Sexist Language in Indonesian via Metaphor and Transitivity: An Exploratory Study

Luh Putu Laksminy, Gede Primahadi Wijaya Rajeg

Udayana University

putu_laksminy@unud.ac.id, primahadi_wijaya@unud.ac.id

Abstract

This paper discusses how stereotypes and/or attitudes and positions of women and men are reflected in sexist language, focusing on metaphorical sexist expressions and the study of syntactic structures such as transitivity and grammatical relations. Based on qualitative analysis of web-based linguistic data and two novels from a female author, we found that metaphorical sexist expressions in Indonesian conceptualise women as ANIMALS, COMMODITIES/GOODS, FOODS, and DUMPING SITES, indicating negative attitudes towards women. In terms of the transitivity analysis, we illustrate that the women character is portrayed as the undergoer of the action enacted by the man-actor. Overall, the findings indicate that unfavourable attitudes towards women can still be found in language and that could call for a change in language use without discriminating against women.

Keywords: sexist language, metaphor, transitivity, sociolinguistics

I   INTRODUCTION

The study of language and gender, according to Meyerhoff (2006, p. 201), is characterised by the debate around the pros and cons associated with different ways of conceptualising the relationship between language and society. According to Coates (2007, p. 62), gender differences in language use are directly related to the relative social power of male speakers and the relative powerlessness of female speakers. In social groups, this notion made women to be often seen as a minority while men are the majority (Coates, 1986, p. 12); such an imbalance view is known as sexism, a behaviour that maintains inequality between men and women, so that sexist attitudes stereotype someone based on gender, rather than evaluating individual achievements and abilities (Holmes, 2001, p. 305) (cf. §2.2). This non-parallel treatment of men and women is a feature present in most languages and language communities (Pauwels, 2003, p. 553). Actions that view men as prototypes for human representation led women to a status that makes them someone who is "invisible", "unnatural (marked)", and "subsumed" (Pauwels, 2003, p. 553). At the heart of feminist activists and experts is the attention to changing language that is discriminatory against women and which seems to downplay women-related activities. A related endeavour is to change the way women are represented in advertisements, newspapers and magazines, as well as the way they are addressed in texts and in interactions (Mills, 2008).

In this paper, we discuss and illustrate how stereotypes (see §2.3) and/or attitudes and positions of women and men are reflected in language. The rationale of this aim is that until now, the representation of women and men is still seen as asymmetrical, which could be reflected in language, which is called sexist language (Wareing, 2004, p. 76; Mills, 2008, p. 38; Weatherall, 2002, p. 12; Payne, 2001, p. 112) (see §2.4 for details). The aim is in line with Holmes' (2001, p. 305) assertion that the focus of research on sexism (§2.2) and sexist language (§2.4) lies in how language is used to convey negative attitudes towards women; the expression evoking such an attitude is also the focus of this paper. However, until recently, it was still being debated whether language could actually be sexist towards men, or only towards women (Wareing, 2004).

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 215) and Holmes (2001, p. 305) note that sexist language is often expressed metaphorically. Following up on this, this paper will present data on sexist language with metaphorical nuances (§2.5 and §4.1) that evoke semantic derogations for women. In addition to metaphorical expressions, the syntactic aspect of transitivity (§2.6 and §4.2) in the use of language in the text will also be discussed to show one's perspective on women in relation to their position with men. Through the analysis of what is said and how it is said (R. Lakoff, 1975, p. 1), if she is a woman, or talking about women whoever they are, one can gain insight into how a person feels—about herself, about women. This is because language conveys attitudes (Holmes, 2001, p. 305).

II   MATERIALS AND METHOD

2.1   THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

2.1.1 SEX OR GENDER?

In sociolinguistics, sex is increasingly limited to the biological and physiological differences between men and women (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 201). According to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 10), and Wareing (2004, p. 76), sex is a biological classification, usually fixed before birth and based primarily on reproductive potential. In other words, sex is something that we possess and can be defined according to objective and scientific criteria—namely the number of X chromosomes in a person (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 202).

