

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Review of Related Theories**

##### **2.1.1 Language and Gender**

The study about language and gender in society had always been an interesting issue to be discussed. According to some experts, men and women were different in their linguistic behavior. Men and women were considered to have a different language because they had different linguistic features when they spoke. The differences were caused by several factors such as biological and socio-cultural problem.

In term of biological (anatomical) problem, one of the most obvious differences between the speech of men and women was that they had distinctly different voice qualities. As noted by Montgomery (1995:149), in the majority of cases, most people could easily tell whether a voice belongs to a man or a woman because men's voices were commonly thought to be lower-pitched and more resonant than women's voices. The obvious explanations for this usually draw upon the evident differences of physiology. The pitch of the voice, for instance, was produced by vibration of the vocal cords in the larynx (the 'voice box') which was situated at the top of the windpipe. As breath from the lungs passes through the larynx, the vocal cords could be set to vibrate. Thick and heavy vocal cords vibrate more slowly than lighter ones. Since men tended to develop a larger larynx than women, their voices tended to be pitched lower.

In term of socio-cultural problem, men and women were different in their linguistic behavior because men and women were raised in different subcultures. Just like what Lakoff said (cited in Cameron, 1990:221-222), little boys and little girls, from the very start, learned two different ways of speaking. Since the mothers were the dominance influences in the lives of most children under the age of 5, probably both boys and girls first learned 'women's language' as their first language. As they grow older, boys especially went through a stage of rough talk. By the time children were 10 or so, and split up into same-sex peer groups, the two languages were already present. The boys then had unlearned their original form of expression and adopted new forms of expression, while the girls retained their ways of speech.

The socio-cultural differences between men and women then caused other differences in their linguistic features, especially in terms of lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic problem. In term of lexical differences (the choice of words), women were considered less assertive (more tentative) in their speech than men. It was said that women use fewer taboo forms and more euphemisms than men. They were also considered to talk more than men, or conversely that they talked less than men (it depends on the situation, whether it is formal or non-formal). Women were also inclined to gossip. They were more conservative in their speech, and at the same time, more sensitive to matters of correctness (Montgomery, 1995:151). These might be described as folk-linguistic beliefs. Male linguistic behavior was also often assumed implicitly to be the norm, while

the linguistic behavior of women was often treated as a departure from a norm centered on male behavior.

In terms of grammatical differences, women were claimed more linguistically polite than men. When men used a form more often than women it was usually a vernacular form, one which was not admired overtly by the society as a whole, and which was not cited as the 'correct' form (Trudgill, cited in Holmes, 1992:170)

Some linguists had suggested that women used more standard speech forms than men because they were more status conscious than men. Women used more standard speech forms as a way of claiming such status. Women were designated the role of modeling correct behavior in the community. Holmes also said that society expected women to speak more correctly and standardly than men, especially when they were serving as models for children's speech (1992:173).

People, who were subordinate, such as women, usually tended to be polite. As subordinate group, they had to avoid offending men and they spoke carefully and politely. By using more standard speech forms, women were looking after their own need to be valued in society (Holmes, 1992:173). On the other side, men preferred vernacular forms because they carried macho connotations of masculinity and toughness. Holmes also pointed out the standard speech forms tended to be associated with female values and femininity (1992:175).

At the early research the analysis of language differences used by women and men were focusing on syntax, morphology, and pronunciation. But now many

sociolinguists realized that the view of language like that is far too narrow. They had to deal with real language data from a wide variety of situations. In response to the growing awareness that the study of language should be more than the study of grammar and phonology, new disciplines had emerged such as discourse analysis and pragmatics. Other studies were also interesting to be analyzed such as conversation analysis and speech act theory.

Sociolinguists who studied about the difference of men and women language by using language and gender theory had proved that the differences that emerged in cross gender conversation had become the problem of miscommunication between the speaker and the listener. The miscommunication even still happened although they used the same language when they spoke. In order to understand what the speaker meant and to minimize the miscommunication in a conversation the listener had to know a study called pragmatics.

### **2.1.2 Pragmatics**

J.L. Austin, a philosopher at Oxford University (1940s-1950s) who was interested in language, laid the groundwork for what was to become Pragmatics. He wanted to know how humans communicated as efficiently as they in fact did. In the early 20th century, other philosophers were interested in creating an ideal language, but Austin wanted to know how humans manage to communicate despite the imperfections in language.

