Ruang Kata: Journal of Language and Literature Studies
Affection versus Solidarity in the Phatic Strategies of Men and Women: A BNC64 Corpus Analysis
Vol. 6 No. 01 2026
E-ISSN: 2807-1867
Universitas Ma'arif Nahdlatul Ulama Kebumen

Affection versus Solidarity in the Phatic Strategies of Men and Women: A BNC64 Corpus Analysis

Rizky Ismail J.[1*], Annisa Nurul Firdausi[1]

[1]*Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

rizkyismailj@uny.ac.id[*]

Received: 20/12/2025 *Revised: 01/01/2026* *Accepted: 04/01/2026*

Abstract

Language as a communication mode reveals certain patterns to both our conscious and unconscious minds which help to index people as a part of certain groups such as determining speech in gender study. Gender study is now commonly grouped into men's and women's speeches. Men's and Women's sociocultural behaviors are different and can be reflected through their speech. This study aims to analyze the phatic expressions used by two genders: men and women. This study applied a qualitative method with thematic analysis to discover the pattern of gender speech and used quantified data to determine the frequency. The data were collected using BNC64 and the frequency distribution was also taken from the corpus. The findings show that women speak in a more prolonged speech to keep the communication going compared to men who are still using it but in shorter ways than women. The findings show phatic speech in the form of expressing greetings, invitations, comments, and condolences. These results indicate that women are speaking in a more caring and friendly way than men. Therefore, phatic expressions can be used for further study to analyze the characteristics and stereotypes in men's and women's conversations in a certain community.

Keywords: gendered speech, phatic expressions, BNC64 corpora

Introduction

Language is essential in building human interaction. It is not only used as a medium of communication but also as a medium to convey meanings. Language and communication have an inseparable bond as it is used by the addresser and addressee (Purnami, 2018). However, language can be projected differently, especially in the field of gender study. While **Tannen (1990)** established a binary view of gendered speech, recent scholarship suggests that context frequently overrides these norms. Studies in formal and academic domains reveal that traditional gender markers often shift or disappear entirely (Alhammadi et al., 2024; Jabeen et al., 2023). It is important, thus, to study the languages spoken between genders. Not only so that we can understand the gender better, but it is also to lead in a successful communication. Under the umbrella of language, communication is aimed to be successful.

In projecting successful communications, people have to consider many things. One of the many things is within the use of phatic communication and expression which could help to

identify prolonged communication. Phatic communication was first introduced by Bronisław Malinowski in 1936 through 'Phatic Communion'. He proposed that "Phatic communion serves to establish bonds of personal union between people brought together by the mere need of companionship and does not serve any purpose of communicating ideas.". What he meant by phatic communication is that it is used not to convey information but rather to keep the conversation going (Rinawati et al., 2023). After the first highlight of phatic communion by Malinowski in 1936, Jakobson (1960) then developed the theory. He categorized six functions of languages: emotive, conative, referential, phatic, poetic, and metalingual. It can be seen from the six functions of language that he included phatic communion which is elaborated into 'phatic function' in the language functions. The use of phatic communication is to create a sense of union, and belonging, and to engage in conversation (Jumanto, 2014). Such things are necessary to be applied in a real-life setting. However, understanding society requires acknowledging that each gender perceives reality and communication differently.

The study of gender in language gained prominence when Lakoff (1973) introduced the discourse of "women's language". Since then, sociolinguistics has sought to understand the distinctions between men's and women's speech. It is essential to distinguish that while sex relies on biological features, gender is socially constructed. Within this construction, distinct communicative patterns emerge. Xia (2013) suggests that to understand these relations, one must analyze the similarities and differences in how genders utilize language. For instance, Newman et al. (2008) proposed that women tend to use language to convey information and build rapport, whereas men are often more directive and secretive. Sellberg et al. (2016) utilized the British National Corpus (BNC) to demonstrate that men and women continue to employ phatic strategies differently for solidarity and politeness, respectively, underscoring the enduring relevance of gender in informal corpora. Sellberg's findings highlight a gap, i.e. while we know gender affects speech generally, we need to understand specifically *how* these patterns manifest in the frequency of certain linguistic features through a large-scale data like the BNC.

