



Research Article

Men’s image projection through discourse analysis

Joanne A. Alada

College of Fisheries-San Enrique Campus, Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology - Dingle Campus, Philippines

joannealada24@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

E-ISSN: 2961-3809

KEYWORDS

*discourse analysis,
men’s image,
projection*

Speech acts are utterances that serve a function in communication. These speech acts were used to describe men’s images who are members of a fraternity. Fraternities exist due to the ideology of gender polarization. Power is central to men’s identities and this power is displayed through language use. This study investigated how language is used by the members of a fraternity to identify and assess men’s image and social status. It used a qualitative design using discourse analysis. This was done through transcribing and deconstructing a conversation or piece of text. The participants of the study were the members of a community-based fraternity group composed of college students, with ages ranging from 19-26 years old. Among the 40 members, there were at least eight members who were consistently present in three contexts of conversations: meetings, bonding sessions, and social gatherings, and were selected as participants of this study. The collection of data was done through recordings of men’s conversations with their consent. The data analysis procedure began with the recording of the conversations which were transcribed according to Kiesling’s (2008) transcription conventions. The researcher identified features in the text, such as themes in the text, especially those that relate to men’s images. A tape recorder was used to capture the actual words spoken by the participants and the transcription of data. This study suggested that behavior in the form of speech acts consistently manifested itself as an attribute of personality traits and the words men use to weave the images of who they are or are not.

Copyright © 2023, Alada

This is an open-access article distributed and licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial NoDerivs.



How to cite:

Alada, J.A. (2023). Men’s image projection through discourse analysis. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends*, 2(1), 58-72.



INTRODUCTION

Language is a representation of thought. We use language to communicate our thoughts to others. But language is not just limited to the act of communication of one's thoughts. We do many more things with language (Sitarama, Dong, Alice, & Agogino, 2001). Most types of utterances in conversation do not involve simply communicating a meaning; rather, they are designed to accomplish something or to get someone to do something (Austin, 1962; Nastri, Peña, & Hancock, 2006). The different types of actions that people try to accomplish with utterances are referred to as speech acts. The way meanings and acts are linguistically communicated is embodied in the "speech act theory".

John Searle (1969) developed the speech act theory, integrated it with linguistic theory, and came up with a systematic framework known as the Principle of Expressibility. This principle claims that whatever can be meant can be said. For every possible speech act, there is a possible linguistic element the meaning of which (speakers' intention, hearers' understanding, and intuitions) is sufficient to determine that its literal utterance is a performance of precisely that speech act (Schiffrin, 1994). In the last three decades of the twentieth century, linguists began to study how language is used by speakers to do social things like expressing power, solidarity, and identity. Within that research, one of the most fruitful and contentious areas has been the investigation of how people use language to express gender, how a person's gender affects the choices they make in how they speak, and how their talk is received (Kiesling, 2007). For Coates (1986), in Graddol and Swann (1989), linguistic differences are merely a reflection of social differences, and as long as society views women and men as different and unequal, then differences in the language of women and men will persist. Similarly, this is supported by Ochs (1992), cited by Freed (1996), who asserts that particular language features do not simply represent women's or men's speech but rather that language features operate as indexes of certain social meanings which in turn help to constitute gender meanings. Much has been learned from the studies of gender and language relationships. Kiesling (2007) states that there has been a striking asymmetry of gender and language: with women as the object of study overwhelmingly more than men. With the publication of Robin Lakoff's book, *Language and Woman's Place* in 1975, the book became the foundation of the field of language and gender studies. Freed (1996) explains that from these studies people generally persist in believing that women are more conservative in their speech than men (Jespersen, 1972), that women seek more verbal intimacy than men (Tannen, 1990), that women are more polite than men (Lakoff, 1975), that women are less secure and more status-conscious in their speech than men (Labov, 1972) and that women use standard speech than men (Trudgill, 1972). However, other researchers have found out that gender variation in language is not as clearly and easily defined as much of the earlier research may claim. The influence of context (local and global), social factors other than gender (ethnicity, age, socio-economic status), and issues of power have also been found to play a role in how men and women use language (Dennison, 2006).

Many research studies tried to explain men's linguistic behavior across and within different communities. However, there have been fewer pieces of research conducted locally in line with these topics and fewer pieces of research on men's speech patterns concerning their identity. Accordingly, the researcher was interested to study a group of men and their speech to find out how language is used in projecting men's images both individually and in a group. With the theory of speech acting as a basis, the researcher proposed that men's images can be represented through their "speaking". This thought is supported by Thomas Reid, in Schuhmann and Smith (1990), who stated that language is the expressed image and picture of human thought, and by Austin (1976) and Searle (1975), who expressed that language is a form of verbal activity. The words men utter are representations of their notions and assessment of their personalities. Whatever images they will likely project can be revealed through their utterances. This study hoped to find out what these various images are, how they are created, why they are created, and what the intended functions of these images are.



