CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the writer will be present the theories and references that are related to analysis. They are women's language, women's speech features, and previous study.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Women's Language

Language is sometimes believed to be varied in accordance with gender, namely men's language and women's language variety (Jendra, 2010:51). Women's language has become fondation the attitude that women are weakness. The weakness and powerlessness of women is reflected in both the ways women are expected to speak, and the ways in which women speak. In appropriate women's speech, strong expression of feeling is avoided, expression of uncertainty is favored, and means of expression in regard to subject-matter deemed 'trivial' to the 'real' world are elaborated (Lakoff, 1973:45).

Robin Tolmach Lakoff has a professor of linguistics at the University of California at Berkeley since 1972. She is the first linguist who began the research for definitive features of women's language. She introduced the terms *women's language* in 1973 article in Language and society, and made it the title of a 1978 book chapter. Her 1975's book Language and Woman's Place has been

enormously influential and cited by a lot of linguistics who study the search of sex in language use for the next two decades. As cited in Cuellar (2006), during the last three decades, Lakoff's ideas have been appraised, discussed, disputed, accepted and/or rejected.

According to Ceullar (2006), Robin Lakoff's seminal book Language and Women's Place (1975) opened a new start in linguistic studies when she called the attention to a traditionally forgotten issue: the differences in language used by men and women. Lakoff's work was portrayed a clear situation of inequality in society and how it was reinforced by the use of language by men and women. Moreover, Lakoff underlines that linguistic features typical of women's language are general tendencies and correspond to spoken, not written language.

Lakoff's writing has become the basis for many researchers who conduct the research about women's language as subject. She published ten basic assumptions about what she felt as special women's language in 1975.

2.1.2 Women's Speech Features

Lakoff suggested that a distinct group of feature-lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic-distinguish the speech of women by using intropection and linguistic intuition as her method. Below are the types of features of women's language based on Lakoff's theory as cited in several sources.

2.1.2.1 Lexical Hedges Fillers

Lakoff decided hedging as one of characteristic of features of women's language. She refers to the frequent use of such as well, you see, like, you know, sort a/sort of, kind a/kind of, I think, I guess and It seems like. For example :

    a. *It's sort of a good film*

Lakoff (cited in Holmes, 1992:316) claimed that hedging devices explicity signal lack of confidence. So, she claimed women use hedging devices to express uncertainty, and they use intensifying device to persuade their to take them seriously.

2.1.2.2 Tag Question

The tag question is a syntactic device listed by Lakoff which may express uncertainty (Holmes, 1992:318). We find that syntactically too women's speech is peculiar. There is no syntactic rule in English that only women may use. But there is at least one rule that a women will use in more conversational situations than a man. This is the rule of tag question formation (Lakoff, 1973:53). A tag question, being intermediate between these, is used when the speaker is stating a claim, but lacks full confidence in the truth of the claim. For example if she says:

    a. *John is here, isn't he?*

Woman will probably not be surprised if her respondent answer 'no', but if she says:

    b. *John is here, isn't he?*

Based on that question, one of the chances that she is already biased in favor of positive answer, wanting only confirmation by the addresssee. She still want a response from her addressee, as she do with a yes-no question; but she has enough knowledge to predict that response, much as a declarative statement without assumption that the statement is to be believed by the addressee leeway, not forcing the addressee to go along with the views of the speaker.

2.1.2.3 Rising Intonation on Declaratives

Related to this special use of a syntactic rule is a widespread difference perceptible in women's intonational patterns. Lakoff (1973:55) said that there is a peculiar sentence intonation-pattern found in English only among women, which has the form of declarative answer to a question, but has the rising inflection typical of yes-no question, as well as being especially hesitent.

