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INTRODUCTION

The present study is an attempt to investigate the phenomenon of gender related differences in male and female speech patterns in relation to language varieties used by women among Urdu speech community in Aligarh.

In order to furnish a proper perspective on this work it is necessary to analyse in some details, the variations in verbal repertoire of Urdu speakers in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax, discourse and lexicon. It is generally held that there exists a difference between male and female speech but it is to be stressed through supportive details that the differences between the speech of the two, do not result from the sex difference but from the social inferiority of women.

It is also considered that there is a total cleavage between the male and female speech. This seems to be an oversimplification of facts for the gender of a person can only determine choices to certain forms of a language. It is observed that there are certain linguistic forms that are used only by females, while other forms are preferred by men. These differences are known as gender preferential differences.

It is also highlighted that women hardly resort to stigmatized language and they generally use prestige forms more than men. They are more and more prone and sensitive to the prestige forms of language than their counterparts. Manifestations of conservative and innovative elements in women’s speech are also discussed elaborately. Irrationality of the notion that regards women’s speech as aberrant is examined with illustrations.
Though the speech of both sexes is influenced by each other’s way of speaking. It sharply differs not only in communicative strategies but also in lexicon and morphology. Various queer and quaint Urdu expressions of day to day conversation have been scrutinized with an emphasis on women’s use of Urdu in their daily round of talk.

This analysis is based upon the data collected through the field work by using varied procedures and techniques. A sociolinguistic analysis of gender based differences in Urdu speech community of Aligarh is carried out in this thesis.

With a view to providing a proper perspective on the present work we have classified the work in five sections. SECTION 1 deals with the term Sociolinguistics, binary term sex and gender, an overview of the differences between the language of the two sexes, language variations at the gender level, differences between the speech of males and females in relation to phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax and discourse. SECTION 2 expounds communicative competence of males and females, taboo language, language and power, dominance versus subjection, changing the topic of conversation, women’s derogatory terms for men, language and sex: a case of Double Standards, and stereotypes attached to these differences. SECTION 3 covers linguistics setting of the Urdu speech community and includes profile of urdu speakers in District Aligarh. Research methodology is taken up in SECTION 4 while aims and scope of the study are treated in SECTION 5.

SECTION- 1

1.1 Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is the study of language in its social context. Social context as applied to language basically means the linguistic
variation. If an individual speaks in different ways in different social contexts—that is a stylistic variation and if an individual differs from the others in terms of age, sex, social class, ethnic group and also in his/her speech, even in the same context it will then constitute social variation and sociolinguists are interested in all such aspects of language variations. There is a close relationship between language and society by which the sense of sociolinguistics comes out as the branch of the study of language in terms of society in which language is being used. It studies the effects of any and all aspects of society including cultural norms, expectations and contexts on language.

Sociolinguistics studies many communicative issues and in a significant way correlates social structure with linguistic structure and analyses changes that occur. Sociolinguistics thus deals with the matters such as the linguistic identity of social group, social attitude of language, standard and non-standard forms of language, the patterns and needs of national language use, social varieties and level of language and also the social basis of multilingualism and some other manifold that are closely related to language and society.

The social aspects of language, in the modern sense were first studied by Indian and Japanese linguists in the 1930’s and also by Gouchal in Switzerland in the early 1900’s. The study of the social motivation of language change, has its foundation in the wave model of the late 19th century. Sociolinguistics in the West, first appeared in the 1960’s and was pioneered by linguists such as William Labov in the U.S. and Basil Bernstein in the U.K. The most important reason that has led to the growth of socio linguistic research has been the recognition of the importance of the fact that language is a much variable phenomenon and this variability may
be explained in terms of language and society. Language is not merely a single code that is used in the same manner by all people in a speech community. Linguistic insight helps to tackle these variations. It is an applied branch of linguistics which studies those properties of language and languages which acquire references for social contexts including cultural factors in their explanation in which it is learned and used. It is that aspect of linguistics which analyses all the manifestation of the relationship between language and society. It identifies social functions of language and the ways in which language is used to convey social meaning.

Sociolinguistic studies started with a correlational approach as Gumperz (1971) observed and referred to the relationship between two variables such as social structure and linguistic structure. Both have assumed and become basis of approach that is fundamentally linguistic in nature. Sociolinguistics finds out how language itself works because the goal of such work is the discovery of universal truth about language including the reasons for changes that occur.

Sociolinguistic studies are related to the evaluation and analysis of social phenomena and processes. For this purpose, sociolinguistic studies examine the entire problems which are lying within social determination of language, function of language and social effect on language development. Any linguistic discipline cannot avoid the social essence that lies in the nature of language, and in sociolinguistics that essence is studied systematically.

It is a well known fact that language as a social practice occupies all aspects of social life in society and will continue to hold on them in the future. Sociolinguistics builds up its own theory by determining language as a social phenomenon. It's not a mechanical amalgamation but it is an organic unity of both the sociological and linguistic aspects that are investigated.
Therefore, it may be said that sociolinguistics is a problem oriented social science subject and its methods and techniques of research are similar to those of other social sciences. It approaches the problem from inside of the society and not from the outside of the society. At the very outset it is stressed that if some one wants to communicate successfully in a language other than his own, then it would not only enough for him to learn the phonology grammar and vocabulary of that language but also to learn how appropriately it is used in certain social situations keeping in view the norms which are employed and accepted by its native speakers. As the topic of the research is a sociolinguistic investigation into language varieties used by the women of Urdu speech community, this work is purely based on field data and statistical analysis of the data at the level of phonology, morphology syntax and discourse and lexis which will be taken up in succeeding chapters.

1.2 Sex and Gender

In a social construction perspective, both sex and gender are seen as socially developed notion (Lorber and Farrell, 1991:7). Sex is understood more as a continuum made up of chromosomal sex, gonadal sex and hormonal sex and all of which "works in the presence and under the influence of a set of environments" (Fausto-Sterling, 1985:7). Whereas, "gender", the psychological, social and cultural differences between males and females are concerned (Anthony Giddens 1989:158).

1.3 Difference between the languages of the Sex: An overview

In what way the female's speech is different from that of males? Are these differences purely hypothetical constructs? What are the socio linguistic explanations given to these differences?
It has been observed that women have a greater tendency to ask questions. As Fishman (1978: 404) comments “at times I feel that all women did was to ask questions”. They are more likely than man to make utterances that demand or encourage responses from their fellow speakers and are therefore in Fishman’s words “more actively engaged in insuring interaction than the men” (1978: 404)

They also show a greater tendency to make use of positive minimal responses especially ‘mm’, ‘hmm’ and are more likely to insert such comments throughout streams of talk rather than simply at the end.

According to Herschman (1973: 6) women have a far greater tendency to use the pronouns ‘you’ and ‘we’ which explicitly acknowledge the presence of the other speaker.

The strategy of ‘silent protest’ seems to be operative in women’s speech. They adopt this strategy when they are interrupted or they receive a delayed minimal response. (Zimmerman & West 1975; West & Zimmerman 1977: pg 524) Deborah Cameron and Jennifer Coates (1985) in an article entitled “Some problems in the sociolinguistic explanation of sex differences” found that women on average deviate less from the prestige standard than men. According to Cameron and Coates three explanations may be given for this persistent difference:

1. Conservatism
2. Status
3. Solidarity

1.3 (a) Conservatism

Conservatism, although provides a viable explanation, is rife with self-contradiction. Otto Jesperson (1922, pg 240) asserts that women’s conservatism and modesty prevent them from innovating
in language while he praises men for coining new fresh expressions. In 18th Century, women were blamed for introducing new items into the English lexicon and men were supposed to have guarded the purity of standard language.

Trudgill (1974, pg 90) cites the example of Koasatic and Chukchi as cases where the women’s speech preserves older form and is looked upon as conservative.