In contrast, gender denotes a social identity that emerges or is built through social actions (Meyerhoff, 2006, p. 201). This is in line with Eckert and McConnell-Ginet's (2003, p. 10) emphasis that "gender is not something we are born with and not something we **have**, but something we **do**—something we **perform**" (boldface in original). Gender is a socially constructed category based on sex and most societies now operate based on two types of gender, namely masculine and feminine (Coates, 2007, p. 63). Meyerhoff (2006, p. 202) concludes that gender is a social property: something acquired or built through our relationships with others and through individual adherence to certain cultural norms and restrictions. Gender is a social elaboration of sex, and "gender builds on biological sex" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 10). It is worth noting that this paper will not pursue LGBTQ issues any further.

2.1.2 SEXISM

Mills (2008, pp. 1–2) emphasises that sexism, like racism and other forms of language discrimination, is rooted in greater social power, wider power inequalities, and finally, the ongoing conflict between men and women. especially in public activities, regarding who has the right to certain positions and resources.

Sexism is not just a statement that seems to constantly focus on gender when it is irrelevant. A statement can be considered sexist if it is based on outdated beliefs and stereotypes when it is used to refer to certain women (e.g., "Look at you crying over this film"—suggesting women are very emotional) (Mills, 2008, p. 2). A further factor for a statement being judged as sexist is when it emphasises that male experience is human experience in general, and when the statement is based on the presupposition that any activity related to women is secondary to that of men (e.g., "Women tennis players get lower prize money at Wimbledon because the game is less exciting") (Mills, 2008, p. 2). From these two examples, it can be seen that none of the linguistic elements (i.e., words) in those two expressions is sexist; it is the belief system expressed that is sexist, which sees that women are certainly different from and inferior to men (Mills, 2008, pp. 3, 10).

In sum, it is essential to note that sexism is not only seen from the elements of language but also from beliefs or discourses about men and women that are displayed in and conveyed through the language (Mills, 2008, p. 3). We ought to be able to distinguish between statements that can be classified as sexist (based on stereotypical knowledge or the gender discourse that appears to underlie them) and linguistic features that indicate sexism in most contexts (Mills, 2008, p. 11).

2.1.3 STEREOTYPES

When talking about sexism, the notion of "stereotype" is often brought up, and it is often assumed that we all have access to the same stereotypes. Stereotypes are hypothesised based on structural inequalities, although it is important not to generalise too much about stereotypes of men and women (as they are formed from specific contexts) (Mills, 2008, p. 126). According to Bourdieu (cited in Mills, 2008, p. 126), stereotypes can be defined as "a fixed set of characteristics than as a range of possible scripts or scenarios (sets of features, roles, and possible narrative sequences) that we hypothesise". Bourdieu's view suggests that some extreme aspects, which are seen and imagined, from the behaviour of several out-group members, are assumed and then these features are generalised to the group. Assumptions about stereotypes usually (i) reflect judgments about men and women, and (ii) establish notions, often unconsciously, about what is appropriate (Mills, 2008, pp. 126–127). Geeraerts (2008, pp. 26–27) states that "stereotypes and prototypes alike involve semantic information that is salient within a category but that is not sufficient to adequately characterise the category as a whole". Stereotypes are prototypes viewed from a social angle and are social entities (Geeraerts, 2008, p. 27).

2.1.4 SEXIST LANGUAGE

Holmes (2001, p. 305) states that sexist language is a medium that can be used by a culture or society to convey its values from one group to another, and from generation to generation. Sexist language displays the inequality of men and women as if members of one sex seem less completely human and less complex and have fewer rights than members of the other sex (Wareing, 2004, p. 76; Payne, 2001, p. 112). Sexist language also displays stereotypes of women and men, which sometimes harms the men, but more often impacts the women (Wareing, 2004, p. 76; Weatherall, 2002, p. 12).

