

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The presentation and analysis of the data for each pattern were done per conversation. The data of one conversation would be presented and analysed; after that the data of another conversation would be then presented and analysed in the next section, and so on. The analysis of the whole conversations for each pattern would be done at the very end section of each pattern analysis. The complete transcriptions of all conversations could be seen in the Appendix.

III.1 ASKING QUESTION

Not every question/interrogative form (with question marker (?)) in all of the conversations will be counted and analysed here. There is an exception for expressions in interrogative form with categorization as below :

1. The expression is not a minimal response like 'he-eh', 'iya', etc, except when it is followed or preceded immediately by one or more phrases, other than those, like in:

M2 : nunggu lagi dari cabang pembantu.
 →F6 : L Dari lain-lainnya. He-eh?

Forms like 'he-eh', 'he-em', and 'iya' with the exception above were categorized as minimal responses and will be analysed in 3.2 about Minimal Response Pattern.

2. It is not a question from the third person imitated by the respondents.
3. It is not a repeated question motivated by the partner of conversation who does not hear or understand the question.

Example :

F1 : - Kerjanya di mana?
 M1 : [/Enak/] Kenapa?
 →F1 : Kerjanya di mana?

4. It is not an explanation of the previous question motivated by the partner who does not hear or understand the question.

Example :

M1 : Kanu, apa?
 F1 : Apanya?
 →M1 : Sudah lulus?

Questions included in number 2, 3, and 4 were not analysed since their occurrences depend on the partner's questions.

III.1.1 CONTEXT 1: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.1.1.1 CONVERSATION 1 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.1.1.1 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 1

	M1	F1
Questions	31 (36%)	55 (64%)
Total	86 (100%)	

It could be seen from the table above that the female conversationalist proposed more questions than her male partner.

Here F1 indeed asked more questions than M1, but not all of her questions were facilitative. 3 of her questions showed her hesitancy in talking:

F1 : .. Tapi kan kalau di: mana? Sipi:l, arsitektur, ... terus apa? e lingkungan itu cewek.

She also used 'Ha?' or 'He?' (3 questions) that forced M1 to repeat his question. She questioned not because she did not hear M1's questions, since the three questions asked by M1 were proposed clearly without any noise in the background.

She asked more explanation about M1's questions which were clear enough (2 questions), like when M1 said that he had graduated from FIA in Brawijaya University and asked:

M1 : Kanu, apa?

It was clear enough that he wanted the same infor-

mation from F1 about her graduation, but F1 asked :

F1 : Apanya?

that forced him to change his question into :

M1 : Sudah lulus?

4 of her questions might function as a confirmation of her statement, like in :

F1 : Oalah, modin itu ya?

or

F1 : Oh hanya itu aja yang membedakan? Jadi sudah berhubungan itu boleh?

And she repeated M1's statements in interrogative form that might function to ascertain his.

M1 : Dia A satu: aku A dua.

→ F1 : A Dua?

Those questions could also be facilitative. They might be used to keep the conversation going, to show her attention to the partner's talk.

She broke silence (with the duration more than a second) by proposing questions with absolutely new topics (three times). She kept asking to prevent the failing of interaction.

The man asked 31 questions, fewer than F1, but not all of them were facilitative. Four times he showed his uncertainty in talking:

M1 : E:, informatika kan ada di sana. Eh, kok informatika. Ck, listrik apa ya? [inhales]

He repeated F1's words three times that might be used to ascertain her statements :

M1 : Dari?

F1 : E di ITS:.

→ M1 : O ITS?

4 of his might be a confirmation for his claims :

.....
 M1 : Ini nanti, ngobrol sama ... itu. Terus minggu depan nanti umurnya yang lebih tua lagi. Iya? Terus habis gitu paling .. lebih tua lagi?

The question above could be facilitative too for it broke the silence and the topic was different from the previous. Thus, man could also make an effort to keep the conversation going.

III.1.1.2 CONVERSATION 2 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.1.1.2 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 2

	M2	F2
Questions	58 (69.9%)	25 (30.1%)
Total	83 (100%)	

The man was more active in asking questions compared to the woman. Thus M2 and F2 deviated from Fishman's theory that woman asked questions more than man (in Graddol & Swann, 1989:72).

From his questions, 3 indicated his uncertainty in talking :

M2 : Ya: sepet saya nikaati sih. Saya juga bisa ... apa? istilahnya itu?

5 of his questions might be proposed to make confirmation to F2 about his claim. For instance, he wanted to confirm Torik's (or Tofik's) apperance that had been informed previously by him :

M2 : ... Arab itu lo. ... Tinggi. Kurus.

.....

F2 : Kalau Torik ada, saya kenal. Iya apal.

→M2 : L Tinggi, kurus?

Three times he questioned that put F2's statement into doubt; 2 of them by using expressions 'Masak' as indication of his doubt.

M2 : Masak Torik se?

8 of his questions might show his uncertainty about F2's statement by repeating her statements like in

M2 : Tapi [a bank] itu kontrak ya?

F2 : Endak kok.

→M2 : Endak ya?

Compared to the woman, he broke silence more often (six times) than F2, and 3 of them were with new topics.

M2 : es nem-PHK gitu, tanpa alasan yang kuat, kan saya rasa nggak mungkin.

F2 :

Ma.

.....

→M2 : Kenal sama Taufik juga ya?

On the contrary, F2 only did it once.

4 of F2's questions might be used to make a confirmation:

M2 : Masih murah itu di Gresik.

→F2 : O Nggresik sini?

Three times she repeated M2's words, all of them in the form of somebody's name, indicated that she did not recognize the names.

M2 : Kenal sama Taufik juga ya?

→F2 : Taufik?

And hesitant question was only one.

F2 : Kuliah dulu sama Ade. Terus .. apa? terakhir-terakhir kan ... dia kerja,

As a whole M2 was the one who tried to prevent the failing of interaction by asking more questions to F2. This might be due to the passiveness of his partner that

motivated him to keep asking in order to make her contribute more.

III.1.1.3 CONVERSATION 3 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.1.1.3 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 3

	M3	F3
Questions	80 (69.6%)	35 (30.4%)
Total	115 (100%)	

There was significant difference between the number of question-asking of M3 and F3. F3 seemed more passive in proposing questions, and almost one third of her questions showed her hesitancy in talking about her agendas.

F3 : ... Di apa? bukan di hotelnya, di /Function Companynya/. Kayak, apa ya? ... Et, ... /?/, gitu ya. Ini, apa? ...

A question indicated that she did not understand the man's question.

M3 : Ikut /Hernawan/ berarti?
→ F3 : Siapa?

Three times she repeated M3's utterances, like in:

M3 : Bapak nggak kerja lagi?
→ F3 : Bapak?

It might function to ascertain that M3's question was indeed like that.

4 questions might work as confirmation of her opinion or information.

F3 : Kadang-kadang juga debu masuk ya?

But that question could be facilitative in providing M3 entry to the conversation (Montgomery & Thomas, 1994:33).

While she was passive, M3 tried to be active by proposing many questions. From 80 questions, 1 was not facilitative and showed his uncertainty in talking,

M3 : Masih ada, apa ya? Tenggang waktu ^{buat}
 → F3 : [Tenggang waktu buat .. sekolah lagi.

9 questions repeated F3's words to ascertain them, like in :

F3 : Masih di situ itu.
 → M3 : Masih?

5 to confirm his opinion to the woman:

M3 : Radison itu Surabaya Plaza itu ya?

And 3 of the 17 questions interrupted so that prevent the woman to complete her talking.

F3 : Cari nasabah yang seratus ^{juta}
 → M3 : [Nasabahnya datang, gitu?

But those questions might be facilitative too; they were proposed to invite more response from F3, to show his excitement in order to encourage her to "become equally excited". (Tannen, 1984:60)

Here M3 tried to be facilitative, more talkative by proposing many questions for he wanted F3 to give response. He was the one who broke silence more often (22 times) than the female (only twice), 9 of them were with new topics, possibly to find interesting topics that could make the woman more responsive.

III.1.2 CONTEXT 2: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 30 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.1.2.1 CONVERSATION 4 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 4 (F4))

Table III.1.2.1 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 4

	M3	F4
Questions	62 (58.5%)	44 (41.5%)
Total	106 (100%)	

F4 seemed not to work in Fishman's way; she proposed questions fewer than the man and even 7 of them were not facilitative questions. They showed her hesitancy in talking by inserting 'apa', 'mana' in her stream of talking.

F4 : Nggak, apa istilahnya? Hdak pakai iuran wong nggak apa-apa.

6 times she made utterances in interrogative forms towards M3's questions (proposed to her), though the questions were clear enough to comprehend. 3 of them used 'siapa?', 2 used 'ha?', and 1 used 'aku?'.

- M3 : Saapeyan di mana abak?
 → F4 : Ha?!
 M3 : Saapeyan.
 → F4 : Siapa? Ikut ibu, ngajar.

It seemed to be her habit to propose questions in this form.

Twice she put M3's statements in doubt by asking 'masak?'.

M3 : Sana aku .. tertutup lo abak, dia.
 → F4 : Masak?

15 questions were used to confirm her opinions or

claims to the man, like in:

F4 : Kalau kantor kan kayaknya di- terikat ya? Istilahnya resmi ya? pakaiannya resmi ya?

And once she repeated her male partner's utterances that might indicate that she wanted to make definite about them.

While she proposed 44 questions, M3 proposed more often by asking 62 questions. But, the same with F4, not all of them were facilitative, for two of them indicated his uncertainty in talking.

M3 : Tapi, VW Kombi itu sering itu abak, apa namanya? VW VW itu sering kebakaran.

4 questions proposed towards the woman's questions, since they were not clear enough or too fast. Like when she uttered in speed :

F4 : Adik ini nggak berangkat pagi ya?

M3 could not catch the question and asked :

M3 : Apa?

3 questions were asked to show that he did not understand who was [a name] said by F4.

Beside those, there were 27 might-be-unfacilitative ones. 9 questions put F4's utterances in doubt by using 'masak?' or 'mosok?' 9 times.

F4 : VW Kombi itu sekarang mahal.

→ M3 : Mosok se?

9 times he repeated the woman's statements.

F4 : Bukan PAL! Pelayaran /?/ itu lo dik.

→ M3 : Pelayaran?

It seemed that he was rather surprised by her information. Rising intonation (the question) could

indicate surprise (Edelsky, in Graddol & Swann, 1989:84).

He interrupted twice that might be facilitative too, since they might show that he was excited in conversing with F4.

F4 : VM. Ikut-
M3 : } Bagian apa? O, Tour terus lo VM itu.

And 6 questions might show that he wanted to confirm his opinion to the woman.

M3 : Tapi udah lama to [a name] .. di situ. Sak- dua tahun ya? Iya?

He, considering that his partner was active in conversing, reduced his effort to break silence, compared to when he conversed with F3 by giving 22 questions to break silence (See III.1.1.3). He, at the time, only broke silence once with new topic. The previous topic was about 'briefing activity in school'. Then he shifted the topic after silence by proposing :

M3 : Sampeyan ngajar opo abak?

It seemed that he considered F4 talkative enough compared to F3 and did less effort to make her active by proposing question after silence.

III.1.2.2 CONVERSATION 5 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 5 (F5))

Table III.1.2.2 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 5

	M1	F5
Questions	21 (56.8%)	16 (43.2%)
Total	37 (100%)	

The man asked questions more often than the woman but it did not mean that he was more attentive to her in the conversation. It should be considered first what kind of questions proposed by him.

From all of his questions, there might be 17 ones that operated not in facilitative way. They could be interpreted as a way of M1 to confirm his opinion (he was not certain about it), and the others as a way for him to take a chance in the conversation for F5 was very talkative and gave very little chance for him to take his turn.

12 questions might function as confirmation of his claims or informations. The kind of question was a syntactic device which might express uncertainty according to Lakoff (in Holmes, 1992:318). The questioner was uncertain about the accuracy of the claim or information he was giving.

In his question :

M1 : Tapi di Ngagel masih ada kan?

when talking to F5 about 'IKIP PGRI', he might be not sure that IKIP PGRI was still in Ngagel or not.

2 questions proposed because he wanted to make sure the woman's statement that she was working in KP3. It seemed he was rather surprised, considering his tone.

M1 : Lo sekarang kerjanya di mana mbak?

F5 : KP Tiga malahan.

....

→ M1 : Di mana?!

F5 : KP Tiga.

→ M1 : Polisi?

The others, 4 questions, might not be facilitative due to their occurrences not in a relevance turn-taking place (interruption) and due to his talkative partner. But those questions could be facilitative too, that operated to prevent the failing of interaction, except for those 2 questions said in amazed tone.

He tried to break silence 3 times, all of them were with new topics. He shifted to another topic after talking about the woman's experience when applying for KOWAL.

M1 : Sudah berapa .. tahun di KP Tiga.

But that question could also indicated his lack of interest in continuing to talk about the previous topic that might be due to F5's domination in talking.

On the other hand, F5, the woman of older age, proposed only 16 questions. She dominated the conversation by telling her own experiences. 7 questions showed her hesitancy in talking :

F5 : Dapat .. dapest, apa istilahnya? lulus langsung dapat ijazah ngetik.

5 might function to confirm her claims :

F5 : bener misalnya gajinya agak gede, ... ilang ke transport, ya .. percuma kan?

2 became interruptions and prevented the man to complete his turn :

M1 : Pertama dateng saya kan nggak ada. Terus .. [//la pembantu saya/
 → F5 : Tapi ndak kenal? Sebeluannya nggak
 kenal?

And a question was proposed because she wanted to complete her talking, like in :

→F5 : ..., misalnya Pak Kusmadi BA ya. Terus punyaanya: dik sopo ini? (coughs)
 M1 : (M1's name)
 F5 : Dik [a name] ini sama, Kusmadi BA, ...

As a whole, the woman deviated from Fishman's claim:

... women are more attentive in their talk to the needs and rights of others. (in Montgomery & Thomas, 1994:32)

Conversely, the man did propose more questions though fewer than when he got a more cooperative partner as F1 (See III.1.1.1).

III.1.2.3 CONVERSATION 6 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 6 (F6))

Table III.1.2.3 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 6

	M2	F6
Questions	23 (29.9%)	54 (70.1%)
Total	77 (100%)	

Compared to his first conversation with F2 (See III.1.1.2), M2 reduced his questions when conversing with F6. He asked only 23 questions, while F6 asked 54 questions.

But it did not mean that the female's many questions all indicated she was an attentive conversationalist. 7 questions showed her hesitancy or uncertainty in talking, and about 16 questions (could be more) might be unfacilitative. It was said 'could be more' for, as stated by Holmes (1992:321), classification of questions into different types was not always identifiable and

straight forward.

The quotation below was an example of her 7 un-facilitative questions :

M2 : Mbak [F6's name] ini nomerr berapa mbak, di keluarga?
 → F6 : None::r .. berapa ya? Nomer dua be-e.

She actually knew the answer since it was a question about her own identity, but she was hesitant in giving the answer.

The others were might-be-unfacilitative questions. 4 times she interrupted the man by questioning him.

M2 : Cuma .. persisnya bagian apa, saya kurang Oh, [.... bagian komputer!
 → F6 : [Pokoke ngurusi komputer
 gitu?

The question here could be considered as an un-facilitative question, for it cut M2's utterance. But it could be facilitative too because she might be trying to help him to 'find the right words' for his uncertain statement.

3 times she repeated the male's utterances, like in :

M2 : Jadi .. ya .. yang jelas sampai setengah tiga. ...
 → F6 : L Setengah tiga?

It could be facilitative since it could indicate her continuous attention to M2's utterances, but it could be considered as her way to ascertain his information too.

In the question quoted below, she might be showing her impatience towards M2's halted question.

M2 : Sudah lama mbak, di: ... [a university]?
 → F6 : L Mana?!

When she was told that 'Pak X''s home was in Teluk Sampit, she asked :

F6 : Sini?

She might be asking for M2's confirmation or wanted to be facilitative. There were 7 questions that could function as confirmation.

The man only proposed 23 questions. But not all of them were facilitative. There were 6 ones indicated his hesitancy in talking.

M2 : Terus ketahuannya di di mana? di khasanah gitu. ...

2 questions occurred because the woman's questions proposed to him were not clear enough.

F6 : Dari mana dulu?

→ M2 : Ssebeluannya?

F6 : He-eh.

→ M2 : } Lulusannya?

Thus, those questions did not function as facilitation to keep the conversation going. They were proposed since he did not catch F6's point in questioning.

His question came in the place of interruption below could come as unfacilitative ones since it changed abruptly the previous topic F6 was still talking about.

F6 : Nek saiki } kan

→ M2 : } Baskaras berapa mbak?

The woman broke the silence twice by asking questions with new topics, while the man only did it once. But as a whole, the female did asked questions more often than M2 and showed that he who at first, when conversing with F2 (See 3.1.1.2), proposed more ques-

tions, could reduce his questions fewer than F6's.

III.1.3 CONTEXT 3: 30 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.1.3.1 CONVERSATION 7 (BETWEEN MALE 4 (M4) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.1.3.1 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 7

	M4	F1
Questions	16 (22.9%)	54 (77.1%)
Total	70 (100%)	

F1 proposed more questions than M4. It could be seen that M4 was very passive in the conversation; he did less effort to keep the conversation going. This motivated the woman to do hard work to make an active conversation. 7 of her questions showed her uncertainty in talking; 1 in the form of 'ha?'. Perhaps she wanted to make sure the man's question that was proposed to her.

M4 : Oya, instruktur komputernya di mana?

→ F1 : Ha?!

M4 : Jadi instruktur komputer di mana?

1 question was the imitation of the man's statement.

F1 : Orang mana yang punya mas?

M4 : Orang Cina.

→ F1 : O, Chinese ya, biasanya ya?

But that question could operate in facilitative way, considering M4's passiveness. She realized that M was a

passive partner, so she asked questions that could make him give responses.

The rest of her questions, 45 questions, might work in facilitative way. She tried to prevent the failing of interaction by breaking the silence 14 times! Compared to her conversation with M1 (See III.1.1.1), only 3 questions broke the silence. Most of the silences were long enough, about 6 seconds, like the one below :

M4 : Setelah itu di .. laksanakan.

→ F1 : Dupa:k, Dupak yang sebelah mananya ya itu?

While she was active in asking questions, the man only asked 16 questions, a significant difference compared to hers. 5 of them showed his uncertainty or nervousness in talking. Twice he asked whenever being questioned by the woman.

F1 : Saudaranya berapa?

M4 : Saudaranya ada tujuh.

F1 : O. Nomer?

→ M4 : Saya?

He seemed little nervous to be engaged in the conversation.

He did very little effort to break the silence (only 2 questions), even one of them break only less than a second duration silence.

A question was proposed because the woman's question was not clear enough.

F1 : Nggak pernah di tempat lain?

→ M4 : Maksudnya?

It was not clear what subject F1 was asking for.

2 questions could be facilitative if they did not interrupt F1's stream of talk.

F1 : Yang diajari berapa [/anaknya/.
 → M4 : Tapi agak sulit .. ngajari .. anak-anak SD?

But the question could be proposed to show to F1 that he was still listening to her talk.

He often wrong in interpreting F1's questions or he did not give a satisfying answer to her. That was why she often repeated her questions until she got the right answer.

→ F1 : Sudah lama ... kerja di sana? Udah berapa tahun sih?
 M4 : Sudah lama.
 → F1 : Berarti sudah berapa tahun sama itu?

Here she proposed many facilitative questions than her male partner, since he was a passive conversationalist. Thus, she was working in Fishman's theory.

III.1.3.2 CONVERSATION 8 (BETWEEN MALE 5 (M5) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.1.3.2 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 8

	M5	F2
Questions	42 (53.2%)	37 (46.8%)
Total	79 (100%)	

M5 proposed questions more often than F2. But, as stated by Holmes (1992:321), his questions might have more than one function at once. From 42 questions, 5 were unfacilitative, and 16 were might-be-unfacilitative ones.

5 unfacilitative questions occurred to show his lack of attention to F2's information that had been said previously. She had said that Civil Technic in UPN had been moved from Tambak Bayan, but he seemed not catch the point by asking :

- M5 : *Di Tambak Bayan?*
 F2 : *Iya. /Tehniknya jadi/.*
 →M5 : *Pindah?*
 F2 : *Ya /di situ/*
 →M5 : [*Sipil masih di Tambak Bayan?*

He was not attentive to her utterances mentioned before.

2 of his indicated that he did not catch the female's utterances by saying 'ha?'.

- F2 : *Biaya berapa jadinya? Kan ada yang, ... Karcisnya.*
 →M5 : [*Ha?! J*] [*Ha?!*

4 repeated the woman's utterances that could indicate he tried to ascertain hers, like in:

- F2 : *He-eh. Interior.*
 →M5 : *Oh, interior?*

2 questions functioned to confirm his claims.

- M5 : *Seni. Jadi dia e:, lebih dianukan ke seni to?*

3 questions might indicate that he did not understand F2's utterances or merely questioned to ascertain them, since he seemed not need the answer.

- F2 : *Itu /perusahaannya/ di pemerintahan atau di .. swasta?*
 →M5 : [*Siapa? Saya? Saya swasta.*

And 2 of his ascertained the female's statement that she never watched 'Tujuh Bintang' when in senior-high-school.

- M5 : *Ndak nonton ya? Waktu SMA .. ndak ada itu nonton-nonton ya?*

The female asked fewer questions than him, 37

ones, but there could be questions with more than one function.

4 times she repeated his utterances. that might signal she wanted to ascertain them.

F2 : Kerjasama sama polisi ya? rencananya?
 M5 : L DLLAJR biasanya.
 → F2 : DLLAJR?

6 might confirm her opinions to the man, like in :

F2 : Baru bentuk-bentuk bangunannya itu arsitektur?

And a question proposed when she did not understand M5's question which was actually the wrong one. He wanted to ask what year she was first in college.

M5 : Masuk tahun tujuah satu?
 → F2 : Kenapa?
 M5 : L Eh, tujuh satu. Nggak. Sembilan satu?

But compared to the man who broke silence 5 times, one with new topic, she did it 6 times, 3 were with new topics.

Thus, more questions might not be used to indicate definit facilitative behaviour in conversing.

III.1.3.2 CONVERSATION 9 (BETWEEN MALE 6 (M6) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.1.3.3 The frequency of asking-question pattern in conversation 9

	M6	F3
Questions	30 (52.6%)	27 (47.4%)
Total	57 (100%)	

52.6% of 57 questions in conversation 9 were

proposed by M6. But it should be analyzed first what types of questions he proposed before concluding that he was more facilitative than the woman.

From 30 questions, 4 indicated his uncertainty in talking about his agendas. He was talking about the Surabaya situation:

M6 : Kalau .. jalan-jalan di sini. Nggak begitu apa? nggak begitu, tahu lah ya.

Twice he used 'saya?' whenever F3 asked about himself.

F3 : Kalau mas, angkatan berapa?

→M6 : Saya?

By using 'Saya?' he possibly want to ascertain that F3's question was really proposed to him or he merely said it while thinking for the answer (he probably could not remember the answer).

5 times he repeated F3's utterances. He was talking about his bad experience in his dormitory and then halted. Might be he realized that it was not an appropriate matter to be told to his new acquaintance for rather private. After three and a half second, F3 continued his halted remark.

F3 : Belajar bermasyarakat, [ya

→M6 : (1) [Tapi abak F3 sebelum tinggal di sini, di mana?

F3 : Enggak, di sini sih dari kecil.

→M6 : Dari kecil? (2)

He might be propose question (2) to ascertain F3's information. Noted also his first question ((1)). It functioned to change the previous topic; probably he did not want to continue the topic for its privacy.

5 times he broke silence by proposing questions and 4 of them were with absolutely new topics.

F3 asked 47.4% of 57 questions. One showed her uncertainty in talking about the comparison between Surabaya and Jakarta.

F3 : Tapi ya lebih, apa? masih mending lo daripada Jakarta, jauh sekali.

Once she repeated M6's remark that might be used to ascertain the remarks. And 3 times she asked about 'Ngoro', name of an area in Jombang, mentioned by M6.

F3 : Mana? (1)

M6 : Ngoro, Ngoro.

→ F3 : Ngorok? Ngorok? Ngorok tidur. (F3 + M6 chuckles)
(2) (3)

Her first question indicated that she never heard the name 'Ngoro' and thus it functioned to find out something without any facilitative meaning. While questions (2) and (3) were meant as a joke for they were homonyms of another word.

3 times she broke silence by questioning; two of them were with absolutely new topics. She might be want to be facilitative: to prevent the failing of interaction.

Twice she proposed facilitative questions functioned to find 'the right words' for M6's halted utterance.

M6 : Malem ini tadi baru mengalami perang dunia sama [anak-anak.]
→ F3 : [Yang kos-kosan?]

Her other questions were possibly facilitative questions too, depended on her intention.

Thus man could also prove to be supportive in conversing with woman.

III.1.4 THE ANALYSIS OF ALL OF THE CONVERSATIONS

Table III.1.4 The frequency of asking-question pattern in all of the conversation

	Men	Women
Questions	363 (51.1%)	347 (48.9%)
Total	710 (100%)	

From 9 conversations, 710 questions were found and 51.1% of them were proposed by the man. It could be seen that there were two men for each of the context who proposed more questions to their female partners : in context 1 (a context of the same age respondents), the males in conversation 2 and 3 proposed more questions than the women; in context 2 (a context of males of 25 and females of 30), the men in conversation 4 and 5 questioned more than the women; and in context 3 (a context of males 30 and females 25), the men in conversation 8 and 9 proposed more questions than the younger female respondents.

This fact deviated from Fishman's claim that women tend to ask more questions than the men, that is, the women are more attentive than the men. It is due to their 'subordinate status' : subordinate one tends to be polite to the superordinate, here the man.

If based on her theory, the result of the research

should be the men questioned fewer than the women, especially when they conversed with the younger women. But most of the conversations in this research, 6 conversations, the men asked more than the women. The reasons were various. The man would question more if the partner was passive in order to get more responses or to prevent the failing of the conversation, like in conversation 3: the woman mostly spoke if being questioned by the man. Another reason might be to give enough contribution to the talk; to show that he was still listening to the woman's talk.

Montgomery and Thomas (1994:32) said that woman's tendency to ask more questions than the man could not be used to support the claims that woman is more attentive than man to the needs and rights of others. Questions have many functions other than supportive. Thus, they criticized Fishman's conclusion for woman's asking question as supportive.

There were various functions attached to the questions of the respondents:

1. to be facilitative, that is to motivate the partner to talk more, or to prevent the failing of conversation;
2. to ascertain / confirm the partner's utterances;
3. to show their amazement toward something;
4. to find out something/someone they did not know;
5. or to question the questions that were not clear.

Gender and age did not play role here, but the speakers' characters and the characters of the person they were talking to could induce the question-asking pattern.

A respondent who at first questioned more when talking to a passive partner could do it fewer when talking to an active partner, or a respondent that proposed fewer questions to an active partner might propose more to a passive partner, regardless of the gender and age. The younger one could not guarantee that he/she proposed more to the older one.

Thus, the question-asking pattern was not influenced by gender and age, considering too the only 2.2% difference between males' and females' pattern.

III.2 MINIMAL RESPONSE

The analysis of minimal response pattern between male and female engaged in the conversations were done for responses like 'he-eh', 'he-em', 'mm', 'iya', 'ya', 'o', 'oh', 'e', and the like with a note that there were no phrases other than those coming immediately before or after them. There would be an exception for the patterns in those forms if their occurrences were due to the partner's questions, for they would depend on the partner's question, not on the speaker's own willingness.

Example :

M1 : O ITS?
 →F1 : He-eh.

III.2.1 CONTEXT 1: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.2.1.1 CONVERSATION 1 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.2.1.1 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 1

	M1	F1
Supportive	16 (55.2%)	32 (72.7%)
Not supportive	13 (44.8%)	12 (27.3%)
Total	29 (100%)	44 (100%)

F1 gave more minimal responses (60.3% from the whole minimal responses in the conversation) than M1 (39.7%). Holmes (1992:328) said that the woman gave more supportive feedbacks than the man. But both of the male and female conversationalists in this conversation did the supportive feedbacks.

Indeed the man gave fewer minimal responses, but most of his response were supportive (55.2%), while 44.8% were discouraging. Thus, the man did not work as Fishman's theory, that most of man's minimal responses operated to discourage interaction (in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:96).

The man might be motivated to give more encouraging feedbacks to his 'new friend' to show his willing-

ness to talk with her. The same reason might be in the female's thought.

When F1 talked, M1 gave supportive responses more often than his discouraging ones.

F1 : Nggak, nggak juga, nggak selalu alat. Teori aja udah. Ya penelitian bisa.
 → M1 : L Nggak? J L Maa J L Maa J
 Ya sak sukanya wis, sak anu dosennya. [chuckles] Pokoknya terina, gitu aja.

Those minimal responses might convey meaning 'I'm listening to you, please continue'

F1 also did the same to encourage her partner's turn.

M1 : Kalau ekonomi, upamanya akuntansi,
 → F1 : He-em?
 M1 : Akuntansi itu /didalemn/, syust itu, gitu. Didalemn sasapai analisisnya kan. ...
 → F1 : L He-em!

Those 'he-em' implied that F1 wanted M1 to continue his talk.

III.2.1.2 CONVERSATION 2 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.2.1.2 The frequency of minimal response pattern

	M2	F2
Supportive	8 (53.3%)	14 (33.3%)
Not supportive	7 (46.7%)	28 (66.7%)
Total	15 (100%)	42 (100%)

M2 was more active in the conversation than F2. He talked more often than she; she gave fewer contribution to the conversation. The woman's minimal responses (73.7% from the whole responses) were more often than

the man's (only 27.3%). But most of M2's were supportive (53.3% from 15) and 46.7% were discouraging. On the contrary, though F2 gave more minimal responses than M2, her discouraging feedbacks were higher in percentage compared to M2's. Thus her more responses, compared to M2's, did not guarantee she paid more attention to her partner than M2 did. 4 of her unsupportive feedbacks were delayed ones that occurred after silence. According to West and Zimmerman (in Graddol & Swann, 1989:78), minimal responses might indicate inattention or disinterest. Others were indicated by her

S.Ing. 0611/97
Wir
a

WIRATMANI, RATIH
079213506/F.SASTRA UNAIR
AN ANALYSIS OF INTERACTIONAL PATTERNS IN CROSS-SEX CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN UNACQUAINTED MEN AND WOMEN LIVING IN SURABAYA WITH AGE DIMENSION

Nilai : 4

- 1. Bukannya ...
- 2. L He-eh!
- . benda: hati yang,

with you'.

es, but 86.7%

courage F2 to

asking her ques-

(See III.3.1.2),

. His supportive

contributions (See III.1.1.2), or giving encouraging minimal responses. His supportive feedbacks could be heard from his enthusiastic minimal responses said throughout F2's talk that signalled 'I'm listening to you, please continue'.

F2 : Iya. ... Pokoknya ada rumah baru ya, kosong gitu ya, biasanya perusahaan it- saya

→ M2: LHe-eh! Lya,iya!

itu yang mendorong semua. Furniturnya:, Kaca-kaca, gitu, biasanya.

→ M2 :L O: J

III.2.1.3 CONVERSATION 3 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.2.1.3 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 3

	M3	F3
Supportive	12 (23.1%)	3 (16.7%)
Not supportive	40 (76.9%)	15 (83.3%)
Total	52 (100%)	18 (100%)

The male gave more minimal responses (74.3% from the whole responses in conversation) than the female (25.7%). Most of his were discouraging ones (76.9%) and only 32.1% were supportive. As stated by Fishman that the man tend to give discouraging minimal responses than supportive ones (in Graddol & Swann, 1989) which conveyed the meaning 'I agree with you' or 'I follow your argument so far'. He here also used such kind of responses.

F3 : He-eh, customer service. /Saya/ Private Bankingnya itu. Buat para nasabah yang seratus juta ke atas itu.

→ M3 : Ma.

M3's 'mmm' indicated that he followed F3's argument so far.

7 of his minimal responses were delayed ones, for they occurred after silence.

F3 : He-eh, sekarang pindah lagi di depan sini.

.....

→ M3 : Ma.

It showed his lack of interest or attention that might be due to F3's passiveness. But it could also

occur to give her chance to make longer talk.

Only 23.1% of his were supportive; they encouraged F3's talk and conveyed meaning 'I'm listening to you, please continue'.

F3 : Lagipula mereka jarang ke bank loh, nyuruh ... anak buahnya kan.
→ M3 : *He-eh*

He wanted her to continue her utterances and also indicated he was listening to her.

F3 deviated from Fishman's theory stated that most of woman's minimal responses were supportive. She only gave 3 supportive feedbacks: 16.7% from 18 responses she said. The rest (83.3%) were not supportive, like the following :

M3 : Itu ada ... temen ya, Teluk Tomini yang sebelah sana. Mungkin yang .. di belakangmu mungkin.
→ F3 : *Mm.*

.....

She might mean that she 'follow his argument so far and that was all'.

Her supportive feedbacks were very rare, only 3 responses.

M3 : Yang daerah-daerah sana ya, daerah Ngage:1 gitu itu, pernah lo, sekali s-
→ F3 : *L Mm J*
dua kali [hujan.
F3 : [hujan ya?]

The man in the conversation seemed to encourage the woman to talk more often by proposing many questions (See III.1.1.3) and giving many minimal responses though still based on Fishman's theory of man's minimal responses characteristic that came at the end of the partner's remark, here F3. While F3's passiveness was

shown by her fewer responses.

III.2.2 CONTEXT 2: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 30 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.2.2.1 CONVERSATION 4 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 4 (F4))

Table III.2.2.1 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 4

	M3	F4
Supportive	19 (51.4%)	0 (0%)
Not supportive	18 (48.6%)	4 (100%)
Total	37 (100%)	4 (100%)

M3 gave more supportive feedbacks (51.4% from his whole responses) than discouraging ones (48.6%). His minimal responses were more than F4's: 90.2% from the whole feedbacks in the conversation. It might be due to F4's talkactiveness; she talked longer than him and dominated the conversation. This could increase M3's number of minimal responses, for he got more chances to comment on her remark.

His higher number of supportive feedbacks might be related to F4's talkactiveness and he became more interested and enthusiastic compared to when he talked with F3 (See III.2.1.3).

F4 : Meskipun kita: .. bidang studinya kayak gitu, ->
 -> M3 : Iya,
 F4 : tapi sekolah itu tidak membutuh-
 -> M3 : He-em
 kan, kita suruh ngajar lain, harus mau.

His 'iya' and 'he-em' indicated his attention and sup-

port to F4's talk.

But many of his were still discouraging, like in:

F4 : O enak ya. Kita Sabtu itu malah masuk. Kan /ganti suasana/ sedikit, gurunya itu.

→M3 :L Iya J

Sepi.

→M3 : L Iya J

Those two 'iya' might mean that M3 'agreed with her'.

F4 here gave only 4 minimal responses and all of them were not supportive, but only gave agreement.

M3 : Kadang-kadang kalau .. nggak sesuai gitu diancam, hayo ati-ato yo! Ngo:no.

→F4 :L Iyo!

Thus she deviated from Fishman's theory about woman's tendency to give more supportive feedbacks than the male.

III.2.2.2 CONVERSATION 5 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 5 (F5))

Table III.2.2.2 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 5

	M1	F5
Supportive	32 (59.3%)	10 (76.9%)
Not supportive	22 (40.7%)	3 (23.1%)
Total	54 (100%)	13 (100%)

The male did most of the minimal response patterns in the conversation (80.6%) than the female (only 19.4%). It seemed that the higher number of the male's minimal responses related to the talkactiveness of F5. The conversation was dominated by her, while the man had only little chance to talk. It could be the reason of

her fewer responses.

But the responses of both of them were mostly supportive: 59.3% for the man and 83.3% for the woman. The man in this conversation also deviated from Fishman's theory about the tendency of man to use more discouraging feedback. Conversely, most of his minimal responses were supportive.

He, previously, gave many supportive feedbacks to F5 that indicated he listened to her and supported her to continue.

F5 : Iyas. Intel kan. Harus e: Kasat Intelnya itu kadang-kadang dia nglitsus.
 →M1 : L'He-eaJ
 Nglitsus di: POLDA sana. Atau di: perusahaan- di: pokoknya yang perlu ->
 →M1 : L'Haan J
 litsus-litsus itu kan. /Dipikir ya itu/.
 →M1 : L'HaJ

The supportiveness could also be heard from his tone whenever said those responses. But then he became less and less encouraging and gave many discouraging feedbacks. It might be due to the domination of the woman in the conversation and he became less interested and gave only fewer responses.

F5 : Ma, pertama kan honorer ya, kalau anu. Saya .. waktu itu ndak tahu, apa sisteunya di
 →M1 : L'He-eaJ
 situ itu gimana. Soalnya dulunya itu juga dilarang, bapak kan juga angkatan laut.
 Kahu kalau .. mau jadi .. karyawan sipil, mending angkatannya sekali:, katanya
 gitu. Ya itu.
 →M1 : L'He-eaJ

She kept countinuing her talk and M1 only gave a few feedbacks.

F5, on the other hand, gave more supportive than discouraging minimal responses in percentage (83.3%),

compared to supportive feedbacks of the man, though she gave fewer than him, as a whole. The minimal responses below contained a message 'I'm listening to you, please continue'.

M1 : Waduh, lak iki lak ... cuman sekali pakai. Akhirnya apa. Saya fotokopi, saya tutupi
 → F5 : L He-eh J
 itu. Untuk perusahaan, gitu aja tak tutupi.
 → F5 : UHe-ehJ LYaJ L Iya.

III.2.2.3 CONVERSATION 6 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 6 (F6))

Table III.2.2.J The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 6

	M2	F6
Supportive	6 (46.2%)	25 (71.4%)
Not supportive	7 (53.8%)	10 (28.6%)
Total	13 (100%)	35 (100%)

This conversation was done by active interactants; both of them gave support to the partner's talk, both of them tried to make the conversation going. The female gave minimal responses more often than M1 (72.9% from the whole responses in the conversation). Most of her responses were enthusiastic ones (71.4%) and supported her partner's remark.

M1 : Tahu, ini kalau dulu satu sekolah, gitu. Tapi ya itu, saking mungkin ... ndak
 → F5 : UHe-ehJ UHe-eh, iyaJ
 pernah satu kelas, jadi nggak begitu kenal, ya abak ya?
 → F5 : UJyaJ

All of those three responses done by F5 were supportive. They contained a message 'I'm listening to you, please

countinue'. Thus, F5 gave support to the man to continue his talk. The responses indicated her intense attention.

The male also gave the kind of responses in supportive way, but the percentage was lower than the woman (46.2%). It seemed that in this conversation almost half of his minimal responses contained a message 'I agree with you' or 'I follow your argument so far'.

F5 : O:, ya kalau pagi itu hukun ada di sana, Sukolilo.

→ M1 : He-em?

F5 : Kalau sore kuliah di sini, gitu.

→ M1 : Maa.

One of the minimal responses above ('mmm') contained a message 'I follow your argument (about the place of the lecture) so far', and that was all. 'He-em' gave support for her to continue (considering the rising intonation in interrogative form).

Compared to his conversation with F2 (See III.2.1.2), the characteristic was different. Most of his responses were supportive. It might be due to the passiveness of his partner (F2) that motivated him to give more supportive feedbacks than when he conversed with F5, an active partner.

III.2.3 CONTEXT 3: 30 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.2.3.1 CONVERSATION 7 (BETWEEN MALE 4 (M4) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.2.3.1 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 7

	M4	F1
Supportive	5 (19.2%)	12 (54.5%)
Not supportive	21 (80.8%)	10 (45.5%)
Total	26 (100%)	22 (100%)

The woman's number of minimal responses in talking with M4 was fewer than the number when she talked with M1 (See III.2.1.1). She gave only 22 minimal responses and 45.5% of them were discouraging. But the number of the female's responses in this conversation (45.8%) was lower than the man (54.2%). It might be due to the fewer remark of the man that gave little chance for the occurrence of F1's responses.

M4 was not an active speaker like M1, most of his talk were short, and he usually took his turn-taking whenever being questioned by F1. (See III.1.3.1)

The woman in this conversation gave 5 delayed minimal responses. According to West and Zimmerman (in Graddol & Swann, 1989:78), delaying minimal responses might indicate inattention or lack of interest.

She, possibly because realizing she got a passive partner, tried to make him talk by asking many questions

(See III.1.3.1), but it did not work well. He was still passive. It might make her become rather uninterested by making many delayed minimal responses.

F1 : Rata-rata teman .. lulusannya yang bareng itu, kerja di mana?

M4 : Ya banyak yang keluar kota:, /dan/ ada yang di .. Sulawesi.

→F1 : Ma.

But her delayed responses could also indicate that she wanted to give M4 a chance to talk more by waiting for him to continue and thus produced silence.

She still supported him by giving 45% supportive feedbacks from her whole responses, while most of M4's feedbacks were discouraging (about 80.8%).

M4 seemed feel rather uneasy in 'his first conversation' with F1. Almost half of his minimal responses (44.4%) came after the female's lengthy remark that had meaning 'I agree with you' or 'I follow you argument so far'.

F1's, on the contrary, were more supportive. She inserted 'mm', 'he-eh', etc throughout the stream of M4's talk.

III.2.3.2 CONVERSATION 8 (BETWEEN MALE 5 (M5) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.2.3.2 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 8

	M5	F2
Supportive	0 (0%)	8 (17%)
Not supportive	5 (100%)	39 (83%)
Total	5 (100%)	47 (100%)

M5 gave only 5 minimal responses while F2 gave almost all of the minimal responses in the conversation (90.4%). But not all of her responses were supportive. Only 17% operated to support the partner's talk, the rest of them were discouraging (83%). Even she made 10 delayed minimal responses as indication that she was not too interested or did not pay attention to the man's remark.

M5 : Masuknya Japan lina . /?/.

.....

→F2 : Ma.

She deviated from Fishman's theory that woman's usage of this pattern was mostly supportive compared to the man.

M5 : Tapi yang paling berat saya lihat itu permasalahan itu, ... ngatur lalu lintas.

→F2 : Ma.

M5 : Sistem transportasi.

.....

→F2 : Ma.

Those two 'mm' operated to discourage M5's talk; they indicated her lack of attention and might mean, according to Maltz and Boker (in Graddol & Swann,

1989:90), 'I agree with you' or 'I follow your argument so far. Her lack of attention were also shown in her unenthusiastic tone when said them.

The man contributed only 5 (9.6% from the whole minimal responses in the conversation), and all of them were not supportive. They conveyed meaning 'I follow your argument so far'.

M5 : Tahu juga jurusan-jurusannya.
 F2 : Iya, ada temen soalnya. [chuckles] Kuliah di ITS.
 → M5 : [0.]

III.2.3.3 CONVERSATION 9 (BETWEEN MALE 6 (M6) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.2.3.3 The frequency of minimal response pattern in conversation 9

	M6	F3
Supportive	1 (14.3%)	7 (25.9%)
Not supportive	6 (85.7%)	20 (74.1%)
Total	7 (100%)	27 (100%)

The woman gave more minimal responses than the man (about 79.4%) but most of them were not supportive. The unsupportiveness could be noted from her tone and/or from their place after M6's lengthy remark. And her supportive responses were only 25.9%. Like in :

M6 : He-eh. Kemarin-kemarin saya sudah lama tinggal di Rungkut,
 → F3 : He-eh?
 M6 : Tapi ranaai.

Her 'he-eh' conveyed meaning that she was listening to M6 and wanted him to continue.

M6 gave only 7 minimal responses and only one was supportive, having enthusiastic tone and containing motivative message. The rest were not supportive.

M6 : Teluk
 F3 : [Senaya, Teluk Sampit, Teluk Tomini, Teluk Penanjung, Teluk Bayur, Teluk Betung.
 → M6: UHe-er]

III.2.4 THE ANALYSIS OF ALL OF THE CONVERSATIONS

Table III.2.4 The frequency of minimal response pattern in all of the conversation

M		F	
Supportive	Unsupportive	Supportive	Unsupportive
99 (41.6%)	139 (58.4%)	111 (44%)	141 (56%)
238 (100 %)		252 (100 %)	

It could be seen that most of the men's minimal responses were unsupportive (58.4%) and the women's too (56%). The result deviated from Fishman's claim that men tended to use unfacilitative responses, while women's are the opposite.

But in context 3, in which 30 year old men conversed with 25 year old women, most of the men's minimal responses were unsupportive. They tended to give fewer supportive feedbacks when talked to younger women. Two men in context 1 (a context of the same age respondents) used more supportive responses than unsupportive, only the man (M3) in conversation 3 deviated. But in context 2 (a context of males 25 and females 30), M3 made more supportive feedbacks than unsupportive, but

the different was only one response; and, on the contrary, M2 who in context 1 used more supportive feedbacks, in context 2 used more unsupportive one, but the different was only one response too. M3's significant different between supportive (12) and unsupportive responses (40) in context 1, was due to his passive partner. He became rather uninterested; he merely fulfilled his duty to respond to his partner. But in context 2, he gave fewer minimal responses, but most of them were supportive that might be due to his interest to talk with a talkative partner.

Only three women whose most of their responses were supportive : F1, F5, and F6. F1's pattern did not change even when she got a very passive partner in context 3. F5 and F6 were paired with younger respondents and theirs were mostly supportive. F2 and F3 used mostly unsupportive feedbacks whether they conversed with respondents of the same age or the older age. Thus for women, age did not play role. And as a whole, the men and the women deviated from Fishman's, except in context 3, in which age played role. The women's minimal responses were not always supportive and the men's were not always unsupportive. Thus, gender could not explain the occurrence of such pattern.

III.3 TOPIC INITIATION

III.3.1 CONTEXT 1: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.3.1.1 CONVERSATION 1 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.3.1.1 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M1	6 (66.7%)	3 (33.3%)	1	10 (52.6%)
F1	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	1	9 (47.4%)
Total	10	7	2	19 (100%)

Conversation 1 was an interactive conversation. Both of the respondents tried to develop the conversation by initiating topics. Their topic initiation were almost equal in number.

From 10 topics initiated by F1, 50% of them (excluding an uncertain topic) were successful. The percentage was not so different from M1's (66.7%). Fishman's theory was proven, but the number was not so dramatical. It was due to their mutual orientation to one another.

Topics initiated by the male were developed by the woman. 66.7% of them were successful for he was interested to talk about his own topics and also the woman gave support to them. When F1 initiated a topic, M1 also gave supportive responses enough to keep the topic

going. But, it deviated from Fishman's research which proved that women initiate topics more frequently than men, topics in this conversation were initiated more frequently by the male rather than the female. 52.6% of the whole topics were initiated by M1. It proved that the man also tried to keep the conversation going. Thus they worked together to turn the initial topics into an actual conversation.

III.3.1.2 CONVERSATION 2 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.3.1.2 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M2	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	1	11 (91.7%)
F2	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	1 (8.3%)
Total	7	4	1	12 (100%)

In conversation 2, it was the man who attempted to keep the conversation going by initiating many topics (11 of 12), while F2 only did it once.

Here 40% of M2's topics (4 of 10) succeeded because he was interested and the woman was also interested and developed an initial attempt into an actual conversation. The topics failed for the woman did not give enough responses to enhance the topics though M2, the initiator, spoke to develop them. A topic was not successful if only one person raised it (Fishman, in

Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:97). Many times M2 tried to make a new topic in order to motivate the woman to be interested and then gave responses that might support the topic.

Fishman stated that the woman who did more topic initiation than the man and her attempt usually failed. but in this case, the woman initiated topic fewer than the man, and her only topic succeeded. It was due to her enthusiasm and also M2's support to the development of the topic about 'the relationship of his educational background with his previous job'.

Thus M2 was a facilitative partner who was attentive to his partner and was willing to keep the conversation going, while F1 was more passive but was still willing to enhance some of the topics initiated by M2.

III.3.1.3 CONVERSATION 3 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.3.1.3 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M3	0 (0%)	14 (100%)	1	15 (75%)
F3	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0	5 (25%)
Total	0	19	1	20 (100%)

Both of the respondents had difficulty to make a topic to be a real conversation. None of their topic initiations were successful.

It could be seen that the man did more effort to prevent the failing of interaction by initiating topics many times (15). But all of them failed. Their failure was usually caused by the woman's minimal responses which did not have facilitative meaning (See III.2.1.3) and by his own lack of interest to keep the topics survive. When the women said something to develop the topic he initiated, he only gave responses like 'mm', 'he-eh', and thus the woman seemed rather doubtful to continue her speaking. Her doubt could be noticed from her more and more indistinct utterances. The same case also happened to F3's topics. When M3 responded, F3 gave only few responses to develop the topics.

It was a question-answer conversation. The conversation could survive for one of the respondent asked and the other answered it.

However, it was clear that not the woman who did more topic initiation, but the man. Thus, it deviated Fishman's theory which stated that women initiated topic more often than man to prevent the failing of interaction.

III.3.2 CONTEXT 2: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 30 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.3.2.1 CONVERSATION 4 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 4 (F4))

Table III.3.2.1 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M3	7 (100%)	0 (0%)	1	8 (72.7%)
F4	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	3 (27.3%)
Total	10	0	1	11 (100%)

M3 and F4 produced a 'hybrid style' conversation (Holmes, 1992:330). This style is a combination of some features of both male and female that contribute to and develop the topic in a supportive rather than a competitive way.

This conversation was the opposite of Conversation 3 done by M3 and F3 (See III.3.1.3). While the previous conversation done by M3 was an unsuccessful one, in which none of the topics succeeded, this conversation was a successful one. All of the topics introduced could survive.

Though F4 dominated the talk, but she still gave chances for M3 to take his turns, or if not, M3 himself took his turns by interrupting, though some of those interruptions disorganized the conversational topics. As stated by Holmes (1992:330), not all of interruption patterns disorganize topics being talked about. They

also develop the topics. Though he interrupted, he directed the course of the topic and thus enhanced the core of the topic into a wider discussion.

All of F4's topic-initiations got supportive responses from M3, and vice versa. It was indeed the woman who initiated more often, but, deviated from Fishman's theory, none of them failed that was due to both of the speakers' contribution to develop the conversational topics.

III.3.2.2 CONVERSATION 5 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 5 (F5))

Table III.3.2.2 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M1	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1	3 (50%)
F5	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	0	3 (50%)
Total	3	2	1	6 (100%)

M1 and F5 initiated topics in an equal number; each of them initiated 3 topics. There was a statement about 'IKIP' that was actually mentioned by the female in the previous topic about 'their acquaintanceship with Ratih'. But 'IKIP' was not a topic at that time. It was only an additional information for the real topic. M1 asked about it and then it became one of the conversational topics.

It could be seen here that the female's initia-

tion-topic reached a higher percentage to be successful (100%) compared to M1's (50%). It was due to the man's support to hers. She was a talkative conversationalist and dominated the conversation. It seemed she was very interested to talk about her own. M1's support was given to her first topics and they succeeded. But it seemed he got bored for she dominated the conversation with her own story. From 6 conversational topics, 5 of them were about the woman's experience; the topics centered on her experience than on M1's. There were very few conversation about his background.

M1's failure topic about 'F5's experience when applying for KOWAL' came after F5's last topic. It seemed he initiated it just to fill his turn with little enthusiasm to talk more about it. Then F5 developed the topic, dominated the talk, and M1, the topic initiator, only gave few responses included many unfacilitative minimal responses that made the topic failed.

Thus, a topic's successful could be gained if the two parties are really willing to develop it. "Not only must one person raise the topic, the other must respond, and at least some of those responses must contribute to the topic's elaboration" (Fishman, in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:97).

Here Fishman's theory was not in effect for one person dominated the talk; though contributing to the conversational topic, she gave a scarce chance to the

partner to take his turns.

F5's successful topics were due to the support from the man and also the initiator was very enthusiastic to talk about them since the topics were about her own experience. Thus, it was the woman who made more successful topic in conversation 5.

Compared to his first conversation with F1, his successful topic percentage was fewer. Age seemed not play role here, but F5's talkactiveness influenced his fewer percentage of successful topic.

III.3.2.3 CONVERSATION 6 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 6 (F6))

Table III.3.2.3 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M2	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	0	5 (55.6%)
F6	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	4 (44.4%)
Total	6	3	0	9 (100%)

It was a communicative conversation; both of the conversationalist developed the construction of conversational topics. They gave almost an equal number of topic-initiation and most of theirs were successful.

60% of M2's topic-initiation (3 of 5) succeeded since he was interested to talk about his subject and F6 supported it by giving comments or facilitative minimal responses (See III.2.2.4) that could contribute to the

topic development. 50% of F6's topics (3 of 4) was successful that was due to the same reason.

Thus, both of them attempted to make an initial topic to be an interesting thing to be talked about. M2, though a man, he was a facilitative conversationalist. It was also proven when speaking with F2 (see III.3.1.2). He got a supportive partner that produced a communicative conversation.

Age did not play role here for the man was still facilitative, whether he conversed with F2 or F6. The success of the conversation could not be determined from the age of the respondents. It was more appropriate if the characters of the respondents, whether they were supportive or not, played more important role.

III.3.3 CONTEXT 3: 30 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.3.3.1 CONVERSATION 7 (BETWEEN MALE 4 (M4) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.3.3.1 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M4	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	1	4 (23.5%)
F1	0 (0%)	13 (100%)	0	13 (76.5%)
Total	0	16	1	17 (100%)

M4 was a very passive partner. He did few contribution to the conversation as a whole. His topic-initia-

tions were only 4 of 17 topics (23.5%), while F1 gave 13 of 17 (76.5%).

From the data, it could be concluded that because of the passiveness of the man, the woman tried to prevent the failing of the interaction by initiating many topics and none of them succeeded. She tried to make M4 talk by initiating topics, usually in the form of a question. But M4 almost gave no support to develop except answering F1's question. F1's topic failed because the man did not respond with the attention necessary to prevent the failing of the topics.

The same thing happened when M4 initiated topics. When he initiated a topic about 'F1's work as a computer instructor' she actually tried to develop the topic, but failed because M4, who initiated the topic himself, did not give contribution. There were many indications of the failing of the topics: unfacilitative minimal responses and question-asking given by M4, and also internal pauses in F1's stream of talk. (Fishman, in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1993:97)

M4's topics failed since he was not inherently interested and did it just to fill his turn, though the woman developed it. As if he was thinking "Oh, yeah. I have to say something here". Only one person corresponded, while the other was passive that made Fishman's theory did apply here.

III.3.3.2 CONVERSATION 8 (BETWEEN MALE 5 (M5) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.3.3.2 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M5	0 (0%)	7 (100%)	0	7 (58.3%)
F2	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	0	5 (41.7%)
Total	0	12	0	12 (100%)

None of the conversational topics succeeded because both of the respondents seemed not interested to enhance the topic to make a real conversation.

The topics initiated by M5 failed since F2 was not interested to talk more and also M5 did not try to say something to make it survive. When he said that his graduation did not take a long time, her answer showed her unenthusiasm. Many times he repeated that, and F2 only said :

F2 : Iya ta?

F2's unenthusiasm could be seen from her many un-facilitative minimal responses and utterances that seemed function just to fill her turn. Both of the respondents did not made successful topics. The woman who, according to Fishman, is more facilitative, in this conversation could do nothing to make a successful conversation due to M4's passiveness. Thus the topics failed, in the sense that both or only one of the respondents did not show their interest. Fishman's theory

did not apply here. F2's topic was the only one that was survive throughout the whole conversation, not the man's, because the topic was related to him, to his faculty in a university.

III.3.3.3 CONVERSATION 9 (BETWEEN MALE 6 (M6) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.3.3.3 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
M6	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0	10 (66.7%)
F3	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0	5 (33.3%)
Total	1	14	0	15 (100%)

One of F3's topics about 'M6's dormitory' and then directed into 'his dormitory and the place of his previous work in Perak' succeeded that was shown by M6's responses that develop the topic and also F3's facilitative minimal responses and also other longer utterances. While other topics initiated by her failed because she seemed not interested to develop them, though M6 responded by telling his opinion toward the different situation in Surabaya and Jakarta. She then only gave unfacilitative minimal responses.

The conversation deviated from Fishman's theory about woman's tendency to initiate more topics than the man and the fact that man's topic tended to be more successful than the woman's. The failing of topic-initia-

tion pattern was due to the respondents' lack of interest. It seemed they initiated topics just to fill the time without interest to enhance the topics into the real conversation.

III.3.4 THE ANALYSIS OF ALL OF THE CONVERSATIONS

Table III.3.4 The frequency of topic-initiation pattern in all of the conversations

	Success	Failure	Uncertain	Total
Men	21 (31.3%)	46 (68.7%)	6	73 (60.3%)
Women	14 (29.8%)	33 (70.2%)	1	48 (39.7%)
Total	35	79	7	121 (100%)

Generally men initiated topics more frequently. Of 121 conversational topics, 60.3% were raised by the males and women only initiated 39.7%. 31.3% of 73 topics (excluded 6 uncertain ones) initiated by men succeeded and 68.7% failed, while 70.2% of the topics raised by female respondents failed, and only 29.8% of them were successful.

From the data of the whole conversations, could be concluded that people met for the first time got more difficulty to make the conversation going and to make it become more interesting. It could be seen from table III.4.4, 79 of the total topics initiated in the conversations failed.

The respondents met for the first time and they did not have knowledge about their partners in the

conversations. It was the reason why most of their topics proposed in the form of a question. They wanted to know more informations about their new acquaintances, probably those informations could be used as interesting matters to be talked about.

The percentage of the successful topics between males and females was not so dramatical, compared to Fishman's research. She in her research (in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983) found out that while women made 62% of all attempts to introduce topics, they only raised 38% of successful topics. The men, in contrast, initiated only 38% of the conversational topics, and all of them (except 1 uncertain topic) succeeded.

The difference between the men and women met for the first time in this research was not so significant. In contrast with Fishman's, here 60.3% of the topics were raised by men. And the difference between the percentage of successful topics of men and women was only 1.5%. Thus both of them had difficulty getting the conversations going and the men who worked harder to save the interactions from failure.

Clearly, gender did not have effect towards topic-initiation pattern, if any, the difference was very small. There was no result prove that the women, as the whole, were more supportive in this pattern. Conversely, the men who were more facilitative, considering the fact that they raised more topics than the women. It might be

due to the context of the conversations : they met for the first time. "People meeting for the first time are more likely to 'stand on ceremony'" (West & Zimmerman, 1983:106). The context might induce the influence towards the respondents' pattern.

Age also did not influence the pattern. A female respondents when coupled with an older man did not always less successful than the man. On the contrary, in context 3, in which 25 year old females were coupled with 30 year old males, their successful topic percentage were equal to, or higher than the males. In context 2, in which 25 year old males were paired with 30 year old females, age also could not explain the pattern. M1 was less successful when conversed with a very talkative older woman since she dominated the talk and M1 finally was not inherently interested and initiated topics just to fulfill his 'duty to take his turns'. (See III.3.2.2) That was why his topic failed. M2 was more successful than 30 year old woman he conversed with, for she supported and developed his topics. (See III.3.2.6) M3 reached an equal percentage of successful topic-initiation when talked with a 30 year old woman (See III.3.2.1).

It seemed the speakers' and their partners' characters influenced more than age or gender. A facilitative woman coupled with a facilitative man would make more successful conversational topics; a facilitative

respondent coupled with an unfacilitative respondent would make less successful topics, and so on. The deviation from Fishman's theory could be seen here.

III.4 INTERRUPTION

III.4.1 CONTEXT 1: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.4.1.1 CONVERSATION 1 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.4.1.1 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M1	4 (80%)
F1	1 (20%)
Total	5 (100%)

M1 did most of the interruptions in the conversation (80%), while F1 interrupted only once. One of his interruptions changed the conversational topic being talked about.

M1 : Sekarang?

F1 : [laughs] Wis, sekarang ya gitu-gitu. [chuckles] Ya kerja ya

→ M1 : L Tapi kenal sama: Ratih udah
lana kan?

He interrupted F1's answer to his own question, and, at the same time, destructed the previous topic.

Interruption operated to "disorganize the conversational topic and disrupted turns at talk" (West & Zimmerman, in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1989:105).

According to Holmes (1992:326), the one being interrupted, especially the woman, dropped her utterances with little or no protest at all. It happened to F1 too. She even gave response to M1's interruption in the form of a question and the previous topic disappeared, replaced by the topic pursued by M1.

But the other 3 interruptions had more facilitative characteristic to the development of the topics. Like in the following excerpt.

F1 : Aku enggak tahu definisinya yang tepat untuk kawin siri itu gimana sih?
 →M1 : Kawin siri itu gini.

He tried to explain to her about 'kawin siri'. He did not change the course of the topic but supported it. But it might also be a signal of his impatience to take the turn as soon as possible (to give explanation).

F1's only interruption did not have any tendency to destroy or disorganize the topic. On the contrary, it gave response to M1's remark.

M1 : lihat terainas! gitu, tahu-tahu dia masuk. /?/. Lo anak ini nggak abayar! Na:, gitu-gitu itu.
 →F1 : O ketahuan ya. Maksudnya .. e kok .. Tiap mata kuliah dia kan mesti abayar.

Tannen (1984) stated that interruptions might show enthusiasm and interest; "how excited and interest I am". (p.60). It might be the implicit message of F1's interruption.

Interruptions might indicate different power of male and female, though the interrupter, especially the male, probably does not realize it. Thus, here M1 did interrupt, but he probably did not mean to dominate the

conversation. It was like a habit for him.

III.4.1.2 CONVERSATION 2 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.4.1.2 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M2	4 (80%)
F2	1 (20%)
Total	5 (100%)

The man did most of the interruptions (80%), while the female only once. From his four interruptions, one of them was the continuation of his previous remark that halted, probably because he tried to find the right word. And then, after F2 helped him (to find the word), he continued though interrupted F2.

M2 : Customer Service. Tak rasa ya ada hubungannya. Soalnya kan, ...

F2 : Langsung itu ya, berhadapan dengan:

→ M2 : He-eh, kita psikologi itu kan memang selalu berhadapan sama manusia.

He interrupted, but at the same time, continued his first utterance.

One interruption had more supportive than destructive function since it gave comment to F2's remark.

M2 : Udah lama kenal sama Ratih?

F2 : Nda:k, barusan itu. Kan .. dikenalkan teman, ->

→ M2 : (Barusan?) [O yang ngasih tahu /itu/?]
F2 : [(a name)] He-eh.

He showed his intense listening to F2's utterance. Considered too his remark "Barusan?". West and Zimmerman

(in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1993:105) said that an interruption showed passive listening and disregarded the partner's remark. But those characters did not apply here.

The other two interruptions, in contrast, signalled his disregardness toward F2's remark. When they were talking about 'the pollution in Gresik', he interrupted F2's contribution to the speaking.

M2 : Itu tu harga kesehatan ndak bisa dinilai dengan seperti itu.

F2 : Iya, kalau bertahun-tahun si itu kena anu ya, sudah

→M2 :

yang ... sampai, apa namanya itu? Menahun itu lo. [Katanya memang .. ada penyakit

"The right of the female to speak was casually disregarded by the male". (West & Zimmerman, in Karp & Yoels, 1983:180). It seemed he did not pay attention to her and continued his previous talk. He dominated the talk.

The woman interrupted once. They were talking about how long M2 had been working in the bank.

M2 : Ya empat bulan lah. Empat bulan,

→F2 :

L [a bank] cabang mana?

She was still in the course of "the bank" topic and her interruptions might mean to support the topic.

Only one of M2's interruptions signalled his domination. He used it to "control one's (his) turns at talk" (West & Zimmerman, in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:111).

III.4.1.3 CONVERSATION 3 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 3 (F3))

Table III.4.1.3 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M3	1 (100%)
F3	0 (0%)
Total	1 (100%)

M3 did interruption once that was the only interruption in the conversation. F3 gave none at all in the 12 minutes conversation. The interruption occurred when she was talking about her family.

F3 : 0, iya. /Kalau aku kedua/. Ada lagi. Di atas [dua tahun.
 →M3 : [Kedua] [Seua berapa?
 F3 : Empat.

Noticed M3's remark "Kedua.". It signalled his intense listening to F3's talk. Then he interrupted.

West & Zimmerman stated that interruption showed that the speaker did not regard the partner's talk. It changed or disorganized the conversational topics.

In contrast, M3's interruption, in this case, did developed the construction of the topic being talked about. In III.1.1.3 could be seen that F3 was more passive than M3 that made him proposed many questions to motivate her to contribute more. Thus the question occurred as an interruption above could be the supportive one. He probably did not mean to exert his 'domination', but rather supported F3. According to Graddol and Swann

(1989:80), interruption may even be supportive, depend on the context.

III.4.2 CONTEXT 2: 25 YEAR OLD MALES AND 30 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.4.2.1 CONVERSATION 4 (BETWEEN MALE 3 (M3) AND FEMALE 4 (F4))

Table III.4.2.1 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M3	8 (72.7%)
F4	3 (27.3%)
Total	11 (100%)

M3 did most of the interruptions (72.7%), while F4 only did 27.3% of the whole interruptions.

6 of the man's interruptions made the woman drop her utterance. That could be seen in the following excerpt.

- F4 : Aku nggak mau ngajar di SMA. Apa, anak-anak segitu, .. besar-besar. Gurunya segini,
 (M3 chuckles)
- digodain e aku. Kalau S
- M3 : [/Ya, sampeyan kan digudoi/. [laughs]
- F4 : Wo segitu e. Wong aku SMP kayak
- M3 : [Lo, kok .. kok digudoi. Njarake iku lo, kadang-kadang yo? [chuckles]

M3 interrupted twice with the same core and F4 always dropped her speaking. In her first remark, she was probably about to speak "Kalau SMP", but then got interrupted. She tried to continue her first remark by the second one and was interrupted again. She did not try to

do the third effort and dropped the thing she wanted to talk about. She "gave up the floor with little or no protest". (Holmes, 1993:326)

Here M3 disorganized the construction of conversational topics and took F4's right to be engaged in the conversation.

Many times he directed the course of the topics. For instance, he directed the female's speaking about "the expensive price of VW Kombi" into "the potency of the car to be burnt".

- F4 : VW Kombi itu sekarang mahal!
 M3 : Mosok se?
 F4 : [Lo, iya! ... Meski yang ukuran [panjang
 → M3 : [Tapi, VW Kombi itu sekarang itu abak,
 apa namanya? ... VW VW itu sering kebakaran.

And again the female gave up the floor by asking :

F4 : Kenapa?

There was also an interruption that developed the topic and at the same time supported F4's remark.

- F4 : .. sana lo kuliah mumpung masih anu. Ndak mau [kalau
 → M3 : [Ndak mau? ... Sekarang nggak kuliah
 dia? Mggak disambi?

He responded and thus continued or developed her speaking.

F4's interruptions, on the contrary, were less disruptive. One of them continued the course of the topic being talked about.

- F4 : Naik mobil jenasah itu. [laughs]
 M3 : /?/. /Lo kok [bisa itu lo?
 → F4 : [Aku nganke! aku. Koyok gak duwe mobil ae, [a name]!.

Even one of them was only an 'interruption can-

didate' since she did not continue her remark to be the real interruption.

M3 : O pinter ya, lihat [tangannya,] ketrampilan terus.
 →F4 : [Soalnya]

Only one of hers did changed the topic. They previously talked about 'the plan of six days working', then she shifted the topic into :

F4 : O, tak bilangin [a name]. [a name], [a name], temennu kerja di [a company]. Pajeki ae, [a name].

Thus M3's interruptions were more disruptive than F4's. West and Zimmerman said that it was an indicator of a different power between the man and the woman. But M3 probably did not mean it. His interruptions might be interpreted as "interest and enthusiasm" (Tannen, 1984:78). It was like a habit for the man though his real intention possibly was not like that. His number of interruption increased compared to when he conversed with F3. (See III.4.1.3) It might be due to F4's talkativeness, while F3 was passive.

III.4.2.2 CONVERSATION 5 (BETWEEN MALE 1 (M1) AND FEMALE 5 (F5))

Table III.4.2.2 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M1	4 (66.7%)
F5	2 (33.3%)
Total	6 (100%)

It could be seen that there was no changes on M1's

pattern of interruption, whether he conversed with the same age female respondent (See III.4.1.1) or with the older one. He still interrupted more often than the female.

None of his disrupted the conversational topics, though interrupted F5 and three times she dropped her talk because of being interrupted. When they were talking about her experience when applying for POLWAN, she was interrupted by M1.

F5 : Sabtu dipanggil, POLWAN

→ M1 : L Pas .. pas anu ya? Pa:s libur berarti Sabtu ya?

He did not disorganize the topic and his interruption showed his intense listening to F5's. Thus, it did not operate as stated by West and Zimmerman (in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1989:105) that interruptions showed lack of attention to the partner's talk. He did not also extremely take her right to be engaged in conversation. His interruption gave her such kind of right for it invited her next remark.

F5's interruptions might signal her impatience to take her turn. It could be seen when M1 talked about the survey done by Ratih. He spoke at length and then reached the remark:

M1 : Yo wis. Akhirnya [terus ternyata sebelum
→ F5 : [La aku enggak kok.] Tapi lama ditelpon. ...

It seemed she could not resist to tell him about her own experience related to the writer's research. At that time, it did not the female who gave up the floor, but

the man.

Still, he interrupted more often that was considered by West and Zimmerman as a signal of different power between man and woman in a cross-sex conversation. He interrupted though he might be not mean to show his 'power', but rather his support.

Thus, the age did not influence him to change his pattern to be lesser than the female's interruptions. Gender seemed to play more role here.

III.4.2.3 CONVERSATION 6 (BETWEEN MALE 2 (M2) AND FEMALE 6 (F6))

Table III.4.2.3 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M2	3 (75%)
F6	1 (25%)
Total	4 (100%)

M2, though conversed with an older woman, he still interrupted more often (75%), while the woman only 25%. One of his even changed the previous topic that F6's had a lot of brothers and sisters that was introduced by M2.

M2 : Banyak juga ya. [laughs]
 F6 : Lo banyak. Jaman dulu kan banyak ya? Nek saiki kan
 [chuckling].....
 → M2 : UHe-eh! Baskara: berapa abak?

He changed the topic abruptly and cut F2's response to his remark. He pursued his own topic, and F6 gave up without protest by answering :

F6 : Baskara Jaya dua.

and the previous topic was gone.

Another interruption might be showed his disregard toward the woman's speaking he interrupted.

M2 : Kalau dulu kan e, sudah sering di lapangan. Iya.

F6 : (1) L Pindah-pindah ya? J

(2) Enak wong pengalamannya banyak ya, [kalau di /kontraktor/.

→M2 : [Kalau pindah-pindahnya sih nggak.

He did not listen to F6's statement ((1)), but to (2).

He corrected (1) rather than responded to (2).

But one of his interruptions displayed his excitement to F6's remark.

F6 : Satu-satu sak bendel, nek sepuluh bendel [kan sudah sepuluh!, Wah, wis.

→M2 : [Na:, makanya.] Itu kan kadang juga...

He showed his interest to F6's and "hardly contained" himself (Tannen, 1984:60).

F6's only one interruption facilitated the conversational topic.

M2 : /Mungkin/ sudah pindah pak [a name] itu ya?

→F6 : [Mana ini? Teluk Tomini apa pak [the name] itu?

Thus two of M2's interruptions operated on the West and Zimmerman's theory (in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983). They destroyed the conversational topic, took the partner's right to converse, and displayed lack of attention. The man's characteristics of interruption pattern related to "a sexual division" between the two interactants (p.10). Older age of the female respondents did not made him interrupted less frequently than her.

III.4.3 CONTEXT 3: 30 YEAR OLD MALES AND 25 YEAR OLD FEMALES

III.4.3.1 CONVERSATION 7 (BETWEEN MALE 4 (M4) AND FEMALE 1 (F1))

Table III.4.3.1 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M4	1 (50%)
F1	1 (50%)
Total	2 (100%)

F1 only did one interruption in the 12 minutes conversation. Even it had more supportive characteristic than disruptive though stopped M4's speaking.

M4 : Supliernya semen. Ya, alat seperti
 → F1 : } O alat anu, bangunan itu ya?
 M4 : } L He-eh.

She continued M4's utterance though interrupted. It displayed her intense listening.

M4's interruption came after F1's very long remark. He only gave few responses to hers and then interrupted.

F1 : Kalau kita sendiri, ya mungkin ampun. Yang diajari berapa, /anakya/.
 [chuckling]
 → M4 : Tapi agak sulit ..
 ngajari .. anak-anak SD? Apa? Agak sulit ya?

It could be noted, both from her tone and internal pauses within her talk, F1 had become rather listless to continue her talk that might be due to M4's passiveness who only responded very little.

West and Zimmerman (in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley,

1983:109) argued that males tend to interrupt females when they, the females, talk on at length. The men tried "to get a word at edgewise", or, put in another way, they were impatient for not being able to talk.

Here F1 talked at length and then M4 interrupted. But the male's interruption seemed not to operate to get a word at edgewise, that is to take the turn. He seemingly tried to show to F1 his attention to her talk by inserting the interruption. He felt rather uneasy probably because he noticed her more and more listless in talking.

He did not pursue his own agenda for he let her to continue her talk (at length). However, he did not change the course of the topic, but supported it.

Thus, F1 still did not change her pattern from her previous conversation with M1 (See III.4.1.1) and her interruptions did not have any disruptive effect to the conversational topic.

III.4.3.2 CONVERSATION 8 (BETWEEN MALE 5 (M5) AND FEMALE 2 (F2))

Table III.4.3.2 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
M5	1 (50%)
F2	1 (50%)
Total	2 (100%)

M5's interruption contributed to F2's core of

M6's interruption made F3 drop her speaking and he pursued another topic.

F3 : Belajar bernasyarakat, ya
 → M6 : Tapi abak F3 sebelum tinggal di sini, di mana?

Before it, he talked about a private matter he experienced at a boarding-house where he stayed. It seemed he then realized that it was not an appropriate thing to be said to his new acquaintance and shifted to another topic abruptly. It disorganized the previous topic. He might not mean to disregard F3's comment to his talk, but he might be just feel rather uneasy and automatically changed the topic.

F3, conversely, did not give any interruption. Her pattern did not change from her first conversation with M3 (See III.4.1.3).

III.4.4 ANALYSIS OF THE WHOLE CONVERSATIONS

Table III.4.4 The frequency of interruption-initiation pattern

	Interruption-Initiation
Men	27 (71.1%)
Women	11 (28.9%)
Total	38 (100%)

A total of 38 interruptions were observed, of which twenty-seven or 71.1% were male-initiated. Males interrupted more often in 7 of 9 conversations and only two others deviated. In conversation 8 the female interrupted more often than the male (66.7% or 2 of 3), and

both of the respondents in conversation 7 had an equal number of interruptions (each of them was 1). But it should be noticed here that both of the women in the two conversations gave interruptions that were facilitative to the conversational topic. They did not destruct the conversational topic as stated by West and Zimmerman (in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:105).

But as a whole, the male respondents interrupted more than the females. They might not mean to dominate or to take over bid in the conversations, though there were some of them really showed their disregardness to the partners' talk.

Gender seemed to play more role than age for the men still interrupted more frequently than the female respondents of 5 years older age. Age did not change the tendency of men to interrupt women.

Goffman stated that social occasions experienced by men and women are "not immune" to the influence of "externally realized matters" which

... are given some official place and weight in most encounters, figuring as avowed elements in the situation, even if only as determinants of the terms of address employed, as when two customers are treated alike except that one is called Sir and the other Miss. (cited from West & Zimmerman, in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:110)

Thus when male and female respondents encounter one another for the first time, they still take into account the circumstances they share in the society. Though the females are university graduates and workers,

the same with males, the pattern of interruption did not change.

It might be due to the influence of society where they have been living until now. Though there is expanding opportunity for women in education and working area, but the differences between women and men still persist. They are still treated differently by the society, probably since their childhood. "Women are evidently socialised from early childhood to expect to be interrupted (by men)" (Holmes, 1992:326) for there were studies found that daughters were interrupted more and that some boys started practising this strategy for dominating the talk at a very early age. Women are expected to "give in" to men.

Thus interruption pattern is natural for the man. As a habit though he might not mean to exert his power. On the contrary, the woman usually gave up the floor when got interrupted. Interruption constitutes "a power differential readily found in both ordinary and extraordinary setting in which men and women come together" (West & Zimmerman, in Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983:111). Unacquainted people met for the first time where they were expected to inhibit pattern of interruption related to different power between male and female, the pattern was still based on gender, rather than age.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION