A Comparative Study of the Lexical Differences in Speech of the Graduate Working and Non-Working Women in District Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Reema Usman, Humaira Riaz and Muhammad Ishtiaq
City University of Science & IT, Peshawar Pakistan

Previous studies delineate speeches of men and women on the basis of gender, ignoring factors like context and social roles, which the present study takes into consideration by exploring the lexical differences in speech of the graduate working and non-working women in District Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa; stereotyped for following the patriarchal norms. The study evaluates differences in the use of lexical items based on context-based authority, not gender and challenges Lakoff's (1975) theory of women's language as powerless in the context of KP. Mixed method research and Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis technique (CDA) help to analyse five features from women's language namely lexical hedges, adjectives, intensifiers, minimal responses and super polite forms. The research sample comprises fifteen female participants;six non-working graduate women and nine working graduate women selected randomly from the district Peshawar. Data is collected through semi-structured interviews.The study finds that non-working women use five lexical items 1,261 times i.e. 34.84 % whereas working women employed these 777 times i.e. 17.73 % illustrating a difference of 484. The study concludes that women's speech changes as the roles change particularly as per the context-based authority, not gender. The present study is helpful in understanding the sociolinguistic perspective of women's language in KP. In future, researchers may investigate women's speech in English learning classrooms in KP .

Keywords: Lakoff; Powerless speech; Lexical items;Peshawar KP; Working woman;Non-working woman

Language and gender are the most debated topics in the contemporary world. Mostly researchers in the westinvestigated gender-based differences in language (Fishman, 1980; Holmes, 1984; Montgomery, 1995; Wardhaugh, 2006). InKP, Pakistan, less attention is paid to women's speech considering context and social status as determining factors. In fact, "Pakistan,more specifically, comes into the region of classic patriarchy where women not only observe but are victims of stereotypical patriarchal traditions" (Moghadam, 1992; Kandiyoti, 1988; Snauddin, 2015). Linguistic choices used for women in Pakistan are quite different from those used for men.

Social roles and context make speech powerful. Women's status in District Peshawar is influenced by ethnic background and women "are under the heavy weight of

patriarchy…not fit for taking part in the public sphere" (Ahmed et al., 2019). However, despite of being overlooked and degraded, women from KP challenged patriarchal norms namely *Zamkhulakezibalaram* "I too have a tongue in my mouth" (Sanauddin, 2015).

Lakoff (1975) explored that "women in their speech use ten linguistic features which make their speech deficit". Women's use of hedges or fillers such as "*You know*" or *"Aaa"*indicate their powerless social position (as cited in Holmes, 2013). Women speech is deficit compared to men (Sanauddin 2015).Presence of these features in women's speech is the sign of women's insecurity and powerlessness (Lakoff cited in Amanda, 2017).

"Gender identities are individual as well as social and thus subject to change among different generations, situations and language users" (Litosseliti, 2013). Thus, speech is genderless and restricting speech to gender is only a biased representation of speech.

Theoretical Framework and Review of Literature

Lakoff's theory used as a standpoint for the analysismaintains thatwomen speech is powerless due to the presence of ten linguistic features. She connected ten linguistic items namely hedges, tag questions, intensifiers, minimal responses, empty adjectives, polite forms, intonation emphasis, colour terms, super polite forms and swear words considering their use characteristic of women speech illustrating the inferior social status of women. It asserts that women, in their speech, frequently use these features, which create negative impact on women and their status in society. Lakoff(1975) named the linguistic items, comprising a specific language style, as "women's language," characteristic of every woman's speech. These 'women's language' items are problematized in the sense that as they add to the subjugation of "women's personal identity by denying her the means of expressing herself strongly".

Lakoff (1975) asserted that the inferior status of women's speech was due to their powerless position in the society. It was powerless due to

"their empty vocabulary, their weedier exclamations, their tendency to be over-polite…their intonation patterns indicate their uncertainty and speaker's approval…other features that indicate their insecurity are tag questions and the use of more intensifiers and qualifiers" (cited in Litosseliti, 2013).

District Peshawar is falsified for its women being underrated and docile. The present study explores the lexical differences of working and non-working graduate women in District Peshawar, KP to challenge Lakoff's theory in the contemporary context.Due to the time constraint, it analyses only five features as indicators of powerless speech.Occurrence of these features is investigated in the speech of working and non-working graduate women to conformthat women speech varies according to their social positioning. It is delimited to Lakoff's five language features; hedges, adjectives, minimal responses, intensifiers and super polite forms.

Women's Speech from the Perspective of Dominance Approach

A more empirical and dominance perspective found that women in speech used more hedges and tag questions than men (Fishman, 1983). Brown and Gilman (1960) also based their findings on the context by focusing power and solidarity. Gender studiesassociates power with 'men's speech' while solidarity is associated with 'women's speech.' However, solidarity also indicated the social distance between two people.Men and women used fewer hedges in formal context than in informal context, challenging Lakoff's claim (Dixon & Foster, 1997). A study on four lexical items namely tag questions, intensifiers, minimal responses and hedges of "tentative language" under six conversational aspects like gender, status, relation among participants, setting, discussion activity and size of the group confirmed that women used tentative language more than men (Leaper &Robnett, 2011).

