

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics is one of the branch studies in linguistics. It has often been defined as the study of language in society. There are some more definitions about the term sociolinguistics which were defined by some experts. These are elaborated in the following paragraphs.

In his book, "*Sociolinguistics: An Introduction*", Trudgill (1974: 32) wrote that there are a number of ways in which language and society are inter-related. He said that language is very much a social phenomenon. Language is not simply a means of communicating information, but it is also a very important means of establishing and maintaining social relationships with other people (Trudgill, 1974: 13-14). These two aspects of language behavior are very important from a social point of view.

According to Trudgill (1974: 32), a study of language totally without reference to its social context inevitably leads to the omission of some of the more complex and interesting aspects of language and to the loss of opportunities for further theoretical progress. Sociolinguistics, then, is that part of linguistics which is concerned with language as a social and cultural phenomenon. It makes use of the subject matter, methodology or findings of the social sciences-sociology and social anthropology in the main, but it is also impinges in certain respects on social or human geography (1974: 32-33).

On the other hand, Holmes discussed the term sociolinguistics in the sociolinguists point of view. She said that sociolinguists study the relationship between language and society. They are interested in explaining why we speak differently in different social contexts, and they are concerned identifying the social functions of language and the ways it is used to convey social meaning. In Holmes opinion (1992: 1), examining the way people use language in different social contexts provides a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationships in a community.

Holmes (1992: 6) added that sociolinguists are also interested in different types of *linguistic* variation used to express and reflect social factors. Vocabulary or word choice is one area of linguistic variation. But linguistic variation occurs at other levels of linguistic analysis too: sounds, word-structure (or morphology), and grammar (or syntax) as well as vocabulary. She said that within each of these linguistic levels there is variation which offers the speakers a choice of ways of expression. They provide us with different linguistic styles for use in different social contexts. So, according to Holmes, the sociolinguist's aim is to move towards a theory which provides a motivated account of the way language is used in a community, and of the choices people make when they use language (1992:16).

Coates also supported that idea by stating that sociolinguistics is the study of language in its social context, especially the linguistics variation (1993: 4). She said that in different social contexts, an individual would speak in different ways (this is called stylistic variation). Moreover, she said, speakers who differs from

each other in terms of age, gender, social class, ethnic group, for example, will also differ from each other in their speech, even in the same context (this is called social variation).

According to Coates, sociolinguists are interested in both stylistic and social variation. They analyze speech in order to show that linguistic variation does not occur randomly but is structured. In here, the aim of sociolinguistics is to expose the orderly heterogeneity of the normal speech community. Unlike theoretically inclined linguists, who concentrate on the imaginary sentences of the ideal speaker-hearer in a homogeneous speech community, sociolinguists choose to grapple with the utterances of real speaker in real (heterogeneous) communities. (1993: 4-5).

In conclusion, just like Trudgill wrote (cited in Fasold, 1984: vii), sociolinguistics is a discipline that is capable of combining linguistic and societal concerns in varying degrees. Therefore, the study of language and gender in society is also paid attention by a lot of sociolinguists.

2.2. Language and Gender

The study about language and gender in society have always been an interesting issue to be discussed. According to some experts, men and women are different in their linguistic behavior. Men and women are considered to have a different language because they have different linguistic features when they speak. The differences are 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 is that they have distinctly different voice qualities. As noted by Montgomery (1995: 149), in the majority of cases, most people can easily tell whether a voice belongs to a man or a woman because men's voices are 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, is produced by vibration of the vocal cords in the larynx (the 'voice box') which is situated at the top of the windpipe. As breath from the lungs passes through the larynx, the vocal cords can be set to vibrate. Thick and heavy vocal cords vibrate more slowly than lighter ones. Since men tend to develop a larger larynx than women, their voices tend to be pitched lower.

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

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

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

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

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

In terms of pragmatic differences, women are also considered as cooperative conversationalists than men. Men tend to be less responsive to the speech of others and to their conversational needs. Women provide more encouraging feedback to their conversational partners than men do, e.g. using noises such as mm, mhm. The goal is to support others opinion. Different from women, men are more competitive and less supportive when talking to others.

The differences between men and women in ways of interacting, according to Holmes (1992: 330) maybe the result of different socialization and acculturation patterns. Maltz and Borker (cited in Van Dijk, 1997b: 130) argued that the subcultures of girls stress cooperativeness and equality, while the subcultures of boys put the emphasis on dominance and competition.

