



**WOMEN'S AND MEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES
SHOWED BY NATALIE AND BLAKE'S
UTTERANCES IN THE MOVIE *ISN'T IT ROMANTIC*
(2019): A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY**

A THESIS

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for S-1 Degree Majoring Literature in the English Department,
Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University**

Submitted by:

Venia Anggraeni

13020118120005

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIPONEGORO UNIVERSITY**

SEMARANG

2023

PRONOUNCEMENT

I honestly state that this thesis is written by myself without taking any works from other researchers in any university, in diploma degree, S-1, S-2, and S-3 degrees. I also ascertain that I do not take any material from other works except the references mentioned.

Semarang, 09 January 2023



Venia Anggraeni

MOTTO AND DEDICATION

*You can't go back and change the beginning,
But you can start where you are and change the ending.*

C.S. Lewis

*Life is not about waiting for the storm to pass.
It's about learning how to dance in the rain.*

Vivian Greene

*It's okay not to know everything,
but it's not okay not trying to learn something.*

Jerry Lolandes

This thesis is dedicated to

My dearest parent

And my loved ones

APPROVAL

**WOMEN'S AND MEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES SHOWED BY
NATALIE AND BLAKE'S UTTERANCES IN THE MOVIE *ISN'T IT
ROMANTIC* (2019): A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY**

Written by:

Venia Anggraeni

NIM: 13020118120005

Is approved by the thesis advisor

on 09 January 2023

Thesis Advisor



Dwi Wulandari, S.S., M.A

NIP. 197610042001122001

The Head of the English Department



Dr. Drs. Oktiva Herry Candra M.Hum.

NIP.196710041993031003

VALIDATION

WOMEN'S AND MEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES SHOWED BY NATALIE
AND BLAKE'S UTTERANCES IN THE MOVIE *ISN'T IT ROMANTIC* (2019):
A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY

Written by

Venia Anggraeni

13020118120005

was tested and defended in the examination session in front of Strata 1 Thesis
Examination Committee Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University
on 31 January 2023, and was revised according to the suggestion of the
Examination Committee

Thesis Advisor

Dwi Wulandari, S.S., M.A.



on 14 February 2023

NIP. 197610042001122001

Thesis examiner

Chair Person

Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum



on 14 February 2023

NIP. 196610041990012001

First Member

Prihantoro, S.S., M.A., Ph.D



on 14 February 2023

NIP. 198306292006041002

The Dean of

Faculty of Humanities Diponegoro University on 14 February 2023



Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum
NIP. 196610041990012001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Praise be to Allah SWT, who has given us His countless blessing and great mercy, so this thesis came to a completion. Shalawat and greetings will not forget always to be devoted to the Prophet Muhammad SAW. This part is presented to thank all people who have given them in the accomplishment of this thesis. This gratitude might never be equal to their help and support.

First and foremost, the writer has to thank Dwi Wulandari S.S., M.A, as the writer's thesis advisor, for the help, instruction, guidance, and support in correcting and helping finishing this thesis. Without her assistance and dedicated involvement in every step throughout the process, this thesis would have never been accomplished.

My greatest thank also goes to the following:

1. Dr. Nurhayati, M.Hum, as the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
2. Dr. Oktiva Herry Chandra, M.Hum, as the Head of the English Department of the Faculty of Humanities, Diponegoro University.
3. All lecturers of English Department at Diponegoro University for precious knowledge and advice that would be unforgettable for the writer.
4. My parents and my sister without their love and support the writer would not be able to finish this thesis.

5. Katarina Dhania Dwiwahyu Ariani, Maharani Laksmi Anindita, and Ignatius Krisna Pandita Rama for becoming the writer's 911 call, for every moment we spent together and for the endless support you always give.
6. Anggita Ambarina, Atika Zumna, Berliana Anandya Sukma, Erlita Dwi Rosiana, Maretha Embun Sari, Lintang Ida Amalia, and Radika Ayu Destiara, for the amazing four years we spent together, which makes Semarang feel like home.
7. Amalia Kartika Putri, Bernita, Cori Nur Isa for the craziest eight years journey we have been spending together.
8. My fellow students in English Literature 2018, especially Class A, for motivation and cherished the time we spent together in college.

This thesis of course still needs to be improved since I realize that this is far from being perfect. Thus, any recommendation and constructive suggestion would always be welcomed and appreciated. Finally, I hope that this thesis would be helpful for those who want to learn about sociolinguistics especially gender language.

Semarang, 09 January 2023



Venia Anggraeni

TABLE OF CONTENT

PRONOUNCEMENT	i
MOTTO AND DEDICATION	ii
APPROVAL	iii
VALIDATION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
TABLE OF CONTENT	vii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of Study	1
1.2. Research Questions	3
1.3. Scope of the Study	4
1.4. Previous Study	4
1.5. Writing Organization	9
CHAPTER II THEORY AND METHOD	10
2.1. Theoretical Framework	10
2.1.1. Gender and Language	10
2.1.1.1. Women's Language	10
2.1.1.2. Men's Language	17
2.1.2. Speech Function	19
2.2. Research Method	21
2.2.1 Types of Research	21
2.2.2. Data and Data Sources	22
2.2.3. Population and Sample	22
2.2.4. Method of Collecting Data	23
2.2.5. Method of Analyzing Data	24
CHAPTER III FINDING AND DISCUSSION	27
3.1 Findings	27
3.1.1 Women's Language Features	29
3.1.2 Men's Language Features	54
3.2 Discussions	69
CHAPTER IV	77
REFERENCES	80

ABSTRACT

Lakoff conducted a research in 1973, and concluded that women and men speak in different ways as a result of the differences in social roles that existed. However, as time went on, women and men began to adopt features aimed for the opposite gender. Therefore, the research entitled *Women's and Men's Language Features Shown by Natalie and Blake's Utterances in the movie Isn't It Romantic (2019): Sociolinguistic Study* aims to classify and describe women's and men's language features used by the two characters. In addition, this study also aims to describe the purposes of using those features. Lakoff's, Coates', and Holmes' theories were used for those aims. Identity referential and articulatory phonetics methods are used to analyze the data. The results showed nine out of ten women's language features were found in Natalie and Blake's utterances. Those features are lexical hedges or fillers, intensifiers, tag questions, 'empty' adjectives, 'hypercorrect' grammar, 'super polite' form, rising intonation, avoidance of strong swearing words, and emphatic stress. As for the men's language features, five features were found: minimal responses, questions, compliments, swearing and taboo language, and commands and directives. The main purposes of using those features were to express the speaker's emotion.

Keyword: *Lakoff's theory; Coates' theory, Isn't It Romantic movie; women's language features, men's language features; speech functions*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of Study

One of the most interesting and widely studied areas in the sociolinguistic field is related to Gender Language. Gender Language is a language variation influenced by gender differences, in this case, men and women (Lakoff, 1973, Coates, 2013; Holmes, 2013). Regarding gender language, linguists such as Robin Lakoff (1973, pp. 45-80) believe that the language used by men and women has its characteristics, leading Lakoff to formulate ten features of language that women often use. These features were caused by women and men having different societal roles, where women were considered inferior to men (Lakoff, 1973, p.62). However, Lakoff (1973, pp. 48-49) also stated that the features she put forward are the guidelines for how society expects a woman to talk. They are expected to speak in a certain way or what Lakoff calls ‘talking like a lady’.

At a time, especially before and around the 1970s, women were still caught up in an environment that required them to become inferior. The space for movement and their environment was limited. The language used by women does not show an imbalance of power between women and men. However, it refers to gender differences that indicate differences in conversation norms because women tend to be in a friendly environment rather than a competitive environment like men (Mizokami, 2001, p. 147).

Recent studies have found that these language features are no longer applicable strictly in modern times due to the changing era where women's position and space

for movement are no longer as limited as they used to be. Women and men began to adopt language features from the opposite gender. They used those features to convey their purposes better, and to be considered equal by their interlocutors.

The utterances created by women and men can be seen easily in movies. The movie itself is a form of literary work where the literary work reflects society at that time. Literary works reflect how people interact with one another. In addition, literary works also reflect what people think, say, and do in society (Keerthika, 2018, p. 471-472).

In this research, the researcher used a movie called *Isn't It Romantic*, released in 2019. This movie focuses on the story of the main female character named Natalie. She is described as a woman who physically does not meet the beauty standards in society. That made Natalie grow up in a harsh environment. She is independent, she has a career as an architect where she has to be in a very competitive work environment, but she lives with lack of confidence. Until one day, she gets stuck in life like a romantic comedy and meets Blake. Blake himself is a successful businessman. Although not the male lead, Blake's figure is strong enough to carry on the story. His figure manifests what people consider the ideal man from how he acts and talks, especially his physical appearance.

In the context of this movie, the language used by Natalie and Blake showed the language features proposed by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013). However, when they used the features, Natalie and Blake not only used the features designed for their gender but also adopted the features of the opposite gender. This led the

researcher to assume that gender brings differences in the way women and men speak, but the application does not always match the existing theory.

The researcher found that research using this movie in gender language especially using the theory of Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013), had not been carried out. This becomes the primary reason why this research is required. After observing this movie, the researcher found issues related to linguistics, especially in the sociolinguistic field, regarding gender language using Lakoff's (1973) and Coates's (2013) theories. The movie, set in modern life, presents many issues regarding gender and language, especially in the utterances produced by two characters, Natalie and Blake.

Although the theory put forward by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013) is considered a solid basis for determining the characteristics of the language of women and men produced in the speeches of these two characters, there is a possibility that changing times have affected the application of these two theories. In other words, there is a possibility that the language features intended for specific gender do not strictly follow these theories. Therefore, the researcher decided to conduct a research using a movie set in the modern era to see how much these features have changed and what features have remained the same.

1.2. Research Questions

Based on the background study explicated above, there are some questions regarding the research:

1. What are the women's and men's language features used by Natalie and Blake in the movie *Isn't It Romantic* (2019)?
2. What are the purposes of using the features used by Natalie and Blake in the movie *Isn't It Romantic* (2019)?

1.3. Scope of the Study

This research engaged in the sociolinguistic field, especially regarding gender and language. The researcher used the object of study in the form of a movie entitled *Isn't It Romantic* (2019) and its movie subtitle. It focused on the dialogue used by Natalie and Blake. The theories used as references and guidelines are Lakoff's theory of women's language features, Coates's theory of men's language features, and Holmes's theory of speech functions.

1.4. Previous Study

The researcher found fifteen previous studies that are similar to this study. From these fifteen studies, the researcher categorized them into three groups. The first group is the previous studies that discussed about gender language. The researcher found nine studies, five studies used Lakoff's (1973, 1975) theories, one studies used Lakoff (1973) and Mulac et al. (2001) theories, two studies used Lakoff (1975, 2014) and Coates (2013) theories, and one used Coates' theory (2014).

The first five studies used only Lakoff's (1973, 1975) theories with the qualitative description as a research method. The five studies found quite varied results. Two studies found nine female language features (Retiningrum, 2018; Apridaningrum, 2018), and three others found eight female language features (Pebrianti, 2013; Diraisyah, 2014; Murti, 2018). From these studies, three studies found that lexical hedges are mainly found as the features of women's utterances (Diraisyah, 2014; Murti, 2018; Retiningrum, 2018), followed by intensifiers (Pebrianti, 2013) and empty adjectives (Apridaningrum, 2018). Meanwhile, the language features that are not used are precise color terms (Diraisyah, 2014; Apridaningrum, 2018; Murti, 2018; Retiningrum, 2018), rising intonation (Pebrianti, 2013), hyper-correct grammar (Pebrianti, 2013; Diraisyah, 2014), and avoidance of strong swear words (Murti, 2018). They also found that women often show insecurity and lack of confidence in conversation.

The next study used the theories of Lakoff (1975) and Mulac et al. (2001) and the qualitative method (Priyadi, 2015). They found that the female characters in their object used nine out of ten features of the female language proposed by Lakoff (1975). Those are intensifiers, super polite form, lexical hedges, rising intonation on declarative, empty adjectives, avoidance of swearing words, hypercorrect grammar, and tag questions. In addition, the male characters used three out of five features proposed by Mulac et al. (2001), such as brief sentences, command sentences, and humor sentences.

Two former studies that used the theories of Lakoff (1975, 20014) and Coates (2013) simultaneously to examine female and male characters were research

conducted by Juwita et al. (2018) and Putra & Prayudha (2019). Juwita et al. (2018) found seven out of ten language features used by female characters in their research objects, while Putra & Prayudha (2019) found six out of ten. There are similarities between the two studies; lexical hedges or fillers are language features most often used by female characters. On the other hand, research by Juwita et al. (2018) found four out of ten language features used by male characters, while Putra & Prayudha (2019) found three out of ten with swearing and taboo words were features that were found in both studies. Juwita et al. (2018) also found that female and male characters did not consistently use women's and men's language based on each gender due to environmental factors when they made speeches.

The following research is a research conducted by Nabilah (2019). Nabilah compared the use of language features on female and male vloggers with Coates' theory (2014) as a foundation. The research found that both female vloggers used five of the same seven language features: hedges, compliments, command and direct, questions, swear and taboo words. The minimal response and question tag were not found in the utterances of female vloggers and male vloggers.

In the second group, the researcher found four studies regarding speech function. Two of them used Holmes' theory (2013), and the other two used another theory from Jakobson (1960) and Hallidays (1978). The first study that used Holmes' theory was conducted by Munir (2018). The second is a study by Wijayanti & Chasanah (2021). These studies used descriptive qualitative methods, but the results were different. Although the two studies used the six speech functions proposed by Holmes, the dominant speech function differs. The most dominant

speech function used by the main character analyzed by Munir (2018) is expressive, while the character analyzed by Wijayanti & Chasanah (2021) dominantly used referential function.

The following study was written by Arista (2014). The author used Jakobson's theory (1960) of speech function to analyze the speech function used by the main character of *Sherlock Holmes II: A Game of Shadow* movie. She used the descriptive qualitative method. She found that the most dominant speech function used by the main character is the metalinguistic function. The last study that the writer found regarding speech function was conducted by Tarigan (2018). This study used the speech function theory proposed by Halliday (1973). Tarigan analyzed the speech function used by Moana and Maui characters in a movie called *Moana*. The results show that Moana and Maui used different amounts and dominant speech functions. Moana used five speech functions, with the dominant speech function being regulatory and heuristic functions. In comparison, Maui used six speech functions, with the dominant speech function being representational, interactional, personal, and imaginative function.

The last group discussed about the previous studies that using the same object of the study. The researcher found two studies that discussed *Isn't It Romantic (2019)* as an object. The first one was conducted by Montemorano (2020), which compared two romantic comedy movies, *Isn't It Romantic (2019)* and *Playing It Cool (2014)*. She used content analysis and comparative analysis methods to analyze the data. Through this research, she found that the gender difference of the main character of a movie often leads the plot in different directions, and a romantic

comedy genre is indeed always attached to its trope. The subsequent research is sociopragmatics research conducted by Rusydah (2020). This research aims to determine what feminine speech styles female characters use in the movie and determine their accuracy. The method used is the qualitative descriptive method, and the theory used is the theory proposed by Holmes and Stubbe (2003) and the theory by Yule (2003). The researcher found that more than half of the speeches of female characters in the movie belong to the feminine style of speech, and collaborative is the most dominant.

From the fifteen previous studies above, the researcher found that the analysis using female and male language features was limited. Most previous studies that the researcher have found above focused on grouping what features were used by the objects they studied but only used one theory or one gender. Women's language features are used only to analyze the speech style of female characters, and men's language features are only used to analyze the speech style of male characters. Only three studies have analyzed female and male characters using women's and men's language features, but were not based on either Lakoff's or Coates' theory. In this study, the researcher aims to analyze both characters – woman and man – using both theories – women's and men's language features theories – at once, and also explaining the purposes of the features they used. Hence, the gap between this study and the previous studies is that only a few studies analyze the speech styles of two genders using women's and men's language features simultaneously along with explaining the purpose of the features they use. In addition, research with the object

Isn't It Romantic (2019) movie regarding gender language using the theory of Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013) has not yet been carried out.

1.5. Writing Organization

This research consists of four chapters which are then divided into several sub-chapters. Those four chapters are:

1. CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION. This chapter contains the background of the study, research question, purpose of the study, the scope of the study, significance, previous study, and the organization of the thesis.
2. CHAPTER II: THEORY AND METHOD. This chapter explains the theory and the method used to analyze the movie.
3. CHAPTER III: RESULT AND DISCUSSION. This chapter shows and discusses the results that the researcher finds to answer the research question.
4. CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION. This chapter contains the complete summary of the previous chapter.

CHAPTER II

THEORY AND METHOD

2.1. Theoretical Framework

2.1.1. Gender and Language

The influence of gender differences resulted in the emergence of different language variations used between women and men. For example, some social dialectologists say women, as parties with a higher conscious status, tend to use standard speech forms in communicating (Holmes, 2013, p. 301). Another opinion was also stated by Robin Lakoff (1973); from her research, she concluded that in communicating, women are so attached to their roles and positions as inferior parties in society. This situation makes their language more polite and sometimes indicates a lack of confidence. On the other hand, the language used by men is believed to be harsher and more direct than women (Haas, 1979, p. 616).

2.1.1.1. Women's Language

Sociolinguists believe that the language variety used by men and women is different. In 1973, Robin Lakoff (1973) conducted a study related to these differences in which she focused on variations in the language used by women. In her paper entitled *Language and Women Place* (1973), Lakoff found that women use certain linguistic features when communicating. She then formulated these variations into ten features of women's language, which include *lexical hedges*, *tag questions*, and others. Haas (1979, p. 623) stated that, euphemism, politeness forms,

apology, laughter, crying, and unfinished sentences are often found in women's speech. Lakoff stated that women are seen as having a subordinate position to men, and this fact is proven linguistically, namely when they use language (Lakoff, 1973, p. 62).

The language features that Lakoff (1973) said tend to be used by women in communicating are

2.1.1.1.1. Lexical Hedges/Fillers

Lakoff argues that using hedging devices for women is a way for them to show their uncertainty (Holmes, 2018, p.304). A research from Apridaningrum (2018) found that lexical hedges or fillers indicate uncertainty, and lack of confidence can reduce the power of certainty of a speech, *e.g., well, you know, you see, seems, may, sort of, belief, and looks.*

2.1.1.1.2. Tag Question

Lakoff stated that although there are no syntactic rules that women only use, there is at least one rule that women will use more often than men in conversation. This rule is called a tag question. Tag question is often used when the speaker makes a claim but he still doubts his claim. Tag question can also be found in many cases where the speaker does not need confirmation or the question is because both the speaker and the listener know the correct answer. In addition, this feature can also be used in situations where the speaker is trying to make 'small talk' (Lakoff, 1973, pp. 53-55). Asking a question would be a sign of insecurities;

they used the tag question to find validation and strengthen their speech because they were uncomfortable without it (Lakoff, 1973, p. 11). An example of sentences using tag questions is John is here, *isn't he?*; She goes to school, *doesn't she?*; Anna is Elsa's sister, *right?*

2.1.1.1.3. Rising intonation

Based on research conducted by Lakoff in 1973, she found that women have intonation patterns that distinguish them from men. This pattern is usually used as a declarative answer to a question and has the increased inflection that is typical of yes-no questions and is very hesitant. This indicates that the speaker is seeking confirmation, but at the same time, the speaker may be the only person who knows the answer (Lakoff, 1973, p. 55). For example, in the following conversation:

(A) When will dinner be ready?

(B) Oh ... around six o'clock... ?

In addition, Qi Pan stated that women tend to change their tone to show rich emotion and make their sentences gentle and tender (2011, p. 1015). This was later proven in Apridaningrum's research (2018) that women often raise their intonation when they speak to emphasize their sentences.

2.1.1.1.4. 'Empty' adjectives

Lakoff found that another language feature that distinguishes between women and men is the use of particles called grammarians, often described as 'meaningless' (Lakoff, 1973, p. 50). She also stated that women use empty adjectives to indicate their approbation or admiration for something. Men could also use this feature, but it might damage their image. Examples of empty adjectives are *adorable, charming, sweet, lovely, divine, and cute*. It is supported (Haas, 1979, p. 621), that women are more often used 'meaningless' adjectives like the words *lovely, delightful, wonderful, nice, pretty, pathetic, pretty little, smartly uniformed, cute, dearest, gentle, gaily, beautifully, lovelies, very very, devoted, meek, perfectly wonderful, and stylish*.