Following Sellberg et al., this study tries to shed light on different frequencies of phatic expressions deployed by men and women through BNC64 (Brezina 2013) corpus analysis. The selection of this specific corpus is strategically motivated by its specific sociolinguistic design and demographic composition. While the full British National Corpus (BNC) comprises 100 million words of diverse text types, BNC64 is a 1.5 million-word sub-corpus. Specifically extracted from the demographic spoken component of the original BNC dataset

Extensive research has investigated gendered linguistic patterns across various platform, from social media (Bamman et al., 2014; Schwartz et al., 2013) to phonetic and lexical variations in speech (Weirich & Simpson, 2018; Putra & Prayuda, 2020). Similarly, the pragmatic functions of phatic communion have been scrutinized and observed in diverse context (Jumanto, 2014; Rahadi, 2019; Rinawati et al., 2023). However, despite the wealth of data in both fields, the spesific intersection of phatic functional strategies and gender remains relatively under-explored. This study, thus, aims to bridge this gap by synthesizing these two domains, providing a clearer understanding of how gender identity is indexed through social-bonding strategies.

Based on the explanations of the background, this study aims to answer the following questions:

1. How do the frequencies of phatic categories vary across male and female speakers in the BNC64 corpus?
2. What qualitative linguistic features distinguish the phatic strategies men and women in establishing social bonds?

This study is intended to see genders' perceptions towards language while identifying phatic communication. However, we do not focus on the politeness study in this gender. This study is focused more on how the two genders keep the conversation going by using phatic expressions in their speeches.

Theoretical Framework

What do people say to build interactions with strangers? Why do people have to build interactions with them? Why does someone talk about the weather to break the silence? Why does someone talk about how somebody is doing? Those things are answered in the use of phatic communication or small talk.

The use of phatic communication such as 'Hello? How are you?' is uttered as a form of interaction between addresser and addressee which begin an interaction (Zimmerman, 2011). Phatic is intended to be used as a social interaction rather than a means of communication (Ambarwati et al., 2019).

Malinowski (1936) started the discourse about small talk as a talk which is not used as a mean to give or gain communication but just as something to keep the conversation going. The small talk or phatic communion can be found while we are in a coffee shop, bus stop, market, and many public spaces that require human interactions (Zuckerman, 2021). Zuckerman (2021) delivered that its existence is to "commune" rather to "communicate". In other words, the phatic communion does not require information transfer but rather as a mode to unite and engage with other people. Phatic communion covers the speakers' identity, attitude, and attributes (Laver, 1975).

The term of 'Phatic Communion' was then developed by Jakobson in 1960 which he included in his six functions of language. He labelled it as 'Phatic Expression'. By the differences of terms, Malinowski (1936) and Jakobson's (1960) terms have slight differences. While Malinowski (1936) described phatic as to commune, Jakobson, on the other hand, proposed phatic as contact or contact phaticity.

> "physical channel and psychological connection between the addresser and the addressee, [that enables] both of them to enter and stay in communication" (Jakobson, 2000 , p. 353).

Contact phaticity exists because the addresser and addressee's contacts. The interaction between them are only possible because they encountered one another (Rahardi, 2019). After Jakobson's (1960) developed phatic into phatic function, some linguists had also put attention to the phatic function. Some of them Leech (1994), Cook (1989), Renkema (1993), O'sullivan et al. (1994) (Cook, 1989; Leech, 1974; O'sullivan et al., 1994; Renkema, 1993).

