

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEWS

2.1. Review of related theories

In this chapter, the writer explains the related literature that he uses in this study. Those theories are important for the writer as a guide in analyzing the data later.

2.1.1. Language and Gender

Many researchers have conducted research about the language used by different gender. The most interesting part is the finding which shows that men and women use language differently. According to Maltz and Borker, males and females converse differently. Their evidence showed that women use conversation primarily for negotiating and expressing a relationship while men use conversation as display (Poynton, 1989:27). Moreover, Coates found that men and women have different conversational style (1986:11). According to her, men typically adopt a competitive style in conversation, treating their turn as a chance to overturn the earlier speaker's contribution and to make their own point as forcibly as possible. Women, on the other hand, typically adopt a co-operative mode. They usually add rather than demolish other speaker's contribution. They are supportive of others and they tend not to interrupt each other.

The differences between men and women are also found in the way they chat. Coates has analyzed some of the differences between men and women in chatting. According to her, in chatting, women often discuss one topic for half an

hour or more and they share a great deal of information about themselves and talk about their feelings and their relationship. Men, on the other hand, jump from one topic to another. They rarely talk about themselves, but compete to prove themselves better informed about current affairs, travel, and sport. Moreover, she also found that men and women are also different in linking between speaker turns and shifting the topic in conversation. Those two strategies always occur when people have conversation or chat. According to her, women usually take their turn in conversation by explicitly acknowledging the contribution of the previous speaker(s) and then talk on a topic directly connected with what has been mentioned before. Men, on the other hand do not feel that they need to link the previous topic with the new topic; on the contrary, men are more likely to ignore what has been said before and to concentrate on making their own point. In shifting the topic of the conversation, men tend to shift the topic abruptly while women develop the topic progressively and shift the topic gradually because women usually build in each other's contribution (1986:151-152).

All of those evidences show that men and women differ in terms of language use, conversation, and conversational style. Unfortunately, these differences usually lead to miscommunication when men and women are involved in conversation. Therefore, it is important to identify and understand those differences to avoid miscommunication and misunderstanding.

There is a significant body of research that claims men and women actually have different conversational behaviours manifested into two styles of talk as it had mentioned above. Jones argued that women, when talking, use a

collaborative style in the sense that they are supportive of each other's contributions and roles within the conversation, while men, when talking among themselves, adopt a competitive style by using an aggressive style (1980).

Collaborativeness, according to Coates (1996) 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 conversation not as an individual but as a group to construct a meaning. Coates said that the talk of women's friends is a kind of 'jam session' adopting jazz musicians when they play music; women often get together spontaneously in improving performance of talk (Coates, 2004). The 'jam session' that Coates meant here is a conversation in which the conversational floor is open to all participants simultaneously (2004). Moreover, Coates (2004) suggested some relevant categories to understand how women's collaborative style is achieved, as follows:

1. Minimal Responses

Coates stated that minimal responses consist of one-word utterances, such as *right*, *yeah* or *uhm* which is used by women to signal their active listenership and support to each other. She also said that, women use it to accept new topic or acknowledge the end of a topic (2004).

2. Hedges

The usage of hedges, according to Coates, is to respect the face needs of all participants, to negotiate sensitive topics and to encourage the participation of others. Women often discuss sensitive topic, using hedges prevents speakers taking a hard line (Coates, 2004).

3. Questions

Coates suggested that women use questions to invite other speakers to participate in the conversation, to introduce new topics, to hedge, to view other speaker's opinion and to start stories. When discussing something, women's speaker will use question frequently to look forward to an agreement from other participant and to confirm that they are listening to them (2004).

4. Commands and Directives

We can define a directive as a speech act which tries to get someone to do something.

2.1.2. Outline of Conversation Analysis as an approach

Conversation analysis is a new approach to spoken discourse because it began to develop in the mid 1960s (Paltridge, 2000). Similar to other approaches to spoken discourse, CA sees that a context influences the production of utterances through conversation (van Dijk, 1997). Put in another way, the spoken discourse approaches are approaches that try to explicate the relationship between two attributes: conversation and context. It is difficult to describe what context is. Schiffrin (1994) states that context is a world that is filled with people producing utterances: people who have social, cultural and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, goals and wants and who interact with one another in various defined circumstances. To make it clearer, the writer will give one instance of spoken discourse approaches that is, speech act. Speech act is a study that attempts to

classify utterances into general level (directives, commissives, and so forth) or into specific levels (question, offer, command, inquiry, and the like) (Schriffin, 1994). Schriffin further states that different contexts can construct different utterances in terms of general levels or the specific ones as stated beforehand. Same as speech act, CA sees that context can shape conversations (1994). Nonetheless, different from other approaches to spoken discourse, CA sees context more on how it can shape how things are said. Nevile and Walker states that CA examines how people say things in a context (2005).

To make it clearer, CA is a study that tries to find out how conversation is organized within a context. Therefore, many CA studies have been conducted to compare the organizations of talks between an informal and an institutional context (Heritage, 1995). However, CA does not only consider context as a world that is filled with particular people as defined by Schiffrin (1994), but also see that sequences are part of contexts itself. It is the same as what Goodwin and Heritage claim (1990). They state that CA sees that anything anyone says in a conversation not only builds on what has been said or what has been going on but also creates a circumstance for what will be said next. It means that context is very important in the CA enterprise. The importance of context is just one feature of CA.

The next feature of CA is that CA puts its interest in naturally occurring conversations (Goodwin and Heritage, 1990). It means that conversations that are sampled in a CA study are not talks that are specifically generated for research purposes. Therefore, Cameron states that many CA researchers named their studies 'talk-in-interaction' instead of 'conversation' (2001). This brand is

utilized because CA places its focus on talk (instead of written text) and more importantly, the kind of talk that is natural and interactive.

The superiority of CA compared to other approaches to spoken discourse is that CA uses highly detailed and revealing transcriptions of conversations. The advantages of transcriptions are not only to know what people say but also how they say it (Nevile & Walker, 2005). Stated in another way, the transcription of CA allows deeper analysis of how people interact. The explanation about CA transcription will be discussed further in the following chapter.

Different from some other research paradigms, CA does not use theory to ground and to explain its argument. As ten Have (1999) states, CA neither utilizes theory nor construct a theory of its own. However, CA is divided into two fractions; pure CA and applied CA. Schegloff (2002) asserts that applied CA study is conducted to answer research questions that are theoretically motivated, also the kinds of questions that are similar to the ones that are employed in applied linguistics, education and many other fields of the study. Quite the reverse, a pure CA practitioner does not intend to answer those kinds of research questions. Regarding to the differences between pure and applied CA, Mori (Nuzuliyanti, 2004) affirms that a pure CA study accomplished not only for having better insights of the nature of human interaction, but also for advancing CA as a methodology.

CA as a methodology just seeks the orderliness in conversations because CA regards that there are rules existing in every interaction. These rules are systematic (Sacks, cited in Nuzuliyanti, 2004). Speakers in every conversation

have to understand these kinds of rules so that the interaction can flow easily. The deviation of rule can lead to disorganization of conversation. Moreover, the disagreement and misunderstanding may show up (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

2.1.3. Classroom Interaction

According to Oxford (Dictionary of Sociology 1998, originally published by Oxford University Press 1998), classroom interaction describes the form and content of behaviour or social interaction in the classroom. In particular, research on gender, class and race in education has examined the relationship between teacher and students in the classroom. In addition, Ana Metelo (<http://www.ling.lancs.ac.uk/groups/crile/docs/crile50.pdf>) also describes about classroom interaction as the classroom process in which teachers and students have a mutual effect upon each other through which they say and do in the classroom. Based on the explanation above, the writer tries to examine the way the interaction is built from the lecturer's point of view. To make a classroom interaction, the lecturer needs to use a conversational strategy. The conversational strategy consists of some features which have certain functions. These functions may appear differently depending on the lecturer's gender. In order to distinguish the features' function, the writer takes male and female lecturer as the subjects. In this study, the writer excludes the class and race aspect. Instead, the writer will focus on the use of conversational strategy's features by male and female lecturer.

2.2. Related Studies

The study of Conversation Analysis in conversation had been done by Afiana (2006), a student of English Department Airlangga University in Surabaya. The title of her study is “Analysis of Turn-Taking Irregularities in Same-Sex and Mixed-Sex Conversation on the Talk Radio”.

The aims of Afiana’s study are to find out the turn-taking irregularity, in her case, in overlaps and interruptions produced by the participants in same-sex and mixed-sex conversation. The 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 her study are including three participants; a female and male radio’s host and a female radio’s listener.

Afiana’s study is similar with the writers’, because it was also conducted with Conversation Analysis as the methodology. The reason why she uses CA as her approach is because CA paradigm puts its interests in the aspects of conversational interactions; one of them is turn taking (Paltridge, 2000) and the aim of her study is to find out the turn-taking irregularity. Therefore, CA is the best method to achieve the aim of her study.

Based on the data analysis, Afiana’s findings show several patterns of turn-taking irregularities which indicate different functions, such as: interruptions in mixed-sex conversation indicating the dominance of male speaker, but overlaps in same-sex conversation indicating the next speaker’s support and encouraging the current speaker to continue. She also finds that there are some utilization

hedges and minimal responses which have different functions such as expressing uncertainty and showing attention.

The study about women's speech features had been done before by Dewi Rosita, a student of English Department Petra Christian University in Surabaya. The title of her thesis is, 'A Sociolinguistics Study on Speech Features of Female Students of Petra Christian University while Gossiping in Campus'. Her study analyzed the type of speech features used by female students of Petra Christian University while gossiping in campus and the topics that occur in each conversation and then analyzed the relationship between topics of gossip and the speech features used.

The study done by Rosita looks similar with this study but actually there are lots of differences between these two studies. The study of Rosita used Robin Lakoff's theory definition of women's linguistic features such as lexical hedges or filler, tag questions, avoidance of strong swear words, empty adjectives, hypercorrect grammar, precise color terms, and intensifiers. In this view, Women's Language is considered as a weak and unassertive (Coates, 2004). Moreover, this study sees women's language and conversational features such as minimal responses, tag questions, interruptions and overlaps which are mostly found in the data.

Rosita also emphasizes four topics of gossip following Deborah Jones (1980) such as house-talk, scandal, bitching, and chatting. House-talk is the exchange of information and resources connected with the female roles as an occupation, in other words it consists of things related to women's activity as

female. Scandal is when women criticize other women especially in appearance and attitudes. Bitching is the overt expression of women's anger at their restricted role and inferior status. Last, chatting is the most intimate form of gossip because it only happens in situation where the participants really know her partner really well, so they can share all their private life.

She used qualitative method because her data are in form of words and it involves obtaining a holistic picture of what goes on in a particular situation and setting.

The results of her study show that the speech features which are mostly used by Female Students of Petra Christian University while gossiping in campus were lexical hedges and intensifiers and those which do not appear in all conversations were 'hypercorrect' grammar, 'super polite' forms, and precise colour terms. The topics of gossip which are mostly produced by the speakers were 'house-talk' (refers to daily activities) and 'chatting' (refers to private problems). Finally, she also found that the topics of gossip influenced the amounts of speech features produced and also influenced the kind of speech features that occur.