A Sociolinguistic Study of Dominance in Male/Female Language in the Professions of Doctors and Farmers in Anbar Society

دراسة لغوية اجتماعية للهيمنة في لغة الذكور والإناث في مهن الأطباء والفلاحين في مجتمع الأنبار

MA Student/ Omar Abid Abood	**Prof. Dr. Muslih Shwaysh Ahmed**
English Department	English Department
College of Education for Humanities	College of Education for Humanities
University of Anbar	University of Anbar
E-mail:oa74587@uoanbar.edu.iq	E-mail: ed.muslih.shweesh@uoanbar.edu.iq
الباحث/ عمر عبد عبود	**الاستاذ الدكتور. مصلح شويش احمد**
قسم اللغة الانجليزية	قسم اللغة الانجليزية
كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية	كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية
جامعة الانبار	جامعة الانبار

Abstract

The present research is an attempt to investigate dominance in male/female language in the professions of doctors and farmers in Anbar society. Male/female language, as described by many sociolinguists, refers to the superiority of males and inferiority of females. The present research aims at knowing whether there is dominance in the professions of male (doctors and farmers) language over female (doctors and farmers) language in Anbar society, and showing the role of education in increasing or decreasing dominance in male/female language. It is hypothesized that there is dominance in the language of male doctors and male farmers as compared with female doctors and female farmers. It is also hypothesized that education plays a great role in maximizing or minimizing dominance in male and female language. The data selected for this study include mixed-methods of quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis. As for quantitative analysis, it is based on two questionnaires: one for males and the other for females. The sample of the present study consists of 40 participants; 20 males and 20 females. Concerning qualitative analysis, it is based on a retrospective interview of 8 questions to be answered by : 2 males and 2 females. The model of analysis is based on Lakoff (1975) and Cameron (1998 and 2008). The findings arrived at validate the two hypotheses given. At the end of this research, the most important conclusions are mentioned.

Key words: language and gender, dominance, male and female language

1 Introduction

The study of language and gender in sociolinguistics is often said to have begun with Robin Lakoff, in her book, "Language and Woman's Place" in 1975. Lakoff

considers language and gender as an interdisciplinary field of study which differentiates between male and female language. Keating (1998:23) mentions that American English is considered as the base for language and gender which shows the differences between males' and females' speech. Males are considered as the baseline and the dominant, whereas females are used as an inferior version of male language. Similarly, Trudgill (1973:182-183) conveys that females try to use low-status, i.e. prestigious and inferior language which is compared with males who tend to be superior and powerful.

Two influential views on the relationship between language and gender, the essentialistic view and the constructionistic view, have been theoretical in accordance with Crawford (1995:12). These two views have also been debated by Sadiqi (2003:2-3). With regard to the essentialistic view, sex is based on organic sex and is considered essentially dichotomous. The unmarked, basic, major, superior and bigger categories are often regarded in most of human cultures, but the marked, secondary, lesser, and minor versions are the women on the other hand. All about gender was seen as built from the constructionist point of view. This view is based on the premise that human and social diversity differs considerably, for example race, age and gender. (ibid:3)

This research concentrates on the differences in the speech of men and women based on the theory of dominance. This study investigates gender; male/ female distinctions as a reflection of the human identity from a sociolinguistic perspective. Every culture and society participate two things in general: firstly, the presence of male/female and secondly, the need to communicate between the two genders. (ibid:4)

Different theories on the relationship between language and gender have been appeared depending on two views: the essentialist view and the constructionist view by many linguists such as Lakoff (1975), Tannen (1990), Cameron (1998), Sadiqi (2003), and Bassiouny (2009). These theories are as follows:

1) the Deficit theory,
2) the Dominance theory,
3) the Difference theory,
4) the Reformist theory,
5) the Radical theory,
6) the Community of Practice theory,
7) the Semiologist theory and
8) the Postmodernist theory.

The present research aims at knowing whether there is dominance in male language over females in Iraqi society. It also aims at highlighting the difference in dominance in male/female language in the light of professions of people in Anbar society and showing the role of education in increasing or decreasing dominance in male/female language. The current study hypothesizes that there is dominance in the language of males over females. It is also hypothesized that education and profession contribute in increasing/decreasing dominance in male/female language.

