

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Review of Related Theories

2.1.1. Language and Gender

It is a common belief that gender differentiates the way men and women's use language. The interpretations of gender-differentiated language fall into one of two approaches, which reflect how women are viewed in the society; the dominance approach and the difference approach. The dominance approach sees the differences in language use between men and women are concerned with the imbalance of power between the sexes. Men are considered in the dominance position and women are in subordinate position. Study that is categorized in this approach is Robin Lakoff's work 'Language and Women's place' (1975). In her work, Lakoff provides a list of ten linguistic features which characterize women's speech, such as: Lexical hedges or fillers, Tag questions, Rising intonation on declaratives, 'Empty' adjectives, Precise color terms, Intensifiers, 'Hypercorrect' grammar, 'Superpolite' forms, Avoidance of strong swear words, and Emphatic stress. According to Lakoff, these women's linguistic features are functioned to express women's lack of confidence (1975).

In contrast, the difference approach sees the speech differences between men and women because of they are from different subcultures. Maltz and Borker argue that the features in women's speech are not reflecting the imbalance power between sexes. However, the sexes itself have different norms for the conversational interaction between men and women because they come from different sociolinguistic subcultures (1982).

2.1.2. Conversational Strategies in Mixed-Sex Talk

Coates states that men and women have different strategies in conversational interaction. She suggested there are aspects of conversational strategies used by men and women, as follows:

1. Minimal responses

Fishman stated that the use of minimal responses can show the power and powerless position in a conversation between man and women respectively (In Coates, 2004). Women use minimal responses to signal their active listenership and support to each other. In contrast, when men use minimal responses, there are often delayed that can be concluded as a tactic for man to weaken the current speaker and to strengthen their dominance (Coates, 2004).

2. Hedges

Hedges are linguistic forms such as *I think*, *you know*, *sort of*, and *perhaps* which express the uncertainty of the speaker (Coates, 2004). According to Lakoff, one would expect 'you know' to be randomly scattered throughout women's speech, since its usage is supposed to reflect the general insecurity of the speaker (1970). If 'you know' does some kind of work in conversation, people would expect its occurrence to cluster at points in conversation where the interaction context seems to call for its usage (1970).

3. Tag questions

Lakoff stated that using tag questions may decrease the strength of assertions. She also said that women use more tag questions than men

(In Coates, 2004). However, this conclusion can be claimed true fully because based on the data of the use of tag questions in formal situation taken by Dubois and Crouch showed that all the tags that appeared in the data were all produced by men (In Coates, 2004).

4. Questions

According to Sandra Haris (In Coates, 2004), establishing questions in formal situation like in court are crucial resource for powerful participants. She also added that in this particular situation, questions require the addressee to produce an answer that is conversationally relevant. In other words, questions control what the next speaker is able to say. Other situations that are also confirmed the same findings are in doctor-patient and teacher-pupil interactions or host and caller on radio phone-ins (Coates, 2004). It is certainly true that questions are exploited by powerful linguistic forms which give the speaker the power to elicit a response from the other participant (s). This characteristic of questions is exploited by powerful participants in asymmetrical situations. Men ask more questions than women when the context has high status while women as the powerless participants exploited questions to keep the conversation going. Research findings so far suggest that if women use interrogative forms more than men, it reflects women's relative weakness in conversation: they exploit questions and tag question in order to keep conversation going (Coates, 2004).

5. Commands and directives

According to Coates, command and directives are part of speech act which tries to get someone to do something (Coates, 2004). Based on Goodwin's observation (In Coates, 2004), boys tend to use 'aggravated' directives such as *Give me, I want, Get off* and use them to establish status differences between themselves. The girls, on the contrary, use more 'mitigated' directives such as *let's, could, and can* which make suggestion than demanding for future action.

6. Swearing and taboo language

Men are believed to do more swearing and use taboo language than women in their same-sex interactions. Lakoff claimed that men use stronger expletives such as '*damn*' or '*shit*' than women which usually use '*oh dear*' or '*goodness*' (In Coates, 2004). In mixed-sex conversations, male and female speakers seem to accommodate to the perceived norms of the other gender: male speakers use far less swearing words and taboo language than in same-sex context and female speakers are even more far less.

7. Compliments.

Research suggests that women give and receive more compliments than men (Coates, 2004). Based on Holmes's analysis of 484 compliments are showed that 51 per cent (248) were given by a woman to another woman, 9 per cent (44) were given by a man to another man, 23.1 per cent were given by a man to a woman and 16.5 per cent by a woman to a man. Women usually use pattern 'What (a)

Adj NP!' while men use the minimal pattern. Compliments in mixed-sex conversation can not always be seen in positive way although it seems to function as positive politeness strategies. Mixed-sex compliments are more face-threatening than same-sex compliments, and compliments seem to be more face-threatening to men than to women. Pomerantz (In Coates, 2004), states that compliments place addressee in a difficult position where they have to juggle two conflicting conversational rules; to be agreed with the speaker or to avoid self-praise.

2.1.3. Conversational Dominance in Mixed-Sex Talk

In conversation we may find a speaker who dominating others which is usually known as 'Conversational dominance' (Coates, 2004). This phenomenon often happened in mixed talk where men use certain strategies to dominate the conversation. There are many linguistic strategies which can be used to achieve dominance in conversation, as follows:

1. Grabbing the floor: interruptions

One of the examples of the strategy that men use to dominate the conversation is to interrupt others. 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).

2. Hogging the floor: talking too much

In public contexts which have higher status, men tend to talk more than women in mixed-group such as in staff meetings, seminars, or television panel discussion (Coates, 2004). Spender explains that we have different expectations of male and female speakers, if men have the right to talk women are expected to remain silent (In Coates, 2004).

3. Strategies of non-cooperation

Non-cooperation strategy involves the interaction where one participant displays a lack of commitment to having a conversation at all (Coates, 2004). From the result of her study, DeFrancisco found that women worked harder than men to keep the conversation going, but were not really successful because the addressee, in this case men were giving non-cooperative responses. She also found that although women talk more than men it does not mean that they were trying to dominate the conversation and they even fail more to get their topic accepted than the men (In Coates, 2004). Lack of response that men often do in the conversation is part of turn-taking violation which is called the no-response violation which allows them to control the mixed and all-male conversation.

4. Silence: symbol of power or powerless?

Silence; long pauses at points where no response occur that usually happen after interruptions is also part of turn-taking violation (Coates, 2004). In other words, silence is known as a sign of malfunction in conversation.

Based on the result of the data taken by Zimmerman and West (In Coates, 2004), silences or non-cooperative responses are not just from interruptions and overlaps, but also from delayed minimal responses which is a signal of lack understanding and lack of interest to the speaker. Male speakers in mixed-sex conversation often delayed their minimal responses. When a man does not want to cooperate in the interaction with his partner, he uses silence which is demonstrated his power to choose whether or not to participate in the talk. However, when a woman falls into silence after getting non-cooperative responses from her partner, then her silence is a signal of powerlessness (Coates, 2004).

2.1.4. Insecurity

Pamela Fishman argues in *Interaction: the Work Women Do* (1983) that conversation between the sexes sometimes fails, not because of anything inherent in the way women talk, but because of how men respond, or don't respond. In *Conversational Insecurity* (1990) Fishman questions Robin Lakoff's theories. Lakoff suggests that asking questions shows women's insecurity and hesitancy in communication, whereas Fishman looks at questions as an attribute of interactions: Women ask questions because of the power of these, not because of their personality weaknesses. Fishman also claims that in mixed-sex language interactions, men speak on average for twice as long as women. She considered two examples of women's conversational style *question-asking* and the use of *'you know'*, where both are seen as the indicatives of women's tendency to be more 'insecure' and 'hesitant'.

2.1.5. The Bachelor

2.1.5.1. General Description

The Bachelor is a reality television dating game show that first appearance in 2002. The game is about a wealthy bachelor that is persuaded by 25 women. The bachelor narrows down the 25 women and eventually selects only one. The show includes series of group dates until there are few remaining women which are go to some luxurious place such us Las Vegas, Hawaii, New York, etc., and then they go on individual dates with the bachelor, and finally overnight dates and meetings with the bachelor and bachelorettes' families.

2.1.5.2. The Bachelor (first season)

In the Bachelor, the most eligible bachelor is trying to find his bride and 25 women who are trying to prove that they are the one that the bachelor is trying to find. Each week these women have to compete to each other to have the opportunity to stay for another week and finally will be chosen as the bachelor's bride. The contestants have to use their strategy to attract the bachelor therefore at the elimination they are chose to stay.

The bachelor, Alex Michel, is a good-looking, successful, and ready to get married. Through the reality show, he has the chance to choose one from 25 fantastic women who are also looking for love. This is no ordinary relationship show because the bachelor and the contestants will get the chance to know each through dates which arrange by the host. They get to know all about one another in an effort to find love and soul mate and for Alex is to find his future bride.

Alex goes on many dates in the same time. Sometimes he has a group date which is consist of five women, and go on individual dates that arranges by the crew. He eliminates one woman each week that he thinks is not the one he is looking for. He analyzes each woman on every date, sometimes he asked one of the women to go on privacy date that can make the other women jealous. In the final episodes, there will be only two women left which of course Alex still has to choose one of them.

2.2. Review of Related studies

2.2.1. Previous study of insecurity through woman's language in reality show

The study about politeness and insecurity had been done before by Arinta Shalomitta, a student of English Department Airlangga University. The title of her thesis is "A Study on Insecurity Performed by Jessica Simpson through Question Asking and Tag Question in MTV Reality Show Newlyweds". Her study analyzed that Jessica Simpson is an insecure speaker. She also analyzed the relationship between the topics which Jessica always discusses with her husband and the insecurity and politeness. The object of her study is Jessica Simpson who is the stars in Newlyweds Reality Show. In her study, she used the theory of Robin Lakoff about insecurity and tag question and the theory of Pamela Fishman about Conversational Insecurity. The result of her study shows that the reason why Jessica Simpson was an insecure is Jessica was anxious that she would force her husband, to go along with her view if she stated her ideas in directive statements. Jessica was unconfident of her own ideas, or that she was not sure of what she would say. And also Jessica was irritated of several situations that annoyed her feeling. And finally,

she found that Jessica mostly used the function of Pre-Invitation through her questions and tag questions to show her insecurity.

2.2.2. Previous study of mixed-sex conversation on conversation

The study of mixed-sex conversation had been done by Afiana, 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 conversations. The purpose of the study also 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 listener.

In her study she used Conversational Analysis as the methodology. She used CA as her approach because CA paradigm puts its interests in the aspects of conversational interaction; such as turn-taking and the aim of her study is to find out the turn-taking irregularity.

Afiana’s study is similar with this study, because it was also examined the mixed-sex conversations. She analyzes the differences between male and female speech in informal situation and spontaneous way.

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 female speaker. She also finds

that there are some utilization hedges and minimal responses which have different function such as expressing uncertainty and showing attention.