainty that Dutch women use more apologies than men do.

Other interesting possibilities of future research can be found by changing the methodology. As aforementioned, the results found in this thesis apply to speakers in conversation with strangers and future research can analyse male and female speech with people in a conversation with friends or with the researcher, or when the speaker is holding a

monologue. Another idea for future research is using other features to analyse, such as interruptions, hedging or the use of certain verbs.

5.2 Application of the results

This thesis and all the studies that went before it have made it clear that there are numerous differences between the language of men and women. While some of these differences are obvious, such as the differences in the voices of men and women and the stereotypical subjects of their conversations, other differences are more subtle. This thesis was written in order to further clarify these differences, especially in case of the Dutch language, since most studies done in this field are solely focused on English and English speaking countries. Being aware of the differences in the speech of men and women can help the different genders understand each other better. In her book, Tannen describes many conversations between a man and a woman that ended in misunderstandings (1990). For example, Tannen talks about a female teacher, who has sent a student to the principal, who is a man, to be disciplined (1990, p. 232). Later, the teacher is told that the student received a suspension and she says “I am sorry” to the principal. While she meant that she is sorry to hear that the principal had to suspend the student, the principal thought she was trying to apologize for the student misbehaving and he assured her it was not her fault. If the principal had been aware that in English women often use apologies to sympathize with their conversation partners or if the teacher had been aware that men only use apologies out of guilt and changed her sentence to “I am sorry to hear that” the misunderstanding would not have happened. By being aware of the way the other gender tends to phrase certain thoughts, misunderstandings can be avoided.

Individuals can find value in the results gathered in this thesis if they encounter situations where they are forced to adapt to the speech patterns of the other gender. For example, in various fields of work, the majority of figures of authority are male. Women who

want to break into this business will have to adjust their speech in order to be taken seriously, for example, by removing most diminutives from their speech or using less emotional words.

People with jobs in writing, marketing or similar fields are able to use the results in order to adjust their texts to make contact with the exact demographic they want to reach and make the members of this demographic feel comfortable by communicating with them in speech that is familiar to them.

As for theoretical purposes of this thesis, the results of this thesis give a different perspective on language variation due to gender, since it is a study about gender variation in the Dutch language, instead of in the English language. It gives others who conduct similar studies about other languages a point to compare their language against and can lead to the discovery of essential differences in male and female language across different languages. Hopefully, it will also inspire others to continue the research in the field of gender variation in language, specifically about the subject of gender variation in Dutch vocabulary.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Blazhoffschi Productions (Producer). (2015-2016). *Hello Goodbye* [Television series].

Hilversum, Netherlands: KRO-NCRV.

Dijkman, A. (Director). (2015-2016). *Van de Kaart* [Television series]. Den Haag,

Netherlands: Omroep West.

Hillen, J. (Producer). (2016). *De Bloemenstal* [Television series]. Hilversum, The

Netherlands: RTL4.

Secondary sources

Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, K. T. (2008). Justifying race talk: Indexicality and the social construction of race and linguistic value. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 18(1), 108-129.

Argamon, S., Koppel, M., Fine, J., & Shimoni, A. R. (2003). Gender, genre, and writing style in formal written texts. *Text & Talk*, 23(3), 321-346.

Brouwer, D., Gerritsen, M., De Haan, D., & Van der Post, A. (1979). *Vrouwentaal en mannenpraat: Verschillen in taalgebruik en taalgebruik in relatie tot de maatschappelijke rolverdeling* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Van Genneep.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Gefen, D., & Ridings, C. M. (2005). If you spoke as she does, sir, instead of the way you do: A sociolinguistics perspective of gender differences in virtual communities. *The Data Base for Advances in Information Systems*, 36(2), 78-92.