2.1.1.1.5. Precise color terms

Lakoff mentions that women have a naming system for colors that varies more intensely than men; words like *beige, ecru, aquamarine, lavender, and mauve* represent more in women than in men's speech. If men use these color terms, it can be said that they are just imitating sarcastically or are homosexual or interior decorators. This is a result of the unnecessary role of women in deciding matters of importance. Therefore, women are relegated to the non-crucial decision as a sop (Lakoff, 1973 p. 49).

2.1.1.1.6. Intensifiers

According to Lakoff (1975, p. 54), intensifier is used to emphasize the meaning of what the speaker is trying to convey and is more likely to be used by

women. Holmes (2018, p. 330) states that the intensifiers included in the boosting device can indeed emphasize assertion. Holmes (2018, p. 304) also states that women use intensifying devices to make their addressees take them seriously. Lakoff (1975, p. 56) argues that women always try to emphasize their sentences based on women's fear of being ignored.

2.1.1.1.7. 'Hypercorrect' Grammar

According to Holmes (2018, p. 169), women are subordinate to males and, as such, must take care not to offend them and speak formally. The use of this standard form is more widely used by women than men, among others, because women are more aware of their social position; as an inferior party, women must be polite to be respected in society (Holmes, 2018, p. 168). Lakoff (1975, p.55) stated that women are not supposed to use hars language. In addition, women are also not accustomed to 'dropping' their 'g' sounds. For example, women will prefer to say 'going' rather than 'goin' as is usually used by men. The use of 'a'int' is also very rarely seen in women because when a woman uses 'a'int' she will get scolded. See the example below:

(A) *Comin' down the book study?*

It ain't that bad.

(B) *Coming down to the book study tonight?*

It is not that bad.

From the two examples above, it is safe to conclude that women prefer speech variation (B) over (A).

2.1.1.1.8. ‘Super Polite’ Forms

Lakoff (1973, p. 13) argues that the language spoken by women sounds much more polite than that spoken by men. ‘Super polite forms have a solid relationship with applying hypercorrect grammar to women. As explained in the previous point regarding the position of women and their obligation to be polite, this is also to keep them from offending others (Holmes, 2018, pp. 167-168). Politeness involves the absence of strong statements, and women’s speeches are made to prevent strong statements (Lakoff, 1973, p. 57). They often use indirect requests and euphemisms. The use of indirect requests does not indicate the need to comply with the speaker’s request and leaves the option open when the speaker suggests something to be done as a favor to the speaker. The use words ‘*please*’ and ‘*thank you*’ are the words that appear most often in ‘super polite’ forms. For example, the four sentences below are in order from the lowest level of politeness (a) to the highest (d) (Lakoff, 1973, p. 56).

(A) *Close the door.*

(B) *Please close the door.*

(C) *Will you close the door?*

(D) *Will you please close the door?*

2.1.1.1.9. Avoid Strong Swearing and Taboo Words

Lakoff believes that in various events, the use of ‘stronger’ expletives (such as *damn*, *shit*, *fuck*) are more devoted to men, while women tend to use

'weaker' expletives (such as *oh dear*, *goodness*, *oh fudge*). Lakoff also argues that the use of 'stronger' or 'weaker' expletives depends on how strong the emotion is felt by the person who uses it. However, women do not get the same understanding as men in showing these emotions. Lakoff said that "women are allowed to fuss and complain, but only a man can bellow in rage" (1973, p. 51). This is reinforced by De Klerk (1991, p. 160), who argues that somehow women are forbidden to do swearing, unlike men who are free to do this.

2.1.1.1.10. Emphatic stress

The use of emphatic stress can show doubts about women's self-expression (Lakoff, 1975, p. 56). Holmes (2013) stated that as part of a boosting device, emphatic stress carries a function in some way to strengthen the meaning of words in a text. Women may employ italic, bold, coloring, repetition, capital letters, or lengthier letter typing to enhance or provide greater emphasis to the words they want to emphasize in written text (Pebrianti, 2013, p. 112). Examples of using emphatic stress in the text are:

- (A) It was a BRILLIANT idea.
- (B) I would **love** to watch your performance.
- (C) She is a very very good teacher.

2.1.1.2. Men's Language

Male language is said to be coarser and more direct (Haas, 1979, p. 616). Jennifer Coates (2013) then provides a further explanation of these differences in her book entitled *Women, Men, and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* and mentions five features of the male language. These features are as follows:

2.1.1.2.1. Minimal Response

Minimal response, also called backchannel, includes terms such as *hmm*, *yeah*, and *right*. (Coates, 2013, p. 87). Zimmerman & West (1996, pp. 108-109) indicates expressions such as *yeah*, *um hmm*, *uh huh*, and *yeah* are forms of minimal responses in the English Language. Men use this feature to establish dominance (Coates, 2013, p. 87).

2.1.1.2.2. Questions

Coates (2013, p. 93) explains that question is a part of conversational sequencing devices linked together with answers. In other words, the question demands an answer as a response. Men use questions to gain information. Two studies by Juwita (2018) and Putra & Prayudha (2019) show that men tend to have the intention to dig up information from their interlocutors in conversation.

2.1.1.2.3. Commands and Directives

Haas (1979, p. 616) argued that men's sentence tends to be coarser and more direct. Men often use their language to give commands, lecture, debate and argue. Goodwin (1980, 1990, 1998), cited in Coates (2013, p. 169), found from his observation that the boys tend to use explicit commands, which are called 'aggravated' directives (*e.g., gimme, I want*) to assert status differences. On the other hand, the girls use more 'mitigated' directives (*e.g., Let's go around..., We gonna paint..., We could go around...*) to include the addressee(s) with them and to suggest rather than demand action. Another study by Hennessey and Nicholson (1972) on television commercials showed that men tend to use directives, that is, the advice or commands to buy products (cited in Haas, 1979, p. 623).

2.1.1.2.4. Swearing and Taboo Language

Coates (2013, p. 97) believe that the use of swearing and taboo words is more committed by men than women. Lakoff (1975, p. 10) stated that men often use swearing words stronger than women. They are not hesitant to use *shit, damn,* and *hell* while communicating (Haas, 1979, p. 617). Kramer (1974), cited in Coates (2013, p. 97), analyzed the cartoon and found that the cartoonist makes swearing words used more male characters.

2.1.1.2.5. Compliment

Holmes (1995, p. 127) stated that compliments are remarkably formulaic speech acts. Most draw on . . . a very narrow range of syntactic patterns. When women use the 'What (a) ADJ NP!' (*e.g., what lovely earrings!*) pattern more, men

prefer to use a minimal pattern (*e.g., good shoes!*). When it comes to compliments, men more often praise another man on their possessions or skills.

2.1.2. Speech Function

2.1.2.1. Expressive

Expressive utterances convey the speaker's utterances to the addresser by involving what the speaker feels, including emotions or expressions (Holmes, 2013, p. 275; Arista, 2014, p. 14). In its application, the main focus is on the addresser. This means that when giving a speech, the speaker carries the message. This tends to give the effect of the speaker's exact feeling. The example that Holmes (2013, p. 275) gives about Expressive utterances is, *e.g., I'm feeling great today.*

2.1.2.2 Directive

Directive utterances focus on getting someone to do something the speaker is saying. Directive utterances tend to be applied in the imperative form. In English, a more polite way of making people do what is said is in the interrogative or declarative form. However, this will be based on intonation, tone of voice, and context. (Holmes, 2013, p. 277). The addresser becomes the focus of this utterance, which means the speaker needs an addresser to act (Arista, 2014, p. 13). An example of directive utterances is '*sit down*' or, in a more polite form, *could you sit down?* (Holmes, 2013, p. 277).

2.1.2.3 Referential

According to Holmes (2013, p. 275), referential utterances deliver information. Tribus (2017, p. 8) argues that speech delivering the task of many messages or delivering information is a function of referential utterances. This function conveys fact and truth value according to the speaker's beliefs. The referential function focuses on context; It means the reference or the subject of the discourse and the things it refers to (Arista, 2014, p. 10). The example of referential utterances is '*At the third stroke, it will be three o'clock*' precisely (Holmes, 2013, p. 275).

2.1.2.4 Metalinguistic

According to Holmes (2013, p. 275), metalinguistic utterances are utterances that comment on the language itself (*e.g., 'Hegemony' is not a common word*). According to Jakobson (1987, p. 69), the focus of the metalinguistic function is to check the language's code or response. The goal of this function is to communicate information about the linguistic structure of languages, such as explaining the item with synonyms, definitions, paraphrases, or examples. The metalinguistic function aims to express the code analysis when the code is misinterpreted and requires correction or explanation. It causes a metalinguistic function to be particularly prevalent in questions like '*Excuse me, what do you mean by that?*'.

2.1.2.5 Poetic

Aesthetic features of the language became the main focus of poetic utterances, *e.g.*, *a poem, an ear-catching motto, a rhyme, Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled peppers* (Holmes, 2013, p. 275). According to Jakobson (1987, p. 72), utterances with an emphasis on word sequences and poetry in a more general sense serve as poetic expressions. The purpose of a poetic function is to express enjoyment (Gustina, 2019, p. 22).

2.1.2.6 Phatic

According to Holmes (2013, p. 275), phatic utterances convey empathy and solidarity with others (*e.g.*, *Hi, how are you, lovely day isn't it!*). Phatic utterances focus on the relationship between the speaker and the listener. The purpose of a phatic function is to stabilize and foster feelings in social relationships. The speaker's proficiency is more apparent to the listener when the phatic function is used than when it is not. Additionally, it can be done by gesture, physical contact, and facial expressions, including waves, hand motions, and grins (Hidayah, 2012, p. 31).

2.2. Research Method

2.2.1 Types of Research

The researcher used a descriptive qualitative along with quantitative research model. The results of this study were compiled in descriptive form. According to Mack et al. (2005, p. 1), descriptive qualitative research is suitable to

be carried out in a study that tries to find culturally specific information about the values, opinions, behaviors, and social contexts of the community, specific population, and this method is also effective in identifying intangible factors, one of which is gender roles. Quantitative research was applied to calculate the tendencies of the linguistic features and the purposes of the utterances produced by Natalie and Blake. The researcher focused on Natalie and Blake's utterances which have the women's and men's language features proposed by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013).

2.2.2. Data and Data Sources

The primary data of this research had been taken from the utterances spoken by Natalie and Blake on the movie entitled *Isn't It Romantic (2019)* on Netflix and its subtitle, from [subslikescript.com](https://www.subslikescript.com). One utterance is from Natalie or Blake starting to speak to a pause caused by an interruption, either from taking a breath, the appearance of a distraction, or being interrupted by someone else. The secondary sources are books, papers, and journals related to language and gender, such as *Language and Women's Place* (Lakoff, 1973) and *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (Coates, 2013).

2.2.3. Population and Sample

The population of this study is all of the utterances produced by Natalie and Blake in the movie. The utterances collected as a population are then looked at in

more depth which ones contain female language features based on Lakoff's theory (1973) and which contain male language features based on Coates' theory (2013). All of the utterances that contain the language features are then used as samples.

2.2.4. Method of Collecting Data

In collecting the data, the researcher used the non-participant observation method. The researcher used the non-participant observation method because the researcher's position was only as an observer, and does not participate at all in the object being observed. The researchers started by observing the utterances used by Natalie in the movie *Isn't It Romantic (2019)* by watching the movie and observing the existing movie script. The researcher followed these steps to collect the data:

1. Watched and listened to the movie on Netflix and turned on the English subtitle to see what they spoke clearly.
2. Downloaded the movie subtitle from [sublikescript.com](https://www.sublikescript.com). and confirmed it with the subtitle from Netflix.
3. Identify the utterances produced by Natalie and Blake. The utterances from other characters are eliminated. After that divided them into two groups, the first group is the utterances produced by Natalie and the second group is the utterances produced by Blake.
4. Kept their utterances, then re-watch *Isn't It Romantic movie (2019)* on Netflix. At this stage the researcher paid more attention to when Natalie and Blake utter their words. If there is an increased intonation in an utterance, it

will be marked with a “↗” beside those utterances. For data analyzing purposes on the next step, the author used different codes for each feature.

The code that is used is as follows:

- Women’s Language Features:

LH	: Lexical Hedges/Fillers	PC	: Precise Color Terms
I	: Intensifier	HG	: ‘Hypercorrect’ Grammar
TQ	: Tag Question	RI	: Rising Intonation
EA	: ‘Empty’ Adjective	SF	: ‘Super polite’ Form
ES	: Emphatic Stress	AS	: Avoidance of Swear Words

- Men’s Language Features:

MR	: Minimal Response	C	: Compliment
CD	: Command and Directives	Q	: Question
ST	: Swearing and Taboo Language		

2.2.5. Method of Analyzing Data

The referential identity method was used to analyze the data and the purpose of the features in this research. According to Sudaryanto (1993, pp. 13-17), referential identity method is effective to analyze the language using reference sources outside the language itself. In addition, the researcher analyzed Natalie's and Blake's utterances using the articulatory phonetics method, where the researcher listened to whether there was an increase in intonation when Natalie and Blake spoke. The analysis results were then grouped based on the theory of Lakoff

(1973) and Coates (2013), and the researcher noted that deviations have occurred.

The steps that the researcher took for analysis are:

1. Categorized utterances used by Natalie and Blake based on the theory proposed by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013) and marked them with a code at the end of the utterance.
2. Eliminated Natalie and Blake's utterances which do not contain either women's language features or men's language features. Then examine the utterances that contain women's and men's language features based on their purpose using Holmes' theory (2018) of speech function.
3. Calculated the frequency of each feature. The results of the analysis at this stage are tabulated.

Table 2.1 Women's Language Features Used by Natalie and Blake in *Isn't It Romantic Movie (2019)*

Women's Language Features	Used by Natalie (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Natalie	Used by Blake (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Blake
Lexical Hedges/Fillers				
Intensifier				
Tag Question				
'Empty' Adjective				
Precise Color Terms				
'Hypercorrect' Grammar				
'Super polite' Form				
Rising Intonation				
Avoidance of Strong Swear Words				
Emphatic Stress				

Table 2.2 Men's Language Features Used by Natalie and Blake in *Isn't It Romantic Movie (2019)*

Men's Language Features used	Used by Natalie (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Natalie	Used by Blake (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Blake
Minimal Response				
Question				
Compliment				
Swearing or Taboo Language				
Command and Directive				

- Analyzed the function of the features used by Natalie and Blake by referring to the speech function theory proposed by Holmes (2018).

CHAPTER III

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Findings

The language features used by the two characters are synchronous. Natalie and Blake used nine of the ten women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1973). These features include lexical hedges or fillers, tag questions, rising intonation, 'empty' adjectives, intensifiers, 'hypercorrect' grammar, super polite forms, avoiding strong swear words, and emphatic stress. The feature not found in the analyzed data is the precise color terms. Meanwhile, for the men's language features proposed by Coates (2013), Natalie and Blake used five features: minimal responses, questions, compliments, swearing and taboo language, and command and directives.

In the use of both women's and men's language features carried out by the two characters, the purposes - based on the speech function theory proposed by Holmes (2018) - of why Natalie and Blake used those features was also found. Through the analysis that has been done, all speech functions are found in the utterances containing male and female language features of Natalie and Blake. The results of the data analysis carried out by the researcher are presented in the tables below:

Table 3.1 Women's Language Features and Language Functions used by Natalie and Blake in *Isn't It Romantic Movie (2019)*

Women's Language Features	Used by Natalie (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Natalie	Used by Blake (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Blake
Lexical Hedges/Fillers	24.87% - 95 utterances	Expressive	15.18% - 17 utterances	Expressive
Intensifier	13.35% - 51 utterances	Expressive	8.93% - 10 utterances	Expressive
Tag Question	2.36% - 9 utterances	Referential	6.25% - 7 utterances	Directive
'Empty' Adjective	4.71% - 18 utterances	Referential	16.07% - 18 utterances	Expressive
Precise Color Terms	0%	-	0%	-
'Hypercorrect' Grammar	6.28% - 24 utterances	Directive	7.14% - 8 utterances	Expressive
'Super polite' Form	0.26% - 1 utterance	Directive	0.89% - 1 utterance	Expressive
Rising Intonation	7.59% - 29 utterances	Expressive	1.79% - 2 utterances	Expressive
Avoidance of Strong Swear Words	1.05% - 4 utterances	Expressive	2.68% - 3 utterances	Expressive
Emphatic Stress	1.83% - 7 utterances	Referential	5.36% - 6 utterances	Expressive

Table 3.2 Men's Language Features and Language Functions used by Natalie Blake in *Isn't It Romantic Movie (2019)*

Men's Language Features	Used by Natalie (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Natalie	Used by Blake (Frequency - features used)	Dominant Language Functions by Blake
Minimal Response	3.40% - 13 utterances	Phatic (8 times)	7.14% - 8 utterances	Phatic
Question	10.21% - 39 utterances	Phatic	15.18% - 17 utterances	Phatic
Compliment	1.05% - 4 utterances	Expressive	5.36% - 6 utterances	Expressive
Swearing or Taboo Language	4.71% - 18 utterances	Expressive	1.79% - 2 utterances	Expressive
Command and Directive	3.40% - 13 utterances	Directive	6.25% - 7 utterances	Directive

3.1.1 Women's Language Features

The researcher discovered 140 of Natalie's and 32 of Blake's utterances that exhibit only women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1973). Besides that, there are also 33 of Natalie's and 14 of Blake's utterances that exhibit women's language features along with men's language features. Blake and Natalie used nine out of ten features. The only features they did not use were precise color terms.

3.1.1.1 Lexical Hedges or Fillers

Lakoff (1973) observed that hedges seem to lessen the impact of a statement. Hedges include words and phrases like 'well,' 'you know,' and 'I think'. The

meaningless words and phrases women use as fillers are included in the same category as pause fillers like 'oh', 'um', 'uh', and 'ah'. Natalie used lexical hedges or fillers in 95 utterances, while Blake used lexical hedges or fillers in 17 utterances. From the data obtained, it was also found that Natalie tended to use this feature for expressive function in purpose to express how they felt. In addition to show their feelings, Natalie and Blake also used this feature when they are making statements that they believe to be accurate but are still not entirely sure about it.

The example of lexical hedges or fillers used by Natalie in the movie *Isn't It Romantic* (2019) can be seen below:

Data 1

Coworker : Hey, Nat, do me a favor, throw this away for me. I'm so busy.
Natalie : ***Uh, I'm kind of... (0.1s)*** busy too, but yeah, yeah.
(Natalie, 00.03.51 - 00.03.58)

The conversation above occurred between Natalie and one of her coworkers in the office. Natalie had just arrived at her desk when her coworker stopped her and handed Natalie the food waste unceremoniously. He said he was busy, so he asked Natalie to throw the garbage. Natalie initially tried to refuse by saying she was also busy, but she did what her coworker asked her to do. In her office, Natalie is an architect who only handles small projects, often considered unimportant by colleagues. The employees then looked down on her, tended to underestimate her, and paid no respect to her. Her position, considered low, made Natalie feel insecure and thinks she was powerless.

From the data above, it was found that lexical hedges follow fillers. Natalie used the '***uh, I'm kind of... (0.1s)***' feature with a 0.1-second pause as her first

response because she was unsure what to say in that situation. To avoid gaps in the conversation, Natalie used the fillers' *uh*' as she tried to think of what to say. After the gap was filled with '*uh*' fillers, Natalie tried to deny her coworker's request by saying she was busy too. However, because she was aware that people always thought she was free, she hesitated to make the statement. Therefore, Natalie used the lexical hedges "*I'm kind of ...*" by giving a 0.1 second pause which shows doubts about whether she should say her statement or not.

Data 2

Whitney : For someone who hates romantic comedies, you have certainly thought about this a lot.