Pragmatics was the branch of linguistics which studied how speakers used language to achieve their goals and how hearers interpreted the meaning the speaker wished to convey (Aitchison 2003:104). A conversation depended not only on the speaker, who was trying to deliver a message, but also on the hearer, who drew a conclusion from the implication of the utterance, depending on the context in which it occurred. In contrast to syntax and semantics, pragmatics focused on human cooperation and knowledge instead of on linguistic meaning and structure only. Semantics, which concentrated on the study of meaning of the lexical item and lexical structure, was the precursor to pragmatics, which focused on the intended meaning dependent on the context (Aitchison 2003:88104). As mentioned earlier, pragmatics was the branch of linguistics concerned with how humans used language, what the speaker meant and how the hearer interpreted the words uttered.

Jenny Thomas stated in her book *Meaning in Interaction* that speakers frequently meant much more than their words actually said (Thomas 1995:1). That was, the hearer interpreted a meaning that was not clearly stated in the utterance of the speaker. When communicating the speakers constantly encountered utterances that were confusing to the hearers when standing alone out of context, when the utterances were put into context however, the hearers could interpret the words and phrases in a way that made them understand the intentional meaning of the utterance. The reason was that speakers and hearers, according to the American philosopher- linguist Paul Grice, operated under the cooperative principle, which meant that both speaker and hearer conversed with

good intentions. In other words, the speaker uttered words and phrases in order to deliver a message to the hearer, who interpreted a meaning with the knowledge that there was a message behind the utterance.

In order to show what went on in conversation, Grice introduced four conversational maxims. A speaker might fail to observe a maxim but still get the intended meaning through to the hearer. Failing to observe a maxim was often referred to as 'flouting a maxim'. In sitcoms these maxims were constantly flouting to create humor.

### **2.1.3 The Cooperative Principle**

In order to explain how hearers interpreted the utterance implicature, Grice introduced the Cooperative Principle (CP). The CP runs like this: "Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice in Grundy 1995:37). According to the Cooperative Principle both speaker and hearer conversed with the willingness to deliver and interpret a message. The speaker and hearer cooperated and that was why they communicated efficiently (Thomas 1995:63). What made sense in conversations differed between and within cultures (Finegan 1994:339).

In order to illustrate how the hearers interpreted meaning, Grice (1975) presented, in addition to the Cooperative Principle, four conversational maxims to show how the speaker and the hearer communicated effectively in the light of

certain rules. They were: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner, and maxim of relevance.

### **The maxim of quantity**

When two people conversed, the listener usually assumed that the speaker was telling everything s/he needed to know. If the speaker did not say something, then the listener assumed that the speaker simply did not know that information. The maxim of quantity required the speaker to give the right amount of information when s/he spoke, which meant not to be too brief or to give more information than the situation required.

### **The maxim of quality**

The maxim of quality was a matter of giving the right information. The speaker said nothing that s/he knew to be false or for which s/he lacked sufficient evidence (Grice in Thomas, 1995:67). The other maxims were dependent on this maxim since, if a speaker did not convey the truth then the utterance was false, even if the right amount of information was given or the speaker was clear and orderly when speaking (Finegan 1994:341). An example of non-observance was: “you look good with your new haircut” when one actually believed the opposite. The statement was then an untruth, the speaker failed to observe the maxim in order to be polite.

**The maxim of relevance**

The maxim of relevance required the speaker to be relevant to the context and situation in which the utterance occurred (Grice in Thomas, 1995:70). For instance, a speaker should not say “I am on the phone” when someone asked if s/he wanted dinner. Here the utterance meaning was irrelevant and the speaker failed to observe the maxim.

**The maxim of manner**

The maxim of manner was a matter of being clear and orderly when conversing. The speaker described things in the order in which they occurred and avoided ambiguity and obscurity (Grice in Thomas, 1995:64).

**2.1.4 Flouting the Cooperative Principle**

Grice argued that speakers had two options. They could choose to cooperate in accordance with the cooperative principle or they could choose deliberately to flout it. Maxims could be flouted for various reasons, such as to create humor or irony as well as to avoid an uncomfortable situation.

There were also times when the sender meaning derived from deliberate violations or flouting was intended to be perceived by the receiver. If the sender did not intend violations of the principle to be perceived by the receiver, or if the receiver did not realize that they were deliberate, then communication degenerated into lying or simply broke down altogether (Cook, 1989:31). It was possible, for

example, to flout the quality maxim without lying. For that reason Cook (1989) gave an example:

*I've got millions of beer bottles in my cellar*

Although it was not literally true, people would perceive the example as figures of speech, hyperbole, a way of making the meaning more forcefully, rather than as lies. The same happened for metaphor, irony, and sarcasm. These figures of speech (hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and sarcasm) worked only if the sender had enough knowledge to know that average house of cellars would not hold millions of bottles.

