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Abstract
There have been numerous studies analysing gender differences in language use. Most of them predominantly adopted static or hierarchical approach with obsolete understanding of gender differences. Concurrently with the high demand of socio-cultural aspects inclusion in language development studies, the research of gender in language use has also driven to the same direction with mixed talk and the use of dynamic approach as an alternative for more inclusive socio-cultural spectrum. Two student university classes were observed and their classroom conversations in mixed gender were meticulously selected for detailed analysis via N-VIVO. The study shows that social dimensions such as power, status, economy, and identity seem to be influential to Acehnese language users in mixed talks. Yet, some mixed talks are more likely to be affected by individual ontogenetic language development; the dominance of talk is relatively fading and mutual-respect is bold. Therefore, the advocacy for the dynamic approach to conducting further research in this domain is decisively important. It is also crucial for more thorough and deep analysis on the genetic language development of speakers such as their social backgrounds and study or learning experiences. This paper draws merely a minor part of a larger research project conducted in Aceh and is expected to be a trigger for future studies.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Language has been universally defined as a meaningful complex system consisting of units: namely, phoneme, morpheme, syntax and lexicon as well as a
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meaningful functional discourse throughout the development of social sciences especially in linguistics and applied linguistics. Such language definition is still a main reference and essential for the interpretation of language because the study about language is highly contextual, specific, and dependent for persons who become the subject of a study.

Nevertheless, there is a conclusive consensus that language is hardly independent of a social system called culture. Culture is a socially-mediated identity to all people when they were born to the earth. It is a complex unity of belief, values, norms, morals, and behavioural patterns that are internalised into human being’s mental framework (Hofstede, 1991). The process of cultural internalisation is affected by social systems and in turn becomes a particular culture representation. A concrete example is the use of language in accordance with gender differences. For example, a unique language feature may have been unconsciously internalised within a person’s repertoire due to a habitual system made in a cultural group.

Gender, in this context, is not defined as sex or biological differences. Many scientific research studies in the past, nevertheless, have used biological differences in order to accentuate a clear demarcation between women and men. This paper strives for established understanding of gender as a social construct for both masculinity and femininity. Masculinity in speech is more attached to men, whereas femininity is in proximity to women. Their speech habits or particular features of repertoires become the object of the study.

The question in this paper is aimed to reveal the gaps between both genders in a particular group of culture. In other words, this study is to find out whether there are significant differences between both genders as well as other aspects out of gender that influence and underlie the differences.

The theoretical significance becomes scientific evidence for applied linguists, teachers, educators, as well as practitioners of Second Language Learning to start analysing Acehnese language as an invaluable asset of a particular social group. This is also to enrich the diversity of language studies in a global context. The practical significance of the study can be used for controlling, monitoring, and managing the existence of the language and rendering balanced development of male and female language learners’ communicative competence by some innovative strategic learning programmes at school or university level as a local language content.

In order to build on its logical argument, this study has two focused research questions. First, to what extent do women and men use the Acehnese language differently? Second, what might underlie the differences? This study incorporates the Vygotskian socio-cultural theory on ontogenetic development stating that life span learning in a particular environment may mould a model of repertoire internalised into one’s repertoire (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). In brief, this study adopts a critical theory paradigm with historical realism ontology stating that gender might lead to demarcation of arising differing repertoires. The paradigm is to analyse the implication of socio-cultural influences on language use by gender differences in Acehnese language.

In the following section, the socio-cultural theory view of human cognition over times is presented. It is then continued with a short explanation about ontogenetic development. In the last part, gender studies and their approaches are elaborated thoroughly.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Socio-cultural Theory on Genetic Development

The debate on socio-cultural influences on language development has not reached saturation, yet. Since the argument was raised by Firth and Wagner (1997) with regard to studies that include socio-cultural aspects in one’s language ability. One of the phenomenal studies is a comparative study between study abroad and classroom context where the former has outnumbered the latter in some remarkable achievements (Lafford, 2006). Since then, socio-cultural theory has been gradually incorporated into language studies discussion.