Specifically, this study adopts the taxonomy put forward by Kridalaksana (2014) to operationalize the concept of phatic in communion. Kridalaksana's framework is particularly suited for corpus analysis as it categorizes phaticity into distinct social functions, such as Greetings, Harmony, Solidarity, and Sympathy. By focusing on these four categories, the study can move beyond a general definition of small talk and instead analyze the specific pragmatic strategies used to negotiate social presence and relational maintenance (Jumanto, 2014).

Afterwards, gender study has a broad coverage. The field of gender study was first called out by Lakoff (1973) who was first labelled the differences between genders as abnormalities. However, many scholars then opened up the discourse about gender study up until today. Although in this study we are only talking about the two genders: men and women. When talking about genders, we talk about their identities, behaviours, and attitudes (Weirich & Simpson, 2018). In determining it, we have to see the similarities and differences between them, to be able to identify them in terms of language use (Xia, 2013). Gender study has a broad coverage which we have to scrutiny.

The keen difference between genders is in the languages they use. Newman et al (2008) proposed that women tend to use language to convey information more than men, while men are more secretive and speak less than women. Women include family, relatives and friends inside their talk (Newman et al., 2008). The difference of men and women are, women can talk about what happened within them more than men (Rustamov et al., 2021).

Gender study is an interesting thing to discuss because it unveils not only their behaviors and attitudes but also unveil what is happening within them socially and culturally. Combining phatic function of language which was originated from Jakobson (1960) and was developed into 12 functions of language by Kridalaksana (2004) and Gender study will bring us to a new level of recognization. While phatic function does not have any informations delivered within them, gender study tried to look at the information that can be taken from those genders.

This study, thus, tries to synthesizes the functional pragmatic approach of Kridalaksana with the sociolinguistic paradigms of Tannen to investigate the intersection of gender and phaticity. We propose that phatic expressions serve as social indexed that reveal underlying gendered values. Specifically, the concept of Affection is mapped onto linguistic choices that prioritize emotional alignment and inter-personal warmth, while Solidarity is mapped onto markers that prioritize group-level belonging and shared companionship. By applying this framework to the BNC64 corpus, this study aims to provide empirical, corpus-based evidence of how these two orientation, i.e. Affection and Solidarity, are linguistically distributed across male and female speech.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a corpus-based descriptive qualitative design. While this study utilized frequency counts, the primary objective is not statistical inference, but rather a descriptive analysis of the functional patterns of phatic expressions. Following the framework put forward by McEnery and Hardie (2012), this approach uses the corpus as a source of evidence to illustrate how social-bonding functions are realized in natural

speech. The quantitative data serves to support qualitative observations, providing a measure of typicality an prominence for the identified phatic strategies across genders.

Data Source

The data of this study were drawn from the BNC64 (Brezina, 2013), a sociolinguistically motivated sub-corpus of the original British National Corpus (BNC). Unlike boarder corpora that include formal or written text, BNC64 is extracted from the BNC's demographic component, representing 1.5 million words of informal, spoken interaction. Crucially for this gender-based analysis, the corpus is socially balanced, featuring an equal representation of 32 male and 32 female speakers. This balance provides a rigorous foundation for comparing phatic strategies. The use of this sub-corpus then was expected to ensure that the analyzed phatic expressions reflect genuine social-bonding strategies in casual interaction rather that formal or scripted speech.

Data Collection and Identification

Phatic expressions were identified using a top-down corpus-based approach. A list of potential markers was compiled based on Kridalaksana's (2004) taxonomy of phatic functions, comprising Greetings, Harmony, Solidarity and Sympathy). These markers were then searched using the BNC64 Search and Compare tool. To ensure the accuracy of the descriptive analysis, each hit was manually verified through concordance lines to confirm that the expression was functioning phatically rather than transactionally.

Data Analysis

The analysis proceeded by quantifying the occurrence of phatic markers to identify gendered preferences. As emphasized by McEnery and Hardie (2012), raw frequency counts can be misleading if the total word counts of the sub-groups (male vs. female) differ. Thus, all raw counts were converted into normalized frequencies.

