



INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research

Volume 4 Nomor 6 Tahun 2024 Page 6782-6797

E-ISSN 2807-4238 and P-ISSN 2807-4246

Website: <https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative>

## Language And Gender Dynamics: How Speech Shapes Social Roles In Men's Rights And Feminism

Vinlie Antonetta<sup>1✉</sup>, Shoofy Jasmine<sup>2</sup>, Shakira Dwi Azura Arianto<sup>3</sup>, Rahmadsyah Rangkuti<sup>4</sup>

Universitas Sumatera Utara

Email: : [Shoofyjasmine.precious@gmail.com](mailto:Shoofyjasmine.precious@gmail.com)<sup>1✉</sup>

### Abstrak

Jurnal ini meneliti dinamika bahasa yang berkaitan dengan peran gender dalam konteks gerakan Hak Pria dan Feminisme, menggunakan data yang diambil dari video YouTube "Hak Pria vs Feminisme: Apakah *Toxic* Maskulinitas Itu Nyata? | Jalan Tengah." Dengan menganalisis interaksi dan wacana antara partisipan pria dan wanita, kami mengeksplorasi bagaimana pola bicara mencerminkan dan memperkuat ekspektasi gender, ekspresi emosi, dan hierarki sosial. Kami menggunakan kerangka sociolinguistik pragmatis untuk mempelajari bagaimana percakapan partisipan tentang maskulinitas beracun, represi emosional, dan definisi kekuatan memberikan wawasan tentang pembentukan peran sosial dalam dua perspektif ideologis ini.

Kata Kunci: *E-Voting, Demokrasi, Regulasi Hukum, dan Keamanan Data*

### Abstract

This journal examines the dynamics of language as it relates to gender roles in the context of the Men's Rights and Feminism movements, using data drawn from the YouTube video "Men's Rights vs Feminism: Is Toxic Masculinity Real? | Middle Ground." By analyzing the interaction and discourse between male and female participants, we explore how speech patterns reflect and reinforce gendered expectations, emotional expression, and social hierarchies. We employ a pragmatic sociolinguistic framework to study how the participants' conversations about toxic masculinity, emotional repression, and the definition of strength provide insights into the shaping of social roles within these two ideological perspectives.

Keyword: *E-Voting, Democracy, Legal Regulation, Data Security*

## INTRODUCTION

The discussion about Language and Gender has been a topic of conversation in the scientific and academic realm for a long time, Especially from the perspective of Gender Dynamics, there are many issues and debates within the social layers and society in every era. Language can reflect social dynamics, shape societal structures, and depict the thought patterns formed within society, including perspectives on gender roles and equality in social life. Other research has indicated that language expresses attitudes among speech community members and defines their social roles (Sekhukhune, P. D. 2012). The relationship between language and gender has long been a central focus of sociolinguistics, particularly in exploring how language both reflects and reinforces societal roles and norms. Language does not merely serve as a tool for communication; it is deeply entwined with the social structures that shape our understanding of identity, including gender. In this context, the ways in which individuals express themselves, the language choices they make, and the power dynamics embedded in discourse can reveal much about societal expectations and the construction of gendered identities. One compelling example of this is found in the debate between two distinct groups—the Men’s Rights Activists (MRAs) and Feminists—in the Middle Ground video, which engages with the complex issues of toxic masculinity, emotional repression, and social expectations surrounding both men and women. By analyzing the language used by the participants, we can gain insights into how these groups navigate and articulate their understandings of gender roles and emotional expression.

Through a sociolinguistic lens, this analysis seeks to uncover how participants’ language choices are not only reflections of their own beliefs and identities but also how these choices function to communicate, challenge, or reinforce broader societal norms related to masculinity and femininity. The debate, which centers around issues like toxic masculinity and emotional suppression, provides rich data for exploring how language constructs and enforces specific gendered roles. In particular, the ways in which the participants talk about emotional expression—whether it be through dismissals, validations, or confrontations—offer insight into how emotional vulnerability is framed differently for men and women. The language of both MRAs and Feminists in this exchange helps to illuminate the tensions surrounding societal expectations of gendered behavior, particularly regarding emotional openness and strength. This emphasizes the significance of exploring how individuals (themselves) shape their gender roles and the consequences of self-imposed restrictions on women's career progression for theoretical development and the potential for change ( Carrasco-Santos.M.J , et al. 2024).