METHODS

This study followed a qualitative design using discourse analysis (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). This method was used to describe men's group norms, variations, and individual experiences as well as explain relationships among them.

Participants and Ethical Consideration

The participants of the study were members of a fraternity group composed of 40 members. The fraternity is a community based-group. This means that group was founded in the community by members who reside in the said local chapter. For this study, pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the members. Among the participants, there were at least eight members who were consistently present in three contexts of conversations; meetings, bonding sessions, and social gatherings. The members were Bob, Brian (one of the pillars of the group), Jl (deputy), John (president of the chapter), Jun-jun, Rolly, Rush, and Mel (deputy).

Data Collection

The researcher used a tape recorder to capture the actual words spoken by the participants and the transcription of the data. The collection of data was done through recordings of the men's conversations with their consent. The researcher met with the members to get acquainted with them and explained the research study. The group activity types such as meetings, bonding sessions, and social gatherings were essential to the analysis of the men's language since this was where interactions were best captured. The president of the fraternity chapter discreetly recorded the conversations in a specific context. This was done to avoid the researcher's presence which may have unnecessary effects on the men's typical conversations.

Data Analysis

Recording of the conversations

The conversations were audio-recorded. There were two recordings of each of the group's meetings, bonding sessions, and social gatherings. The recorded conversations on meetings ran for 35 minutes, bonding sessions for 60 minutes each, and social gatherings, for 60 minutes. This was done to gather adequate data on men's speech acts.

Transcription of Data

Taped conversations were transcribed according to Kiesling's (2008) transcription conventions. An original text in Kiniray-a was presented. The researcher dealt with the speech acts sequences by turn. A turn referred to speaker turn which was used as the unit of analysis. It referred to the uninterrupted utterance or utterances of a speaker that identifies where one ends and another begins (Goheco, 2007). In meetings, 110 speaker turns were coded, on bonding sessions, there were 166 speaker turns coded, and 76 speaker turns coded during social gatherings. A total of 352 speakers' turns in all were considered in this corpus.

Identification of Speech Acts

The men's utterances were coded using Searle's (1979) five main categories of speech acts: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. The speech acts were presented and analyzed according to their propositional content and to their real intended meanings. The frequency level of individual speakers' speech acts concerning a specific context was analyzed and used as supporting facts in realizing the images projected.

Analysis of Speech Acts

Analysis of speech acts was done to determine how men used language in creating and shaping images. The researcher looked for the expressions of ideas composed of specific words or patterns that represented themes of self and group images. This was based on the assumption that men's characters tend to become encoded in language. The representation of aspects in the lexicon of a language was used to identify the most salient characteristic of men. However, the researcher made no prior assumption that the characters encoded in language were stable ones or that it was universal among men. The descriptions used for the men's images referred to observable characteristics only which were noticed through the analysis of the men's speech acts. In addition, salient features in the men's language were analyzed and discussed such as topic raising, topic initiation, interruptions, and teasing. Results drawn from the numerical analysis of the text provided hints for further interpretative and qualitative examination of the men's images realized through the use of language.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Speech Acts on Three Contexts

Speech Acts on Meetings

Men used mostly assertive speech acts in three contexts of conversations. The illocutionary acts of suggesting, explaining, and asking for information were used to convey men's ideas in the discussion of the meeting's agenda. Nine directive speech acts were used to instruct members on the accomplishments of tasks regarding the meetings' agenda and four declarative speech acts were given by the president of the group. Six indirect speech acts were coded as a form of indirect suggestion and request for the members' agreement, information, and compliance. In a meeting, men used strategies identified as women's strategies, such as finding agreement and consensus. However, among men, these were used to create a pair or group against another speaker such as speaker Rolly and an unknown speaker made an alliance with speaker John in contrast with speaker JI regarding the schedule of meetings. Greig, et al. (2000) stated that although men are affected by power structures interwoven with other hierarchical structures, they generally have a strategic common interest in defending and not challenging their gender privilege. This is what prompted speakers to agree and create a consensus to win over an opponent and still maintain the power hierarchy.

The analysis revealed that the context of the conversation was assumed to be a significant factor in influencing men's linguistic style. A group of men bound by law and rank could not ignore the presence of a hierarchy in the organization which then taught them to recourse to language manipulation to display knowledge and status. In the first meeting, there were at least seven members present and in the second meeting, five members were present. Among these members, only three to four were actively participating in giving their opinions and suggestions. Except for speaker JI, who gave directives to his fraternity brothers, the rest of the high-status members conveyed their opinions and suggestions briefly and indirectly. It is assumed that the low-status members such as speakers Jun-jun, Rolly, and Bob, and the rest of the members not included in the study opted to keep quiet and agree with the president's decisions. This fact might have been understood by the high-status members such as speakers John, Rush, Brian, and Mel. This prompted them in using illocutionary acts of question and statements to give information and suggestion. Their directives were also uttered using indirect speech acts of questions. This was to show their recognition of the low-status members' presence during meetings and of their chance to voice their opinions. Legitimization of male friendships is an important aspect of the fraternity. The fraternity's interactional spaces allow the men to safely express their connections with one another through approved channels (Kiesling, 2002). However, as authority was exclusive if not distributed only to speaker John and the high-status members, the low-status members refused to discuss their opinions.

The meeting context initially showed the men's speech acts tendencies and personalities. This context of conversation highlighted speakers John and JI's power display which made the discussion of the meeting's agenda interesting. Speaker JI informed the researcher that he was the former president of the group. He had a strong presence with his dignified posture. His voice sounded secure and decisive. Speaker John, on the other hand, was firm when it comes to opposition and interruptions. Ultimately, they were always involved in arguments. Tannen in Kiesling (1998) suggested that men tend to see conversation as a contest. Because the display of powerful relationships and dominance is an important component of men's identities, men's language should be intimately involved in this display. As stated earlier, the presence of hierarchy influenced men's usage of a certain type of speech act to fight for status and knowledge display. Some of the men succeeded and others failed in this battle discourse.

Sample Excerpts of Meeting Sessions

Excerpt 1

- 1 John: First agenda ta gali ang: ano ta ang: banner ta gali. (1.84)
Sa: pototan-
(Our first agenda is our banner.) (In [a certain town])-
- 2 JI: Dapat ang biskan way na banner. |Una lang =
(There should be no banner). (First only) - =
- 3 Brian: | P'wede eh,|
(possible)
(Brian cooks in the kitchen while the rest are in the living room. He comes to the living room every now and then to give his opinion and suggestion. Sometimes he just shouts his opinions as in this case.)
- 4 John: Indi ah banner gid una ah =
(No, the banner will be the first.)
- 5 JI: = Ti gani biskan way lang it frat shirt kung may banner=
(Yes I agree that even if there is no fraternity shirt, if there is a banner)=
- 6 John: = Oo banner una. Ti : ang budgeton ta bi ang kada isa bi :
singkwenta-singkwenta . . . sugot kamo?
(Yes banner first.) (So our budget will be fifty for each one, do you agree?)
- 7 Jun-jun: *Kada isa gid ran?*(Is it individually?)
- 8 John: Huo.
(yes)
- 9 JI: Tag-arani ah,
(On harvest time.)
- 10 Rolly: Tag-arani dun burubhay.
(It will be harvest time soon.)
- 11 JI: Garab sanda run.
(They have started the harvest now.)

Excerpt 2

- 1 John: Sa dason mag meeting | ta nga =
Next time when we conduct meeting | in
- 2 JI: =|Suktun mo taglima kada | adlaw| =
= | Collect 5 pesos every day |
- 3 John: = | lugar | mag
= | instead | when
meeting ta itao nyo dlang.
meet just give it
- 4 ??: * Pulo-
* 10-*
- 5 Rolly: Tingbun dlang | para =
Gather | so that =

- 6 John: = | Next week sa meeting sa sabado bi?
= | *Next week in our meeting on Saturday maybe?*
- 7 Rolly: Next week huo, sabado?? O domingo eh, =
Yes next week Saturday?? Or Sunday, =
- 8 Jl: =Sabado domingo eh?? =
= Saturday Sunday??=
- 9 John: = Sabado meeting ta next week.
Saturday let's have a meeting.
- 10 Jl: Domingo?? da pirmi meeting mo,
The meeting is always Sunday,
- 11 ??: Sabado (amon di tol mo,) *Saturday (ours here dude,)*
- 12 Rolly: (Domingo lunes may klase dun, ti kon may inom hang-over timo *Sunday Monday there is a class so when you drink liquor you 'll have hangover*
Pro kon sabado) –
But if Saturday -
- 13 Jl: Sabado | it ha =
Saturday in the af=
- 14 John: = | Sabado it hapon (.) ya meeting. (.)
Saturday afternoon(.) will be the meeting. (.)
Ti: ti singkwenta sa ano sabado?
So: fifty on Saturday?
- 15 Rolly: Ti huo next week lang.
So yes next week.

