CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Sometimes students do not pay attention to the lecturer when they are in a class. This is very common in schools and universities. They do not respond to the lecturer's question or look away when addressed. Some of them say that it is because of the way or style that the lecturers teach. The writer also experienced this situation himself, which prompted him to start paying attention to the lecturers of the Faculty of Letters English Department.

For example, there is a female lecturer in English Department about whom many students complain about the way she teaches in a class. Many of her students say that she teaches with a style which makes the students bored. She always teaches with a serious face and never tells or gives a joke to the students. There is another female lecturer who makes the situation in a class boring. This lecturer explains the material in one and a half hours. She just talks without involving the students in a class and there is no interaction between lecturer and students at all. This is interesting to analyze because the writer has been in classes like that taught mostly by female lecturers. This is not to say that classes taught by male lecturers are livelier or not boring. It just happened that when the writer joined a class which is taught by a male lecturer, the classroom situation is more relax. There are interactions between the lecturer and students. This situation happened because the male lecturer probably uses different style in teaching than

female lecturer. He tells jokes to his students to make the situation in the class more attractive.

Therefore, the writer interested to investigate the use of conversation strategies produced by the lecturers from the Faculty of Letters English Department in Airlangga University. Different lecturers have different way or style in teaching, which can influence the situation in the class. The writer is interested in analyzing the lecturer's conversation strategies, because it is important for communication in a class, regardless of any teaching methods that they are using. Understanding conversation strategies can also to make the lecturer aware of their way of teaching and communicating in class, so the students are not getting bored and pay more attention to the lecturer explanation.

When we talk about men and women, there will be differences between them especially in the way they communicate. Sally Johnson and Frank Finlay said that there are differences if we compare women and men's communication. First, the way men talk is different from women. Men tend to use competitive talk when they are talking with their male friends, while women use cooperative and supportive way of talking with female friends. Secondly, women's talk focuses mainly on topics such as: celebrity life, problems in relationship, or even other people's matters. In general, women's talk is more focused on relationship between people. Women talk to get information and to connect or to gain rapport. They talk about people rather than things. They convey feelings and details. They are relationship oriented. They are quicker to ask for and accept help or directions. On the contrary, men talk to give information or report. They talk about things

like business, sports, and food rather than people. They convey facts, not details. They are goal-oriented. They focus on solving problems and are less likely to ask for help or directions (Coates, 2004).

In this study, the writer wants to compare the differences between men and women's conversational strategies. As the writer mentioned earlier, women have their own way of talking, they tend to acknowledge cooperative and supportive way of talking or it is commonly labeled as 'women's collaborative style'. Trudgill defined collaborative style as a way of talking which have the sense of giving support to each other in order to emphasize solidarity between the women's involved (in Coates, 1996). According to Coates, collaborativeness is the key features of the women's style of talking where all the participants build the conversation not as an individual but as a group to construct a meaning (1996). Coates also defined the features of collaborative style such as; topic and topic development; minimal responses; hedges; questions; turn-taking patterns (2004).

However, in public space, the nature of interaction between men and women may change. The public space is a male-dominated area, and the discourse patterns of male speakers have become the established norm in public life. In Britain, for example, the split was established in the early nineteenth century, and involved a new demarcation of gender roles: 'men were firmly placed in the newly defined public world of business, commerce and politics; women were placed in the private world of home and family' (Hall 1985: 12). Certainly, women and men bring different conversational strategies to the public space. In

public space, female speakers use overlapping turns, constructed talk and positive feedback when they talk with each other, while the men's talk exhibits playful conflict and competition.

In institution, men feel comfortable in a lecturing role. Men talk more, talk longer, and tend to control the choice of themes more than females do. Meanwhile, women apparently feel comfortable in a listening role. This listening shows a desire to cooperate, support others' themes and initiate more topics than men do. Women feel more comfortable sharing their expertise with others, rather than rivaling others with it.

These two contrasting view may lead to a communication breakdown when men and women talk or communicate to each other. Women want to be listened to more (especially with "um" and "yeah" listening signals) and lectured at less. Meanwhile, men want to be listened to in a quietly helpful way (without the "um" and "yeah" listening signals), and they also want women to be less passive and take more initiative (Coates, 2004).

The writer is interested in knowing whether female and male lecturer of English Department Airlangga University as the subjects of this study also shows the same kind of tendency. In that case, the writer uses Conversation Analysis (CA) as his method of the study considering that it is the best method to analyze the interactions in details and how people orient themselves to rule of interactions in a particular setting.

People always communicate with each other through many ways, one of which is conversation. Therefore, conversation is considered to be very important

in human lives, as people use it in everyday life, both in the informal or formal form. Conversation itself contains topic, in which the topic may develop to another topic and sub-topic or may change into another topic which has no connection with the previous topic. These topics are affected by immediate environment like campus, company, neighborhood, and so on. In other word, different communication styles are dictated by the different settings where the interaction occurs (http://www.theintrovertzcoach.com/communication.html).

According to Schegloff (2002), CA is a micro-analytical approach that includes the use of paralinguistic features (pitch, stress, sound quality and so forth) and accounts of conduct (gesture, gazing, and interruptions). The CA approach is different from qualitative and quantitative paradigms. It is different from the quantitative one because CA does not seek to find the correlation between variables, as quantitative approach does. CA attempts to find a number of phenomena that occur in the data. The CA paradigm is distinguished from the qualitative in a way that a CA practitioner does not need to gain detailed knowledge about participants' identities, daily routines and beliefs (Cameron, 2003). A qualitative analyst must gain knowledge about participants' backgrounds, positions and the like. Therefore, qualitative researcher generally uses an interview data. Based on the approach of the study, thus, the aim of doing this study can not be approached if the writer uses quantitative or qualitative paradigms.

Aside from the differences that the writer had mentioned above, there are also several reasons why the writer thinks that CA is the best method in doing this

study. The first reason is because CA paradigm puts its interests in aspects of conversational interactions (Paltridge, 2000). Second, CA using research questions before a researcher gains data to discover the phenomenon that comes out from a study. In this case, the result is really grounded on the data from the site. Psathas (1995) states that a conversation analyst must not close his/her mind to a new fact that possibly appears during the time of conducting a study.

When a lecturer teaches in a class, they have their own ways in teaching. Male and female lecturers use different strategies in conversational interaction. Sometimes they use gesture, gazing, and interruptions. They also use different conversational strategies when they teach. CA is a suitable approach to understand these conversational strategies because of its focus on the aspects of conversational interactions.

In addition, Conversation Analysis does not deal only with informal conversation. The approach has also been applied to talk in professional and workplace or public space settings (Drew and Heritage 1992). Therefore it is a suitable approach to look at interactions in the classroom like in this study.

1.2. Statements of the Problem

In conducting this study, the research problem is elaborated into four research questions:

1. What types of conversational strategies do the lecturers produce?

2. What are the effects of the different conversational strategies used by the lecturers on the classroom interactions?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The objective of the study is to find the answer for the proposed problems through the analysis. Thus, this study is intended:

1. To find out the types of conversational strategies produced by the lecturers.

2. To find out the effects of the different conversational strategies used by the lecturers on the classroom interactions.

1.4. The Significance of the Study

This study is aimed to find out the conversational strategies of teaching between female and male lecturers. The writer hopes that this study can give information on how different sex (male and female) produces the conversational strategies in different ways in classroom setting. Therefore, we could understand the use for conversational strategies in a better way. The writer also expects that my thesis provide a basis for those who are interested in studying conversational strategies. For CA practitioners, this study is expected to give them more useful information and knowledge about how the organization of conversational strategies operates in certain institutional context.

1.5. Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding, the writer defines the following key terms:

a. **Minimal Responses**

The words 'right', 'yeah', or 'mhm' are minimal responses. Women use minimal responses to signal their active listenership and support for each other. They also use minimal responses to mark their recognition of different stages of a conversation, for example, to accept a new topic or to acknowledge the end of a topic (Coates, 2004:129).

b. **Hedges**

Hedges are linguistic forms such as 'I think', 'I'm sure', 'you know', 'sort of' and 'perhaps' which express the speaker's certainty or uncertainty about the proposition under discussion. Robin Lakoff claimed that women's speech contains more hedges, and argued that this is because women 'are socialized to believe that asserting themselves strongly isn't nice or ladylike, or even feminine' (Lakoff 1975: 54).

c. **Tag questions**

Declarative statement without the assumption that the statement is to be believed by the addressee, therefore they use questions. The tag gives the addressee leeway, not forcing him to go along with the views of the speaker (Lakoff, 1975:16). Coates defines an affective function

for tags which are directed toward the addressee and signal solidarity. Moreover, tag-questions also serve a modal function. As such they are speaker oriented and indicate a request for information or a confirmation of the information (2004).

d. Turn taking patterns

The turn taking patterns that this study focuses on are interruptions and overlaps. Based on Coates in her book Women, Men and Language, interruptions are violations of the turn taking rules of conversation (2004: 113). The next speaker speaks while the current speaker is still speaking, at a point in the current speaker's which could not be defined as the last word. Interruptions break the symmetry of the conversational model: the interrupter prevents the speaker from finishing her or his turn, at the same time gaining a turn for her or himself (Coates, 2004). In the other hand, Hutchby considered overlaps as an evidence of an incoming speaker's failure to take notice of whether the current speaker has or has not finished (in Coates, 2004). Overlapping speech may occur in many different contexts. Co-conversationalists may ask questions or make comments while another participant is speaking or like minimal responses which signal active listenership, but they contribute more substantially to the production of joint text. It also occurs when speakers repeat or rephrase each other's words (Coates, 2004).