The normalization process allows the qualitative description to be grounded in a standardized comparison. This step bridges the gap between the raw data and the qualitative interpretation, providing a clear representation of which gender over-uses or under-uses specific phatic strategies such as affectionate nouns or brief solidarity markers.

Results and Discussion

The result of this study are presented through a synthesis of quantitative frequency patterns and qualitative functional analysis. To facilitate a rigorous comparison between 32 men and 32 women speakers, all raw data (hits) retrieved from the BNC64 corpus were converted into normalized frequencies per million words (pmw). This normalization process is a critical methodological requirement as the total volume of speech in the gender sub-corpora is unequal. The women sub-corpus (967,571 words) is approximately 1.5 times larger than the men sub-corpus (642,942 words). By standardizing the distribution, the analysis avoids the risk of over-generalization (Brezina, 2013) and provides an accurate measure of the linguistic preferences inherent to each gender. The following sections categorize these findings according to the pragmatic taxonomy provided by Kridalaksana (2004), illustrating how the dichotomy of Affection vs. Solidarity is indexed through specific phatic strategies.

Expressing Greetings

In their speeches, women tend to keep the conversation going after saying 'hello' by asking 'how are you' than men. Moreover, women added pronouns and adjectives such as personal pronoun by inserting names or adding nicknames. While men tend to use short greetings without adding anything after. Women tend to engage in greetings or small talk more than men. They use the words hello, hi, hey, how are you, and have a nice day more than men.

The frequency distribution of men and women speech in expressing greetings is shown in Table 1. as follows. There are five expressions that are present in the table, they are Hello, hi, hey, how are you and have a nice day. 'Hello' in women has 292 data, while men has 146 data. 'Hi' in women has 41 data, and men has 29 data. 'Hey' in women consist of 77 data and in men consist of 48 data. 'How are you' in women has 46 data while in men has 28 data. 'Have a nice day' only has women's data with two. Thus, it can be concluded that women have higher frequency in the phatic greeting expressions than men.

Table 1. Number of greetings by genders

Phatic Category	Male (Raw)	Male (pmw)	Female (Raw)	Female (pmw)
Greeting	227	353.06	319	329.69
Harmony	19	29.55	74	76.48
Solidarity	40	62.21	19	19.64
Sympathy	1	1.56	18	18.60
Total	287	446.38	430	444.41

The normalized data reveals a sharp divergence in phatic strategy between genders. While both groups utilize greetings at roughly similar rates (approx. 330–350 pmw), their usage of other categories differs fundamentally.

Women speakers exhibit a significantly higher frequency in Harmony (76.48 pmw vs. 29.55 pmw) and Sympathy (18.60 pmw vs. 1.56 pmw) categories. This supports the "Rapport-talk" hypothesis (Tannen, 1990), suggesting that women prioritize expressions that maintain emotional synchronization and minimize social distance. Men speakers, on the other hand, favor Solidarity markers at a rate three times higher than females (62.21 pmw vs. 19.64 pmw). This indicates a preference for "horizontal" bonding strategies that emphasize shared group identity over interpersonal emotional depth.

Here are some examples of greetings in men and women's speeches in greetings.

The greeting 'hello' in women speech:

1) hello jenny, you're up early this morning.

2) hello lovey, got poppers there # don't get them muddled…

3) hello hello henry, hello lucy. # hello love, your, # ... 170....who's

4) hello love, i mean if they, if they were in

5) hello little doggy! # hello! # look, she # look at it! # it'

The greeting 'hello' in men speech:

1) hello hello hello. # hello. # hello hello hello. # are we here? #
2) hello, yeah. # well we can, we can # pick her up
3) hello i'll have a look. # There's only a
4) hello, is that tammy?
5) hello, thank you, ah i wish i was going with…

In Table 1. 'hello' is uttered more by women than men. To identify women's and men's speeches we have to look at the similarity and differences as what Xia (2013) said. Both use 'hello' as a bubble to talk in small talk, by greeting their communication partner. However, women tend to use 'hello' followed by noun like 'jenny', 'little doggy', 'henry'. While men tend to use 'hello' followed by a more directive topic, talking to what they intended to without much of mentioning any other stuff. These findings go in line with what Newman et al. (2008) said about men talk in more of directive way than women.

The greeting 'hi' in women's speeches

1) hi, shane! # in fact, it's so good good innit?
2) hi, miss! # miss, did you mark my work?
3) hi bob! # i need to know as soon as possible now whether
4) hi you, alright? # yeah # good morning ladies
5) hi! # i've got all different things i don't like these ea.

The greeting 'hi' in men's speeches

1) hi # how are you? # keeping well?
2) hi jeanie. # yup. # you got that. # ooh! # oh that'
3) hi yeah, how are you? alright and hello and stuff like
4) hi love. # erm # so a one-legged person going out of her
5) hi there. # i'm wired for sound ma'am. # looking for you

The greeting 'hi' is uttered more by women with 41 utterances and 29 utterances for men. The context and structure of the talks on both genders are the same. They are starting the greeting as what Jumanto (2014) said with saying 'hi' and then followed by context such as asking of how they are doing. In this case, women and men do not have significant differences in their language and context of utterances. Both are talking about the similar context and followed by similar

situation. The similarity of men and women's language goes together with what Xia (2013) said in gender speech.

The greeting 'hey' in women's speeches

1) hey, my name's louise # my husband wasn't nice to me an
2) see what's happened, hey, hey what's this?
3) hey hey hey hey what's the problem what's the problem…
4) hey, where you going?
5) hey up kath! # are you alright?

The greeting 'hey' in men's speeches

1) hey there's danny's dad, he'll go right up hig….
2) hey! # quite a nice thingy innit? # yeah, it's alright...
3) hey ann! # did you read your stars today?
4) hey! # i'm mark. # eh! # i tell you # what last satu
5) hey? # happy birthday mary

The frequency of hey in men is 48 and in women is 77. The use of the word 'hey' is more like a small talk which has no meaning and does not convey any information behind it. Both men and women use 'hey' to get the attention of their addressees. However, women use repetition more than men. They repeat the words to get the attention of their addressee.

The greeting 'how are you' in women's speeches:

1) how are you doing love?
2) how are you feeling?
3) hey look who's here. # how are you diddling?
4) oh well how are you doing then scott my friend?
5) how are you? # are you better?

The greeting 'how are you' in men's speeches:

1) it's seamus o seamus, how are you doing seamus ?
2) hi susan how are you?
3) morning mary how are you?
4) hello, here's arthur. # how are you?
5) hallo stewie. how are you mate!

The frequency of 'how are you' in men is 28 while in women is 46. The differences that we can spot in men and women speeches is on how women add noun which relates to the way they show and indicate affection by mentioning adjective such as 'love' while men use a different adjective such as 'mate' which shows more solidarity than affection. Thus, 'how are you' is meant to be used as a way to seek addressee's information even though its function is mainly to create a small talk situation.

The greeting of 'have a nice day' in women:

1) you ain't gotta say who you are nothing like that bye! # have a nice day

2) i don't think we'll be at the air field tomorrow . # have a nice day at shoreham

The greetings of hello, hi, hey, and how are you stated by both men and women signals their sense of contact. The contact we meant in this study is how the addresser and addressee maintain the conversation going by starting on various topic just as what Rahardi (2019) said. The use of phatic expressions is to create a mood and the feeling of belonging within culture and society just as what Jumanto (2014) proposed.

However, comparing both men and women by looking at the frequency distribution of the words provided by the corpus BNC64, women have higher frequencies in engaging with greetings than men. Women tend to keep their attentions for small talk as in greetings than men. Therefore, both men and women share a kind of similarity by what words followed those greetings mentioned previously. They tend to mention names and ask how the things are going on the other side. Some even use weather to keep the talk going.