Natalie : Okay, don't wait for me. What about how, at the end of those rom-coms, they always do this stupid, *like* <0,1s>, slow motion running sequence? Aah! Aah! And, *like* <0,1s>, they're trying to break up a wedding or get their lover back. Well, guess what? <0,1s> He doesn't love you. That's why he's not currently with you or marrying you.
(Natalie, 00.10.24 - 00.10.48)

The dialogue above took place between Whitney and Natalie in the office. Natalie expressed her opinion that was contradictory to Whitney's regarding romantic comedies movie. While Whitney liked romantic comedies, Natalie hated them. She thought those movies were stupid and then tried to tell Whitney about the unrealism of such movies.

In her sentences, especially when she said about her opinion, Natalie often added lexical hedges or fillers '*like*'. Natalie used the word '*like*' when describing scenes in a romantic comedy movie and tried to avoid firm statements. Natalie used '*like*' and '*well*' followed by '*guess what?*' before pausing for 0.1 seconds.

Natalie did that because she was unsure how to speak her mind as she knew that Whitney loves romantic comedy movies, so if she got too fierce for it, she was worried that Whitney would get offended and see her as a heartless woman.

Data 3

Blake : Are you okay?

Natalie : No! Don't you smell what's happening? New York doesn't smell like shit anymore. Everything smells like lavender.

Blake : ***I think*** you might have hit your head. Why don't we check you in at the doctor, maybe? Or just take you home?

(Natalie and Blake, 00.16.53 - 00.17.04)

Natalie, who has just been trapped in the world of romantic comedies, was accidentally hit by Blake's car. Blake, who saw that immediately got out of the car to check on Natalie. Natalie looked so confused and weird when she answered Blake. He got worried and thought that Natalie got her head hit because of him. Even so, Blake was not sure about his statement. Therefore, he used lexical hedges or fillers ***'I think***, because he felt uncertain.

Data 4

Blake : Good morning, beautiful. Last night was amazing. ***You know*** *<0,Is>*, I was just thinking in the shower, when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. Natalie, I love...

(Blake, 00.41.03 - 00.41.13)

Blake spoke the sentence above after he spent the night with Natalie. He shared his thoughts on his experience with Natalie last night and what he thought of Natalie. Blake used lexical hedges or fillers, ***'you know***, before making his

statement because he was not sure how he should express his opinion. He wanted to make a deep impression on Natalie through his statement, so he first used '*you know*' and paused for 0.1 seconds so that there was no gap that would create an awkward impression before he found the right way to convey his statement the way he wanted.

3.1.1.2 Intensifiers

Natalie used intensifiers in 51 utterances, while Blake only used intensifiers in 10 utterances. However, when viewed from the frequency of using this feature considering the different number of their utterances, the frequency of using intensifiers by Blake did not show a huge gap to Natalie, with Blake as much as 10.78% and Natalie as much as 12.99%. Natalie and Blake's most dominant function when using intensifiers is the expressive function. In addition, they also use referential functions for Intensifiers. This implied that the purposes of using intensifiers for Natalie and Blake mostly are for showing their emotion and delivering information.

Data 5

Natalie : Erm, thanks for coming to get me.

Blake : Are you kidding? I was *so* excited to hear from you. I mean, even though it was to bail you out of jail. Pretty cool.

Natalie : Normally, I'd be *so* excited to hear that someone like you is *so* excited to hear from someone like me, but..

(Natalie and Blake, 00.32.13 - 00.32.23)

Natalie, who was trying to jump onto the train tracks, was stopped by a police officer who later got her arrested. Having no other choice, Natalie contacted Blake to bail her from jail. Blake came and got her out, and she politely thanked Blake for being willing to bail her from jail. Natalie also felt terrible that they had only met the day before and had already troubled Blake. However, Blake, who likes Natalie, did not mind at all. He tried to make Natalie not feel guilty because he was so happy to do it for her.

Blake expressed his joy by saying, '*I was so excited to hear from you.*' Blake used the intensifier '*so*' before the word '*excited*' to emphasize and strengthen his excitement's meaning and make Natalie take his words seriously. Data 5 also showed that intensifiers that have expressive functions apply to Natalie. She used the phrase '*so excited*' twice in her sentence to show Blake her response to what Blake had just said. The intensifier '*so*' is also applied to Natalie when she wants to emphasize and strengthen the impact of her speech.

Data 6

Blake : Come on, you can tell me anything you want, anything at all. Except that you think koalas are the cutest things ever. They have chlamydia and are actually *quite* hostile, so stay away from 'em, all right? Anyway, let's hear it.

Natalie : Okay. I hit my head *really* hard... and I woke up in this alternate universe.

Blake : Okay.
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.32.29 - 00.32.49*)

After getting Natalie out of jail, Blake asked Natalie why she got arrested. Blake, who had been watching Natalie since they first met, felt something strange

about Natalie because she was always looking restless and behaving strangely. At first, Natalie refused to explain because she thought Blake would not believe it and might even think she was crazy. However, Blake made sure he was a good listener and ready to listen to whatever Natalie had in mind. He even tried to lighten the mood by joking about Koalas.

In his pleasantries about Koalas, Blake used the phrase '*quite hostile*' to describe the characteristics of the Koalas. Blake added intensifiers '*quite*' before the word '*hostile*' to emphasize that although his statement was conveyed jokingly, his information was valid. Convinced by Blake, Natalie finally wanted to talk, and she used the phrase '*I hit my head really hard...*' to explain to Blake what had happened to her. The '*really hard*' phrase Natalie used served as an adverb explaining how she hit her head. Intensifiers '*really*' were added before the adverb '*hard*' to strengthen the utterance's meaning. Natalie wanted Blake to understand that the way he was bumped was not something to be trifled with but had severe repercussions. Blake and Natalie used referential functions in their speech, this time by conveying the information they believed.

3.1.1.3 Tag Questions

Natalie used tag question in 9 utterances, while Blake only used it in 7 utterances. However, when viewed from the frequency of using this feature, Blake's is higher than Natalie's. Blake used 6.25% of his total utterances in the form of tag questions, while Natalie only used 2.36%. Blake used the question tag more for directive functions, which implied that Blake used tag question on a purpose to

make his interlocutors do what he wanted. On the other side, Natalie tends to use tag question for referential functions, on a purpose to deliver information.

Data 7

Josh : Just to be clear, you're not still stopping the wedding?
Natalie : No, just go... carry on. You guys, erm... Yeah, do your thing. I'm gonna do me. Good luck with everything. I don't have high hopes for what's going on there. Josh and Iz, what's their couple name gonna be? Jiz? Love! It's crazy, **right?** (*walk out from the church, and then saw the bride and groom's car park outside*) I guess I don't really have a choice, **do I?** (*Natalie, 01.09.45 - 00.10.17*)

The conversation above occurred when Natalie initially wanted to stop the marriage between Isabella and Josh because she thought that to return to her normal life, Natalie had to admit that she loved Josh. However, after realizing that all she had to do was love herself, Natalie changed her mind and canceled her intention to stop the marriage. She stole Josh's and Isabella's car and drove away from the church.

As Lakoff (1973, p. 55) said, when using a tag question, women do not need answers to the questions they ask because they already have their answers and only need the other person to validate the information she conveys in her question. We can see this example from Natalie. She said, '*Love! It's crazy, right?*' in the center of the church hall. She stated that love is crazy, and by using the question tag '**right?**' she tried to get validation from what she just said while trying not to sound too firm. In addition to using the tag question '**right?**' Natalie also used the question tag '**do I?**' in data 7. It showed us that Natalie made a statement that she

had no other choice but to bring the groom and bride's car, but in order not to look too firm, she added a tag question to soften the tone of the statement she made.

Although Lakoff (1973, p. 54) said that the question tag, when the speaker does not need an answer from the interlocutor, tends to be done by women, from the data collected, it was found that Blake also used the tag question for this. [8] *'I am so sorry. My driver was probably distracted by you. Wow, you're... you're quite beguiling, aren't you?'* (Blake, 00.16.31 - 00.16.36). At the end of his sentence, Blake used the tag question, *'aren't you?'* to show his admiration for Natalie, not to get Natalie's answer.

Data 9

Natalie : You need to stop staring out that window at some stupid girl in some stupid little swimsuit. ***Okay?*** That's not all it's cracked up to be. You need to start living in the real world, and stop thinking that you're gonna get with some model, and that that's gonna make you happy.
(Natalie, 01.16.46 - 01.17.00)

Data 9 shows Natalie's words she said to Josh. Natalie caught Josh's glances at her position several times. However, instead of thinking that Josh was watching her, Natalie thought that Josh was glaring at a billboard showing a sexy model. In the end, Natalie came to Josh and told him to stop doing this because, for Natalie, what Josh was doing was a fantasy.

She told Josh what to do by saying, *'You need to stop staring out that window at some stupid girl in some stupid little swimsuit. Okay?'*. Natalie knows what she said to Josh was true, and from Natalie's sentence, we can see that Natalie used the directive function with the phrase *'You need to...'* appearing. Natalie's sentence,

which has a directive function, looks quite firm. However, because she talked to Josh, her close friend, Natalie does not want to ruin her reputation in front of Josh by making her look bossy and firm. Therefore, Natalie added a tag question, '*okay?*' to weaken her sentence.

Data 10

Natalie : Something is really wrong.

Blake : Okay, well, why don't you, um... Why don't you let me take you home? I'm not gonna hurt you. Let's... Let's get you home, though. I'll give you a ride, *okay?*

(Natalie and Blake, 00.17.05 - 00.17.14)

Data 10 shows a conversation between Blake and Natalie after Blake hit Natalie by car. Natalie, who had just been thrown into the alternate universe of the romantic comedy genre, looked so confused. Blake, who saw Natalie so nervous and scared, finally offered to take her home. He also assured Natalie that he would not hurt Natalie because Natalie seemed to think so.

Blake said in data 10, '*I'll give you a ride, okay?*'. He used directive functions to get Natalie to do what he said. In the movie scene, Blake even gestures that lead Natalie to get into his car. However, Blake, who had just met Natalie, was trying to keep his reputation from appearing too demanding. That is why he added the tag question '*okay?*' at the end of his sentence.

3.1.1.4 'Empty' Adjectives

Natalie used 'empty' adjectives in 18 utterances, while Blake used in 18 utterances. However, when viewed from the frequency of using this feature, Blake's frequency is three times higher than Natalie's. Blake used 16.07% of his utterances for 'empty' adjectives, while Natalie used 4.70% of hers. Blake used the 'empty' adjective more to show his feelings, unlike Natalie, who tends to use the 'empty' adjective to convey information.

Data 11

Natalie : Okay, get a grip. Let's just think about this. I have an *amazing* apartment and a super *cute* dog. A gay sidekick. I have a *Great* job, but the only woman that works with me has now become my mortal enemy. Oh! I keep falling down all the time. And I'm talking to myself out loud. (Natalie, 00.28.17 - 00.28.38)

The sentence above was a sentence that Natalie monologued with herself. After experiencing confusion over the surrounding situation, Natalie began to think about every detail of the changes. She listed what she had in this alternate universe and what difference it made in her original world. Her observations led her to conclude that she was trapped in an alternate universe where the situation was similar to a romantic comedy movie.

Data 11 showed that Natalie used several forms of 'empty' adjectives. According to Lakoff, 'empty' adjectives show someone's admiration or approval for something (1973, p. 51). Natalie used '*amazing*' to refer to her apartment, '*cute*' for her dog, and '*great*' for her work. The three words belong to the group of 'empty' adjectives because the words are considered meaningless and

used to show her admiration for what she has now. Natalie also used the ‘empty’ adjectives to show the differences between her apartment, dog, and the job she has in this alternate universe with what she has in her real world.

Data 12

Blake : I had an ***amazing*** time tonight
Natalie : So did I. (*chuckles*) I'm just, like... I've never had a night like this before.
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.39.54 - 00.40.02*)

The conversation in data 12 occurred between Blake and Natalie while they walked after enjoying ice cream. On the way, Blake told Natalie how he enjoyed their time together that night, went from dinner on the cruise ship to barging into a closed ice cream shop. Blake added the ‘empty’ adjective ‘*amazing*’ before the word ‘*time*’ to help him describe his admiration for their time together.

Data 13

Isabella : But, speaking of great parties, you guys have to come to the Hamptons this weekend. We're having a few of my friends over at my charming little beach house.
Blake : That sounds ***lovely***. Well, I was gonna take my helicopter out anyway, so...
Isabella : So funny. I was gonna offer you guys a ride in my helicopter.
Blake : That's so ***sweet, darling***, but better we take our own. Nat and I might wanna hit the, er, old Caperoo, if you know what I mean.
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.49.01 - 00.49.23*)

The conversation above occurred between Blake and Isabella when he and Natalie just entered a restaurant and found Isabella having a date with Josh. Isabella and Blake, who had known each other before, began to explain that their first

meeting was at a terrible party. After discussing this, Isabella invited Blake and Natalie to her party and offered them a ride. However, the ride offer was rejected by Blake because he wanted to use his helicopter.

After hearing Isabella's invitation, Blake's first response was to say, '*That sounds lovely...*'. Blake expressed his joy at getting an invitation from Isabella by using the 'empty' adjective in the form of '*lovely*'. Then when he heard Isabella offered him a ride in his helicopter, Blake's first response was, '*That's so sweet, darling...*'. The word '*sweet*' in Blake's sentence is an example of an 'empty' adjective. Blake, who is close friends with Isabella, responds to both of Isabella's words with gratitude and joy, also to honor Isabella. To show these feelings of gratitude and joy, Blake needs the 'empty' adjectives '*lovely*' and '*sweet*' so that the meaning he was trying to convey becomes stronger and Isabella knows that he means what he said. In contrast, the 'empty' adjective '*darling*', which he addressed to Isabella, was to show that he was close to Isabella and to show his admiration for Isabella as a friend.

3.1.1.5 Emphatic Stress

In the movie *Isn't It Romantic (2019)*, Natalie and Blake used empathic stress in 13 utterances with the following division: Natalie used empathic stress in 7 utterances and Blake in 6 utterances. However, when viewed from the total speech frequency, Blake used this feature more often than Natalie. 5.36% of Blake's utterances contain emphatic stress, while for Natalie, only 1.83%. For the speech

function they used, Blake tended to use this feature for expressive functions, while Natalie used it for referential functions.

Data 14

Natalie : Masterpiece of shit. Whitney, ***all*** those movies are ***lies***, set to ***terrible*** pop songs.

Whitney : I love those songs. And those movies are not lies.
(Natalie, 00.09.05 - 00.09.12)

The conversation above took place between Natalie and Whitney. They discussed Whitney, who loves watching romantic comedy movies so much that she thought they were a masterpiece. Natalie, who had the opposite opinion of Whitney, immediately said it was not true. She tried to tell Whitney the truth about that kind of movie, but Whitney stood firm.

Natalie used empathic stress to emphasize the facts she believed Whitney. There were three words where Natalie used emphatic stress in data 14. The first word is '***all***'. Natalie stressed the word '***all***' to strengthen the meaning of her sentence that what she was referring to are all movies in the romantic comedy genre, not just some of it. Then she also said the word '***lies***' with the word lengthening '***li; es***' to reinforce her point when showing Whitney that these movies cannot be trusted. Lastly, Natalie stressed the first syllable of the word '***terrible***' and told Whitney how bad the background music was in the romantic comedy movie.

Data 15

Natalie : Okay. What's your second favorite ice-cream flavor?
Blake : Rum raisin.

Natalie : No! That's even worse.
Blake : Yeah. I know. It's been a *lifelong* source of insecurity for me.
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.38.50 - 00.39.00*)

Data 15 was taken from the conversation between Blake and Natalie in the ice cream shop they managed to break into. Inside the ice cream shop, they talked about Blake's favorite flavors. Natalie ridiculed Blake because Natalie thought that Blake's favorite ice cream flavors were extraordinary. Blake, who got ridiculed, was no longer surprised because many people had done that to him.

Blake, who got repeated taunts from Natalie, used empathic stress on the word '*lifelong*' to tell her that his insecurity about the ice cream flavor he likes has affected his life for a very long time. When saying the word '*lifelong*,' Blake stressed the first syllable '*lifelong*' to strengthen the meaning of the message he wanted to convey to Natalie. Blake was trying to emphasize how long his insecurity had been affecting him, and he could not do anything about it.

Data 16

Natalie : Uh, let me guess. You guys met at some fabulous yacht party.
Isabella : Actually, it was a really disappointing yacht party. You remember that?
Blake : It was *the worst* yacht party ever!
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.48.49 - 00.48.59*)

The conversation above was conducted by Blake, Natalie, and Isabella at a restaurant. Blake and Natalie, who came to the restaurant to eat, accidentally found Isabella and Josh. Blake, who had known Isabella before, immediately greeted Isabella in a friendly and welcoming manner. Natalie, who saw this, then asked where they first met and guessed that Blake and Isabella might meet at a fabulous yacht party. Natalie's guess was wrong, and Isabella said that the situation at that

time was the exact opposite of Natalie's guess. The yacht party where they met was nasty. Blake supported Isabella's statement.

Blake gave a supporting statement for Isabella's statement regarding the yacht party where they first met. Blake used the emphatic stress of '*the worst*' in his supporting statement to describe the yacht party. The emphatic stress in Blake's sentences was used to strengthen the meaning of the sentence he was trying to convey and make the other person see how bad the thing he was trying to explain was. Blake tried to show how much he disliked the situation and conditions at that time until he did not hesitate to say the party was the worst.

3.1.1.6 'Hypercorrect' Grammar

'Hypercorrect' grammar was used by Natalie in 24 utterances, and in 8 utterances by Blake. Even though Natalie used it in 24 utterances, Blake dominated this feature based on the frequency. The most dominant purposes of using this feature by Natalie and Blake were different. Natalie used it most of the time to direct someone's act, while Blake used to express his feelings.

Data 17

Natalie : Oh, Whitney... Oh, er... Wow, you look really, really different. Erm, *you have to explain to me what on earth is going on here.*
Whitney : I don't have to explain shit to you. I don't work for you.
(Natalie, 00.23.18 - 00.23.30)

Data 17 is taken from Natalie's speech to Whitney. However, Whitney, who was in front of her, was a different version of Whitney. Natalie, who saw a difference in Whitney's appearance, was quite hesitant to approach her, considering

that everything in her world was different at that time. However, Natalie still tried to find information from Whitney about strange things happening in her world.

Lakoff (1975, p. 55) stated that women tend to use precise pronunciation where women would prefer to clarify the *g* sound at the end of a word and mention the proper form, *going*, rather than the informal form, *goin*. Data 20 shows that Natalie used this form, where the sentence was not only grammatically correct, but Natalie also did not drop the 'g' at the end. Instead of saying '*goin*', Natalie used the standard form, '**going**'. Another example of Natalie using precise pronunciation was when she was with Josh and noticed that Josh looked fitter than ever. It made her ask, [18] '*Have you been **working** out?*' (Natalie, 00.07.48). Instead of saying '*workin*' Natalie stressed the *g* sound and said '**working**' at the end of the word.

From the data obtained, Natalie was not the only one who stressed the *g* sound at the end of the utterance. Blake also did this in data 12, where Blake mentioned '**amazing**' instead of '*amazin*'. Another example is when Blake, who had just come out of the bathroom and found Natalie in his bed after spending the night with Natalie, said [19] '*Good morning, beautiful. Last night was **amazing**. You know, I was just **thinking** in the shower, when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm **seeing** it for the first time...*' (Blake, 00.41.04 - 00.41.12). Blake did not drop the *g* sound when he spoke.

In her research, Murti (2018) found that 'hypercorrect' grammar makes the speaker's speech sound softer. Natalie used 'hypercorrect' grammar to soften her speech and look more polite to maintain her image in front of the other person.

Natalie, who asked Whitney for an explanation, tried to make her speech sound softer to maintain her image in front of Whitney so that Whitney did not take her utterances as demanding. Blake also used it to maintain his relationship with Natalie, whom he fell in love with. In addition, Blake also used this feature to show his admiration for Natalie.

Data 20

Natalie : Just to be clear, *I cannot call you*.

