

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Review of Related Studies

2.1.1. Language and Gender

Discussing about language and gender in society, it means discussing about the way men and women talk in community. In this case, we will find that the language used by men and women is different. From very beginning, family teaches girls to “talk like women” and boys to “talk like men”. Our culture also constructs that women tend to be feminine and men, in the other hand, are masculine.

The language patterns called “feminine” are used by both genders in situations of subordination; those called “masculine” are used by both genders in situations of dominance. Both genders know both patterns and can use them appropriately-women tend to get more practice in the subordinate ones and men more practice in the dominant ones because of the way power is structured in our society (Elgin, 1993:280).

Besides the study above, Elgin gives deeper explanation about differences between men’s and women’s pitch of voice. It is argued that male voice is deeper and richer, less nasal, and the more it is admired. Women tend to pitch their voices higher than men do, and this is a strike against them in almost every language interaction (1993:63). In other words it is argued that men have lower pitched than women’s.

Maltz and Borker (1982) claim that boys' and girls' speech is thought to have different content and to serve different purposes. Male speech can be characterized as competition oriented or adversarial. Boys' (and men's) groups are thought to be hierarchical and competitive. They state that boys use speech to "1) assert one's position of dominance, 2) attract and maintain an audience, and 3) assert one's oneself when other speakers have the floor (in Tannen, 1993).

On the other hand, Mealtz and Borker (1982) state that female speech can be characterized as collaboration oriented, or affiliative. They claim that girls learn to use words: "1) to create and maintain relationships of closeness and equality; 2) to criticize others in acceptable ways; and 3) to interpret accurately the speech of other girls." DiPietro (1981), Fishman (1983), Goodwin (1980), Kal ik (1975), Leaper (1991), and Maccoby (1986) claim that girls (and women) use language more cooperatively, sharing turns to speak more often than boys, showing more verbal organization of group behavior, acknowledging what others have said, and expressing agreement more. They show more interest in what other people are saying by responding to and elaborating on what other have said, by making more supportive comments, by asking more questions, and by working harder to keep conversations going (in Tannen, 1993).

2.1.1.1 Women's Collaboration Style

Trudgill explained that collaboration style is a way of talking which has t he sense of giving support to each other in order to emphasize solidarity between the participants (in Coates, 1996).

It is known that men and women have different behavior in conversation as it had mention above. Coates claimed stated that collaborativ eness is some kind of merging or blending which are the key features of the women's style of talking where all the participants build the conversational as a group to construct a meaning. Further she said that the talk of women's friends is a kind of a jam session' adopting jazz musicians when they are playing music; women often get together spontaneously to improve performance of talk (2004). The jam session that had explained above meant as a conversation in which the conversational floor is open to all participants spontaneously (Coates 2004). The characteristics of this speech style includes the use of collaborative floor, jointly constructed utterances, simultaneous speech, incomplete utterances, sharing in the search for the right word, overlapping speech, minimal responses, laughter, latching, elaboration on the same subject and researching of topics (Coates, 2004).

2.1.1.2 Women's Conversational Strategy

According to Coates (2004) women have different strategies in conversational interaction. Several aspects to understand women collaboration style as follow:

a. Topic and topic development

When talking with their female group, women usually talk about people and feelings rather than about things. They tend to develop the topic slowly and

accretively where participants building on each other's contribution and making an agreement (Coates, 2004).

b. Minimal Responses

Minimal responses include the words such as 'mh m', 'right', 'yeah', 'uh-huh' (and nonverbal equivalents such as nods) and are uttered by a listener primarily to indicate interest and attention to what the speaker is saying. Women use minimal responses more often than men do. They use minimal responses indicate listener's support to the currents speaker (Tannen, 1993). Coates stated that women use this style to accept new topic or acknowledge the end of a topic (2004).

c. Hedges

According to Holmes lexical hedges included the words *you know, sort of, well, you see* (1992). They express speakers' certainty and uncertainty about the proposition under discussion. The usage of hedges is to respect the face needs of all participants, to negotiate sensitive topics and to encourage the participation of others (Coates, 2004). Further Coates claimed that women often discuss sensitive topic: they use hedges to prevent speakers taking a hard line (2004).

d. Question

According to Coates women use questions to invite other speakers' participation in the conversation, to hedge, to introduce new topic, to views other speaker's opinion, and to start stories. In discussion, women's speaker will use question frequently to look forward to an agreement from other participant and confirm that they are listening.

e. Turn Taking Pattern

Turn taking patterns include interruptions and overlaps. According to Coates, interruptions are violations of the turn taking rules of conversation. The next speaker speaks while the current speaker is still speaking, at a point in the current speaker's turn which could not be defined as the last word (2004). Interruptions not necessarily disruptive in nature, but they can function to indicate support, collaboration and solidarity. It is argued that interruptions may tend to be more commonly of the collaborative, supportive type in all female than in all -male interaction (Tannen, 1993).

Coates stated that overlaps occurred when speakers make utterances or talk at the same time. Overlapping speech may occur in many contexts, such as the participant is asking questions or making comments by repeating or rephrasing other's words: overlaps occur in women's talk to work each other not against each other and to construct meaning (2004).

2.1.1.3 Women's Gossip Talk

According to Holmes, gossip is described as the kind of relaxed in-group talk that goes on between people in informal contexts. In Western society, gossip is defined as 'idle talk' and is particularly characteristic of women's interaction. Its overall function for women is to affirm solidarity and maintain the social relationships between the women involved (1992).

Women's gossip focuses predominantly on personal experiences and personal relationships, on personal problems and feelings. It may include criticism of the behavior of others, but women tend to avoid criticizing people directly because this would cause discomfort (Holmes, 1992).

In other hand, male equivalent of women's gossip is difficult to identify. In parallel situations the topics men discuss tend to focus on things and activities, rather than personal experiences and feelings. Topics like sport, cars and possession turn up regularly. The focus is on information and facts rather than on feelings and reactions (Holmes, 1992).

2.1.2 Infotainment

Infotainment is information-based media content or programming that also includes entertainment content in an effort to enhance popularity with audiences and consumers. The label 'infotainment' is emblematic of concern and criticism that journalism is devolving from a medium which conveys serious information about issues that affect the public interest, into a form of entertainment which happens to have fresh 'facts' in the mix. Infotainment includes the need for higher ratings, combined with a preference among the public for feel-good content and

"unimportant" topics (like celebrity gossip or sports).
<http://www.dictionary30.com/meaning/Infotainment>.

2.2. Review of Previous Studies

2.2.1. Previous studies of Women's Conversation Features in Gossip Talk

The study of women's conversational feature had been done by Aulia, a student of English Department Airlangga University in Surabaya. The title of her study is "Gossip Talk between Female Students of English Department Airlangga University."

The aims of Aulia's study are to find out the conversational features in the function used by female students of English Department Airlangga University. The study also aims to reveal the functions of the conversational features which are used by female students of English Department Airlangga University while gossiping in campus. In her study the data were taken when the participants were gossiping at canteen in there campus.

Aulia's study is similar with the writer's, because it talks about women's behavior in conversation. In her research she uses Conversation Analysis as the methodology. The reasons why she uses CA as her approach are because, first, CA paradigm puts its interests in aspects of conversational interactions; one of them is turn taking (Paltridge, 2000). Hence, to analyze the phenomena of turn taking in the conversations she must use Conversation Analysis method. Second, CA avoids using research questions before a researcher gains data to discover the phenomenon that

comes out from a study. Her study actually did also; therefore CA is an appropriate approach to be employed in this study.

Based on the data analysis, Aulia's findings show that the subjects of her study (female students) use certain language strategy when gossiping which is called collaborative style. The conversational features mostly used by the participants are minimal responses, tag question, overlaps, and interruptions. The functions of these conversational features are to show that the participants are collaborating and supporting to each other. Therefore, any violation rules of turn taking are acceptable because it has no purpose to dominate the conversation.

2.2.2. Previous studies of Turn-taking Analysis using CA approach

Afiana a student of English Department Airlangga University in Surabaya has done a study about Turn-taking. The title of her study is "Analysis of Turn-taking in Same-Sex and Mix-Sex Conversation on The Talk Radio." The aims of her study are to find out the turn-taking irregularity includes overlaps and interruptions produced by the participants in same-sex and mix-sex conversation. Her study also aims to find out the function of significant features from the participants' turns in term of minimal responses and hedges. The objects of the study are including three participants; a female and male radio's host and also a female radio's listener.

Afiana's study use CA as the methodology because CA paradigm puts its interest in the aspects of conversational interaction; one of them is turn taking (Paltridge, 2000). The aim of her study is find out the turn-taking irregularity, therefore, CA is the appropriate method to achieve this aim.

Based on the data analysis, Afiana found several patterns of turn-taking irregularities that indicate different functions. Interruptions in mix -talk conversation are indicating the dominance of male speaker, but overlaps in the same -sex conversation are indicating the next speaker's supports and encouraging the current speaker to continue. And the last finding is about significant features: there are some utilizing hedges and minimal responses which have different functions such as expressing uncertainly and showing the attention.