Feminist Critique of Women's Speech

Difference between men and women in every aspect of their social life is a cultural imposition.Contemporary gendered discourses embody and reconstitute, and challenge gendered social practices.Gender is seen as multifaceted identity, continually being constructed and performed (Sunderland, 2006). Constitutive potential also contributes to the gender and language study. Power interfaces with both gender and discourse."Power is seen as a continuous fluctuation, flexible and manifold, so that a given member in a given condition is located by and within the system of speeches" (Baxter, 2002 as cited in Sunderland, 2006).Pakistani women continuously change and develop with time (Ahmad, 2009, Ghani etal., 2007, Rind et.al., 2015).

Objectives of the Study
1. To challenge Lakoff's idea of women language as powerless by examining the lexical items in the speech of working and non-working graduate women in District Peshawar, KP
2. To explore differences in the use of lexical items of the working and non-working graduate women in District Peshawar based on context-based authority, not gender

Theoretical Framework

The researcher challenges Lakoff's (1975) theory regarding women's language on the basis of its relation to the women's speech in society. Lakoff developed a connection in language, gender and power relationships asserting that women in their speech frequently used tag questions, hedges, intensifiers, amplifiers, minimal responses, polite forms, question sentences, intonation emphasis, and other features, which created a negative impact on women, and weakens women's position in society.

Lakoff named these linguistic items, comprising a specific language style, as "women's language," characteristic of every woman's speech. These items were problematized as they added to the subjugation of "women's personal identity by denying her the means of expressing herself strongly". Discriminationsagainst women in society may also be associated to their linguistic exposure in patriarchal societies.

THE LEXICAL DIFFERENCES IN SPEECH

Lexical Hedges or Filler
Hedge or filler is a lexical item that reduces the force of an utterance. Hedges are the sign of speaker's insecurity (Talbot, 2010). Hedges express uncertainty, politeness, certainty and vocalizations (Lakoff, 1975).

Intensifier
Intensifiers increase or decrease the intensity of an utterance. These reinforce, convey the emotive function of message, and strengthen the statements for seriousness (Holmes 1984; Amanda, 2017).

Minimal Responses
Minimal responses are attributes frequently used by women, however, these forms should not be assumed as signs of powerlessness rather these forms the best conversational strategies (Coates,2004).

Empty Adjectives
Women use empty adjectives to express emotions,admiration or approval used by both sexes (Lakoff, 1975).

Super-polite Forms
Super-polite forms are used to avoid swear words, euphemism, assertion and use more particles in a request sentence (as cited in Lakoff, 1975). However, it does not lower the speaker's position (Amanda, 2017).

Method
Women's language limits women's means of expression as well as suppresses their identity. Possible differences of goals in different roles of the women constitute the powerful and powerless patterns of speech. The present study uses Fairclough's 3-D Model (1989) to analyse the speech items in women's speech, which elaborated the link between language, power and ideology. Its 3 dimensions of analysis are 1) textual analysis (description), 2) Processing analysis (interpretation), 3) Social Analysis (explanation).

"Linguistic analysis includes the analysis of grammar, vocabulary, sound system, semantics and cohesion organization above the sentence level" (Fairclough,1995). This study, has considered open-ended responses of the selected Pashtoon working and non-working graduate female participants as "Text". Processing Analysis shows the relationship between discourse processes and the text. Reading is a product of interface between the properties of the text and the interpretive resources and practices, which the interpreter brings to bear upon the text. It interprets the collected data (lexical items) by analysing the whole context in which the data is collected and provides a relationship between the data and the context i.e. age, education, profession, family background and setting. "Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context with the social determination of the process of production and interpretation, and their social effects" (Fairclough, 1989). Hence, the analysis focuses on the language and individual words shaping text. Social factors such as

ideology or power are crucial to fully explain the interaction between socio-cultural context and the production and consumption of texts.

Data Collection Tool

The present study used semi-structured interviews as tool for collecting data. Semi-structured interviews consisting of 10 question help guide the conversation and keep the respondents focused. Responses of each participant were recorded via tape recorder and transcribed manually by gathering notes focusing context, nuances, and meanings.Data in the form of lexical itemswas arranged into tables to compare the quantity of the 5 selected lexical items in two different contexts i.e. household and work place.

Sampling and Population

The research sample consisted of 15 graduate working and non-working women, selected randomlythrough stratifiedsampling technique from district Peshawar. The researcher divided the research population into two strata on the basis of their gender, job and education level. Thus, the research sample includes women withhigher education that is from Bachelors (B.A) to Masters (M.A) with a difference of income level. The researcher took9 graduate women from the working womengroup while 6 graduate womenfrom the non-working group. Graduate working women group is further divided into three sub-stratasuch as three medical officers, three lady police constables and three bank officers.Following the research ethics, the participants' identity was kept confidential and used label as 'Interviewee I, II, III ... XVI' for each participant.

Following section has two dimensions i.e. text and interpretation to investigate the lexical differences in the speech of working and non-working graduate women in various contexts.

Interviewee I (Technician in Hospital)

Interviewee I from districtPeshawar,graduate in Arts with Pathology diploma is a technician in Hospital.Following data was collected from her interview.

Table 1

Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee I:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of	Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	02+09=11		2.933%
2.	-	Adj.	28		7.466%
3.	-	I.	03		0.8%
4.	-	M.R	10		2.66%
5.	-	SPF	-		00%
Total	**375**	**52**			**13.86%**

Table 1 illustrates the lowest number of lexical items i.e. 52 of 375 utterances with 13.86 %. used by Interviewee I. She used 11 lexical hedges i.e.2.933 % of which 2 are hedges e.g. 'My thinking', 'You know' and the remaining 9 are fillers like 'aaa', 'eee' and 'likely.' Lakoff proposed that women used the highest number of lexical hedges as compared to men however, it turnedthe contrary. Adjectives in her speech occurred 28

times with 7.466 %though a highest percentage was expected. She used only 3 intensifiers with 0.8 %indicating she did not assert herself or her position. Interviewee I used fewer intensifiers.Although minimal responses as a strategy to improve the conversation, show the responsive attitude of the listener, however she uttered 10 minimal responses implying her lack of command of English responding in 'yes', 'no', 'hmmm' etc.Super polite forms were hardly usedprobably due to work environment. Overall, she used 52 lexical items.

Interviewee II (NTI as Post-Doc House Officer)

Interviewee II, from Swat, MBBS graduated from Saidu Medical College Swat works as NTI-a Post-Doc house officer. Following data was collected from her responses during interview.

Table 2
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee II:

No.	Total	Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-		L.H+F	14+90 =104	6.071%
2.	-		Adj.	147	8.581%
3.	-		I	98	5.720%
4.	-		M.R	09	0.525%
5.	-		SPF	-	00%
Total	**1,713**			**358**	**20.89%**

Table 2 illustrates the lexical items used by Interviewee II. Among all the working women participants, she used the highest number of lexical items i.e. 358 out of 1,713 with 20.89 %. She used 147 adjectives with 8.581% of the entiredata. Most common adjectives used by her included 'good', 'negative', 'positive', 'important', 'educated'. She used lexical hedges 104 times including hedging device 'I think' occurring 14 times; the remaining 90 were fillers like 'ShukarAlhamdullilah', 'Insha'Allah' indicating her religious zeal. She frequently used fillers e.g. 'likely'/'like', 'aaa' and 'amm' for explanation. Similarly, 98 intensifiers as 'all', 'most', 'just' etc. were used for emphasizing social reforms. She used 09 minimal responses indicating her expressive nature. She frequently used responses like 'aaaaaa' when recalling the words. Her speech lacked super polite forms. Overall, her speech did not appear powerless rather her profession demandedthe use of such items in dealings.

Interviewee III(House Officer in Surgical Unit)

Interviewee III MBBS graduate from Saidu Medical CollegeSwat is a House Officer and serves in Surgical Unit. Following data was collected from her interview:

Table 3
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee III:

No.	Total	Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-		L.H+F	06+23=29	4.166%
2.	-		Adj.	36	5.172%
3.	-		I	49	7.040%
4.	-		M.R	05	0.718%
5.	-		SPF	03	0.431 %
Total	**696**			**122**	**17.52%**

Table 3 illustrates lexical items used by Interviewee III during her interview. She uttered 696 words where total 122 lexical items appeared with 17.52 %. Lexical hedges occurred 29 times with 4.166 %. She used 06 typical hedges e.g. 'you know', 'sort of', 'I mean', etc. to initiate the conversation with the interviewer and 29 fillers i.e. 'look', 'just', 'like' and 'aaa;49intensifiers with 7.040 % . Adjectives usedin low frequency constituting 5.172 % were situational e.g. 'supportive', 'successful', 'role model', etc.Minimal responses, 'yes', 'no' and 'obviously' supported the topic. One polite marker 'I would' was repeated 3 times with 0.431 of the data.

Interviewee IV (Operation Manager in Bank)
Interviewee IV, MA Public Administration, works as Operation Manager in a bankof Peshawar. Following number of lexical items were used during her interview.

Table 4
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee IV:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	00+19=19	5.307%
2.	-	Adj.	23	6.424%
3.	-	I	15	4.189%
4.	-	M.R	05	1.396%
5.	-	SPF	-	00%
Total	**358**		**62**	**17.31%**

Table 4 demonstrates the lexical features used62 times of 358 utterances with 17.31%.Responses were direct, precise and formal devoid of hedges while fillers such as 'aaa' and 'amm' occurred 19 times due to difficulty in speaking English. Contextual adjectives used 23 times with 6.424 % e.g. 'banking sector', 'dominant place', 'different jobs', 'present position', etc. Intensifiers occurred in low frequency i.e. 4.189 % asserting her message instead her position. Minimal responses with 1.396 %; the most common response was 'yes'.