1.3 (b) Status

The status explanation of linguistic sex difference is very much tied up with an approach to variation based on serial stratification (Labov, 1972, and Trudgill, 1974 a)

Surveys using this approach have produced the result that women have higher values than men for prestige variants and correspondingly lower values for vernacular variants. But women also show more marked pattern of style shift. This leads to disbelief any notion of conservatism and leads to believe that women may be hyper correcting.

Trudgill (1974, pg 94) says that women may be more status conscious than men partly because society sets higher standards of behavior of females and because women’s lifestyle confers very little status in itself.

Trudgill says that they are thus under pressure to acquire status by other means such as their speech patterns. Their sensitivity to linguistic norms is associated with the insecurity of their social positions.

This status-based explanation of linguistic sex-difference methodology is also partly questionable. Both Trudgill and Labov use a standard sociological model which places heavy emphasis on occupation as an indication of social class.
1.3 (c) Solidarity

There are some languages in the world which may be pointedly called women’s languages. Japanese is an interesting example of existence of women’s language. To Sridevi (1977) characteristics of women’s language are as follows:

1. Avoidance of vulgar language and slangs.
2. Special sentence-ending particles and exclamations.
3. Special self-reference and address forms.
4. Frequent use of honorific styles.
5. A particular pitch range and set of intonations.

Lesley Milroy (1980, pg 194) asserts that the importance of solidarity is a factor that influences pattern of language use. The evidence is that a tight-knit network is an important mechanism of language maintenance. The two key notions in the work of Milroy are density and multiplicity.

1. Density refers to the reciprocal links among a group of people.
2. Multiplicity refers to the different kind of links between members of the network.

1.4 Language Variation at the Gender level

The major issue of sociolinguistics of speech is the study of the relationship between the sex and the language, which was initiated at the end of 1960’s and early in 1970’s. Through linguistic research in many societies it is possible to observe that the speeches of men and women differ but what are the ways in which female speech differs from that of males? What are these differences? Are they really hypothetical constructs? What are the socio linguistic explanations to show these hypothetical differences? And these differences are quite small in some cases and greater in
some others. But in many cases they are not even being noticed. The main reason may be that male and female are losing their individuality or priority equally. There are following overviews that provide an account of the differences between the languages of the gender.

On average, men and women differ a bit in their different language styles as compared to their counterparts and such differences occur on quantitative basis rather than on qualitative. By and large the differences between the languages of the sex highlight the characteristics of the females’ speech. However, there are certain features which may be exclusively attributed to males’ speech, for example, the notion of their interruption. Men are more likely to interrupt the speech of their conversational partners i.e. the speech of women. (Zimmerman and West 1975; West and Zimmerman 1977; West 1979)

Zimmerman and West (1975) have also pointed out certain mechanisms that are used mostly by men as compared to women for controlling the topic of development and the introduction of new topics.

They may even challenge or dispute their partner’s utterances or ignore their comments i.e. they would offer no response or acknowledgement at all (Hirschman 1973) or may respond unenthusiastically (Fishman 1979) or slowly in a way that has been described as a delayed minimal response.

“Men make more direct declarations of fact or opinion than women, including suggestions and statements of orientation” as Strodbeck and Mann (1956).

This is to say, that women make more minimal responses than men. It is most likely the same to say that as the men are taller than women (i.e. men are on average taller than women,
however some women are taller than some men). Robin Lakoff in 1975 argued that style of language served to maintain women’s inferior role in society (Female Deficit Approach) and later he refined his argument revealing that gender difference reflected a power difference or difference in dominance (O’ Barr & At Kins, 1980) (“dominance Theory”). These perspectives represent that language of men is normative which implies that women’s style is inferior in society.

Sometimes, gender difference in language is also determined by cultural differences. Deborah Tannen (1991) has compared gender difference to cultural differences and pointed to similarities between them. She argued that men have a reporting style and aim to communicate factual information and women have a rapport style which is concerned with building and maintaining relationships. Such differences are more in use across media, including face to face conversation (Fitzpatrick, 1999), writing essays of primary school children (Mulac, studley, & Blau, 1990), email (Thomson & Murachver, 2001), and even toilet graffiti (Green, 2003).

Communicative styles are a product of context. Such gender differences most likely happen in single gender groups and one explanation for this gender pattern is that people accommodate their language style to the style of the person whom they are interacting with. Therefore such gender differences are less pronounced in a mixed gender group. The same important observation is that such accommodation is usually for the language style not for the gender of person (Thomson, Murachver & Green, 2001).
1.5 Difference of speech in males and females

1. Phonological difference
2. Morphological difference
3. Lexical difference
4. Syntactic difference
5. Variation at discourse and communicative strategy levels

We exemplify these differences with languages across the world.

1.5 (a) Phonological difference

The phonological differences between the speech of males and females have been noticed in a variety of languages, for instance, the Chukchi language which is spoken in Eastern Siberia but varies phonologically in terms of the sex of the speaker. Females generally use /s/ whereas males use /ts/ or /r/; women say /šamkišsin/ and males say /ramkišsin/ to ‘people’.

In Montana, men and women of the Gros Ventre tribe have differences in the pronunciation. For example, the velar plosive /k/ is replaced by an affricate in the men’s speech; /kjasta/ is pronounced by women and /djasta/ by men for ‘bread’.

In Yukhagir a north-east Asian language, both women and children have /ts/ and /ds/ whereas men have /tj/ and /dj/.

1.5 (b) Morphological difference

Males and females also differ at the morphological level. To Edward Sapir a language which is spoken by the Yanas (California) is different morphologically from that used in other situations (from men to women, women to men, and women to women).

Men’s language seems to preserve historically older forms. Sapir suggests that the reduced female forms symbolize women’s lower status; the men’s fuller forms are associated with ceremony.
and formality. This is an interesting case of male speech being associated with conservation and linguistic purity characteristics.

Kurukh, a Dravidian tribal language which is spoken in Bihar, Orissa, Bengal and Madhya Pradesh shows difference in the use of language among males and females. According to Abbi (1991) Kurukh women speakers have distinct set of grammatical rules operating in verb endings, demonstrative pronominal and some nominals.

The rules are formed in such a way that men to men, women to women or women to men conversations differ in lexical and grammatical forms. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men's Speech (Plural)</th>
<th>Female's Speech (Plural)</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kukko-r</td>
<td>Kukka: xdd</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pægi-r</td>
<td>pægi = œ : 1æ</td>
<td>old men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 (c) Lexical difference

In almost every language, the pronoun system marks sex distinctions in the 3rd person (e.g. he/she) but the distinction is less commonly made in the first and second persons where sex of the speaker is involved. Bodine (1975a) says Japanese is a language which marks sex in all three persons of the pronoun.

1.5 (c.1) Colour terms:

Males and females also use different lexical sets in their total repertoire. Lakoff gives us the best known example of colour terms which are more confidently used by female than males. There are some colour terms that are common for both sexes, for instance, red, green, pink and blue. However, there are certain colour terms
that are largely used by females like beige, magenta, fawn, ultramarine, mauve.

1.5 (c.11) **Evaluative Adjectives**

Some disparities co exist elsewhere in the vocabulary in terms of sex, consider for example: a group of adjectives which has specific and literal meanings and the other use of adjectives indicating speakers approbation or admiration for something. Some adjectives are neutrals which are either used by men or by women, but some of these adjectives are largely confined to the use of women’s speech. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Women’s only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Adorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrific</td>
<td>Charming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>Divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 (c.111) **Difference in the use of particles**

There is difference in the speech between women and men in the use of particles. There may be no referent for them, but they are far from being meaningless: they define the social context of an utterance that indicates the relationship the speaker feels between himself and his addressee, between himself and what he is talking about. For example a female might say:

“Darling, you have put the chappati in the oven again.”