(*Natalie, 00.19.03 - 00.19.05*)

Blake wrote his number on rose petals, then spread it inside Natalie's hat, and asked Natalie to call if Natalie needed anything. Natalie, who saw that, told Blake it was logically impossible because the digits of Blake's phone number were now scrambled. However, Blake did not seem to care. He still asked Natalie to call him, so Natalie made it clear to Blake that she could not do that.

Natalie used 'hypercorrect' grammar when saying, '*I cannot call you*', especially for that time. Instead of saying '*can't*', like Natalie always did on other occasions, Natalie sticks to the original form, '*cannot*', when he spoke to Blake, whom she had just met. Natalie used 'hypercorrect' grammar in a referential function to inform Blake about her inability to call Blake. It is said that because of their more subordinate position than men, women should pay more attention to what they say to avoid offending them and so they must speak carefully and politely (Holmes, 2018, p. 169). Hence, Natalie used 'hypercorrect' grammar to not offend or upset Blake, who emphatically said he expected a call from Natalie.

3.1.1.7 Rising Intonation

There is a massive gap in using this feature of the two characters. Natalie used this feature 7.59% of her total utterances, while Blake only used it 1.79% of his total utterances. Rising intonation used to show the emotions they felt at that time. From the data collected, Natalie used this feature when she felt frustrated, disturbed, shocked, scared, and happy. Meanwhile, Blake only used these features to show his dislike for something. In addition to show emotion, Natalie also used this feature to direct someone act.

Data 21

Blake : Are you okay?

Natalie : **↗No! Don't you smell what's happening? New York doesn't smell like shit anymore. Everything smells like lavender. ↗**
(Natalie and Blake, 00.16.53 - 00.16.59)

Blake asked a confused-looking Natalie if she was okay. Natalie felt confused and frustrated at the sudden change in many things. Even the smell of New York now turned from shit into lavender. Natalie used rising intonation to show how frustrated and confused she was about what was happening.

Data 22

Natalie : Hey, Whitney, can you get me the... Whit? **Whit? ↗** Um... can you maybe stop watching full-length feature films in the office and just, like, do your job and assist me?
(Natalie, 00.08.13 - 00.18.25)

Natalie, who was doing her job, asked Whitney to get something. However, she received no response from Whitney because Whitney was watching a movie using headphones. Natalie got annoyed, she tried again, but this time she used a rising intonation to show her annoyance. Natalie said, '*Whit? ↗*' to make Whitney listen to what she was going to say.

Data 23

Donny : Why are we screaming?
Natalie : ***↗Donny! How did you get in here? ↗***
(Natalie, 00.21.41 - 00.21.44)

Besides showing her annoyance, Natalie also used a rising intonation to show when she was shocked. When she finished a call, Natalie found Donny in her bathroom and made her scream. Natalie then asked Donny, using a rising intonation to show how shocked and surprised she was to see Donny there.

Data 24

Josh : You just busted through that potential new couple back there. Yeah, they were about to have a moment, that spark was there, and you lowered your shoulder and plowed through 'em like a linebacker.
Natalie : ***↗Stop ↗*** being an idiot, all right?
(Natalie, 00.07.35 - 00.07.46)

Natalie was walking with Josh, and they talked about Natalie not believing and being blind to love. Josh explained the example of Natalie's blindness in love. Natalie dismissed Josh's explanation as gibberish and saw Josh as an idiot for saying it. Natalie then said, ***↗Stop ↗*** with a rising intonation to make Josh stop.

Data 25

- Blake : *(take coffee from Natalie)* Oh, thanks, hon.
Natalie : Oh, no, that's mi...
Blake : **↗Oh, goddamn it.↗** Who puts whipped cream in a coffee? Do you mind? I'll just have a normal coffee, thanks.
(Natalie, 00.05.55 - 00.06.05)

Blake saw Natalie enter the meeting room and took Natalie's coffee without asking. After that, he drank the coffee but then immediately regretted his decision. He was disgusted by the taste of the coffee. Blake said, '*oh, goddamn it*' with a rising intonation to show and emphasize his disgusting feeling. He then discussed the whipped cream in the coffee to show what disgusted him.

3.1.1.8 Super Polite Forms

According to Lakoff (1973, p. 56), when speaking, women tend to speak more politely than men. This is to maintain their image in public, be respected in society, and prevent them from offending others (Holmes, 2018, 169). Based on table 3.1, there are two super polite forms features in Natalie and Blake's utterances. Table 3.1 also shows that Natalie predominantly used this feature. Natalie used this feature to direct someone's action. While Blake used to show his feelings.

Data 26

- Natalie : '*Hey! Oh. Hi. Erm... Hey. Erm... Can you please mug me?*'
(Natalie, 00.29.48 - 00.29.54)

Natalie used the word '*please*' when she asked a stranger on the subway to mug her. Natalie could say 'can you mug me?' or 'mug me!' to convey her message to her interlocutor, but she added '*please*' to sound more polite because

she realized she was talking to a stranger and did not want to sound too demanding. Therefore, Natalie must maintain her image as a woman to gain respect from the person she was talking to and for that person to follow her request. Data 26 showed Natalie used a directive function where she tried to direct her interlocutor to do something for her. Lakoff (1973, p. 56) argues that when they want something, women will make suggestions and make their interlocutors do it as a favor for themselves. Hence, Natalie used ‘*can you please mug me?*’ instead of a direct request, ‘*mug me!*’.

Data 27

Blake : "Tender as a marshmallow." You are beguiling.
Natalie : Did you just learn that word? 'Cause you tend to say it a lot.
Natalie : If you want me to stop saying it, I will. But you're gonna have to stop being so damn beguiling. (*phone ringing*) Oh. **Sorry**, it's my father. (*get up from the chair and go somewhere*) Y'ello?
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.50.16 - 00.50.33*)

Blake attended Isabella’s party along with Natalie. While they were enjoying a sizable lobster, Natalie complimented the dish she was eating, and then Blake praised Natalie. While they were talking, Blake’s cell phone rang, indicating an incoming call from his father. Blake then informed Natalie about the call and walked away to take the call.

Blake used the female language features’ super’ polite form feature on data 27 for expressive function. When his cell phone rang in the middle of his conversation with Natalie, Blake used the word ‘**sorry**’, which was considered a ‘super’ polite form because, at that stage, Blake and Natalie were already dating,

which meant that their relationship was very close. Generally, at this stage, lovers will talk more casually to each other. However, Blake still tried to look more polite in front of Natalie. He expressed his regret to Natalie for the interruption that came from him. Blake showed that he appreciates Natalie's existence. Lakoff (1975, p. 83) states that women usually use the super polite form to maintain their relationships with others. However, Blake's data shows that men also used this feature. Blake tried to maintain his relationship with Natalie because he likes Natalie and did not want to damage his reputation in front of her or hurt her feelings

3.1.1.9 Avoidance of Strong Swearing Words

Table 3.1 shows that the use of women's language features, avoidance of strong swearing, and words between Natalie and Blake are only one utterance apart. Natalie used it in 4 utterances, while Blake used it in 3 utterances. However, the frequency with which Natalie (1.05%) used this feature is less than Blake's (2.68%). The only purpose found when Natalie and Blake used this feature are to show their feelings.

Data 28

Donny : Who do you love, Natalie?
Natalie : Josh. I've never had the chance to tell him that. I need to tell him that. Right now. Erm... Oh, I'm never gonna make it. But I have to try. **Oh, my God**, of course. Why am I so dumb? It was always gonna come down to running to stop the wedding!
(Natalie, 01.06.05 - 01.06.31)

Towards the movie's ending, Natalie was in her hotel room when Donny entered and saw Natalie packing her clothes. Natalie explained to Donny that she was going home, as her attempts to make Josh fall in love with her failed. Natalie also parted ways with Blake. After a long conversation with Donny, Natalie realized that all this time, she loved Josh. Natalie regained her spirits, and Natalie then remembered what usually happens at the end of a romantic comedy, the scene stopping the wedding. Since Natalie was caught up in it, she had to do the scene.

Eckert (2003, p. 181) states that swearing is an embodiment of powerful emotion. However, instead of using strong swearing words, women will use avoidance of strong swearing words or 'weaker' expletives (such as *oh dear*, *fudge*, *oh my God*, *goodness*) to show a powerful emotion of them (Lakoff, 1973, p. 50). In data 28, Natalie used this feature to express her realization of something she had forgotten. Instead of strong expletives such as "*fuck*" or "*damn*", Natalie used "**Oh, my God**" to express her immense emotions. Natalie did this to soften her statement in front of her interlocutor, so they did not see Natalie as rude. Natalie also used avoidance of strong swearing words in [29] "**Oh, my God**, *this whole time, I thought I had to get somebody else to fall in love with me, but I... I had to love me...*" (Natalie, 01.09.32 - 01.09.39), when she finally found out that she only had to love herself to get out of that alternate universe.

Natalie not only used avoidance of strong swearing words to show her emotions when she realized something but also when she felt happy. As seen in [30], "*Oh, Whitney. Oh, my God! Hi!*" (Natalie, 01.13.55 - 01.13.58) Natalie, who has managed to return to her world, meets her assistant and best friend, Whitney.

Natalie used “*oh, my God!*” to avoid strong expletives as she showed how happy she was to meet the Whitney she knew.

Last but not least, she used avoidance of strong swearing words to show when she realized that Josh jokingly moaned. Natalie said [31], “Oh, *my God*, okay. *You sound like you’re having a...*” (Natalie, 00.46.21 - 00.46.23).

In general, Natalie preferred to use avoidance of strong swearing words to show an expression of realization and happiness. She also used it more when there were other people besides her and her interlocutor. Natalie did that to save her image in front of the crowd. This was supported by the results of data analysis in sub-chapter 3.1.2.4 (page 63), which showed that avoidance of strong swearing words did not appear in Natalie’s utterances when there were not a large number of audiences around her. Instead, she would be more accessible and comfortable using strong swearing words.

Data 32

Natalie : And I'm not special.
Blake : Still waters run deepest, don't they?
Natalie : What?
Blake : ***God***, there's so much more I wanna know about you.
(Natalie and Blake, 00.32.59 - 00.33.09)

Blake talked with Natalie after he bailed Natalie from prison. Blake listened to Natalie intently about what had happened to her. Natalie also said people behaved strangely by treating her like a special person. Natalie hoped Blake would understand what she meant, but he responded in a way she did not expect. Natalie’s story, especially when she said that she was not special, actually managed to amaze

Blake. He thought Natalie was humble, which strengthened Blake's interest in Natalie.

Besides Natalie, Blake avoided the strong swearing world to express his feelings. Lakoff (1973, p. 50) stated that men use 'strong' expletives (such as *fuck*, *damn*, *shit*) when showing extreme emotion. However, in data 35, Blake did not do this. Instead, he used 'weaker' expletives or avoidances of strong swearing words, '**God**', to show his deep admiration for Natalie. Blake did this to maintain politeness in front of the person he has a crush on. He tried to maintain his modesty and tried to maintain his image in order to attract Natalie's attention.

3.1.2 Men's Language Features

Coates (2013) argues that men's language has five features: minimal response, question, compliment, strong and taboo language, and command and directives. It was found that both Natalie and Blake used all the men's language features proposed by Coates (2013). 14.92% or 57 of Natalie's utterances and 24.11% or 27 of Blake's utterances contain only men's language features. There are also 33 of Natalie's and 14 of Blake's utterances that contain men's language features along with women's language features.

3.1.2.1 Minimal Response

In table 3.2, Blake and Natalie show almost the same number of minimal responses used. However, when viewed based on the frequency, Blake dominated

it with 7.14%. Table 3.2 also shows that the minimal response used by Blake and Natalie was dominantly used to show their engagement in the conversation.

Data 33

Blake : You sure I can't get you something? Maybe a hanky or a tissue?
Natalie : I think I just, erm... I need to lie down. I'll be... I'll be totally fine then.
Blake : ***Okay.***
Natalie : Erm... Uh...Thank you, I just... I have no idea why you're being so nice to me. I just... I don't get it, but thanks.
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.17.59 - 00.18.10*)

Natalie kept sneezing in front of her apartment building because the sidewalk was covered with flowers, which she was allergic to. Blake, worried that Natalie kept on sneezing, finally asked if Natalie needed something like a hanky or a tissue. Natalie then said she just needed to lie down and would be fine.

Men's language feature, namely minimal response, was used by Blake in data 33 to respond to Natalie. Schegloff (1972) states that minimal response is a signal from active listening activities (cited in Fellego, 1995, p. 186). Blake used '***okay***' to show that he listened actively to what Natalie said. In addition, Blake also used a minimal response of '***okay***' to signal that he agreed with the statement made by Natalie. This is in line with what was agreed by Maltz and Borker (1982); Tannen (1990) that men use a minimal response as a form of approval (cited in Fellego, 1995, p. 186). Besides '***okay***', Blake also used a minimal response of '***Mm-hm***' with the same purpose in [34] '***Mm-hm. <0.3s> That's exactly what it is***' (*Blake, 00.37.04 - 00.37.06*). Blake used this sentence when Natalie mentioned that the tablecloth in front of them smelled and was made by fetal Alpaca. Blake

used '*Mm-hm*' to agree and confirm Natalie's guess about the material used to make the tablecloth.

Fellegy (1995, p. 186) states that minimal responses such as '*mmhmm*', '*yeah*', '*uh-huh*', and '*right*' are made to indicate a certain level of engagement in the conversation. In addition to showing active listening activity, minimal responses can also be used when bored as Blake did in data 35.

Data 35

Natalie : ↗What?↗ Who likes butter pecan? What's wrong with you?

Blake : That's what I thought would happen.

Natalie : You're like an 80-year-old grandpa.

Blake : ***Right.***

Natalie : Okay. What's your second favorite ice-cream flavor?

Blake : Rum raisin.

(Natalie and Blake, 00.38.43 - 00.38.58)

Natalie and Blake were relaxing in an ice cream shop when Natalie asked Blake's favorite ice cream flavors and then mocked him by referring to him as an 80-year-old grandpa to describe how old-fashioned and weird his tastes were. Blake, who was used to hearing ridicule from people about his favorite ice cream flavor, already suspected that Natalie would do the same thing.

Blake said '***right***' not to agree with Natalie's statement calling him a grandpa, but to show his boredom of hearing Natalie mock his taste for ice cream. Blake thought Natalie's teasing was nothing new because he had often heard people ridicule the same thing throughout his life. Therefore, when hearing Natalie's joke,

Blake did not give much of a response and only said '**right**' not to extend on the topic.

Data 36

Boss : You're our star architect, come on. Give us your vision.
Natalie : I do... I don't really have a... erm...
Whitney : She's got nothing.
Natalie : Erm.... (*looking at Josh asking for help*)
Josh : It's a surprise.
Natalie : **Yeah.** (*smile to everyone*)
Josh : And you're saving the best for the actual presentation, and I applaud that.
(*Natalie, 00.43.44 - 00.44.01*)

Natalie felt cornered because she was asked to present her design for a hotel in front of people. She then looked to Josh for help. Josh immediately backed up Natalie by saying that Natalie's design was a surprise and that she would show it in the actual presentation. Josh's words were able to help Natalie from looking unprofessional and turn things around to make people think Natalie was a great and mysterious architect.

In contrast to men who use the minimal response as a form of agreement, Maltz & Borker (1982) and Tannen (1990) describe that the function of minimal response used by women is to show support and active listening activity (cited in Fellego, 1995, p. 186). However, Natalie proved that women could use all three things simultaneously. In her use of '**yeah**' in data 36, the utterance '**yeah**' was intended to signal that she was actively listening to what Josh was saying. Apart from that, Natalie also used '**yeah**' to show that she gave an agreement and supported the claims made by Josh that the claims were valid. Natalie also

used **'yeah'** in data 37 to support and agree with Josh's surprising response when he discovered that Isabella and Blake had known each other before Josh introduced them

Data 37

Josh : So, here, let me introduce you. Isabella – (*Isabella and Blake hugs*)
Blake : Izzie!
Isabella : Hi...Blake, how are you?
Josh : I was gonna introduce you but you know... know each other. Okay.
Natalie : **Yeah!** (*look at Blake and Isabella*)
Blake : You didn't tell me the guy you were seeing was Nat's assistant. (*talk to Isabella*)
(*Natalie, 00.48.09 - 00.48.20*)

Natalie used **'yeah'** to signal her agreement with Josh's confusion because she was also going through the same thing. In this context, Natalie also used a minimal response of **'yeah'** to support Josh's statement to show that they did not know Isabella and Blake had known each other beforehand.

3.1.2.2 Question

Table 3.2 shows that Blake and Natalie used this feature. Blake used the question 15.18% or in 17 utterances, while Natalie used it 10.21% or in 39 utterances. The most dominant purpose while using this feature by Natalie and Blake was to convey solidarity with their conversation's partner.

Data 38

Blake : You know, the Buddhist say that if you met someone...and you heart pounds and your hands shake and your knees go weak, that that's not

the one. When you meet your soulmate, you'll feel completely calm. I feel very calm right now. **How about you?**
(Blake, 00.39.16 - 00.39.41)

The conversation above occurred between Blake and Natalie at the ice cream shop they managed to break into. They had a great night, making Blake fall in love with Natalie even more. In between enjoying ice cream, Blake then quoted a sentence said by the Buddhist to show his feelings for Natalie.

Blake used men's language features which are called 'question'. He said he felt very calm then, indicating that Blake had found his soulmate, Natalie. At the end of his sentence, he asked Natalie, '**How about you?**'. Blake used a question to determine whether Natalie also feels calm around Blake. Because if Natalie says 'yes', then that means Natalie also believes that Blake is her soulmate. Blake tried to find a clue as to whether Natalie liked him too.

Data 39

(Natalie enters the meeting room)

Blake : Perfect. Let's get some coffee.

Natalie : Actually, I don't do that.

Blake : **What do you do?**

Natalie : Take a seat, darl, you'll find out. I think you'll find it very...
beguiling.

(Natalie and Blake, 01.14.38 - 01.14.49)

The conversation above appeared between Blake and Natalie. Blake was in a meeting room while Natalie made an entrance. When she entered the room, Blake thought Natalie was a staff member whose job was to make coffee. However, Natalie confirmed that she did not do that. Natalie then told Blake to sit down and listen to her presentation to find out what she did.

Blake said, *'What do you do?'* when he tried to gain information about Natalie's job if she was not the one to ask to make coffee. Blake wanted to know what Natalie did, so Blake did not say anything else. In the men's language feature used by Blake in data 39, a phatic function is found where the sentence Blake conveyed solidarity for Natalie. Blake tried to maintain his social relationship with Natalie, who works at the company he hired to design his hotel.

Besides the phatic function, there is also found metalinguistic function when Blake used this feature. In the same situation and place as data 39, Blake asked, [40] *'What does beguiling mean?'* (Blake, 01.16.28 - 01.16.30) to the people after Natalie had left the room. Blake asked for information on the meaning of the word *'beguiling'* that Natalie had used earlier because it was unfamiliar to him. This is in line with the metalinguistic function mentioned by Jakobson (1987, p. 69)

Data 41

Natalie's mother : Wake up, Natalie. It's just a movie. Forget about men. (*sigh*)
Forget about love. In real life, girls like us don't get that.

Natalie : ***Why?***

Natalie's mother : Well, look in the mirror, darl. We're no Julia Roberts.

Natalie : ***We're not?***

Natalie : That woman has got a million-dollar smile. She's got a gorgeous mane of hair. Okay, she might not have to bleach her mustache, but she hasn't even got room for a mustache. She's got a tiny little space here. They'll never make a movie about girls like us. You know why?

Natalie : ***Why?***

Natalie's mother : Because it would be so sad. They'd have to sprinkle Prozac on the popcorn or people would kill themselves. You see, Natalie, love's not a fairytale. There's no happy endings.
(Natalie, 00.00.58 - 00.01.43)

The opening of *Isn't It Romantic* (2019) showed a young version of Natalie watching a romantic comedy in her living room. Natalie was so captivated by the idea of the perfect life of a woman shown on TV that her mother then came and told the harsh reality that what Natalie saw was not real, especially for overweight women like them.