There are many socio-cultural approaches adopted into language studies, nevertheless, this study merely presents the Vygotskyan socio-cultural theory generating a concept of genetic development. The proponents of this concept claim that one’s human cognition development is highly affected by mediation one made in a discrete context. It is due to the fact that mediation itself is influenced by culture along with cultural artefacts and concepts, context, language, and social interaction (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). In brief, the development would vary depending on the impacting aspects on mediation that works individually. Therefore, such mediation may lead to some revealing differences across genders.

Furthermore, the domains of genetic development analysis have been established in the socio-cultural theorists. The approach to analysing human language development has shifted from a descriptive analysis to a genetic analysis (Cross, 2010). This means the domains out of the cognition properties of individual such as learning context, the capability of peers, and the availability of supports have been taken into account (Cullen, 2002; Donato, 2000). The most appropriate domain for this study is ontogenetic domain in which the scope is ‘the development of individual subject across times’ (Cole & Engeström, 1993).

2.2 Gender Difference in Language Use Studies

Gender differences in language use studies have always been exciting for experts due to a rationale that both genders seem to have their own uniqueness to construct social dimensions in communication. At the initial stage of its development, the studies were debunked with some contradictory presuppositions that men were likely to be more directive, whereas women asked more questions (Mulac, Wiemann, Widenmann, & Gibson, 1988). It is undeniable that the studies in the past are restricted with gender stereotypes such as longer words for men and more words for women (Mulac, Seibold, & Farris, 2000), more hedges and more tag questions (McMillan, Clifton, McGrath, & Gale, 1977), and so forth. In addition to that, the objects of data also varied from words, phrases, language functions, or even gestures.

Throughout its vast expansion in language studies, the typical study has been undertaken more inclusive of socio-cultural influences. One of the seminal studies was conducted by Caplan, Crawford, Hyde, and Richardson (1997) who strived to find where such emerging differences stem from; human cognition that has been influenced over the lifespan by cultural values/concepts is presumed to be a main contribution. Next, the inclusion of socio-cultural approach to this study has solidified when the
studies have gradually left biological orientation and moved forward to the influences of socio-cultural aspects in one’s gender construction (Cameron, 2005).

This study would like to support such a standpoint claiming that men and women may use language diversely and such diversities may be caused by context and other ontogenetic developmental aspects such as power, status, identity, and context.

3. METHOD

The data for this qualitative descriptive research were mainly collected from classroom interaction amongst university students at Syiah Kuala University. Two classes that each consists of 30-35 students were selected purposively. The students were acknowledged that the conversations were audio-video taped on an informed-consent basis even though there was not a thorough explanation about the topic of research in order to avoid bias, especially when the participants controlled and modified their discourse behaviours. Subsequently, the recording audio-video file was shown to a particular group of students and a stimulated recall was conducted. The gap between these two processes was approximately three weeks. The narratives as the output of stimulated recalls are presented alongside the extracts of observational method.

The demography of classroom is usually homogenous. This means most of the students are Acehnese who pursue their tertiary education in English Education School in the English as Foreign Language context. The classroom instruction language is a mixed combination between Bahasa and English, but Acehnese language is inevitably used amongst students.

A high priority is given to identity protection, minimization of risks, timely secured data storage, and rights to terminating participation. First, the use of pseudonym is strictly adhered to disguise identity in terms of age and any identity-related information. Second, the process of data collection does not contain an element of coercion in enquiries/remarks/gestures. The transcription also eliminates identity information such as name and age with coding or nodding.

The data collection on both two classes took approximately 4 hours through 4 teaching visits. In the purpose of data transcription, this study solely extracted the use of Acehnese language in mixed talks. This means that only the data that fulfilled these two requirements were analysed to further scrutiny: expressions in Acehnese language and mixed talks (talks involving both genders). The Acehnese orthography follows Pillai and Yusuf (2012) and Yusuf and Pillai (2013). The extracts were also accompanied by English translation in the paper.

The data analysis used analytic induction (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2013) in recursive cycles: data condensation, data display, and data verification and conclusion. In data condensation, mixed talks in Acehnese language were extracted from the whole data. Then, the extracts were selectively chosen when they allegedly contained some socio-cultural dimensions affecting the conversations (only a few extracts are presented in this paper). In data display, the selective extracts became objects of in-depth genetic-oriented analysis where the approach of describing was functioned to generate provisional rationales underlying each extract. In data verification and conclusion, some themes were constructed that these themes were liaised with the same issues in gender studies of language development. Further elaboration and discussion were served in the upcoming section.
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The arising argumentation in this paper is predicated on the claim that there can be other factors that underlie gender differences in language use and mixed talk is among the mainstream approaches to analyse the different use of language in both genders.

The consideration of participants’ composition in language use is one of interesting phenomena, especially in mixed talks when both genders are engaging in conversation and talk. Such differences might appear as gender differences. Two of indicators are following explicated, namely interruption and dominance of talk. Extract 1 and 2 become the reference for the former, whereas Extract 3 and 4 for the latter.

**Table 1.** Extract 1 (File No.4: 24.84 – 27.02 - a case of interruption).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 96   | Male 23  | *Kiban, peu neu-jaweub soal limboi limong bunoe?*  
(What’s up? What was the answer for number 5 just now?) |
| 97   | Male 18  | *B jawaban jih, teulat that droe-neuh, ureung ka diskusi limboi lapan, droen mantong [limboi limong...*  
((B is the answer, how could you be lost? Others are discussing number 8, yet, you are still number 5...)) |
| 98   | Female 6 | *=[Nyan keuh droe-neuh! Bèk lalèè bak ma’en hp!*  
((How could you! Don’t get distracted by your phone!)) |
| 99   | Male 18  | *Maka jih neu meuranoe-beu gîgèh bacut.*  
((You have to push yourself a bit.)) |

From Extract 1, three participants were involved in this short mixed classroom conversation. It was clear that an interruption was made by a female student (line 98). It was then followed by a fast response without any break (=) from a male student (Male 18) supporting the advice of the female student (Female 6). The interruption was also produced naturally when the previous utterance was not finished, yet. It is evident that the interruption is practiced by a woman in which such a phenomenon is barely associated with woman in the past language studies. It seems that the female student exposed a masculine feature of language here. It can be surmised that the status amongst the participants is relatively equal and close, indicated by the content of interruption is an advisory comment. Male 23 explained that:

Narrative 1 (File No. 4 – a case of interruption):
“I did not get irritated with the interruption she made. She is one of good students in this class. What she said is true; I just did not hear the teacher’s explanation on number 5”. (Male 23)

**Table 2.** Extract 2 (File No 5: 84.35 – 89.02 - a case of interruption).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 152  | Female 15| *Lon hawa that peugah haba Basa Inggrêh lağèe Ibu nyan. Leupah caröng gob nyan!*  
((I have always wanted to be proficient at English like her. She is so smart!)) |
| 153  | Female 12| *Lon hawa that neuk belajar u luwa nangngroe. Kiban peu jeat tanyoe lagêe gob nyan meuranoe ilmèe u luwa nangngroe?*  
((I have always wanted to study overseas. Is it possible if we can pursue knowledge abroad like her?)) |
Table 2 continued...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Male 8</td>
<td>Hai bèk neu-pikée ka jak u luwa nanggroe, ka pasti jeut Basa Inggrëh lagëe gob nyan. ((Don’t be naïve thinking that studying abroad would have a level of proficiency like her))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Female 15</td>
<td>Nyoe hai. Kiban jeut ta-jak meunyoe han jeut Basa Inggrëh? Kan hana mungkën ta-jak meunyoe [hana lancar Basa Inggrëh. ((I could not agree more. How could we make it without English proficiency? It is impossible we go abroad with lack of English competence.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Female 12</td>
<td>={Jeut lah! Basa Inggrëh geu-panyoe euneuk berkembang disidëh. Dasar mantong kan jeut ta-cok TOEFL mantong dilëe. ((We can, why not! Our English will develop there. A fair competence level seems to be great to take a TOEFL test now.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Male 8</td>
<td>Lôn lakëe do’a beu meu-teumëe ron dua jak u luwa nanggroe. ((I wish both of you luck to go abroad for studying.))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Extract 2, three participants were conversed within this talk. There was an interruption in this extract in line 156. The interruption was made by a female student (Female 12) upon the other female (Female 15), even the utterance was truncated (l) in line 155. The male student was interacting calmly after putting forward an argument. Both female speakers responded to the argument and raised their own opinions. It can be surmised that the interruption ensued within arising argumentative interaction. It can be said that the status amongst these speakers is comparatively the same. Female 12 informed that:

Narrative 2 (File No. 5 – a case of interruption):
“I simply gave opinion based on what I feel is correct. I was not aware of such interruptions by myself. Sometimes, we had some debates, which I thought positive as long as having good reasoning. I just believe that proficiency and study abroad are interrelated to each other”. (Female 12)

Table 3. Extract 3 (File No 2: 12.45 – 14.55 - a case of dominance of talk).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Male 7</td>
<td>Hai, ka leuh pé-ér singoh ka payah kumpöi ban beungoh? ((Have you finished the homework to hand in tomorrow morning?))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>Goh lom leuh lôn peugøi, bang, kiban droe-neuh? Ka leuh neu-peugøi? ((Mine is not finished, yet, brother, how about you? Have not you?))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male 7</td>
<td>Goh lom syit, lôn pih mita-mita bahan jih. Goh meuteumëe lom. Leupah payah! ((Not, yet, too, I have been searching for its materials. Have not found the great ones. What a difficult task!!))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Female 9</td>
<td>Neu-cok mantong bahan lôn, bang. Tapi bèk sama that neu-peugøi asoe pé-ér jih. ((You may take look at mine, brother. But, do not imitate what I have made in its content!!))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Male 3</td>
<td>Oh, nyan keuh, bang. Lôn pih mumang syit bak peugøi tugah kali nyoe. ((Oh, as what I see brother. I get confused, too, in making this homework.))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Male 7</td>
<td>Teurimong gasëh, dék_böh. ((Thank you, sister))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Female 9</td>
<td>Sama-sama, bang. ((You are welcome, brother.))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were three persons interacting in Extract 3: two males and one female. The dominance of talk was relatively shared throughout the talk. The dominance was not so
sharp because each speaker had some expectations from their interlocutors. Alas, the first male speaker (Male 7) who was worried about the homework could not get help from the other male speaker (Male 3). In fact, a female speaker offered her assistance with a conditional request. More interestingly, the dominance blurred with the status of all participants. It can be seen that there is a different status shown by the use of words ‘brother’ and ‘sister’. The phenomenon shows that each speaker is aware of the status gap amongst them (in line 40, 42, 43, 44, and 45). The status can be seniority of students related to the different ages amongst participants. Male 3 said that:

Narrative 3 (File No. 2 – a case of dominance of talk):
“I respected him as my senior student. I also heard he was older than me. I did realize that I could not help him too much and glad to hear somebody else helped him. I was aware of using polite language with him even though it was in Acehnese language”. (Male 3)

Table 4. Extract 4 (File No 1: 01.12.32 – 01.14.21 - a case of dominance of talk).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 178  | Male 13  | *Ta-jak bak pustaka jak!*  
((Let’s go to the library!)) |
| 179  | Female 9 | *Pustaka yang pat nyan?*  
((Which library do you mean?)) |
| 180  | Male 13  | *Pustaka universitas mantong.*  
((The university library is fine)) |
| 181  | Female 11| *Na mangat ta-duek di sinan?*  
((Is it nice to study there?)) |
| 182  | Female 9 | *Ngon lôn mangat ta-duek di sinan. Buku ka leungkap that jinoe. Na padum gôn duék.*  
((It is nice to me. The collection of books is improved now. I had some visits there.)) |
((Okay, the library is fine. They also sell coffee in there. The interior is also more comfy. Sometimes, we can find some art performances of students organised by the staff of library)) |
| 184  | Female 11| *Gût, jeut syiût di sinan. Lôn ikôt mantong.*  
((Great, it seems to be a good place to visit. I will just follow you.)) |

In Extract 4, there were three participating students in this mixed talk. They were two females and one male. In this extract, the dominance was mutually shared even though the turn-taking of the male speaker slightly outnumbered that of the female ones. However, such a slight difference was not due to gender issue but the functionality of the female speaker (Female 9) in presenting her good experience with the target library (line 182). At the same time, the male speaker (183) also gave his opinion. As a result, a consensus was made within this talk. Male 13 acknowledged that:

Narrative 4 (File No. 1 – a case of dominance of talk):
“I saluted on Female 9 that she had experience in visiting the library. As you know that not everybody visits the library quite often, except for the last semester
students. At the moment, she also gave her opinion about the place. I also wanted to hear about that”. (Male 13)

Firstly, interruption seems to be not exclusively associated with men. Indeed, a study was conducted by Winter (1993) toward broadcast interviews in an Australian TV. The study showed that men were more likely to interrupt the interviewees than that of women. On the other hand, women were more likely to be interrupted by their interviewees. It is apparent that the result of this study is contradictory with the broadcast interview study. It can be inferred from the above data presentations that a binding status of speakers as a socio-cultural aspect underlie the interruptions, not the gender difference.

Secondly, holding the floor is predicated on various social dimensions such as familiarity, networking, and functionality. This study shows dominance may arise because of other aspects, namely status and functionality. For some cultures/subcultures, allowing somebody older than you to speak more is a reflection of politeness. In functionality, we deserve the right to give our opinion when we feel that our opinion is resourceful for a talk. These results debunk the myths that the dominance of men in talk is always associated with quantitative-perspective by the total number of words counted through their contributions in talks (Herring, 2003). The perspective of recent research is more qualitative, social inclusion and quality of utterances.

4.1 Socio-cultural Dimensions in Mixed Talks

Research studies in this field must consider social dimensions such as power, status, functionality and so forth as underlying causes of the phenomena in the above extracts. The interruptions and a large number of words or turn-takings are the manifestation of power in the society to accentuate the dominance in mixed talks.

However, the incorporation of social dimensions will not be fruitfully employed if the understanding of socio-cultural spectrums is still constrained with a biological perspective. A core question is where the power originates from. Gender differences cannot construct the power without social aspects such as status between both genders. This means that masculinity is not necessarily more strengths, whereas femininity is always weaknesses. Indeed, the inequality of rights for women to speak nowadays is still found in a few societies.

It is undeniable that social dimensions such as status, functionality, network, power, subcultures to politeness and conversational maxim, even economic factors are contributing factors of such dominance in mixed talk (Coates, 2004). This signifies that not only is gender the key determinant of language use differences, but also are social dimension factors.

Such a misconception that reinstates gender as the main cause is due to the lack interpretation of gender and language. When gender was termed as biological differences, inevitably the studies would emphasise on sexual differences to strengthen the myth that has been believed by society for centuries. Likewise, it is hard to build a decisive proposition of language merely on a language user. Social dimensions, however, construct a meaning to linguistic features or sociolinguistic behaviours of language users.

Another important aspect is one’s ontogenetic development after having been exposed with his/her own cultural values or concepts. This means that the person may
gradually develop and filter those principles in gender construction through self-appropriation in his/her learning experiences (Lantoif, 2006). Changing their standpoints towards a sociolinguistic behaviour can be a good exemplification. This process is a lifetime process where both gender groups seem to have converge in speech behaviours, showing there is no a demarcation of linguistic behaviour on gender differences.

4.2 Dynamic Approach with Constructivism Perspective

Concerning a shift of attention from gender to other social aspects, the breakthrough in scientific research has shown a positive direction. Through scientific development, the methods of research used that concern to the issue has gradually improved. In the past, the approach of research was still influenced by anthropology and dialectology in which the perspective is still fettered with naive realism with senses and more akin to historical realism. Some popular methods of research such as phenomenology, case study and ethnography would be imperative for the findings of research when the worldview is broadened to be relativism/constructivism (Dezin & Lincoln, 2013). This affirms that a linguistic behaviour can be understood with a constructivism perspective because such behaviour is locally, specifically, and contextually-constructed.