To deepen our understanding of these dynamics, this analysis employs a pragmatic methodology, which focuses on the underlying meanings and speech acts embedded in the participants' discourse. Pragmatics allows us to examine not only what is said but also how it is said, and to consider the context in which language operates. This approach is particularly useful for analyzing power relations, as language often reflects and perpetuates hierarchies and social structures. By closely examining the language used by the participants in the video, we can uncover the subtle ways in which power, dominance, and resistance are negotiated through discourse. This is particularly relevant in the context of the debate on toxic masculinity, where participants may either challenge or reinforce normative expectations of what it means to be "masculine" or "feminine."

Finally, the transcript of the conversation serves as a valuable data set for examining how language constructs social roles and reflects underlying ideologies about gender. As the participants navigate the complexities of masculinity and feminism, their language choices reveal how they position themselves within these ideological frameworks. For example, the use of terms like "toxic masculinity," "victimhood," and "equality" not only conveys specific ideological stances but also contributes to the broader discourse surrounding gender relations. In this way, language becomes a tool for both reflecting and shaping societal beliefs about gender, and by analyzing the linguistic features of the debate, we can better understand the ways in which gendered identities are negotiated and reinforced through everyday speech. Courtenay, W. (2000). "Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health." *Social Science & Medicine*, 50(10), 1385-1401.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study is grounded in pragmatics, a field of sociolinguistics that explores how language is used in context, focusing on meaning, speakers' intentions, and how speech functions socially. Pragmatics helps understand how language performs actions, asserts power, conveys ideologies, and navigates social relationships. In analyzing the Middle Ground debate between Men's Rights Activists (MRAs) and Feminists, the study applies key concepts from pragmatics to examine how participants communicate beliefs about gender, power, and emotional expression.

A central concept is Speech Acts Theory, developed by J.L. Austin and John Searle, which argues that language is not just a medium for transmitting information but performs actions. Speakers assert, question, suggest, or command, with each act serving a social

function. In this debate, participants' speech acts actively shape the discourse on masculinity and feminism, revealing their ideological positions and roles within the debate.

Another component is the concept of Gender and Power in Discourse, drawing on scholars like Deborah Tannen and Penelope Eckert. This framework explores how gendered speech reflects and reinforces societal power structures. Tannen's work shows how men often assert dominance in speech, while women may adopt cooperative tones. Eckert emphasizes that gender is a social construct enacted through discourse. In the debate, language choices, whether assertive or confrontational, reflect gendered power dynamics.

Additionally, the study incorporates Hegemonic Masculinity, a concept by R.W. Connell, which refers to the dominant form of masculinity, often associated with male power and emotional stoicism. Participants in the debate may either challenge or uphold this ideal, with MRAs critiquing the feminist view of emotional expression as emasculating, while Feminists argue that hegemonic masculinity harms both men and women by suppressing emotional freedom. Analyzing how language reflects or resists hegemonic masculinity helps understand its role in shaping gender identities and power relations.

The Middle Ground debate video, featuring MRAs and Feminists, serves as an ideal setting to explore these themes. MRAs highlight issues like mental health and family law, critiquing societal norms, while Feminists advocate for gender equality and critique structures of inequality, including toxic masculinity. This debate reflects broader societal discussions on gender, power, and emotional expression, offering insights into how language negotiates these complex issues.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In analyzing the YouTube video "Men's Rights vs Feminism: Is Toxic Masculinity Real? | Middle Ground" from a sociolinguistic perspective, we see how language reflects and reinforces gender identities, power dynamics, and societal expectations around masculinity and feminism