- Gleser, G. C., Gottschalk, L. A., & John, W. (1959). The relationship of sex and intelligence to choice of words: A normative study of verbal behavior. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 15*(2), 182-191.
- Haeseryn, W., Romijn, K., Geerts, G., De Rooij, J., & Van den Toorn, M. C. (Eds.). (1997). *Algemene Nederlandse spraakkunst* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <http://ans.ruhosting.nl/index.html>
- Hyde, J. S., & Linn, M. C. (1988). Gender differences in verbal ability: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 104*(1), 59-69.
- Kendall, S., & Tannen, D. (1997). Gender and language in the workplace. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse* (pp. 81-105). London, England: Sage publications.
- Keune, K. (2013). *Explaining register and sociolinguistic variation in the lexicon: Corpus studies on Dutch* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Lakoff, R. T. (2004). *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries*. M. Bucholtz (Ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. (1978). Intonation in a man's world. *Signs, 3*(3), 541-559.
- McMillan, J. R., Clifton, A. K., McGrath, D., & Gale, W. S. (1977). Women's language: Uncertainty or interpersonal sensitivity and emotionality? *Sex Roles, 3*(6), 545-559.
- Mehl, M. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2003). The sounds of social life: A psychometric analysis of students' daily social environments and natural conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 857-870.
- Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Oxon, England: Routledge.
- Mulac, A., Bradac, J. J., & Gibbons, P. (2006). Empirical support for the gender-as-culture hypothesis: An intercultural analysis of male/female language differences. *Human Communication Research, 27*(1), 121-152.

Mulac, A., & Lundell, T. L. (1986). Linguistic contributors to the gender-linked language effect. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 5(2), 81-101.

Muñoz, R., & D. Okuniev. (2012). Typeform [Computer software]. Barcelona, Spain.

Retrieved from <https://www.typeform.com/>

Newman, M. L., Groom, C. J., Handelman, L. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Processes*, 23, 211-236.

Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 335-358). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Pennebaker, J. W., Mehl, M. R., & Niederhoffer, K. G. (2003). Psychological aspects of natural language use: Our words, our selves. *Annual Review Psychology*, 54, 547-577.

Schumann, K., & Ross, M. (2010). Why women apologize more than men: Gender differences in thresholds for perceiving offensive behavior. *Psychological Science*, 21(11), 1655.

Scott, M., 2016, WordSmith Tools version 7, Stroud: Lexical Analysis Software.

Taalunie. (2007a, March 22). De negatie. *Taalblad.be*. Retrieved from <http://www.taalblad.be/zinsbouw/de-negatie>

Taalunie. (2007b, March 21). Het adverbium. *Taalblad.be*. Retrieved from <http://www.taalblad.be/woordleer/het-adverbium>

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language and discourse*. East Sussex, England: Routledge.

Appendix

A. List of participants and information about the conversationsTable 5: *Information about the speakers and their conversations*

Name	Gender	Programme	Episode	Time frame
Participant 1	Female	De Bloemenstal	Episode 35, 21 February 2016	0:44-3:01 (2:17)
Participant 2	Male	De Bloemenstal	Episode 35 21 February 2016	3:17-5:25 (2:08)
Participant 3	Male	De Bloemenstal	Episode 35 21 February 2016	5:39-8:37 and 11:46-13:28 (4:40)
Participant 4	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Rijnsburg 25 February 2016	3:30-5:41 (2:11)
Participant 5	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Rijnsburg 25 February 2016	09:35-12:03 (2:28)
Participant 6	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Wageningen- Rijswijk 18 February 2016	2:07-6:56 (4:49)
Participant 7	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Voorschoten 11 February 2016	3:51-8:40 (4:49)
Participant 8	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Voorschoten 11 February 2016	9:44-12:49 (3:05)
Participant 9	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Noordwijkerhout 4 February 2016	3:00-7:49 (4:49)
Participant 10	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Noordwijkerhout 4 February 2016	12:34-15:30 (2:56)
Participant 11	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Zoetermeer 26 November 2015	2:33-5:05 (2:32)
Participant 12	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Moordrecht 17 March 2016	2:25-5:40 and 6:42-7:45 (4:18)
Participant 13	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Voorhout en Sassenheim 28 January 2016	2:51-5:15 and 6:20-7:20 (3:24)
Participant 14	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Den Haag 21 January 2016	13:26-16:44 (3:18)
Participant 15	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Zoetermeer 26 November 2015	1:07-4:37 (3:30)
Participant 16	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Zoetermeer 26 November 2015	8:30-12:12 (3:42)
Participant 17	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Waddinxveen 19 November 2015	10:25-13:46 (3:21)
Participant 18	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Delft 12 November	9:44-11:54 (2:10)