Fiksdal (2008, p. 422) indicates that gender differences in language exist in the way men and women use linguistic features (e.g., phonology, syntax, metaphors [cf. §2.5 and §4.1]) or certain discourse strategies (e.g., turn allocation), amongst others. Moreover, Mills (2008, p. 10) notes that sexist language can refer to a wide range of linguistic elements, from (i) generic pronouns (e.g., the English pronoun he used to refer to both male and female), (ii) words suffixed with -ette indicating female (e.g., usherette), nouns referring to male and female (e.g., landlord and landlady, or manager and manageress, which seem to have a range different meanings), (iii) swearing expressions that seem different for boys and girls (cf. Ningrum et al., 2021), (iv) names given to us and used for parts of our bodies, etc.

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 215) and Holmes (2001, p. 305) also state that sexist language that conveys negative attitudes towards women is often expressed metaphorically (to be explained in §2.5 below and illustrated in §4.1). Much of what is termed 'sexist language' is felt to be offensive/derogatory because problematic attitudes lie behind metaphorical identifications with women and their sexes, for example, commodities, small animals, and with fruit or other desserts (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 220).

2.1.5 METAPHOR

The concept of metaphor in this paper is adopted from the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) (G. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999; Kövecses, 2010), a contemporary theory of metaphor widely recognised in the last 30 years proposing metaphor as a central cognitive process. Contrary to the classical view of metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999) argue that metaphor permeates humans' everyday life, including not only language but also thoughts and actions. Metaphor plays a very important role in the human mind as the mechanism to conceptualise the world and its activities (G. Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 3; Deignan, 2005, p. 13; Gibbs, 2008, p. 3). As an example, the way we understand and talk about abstract concepts such as emotions is largely metaphorical in nature. For instance, across many different languages (cf. Kövecses, 2000) including Indonesian (I. M. Rajeg, 2013; G. P. W. Rajeg, 2014), anger can be talked about using vocabulary from the domain of fire (e.g., ***api kemarahan berkobar*** 'blazing fire of anger'; ***memadamkan*** kemurkaan 'extinguish [the] wrath'; data from Table 1 in G. P. W. Rajeg (2014, p. 165)). In CMT, metaphor is viewed to arise from the interaction between the brain, body, language and culture (Gibbs, 2008, p. 4). Concerning the role of sexist language in conveying negative attitudes towards women (cf. §I), metaphorical language could play a central role as indicated by Charteris-Black (2005, p. 13):

> "Metaphor influences our beliefs, attitudes and values because it uses language to activate unconscious emotional associations and it influences the values that we place on ideas and beliefs on a scale of goodness and badness. It does this by transferring positive or negative associations of various source words to a target metaphor."

We will, in §3.1, discuss data manifesting Charteris-Black's quote above.

2.1.6 TRANSITIVITY

Sexism as discussed in §2.2 and §2.4 can be evoked not only via specific words, but also via the entire utterance, a sentence, or a longer text (Wareing, 2004, p. 82). One aspect in the analysis of a sentence relevant to sexist language is "transitivity".

Transitivity is one part of the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory developed by Halliday (1994) (see also Eggins, 2004, for an introduction). As viewed in SFL, transitivity serves to convey the type of process or experience: action, event, conscious process, and relationships (Halliday, 1994). Halliday (1994, p. 101) adds that the process which is expressed through language is the result of our conception of the world or point of view. The transitivity model provides a way to find out how certain linguistic structures in a text point to different viewpoints or mindsets towards the world or one's

ideology, both traditional and in special circumstances. The viewpoint in this paper is related to the view towards sex and gender.

The transitivity analysis in this paper is guided by the question of "who or what does what to whom or what" (Mills, 2008, p. 69). This question is also central to the study of syntax. Concerning sexism, in many literary works, there is often a tendency for female characters to be grammatically presented as objects of the actions of other characters; as an end-point of other actions, and in a position as an object compared to a subject position (Mills, 2008, p. 69). Wareing (1994, as cited in Mills, 2008) states that even in women's literary works, where initially the female characters are active and confident, there is still a tendency for the characters to be shown as passive at certain crucial moments in the text, for example in sexual scenes (see §3.2 for some evidence and the discussion).

