

Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci
Pedagogická fakulta
Ústav cizích jazyků

Bakalářská práce

Klára Bajtová

Male and female conversational style in films

Olomouc 2022

vedoucí práce: Mgr. Josef Nevažil, Ph.D.

I would like to thank Mgr. Josef Nevařil, Ph.D. for his helpful approach, valuable advice and professional guidance during the writing of this bachelor thesis. The biggest appreciation goes to my parents and my partner, who have supported me throughout my studies, and to my friends who made studying a great time.

Místopřísežně prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou diplomovou prací na téma: „Male and female conversational style in films“ vypracovala samostatně pod odborným dohledem vedoucího bakalářské práce a uvedla jsem všechny použité podklady a literaturu.

V Olomouci dne 20. 4. 2022

Podpis

LIST OF TABLES AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
INTRODUCTION.....	7
THEORETICAL PART.....	8
1. Men and Women in Society	9
1.1. Men and Women in a Current View	9
1.2. Men and Women in a Retrospective View.....	10
2. Language and Gender	11
2.1. Language	11
2.2. Gender	12
3. Theories about Male and Female Conversational style	13
3.1. Approaches.....	13
3.2. The Possible Root of Different Male and Female Conversational Style	15
3.3. Robin Lakoff's Theory.....	16
3.3.1. Women's talk	16
3.3.2. Politeness Principle.....	18
3.4. Deborah Tannen's Theory.....	19
3.4.1. Rapport- and Report-talk	19
3.4.2. Interrupting	20
3.4.3. Conflicts and Commands	21
3.4.4. Genderlects	22
3.5. Portrayal in medias.....	22
RESEARCH PART	23
4. Research aim	24
5. Methodological framework, research strategy, data collection, methods	25
5.1. Methodological framework.....	25
5.2. Research strategy, Data collection, Methods	25
6. Results of data analysis	27
7. Discussion	32
7.1. What historical development of speech can be observed through the use of specific linguistic devices (intensifiers, lexical hedges)?	32
7.2. What is suggested by the use of specific linguistic devices about the position of men and women in society?.....	33
7.3. What are examples of moments that mirror each other?.....	36

8. Summary of the Research Part	40
9. Conclusion	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45
APPENDICES	49
List of Appendices	50
1. Stereotypes and Sexism in Language.....	51
2. List of Examples of Adaptations of Pride and Prejudice	55
3. Intensifiers and Lexical Hedges in Analyzed Films	56
RESUMÉ	69
ANOTACE.....	71

LIST OF TABLES AND ABBREVIATIONS

This bachelor thesis contains 3 tables:

Table 1 „*The Number of Occurrence of Intensifiers and Lexical Hedges in Analyzed Films*” on page 28,

Table 2 „*The Number of Occurrence of Intensifiers in Detail*“ on page 29,

Table 3 „*The Number of Occurrence of Lexical Hedges in Detail*“ on page 30.

This bachelor thesis contains 3 acronyms:

Int. + L.Hedges stands for Intensifiers plus Lexical Hedges,

PaP stands for Pride and Prejudice,

BJD stands for Bridget Jones’s Diary.

ABSTRACT

This bachelor's thesis deals with male and female conversational style in films. The theoretical part defines and describes the key terms – language and gender - and outlines selected authors' theories about men and women using language differently. The research part is based on the analysis of two chosen films by investigating the occurrence of selected linguistic features (lexical hedges and intensifiers). The results support the premise that women use lexical hedges and intensifiers more often than men.

INTRODUCTION

The difference between men and women is a phenomenon that attracts attention. These distinctions include, among other things, variances between male and female speech. This is an area in which I am particularly interested since I encounter differences in men's and women's speech in both academic theory at university and in situations of everyday life. This thesis examines the conversational gender difference and their portrayal in the film. The thesis aims to explore whether and how male and female speech differs through specific linguistic devices, both between men and women in each film, but also in how and whether male and female speech changes in comparison of two films, one depicting a society two hundred years ago, second depicting a more contemporary society. Thus, it explores whether there is a certain historical development and further considers whether women's and men's different use of language can be inferred from their different positions in society. As the two chosen and analyzed films are related, it is looked for moments in dialogues that mirror each other. Men's and women's diverse use of language and conversational styles is an intriguing phenomenon that many people come across in their daily lives, as well as in films they watch and books they read. Nevertheless, speech is all around us, and for most people, it is a fundamental method of connecting with their surroundings, not only in their personal lives but also at school or in the workplace. It is simply almost impossible not to communicate in our world - plus, speech also creates our social identity and is specific in certain periods. Our social identity and humanity are determined not just by our attire or habits, but also by our words. Experts have examined speech from various aspects, including how speech differs between men and women and what can be considered typical for each gender. These experts include sociolinguists such as Robin Lakoff or Deborah Tannen; for example, Robin Lakoff (1973a) has proposed and specified aspects typical of women's speech. This theory of hers is very well known and has fuelled debate on this subject. Additionally, Deborah Tannen (1995) has addressed the difference between what men and women want and expect from a conversation. A number of authors have then built on their findings; I, for example, work with Robin Lakoff's theory of women's talk with the intention to investigate the occurrence of two specific linguistic devices identified as typical for female speech - intensifiers and lexical hedges - in two different yet related films. These films are *Pride and Prejudice* (2004) and *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001). They share the same plot but depict two different societies – a

society approximately two hundred years ago and a more modern and contemporary society. The goal is to investigate if and how the two specific linguistic features that have been recognized as characteristic of female speech (Lakoff, 1973a) - intensifiers and lexical hedges – appear in two chosen films. The intention is to determine the number of occurrences of intensifiers and lexical hedges in each film, see how they differ in male and female speech and juxtapose the selected films. The historical development of men's and women's speech is to be outlined by this analysis as well as the status of men and women in society in the period in which the film *Pride and Prejudice* (2005) is set and in which *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001) is set. As the films are initially chosen for their similarity, it is expected to see moments in both films that mirror each other. A number of these is about to be analyzed and commented on.

THEORETICAL PART

1. MEN AND WOMEN IN SOCIETY

In the first chapter, the changing roles of men and women in society are discussed, together with what they used to be historically and what the connection between social roles and a way of using speech could be.

1.1. Men and Women in a Current View

“I do not give you the right to raise your voice to me because you are a woman and I am a man.” (Tannen, 1995, p. 17)

Are men better than women? Are women more fragile, therefore, to be protected? Should only those of the male sex have access to education? Those are some of the questions resonating in society, and a lot has been ingrained throughout history. The quotation above depicts one of the differences that existed and assumably still exists between men and women - in this particular case, a difference between male and female speech and status in society. In the given passage, it is concerning for the man to be yelled at by a woman, and if the woman intended to raise her voice, the man would not allow her to do so, as he is the man and she is a woman (Tannen, 1995, p. 17). Modern times are increasingly progressive, and therefore, the differences between men's and women's roles are - in our current European culture - less prominent than they were years ago (for more, see subchapter 7.2). Previously, there were more clearly established paradigms regarding what roles belong to women and what roles belong to men than there are today. Hence, the truth remains that history influences the present, and it was not so long ago that women just gained the same rights and the same options to choose from as men could. Women today can choose their life paths, no matter if that indicates persuading a career or staying at home with the children.

1.2. Men and Women in a Retrospective View

The roles of women and men in society were formerly clearly delineated. Women were expected to care for their home and children, while the expectation of men was to participate in public life. A young lady could not always choose her future husband and get married for love, as marriages were hoped for to be primarily beneficial. The father frequently chose the most acceptable husband for his daughter based on wealth and money. Young girls were already encouraged to be good wives and were taught to take care of the house instead of getting academic or scientific education. Some girls were acquainted with singing or playing a musical instrument, especially those from upper social circles; however, the favoured offspring was usually a male, as he was the family's heir. Overall, men were in charge of providing financial support for the family. That is presumably why boys and young men were encouraged to pursue higher education while it was considered something not as important for girls and young women. Considering all this, it is reasonable to conclude that women were regarded as inferior and men as the more dominant sex. The reason for evaluating these facts is that this place could spread the roots of how men and women use language. As Crystal (2003, p.364) claims, it is usually language (more than the clothing or the appearance of a person) that forms and creates human social identity; that is why social identity is bounded with social roles and social classes.

,

2. LANGUAGE AND GENDER

In this chapter, the complexity of language as per se is outlined, and as this thesis ties together language with gender, the following segments regard both of these key terms. The difference between social gender and biological sex is explained and illustrated on an example of a bicycle.

2.1. Language

To detect distinctions between male and female speech, it is convenient to define the language itself. According to Baugh & Cable (2003, p.1), language is a “*medium by which speakers of the language communicate their thoughts and feelings to others*”. Language is widely acknowledged as distinguishing humans from other animals, allowing humans to communicate with one another and express themselves. Communication is practically impossible to avoid in today's society; it is essential not just in personal concerns but also in the workplace. Language is a fundamental aspect of being human, such as being birthed as a male or female biological sex is. Because of language, we can fully appreciate humanity - the beauty of art, poetry, philosophy, or theatre. Language has also become a powerful platform for demonstrating economic, political, technological, or military dominance (Baugh & Cable, 2003, *ibid*). Everything mentioned above indicates the importance and irreplaceable role of speech for humankind.

Over time, language undergoes fractionally (and gradually big) changes and is shaped by many factors. The language changes and evolves in tandem with society and vice versa - society was undeniably different two hundred years ago than it is today. The language used back then differs from the contemporary used one, too. According to Crystal (2003, p.364), language (rather than clothing or a person's appearance) forms and creates human social identity, which is why social identity is linked to social roles and social classes. The beauty of a speech also lies in how one language varies within its own,

depending on the demographic unit (dialect) or the specific segment of the population (jargon), whether males or females use it, young children or adults.

Essentially, language is a powerful tool that may demonstrate superiority or inferiority, compassion or malice. Words have the power to both heal and harm. After all, it is speech that distinguishes us as human beings.

2.2. Gender

There are two ways to define gender: gender as a social position and social status (*social gender*) and gender as *biological sex*. Because biological sex is assigned at birth, it is governed only by biological regulations. Social gender, on the other hand, is based on cultural qualities and patterns that society assigns to men and women (Český statistický úřad, 2016). Most modern authors work with this concept and distinguish between sex determined biologically by birth and social gender determined socially (Gramley & Pätzold, 2004, p. 209).

Gramley & Pätzold (2004) use an average bicycle to demonstrate that social gender and biological sex are not interchangeable. Bicycles for women feature larger seats (since women have wider pelvises than men) and no crossbars (as women wear skirts). Women's broader pelvises result from biological gender (i.e. *the sex difference*), whereas women wearing skirts are a product of social gender (i.e. *the gender difference*). The impression is given that some things are, at least to a certain extent, attributed to women and that certain things are ascribed to men. The strong association between men and public life and women and domestic life can be seen as a result of this gendering (Beasley, 2005). Furthermore, even in language as such, a particular bias can be observed, as it has a social attitude toward males and females (i.e., grammar and vocabulary constructed in a way that is fitting to the traditional men's view of the world) (Crystal (2003, p.368).

3. THEORIES ABOUT MALE AND FEMALE CONVERSATIONAL STYLE

In this chapter, different theories regarding male and female speech are presented. First, general approaches to male and female speaking styles are outlined - described is the difference between “*essentialist view*” and the “*anti-essentialist view*” and the four probably most popular approaches (*deficit, dominance, difference and dynamic approach*) are contrasted. Later, the chapter progresses to specific theories of sociolinguistics such as Robin Lakoff or Deborah Tannen. Therefore, terms such as “*women language*”, “*polite principles*”, “*rapport- and report-talk*”, or “*genderlects*” are described. The phenomenon of “*interrupting*”, “*conflicts*”, and “*commands*” are investigated, too.

