DIGLOSIA
Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya
Volume 9 | Nomor 1 | Tahun 2026 | Halaman 59—74
E-ISSN 2615-8655 | P-ISSN 2615-725X
http://diglosiaunmul.com/index.php/diglosia/article/view/1415

From Austen to DeepL: Women's language translation in *Sense and Sensibility*

Dari Austen hingga DeepL: Analisis terjemahan bahasa perempuan dalam "Sense and Sensibility"

Dyah Raina Purwaningsih
Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia
Corresponding email: dyah.purwaningsih@unsoed.ac.id

Article History
Received 14 July 2025
Revised 16 December 2025
Accepted 8 January 2026
Published 15 February 2026

Keywords
equivalence; translation studies; female speech patterns; sense and sensibility; machine translation.

Kata Kunci
kesepadanan; kajian penerjemahan; pola tutur perempuan; sense and sensibility; mesin penerjemah.

Read online
Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

Abstract
This paper aims to analyze the translation of women's language features in Jane Austen's novel *Sense and Sensibility*. The study focuses on understanding how the unique linguistic characteristics of female characters in the novel are rendered in the target language both by the official translator and by DeepL.The researchers are interested in cutting open the translation resulted by those two different translators. The study considers both the linguistic and cultural aspects of the translations, aiming to identify any potential challenges faced by translators in conveying the subtleties of women's language features. The research used qualitative methods. Close reading and textual analysis were employed to identify and examine instances of women's language features in the original text. Theoretically, the findings of this research shed light on the strategies employed by both the human translator and the DeepL in rendering women's the language features. It is empirically proven that emphatic stress, lexical hedges/fillers, and intensifier are the most frequently used features in the novel. As for the translation strategies, the official human translator tends to employ a wider range of translation strategies than the DeepL.

Abstrak
Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis penerjemahan fitur bahasa perempuan dalam novel *Sense and Sensibility* karya Jane Austen. Studi ini berfokus pada pemahaman bagaimana karakteristik linguistik tokoh-tokoh perempuan dalam novel tersebut dialihkan ke dalam bahasa sasaran. Peneliti menelaah bagaimana fitur bahasa perempuan diterjemahkan oleh penerjemah resmi dan oleh DeepL. Peneliti tertarik untuk menganalisis hasil terjemahan dari dua penerjemah yang berbeda tersebut. Penelitian ini mempertimbangkan aspek linguistik maupun kultural dari terjemahan-terjemahan tersebut, dengan tujuan untuk mengidentifikasi tantangan yang dihadapi penerjemah. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif. Teknik close reading dan analisis tekstual digunakan untuk mengidentifikasi dan mengkaji fitur bahasa perempuan dalam teks asli. Temuan dari penelitian ini memberikan gambaran mengenai strategi yang digunakan oleh penerjemah resmi dan DeepL dalam menerjemahkan fitur bahasa perempuan tersebut. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa *emphatic stress, lexical hedges/fillers,* dan *intensifier* merupakan fitur yang paling sering ditemukan. Dalam hal strategi penerjemahan, penerjemah resmi cenderung menggunakan lebih banyak variasi strategi dibandingkan dengan DeepL.

How to cite this article with APA style 7th ed.
Purwaningsih, D. R. (2026). From Austen to DeepL: Women's language translation in *Sense and Sensibility*. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, *9*(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v9i1.1415

A. Introduction

Language serves as a reflection of social identity, and gendered language use has long been a topic of linguistic and literary analysis. In literature, female characters often exhibit distinct linguistic features that convey their social roles, emotions, and relationships. Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* provides a rich example of such gendered language use, particularly through its portrayal of women's speech patterns. As said by Trudgill in Wardhaugh & Fuller (2015), women tend to be more conscious of social status due to their relatively lower security and less extensive social networks compared to men. Their societal position is often subordinate to men, placing them in a less dominant role. Generally, men are judged based on their actions, women are by their appearance, with speech being a significant aspect of that perception. As a result, women have a stronger need to use language as a means of signalling their social status. Women's language features are proposed by Lakoff, cited in Holmes (2013), which are lexical hedges/filler, tag question, rising intonation, empty adjective, intensifier, super polite form, emphatic stress, avoidance of strong swear word, and hypercorrect grammar. Studies about women's language features have been conducted by some researchers focusing on various objects. To start with, Putri et al. (2021) examined women's language feature in *Emily in Paris* in which lexical hedges or fillers were ere the most frequently occurring feature. The expressions like *I think*, *I guess*, *maybe*, or *sort of*, are used to soften statements, express uncertainty, and reduce the degree of assertiveness. Hedges allow Emily to convey opinions without sounding forceful, show respect toward superiors and others, and maintain positive fellowship in unfamiliar cultural contexts. A study by Utami (2022) was conducted to analyze women's language features in a novel called *Tempurung,* in which the result showed intensifier, empty adjective, and tag question as the most frequently features to be found. Another study conducted by Wibawani & Rohman (2023) showed three dominant characteristics of women's language in *Capciptop* short film, namely intensifier, avoidance of strong swear words, and tag question. Meanwhile, in research on women's language features in *The Poppy War* conducted by Adara et al. (2025), it was found that the most dominant feature was lexical hedges, used most frequently to soften the statements and express uncertainty. This shows that the character is often portrayed as thoughtful in her interactions, reflecting her prone social position and the need to navigate power dynamics in her surroundings. Based on the provided evidence from those studies, there is a consistent pattern in which women characters frequently rely on hedges, intensifiers, and tag questions features that soften speech, heighten emotional nuance, and navigate social hierarchies across different narrative contexts.