A.   *When will dinner be ready?*

B.   *Oh ..... around six o'clock?*

It is as though (B) were saying, 'Six o'clock, if that's OK with you, if you agree'. Example (A) is put in the position of having to provide confirmation, and (B) sounds unsure. Here we find unwillingness to assert an opinion carried to an extreme. One likely consequence is that these sorts of speech-patterns are taken to reflect something real about character and play a part in not taking a woman seriously or trusting her with any real responsibilities, since 'she can't make up her mind', and 'isn't sure of herself'. And here again we see that people form judgments about other people on the basis of superficial linguistic

behavior that may have nothing to do with inner character, but has been imposed upon the speaker, on pain of worse punishment than not being taken seriously.

Lakoff (1973:56) Such features are probably part of the general fact that women's speech sounds much more 'polite' than men's. One aspect of politeness is as we have just described: leaving a decision open, not imposing your mind, or views, or claims, on anyone else.

2.1.2.4 Empty Adjectives

Similar sorts of disparities exist elsewhere in the vocabulary. For instance, a group of adjectives which have, besides their specific and literal meanings, another use, that of indicating the speaker's approbation or admiration for something. Some of these adjectives are neutral as to sex of speaker, either men or women may use them. But another set seems, in its figurative use, to be largely confined to women's speech. This kind of adjectives called 'empty' adjectives, which means that those only convey an emotional reaction rather than specific information. Representative lists of both types are below:

Neutral	*Women Only*
Great	adorable
Terrific	charming
Cool	sweet
Neat	lovely
	Devine

In Lakoff's opinion (cited in Cameron, 1990:226-227), if a man uses the women's adjectives, the word women's adjectives will damage his reputation. On the other hand, a women may freely use the neutral words. However, a women's use of women's words' is without risks. Where a woman has a choice between the neutral words and the women's words, as man has not, she may be suggesting very diffrent things about her own personality and her view of the subject matter by her choice of words of the neutral words or words of the women's words. Look at these two sentences:

a. *What a terrific idea!*

b. *What a divine idea!*

Sentence (a) might be used under any appropriate conditions by a female speaker, but (b) is more restricted. Probably it is used appropriately only in case the speaker feels the idea referred to be essentially unimportant to the world at large – only an amusement for the speaker herself. In other words, the use of neutral word is more appropriate for formal situations, while the use of women's words is only used in non-formal situations.

Lakoff (1973:53), said that These words aren't, basically, 'feminine'; rather, they signal 'uninvolved', or 'out of power'. Any group in a society to which these labels are applicable may presumably use these words; they are often considered 'feminine', 'unmasculine', because women are the 'uninvolved', 'out of power.

2.1.2.5 Precise Color Terms

Lakoff (cited in Wardhaugh, 2006:318) claims that women use color words like *mauve, beige, aquamarine, lavender, and magentabut* most men do not. Fine discrimination of color is relevant for women, but not for men. Men find such discussion amusing because they consider such a question trivial, irrelevant to the real world.

a. *The wall is mauve*

Women are not expected to make decisions on important matters, like what kind of job to hold they are relegated the non-crucial decisions as a sop. Deciding whether to name a color 'lavender' or 'mauve' is one such sop. This lexical disparity reflects a social inequity in the position of women. If we want to change this opinion, we should give women the opportunity to participate in the real decision of life (Lakoff, cited in Cameron, 1990:224).

2.1.2.6 Intensifier

Intensifier such; so, just, very and quite seem more characteristic of women's language than of men's, though it is found in the latter, particularly in the speech of male academics. For example, the following sentences:

a. *I feel so unhappy!*

b. *That movie made me so sick!*

Men seem to have the least difficulty using this construction when the sentence is unemotional or non subjective-without reference to the speaker himself:

c. That sunset is so beautiful!

d. Fred is so dumb!

Substituting an equative like so far absolute superlatives (like, very, really) seems to be away of backing out of committing oneself strongly to an oponion. Rather like take question. One might hedge in this way with perfect right in making esthic judgment (as in (c) or intellectual judgements (as in (a)). To hedge in this situation is to seek to avoid, making any strong statement: a characteristic, as we have noted already and shall not further, women's speech.