2.3. Lakoff's Theory of Women's Linguistic Features

Robin Lakoff is the first linguist who began the search for the definitive features of women's speech. She introduced the term 'women's language' in a 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 linguists who study the search of sex differences in language use for the next two decades.

Language and Woman's Place was widely reviewed and discussed in both scholarly journals and mass media (for example, *Psychology Today* magazine). An interview with Lakoff also appeared in the notorious US tabloid *National Enquirer*. As one critic noted, when an issue is discussed in the *National Enquirer*, one may safely assume that it has penetrated the public consciousness (Hill, cited in Crawford, 1995: 23).

Lakoff (cited in Crawford, 1995: 24) wrote that her goals in assessing women's language were threefold: to 'provide diagnostic evidence from language use' on gender inequity; to discuss whether anything can be done about gender inequity 'from the linguistic end of the problem'; and to provide, not the final word on sexism and language, but a 'goad to further research'. She expressed the belief that linguistic behavior reflects hidden feelings and attitudes, and is especially useful in revealing them because 'linguistic data are there, in black and white, or on tape, unambiguous and unavoidable'.

2.3.1. The Types of Women's Linguistic Features

Using introspection and linguistic intuition as her method, Lakoff (1975) suggested that a distinct group of features – lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic – distinguish the speech of women. Below are the women's linguistic features

defined by Lakoff (cited in Cameron, 1990: 221-241; Holmes, 1992: 313-314; Crawford, 1995: 24-25):

1. Lexical Hedges or Fillers

Lakoff discusses hedging as another aspect of women's insecurity. By hedges, she refers to the frequent use of such phrases as *sorta / sort of, like, you know, well, kinda / kind of, I guess, and it seems like*. Fishman (cited in Cameron, 1990: 237), in her own analysis of conversations in 1979, also deals with 'you know'. In her transcripts, the women used 'you know' five times more often than the men (87 to 17). Fishman found that the 'you know' were almost all places where the women were unsuccessfully attempting to pursue topics.

According to Lakoff (Cameron, 1990: 237), one would expect 'you know' to be randomly scattered throughout women's speech, since its usage is supposed to reflect the general insecurity of the speaker. If, however, 'you know' does some kind of work in conversation, people would expect its occurrence to cluster at points in conversation where the interactional context seems to call for its usage.

Fishman (cited in Cameron, 1990: 238) said that 'you know' displays conversational trouble, but it is often an attempt to solve the trouble as well. 'You know' is an attention-getting device, a way to check with one's interactional partner to see if they are listening, following and attending to one's remark. When people consider 'you know' interactively, it is not surprising to find that its use is concentrated in long turns at talk, where the speaker is unsuccessfully attempting to carry on a conversation. 'You know'

also seems to be an explicit invitation to respond when it occurs immediately prior to or after pauses in the woman's speech (Fishman, cited in Cameron, 1990: 239).

2. Tag Questions

In syntax, we find that syntactically too women's speech is peculiar. There is at least one rule that a woman will use more conversational situations than a man. This is the rule of tag-question formation. Lakoff (cited in Cameron, 1990: 229) wrote that a tag question, in its usage as well as its syntactic shape (in English) is midway between an outright statement and a yes-no question (midway between a statement and an outright question): it is less assertive than the former, but more confident than the latter. Therefore, it is usable under certain contextual situations: not those in which a statement would be appropriate, nor those in which a yes-no question is generally used, but in situation intermediate between these.

One makes a statement when one has confidence in his / her knowledge and is pretty certain that his / her statement will be believed; one asks a question when one lacks knowledge on some point and has reason to believe that this gap can and will be remedied by an answer by the addressee. A tag question is being intermediate between these. Lakoff (cited in Crawford, 1995: 24) proposed that tags are used when a speaker is stating a claim but has less than full confidence in the truth of the claim.

According to Lakoff (cited in Cameron, 1990: 229), if she says: "Is John here?", she will probably not be surprised if her respondent answers 'no';

but if she say: "John is here, isn't he?" instead, one of the chances is that she is already biased in favor of a positive answer and wanting only confirmation by the addressee. She still want a response from him / the addressee, as she does with a yes-no question; but she has enough knowledge to predict that response, much as with a declarative statement. A tag question, then, might be thought of as a declarative statement without the assumption that the statement is to be believed by the addressee: one has an out, as with a question. A tag gives the addressee leeway, not forcing him to go along with the views of the speaker.