Speech Acts on Bonding Sessions

In bonding sessions, the illocutionary acts of asking, informing, stating, agreeing, and explaining information were used in the discussion and arguments of various ideas shared by each member. Directive speech acts were used in ordering and instructing members to do a task as a challenge for the resolution of arguments.

Men's narratives can be viewed as competitive. This was in accord with Kiesling's (2002) statement that while the aspect of the competition is discernible, it does not negate the sharing aspect of the speech event because men share the values on which they evaluated the stories and they cooperated to allow each to tell their stories. Male solidarity plays a role in the maintenance of men's power. As such, men built camaraderie even if they competed for status. Bonding sessions gave men the idea that in this context of a conversation, everyone had the freedom of expressing their opinions and suggestions. At the same time, everyone could refute and discuss these given ideas. Arguments were inevitable and men merely dropped topics if they felt the discussion was becoming insignificant and members involved were becoming unreasonable. This was done to avoid brawls among members. This assumption was validated through the information provided by the mother of a fraternity member who confirmed that the men could physically hurt each other as a result of these heated arguments. The fraternity's level of membership showed the men's hierarchical view of the world, in addition to valuing competition and camaraderie (Kiesling, 1998). According to many theorists, status is ubiquitous in social life and an organizing force in personality. In addition, Adler (1930), in Anderson (2001), emphasized that humans are inherently social creatures, motivated by what he called the "striving for superiority". Striving for status has been proposed as a primary and universal human motive and is not only ubiquitous but also important. Status attainment leads to a host of vital consequences for the individual. Research has shown that individuals' status within their group influences personal well-being, social cognition, and emotional experience (Barkow, 1975; Hogan & Hogan, 1991; Anderson, 2001). In the recordings of the two bonding sessions, the men who were mostly involved in arguments were speakers John, Jl, and Rush. They were the high-status members who were respected for their authority and intelligence and they were also the 'best buddies' among the members.



Sample Excerpts of Bonding Sessions

Excerpt 1

- 1 Rush: Kailangan 'tol mag anniversary dukaron may frat shirt dun ma:y –
Nowadays during anniversaries you ha:ve to have frat shirt -
- 2 Jl: Laban eh.,
I agree.,
- 3 Brian: Frat shirt dun. =
Frat shirt already. =
- 4 Rush: Ma:y –
Ha:ve -
- 5 John: May banner.
Have a banner.
- 6 Jl: Banner.,
Banner.,
- 7 Brian: |Kang may kwarta-
| When you have money-
- 8 Rush: |KUNG MAY BUDGET TIMO SA IBANG CHAPTER NGA ATON DI
GANI: a-a banwa d'ya aton.
If you have a budget In other chapter when ours here ours is a town
- 9 Brian: A-a-a liwat anay bi ha-ha-ha.
A-a-ah again please hahaha.
- 10 John: * Laban eh*.
**I agree*.*
- 11 Rush: Indi aw ah (sipin sipin) lang da gani baw: ah.
No it was not chip in chip in only oh:

Excerpt 2

- 1 Mel: Pira to 'aw?
How much was it?
- 2 Bob: One-fifty ah., Baklon mo to?
One hundred fifty will you buy that?
- 3 Rush: Shen.
One hundred.
- 4 Bob: G'wapo eh
Handsome (said sarcastically)
- 5 Rush: Nagamit mo daman,
You have worn it,
- 6 Bob: Kag isa ang ga- t-shirt tag eh nubenta:y-
And t-shirt costs ninety:-
- 7 Rush: =Tag sitinta b'la t-shirt sa may novo pay-
=T-shirt costs seventy pesos in Novo-
- 8 Bob: =Ti noh? Abaw grabe-
=So yes wow amazing-
- 9 Rush: =Sitinta.
=seventy.
- 10 Bob: =(Di'n timo kabakal kada man?).
=(Where did you buy that?).
- 11 John: Pira?
How much?
- 12 Rush: Sinintay singko.
Seventy five.
- 13 John: Araw?
Ow?
- 14 Rush: Sa [store] sa [town] (.) Pirmi ko-
In _____ in _____ I always-