3.1. Approaches

Very broadly, it could be stated that there are two major theoretical and conceptual frameworks for how to look at the gender difference - the *essentialist view* and its opposite, the so-called *anti-essentialist view*. The essentialist view claims that specific differences between the sexes are unquestionably biologically determined, and gender is based on that (therefore, male and masculine or female and feminine are permanent attributes). The anti-essential theory claims that social inequality between men and women has led to the polarisation of the sexes, which is therefore considered natural, but according to the experts who support this theory, it is not (Vayda, 1990, p. 29-45). This idea emerged as a reaction to the essentialism theory, especially in second-wave feminism, where feminists like Simone de Beauvoir (the author of “*one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.* ”) theorised about gender (Leboeuf, 2015, p. 138-145).

The differences between male and female conversational styles can also be approached according to "what is missing" or "what the dynamic between the two genders is", i.e. whether they are considered equal or not. For example, British professor Jennifer Coates (2004, p.5-7) collected and outlined them as follows:

- *The deficit approach* is a perspective that states the norm of speech, and according to this approach, it is the adult male speech. Therefore, the women's speech is seen as missing vital elements from the norm. The concept of the deficit is a contradiction between the expectations of men's and women's language. It considers men's language as a standard and women's language as something not equal, i.e., one gender (female) is deficient in the other (male).

- Approach that declares that the differences in speech are tied to the differences in society is called *the dominance approach*. More specifically, it argues that the different speaking styles of men and women are rooted in male supremacy; therefore, it could be an effect of patriarchy; the language is primarily male-centred.

- *The difference approach* considers female and male conversational styles as equal, only different. It explains that men and women have naturally belonged to different "sub-cultures" from early childhood in how they have been socialised. This different socialisation later results in different conversational styles. A proponent of this approach is Deborah Tannen, whose theory will be discussed in subchapter 3.4.

- *The dynamic approach* differs from the other approaches discussed above. It deviates from the strict paradigm of male speech belonging to men only, and female speech only belonging to women. Instead, this approach proposes that various social factors and context influence speech, and although some specifics might be more male- or female-biased, both genders can utilise them.

3.2. The Possible Root of Different Male and Female Conversational Style

Jennifer Coates, British Emeritus Professor of English Language and Linguistics at the University of Roehampton and author of *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language* (originally published in 1986, 3rd edition 2004), *Women in their Speech Communities* (1989), *Women Talk. Conversation Between Women Friends* (1996) or *Language and Gender: A Reader* (1998) presents a possible reason for the different usage of speech by the two genders.

Coates (2004, p.160-190) proposes an explanation for why men and women speak in different ways and claims that the reason lies at a young age, given by vastly different interactions in boys' and girls' friendship groups. She theorizes that this is why girls and boys develop different speaking styles. Girls and boys are more likely to be in same-sex groups (i.e., boys in boys' groups and girls in girls' groups) and are unlikely to confront a group of the opposite sex unless necessary. The size of the group and the way the boys and girls play differ as well, as girls tend to play in smaller groups and talk a lot, whereas boys tend to play in larger groups where there is a more apparent hierarchy. It has been observed that a child's peer group directly affects the child's social and linguistic development. Thus, differences between girls and boys arise already at this young age. Traditionally, girls are encouraged to be typical "girls", and boys are encouraged to be typical "boys." In addition to her own theories, Coates also refers to the theories of Daniel Maltz and Ruth Borke (1982, p. 168-185) who work with the idea that the purpose why girls and boys talk differs. Therefore, girls should be able to: 1) *form and maintain intimate, equal relationships*, 2) *critique others in appropriate ways*, and 3) *appropriately understand the words of other girls*. On the other hand, when it comes to speaking, boys are more likely to 1) *assume a level of dominance*, 2) *captivate and keep an audience*, and 3) *assert themselves when another speaker takes the stage*.

3.3. Robin Lakoff's Theory

First, Lakoff's theory will be introduced. Her idea has been influential and impactful in addressing male and female speech, especially after the publication of her

work *Language and Woman's Place* (1973a) or *Talking Power* (1990). This thesis will mainly proceed from the first one mentioned, as it is acknowledged as a paper that stirred up the debate about the relation between linguistics and gender and how these two elements are connected. Robin Lakoff could be called "*the first lady of a gender linguistic*", as she chose a life-long academic career regarding this issue (Bucholz, 2004, p. 3-14).

3.3.1. Women's talk

Lakoff's (1973a) opinion is that in society, women are inferior. Men dominate them, and accordingly, that is reflexed in speech (i.e. men's speech is more dominant, whereas women's speech is usually less dominant). Women learn to use language differently, and general language treats them differently, too. The language of men is seen as more prestigious and desirable; the women's use of a language enforces their (woman's) inferior position in society. On the other hand, there is a paradox in the fact that "*if a woman refuses to talk like a lady, she is ridiculed and subjected to criticism as unfeminine; if she does learn how to talk like a lady, she is unable to think clearly and she is less than fully human,*" says Lakoff (1973a, p.48). This effect of expected "lady-talk" most likely starts in young age already when it is preferable (and appropriate) for girls to be ladylike (which includes speaking), and that, in a given culture, precludes using strong language (and therefore being less manly and "powerful" in language) later (Lakoff, *ibid*).

Lakoff, as cited in Holmes (2017), claims that there are ten types of women language features, which include lexical hedges, intensifiers, super polite forms, tag questions, empty adjectives, avoidance of strong swear words, precise colour terms, hypercorrect grammar, rising intonation on declaratives and emphatic stress. The following is a description of each item:

- *Lexical hedges* are phrases used in linguistics to suggest indirectness or carefulness. Examples of hedges are phrases such as "I think, "I mean, " or "maybe", and phrases like "lean towards", making the tone of a statement lighter and less serious. Lexical hedges can make a statement easier to take back or turn around if needed.

- *Intensifier* adds additional emotional context to the word it modifies but does not contribute to the propositional meaning of the clause. Intensifiers boost the impact of a verb by adding an adverb that emphasises the word's emotional content. Common intensifiers are "very" or "so". (See chapter 6.)

- *Super Polite Forms* are, for example, phrases like "Would you mind", "if you wouldn't mind", "I would like to", "is it okay if", or "if it's not too much to ask". The reason women talk politely like that could be psychologically determined by their long-lasting inferior position in society (whether in the workplace, at their home or in society overall). Therefore, being subordinate could explain the excessive usage of these super polite terms. Lakoff (1973a, p.56) suggests that women could be seen as unable to make their minds because of the usage of linguistic features like these (hedges, being super polite). Therefore, no real responsibilities would be given to her.

- *Tag questions* are a type of construction where an interrogative fragment is adjoined to a declarative (or an imperative) clause; in other words, it is a statement with a mini question at the end. According to Lakoff (p.53-54), tag question stands is between an outright statement and a yes/no question. Examples of tag questions could illustrate phrases like "John is here, isn't he?" or "The war in Vietnam is terrible, isn't it?" The speaker can avoid conflict with the other person by using this linguistic feature.

- *Empty adjectives* are adjectives like "divine", "charming", or "cute". According to the linguistic professor (p.49-51), these adjectives are used because they sound good and not because they carry any significant meaning. A neutral alternative for these adjectives would be "great" or "cool". Women use *more precise colour terms*, too. That would be seen as strange for a man unless the man works in a field where precise colour detection is necessary; another possibility is that it might suggest that the man is gay. Women also choose more emotional evaluations than intellectual evaluations.

- Women do not use that many *expletives*, and if they do, they use the weaker forms (of which it follows that there are two forms of expletives - a weaker form a stronger form, mostly reserved for men). The strength of an expletive suggests how strongly a person lets

himself feel about something. Thus, following this idea, men are allowed to feel more decisive about things, to have stronger opinions, and for this reason, stronger expletives are reserved for them, explains Lakoff (p.50).

- Many languages, including English, have *intonation that raises towards the end of questions*. Rising intonation is utilised to transform a statement into an inquiry by weakening its impact and making the speaker appear unsure. Rising declarative intonation was linked to indicating tentativeness by Lakoff (1973a). When the speaker wants confirmation, rising intonation is utilised on declarative, even if the speaker is the only one who knows the necessary knowledge. Women also tend to use the *correct grammar* (p. 55).

- Lakoff (1973a, p.57) defines *emphatic stress* as emphasising the most important word in a speaker's sentence; this feature is also typical for a woman's speech.

3.3.2. Politeness Principle

Lakoff also reformulated Grice's maxims (the cooperative principle called Grice's maxims, in short, these maxims are quantity, quality, relation, and manner) for effective conversational communication (Grice,1989) and formulated a "*Politeness Principle*" in which she suggested principles that should be followed in a conversation to make it successful and cooperative. The big two rules are "be clear" (here she subsumed Grice's Maxims as they are all related to this goal) and "be polite". The rule of being polite is further broken down to "Don't impose, Give the recipient a Choice and Make them feel good" (Lakoff, 1973b).

Overall, Lakoff's views and ideas were followed by other experts and authors interested in sociolinguistics; she certainly stirred up a debate, which was then picked up by other authors.

3.4. Deborah Tannen's Theory

Secondly, Tannen's theory will be presented. Deborah Tannen, a professor of sociolinguistics at Georgetown University, published a book named *You Just Don't*

Understand regarding male and female speech. It was popular among the public, as it is written in clear language and interspersed with anecdotes. It was translated into numerous languages as well. In terms of her ideas, "rapport-talk", "report-talk", and "genderlects" are important points in her theory.

3.4.1. Rapport- and Report-talk

Tannen (1995) argues that for most women, language is first and foremost a bonding experience: through language, they form bonds and relationships. The emphasis in this interaction is often on similarities and shared experiences. This communication style, geared towards promoting social affiliation and emotional connection, is called "rapport-talk". On the other hand, for men, speech is a tool for gaining and maintaining status and attention, which they do by demonstrating their knowledge (by providing information, for example) or their interestingness (by telling stories, for instance). Overall, men use speech to exchange information with little emotional import, meaning that they do not seek bonding through it. This communication style, typical for men, is called "report-talk" (p. 72-73). As two distinct communication styles are demonstrated, it is not surprising that misunderstandings can occur between those who use "rapport-talk" and those who use "report-talk". According to Tannen, women often complain that men don't actually listen to them or that they talk with everyone else but them. She explains that the root of these problems is often in the differing styles of speech (p. 73-75).

The differences between how women and men use language are, according to Tannen (1995), embedded already in childhood, where friendships between girls and boys are often created differently. Friendships of girls are often based on talking and sharing secrets. This emerges into adulthood, where women often talk with their friends about almost everything (they chat about what happened during the day; often share feelings; communicate thoughts), whereas men are more likely to be engaged in activities (such as playing sports) together, rather than sitting down and having a chit-chat (p. 75-76). The dissimilarity that comes with rapport- and report-talk might also result in women often resenting that men do not respond to their concerns by sharing similar ones as they would

wish (p. 45). In addition, women crave a sense of belonging, and so they might not feel satisfied by men's responses. Men often tend to offer a solution instead of sharing their feelings, as they are naturally inclined to seek solutions to problems rather than confiding concerns; they see themselves as "problem solvers" (p. 48). This can frustrate women, as they want to talk and thus share and bond, not to be given the solution right away. Tannen (1995) explains that what men forget to understand is that for women, talking about troubles is the essence of connection - "*I tell you my troubles, you tell me your troubles, and we're close,*" (p. 47). However, men understand troubles talk as a request for advice, so they respond with a solution. Plus, giving advice could also be seen as a form of higher status and showing dominance, guesses the sociolinguistic professor (p. 46 - 48).

3.4.2. Interrupting

Interrupting is another aspect that men and women perceive differently, explains Tannen (1995). Men often feel offended if a sentence or idea is finished for them or if, even in agreement, the emphasis is shifted on a different point than he intended it. A man feels deprived of his right to tell the story his way, even though the woman did not intend to do so. He might also feel manipulated and restricted; overwhelming female support can be an aggravation to men, too. However, women perceive interrupting in speech differently, as they tend to see it less as interrupting and more as an "overlapping". By that outlook, adding short passages is considered a way of showing agreement and mutual understanding. Women often take the conversation as a game, where one supports the other (this is the reason women tend to use hedges, which give the possibility of uncertainty and, therefore, possible consistency between the statements of the two actors in the conversation to make it continue). In contrast, men see a conversation as a duel where they try to take the word. Generally, women are more likely to talk about feelings, relationships, or people in conversations than men are. Accordingly, women use emotional elements, such as intensifiers (as "*so*" or "*too*"); for more on this topic, see chapters 6 and 7. Women seek an emotional bond in the conversation, and they usually make better listeners; they do not try to shift the attention to themselves. When women interrupt, it is usually concerned agreeing or showing understanding. Otherwise, they can listen for a long time, and by these conversations, they create empathy (p. 214-219).

3.4.3. Conflicts and Commands

"To most women, conflict is a thread to connection, to be avoided at all costs," (Tannen, 1995, p. 149). This is why women seek to find a solution without confrontation. On the other hand, men are usually not as timid of conflict as women are, as they see conflicts like a tool by which status is negotiated (p. 149-150). According to Tannen (1995), men have a tough time with feeling that they are ordered around; they will complain that it is violating their freedom. This point of view is confusing to women, as they do not mean to order them around nor violate their freedom. Conflict situations can also arise in simple and seemingly innocuous phrases, such as complimenting a man and thanking him for doing house chores. What often happens is that instead of being happy about the praise, the man resent it and says like that "it makes him feel like by that, she is demanding that he now does it all the time", i.e. it made him feel like he was commanded to doing the house chores. Another example given is about a man, who was complimented by his mother to be "a very good person" for calling her, however he understood it the way that if he did not call her (regularly), he would not be a good person anymore (i.e. that he would be a bad person). Therefore, he felt like he is commanded to make calls regularly. Tannen (1995) gives both of these examples on page 151.

3.4.4. Genderlects

Genderlects is a term given by Tannen (1995, p.18), who uses it to explain the differences between how men and women talk. Both genders use speech, however, its execution and the expectations they have of communication differ. Women seek bonding and emotion; men seek status and independence. Just as a language (i.e. English, Czech and other languages) has dialects, it is possible to think of male and female conversational styles in the same way. Both of them are conversation styles; they are just not the same. For this analogy, the term "genderlects" is used - there is a certain difference in conversational styles, but both of them are equally valid.

3.5. Portrayal in medias

Different male and female conversational style can be observed not only in common situations of everyday life, but also in films or literature. In the research part of this thesis, male and female conversational styles and specific aspects of women's and men's speech in films are to be examined.

The world of media is all-surrounding, whether it is social networks, television, print media or the recent phenomenon of social medias. Different types of entertainment and medias are more prevalent at different times, but movies and literature seem to be at the top of the list at all times. There are various genres of film and literature, and therefore it is to be expected that the means of expression of the characters may vary depending on the author's goal. For the purpose of the research of this bachelor thesis, an analysis of two films that are adaptations of books was chosen - *Pride and Prejudice* (2005) and *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001). These films take place in the realities of our world (i.e. neither fantasy nor sci-fi genre), but each of them portrays a society of a different period. The films mirror the society of the given time, including men, women, and the way they speak. The films are also based on common experiences.

RESEARCH PART

4. RESEARCH AIM

In the theoretical part of the thesis, the phenomenon of men and women using language differently was outlined. Key terms (language and gender) were defined, and the relation between these two attributes was outlined. Theories about male and female conversational styles given by two experts, Robin Lakoff and Deborah Tannen were discussed. In particular, that section drew on Lakoff's paper Language and Women's place (1973a) and Deborah Tannen's book You Just Don't Understand (1995), which are widely accepted as the basis for the topic of different language usage by males and females and the divergent conversational styles between them. A number of studies have focused on investigating the male and female conversational styles; some of them were based on a real-life investigation (Hirschman, 1994) or reviewing an interview with a person (Handyanta, 2018), but studies examining male and female conversational styles in films or literature also exist, such as Schofield and Mehr's 2016 study. The topic of male and female conversational styles also appears through a series of student works, usually thesis (Cooper, 1992). The research aim of this bachelor thesis is to investigate male and female conversational style through already available theories and by the use of specific linguistic features occurring in given films. The research questions are as follows:

- **RESEARCH QUESTION 1:** What historical development of speech can be observed through specific linguistic features (intensifiers, lexical hedges)?

- **RESEARCH QUESTION 2:** What does the usage of specific linguistic devices suggest about the position of men and women in society?

- **RESEARCH QUESTION 3:** What are examples of dialogues that mirror each other?

5. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK, RESEARCH STRATEGY, DATA COLLECTION, METHODS

This chapter discusses the methodological framework of the research. The research strategy will be described, including the methods specifically used in this thesis.

5.1. Methodological framework

A qualitative methodological strategy was chosen to answer the research questions. The main feature of qualitative research is the concern within the process, context, interpretation, meaning or understanding the phenomenon of interest through inductive reasoning. That distinguishes qualitative research from quantitative research, emphasising outcomes, generalisation, prediction, and causal relationships using deductive reasoning. Qualitative research is widely used to interpret concepts that are hardly measured or cannot be measured in numbers. The aim is not to gain much new knowledge but rather to discover the depth (Yilmaz, 2013 p. 311-325). Methods used in this research are analysis and open coding. The author of this thesis chose these methods as the most appropriate for this particular project and for their convenience in answering given research questions. Purposive sampling was used to select the dialogues to analyse in answering research question three.

5.2. Research strategy, Data collection, Methods

The primary sources for the research part were two films, namely *Pride and Prejudice* (2005) and *Bridget Jones's Diary* (2001). Both films were carefully watched several times, and transcripts of their screenplay were studied to ensure that the author of this bachelor thesis was well-versed in them. The analysis then proceeded with the intention of answering the research questions.

Several steps were required to answer the first research question regarding the historical development of speech that can be observed through specific linguistic features (intensifiers, lexical hedges). Therefore, it was necessary first to analyse *Pride and Prejudice*, a film that depicts a society roughly two hundred years ago. An analysis of the dialogues was carried out, and the number of intensifiers used by men was calculated. Then, the number of intensifiers used by women was measured, too. These numbers were compared to determine which group (men or women) used this particular language device more often. The finding correlates with that of Robin Lakoff, who, in her paper *Language and Women's place* (1973a), listed intensifiers as an attribute belonging to women's speech (see Chapter 3.1). In order to make a comparison and observe the historical development of speech through the specific linguistic tools, it was also necessary to analyse the occurrence of intensifiers in the film *Bridget Jones's Diary*, which depicts contemporary society, too. The number of intensifiers used by males was enumerated after examining the dialogues. The number of intensifiers utilised by women was also counted. These two figures were compared to see which group (men or women) utilised this particular linguistic device more frequently. Then, the results of both films were juxtaposed. The second observed linguistic feature was the occurrence of lexical hedges. By that, it could be found whether this linguistic feature in *Pride and Prejudice* is different from their use by men and women in *Bridget Jones's Diary*. For this purpose, the same strategy was chosen, i.e., the dialogues were analysed. Men's and women's lexical hedges usage was first counted in the *Pride and Prejudice*, then in *Bridget Jones's Diary* and then compared.

The results were analysed to observe the historical development of the usage of this particular linguistic devices. Therefore, this data served mainly to answer two research questions (research question one and research question two); dialogue analysis was chosen for this area, considering earlier findings. For research question three (What are examples of moments in dialogues that mirror each other?), purposive sampling was chosen, and then it proceeded with open coding, which created codes and categories that helped select moments of dialogues that mirrored each other.

6. RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

After carefully watching the films several times and studying the transcript of the films, a number of specific linguistic features was found. The following table (Table 1) was created for clearer orientation in data. The first column of the table is used to distinguish the two linguistic features, intensifiers and lexical hedges; and then join them for the total number of. The acronym Int.+ L.Hedges stands for Intensifiers plus Lexical Hedges, as the total number of occurrences of these two linguistic features. The second column shows how the men in *Pride and Prejudice* performed in each category. The third column indicates the number of occurrences in women's speech in *Pride and Prejudice*. The fourth column marks the number of occurrences in men's speech in *Bridget Jones's Diary*, shown here under the acronym BJD. The last column marks the number of occurrences in women's speech *Bridget Jones's*, again in both categories. Only the numbers of each category are listed here. A table breaking down each category (Table 2) will follow. The specific phrases or sentences where the observed linguistic features appear can be found in Appendices no. 3.

Table 1

The Number of Occurrence of Intensifiers and Lexical Hedges in Analyzed Films

Linguistic Feature	Pride and Prejudice		BJD	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Intensifiers	39	93	59	82
Lexical Hedges	24	33	33	42
Int.+ L.Hedges	63	126	92	124

As the table shows, the use of intensifiers and lexical hedges differs between men and women. In all of the cases, women use the given linguistic device more, which correlates with the theory of R. Lakoff (see chapter 3.1). In *Pride and Prejudice*, women used 93 intensifiers; men 39. In *Bridget Jone’s Diary*, women used 82 intensifiers; men 59.

The following table (Table 2) breaks down the category of intensifiers.

Table 2

The Number of Occurrence of Intensifiers in Detail

Intensifiers	PaP Men	PaP Women	BJD Men	BJD Women
So	14x	37x	11x	12x
Too	4x	8x	0x	6x
Very	14x	33x	20x	34x
Quite	4x	7x	5x	10x
Absolutely	0x	2x	7x	4x
Totally	0x	1x	2x	3x
Really	2x	5x	14x	13x

Intensifiers that have been traced in these particular films and were further worked with are *so* (as “I am **so** pleased”), *too* (as “he considered me **too** lowly to be worth”), *very* (as “**very** beautiful”), *quite* (as “marriage counts for **quite** a lot”), *absolutely* (as “Human Rights is **absolutely** key stuff”), *totally* (as “**totally** innocent”) and *really* (as “I am **really**

sorry”). Generally, the most commonly used intensifiers by both genders are “*very*” (“it is **very** kind of you” or “you’re still a **very** attractive man”) and “*so*” (...and her hair, **so** blowsy and untidy” or “he has been **so** unlucky as to lose your friendship”).

The following table (Table 3) breaks down the category of lexical hedges.

Table 3

The Number of Occurrence of Lexical Hedges in Detail

Lexical Hedges	PaP	PaP	BJD	BJD
	Men	Women	Men	Women
I think	2x	7x	9x	16x
Perhaps	7x	8x	7x	2x
May	8x	9x	3x	4x
Might	3x	4x	8x	8x
Maybe	1x	1x	2x	3x
I mean	3x	0x	4x	6x
Likely	0x	1x	0x	0x
You know	0x	2x	0x	1x
Sometimes	0x	1x	0x	2x

Lexical hedges that have been traced in these particular films and were further worked with are *I think* (as “**I Think** you should dump him”), *perhaps* (as “**perhaps** you will understand”), *may* (as “**May** I please have skirt’s adress?”), *might* (as “it **might** be my job to protect you”), *maybe* (as “**maybe** he's changed his mind”), *I mean* (as “**I mean** - you're welcomet”) *likely* (as “it is **likely** that he does not love”), *you know* (as “you would be in nobody's way, **you know**, in that part of the house”) and *sometimes* (as “I **sometimes** wonder). Generally, the most frequently used lexical hedges include, for example, “*I think*” (“**I think** I’ll give dinner a miss” or “**I think** that’s all we can take of that”) or “*perhaps*” (“**Perhaps** you will do me the honour, Miss Lizzie?”).

Open coding created categories and codes. For the purposes of this thesis, the method of open coding was applied to the films *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jone's Diary*. It resulted in the creation of the following categories:

- Meeting
- the Insult
- Wrong First Impressions
- Misunderstandings
- The Importance of Dating and Marriage
- the “Bad Guy”
- Wealth
- Looks
- Stubbornness

7. DISCUSSION

7.1. What historical development of speech can be observed through the use of specific linguistic devices (intensifiers, lexical hedges)?

In terms of the intensifier usage, the data demonstrates that women use intensifiers much more frequently than males in both eras. This is a conclusion of other studies as well (for example Fusch, 2012 and Fusch and Gut, 2017). Historical development in the two selected linguistic features (intensifiers, lexical hedges) can be more clearly observed in the usage of intensifiers - its use in Bridget Jones's Diary by men has increased, and its use by women has decreased, compared to Pride and Prejudice. Therefore, intensifiers appear to be less of a gendered linguistic feature, which could be related to thinning boundaries between gender roles in more modern society.

As for the second observed linguistic feature, lexical hedges, its overall increase in Bridget Jones's Diary can be observed; however, the male-female ratio remained unchanged with minor modifications of slight overall growth. The findings show that the ratio between the number of occurrences of lexical hedges in men's speech "then" (24 occurrences of lexical hedges) and "now" (33 occurrences of lexical hedges) and women's speech "then" (33 occurrences of lexical hedges) and "now" (42 occurrences lexical hedges) remained the same with slight modification; there is an overall increase in the number of utterances in the Bridget Jones's Diary. Therefore, it cannot be stated that a very significant historical development between men and women in that area could be observed from the usage of lexical hedges, only an overall increase in the use of lexical hedges was found.

Another interesting observation was made during the data analysis - the phrase "you know" was used as either a lexical hedge, indicating uncertainty and the possibility of retraction (see subchapter 3.1) or as a statement actually showing determination and conviction, strengthening the speaker's assertions. ("*But I have other reasons, you know I have!*" or "**You know** perfectly well I do not believe marriage should be driven by thoughts of money!"). The authors of both statements are women.) This occurrence was not counted in the lexical hedges inventory as it contradicts the observed purpose. This example also emphasizes the importance of context.

7.2. What is suggested by the use of specific linguistic devices about the position of men and women in society?

In the previous subchapter, the data obtained from the analysis were evaluated. Their occurrence in a film depicting a society two hundred years ago and in a film depicting a society of the new millennium was calculated. These films portray society at two different stages, however, they still focus on English society, which the author of this thesis considers to be an advantage as it provides more direct comparisons.

It is a widely accepted fact that society at the turn of the 19th century was structured differently and had different forms and rules. Women were taken as a gender for whom higher education was not as important as looking after the household and bearing children (see chapter 1). Girls belonged first to their father and later to the husband, often chosen and assigned to them by the father, the head of a family. Marriage was more often a matter of material convenience than reciprocated affection and love. Women did not have the same rights, education, or access to money and public life that men had. These may all be reasons why their opinions remained silent and thought of as less valid than those of men; their words were less often heard and considered. All of this might be why women picked a distinct speaking style and a different conversational style than men. The period portrayed in *Pride and Prejudice* shows a higher incidence of intensifiers and lexical hedges in women's speech than in a man's speech. These two attributes (intensifiers and lexical hedges) are linguistic features that, according to Robin Lakoff's theory, are part of so-called "woman talk" (see subchapter 3.1) and are therefore typical components of

women's speech. Lakoff (1973a) argues that their use indicates feminine inferiority - for instance, lexical hedges are means of definite statement refinement. They can be used to slightly modify and soften a phrase, statement, or sentence and make it sound less straightforward and harsh. For this reason, they are convenient and easy to change or retract later, especially if the other participant in the conversation disagrees with the speaker. This phenomenon could be characteristic of some male-female dialogues; the woman is subordinate and perhaps self-conscious, insecure or not fully confident in her views or is pushed by society to think that. She might also be hesitant and unsure whether she can afford to present her ideas and opinions to the man (or men) or in front of a man (or men). Therefore, she prefers lexical hedges that give her room to backtrack if needed. The fact that somebody is afraid to present their opinion fully may indicate an unequal and unbalanced dynamic. In this case, it relates to gender, with men seen as dominant and women as subordinate. The use of lexical hedges is typical for those who try to avoid direct phrasing in conversation. If direct phrasing were used, it would be harder to reformulate the opinion when the other party disagrees. The analysis of the film *Pride and Prejudice* showed a higher incidence of lexical hedges in women's speech (see Table 1 and Table 3), which contributes to and reinforces the theory that women are less dominant than men and their status in society is lower, which was generally true for the society roughly two hundred years ago.

On the other hand, if generally observing contemporary society, it can be found that gender roles of men and women are no longer so strictly separated, and the division of masculine and feminine attributes is not as particular as it was at the beginning of the 19th century. Women now can participate in politics, own property, invest, make decisions, choose their life paths and careers. If they choose to, they can be self-sufficient. For the heroine of *Pride and Prejudice*, Elizabeth, to have her own place was completely unthinkable. However, for Bridget, the main female protagonist of *Bridget Jones's Diary*, it was the norm. Elizabeth was first dependent on her father and then on advantageous marriage to be financially secure. She could not work and receive a salary, nor could she be the family heir. Consequently, it was inevitable for her to marry one day. On the other hand, Bridget is pressured into finding a life partner and getting married by social conventions and also by relatives and people surrounding her, but she does not need a husband to provide for her materially; she has a job that earns her money, and she can decide for herself what to do with the money she makes. Again, something that would have

been impossible for Elizabeth two hundred years ago. Nevertheless, even in Bridget Jones's Diary, the occurrence of lexical hedges is higher in women's speech despite the fact that women's general status in society is now closer to that of males. It could be assumed that this could be because of a certain coding that women carry within themselves. After all, despite all the modern accomplishments regarding this issue, women have been seen as inferior for many centuries, and female equality has only been a phenomenon for the last few decades. It is, therefore, a relatively recent phenomenon. It can be supposed that studies of the most modern contemporary films might yield further results, and it will be interesting to see how gender linguistics develops over the next thirty or fifty years.

The films thus suggested that there has been a certain change in social norms and habits, but although women have become independent and self-sufficient, the occurrence of lexical hedges between male and female speech remained in a very similar ratio in *Pride and Prejudice* (23 occurrences in men speech; 33 occurrences in women speech) and *Bridget Jones's Diary* (33 occurrences in men speech; 42 occurrences in women speech).

As intensifier adds additional emotional context to the word, they are suggested to be a part of women-speech (Lakoff, 1973a). Women are often considered the more emotional of the two genders - they tend to (sometimes frequently and enthusiastically) talk about their emotions and feelings and share them with others, thus connecting through shared experience and gaining a sense of belonging. In contrast, men are generally seen as the gender that does not engage in sharing and expressing emotions and feelings (for more on this topic, see subchapter 3.4). Women's increased use of intensifiers (in comparison to men) appears to be linked to this phenomenon, so it was peculiar to observe their appearance in the two aforementioned films.

In *Pride and Prejudice*, the incidence of intensifiers was higher among women, and quite significantly so (39 occurrences in men's speech; 93 occurrences in women's speech). This can be considered to confirm Robin Lakoff's (1973a) theory that intensifiers are typical attributes of female speech. Same as lexical hedges, this occurrence may again indicate the lower status of women in society. Generally, emotions are often considered to be a weakness. Thus, if proceeded from this assumption, women come out weaker and therefore have lower status. This fact is particularly noticeable in the previously mentioned

Pride and Prejudice - the amount of intensifiers was significantly higher in women-speech in the speech of men, confirming and intensifying the differences between men and women.

On the other hand, there was an exciting finding in Bridget Jones's Diary that could be related to the changing gender roles of men and women in the new millennium. The incidence of intensifiers was still higher in female speech, but in contrast to Pride and Prejudice, the number has decreased for women-speech and increased for men-speech; the distribution was specifically 59 occurrences in men's speech; 82 occurrences in women's speech. This might suggest that the intensifiers are closer to be a gender-neutral linguistic feature in the film depicting the more contemporary society.

7.3. What are examples of moments that mirror each other?

The story of Bridget and Mark Darcy in Bridget Jones's Diary is inspired by and based on the story of Elizabeth Bennet and Mr. Darcy. This is a well-known fact, admitted by the author of Bridget Jones's Diary herself (BBC Arts, 2016). Therefore, it is not surprising to find moments that mirror each other in the two films. Some examples of these will be discussed and analysed. Both films feature a young woman as the protagonist - the main female characters and their struggles are one of the most notable parallels. Both Elizabeth Bennet and Bridget Jones are great heroines, strong and independent single women. Their mothers' continuous attempts to set them up with a date ("*Every year, she tries to fix me up with some bushy-haired, middle-aged bore,*" Bridget in Bridget Jones Diary, using quite colloquial speech), but usually have little or no success with the main female protagonists. Mrs Bennet's primary preoccupation in life in Pride and Prejudice appears to be marrying off her five daughters ("*...he must marry one of them!*" Mrs Bennet in Pride and Prejudice). Ironically, not that much has changed in this field in the last two hundred years, since Bridget's mother Pam remains to do the same thing. ("*Your mother's trying to fix you up with some divorcee,*" Mr Jones in Bridget Jones Diary). On the other hand, this is not necessary step for a woman financially, as she can earn her own money and manage her own finances. Single households are now more popular than before, too. Still, Bridget's status as a single young woman is frequently discussed as if it was a negative or embarrassing trait. Relatives and friends frequently inquire about Bridget's

romantic life, too (*"So, how's your love life? (...) Still no fellow, then, eh? I don't know,"* Uncle Geoffrey in *Bridget Jones's Diary*). Returning to the main storyline, soon after they meet for the first time, Mr Darcy makes a rude comment about Elizabeth, Mark Darcy makes snide remarks about Bridget, and some interesting word choices can be observed. The scene of Elizabeth's insult takes place at a ball; two gentlemen are talking:

MR BINGLEY: *Upon my word, I've never seen so many pretty girls in my life.*

MR DARCY: *You are dancing with the only handsome girl in the room.*

MR BINGLEY: *Oh, she is the most beautiful creature I have ever beheld, but her sister Elizabeth is very agreeable.*

MR DARCY: *Perfectly tolerable, I dare say, but not handsome enough to tempt me.*

The scene of Bridget's insult takes place at a party at her parents' house. Mark exchanges a few words with Bridget before turning to his mother:

- **MARK'S MOTHER:** *There'd be no harm taking her number. Apparently she lives just around the corner from you.*

- **MARK:** *Mother, I do not need a blind date, particularly not with some verbally incontinent spinster who smokes like a chimney, drinks like a fish and dresses like her mother.*

Being called *"not enough"* must be unpleasant, however Mark Darcy in *Bridget Jones's Diary* chooses very straight-forward label *"verbally incontinent spinster"* and continues with *"who smokes like a chimney, drinks like a fish and dresses like her mother."* It is hard to imagine Mr Darcy in *Pride and Prejudice* choosing words such as these.

Another example of moments in dialogues mirroring each other is a scene showing the approach to money, wealth and potential marriage. First it shows the Bennet sister's and their mother in *Pride and Prejudice*:

ELIZABETH: *Liddy! Kitty - what have I told you about listening at -*

LYDIA: *Never mind that, there's a Mr Bingley arrived from the North*

KITTY: *- with more than one chaise*

LYDIA: - and five thousand a year!

ELIZABETH: Really?

LYDIA: And he's single!

(...)

MRS BENNET: What a fine thing for our girls!

MR BENNET: How can it affect them?

MRS BENNET: My dear Mr Bennet, how can you be so tiresome! You know that he must marry one of them.

Then it shows Bridget and her mother Pam in Bridget Jones's Diary:

MOTHER PAM: (...) By the way, the Darcys are here! They've brought Mark with them. He's just back from the U.N., for Heaven's Sake. You remember Mark. You used to play in his paddling pool? He's a barrister. Very well off.

- **BRIDGET:** No. I don't remember (...) And I want you to stop right there - I may be single, but I will not, repeat not be reduced to being match-made with the dreadful children of your awful friends.

- **MOTHER PAM:** He's just back from America. Divorced last Christmas. Wife was Japanese. Very cruel race. Now, what are you going to put on?

Again, wealth and potential marriage are the topics of the conversation, which is not surprising, as these two films are indeed related.

These were some examples of moments of dialogue that are mirrored. The subchapter will be closed here, but other moments of dialogue mirroring each other could be analyzed in future studies. Regarding the studies on this topic, it is often worked with the literary template (Lindgren, 2009, Radková, 2017 or Jonsson, 2018). Some thesis also compared the *Pride and Prejudice* novel and its film adaptation (Šustková, 2014). Parrill (2002) examined the different film adaptations of *Pride and Prejudice*; for the research, of this thesis, however, the 2005's adaptation starring Kierra Knightley and Matthew MacFadyen was chosen, as it is considered by many to be one of the finest adaptations and is very successfully reviewed by the audience. Nevertheless, Jane Austen's 1813's novel has received many film adaptations, at least seventeen since 1938 (Bromley, 2020). *Pride and Prejudice* also loosely inspired other authors who borrowed the main idea, although it

did not reach the amount of worldwide fame as the original did. An example of this could be *Bride and Prejudice* (2004), *Austenland* (2013) or *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (2016); thus, research on women's speech or the portrayal of men and women in society could also be conducted here and compared with its inspiration.

8. SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH PART

The phenomena of men and women utilizing language differently were discussed in this thesis' theoretical section. Two specialists, Robin Lakoff and Deborah Tannen, described language and gender and the relationship between these two characteristics. They also presented hypotheses concerning male and female conversational styles. That portion, in particular, mainly relies on Lakoff's article *Language and Women's Place* (1973a) and Deborah Tannen's book *You Just Don't Understand* (1995), both of which are widely considered as the base for the topics of male and female language usage and diverse conversational styles. Sexism and stereotypes in language were also examined; however, this section is provided in the appendices for review.

The research part of the thesis is thus a continuation of earlier studies touching on a similar topic. After summarizing the theoretical background knowledge, the thesis developed into a practical part, the aim of which was to answer the research questions. It has been experienced that by observing the number of occurrences of lexical hedges and intensifiers, a certain historical development of speech between males and females can be deduced. In particular, the number of occurrences of intensifiers yielded an exciting finding: intensifiers appeared to be a less gendered language trait in *Bridget Jones's Diary* compared to *Pride and Prejudice*, which might be linked to the blurring of gender roles in more modern culture. The historical development in the two selected linguistic features was thus to be more clearly observed in the usage of intensifiers. As the second observed feature did not show such significant differences - the use of lexical hedges is consistently (in both films: *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*) higher in a female speech, thus confirming Robin Lakoff's theory; yet, the male-female ratio when comparing *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* remained unchanged with minor modifications of slight overall growth. These results thus help to estimate the resulting position of men and women in society in both periods examined. When comparing society approximately two hundred years ago and society in the new Millennium, the films suggested that there has been a change in social conventions and habits. This fact is most visible in particular the

prevalence of intensifiers, which, according to Lakoff (1973a), is an element typical of female speech, which adds emotional value and indicates a lower status in society. In *Bridget Jones's Diary*, the number of occurrences in men's speech increased, yet decreased in women's speech, in comparison to *Pride and Prejudice*. This highlights the idea that gender roles are no longer so clearly defined in the new millennium and that women's status in society is no longer necessarily lower than men's. It is a well-known fact that *Bridget Jones's Diary* is based on *Pride and Prejudice*. As a result, it was not surprising to see moments in both films that mirror each other. A number of these were analyzed and commented on, such as the conversation about wealth and potential marriage between the Bennet sisters and their mother and Bridget and her mother, or the scene of Mr Darcy insulting Elizabeth and Mark Darcy insulting Bridget.

9. CONCLUSION

Many societal concerns have been reverberating in society, one of which is the social status of men and women, which includes their different use of language. As modern times are increasingly progressive, the distinctions between men's and women's gender roles generally seem less evident than years ago. Generally, women used to be seen as the subordinate gender, in charge of the household and children but not invested in public life or education. They were usually not given the choice of choosing the husband or a career according to their own opinion and beliefs, nor could they decide for themselves whether they wanted to care for the household or pursue higher education. This is now different in our culture; women can become anything men can. The lasting different use of language could be due to the formerly different status of men and women in society; as As Crystal (2003, p.364) reasons, it is usually language (more than the clothing or the appearance of a person) that forms and creates human social identity.

Two fundamental terms when the issues of different male and female conversational styles are examined are language and gender. Baugh & Cable (2003, p.1) define language as a "*medium by which speakers of the language communicate their thoughts and feelings to others.*" The definition of gender is perhaps more complex, as it distinguishes between social gender based on cultural qualities and patterns that society assigns to men and women and gender as biological sex that is assigned at birth (Český statistický úřad, 2016).

Regarding the phenomenon of men and women utilizing language differently, it has been studied by experts; probably the most well-known specialists in the field include Robin Lakoff, Deborah Tannen or Jennifer Coates. Coates (2004, p.5-7), gathered and explained how distinct approaches to male and female conversational styles might be identified based on "what is lacking" or "what the dynamic between the two genders is"; *the deficit approach* (where the norm is considered adult male speech and thus, the women's speech is seen as missing vital elements from the norm), *the dominance approach* (which asserts that linguistic differences are linked to societal disparities), *difference approach* (female and male conversational styles are seen as different, yet

equal) and *dynamic approach* (this viewpoint contends that a variety of social circumstances and context impact speech, and although some specifics might be more male- or female-biased, both genders can utilise them).

Coates (2004) also presents a possible reason for the different usage of speech by the two genders. According to her, its roots are already in childhood and in how little girls and boys play and make friends. Children tend to stick to same-sex groups. Girls talk more and bond through chatting in smaller groups; boys are more likely to play in larger groups with a more apparent hierarchy, and it has been discovered that a child's peer group has a direct impact on his or her social and language development. Plus, from an early age, girls are encouraged to be typical "girls", and boys are encouraged to be typical "boys." Another theory presented is that of Robin Lakoff (1973a), who is well known for defining the parameters that determine women's speech (these are lexical hedges, intensifiers, super polite forms, tag questions, empty adjectives, avoidance of strong swear words, precise colour terms, hypercorrect grammar, rising intonation on declaratives and emphatic stress). She then redefined Grice's Maxims and created Politeness Principle.

Deborah Tannen, author of *You Just Don't Understand* (1995), described the difference between male and female speech by creating terms rapport and report talk. Rapport-talk is typical for women; the emphasis in this interaction is often on similarities and shared experiences and is geared towards emotional connection. Report-talk is typical for men when speech is means of exchanging information with little emotional import (p.72-73). Men also tend to offer a solution instead of sharing their feelings. They are naturally inclined to seek solutions to problems rather than confiding concerns; they see themselves as "problem solvers" (p. 48). Tannen also came up with the term "genderlects" to describe the disparities in how men and women communicate. Both genders utilise speech, but their delivery and communication expectations are different, however, that does not make one less equal (p.18).

The phenomena of men and women using speech differently can be observed in everyday interactions, as well as its representation in cinema and literature. In the research portion of this thesis, male and female conversational styles are investigated through intensifiers and lexical hedges (defined as part of women's language by Lakoff, 1973a).

Two films, *Pride and Prejudice* (depicting society roughly two hundred years ago) and *Bridget Jones's Diary* (depicting more modern society), were chosen for analysis. After

calculating the number of occurrences of intensifiers and lexical hedges and their use by males and females, it was discovered that both films support Lakoff's (1973a) theory that their use is higher in female speech. The use of lexical hedges is consistently (in both films: *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary*) higher in a female speech; however, the male-female ratio when comparing *Pride and Prejudice* and *Bridget Jones's Diary* remained unchanged with minor modifications of slight overall growth in *Bridget Jones's Diary*.

The prevalence of intensifiers in both films shows that the number of occurrences in men's speech in *Bridget Jones's Diary* increased, yet decreased in women's speech, in comparison to *Pride and Prejudice*. This suggests that in more modern society, intensifiers (that add emotional value to the statement (Lakoff, 1973a)) are means no longer only reserved for women, but they are less of a gendered linguistic feature. That might also hint that gender roles are no longer so clearly defined in the new millennium and that women's status in society is no longer necessarily lower than men'.

Another interesting finding was that the phrase "*you know*" can serve two purposes: to indicate uncertainty in a sentence (as "you would be in nobody's way, **you know**, in that part of the house") or to strengthen an opinion (as "*But I have other reasons, you know I have!*"), which shows the importance of context.

Pride and Prejudice have received at least 17 film and television adaptations (Bromley, 2020) and has also inspired other authors. This is how *Bride and Prejudice* (2004), *Pride and Prejudice and Zombies* (2016), or *Austenland* (2013) were created. Various experts from different perspectives have already examined the original novel and its various films adaptations. However, it would also be worth examining these new alternatives; research on linguistic traits, women's and men's speech, and the portrayal of men and women in society might all be done here and compared to the source material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAUGH, A. C. a Thomas CABLE. *A History of the English Language*. Fifth Edition. 5th edition. London: Routledge, 2003. ISBN 0415280990.
- BBC Arts. *Helen Fielding on stealing the plot of Pride and Prejudice* [online]. BBC: 2016 [cit. 2022-03-09]. Accesible from: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p04lj4x6>
- BEASLEY, Chris. *Gender and sexuality: Critical theories, critical thinkers*. Sage, 2005.
- BROMLEY, Anna. *It's a Good Time to Binge on 'Pride and Prejudice' Adaptations* [online]. University of Virginia [cit. 2022-03-22]. Accesible from: <https://news.virginia.edu/content/its-good-time-binge-pride-and-prejudice-adaptations>
- BUCHOLTZ, Mary (ed.). *Language and Woman's Place: Text and Commentaries. Studies in Language and Gender*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2004.
- CINEMA.COM. *Bridget Jones's Diary : Production Notes* [online]. Cinema.com [cit. 2022-03-29]. Accesible from: <https://www.cinema.com/articles/339/bridget-joness-diary-production-notes.phtml>
- COATES Jennifer. *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004. ISBN 9780582771864.
- CRYSTAL David. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. ISBN 0521530334.
- FUCHS, Robert. Do women (still) use more intensifiers than men?: Recent change in the sociolinguistics of intensifiers in British English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 2017, 22.3: 345-374.
- FUCHS, Robert; GUT, Ulrike. *Do women use more intensifiers than men?-Investigating gender and age-specific language use with the International Corpus of English*. ICAME332012, 2012.
- Genderové statistiky - Úvod. Gender: Základní pojmy [online]. Český statistický úřad. 2016. [cit. 2022-02-15]. Accesible from: https://www.czso.cz/csu/gender/gender_pojmy
- GRAMLEY Stephan, Michael-Kurt PÄTZOLD. *A Survey of Modern English*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge, 2004. ISBN 9780415300353
- GRICE, Paul. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press, 1989.