As cited in Cameron (1990: 229) and Crawford (1995:24), Lakoff said that in some situations, a tag question would be a perfectly legitimate sentence form. So, for example, if the speaker has seen something only indistinctly, and has reason to believe that her / his addressee had a better view, the speaker can say: "I had my glasses off. He was out of third, wasn't he?"

Sometimes, we find a tag question used in cases in which the speaker knows as well as the addressee what the answer must be, and doesn't need confirmation. One such situation when the speaker is making 'small talk', trying to elicit conversation from the addressee, like the following sentence: "Sure is hot here, isn't it?"

In discussing personal feelings or opinions, only the speaker normally has any way of knowing the correct answer. This case apparently exist, in which it is the speaker's opinions, rather than perceptions, for which

corroboration is sought, as the example below: "The way prices are rising is horrendous, isn't it?"

One possible interpretation of the sentence above is that the speaker has a particular answer in mind – 'yes' or 'no'- but is reluctant to state it baldly. In Lakoff's opinion (cited in Cameron, 1990: 230), this sort of tag question is much more apt to be used by women than by men because these sentence types provide a means whereby a speaker can avoid committing himself / herself, and thereby avoid coming into conflict with the addressee. The problem is that, by so doing, a speaker may also give the impression of not being really sure of himself, of looking to the addressee for confirmation, even of having no views of his / her own. This last criticism often leveled at women. Thus, a tag question is a kind of polite statement, in that it does not force agreement or believe on the addressee.

3. Rising Intonation on Declaratives

Still relates to the special use of the syntactic rule, Lakoff found (in English language) that there is a peculiar sentence intonation pattern, only among women, which has the form of a declarative answer to a question, but has the rising inflection typical of a yes-no question, as well as being especially hesitant (cited in Cameron, 1990: 230). The effect is as though one were seeking confirmation, though at the same time the speaker may be the only one who has the requisite information. Look at the following sentences:

- a. When will dinner be ready?
- b. Oh ... around six o' clock...?

What is meant by *b* statement is that if six o' clock is ok with *a* or if *a* agree. *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. The consequence is that these sort of speech pattern 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 not make up her mind and 'is not sure of herself'. From here we see that people form judgements 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.

Such features are probably part of the general fact that women's speech sounds much more 'polite' than men's. One aspect of politeness here is: leaving a decision open, not imposing your mind, or views, or claims on anyone else.

4. 'Empty' Adjectives

In term of vocabulary, there is a group of adjectives which have, besides their specific and literal meanings, also 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 (largely restricted to use by women). This kind of adjective is called 'empty' adjectives, which means those that convey only an emotional reaction rather than specific information (Crawford, 1995: 24). The representative lists of the

adjectives are neutral (e.g. great, terrific, cool, neat) and women only (e.g. adorable, charming, sweet, lovely, divine, gorgeous, cute).

In Lakoff's opinion (cited in Cameron, 1990: 226-227), if a man uses the women's adjectives, it will damage his reputation. On the other hand, a woman may freely use the neutral words. However, a woman's use of the '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 different 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, while sentence B is more restricted and 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. Therefore, the choice of words for women are not really free: words restricted to 'women's language' suggest that concepts to which they are applied are not relevant to the real world of male influence and power.

In short, Lakoff said that the women's restricted words basically are not 'feminine', but they signal 'uninvolved', or 'out of power'. However, any

group in a society (especially male) who may use these women's restricted words, are often considered 'feminine' and 'unmasculine', because women are the 'uninvolved' and 'out of power' group. Therefore, people who use these words are also considered as 'feminine' and 'unmasculine' (cited in Cameron, 1990: 228).

5. Specialized Vocabularies (e.g.; Precise Color Terms)

'Women's language' shows up in all levels of the grammar of English. As an example in lexical differences, women are likely to use more precise terms for colors (e.g; mauve, plum) and to have richer vocabularies in areas that are traditionally female specialties, such as cooking (e.g.; sauté, knead) and sewing (e.g.; whipstitch). Of course, men also have their own vocabularies in masculine areas such as sports and auto mechanics.