Whereas, a male will say:

“Shit, again you put chappati in oven.”
1.5 (d) Syntactic difference

Women’s speech is peculiar syntactically. Although there is no such rule in English that is exclusive to male or female, there is at least one rule that a woman uses more in conversational situations than a man that is a tag question. For example a male will say:

“War is terrible.”

And female will say:

“War is terrible, isn’t it.? (Lakoff pg 19).

SECTION-2

Variation at discourse and communicative strategy levels

2.1 Communicative Competence of males and females

2.1(a) Minimal responses

The ways in which communication of men and women differs is in their use of minimal responses i.e. paralinguistic features such as ‘mhm’, ‘yeah’. These behaviors are associated with collaborative language use (Carli, 1990). Moreover, men use them less often and where this does happen is generally to display agreement as Zimmerman and west’s (1977) study of turn taking in conversation indicates.

2.1(b) Questions

The other way of difference between two genders is apparent from their use of questions in conversation. For men, a question is generally a genuine request for information and where women are concerned, it can often be a rhetorical means of engaging others conversational contribution or getting attention from others conversationally involved and these techniques are associated with a collaborative approach to language use (Barnes, 1971), Thus women more frequently ask questions (Fitzpatrick, et
al; 1995; Todd, 1983). But as far as writing is concerned, they, both use rhetorical questions as literary devices. For instance, mark Twain used it in “A war Prayer” to provoke the reader to question his actions and beliefs.

2.1(c) Turn taking

The work of De Francisco (1991) reveals that female linguistic behavior characteristically encompasses a desire to take turns in conversation with others. It is totally opposed to men’s tendency towards centering on their own point or remaining silent which offers such implicit offers of conversational turn-taking as are provided by hedges such as “y’ know” and “isn’t it? such desire for turn taking leads to complex forms of interaction in relation to the more regimented form of turn-taking commonly exhibited by men (Sacks et al; 1974).

2.1(d) Self-Disclosure

Females usually have tendencies to self-disclosure i.e. sharing their problems and experiences with others who often offer sympathy (Dinda & Allen, 1992; Tannen, 1991; 49). On the contrary, males have tendencies towards non-self disclosure; they don’t tend to offer advice or solution when confronted with another’s problems.

2.1(e) Verbal aggression

Men are often more verbally aggressive while conversing (Labov, 1972), frequently using threats, profanities Yelling and name calling. Women, on the other hand are often different from their opposite sex. Women, on the whole, deem this to disrupt the flow of conversation and not (Eder’s 1990) as a means of upholding one’s hierarchical status in the conversation. In fact, where women
swear, that usually demonstrates to others what is normal behavior for them. (Eder, 1990).

2.1(f) Politeness

Politeness in speech can be described having both positive and negative face; respectively, the idea of pandering to others desire to be liked and admired and not to suffer imposition. Both forms, according to Brocon’s study of the Tzeltal language (1980) are more frequently used by women whether in mixed or single sex-pairs and, suggest a greater sensitivity in women than in men to the face needs of others. In other words, women depend more on politeness rather than men do. However, negative face politeness is viewed as weak and frail language because of its association with hedges and tag questions. A positive face politeness expresses solidarity by attributing relevant knowledge to the addressee. This view is propounded by O’ Barr and Atkins (1980) in their work on courtroom interaction. A positive face politeness expresses solidarity by attributing relevant knowledge to the addressee.

2.1(g) Command and Directives

A directive may be defined as a speech meant to get someone to do something. Women seem to be taught to use the more polite, weaker and more self-effacing forms of directives such as

Would you please close the door?

Vs, close the door.

Lakoff argues, if it is asked, “What time are we leaving for our trip tomorrow? Then it would seem natural to expect a man to reply with something like ‘At 7.30 and I want everyone to be ready’. In Lakoff’s view, women would tend to avoid answering, ‘At six o’ clock, and would say everybody better be here, and from men would answer ‘At 7.30?’”
Goodwin (1980a) observed the boys and girls play groups and noted down that the boys used different types of directive from the girls. They are more tended to use bald imperatives whereas the girls tended to use forms like “let’s and why don’t we”.

The form “let’s” is hardly used by boys, it explicitly includes the speaker in the proposed action. Maltz and Borker hypothesize, boys learn to use language to create and maintain dominance and hierarchies and the girls create horizontal ties through their words and negotiate shifting alliances in their mainly single sex peer group.

2.1(h) Difference according to class

To understand language in our society, one has to read and understand the trap of social networks in which language is embedded. Class and occupation are most significant linguistic markers which are found in our society. One of the fundamental findings of socio linguistics is that it has been more difficult to disprove the theory that class and language variety are not related. Members of the working class usually speak less standard language, while the lower middle and upper middle class will tend to speak language closer to the standard. However, the upper class, even members of the upper middle class, may often speak (less) standard language than the middle class. Because class has significant role but aspirations play a key role in it.

2.1(i) Class Aspirations

Those studies such as made by William Labov in the 1960 have revealed that social aspirations influence speech patterns. The same is true of class aspirations. In the process of wishing to be closer or linked to a certain class such as upper class and upper middle class, people who are moving in that direction will socio-economically adjust their speech patterns to sound like them.
However, being not a native of upper class speakers, they correct and end up speaking in a more standard language than those who usually are trying to imitate. The same happens in the case of individuals moving down ward in socio-economic status.

With the advent of quantitative sociolinguistic studies that include female speakers who often tend to speak more prestigious form than their opposite sex. The pattern is revealed by Labov's New York city study (1972 a Trudgill's Norwich survey 1974 b); Macaulay's (1977, 1978) study of Glasgow English, New brook's (1982) study of west wirral, and Romaine's (1978) Edinburgh study and is summed up by Coats (following Coats, 1986, pp. 65-6) who reveals that in every styles, women are accustomed to using fewer stigmatized forms than men. Formally, they are more sensitive than men. Lower class women make significant shift in style; they use a high proportion of the stigmatized variant, Formally, women correct themselves in speech corresponding to class which is above them. Use of non-standard form seems to be associated with working class speakers, and also with male speakers.

This kind of evidence reveals that women are more sensitive to linguistic norms than males as is concluded by Trudgill's self evolution test. (1972, 1974b).

According to sociolinguistic research, non-standard speech typically functions to maintain group identity. Another explanation is possible that males tend to belong to close-knit groups while females do not tend to do so. Males have greater access to membership of such groups than females because they are exposed and have greater access to work and to evening activities outside the home.

As far as differences in syntax, morphology and pronunciation are concerned both gender differ in terms of communicative
strategies. Whenever men and women converse, men tend to make interruptions very frequently and are very slow to provide supporting responses to women's speech turns. On the contrary, women use more facilitative tags (Lakoff, 1975; Holmes, 1984) than men which help a conversation to move along smoothly. They also use more yes/no questions which, of course, help to keep a conversation going.

Men generally talk much more than women (Bernard, 1972, Swacker, 1975 Eakins and Eakins, 1978). This clearly contradicts the old and popular belief that women talk more than men, and the reason behind this is that men are expected by the culture in general, to talk while women are expected to remain silent. That is why when women talk, it is more noticeable that men also talk.

When women talk to other women, the term 'gossip' is often used to describe their activity and this term is loaded with negative connotation in popular parlance. However in anthropology and sociolinguistics, no negative connotations are attached to the term 'gossip' which is used to denote informal communication between members of a social group.

Gossip has the important function of maintaining the group unity and preserving morals and values which characterize women's way of interacting in conversation. It is a kind of interaction that reflects solidarity and support and in which expressions intended to reflect or gain power for a speaker have no place.

These gender related differences in speech patterns are acquired by children as they learn to speak, just like other gender stereotypes (how boys should behave and how girls should behave) and culture values are learnt along with language in general way.
2.1(j) Topic Control

When talking to woman, men seem to use not only interruptions, overlaps and delayed minimal responses but also deny women the right to control the topic of conversation. Men disobey the normal turn taking rules in order to control topics. Control of topics is normally shared equally between participants in a conversation. In conversation between speakers of the same sex, this seems to be the pattern, but when one speaker is male and another female, male speaker tends to dominate.

2.1(k) Hedge

Females use more hedged-form-structures like you know”, sort of, just as is bought out by Fishman (1980) who taped the daily conservations of three American couples and found out that the women used , you know , 5 times more than men.

2.1(l) Verbosity

There is a widespread belief in our society that women talk more than men, yet research findings consistently contradict this. Men have been shown to talk more than women in every context and setting.

There is a common cultural stereotype which describes women as being talkative, always speaking and expressing their feelings. This is probably true. However, do women do it more than men? No! Infact an observation designed to measure the amount of speech produced suggests that men are more prone to use up more talking time than women. An experiment by Marjorie Swaeker entailed using three pictures by a fifteenth century Flemish artist, Albrecht Durer which were presented to men and women separately. They were told to take as much time as they wanted to
describe the pictures. The average time taken by males was 13.0
minuets while it was 3.17 minutes in case of women.

Sociolinguists try to make the connection between our society
and our language in a way that suggests that women talk less
because it has not always been as culturally acceptable as it has
been for men. Men have tended to take a more dominant role not
only in the household, but also in the world of business. This ever-
changing concept is becoming less applicable in our society,
however, the trend is still prominent in some societies across the
world. It is more acceptable for a man to be talkative, carry on long
conversation, or give a long wordy speech, however it is less
acceptable for a women to do so. It has been a historical truth that
men have more rights to talk. However, it is common for men to be
more silent in situations.

2.2 Taboo language

The folk linguistic belief that men swear more than women
and use more taboo words in general. Flexner claims that ‘most
American’ slangs are created and used by males.

Debroah Cameron’s latest book “The myth of mars and
venus” tries to breakdown gender stereotypes. She tells time and
again about real life, “I don’t think there is a need of Mars and
Venus theory. We are not alien beings from different planets. There
is a need of constant hearing men and women talk, and making
note of exaggerations. It’s not true that men and women use
language in completely different ways.

Look around you. Do men and women speak the same
language? If they do, why don’t they understand each other? There
are many theories about men and women’s language use. Women
talk more than men. In fact, tallest research reveals language skills
of men and women are identical. The theory that women talk much
more has been debunked by science. The Guardian reports a recent study in the American journal of science that asserts that men and women speak almost exactly the same number of words a day i.e. 16,000. Men are emotionally stunted, thick and selfish without having any awareness. Are women the smarter species? “Given similar intelligence, women are more articulate and more aware than men. They can use words that have multivalent meanings and nuances, which they utilize with more fluidity, women always win on agreement, just accept that; it makes life easier.”

“The new feminine brain is as equipped with real life situations as the male brain” that is said by a media expert Akhila Shivdas of Centre of media Advocacy, Delhi. “The female brain can multi-task, it cannot filter or shed, women carry baggage. While the male brain is focused, they do one thing at a time, yet, they have many micro-conflicts”.

So, what’s the essential reason for misunderstanding between the two genders? “Misunderstandings arise because language is not mind reading. Even if we know someone well, we would not understand them perfectly every time. Some- sex couples also have misunderstanding and conflicts. Conflicts which are described as “communication problems are a smokescreen: The real problem is that the people involved do not want the same thing,” adds Cameron.

Most research studies ask the questions, “is there a difference between men and women?” says director Meghna Gulzar, “The difference is just in the mind. I think humans have a male/female brain. If a man is sensitive, his female side of brain is more alert, while if a women is aggressive, her male brain is more alert. Men in my films have been very utopian, because I show them to be compassionate, honest and emotional.”
The war between sexes is sometimes nothing but power play. Women are still the second sex; they are too caring. There will always be gender politics in relationship.

*There are two types of explanations that account for this phenomenon*

1. First, so-called linguistic insecurity
2. Second, the role of women’s in child rearing.

The first one “linguistic insecurity” claims that women initiate the prestigious and more standardized language of the social classes in terms of becoming more prestigious and powerful themselves. Initially this explanation was more advanced as a way of explaining not merely women’s usage patterns but also the usage patterns in the same studies of the lower middle class, which “hypercorrect” its language, emulating linguistic features of the middle class in terms of gaining social prestige (Labov 1966, Trudgill 1972). The men’s language, in this way is linked to a working affiliation, although the women’s language rises upward across the class of sociolinguistic strata that reflects their social and linguistic insecurity.

The second one is the “role of women’s in child rearing”. Since in most of the societies women are responsible for taking care of their children, researchers have theorized that women would tend to improve their children’s prospects from their exposing the most prestigious language possible, and then, that children would co-opt this prestigious input as the normal distribution for their social class and they will carry succeeding generation of girls would co-opt higher and higher strata of linguistic behavior, and it would gradually but surely propel language change. But this explanation has difficulty in accounting for the speech of many women who are not involved in or oriented toward child rearing in any significant
way. Both explanations tend to try to forging a simple link between a wide of language and gender across a wide range of situations although it’s avoiding the possibility which other social factors as such ethnic identity and workplace intereactions might play a crucial role in shaping the language use of women and men in a given speech community.

2.3 Language and Power

The influential study of language features is presented by Lakoff in a book "Language and women’s place (1975) which makes her proud of herself as a catalyst for women’s language use. She conveys in her book that women deny strong self expression. On the one hand they are ridiculed if they don’t learn a language like a girl, but on the other a women’s language is seen as weak and concerned with the trivial.

Lakoff has described the features of women’s language in terms of precise colour terms e.g. mauve, instead of purple) weak expletives (e.g. oh dear vs. Shit), empty adjectives, (e.g. darling, adorable), the tag question (e.g. it’s late, isn’t it?) and also the words of polite speech (e.g. would you please close the door? Vs close the door). But Lakoff’s specific claims about “women language usage” have not been served as satisfactory catalyst and it has been modified. Many of the studies show that both men and women make abundant use of tag questions although it is not essentially the same type of tag question (Cameron et al. 1989). This is manifested that Lakoff’s interpretation of tag questions is simplistic and does not explain that all the tag questions convey uncertainty or inability to present oneself strongly. Some of the tag questions simply encourage further conservations (e.g. nice day, isn’t it?) while other type of tag questions might be quite powerful
and even threatening (e.g. prosecutor to defendant: you shot Chris, didn't you?)

Some of the studies have claimed that in cross sex conversations, men interrupt women more frequently than their counterpart of women who interrupt men. However, many of the studies have found out no significant difference between men and women in the number of interruptions. The crucial difficulty which arises in studying interruptions is determined when they occur and what they mean. As the tag questions, interruptions can have several functions. All the interruptions can not be meant to attempt dominance on the floor of conversations. For instance, some interruptions are simply our lapses in speakers’ turns and some of the interruptions are attained by both speaker and interrupter to be collaborative and supportive of the conversation. There is a difficulty to reach any conclusion about this particular potential manifestation of power in conversational interruptions because there is no precise way to determine when interruption is infact a violation of a speaker’s turn.

On the other hand, women interpret minimal responses as an indication that the interlocutor is listening while the men interpret it as an indication of agreement. Therefore the result is to be in an unintentional misunderstanding in which women think men aren’t listening to them and men think women are arguing with everything they say.

Maltz and Borker propose that these different assumptions about the language use are acquired by them from the school stage from 5-15 years. When interactions are focused on the same-sex peer groups. In these play groups’ sex differences are exaggerated. One side i.e., of girls learns to use language by establishing emotional intimacy while the other side of boys learns to use
language to establish status in a social hierarchy. There are, however other ways in which girls and boys might acquire sex differentiated language. They can be told explicitly how to speak (e.g. girls don’t say that!); they can observe adults interacting with each other, they can observe how adults talk to girls and boys differently (e.g. adults tend to interrupt girls more), and they can observe how adults respond differently to boys and girls (e.g. assertive boys tend to receive positive responses).