2.1.2.7 Hypercorrect Grammar

Lakoff (cited in Holmes, 1992:314), stated that hypercorrect grammar is the consistent use of standard verb forms. Lakoff said that hypercorrect grammar involves an avoidance of terms considered vulgar or coarse.

a. 'g' in words such as 'going' instead of the more casual 'goin'

2.1.2.8 Superpolite Forms

A request may be in the same sense a polite command, in that it does not overtly require obedience, but rather suggests something be done as a favor to the speaker. An overt order (as in an imperative) expresses the (often-impolite) assumption of the speaker's superior position to the addressee, carrying with it the right to enforce compliance, whereas with a request the decision on the face of it is left up to the addressee. The same is true of suggestions. Here, the implication is not that the addressee is in danger if he does not comply,

merelythat he will be glad if he does. Once again, the decision is up to the addressee, and a suggestion therefore is politer than an order.

a. *Close the door*

b. *Please close the door*

c. *Will you close the door?*

d. *Will you please close the door?*

e. *Won't you close the door?*

A sentence like *won't you please close the door* would then count as a doubly compound request. A sentence like (c) is close in sense to 'Are you willing to close the door?' According to the normal rules of polite conversation, to agree that you are willing is to agree to do the thing asked of you. Therefore this apparent inquiry functions as a request, leaving the decision up to the willingness of the addressee. Phrasing it as a positive question make the (implisit) assumption that a 'yes' answer will be forthcoming. Sentence (d) is more polite than (b) or (c) because it combines them: Please indicating that to accede will be to do something for the speaker, and will you, as noted, suggesting that the addressee has the final decision. If the question is phrased with a negative, as in (e), the speaker seems to suggest the stronger likelihood of a negative response from the addressee. Since the assumption is then that the addressee is that much freer to refuse, (e) acts as a more polite request than (c) or (d): (c) and (d) put the burden of refusal on the addressee, as (e) does not.

2.1.2.9 Avoidance of Strong Swear Words

Lakoff (1973:50) found that the speech of women and that of men in the use of particles that grammarians often describe as 'meaningless'. There may be no referent for them, but they are far from meaningless: they define the social context of an utterance, indicate the relationship the speaker feels between himself and his addressee, between himself and what he is talking about. For example, the following sentences:

a. *Oh dear, you've put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.*

b. *Shit, you've put thr peanut butter in the refrigerator again.*

It is safe to predict that people would classify the first sentence as part of 'women's language', the second as 'men's language'. Women usually use softer forms such us 'Oh, Dear!', while the men use stronger ones such as 'Dammit!' or 'Shit!'. It is interesting, by the way, to note that men's language is increasingly being used by women, but women's language is not being adopted by men, apart from those who reject the American masculine image (e.g. homosexuals).

2.1.2.10 Emphatic Stress

Women tend to use words which to emphasize the utterance or strengthen the meaning of an utterance.

a. *It was a brilliant performance*

The word *brilliant* is one of the examples of an emphatic stress. This word can be used to strengthen the meaning of the utterance.

As cited in Holmes (1992:316), the internal coherence of the linguistic featured Lakoff identified can be illustrated by dividing them into two group. First, there are linguistic devices which may be used for hedging or reducing the force of an utterance. Secondly, there are features which may boost or intensify a proposition's force. Features which may serve as hedging devices are lexical hedges, tag questions, question intonation, superpolite forms, and euphemisms, while boosting devices are intensifiers and emphatic stress.

Lakoff (cited in Holmes, 1992:316), claimed both kinds of modifiers were evidence of an unconfident speaker. Hedging devices explicity signal lack of confidence, while boosting devices reflect the speaker's anticipation that the addressee may remain unconvinced and therefore supply extra reassurance. So, she claimed women use hedging devices to express uncertainly, and they use intensifying devices to persuade their addressee to take them seriously. Women boost the force of their utterances because they think that otherwise they will not be heard or paid attention to. So, according to Lakoff, both hedges and boosters reflect women's lack of confidence.