2 Dominance theory

This research tackles one theory of language and gender, namely dominance theory. Lakoff (1975:10) states that the dominance theory of gender differences has focused on the distribution of power in society, and suggested that women's speech reflects their subordinate position. This has two distinct, parallel branches: language as social interaction, which considers how gender inequalities were constructed through routine interactions between men and women, and language as a system focusing on sexism within the language.

Sadiqi (2003:6) points out that linguistic differences between males and females led to unfair power relations between the two genders. The dominance of male was based on the political and cultural dominance in society. The concept of power was an essential characteristic in language and gender relationship.

Similarly, Coates (2007:65) shows that this approach sees females as an oppressed group and considers differences between males/females' speech in terms of males' dominance and females' subordination.

According to Bassiouney (2009:131) a linguistic difference between male and female is established on power inequality between the two sexes. This theory concentrates on male dominance, so according to this theory, society's norms are being formed by males. A very early explanation of the dominance approach can be traced back to Jane Austen's Anne novel 'Persuasion' at the end of 18th century. "Men have had every advantage of us in telling their own story. Education has been theirs in so much higher a degree; the pen has been in their hands".

Mesthrie et. al. (2009:227) state that the work of Zimmerman and West focused on dominance position of males'/females' language. They relate local interactional behaviour to the greater degree of power more generally connected with males. Other researchers, such as Fishman (1983) cited in Mesthrie et. al. (2009) and Maltz and Barker (1982:197) explain that in conversational analysis between the couples, females tend to use more conversational support than males and they also used minimal responses such as 'mhm, yeah, right' to get involvement and to indicate attention. On the other hand, minimal responses that are used by males indicated that they are listening.

In their impressive study of dominance, Freeman and McElhinny (1996: 231-232) retain a tradition, negative evaluation of women's speech but ascribe females' linguistic deficiencies to their political and cultural subordination to males. That is, males' conversational dominance shows their political and cultural domination of females. Likewise, Spender (1980) cited in Sunderland (2006,14,18) focuses on how in mixed-conversation, males dominate the talk, interrupt their conversational partners and are more successful at having the topics. This leads to what is known as male dominance. Cameron (1998:14)

----

also declares that power is the key variable in this theory which suggests that women's language of speaking is less because of the result of their gender.

3 Previous Studies

This section presents a brief discussion regarding theoretical background and past studies related to this study. Samar and Alibakhshi (2007) state in their article "The Gender Linked Differences in the Use of Linguistic Strategies in Face-to-Face Communication", that research on language and gender interaction can be returned back to the seventies of last century and the related review of literature has shown that males and females tend to differ in face-to-face speech and in written language. The results of the study indicate that there is a significant difference between males and females in the use of linguistic strategies in male-male and female-female communications. The results also indicate that there is an interaction between gender and experience, education and power of the interlocutors in the use of linguistic strategies. Hameed (2010) in her research paper "The Impact of Gender in Determining Politeness Strategy with Reference to Iraqi Students of English" states that the present study intends to investigate the impact of gender on the linguistic politeness especially acts threatening the interlocutor's face such as requests, offers, orders …etc. It intends to answer some questions concerning the very nature of politeness as a linguistic phenomenon and as a cultural specific concept. Moreover, it explores which strategies are attributed to be females and which are attributed to be males.

Malkawi (2011), in her article entitled "Males' and Females' Language in Jordanian Society", points out that her paper analyzes the difference between the language of male and female speakers, in terms of gender in Jordan in some fields. The paper answers the following question: Do men and women talk differently, in terms of gender in Jordan by occasion of the gladness, consolation, thankful after banquet and farewell? Thus, the paper aims to find the causes of the differences between male and female in language. Al-Harahsheh (2014) aims in his article "Language and Gender Differences in Jordanian Spoken Arabic: A Sociolinguistics Perspective", to investigate the gender differences between men's and women's language in Jordanian Spoken Arabic. It studies both genders' conversational styles and phonological variations. Twelve dyadic conversations (mixed and same-sex) were conducted at Yarmouk University (Jordan), each conversation lasted for 30 minutes. The theoretical framework for this study draws on sociolinguistics, conversation analysis and politeness theory. The findings of the study indicate that Jordanian women and men have different linguistic styles that distinguish their gender in conversations, and women are more linguistically conservative than men. The present research is different from the above previous studies. This study deals with dominance of male/female language in Anbar society.