2.2 METHODOLOGY

The illustrative Indonesian data in this study will be taken from authentic language use on the web and two novels by a female author Oka Rusmini (Rusmini, 2000, 2003); this author is famous for her novels that focus on women's portrayal, especially against the socio-cultural background of Bali. The web-based data is given the URL via the footnote while the novel source is provided with an in-text citation. If none of these sources was given, the data would be provided introspectively by the authors. It is important to emphasise at the outset that the nature of this paper is mainly qualitative and exploratory. Further studies with a larger pool of datasets are needed to further substantiate the proposal presented in this paper.

III   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the following two sections, examples of Indonesian sexist expressions will be presented, together with the discussion of textbook-example from English as a comparison (citation to the author will be given in the main text after the example). In §3.1, we show several forms of sexual metaphors and their impact on women's views. Then, §3.2 presents a discussion on sexist language as reflected in the sentence's syntactic structure related to transitivity.

3.1 METAPHORICAL SEXIST EXPRESSIONS

In the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT; §2.5), metaphor is defined as a process of understanding a conceptual domain (the so-called the target-domain or tenor) using knowledge from another conceptual domain (namely the source domain or vehicle) (Kövecses, 2010). The examples include thinking and talking about (i) LIFE via the concept of TRAVEL/JOURNEY (*Hidupnya sedang melalui **jalan terjal** 'his life is going through a steep road'*), (ii) ARGUMENTATION via the concept of WAR/FIGHT (Bersilat lidah 'crossed tongues'), or (iii) LOVE via the concept of INSANITY (*Dia **tergila-gila pada** dirimu '(s)he is crazy about you'*), amongst others.

According to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 215), vocabularies and concepts related to sex and gender are widely used as the metaphorical source domain to talk about another concept (see the linguistic examples for Indonesian below). "Sexual metaphor" highlights a marked tendency to use the conception of male-female differences in structuring speech and thought from a myriad of other differences (Haste, 1994 as cited in Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 215). Particularly, sexual metaphor plays a central role in maintaining a sex-gender system that supports male dominance (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 215). One example is the feminists' notion that English is a sexist language discriminating against women through metaphors as reflected in such words as bitch, ho (slang for whore), pimp, and faggot (Holmes, 2001, p. 305). The animal is another domain used in metaphor to characterise women as inferior to men. For example, the use of bitch for women indicates its negative traits compared to the use of studs and wolves for men (Holmes, 2001, p. 306).

Sex and gender can also be used as the target domain or tenor of a metaphor, for example, using elements from the sports field as a source domain for understanding (hetero)sexual relations, as in the following English expression: "I didn't get to first base with him", which projects images of men actively defeating women as in a baseball game (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 220). Much of what is termed 'sexist language' is felt to be offensive/derogatory because problematic attitudes lie behind metaphorical identifications with women and their sexes, for example, commodities, small animals, and with fruit or other desserts (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 220). In the remainder of this section, we present examples of Indonesian metaphorical sexist expressions, starting with (4-1).

(3-1)   *Hai   **manis**, apa   kabar-mu   di   sana*?

hi	sweet	what	news-your	at	there

'Hi sweetie, how is it going with you over there?'

Expression *hai manis* 'hi sweet(ie)' in (3-1) is often used to greet women. The word *manis* 'sweet' is used metaphorically by using the image of food, especially saccharine. Metaphorical expression based on the saccharine concept is also common in English, for example, *sweetie*, *honey*, and *sugar* (Holmes, 2001, p. 306). The use of terms such as 'sweet', which initially were neutral or loving, could eventually acquire a negative connotation when the term was used to address women with a focus on women as sexual objects (Holmes, 2001, p. 306). In Indonesian, it can be said that there are almost no food-related terms that seem appropriate to refer to men. Example (4-2) shows gender bias reflected in language based on animal metaphor.