Grice added that the speaker could also choose to be blatant. The term was borrowed from Grice, namely blatancy. For Grice, blatancy was one of the defining characteristics of flouting. The speaker may flout a maxim that was s/he may blatantly fail to fulfill it ((2002:30), (see also Thomas, 1995:65). Blatant could here mean ostensive which meant that the intention was easily observable to communicate something or just loud which meant strongly noticeable, or in fact, thematically relevant.

If the quality maxim could be flouted for effect then it could be done also to the other three. The quantity maxim can be violated in two ways. The sender could create prolixity if s/he said too much and terseness if s/he was too brief. People often said more than they need to mark a sense of occasion or respect. And they often said less than they need, perhaps to be rude, blunt, or forthright.

Sometimes people deliberately flout the maxim of relevance to signal embarrassment or a desire to change the subject. Lastly, the maxim of manner is violated either for humor, as in the case of puns where the meaning could be ambiguous or unclear.

## **2.2 Review of Related Study.**

A thesis written by R.A.Diah Kusuma Indah Handayani entitled *An Analysis of figures of speech Found in Advertisements in Cosmopolitan and Men's Health* by using descriptive qualitative method gave the writer many ideas in doing this study. She presented the steps to analyze the advertisements in *cosmopolitan* and *Men's Health*, which made the writer interested in using them in this study.

In her thesis, Handayani analyzed the different language use of women and men, which were framed by using figures of speech as the data taken from advertisements in *Cosmpolitan* and *Men's Health*. The objective of her study was to find out the types of figures of speech used in advertisements in *Cosmopolitan*, the types of figures of speech used in advertisements in *Men's Health*, and the differences and the similarities of the use of figures of speech in the advertisements in both magazines. She used three general frames of theories, which were language and sex theory, advertisements theory, and figures of speech theory. The figures of speech theory were focused onto simile, metaphor, personification, hyperbole, litotes, paradox, metonymy, synecdoche, erotema, and asyndeton. The findings of this study showed that *Cosmopolitan* tended to use

hyperbole, simile, and asyndeton and Men's Health tended to use erotema. From the findings, Handayani concluded that the use of those three prominent figures of speech in Cosmopolitan was suitable with the language and sex theory that women tended to see something in detail and verbose. On the other hand, the use of erotema was prominent in the Men's Health. It showed that men tended to see something in direct, got the point across, gave a very prominent cue, thought in macro way, needed to be shown the big picture, and less complex metaphors. This thesis added some valuable knowledge on the language characteristic of women and men.

Emma Dornerus wrote a thesis entitled *Breaking maxims in conversation: A comparative study of how scriptwriters break maxims in Desperate Housewives and That 70's Show* using descriptive qualitative method to analyze violated and flouted maxims from the conversation. Her research showed that the maxim of relevance was the maxim that was most frequently flouted to create the different comical or dramatic situations. The maxim of manner and quantity was also commonly flouted mainly to create humorous situations. The reason was that the characters in *That 70's Show* were often meant to be portrayed as slow and weird, not mean or deceitful. On the other hand the maxims of quantity and quality were more often broken in *Desperate Housewives* in dramatic contexts in order to make the characters look shifty and unreliable.

In the shows which she chose to examine, the maxims were broken in almost every interaction. She claimed that it was necessary for scriptwriters to have the characters break maxims in order to create and develop humorous and

dramatic situations in verbal interaction. It was important to note that the conversational maxims were commonly observed in TV sitcoms and dramas for various reasons. For example, scriptwriters adhere to different maxims in order to get the intended meaning from one speaker to another. It was necessary to break maxims in order to create humor and drama as well as to bring out different characteristics and personality in the different characters. She also said that an interesting topic for further study would be how maxims were broken in real conversation. Another idea would be to look into whether the breaking of maxims differed between the sexes.

The thesis of the writer entitled *A Study on Cooperative Principle of Male and Female Broadcaster in 'Club 69' program ISTARA FM* analyzed the maxims that occurred in the dialogues of male and female broadcasters. The writer used four maxims of Paul Grice: the maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. Hopefully, this thesis could enrich the knowledge of the characteristic of male and female language in language and gender theory.