From data 41, it was found that Natalie used the men's language feature, question, three times. First, she asked '*why?*' to demand an explanation and get more information about why her mother said that kind of life, which she watched in the movie, was not for them. Natalie then asked again, '*we're not?*' to demand her mother provide additional information about why she was so different from the character she saw in the movie. Finally, Natalie used, '*why?*' one more time when her mother said that there would never be a movie about overweight women like them. The three questions in data 41 were asked by Natalie directly. She did not even add words after that to make her interlocutor focus on answering and providing the information she wanted.

3.1.2.3 Compliment

Data 42

Blake : Wow. <5.0s> *Natalie, you look beautiful.*
(Blake, 00.36.12 - 00.36.19)

The sentence above was spoken by Blake when he saw it. Natalie wore a red dress with loose hair. Blake, amazed by Natalie's appearance, then gave a compliment by saying, '*Natalie, you look beautiful*'. He expressed what he was feeling at that time. Another example where Blake used compliments to express the

emotion he was feeling can be seen in data [27], Blake told Natalie'. . . *You are beguiling.*' to show his admiration and love for Natalie's personality. In addition to data 27, Blake complimented Natalie by using the word '*beguiling*' when Blake, Natalie, and Josh were at Natalie's apartment. He said [43], '*I love this beguiling woman.*' (Blake, 00.46.58 - 00.47.00) Blake used the word '*beguiling*' as a synonym of '*charming*' and '*enchanting*' to describe Natalie.

Data 44

Natalie : That's our new client? *Why is he so beautiful? He's, like, CW hot.* I just suddenly got the urge to catcall. Like, I... I don't whistle, but I just, like, wanna...

(Natalie, 00.04.27 - 00.04.37)

Natalie said the above line to Whitney when she saw Blake walking towards the meeting room. Natalie and Whitney could not take their eyes off Blake as Blake was beautiful. Natalie said, '*Why is he so beautiful?*' not to get an answer from Whitney about why Blake looks so attractive. However, Natalie said that to show her admiration for Blake's physical appearance. She could not believe that there was anyone as handsome as Blake. In addition to the word beautiful, Natalie used the phrase '*CW hot*'. According to Urban Dictionary, '*CW Hot*' means '*attractive men, usually with nice chiseled and very sexy tan*'.

Holmes (1995, p. 127) argues that minimal patterns (such as *good shoes!*) tend to be said by men while women use 'what (a) ADJ NP!' or other complex patterns. However, Natalie used both. First, she used a more complex pattern where Natalie used questions to convey her statement when she said, '*Why is she so*

beautiful?'. Second, she used minimal patterns when she said, '*He's, like, CW hot*'.

Data 45

Blake : Natalie, have you ever heard of a man called Gandhi?
Natalie : Er...yes.
Blake : He once said that true happiness was when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in perfect harmony. Isn't that great?
Nathalie : Yeah, *it's so cool you know all these sayings by heart, Blake.*
(*Natalie and Blake, 00.47.38 - 00.47.56*)

The conversation above occurred between Natalie and Blake while walking toward a restaurant. To avoid silence, Blake began to quote the wise words of Gandhi. Natalie, who heard the quote spoken by Blake, was amazed by Blake's knowledge. Since her first meeting with Blake, the man has quoted several wise words from famous people. Natalie thought Blake was excellent because he could rephrase those lines without rereading them, and she was amazed at his ability. She expressed her admiration by complimenting Blake, '*it's so cool you know all these saying by heart, Blake*'.

3.1.2.4 Strong Swearing and Taboo Language

Although Coates (2013, p. 86) mentioned that strong swearing and taboo language are features of male language, table 3.2 shows that Natalie also used this feature. She used strong swearing and taboo words more than Blake. Natalie used this feature 4.71% of her total utterances, while Blake only used it 1.79% of his total utterances. They used this feature to show their strong emotion. The data

showing the use of strong swearing and taboo words by Blake and Natalie are as follows:

Data 46

Doctor 2 : What are you doing with that?

Natalie : (*forcibly removing the infusion, blood splattered on the doctor's face; Natalie scream*) **Fuck!** Oh, did you hear that?

Doctor 2 : Yeah.

(*Natalie, 01.11.16 - 01.11.38*)

The conversation above happened at the end of the movie. Natalie managed to get out of the alternate universe. After the doctor said that she could go home with one condition, Natalie got too excited. She forcibly pulled out the infusion on her and caused Natalie to feel so much pain that she screamed.

Natalie screamed, '**fuck!**' after she pulled the infusion out of her hand. The word '**fuck**' itself is included in the category of stronger expletives. Natalie used strong swearing words to show how much Natalie was in pain due to the action she had just done. In addition to using '**fuck**' to express her pain, Natalie also used the strong swearing word '**shit**' to indicate when she hated something and thought it was terrible. Data 3, data 14, and data 21 were some examples of when the word '**shit**' was found in Natalie's sentence. Compared to data 28 until data 31, Natalie used strong swearing words when she felt negative emotions such as pain and dislike of something. She was also freer to use this feature when there was no large audience around her.

Data 47

Officer Hansom : I'm arresting you.
Natalie : What for?
Officer Hansom : Jumping the turnstile. (*handcuffed Natalie*) Let's go.
Natalie : My hands are right on your **junk**.
(*Natalie, 00.30.59 - 00.31.09*)

In addition to strong swearing words, Natalie was also found using taboo words on several occasions. As in data 47, Natalie was caught by an officer when she was about to jump onto a moving train track. Natalie's hands were handcuffed behind her body where the officer was behind her. Then Natalie said that the position of her hand was currently touching the officer's private area.

The Urban Dictionary explains that '**junk**' has several meanings. Among them are: '*Seemingly useless which sits around for months and is disposed of the day before it is needed*'; '*the male genitalia*'; '*a kind of Chinese boat*' and '*heroin*'. However, in the context of data 47, '**junk**' means '*the male genitalia*'. The word '**junk**' is taboo in this context because it refers to the male genitalia and should not be said explicitly, especially by a woman. This will make the atmosphere awkward and hurt the other person's feelings. However, Natalie, who had a character where she always said what was on her mind, easily said that in front of officer Hansom without thinking it would be awkward.

In addition to data 47, Natalie also mentioned the male genitalia with the word '**penis**' in [48] '*I got distracted by Blake's wealth, and his face and his, um... **giant penis***' (*Natalie, 00.54.43 - 00.54.48*) when he was chatting with Donny at Isabella's party. Natalie explains to Donny what made her pay attention to Blake. Natalie casually described Blake's genitals in that conversation by calling it a '**giant**

penis'. Just like *'junk'*, *'penis'* is also a taboo thing to talk about because it is a personal thing, and talking about it is considered inappropriate.

Blake only used strong swearing words twice throughout the movie and was not found using taboo words. The strong swearing words used by Blake are in the form of *'goddamn'* as in [25] *'∇ Oh, goddamn it. ∇ Who puts whipped cream in a coffee?. . .'* and *'damn'* in [27] *' . . . you're gonna have to stop being so damn beguiling. . .'*. The two utterances used by Blake have the same speech function, which is an expressive function to express an extreme emotion that Blake felt at that time. When using *'goddamn'* on data 25, Blake indicated that he hated the coffee and was disgusted by the taste. Meanwhile, when he said *'damn'* to data 27, Blake showed his admiration for Natalie by emphasizing and strengthening the meaning of the word *'beguiling'* before adding the word *'damn'*.

3.1.2.5 Command and Directive

Haas (1979, p. 623) argues that when speaking, men use their language to give orders, lecture, debate, and argue. Men will use more 'aggravated' directives (such as *gimme, I want*) while they are giving orders and tend to be more direct, while women will use 'mitigated' directives (such as *let's...*) (Goodwin; 1980, 1990, 1998). Table 3.1 shows that the use of commands and directives is dominated by Blake with a frequency of 6.25%, while Natalie is only 3.40%. The purpose of using this feature is to make their interlocutors do what they want.

Data 49

Blake : Well, erm... <2,0s> ***Hold on a second.*** <6,0s> (*take one white rose*)
If you need anything, anything at all... ***don't hesitate to...give me a call***
on my cellular... telephone... device. Yeah. That's my number.
(*Blake, 00.18.17 - 00.18.40*)

Blake took Natalie home to the front of Natalie's apartment building. Natalie sneezed because she was allergic to flowers, and there were loads of them. Blake offered Natalie a tissue or a handkerchief, but Natalie refused. He said he just needed to lie down to get better. Blake, who had liked Natalie at first sight, was unwilling to let his meeting with Natalie end just like that. So, he then gave Natalie her number on a white rose and asked Natalie to call him.

As Goodwin (1980, 1990, 1998) has researched, men tend to use 'aggravated' directives in which they make statements about what the other person should do. In data 49, Blake used two men's language features in the form of commands and directives. He used, '***Hold on a second...***' when he made a statement to Natalie not to move from her position while he picked up a white rose. In addition, Blake said, '***don't hesitate to...give me a call***' to direct Natalie to do what he wanted. Blake tried to dominate Natalie by making her do as Blake said. Not only that, Blake even returned to using this feature more forcefully when he shouted at Natalie from inside his car, saying [50], '***call me!***' (*Blake, 00.19.08 - 00.19.09*) to instruct Natalie that she should do as he said.

Data 51

Blake : Good morning, beautiful. Last night was amazing. You know, I was just thinking in the shower, when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. Natalie, I love...

Natalie : Wait, wait, wait. Erm, ***hold that thought, don't say another word. Just... Just get back into bed.*** I don't think we actually did anything. It just cut to the next morning.

Blake : What?

Natalie : Just get back here.

(Natalie and Blake, 00.41.03 - 00.41.22)

After spending the night with Blake, Natalie woke up when Blake had just come out of the bathroom. Blake greeted Natalie and complimented her. He also explained his happiness about the moment between them last night. In the plot, it was told that Natalie and Blake had sex. However, because the alternate universe where Natalie was currently in has PG13, the sex scene was not allowed to be shown, which made the moment between Blake and Natalie immediately move to the following day. During Natalie's confusion, Blake was about to say he loved Natalie, but Natalie cut Blake's sentence before he could finish. Natalie did this because she thought that if she heard Blake say he loved her, she would immediately be thrown back into her real world. She was not willing to go back before actually having sex with Blake.

In addition to men, Goodwin also emphasizes in her research that women can use 'aggravated' directives in some contexts besides men. Especially in cross-sex conversations. Natalie also used 'aggravated' directives in her utterances. Natalie used it to stop Blake, who was almost saying that he loved Natalie. She made the imperative statement, '***hold the thought, don't say another word.***' to keep Blake from confessing his feeling towards her. Natalie tried to control what Blake

had to do by using those words. After successfully getting Blake to stop his sentence, Natalie again told Blake what to do next. Natalie said, '**Just get back into bed**' to get Blake to do what she wanted. Natalie even repeated her statement with the sentence, '**just get back here**' when Blake questioned Natalie's previous sentence. In the end, Natalie managed to get Blake to do as she said.

3.2 Discussions

Based on the data collected by the researcher, it was found that Natalie produced 362 utterances. From all of her utterances, 125 or 34.53% utterances contain women's language features only, 55 or 15.19% utterances contain men's language features only, 33 or 9.12% utterances contain women's and men's language features simultaneously in one turn, and 41.16% utterances contain no women's or men's language features at all. On the other hand, Blake produced 102 utterances. From all of his utterances, 28 or 27.45% utterances contain women's language features only, 25 or 24.51% utterances contain men's language features only, 16 or 15.69% utterances there were women's and men's language features simultaneously in one turn, and 33 or 32.35% utterances contain no women's or men's language features at all. From here, it can be implied that of all the language features put forward by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013), it was found that both male and female characters in the movie *Isn't It Romantic* (2019) used almost all of the features of men's and women's language when they speak. In addition, in some utterances they use both variations of the language at the same time. Of all the

features in the women's and men's language features, only the precise color term was not found.

Based on the data in table 3.1, the use of women's language features is not dominantly used by women only. Through the analysis that has been done, Natalie only dominated three of the nine language features used. These features are lexical hedges, intensifiers, and rising intonation. Meanwhile, Blake dominated five of the nine features of women's language. The use of tag questions, 'empty' adjectives, 'hypercorrect' grammar, avoidance of strong swearing words, and emphatic stress from Blake has a higher frequency than Natalie.

Table 3.1 shows that Natalie used lexical hedges or fillers more than Blake. This was influenced by Natalie's character, who was described as a character with low self-confidence and often ignored by others in the movie *Isn't It Romantic* (2019). Blake also used lexical hedges or fillers for the same purposes, which was to express his lack of confidence when expressing an utterance. However, based on Table 3.1, Blake's lack of confidence was not as significant as Natalie's.

The second feature used by Blake and Natalie was intensifiers. As a woman, Natalie applied this feature. Natalie used this feature to strengthen the meaning of her utterances to make another person listens carefully to what she was trying to convey so she could gain her place in the conversation. However, what was interesting was Blake's use of intensifiers. Even though Blake's use of intensifiers was the same as Natalie's, his goals differed. Blake used intensifiers to gain trust. Especially from Natalie because almost every of Blake's conversation was with Natalie.

Next are tag questions and ‘empty’ adjectives. These two features are mentioned by Lakoff (1973) as two features that more women than men will use. However, based on the data shown in table 3.1, these two features tend to be used by the male character, Blake. For the tag question, Natalie and Blake both used this function not to show their lack of confidence in their claims. They used it to convey a claim they believe but try not to look too firm and pushy in front of their interlocutors. As for the ‘empty’ adjectives, Blake used them more than Natalie because, from the storyline, it was known that almost every of Blake’s conversations were with Natalie. This movie also told that Blake liked Natalie, so based on emotional closeness, Blake feels that way more than Natalie. In line with what Lakoff (1973) said that ‘empty’ adjectives describe the social context in which the speaker feels an emotional connection between them.

The following features are ‘hypercorrect’ grammar, super polite forms, and avoidance of strong swearing words. Natalie and Blake used these features in their speech. However, data from table 3.1 show that the three features Lakoff (1973) see as features of the female language are not dominated by Natalie. The percentage of Natalie using these features was lower than Blake. This was because Natalie and Blake had different backgrounds. Natalie grew up in a middle-class environment in New York City, where people spoke more freely without paying attention to other people's views. Even Natalie’s mother did not use these features when she talked to her. On the other hand, Blake came from upper-class society and was a billionaire whose life revolved around business activities. Blake has to maintain his image in

public. This taught Blake from a young age to speak according to the standard English form, be more polite, and avoid stronger expletives.

The last feature found is emphatic stress. Blake has a superior percentage of 5.88% compared to Natalie, which is only 1.93%. However, their use of empathic stress was similarly based on the number. Blake used this feature six times, and Natalie seven times. Blake and Natalie use this feature to strengthen the meaning of their utterance. However, Blake dominantly used this feature to show his emotions, while Natalie to convey information. Unlike Blake, whose words will always be noticed because he was a man and was a person from the upper class, Natalie, who was a woman, needed emphatic stress to highlight the points of the words she wanted to convey.

The last feature is precise color terms. This feature is not even found in Blake and Natalie's utterances. Not a single moment in the plot gives them a chance to talk about color. Therefore, women's language features, namely precise color terms, cannot be identified from the utterances of Blake and Natalie.

In addition to women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1973), it was found that Natalie and Blake also used men's language features proposed by Coates (2013). From the data that has been analyzed, it was found that Natalie and Blake used all of the men's language features proposed.

The first feature is minimal response. This feature has the same function for Natalie and Blake, as a signal from an active listening activity where the two characters used this feature to show their involvement in the ongoing conversation. In addition, although it was said that minimal response as a form of agreement tends

only to be used by men, and women primarily use this feature as support, Natalie also used the agreement function. This was because Natalie worked in an environment that had many male members. So, in her daily life, she adopted their way of speaking to be considered equal, and the minimal response was a more to-the-point way of conveying answers.

The second feature is question. Blake used this feature to dig up information about Natalie because he was curious about her. Table 3.2 shows that as a man, Blake still dominates in this feature, even though Natalie used this feature a lot for the same purpose. The use of the question feature rapidly increases after Natalie is in an alternate universe where all the details about her life change. Natalie was left with very little information about her own life. Therefore, Natalie used this feature to get information about many things she did not know yet.

Next is compliment. From the data, none of Blake's compliments were directed at men because, as a man, that would tarnish his image. Meanwhile, in Natalie's speech, compliments were still addressed to the interlocutor, who comes from the same gender. Natalie's position as a woman who made compliments in same-sex conversations was still considered normal and seen as a form of self-intimacy to maintain relationships with others.

Strong swearing and taboo languages were the only men's language features that Natalie used more than Blake. This result supports the results of data analysis regarding the avoidance of strong swearing words, which showed that Blake paid more attention to his speech and preferred avoiding strong swearing words in women's language features. Natalie was found to use words

like '*shit*' and '*fuck*' freely because, since childhood, she lived in an environment that also used these expressions freely. Therefore, Natalie saw that these words were not taboo to bring into the conversation. In contrast to Natalie's environment, Blake's environment, which was dominantly filled with business matters, did not allow Blake to use these utterances. Because in Blake's professional environment, the use of these utterances will give the impression that Blake is an uneducated and unprofessional person as well as a rude person.

The last feature is command and directives. This feature was used more by Blake than Natalie in the percentage of usage. Blake was more flexible in using this feature because of his more dominant position than his interlocutor. Even though almost all of Blake's conversations were with Natalie, Blake was aware of his different position with Natalie. He was a billionaire who worked with Natalie's company. This situation gives Blake higher power than Natalie. Natalie, powerless all her life, has no courage to give orders to others because she has always been ordered. Natalie's ability to give commands and directives only appeared when she was in an alternate universe where her position changed. Natalie's self-confidence began to form, and she also got the courage to use commands and directives.

Based on the theory presented by Holmes (2013) regarding the types of speech functions, which was used by the researcher to categorized the purposes of the features used by Natalie's and Blake's utterances, the researcher found that all speech functions. Expressive function, referential function, poetic function, metalinguistic function, directive function, and phatic function are used by Natalie and Blake when they use women's and men's language features in their speech.

Natalie's most dominant speech function in her speech, which contains women's language features, is the expressive function, followed by the referential function, then the directive function. On the other hand, Blake also shows that the expressive function is the most dominant in his speech which contains women's language features, followed by the directive function. This result shows that women's language features in the speeches of Natalie and Blake have a dominant expressive function. The two characters often use the features proposed by Lakoff (1973) to show their emotions at that time. Apart from women's language features, expressive functions appear as one of the most dominant functions when Natalie and Blake use men's language features proposed by Coates (2013) parallel to phatic functions. These two speech functions are dominant for each feature, followed by the dominant directive function used for one feature. Through the results that have been obtained, overall the expressive function is the most dominant. This imply that Natalie and Blake mostly use these language features to show the emotions they feel.

Through the data that has been analyzed, it is found that both Natalie and Blake used women's and men's language features. Natalie and Blake used features designated by their respective genders. However, they also freely adopt features reserved for the opposite gender. The features they used show that the most dominant purpose of their speech is to show what they feel. From this, we can see that the language features proposed by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013), which refer to differences in the usage of one particular gender, have changed. The

differences in the use of these features emphasize not only gender differences but also the environment, social life, and the situations and conditions of the speakers.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Through the analysis that has been done, the researcher found that Natalie produced a total of 362 utterances while Blake produced 102 utterances. Of this total, 125 of Natalie's utterances and 28 of Blake's utterances contain only women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1973). The men's language feature proposed by Coates (2013) is found in 55 of Natalie's and 25 of Blake's utterances. Beside that, it was also found 33 utterances from Natalie and 16 utterances from Blake contained both of women's and men's language features. From these details, it can be seen that both women's and men's language features can be used not only by the same gender, but these language features can also be used by the opposite gender in the context of *Isn't It Romantic (2019)* movie.

To answer the first research question that the researcher had regarding what features were used by Natalie and Blake, the researcher analyzed each utterance of the two characters and was guided by the theory proposed by Lakoff (1973) and Coates (2013). The analysis showed that Natalie and Blake used nine women's language features except for precise color terms and all five men's language features. Although both characters used the same features, the frequency with which they were used was different.