Creating Harmony, Expressing Solidarity, and Expressing Sympathy

The expressions of creating harmony, expressing solidarity, and expressing sympathy is put in the same section and the same table because the word choices are quite similar to one another. The frequency distribution of the expressions of creating harmony, expressing solidarity, and expressing sympathy is shown in Table 2. There are three expressions that can be found, they are thank you, good luck, and congratulations. 'Thank you' in women has 380 frequency and men is with 246. While 'good luck' is 7 in women, and 4 in men. 'Congratulations' in men and women has the same number with one each. Thus, it can be concluded that women have a higher phatic expression frequency than men even though there is one expression that has the same number but overall, women have higher frequency than men.

Table 2. Expressions by genders

Noun/Marker	Men (Raw)	Men (pmw)	Women (Raw)	Women (pmw)
Love	6	9.33	126	130.22
Mate	22	34.22	1	1.03
Dear	3	4.67	25	25.84
Man	6	9.33	0	0.00
Darling	0	0.00	10	10.34

The noun distribution provides the most striking evidence for the "Affection vs. Solidarity" dichotomy. Women speakers dominate the usage of terms like "love" (130.22 pmw) and "dear" (25.84 pmw). These markers function as "affectionate indexes," framing the conversation as an intimate and warm interaction. The almost complete absence of these terms in men speech highlights a gendered boundary regarding verbal affection in the early 1990s British context.

Men speech is characterized by markers of camaraderie such as "mate" (34.22 pmw) and "man" (9.33 pmw). These terms are used to establish a bond based on "mateship" or shared status rather than individual intimacy. Notably, women speakers almost entirely avoid the term "mate" (1.03 pmw) and never use "man" as a phatic marker in this dataset.

The expression of 'thank you' by women:

1) thank you love.
2) thank you dear, lovely
3) thank you peter, oh that's the biggest ice cream to
4) thank you very much tim, that's lovely
5) not too bad thank you. # not very nice morning is it?

The expression of 'thank you' by men:

1) oh thank you jane
2) robert excuse me please, thank you
3) okay thank you very much
4) if if you're happy too bill, thank you
5) well thank you very much

The difference of men and women's speeches in expressing 'thank you' or gratitude can be seen from the use of adjective on women's speeches. They speak in a more attentive and affectionate manner then men. Women have longer utterances than men as well in expressing gratitude. This proves the openeness of women as what Newman et al (2008) said. Men tend to keep it short and direct. We can also sense men tried to keep the distance by not using adjectives to express their feelings.

The expression of 'good luck' by women:

1) well, good luck with the driving!
2) there we are! # good luck!
3) oh yeah. #good luck
4) wish me good luck it should be

The expression of 'good luck' by men:

1) yeah, good luck
2) good luck, see you later….
3) good luck!
4) ni-night. # bye julie. # good luck

In the use of 'good luck' expression, men and women share a similar trait. They deliver the expression in short utterances. However, we can spot a difference where women ask someone to 'wish me good luck'. Considering about what Rustamov (2021) said, women can talk about what is happening to them than men. In the utterance, the speaker asks for someone's blessings. While men only give blessings. This signals how less secretive women in their speech than men

The expression of 'congratulations' by women:

……brand new? # well? # mhm. # mhm. # well congratulations ! # er i can't say…..

The expression of 'congratulations' by men:

……..you might have won something. #congratulations, you have won a holiday to Canada…..

There is only two data with one datum each for men and women in expressing 'congratulations'. The differences between 'congratulating' in women and men are in the use of voice fillers. Women use more voice fillers and small talk like 'well?', "mhm", and 'er' before and after they express the sympathy well men are more forward by jumping right to the context without adding more small talk to the utterances.