Moreover, the classification of data involves other factors that can influence the final result of research such as the grouping of the objects of research based on social status. In sociolinguistics itself nowadays, the tendency to combine quantitative and qualitative as a scientific research has resulted a valid and reliable findings. More convincingly, the research data analysis may use computer technology such as corpus analysis or statistical analysis.

One representative of recent research studies was conducted by corporate experts, they are Newman, Groom, Handelman, and Pennebaker (2008) who analysed 14,000 texts to find the differences of language use between men and women in U. S. A. (14 universities), New Zealand (1 university) and England (3 universities). They used two innovative methods of analysis namely Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) and Corpus Collection. In respect to avoid misinterpretation of language, they composed a conceptual framework of 74 linguistic categories consisting of standardised set language categories and standardised set of features of English for data analysis. More essentially, the contextual aspects were also considered when the linguistic features were correlated with seven types of contexts. The research found that the language uses of women were likely to be close to psychological and social processes, while men were likely to be impersonal. The finding was revealed by in-depth analysis on word choices especially function and content words.

The strength of this research is mainly caused by the approach of research itself. This approach is called dynamic approach. Dynamic approach tries to reduce the intervention of both power and status and focuses on how people use masculine language or feminine language. This approach believes that gender is a social construct where all members of society are using language as doing gender (Coates, 2004). This approach never denies the influence of social system is high to the language users, but the consideration of gender is put on the preference of people to use one kind of variation that is acceptable in one particular context.
Regarding to the uniqueness of research context, this approach also believes that it seems to be unfair that the findings of differences in language use by women and men are generalizable. It means that if there are some differences in one place, the differences are caused by some social dimensions in that place. There must be definitely different findings when the same linguistic features are analysed in other places where power and status might be strongly preserved.

### 4.3 Implication for Pedagogy

In pedagogy, there is one contested point to be questioned whether masculinity and femininity of language should be differentiated in learning second language. It seems to be risky when the differentiation arises because possibly the effect of powerless and powerful language can influence the language users. At least, the awareness of English teachers to the differences is an important thing. There is a pressure in this issue that it is time in which commonalities between genders must be massively encouraged rather than differences. For example, English teachers have to provide the similar treatment in all language learning activities to both men and women. The positive result may be achieved when the similarity becomes the focus of research.

In sociolinguistics, for instance, the impact may reduce the gap between women and men in society. It is realised that women and men have the rights to speak, vote, do, and acquire something without any discriminations. In other words, the emancipation of women can be accelerated. In turns, both women and men can contribute to the development of society.

### 5. CONCLUSION

To answer the questions, there are some differences in language use of Acehnese language speakers across gender in mixed talks. However, it is strongly-believed that those differences are influenced by social dimensions such as power, status, and functionality. There is one thing for sure that there is no absoluteness stating that solely gender factor underlies the differences. Moreover, human language development is a lifespan process that may lead to changes continuously through self-internalisation. Since gender construction is not independent of socio-cultural aspects, therefore such differences must be interpreted with the constructivist perspective. This perspective recognises a reality as specific, local, experiential, and contextual.

A new approach appears to be ideal with this situation called dynamic approach. This approach defines gender as stylisation of a language user to choose which language style to be used (masculinity or femininity). It tends to bring the research of gender to the cognitive – socio-psychological process that strives to incorporate social dimensions influences into language use. This means that the theory of language acquisition will not be restricted with the individual-cognitive aspects such as cognitive level or intelligence.

There is also a high thrust to leave the issue of differences to the similarity between both genders. The impacts would bring some benefits in which the equity of rights between women and men can be achieved. There must be some innovative and creative methodologies and domains of research needed to realise it. In the future, this can be a momentum of socio-cultural theories.
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