

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to present some concluding remarks based on my findings in the previous chapter. I have three main problems for my thesis as I have already stated in the first chapter. I use two films, Miss Congeniality 2 and Taking Lives, as the sources of my data.

I use sociolinguistic approach to analyze the data. I focus on Lakoff's characteristics of women's speech that women are indicated to have different ways of talking from those of men. I realize that the way people use language indicates their social identity.

In analyzing the data, I find that the main female characters in both films show some evidences of using the utterances that conform to Lakoff's characteristics of women's speech. However, when doing their job as police officers, the critical situations force them to use utterances that violate Lakoff's theory.

Having watched the two films closely and discussed the use of women's speech in them, I find some similarities between the two films. The main female characters, Gracie Hart in Miss Congeniality 2, and Illeana Scott in Taking Lives,

work as FBI agents. In their work place most of the officers are men. Naturally, their duties require them to speak clearly and briefly as men do.

From the two films, Miss Congeniality 2 and Taking Lives, I get seventeen data: eight data from the first film and nine data from the second film. Some of the data that I have analyzed conform to Lakoff's characteristics of women's speech, others violate them. There are some data that are related to more than one characteristic, such as data three. In it, the speaker uses a lexical hedge, an intensifier, an 'empty' adjective, and an emphatic stress. So, I have twenty utterances that conform to and violate the theory.

From the first film, Miss Congeniality 2, I get eleven utterances. Seven of the utterances conform to Lakoff's characteristics of women speech, while the other four utterances violate them. In Hart's utterances which conform to women's speech style, I get two which contain 'empty' adjectives, one containing lexical hedges, one dealing with emphatic stress, one related to intensifiers, and two reflecting avoidance of strong swear words. I get four utterances that violate Lakoff's characteristics of women's speech of 'superpolite' forms.

While in the second film, Taking Lives, I get nine utterances. Four of the utterances conform to Lakoff's characteristics of women's speech and five utterances violate the theory. In Scott's utterances which conform to women's speech style, I get one containing 'empty' adjectives, one containing lexical hedges, one dealing with emphatic stress, and one concerning intensifiers. Then I get five utterances that violate Lakoff's characteristics of women's speech, two violations of 'superpolite' forms, one violation of rising intonation of on declaratives, and two violations of avoidance of strong swear words.

In analyzing the data, I avoid discussing the use of ‘hypercorrect’ grammar and ‘superpolite’ forms that conform to Lakoff’s characteristics of women’s speech. The reason is that there is not clear information about what it actually is. I have tried to search in the Internet, but they have different explanations.

Hart and Scott do not use Lakoff’s characteristics of women’s speech about women’s use of tag questions, rising intonation on declaratives, and precise color terms. Their profession as police officers always demands that they speak briefly, clearly, and straight to the point. This makes them look assertive and confident.

The main female character in Miss Congeniality 2, Gracie Hart, is an FBI agent and also the runner-up of Miss United States pageant. This situation causes her to change her masculine appearance and character to be feminine. She dresses like a woman and behave like a star. That is why I do not find her using swear words. She uses Oh my God to express her concern, Praise Jesus and Moses to express her feeling when she is shocked. While the main female character in Taking Lives, Scott, uses the swear words shit and fuck you to express her anger.

I use Holmes’ four social factors, which consist of participants, setting, topic, and function to analyze the reason for the two main female characters to use the utterance. The social factors play an important role in using different speech styles. The participants and function are the factors which Hart and Scott mostly use in their utterances. Hart and Scott use different speech styles when they talk to their superior. This is due to the relationship that has a high element of formality. But they change their speech style when they talk to their partners who are not

close with them. The function is the reason for Hart and Scott to show their feeling through the utterance.

In Miss Congeniality 2, there is only one data that is related to the setting in which the utterance takes place. It can be seen when Hart uses ‘empty’ adjectives to respond to the reporter’s statement on a TV show. The topic is the reason for Hart to use the utterance when she shares information about her ex-boyfriend and about her experience of skincare. In Taking Lives, setting and topic do not play an important role in Scott’s language choice.

In my opinion, Lakoff’s characteristics of women’s speech can reflect women’s speech style in general. It can be seen from my analysis that women’s speech style in Miss Congeniality 2 and Taking Lives, fits the theory. However, women can violate Lakoff’s theory when they are in a hurry or facing a critical situation. The social factors affect women to conform to or violate Lakoff’s characteristics of women’s speech.

I hope this thesis will be helpful to the other students who intend to take the same topic. However, they should really understand the theory. Besides, it is crucial to see that nowadays men and women more or less speak the same style of language. Therefore, there is not a clear-cut division between the so-called men’s and women’s languages.

It contains 991 words