Participant 19	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Delft 12 November 2015	12:13-16:15 (4:02)
Participant 20	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode Noordwijk 5 November 2015	11:33-14:53 (3:20)
Participant 21	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Reeuwijk 29 October 2015	10:07-13:29 (3:22)
Participant 22	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Leiden 22 October 2015	11:17-14:09 (2:52)
Participant 23	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Leiderdorp 1 October 2015	13:01-13:40 and 14:40-17:33 (3:32)
Participant 24	Female	Van de Kaart	Episode Voorburg 24 September 2015	13:54-16:40 (2:46)
Participant 25	Male	De Bloemenstal	Episode 34 14 February 2016	1:00-5:28 (4:28)
Participant 26	Female	De Bloemenstal	Episode 34 14 February 2016	5:44-8:41 (2:57)
Participant 27	Female	De Bloemenstal	Episode 29 31 January 2016	6:33-11:20 (4:47)
Participant 28	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 12 February 2016	4:42-9:42 (5:00)
Participant 29	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 12 February 2016	33:30-38:30 (5:00)
Participant 30	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 5 February 2016	30:45-33:45 (3:00)
Participant 31	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 29 January 2016	6:06-11:6 (5:00)
Participant 32	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 29 January 2016	12:59-17:59 (5:00)
Participant 33	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 15 January 2016	1:11-4:33 (3:22)
Participant 34	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 15 January 2016	30:41-35:41 (5:00)
Participant 35	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 8 January 2016	5:17-10:17 (5:00)
Participant 36	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 8 January 2016	27:20-30:33 (3:13)
Participant 37	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 17 December 2015	25:23-30:23 (5:00)
Participant 38	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 26 November 2015	23:00-26:27 (3:27)
Participant 39	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 19 November 2015	13:39-16:56 (3:17)
Participant 40	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 12 November 2015	12:51-17:51 (5:00)
Participant 41	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 5 November 2015	19:13-22:07 (2:54)
Participant 42	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 25 August 2015	5:13-10:13 (5:00)

Participant 43	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 25 August 2015	32:32-37:32 (5:00)
Participant 44	Female	Hello Goodbye	Episode 14 July 2015	4:44-9:44 (5:00)
Participant 45	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 14 July 2015	27:27-29:27 (2:00)
Participant 46	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 30 June 2015	11:58-14:29 (2:31)
Participant 47	Male	Hello Goodbye	Episode 23 June 2015	31:20-36:20 (5:00)
Participant 48	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode 7 April 2016	9:07-11:38 (2:31)
Participant 49	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode 17 September 2015	9:52-12:48 (2:56)
Participant 50	Male	Van de Kaart	Episode 25 June 2015	14:21-16:56 (2:35)

B. List of Dutch modal adverbs

allerlei	intussen	opnieuw
alsnog	integendeel	plots
althans	indien	toch
alvast	immers	uiteraard
alweer	maar	tevergeefs
amper	misschien	trouwens
blijkbaar	minstens	tussendoor
bovendien	namelijk	ongetwijfeld
dankzij	nauwelijks	uitermate
daarentegen	nochtans	voortaan
desnoods	nogal	waarschijnlijk
echter	nogmaals	zeer
graag	onafgebroken	zelfs
inderdaad	ondanks	

(Taalunie, 2007b)

C. List of Dutch locatives

aan	door	onder
achter	elders	op
beneden	ergens	over
benoorden	hier	overall
beoosten	in	rond
bewesten	langs	rondom
bezuiden	naar	tegen
bij	naast	tegenover
binnen	nabij	tussen
boven	nergens	voor
buiten	om	voorbij
daar	omstreeks	waar

(Haeseryn, Romijn, Geerts, De Rooij, & Van den Toorn, 1997)

The word “naar” was added to this list as a Dutch locative, despite its absence in the source, since it is a direct translation of one of the examples given in the original study (Gleser, Gottschalk, & John, 1959, p. 183).