- HANDYANTA, Andreas. *Lakoff's women's language features used by Michelle Obama in the next generation of woman video*. Thesis. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Yogyakarta, 2018.
- HIRSCHMAN, Lynette. "Female-Male Differences in Conversational Interaction." *Language in Society*, vol. 23, no. 3, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 427–42
- HOLMES, Janet; WILSON, Nick. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 5th edition. Routledge, 2017. ISBN 9781315728438.
- HUMAN RIGHTS CHANNEL [online] [cit. cit. 2022-02-20]]. © Council of Europe 2020. Accesible from <https://human-rights-channel.coe.int/stop-sexism-en.html>
- JESENSKÁ Petra. *Essentials of Sociolinguistics*. Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě, Filozofická fakulta, 2010. ISBN 978-80-7368-799-1
- JONSSON, Ida. *Petticoats or Miniskirts: A Comparative Analysis of Feminine Narration in Pride and Prejudice and Bridget Jones's Diary*. 2018.
- LAKOFF, R.T. *Language and woman's place*. *Language in society*, 1973a, 2.1: 45-79.
- LAKOFF, R. T. *The Logic of Politeness or Minding Your P's and Q's*/RT Lakoff. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1973b.
- LEBOEUF, Celine. " *One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman*": *The Sex-Gender Distinction and Simone de Beauvoir's Account of Woman*, 2015, Feminist Moments. pp. 138-145.
- LINDGREN, Johanna. *Women of Substance: The Aspect of Education, Career and Female Identity in Pride and Prejudice and Bridget Jones's Diary*. 2009.
- MALTZ, Daniel N.; BORKER, Ruth A. A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. *A cultural approach to interpersonal communication: Essential readings*, 1982, 168-185.
- MUGUIRE, S.,: *Bridget Jones's diary*. Burbank, CA: Miramax Home Entertainment. 2001.
- PARRILL, Sue. *Jane Austen on film and television: A critical study of the adaptations*. McFarland, 2002

RADKOVÁ, Bc. Barbora. *Oh Darcy! Feminist Analysis and Comparison of Pride and Prejudice and Bridget Jones's Diary*. 2017. PhD Thesis. Masaryk University.

ŠUSTKOVÁ, Veronika. *Pride and Prejudice: Comparison of the Book with its Film Adaptation*. 2014. Bachelor Thesis. Palacký University.

TANNEN, Deborah. *Ty mi prostě nerozumíš: jak spolu mluví ženy a muži*. Přel. Stanislava Pošustová. Praha: Mladá fronta, 1995. ISBN 80-204-0470-8.

UMERA-OKEKE, Nneka. Linguistic sexism: an overview of the English language in everyday discourse. *AFRREV LALIGENS: An international journal of language, literature and gender studies*, 2012, 1.1: 1-17.

VAYDA, Andrew P. Actions, variations, and change: The emerging anti-essentialist view in anthropology. *Canberra Anthropology*, 1990, 13.2: 29-45.

WEATHERALL, Ann. Sexism in language and talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2015, 34.4: 410-426.

XU, Xiang. The Sexism in English and Its Rebuilding. *International Education Studies*, 2008, 1.4: 101-103.

YILMAZ, Kaya. Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European journal of education*, 2013, 48.2: 311-325.

DVD:

WRIGHT, J.: *Pride & Prejudice*. Universal Studios and Scion Films. 2005.

MUGUIRE, S.: *Bridget Jones's diary*. Burbank, CA: Miramax Home Entertainment. 2001

APPENDICES

List of Appendices

1. Appendix 1 - Stereotypes and Sexism in Language
2. Appendix 2 - A List of Adaptations of Pride and Prejudice
3. Appendix 3 - Intensifiers and Lexical Hedges in Analyzed Films

1. Stereotypes and Sexism in Language

A woman stands at the stove with a toddler at her feet and a baby resting in a cradle. The pleasant smell of a freshly baked bun wafts from the oven. Her hair is long; she is smiling, patient, and subordinate to her husband. Her voice is soft, and she never swears. She uses words such as adorable, cute, or lovely. A man came home from work, earning money for the household. He is the dominant one. His voice is deep and harsh. He is the strong, silent type that does not express his feeling with words. (An example given by the author based on personal observation and experience.)

This is how male and female stereotyping could look like. It is obvious and, to some extent, perhaps even natural that some voice characteristics are more typical for a given gender. Men might generally use some phrases more; women might generally use some phrases more. Crystal (2003, p.368-369) points out some aspects of speech typically attributed to a particular gender - from women, it is usually expected to have a soft, pleasant voice; from men, it is usually expected to have a deep voice. Women's intonation is often described as whining, while men are gruff and bark out commands. For the presentation of what words or phrases are stereotypically associated with women, Jesenská (2010, p.50) gives the following examples:

- *“Women tend to use such words as adorable, cute, lovely or sweet in describing people and objects and such vocatives as my dear, darling, sweetie,*
- *Men tend to be more direct and less inclined to show their feelings; tradition also requires them to be laconic (the strong/silent type),*
- *Women often use a great amount of adjectives and adverbs (My dear, it's just simply too wonderful to see you),*
- *Women are often eager to talk about feelings and emotions, while men don't tend to use words concerning the feelings,*
- *Women frequently use so, such and quite as intensifiers (it's been so nice to see you again), or as qualifiers (he's so helpful, it's such a shame he can't be here),*

- *Women are considered to be more polite and more concerned about correct and proper grammar and pronunciation,*
- *In conversations, women are believed to be insecure and hedging (using tags such as do you? or isn't it? and qualifiers such as I think),*
- *Women, traditionally, do not use obscene or blasphemous language (they 'leave' it to men),*
- *Women are more likely to use polite euphemisms for topics such as death and sex,*
- *Men typically talk about 'important' topics such as politics, sports or war, whereas women's talk is 'trivial' and usually gossip."*

Robin Lakoff (1973a), Californian linguist professor, also prepared a list of elements that are hugely typical for female speech and, therefore, could be seen as stereotyped to women to some extent. In short, it refers to women:

- using *lexical hedges*
- using *intensifiers*
- using *super polite forms*
- using *tag-questions*
- using *empty adjectives*
- using *precise color terms*
- using *hypercorrect grammar*
- using *rising intonation on declaratives*
- using *emphatic stress*
- and *avoiding strong swear words*

More on the view of Robin Lakoff in chapter 3.1, where her approach to male and female speech is discussed.

It might look like that stereotypization is at least partially on its way to becoming outdated. As the boundaries between gender roles became thinner, the distinction between what speech is feminine and what speech could be masculine. Women showing their manly side (being strong, doing crafts, using stronger vocabulary, not talking "lady-like,"

swearing, not "high-pitching" their voices), and men showing their feminine side (being emotional, talking about their feelings or talking about being engaged in activities previously reserved for women only, such as cooking, skincare or makeup) are currently trending on social media, such as Instagram or Tik Tok. Here it is possible to see a lessening social gender divide. Plus, it is generally accepted that the way the world around us works affects how we behave, how we think, and how we talk.

As Jesenská (2010, p. 47) puts it, "*sexist language is a language that presents stereotypes of men and women, sometimes to the disadvantage of both, but usually to the disadvantage of woman.*" In this field, it is fairly common to represent one of the sexes as inferior and overall not equally capable, with claims to fewer rights. Thus, what are some specific and relatively common examples of sexism in speech? "One of the most well-documented and researched aspects of sexist language is the use of masculine generics or male terms to refer to people in general (e.g., mankind) or the use of masculine pronouns when the gender of the referent is unknown. However, studies of the use of masculine generic language in situ are rare," claims Weatherall (2015). She adds that another example is the negative connotation of some feminine variations of words ("spinster" carrying a negative attitude, "bachelor" not carrying the same amount of negative attitude) or the fact that the endings of feminine words are sometimes diminutives.

Another example that includes a type of sexism can be the relationship between words and success. "*People psychologically conceive that persons who achieve success are certain to be males. Women who get famous are supposed to be exception,*" says Dr. Xiang Xu from Qingdao University (2008). Hence, we have words like doctor, lawyer, or reporter. When a woman achieves this post, she can be called "*woman lawyer*" or "*lady reporter*" - the additional word (*woman, lady, girl, or female*) is purposely added. Although these words are neutral, we unconsciously associate them with men, at least to a certain extent. That is probably due to historical relations; these professions were reserved for men only for a long time (Xiang Xu, 2008). Example of sexism related to language, apart from assuming that the subject of a sentence is automatically a man when unknown and the fact that *he/him/his* can be used to mention a human being, is, according to the website Human Rights Channel (2020), only naming the male author of a publication.

Furthermore, generally making one of the sexes to appear not competent purely based on gender.

Jesenská (2010, p. 47) outlines two approaches to constructing a sexism-in-language perspective: first, *how much English is inherently sexist*, and second, *how some ways of using language are sexist*. The first approach is illustrated in the lexicon, where there are different words for different developmental stages. Also, there are different words to distinguish between masculine and feminine sex. Therefore, to one (generic) word - *a horse* - is added a *mare* (female), a *stallion* (male), a *foal* (young horse), a *filly* (young female), and a *colt* (young male). This example illustrates the first approach. On the other hand, the ambivalence of the words *Man* (used for men, women, boys, girls) and *man* (used for man only) illustrates the second approach of how some ways of using language are sexist. One term represents a group of people; the second represents males only.

This section will conclude with a thought from Dr. Umera-Okeke, who thinks that sexism in speech is something that everyone, not just feminists, should fight against; however, most people probably do not normally dwell on this issue. He encourages them to do so (Umera-Okeke, 2012).

2. List of Examples of Adaptations of Pride and Prejudice

A list of examples of adaptations of Pride and Prejudice and films and novels inspired by Jane Austen's 1813 'novel (Bromley, 2020):

- “Pride and Prejudice” – 1940 film starring Greer Garson and Sir Laurence Olivier.
- “Pride and Prejudice” – 1995 BBC miniseries with Colin Firth as Mr. Darcy.
- “Bridget Jones’s Diary” – 1999 novel, 2001 film with Renée Zellweger, Colin Firth and Hugh Grant as the main trio.
- “Pride and Prejudice” – popular 2005’s adaptation with Keira Knightley and Matthew Macfadyen, analyzed in this bachelor thesis.
- “Bride and Prejudice” – 2004 Bollywood film.
- “Pride and Prejudice and Zombies” – 2009 novel, 2016 film.
- “The Lizzie Bennet Diaries” – 2012 YouTube serial.
- “Longbourn” - 2013 novel.
- “Austenland” - 2013 film.
- “Death Comes to Pemberley” - 2013 TV mini-series,
- “Unleashing Mr. Darcy” - 2016 film.
- “Eligible: A Modern Retelling of Pride and Prejudice” novel by Curtis Sittenfeld, 2016.
- “Unequal Affections: A Pride and Prejudice Retelling,” 2017 novel by Lara S. Ormiston.
- “Heartstone,” a historical fantasy by Elle Katharine White that sets “Pride and Prejudice” in a fantasy world, 2017.
- “Christmas at Pemberley Manor” - 2018 film.
- “Pride and Passion” – 2018 Brazilian telenovela series.
- “Unmarriageable” - 2019 novel.

- “The Lady’s Guide to Celestial Mechanics” - 2019 novel.
- “Pride, Prejudice, and Other Flavors,” - 2019 novel by Sonali Dev.
- “Pride: A Pride and Prejudice Remix,” by Ibi Zobol, published in 2019.

3. Intensifiers and Lexical Hedges in Analyzed Films

Intensifiers in Male Speech in Pride and Prejudice:

MR BINGLEY: Upon my word I've never seen so many pretty girls in my life.