The four functions of phatic communication answer the first research question. In creating harmony, expressing solidarity and sympathy, women have higher frequency than men even

though in expressing congratulations, they appear to have the same number. Pointing out the differences between men and women in their speech, women use adjective while men do not really use it. women are also using voice fillers in small talk like 'well mhm, and er' while men talk more directly.

The different interactions between men and women are shown in the frequency distribution of how men and women expressing the small talk or phatic expressions. In every category, women have higher number than men in general. That means, women are more engaged in small talk than men. The similarities between them lies on the use of phatic expression to build interactions, and not as something to gain or get information.

Discussing about phatic expression in men and women, phatic expressions can be used to see the differences and similarities of how men and women use languages in both formal and informal context. Relating it to gender study, in engaging with small talk, women are more attentive and affectionate. The statement of women to be more affectionate igoes in line with what Rustamov et al. (2021) said. In the findings, we can see how women added adjectives such as "love, dear, lovely, and et cetera". Men are the opposite of women; they tend to speak in a shorter sentence and directive ways just like what Newman et al (2008) said.

Moreover, women can provide more context in their utterances. The long utterances given by women are intended to give clearer context. This goes in line with what Newman et al. (2008) said. Relating it with phatic function study, women have higher tendency to build phatic interaction.

By discussing about genders' attitude, the second question is answered. Women are more open and doting in their speeches. While men did not open up more and talk only with what is asked. They don't provide extra utterances and practiced lower number of small talk than women. The fact that women has a higher frequency in doing small talk than men proves women's nature that is more attentive and affectionate in expressing themselves openly.

Conclusion

Our analysis of the BNC64 corpus shows that gendered phatic strategies in informal British English are systematically structured to reflect distinct social objectives, moving beyond the traditional view of phaticity as empty and aimless speech. By integrating Kridalaksana's (2004) functional taxonomy with Tannen's (1990) sociolinguistic paradigms, this study provides a relatively robust empirical verification of how Affection and Solidarity serve as primary linguistic indexes for women and men speakers. The normalized data extracted from the BNC64 corpus confirms that while both genders engage in phatic communication at nearly identical rates when standardized per million words, he qualitative realization of these interactions diverges significantly. Women's significant preference for Harmony and Sympathy functions demonstrates a consistent orientation toward rapport-talk aimed at emotional alignment and the reduction of social distance. In contrast, men's reliance on Solidarity markers and abbreviated greetings highlights a focus on report-talk designed to establish group-level belonging and horizontal status without the necessity for individual intimacy.

The significance of this study lies in its methodological rigor. By moving beyond anecdotal evidence and utilizing normalized distribution within a strictly balanced 64-speaker

sample, the research underscores that gendered speech patterns are persistent and systematic within informal British English.

Despite these findings, the temporal nature of the BNC64 suggests that these patterns represent a specific historical and cultural snapshot of the early 1990s, necessitating further comparative research. Future studies should prioritize a diachronic analysis by comparing the BNC64 results with the Spoken BNC2014 to determine how the Affection vs. Solidarity dichotomy has evolved over the past two decades, particularly in response to changing gender norms. Additionally, the rise of digital communication presents a new frontier for phaticity research; future work could investigate how gendered social bonding is indexed through non-verbal markers such as emojis and punctuation in social media environments. Finally, applying this functional framework to non-Western corpora would provide a necessary cross-cultural perspective to determine whether these gendered phatic orientations are culturally specific or reflect broader sociolinguistic universals.

Reference

Alhammadi, W., Rabab'ah, G., & Alghazo, S. (2024). Gender differences in language use in *Talks at Google*. *Kemanusiaan: The Asian Journal of Humanities, 31*(1), 149–176. https://doi.org/10.21315/kajh2024.31.1.8

Ambarwati, R., Nurkamto, J., & Santosa, R. (2019). Phatic and Politeness on Women's Communication in Facebook: Humanistic Teaching Perspective of Being Polite in Social Media. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 95–108.