One significant problem with the different sub-cultural approach is that this does not allow the possibilities that an individual might be aware of communicative behavior and interpretations other than his own, and then he might choose to use those behaviors and interpretations in certain setting for example, if a man involved in a romantic relationship may have “sweet talk” with his partner, that is he may employ expressive “rapport building” conversational strategies such as minimal responses and frequent questions. Doing so he demonstrates competency in the linguistic behavior of the so called women’s subculture, when it is to his advantage to do so. Another problem is this that power differences do exist between men and women (and between other social groups as well), and often cultural differences are called to maintain these power differences.

Language as a tool of transmission of cultural beliefs and values plays a major role in affecting male and female relations. The attitude which is transmitted through language may help either to reinforce the status-quod or may act as a factor in changing it. It is possible to argue that the belief that standard language has been transmitting since the 18th century that males are species, and females are the sub-species thus making it possible that males should dominate. The main feature of language usage generally
mentioned in support of this argument is the use of male terms to refer to both the males in particular and human being in general. Such relation designates man as the "unmarked" and women as the "marked" human category. It has also been noticed that gender biased job advertisements attract fewer female applicants than unbiased ads.

Martyna (1983. p.31) found that women use the generic 'the' less often than men and more frequently turned to alternatives like 'he' or "She" or "they" whenever required. Several strategies suggested for avoiding the use of generic masculine pronouns are: Drop the masculine form for example, we will hire the best person regardless of his sex. Instead of using "his" we should call speak it like this we will hire the best person regardless of sex.

The notion of man as the "unmarked" and women as "marked" category is also reflected in pair of words distinguishing gender sex. For instance, the masculine terms ('kutta' and 'sher' are considered) as natural whereas feminine counterparts "kutiya" and "sherni" are semantically considered the marked ones. The generic terms are usually referred to the species as a whole human kind and the use of such term is generally justified on this ground that everybody knows in generalization that is being referred to includes females. Neither claim appears to stand up to scrutiny. This exhibits that the generic terms are semantically in favour of males that is, it makes user think predominantly of males.

The effect of the use of generic masculine is held to be that women are often being made invisible by the language, that is, the language has only a negative semantic space for women.

Further more, this is easy to find evidence in support of the claim that women are seen through language, they are often seen in an unfavorable light. Indeed, the term "aurat" in itself has
negative connotation in most of the cultures. In spite of this "Khatoon" taking a most favourable connotation. There are very favorable rules that how a "khatoon" should behave and talk.

The theory of maleness which includes features of manhood such as courage, strength, toughness, vigour, rationality, whereas the theory of femaleness includes tenderness and emotionality. Further more, men are judged by dint of their work yet women are assessed according to their appearances including language.

Suppose, if a girl does not learn the quality of speaking like a girl, then she will be pressurized to use language like a girl. For example if girl says "mein nahi khaunga" or mein nahi jata" if she says $ga$ and $ta$ in place of $gi$ and $ti$ then she will be pressurized to learn to use language like a girl and if she does not learn to speak like a girl then she will be denied the access to power because she is not capable of holding it. Therefore, they are linguistically alienated simply women don’t have that supernatural power that men have.

However, it will be very un-usual to hear statement that women are professionally able to combine their professional standing and ability with an undeniable femininity. Because of the fact that it is unlike that anyone would remark on a man’s ability to combine professionalism with masculinity. The language also bears traces of cultural norms of women as housewives and men as workers outside the home.

Therefore, “Kaamkaaji Khatoon” or Kaamkaaji biwi” are more likely to occur than “Kaamkaaji Shauhar” or Kaakkaaji Waalid”.

It is very easy to unearth the linguistic evidences supporting the agreement that those qualities which are assigned to males are held in higher esteem then those being assigned to females.
2.4 Dominance versus subjection

This suggests a dichotomy between a male desire for conversational dominance that is noted by Leet-Pellegrini (1980) with reference to male experts speaking more verbosely than their female counterparts and a female aspiration for group conversational participation. One corollary of this is that according to coats (1993; 202) males are afforded more attentions in the classroom context and this may lead to their gaining more attention in scientific and also technical subjects, which in turn may lead to their achieving better success in those areas which ultimately enable them to have more power in technocratic society. Women, however, on average have higher verbal intelligence than men.

2.5 Changing the topic of conversations

Dorval States (1990) in this study of same-sex friend interactions that males tend to change subject more oftenly than females. This difference may allow then to chatter and talk too much, and may still trigger the same thinking in same males. In this way estimations of women may go up. Incidentally, this endro-centric attitude towards scientific subjects, which in turn may lead to their achieving better success in those areas which ultimately allows than to have more power in a technocratic society. Women, however on average have higher verbal intelligence than men.

2.6 Women derogatory term for men

Generally, women in our society have been seen as a putative part of the life. They mostly perform all rituals duties and they are more caring than men. Therefore their language is also considered prestigious as the most researchers regard women's language suggests that women are socially and linguistically conservative and therefore they are likely to use more standard forms. They are a sign of politeness, they are not only expressions of uncertainty but
also hyper-correct form. Risch (189) has listed the use of derogatory terms which women use to refer to men. But women are prone to the use of standard form of speech, therefore the distinction between standard and nonstandard form is more appropriately applied to the contrast between public versus private discourse than that of the speech pattern of women versus men.

Lakoff (1973a, 1975) makes useful reference to the euphemistic use of the term (Lady) that men use to refer to women. The term “lady” seems too polite; man can make covertly insulting use of reference to women. If ‘Lady’ is signified as “lesbian” than it has pejorative sense. In the same way a man can have worse connotation. A bachelor and a spinster both refer to the unmarried person. But bachelor is seen as probably being unmarried by choice and living a happy and libertine life, while a spinster having an image of an old and unappealing woman living a drab and unfulfilled life because of her failure to marry.

Likewise a madam might be the manager of a brothel but you could never call pimp a “sir” because “sir” is an individual having great ability. Similarly the English word ‘house wife’ which means the female head of the family” but gradually it has deteriorated. Today, it means “a rustic rude woman” and finally it has come to mean “a lewd brazen woman”.

Dell Hymes points out that men have lots of overtly derogatory terms for referring to women but for women, it is not possible to refer to men in an overtly derogatory manner. Such a set of derogatory terms is considered taboo; perhaps such behaviour is not permissible in women’s language.

Women, generally are seen more sensitive to the social connotation than men and they restrain themselves from using the nonstandard forms of speech. Non standard forms are seen, to be
associated with male forms having rough and tough ability. Taking into account the perceptual defuse and the assumption that women are more status conscious than their counterparts, men. Women would be more inhibited about the production of linguistic taboos but unlikely to use them. Particularly those who belong to working class, they are less restrained by the prestige forms of speech and therefore more likely to use non-standard form. But the question is whether they are young, middle and an old age women. The same is said about the higher and upper higher class women, they are also less constrained by the prestigious form of speech.

2.7 Language and Sex: A case of Double Standards

Works that deals with the subject of language relating to sex are often contradictory. Males are rather prejudiced against females and look at them from double standards. On the other hand women are looked upon as conservative and for that reason they are praised for upholding and preserving certain traditional forms of language, but on the other they are criticized and disparaged for hindering innovations in language development. This fluctuating attitude of men towards women accounts to male dominance and is brought out by men’s judgement of women’s pronunciation and spellings. To some men, women are poor spellers whereas there are others who commend women for their good pronunciation and spellings. There are certain legendary theories that heighten the gap between ‘I’ and ‘We’ segregate women from men and push them aside from men’s discourse.

Men often equates women’s language with contradiction and irrationality. They consider women as incapable of improving upon their expressions. They find no streak of novelty in their conversation for they are to the use of conventional form of language.

According to certain myths women must adhere to social behaviour in matters of conversation. They have to follow standards set for them
by men. They are not expected to deviate from the previously accepted social norms which require them to be passive and maintain absolute silence while men talk in the society. This view is strengthened by Harriel Lane (1922) who advises women to observe absolute silence in the presence of men.

Double standard attitude towards women is further evidenced even by a cursory look at their position in society all through the ages.

There was a time when they were nothing short of a goddess. They were highly respected and their presence at religious ritual was considered indispensable. Then the glories of their exalted status gradually diminished with the passage of time and suffered an eclipse over the years. Consequently, they lost their importance in society and came to be looked upon as an object of sex and libido. They were not allowed either to learn or speaks Sanskrit language because of its association with religion. We have come to know from the Medieval Indian Drama that even the women of high rank and most respectable family were not allowed to speak Sanskrit.

They were restrained from participating religious ritual. They were also prohibited from learning Sanskrit. They could conduct conversation only in the language of lower class people. It shows that social stratification and sex discrimination against women was very much rife in these days. Even today the rate of literacy among women is considerably low (lower than man). This is because girls are not given as much freedom as boys in pursuance of their studies. The primary role of girls is restricted to looking after household chores and to rearing children.

Tolkappiyan refers to restrictions that are usually imposed upon women's way of conversation. To her women are required to keep silent when male members of the family discuss important matters about the day to day life. Women are supposed to take part into conversation that goes around their family. They talk about subjects which are dear to
them. While men usually make a parade of their learning during the course of their talk. Women’s speech is considered highly pernicious. This is brought out by Camden who narrates an episode that occurred in the 5th century when the Celtic British having been driven away from their motherland by Germans, cut the tongues of women whom they married on the way for fear that they might corrupt the language of their children.

Women were not treated on par with men in matters of conversation. They had to confine them to use language that was permissible for them to transact conversation with their friends. A departure from conversation norms was allowed to woman not in the least. Men considered women’s language beneath them.

Although Max Muller believes that women have an important role to play in language development, he prohibits them from participating into public conversation. Inspite of all this he is appreciative of women’s language for it has an aura of their domestic idioms and jargons.

2.8 Stereotypes attached to the differences

There are several stereotypes attached to the gender differences which range from linguistic to extra linguistic considerations. As part of these stereotypes, women are admonished to suffer in silence and the penalties for failing to heed these instructions are severe.

2.8(a) Effeminate Language

Berstein states that all the forms of aggressive assertive, hostile and vigorous language are defined as acceptable for men and are placed under taboo for women. Men mostly tend to avoid those forms which sound like feminine or weak. For example (oh dear, good.ess). They use strong expletives such as (damn, shit) but the Lakoff (1975) evidence about weak or strong expletives is purely impressionistic.
The language of males is considered as abstract, rational and creative while the language of female is considered as emotional, practical receptive and concrete.

Lakoff's (1975) theories suggest that females use language that is passive, indicating shyness and lower self-confidence (Eckert & McConnell- Ginet, 2003). In other context, studies have found that females use language that is polite, appreciative & cooperative (Herring, 2000, 2001; Savicki, 1996). By contrast, males use language that is more confident, more aggressive and less concerned with politeness (Herring, 2000, 2001).

In today's study, males do use language that is more active, inflexible, and resolute, which resonates with some of Susan Herring's findings for other modes also. Female, however, do not use more passive, cooperative, or accommodating language as Lakoff's work has suggested. One possible implication is that language and the social interactions on the internet are changing, perhaps because the participants are changing. That is the latest wave of teenage females. At least females may have different gender roles from those of earlier generations that Lakoff observed and alternately, choose to create less traditional waves in their gender roles than the general population.

The language of females in study echoes Michelle Rodino's (1997) claim that comparing language on the internet to traditional gender and language studies is often over simplification because online interactions offer more freedom and flexibility. While males may use more active and resolute language in comparision with their females counterparts. Females do not necessarily use passive or accommodating language. The latter findings support the concept of androgyny where masculinity and femininity are two separate
dimensions rather than being polar opposites on a single continuum (Huston, 1983).

There are differences and similarities between both male and female communication. It is stressed that there are subtle and judgmental consequences. Such consequences, to be noted can be seen in the way that female speakers are rated higher on socio-intellectual status and aesthetic quality while males are rated higher on dynamism.

"Status" is also designated in this power scheme. In much of the "women's language" traits such as politeness and raising the ends of sentences are found more in the language of high-status individuals. "Women's language" seems to be more often used when individuals are unemployed, or that have lower jobs than well-educated people and professionals (O' Barr & Atkins, 1980). Subordinates share higher rates of speech associated with women rather than they use their managers language. Single male parents use language which is similar to single mothers. It is recognized then, that language is not just a matter of gender dominance, but goes hand-in-hand with status as well.

Therefore sex differences become exceedingly complex, particularly in a society in which the women era is moving fast towards self realization. Their position has drastically changed for experiencing the roles and ideologies of the life which develops the ways for men and women for experiencing the culture and society. Hence language variation based on sex may not always be adequate which can be accounted for in terms of binary position.

2.8(b) Emotive language
Havelock Ellis (1894) considers language of males as abstract, rational, and creative while the language of females is considered to be emotional, practical, receptive and concrete.

**2.8(c) Refined Language**

Edward T. Hall (1986) presumes that women are more concerned with refinement in language than men. There are certain expressions which may be attributed to women as part of their use of refined language. For example, the distinction between ‘can’ and ‘may’ in which the former denotes “ability” while the latter taken denotes ‘permission’. Hall attributes to women the usage distraction maintained between can and may and opines that men and boys use ‘can’ while women and girls use ‘may’.

**2.8(d) Phonetic Stereotype**

Jonathan Swift (1955) in an experiment asked a number of males and females to write a series of non-sense words and found out that men used more consonants while the women used more vowels and liquids and produced a string that resembled Italian.

Benajah Jay Antrim (1843) assumes that vowels are feminine because they are soft and delicate and consonants are masculine because they are more harsh and irregular. (Baron 1986)

**SECTION-3**

**3.1 Linguistic setting of the Urdu speech community**

Any language can be used for any purpose. Although languages are not empty vessels, they carry a lot of baggage in the form of cultural and literary heritage, e.g. concepts, collective memories etc. Any language whether it is Urdu or any other language, it is widely understood as a symbol of the religious and cultural identity of its speakers. A large corpus of theological
writings, guide books and manuals for Indian Muslims have been produced in Urdu since the nineteenth century.

Besides, Urdu is by no means the mother tongue of the majority of Indian Muslims. It is rather, the language of an urban elite. In a simplified way, however, it does serve as a common link between speakers of different languages and dialects. This view is largely supported by a rich popular culture of Urdu, newspapers, journals, digests, novels and oral communication. Though, it is often understood that Urdu media seems more orthodox and conservative section of our society, it is also to be noted that much liberal, even socialist or Marxist, writings are to be found in Urdu.

Historically Urdu belongs to an Indo-Aryan branch, belonging to Indo-European family of languages. It developed under the influence of Persian and Arabic, to some lesser degree also under Turkish influence in South Asia during the Delhi Sultanate and Mughal Empire. Urdu refers to a standardized register of Hindustani which is known as Khadiboli. It has now emerged as a standard dialect. In general, the term "Urdu can encompass a dialect of Hindustani other than standardized version. Standard Urdu has approximately the twentieth part i.e., the largest chunk of population of native speakers among all the languages. There are 60,503,579 people who speak Urdu language in the world as a whole. Urdu is often contrasted with Hindi, another standardized form of Hindustani. The main difference between Hindi and Urdu is that standard Urdu is written in Nastaliq calligraphy style of the Perso-Arabic script and some words are taken from Persian and Arabic. While standard Hindi is written in Devangari and has inherited significant vocabulary from Sanskrit.