Table 1. Analysis

Exchange	Speaker	Pragmatic Features	Key Words/Phrases	Explanation
1. "What does toxic masculinity mean? Is it character traits? Is it upbringing?"	Man	Implicature, Maxim of Quantity	"Is it character traits?", "Is it upbringing?"	The use of "character traits" and "upbringing" reflects the man's skepticism, implying a narrow view of toxic masculinity as individual rather than societal. The question is phrased in a way that invites more explanation.
2. "The suppression of feeling for a lot of men because throughout childhood they're told, man up."	Woman	Implicature, Face-Threatening Act (FTA)	"man up"	The phrase "man up" suggests a societal pressure that teaches men to suppress emotions, challenging the man's view by framing toxic masculinity as a societal construct, indirectly threatening the man's self-concept.
3. "Repression then is usually channeled into anger for some people because they don't always know how to express 'cause they're told not to express."	Woman	Maxim of Relation, Implicature	"anger", "told not to express"	"Anger" and "told not to express" are key phrases that connect emotional repression to negative outcomes, implying that societal expectations lead men to internalize anger when they can't express emotions.
4. "So upbringing and environment."	Man	Maxim of Quantity, Presupposition	"upbringing", "environment"	The words "upbringing" and "environment" simplify the explanation, indicating that the man sees external influences as important but does not fully

				engage with the idea of societal conditioning.
5. "But not something that's inherently a part of men."	Man	Face-Threatening Act (FTA), Maxim of Quality	"inherently a part of men"	The phrase "inherently a part of men" directly challenges the idea that toxic masculinity is a societal construct, which threatens the woman's argument and aligns with traditional views of masculinity.
6. "When you're showing your emotions, especially to like, you know, random people, random women in some cases, they will view you as weak."	Man	Implicature, Ambiguity	"random people", "random women", "weak"	The phrase "random women" introduces ambiguity about who the "audience" is for emotional expression, and "weak" frames emotional vulnerability as negative, reflecting societal judgment of men's emotions.
7. "I don't think you can be friends with a woman, so."	Man	Face-Threatening Act (FTA), Stereotyping	"you can't be friends with a woman"	The statement "you can't be friends with a woman" directly threatens the woman's social role by dismissing platonic relationships, reinforcing a gender stereotype about male-female relationships.
8. "I feel like you're conflating two different situations because you started off with saying random person or even women. So it feels like, okay,	Woman	Implicature, Maxim of Relevance	"conflating two different situations"	The phrase "conflating two different situations" challenges the man's view that emotional vulnerability should differ based on the relationship, emphasizing that all relationships should allow emotional openness.

<p>this is a woman that you don't have a bond with or any type of relationship with."</p>				
<p>9. "I don't think showing emotions is a sign of weakness. I actually think it's a sign of strength."</p>	<p>Woman</p>	<p>Implicature, Face-Threatening Act (FTA)</p>	<p>"sign of weakness", "sign of strength"</p>	<p>The contrast between "weakness" and "strength" directly challenges the man's beliefs about masculinity, reinterpreting emotional expression as a form of strength rather than vulnerability.</p>
<p>10. "Men's rights activists are only men's rights activists as a response to women expressing that they want more equality."</p>	<p>Woman</p>	<p>Implicature, Critique, Irony</p>	<p>"response to women expressing", "want more equality"</p>	<p>The phrase "response to women expressing" reflects irony, implying that men's rights activism is more about resisting women's progress than addressing real issues men face.</p>
<p>11. "It has been shown that a person's wellbeing, their lifespan is shortened when they are not able to express their emotions."</p>	<p>Woman</p>	<p>Implicature, Presupposition</p>	<p>"It has been shown that a person's wellbeing, their lifespan is shortened when they are not able to express their</p>	<p>the phrase "A person's wellbeing, their lifespan is shortened when they are not able to express their emotions." Assumes that emotional expression is necessary for well-being and lifespan, as well as implicitly assuming this applies to everyone (but</p>

			emotions." "A person's wellbeing, their lifespan is shortened when they are not able to express their emotions."	potentially more to women due to societal views).
12.when they don't have physical touch or when they don't have a partner to keep them company."	Woman	Face-Threatening Act (FTA), Maxim of Quantity, Ambiguity	"When they don't have physical touch or when they don't have a partner to keep them company."	Women are often socialized to speak more openly about their emotional needs or vulnerabilities in relationships, which may make this statement seem like it's coming from a woman who is expressing frustration or concern over the lack of emotional connection. Women often express their emotional needs in a concise and focused way, particularly when discussing the need for intimacy or relationships, in line with societal norms that position women as more relationally dependent. The simplicity of the statement may reflect a way that women often communicate their emotional desires in a straightforward, yet impactful manner.

