IMPACT OF INTENSIFIER AS WOMEN'S PERSUASION STRATEGY IN POLITICS

Britney Caren Joseph[1], Widyastuti Soewito[2]

[1,2] Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Jl. Lidah Wetan, Kec. Lakarsantri, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60213, Indonesia

Email: britney.19023@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstract: *This study analyses impact of intensifers as persuasive language strategy in politics used by female politician in the presidential debate. The data were in the form of words and sentences. Two primary sources are used in data gathering: vice-presidential debate transcription from USA Today and CNN. The study is a qualitative method focusing to construe in-depth analysis. The theoretical framework used as the main theory to analyse the data were Lakoff's (1975) women language feature and Quirk et al. (1992) types of intensifier. Two research questions are formulated: 1) What type of intensifiers were used by the female politicians in the debate? 2) What is the function of intensifiers used by the female politicians in the debate? The result found that the three types of intensifiers were found. First, the emphasizers were found to be frequently used when female politicians aimed to highlight an important statement. The adding of the emphasis operates as a device to enhance the urgency and seriousness of a particular issue. Second, the amplifiers were found to be frequently used when female politicians wanted to amplify certain statement. Amplifier is a rhetorical and stylistic device that means to make something stronger, louder, and more intense. Finally, downtoners were found to be frequently use when female politicans wanted to reduce the intensity or lessen the force of a particular statement. Furthermore, it was discovered that the two female politicians were using these words as part of a persuasive strategy to convince the constituent.*

Keywords: *intensifier, women's language feature, politic, debate*

Abstrak: Penelitian ini menganalisis dampak *intensifier* sebagai strategi bahasa persuasif dalam politik yang digunakan oleh politisi perempuan dalam debat capres. Data berupa kata dan kalimat. Penelitian ini merupakan metode kualitatif yang berfokus pada konstruksi analisis mendalam. Dua sumber utama digunakan dalam pengumpulan data: transkripsi debat wakil presiden dari USA Today dan CNN. Kerangka teori yang digunakan sebagai teori utama untuk menganalisis data adalah fitur bahasa perempuan Lakoff (1975) dan Quirk et al. (1992) jenis *intensifier*. Dua pertanyaan penelitian dirumuskan: 1) Apa jenis intensifiers yang digunakan oleh para politisi perempuan dalam debat? 2) Apa fungsi alat penguat yang digunakan oleh politisi perempuan dalam debat? Hasil menemukan bahwa ada tiga jenis *intensifier*. Pertama, *emphasizer* ditemukan sering digunakan ketika politisi perempuan bertujuan untuk menyoroti pernyataan penting. Penambahan e*mphasizer* beroperasi sebagai alat untuk meningkatkan urgensi dan keseriusan suatu isu. Kedua, *amplifier* ditemukan sering digunakan ketika politisi perempuan ingin memperkuat pernyataan tertentu. *Amplifier* adalah perangkat retoris dan gaya yang berarti membuat sesuatu lebih kuat, lebih keras, dan lebih intens. Terakhir, *downtoners* ditemukan sering digunakan ketika politisi perempuan ingin mengurangi intensitas atau mengurangi kekuatan pernyataan tertentu. Lebih lanjut, diketahui bahwa kedua politisi perempuan tersebut menggunakan kata-kata tersebut sebagai bagian dari strategi persuasif untuk meyakinkan konstituen politik.

Kata kunci: intensifier, women's language features, politics, debate

Introduction

Women's language in politics, the way they win general election through presidential debate are known to use special linguistics elements. For instance, Hillary Clinton once said "It's just *awfully* good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country," while Trump immediately responded "You'd be in jail" (CNN, 2016). Her statement appear assertive to make it considered seriously by the opponent and the constituent. Language functions differently for a variety of social tasks that are supposedly emphasized by gender, according to cultural norms (Holmes, 2013). Men, for instance, prefer to use language in a more direct manner since they are naturally privileged with authority. Women, on the other hand, are prone to avoid 'manly' speech mannerisms and keep their language pleasant. Their language is marked by uncertainty, politeness, and more meaningless segments or hedges, e.g. "oh dear, well." (Tannen, 1996). Therefore, these societal-based aspects end in affecting how each gender behave to communicate in social settings (Lawless, 2008; Rudman, 2004).