Through the context in the *Isn't It Romantic (2019)* movie, Blake dominated six of the nine women's language features used, namely tag questions, 'empty' adjectives, 'hypercorrect' grammar, 'super polite' forms, avoidance of strong

swearing words, and emphatic stress. Meanwhile, Natalie dominated three, namely lexical hedges, intensifiers, and rising intonation. Blake also dominated the four men's language features: minimal responses, questions, compliments, and commands and directives. On the other hand, Natalie only dominated one feature: swearing or taboo language. The analysis results were then summarized in table 3.1 and table 3.2.

The researcher was trying to answer the following research question regarding the purposes of using the language features used by Natalie and Blake. The results of the analysis in table 3.1 showed that expressive, referential, and directive functions were the most dominant language functions used by Natalie when she used women's language features. As for Blake, only expressive and directive functions were the most dominant. These results imply that the expressive function used by Natalie and Blake aims to show that the purpose of them using certain features were to show the emotions they feel. The directive function was used to direct the interlocutor to do what they wanted. Then, for Natalie, the referential function in women's language features that she used was to share the information she had with her interlocutors.

Apart from the women's language features in table 3.1, the men's language features used by Natalie and Blake in table 3.2 also contained speech functions. Expressive, phatic, and directive functions were the most dominant used by Natalie and Blake. The purpose of using expressive and directive functions by Natalie and Blake in men's language features was the same as that of women's language

features. Then the phatic function was used by both characters to build solidarity and maintain their relationship with their interlocutor.

REFERENCES

- Apridaningrum, Maria Catharina Gustia. 2018. "Women's Language Features Used by Sarah Sechan in Her Talk Show". Diploma thesis. Yogyakarta: University of Sanata Dharma.
- Arista, S. D. 2014. "Language functions used by the main character in Sherlock Holmes II: a game of shadows movie". *Journal of Linguistics of Fbs unimed*.
- Coates, Jennifer. 2013. *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (3rd Edition). London: Routledge
- Diraisyah, V. 2014. "An Analysis of women's speech features used by the main character of 'The Duchess' movie". Doctoral Dissertation. Malang: Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim
- Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2003. *Language and gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Fellegly, A. M. 1995. "Patterns and Functions of Minimal Response". *American Speech Journal*, 70(2), 186–199.
- Gustina, W. R. 2019. "The Analysis of Speech Functions of Teachers' Talk In English Classroom At Mts Aisyiyah Sumatera Utara". Doctoral Dissertation. Medan: University of Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara
- Haas, Adelaide. 1979. "Male and Female Spoken Language Differences: Stereotypes and Evidence". *Psychological Bulletin* 86(3): 616–26

- Hidayah, N. 2012. "The Analysis of Speech Function Used by English Teachers' Instruction at SMPN 6 Salatiga in the Academic Year of 2011/2012". Doctoral Dissertation. Salatiga: IAIN Salatiga.
- Holmes, Janet. 1995. *Women, Men and Politeness (1st edition.)*. London: Routledge
- Holmes, Janet. 2013. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th Edition)*. London and New York: Routledge
- Jakobson, Roman. 1987. *Language in literature*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Juwita, Tri Puspa, Dyah Sunggingwati, and Nita Maya Valiantien. 2018. "The Differences Between Men and Women's Language in The Devil Wears Prada Movie". *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni dan Budaya*, 2(1), 43-52.
- Keerthika, S. 2018. "Literature and Society: How Literature reflects society". *International Journal of Science, Engineering and Management (IJSEM)*, 3(4), 471-472
- Klerk, Vivian de. 1991. "Expletives: men only?". *Communications Monographs* 58.2: 156-169
- Lakoff, Robin. 1973. "Language and woman's place". *Language in society*, 2(1), 45-79
- Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. 2005. *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guidel*. North Carolina: Family Health International.

- Mizokami, Yuki. 2001. "Does Women's Language Really Exist?: A Critical Assessment of Sex Difference Research in Sociolinguistics". *Multicultural Studies journal, Vol 1*, 141-59
- Montemorano, C. 2020. "Leading Lad (y) in Love: Gender and Agency in Two Self-Reflective Romantic Comedies". *Student Research Submissions Journal*, 320
- Munir, A. 2018. "Language Functions Used in the Hawkin's Novel The Girl on the Train". Doctoral Dissertation. Makassar: Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin
- Murti, M. L. 2018. "An analysis of women's language features used by Mia in The Princess Diaries movie". Diploma Thesis. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University
- Nabilah, R. A. F. 2019. "The use of language features between men and women on YouTube vlog". Doctoral dissertation. Surabaya: UIN Sunan Ampel
- Pan, Qi. 2011. "On the Features of Female Language in English". *Journal of Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 1, No. 8*, pp. 1015-1018.
- Pebrianti, Annisa Aga. 2013. "Women's language features used by Indonesian female bloggers". *Passage, 1(2)*, 109-118.
- Priyadi, S. 2015. "Features of Man and Woman Language Used by Two Main Characters in Winds of Evil Novel: Gender Perspective". *Language Horizon Journal, 3(1)*.
- Putra, B, A. & Prayudha. 2019. "The analysis of women and men language features on America's got talent". *Notion: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Culture. Yogyakarta: Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.*

- Retiningrum, C. D. 2020. "Women's language features used by Lara Jean in the movie to All The Boys I've Loved Before (2018)". Doctoral Dissertation. Surabaya: Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel
- Rusydah, M. W.. 2020. "An Analysis of Felicity Condition Found in Female Characters of Isn't It Romantic?". Doctoral Dissertation. Purwokerto: Universitas Jenderal Soedirman
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press
- Tarigan, G. A. 2018. "The Categories of Speech Functions Used by the Main Characters in the Moana Movie". Diploma Thesis. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University
- Tribus, Angela C. 2017. "The Communicative Functions of Language: An Exploration of Roman Jakobson's Theory in TESOL". MA Thesis. *TESOL Collection*. 723. Vermont: SIT Graduate Institute
- Johnston, D. D., & VanderStoep, S. W. 2009. *Research methods for everyday life: Blending qualitative and quantitative approaches*. San Frnsisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wijayanti, G. K., Chasanah, Z. 2021. "Speech Functions by the Main Character in Wonder Movie in Teaching Speaking". *Scripta: English Department Journal*, 8(2), 28-34
- Zimmermann, D. H., & West, C. 1996. "Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation". *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series 4 Journal*, pp. 211-236.

ATTACHMENT

WOMEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES

NATALIE'S UTTERANCES	WOMEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES									
	LH	I	TQ	EA	ES	PC	HG	RI	SF	AS
Oh, hi, Donny. Some girl taped this love note to my door. "To Big D." <i>I think (LH + EX)</i> it's one of the many girls that are obsessed with you. (00.02.49 - 00.02.55)	•									
<i>Uh, I'm kinda of... (LH + EX)</i> busy too, but yeah, yeah. (00.03.55 - 00.03.58)	•									
Donna, <i>you kow, (LH + EX) technically (ES + REF)</i> you're the office manager, <i>right? ʒ (RI + REF) (TQ + REF)</i> (00.04.02 - 00.04.06)	•		•		•			•		
Okay, <i>uh (LH + EX)</i> , I don't know whether I'm fully ready, but... (00.04.20 - 00.04.24)	•									
That's our new client? Why is he <i>so (I + EX)</i> beautiful? He's, <i>like (LH + EX)</i> , CW hot. I just suddenly got the urge to catcall. <i>Like (LH + EX)</i> , I... I don't whistle, but I just, <i>like (LH + EX)</i> , wanna... (00.04.27 - 00.04.37)	•	•								
<i>Josh, stop being such an idiot! ʒ (RI + EX)</i> (00.05.32 - 00.05.34)								•		
<i>Oh, people are <u>listening!</u> ʒ (RI + REF) (HG + REF)</i> (00.05.36 - 00.05.37)							•	•		

Yes, <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) Yes, I am, sorry. (00.05.42 - 00.05.44)	•									
I'm not an assistant, so... Archi... Architect. I'm ju...Yeah, <i>er...</i> (LH + EX) But, <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) I'm also a team player and... I'd be <i>very</i> (I + EX) happy to get you another coffee. (00.06.06 - 00.06.17)	•	•								
Um, (LH + EX) be right back, everyone. (00.06.20 - 00.06.22)	•									
So, it's not like I thought I was gonna be the star of the meeting, or anything. <i>Like</i> , (LH + EX) I'm not that good. But even if I see him again, a guy like that, I'm just invisible to. (00.06.44 - 00.06.53)	•									
<i>You know</i> (LH + EX), a <i>nice</i> <u>ㄤ</u> (EA + REF) (RI + REF) guy with a <i>nice</i> <u>ㄤ</u> (EA + REF) (RI + REF) life. (00.06.55 - 00.06.58)	•			•				•		
Yeah, I know. I know. No, you know what I mean. <i>Like</i> (LH + EX), <i>super</i> (I + REF) rich, <i>like</i> (LH + EX), <i>super</i> (I + REF) successful, a <i>super</i> (I + REF) hunky guy. I'm just <i>extra</i> (I + REF) invisible to a guy like that, <i>you know?</i> (TQ + REF) (00.07.06 - 00.07.14)	•	•	•							
<i>Stop</i> <u>ㄤ</u> (RI + DIR) being an idiot, <i>all right?</i> (TQ + DIR) Oh. <i>Have you been working out?</i> (HG + PH) (00.07.46 - 00.07.48)			•				•	•		
That's <i>quite</i> (I + PH) hard. Yeah. (00.07.51 - 00.07.52)		•								
Hey, Whitney, can you get me the... Whit? <i>Whit?</i> <u>ㄤ</u> (RI + EX) <i>Um...</i> (LH + EX) <i>Can you maybe stop watching</i> (HG + DIR) full-length feature films in the office and just, <i>like</i> (LH + EX), do your job and assist me? (00.08.14 - 00.08.25)	•						•	•		

Because she should be happy with other things in her life, like... (LH + EX) her great (EA + REF) career that she's worked hard for. (00.08.43 - 00.08.48)	•			•						
Masterpiece of shit . ಠ (RI + EX) Whitney, all those movies are lies , ಠ (RI + REF) set to terrible (ES + REF) pop songs. (00.09.05 - 00.09.10)					•			•		
Ah, yes, they are. People waking up in bed with full hair and makeup. It's so (I + EX) unrealistic. Every time someone puts on a pair of pants, it turns into a whole montage . ಠ (RI + REF) (00.09.12 - 00.09.20)		•						•		
For you. Yeah, what about how there's always, like (LH + EX), some main chick, and she's super (I + REF) clumsy. She's always like... (LH + EX) "Oh! Whoops!" And everyone goes, "She's so (I + REF) charming (EA + EX)." No. In real life, people'd think she had muscular dystrophy . ಠ (RI + REF) (00.09.22 - 00.09.35)	•	•		•				•		
Uh (LH + EX), your flaws are what make you ugly. That's why they're called flaws. (00.09.38 - 00.09.41)	•									
And then, like (LH + EX), in those movies, when there are two women in the same workplace, they have to be, like (LH + EX) (EX), mortal enemies. Look at us. Like (LH + EX), I love you, I think (LH + EX) you're the best. The idea that two women can't root for each other at work is just disgusting (ES + EX). (00.09.38 - 00.09.54)	•				•					
And apparently, there's no HR at any of those businesses in rom-com world, because there's no diversity, and people are always boning their co-workers. Oh, and don't even get me started about the cliché gay best friend whose sole purpose in the story is just to help the main hot chick. And, like (LH + EX), does he have a job? Like (LH + EX), what's going on in his life? Who cares? It's so (I + EX) insulting, don't you think? (TQ + REF) (00.09.54 - 00.10.18)	•	•	•							

And then they always have some stupid voiceover that comes on to tell you what you're supposed to think. <i>You know what I think?</i> (LH + EX) Act better. (00.10.19 - 00.10.24)	•	•	•		•					
What about how, at the end of those rom-coms, they always do this stupid, <i>like</i> (LH + EX), slow motion running sequence? Aah! Aah! And, <i>like</i> (LH + EX), they're trying to break up a wedding or get their lover back. <i>Well</i> (LH), guess what? He doesn't love you. That's why he's not currently with you or marrying you. (00.10.31 - 00.10.47)	•									
You two are <i>so</i> (I + EX) soft. (00.11.10 - 00.11.11)		•								
Because it's <i>not</i> <u>∩</u> (RI+ EX) the end. They stop it there because what happens next is, <i>like</i> (LH + EX), <i>really</i> (I + EX) shit. (00.11.14 - 00.11.19)	•	•						•		
Yeah, I'm sure. Do you know how many times a day I catch him gawking at that half-dressed model out there? <i>You know</i> (LH + EX), she's <i>like</i> (LH + EX), "Ooh. Look, I'm <i>so</i> (I + REF) <i>sexy</i> (EA +CREF). I just want a man to buy me a salad. Ooh!" <i>You know</i> (LH + EX), but I don't have that, so that's fine. You know? (00.12.15 - 00.12.32)	•	•		•						
<i>Uh</i> , (LH + EX) Hi... (00.13.25 - 00.13.26)	•									
Natalie. <i>Uh</i> , (LH + EX) Nat, like the bug. (00.13.27 - 00.13.30)	•									
<i>My purse!</i> <u>∩</u> (RI + REF) (00.13.36 - 00.13.37)								•		
Why does this <i>shit always happen to me?</i> <u>∩</u> (RI+ EX) (00.14.00 - 00.14.02)								•		

<i>Uh, no. Um... (LH + EX) I got mugged by this childless sociopath. We need to call the police, and maybe I should do a sketch, so I just... (00.14.34 - 00.14.45)</i>	•									
Did I die? You're, <i>like (LH + EX)</i> , way too hot to be a doctor, and saying <i>really (I + EX)</i> creepy things to me. (00.15.14 - 00.15.19)	•	•								
<i>Why? ʌ (RI + EX) (00.15.22)</i>								•		
Wait. I know what's going on. You're working with that subway guy. <i>First he knocks me out, and then you try to steal my kidneys! ʌ (RI + REF) (00.15.23 - 00.15.29)</i>								•		
<i>Security! Please, I need help! (HG + EX) ʌ (RI + EX) (00.15.30 - 00.15.31)</i>							•	•		
Josh, <i>um (LH + EX)</i> , can you call me? I was mugged and I don't... I don't know, maybe I was harvested for my eggs. I don't know. <i>Please, um (LH + EX), just call me back (HG + DIR), okay? (TQ + DIR) (00.15.49 - 00.15.57)</i>	•		•				•			
This is <i>really (I + EX)</i> weird. (00.16.19 - 00.16.20)		•								
<i>No! Don't you smell what's happening? ʌ (RI + EX) New York doesn't smell like shit anymore. Everything smells like lavender. ʌ (RI + EX) (00.16.53 - 00.15.59)</i>								•		
Something is <i>really (I + EX)</i> wrong. (00.17.05 - 00.17.06)		•								
What? How... how did we get here <i>so (I + EX)</i> fast? That was, <i>like (LH + EX)</i> , 18 seconds. (00.17.27 - 00.17.31)	•	•								

Someone's <i>really</i> (I + EX) cleaned up the street. Those wedding dresses. Those weren't there before. And who put all these flowers everywhere? (00.17.39 - 00.17.50)		•								
<i>I think</i> I just, <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) I need to lie down. I'll be... I'll be totally fine then. (00.18.01. - 00.18.06)	•									
<i>Erm... Uh. . .</i> (LH + EX) Thank you, I just... I have no idea why you're being <i>so</i> (I + EX) <i>nice</i> (EA + REF) to me. I just... I don't get it, but thanks. (00.18.07 - 00.18.10)	•	•		•						
That's <i>very</i> (I + EX) <i>charming</i> (EA + EX). But you do realize there's, <i>like...</i> (LH + EX) 3.6 million permutations of how this could go together? (00.18.43 - 00.18.49)	•	•		•						
Right. That doesn't <i>really</i> (I + EX) make sense. (00.18.52 - 00.18.54)		•								
But, <i>uh...</i> (LH + EX) That still doesn't change the math, though. Just to be clear, <i>I cannot call you.</i> (HG + REF) (00.18.59 - 00.19.05)	•						•			
Whatever reality show this is. <i>You guys win!</i> <u>∩</u> (RI + EX) I'm gonna love it, not list it. (00.20.18. - 00.20.28)								•		
Yeah. I've, <i>erm</i> (LH + EX), been robbed, <i>sort of</i> (LH + EX). Someone's broken into my apartment and... stretched it. And they've taken everything and... replaced it all with <i>much nicer stuff.</i> (ES + REF) (00.20.53 - 00.21.04)	•				•					
<i>Donny! How did you get in here?</i> <u>∩</u> (RI + EX) (HG + EX) (00.21.43 - 00.21.44)							•	•		
<i>Why are you talking like that?</i> (HG + PH) (00.21.53 - 00.21.54)							•			

<i>Is this how you normally get to work? (HG + PH) (00.21.37 - 00.21.38)</i>								•			
<i>Oh, uh (LH + EX), I wasn't fully done with that... (00.23.03. - 00.23.05)</i>	•										
<i>Oh, Whitney... Oh, er... (LH + EX) Wow, you look really, really (I + EX) different. Erm (LH + EX), you have to explain to me what on earth is going on here. (HG + DIR) (00.23.18 - 00.23.26)</i>	•	•						•			
<i>Technically, you.. Actually, you're my assistant, so... (LH + EX) I know you, you know (LH + EX)... I don't like to say "I'm the boss!" or anything, but, uh (LH + EX), you're my assistant. (00.23.31 - 00.23.39)</i>	•										
<i>Thank God, you're still you. Okay. Okay, normal. Yep, yeah, normal Josh. Okay, I really (I + EX) need your help. (00.24.05 - 00.23.11)</i>		•									
<i>I got mugged last night. And suddenly, my apartment is tits, and my neighbor Donny is setting gay rights back, like (LH + EX), a hundred years. And Whitney is giving me <u>resting (ES + REF) murder face.</u> (HG + REF) (00.24.14 - 00.24.22)</i>	•				•			•			
<i>Uh... (LH + EX) Maybe in theory, but this is some kind of (LH + REF) parallel universe. This isn't our office. (ES + REF) Josh, it's not. Look, it's not real. I think (LH + EX) I might be going crazy. (HG + EX) (00.23.34 - 00.23.42)</i>	•				•			•			
<i>So you see it, too. Oh! Yeah, thank God. I think (LH + REF) we should get out of here before they bite us or impregnate us... (00.24.56 - 00.25.03)</i>	•										
<i>See? Doesn't this all feel really (I + EX) weird? (00.25.10 - 00.25.11)</i>		•									

Please, just don't commit me to some <i>super (I + EX)</i> beautiful insane asylum. (00.25.25 - 00.26.28)		•								
All right, <i>well (LH + EX)</i> , maybe if I retrace my steps from last night, we could... (00.25.40 - 00.25.43)	•									
No, she's just being dramatic. I choke all the time. <i>You know (LH + EX)</i> when you put those candies in the back of your mouth and... (00.25.48 - 00.25.53)	•									
Hey, Josh? Is that <i>really (I + EX)</i> necessary? (00.25.58 - 00.26.04)		•								
All right! <i>Oh! Oh, hey! Hey! ㄤ (RI+EX)</i> (00.27.04 - 00.27.06)								•		
<i>Er... er... (LH + EX)</i> (00.28.00)	•									
Oh, I'm so... I'm sorry. I... <i>Uh... (LH + EX)</i> You must think I'm... (00.28.03 - 00.28.09)	•									
I have an <i>amazing (EA + REF)</i> apartment and a <i>super (I + EX) cute (EA + REF)</i> dog. A gay sidekick. (00.28.23 - 00.28.27)		•		•						
I have a <i>Great (EA + REF)</i> job, but the only woman that works with me has now become my mortal enemy. Oh! (00.28.28 - 00.28.32)				•						
<i>I think (LH + REF)</i> I'm trapped in a... (reversing car sound; when Natalie curse) (00.28.40 - 00.28.41)	•									
<i>Come on! What did I do to deserve this? ㄤ (RI + EX)</i> My life's become a... (reversing car sound; when Natalie curse) (00.28.51 - 00.28.55)								•		