D. List of Dutch coordinating and subordinating conjunctions**Coordinating conjunctions**

alsmede	doch	ofwel
alsook	dus (when describing consequences)	maar
dan (opposing)	en	noch
dan wel	of	want (when describing causality)

(Haeseryn, Romijn, Geerts, De Rooij, & Van den Toorn, 1997)

Subordinating conjunctions

aangezien	in zover	tenware
als	laat staan	tenzij
behalve dat	met	uitgezonderd
daar	mits	vermits
dan dat	naargelang	wanneer
dat	naarmate	zo
door	of	zodat
doordat	om	zonder dat
indien	omdat	zover
ingeval	opdat	
in plaats dat	teneinde	

(Haeseryn, Romijn, Geerts, De Rooij, & Van den Toorn, 1997)

E. Complete survey

(This survey was made with Typeform and is available at <https://kim377.typeform.com/to/EBlgDj>)

Page 1:

Bedankt voor het invullen van deze enquête!

Er volgen enkele vragen over uzelf, gevolgd door drie teksten. Lees deze teksten goed door en beantwoordt de vragen. De enquête duurt ongeveer tien minuten.

Page 2:

Vraag 1: Wat is uw geslacht?

- Man
- Vrouw

Page 3:

Vraag 2: Wat is uw leeftijd?

- Jonger dan 18
- 18-30 jaar
- 31-50 jaar
- 51-70 jaar
- Ouder dan 70 jaar

Page 4:

Vraag 3: Is Nederlands uw eerste taal?

- Ja
- Nee

Page 5:

Vraag 4: Deze enquête is uitsluitend bedoeld om informatie te verzamelen voor mijn scriptie. Geeft u toestemming voor het gebruik van uw antwoorden in mijn scriptie?

- Ja
- Nee

Page 6:

Gesprek nummer 1

Lees het volgende gesprek. De persoonlijke informatie van deze spreker, inclusief directe verwijzingen naar zijn of haar geslacht zijn verwijderd of veranderd. De spreker is aangeduid met het cijfer “1”.

Het gesprek begint als de presentatrice in het huis van de spreker een miniatuurdorpje met een modeltrein ontdekt.

Page 7:

Zo! Volgens mij heb jij een hobby! Sodeju zeg. Dit is echt een aardig stukje vakwerk zeg.

1: Ja, dit is nog maar een kleintje.

Echt waar?

1: Ja. Ik heb er, ik heb een tafel van honderd vierkante meter gehad.

Gehad.

1: Aan de andere kant van de straat, waar jullie uitkomen, heb ik mijn kwekerij gehad-

Ja.

1: en daar had ik een hele grote schuur en daar had ik in de schuur een tafel van honderd vierkante meter.

Zo.

1: Dus.

Dus u heeft echt een beetje moeten inkrimpen.

1: Ja, kan je wel stellen, ja, ja.

Ja.

1: Ja, ja.

Vond u dat moeilijk?

1: Ja, heel moeilijk.

Ja.

1: Ja. Want wij moesten weg met ons bedrijf voor woningbouw. Er moest een nieuwe school komen, nou, dat is nu dik twintig jaar terug en de school staat er nog niet.

Ach!

1: En ze gaan nu de school op de oude plek bouwen.

Page 8:

Vraag 5 : Gebaseerd op woordkeuze, welk geslacht denkt u dat de spreker van deze tekst heeft?

- Man
- Vrouw

Page 9:

Vraag 6: Door welke woordkeuze(s) van de spreker denkt u dat?

(space to allow the participant to answer the question)

Page 10:

Gesprek nummer 2

Lees het volgende gesprek. De persoonlijke informatie van deze spreker, inclusief directe verwijzingen naar zijn of haar geslacht zijn verwijderd of veranderd. De spreker is aangeduid met het cijfer “2”.

De presentatrice begint een gesprek met de spreker bij de bloemenkraam op de markt.

Page 11:

Een kaartje bij de bloemen?

2: Ja, zeker.

Mag ik het zien?

2: Ja, dat mag.

[het kaartje wordt overhandigd]

“Bedankt voor alles wat je-“

2: “Voor me doet.”

“Voor me doet.” En wie doet dan alles voor jou?

2: Een moeder van een vriendinnetje van mij.

En zij krijgt dus de bloemen.

2: Ja.

En hoezo helpt ze jou met dingen?

2: Ja.

En wat doet ze dan?

2: In moeilijke tijden - ik heb een scheiding achter de rug - staat zij altijd voor mij klaar, dus da's wel heel lief, hè?