This table contains data from conversations focused on gender issues, particularly exploring topics like "toxic masculinity," emotional suppression, and the role of upbringing in shaping identity. The Exchange column provides transcripts of dialogues, while the

Speaker column identifies whether the speaker is male or female. This distinction allows for an analysis of differing perspectives in discussions, potentially between Men's Rights advocates and Feminists.

The Pragmatic Features column highlights linguistic elements such as implicature, which reveals implied meanings, Gricean maxims (quantity, quality, relevance, and manner), and Face-Threatening Acts (FTA), which assess statements that challenge the self-image of others. These features illustrate how arguments are constructed, whether in a persuasive or confrontational manner.

The Key Words/Phrases column pinpoints central terms like "man up," "toxic masculinity," and "upbringing," which encapsulate the core issues under discussion. The Explanation column adds context and depth, interpreting the significance of these terms and their implications. For instance, phrases like "man up" highlight societal pressures on men to suppress emotions, while "toxic masculinity" is explored through traits or behaviors often linked to patriarchal norms.

This data aligns with the research focus on how Men's Rights groups and Feminists perceive and interact with each other. The analysis of these conversations provides insight into societal competition, patriarchal influences, and feminist aspirations for equality. Through examining these elements, the data supports a deeper understanding of the discourse between these groups.

### Defining Toxic Masculinity: Contesting Meanings

The debate about toxic masculinity in the Middle Ground video underscores the significant role language plays in defining and challenging societal conceptions of masculinity. The exchange between the participants highlights not only differing views on masculinity but also the broader social and cultural forces that shape how men are expected to express (or suppress) their emotions. One key aspect of this debate is how the participants conceptualize toxic masculinity and its origins—whether it is an inherent trait or a consequence of upbringing and environmental factors.

The men in the video assert that toxic masculinity is not biologically ingrained but rather the product of social conditioning, particularly the expectations imposed by society. This position is reflected in their statement:

- Men: "So upbringing and environment."

By attributing toxic masculinity to environmental factors, the men seem to emphasize the role of socialization in shaping masculine behaviors. This perspective implies that masculinity, and its associated norms (like emotional suppression), are learned behaviors

rather than innate traits. The men's argument suggests that, through the process of socialization, boys are conditioned to conform to specific masculine ideals, which include emotional stoicism, toughness, and the avoidance of vulnerability.

In response, the women in the debate agree with this perspective to some extent but add a critical layer to the conversation by emphasizing the harmful impact of these societal norms. The women's response—

- Women: "That's part of it, yes."

—acknowledges the role of upbringing and environment but also implies that these cultural and social forces contribute to negative outcomes, particularly emotional repression. Here, the women subtly critique the male perspective by framing emotional repression not as a neutral or inevitable part of masculinity but as a harmful practice that suppresses emotional well-being. The women argue that it is not just the presence of societal expectations but their consequences—such as stifled emotional expression—that contribute to the negative effects of toxic masculinity. This critique is implicit in the women's response, suggesting that social norms, rather than being neutral, play a culpable role in shaping men's emotional lives in damaging ways.

The disagreement between the men and women regarding the origins and impact of toxic masculinity reflects a deeper tension in the discourse around masculinity. The men view emotional expression as a personal choice or a response to societal pressures, while the women position it as an outcome of deeply ingrained societal expectations that need to be questioned and dismantled. This contrast highlights the gendered expectations at play—men are taught to suppress vulnerability, and women are often encouraged to be more emotionally expressive. However, these gendered norms are not neutral or individualistic; they are part of a larger cultural system that reinforces distinct and often unequal roles for men and women in society.

Another significant moment in the debate is when the men argue that emotional expression—especially in front of women or strangers—can be viewed as a sign of weakness. They say:

- Men: "I think that, you know, when you're showing your emotions, especially to like, you know, random people, random women in some cases, they will view you as weak."