MR BINGLEY: I am so glad to see you!

MR BINGLEY: It's amazing how Young ladies have the patience to be so accomplished.

DARCY: Are you so severe on your Own sex?

MR BINGLEY: I am so pleased.

MR COLLINS: If I May be so bold.

DARCY: With so Little Endeavour at civility.

DARCY: Thank you for explaining so fully.

DARCY: Forgive me, mam, for taking so much of your time.

DARCY: Sentiments that were so disgusting to you.

MR BENNET: ...with so little inconvenience.

MR BENNET: So well concealed!

MR BENNET: On so slight a temptation as (...).

MR BENNET: Be so generous.

WICKHAM: He considered me too lowly to be worth.

MR BENNET: Too poor.

DARCY: Too long

DARCY: You are too generous!

MR BINGLEY: Very much.

MR BINGLEY: Lizzie is very agreeable.

BINGLEY: (...) the country is very diverging, very beautiful, very pleasant, very untoward.

MR COLLINS: Very agreeable alternative.

WICKHAM: I have very poor taste in ribbons.

DARCY: (...) she plays very well, is very fortunate, very Great indeed, very well stocked

MR GARDINER: Very civil.

MR Benet: Very generous.

BINGLEY: Find her quite recovered.

DARCY: I said played "quite well". Quite well, thank you!

MR BENNET: I am **quite** at leisure.

BINGLEY: **Absolutely**

WICKHAM: Do you **really** want to hear?

MR BENNET: If you **really** liked him...

Intensifiers in Female Speech in Pride and Prejudice:

MRS BENNET: My dear Mr Bennet, how can you be **so** tiresome?

JANE: **So** many other things to do!

MRS BENNET: Gentleman **so** much in love!

MRS BENNET: Kitty, be **so** kind and pass the butter.

LIZZIE: I am **so** sorry!

CAROLINE: (...) and her hair, **so** blowsy and untidy!

JANE: Lizzie! Your face is **so** cold! They are being **so** kind to me.

LIZZIE: Thank you for tending my sister **so** diligently

CAROLINE: It's refreshing, is it not, after sitting **so** long in one attitude?

LIZZIE: That makes it all **so** much more enjoyable, don't you think?

LIZZIE: He has been **so** unlucky as to lose your friendship.

LIZZIE: Dear Charlotte, I am **so** glad!

LADY CATHERINE: You give your opinion very decidedly for **so** young a person.

LIZZIE: Your sister does play **so** well.

LIZZIE: (...) with **so** evident a design of insulting me.

JANE: London is **so** diverting. **So** much to entertain.

LIZZIE: They are **so** easily led that they have no minds.

LIZZIE: I am **so** sorry to intrude.

GEORGIANA: My brother has told me **so** much about you. You play **so** well!

LIZZIE: It is **so** beautiful up there.

MRS GARDINER: Thank you **so** much Mr Darcy

LIZZIE: Father, I am **so** sorry.

LYDIA: It was **so** tedious

MRS BENNET: There is nothing **so** bad as this.

LIZZIE: **So** soon?

LIZZIE: I have been **so** blind!

MRS BENNET: It is **so** good to see you again **so** soon.

MRS BENNET: She could not be so beautiful for nothing.

JANE: See you so happy (...)

LIZZIE: Coming so far.

LIZZIE: (...) about so many things. He and I are so similar, both so stubborn.

LIZZE: Too easy to judge.

JANE: It is too far.

CAROLINE: Are you too proud?

LYDIA: It's always too far.

LIZZIE: You are too hasty, sir.

LIZZIE: It is too late.

LIZZIE: You mustn't be too severe on yourself.

MRS BENNET: It's too far off.

MRS BENNET: Very pretty, very nicely, how very glad we are, very short, very hard,

MRS BENNET: Very soon, very agreeable men, very soon to be engaged, very happy indeed.

CAROLINE: Very little to recommend.

CHARLOTTE: Very amiable, Lizzie, it is very kind of you.

LIZZIE: Very mild weather, very little, very poorly, very hard on younger sisters, very dreadful.

LADY CATHERINE: Very odd! Very Young, very decidedly, very welcome, very small

LIZZIE: I am very sorry, very pleasant, I am very fond, not very well

MRS GARDINIER: Very welcomed. He was very civil.

GEORGIANA: Very well then.

LIZZIE: Very well, very much, very much, very well.

CAROLINE: I was quite in raptures.

MRS BENNET: Mr Darcy is quite eaten up with pride, quite certain he is coming.

LADY CATHERINE: Must have been quite a slave!

LIZZIE: I shall be quite allright.

JANE: I am quite over him.

LIZZIE: Quite well is not (...)

CAROLINE: Absolutely

LADY CATHERINE: Absolutely not.

JANE: He was totally ignorant of my being.

JANE: Do you really believe he liked me, Lizzie?

LIZZIE: I **really** think it's time to go. I **really** do not think. You **really** care to know?

LYDIA: I don't **really** like him

Intensifiers in Male Speech in Bridget Jones's Diary:

TOM: Thank you **so** much.

TOM: Thank you **so** much.

DANIEL: How can anything be **so** perfect?

DANIEL: I am **so** glad to be living in Britain today.

DANIEL: Bunnies have **so** many children.

DANIEL: I feel **so** terrible.

SIMON: No wonder he's looking **so** chipper.

DANIEL: I am suddenly not quite **so** sure.

MARK: There might not be two lives in ruins **so** often.

TOM: This is **so** romantic.

DANIEL: It was all going **so** fast.

DAD: Yes. **Very** good Evening.

DANIEL: **Very** childish emailing over Bridget's non-existent skirt.

DANIEL: You are **very** sexy, Jones. **Very** silly skirt.

DANIEL: Let me ask you a **very** important question. Seems **very** quiet here.

MARK: The literary world is **very** lucky to have you.

DANIEL: We've become **very** close.

MR FITZHERBERT: I'm **very** sorry to hear that

MARK: I **very** much enjoyed your LF Report. **Very** inarticulately. I like you **very** much. I like you **very** much just as you are.

TOM: This is **very** hard to call.

MARK: **Very** sorry, I'll pay. Yes- but **very very** foolish mistake. **Very** well.

DAD: It's been **very** hard.

BERNARD: This is also a **very** profitable firm.

DANIEL: I'm suddenly not **quite** so sure.

MARK: Not **quite**.

MARK'S FATHER: Marriage counts for **quite** a lot.

MARK: **Quite**...heavy. **Quite** sure. Bye.

DANIEL: **Absolutely** enormous pants. I **absolutely** love them. **Absolutely** say no if it

worries you.

JULIAN: **Absolutely**, Pamela

MARK: **Absolutely** not. With total confidence, **absolutely** not.

BERNARD: Human Rights is **absolutely** key stuff.

DANIEL: **Totally** innocent. **Totally** fucking finito

DANIEL: I've Ever **really** forgiven him. I am **really** sorry. I am **really** in the thick of it.

DAD: What they are **really** like and what you're **really** like.

DANIEL: Bridget, please - we **really** need to talk. Finding it **really** hard.

SIMON: Well done, babe, **really** hit the jackpot.

COSMO: You **really** ought to hurry up.

MARK: Found out what we **really** wanted. I **really** am sorry. Not **really**.

BERNARD: **Really** superb

MARK: Natasha is **really** superb.

Intensifiers in Female Speech in Bridget Jones's Diary:

BRIDGET: Thank you **so** much for your enquiry.

BRIDGET: He is **so** rude!

BRIDGET: But thank you **so** much for the lovely dinner.

NATASHA: **So** childish.

BRIDGET: Because I don't see what could be **so** important.

BRIDGTE: And everytime I sit down my tail goes ever **so** slightly up my bottom.

JUDE: You seem **so** lost.

BRIDGET: Being in **so** much trouble (...)

WONEY: Yes, why are there **so** many unmarried working women these days?

BRIDGET: I am **so**, **so** sorry.

BRIDGET: And that's why you always behaved **so** weirdly with him.

BRIDGET: **Too** poor.

JUDE: He said I was getting **too** serious and **too** needy.

SHARON: **Too** late,

BRIDGET: **Too** slow.

BRIDGET: Big hair and **too** much mascara.

BRIDGET: Very bad start.

MOTHER: Very well off, very cruel race, it went very well.

PERPETUA: Very good indeed. I'm very excited. I hear it went very well.

BRIDGET: Shut up please, I am very busy and important. Very long. In the very near future.

BRIDGET: You're still a very attractive man. Very well for you. Tricky, very tricky.

MAGDA: Children are very excited.

BRIDGET: Very bad start. I have been very sick recently. Very disappointed not to see

my favorite. BRIDGET: Books which are very good. This is a very very important question.

MOTHER: They're very ornate. He's behaving very bizzarely. She got very frightened.

UNA ALCONBURA: Lovely dress, very exotic.

BRIDGET: Thank you very much, Tom. That was very nice.

PERPETUA: Very important announcement!

BRIDGET: That is very good to know.

MOTHER: He loved a very different mummy.

BRIDGET: We bunnies only wear our tail on very special occasions,

MOTHER: Very reasonably priced.

NATASHA: Your father wants to begin very soon.

BRIDGET: Lots of very high quality magazines with very useful romance and fashion tips.

BRIDGET: Recently we've been having quite a lot of succes.

BRIDGET: Pop icon who only wrote one song then retired because he found one song was quite enough to get him laid.

BRIDGET: Quite an important date.

BRIDGET: Quite a lot of you.

BRIDGET: Quite pervy, really.

NATASHA: Quite right.

MAGDA: ...which aren't quite right.

MOTHER: The other night, quite unexpectedly.

BRIDGET: Someone who isn't quite sure.

BRIDGET: Quite rightly.

BRIDGET: He's absoulutely flipping gorgeous. Absolutely.

BRIDGET: Fat absolutely falling off.

SHARON: **Absolutely**.

JUDE: Then **totally** ignore Daniel.

PERPETUS: Being **totally** spineless.

NATASHA: The caterers have **totally** screwed up.

BRIDGET: It's **really** nice. Next weekend we're going to do something **really** good.

BRIDGET: She loves you **really**.

BRIDGET: I would **really** like to see you.

BRIDGET: You wouldn't **really** miss the person.

NATASHA: We're **really** making progress on the case.

BRIDGET: Did I **really** run around your lawn naked? Quite pervy, **really**.

MOTHER: Andy **really** very reasonably priced.

BRIDGET: Not **really**, no. Uncle Geoffrey, well not **really** my uncle.

BRIDGET: The story is **really** going to kick in on page 4.

BRIDGET: We've decided **really** to go for that this time.

Lexical Hedges in Male Speech in *Pride and Prejudice*:

DARCY: **I think** her concern for her sister does her credit

FITZWILLIAM: **I think** it was her family that was considered unsuitable.

DARCY: **Perhaps** you will give me leave to defer your raptures till I write again. At present I have not enough room to do them justice.

WICKHAM: Ah. **Perhaps**. How long has Mr Darcy been a guest there?

MR COLLINS: **Perhaps** you will do me the honour, Miss Lizzie?

MR COLLINS: (cont'd) But before I am run away with my feelings **perhaps** I **may** state my reasons for marrying.

MR BENNET: (tentatively) Could I offer you a cup of tea **perhaps**, your Ladyship?

MR COLLINS: (cont'd) But before I am run away with my feelings **perhaps** I may state my reasons for marrying.

DARCY: So this is your opinion of me! Thank you for explaining so fully. **Perhaps** these offences might have been overlooked, if your pride had not been hurt -

SIR WILLIAM: And **may** I introduce Mr Darcy. (Significant look) - of Pemberley, in Derbyshire!

MR BINGLEY: **May** I have the honour?

WICKHAM: (cont'd) You **may** well be surprised, Miss Bennet, especially given our cold greeting this afternoon.