(3-2) *keluar   dari   sini   kamu   wanita   **jalang** (...)*
       go.out   from   here   you   woman   wild/untreated.animal
       'get out of here, you bitch (lit. wild/untreated/non-domesticated animal)

The animal-related adjective *jalang* 'undomesticated; wild' in (3-2) often modifies *wanita* 'woman', illustrating how women are described as being like animals. The use of animal comparisons shows a less positive picture of women than men (Holmes, 2001, p. 305). Here is another example of an animal-based sexist metaphorical idiom.

(3-3) *mahasiswi (...)*   *menjadikan*   **ayam**   *kampus   sebagai   profesi*
       female.univ.student   make   chicken   campus   as   profession
       untuk   memenuhi   kebutuhan   hidup
       for   fulfilling need   life
       'a female university student (...) chose *prostitute* (lit. *campus chicken*) as a profession to fulfil life necessities'

Example (3-3) shows that woman working as a prostitute is metaphorically referred to as *ayam* 'chicken' the whole idiom *ayam kampus* meaning 'campus prostitute; that is a female student who also works as a prostitute'. These animal-based expressions for women also exist in English, for example, *chick*, *bitch*, *cougar*, and *kitten*. Even though neutrally *ayam* is not necessarily bad, the aspect of chicken highlighted in its use in the idiom *ayam kampus* could be its helplessness as a pet. The helplessness aspect is then mapped to the target domain of a woman, who is easy to handle and turns into a prostitute. Compare this with the use of animal metaphors for men which often have at least some positive components, such as sexual prowess (e.g., *macan* 'tiger' or *kuda* 'horse; stallion').

In the previous discussion, we show how sex/gender is metaphorically construed using another domain, such as animal. Next, as stated by Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 216), sex/gender can in turn be used as a metaphorical source domain for discussing various topics (see (3-4) and (3-5)). Women and their activities are often the primary source of the metaphors by which men construct a distinct sense of self, their relationship to the world, and their relationships with one another (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 217).

(3-4) *kiper   M. Ridho (...)   ingin   gawang-nya   tetap   **perawan***
       goalkeeper   NAME   want   goalpost-his   stay   virgin
       'the goalkeeper, M. Ridho, (...) wants to keep his goalpost virgin'
(3-5) *sebuah   skema   permainan   **cantik   melahirkan**   gol   keempat***
       a   scheme   play; game   pretty   give.birth.to   goal fourth
       'a beautiful game plan resulted in (lit. give birth to) the fourth goal'

Examples (3-4) and (3-5) are commonly uttered (mostly by men) in sports, especially football (a sport identical to men). Again, these expressions contain words sexist towards women (i.e., *perawan* 'virgin', *cantik* 'pretty; beautiful', *melahirkan* 'give birth to') because these words refer to women's conditions, characteristics, and activities. Intuitively, we never find the corresponding expressions that use words sexist towards men in that context. For example, replacing *perawan* '(female) virgin' with *perjaka* '(male) virgin' in (3-4) into *gawangnya tetap **perjaka*** 'the goal is still (male) *virgin'* sounds infelicitous. The same is true when we replace *cantik* 'pretty; beautiful' with *tampan/ganteng* 'handsome' in (3-5); it sounds unnatural and infelicitous.

Although the use of sexist words in (3-4) and (3-5) does not seem to evoke negative and offensive attitudes towards women, they clearly demonstrate how the realm of women is more conventionally used in the domain identical to men (i.e., football sport). This then could indicate the imbalance in the position of women and men. The construal that a football goalpost can be "virgin" as in (3-4) entails that

the female sexual organ could be conceptualised as if it is a metaphorical goal that must be conquered as in a game of football. This is shown in (3-6) below. A similar image, namely *sangkar* 'cage', is also attested (3-7).