To this, Lakoff proposed women's language features where women's language is distinguished differently from men due to social system. These language features are lexical hedges, tag questions, rising intonation on declaratives, empty adjectives, precise color terms, hypercorrect grammar, super polite forms, avoiding using strong swear words, emphatic stress, and intensifier, which is a boosting device that women use to force emphasis of their statement (Lakoff, 1975). Dealing with intensifier, one of the common ways to intensify words is by adding an adverb. Adverbs can either boost or downgrade the meaning of the word. Quirk et al. (1992) divide intensifiers into three types: emphasizers which aims to indicate that something is particularly important and worth giving attention to, amplifiers which aims to make statement stronger, and downtoners which aims to reduce the force of a statement.

Intensifiers are connected to informal language, nonstandard forms, and emotional expression. In the past, Lakoff (1975) said that as women are more emotionally-focused in their speech, they frequently utilize intensifier expressions to try to communicate their strong sentiments and opinions. In politics, intensifier counts as a persuasion technique to change another's point of view (Setayesh, 2018). Persuasion is commonly understood as human communication that influences others by altering their views, values, or attitudes (Simons,1976, quoted in Mohan, 2013). According to Aristotle, there are three components of persuasive strategy in communication: logos, ethos, and pathos. Simply said, logos denotes persuasion based on logic, ethos denotes persuasion based on the speaker's standing or authority, and pathos denotes persuasion based on emotions and feelings (Aristotle, cited in Kennedy, 2007).

Pathos, as an emotional appeal for persuasion concerns to elicit emotions in the listener. Since humans rely more on their emotions and feelings, Aristotle utilized pathos, which comprises persuasive techniques. The speaker in this situation has to be aware of and in charge of the audience's emotional state. Pathos is the literary term for attracting an audience by stirring their emotions. The speaker can emotionally connect with his audience by using pathos. For instance, a politician would say to his/her constituent, "You will never be

satisfied if you don't take this opportunity, do you want to live years yearning what would've happened if you took the chance?" This technique evokes the emotional appeal or sentiment of the target consitutent (Aristotle, cited in Kennedy, 2007).

Previously, several studies had conducted similar issue. First, Joseph, B.C., Hartanti, L.P., & Leliana, A. (2022) in their study entitled "*The Use of Women's Language Features by Kamala Harris in the Vice-presidential Debate*" analyzed the use of women's linguistic features by Kamala Harris as a female politician with the women's language features theory proposed by Lakoff (1975). The result found that there are five out of ten women's language features used by Kamala Harris in the vice-presidential debates; lexical hedges (16%), empathetic stres (11%), hypercorrect grammar, (33%), super polite form (1%), and intensifier (39%) as most dominant feature. The findings conclude that intensifiers were used by Kamala Harris as a boosting device to add more emphasis to her statement.

Second, Siregar, A. J., & Suastra, I. M. (2020) in their study entitled "*Women and Men Linguistic Features in the First Presidential Debate Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016*" analyzed the use of women's language features used by Hilary Clinton in the second presidential debate 2016. The theory used were women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1975) and men's linguistic features by Coates (2003). The result found that there seven features of ten women linguistic features discovered in this study; lexical hedges (17.5%), rising intonation on declarative (0.4%), empty adjectives (1.1%), intensive adverbs (17.5%), hypercorrect grammar (30.2%), super polite forms (1.9%), and emphatic stress (31.3%). Moreover it was found that empathetic stress (31.3%) was the most dominant.