<i>Excuse me. I need your help (HG + DIR) (00.29.18 – 00.29.19)</i>								•			
I need the surveillance footage from last night, so I can find my mugger, so that, <i>um (LH + EX)</i> , he can fight me a little bit, knock me unconscious, and then I can leave this <i>unbearable romantic world. (ES + EX) (00.29.21 - 00.29.27)</i>	•						•				
<i>Please. I just need access to the surveillance footage. (HG + DIR) (00.29.31 - 00.29.34)</i>								•			
Hey! Oh. Hi. <i>Erm...Hey. Erm... (LH + EX) Can you please mug me? (SF + DIR) (HG + DIR)</i> Yeah, just go for it, and drag me around for a while, and then I'll knock myself unconscious. <i>(00.29.48 - 00.29.58)</i>	•							•		•	
<i>Oh! It's easy! ㄤ (RI + REF) (00.30.03 - 00.30.04)</i>									•		
Yeah, like that. I'll go, like, "Shitbag," and then I'll knock myself cold. What? <i>What's wrong with everybody? Look at you guys! This isn't real! ㄤ (RI + EX)</i> Oh, I hate this place. I hate this place! It's too... <i>(announcement) delightful! (EA+Ref) (00.30.08 - 00.30.22)</i>					•				•		
<i>Erm (LH + EX)</i> , give me my cell phone so I can type the number in. <i>(00.31.13 - 00.31.16)</i>	•										
You're kidding, <i>right? (TQ + REF)</i> I don't know anybody's numbers off by heart. <i>(00.31.17 - 00.31.20)</i>			•								
<i>So (I + EX)</i> dumb! <i>(00.32.09)</i>		•									
<i>Erm (LH + EX)</i> , thanks for coming to get me. <i>(00.32.11 - 00.32.13)</i>	•										

Normally, I'd be <i>so</i> (I + EX) excited to hear that someone like you is <i>so</i> (I + EX) excited to hear from someone like me, but... (00.32.18 - 00.32.23)		•								
Okay. I hit my head <i>really</i> (I + REF) `hard... and I woke up in this alternate universe. (00.32.42 - 00.32.48)		•								
I have to get out of here. <i>How do I get to the end?</i> <u>z</u> (RI + EX) (00.33.26 - 00.33.30)								•		
If I have to do this, I guess it could be worse than a <i>super</i> (I + EX) hot billionaire. (00.33.52 - 00.33.55)		•								
Great. That'd be... <i>wonderful</i> . (EA + EX) (00.34.13 - 00.33.16)				•						
<i>Er</i> (LH + EX), I have to go on a date with that big, fancy Blake guy, and, <i>um...</i> (LH + EX) make him fall in love with me (00.35.00 - 00.35.05)	•									
<i>I think</i> (LH + REF) we're being dragged into some dumb makeover montage. (00.35.33 - 00.35.36)	•									
I'm not trying on different things and coming out and going, "What do you think?" <i>No! No! No!</i> <u>z</u> (RI + EX) (00.35.43 - 00.35.49)								•		
No, I just threw this together. Just... It only took, <i>like</i> , (LH + REF) five hours. (00.36.20 - 00.36.26)	•									
<i>Well</i> , (LH + EX) you invited me and sent the car, so... That's... that's <i>very</i> (I + EX) <i>sweet</i> (EA + EX), though. (00.36.30 - 00.36.37)	•	•		•						

This is <i>so (I + EX) fancy (EA + REF)</i> . What are these tablecloths made of? They're, <i>like (LH), so (I + EX)</i> soft. (00.36.54 - 00.36.59)	•	•		•						
<i>Well, (LH + EX) thank you.</i> This is honestly, like, the best meal I've had in my whole entire life. (00.36.17 - 00.36.22)	•									
Oh, wait... <i>Erm... Er... (LH + EX)</i> I... <i>I think (LH + EX)</i> we're about to have our first fight. (00.37.40 - 00.37.44)	•									
<i>Look, (LH + EX)</i> we can just look through the window, and, <i>erm... (LH + EX)</i> If you look hard enough, I think we can see the flavors and then just imagine eating it (00.38.13 - 00.38.20)	•									
<i>What? Who likes butter pecan <u>z</u> (RI + EX)</i> What's wrong with you? (00.38.43 - 00.38.47)								•		
<i>No! That's even worse. <u>z</u> (RI + EX)</i> (00.38.57 - 00.38.57)								•		
(chuckles)...I can just imagine you sitting at home, <i>like... (LH + EX)</i> (00.39.09 - 00.39.11)	•									
<i>So did I (HG + EX).</i> (chuckles) (00.39.56 - 00.39.57)							•			
I'm just, <i>like... (LH + EX)</i> I've never had a night like this before. Oh! Oh.... (00.39.59 - 00.40.03)	•									
Rain. Hah! Really? That's <i>so (I + EX)</i> cliché... (00.40.10 - 00.40.13)		•								
Without, <i>you know... (LH + EX)</i> (00.40.47)	•									

Wait, wait, wait. <i>Erm</i> , (LH + EX) hold that thought, don't say another word. Just... Just get back into bed. I don't think we actually did anything. It just cut to the next morning. (00.41.13 - 00.41.21)	•									
Wh... <i>Er...</i> (LH + EX) Can you just say that one more time? (00.42.20 - 00.42.22)	•									
<i>Er... You know</i> (LH + EX) how us girls are. We love hearin' it. Just say it. Say it again. (00.42.23 - 00.42.28)	•									
This seems <i>incredibly</i> (I + EX) unnecessary, <i>okay?</i> (TQ + REF) Just 'cause we're two female colleagues, we don't automatically have to be enemies. We marched together, remember? We had that great sign. Girls Just Wanna have Fun-damental Human Rights. (00.43.02 - 00.43.14)		•	•							
Whitney? Whitney, what are you doing? <i>We friends</i> . <u>z</u> (RI + PH) Whitney, come on, we shared a T-shirt. And I stretched it out and you said, "You can have that one now." I was like, "Score." (00.43.15 - 00.43.25)								•		
But <i>I... I...</i> (LH + EX) I don't, <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) design the whole hotels. I normally, <i>erm</i> (LH + EX), just do the parking garages. (00.43.39 - 00.43.43)	•									
<i>I do...</i> (LH + EX) I don't <i>really</i> (I + EX) have a... <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) (00.43.47 - 00.43.49)	•	•								
<i>Erm...</i> (LH + EX) (00.43.52)	•									
<i>Erm...</i> (LH + EX) Okay, do you remember that parking garage idea? <i>Erm...</i> (LH + EX) (00.44.53 - 00.44.57)	•									

<i>Erm... (LH + EX) I just kind of (LH) ran with it. (00.44.59 - 00.45.02)</i>	•									
Hm... To waste <i>so much (I + EX)</i> time on a dumb idea. (00.45.04 - 00.45.07)		•								
<i>Uh, (LH + EX) no, don't go. I could...(LH + EX) I could really (I +PH) use your help on this. (00.45.17 - 00.45.20)</i>	•	•								
I was beginning to wonder if I've gotten it all wrong. Maybe it wasn't Blake who needed to fall in love with me. And do I look <i>cute (EA + EX)</i> in these side braids? (00.45.51 - 00.46.00)				•						
<i>Aren't you supposed to be hanging out with her? (HG + PH) (00.46.07 - 00.46.09)</i>							•			
Oh, <i>my God, (AS + EX)</i> okay. You sound like you're having a... (00.46.21 - 00.46.23)										•
I should've... I was gonna say something earlier. <i>We just... erm... (LH + EX)</i> I've just been, <i>erm (LH + EX)</i> , seeing Blake a little bit. (00.46.49 - 00.46.56)	•									
<i>Ah...Erm... (LH + EX) Yes. (00.47.41 - 00.47.42)</i>	•									
Yeah, it's <i>so (I + EX)</i> cool you know all these sayings by heart, Blake. (00.47.53 - 00.47.56)		•								
<i>Uh, (LH + EX) let me guess. You guys met at some fabulous (EA + REF) yacht party. (0048.50. - 00.48.54)</i>	•			•						
You two have such <i>amazing (EA + REF)</i> chemistry. Maybe we should swap. (00.49.29 - 00.49.23)				•						

<i>Well, (LH + EX) you and Isabella... (00.51.04 - 00.51.06)</i>	•									
<i>Yeah, really... really (I + EX) crazy. (00.51.13 - 00.51.16)</i>		•								
<i>Well, (LH + EX) why didn't you ask me out, then? Why don't... why don't you just, like (LH + EX), ask me out right now? (00.51.33 - 00.51.39)</i>	•									
<i>What are you talking about? Uh... (LH + EX) I never shot you down. (00.51.47 - 00.51.50)</i>	•									
<i>For, like (LH + EX), drinks at happy hour after work, or to go to the karaoke bar with your kickball team. I didn't wanna sit there and listen to you chat about some girl you had a crush on. (00.51.54 - 00.52.03)</i>	•									
<i>Are you comfortable with that nickname? It seems kind of (LH + PH) like a negative. (00.52.20 - 00.52.24)</i>	•									
<i>Yeah, with me, his best friend. I'm... (LH + EX) I'm his best friend, so... (LH + EX) (00.52.53 - 00.52.55)</i>	•									
<i>Oh, well, (LH + EX) sorry. (00.54.41 - 00.54.42)</i>	•									
<i>I got distracted by Blake's wealth, and his face and his, um... (LH + EX) giant penis. (00.54.43 - 00.54.48)</i>	•									
<i>Erm... (LH + EX) No, we can't, but... Of course I had to sneak a peek. (00.54.53 - 00.54.57)</i>	•									

Okay, the point is... it's Josh, <i>okay?</i> (TQ + REF) (00.55.05 - 00.55.07)			•							
And it was always Josh. 'Cause he's such a nerd and he's <i>so</i> (I + EX) <i>sweet</i> (EA + EX) and... he just... like, he <i>really</i> (I + EX) gets me, and that one time when I thought he was moving away forever... I cried all night. And I never ever told him. (00.55.09 - 00.05.22)		•		•						
<i>Uh...</i> (LH + EX) No, I ca... I can give it a go. (00.57.07 - 00.57.09)	•									
<i>Mm...</i> (LH + EX) (00.57.31.)	•									
<i>How did everyone know the choreography?</i> (HG + EX) (01.01.07 - 01.01.09)							•			
Don't you wanna figure it out with someone you <i>really</i> (I + EX) know? (01.01.44 - 01.01.46)		•								
<i>Were you just pitching my idea and passing it off as your own?</i> (HG + REF) (01.02.45 - 01.02.47)							•			
<i>Mmm...</i> (LH + EX) <i>I like being an architect.</i> (HG + EX) (01.01.14 - 01.03.16)	•						•			
You're <i>really</i> (I + EX) projecting. You think, what, we're gonna get married? (01.03.22 - 01.03.24)		•								
<i>Why don't you piss off?</i> <u>↯</u> (RI + EX) (01.03.52 - 01.03.53)								•		
Josh. I've never had the chance to tell him that. I need to tell him that. Right now. <i>Erm...</i> (LH	•	•						•		•

+ <i>EX</i>) Oh, I'm never gonna make it. But I have to try. <i>Oh, my God, (AS + EX)</i> of course. <u><i>Why am I so (I + EX) dumb? It was always gonna come down to running to stop the wedding!</i></u> \nearrow (<i>RI + REF</i>) (01.06.14 - 01.06.31)																						
Slow motion. <i>Soooo (I+ EX)</i> dumb. (01.07.01 - 01.07.06)			•																			
<i>Er, (LH + EX)</i> no, she doesn't even know Josh. (01.07.57 - 01.08.00)	•																					
Really? <i>Uh, (LH + EX)</i> what's his favorite vegetable, then? (01.08.01 - 01.08.05)	•																					
Josh. <i>Look... (LH + EX)</i> I know you think Isabella is the girl of your dreams. But what if you're wrong? (01.08.31 - 01.08.39)	•																					
But... I'm smart and kind and funny and... I'm passionate about work, and I'm <i>really (I + EX) weirdly (EA + REF)</i> good at karaoke. Josh... (01.08.49 - 01.08.58)		•		•																		
I love me. Holy crap. I love me. <i>Oh, my God, (AS + EX)</i> this whole time, I thought I had to get somebody else to fall in love with me, but I... I had to love me. Okay, I'm just gonna go (01.09.24 - 01.09.44)																						•
No, just go... carry on. You guys, <i>erm... (LH + EX)</i> Yeah, do your thing. I'm gonna do me. Good luck with everything. I don't have high hopes for what's going on there. Josh and Iz, what's their couple name gonna be? Jiz? Love! It's crazy, <i>right? (TQ + REF)</i> (01.09.47 - 01.10.05)	•			•																		
I guess I don't really have a choice, <i>do I? (TQ + REF)</i> (01.10.15 - 01.10.17)				•																		

<p>Bonk? No, no, no, no, no. You're <i>too</i> (I + REF) hot to be a doctor. <i>How can I still be stuck here?</i> <u>z</u> (RI + EX) (01.10.53 - 01.10.58)</p>		•							•		
<p>Here, can you just... <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) (01.11.27 - 01.11.28)</p>	•										
<p><i>My apartment's sh shitty again! Yeah!</i> <u>z</u> (RI + EX) (01.12.13 - 01.12.16)</p>									•		
<p><i>Erm,</i> (LH + EX) I have things to do and places to be, so why don't you clean that shit up? (01.13.28 - 01.13.31)</p>	•										
<p>Oh, Whitney. <i>Oh, my God!</i> (AS + EX) Hi! (01.13.55 - 01.13.58)</p>											•
<p><i>Well,</i> (LH + EX) about that, I was thinking that we cut back on the movies. (01.14.16 - 01.14.19)</p>	•										
<p>Take a seat, darl, you'll find out. <i>I think</i> (LH + EX) you'll find it <i>very...</i> (I + REF) beguiling. (01.14.44 - 01.14.49)</p>	•	•									
<p><i>Well,</i> (LH + EX) I am. I'm ready. Ow! (01.14.55 - 01.14.58)</p>	•										
<p>Nobody <i>ever really</i> (I + REF) (01.15.30 - 01.15.33) notices them.</p>		•									
<p>something that was invisible, something nobody <i>ever</i> (I + REF) cared about or looked twice at... suddenly, they're not invisible anymore. (01.15.50 - 01.15.59)</p>		•									
<p><i>I think</i> (LH + EX) that could be, <i>like</i> (LH + EX), <i>really</i> (I + REF) special. (01.16.09 - 01.16.10)</p>	•	•									

Thank you. It's actually a <i>great</i> (EA + REF) idea, that I thought of. And I'm just gonna get started on it. All right, let's do it. Okay, I'll see you guys later. Peace out. (01.16.17 - 01.16.27)				•						
And you! <i>You need to stop living in a fantasy land.</i> (HG + DIR) Hello? Hello? Hello, Josh! (01.16.37 - 01.16.43)							•			
You need to stop staring out that window at some stupid girl in some stupid little swimsuit. <i>Okay?</i> (TQ + DIR) That's not all it's cracked up to be. You need to start living in the real world, and stop thinking that you're gonna get with some model, and that that's gonna make you happy. (01.16.46 - 01.17.00)			•							
Okay. <i>Well</i> (LH + DIR)! Maybe we should go out sometime, then. (01.18.16 - 01.18.23)	•									
Okay. <i>Yeah,</i> (LH + EX) good. Good... Great. Great. ((01.18.26 - 01.18.28)	•									
I don't know. I was just on a roll this morning, and now I'm... Now I'm <i>really</i> (I + EX) happy. (01.18.33 - 01.18.39)		•								
<i>Yeah, that'd be...</i> <i>Yeah</i> (LH + EX). I mean, I might outshine you, but... (01.18.43 - 01.18.48)	•									
Wait, <i>did you just run down the stairs?</i> (HG + REF) (01.19.43 - 01.19.44)							•			

BLAKE'S	WOMEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES
----------------	----------------------------------

UTTERANCES	LH	I	TQ	EA	ES	PC	HG	RI	SF	AS
Mm! Oh, <i>goddamn it</i> . <u>Z</u> (RI + EX) Who puts whipped cream in a coffee? Do you mind? I'll just have a normal coffee. Thanks. (00.05.58 - 00.06.05)								•		
<i>I am so</i> (I + EX) <i>sorry</i> . My driver was probably distracted by you. Wow, <i>you're...</i> (LH + EX) <i>you're quite</i> (I + Ref) <i>beguiling</i> (EA + EX), <i>aren't you?</i> (TQ + EX) (00.16.31 - 00.16.37)	•	•	•	•						
I find it <i>impossible to believe</i> (ES + REF) that we've met before and I don't remember you. (00.16.47 - 00.16.50)					•					
<i>I think</i> (LH + REF) you might have hit your head. Why don't we check you in at the doctor, maybe? Or just take you home? (00.17.00 - 00.17.04)	•									
Okay, <i>well</i> , (LH + EX) why don't you, <i>um...</i> (LH + EX) Why don't you let me take you home? I'm not gonna hurt you. Let's... Let's get you home, though. I'll give you a ride, <i>okay?</i> (TQ + DIR) (00.17.07 - 00.17.14)	•		•							
<i>Well, erm...</i> (LH + EX) Hold on a second. If you need anything, anything at all... don't hesitate to... give me a call on my cellular... telephone... device. Yeah. That's my number. (00.18.17 - 00.18.40)	•									
<i>Are you feeling what I'm feeling?</i> (HG + EX) (00.19.05 - 00.19.06)							•			
<i>Are you kidding?</i> (HG + EX) I was <i>so</i> (I + EX) excited to hear from you. I mean, even though it was to bail you out of jail. Pretty cool. (00.32.13 - 00.32.18)		•					•			
Tell me what's goin' on. I'm a good listener, I've got <i>very</i> (I + REF) big earholes. (00.32.24 - 00.32.26)		•								

Except that you think koalas are the cutest things ever. They have chlamydia and are actually <i>quite</i> (I + REF) hostile, so stay away from 'em, <i>all right?</i> (TQ + DIR) Anyway, let's hear it. (00.32.33 - 00.32.41)		•	•							
Still waters run deepest, <i>don't they?</i> (TQ + EX) (00.33.04 - 00.33.06)			•							
<i>God</i> (AS + EX), there's so much more I wanna know about you. (00.33.07 - 00.33.09)										•
Hold that thought. <i>It's my father calling from Singapore.</i> (HG + ref) You know how it is. (00.33.19 - 00.33.22)							•			
<i>Natalie, I am so</i> (I + EX) <i>sorry, but, uh...</i> (LH + EX) <i>I have to run back to the office and put out some fires.</i> (00.33.47 - 00.34.03)	•	•								
Whoosh! But, <i>erm...</i> (LH + EX) why don't you do me a favor, and, <i>uh,</i> (LH + EX) have dinner with me later, <i>okay?</i> (TQ + DIR) I'll send a car for you. (00.34.04 - 00.34.13)	•		•							
I'm just trying to extend this date for as long as possible. And it just so happens I know of a <i>great</i> (EA + EX) old ice-cream shop in Red Hook. If you wanna dock and maybe take a stroll? (00.37.44 - 00.37.54)				•						
Oh, <i>My God</i> (AS + Ex), Natalie, I am so sorry. I was sure they'd be open this late. (00.38.07 - 00.37.12)										•
Yeah. I know. It's been <i>a lifelong source of insecurity</i> (ES + EX) for me. (00.38.57 - 00.39.00)					•					
In grade school I was teased about it <i>so</i> (I + EX) mercilessly that I went a solid decade where I only ate ice cream in the privacy of my own home. (00.39.01 - 00.39.08)		•								