Back to the women specialized vocabulary, Lakoff wrote that women make far more precise discriminations in naming colors than do men. Words like *beige*, *ecru*, *aquamarine*, *lavender*, *maroon*, and so on are unremarkable in a woman's active vocabulary, but absent from that of most men. Men find the discussions about precise color terms are amusing because they consider such a question trivial and irrelevant to the real world. When men saying something in precise color terms, people might well conclude he was imitating a woman sarcastically, or was a homosexual (cited in Cameron, 1990: 223).

Actually, fine discrimination of color is relevant for women, but not for men because women are not expected to make decisions on important matters, such as 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 may reflect 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 decisions of life (Lakoff, cited in Cameron, 1990: 224).

6. Intensifiers

Intensifiers such as *so*, *just*, *very*, and *quite* seem more characteristic of women's language than of men's. But sometimes it is also particularly found in the speech of male academics. Look at 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. Compared sentence a and b with sentence c and d below:

- c. That sunset is *so* beautiful!
- d. Fred is *so* dumb!

Lakoff (cited in Cameron, 1990: 233) said that substituting an equative like *so* for absolute superlative (like *very*, *really*, *utterly*) seems to be a way of backing out of committing oneself strongly to an opinion, rather like tag questions. One might hedge in this way with perfect right in making aesthetic judgements, as in c, or intellectual judgements, as in d. But it is somewhat odd to hedge in describing one's own mental or emotional state. To hedge in this

situation is to seek to avoid making any strong statement, which is a characteristic of women's speech.

7. 'Hypercorrect' Grammar

'Hypercorrect' grammar is the consistent use of standard verb forms. As cited in Crawford (1995: 25), Lakoff said that 'hypercorrect' grammar involves an avoidance of terms considered vulgar or coarse, such as 'ain't', and the use of precise pronunciation, such as sounding the final g in words such as 'going' instead of the more casual 'goin'.

8. 'Superpolite' Forms

Women usually use compounded and indirect request forms, as well as other excessively polite and euphemistic language (Crawford, 1995:25). Below is the example of compounded and indirect request:

- I wonder if you would mind handling me that book.

Lakoff (cited in Cameron, 1990: 231) argued that 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 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 / she does not comply, merely that he / she will be glad if he / she does. The decision is also up to the addressee. Therefore, a suggestion is politer than an order.

The more particles in a sentence that reinforce the notion that it is a request rather than an order, the politer the result. Look at the sentences below:

- 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?

Sentence a is a direct order, sentence b and c is simple request, while sentence d and e is compound request. A sentence like "Won't you please close the door" would then count as a doubly compound request.

Sentence c means "Are you willing to close the door?" Even though this sentence has function as a request, the decision is living up to the willingness of the addressee. Phrasing it as a positive question makes the implicit 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' suggesting that the addressee has the final decision.

If the question is phrased with a negative like in e, the speaker seems to suggest the stronger likelihood of a negative response from the addressee. The assumption is that the addressee is much freer to refuse. So, e acts as a more polite request than c or d because c and d put the burden of refusal on the addressee, while e does not.

The following phrases are kind of 'superpolite' forms also:

- Would you please
- I'd really appreciate it if
- Would you mind
- ... if you don't mind.

In conclusion, the more one compounds a request, the more characteristic it is of women's speech, the less of men's.

9. Avoidance of Strong Swear Words (e.g.; The Use of Expletives)

Women usually use milder forms such as 'Oh, dear!' or 'Darn!', while men use the stronger ones such as 'Dammit!' or 'Oh shit!'. Consider the following sentences:

- a. Oh dear, you've put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.
- b. Shit, you've put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.

Those pairs of sentences are identical syntactically and in terms of referential lexical items. The differences are only in the choice of 'meaningless' particle. People would classify the first sentence as part of 'women's language', and the second as men's language, even though women are also able to use sentence b.

As said by Lakoff (cited in Cameron, 1990: 225), the language of the favored group, the groups that holds the power, along with its non-linguistic behavior, is generally adopted by the other group, not vice versa. The consequence is 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 (for example; homosexuals). The 'stronger' expletives are reserved for men, while the 'weaker' ones for women. The difference between using 'shit' or 'damn' as opposed to 'oh dear', 'goodness', or 'oh fudge' lies in how forcefully one says how one feels.