Je kunt altijd je ei bij haar kwijt

2: Ja, altijd.

Ja, nee, natuurlijk is dat belangrijk.

2: Ja

Dat je met iemand kan kletsen.

2: Ja, lijkt me heel belangrijk.

Page 12:

Vraag 7: Gebaseerd op woordkeuze, welk geslacht denkt u dat de spreker van deze tekst heeft?

- Man
- Vrouw

Page 13:

Vraag 8: Door welke woordkeuze(s) van de spreker denkt u dat?

(space to allow the participant to answer the question)

Page 14:

Gesprek nummer 3

Lees het volgende gesprek. De persoonlijke informatie van deze spreker, inclusief directe verwijzingen naar zijn of haar geslacht zijn verwijderd of veranderd. De spreker is aangeduid

met het cijfer “3”.

De presentator komt de spreker tegen tijdens het wachten op het vliegveld.

Page 15:

Op wie sta je te wachten?

3: Op mijn vader. Die komt vanuit Nairobi en die hebben vrijwilligerswerk gedaan voor een maand, dus.

In Kenia.

3: Ja.

En wat voor werk deed hij dan?

3: Hij is bouwvakker geweest, hij is nu met pensioen en hij is van de zomer gevraagd of hij mee wilde en heeft hij ja op gezegd. Hij is, hij heeft altijd vloer leggen gedaan, en daarvoor is hij daar naartoe gegaan. Dus.

Hij is daar alleen naartoe gegaan?

3: Nee, ze zijn met een groep. Uit mijn hoofd acht of negen bouwvakkers en iedereen heeft zijn eigen taken daarin natuurlijk, dus. En dat mijn vader nu mee is gegaan is eigenlijk, heeft ook te maken, anderhalf jaar geleden is mijn moeder overleden. En hij is nu helemaal alleen. En anders had hij dat denk ik niet gedaan, als mijn moeder nog leefde, maar nu dit is wel voor hem een, ja, een hele speciale uitdaging natuurlijk, dus.

Ja

3: Een maand alleen weg met met bouwvakkers dus dat is wel bijzonder.

Page 16:

Vraag 9: Gebaseerd op woordkeuze, welk geslacht denkt u dat de spreker van deze tekst heeft?

- Man
- Vrouw

Page 17:

Vraag 10: Door welke woordkeuze(s) van de spreker denkt u dat?

(space to allow the participant to answer the question)

Page 18:

Dit waren alle vragen van de enquête.

Heeft u nog opmerkingen?

(space to allow the participant to answer the question)

Page 19:

Heel erg bedankt voor het invullen van deze enquête! U heeft me erg geholpen met mijn scriptie.

Vergeet niet op "verzenden" te drukken op het volgende scherm, zodat de antwoorden worden opgeslagen.

F. The participants' answers to the survey questions

Please note that table 6 contains the answers given by the participants in response to the survey that is shown in part E of the appendix. The third column of this table contains the participants' answers to questions 5, 7 and 9 of the survey, which is the question *Gebaseerd op woordkeuze, welk geslacht denkt u dat de spreker van deze tekst heeft?* ("Based on lexical choice, which gender do you think the speaker has?"). The fourth column of the table shows the participants' answers to questions 6, 8 and 10 of the survey, which is the question *Door welke woordkeuze(s) van de spreker denkt u dat?* ("Because of which lexical choice or lexical choices by the speaker do you think that?").

Table 6: Information about the participants and the answers they gave in the survey

Gender of participant	Number of the transcription	Gender of speaker, according to participant	Lexical choice or lexical choices that the participant used to determine the speaker's gender
Woman	1	Man	Het hebben over de modeltrein
	2	Man	Mevrouwtje
	3	Man	Een speciale uitdaging
Woman	1	Man	Heel veel: "Ja"
	2	Woman	"vriendinnetje van mij"
	3	Woman	Door uitgebreid antwoord te geven op de gestelde vragen
Woman	1	Man	Ja, ja, en kwekerij
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje
	3	Woman	Geen specifieke woorden maar dat de zinnen lang en uitgebreid zijn.
Woman	1	Man	Het feit dat hij een modeltreintje heeft
	2	Woman	Presentatrice zegt "mevrouw"
	3	Man	Dus
Woman	1	Man	"kan je wel stellen", "honderd vierkante meter", "nou... dik twintig jaar terug"
	2	Woman	"vriendinnetje", "lief"
	3	Woman	"een hele speciale uitdaging"
Woman	1	Man	Veelvuldig gebruik van "en" in sommige zinnen; "en daar had ik" ... "en daar had ik in de schuur"
	2	Woman	"da's wel heel lief, he"; "vriendinnetje"
	3	Man	"dus"; weglaten van "hij"