Third, Fidelia Ratih Widya Wardani and Maria Komang Grace Kristiani in their study entitled "*Women's Langauge Features in Michelle Obama's Speech "The First Lady on the Importance of Studing Abroad*" aims to pinpoint the women's language elements that can be found there. The information was gathered using a descriptive qualitative approach by watching the video of Michelle Obama's speech numerous times and reading the speech's transcript, which was posted on YouTube and contained the women's language features. Utilizing Lakoff's (1975) analysis of women's language, the data were examined. According to the study's findings, 89 items were discovered, of which 18 items (or 20%) are lexical hedges or fillers, 1 item (or 1% of declaratives) uses rising intonation, 13 items (or 15%) are intensifiers, and 57 things (or 64% of them) use emphatic stress.

While previous studies mostly focused on quantitative classification of women's language features used by female politicians in presidential elections debates, this study, however intends to further examine the role of intensifier as a persuasive language tool used among female politicians. Unlike former studies that focus on doing sole identification on women's language features used by female politicians. This study, however, in tends to further analysis intensifier as persuasion strategy used in politics. The theoretical basis adopts Quirk et al. (1992) framework where intensifiers are divided into three types: emphasizers (attitudinal and style disjunct), amplifiers (maximizers and boosters), and minimizers (approximators, compromisers, diminishers/minimizers), which will be elaborated in the following.

1. Emphasizers

The first type of intensifier is emphasizer. Emphasizers expresses the speaker's point of view, making it clear that something is to be considered emphatic and stressed. It classifies into attitudinal disjunct and style disjunct. Each of them has different functions. Attitudinal disjunct aims to comment on the content of what is being said. While style disjunct emphasizes the style or manner in which they are speaking (Sardabi, 2015).

Attitudinal Disjuncts	Style Disjunct
actually, certainly, clearly, definitely, indeed, obviously, plainly, really, surely: for certain, for sure, of course, surely	frankly, honestly, literally, simply: fairly, just

2. Amplifiers

The second type of intensifier is amplifier. Amplifiers increase the strength of the modified word. It categorizes into maximizers and boosters where each is used in slight different ways. In some cases, it is quite challenging to tell them apart. They differ in terms of semantics. Maximizers are used to modify non-gradable objects, whereas boosters are used to modify gradable goods like tall and short (Sardabi, 2015).

Maximizers	Boosters
absolutely, altogether, completely, entirely, extremely, fully, perfectly, quite, thoroughly, very, totally, in all respects, the superlative most	badly, bitterly, deeply, enormously, far, greatly, heartily, highly, intensely, much, severely, so, strongly, terribly, a great deal, a good deal, a lot,

3. Downtoners

The third type of intensifier is downtoner. Downtoners diminish the strength of the modified word. It categorizes into three types which are compromisers, diminishers/minimizers, and approximators. (Sardabi, 2015). Compromisers are used for small group that implies the speaker is not entirely certain. Diminishers/minimizers reduce the effect of the modified word Diminishers reduce the strength of the statement and are the opposition of boosters. While Approximators suggest that the quality is close but not in fact quite there yet.

Compromiser	Diminishers/Minimizers	Approximators
Quite, sort of, rather, enough, sufficiently, more or less	Mildly, moderately, partially, partly, slightly, somewhat; respects, to some extent; a little, least	Almost, nearly, virtually, as good as, practically, all but, slightest, at all

Dealing with the use of intensifiers by female politicians as persuasive language strategy, this study formulates two research problems: 1) What type of intensifiers were used by the female politicians in the debate? 2) What is the function of intensifiers used by the female politicians in the debate?

Research Method

This study employs the inductive qualitative research method. Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2021) state that qualitative methods are mostly concerned in observing human interaction and how meaning can be interpreted through words and action. Two primary data sources in this study are Kamala Harris vice-presidential debate transcription from https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/10/08/vice-presidential-debate-full-transcript-mike-pence-and-kamala-harris/5920773002/, and Hillary Clinton presidential debate transcription from https://edition.cnn.com/2016/10/10/politics/presidential-debate-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-quotes/index.html. The data were in the form of word and sentences and taken through documentation. The theoretical framework used as the main theory to analyse the data were Lakoff's (1975) women language feature and Quirk et al. (1992) types of intensifier. The key instrument relies on the researcher. The data analysis technique consists of four steps: skimming the transcript, analyzing the data and coding with theory of intensifier by Quirk et al. (1992), interpreting the result and discussion, and presenting the data.