- 7 Mark: *No that time when we went there?=
Ti huo insa't bal-an mo mangelabo kamo?
Yes so why are you aware that we plan to eat coconut fruits?*
- 8 Rush: *Pag ka aga pag ka aga-
In the morning in the mor-*
- 9 John: *Ti ano ano rason mo to ay? Hambalan mo may obra ko 'tol ah,
ehehehe.
What was your reason that time? You said I have work dude hehehe*
- 10 Mark: *Huo may obra ko subong gani hambal sanda pag ka aga ti
mangelabo sanda aw?
Yes I have work but they said in the morning will they eat coconut fruits?*
- 11 John: *Oo eh.
Yes of course*
- 12 Mark: *Oo wa'y sanda ka hambal tana-
Yes they failed to tell me*
- 13 John: *Gin munuhan da 'kaw | kato |.
They informed you |about that|.*
- 14 Mark: *| Huh | wa'y sanda ka hambal mangelabo
pag ka aga.
|Huh|They did not tell me they plan to eat coconut fruits in the
Morning.*
- 15 John: *Wa'y takon may gina adtunan ko to.
I was not present I went somewhere that time.*
- 16 Mark: *Kun naghambal sanda mangelabo to sa tangkal duro kulabo to
ah.=
If you said you wanted to eat coconut fruits there near the pig pen there are lots
of coconut fruits*
- 17 Mel: *Diin?
Where?*
- 18 Mark: *Tangkal to ah.
In the pig pen*
- 19 Mel: *Sakaon ta?
You want us to climb it?*
- 20 Mark: *Indi- libog ulo ta kanimo.
No I get confused of you*
- 21 Mel: *hahaha.
hahaha*

Men's Projected Images

The analysis of speech acts on each episode of excerpts in the three contexts revealed the men's projected images: pragmatic dominator, adamant leader, candid thinker, responsive happy-go-lucky guy, naive member, nonchalant joker, supporter, and cautious conversant. The personalities represented through the analysis of the men's speech acts and used to describe their images were concurrent to Aguilin-Dalisay et al.'s (1995) study of Ilonggo characters. Their study described Ilonggo respondents as serious (pragmatic dominator), insist opinion and never changing their minds or decisions (adamant leader), good in decision making (candid thinker), being happy, easygoing, happy-go-lucky (responsive happy-go-lucky guy), quiet (naive member), happy, "makulit or dungol" (nonchalant joker), and patient (cautious conversant). However, it was clarified that the descriptions used to describe the men's images referred to observable personalities only through the analysis of speech acts and did not claim that these were established to be a collective of the men's images.

The Pragmatic Dominator

A pragmatic dominator was noted for his unsolicited opinions and directives. In almost all contexts of fraternity members' gatherings, he was observed to have coded high occurrences of

speech acts. His inclination for knowledge and power display is dictated by his intellectual capability and rank in the group.

The Adamant Leader

Speaker John's image projection speaks of the indispensable if not an appropriate character of an individual trying to take hold of authority in all aspects of his leadership.

The Candid Thinker

The candid thinker is precisely skillful. He knows when to assert his point, share his knowledge, and decide on matters based on facts. This image projection is in the character of speaker Rush.

The Responsive Happy-Go-Lucky Guy

This image projection is easily recognized among the different personalities observed in the fraternity because of its unperturbed voice tone and accommodating characteristic. The responsive happy-go-lucky guy managed to be involved with the fraternity's dilemma even if he was not deeply involved in the decision-making of the group.

The Naive Member

A diffident person is different from a naive one and more specifically different from a naive who can be assertive at times. This is the image projection of the naive member of the fraternity in the character of speaker Jun-jun. In meetings, the naive member was hesitant to share his opinion because this might be misinterpreted by the rest of the members or this might be a wrong suggestion. His awareness of his status in the presence of others might have been one of the reasons for his actions.

The Nonchalant Joker

The cool dude of the group projected as a nonchalant joker image is characterized by speaker Mel. Like any other ordinary man, a nonchalant joker might have reasons to be serious in life, but even in serious circumstances he finds joy and this he willingly shares with his fraternity brothers through his funny anecdotes.

The Supporter

In every discussion, there is an opposition group and a supporter of ideas. If some fight for recognition, some just settle as the workforce in the backdrop. This is how the researcher describes this next image projected in the character of speaker Rolly. The supporter was considerate and cautious with his speech acts. He rarely gave comments and ideas unless necessary. He coded fewer speech acts in the meeting and bonding session.

The Cautious Conversant

Choosing what to say and how to say it best describes this image projected in the character of speaker Bob. In terms of language usage, speaker Bob is observed to have minimal utterances. However, these utterances are important as they serve to encourage and support others.

Salient Language Features Found in Men's Data

Topic raising



During the topic discussion, men used an illocutionary act of questions and statements to take control of the floor and to provide information. Topics were abrupt and left-hanging. Topics were understood to be ended, resolved, or unresolved through total abandonment through silence or initiation of a new topic to deviate from the discussion. Topics were not discussed at a great length because the men responded to the discussion by raising a topic of their concern or by downplaying the previous concerns of their fraternity brothers. Simultaneous speech and overlaps functioned as attempts to take the floor rather than a sign of active listenership. During bonding sessions, the men were inclined to give their knowledge on the current topic discussed and these attempts were motivated more by their tendencies to take control of the floor.

Topic initiation

Men's way of controlling conversations and developing topics was asymmetrical. It was observed that the men's intelligence, rank, socio-economic status, assertiveness, and confidence influenced their tendencies to initiate topics. There was a presence of a hierarchy of power dictated by position and status in the fraternity. The difference in pacing and pausing affected the men's tendencies to be dominant or reserved in certain conversations. The adamant leader was noted for his prolonged pronunciation and some fraternity brothers such as candid thinkers would insert his ideas assuming that the adamant leader had nothing else to add to his statement. This was also a pragmatic dominator's tendency when an adamant leader presided over meetings. A pragmatic dominator would insert his ideas whenever he wanted to and did not consider the prolonged or not prolonged ending statements of an adamant leader. This was what differed him from candid thinkers. While in the case of the responsive happy-go-lucky guy and nonchalant joker, they tended to wait for the appropriate turn-exchange pause during conversations and so they always tried to find the best chance to insert their ideas. However, some fraternity brothers continued to dominate the floor and refused to allow them, as such their statements could be noted for the first few words of utterances which were interrupted. Their statements were successfully delivered due to their assertiveness and fight for status and knowledge display. As officers in the group they were aware of their images and successfully initiating a topic was the same as emphasizing their position in the group. Low-status fraternity members such as cautious conversant, naive members, and the supporter, who were also waiting for the appropriate turn-exchange pause, refused to continue asserting their ideas once interrupted.

Interruptions

Men coded higher occurrences of intrusive interruptions highlighting floor-taking. Floor-taking interruptions were used to develop the topic of the speaker by taking over the floor from the current speaker. Although the men did develop topics and used a collaborative floor, the men's initiated topics concerned more with their knowledge and they took the discussion in a different direction away from the current speaker and towards their own experience or knowledge. In other words, the men's motive in initiating a new topic was not solely to develop the main topic being discussed because the initiated topic was somewhat different, but for the men to display their knowledge and to emphasize their status in the group. As such, this study claimed that interruption occurred to maintain the conversation and to display the men's knowledge and status.

Teasing

Humor and teasing were used as a device in conversation in two ways. First, the ability to play along with teases no matter how direct and personal was a means of building rapport among members of the fraternity. It was used to enhance camaraderie among men. Second, humor and teasing were used to display status and image. If other members used dominance and interruption to display knowledge and status, some men such as nonchalant jokers and happy-go-lucky guys used it to accentuate their status in the group by taking the spotlight away from other men and focusing it

on them. Teasing was a way of establishing a parallel relationship among members despite the hierarchy of rank and status and personality differences. It was a way of showing knowledge and power without imposing it. Besides the two functions of humor and tease, there was another function found. It was used as a way of handling the unlikely attitude of the members to avoid an argument. Some members were serious even unreasonable. When the men were involved in arguments, humor, and teasing were used to lighten up the serious mood of the speakers. It was a way of reminding the speakers involved in serious conversations to take it lightly. It was also a way of premeditated attempt of putting a stop to the argument and to change the topic. Men opted to use humor and teasing to indirectly avoid arguments. If they chose to directly reprimand or remind a fraternity brother, there was a tendency that the reprimanded fraternity brother might deny, ignore or defend himself resulting in misunderstanding and resentment. As such this linguistic device was used to convey the message appropriately.

CONCLUSION

Men's linguistic strategies could be understood in terms of their common struggle to create and sustain a sense of coherence in their personality or images. They found ways to represent their unique ideas and due to their concern with status and knowledge display, the use of linguistic devices became an important aspect of the men's communicative event.

The fraternity membership symbolized power in several ways. Access to sports, women, jobs, a wider network of friends, and respect were some of the privileges of fraternity membership. Discourses constructed, and to some extent, embodied this power. Men were attracted to fraternity organizations as these discourses created and embodied the power of fraternity members and they believed an alliance with something powerful would make them more powerful. The men used various strategies that could construct their images. One strategy was to create privileged speech events found in group meetings and bonding sessions. These were indirect expressions of the men's desire for status and image. The men relied on indirect speech genres, acts, and stances such as insults boast and another competitive linguistic form to create images.