Here, the men perform a speech act of assertion, stating that the act of showing emotions is perceived as a weakness in society, particularly when it is directed toward women. This assertion does more than just express a personal opinion; it reinforces a cultural norm about what constitutes acceptable masculinity. By framing emotional expression as a vulnerability that is "viewed" as weak, the men are engaging in a form of social negotiation

that defends the traditional ideals of masculinity. The language used in this assertion reflects the dominance of hegemonic masculinity—a culturally dominant form of masculinity that valorizes emotional control, toughness, and stoicism. According to this ideal, men are expected to be resilient, independent, and emotionally reserved, especially in public or social situations. Emotional expression is, in this context, seen as deviating from these expectations and thus as a threat to one's perceived masculinity.

The idea that showing emotions in front of women, especially "random" or unfamiliar women, makes a man appear weak speaks to a gendered power dynamic in the way emotions are framed. In this assertion, emotional vulnerability is not only a personal weakness but also a social liability—particularly in heterosexual interactions where traditional gender roles dictate that men are supposed to be emotionally strong and women are often expected to be more emotionally receptive. This reflects a key element of hegemonic masculinity, where emotional expression is relegated to the "feminine" sphere, thus reinforcing the gender binary and the unequal power relations between men and women. By positioning emotional vulnerability as a form of weakness, the men in the debate are indirectly affirming the cultural hierarchy that places men in dominant, stoic roles and women in subordinate, emotional ones.

In summary, the language choices made by the participants in the debate highlight the deeply embedded societal views surrounding masculinity and emotional expression. The men's defense of emotional stoicism and their portrayal of emotional vulnerability as weakness reflect the dominance of hegemonic masculinity, while the women's critique of these norms points to the harm that emotional repression can cause. By analyzing these language choices through the lens of speech acts theory and gender and power in discourse, we gain insight into how language can both reflect and perpetuate power structures that shape men's and women's emotional lives. The debate not only illustrates the tension between different definitions of toxic masculinity but also reveals how gendered expectations are negotiated, defended, and challenged through everyday speech.

### Emotional Repression and Health Consequences

The women's argument that emotional repression among men leads to shorter lifespans is grounded in both empirical research and a critique of traditional gender roles. Their assertion:

- Women: "Men do live shorter lives and that's because of a repression of emotions... Repression of emotions... has been shown that a person's wellbeing, their lifespan is shortened when they are not able to express their emotions," highlights a well-documented

link between emotional suppression and negative health outcomes. Studies in psychology and health have indeed demonstrated that when individuals, particularly men, are socialized to suppress their emotions, they experience higher rates of stress, depression, and cardiovascular disease. These health risks stem from the physiological and psychological toll of bottling up emotions rather than processing and expressing them in healthy ways.

The women's stance also reflects a feminist critique of patriarchy, which they argue is harmful not only to women but also to men. Traditional masculine norms often equate emotional stoicism with strength and resilience, pressuring men to conform to rigid expectations that discourage vulnerability. By challenging these norms, the women are advocating for a broader understanding of masculinity—one that allows men to embrace their emotional experiences without fear of judgment or perceived weakness. Their point aligns with feminist perspectives that recognize how patriarchal structures, which dictate narrow roles for both women and men, undermine the well-being of all individuals.

In contrast, the men in the exchange dismiss this critique, framing emotional expression as a form of weakness rather than a healthy emotional practice. This dismissal often stems from a deep-rooted cultural belief that vulnerability or emotional openness undermines traditional masculine traits such as strength and independence. Such attitudes are reflective of an ideological divide: the women argue for a more expansive, inclusive understanding of masculinity, while the men cling to the old norms that valorize emotional repression. Their responses highlight how language can be a tool for reinforcing or challenging societal expectations.

This divergence in perspectives is significant because it demonstrates how language can reinforce dominant ideologies. The women's language uses empirical data to make a clear, reasoned case for emotional expression as integral to health, while the men's dismissive responses reflect a reluctance to challenge ingrained social norms. Both groups are not only negotiating personal experiences but also engaging in a broader cultural debate about the roles men and women are expected to play. This exchange underscores the power of discourse in shaping the ways we understand and enact gender, health, and well-being.

### The Role of Gendered Friendships

An interesting aspect of the debate emerges when the men discuss their emotional expressions in the context of relationships, specifically friendships with other men:

- Men: "I think that's fine. You know, he's your best friend, and you're crying about something really personal. I think that's fine."