(3-6)   *David   mulai   **membobol**   **gawang** gadis   itu*
        NAME   start   break.into   goalpost girl   that
        dengan   sangat   hati-hati   ia   tahu   jika   dia   masih   virgin
        with   very   be.careful   he   know   if   she   still   virgin
        'David starts penetrating (lit. broke into the goalpost/vagina of) that girl with care, knowing that she is still a virgin'

(3-7)   *Kelamin   yang   **menghinggapi**   **sangkar** perempuan   itu.*
        sex.organ   which   overtake   cage   woman   that
        '(it knows precisely how many) sex organs (i.e., penis) which have overtaken the cage of that woman.'

Despite the similarity in form between a goalpost and a cage, (3-6) and (3-7) suggest that women are construed as objects that must be conquered, in this case for example, sexually, as well as other things (e.g., power, domination, etc.). This contrasts with the image used to construe the male sexual organ. In Indonesian, the penis can be referred to as *senjata* 'weapon' (3-8) or even *rudal* 'missile' (3-9).

(3-8)   *Memperbesar   ukuran   **senjata** pria*
        enlarge   size   weapon   male
        'Enlarging the size of the penis (lit. male weapon)'

(3-9)   *ia   menendang   **rudal**   pria   itu*
        (s)he   kick   missile   male   that
        membuat   sang   pria   kesakitan
        make   the   male   get.hurt
        '(s)he kicked the man's penis (lit. the man's missile) making him hurt'

The implication of these metaphors is the view that men are portrayed as strong and powerful compared to women with respect to their same biological aspect (i.e., the construal of their sexual organ). The different choice of metaphor for women and men in examples (3-6) to (3-9) could be viewed as sexism because it tends to highlight the weak side of women. It raises gender bias in society regarding the views on women. The following examples illustrate other metaphorical expressions evoking negative attitudes towards women as if they are metaphorical objects for men.

(3-10) Data from Rusmini (2000, p. 26)
        lelaki   dengan bebasnya   memilih perempuan-perempuan   baru
        man   with   freely   choose women   new
        *untuk   **mengalirkan**   **limbah**   laki-laki-nya.*
        for   stream   waste   male-his
        'men freely chose new women to stream their manly waste (i.e., sperm)'

The implication of (3-10) is that women are viewed metaphorically as the 'dumping place' to channel men's sexual desires; this desire is metonymically evoked by the word *limbah* 'waste' in *limbah laki-lakinya* 'men's manly waste/semen'. The opposite of this metaphor as applied to men is theoretically not the case.

Next, other examples in (3-11) and (3-12) show that women's body is construed as food that men want to taste and eat.

(3-11) Data from Rusmini (2000, p. 28)
        *laki-laki yang   sering   **menjilati**   tubuh   Sekar*
        men   who   often   lick   body   NAME
        dengan   mata   mereka ....
        with   eyes   their
        'men who often lick Sekar's body through their eyes....'

(3-12) *Sebelum menikah   siri,   Farhat mengakui   sempat*
        before be.married   unregistered   NAME   admit   ever.once
        *"**mencicipi**"   tubuh   molek   Regina.*
        taste   body   comely   NAME
        'Before committing the unregistered marriage, Farhat admitted that he has once tasted Regina's comely body'

Finally, (3-13) below indicates that women are considered as a commercial commodity that can be sold. Therefore, women who are prostitutes are often referred to as *barang* 'goods', which evokes a negative connotation.

(3-13) Data from Rusmini (2000, p. 211)
      *Dari orang-orang Sadri   mendengar, Kendran **menjual** seluruh tubuh-nya.*
      from people   NAME   hear   NAME sell   entire body-her
      'Sadri heard from people that Kendrad sells her entire body'

In sum, all the metaphorical expressions above indicate that women are still considered inferior, subordinate, and discriminated against men.

3.2 SEXIST EXPRESSIONS VIA TRANSITIVITY

Transitivity analysis in this paper examines "who does what to whom" (Mills, 2008, p. 69). Such an analysis captures actions performed by actors against patients. We investigate the semantic roles men and women fill in the sentence. For that reason, we identify the use of passive and active sentences with transitive verbs with men and female participants. The following extracts exemplify transitivity in sentences with sexist nuances.