With the existing negative image of the group in the community, the men had to learn to strategically use linguistic devices to help accrue local status or images. Further, as the men desired to acquire a positive social status in the community and a better and definite image, the more it was manifested linguistically. As these social statuses and images were constantly changing, there is a possibility that the men opted for more aggressive and extreme expressions of their power, respect, and credibility. The men in this study had emphasized their gender and masculine role by being members of a fraternity. This membership had conferred them power, which they enjoyed and used to dominate each other, other men, and women as well. However, their power was limited to the extent that their group was treated and despised as one of the ordinary, and non-sense gangs in town. Power and respect must be worked out to achieve a positive image and social status. These images and social status were hard to realize at present because the men were confined to their limitations of achieving personal empowerment. The analysis of the men's speech acts revealed their tendencies to give importance to power and respect and validated their tacit insecurities. For as long as these men continuously struggle to compete and prove themselves, their ambition to create a unified image endowed with power and respect will have to take a gradual process of realization.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Implication for Practice

Discourses play a primary role in education and learning materials in schools mainly consist of text. Structures of discourses used in education may refer to communicative class interaction such as dialogue between teachers and pupils, reading and comprehension which will eventually lead to more abstract, descriptive, argumentative discourses, such as newspaper texts and philosophical essays, or complex literary narratives. There are a variety of discourse types that are relevant to students, both



in school and in personal and social contexts. The list can include natural everyday discussions, meetings, lectures, advertisements, interviews, drama, etc. Huckaby in Stowe Master (2009) refers to music, paintings, commercials, movies, and even conversations as public pedagogies.

According to Huckaby, in Stowe Master (2009), these public pedagogies can have a profound impact on how people think about themselves and others. She stated that we conceptually confine pedagogy to the intentional practices of teachers within classroom boundaries however; pedagogy breaks through imposed borders to take on numerous forms and enactments in many sites. It means learning doesn't occur solely in a classroom setting but reaches into every corner and facet of life. This linguistic study brought pedagogy from the four corners of the classroom and into the streets, dealing with fraternity men's use of speech acts concerning their projected images. The speech act theory is built upon the argument that human existence is defined by the ability to coordinate efforts through the use of language (Albornoz et al., 2007). Men's use of language conveys meanings and produces a force that has consequential effects on the hearer. The analysis of speech acts indicated the context types, situations, men's various functions (roles, positions, status, etc.) in the organization, and the rules and conventions regulating their possible actions and speech acts in three different contexts. Through language use, the men create images and construct reality.

Conversations, according to Huckaby, in Stowe Master (2009) are a form of pedagogy and as the researcher points out, conversations are learning processes where both speakers and hearers can share not only ideas but more significantly personal stories and valued experiences. Knowledge can be found through a simple conversation and not just the structured questioning in a teacher-student interaction or group discussion observed in schools and universities. This knowledge is learning the type of thinking that goes on in the actual lives of the men in the type of settings where they exist. It is interesting to know what these men think about, how their thoughts shape their daily lives, how they engage with others, and how they use words as a tool in all these things. The researcher claimed that a fraternity is a community by itself. A community that observes differences in culture, certain religious or other practices, and language is a vital component of the group's continued existence.

Implication for Further Research

Based on the practice recommendations, the following are implications for further study: This research has demonstrated that effective communication through the use of appropriate speech acts will improve role clarification and expectations of men. This will give insights to teachers in studying students' positive and negative behaviors through the analysis of disagreement speech acts. It intends to examine gender as status and gender and dominance as identities of students in resolving conflicts within student organizations.

Effective communication provides clear, direct, and concrete examples helping the men understand what is expected of them. This will give insights to teachers in studying how their teaching-learning objectives are conveyed and assessed by students through the speech act analysis of teacher-student dyadic interaction. The men use more than one type of speech act and the use of strategy such as competition is an indirect way of accomplishing images. One example is the use of insult through teasing is a competitive strategy that is socially indirect in that it is not serving only competition but solidarity as well. The researcher proposes that teachers study the meaning of strategy, the conversational style of students, and the interaction of their styles and strategies with each other such as solidarity and power and similarity and difference to determine the correlation between their linguistic strategies and academic competition. The teaching of speech act analysis can be a tool in training students to analyze real-world conversations in an organizational context such as telephone conversations, email, and Facebook. This is to provide important theoretical information and empirical data in the study of how media is used to communicate.

The images of the men can further be studied by analyzing other linguistic features such as politeness markers, silence, and usage of vernacular and standard phonological and grammatical

features. The pattern of the men's language discourse can also be explained through the study of the men's gossip as well as the role of heterosexuality concerning the men's hegemonic views of male solidarity. The study can give insights to educators in assessing how men's and women's expressiveness is constructed through an analysis of speech acts which will then give way to how we understand students' subjectivities that shape their desires and identities. In the same way, teachers can explore the role of prosody and situational context in students' understanding of expressive utterances.

RECOMMENDATION

English language teachers can gain insights from the study and prepare well-planned activities that focus on the analysis of authentic discourse. By teaching students to analyze the discourse in such sources as news articles, letters, reports, simulation activities, and lectures, students become critical thinkers and can construct personal meanings relevant and beneficial to their emerging professional lives.