The methodology is also different, because the researchers deal with two instruments: two questionnaires and a retrospective interview.

4   Male/Female Language

Trudgill (1972) states that it is a related explanation for the tendency of females to use more standard forms. Kramer (1974) cited in Throne and Henley (1975: 24-25) describes females' speech as weaker and less effective than males' speech. They also agree with many sociolinguists in that females' speech contains patterns of weakness and uncertainty, whereas males' speech is considered as strong and superior. They point out that females' speech is more polite, correct and proper than the speech of males. They use the more standard, prestigious linguistic forms which are more prevalent in higher social classes and in formal situations they seem to oppose their position of subordination.(ibid: 17-18)

Littosseliti (2006: 13) claims that females tend to use more standard forms than males and they are more status-conscious and they are well-spokeness in adapting to the types of social behaviour most expected of them.

Trudgill (1974) and Jespersen (1990) cited in Littosseliti (2006: 27-29) claim that females' language which is described as deficit model that can be seen as an inferior version of males' language. Females' speech can be found in their use of hyperbole, incoherent sentences, inferior command of syntax, less extensive vocabulary and non-innovative approach to language. The most significant work on deficit model is written by Robin Lakoff who describes females' language as lacking, weak, trivial and hesitant when compared to males' language. Lakoff highlights issues of tag questions as a way of seeking approval through politeness. Rising intonation can be seen as diminishing females' contributions and disadvantaging their power positions in more serious contexts. Lakoff also asserts that girls are from birth taught or socialized to speak and behave like little ladies which results in more polite speech. Weatherall (2002:54-55), Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003:158-160) and Schilling (2011:221-222) assert the above mentioned information concerning the difference between male and female language.

Comparatively, Sunderland (2006:118) states that in females' conversation the structures and strategies show an interaction and the negotiations express a relationship in the form of support and closeness. Females orient themselves to the person they are talking to and they expect such orientation on return. There are a number of characteristics of speech strategies which are related to females' talk. Firstly, females tend to use personal and inclusive pronouns such as 'you and we'. Secondly, females give off and look for signs of engagement such as nods and minimal response. Thirdly, females give more extended signs of interest and attention. For example, interjecting comments or questions during a speaker's discourse. Fourthly, females acknowledge and respond to what has been said by others. Fifthly, females attempt to link their utterance to one preceding it by building on the previous utterance or talking about something equal or related to it.

Correspondingly, males' speech is different from that of females'. This means that there are salient cultural variations between subcultures in whether males consider certain ways of speech suitable for dealing with females (ibid:119)

Moreover, in mixed-conversation, males differ from females. For example, in questions, females see questions as part of conversational maintenance. On the other hand, males seem to view them as requests for information. In the matter of starting an utterance and linking it to the preceding utterance, females' rules seem to depend on explicit acknowledgement of what has been said and making a connection of it, whereas males don't have such a rule and they call for ignoring the preceding comments. In verbal aggressiveness, females seem to interpret overt aggressiveness as personally directed, negative and disruptive. Males tend to view it as one conventional organizing structure for conversational flow. (ibid)

Furthermore, Mesthrie et. al. (2009: 214-215) state that males have many expressions odd to them. The females have words and phrases which males never use or they would laugh to scorn. This happens in their conversations. It often seems as if females had another language different from the males. In some languages around the world, we can notice the difference between male/female language grammatically and sociolinguistically. That is, females tend to be polite, soft-spoken, non-assertive and empathetic.

Equally important, Holmes (2013:301-303) points out that social dialect research focuses on differences between males' and females' speech in different disciplines: phonetics, morphology, with some attention to syntax. Lakoff (1975) shifted the focus of research on gender differences to syntax, semantics and style. She suggested that females' subordinate social status in US. Society is indicated by the language women use as well as in the language used about them. She determined a number of linguistic features which she characterized as uncertainty and lack of confidence such as:

- Lexical hedges or fillers: you know, sort of well , you see
- Tag questions: she's very nice, isn't it?
- Rising intonation on declarative: it's really good
- Empty adjectives: divine, cute, charming
- Intensifiers: just, so, I like him so much .
- Hypercorrected grammar: consistent use of standard verb forms
- Superpolite forms: indirect requests, euphemisms

Aikhenvald (2016: 152-153) concludes that in any society, the manner females choose to speak may associate with their roles and position. This means, as if we've seen in many sources that females' way of talking is more deferential, whereas males' speech is a matter of fact. Females are more sensitive than males to what they are saying and adapting their speech accordingly .

There are certain reasons which show the difference between males and females. Firstly, females are vulnerable to males in a society where females are likely to be beaten if there is any threat to their reputation and females are vulnerable to females as possible sources of damage to their reputation. Secondly, females may have to

behave in a polite way to other females in a household because they, in a tradition form, move to live with their husbands. Thirdly, females spoke more cautiously than males, for example talking to unrelated males are considered as highly face-threatening.

5 Methodology

The current research deals with mixed methods by using explanatory sequential design. The explanatory sequential design occurs on two sides. This design begins with quantitative data collection and analysis which has the priority in the present study and follows by qualitative data collection and analysis. This research contains 40 participants: 20 males and 20 females. It is categorized into two groups: well-educated people and non-educated or low-educated persons. The first group which includes well-educated people is doctors, whereas the second group is non-educated or low-educated people includes farmers. The present study used mixed methods data collection and analysis, specifically Multiple-Choice Discourse Completion Test (MDCT) and a Retrospective Interview. MDCTs were used quantitatively to collect data and analysis, whereas a Retrospective Interview was used qualitatively in data collection and analysis by using 8 questions from 4 participants: 2 males and 2 females. However, these interviews were chosen randomly. The present research used a quantitative research design because this type of design deals with statistical and mathematical numbers, and tables in data collection and analysis.

6 Data Analysis and Discussion

6.1 Analysis and Discussion of Dominance according to Professions

The researchers are going to point out whether there is dominance in males' language or females' language according to the profession of doctors, and farmers. Chi-square test is used in order to analyze the collected data of the questionnaires and get differences between males and females' language and whether dominance is affected by professions. Analysis and discussion of dominance include into male/female doctors' language and male/female farmers' language.

6.1.1   Male/Female Doctors' Language

The results of analysis of male/female doctors will be shown by using chi-square test according to dominance. The results will be analyzed quantitatively, then it will be supported by retrospective interview

qualitatively to show the difference between males and females' language. The following table shows the differences in dominance between males and females' language illustrates:

Table (1) Dominance in Male/ Female Doctors' Language

Item	Male		Female		X2	P. value
	Frequency	**Percent-age**	**Frequency**	**Percent-age**		
X1	0	0%	4	2%	5.000	.025
X2	2	1%	0	0%	2.222	.136
X3	3	1.5%	1	0.5%	1.250	.264
X4	5	2.5%	0	0%	6.667	.010
X5	8	4%	1	0.5%	9.899	.002
X6	6	3%	3	1.5%	1.818	.178
X7	10	5%	5	2.5%	6.667	.010
X8	2	1%	0	0%	2.222	.136
X9	10	5%	7	3.5%	3.529	.060
X10	8	4%	9	4.5%	.392	.531
X11	3	1.5%	10	5%	10.769	.001
X12	4	2%	0	0%	5.000	.025
X13	1	0.5%	3	1.5%	1.250	.264
X14	5	2.5%	1	0.5%	3.810	.051
X15	3	1.5%	7	3.5%	3.200	.074
X16	5	2.5%	4	2%	.202	.653
X17	7	3.5%	1	0.5%	7.500	.006
X18	6	3%	0	0%	8.571	.003
X19	3	1.5%	2	1%	.267	.606
X20	2	1%	1	0.5%	.392	.531
Total	93	46.5%	59	29.5%		

p< 0.05

As presented in table (1), the chi-square analysis revealed significant differences between male and female doctors' dominance in a number of situations: (x1, x4, x5, x7, x11, x12, x14, x17, and x18). Whilst male doctors show greater dominance in their language than female doctors in situations such as: x4 (2.5% & 0%),x5 (4% & 0.5%), x7 (5% & 2.5%), x12 (2% & 0%), x14 (2.5%% & 0.5%), x17 (3.5% & 0.5%), and x18 (3% & 0%), respectively, female doctors tended to be greater in their dominance in other situations such as: x1 (0% & 2%), and x11 (1.5% & 5%). As for other situations, they revealed non-significant differences between males and females. This could refer to the

similarity between males and females in some situations: x2 (1% & 0%), x3 (1.5% & 0.5%), x6 (3% & 1.5%), x8 (1% & 0%), x9 (5% & 3.5%), x10 (4% & 4.5%), x13 (0.5% & 1.5%), x15 (1.5% & 3.5%), x16 (2.5% & 2%), x19 (1.5% & 1%), and x20 (1% & 0.5%)

The results indicate that both males and females' language have dominance according to the profession of doctors, but males are more dominant than females as illustrated in the above table. This refers to the level of education the female doctors have. The current study is in concord with Lakoff's (1975) study which describes male language as stronger, more prestigious and more desirable. She argues that women are socialized into behaving like ladies. The present findings support Hameed's (2010) study which indicates that social pressure is a factor to differentiate between males and females. These findings are also in accordance with the study of Samar and Alibakhshi (2007) which states that there is a difference between males and females in the level of education. The results also show that there is no great dominance for males over females. This could be the result of profession. Since the researchers deal with different professions, the results will be different concerning dominance and deficiency. In the above table (1), it is noticed that there is no great difference between males and females' language concerning the profession of doctors.

The responses of males are more than the responses of females in which there are more dominance. On one hand, males' situations (x2, x3, x5, x6, x8, x9, x14, x16, x17, x18, x19, x20) indicate that males' responses are more than that of females' situations, (i.e. more dominant). On the other hand, females' situations (x1, x4, x7, x10, x11, x13, and x15) show that females' responses are more dominant than that of males'. These findings are in line with the findings of Lakoff (1975) and Cameron (1998 and 2008).

These results are supported by the qualitative data from the retrospective interviews with the profession of doctor: males and females. In the following responses, a male interviewee shows his dominance in responding to the question about his opinion regarding the person who uses great dominance with his spouse, he says:

I think this person is impolite and ignorant. This person ignores the rights of the wife. The wife is a partner in the marital life and she is not a slave or a pariah person. So the husband has to be more kind and more respectful. (M/P1)

And in responding to another question about his viewpoint of educated women in society, he states:

I think it is good and nice for women to be educated and cultured because a woman is half of society and she is responsible for raising children and upbringing them with good morals and conventions. Society needs woman in education and medicine, so educated women must be very necessary in society. (M/P1)

The above responses illustrate that the interviewee was aware of using dominance and deficiency in his speech. Although the researchers deal with males, the responses refer to deficiency in most questions. This could refer to the level of education. Most of males' responses refer to deficiency.

Concerning the retrospective interview of female doctor, the interviewee was also aware of using dominance and deficiency in her speech, as shown in her response to a question about her idea concerning the phenomenon that a man dominates over a woman or a woman dominates over a man, she says:

Concerning the phenomenon of domination, it is unfavorable phenomenon for both husbands and wives because martial life is based on cooperation in everything. The husband should discuss some matters with his wife and vice versa, if she wants to do necessary things, she must get a permission from her husband. (F/P1)

See also the following answer to a question about her viewpoint of uneducated men in society, she states:

In my opinion, a man who is not educated is a big obstacle in society because he will put his family, when he is going to marry, and his children in the future in difficult situations, especially if no one supports and helps him in his life. (F/P1)

The above responses show that the female's interviewee was more dominant in her speech than in other responses. That is, she had equal responses concerning dominance and deficiency. This could refer to the level of education since the researcher deals with well-educated persons of the same profession, it is noticed that there is dominance in the responses of females.

6.1.2 Male/Female Farmers' Language

Male/female farmers' language in dominance will be shown according to the collected data of the questionnaires by using chi-square test. As for retrospective interview, a mobile recording device is used to record the speech of the interviewee: male farmer and female farmer. In the following table, male and female farmers' language will be shown according to dominance:

Table (2) Dominance in Male/ Female Farmers' Language

Item	Male		Female		X2	P. value
	Frequency	Percent-age	Frequency	Percent-age		
X1	9	4.5%	5	2.5%	3.810	.051
X2	4	2%	6	3%	.800	.371

X3	10	5%	3	1.5%	10.769	.001
X4	9	4.5%	3	1.5%	7.500	.006
X5	4	2%	1	0.5%	2.400	.121
X6	10	5%	3	1.5%	10.769	.001
X7	10	5%	3	1.5%	10.769	.001
X8	8	4%	3	1.5%	5.051	.025
X9	9	4.5%	3	1.5%	7.500	.006
X10	3	1.5%	7	3.5%	3.200	.074
X11	2	1%	8	4%	7.200	.007
X12	9	4.5%	1	0.5%	12.800	.000
X13	7	3.5%	2	1%	5.051	.025
X14	5	2.5%	3	1.5%	.833	.361
X15	10	5%	0	0%	20.000	.000
X16	7	3.5%	4	2%	1.818	.178
X17	7	3.5%	4	2%	1.818	.178
X18	8	4%	3	1.5%	5.051	.025
X19	6	3%	8	4%	.952	.329
X20	6	3%	4	2%	.800	.371
Total	143	71.5%	74	37%		

$p < 0.05$

As demonstrated in Table (2), the chi-square analysis disclosed significant differences between male and female farmers' dominance in several situations: x1, x3, x4, x6, x7, x8, x9, x11, x12, x13, x15, and x18). Male farmers tend to be greater in their dominance in a number of situations: x1 (4.5% & 2.5%), x3 (5% & 1.3%), x4 (4.5% & 1.5%), x6 (5% & 1.5%), x7 (5% & 1.5%), x8 (4% & 1.5%), x9 (4.5% & 1.5%), x12 (4.5% & 0.5%), x13 (3.5% & 1%), x15 (5% & 0%), and x18 (4% & 1.5%). Whereas female farmers tend to be greater in dominance in one situation only: x11 (1% & 4%). As regards other situations, they revealed non-significant differences between males and females such as: x2 (2% & 3%), x5 (2% & 0.5%), x10 (1.5% & 3.5%), x14 (2.5% & 1.5%), x16 (3.5% & 4%), x17 (3.5% & 2%), x19 (3% & 4%), and x20 (3% & 2%).

The results indicate that male farmers are more dominant than female farmers. This could refer to the person's culture. Most farmers are from rural areas, they have feeling of superiority to females. Because they brought up in males' society which rejected the idea of equality with females. Furthermore, this also refers to the background of the person. Since most farmers are non-educated or low-educated people, they use harsh language with females and they consider them inferior. Female farmers may have no right to speak or ask for their equity with men in most Iraqi rural areas.

Moreover, the findings support the previous study of Hameed's (2010) study which focuses on the factor of power. Males' farmers have power which they

dominate females' language and their behavior. Hameed's results also refer to level of education. Males' farmers are non-educated people. The findings are also in line with Al-Harahsheh's (2014) study which showed that males use less polite language than females and in informal way. This differentiates them from females who use more polite and formal language.

As seen in Table (2), most of the responses tend to be dominant by males. This means that males dominate females' language. Males' situations: (x1, x3, x4, x5, x6, x7, x8, x9, x12, x13, x14, x15, x16, x17, x18, x19, and x20) show that males' responses are more than females' responses. On the contrary, females tend to be dominant in other situations such as (x2, x10, x11). This means that females' responses are more than males'.

As for retrospective interviews, the interviewee M/P2 (male/participent2) is in agreement with quantitative findings which indicate that males farmers are more dominant than females. As illustrated in his answer to the question about his idea concerning someone who uses great dominance with his spouse, he states:

For me, I use an easy, simple language with my wife, but if she doesn't hear my words or does anything that annoys me, I will know how to behave with her. (M/P2)

In responding to another question about his opinion regarding a phenomenon that a man dominates over woman or a woman dominates over man, he says:

Well, this phenomenon isn't good because a woman must be polite and respect herself and doesn't raise her voice whether with her brother or her husband, concerning men's domination over women, this is possible in order for men to control his house and his family. (M/P2)

In the above responses, the qualitative results showed that male farmer was more powerful in using his language. The interviewee showed, in his responses of retrospective interview, his superiority over females and that females should be subservient to males. Concerning female's interviewee, her responses were deficient.

In Table (3), the researchers show the total frequencies and percentages between males and females' dominance according to professions.

Table (3) Frequency and Percentage of Professions according to Dominance

No.	Profession	Male		Female	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Doctor	93	46.5%	59	29.5%
2.	Farmer	143	71.5%	74	37%
Total		236	59%	133	33.25%

As illustrated in table (3), the total frequency and percentage in each profession showed that there is dominance for males over females such as: doctors (46.5% & 29.5%), and farmers (71% & 37%).

These findings are in agreement with the findings of previous studies. They validate the first hypothesis which states that there is dominance in the language of males over females. They also prove that there is strong relationship between education and the profession. This relationship affects the increase or decrease of dominance males/females language. The present results showed on one hand, that male doctors are more dominant than female doctors concerning dominance. On the other hand, female doctors are less dominant than male doctors. The current findings of farmers demonstrated significant differences between males and females in dominance. Males are more dominant than females. Conversely, females are more deficient than males.

7   Conclusions

It is concluded that there is dominance in the language of males over females. Male persons regardless their professions are more dominant than female individuals. This is considered normal in Iraqi society, namely people in Anbar province who adopt certain traditions and customs that govern the relationship between males and females. Men are raised to be privileged, practice power and authority, whereas women are taught to accept their position in society which is less important. The type of environment in which males and females grow up has a crucial role in shaping their views and influencing their attitude toward each other's socially constructed roles. It is also concluded that the level of education plays a prominent role in minimizing and/or maximizing dominance. Well-educated people who have professions such as doctors, decrease dominance, whereas male persons of low education who work as farmers, increase the aspect of dominance. Conversely, female people who have the same professions minimize the aspect of dominance. Males' speech is somehow less polite and they often tend to use aggressive words whereas females' speech is more polite and they prefer to use respectful words.

References

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2016). *How Gender Shapes the World*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

Bassiouney, R. (2009). *Arabic sociolinguistics*.: Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.

Cameron, D. (ed.). (1998). *The Feminist Critique of Language*. Routledge. London.

Coates, J. (2007). Gender. Edited by: Llamas, C., Mullany, L. and Stockwell, P. *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Crawford, M. (1995). *Talking Difference: On Gender and Language*.: Sage Publications. London.

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

Freeman, R. D. and McElhinny, B. (1996). Language and Gender. Edited by: Mckay, S. & Hornberger, N. *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. London.

Keating, E. (1998). Power Sharing*: Language, Rank, Gender, and Social Space in Pohnpei, Micronesia*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

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

Litosseliti, L. (2006). *Gender & Language: Theory and Practice*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. London.

Maltz, D. N. & Borkcr, R. A. (1982). A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication. Edited by: John J. Gumperz. *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., and Leap, W. L. (2009). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.

Sadiqi, F. (2003). *Women, Gender and Language in Morocco*. Brill Academic Publishers. Boston.

Schilling, N. (2011). Language, Gender, and Sexuality. Edited by: Mesthrie, R. *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Sunderland, J. (2006). *Language and Gender*. Routledge. London and New York.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Thorne, Barrie and Henley, N. eds. (1975). *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley. Newbury House. Massachusetts.

Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, Covert Prestige and Linguistic Change in the Urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society*, *1(2)*. 179-195.

Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, Language and Discourse*. Routledge. London.