Bamman, D., Eisenstein, J., & Schnoebelen, T. (2014). Gender identity and lexical variation in social media. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 18*(2), 135–160.

Brezina, V. (2013). *BNC64: Search and compare*. Lancaster University. http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/bnc64

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2017). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.

Jabeen, I., & Alsmari, N. (2023). Phraseological expressions: Gender-based corpus analysis of EFL/ESL academic research articles. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 13* (8), 2059–2069. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1308.22

Jakobson, R. (2000). *Linguistics and poetics (1960). The Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. London: Routledge, 334–339.

Jumanto, D. (2014). Phatic Communication: How English Native Speakers Create Ties of Union. *American Journal of Linguistics, 3*(1), 9–16.

Kridalaksana, H. (2004). *"Pengantar Ilmiah: Dari Fungsi Fatis ke Ungkapan Fatis," in Ungkapan Fatis dalam Pelbagai Bahasa. In H. Sutami (Ed.)*, University of Indonesia.

Laver, J. (1975). Communicative functions of phatic communion. *Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction,* 215, 238.

Leech, G. (1974). *Five Functions of Language. UK Essays. Retrieved from Https://Www. Ukessays*. Com/Essays/English-Language/Five-Functions-of-Language-English-Language-Essay. Php.

McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Newman, M. L., Groom, C. J., Handelman, L. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Gender differences in language use: An analysis of 14,000 text samples. *Discourse Processes, 45*(3), 211–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/01638530802073712

O'sullivan, T., Hartley, J., Saunders, D., Montgomery, M., & Fiske, J. (1994). *Key concepts in communication and cultural studies*.

Purnami, N. M. A. (2018). A Gender-Based Analysis of Observance and Nonobservance of Conversational Maxims in Front Office Students'speech At Mediterranean College In Academic Year 2015/2016. *Wahana Chitta Jurnal Pendidikan, 1*(1), 74–79.

Putra, A. B., & Prayudha. (2020). *The Analysis of Women and Men Language Features on America's Got Talent*. 2004, 1–9. http://eprints.uad.ac.id/id/eprint/14761

Rahardi, R. K. (2019). Pragmatic perspective on phatic functions and language dignity. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology, 8*, 261–268.

Renkema, J. (1993). *Discourse studies: An introductory textbook*. Benjamins.

Rinawati, D., Hidayat, D. N., Husna, N., & Alek, A. (2023). Phatic Communication in Online English Class Discussions through Facebook Comments. Linguists: *Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching, 9*(1), 1–13.

Rustamov, D., Shakhabitdinova, S., Solijonovc, S., Mattiyev, A., Begaliyev, S., & Fayziev, S. (2021). Research of peculiarities of speech of male and female on phonetic and lexical levels of language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(1), 421–430. https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.26

Schwartz, H. A., Eichstaedt, J. C., Kern, M. L., Dziurzynski, L., Ramones, S. M., Agrawal, M., Shah, A., Kosinski, M., Stillwell, D., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2013). *Personality, gender, and age in the language of social media: The open-vocabulary approach*. PloS One, 8(9), e73791.

Sellberg, O. (2016). *Women's and men's language use and all that stuff: A corpus analysis of general extenders*. Lund University Publications.

Shields, D. M. (2016). *Military masculinity, movies, and the DSM: Narratives of institutionally (en) gendered trauma*. Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 17(1), 64.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. Ballantine Books.

Weirich, M., & Simpson, A. P. (2018). *Gender identity is indexed and perceived in speech*. PloS One, 13(12), e0209226.

Xia, X. (2013). *Gender differences in using language*. Theory & Practice in Language Studies, 3(8).

Zimmerman, L. W. (2011). Using Phatic Expressions in Introductions in Intercultural Online Discussions. *Journal on English Language Teaching, 1*(3), 53–59.

Zuckerman, C. H. P. (2021). *Phatic, the: Communication and Communion. The International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*. New Jersey: Wiley–Blackwell.