Teachers should help students understand language as a linguistic system and develop their communication skills on their own by providing students with concrete opportunities to exercise greater autonomy in their language learning. Helping students understand the different forms of discourse will enable them to cope with problems and generate their concepts and generalizations from their everyday communicative events. The speech act theory should be used as a tool to describe sentences that have multiple, interlocking purposes related to literary contexts such as the classic genres of novels, Bible scriptures, and poetry. Students should understand that multiple discourses of politics, religion, media, and academia can be judged according to their subjectivity. They must learn that these competing discourses define what it means to be a social being and knowing what is useful and essential about these discourses will equip them with knowledge of the new facets of learning. Sources of support from a variety of institutions such as the local government and schools may consolidate efforts in promoting youths' personal and intellectual development. The community and schools can create intervention programs to help supervise the youths and their respective organizations through efficient and constant communication.

REFERENCES

- Aguiling-Dalisay, G., Nepomuceno-Van Heugten, M.L., & Sto. Domingo, M.R. (1995). Ang Pagkalalaki ayon sa mga lalaki: Pag-aaral sa tatlong grupong cultural sa Pilipinas. *Philippine Social Science Review*, 52. <http://wat2146.ucr.edu/Papers/oob.pdf>
- Albornoz, C., Batista, L., Bitela, S., Fuller, G., & Shuck, B. (2007). Communication and organizational learning: Applying the speech-act theory to the learning organization. [www.carlosalbornoz.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/applying-the-Speech-Act Theor](http://www.carlosalbornoz.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/applying-the-Speech-Act-Theor)
- Cheng, K.H.C. (2008). Personality as relational resource in persuasion settings. *Asian Social Science*, 4 (6). <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ass/article/viewfile/1440/1387.pdf>
- Dennison, C. (2006). The effect of gender stereotypes in language on attitudes toward speakers (Master's thesis). <http://www.etd.library.pitt.edu/ETD/.../CCLDennisonETD2006version.pdf>
- Fitzpatrick, J. (2007). Analyzing hip hop discourse as a locus of men's language. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium about Language and Society-Austin. Texas Linguistics Forum 51, 64-73. <http://www.studentorgs.utexas.edu/salsa/proceedings/.../Fitzpatrick.pdf>
- Freed, A. (1996). (Ed.). Language and gender research in an experimental setting. In Bergvall, V., Bing, J.M., & Freed, A. F., (Eds.), Rethinking language and gender research: theory and practice (pp. 54-77). USA: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Goheco, P.M. (2007). Discourse analysis of mediated political advertisement campaigns. In Dayag, D. T., & Quakenbush, J.S. (Eds.), *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 38(1-2), 87, 92. Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Graddol, D. & Swann, J. (1989). Gender Voices (pp. 1-10, 41-94). Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers. Copyright [1989] by David Graddol and Joan Swann.
- Greig, A., Kimmel, M., & Lang, J. (2000). *Men, masculinities & development: Broadening*



- http://www.health.columbia.edu/pdfs/men_masculinities.pdf.
- Kiesling, S.F. (2002). Homosociality in men's talk: Balancing and recreating cultural discourses of masculinity. <http://www.piH.edu/~kiesling//kiesling-homosociality.pdf>
- Kiesling, S.F. (2007). Men, masculinities and language. Journal Compilation. USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Copyright [2007] by Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Kiesling, S.F. (2008). Gender, interaction and meaning in linguistic variation. <http://www.jones.ling.indiana.edu/~/kiesling-SixFest-Notes-3.pgf>
- Nastri, J., Peña, J., & Hancock, J.T. (2006). The construction of away messages: A speech act analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(4), article 7. <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue4/nastri.html>our work towards gender equality. [Gender in Development Monograph Series # 10].
- Schenk, P.W. (2002). Great ways to sabotage a good conversation (p.10). USA: Standard Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994) Approaches to Discourse (pp. 49-91). USA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schuhmann, K., & Smith, B. (1990). Elements of speech act theory in the work of
- Searle, J. (1979). Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sitarama, S., Dong, A., Alice, M., & Agogino, A. (2001, August). Speech acts and peer learning in product development case study discussions. Paper presented at the International Conference on Engineering Education, Oslo, Norway. http://best.berkeley.edu/pubs/01_0401_P.pdf
- Stowe Master, R. (2009, April). Identifying public pedagogies. TCU-ENDEAVORS Research Magazine. www.newevents.tcu.edu/print/1539.htm
- Tannen, D. (1994). Gender and Discourse (pp. 20-184). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc. Copyright [1994] by Deborah Tannen and Copyright [1996] for Chapter Six by Deborah Tannen.
- Thomas Reid. *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 7, 47-66. <http://www.ontology.buffalo.edu/smith/articles/reid.PDF>