Interviewee V (Operation Manager in Bank)
Interviewee V from Peshawar,MA in Public Administration is Operation Manager in one of the banks in Peshawar. From her interview, following data was collected:

Table 5
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee V:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	04+06=10	3.891%
2.	-	Adj.	16	6.225%
3.	-	I	09	3.501%
4.	-	M.R	05	1.945%
5.	-	SPF	02	0.778%
Total	**257**		**42**	**16.34%**

Table 5 illustrates the overall lexical features. Lexical forms occurred 42 times out of 257 utterances forming 16.34 % of her total utterances; 3.891 % of the total

utterances werehedges and fillers such as 'I think', 'I guess' and 'well' and 'Alhamdullilah', 'since', 'like', 'just' and 'since'. Only 16 adjectives, highly contextual e.g. 'work place', 'female education', 'working woman', etc. appeared in her entire interview.Nine causal intensifiers such as 'so', 'very', 'really', etc.with 3.501 % and 5 minimal responses indicated her fluency in English. Like Interviewee III, she repeated 01 polite marker 'I would' twice in her interview. Overall, Interviewee V used minimum lexical features associated with women's speech.

Interviewee VI (General Bank Officer in Peshawar)

Interviewee VI,MSc. in Economics works as General Bank Officer in Peshawar. She used the following lexical items in her interview:

Table 6
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee VI:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H +F	03+12=15	4.249 %
2.	-	Adj.	23	6.515 %
3.	-	I	15	4.249%
4.	-	M.R	06	1.699 %
5.	-	SPF	04	1.133 %
Total	**353**		**63**	**17.84%**

Table 6 indicates the lexical features used by Interviewee VI. In comparison, Interviewee VI scored high in using lexical forms i.e. 63 times out of 353 utterances forming17.84 % of her total utterancesin which 15 were lexical hedges with 4.249 %andonly 3 commonly used hedges i.e. 'I think' and 'I guess' adopted as strategies for the flow of conversation; fillers such as 'since', 'like' and 'aaa' occurred 12 timesfor explaining her stance as well as for recollection. Beside this, adjectives occurred 23 times that make up 6.515 %. Like other participants, her adjectives are related to the topic and context such as 'dominant', 'educated', 'challenging', etc. Intensifiers occurred 15 times with 4.249 % of the total.6 minimal responses 'yes' and 'no' and super polite forms i.e. 'I would prefer' and 'I would like' appeared one and three times respectively with 1.133 %. From her responses, she appeared a calculatedand influential woman.

Interviewee VII (Sub-Inspector in Peshawar Ladies Police)

Interviewee VII, Masters in Urdu serves as sub-inspector in Ladies Police in Peshawar. Following data was recorded during her interview:

Table 7
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee VII:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	00+2= 2	0.833 %
2.	-	Adj.	17	7.083 %
3.	-	I	03	1.25 %
4.	-	M.R	03	1.25 %
5.	-	SPF	-	00 %
Total	**240**		**25**	**10.41%**

Table 7 demonstrates the lexical items used by Interviewee VII;24 utterances in which lexical items appeared 25 times;10.41 % of the total. No hedging device rather 2 most common fillers like 'aaa', 'mmm', 17 adjectives like 'respectable', 'dominating', 'successful' etc.related to the topic and context with 7.083 % of the total, 3 intensifiers 'so', 'very' and 'easily' infrequently appearedin her responses, 3 minimal responses with the most common one 'Yes'. The speech was devoid of super polite forms, which indicated context and situationbased authority.

Interviewee VIII (Assistant Sub-Inspector in Peshawar)

Interviewee VIII,MA in Islamiyatserves as an Assistant Sub-Inspector (ASI) in Ladies Police Station, Peshawar. Following lexical items were recorded during her interview:

Table 8
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee VIII:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	01+03=04	2.173 %
2.	-	Adj.	10	5.434%
3.	-	I	02	1.086 %
4.	-	M.R	08	4.347%
5.	-	SPF	-	00 %
Total	**184**		**24**	**13.04%**

Table 8 shows only 24 lexical items recorded out of 184 utterancesi.e. 13.04 % of total utterances. The speech consisted of 4 lexical hedges making 2.173 %with one hedging device 'I think', one filler 'as a lady police' repeated three times, 10 adjectives like 'respectable', 'peaceful', 'educated', 'successful' etc. within the contextshowing 5.434 %, 2 intensifiers with 1.086 % of her total utterances, 8 minimal responses i.e. 'Yes' was frequent with no super polite form. Interviewee VIII's speech appearedcontext bound.

Interviewee IX (Assistant Sub-Inspector in Peshawar)

Interviewee IX, MA in Islamiyatserves as Assistant Sub-Inspector in Ladies Police Station Peshawar.She used followinglexical items:

Table 9
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee IX:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	02+10=12	5.825%
2.	-	Adj.	13	6.310%
3.	-	I	03	1.456%
4.	-	M.R	01	0.485%
5.	-	SPF	-	00%
Total	**206**		**29**	**14.07%**

Table 9 illustrates Interviewee IX using 29 lexical items out of her 206 utterances i.e. 14.07 %, consisting of 12 hedges where one hedging device i.e. 'I think' was repeated twice and 10 fillers in which the commonest one was 'as a police officer'

and 'aaa.' Adjectives e.g. 'different courses', 'multiple roles', 'key role', 'better way', etc. were contextual; 13 in number i.e. 6.310 %; 3 intensifiers with 1.456 % and the commonest minimal response 'yes' occurred only once infrequently used with 0.485 %.Her speech devoid of any super polite form indicated her authority within the context of her profession.