In contrast, the men argue that crying in front of women or strangers is inappropriate:

- Men: "I don't think it's fine to act that way with a woman."

This linguistic distinction between acceptable emotional expression with close male friends and the inappropriateness of expressing vulnerability in front of women underscores the gendered nature of emotional expectations. Men are socially conditioned to display stoic masculinity in public or in the presence of women, while emotional vulnerability is reserved for intimate male friendships.

The distinction in how emotional expression is navigated between men and women in this dialogue speaks to broader societal expectations around masculinity and vulnerability. Men in this conversation are acknowledging that it's acceptable to show emotional vulnerability, like crying, with close male friends. This acceptance, however, is predicated on the idea that these friendships are intimate enough to allow for emotional depth, providing a safe space where men can express themselves without fear of judgment. In these male-to-male relationships, vulnerability is seen as a sign of closeness and trust, reinforcing the idea that emotions can be shared freely within a specific, non-romantic context.

However, the shift in behavior when it comes to expressing vulnerability in front of women highlights the traditional gender norms that dictate how men and women are supposed to behave emotionally. The sentiment that crying in front of a woman is inappropriate reflects the cultural expectation that men should maintain a stoic, composed demeanor in the presence of women. This is linked to the broader societal construct of stoic masculinity, where emotional restraint, particularly in public or in interactions with women, is seen as a sign of strength and control. Women, conversely, are often expected to be more emotionally expressive, which reinforces the gendered divide: men are supposed to be stable and emotionally resilient, while women are expected to be more empathetic and emotionally open.

The implication of these gendered expectations is that men are socialized to suppress their vulnerability in public or in mixed-gender spaces. In contrast, their vulnerability within same-gender, close male friendships is viewed as acceptable, but often with the understanding that it should be kept private or confined to specific contexts. This binary creates an emotional paradox, where men are conditioned to hide their feelings in front of women or strangers, but are allowed, perhaps even encouraged, to let their guard down with male friends. It underscores the complexity of modern masculinity, which is simultaneously expected to be emotionally distant and yet capable of deep emotional connection — but only within certain prescribed boundaries.

These social norms have far-reaching implications for how men navigate their emotional lives, as they can create a sense of emotional isolation when men feel they cannot express their feelings in a broader context. This dissonance may contribute to higher rates of mental health issues among men, as the inability to express vulnerability in a wide variety of social situations can lead to feelings of alienation and repression. The idea that emotional vulnerability is "reserved" for male friendships can also undermine the potential for more open emotional exchanges between men and women, reinforcing outdated ideas about gender roles and emotional expression.

#### Power Dynamics in the Interaction

The conversation culminates in a direct critique of Men's Rights Activists by one of the women:

- Women: "I think that men's rights activists are only men's rights activists as a response to women expressing that they want more equality."

The statement from the woman reflects a critical perspective on the Men's Rights Activist (MRA) movement, suggesting that their advocacy is less about addressing genuine grievances men face, and more about resisting or countering the progress of feminist movements. This view frames MRAs not as an independent, altruistic force working to improve the lives of men, but rather as a reactionary group motivated by a perceived threat to traditional gender hierarchies.

The core of this critique lies in the accusation that MRAs are primarily responding to the demands of women for more equality. In this interpretation, the rise of the MRA movement is seen as a backlash to feminist calls for social, political, and economic equality between the sexes. The implication is that, rather than focusing on the real issues that men face (such as mental health, fatherhood rights, or societal expectations of masculinity), the MRA movement is driven by a desire to "maintain the status quo" of male dominance in society. This could manifest in resistance to legal and social reforms that challenge patriarchal norms, even if those reforms are intended to improve equality for both men and women.

From this standpoint, the MRA movement may be perceived not as a vehicle for improving men's lives, but as an ideological force that seeks to preserve or restore male privilege. This idea ties into a broader feminist critique that some factions of the MRA focus disproportionately on perceived losses or challenges to traditional male power—like the increasing visibility of feminist activism, the rise of female empowerment, or legal changes seen as benefiting women—rather than acknowledging and addressing systemic issues that

disproportionately affect men (such as higher rates of suicide, homelessness, or workplace deaths).