MR COLLINS: It is my intention, if I **may** be so bold to remain close to you throughout the evening.

MR COLLINS: Well, it is my avowed hope that soon I **may** find a mistress for it, and I have to inform you that the eldest Miss Bennet has captured my special attention.

DARCY: **May** I have the next dance, Miss Elizabeth?

DARCY: **May** I see you to the village?

DARCY: **Maybe**, it's that I find it hard to forgive the follies and vices of others, or their offences against myself. My good opinion, once lost, is lost forever.

DARCY: **Might** I ask why, with so little endeavour at civility, I am thus repulsed?

DARCY: **Might** I ask why, with so little endeavour at civility, I am thus repulsed?

MR COLLINS: Mrs Bennet - I was hoping, if it would not trouble you, that I **might** solicit a private audience with Miss Lizzie in the course of the morning.

BINGLEY: Not a good reader, you see. I prefer being out of doors. **I mean**, I can read, of course and, and I'm not suggesting you can't read outdoors - of course

BINGLEY: It is a pleasure - **I mean** - not a pleasure that she's ill, of course not, but a pleasure that she's here - being ill.

BINGLEY: You're welcome anytime you feel the least bit poorly. **I mean** - you're welcome at any time, but not any less welcome if **you know** you're - (...)

Lexical Hedges in Female Speech in Pride and Prejudice:

CAROLINE: (small smile) A family trait **I think**.

MARY: **I think** a Ball is a perfectly irrational way to gain new acquaintance.

KITTY: **I think** one of them just winked at me.

CHARLOTTE: My dear, **I think** our guest is tired after her journey.

LIZZIE: But **I think** it would be very hard on younger sisters, not to have their share of amusement because the elder is still unmarried.

LIZZIE: Sir, **I think** it is too late.

IZZIE: **I think** you are in great danger of making him as much in love with you as ever.

CHARLOTTE **Perhaps** he is through here.

LIZZIE They are, thank you. (pause) My eldest sister is currently in London, **perhaps** you happened to see her there?

LIZZIE: **Perhaps** you should take your aunt's advice and practice.

LIZZIE: Do you think that anything might tempt me to accept the man who has ruined, **perhaps** for ever, the happiness of a most beloved sister?

MRS BENNET: When you have five daughters, Lizzie, tell me what else will occupy your thoughts and then **perhaps** you will understand.

LIZZIE: **Perhaps** Mr. Collins has a cousin.

LIZZIE: That reply will do for the present. **Perhaps** by and bye I **may** observe that private balls are much pleasanter than public ones. But for now we may be silent.

LIZZIE: That reply will do for the present. **Perhaps** by and bye I **may** observe that private balls are much pleasanter than public ones.

CHARLOTTE: Miserable he **may** be, but poor he most certainly is not.

LIZZIE: Of a fine, stout love it **may**.

MRS BENNET: As you well know, Mr Bennet, when/ you die, which **may** in fact be very soon.

LIZZIE: Indeed. Everything, apparently. He **may** leave us our stays, but even my piano stool belongs to Mr Collins.

LIZZIE: You **may**.

LIZZIE: You **may** ask the questions, which I **may** not choose to answer.

MARY: **Maybe** he's changed his mind.

JANE: But I know her to be incapable of wilfully deceiving anyone. It is far more **likely** that he does not love me and never has.

LIZZIE: Though she **might** well perish with the shame of having such a mother.

MRS GARDINER: If he should marry, you **might** see more of him.

LIZZIE: (trembling with emotion) I **might** as well enquire why, with so evident a design of insulting me, you chose to tell me that you liked me against your better judgement.

LIZZIE: Do you think that anything **might** tempt me to accept the man who has ruined, perhaps for ever, the happiness of a most beloved sister?

LYDIA: Oh stop it, Lizzie. Mr. Darcy's not half as high and mighty as you, **sometimes**.

LIZZIE: You're a great deal too apt to like people in general, **you know**. All the world is good and agreeable in your eyes.

LADY CATHERINE: You would be in nobody's way, **you know**, in that part of the house.

“You know” as strengthening their assertions:

MRS BENNET: **You know** that he must marry one of them.

JANE: **You know** perfectly well I do not believe marriage should be driven by thoughts of money.

LIZZIE: But I have other reasons, **you know I have!**

Lexical Hedges in Male Speech in Bridget Jones's Diary

DANIEL: **I Think** by contract you're expected to give at least 6 weeks notice.

TOM: Then **I Think** as usual

MR FITZHERBERT: **I Think** it's a masterpiece.

DANIEL: I **Think** it's time for this.

MARK: **I Think** I can say, with total confidence, absolutely not.

DANIEL: And **I Think** in the end it's got to be something extraordinary... **I Think** Lara and being American.

TOM: **I Think** that's all we can take of that.

DANIEL: **I think** we're both old enough to put the past behind.

MARK: **Perhaps** it's time to eat then.

MICHAEL: **Perhaps** it's not a good moment.

DANIEL: -just dinner, **perhaps?**

DANIEL: Lots of prospects for a person who **perhaps** for Personal reasons has been slightly overlooked professionally.

MARK: **Perhaps** if we, you know, waited,...

MARK: -is that in fact, **perhaps** against appearances and situations -I like you very much

MARK: Time to start again, **perhaps**

DANIEL: **May** I please have skirt's address and phone number so **May** send flowers?

MARK: **May** I tell her who's calling?

MR FITZHERBERT: It **might** be fun if you introduced me before I introduced him.

DANIEL: It **might** be a charitable thing to take your skirt out for dinner.

MARK: I brought Natasha - I **might** make it a not entirely wasted weekend.

DANIEL: I just wondered - if we **might** have a dinner.

MARK:...there **might** not be two Lives in ruins.

DANIEL: I thought you **might** be on your own.

MARK: I thought it **might** be my job to protect you. ...-actually, this **might** be hard to Fedex.

DANIEL: **Maybe** you could Come, too.

MARK: **Maybe** we should go upstairs for a minute.

MARK: what **I mean** is... **I mean** there are elements of the ridiculous about you.

Lexical Hedges in Female Speech in Bridget Jones's Diary:

BRIDGET: Yes, Daniel, **I Think** I can.

BRIDGET: But **I Think** I'll give dinner a miss.

UNA ALCONBURY: **I Think** it's going to need sieving.

JUDE: **I Think** it's time to kill.

BRIDGET: **I Think** I've got... **I think** I've thrown it away with the newspapers.

MAGDA: **I Think** you should dump him now.

BRIDGET: **I Think** I saw Salmaan handing out cocaine.

BRIDGET: actually **I Think** I'd better get a taxi.

BRIDGET: **I Think** you're wrong.

NATASHA: **I Think** the weakness of their case lies in the deposition they made.

MOTHER: **I Think** he was actually trying to flirt with Penny.

BRIDGET: **I Think** you should know, sit, that this is my last afternoon.

MOTHER: **I Think** I spotted some nice egg and cress.

BRIDGET: **I Think** I'm wearing exactly what I Want to wear, old woman.

BRIDGET: and **I Think** you should rethink the length of your sideburns.

BRIDGET: **Perhaps** she's worried that you might, **you know**, attack him or something.

BRIDGET: I **May** be single, but I will not - repeat, not- be reduced to being match-made with the dreadful children of your awful Friends.

PERPETUA: **May** your children burn in hell

BRIDGET: Come on -a toast to Singleton wherever they **may** be.

BRIDGET: But I see I **may** have come at a bad time.

BRIDGET: **Migh** have been amazement at Number of flat notes in rendering of Nilsson Classic.

MOTHER: We **might** invite the Alconburys over tomorrow.

BRIDGET: **Perhaps** she's worried that you **might**, you know, attack him or something-

BRIDGET: Bernie, **it might** be helpful for me to point out that Daniel's not marrying me.

BRIDGET: ...It **might** be fun and glamorous.

MAGDA: Come on, everyone - we **might** as well eat

MOTHER: ...your area of expertise you **might** be able to offer some advice. ... I **might** ask the nice chap.

BRIDGIT: **Maybe** it's a sort of end of Life crisis.

BRIDGET: But I love him, **maybe**.

BRIDGET: **Maybe** this was the mysterious Mr. Right.

BRIDGET: Yes. **I mean** no.

BRIDGET: **I mean**...not end of life

BRIDGET: ehm, what **I mean is** -

BRIDGET: **I mean** you seem to go out of your way to make me feel like a complete idiot.

BRIDGET: **I mean** his parents are friends of my mom.

BRIDGET: Mark, I'm sorry - I didn't mean it - **I mean** I meant it - but I was stupid.

BRIDGET: I **sometimes** wonder what would happen if I just let myself revert to nature

MOTHER: I do know what I'm like **sometimes**, but it doesn't help that you and Bridget have your lovely grown-up club of two.

RESUMÉ

Bakalářská práce je zaměřena na zjišťování rozdílů ve vyjadřování mužů a žen. Na základě uvedené literatury byly definovány pojmy “řeč” a “gender” a následně byly identifikovány znaky do určité míry typické pro vyjadřovací styl obou pohlaví. Definována byla tzn. ženská řeč, poté byly diskutovány teorie týkající se problematiky odlišného konverzačního stylu mužů a žen vybraných autorek. Zanalyzovány byly vybrané filmy; analýza byla zaměřena zejména na odlišný konverzační styl mužů a žen. Pomocí analýzy výskytu vybraných konverzačních prostředků (tzv. “Lexical Hedges” a “Intensifierů”) byl načrtnut jejich historický vývoj v řeči mužů a žen. Na základě výskytu těchto lingvistických prostředků byl také diskutován status mužů a žen ve společnosti, a to v období, ve kterém se odehrává film *Pýcha a předsudek*, tedy před přibližně dvěma sty lety, a v období, ve kterém se odehrává *Deník Bridget Jonesové*. Následně byly zanalyzovány momenty v dialozích, kdy se zmíněné dva filmy tzv. zrcadlí, neboť *Deník Bridget Jonesové* je inspirován a založen na příběhu *Elizabeth a pana Darcyho z Pýchy a předsudku*. Byly též předloženy návrhy pro budoucí výzkum týkající se stejné nebo podobné problematiky.

ANOTACE

Jméno a příjmení:	Klára Bajtová
Katedra:	Ústav cizích jazyků
Vedoucí práce:	Mgr. Josef Nevařil, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2022

Název práce:	Male and female conversational style in films
Název v angličtině:	Male and female conversational style in films
Anotace práce:	Bakalářská práce se zabývá rozdílným užíváním řeči muži a ženami. Za pomoci uvedených zdrojů byly identifikovány nejvýznamnější rysy takzvané ženské řeči a byly uvedeny teorie vybraných autorek týkající se mužského a ženského konverzačního stylu. Následně byla zanalyzována mužská a ženská řeč ve vybraných filmech, a to zejména za pomoci analýzy počtu vybraných lingvistických prostředků.
Klíčová slova:	Řeč, pohlaví, ženská řeč, konverzační styl, řeč sblížovací, řeč sdělovací, filmy, Pýcha a předsudek, Deník Bridget Jonesové.
Anotace v angličtině:	The bachelor's thesis deals with the different language usage by men and women. The most significant features of the women's speech were identified with the help of sources listed, and selected authors' theories concerning male and female conversational styles were discussed. Consequently, male and female speech in selected films was analyzed, in particular by analysing the number of occurrences of selected linguistic devices.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Language, Gender, Women's talk, Conversational Style, Rapport-talk, Report-talk, Intensifiers, Lexical Hedges, Films, Pride and Prejudice, Bridget Jones's Diary.

Přílohy vázané v práci:	3 přílohy
Rozsah práce:	44s.
Jazyk práce:	AJ