Table 10

Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Working Women:

No.	Name	Occupation	LH+F	Adj.	I	MR	SPF	Total Utterances	Total Items	Percentage
1.	Interviewee I	Technician	11	28	03	10	-	375	52	13.86%
2.	Interviewee II	Doctor	104	147	98	09	-	1,713	358	20.89%
3.	Interviewee III	Doctor	29	36	49	05	03	696	122	17.52%
4.	Interviewee IV	Operation Manager	19	23	15	05	-	358	62	17.31%
5.	Interviewee V	Operation Manager	10	16	09	05	02	257	42	16.34%
6.	Interviewee VI	Bank Officer	15	23	15	06	04	353	63	17.84%
7.	Interviewee VII	Sub-Inspector	02	17	03	03	-	240	25	10.41%
8.	Interviewee VIII	Assistant Sub-Inspector	04	10	02	08	-	184	24	13.04%
9.	Interviewee IX	Assistant Sub-Inspector	12	13	03	01	-	206	29	14.07%
Sum Total			**206**	**313**	**197**	**52**	**09**	**4,382**	**777**	**17.73%**

Table 10 demonstrates the overall lexical items used by the participants i.e. 777 out of total 4,382 utterances with 17.73 %. The item used less frequently was 'super polite form' occurring 9 times. Next infrequent item was 'minimal responses' used 52 times. Similarly, intensifiers occurred 197 times. Lexical hedge or filler appeared 206 times as the second frequent item. Most frequent item used was adjectives appearing 313 overall. The table reflectsthat the working women used lexical features of women's language less frequently due to context and power-based authority.

Data Analysis of Graduate Non-working Women
Interviewee XI

Interviewee XI, MA in Political Science,is unmarried and non- working woman.

Table 11

Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee XI:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	13+106=119	14.583%
2.	-	Adj.	115	14.093%
3.	-	I	48	5.882%
4.	-	M.R	09	1.102%
5.	-	SPF	02	0.245%
Total	**816**		**293**	**35.90%**

Table 11 shows 816 words with lexical items occurring 293 times i.e. 35.90 % of the data. Frequent lexical items used were hedges appearing 119 times with 14.583 %; 'I think', 'well' and 'you know' occurred 11 times while remaining 108were the most

common fillers like 'aaa', 'amm' and 'Alhamdullilah'.Adjectives at a frequency of 115 appearedforming 14.093 % of the entire data. She used adjectives related to education such as 'high level', 'broad vision', 'positive', 'open-minded', 'wise', 'successful', 'educated', as well as to informal context i.e. 'good', 'important', 'vital', 'hard', 'far away'; the most frequent adjective was 'good. Intensifiers occurred 48 times with 5.882 %. Furthermore, minimal responses occurred 9 times making 1.102 % of the data. 'Aaaa', 'yes' and 'amm' were the most common minimal responsesdue to lack of command on English language. The least frequent item used was super polite form 'I would' occurringonly twice with 0.245% of the entire data. Her speech contained women's speech lexical features due to informal context reflecting her lack of authority.

Interviewee XII

Interviewee XII, a graduate anddiploma holder in Homeopathic, is a young, married non-working woman.

Table 12
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee XII:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H	12+69=81	11.722 %
2.	-	Adj.	95	13.748%
3.	-	I	40	5.788 %
4.	-	M.R	05	0.723 %
5.	-	SPF	-	00%
Total	**691**		**221**	**31.98%**

Table 12 illustrates total 691 utterances where 221 lexical items appeared i.e. 31.98 % of the entire data. Adjective appeared 95 times forming 13.748 %. The most causal adjectives were 'good', 'important', 'supportive', 'Pashtoon society', 'well educated' in accordance with the context. The second most recurring item is lexical hedges used 81 out of which 'you know' and 'I think', 'I guess' were recorded 12 times while the common fillers used by Pashtuns like 'aaa' and 'amm' appeared 69 times with11.722 %.Forty intensifiers formed 5.788 % with recurring 'also', 'very' and 'so'. Beside this, only 5 minimal responses with0.723 % including 'Yes', and 'No' intended to support the speaker as well as insufficient English vocabulary and difficulty in spoken English. No polite forms appeared. Her speech reflected the typicallexical items mentioned by Lakoff (1979).

Interviewee XIII

Interviewee XIII, from Peshawar, MA in Education, is a young unmarried woman.

Table 13
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee XIII:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	12+57=69	21.630%
2.	-	Adj.	26	8.150%
3.	-	I	27	8.463%
4.	-	M.R	06	1.880%
5.	-	SPF	-	00%
Total	**319**		**128**	**40.12%**

THE LEXICAL DIFFERENCES IN SPEECH

Table 13 illustrates 319 utterances throughout her interview with 128 lexical items i.e.40.12 % of the whole data. Lexical hedges occurred69 times with 21.630 % including 8 hedges 'you know' and 'I think' implying her hesitation as she asked the approval of the interviewerfor every responseTypical fillers like 'aaa' and 'amm' occurred 61 times. Intensifiers as 'very', 'so' and 'also' recurred 27 times, while 26 adjectives with mostly recurring expressions e.g. 'good'; 'strict' formed 8.150 % of the entire data. Like Interviewee XII, Interviewee XIIIused minimal responses 'Yes' and 'No' 06 times forming 1.880 % of the data. Her responses lacked polite markers.

Interviewee XIV

Interviewee XIV,MA in Islamiyat, is a house wife living in a joint family system.

Table 14
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee XIV:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	01+70=71	14.853%
2.	-	Adj.	28	5.857%
3.	-	I	25	5.230%
4.	-	M.R	07	1.464%
5.	-	SPF	-	00%
Total	**478**		**131**	**27.40%**

Table 14 shows 478 as the total number of lexical items. A number of 131 items with 27.40 % shows lexical hedges as the recurring item with 01 typical hedge 'I mean' used to justify her stance while the remaining 70 are the typical fillers as 'ammm' and 'aaa.' 71 hedges were recorded comprising 14.853 % of the entire data. Adjectives appeared 28 times with a percentage of 5.857%. She used typical adjectives as 'good', 'better', 'important', 'difficult', etc. Similarly, she used intensifiers 25 times, which were also typical like 'so', 'very' and 'also'. It was probably due her limited vocabulary and less exposure. She uttered minimal responses 'yes', no' and 'hmm' 7 times.' No polite markers occurred in her speech.

Interviewee XV

Interviewee XV, MA in Education and English is a house wife living in joint family system.

Table 15
Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee XV:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H +F	18+173=191	20.405 %
2.	-	Adj.	80	8.547%
3.	-	I	68	7.264 %
4.	-	M.R	15	1.602 %
5.	-	SPF	03	0.320 %
Total	**936**		**357**	**38.14%**

Table 15 represents 357 lexical items out of 936 utterances with 38.14%; the highest score amongst the participants of working and non-working women. Lexical hedges occurred frequently i.e. 191 times with 20.405% in which 18 are hedges such as 'I think', 'You know' and 'well' and the remaining 173 are fillers like 'aaa', 'amm'

articulatedfor recollection; the rest created religious identity e.g. 'Alhamdullilah' and 'Inshallah'. Adjectivewas recorded80 times as the 2nd most recurring item with 8.547 % of thedata. Most typical adjectives such as 'good', 'important', 'respectful', 'educated', gavean idea of her bookish knowledge. Adjectives and intensifiers appeared frequently, 68 times forming 7.264 % with typical intensifiers 'very', 'so', 'also' and some are latest as 'rarely', 'definitely', 'especially'. Minimal responses appeared 15 times with 1.602% e.g. 'yes', no', 'of course' and 'hmm.' As compared to other participants, she used 01 polite marker 'I would' 3 times in her speech. She made efforts to convey her message in English. This indicated her willingness and spirit towards learning.

Interviewee XVI

Interviewee XVIis a young, unmarried woman, holdingMA Degree in Islamiyat.

Table 16

Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Interviewee XVI:

No.	Total Utterances	Lexical Items	Total No. of Items Use	Percentage
1.	-	L.H+F	11+55=66	17.414 %
2.	-	Adj.	28	7.387 %
3.	-	I	25	6.596 %
4.	-	M.R	11	2.902 %
5.	-	SPF	01	0.263%
Total	**379**		**131**	**34.56%**

Table 16 represents 131 lexical items out of 379 with 34.56%. Maximum recorded itemwas lexical hedges i.e. 66 showing 17.41%, in which 11 were general hedges like 'I think' and 'you know' while the remaining 55 were typical fillers as 'aaa' and 'ammm.' Likewise 28 adjectivesformed 7.38 % of the data. The commonest of these were 'good', 'peaceful', 'important', 'educated' observed in the speech of almost every participant. Intensifiers appeared 25 times with 6.59% e.g. very', 'so' and 'also.' On the other hand, 11 minimal responses were recorded with general responses like 'Yes', 'No' and 'of course'.' In addition, 01 polite marker 'I would' formed the least percentage.The speech contained the items similar to the other non-working women's speech items due to informal context and lack of power and social authority.

Table 17

Total No. of Lexical Items Used by Non-working Women:

No.	Name	LH+F	Adj	I	MR	SPF	Total Utterances	Total Items	Percentage
1.	Interviewee X	119	115	48	09	02	816	293	35.90%
2.	Interviewee XI	81	95	40	05	-	691	221	31.98%
3.	Interviewee XII	69	26	27	06	-	319	128	40.12%
4.	Interviewee XIII	71	28	25	07	-	478	131	27.40%
5.	Interviewee XIV	191	80	68	15	03	936	357	38.14%
6.	Interviewee XV	66	28	25	11	01	379	131	34.56%
	Sum Total	**597**	**372**	**233**	**53**	**06**	**3,619**	**1,261**	**34.84%**

THE LEXICAL DIFFERENCES IN SPEECH

The above table shows the total number of lexical items used by non-working women during their interview. Sum total of these items is 1,261 out of 3,619 utterances with 208.1% of the total utterances of the non-working women. Most frequently used item by non-working women was lexical hedges occurring597 times. Adjective recorded 372 times and intensifiers appeared 233 times while 53 minimal responses were noted. The least uttered item was super polite forms occurring just 6 times of the whole data. It is proved from the above table that non-professional women used the lexical items more frequently than the professional women. Difference of about 484 in the use of lexical items is seen among the participants of both the groups.

Discussion

Data analysis illustrated that working women used scholarly adjectives according to the context intended for emotional messages rather than admiration and approval. The second frequent item was intensifier that occurred 150 times, to convey emotional message and strengthen the conversation seeking serious attention (Armida, 2017, p. 48). Likewise, 144 lexical hedges appeared for the tentativeness e.g. 'I guess' and 'well' and reflection like 'aaa', 'amm', for explanation e.g. 'like' and 'since' or as a sign of good omen e.g. 'Alhamdullilah', 'Mashallah' and 'Inshallah.' Hedges were144 as a strategy adopted for ongoing conversation. Lakoff(1979) characterized hedges as the devices used for uncertainty and tentativeness in communication whereas Amanda (2017) defined them increasing the confidence level of females. 24 Minimal responses occurred and 3 polite markers were used by a single participant.

Polite markers were also used as a strategy to avoid suppressed expression and identity (Lakoff, 1979). However, in case of doctors the least use was due to the formal topic and context. It implied that it was their profession's demand to deal the patients graciously. Similarly, women working in Banks used lexical itemsless frequently i.e. 167 lexical items, 62 contextual adjectives as compared to doctors' speech. Lexical hedges as the second frequent items like 'I guess' and 'I think' indicated certainty on the speakers' part while the other hedging devices 'you know' and 'well' showed uncertainty whenasked for the suggestions. Common fillers 'aaa' and 'amm' 'since' and 'like' were used for explanation process. Similarly, 39 intensifiers were recorded in their speech thrice lesser to doctors. Common intensifiers like 'so' and 'very' were used for emphasis rather than assertion. On the other hand, only 16 minimal responses were uttered.Doctorsappeared firm and authoritative with powerful speech displaying no hesitation, uncertainty or insecurity.

Lady police officers used the least number of items i.e. 78 of the total data. They used adjectives 40 times; the highest score recorded in their entire data, however, lowest recorded score as compared to other participants. They used simple but contextual adjectives. They used lexical hedges along with 18 fillers; the most common was 'as a lady police' uttered as assertion of position. 12 minimal responses were used such as 'yes' and 'no' in their answers intended to maintain and accept the topic. Lowest number of intensifiers i.e. 8 including 'so', 'very' and 'all' were used. A remarkable difference was theabsence of super polite form inthe speech of lady police officers indicating theywere commanding and determined ladies of high standing. Hence, claim about women's speech as powerless is doubtful in the case of professional women's speech.

Table 17 illustrated the overall items used by non-working women in their interviews. They used the maximum number of lexical items i.e. 1,261. The calculated difference between the data of working and non-working women speechwas 484. Unlike the working women, the non-working women used 597lexical hedges e.g. 'you know', implying uncertainty. They frequently used fillers i.e. 'aaa' and 'amm' implying hesitation, insufficient vocabulary and poor command on English language; reason being their limited life and activities. Through adjectives, intensifiers and lexical hedges, they explained their stance. They used general type of lexical items, which Lakoff characterized as feminine features. Whereas the second most frequent item occurring in their speech was causal adjectives, 372 in number e.g. 'good', 'hard', 'important', 'narrow-minded', 'hard-minded' etc. Intensifiers were used in high frequency i.e. 233. The most common were 'very', 'so', 'also' repeated often. 53 Minimal responses like 'yes', 'no' and 'hmm' were used in support of the speaker to grip the topic before any response.

To concludeparticipants from both groups demonstrated difference in the speech due to their respective contexts. The non-working women had no self-image; their priority was family andhouse hold. In a patriarchal context of District Peshawar, they earned respect but lacked self-image. Therefore, use of lexical itemsasserted their position and conformed to the social norms designed for women. Working women had different learning experiences to construct their self-image. They were dominant and strong; theirvision broadened reflected in their speech;flexible according to the context.

Conclusion
Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model of Text Analysis (CDA) as a research method helped to analyse the responses of working and non-working graduate women, collected through a semi-structured interview. Based on findings and discussions, the non-working women frequently employed five features in their responses more as compared to the working-women.

The working women employed adjectives in highest frequency whereas as these were the second highest item in the speech of non-working women. Working women mostlyused adjectives based on context intended for meaning and emphasis of the message rather than admiration and praise. They did not conform to the claims of Lakoff that women used empty adjectives, which were more feminine in nature. Non-working women made highest score in Lexical hedges or fillers with a great pace because their spoken English was not strong and they did not have sufficient English vocabulary, which caused pauses in their answers. Their utterances showed inclination to contentment.Intensifiers, in both cases, functioned as boosting device used for emphasis and emotional message. Both working and non-working women used minimal responses to support the speaker or to accept or end the new topic.The least occurred item in the responses of both working and non-working women was super polite form. Reason behind the infrequent use of super polite forms was that the participants of both groups did not have the tendency to use polite markers due to professional engagement and exposure.In a nut shell, both the groups employed five lexical items in their utterances

but with different frequencies. Lexical differences in speech of the graduate working and non-working women in District Peshawar, Khyber PukhtunKhwa, were the result of context-based authority, not gender.

Implication

The present research opens avenue for future researchers in KP to investigate women's language to understand their position in the political and religious context.It also invites the researchers to make a comparative study of men and women speech in different cultural contexts.

References

Ahmad, N., Bano, A. & U. Rehman, A. (2019). "Women's Political Empowerment through Local Government in the Patriarchal Society of Pakistan." *Liberal Arts and Social Sciences International Journal.Vol. 3,* (1), pp. 05.

Ahmed, Z. (2009). "Pakistani Feminist Fiction and the Empowerment of Women" *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies. Vol. 1*, No. (2), pp. 91-92

Amanda, S. (2017). An Analysis of the Use of Women's Language Features by Hillary Clinton in Presidential Debates. A Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements to Obtain the Sarjana Pendidikan Degree in English Language Education. *Sanata Dharma University, YogyAkarta.* pp. 1-51.

Baxter, J. (2002). 'Competing discourses in the classroom: a post-structuralist discourse analysis of girls' and boys' speech in public contexts', *Discourse and Society* 13 (6): 827–42. Also 'Is PDA really an alternative? A reply to Candace West', pp. 843–52.

Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). *'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in T.A. Sebeok* (ed.), Styles in Language, MTI Press, pp. 253-76.Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net>2298.

Coates, J. (2004). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*, (3rd ed.) Longman: Harlow. pp.197.

Dixon, J. A. & Foster, D. H. (1997). "Gender and Hedging: From Sex Differences to Situated Practice." *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 26 (1): 89-107. Doi: 10.1023/A: 102506420547.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, Longman.

Fishman, P. (1980). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Fishman, P. (1983). *Interaction: The Work Women Do*. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Ghani, M. ,Naz,B., &Akram, R. (2007). "Feminism, Language Choice and Discourse Practice: A Pakistani Perspective" *Journal of Research (Languages and Islamic Studies)*, 11(1).

Holmes, J. (1984). 'Hedging your bets and sitting on the fence: Some evidence for hedges as support structure.' TeReo27: 47-62. Retrieved from Researchgate, Hedging_your_bets_and_setting_on_the_fence_some_evidence_for_hedges_as_support_structures. Accessed June 27th, 2020.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). "Bargaining with Patriarchy," *Gender and Society*, *Vol. 2*, No. 3, pp.274-290.

Lakoff, R. (2004). *Language and Women's Place: Text and Commentaries*. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Leaper, C &Robnett, R. (2011). "Women Are More Likely Than Men to Use Tentative Language, Aren't They? A Mete-Analysis Testing for Gender Differences and Moderaters." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 35 (1): 129-142.Doi: 10.1177/0361684310392728

Litosseliti, L. (2013). *Gender and Language: Theory and Practice*. (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge. Pp. 13. Retrieved from http://www.dl1.cuni.cz/pluginfile.php/566783...

Moghadam, V. (1992). "Patriarchy and the Politics of Gender in Modernising Societies in Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan," *International Sociology*, *Vol. 7,* pp.35-53.

Montgomery, M. (1995). *An Introduction to Language and Society*, London: Routledge.

O'Barr, W. M., & Atkins, B. K. (1980). "*Women's Language" or "Powerless Language?"* In S. McConnell-Ginet, N. Borker, & R. Thurman (Eds), Women and Language in Literature and Society, New York: Praeger, 93-110.

Rind, I. &Gritter, K. (2015). Gender identities and female students' learning experiences in studying English as Second Language at a Pakistani University. *Cogent Education.* https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1115574

Snauddin, N. (2015). *Proverbs and Patriarchy: Analysis of Linguistic Sexism and Gender Relations Among the Pashtuns of Pakistan*. A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Glasgow, Scotland. Pp. 65-195.

Sunderland, J. (2006). *Language and Gender: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge Applied Linguistics. Pp. 1-10.

Talbot, M. (2010). *Language and Gender*. (2nd Ed). Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Wardhaugh, R. 2006. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (5th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.

Xu, L. (2009). Power Adjustment in Professional Women's Language-An investigation into the use of directives in the TV-series Cashmere Mafia. The C-level of English Linguistics Elective Course: Language and Gender. University of Kristianstad, p. 1.