The choice of particles is a function of how strongly one allows oneself to feel about something, so that the strength of an emotion conveyed in a sentence corresponds to the strength of the particle. In a really serious situation, the use of 'women's particles' constitutes a joke, or at any rate is highly inappropriate. These sentences below are inappropriate in some sense, either because it is syntactically deviant or used in the wrong social context:

- a. Oh fudge, my hair is on fire.
- b. Dear me, did he kidnap the baby?

Lakoff argued that, as children, women are encouraged to be 'little ladies' and are not allowed to show temper. 'High spirits' are expected and therefore tolerated in little boys, while docility and resignation are expected in little girls. Women are allowed to fuss and complain, but only a man can below in rage (cited in Cameron, 1990: 225).

Men are allowed to express stronger means than women because men have strong position in the real world. The more strongly and forcefully someone expresses opinions, the much likely he / she to be taken seriously. Therefore, men usually also have the ability to use strong particles like 'shit' and 'hell'.

If someone is allowed to show emotions, others may well be able to view him / her as a real individual in his / her own right. The behavior a woman learns as 'correct' prevents her from being taken seriously as an individual, and further is considered 'correct' and necessary for a woman precisely because society does not consider her seriously as an individual (Lakoff, cited in Cameron, 1990: 226).

10. Emphatic Stress

Women tend to use words which are used to emphasize the utterances or strengthen the meaning of an utterance. For example: "It was a brilliant performance." The word 'brilliant' is one of the examples of an emphatic stress. This word can be use to strengthen the meaning of the utterance.

As cited in Holmes (1992: 316), the linguistic features identified by Lakoff above can be divided into two groups. First, the linguistic devices which may be used for hedging or reducing the force of an utterance. Secondly, the features which may boost or intensify a proportions of a force. Features which may serve as hedging devices are lexical hedges, tag questions, questions intonation, superpolite forms, and euphemisms, while intensifiers and emphatic stress serve as boosting devices.

The hedging devices can be used to weaken the strength of an assertion, while the boosting devices can be used to strengthen it. Lakoff also claimed that both kinds of modifiers were evidence of an unconfident speaker. Hedging devices explicitly 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 uncertainty, 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. Therefore, according to Lakoff, both hedges and boosters reflect women's lack of confidence.

2.4. Gilmore Girls

2.4.1. General Description

Since the first appearance of Gilmore Girls in May 10, 2000, this series has become one of the favorites American TV drama series, both in The United States and Indonesia. The reason why a lot of people, especially female teenagers, watch this series every week is because the story of Gilmore Girls is pretty simple and reflects the growing reality of the new type of an American family.

As said in www.thewb.com, this series has won a Family Television Award for New Series, and was named as Best Family TV Drama Series by the Young Artist Awards. The series star Lauren Graham was also nominated for a Golden Globe Award for Best Performance by an Actress in a Television Series and received two consecutive nominations for Outstanding Performance by a Female Actor in a Drama Series from the Screen Actors Guild. She has also won two Family Television Awards. In addition, the series star Alexis Bledel, also has won a Young Artist Award and a Family Television Award. Her best friend in this series, Keiko Agena, also honored in the Supporting Young Actress category.

The story of *Gilmore Girls* itself tells about the strong and loving mother-daughter relationship who live in a small town named 'Stars Hollow'. Thirty something Lorelai Gilmore (Lauren Graham), the mother, has made a mistake in her life. She has been doing her best to see that her daughter and best friend in the world – Rory (Alexis Bledel), does not follow her footsteps. But that may be easier to say it than do it, since both of them share the same interests, the same intellect, the same coffee addiction, and the same eyes. Even though Rory is more serious than her mother, there are tendencies, especially in the love department, that clearly indicate she is her mother's daughter.

From the beginning, this unique mother-daughter team has been growing up together. Lorelai was just at Rory's age when she became pregnant and made the tough decision to raise her baby alone. This defiant move, along with Lorelai's independent nature, caused a rift between her and her strict, rich, and old fashioned parents, Emily (Kelly Bishop) and Richard (Edward Herrmann). However, Lorelai was forced to reconcile with her parents when she found herself desperate and need a lot of money for Rory's tuition.