Woman	1	Man	Kwekerij, schuur, ja ja
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje, kletsen
	3	Woman	Hij is, hij heeft vloeren gelegd
Woman	1	Man	Vakmanschap, bedrijf
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje, lief, m'n ei kwijt
	3	Man	De herhaaldelijke "dus" en "ja"
Woman	1	Man	Kwekerij
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje, lief
	3	Man	Dus
Woman	1	Man	Veel ja en ik, weinig extra info
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje
	3	Man	Dus
Woman	1	Man	Dit is nog maar een kleintje, dus, dat kan je wel stellen ja
	2	Woman	Da's wel heel lief, scheiding achter de rug, heel belangrijk
	3	Woman	Helemaal alleen, wel bijzonder, heeft ook te maken met, een speciale uitdaging natuurlijk
Woman	1	Man	Ik had en ons bedrijf
	2	Woman	Ze vraagt verder over voor wie de bloemen zijn
	3	Man	Aaa
Woman	1	Man	Honderd vierkante meter. Heb ik een kwekerij gehad
	2	Woman	Een vriendinnetje. Ja lief hè
	3	Man	Dus. Uitdaging.
Woman	1	Man	Simpele woorden, vrijwel geen bijvoegelijke naamwoorden
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje
	3	Woman	Bijzonder
Woman	1	Man	Door het continu herhalen van dezelfde woorden
	2	Man	"En wie doet alles dan voor jou"
	3	Woman	"En hij is nu helemaal alleen"
Woman	1	Man	Door de korte antwoorden die de spreker gebruikt, zoals "ja, ja" of "dus". Verder stel ik me er ook een man bij voor, bij deze hobby. Dat zal mijn keuze mogelijk beïnvloeden.
	2	Woman	Door de wat uitgebreidere antwoorden en woorden als "vriendinnetje"
	3	Man	De keuze is meer een gevoel. En misschien door de redelijk gevoelloze uitspraken over een toch wel gevoelige gebeurtenis. Dat de vader weg is gegaan, heeft verband met het overlijden van de moeder.
Woman	1	Man	Door zijn modeltreinen.
	2	Woman	Omdat de spreker bloemen aan het kopen is en er een kaartje bij schrijft.
	3	Woman	Het stuk dat de spreker het heeft over de beweegredenen van de vader.
Woman	1	Man	"kan je wel stellen"

	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje, da's wel heel lief
	3	Man	Dus
Man	1	Man	Kortaf. Ook vanwege werk en hobby. Ook de manier waarop hij over zijn tafel van 100 vierkante meter spreekt
	2	Woman	Moeilijke tijden, voor mij klaar staan
	3	Woman	Vloeren leggen gedaan, alleen weg met bouwvakkers
Man	1	Man	Vierkante meter, ja, tafel
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje
	3	Woman	Speciale uitdaging
Man	1	Woman	Een hoop "ja"
	2	Woman	Idem
	3	Man	Dus, hij heeft "... " gedaan
Man	1	Man	Kan je wel stellen, ja
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje
	3	Woman	Hij is, hij heeft altijd vloer leggen gedaan,
Man	1	Man	De hobby, ik heb een kwekerij gehad
	2	Woman	Een vrouw zoekt eerder een gesprekspartner voor dergelijke problemen bij een andere vrouw
	3	Woman	Geeft erg veel specifieke informatie
Man	1	Man	Kwekerij gehad
	2	Woman	Vriendinnetje van mij
	3	Man	Een maand
Man	1	Man	Door woorden zoals "nou" in het midden van een zin
	2	Man	Mannen gebruiken vaak kleinere antwoorden denk ik
	3	Man	Mannen hebben vaak de neiging om "hij" te zeggen