Result and Discussion

The result found that the three types of intensifiers were found. First, the emphasizers were found to be frequently used when female politicians aimed to highlight an important statement. The adding of the emphasis operates as a device to enhance the urgency and seriousness of a particular issue. Second, the amplifiers were found to be frequently used when female politicians wanted to amplify certain statement. Amplifier is a rhetorical and stylistic device that means to make something stronger, louder, and more intense. Finally, downtoners were found to be frequently use when female politicans wanted to reduce the intensity or lessen the force of a particular statement. Moreover, these modifiers were found to give idea in persuasive strategy on how the constituent should react to the particular issue. Furthermore, a detailed description of each type and its examples will be provided orderly in the following.

The distribution of Emphasizers

The first type of intensifier is emphasizer. It was found that emphasizers were used by female politicians to give emphasis the important statement and that it is worthy to give attention to. Quirk et al. (1992) divided emphasizer into attitudinal and style disjunct.

Attitudinal Disjunct

Attitudinal disjunct was found to be used as a persuasive technique to express the female politicians' certainty by adding an emphasis in their statement. Attitudinal disjunct found were **Clearly**, **Actually**, **Of Course**, **Certainly**, and **Really** as elaborated in the following.

> (1) MIKE: President Donald Trump has put the health of America first. Before there were more than five cases in the United States, all people who had returned from China, President Donald Trump did what no other American president had ever done …
> SUSAN: Thank you, Vice President Pence. Senator Harris, would you like to respond?

KAMALA: Whatever the vice president is claiming the administration has done, **clearly**, it hasn't worked. When you're looking at over 210,000 dead bodies in our country.

In datum (1), Kamala Harris talked about how the Trump administration's coronavirus prevention plan did not successfuly work since there are serious loss over 210.000 dead bodies due to the virus. In here, Kamala employed **clearly**, an attitudinal disjunct that express her attitude towards the content of what is being said. Attitudinal disjunct may either expresses the degrees of certainty and doubt as to what is being said. Hence, **clearly** as a persuasive strategy intends to show the constituent about the validity that the Trump's administration plan to ban China as coronavirus prevention was a total failure.

(2) TRUMP: I'll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. Companies will come. They will expand. New companies will start.
HOLT: Secretary Clinton, would you like to respond?
CLINTON: We need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. We just have a different view about what's best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will **actually** produce jobs and rising incomes.

In datum (2), Hillary Clinton responded to Trump's plan to reduce taxes tremendously for companies in which he prospected company expansion and growth further. She disagreed with Trump's plan, and stated that she and Trump had different view in viewing what's best for the economy growth. In her last line, Clinton employed **actually**, an attitudinal disjunct that she use to emphasize the truth of an assertion. Hence, **actually** as a persuasive strategy intends to show the constituent that in reality, Trump's ongoing plan was a mess, and it was contrary to what he had said and expected.

(3) MIKE: President Donald Trump got us out of the deal and when Qassem Soleimani was traveling to Baghda to harm Americans, President Donald Trump took him out.
HARRIS: …you mentioned Soleimani. Let's start there. So, after the strike on Soleimani, there was a counter strike on our troops in Iraq, and they suffered serious brain injuries, and you know what Donald called it? Headaches. Donald went to Arlington cemetery and stood above the graves of our fallen heroes and said, "What's in it for them?" Because **of course** he only thinks about what's in it for him.

In datum (3), Kamala Harris responded to Mike Pence's statement where Trump took Soleimani out before he harmed Americans. She stated that after the Soleimani attack there was a counter strike on American troops in Iraq and they had serious injuries but Trump with ignorance said it was a headache. Not only that, Trump also went to the Arlington cemetery and stood above the fallen heroes graves and said, "What's in it for them?" In her last line, kamala employed **of course**, an attitudinal disjunct that emphasizes her certainty toward her statement. Hence, **of course** as a persuasive strategy intends to show the constituent about the validity that Trump never cared about the American troops and only thought about himself.

(4) HOLT: One of you will not win this election, so many final question to you tonight: are you willing to accept the outcome as the will of the voters?
CLINTON: Well, support our democracy. And sometimes you win. Sometimes you lose. But I **certainly** support the outcome of this election.

In datum (4), Hillary Clinton responded to the moderator's question on whether Hillary would accept the outcome of the voters. She stated that she supported their democracy and there are win and lose. In her last line, she employed **certainly**, an attitudinal disjunct that emphasize certainty toward her statement. Hence, **certainly** is a persuasive strategy that intends to show the constituent about Hillary's certainty in supporting whatever the outcome of the election. It is a technique to evoke the constituent strategy through emotional response by creating a down-to-earth self-image.

> (5) TRUMP: We need law and order in the inner cities. Because the people that are most affected by what's happening are African-American and Hispanic people.
> HOLT: Secretary Clinton?
> CLINTON: I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's **really** unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country.

In datum (5), Hillary Clinton responded to the moderator's perception on the current law against black communities. She stated that she heard Donald said something at his rallies, and she thought it was unfortunate the way he painted a negative picture of the black communities in the United States. In here, she employed **really**, an attitudinal disjunct that emphasizes seriousness and sincerity of her statement. Hence, **really** is a persuasive strategy that intends to show the constituent that it is a serious matter that Donald Trump, as the president, had to paint a negative picture of black communities in our country. And, it needs to be taken seriously.

Style Disjunct

Aside attitudinal disjunct, there is style disjunct. Style disjunct was found to be used as a persuasive technique to express the style or manner in which the female politicians are speaking. It conveys their assertion of truth. Style disjunct found were **Frankly** and **Literally,** as elaborated in the following.

> (6) KAMALA: …. And our plan is about a national strategy for contact tracing, testing, administration of the vaccine, and making sure it will be free for all. That is the plan Joe Biden and I have. And Joe Biden is the best leader to do that. And **frankly** this administration has forfeited their-
> SUSAN: Thank you, Senator Harris-
> KAMALA: … right to reelection based on this.

In datum (6), Kamala Harris talked about how the Trump's administration took toll in governing the pandemic. She claimed that the administration had known what was happening but chose not to tell the public and said that the virus was only a hoax. As a consequence, 210.000 people were dead, over 7 million people contracted the disease. In here Kamala employed **frankly**, a style disjunct that emphasize the truth of a statement in an honest manner or style. Hence, the use of **frankly** is a persuasive strategy to show the constituent that Kamala was telling in honesty that the administration has forfeited their right to re-election based on the particular problem.'

> (7) SUSAN: …do voters have a right to know more detailed health information about presidential candidates, especially when they're facing some kind of challenge?
> KAMALA: …Joe Biden has been so transparent. And by contrast the President has not, both in terms of health records, but let's look at taxes. Donald Trump paid $750 in taxes. When I first

heard about it, I **literally** said, "You mean $750?" We now know Donald Trump owes debt for $400 million. And **just** so everyone is clear, when we say in debt, it means you owe money to somebody. And it'd be really good to know who the President of the United States owes money to because the American people have a right to know what is influencing the President's decisions.

In datum (7), Kamala Harris answered the host, Susan Page's question on whether voters have the right to know about health information and presidential candidates. In response, Kamala stated a comparison where Joe Biden was transparent whereas trump was not in both health and tax records. In the third line, Kamala employed **literally,** a style disjunct that emphasize the truthfulness of her statement in an honest style. She highlighted the fact where she was truly surprised to know that Trump paid $750 taxes. Consequently, Kamala also employed **just**, a style disjunct that emphasize the preciseness of her statement. She made sure everyone understood that debt meant owing money to somebody, and that it'd be great to know who the president owes money to. Hence, **literally** and **just** are persuasive strategies to show the constituent that Trump's lack of transparency in tax and debt information is serious matter.

The distribution of Amplifiers

The second type of intensifier is amplifier. It was found that amplifiers were used by the female politicians as a boosting device to strengthen the force of a statement by female politicians. Quirk et al. (1992) divided amplifier into maximisers and boosters.

Maximisers

Maximisers were found to be used by female politicians as a persuasive strategy to emphasize and strengthen statements by intensifying non-gradable words. Maximisers found were **absolutely**, **Incredibly**, and **Very** as elaborated in the following.

(8) TRUMP: I think I did a great job and a great service, not only for the country but even for the president in getting him to produce his birth certificate.
HOLT: Secretary Clinton?
CLINTON: He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was **absolutely** no evidence for it…

In datum (8), Hillary Clinton responded the host question on the issue of previous United States president, Barrack Obama. As seen, Hillary disagreed with Trump's statement. She mentioned that Trump started his political activity based on racist lie that president Barrack Obama was not an American citizen. Her statement suggested there was no evidence. In stating it, she employed **absolutely**, a maximiser that strengthen the force of her statement. Clinton used **absolutely** in her utterance to modify her statement as a persuasive strategy. She put emphasis on the fact that there was no evidence that Barrack Obama was not an American.

(9) SUSAN: Do voters have a right to know more detailed health information about presidential candidates, especially when they're facing some kind of challenge?
KAMALA: Joe has been **incredibly** transparent over many, many years. The one thing we all know about Joe, he puts it all out there. He is honest, he is forthright, but Donald Trump on the other hand has been about covering up everything.

In datum (9), Kamala Harris responded to the host question on whether voters have a right to know more detailed health information about the presidential candidates, especially when they're facing challenges. In response, Kamala employed **incredibly** in her first line, a maximiser that strengthen the force of her statement. Kamala used **incredibly** in her utterance to modify her statement into a persuasive strategy. She put emphasis on the fact that Joe Biden was very transparent over many years. She also made a comparison with former president Donald Trump.

> (10) SUSAN: What exactly would be the stance of a Biden-Harris administration toward the Green New Deal? You have two minutes uninterrupted.
> KAMALA: So, first of all, I will repeat and the American people know that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. That is a fact. That is a fact. I will repeat that Joe Biden has been **very** clear that he thinks about growing jobs, which is why he will not increase taxes for anyone who makes less than $400,000 a year. Joe Biden's economic plan…

In datum (10), Kamala Harris answered the host question on what would be the stance of a Biden-Harris administration toward the Green New Deal. Before she goes to her point, Kamala made a disclaimer that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. She made her statement strong by repeating her phrases such as "That is a fact that is a fact. I will repeat." She also employed **very,** a maximiser that strengthen the force of her statement to a great degree. Kamala used **very** in her utterance is to modify her statement as a persuasive strategy. She put emphasis on the fact that Joe Biden will not increase taxes for anyone making less than $400,000 a year.

Boosters

Boosters were found to be used as a persuasive technique to add emphasize and strengthen statement and make it more strongly. Unlike maximisers, boosters modify gradable objects. Boosters found were **So** and **Strongly**, as elaborated in the following.

> (11) HOLT: Our next segment is securing America. We want to start with a 21st century war happening every day in this country, our institutions are under cyber attack, and our secrets are being stolen. My question is, who's behind it, and how do we fight it? Secretary Clinton, answer goes to you.
> CLINTON: I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go? How much would we do? And that's why I was **so** shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is, that is just unacceptable.

In datum (11), Hillary Clinton answered about who is behind cyber attacks and how could the United States fight. Initially, Hillary disclaimed that the United States is one step ahead than Russia, China, Iran, and anybody else in terms of national cybersecurity. And with that, Hillary stated that the states did not want to use their technology to engage in warfare. However, quite contradictory, Hillary mentioned that Trump invited Putin to hack into Americans. She employed **So***,* an amplifier booster that strengthen gradable objects in her statement. It emphasizes Hillary's shock expression toward Trump's decision to invite Putin to hack into Americans. This technique is a great persuasive method as it helps emphasis the point she wanted the constituent to focus.

(12) CLINTON: Many young African-American ended up in jail, and it's just a fact that if you're a young African-American man and do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested. I believe **strongly** that common sense gun safety measures would assist us right now, and this is something Donald has supported along with the gun lobby. Right now we've got too many military style weapons on the streets, in a lot of places our police are outgunned.

In datum (12), Hillary Clinton responded to the issue of criminal system in the United States that was motivated with the legal gun law. She stated her opinion in the second line while employed **Strongly**, a booster that strengthen gradable object in her statement. It emphasizes the persuasive and determinedness of her opinion that common sense gun safety measures would be the right step to assist the crime issue in the United States.

The distribution of Downtoners

The last type of intensifier is downtoners. Downtoners are the opposite of maximisers, it aims to lessen the force of the utterance. It was found that downtoners were used by female politicians to reduce the effect of the statement. Quirk et al. (1992) divided downtoners into compromisers, diminishers/minimisers and approximators, as elaborated in the following.

Compromisers

Compromisers were found to be used by female politicians as a persuasive strategy to tell that something is not entirely certain or exact. Compromisers found were **Quite**, as elaborated in the following.

(13) TRUMP: You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now?
CLINTON: Well, actually, I have thought about this **quite** a bit.
TRUMP: Yeah, for 30 years. [Interruption]
CLINTON: And I have -- well, not **quite** that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again…

In datum (13), Hillary Clinton responded to Trump's question which said why were she just think about solutions on the rise of unemployment in the United States due to the pandemic for after 39 years. She was in an attacked position, and hence that is why she used fillers '**quite**' twice in her statements. As mentioned previously, the use of compromiser may seem quite similar to the use of filler, which is to allow the speaker a moment to consider what to say next. Compromisers imply the confidence levels of speakers. Therefore, the use of **quite** is a hedging device to manipulate her lack of plan, making it seem as if she 'at least' still made efforts to manage things out. This is one of persuasive tool to cover her uncertainty on her plans on unemployment to the opponent and constituent..

Diminishers/Minimizers

Diminishers/maximisers were found to be used by female politicians as a persuasive strategy to reduce the strength of a statement or in other words, it is the antonym of boosters. Diminishers found were **At Least**, as elaborated in the following.

(14) TRUMP: And look at her website. You know what? She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don't think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much.
HOLT: The next segment, we're continuing...
CLINTON: Well, **at least**. I have a plan to fight ISIS.
HOLT: ..achieving prosperity...

TRUMP: No, no, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do.

In datum (14), Hillary Clinton answered Trump's attack where it was stated that Hillary had created a website where it tells how to fight ISIS. Trump consider her website as a failure since it leaked the United States' tactics and information to the enemy. Responding to this, Hillary hedged by employing the word **at least** which counts as a diminisher. Diminisher is the opposite of emphasizer. Therefore, her purpose of using diminisher is to downtone her wrongs; and as a justification strategy. Despite the fact that her method on fighting ISIS through the creation of website is poor, '**at least**' she still has a plan. Therefore, her purpose of using "at least" is to emphasize or reduce the effect of a statement. This is a persuasive strategy to manipulate the opponent and constituent by centraling on the positive qualities.

Approximators

Finally, there are approximators. Approximators were found to be used by female politicians as a persuasive strategy to imply that the quality is close but not quite there yet. Approximators found were **Almost,** as elaborated in the following.

(15) HARRIS: Well, on the issue of jobs.
PAGE: Senator Harris.
HARRIS: You lost that trade war. What ended up happening is because of a so-called trade war with China, America lost 300,000 manufacturing jobs. Farmers have experienced bankruptcy because of it. They will have lost more jobs than **almost** any other presidential administration and the American people know what I'm talking about.

In datum (15), Kamala Harris talked on the issue of job amid the trade war with China which result in the loss of 300,000 manufacturing job of America. In here, Kamala employed the approximator **almost** in her statement. Approximators tell the degree of certainty of the speaker. While approximations might also be used if incomplete information prevents use of exact representations. Therefore, the purpose Kamala uses '**almost**' in her statement is to imply that trump's presidential administration has the most unemployment but she was not too certain–hence, that is why she employed '**almost**' as an approximator since she could not tell exactly whether Trump's administration had the most unemployment. This is a persuasive strategy to drop the opponent.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the result found that there are three different intensifier types present. First, it was discovered that female politicians commonly employed emphasizers to draw attention and highlight a crucial point. The addition of emphasis serves as a tool to increase the importance and urgency of a certain problem. Second, it was discovered that female politicians frequently employed the amplifiers to emphasize a certain remark. A rhetorical and artistic tactic, amplifier refers to the process of making anything more powerful, louder, and intense. Finally, it was shown that downtoners were commonly used by female politicians to minimize the impact of a specific remark or to lower its intensity. Furthermore, it was found that these terms were being used by the two female politicians as a means of persuasion to fight the opponent as well as to attract support from the constituent.

Britney Caren Joseph, et al.

References

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (8th ed.).* New York: Mc Graw HIl

Joseph, B.C., Hartanti, L.P., & Leliana, A. (2022). The Use of Women's Language Features by Kamala Harris in the Vice-presidential Debate. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2021 (IJCAH 2021).*

Kennedy, G. A. (2007). *Aristotle on Rhetoric.* New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th ed.).* USA: Routledge.

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

Lakoff., R. (2003). *"Language, Gender, and Politics: Putting "Women" and "Power" in the Same Sentence,"* in The Handbook of Language and Gender, J. Holmes and M. Myerhoff, Ed. MA: Blackwell Publishing. pp. 161-178.

Lawless, J.L., Pearson, K. (2008). "The Primary Reason for Women's Underrepresentation? Reevaluating the Conventional Wisdom." *Journal of Politics*, pp. 67-82. DOI: doi:10.1017/S002238160708005X

Mohan, B. (2013). A study of the use of persuasive strategies in Religious Oratory. *International Journal of Research (IJR).*Volume (1), (2).

Quirk, R. G. (1992). *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* Longman Group Ltd.

Rudman, L.A., Goodwin, S.A. (2004). "Gender Differences in Automatic In-group Bias: Why Do Women Like Women More Than Men Like Men?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, pp. 494-509. DOI: doi:10.1037/0022- 3514.87.4.494

Sardabi, N. &. (2015). Genderdifferences in the use of intensifiers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(7), 203-213.

Setayesh, B. & D. (2018). A corpus-based contrastive analysis of the frequency of intensifiers in native and Iranian non-native English Speakers appliedlinguistics research articles (RAs). *International Journal of Informatics, Technology & Computers*, 1(1), 49–78.

Siregar, A. J., & Suastra, I. M. (2020). Women and Men Linguistic Features in the First Presidential Debate Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016. *Udayana Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (UJoSSH)*, 4(1), 1.

Tannen, D. (1996). *Gender and Discourse.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wardani, Fidelia & Kristiani, Maria. (2020). Women's Language Features in Michelle Obama's Speech "The First Lady on the Importance of Studing Abroad." *ELTR Journal.* 1. 61-67. 10.37147/eltr.v1i2.44. https://doi.org/10.24843/UJOSSH.2020.V04.I01.P01

https://edition.cnn.com/2016/10/10/politics/presidential-debate-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-quotes/index.html

https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/10/08/vice-presidential-debate-full-transcript-mike-pence-and-kamala-harris/5920773002/