2.2   Related Studies

Studies on women's language have been done by several researchers. First researcher is Dian Rosita (2008) from Airlangga University. She studied about An Analysis of Sex and the City TV Series's Dialogue Based on Ten Types of Women's Linguistic Features. She analyzes the dialogue of Sex and the City drama TV series. There are six season of Sex and the City. But the researcher is only focuses on Sex and the City episode The Real Me. It used qualitative method. It is conducted to find what types and which types of women's linguistic features occur most frequently. The results of this study show that not all types of women's linguistic features occur in the dialogues. There are only nine types of women's linguistic features occur in the dialogues, they are lexical hedges or fillers, tag question, rising intonation on declaratives, `empty' adjectives, specialized vocabularies, intensifiers, `superpolite' forms, avoidance of strong swear words, and emphatic stress. One feature which did not occur in the dialogues is `hypercorrect' grammar. This study has proven Lakoff's theory that women use women's linguistic features more often than male.

Second researcher is Isni Al-Rofi' (2014) from State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya. She analyzed about women's speech features used by the main characters in "*The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion , The Witch and The Wardrobe"* Movie. The researcher focus on women's speech features there are ten types of Women's speech features, they are lexical hedges or filler, tag question, rising intonation, empty adjective, intensifier, hypercorrect grammar, superpolite form, avoidance of strong swear words, and emphatic stress. The result of this

research is the researcher concluded that the most frequently used of women's speech features from all main characters" utterances are lexical hedges or filler and intensifier. It is used by all main characters for 26 times each types from 261 utterances and the percentage is 31,3%. These two features are the common features used by all main characters. Once again, based on Lakoff theory, all main characters can be categorized as people who might has a tendency to be lack of self-confidence and has strong feeling about something. The second rank is empty adjective which is used for 11 times, with the percentage 13,3%. The third rank is superpolite form with 10,8%. The next is tag question with 4,8%. Emphatic stress got 3,6%, hypercorrect grammar got 2,4%. The least features are rising intonation and avoidance of strong swear word with 1,2%. Precise color terms do not find in the main characters" utterances in this movie. This research used theory of Lakoff, Holmes and Cameron to analyze the data that apply descriptive qualitative method.

Third resercher is Futika Permatasari (2010) from State Islamic University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. She analyzed about women's speech features used by the characters of *"Sex and The City"* movie. She used Lakoff's theory to find her research problem. This research focuses on analyzing women's speech features used by thecharacters of Sex and the City movie. Women's speech features are several typesof speech which reflect uncertainty and lack of confidence as the characteristics ofwomen's speech. Meanwhile, women's language is a language that signifies thecharacteristic of women such as avoiding direct and forceful statements, andrelying on conforms that conveys hesitation and

uncertainty.The purpose of this research is to find out how the characters of Sex and the Cityuse women's speech features. The design of this research is descriptivequalitative. The result of this research is the researcher found eight types of women's speech features used in the dialogues, such as lexical hedges or fillers, tag question, rising intonation on declaratives, empty adjectives, intensifiers, superpolite forms, avoidance of strong swear words, and emphatic stress.

Last researcher is Farida Mas Huriyatul Mu'min (2010) from State Islamic University of Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. She analyzed about women's language used by the main character of "Thirteen" movie. She found that there are seven types of women's linguistic features occur in the dialogues, they are lexical emphatic stress, intensifiers, empty adjective, tag question, super polite form, lexical hedges, and rising intonation. She also found that women's language that used by the main character is affected by the social and education background. She used Lakoff's and Holmes theory to answer her research problem.

The present study is different from the previous study. This research analyzed about women's speech features used by the main characters in "Lucy" Luc Besson's movie. The writer used an action movie as her corpus of the study. The writer used Lakoff's theory to answer her research problem. The purpose of her research to find the women's speech features that used by the main characters in "Lucy" movie and find out the type of women's speech features which occur most frequently by the main characters in the movie.