Translating these linguistic features into another language presents a challenge, as it requires capturing not only the literal meaning but also the cultural and stylistic nuances embedded in the original text. It is consistent with Larson's (1998) definition of translation, which is the process of translating the meaning of the source language into the receptor language. The procedure involves moving from the source language's form into the receptor language, moving from the form of the first language to the form of a second language by way of semantic structure. It is the meaning that is being conveyed and needs to be maintained. When translating from the source language to the target language, the translator should preserve the meaning's equivalency. According to Nida & Taber (1982), dynamic equivalency should take precedence over formal correspondence while translating. When the message in the target language has the closest natural equivalent to the message in the source language, dynamic equivalence is attained. It has a strong connection to cultural aspects of translation as it emphasizes delivering meaning in a way that feels natural and suitable for the target language. Cultural differences between the source and target languages should be taken into account when translating literature, especially dialogue that reflects gendered language or societal standards like women's linguistic characteristics. In the target language, some linguistic terms, politeness indicators, or gendered speech patterns might not have exact equivalents. If so, translators are necessary to adapt them while preserving the intended social and cultural impact. Research on gender translation was conducted by Haque & Sajarwa (2025) focusing on translation of sexism forms in *Pasung Jiwa* novel. The research shows several types of

performed lexical transformations, which are generalization, modulation, specification, compensation, metaphoric transformation, and differentiation.

A study on the translation of women's language features was conducted by Kusuma et al. (2023) using *Paper Towns*, a novel by John Green, as the primary object of analysis. In this study, the researchers applied the translation techniques proposed by Molina & Albir (2002) to examine how women's linguistic characteristics were rendered in translation. The findings identified six distinct features of women's language: lexical hedges/filler, empty adjective, tag question, super polite form, avoidance of strong swear word, and intensifier. Among these features, intensifier appeared most frequently throughout the novel. Additionally, the study found that the established equivalent technique was the most commonly employed translation strategy, indicating a tendency to use conventional or standardized equivalents in translating women's language features.

While the previous study focused on the translation of women's language features in *Paper Towns* using a single translation approach, it did not explore how different translation methods might impact the rendering of these features. Furthermore, the study primarily examined a contemporary novel, leaving a gap in the analysis of women's language features in classic literature, where linguistic style and social norms differ significantly. To address this gap, my research investigates the translation of women's language features in *Sense and Sensibility*, a classic and novel that was written by Austen (1811), comparing two distinct translation approaches: an official human translator and DeepL, an AI-based machine translation tool. In addition to identifying women's language features, this study analyzes the translation strategies used in both versions by applying translation strategy framework proposed by Chesterman (2016). By categorizing strategies into syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic types that are then divided again into sub-categories, this research aims to examine how human and machine translation handle gendered linguistic elements and whether one approach is more effective in preserving the nuances of women's language in literary texts.

A nuanced perspective on Machine Translation (MT), particularly in relation to its impact on human translators, linguistic diversity, and the evolution of translation practices, is provided by Cronin (2013). He puts MT within a broader historical line of translation technologies, from early mechanical tools to contemporary AI-driven systems. He emphasizes how technological advancements have continually reshaped translation practices, pushing the boundaries of efficiency and accessibility. He argues that it cannot completely replace human translator, especially in contexts requiring deep cultural and contextual understanding. He also highlights the limitations of MT in dealing with idiomatic expressions, ambiguity, and cultural nuance, emphasizing the enduring need for human expertise. Early MT systems relied on linguistic rules and bilingual dictionaries to translate texts. The development of deep learning and artificial neural networks revolutionized MT. Neural Machine Translation (NMT) models process entire sentences rather than individual words or phrases, improving coherence and contextual understanding. One of the NMT systems that quickly gained attention for its high-quality translations is DeepL that was launched in 2017. It grasps deep learning techniques and ab extensive multilingual database to generate more natural and context-aware translations.

As MT continues to develop, researchers have conducted various studies to analyze its effectiveness, challenges, and potential improvements. A comparative study of machine translation and human translation was undertaken by Nawaz et al. (2024) and it revealed that human translation remains superior in delivering accurate and culturally appropriate renderings, particularly for complex or stylistically rich texts. On the other hand, machine translation provides substantial benefits when integrated thoughtfully into translation workflows, enhancing efficiency and supporting translators in routine or high-volume tasks. The article argues that the optimal approach is not to replace human translators with MT but to combine the strengths of both, positioning machine translation as an aid rather than a primary solution. A different study was conducted by Fitria (2023) focusing on error analysis in three widely used MT systems: Google Translate, Microsoft Translate, and DeepL. This research examined the accuracy and quality of translations produced by these systems, highlighting common errors related to clarity, correctness,

and delivery. The findings indicate that Microsoft Translator exposes the highest number of writing-related issues, followed by Google Translate, which demonstrates fewer errors. In contrast, DeepL shows the least number of writing issues, suggesting a higher level of accuracy and fluency in its translations. Another study done by Vennita & Hasnah (2024) examined the comparison between human translator and DeepL in translating an English text into Indonesian. To be more specific, the research subject was divided into male and female categories, and the research focused on the accuracy, acceptability, and readability level of the translation resulted from both human and DeepL. The results indicate that the female translators achieved higher accuracy, acceptability, and readability levels than male translators did. DeepL also exhibited strong performance, particularly in readability, achieving a perfect score. These results highlight the potential influence of gender on translation quality and underscore the effectiveness of AI-driven translation tools like DeepL in maintaining accuracy and readability.

There is growing research on DeepL as an alternative tool for translating academic assignments. For example, research by Hariroh et al. (2025) found that DeepL often produces more natural and contextually appropriate translations, making it a useful aid for students working with foreign-language texts. This study highlights DeepL's significant potential as an effective alternative translation tool for supporting students, particularly in completing academic assignments in English. The findings indicate that most students find DeepL highly beneficial in producing accurate, natural, and contextually appropriate translations. One of its key strengths is its ability to generate formal and precise word choices, which are crucial for translating scientific and academic texts. In terms of quality assessment toward MT performance, a study was conducted by Abdi (2025) concluding that human translation is rated more intelligible than machine translation, particularly in terms of language quality; grammatical correctness, and clarity are more influential than content accuracy in shaping intelligibility judgments. While research on machine and human translation emphasizes accuracy and style preservation, few studies compare DeepL's translation of classic literature with official versions, particularly in women's speech patterns. To fill the gaps among those previous studies, this study examines what women's language features used in *Sense and Sensibility,* how DeepL and human translator perform their duty in translating the women's language features, and why both of them yield different results.

B. Method

The research materials consisted of two primary data sources. The first was the original English version of *Sense and Sensibility*, which served as the source text. The second was its Indonesian version produced by Murtirahardjan (2022), which functioned as the target text. In addition, translations generated by DeepL were included as comparative data to examine differences between human and machine translation. The unit of analysis comprised sentences or utterances containing women's language features as identified in the source text. A total of 68 data pairs were collected, each consisting of the source text segment and its corresponding translations. These materials provided the basis for analyzing how women's language features were conveyed in the target language by both translation agents.

This study employed a qualitative research paradigm as proposed by Creswell (2014), which emphasizes an in-depth understanding of textual phenomena through systematic interpretation. Data collection began with a close textual analysis of the English version of the novel to identify sentences containing women's language features. This initial stage corresponds to Santosa (2017), in which linguistic units were examined to identify broad categories of meaning related to women's language features as conceptualized by Lakoff. Through this process, utterances sharing similar semantic and functional characteristics were grouped into preliminary domains. A purposive sampling technique was then applied to ensure that only linguistic data pertinent to the research objectives were selected. Subsequently, the research proceeded to taxonomy analysis, in which the identified domains were further organized into more specific subcategories based on Lakoff's types

of women's language features. This hierarchical classification allowed for a more systematic understanding of the relationships among linguistic forms and provided a structured foundation for the subsequent analysis of translation strategies. The analysis on translation strategies was done based on Chesterman's theory, in which the strategies are categorized into syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic categories.

Once identified, the selected data were compiled into a table, alongside their corresponding translations produced by the official translator and DeepL. The data were then categorized according to Lakoff's types of women's language features. Subsequently, an in-depth comparative analysis was conducted to describe how each feature was translated, focusing on similarities and differences between human and DeepL translations. The observed differences were explained by considering the distinct nature of human and DeepL translation processes, particularly in terms of sensitivity to contextual, pragmatic, and sociocultural nuances embedded in women's language features. While the human translator demonstrated interpretative decision-making informed by discourse context and cultural norms, DeepL tended to rely on statistical and neural pattern recognition, which may result in more literal or generalized renderings. To further elaborate on how the features were translated, Chesterman's translation strategies were applied. Throughout those procedures, it can be emphasized that the research was conducted to identify the women's language features used in *Sense and Sensibility*, to describe the strategies used in translating the features, and to explain how human translator and DeepL apply the strategies differently.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Results

a. Women's Language Features in *Sense and Sensibility*

The research shows 68 data that belong to women's language features in forms of avoidance of strong swear words, hypercorrect grammar, empty adjective, lexical hedges/ fillers, intensifier, super polite form, tag question, and emphatic stress. The findings of women's language features are described in Table 1.

Table 1. Lakoff's Women's Language Features

No.	Features	Number of Data
1.	emphatic stress	18
2.	lexical hedges/ filler	14
3.	intensifier	12
4.	empty adjective	9
5.	avoidance of strong swear word	8
6.	hypercorrect grammar	3
7.	super polite form	3
8.	tag question	1
Total Number of Data		**68**

The distribution of women's language features in *Sense and Sensibility* strongly reflects Lakoff's (1975) theoretical framework, in which women's speech is characterized by linguistic forms that index politeness, emotional expressiveness, and indirectness shaped by social expectations. As presented in Table 1, emphatic stress emerges as the most dominant feature, indicating that female characters frequently intensify their utterances to express emotional involvement and evaluative point of view, a pattern consistent with Lakoff's view of women's language as affectively oriented. Likewise, the relatively high frequency of lexical hedges or fillers and intensifiers supports Lakoff's argument that women often mitigate or modulate their statements to avoid sounding overly assertive, reflecting their socially constructed position in interaction. In contrast, features traditionally emphasized by Lakoff, such as tag questions and super polite forms, appear

infrequently in the data, suggesting that their use in the novel is more context-dependent than universal. This finding implies that while Lakoff's taxonomy remains relevant, its features do not occur with equal prominence and may be influenced by narrative context and character roles. Overall, the dominance of affective and stance-marking features reinforces Lakoff's claim that women's language operates as a means of negotiating interpersonal relationships, rather than merely signaling linguistic weakness.

Comparison between Official and DeepL Translation Strategies

Translation strategies found in the official translation are literal, level shift, sentence structure change, illocutionary change, information change, unit shift, clause structure change, emphasis change, synonymy, transposition, phrase structure change, and other semantic change. Meanwhile, the translation strategies found in the DeepL translation are literal, unit shift, level shift, emphasis change, information change, and clause structure change. The findings are described in Table 2.

Table 2. Translation Strategies

No.	Translation Strategies	Official	DeepL
1.	Literal	29	53
2.	clause structure change	12	1
3.	emphasis change	6	2
4.	level shift	5	5
5.	unit shift	3	6
6.	information change	3	1
7.	synonymy	2	
8.	explicitness change (explicitation)	2	
9.	sentence structure change	1	
10.	phrase structure change	1	
11.	illocutionary change	1	
12.	transposition	1	
13.	other semantic change	1	
14.	paraphrase	1	
Total Number of Data		**68**	**68**

The table 2 shows a fundamental difference in how the official human translator and DeepL handle the translation of women's language features. Literal translation overwhelmingly dominates the DeepL output, with 53 occurrences, compared to 29 in the official translation. This strong reliance on literal translation indicates that DeepL prioritizes formal equivalence and surface-level correspondence, which aligns with the operational nature of neural machine translation systems that depend on pattern recognition rather than contextual interpretation. In contrast, the official translator employs a much wider range of strategies, including clause structure change, emphasis change, information change, and illocutionary change, demonstrating greater flexibility in adapting the source text to the pragmatic and discourse context of the target language. Most importantly, clause structure change appears frequently in the official translation but is almost absent in DeepL, suggesting that the human translator actively restructures sentences to maintain naturalness and communicative intent. The presence of strategies such as synonymy, transposition, and explicitation exclusively in the official translation further underscores the human translator's sensitivity to nuance and implicit meaning, which is particularly crucial in rendering women's language features. Overall, these findings indicate that while DeepL achieves consistency through literal and limited structural shifts, the official translation demonstrates a more interpretative and context-aware approach, allowing women's language features to be conveyed more naturally and pragmatically in the target text. Human translators are an important option for translations that call for a high level of expertise because they can effectively represent the intended meaning and tone of the original text and provide a deeper understanding of the cultural background and nuances of the translated language (Moneus & Sahari, 2024).

2. Discussion

Women's language has different characteristics from men's, realized in ten language features, the translation of those features also requires careful consideration to maintain their original nuances, cultural implications, and sociolinguistic functions. Human translators and machine translation systems like DeepL may adopt different strategies in handling these linguistic elements. Human translators can recognize contextual and cultural subtleties, adapting their translations to reflect the intended tone, politeness levels, and gendered speech patterns more naturally. For example, when translating hedges or tag questions, a human translator may choose equivalent expressions that align with the target language's gender norms and communication styles, ensuring that the translation remains contextually appropriate. In contrast, machine translation systems like DeepL primarily rely on pattern recognition and large-scale data training. While they can produce fluent translations, they may struggle with preserving pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects of gendered language. Machine translation may either overgeneralize or omit subtle linguistic markers, leading to potential shifts in meaning or tone. Additionally, without explicit programming for gender-aware translation, machine systems may default to neutral or inaccurate renderings of gendered speech.

a. Lexical Hedges/ Filler

Holmes (2013) distinguishes between *fillers* and *hedges*, categorizing *sort of* as a hedge, while *well* and *you see* are considered *meaningless particles* and grouped with *pause fillers* like *uh, um,* and *ah.* The examples of this feature found in the research are as follow:

(1) "One observation may, **I think**, be fairly drawn from the whole of the story."
(2) "**Well**, Marianne," said Elinor

The first example, Elinor, Marianne, and their mother, Mrs. Dashwood, are involved in a conversation about problems caused by Willoughby's ill-treatment to Eliza Williams. Elinor tried to avoid discussing the past, which might weaken Marianne's spirits, and concluded that all of Willoughby's troubles stemmed from his wrongdoing toward Eliza Williams. Lexical hedges *I think* is used to soften or weaken the force of a statement, making it less direct or assertive. They function to express uncertainty, vagueness, politeness, turn-taking, and often used in communication to avoid appearing overly confident or making absolute claims. The second example is part of a conversation between Elinor and Marianne about Marianne's relationship with Willoughby. The dialogue includes an example of filler; just like lexical hedges, fillers serve important conversational functions. These elements contribute to the natural flow of conversation and help convey the characters' emotions and intentions more effectively. Another study about lexical hedges/ fillers was conducted by (Rosanti & Jaelani, 2016), which focuses on lexical hedges used by female and male students in a debate forum. The most frequently used fillers were *uhh* and *you know*. The study found that female students used lexical hedges and fillers significantly more often than male students.

b. Empty Adjective

According to Lakoff (1973), women tend to use empty adjectives to express approval or admiration, rather than providing specific information, for example the words adorable, charming, lovely, etc. The following datum exemplifies the use of empty adjective found in the novel.

(1) "Perhaps**,** Elinor, it WAS rather ill-judged in me to go to Allenham; but Mr. Willoughby wanted particularly to shew me the place; and it is a **charming** house, I assure you."

In that example, the adjective *charming* is used to describe the house at Allenham, emphasizing its pleasant and attractive qualities. The adjective *charming* is considered an empty adjective in

women's language features, as it conveys an emotional or subjective impression rather than providing specific or factual details about the house. This aligns with the idea that women's language tends to include more expressive and evaluative words to reflect feelings and social connections. As found by Widyasari et al. (2023), women tend to use an empty adjective to express their feeling. For example, in their research on an E Series, there is a dialogue saying, "*Mary is a smart, lovely woman, but you'd know that if you ever said two words to her.*" The adjective *lovely* serves as an adjective to show the speaker's admiration to Mary.

c. Intensifier

Intensifier functions to enhance the meaning of adjectives and adverbs, providing greater emphasis and clarity in communication, such as *very*, *definitely*, *so*, etc. It is also one of women's language features proposed by Lakoff (1973). In this research, the intensifiers can be seen in the following examples:

(1) "You decide on his imperfections **so much** in the mass,"
(2) "It is **very** true said Marianne, "that admiration of landscape scenery is become a mere jargon."

The intensifier *so much* in the first datum is used to emphasize Elinor's disagreement towards Marianne's thought about Willoughby. By using this phrase, Elinor reinforces the intensity of her opposing stance, highlighting the contrast between her perspective and Marianne's idealized view of Willoughby. This choice of words reflects Elinor's firm and rational nature, as well as the underlying tension in their conversation. Meanwhile, in the second datum, the use of intensifier *very* is used to express Marianne's strong agreement with Elinor. By emphasizing her concurrence, the word *very* reinforces Marianne's conviction and emotional involvement in the discussion. This use of intensification highlights the depth of Marianne's feelings and underscores the contrast between her initial perspective and her eventual alignment with Elinor's viewpoint.

d. Hypercorrect Grammar

Hypercorrect grammar refers to consistent use of standard and grammatically correct forms, for example in the following datum.

(1) Where does he come from?

In that datum, Elinor asks about Willoughby's background to Sir John using a standard grammatical structure. Her question, "*Where does he come from?*" follows conventional subject-verb word order, reflecting her polite and formal approach in seeking information. This demonstrates Elinor's adherence to proper language use, which aligns with her composed and rational character throughout the novel.

e. Super Polite Form

Super polite form, according to Lakoff cited in Holmes (2013) is used especially when expressing request indirectly; it also can be realized in forms of euphemisms. For example:

(1) "Allow me to congratulate you on having so respectable and well-judging a friend."

In that example, Elinor uses an indirect expression to congratulate Edward for having such a respectable friend like Colonel Brandon. Rather than offering a straightforward congratulatory remark, she conveys her sentiment subtly, aligning with her composed and reserved nature. This

indirect approach reflects Elinor's tendency to express herself with restraint and diplomacy, reinforcing her characteristic politeness and emotional control.

f. Emphatic Stress

Women tend to emphasize their empathy by using repetitive words, longer sentence structures, and sometimes capital letters for written communication. The example of emphatic stress is seen in the following datum:

(1) "But the **letter**, Mr. Willoughby, your own **letter**"

The example is part of a conversation between Elinor and Willoughby about a letter written by Willoughby to Marianne. The repetition of the word "letter" indicates that Elinor considers the letter is very important and impactful for Marianne, as well as for shaping their understanding of Willoughby's intentions. This repetition reflects Elinor's concern for her sister and her desire to seek clarity in the situation.

Another study by Indanna & Damayanti (2022) can also show us the use of emphatic stress, for instance in "I spent the first Christmas celebration at **Universal Studios Japan!" on her 3rd blog post entitled Christmas at Universal Studios Japan.** That research focused on women's language features used by three Indonesian female travel bloggers. The repetition of some information in that structure indicates that the celebration in Japan Universal Studios it is very important for her and worth informing to others.

g. Avoidance of Strong Swear Words

As explained by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (2003), swearing is generally regarded as a powerful expression of intense emotions, such as anger toward specific individuals or deep frustration, often directed at the nearest available target. It is perceived as a forceful form of language that can, at times, produce striking effects. Additionally, the use of profanity is often deemed inappropriate for women and children. In some contexts, women tend to substitute strong language with euphemistic form to make their speech different from men. In this research there are eight data belonging to this feature that can be seen in the following examples:

(1) "**Dear, dear** Norland!"

The interjection *Dear* indicates an avoidance of strong swearwords. The expression is uttered by Elinor to show her delight and emotional warmth as she can finally return to her homeland after a long absence. The use of *Dear* reflects a socially acceptable way of expressing strong emotions, reinforcing the idea that women's speech tends to prioritize politeness and emotional subtlety. Another example of avoidance of strong swear words is also found in a study conducted by Juanda & Simatupang (2023) with a movie entitled *Turning Red (2022)* as the research object. The research finds this feature in an utterance by one of the female characters named Mailin who says "Ah, fudgesicles! I gotta go." Meilin's friends invited her to join them for karaoke, but she had to leave as the tram she regularly took had arrived. Frustrated by the situation, Meilin expressed her emotions by exclaiming *"fudgesicles."* Although *"fudgesicles"* literally refers to a chocolate frozen dessert with no inherent connection to profanity, its initial syllable closely resembles the offensive word *"fuck."* This phonetic similarity suggests that Meilin deliberately avoids using strong swear words, opting instead for a harmless, playful alternative. By substituting a vulgar expletive with a light-hearted term like *"fudgesicles,"* Meilin not only mitigates the harshness of her frustration but also injects humor into her response. This choice reflects a common linguistic strategy, particularly among those who prefer to maintain politeness or adhere to social norms while still expressing strong emotions.

h. Tag Question

According to Lakoff (1975), women tend to use tag questions in conversations as a way to soften their statements or to indicate a lack of certainty. This linguistic feature is often associated with politeness and indirectness in women's speech patterns. An example of this can be observed in *Sense and Sensibility*, during a conversation between Elinor Dashwood and Ms. Steele.

(1) "You were all in the same room together, **were not you**?"

In the exchange, Elinor asks, *"You were all in the same room together, were not you?"* The use of the tag question *"were not you?"* suggests that Elinor is seeking confirmation rather than making a direct assertion. This structure indicates that she is either uncertain about the information or using a more polite, less confrontational approach in her inquiry. However, Ms. Steele responds by denying the claim, contradicting Elinor's assumption. This interaction exemplifies how tag questions can function as a conversational tool to facilitate discussion while maintaining social harmony. A study conducted by Tombang et al. (2022) examined women's language features used by Elsa and Anna in Frozen II movie. In that study, tag question is also found in the utterance produced by Elsa *"They're all looking at us,* ***aren't they****? Got any advice? Nothing?"* It indicates that Elsa asked something she already knew, and she asked the question to the little lizard which indeed could not answer her question.

Features such as lexical hedges, empty adjectives, intensifiers, emphatic stress, and avoidance of strong swear words play a crucial role in expressing emotional nuance, interpersonal sensitivity, and social harmony. These findings suggest that women's language functions not merely as a marker of gendered speech but as a pragmatic resource shaped by social norms, character roles, and narrative context. Given the nuanced and context-sensitive nature of women's language features, the following section discusses how these features are translated into the target language by examining the translation strategies employed by the human translator and DeepL.

The result of the analysis shows that the official translator applies all strategies with the following distribution in which literal strategy is the most dominant in use. On the other hand, DeepL uses literal, level shift, unit shift, clause change, information change with literal strategy as the most dominant in use as well. Chesterman (2016) categorizes literal translation into syntactic strategy and explains that this strategy involves the translator following the source text's form as closely as possible, aiming for a direct rendering of the source language text into the target language. An example of this can be observed in the following datum.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL target Text
"Good heavens!"	*"Astaga!"*	*"Astaga!"*

The word *Astaga* serves as the closest equivalent, as both expressions convey a similar sense of surprise, disbelief, or astonishment. While *Good heavens* is a soft exclamation in English, commonly used to express shock or amazement, *Astaga* functions in a comparable way within Indonesian linguistic and cultural contexts. This demonstrates how literal translation, despite aiming for structural fidelity, also requires careful selection of equivalent expressions to ensure the intended emotional impact is retained in the target language. In this datum, it is evident that DeepL is quite reliable in rendering an expressive utterance, just like human translator is. It is also proven in Kamaluddin et al. (2024) that DeepL is to some extent, a highly reliable and innovative machine translation tool that complements rather than replaces human translators. The ability of DeepL in producing more equivalence translation is also proven in Freskila & Jayantini (2025) that the translation of DeepL places more emphasis on the linguistic structure that incorporates cultural knowledge elements that may influence more intuitive comprehension.

Move to the next feature, hypercorrect grammar, the official translator applies literal strategy and clause structure change, while the DeepL employs literal strategy for all data belonging to that feature.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL Target Text
"You were all in the same room together, were not you?"	*"Bukankah sepanjang waktu itu kau berada seruangan dengan mereka?"*	*"Kalian semua berada di ruangan yang sama, bukan?"*

In that example, the official translator employs clause structure change strategy, which belongs to syntactic category. Changes in clause structure strategy relate to how the clause is structured in terms of its constituent phrases. The translation of the previously cited statement provides a clear example of this tactic. Although the source text does not specifically specify this element, the official translation adds the term *sepanjang waktu* to lend even more emphasis. This addition helps to improve the target language's clarity and reinforce the concept. The translation strengthens the impression of continuity or duration, which may be suggested but not stated directly in the source text, by using *sepanjang waktu*. Meanwhile, the DeepL translator maintain the exact message of the source language without giving significant change. Instead of modifying the clause structure or adding emphasis, DeepL follows a more direct and literal translation approach, preserving the original wording as closely as possible. This contrast highlights how human translators may adapt and refine a text for greater emphasis and naturalness, while AI-based translation tools prioritize structural fidelity to the source language. Human translator's ability in maintaining the source language style is necessary and proven more preferable, as stated by Youssef (2024) that the translator of literary works needs to translate freely, without the restrictions of literal translation, to generate the equivalent sense of the source text.

The next feature is empty adjective, which is translated with various strategies by the official translator, while the DeepL tends to use literal strategy.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL Target Text
"Perhaps, Elinor, it WAS rather ill-judged in me to go to Allenham; but Mr. Willoughby wanted particularly to shew me the place; and it is a **charming** house, I assure you.	*"Elinor, boleh jadi aku memang kurang bijaksana karena datang ke Allenham, tapi Mr. Willoughby sangat ingin menunjukkan tempat itu kepadaku. Percayalah, rumah itu memang benar-benar sangat* ***menarik****."*	*"Mungkin, Elinor, itu adalah keputusan yang agak buruk saya untuk pergi ke Allenham; tapi Tuan Willoughby ingin terutama untuk menunjukkan tempat itu padaku; dan itu adalah rumah yang* ***menawan****, saya jamin."*

In the official target text, the empty adjective *charming* is translated using emphasis change strategy. This strategy is categorized into semantic strategies, where the translator adds to, reduces, or alters the emphasis or thematic focus, for one reason or another. In this particular example, the official translator renders *charming* as *menarik*, a word that conveys a similar meaning but is positioned differently in the sentence. Notably, the word *menarik* is shifted to the end of the utterance, which naturally heightens its emphasis in the target language. This repositioning not only ensures that the meaning is retained but also enhances the rhetorical impact, making the translated sentence feel more natural and engaging for the target audience. In the DeepL target text, the word *charming* is translated literally as *menawan*, which is lexically equivalent to the source text but does not fully capture its intended meaning. While *menawan* shares a similar dictionary definition with *charming,* its usage in the target language may not align naturally with the context of the original text.

The translation strategies of lexical hedges/fillers by the official translator are more various than those employed by the DeepL as displayed in the table. The DeepL translator translates this feature using literal strategies. Only two data are translated differently, using information change and clause structure change.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL Target Text
"Mr. Willoughby **however** is the only person who can have a right to shew that house; and as he went in an open carriage, it was impossible to have any other companion.	*"**Bagaimanapun,** Mr. Willoughby merupakan satu-satunya orang yang berhak memperlihatkan rumah itu, dan karena kami naik kereta terbuka, sungguh mustahil aku ditemani orang lain."*	*"Tuan Willoughby adalah satu-satunya orang yang dapat memiliki hak untuk menunjukkan rumah itu; dan karena dia pergi dengan terbuka, tidak mungkin ada pendamping lain."*

In the above example, the strategy used by the official translator is clause structure change, and the strategy used by DeepL is information change. One notable difference is the omission of the conjunction *however* in DeepL's translation. This omission is part of the information modification strategy, which entails either removing ST material that is thought to be important or adding new, non-inferable information that is pertinent to the target text readership but not present in the source text. In this case, the removal of *however* affects the logical flow of the sentence, potentially altering the way the contrast between ideas is perceived by the target audience.

The least frequently used strategy is transposition, which is only used to translate intensifier by the official translator. Transposition belongs to syntactic strategies, which describes any shift in word class, such as the shift of noun to verb or adjective to adverb, etc.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL Target Text
"I **certainly** did not seek your confidence,"	*"Aku **jelas** tidak memintamu memercayaiku."*	*"Saya **tentu saja** tidak mencari kepercayaan Anda,"*

The official translator employs the transposition strategy, as there is a shift in word class from an adverb *certainly* to an adjective *jelas*. This structural change not only reflects linguistic differences between the source and target languages but may also subtly influence the emphasis and tone of the sentence. In the meantime, the DeepL translator uses the unit shift technique, which happens when a unit of the source text such as a morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, or paragraph is translated into a different unit in the target text. The word "certainly" is rendered to target text as a phrase *tentu saja*. In this case, the single-word adverb *"*certainly*"* is translated as the phrase *tentu saja* in the target text. This shift from a single word to a multi-word phrase reflects structural differences between the source and target language.

Based on the table of translation strategies distribution, the official translator employs more various strategies, for example illocutionary change strategy that cannot be found in the DeepL translation. Illocutionary change is referred to change of speech act, and it belongs to pragmatic strategies.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL Target Text
"Excuse me,"	*"Maaf,"*	*"Permisi,"*

In the example of super polite feature above, the expressive speech act "excuse me" in the target text is shift to another speech act in the target text as *maaf.* Although both of them belong to the same category, they are different in function; *excuse me* is used, for example, as an attention-getter such as when trying to initiate conversation or politely interrupt someone (Margerie & Muller, 2019). In contrast, the word *maaf* in the target language refers to expression of apology or regret (Setiyaningsih & Rahmawati, 2022). This functional shift may impact the level of politeness and how the utterance is perceived by the target audience. Contextually, the word *maaf* in Indonesian perspective is often used show politeness rather than apology; literary device including emotional nuance contained in certain words needs suitable transfer by human translators. (Karabayeva & Kalizhanova, 2024). It also aligns with Qassem & Aldaheri (2023) in their research those pragmatic meanings such as greeting, empathizing, encouraging, and suggesting are often translated literally, leading to ambiguity or misinterpretation in the target text.

Another rarely used strategy by the DeepL translator is explicitness change (explicitation) that belongs to pragmatic strategies. Either more explicitness (explicitation) or more implicitness (implication) are the goals of this strategy. It is often recognized that one of the most preferred

translation techniques is explicitation. It clarifies the way translators incorporate inferable information that is merely implied in the source text but is expressed openly in the target text.

Source Text	Official Target Text	DeepL Target Text
"He has, he has,"	*"Orang itu pasti dia"*	*"Dia punya, dia punya,"*

In the example above, the official translator demonstrates an understanding of the conversational context, translating the expression contextually by explicitly conveying its intended meaning. The speaker is referring to someone's presence or actions, rather than someone's possession. In contrast, DeepL, lacking contextual awareness, produces a target text that fails to capture the intended meaning of the source text. As a result, the translation may lead to misinterpretation or a loss of nuance. Human translator has a higher ability in producing more accurate translation in terms of content, original spirit, and stylistic appearance than machine translation does (Huang, 2011).

Overall, the findings indicate that the official human translator is able to produce a more contextual translation by employing a wider range of translation strategies. In contrast, DeepL primarily relies on literal translation strategies, which may result in a less nuanced rendering of the source text. The dominant use of literal translation strategy is due to the text processing stage when using DeepL in translation process. This stage enables machine translation to gain a semantic understanding of the target language. In DeepL translation process, there is a process called syntactic analysis techniques to analyze the supplied text and convert it into the target language (Li, 2024). On the other hand, human translator is more capable of adapting to context and meaning of the text as well as choosing more various strategies to be applied in the translation process.

D. Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that emphatic stress is the most frequently used women's language feature in *Sense and Sensibility*, followed by lexical hedges/fillers and intensifiers, suggesting that female characters tend to use language that emphasizes certainty, emotion, and intensity in line with their communicative styles and social roles within the narrative. The comparison between the official human translation and DeepL further reveals a clear difference in contextual awareness, as the human translator demonstrates a stronger ability to interpret pragmatic and conversational nuances. It results in more contextually appropriate translations, while DeepL predominantly relies on literal translation strategies due to its text-based processing and limited capacity to capture deeper contextual meanings. However, this study is still restricted to a single literary work, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other genres or texts; it focuses merely on linguistic features and translation strategies without examining reader reception or translators' cognitive and ideological considerations; and it does not incorporate a broader sociocultural analysis, which could offer a more comprehensive understanding. Future research is therefore encouraged to examine a wider range of texts and genres, integrate corpus-based and reception-oriented approaches, and further explore the role of sociocultural context in shaping the translation of women's language features.

References

Abdi, H. (2025). Machine translation quality evaluation and post-editing efficiency: The case of Abadis Translator. *K@ta*, *27*(1), 18–33. https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.27.1.18-33

Adara, R. A., Victorynie, I., Hamer, W., Lely, L. N., & Cahyati, A. T. (2025). Investigating women's language features in 'The Poppy War' by R.F. Kuang. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, *9*(1), 112–126.

Austen, J. (1811). *Sense and sensibility*. Thomas Egerton.

Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.123

Cronin, M. (2013). *Translation in the digital age*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203073599

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender*. Cambridge University Press.

Fitria, T. N. (2023). Performance of Google Translate, Microsoft Translator, and DeepL Translator: Error analysis of translation result. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa dan Pengajaran*, *8*(2), 115–138. https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v8i2.3442

Freskila, E. P., & Jayantini, I. G. A. S. R. (2025). Translation equivalence of tourism website content: A comparison between Google Translate and DeepL Translate. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, *10*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v10i1.835

Haque, A., & Sajarwa, S. (2025). Transformasi penerjemahan bentuk seksisme dalam novel *Pasung Jiwa* ke dalam novel *Bound*. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, *8*(2), 409–422. https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v8i2.1154

Hariroh, F., & Hamdani, B. (2025). Analysis of DeepL application as an alternative media for translating academic assignments. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, *8*(2), 507–515. https://journal.ikipsiliwangi.ac.id/project/article/view/26880

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Huang, H. J. (2011). Intermediality and human vs. machine translation. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, *13*(3), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1796

Indanna, S. P., & Damayanti, I. (2022). An analysis of women's language features used by the three Indonesian female travel bloggers. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, *6*(4), 578–597. https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.6.4.578-597

Kamaluddin, M. I., Rasyid, M. W. K., Abqoriyyah, F. H., & Saehu, A. (2024). Accuracy analysis of DeepL: Breakthroughs in machine translation technology. *Journal of English Education Forum (JEEF)*, *4*(2), 122–126. https://doi.org/10.29303/jeef.v4i2.681

Karabayeva, I., & Kalizhanova, A. (2024). Evaluating machine translation of literature through rhetorical analysis. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, *5*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.48185/jtls.v5i1.962

Kusuma, F. A., Nababan, M. R., & Djatmika. (2023). Analysis of translation linguistics units of women's language features in the novel *Paper Towns*. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *10*(3), 110–117. https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i3.4442

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, *2*(1), 45–80. https://web.stanford.edu/class/linguist156/Lakoff_1973.pdf

Lakoff, R. (1975). Linguistic theory and the real world. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, *25*(2), 347–378. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1975.tb00249.x

Larson, M. L. (1998). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence* (2nd ed.). University Press of America.

Li, L. (2024). Artificial intelligence translator DeepL translation quality control. *Procedia Computer Science*, *247*, 710–717. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2024.10.086

Margerie, H., & Muller, P. (2019). Excuse Me vs. (I'm) Sorry as two contrasting markers of interlocutive relations. *Corela*, *17*(2). https://doi.org/10.4000/corela.9711

Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs*, *47*(4), 498–512. https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar

Moneus, A. M., & Sahari, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence and human translation: A contrastive study based on legal texts. *Heliyon*, *10*(6), Article e28106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28106

Nawaz, A., Sheeraz, S., & Zahra, S. M. (2024). Assessing the outcomes of digital technologies on translation quality: A comparative analysis of machine translation vs human translation. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies (JALS)*, *2*(4), 2101–2120. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388752439

Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The theory and practice of translation* (3rd ed.). E.J. Brill.

Putri, M. E., Beratha, N. L. S., & Maharani, S. A. I. (2021). Women's language features in *Emily in Paris*: A sociolinguistics study. *HUMANIS: Journal of Arts and Humanities*, *25*(3), 269–276. https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2021.v25.i03.p04

Qassem, M., & Aldaheri, M. M. (2023). Can machine translate dialogue acts: Evidence from translating dialogues from English to Arabic. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *29*(4), 63–81. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2023-2904-05

Rosanti, E. D., & Jaelani, A. (2016). The use of lexical hedges in spoken language by female and male students. *Journal of English Language and Education*, *2*(1), 29–42.

Santosa, R. (2017). *Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan* (D. Purnanto, Ed.). UNS Press.

Setiyaningsih, M., & Rahmawati, L. E. (2022). Bentuk tindak tutur ekspresif dalam mini seri "Sore: Istri dari Masa Depan" karya Yandy Laurens. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Undiksha*, *12*(1), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpbs.v12i1.43933

Tombang, N., Arifin, M. B., & Ariani, S. (2022). Women's language features used by Elsa and Anna in *Frozen II* movie. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, *6*(4), 1385–1395.

Utami, N. N. A. (2022). Penggunaan fitur bahasa perempuan pada novel *Tempurung* karya Oka Rusmini. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, *5*(2), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v5i2.282

Juanda, K. U., & Simatupang, E. C. (2023). Women's language features in *Turning Red* (2022): A sociolinguistics study. *Jurnal Sinestesia*, *13*(1), 455–464. https://sinestesia.pustaka.my.id/journal/article/view/379

Vennita, R., & Hasnah, Y. (2024). A probe into the comparison of human translation and DeepL Translate in translating English text into Indonesian. *JED: Journal of English Development*, *4*(2), 112–126. https://journal.iaimnumetrolampung.ac.id/index.php/jed/article/view/4603

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley Blackwell.

Wibawani, S., & Rohman, S. (2023). Karakteristik kebahasaan perempuan dalam film pendek *Capciptop*: Sebuah kajian atomisme logis. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, *6*(4), 1039–1054. https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v6i4.752

Widyasari, N. P. F., Widiastuti, N. M. A., & Qomariana, Y. (2023). Features of women's language used by female characters in *Anne with an E* series. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Sigli*, *6*(2), 780–786. https://doi.org/10.47647/jsh.v6i2.2058

Youssef, S. S. (2024). Gender issues in translating women's language in Aslan's novel *Nile Sparrows*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(9), 2661–2670. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1409.02

Author Information

Dyah Raina Purwaningsih
Master of Humanities, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman
Jl. Dr. Suparno, Karangwangkal, Purwokerto, Indonesia
Email: dyah.purwaningsih@unsoed.ac.id
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6557-6638