(3-14) Data from Rusmini (2000, pp. 5–6)
      *Keringatlaki-laki itu   benar-benar   **membuat=nya**   mabuk*
      sweat man   that   truly   make=her   drunk
      'The sweat of that man truly made her (i.e., Sadri) drunk'

In (3-14), the change of state that Sadri experienced (namely being drunk, that is in this case losing control of his feelings) is not directly caused by the action of the man (namely Putu Sarma) (an example of indirect causation). However, semantically, an aspect of Putu Sarma (namely his sweat) had an impact on changes in Sadri's (emotional) state. The role of the woman character as the affected here further suggests the view that women tend to be emotional and helpless.

Next, the examples in (3-15) to (3-17) below show the passive forms of transitive verbs *sentuh* 'touch' *perkosa* 'rape', and *peristri* 'cause to become a wife'. In these sentences, women characters are the undergoer of the action performed by the men-actor. This further indicates the positioning of women as the end point of an action chain.

(3-15) Data from Rusmini (2000, p. 56)
      "Bagaimana   mungkin seorang penari Joged
      how   possible a   dancer name.of.a.dance
      *yang   tubuh-nya   biasa   **di-sentuh**   laki-laki*
      which   body-her   usually PASS-touch   men
      bisa   menasihati   cucu-ku   dengan baik."
      can   advise   grandchild-my with   good
      'How is it possible that a Joged dancer, whose body usually gets touched by men, can offer good advice to my grandchildren'
(3-16) Data from Rusmini (2000, pp. 36–37)
      *ibu Sekar   **di-perkosa**   oleh   lebih   dari   tiga   laki-laki.*
      mother NAME   PASS-rape   by   more   from   three   man
      'Sekar's mother was raped by more than three men.'
(3-17) Data from Rusmini (2003, p. 13)
      *Adik-nya   itu   sudah   **di-per-istri**   Bhuana, laki-laki muda*
      younger.sister-her   that   already PASS-CAUS-wife   NAME man   young
      'her younger sister has been made wife by Bhuana, a young man...'

One other active-voice example in (3-18) below further illustrates that semantically, *perempuan-perempuan* 'women' are the endpoint or undergoers of the direct action by the man-actor.

(3-18) Data from Rusmini (2000, p. 61)
      *benih   laki-laki jalang yang   telah   **meniduri***
      seed   man   wild   which   already have.sex.with (lit. sleep on)
      perempuan-perempuan   tidak   terhormat.
      women   not   honored
      '(the) seed of a wild man who has slept with (lit. have sex with) dishonourable women'

In both active and passive sentences above, the transitive verb is associated with the action performed by the male character in the novels. In other words, it is the men who initiate the action

against the object. In contrast, the women characters are cast in passive and helpless roles as they undergo the result of the men's actions or the men's features (see (3-14)).

The tendency for women to fill in the undergoer role (e.g., that of patient or experiencer of an event) can be identified in the way women present themselves in interactions. Due to stereotypical views, some women write themselves as helpless victims, and their texts will contain many "disenabling metaphors, disenabling lexis, and disenabling syntactic structures" (Burton 1982, as cited in Mills, 2008, p. 69). For example, women are more likely to say, "You'll never guess *what happened to me*" than "You'll never guess what *I've just done*". Moreover, as we have seen in the above examples in this section, certain types of verbal habits (e.g., presenting someone as the recipient of an action) are seen as stereotypical for women (Mills, 2008, p. 69).

Overall, it can be said that the syntactic selection in the data above shows a conventional gender assignment of men and women. The data we have presented in this section could indicate the language of conquest and belonging, and the female characters seem unable to resist. We want to show that women are in a position determined by men. In other words, women have a weaker position than men. Women are used as complements, models, and objects of satisfaction and sexual victims.

IV   CONCLUSION

Sexism involves behaviour that maintains inequality between men and women, so that sexist attitudes stereotype someone based on gender, rather than on individual achievement and ability assessments. Sexist language displays the inequality of men and women as if members of one sex do not appear to be fully human.

This paper discusses sexism shown through language or expressions of sexism (§2.1.4) in Indonesian. Sexism can be created using sexual metaphors which sometimes demean women (§3.1). It is found that metaphorical sexist expressions can conceptualise women as ANIMALS, COMMODITIES/GOODS, FOODS, and DUMPING SITES. It was also found that events associated with women's biological reproduction (e.g., childbirth) were used as topics of sexist expression for women which tended to eventually lead to negative stereotypes.

In the analysis of transitivity (§3.2), the author uses syntactic-semantic structures displaying participants interacting in a stereotypical portrait of gender relations between men and women. This happens because there are still stereotyped views, even from the women themselves, so that they (women) are portrayed as helpless victims (or objects of the action of men). Moreover, certain types of verbal habits (e.g., presenting someone as the recipient of an action) are seen as stereotypical for women. This is following what was proposed by Halliday (1994) (presented in §2.1.6) that the transitivity model provides a way to discover how a particular linguistic structure of a text refers to different viewpoints or mindsets towards the world or one's ideology. Future studies can conduct quantitative analysis of the distribution of the semantic role male and female characters occupy in the sentences in which they occur.

REFERENCES

Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Coates, J. (1986). *Women, men, and language: A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language*. Longman.

Coates, J. (2007). Gender. In C. Llamas, L. Mullany, & P. Stockwell (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics* (pp. 62–68). Routledge.

Deignan, A. (2005). *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

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

Eggins, S. (2004*). Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics: 2nd Edition*. A&C Black.

Fiksdal, S. (2008). Metaphorically speaking: Gender and classroom discourse. In G. Kristiansen & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Cognitive sociolinguistics: Language variation, cultural models, social systems* (pp. 419–448). Mouton de Gruyter.

Geeraerts, D. (2008). Prototypes, Stereotypes, and Semantic Norms. In G. Kristiansen & R. Dirven (Eds.), *Cognitive sociolinguistics: Language variation, cultural models, social systems* (pp. 21–44). Mouton de Gruyter.

Gibbs, R. W. (2008). Metaphor and thought: The state of the art. In R. W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought* (pp. 3–13). Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd ed.)*. Edward Arnold.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Longman.

Kövecses, Z. (2000). The concept of ANGER: Universal or culture specific? *Psychopathology, 33*, 159–170.

Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. Basic Books.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.

Meyerhoff, M. (2006). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203966709

Mills, S. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge University Press.

Ningrum, E. E., Netra, I. M., & Rajeg, G. P. W. (2021). Swearing Expressions by Main Male and Female Characters in Night School Movie. *Udayana Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (UJoSSH), 5*(2), 77–80. https://doi.org/10.24843/UJoSSH.2021.v05.i02.p04

Pauwels, A. (2003). Linguistic Sexism and Feminist Linguistic Activism. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender* (pp. 550–570). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756942.ch24

Payne, K. E. (2001). *Different But Equal: Communication Between the Sexes*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Rajeg, G. P. W. (2014). Metaphorical profiles of five Indonesian quasi-synonyms of ANGER: Multiple distinctive collexeme analysis. *Proceedings of the International Congress of the Linguistic Society of Indonesia 2014*, 165–170. https://doi.org/10.4225/03/58578ddba1fd2

Rajeg, I. M. (2013). *Metafora emosi Bahasa Indonesia* [Disertasi doktoral, Universitas Udayana]. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.7886180

Rusmini, O. (2000). *Tarian Bumi*. Tera.

Rusmini, O. (2003). *Kenanga*. Grasindo.

Wareing, S. (2004). Language and gender. In L. Thomas, S. Wareing, I. Singh, J. S. Peccei, J. Thornborrow, & J. Jones (Eds.), *Language, society and power: An introduction* (2nd ed, pp. 75–92). Routledge.

Weatherall, A. (2002). Gender, *Language and Discourse*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203988817.