<i>You know, (LH + REF) the Buddhist say that if you met someone...(00.39.16 - 00.39.21)</i>	•									
I feel <i>very (I + EX)</i> calm right now. How about you? (00.39.39 - 00.39.41)				•						
<u><i>I had an amazing (EA + EX) time tonight. (HG + EX)</i></u> (00.39.53 - 00.39.56)				•			•			
Good morning, beautiful. Last night was <i>amazing (EA + EX)</i> . <i>You know, (LH + PO) I was just thinking in the shower, (HG + PO + EX)</i> when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. Natalie, I love... (00.41.04 - 00.41.12)	•			•			•			
Good morning, beautiful. Last night was <i>amazing (EA + EX)</i> . <i>You know, (LH + PO) I was just thinking in the shower, (HG + PO + EX)</i> when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. Natalie, I lo... oof! (00.41.34 - 00.41.44)	•			•			•			
Good morning, beautiful. Last night was <i>amazing (EA + EX)</i> . <i>You know, (LH + PO) I was just thinking in the shower, (HG + PO + EX)</i> (00.41.53 - 00.41.59)	•			•			•			
Come on. Don't undersell it, babe. I love this <i>beguiling (EA + EX)</i> woman. I love you. (00.46.57 - 00.47.01)				•						
Ah. He seems <i>sweet (EA + EX)</i> . Someone should tell him not to wear a brown belt with black shoes, though. It's tacky. (00.47.20 - 00.47.26)				•						
Yeah, <i>well, (LH + EX)</i> it's a gift. (00.47.56 - 00.47.57)	•									
You didn't tell me the guy you were seeing was <i>Nat's assistant. (ES + REF)</i> (00.48.17 - 00.48.20)					•					

It was <i>the worst</i> (ES + EX) yacht party ever! <u>z</u> (RI + EX) (00.48.57 - 00.48.59)					•			•		
That sounds <i>lovely</i> (EA + EX). <i>Well</i> , (LH + EX) I was gonna take my helicopter out anyway, so... (00.48.10 - 00.48.13)	•			•						
That's <i>so</i> (I + EX) <i>sweet</i> (EA + EX), <i>darling</i> (EA + EX), but better we take our own. Nat and I might wanna hit the, <i>er</i> , (LH + EX) old Caperoo, if you know what I mean. (00.49.16 - 00.49.23)	•	•		•						
<i>Well</i> , (LH) what do you think? Hamptons? (00.48.41 - 00.48.42)	•									
"Tender as a marshmallow." You are <i>beguiling</i> . (EA + EX) (00.50.16 - 00.50.20)				•						
If you want me to stop saying it, I will. But you're gonna have to stop being <i>so</i> (I + EX) damn <i>beguiling</i> (EA + EX). (00.50.23 - 00.50.30)		•		•						
Oh. <i>Sorry</i> , (SF + EX) it's my father. Y'ello? (00.50.31 - 00.50.33)									•	
Oh, that's <i>so</i> (I + EX) great, Dad. I'm <i>so</i> (I + EX) <i>glad</i> (ES + EX) you love it. You're right, it is innovative. And I came up with it all by myself. I'll fill in the architects and they can work up the official plans and models. Okay? Goodbye. (01.02.23 - 01.02.38)		•			•					
<i>God</i> (AS + EX), you look beautiful in the morning light. (01.02.42 - 01.02.45)										•
No. <i>Well</i> , (LH + EX) I saw them when I was in your apartment. And the idea was for me, so...whose idea is it, <i>really?</i> (TQ + Dir) (01.02.48 - 01.02.54)	•		•							

No, you weren't. Darling , (EA + EX) now that you're with me, you're not gonna be working anymore. My girl, slumming it in the realm of the employed? Not on my watch.(01.03.07-01.03.14)				•						
Come on, don't be silly (EA + EX). We should also, at some point, talk about changing your name. (01.03.16 - 01.03.22)				•						
Well , (LH + EX) yes. And obviously, we'll change your last name. But no, I'm talking about your first name. Natalie? I really don't think it's gonna work in my circles (ES+ EX). So I was thinking Georgina. What do you think? Georgina? (01.03.26 - 01.03.39)	•				•					
Beguiling . (EA + EX) (01.03.42)				•						
Okay, I... I think (LH + REF) you're just tired, darling (EA + EX). Why don't you go back to bed? (01.03.48 - 01.03.51)	•			•						
It is so (I + EX) sad... to watch someone you love go mad with ambition. Do you know who said that? (01.03.57 - 01.04.03)		•	•							
What does <u>beguiling</u> (EA + ME) mean? (HG + ME) (01.16.28 - 01.16.30)				•			•			

MEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES:

NATALIE'S UTTERANCES	MEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES				
	MR	Q	C	ST	CD
<i>Why? (Q + EX) (00.01.10 - 00.01.11)</i>		•			
<i>We're not? (Q + EX) (00.01.13 - 00.01.14)</i>		•			
<i>Why? (Q + EX) (00.01.30)</i>		•			
Baxter? Pyeow! Roll over. Play dead. (<i>sigh</i>) <i>Come here. (CD + DIR)</i> Aah! Morning kiss for Mummy? Baxter? (00.02.25 - 00.02.36)					•
<i>What? (Q + EX) (00.03.21)</i>		•			
That's our new client? <i>Why is he so beautiful? (C + EX) He's, like, CW hot (C + EX)</i> . I just suddenly got the urge to catcall. Like, I... I don't whistle, but I just, like, wanna... (00.04.27 - 00.04.37)			•		
I don't know. Sometimes when I go into the big meetings, they just cut me off and I don't get my ideas out right, and everyone just thinks I'm the coffee <i>bitch. (ST + EX)</i> Which is unfair, 'cause sometimes I bring donuts as well. Maybe I could just e-mail it. (00.04.55 - 00.05.08)				•	

<i>What does that mean? (Q + ME) (00.07.24 - 00.07.26)</i>		•			
<i>That's quite hard. (C + PH) Yeah. (00.07.51 - 00.07.52)</i>			•		
Masterpiece of <i>shit (ST + EX)</i> . Whitney, all those movies are lies, set to terrible pop songs. (00.09.05 - 00.09.10)				•	
Because it's not the end. They stop it there because what happens next is, like, really <i>shit (ST + REF)</i> . (00.11.14 - 00.11.19)				•	
<i>What? (Q + EX) (00.13.36)</i>		•			
Why does this <i>shit (ST + EX)</i> always happen to me? (00.14.00 - 00.14.02)				•	
<i>Where am I? (Q + EX) (00.14.50 - 00.14.51)</i>		•			
<i>What's wrong? (Q + PH) (00.15.08 - 00.15.09)</i>		•			
<i>Why? (Q + PH) (00.15.22)</i>		•			
<i>Oh. (MR + PH) (00.16.02)</i>	•				
<i>Why are you now Australian? (Q + PH) (00.16.38 - 00.16.39)</i>		•			

Oh, <i>what's going on?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.16.50 - 00.16.52)		•			
No! Don't you smell what's happening?_New York doesn't smell like <i>shit</i> (<i>ST + EX</i>) anymore. <i>Everything smells like lavender.</i> <u>2</u> (00.16.53 - 00.15.59)				•	
<i>What? How... how did we get here so fast?</i> (<i>Q + EX</i>) That was, like, 18 seconds. (00.17.27 - 00.17.31)			•		
Someone's really cleaned up the street. Those wedding dresses. Those weren't there before. <i>And who put all these flowers everywhere?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.17.39 - 00.17.50)		•			
<i>Holy shit</i> (<i>ST + EX</i>). Okay, you can come out now... (00.20.18 - 00.20.23)				•	
Donny! <i>How did you get in here?</i> (<i>Q + EX</i>) (00.21.43 - 00.21.44)		•			
<i>Why are you talking like that?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.21.53 - 00.21.54)			•		
<i>What presentation?</i> (<i>Q + EX</i>) (00.22.09 - 00.22.10)		•			
<i>Is this how you normally get to work?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.21.37 - 00.21.38)		•			
<i>Are you gonna get a job?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.21.42 - 00.21.43)		•			
<i>Okay.</i> (<i>MR + PH</i>) (00.25.38)	•				

<i>Hey, Josh? Is that really necessary? (Q + EX) (00.25.58 - 00.26.04)</i>		•			
<i>Why not? (Q + PH) (00.29.35 - 00.29.36)</i>			•		
Hey! Oh. Hi. Erm...Hey. Erm... Can you please mug me? Yeah, just <i>go for it, and drag me around for a while</i> , (CD + DIR) and then I'll knock myself unconscious. (00.29.48 - 00.29.58)					•
Oh! It's easy! You! You look like you're prone to violence. <i>Come on, mug me.</i> (CD + DIR) (00.30.03 - 00.30.07)					•
Yeah, like that. I'll go, like, " <i>Shitbag</i> ," (ST + EX) and then I'll knock myself cold. What? What's wrong with everybody? Look at you guys! This isn't real! Oh, I hate this place. I hate this place! It's too... (announcement) delightful! (00.30.08 - 00.30.22)				•	
<i>What for? (Q + PH) (00.31.00 - 00.31.01)</i>		•			
My hands are right on your <i>junk</i> . (ST + REF) (00.31.07 - 00.31.09)				•	
Erm, <i>give me my cell phone</i> (CD + DIR) so I can type the number in. (00.31.13 - 00.31.16)					•
This probably won't work. Unless you believe in the power of love or some <i>bullshit</i> (ST + EX), but it's worth a try. Here goes. (00.31.37 - 00.31.45)				•	
<i>What? (Q + PH) (00.33.07)</i>		•			

I have to get out of here. <i>How do I get to the end? (Q + EX)</i> (00.33.26 - 00.33.30)		•			
<i>oh (MR + PH)</i> (00.34.03)	•				
Oh, wa... <i>Oh, wait, hang on, what time? And what... what should I wear? I need to... What's the name of the restaurant? I like to look it up before, so I can decide what I want from the menu! And do they even have a dessert selection? (Q + REF)</i> (00.34.24 - 00.34.40)		•			
<i>Wait! Okay, what am I gonna wear? (Q + EX)</i> Can't do it up like I do on the usual. Oh, I know who'll know. (00.34.42 - 00.34.49)		•			
This is so fancy. <i>What are these tablecloths made of? (Q + REF)</i> They're, like, so soft. (00.36.54 - 00.36.59)		•			
Okay, <i>what's your favorite ice-cream flavor of all time? (Q + PH)</i> (00.38.00 - 00.38.32)		•			
<i>Mmm... (MR + PH)</i> (00.38.38)	•				
<i>okay. (MR + PH)</i> (00.38.41)	•				
Okay. <i>What's your second favorite ice-cream flavor? (Q + PH)</i> (00.38.50 - 00.38.53)		•			
<i>Ah (MR + PH)</i> (00.39.00)	•				

<i>Yeah (MR + PH) (0040.36)</i>	•				
<i>Yeah. (MR + PH) (00.40.38)</i>	•				
Wait, wait, wait. Erm, <i>hold that thought, don't say another word. Just... Just get back into bed. (CD + DIR)</i> I don't think we actually did anything. It just cut to the next morning. (00.41.13 - 00.41.21)					•
<i>Just get back here. (CD + DIR) (00.41.21 - 00.41.22)</i>					•
Yeah, all right, <i>give it to me. (CD + DIR) (00.42.10 - 00.42.12)</i>					•
Er... You know how us girls are. We love hearin' it. <i>Just say it. Say it again. (CD + DIR) (00.42.23 - 00.42.28)</i>					•
<i>oh. (MR + PH) (00.42.54)</i>	•				
<i>Yeah. (MR + PH) (00.43.56)</i>	•				
Erm... Okay, <i>do you remember that parking garage idea? (Q + PH)</i> Erm... (00.44.53 - 00.44.57)		•			
<i>Aren't you supposed to be hanging out with her? (Q + PH) (00.46.07 - 00.46.09)</i>		•			
Don't. No, <i>stop it!</i> You're such an idiot! <i>Stop it. (CD + DIR) (00.46.29 - 00.46.31)</i>					•

Yeah, <i>it's so cool you know all these sayings by heart, Blake. (C + EX) (00.47.53 - 00.47.56)</i>			•		
<i>Yeah! (MR + PH) (00.48.17)</i>	•				
So, <i>how do you two know each other? (Q + PH) (00.48.46 - 00.48.48)</i>		•			
<i>This lobster...is the size of a cat. Yet it's... as tender as a marshmallow. (C + PO + EX) (00.50.08 - 00.58.16)</i>			•		
<i>Did you just learn that word? (Q + ME) 'Cause you tend to say it a lot. (00.50.21 - 00.50.23)</i>		•			
<i>You did? (Q + PH) (00.51.29 - 00.51.30)</i>		•			
Well, <i>why didn't you ask me out, then? Why don't... why don't you just, like, ask me out right now? (Q + PH) (00.51.33 - 00.51.39)</i>		•			
<i>Are you comfortable with that nickname? (Q + PH) It seems kind of like a negative. (00.52.20 - 00.52.24)</i>		•			
Donny, wh... How the <i>hell (ST + EX) did you get here? (00.54.01 - 00.54.04)</i>				•	
<i>come here. (CD + DIR) (00.54.05)</i>					•
I got distracted by Blake's wealth, and his face and his, um... <i>giant penis. (ST + REF) (00.54.43 - 00.54.47)</i>				•	

It is. <i>What are you gonna do when the drugs wear off? (Q + PH) (01.01.34 - 01.01.36)</i>		•			
<i>Don't you wanna figure it out with someone you really know? (Q + PH) (01.01.44 - 01.01.46)</i>		•			
<i>Are they my plans? (Q + REF) (01.02.39 - 01.02.40)</i>		•			
<i>Were you just pitching my idea and passing it off as your own? (Q + REF) (01.02.45 - 01.02.47)</i>		•			
<i>Stop! (CD + DIR) (01.07.24)</i>					•
I love me. <i>Holy crap. (ST + EX)</i> I love me. Oh, my God, this whole time, I thought I had to get somebody else to fall in love with me, but I... I had to love me. Okay, I'm just gonna go (01.09.24 - 01.09.44)				•	
<i>I... I did? (Q + EX) (01.11.13 - 01.11.14)</i>		•			
<i>Am I... Am I okay? Can I leave now? (Q + PH) (01.11.17 - 01.11.20)</i>		•			
<i>Fuck! (ST + EX)</i> Oh, did you hear that? (01.11.34 - 01.11.38)				•	
New York is a <i>shithole (ST + EX)</i> again! Taxi! (01.11.39 - 01.11.48)				•	
My apartment's sh <i>sitty (ST + REF)</i> again! Yeah! (01.12.13 - 01.12.16)				•	

Hey, Baxter? Pyeow! Baxter, <i>play dead</i> . (CD + DIR) (01.12.24 - 01.12.26)					•
<i>What? What about all those girls that come to the apartment?</i> (Q + REF) (01.12.45 - 01.12.48)		•			
Erm, I have things to do and places to be, so why don't you clean that <i>shit</i> (ST + DIR) up? (01.13.28 - 01.13.31)				•	
Sorry, one second, I'm just gonna call. Donna, hi, it's Natalie. Yeah, can you do your <i>goddamn</i> (ST + DIR) job? (01.13.46 - 01.13.51)				•	
<i>Yeah</i> . (MR + PH) (01.14.29)	•				
<i>Take a seat</i> (CD + DIR), darl, you'll find out. I think you'll find it very... beguiling. (01.14.44 - 01.14.49)					•
<i>Yeah, okay</i> . (MR + PH) (01.14.59 - 01.15.00)	•				
I'm just getting a coffee. 'Cause I'm now my own coffee <i>bitch</i> . (ST + EX) (01.19.47 - 01.19.51)				•	

BLAKE'S UTTERANCES UTTERANCES	MEN'S LANGUAGE FEATURES				
	MR	Q	C	ST	CD

Mm! Oh, <i>goddamn</i> (<i>ST+ EX</i>) it. Who puts whipped cream in a coffee? Do you mind? I'll just have a normal coffee. Thanks. (00.05.58 - 00.06.05)				•	
Good God! <i>Are you okay?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.16.26 - 00.16.27)		•			
<i>Are you okay?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.16.52 - 00.16.53)		•			
Champagne and strawberries. Dom Pérignon once said it was like tasting the stars. <i>Did you know he was a monk?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.17.17 - 00.17.24)		•			
<i>You sure I can't get you something? Maybe a hanky or a tissue?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.17.59 - 00.18.01)		•			
<i>Okay.</i> (<i>MR + PH</i>) (00.18.06)	•				
Well, erm... <i>Hold on a second.</i> (<i>CD + DIR</i>) If you need anything, anything at all... don't hesitate to... <i>give me a call</i> (<i>CD + DIR</i>) on my cellular... telephone... device. Yeah. That's my number. (00.18.17 - 00.18.40)					•
<i>Are you feeling what I'm feeling?</i> (<i>Q + PH</i>) (00.19.05 - 00.19.06)		•			
<i>Call me!</i> (<i>CD + DIR</i>) (00.19.08 - 00.19.09)					•
<i>Tell me what's goin' on</i> (<i>CD + DIR</i>). I'm a good listener, I've got very big earholes. (00.32.24 - 00.32.26)					•
<i>Okay.</i> (<i>MR + PH</i>) (00.32.49)	•				

<i>Yeah. (MR + PH) (00.32.57)</i>					
<i>Hold that thought. (CD + DIR) It's my father calling from Singapore. You know how it is. (00.33.19 - 00.33.22)</i>					•
<i>Natalie, you look beautiful. (C + EX) (00.36.17 - 00.36.19)</i>			•		
<i>Mm-hm. (MR + PH) That's exactly what it is. (00.37.04 - 00.37.06)</i>	•				
<i>Shh. It's okay. I'll leave a hundred in the tip jar. There we go. Come on. (CD + DIR) (00.38.23 - 00.38.30)</i>					•
<i>Hm. (MR + PH) (00.38.34)</i>	•				
<i>But you have to promise you won't make fun of me. (CD + DIR) (00.38.39 - 00.38.41)</i>					•
<i>Right. (MR + PH) (00.38.50)</i>	•				
<i>Yep. (MR + PH) (00.39.12)</i>	•				
<i>I feel very calm right now. How about you? (Q + EX) (00.39.39 - 00.39.41)</i>		•			
<i>What do you mean? Without what? (Q + PH) (00.40.46 - 00.40.47)</i>		•			

<i>Oh. (MR + PH) (00.340.48)</i>	•				
<i>Good morning, beautiful. Last night was amazing. You know, I was just thinking in the shower, when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. (C + PO + EX) Natalie, I love... (00.41.04 - 00.41.12)</i>			•		
<i>What? (Q + PH) (00.41.22)</i>		•			
<i>Okay. (MR + PH) (00.41.24)</i>	•				
<i>Good morning, beautiful. Last night was amazing. You know, I was just thinking in the shower, when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. (C + PO + EX) Natalie, I lo... oof! (00.41.34 - 00.41.44)</i>					
<i>Good morning, beautiful. Last night was amazing. (C + EX) (00.41.53 - 00.41.56)</i>			•		
<i>....when I look at the world through your eyes, it's like I'm seeing it for the first time. (C + PO + EX) (00.41.59 - 00.42.03)</i>			•		
<i>What? (Q + PH) (00.42.22)</i>		•			
<i>Come on. Don't undersell it, (CD + DIR) babe. I love this beguiling woman. (C + EX) I love you. (00.46.57 - 00.47.00)</i>			•		•
<i>Natalie, have you ever heard of a man called Gandhi? (Q + PH) (00.47.38 - 00.47.40)</i>		•			

He once said that true happiness was when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in perfect harmony. <i>Isn't that great? (Q + PH) (00.47.43 - 00.47.52)</i>		•			
Well, <i>what do you think? Hamptons? (Q + PH) (00.48.41 - 00.48.42)</i>		•			
"Tender as a marshmallow." <i>You are beguiling. (C + EX) (00.50.16 - 00.50.20)</i>			•		
If you want me to stop saying it, I will. But you're gonna have to stop being so <i>damn (ST + EX) beguiling (00.50.23 - 00.50.30)</i>				•	
Well, yes. And obviously, we'll change your last name. But no, I'm talking about your first name. Natalie? I really don't think it's gonna work in my circles. So I was thinking Georgina. <i>What do you think? Georgina? (Q + PH) (01.03.26 - 01.03.39)</i>		•			
It is so sad... to watch someone you love go mad with ambition. <i>Do you know who said that? (Q + PH) (01.03.57 - 01.04.03)</i>		•			
<i>What do you do? (Q + PH) (01.14.42 - 01.14.43)</i>		•			
<i>The parking garage? (Q + EX) (01.15.19 - 01.15.20)</i>		•			
<i>What does beguiling mean? (Q + ME) (01.16.29 - 01.16.30)</i>		•			