In essence, the woman's statement highlights a tension in how gender equality movements are perceived and framed: while feminists argue for systemic change aimed at true equality, some critics of MRAs suggest that the movement is not truly concerned with equality but with protecting male dominance from what they perceive as encroachment by women's rights initiatives. The critique suggests that the MRA's focus is on "winning" against feminism, rather than collaborating for mutual improvements across gender lines.

## CONCLUSIONS

The discourse between Men's Rights and Feminist perspectives on toxic masculinity reveals contrasting views on gender roles and the use of language to assert differing ideologies. Men's Rights language reinforces a traditional, rigid conception of masculinity, centered on emotional stoicism, physical strength, and the suppression of vulnerability. This ideal masculinity encourages men to adhere to toughness and self-reliance while discouraging emotional expression, often perpetuating societal pressures that hinder emotional well-being. In contrast, Feminists critique these traditional norms, advocating for a more inclusive and emotionally expressive masculinity. They argue that rigid gender roles harm both men and women, emphasizing the importance of emotional well-being, vulnerability, and the freedom for men to express a broader range of emotions beyond anger and detachment. Feminists seek to deconstruct hegemonic masculinity, viewing it as a societal construct that enforces restrictive norms and limits men's emotional engagement.

From a pragmatic perspective, the language used by both movements reveals how speech acts—whether in arguments, claims, or critiques—serve to negotiate power, reinforce ideologies, and perpetuate gendered norms. Men's Rights language defends the status quo, framing masculinity as an inherent and unchanging trait, while Feminist language challenges these entrenched norms, advocating for change and emotional freedom. Ultimately, the dialogue between the two movements illustrates the profound role language plays in shaping and reflecting societal roles. Through contrasting discourses, both sides highlight how gendered norms are enacted and perpetuated not only through societal structures but also through everyday language, influencing the way masculinity is expressed and understood.

## REFERENCES

- Anggraini, L., Maisarah, I., Syafryadin, & Arsyad, S. (2022). The study of gender on language use through conversation of XI Social 1 students at SMAN 9 Musi Rawas. *8*(2).
- Carrasco-Santos, M. J., Seyfi, S., Hosseini, S., Hall, C. M., Mohajer, B., Almeida-García, F., Cortes Macías, R. (2024). Breaking boundaries: Exploring gendered challenges and advancing equality for Iranian women careers in tourism. *103*, 104913.
- Dinata, A. E., Sukarini, N. W., & Maharani, S. A. I. (2023). Men's and women's language features used in the conversation of the talk show "The Ellen Show." *ULIL ALBAB: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, Vol.2, No.6
- Grieve, R., March, E., & Van Doorn, G. (2019). Masculinity might be more toxic than we think: The influence of gender roles on trait emotional manipulation. *138*, 157–162.
- Kristy, N. M. I. M. (2022). Differences in language conversation use by gender. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Sains dan Humaniora*, *6*(2), 248-253.
- Mankowski, E. S., & Smith, R. M. (2016). *Men's Mental Health and Masculinities*. *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*, *66–74*.doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-397045-9.00182-8
- Sekhukhune, P. D. (1989). Towards a sociolinguistic study of North Sotho language and sex. *9*(3), 112–120.
- Simon, E. (2021). The different language use between male and female university students.
- Sitinjak, V. N., Aprilia S. Meliala, G. C., Sihombing, R. W., & Simamora, M. Y. (2024). Women's communication strategies in the *Barbie* film. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, *7*(2).
- Zahra, A. N., & Prihartini, S. (2023). Analysis of male and female language features of *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire* novel. *Humanitatis: Journal of Language and Literature*, *10*(1).
- Zakharin, M., & Bates, T. C. (2024). Psychological pillars of support for free speech: Tolerance for offensive, disagreeing, socially divisive, and heterodox speech. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *219*, 112502.
- Zansabil, K. (2023). Men and women language features and styles used in "The End of the F\*\*\*ing World," a Netflix TV series. *Buana Pendidikan: Jurnal Fakultas Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan Unipa Surabaya*, *19*(1).