Linguists therefore consider Urdu and Hindi as the two standardized forms of the same language. Hindi and Urdu is the
fifth most widely spoken language in the world. However, Urdu and Hindi are socio-politically different and people who describe themselves as being speakers of Hindi would question their being counted as native speakers of Urdu and Vice-versa. In India, Urdu is spoken in Uttar Pradesh, Delhi, MP, AP, Karnataka, Bihar, Gujarat, Maharashtra and some other states. A great number of schools teach Urdu as a first language and have their own syllabus and examination system. In India, Madarsahs also teach Arabic as well as Urdu. India has more than 2,900 Urdu newspapers. Outside South Asia, it is spoken by large numbers of people in the major urban centers of the Persian Gulf countries and Saudi Arabia.

It shares official language status with English in Jammu and Kashmir. It is used in education, literature, office and court business, media and in religious institutions. Although English is used in most elite circles, yet Urdu is the lingua franca in North India and is expected to prevail as such. Urdu is also one of the officially recognized state languages in India and has official status in the Indian states of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir and Uttar Pradesh, and the national capital, Delhi, while the government school system in most other states emphasizes standard Hindi, yet at several universities and in many cities such as Lucknow, Aligarh and Hyderabad, Urdu is spoken, learned, and recognized as a language of prestige.

Urdu can be considered to be a part of a dialect continuation which extends across eastern Iran, Afghanistan, and Modern Pakistan right into North India. It has four recognizable dialects, i.e. Dakhini Pinjari, Rekhta, and Modern vernacular Urdu (based on the Khariboli dialect of the Delhi region). Modern vernacular Urdu is the form of the language that is least widespread and is spoken around Delhi, Lucknow, Karachi, and Lahore. It has become increasingly
different from the original form of Urdu as it loses some of the complicated Persian and Arabic vocabulary used in everyday business terms. Dakhini is spoken in and around Hyderabad. It has fewer Persian and Arabic words than standard Urdu. In addition, Rekhta the language of Urdu poetry is sometimes counted as a separate dialect.

In states like Uttar Pradesh, Urdu culture and literature have a very rich heritage. The education system can develop teaching of Urdu at infant, primary and secondary school levels to ensure that it is not marginalized, and the teaching of Urdu in the mainstream school would offer a status in this country and especially to the people who belong to Urdu speech community. Urdu as a language has made immense contribution to literature, academic subjects, trade and commerce. Urdu speakers have an immense contribution to make to all aspects of life in India.

“Hindustani” is the term used by linguists to describe several closely related idioms in the northern, central and northwestern part of the *Indian subcontinent*. It encompasses two standardized registers in the form of the official languages of Hindi and Urdu language, as well as several nonstandard dialects. Because Hindustani is not an immediate descendent of Sanskrit, the origin of common Hindustani words can be obscured. Standard or Shuddha (‘pure’) Hindi and Urdu are used only in public address and radio or TV news, while the everyday spoken language in most areas is one of several varieties of Hindustani, whose vocabulary contains words drawn from Persian, Arabic and Hindi. In addition spoken Hindustani includes words from English and other languages as well.

Hindustani or Hindi-Urdu has developed over hundreds of years throughout India. In the same way as the core vocabulary of English evolved from old English (Anglo-Saxon) but includes a large
number of words borrowed from French and other languages (whose pronunciation has changed naturally so as to become easier for speakers of English to pronounce). The same may be said of Hindustani, that has evolved from Sanskrit while borrowing many Persian and Arabic words over the years, and changing the pronunciations (and often even the meanings) of those words to make them easier for Hindustani speakers to pronounce. Therefore, Hindustani is a language that has evolved organically.

3.2 The district Aligarh

The district Aligarh, comprising the northernmost part of the Agra division, lies in the doab of the Ganga and the Yamuna. Bound by these two rivers. It spreads across the short distance. Ganga separates the district from Budayun for a few kms. In the extreme northeast while Yamuna constitutes the dividing line in the North West between Aligarh and Gurgaon, district of Haryana. To the north, the boundary is formed by the Anupshahar and Khurja tehsils of Bulanshahar. On the west and south-west, the district stretches out as far as chhata, Mat and Sadabad tehsils of Mathura district while on the south-east and eastward there lie Jalesar, Etah and Kasganj tehsils of Etah district. The extreme parallels of latitude are 27°28' and 28°10' north and of longitude 77°29' and 28°36 east. The greatest breadth is about 112 kms. From the Yamuna to the Ganga nearing the northern border the maximum length from north to south is about 72 kms.

Total area of the district is 5019 sq. kms. The district headquarters is located at Aligarh. Main languages spoken in the district are Hindi and Urdu. The remaining languages are quite unimportant, since they are merely the native tongues of immigrants, such as Gujrati, Bengali, Punjabi, and English.
Several news papers and magazines are published in Urdu from Aligarh. They are of more than local importance.

The Khatoon, Khana Khazana and other related Urdu magazines occupying a high position to promote female education.

Language contact and language is a common result of day to day conversion. Rahman (2002) notes the acceptance of Urdu by Islamic scholars as a language in which Islam could be disseminated. Today, there is no need to preserve their own language, for their interest has shifted to English.

Religion is also an important contributing factor in language maintenance and loss. Language and religion continued to be closely associated. Older catholics, especially women, typically speak Portugueses, younger catholics speak English, Hindus use Portuguese and preferring Konkani or English. People who use Portuguese for family or social occasions tend to use English for business.

The unfavorable fact is that however, today Urdu in Indian society is losing its cultural charms, and is becoming a matter of neglect to its native speakers. They can not be blamed for it because they have suffered a lot of underdevelopment and misfortune due to the global ascendancy of English in the field of communication. So, over the years the people who worked towards progress, had no other choice but to adopt English consequently and Urdu has gone into the background and over the years it has come to be over looked. But it is still is used in novels that make up the exemplary works of literature on the theatre cinema and also on the aesthetic of poetry.
There are commonality and particularity of social attitudes or the dynamic nature of similarities and differences in multifaceted thought structures among cultural spheres, and such multifaceted thought structures and cultural spheres contribute to the expansion of basic knowledge thereby providing a means of coping with and working reduction of pressing cultural and social problem caused by the increasing complexity of contemporary society and the diversification of values. It is not merely speculative but rational, it has a scientific and material character which renders it applicable in real life situations.

3.3 Profile of Urdu

Now we want to discuss the historical background of Urdu and its origin and evolution. In short, ""Urdu is one of the Indo-Aryan Languages which has developed from Sanskrit through Khari Boli and Saurseni Prakrit. The development of Urdu took place after 1000 A.D. which marks the end of Apabhramsa Period."" (Kelkar: 1968).

""There were certain political and socio-cultural influences which favored and prepared background for the evolution of Urdu in India, Us proper development started, only when Muslim entered Delhi from Punjab in 1193 A.D., and made the city capital of their empire. It has adopted certain elements from Arabic and Persian languages, example phonological features, grammatical features and a considerable part of lexicon."" (Beg: 1986)

Urdu is closely related to Hindi in phonology and grammar. As a language of "mixed" background, Urdu manifests problems of diversity at various structural levels, phonology of which requires a special treatment as it has socio-linguistic and socio-cultural implications. Urdu is not just a language specified in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution; it is widely used in India. Its speakers are spread over a number of states in India including Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and far off states like Karnataka and Maharashtra. It
is the state language of Jammu and Kashmir in India whereas it is Pakistan's official language. In Manorama Yearbook it is recorded that Urdu is spoken by more than twenty-eight million people in India.

Urdu employs the Perso-Arabic script. It has produced extensive literature. Its idioms fascinate even those who know it marginally. One obvious reason for this is the rich and glorious past of Urdu. Urdu has assimilated words from Arabic, Persian and Turkish apart from a large number of words from English and other languages (Kelkar: 1968: 20).

Urdu basically is a Khadi Boli Idiom which developed in the North India especially in and around Delhi by the end of the twelfth century A.D. This was the time when due to the settlement of Muslims comprising Turks, Afghans and Iranians; and establishment of the Muslim rule in Delhi, certain socio-political, cultural and linguistic changes were taking place in North India. It was during this period that Khadi Boli came under the influence of new linguistic and cultural forces and eventually became a full-fledged language called “Urdu”. Though the structure of Urdu is purely Indo-Aryan, its vocabulary is largely derived from Persian and Arabic and it is written in an “adaptation” of the Perso-Arabic script. (Beg: 1986)

Hindi, which is mutually intelligible with Urdu on the colloquial level, uses the Devanagari writing system and derives its formal vocabulary from Sanskrit. Hindi also imbibes rich literary traditions of dialects such as Braj Bhasha, Awadhi, etc. It has developed into Khadi Boli style at a very late stage, i.e., at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even Dhirendra Verma, an eminent Hindi scholar and linguist, admits that “historically, Khadi Boli Urdu in its usage is much older than the literary Khadi Boli Hindi.
“It is interesting to note that during the early phases of the Muslim settlement, anything indigenous to India was termed by the Muslim settlers as “Hindi” (Hindi+i). The word Hind meaning “India”, comes from the Persian language, and the suffix -i which is transcribed in the Persian alphabet as ya-i-ma‘ruf is a grammatical marker meaning “relating to”. The word Hindi, thus, meant ‘relating/belonging to India’ or the ‘Indian native’. This language is called as ‘the Khadi Boli style of Urdu’. (Beg: 1986)

The same Khadi Boli style of Urdu is termed by P.B. Pandit’s in India as a Sociolinguistic Area (Pandit: 1977: 57) as ‘the Northern Lingua Franca’. In course of its development, the Khadi Boli style of Urdu was known by various names such as Rekhta, Zaban-i-Delhi, Zaban-i-Dehlavi, Zaban-i-Hindustan, Hindustan, Hindustani, Zaban-i-Urdu-i-Mu’alla, Urdu-i-Mu’alla, Zaban-i-Urdu or simply Urdu, besides being known as Hindi or Hindavi (Hindawi). In a hierarchical patterning of speech variation, no single variety can be associated with the dominant role of a standard language appropriate for all members of the speech community at all times and on all occasion; high Hindi and high Urdu are spoken in formal setting, and “bazaar Hindustani” is identified with informal interaction. (Khubchandani: 1997: 170).
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Section-4

Research Methodology

The aim of the present investigation is the study of the language variations at the gender level. It is a socio-linguistic investigation of language varieties used by women among the Urdu speech community of District Aligarh. Therefore to fulfill this demand a difference between female speech and male speech has been worked out in relation to age and socio-economic status from socio-linguistic perspective. It is a comparative study between female to female speech and female to male speech.

4.1 Sample

Initially a sample of 50 females and 50 males were selected for the study, which have been divided on the basis of age. In terms of age, three groups have been considered, namely age group 1 from 20-25 yrs, age group 2 from 26-35 yrs and age group 3 from 36-65 yrs and over. In terms of socioeconomic status, informants have been grouped under upper socio-economic status (USES) and middle socio-economic status (MSES). Finally twenty-five females and twenty-five males were selected for the data collections.

4.2 Selection of Informants

The present study has drawn data from 100 informants living in and around Aligarh District. The technique used for data collection involved both questionnaire and interview.
4.3 Procedure

The data was collected in two phases. In the first phase, prior to approaching the respondents we had approached the teachers of the class and explained the purpose of this investigation. The investigator was subsequently introduced to the students in order to ensure students participation in the discourse. After the initial contact, the investigator frequently met the students outside their class room hours with a view to become friendlier with the participants. In the first round of friendly interaction, information pertaining to their name, class, parents name, occupations, income, language(s) known etc. were obtained on a biographical questionnaire. In the second phase, the investigator had approached those girls and boys who were identified as a representative of upper socio-economic status (USES) and middle socio-economic status (MSES) and frequency of interaction with them was further intensified. Through conversation and informal chat rapport was established with these respondents. Once the interaction had achieved the point of unreserved and uninhibited acceptance, the subjects were thereafter asked very general questions in order to elicit their speech to test their knowledge of mother tongue and interference of other languages people of. Data was also collected from the housewives, working class females and males of different age groups and socio-economic status. A list of phonological variants comprising /z/ /s/ /q/ /x/ /y/ was supplied in the form of text in order to see difference between males and females perception in terms of speech. A comparison between the occurrence of the phonological variants in question in the text and in the normal speech helped achieve both the formal and informal styles of language use.
Topics related to social problems such as gulf war, riots in Aligarh, and entertainment related to Hindi movies and dramas were presented before the respondents in small group situations. This was done to know the respondents' awareness of the topic as well as to get acquainted with them. Although these topics were of general nature, the specific topics were given to both females and males depending upon their ages, hobbies and social status. The information regarding the hobby was accrued from the questionnaire.

4.4 Tools for data collection

Data obtained on the basis of discussion were recorded through tape-recorder. In the beginning the speech was recorded with the hidden tape-recorder so that the informants may not be conscious. Later on when the rapport was fully established there was no need to hide the tape-recorder. We approached them in workplaces, and homes according to their convenience.

Since some of the respondents were engaged in the discussion on certain other topics, those discussions were also recorded. Besides tape-recorder, the investigator had also made use of the field diary in which their variations in speech were carefully noted. The interaction recorded was both within sex and that of opposite sex also. The opposite sex interaction mostly revolved around the topics of general and wider interest like traumatic experience of the communal riots in Aligarh, Gulf crisis etc.

4.5 Data Collection

The data has been collected through a combination of techniques, with the help of tape recorder and field diary. These techniques include:
1) Questionnaire  
2) Interviews  
3) Anonymous observations  
4) Field Diary  

4.6 Anonymous Observations  

While the preliminary calculation of correlation was made on the basis of text and words list production by the respondents, the investigator heavily used anonymous observations in order to authenticate the calculations and analysis. For achieving this, the investigator had to participate in religious addresses, speeches, academic lectures etc delivered by learned people. This was also complimented by the observation of each speaker in totally or relatively informal situations, e.g., when speakers were in rash, emotional or friendly moods. The investigator tried to observe all types of speakers including students, scholars, and office-goers, housewives for the purpose of authenticity of data, the investigator had conversations with laborers, clerks, shopkeepers, etc. at as many places as was possible. Radio/Television news and other programmes were also referred to make comparisons between the speeches of elite and non-elite class, urban and rural and formal and informal contexts.

4.7 The Survey Questionnaire  

The Survey Questionnaire was designed and structured to collect the most basic and general information about the speakers. The purpose of Survey Questionnaire is to classify the respondents in terms of the social background in which they are living. This has enabled the investigator to put various respondents into particular social classes.
4.8 **The Field Diary**

A field Diary was maintained throughout the study to systematically record the observations during the data collection. It is found that usually, there is no concordance between the actual uses of language and the attitudes towards one's usage. One speaker who produce and claims to use a particular form, starts using different form with a slight change in the social setting.

4.9 **Validation of the Data**

We have provided with quantitative validation for the qualitative analysis.

**Section-5**

**Aim and scope of study**

The present work is an attempt to investigate the differences between the speeches of women and men in Urdu speech community in Aligarh in relation to age and Socio-economic Status. It is a comparative study.

The present socio-linguistic analysis is limited in scope for the utilization of data only from Aligarh city. It is attempted to determine the relativity between language and social and cultural patterns in Urdu with special reference to the speech of Aligarh females/women. We have focused on those gender variations which are more common and frequent in female speech of the Aligarh Urdu speech community.