In season four, both *Gilmore Girls* are experiencing major life changes. Surprisingly, Rory chose Yale University, her grandfather Richard's alma mater, over her long time dream school, Harvard. Since Yale is so close to Stars Hollow, Rory is able to visit her home for laundry runs and the traditional Friday-night dinner with her grandparents at their elegant and oppressive house. In addition, Rory is able to stay in contact with her best friend, Lane (Keiko Agena), who attends a local college and resolutely pursues her musical streak as a drummer in a

rock band, which is contrary to her conservative Korean mother's wishes. Another constant thing in Rory's life is the presence of her intense former classmate, Paris Geller (Liza Weil), who is now her roommate at Yale. Rory also explores the world of college dating, since Dean (Jared Padalecki), one of her high school love interests, got married, and a bad boy Jess (Milo Ventimiglia), has gone to Venice, California to search his father.

Although her daughter has left the nest, Lorelai sees a bright new dream comes true when she and a fabulous chef, Sookie St. James (Melissa McCharty), her best friend in the world, finally open their own inn, the Dragonfly Inn, after her former place to work, the Independence Inn, was damaged by fire. Now, happily married and had a new baby, Sookie must divide her time between her new business in Dragonfly with Lorelai and being a mother. Meanwhile, Lorelai's longstanding friendship with Luke Danes (Scott Patterson), the gruffly charming owner of the local diner, is getting stronger after Luke is failed with his marriage.

This series is also supported by the colorful town characters such as Miss Patty (Liz Torres), the local dance teacher and social commentator; Michael Gerard (Yanic Truesdale), the haughty former employee of Independence Inn, and Kirk (Sean Gunn), the town's master of nothing. This heartfelt one-hour dramedy was created by Amy Sherman-Palladino, who serves as executive producer, alongside with Daniel Palladino, and produced by Dorothy Parker Drank Here Productions and Hofflund/Polone in association with Warner Bros. Television. Gavin Polone is also credited as an executive producer of this series.

In The United States, *Gilmore Girls* is played on Warner Brothers Television every Tuesday at 8.00 p.m., and now has reached the fifth season. In Indonesia itself, this series had been played by Trans TV in 2001-2003, and played until the third season only. It was played on Trans TV since August 23, 2001, every Sunday at noon (the first season played every Sunday at 11.00 a.m., the second season at 12.00 p.m., the third season at 1.p.m.). The length of each episode of this series is approximately one hour (<http://www.thewb.com>).

2.4.2. The Synopsis of Ballroom and Biscotti

Lorelai and Rory return from their summer backpacking adventure in Europe to get Rory ready for Yale and catch up with the world of Stars Hollow. Sookie is well along in her pregnancy and confides the sex of the baby to Lorelai, while Luke has returned from the cruise with his girlfriend with surprising news. Richard and Emily are eager to resume the family's Friday night dinners, but when Lorelai fails to show, the sparks are soon flying again (cited in <http://www.gilmore-girls.net/episodes/season4/index.html>).

2.5. Related Studies

The study about women's speech features had been done before by Dewi Rosita, a student of English Department Petra Christian University Surabaya. The title of her thesis is "A Sociolinguistic Study on Speech Features of Female Students of Petra Christian University while Gossiping in Campus". Her study analyzed the type of speech feature used by female students of Petra Christian

University while gossiping in campus and the topics of gossip that occur in each conversation. She also analyzed the relationship between topics of gossip and the speech feature used. The objects of her study are the female students of Petra Christian University Surabaya. In her study, she used the theory of Robin Lakoff about women's speech features and the theory of Jennifer Coates about topics of gossip. The method of her study is qualitative method. She collected the data by recording the conversation and analyzed it by the theory she used. The results of her study show that the topics of gossip produced by the participants were mainly 'house-talk' (refers to daily activities) and 'chatting' (refers to private problems) which are the positive gossip, instead of the negative gossip 'scandal' and 'bitching'. The female students of Petra Christian University also tend to use speech features such as lexical hedges and intensifiers, which are appear in all topics of gossip. Feature tag questions did not appear in all topics of gossip, while 'hypercorrect' grammar, 'superpolite' forms, and precise color terms never appear in all conversation. And finally, she found that the topic of gossip influences the amounts of speech features produced and also influences the kind of speech features that occur.

CHAPTER III PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS