CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Conversational Strategies

According to Tannen (1993) conversational strategy is the strategy which consists of linguistic strategies such as interruption, silence and tag questions to get purposes either creating domination or establishing connection. There are several conversational strategies used which focus on the way men and women utilize in mixed-gender conversation. Coates (2004) outlined seven strategies that are minimal responses, hedges, questions, question tags, directive, swearing and taboo language and compliments.

2.1.1.1 Minimal Responses

According to Coates (2004) minimal responses, sometimes called back-channels’, are forms such as yeah or right or mhm. Zimmerman and West (1975:108) mention only um hhm, uh huh, and yeah as minimal responses. Kendon’s (1975:204) come up with yes, quite, surely, I see and that’s true. Many researches show that women use more minimal responses than men. One of them in Hirschman’s (1973) research stating that women show a greater tendency to use positive minimal response, especially ‘mm hhm’. In using
these minimal responses, Fishman (1978) reported that women like to insert minimal responses throughout streams of talk rather than at the end (cited in Coates, 1998). The contributing of Tina and Lyn can then be seen in relation to each other:

Tina : You know you- you just must refer to this
Lyn : yeah, mhm  mhm

2.1.1.2 Hedges

Coates (2004) stated that hedges are linguistic forms such as I think, I’m sure, you know, sort of and perhaps that express the certainty about what is being discussed. It means that hedge express the certainty or uncertainty of the speakers about what they say. The usage of hedges is often associated with women rather than men. As in the following example:

And that way we’d get rid of explanation of man by man all that stuff/you know/ you’ve heard it before (radio interviewee describing past experience)

2.1.1.3 Tag Questions

Lakoff (1975) said that tag questions as one of the linguistic forms associated with tentativeness. According to Lakoff, tag questions decrease the strength of assertions. It means of the usage of tag questions, lakoff claimed that women use sentence which contain taq questions more often than men. Preisler’s (1986) research also contended that women used more tag questions in combination with other linguistic forms such as modals and other stressed auxiliaries
than men. By contrast, research conducted by Dubois and Crouch (197) that listed all formal examples of formal explanation of formal tag question (such as ‘probably industrial too, isn’t it?’) as well as informal tags (such as ‘Right?’, ‘OK?’ as in ‘That’s not easy, right?’) revealed that all questions were produced by men (cited in Coates, 2004). The example of tag question:

She’s coming around noon, isn’t she? (Husband to wife concerning expected guest)

2.1.1.4 Questions

Coates (2004) stated question as part of the conversational sequencing device Question + Answering. Question and answer are linked together in conversation: questions demand a response from the addressee. In interactive terms, then, questions are stronger than statements, since they give the speaker the power to elicit a response. It means that question is one of conversational strategies which consist of question and answer. Many researches argued that women display a greater tendency to ask question. It means that women ask more questions than man.

Question is divided by two types, they are WH question and yes/no questions. WH question is question that use question words such as who, what, where, when, why, whom, which and how. Using who is for asking person, what is for
asking thing/something, *where* is for asking place, *when* is for asking time, *why* is for asking reason, *whom* is asking person, *which* is for asking choose and *how* is for asking manner.

Meanwhile, yes/no question is the answer between yes or no.

In the following example of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meg</th>
<th>Are they nice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petey</td>
<td>Very nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>I thought they'd be nice. You got your paper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.1.5 Directives

Coates described directives as speech acts which try to get someone to do something. Goodwin explained about kind of directive, he called *gimme* and *I want* are ‘aggravated’ directives. It is more used by the boys. Meanwhile, the girls use ‘mitigated’ directives such as *let’s, gonna, can, could* (cited in Coates 2004). The differences occur because of the difference in social organization of the group. Goodwin argued that the linguistic forms used reflect and reproduce the social organization of group. The boy’s group is hierarchically organized with the leader uses strong directive forms to demonstrate control. On the other hand, the girl’s group is non-hierarchical in which all of them participate in making decision (citiced in Coates, 2004). The example of using directives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael</th>
<th><em>gimme</em> the wire... look man, <em>I want</em> the wire cutters right now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td><em>We gonna</em> paint 'em and stuff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.1.6 Swearing and Taboo Languages

Andersson and Trudgil (1992) have defined swearing as ‘a type of language use in which the expression a) refers to something that is taboo and/or stigmatized in the culture b) should not be interpreted literary; c) can be used to express strong emotion and attitudes’ (Anna:2013:5)

Coates (2003) research on conversational narrative as cited in Coates (2004) showed similar result. There are differences between men and women in the usage of taboo language when telling stories in everyday conversation. The stories told by all-male group contain a great deal of taboo language while the story told women to other women contain virtually none. In mixed contexts, however, male and female speakers seem to accommodate to the perceived norms of the other gender: the narratives produces by male speakers in a mixed context contain far less taboo language than in a single-sex context, while the narratives produced by female speakers in a mixed setting far more.

Jay (2009) explained that Taboo is the prohibition or avoidance in any society of behavior believed to be harmful to its members in that would cause them anxiety, embarrassment or shame. Taboo words are sanctioned or restricted on both institutional and individual levels under the assumption that
some harm will occur if taboo words are spoken. The exact nature of harm to befall the speaker, listener, or society has never been entirely clear. Taboo in English are placed primarily on sexual references (*blow job, cunt*) and on those that are considered profane or blasphemous (goddamn, Jesus Christ). Taboo extend to scatological referent and disgusting object (*shit, crap, douche bag*); some animal names (*bitch, pig, ass*); ethnic-racial gender slurs (*nigger, fag, dago*) insulting references to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviation (*retard, wimp, lard ass*); ancestral allusion (*son of a bitch, bastard*); substandard vulgar term (*fart face, on the rag*); and offensive slang (*cluster fuck, tut run*).

### 2.1.1.7 Compliments

According to Holmes (1995), a compliment is a speech act that explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to others for some ‘good’ (possession, characteristic, skill, etc) which is positively valued by the speaker and the hearer. Many researches, especially conducted in the United States and Brain, show that women both give receive more compliment than men. The example of using compliments:

Hi, Joanna, you look nice – your eye make-up is brilliant
You've got such lovely eyes
2.1.2 The Functions of Conversational Strategies

Coates (2004) explained that seven strategies that are minimal responses, hedges, question tags, questions, directive, swearing and taboo language and compliments. There are different functions each strategy.

2.1.2.1 Minimal Responses

Coates (2004) describes women’s skilful use of minimal response as ‘interactional shitwork’. She also concludes that there is a division of labour in conversation which supports men and women in position of power and powerlessness respectively. When men do use minimal response, these are often a tactic which undermines the current speaker and reinforce male dominance.

Anderson (1999:201) said that the use of minimal response ‘increases immediacy, signals that the listener comprehends the speaker’s message, and reinforce the speaker’s role in a conversation. Knapp and Hall (1997:427) argued that minimal responses have different forms and therefore they have different functions. Generally speaking, minimal responses such as yeah, uh-huh, and hm, show the good listener ship and supportive to the current speaker. However, if they are used in a rapid way, they can be used to ask the current speaker. Gardner Rod (2004) analyzed the
functions of some common minima responses such as $Mm/hm$, $Uh$-$huh$, $Yeah$, $Oh$, $Right$, based on this research. $Yeah$ ($Yes$, $Yep$, and so on) can be viewed as agreement and acknowledgment, showing the supportive to the current speaker. Other forms such as $Mm/hm$, $Uh$-$huh$ are generally used as keeping the conversation going, showing the good listenership to the current speaker indicating the high listenership and low speakership incipiency. $Mm$ is weaker of agreement that $yeah$, with low speakership incipiency. $Okay$ indicated the change of topic of activity, which shows relatively high speakership incipiency. $Oh$ indicates that the listener is attracted by the current speaker for the speaker's message is something new to the listener. $Oh$ here shows high speakership incipiency. $Alright$ has the function of agreement and acknowledgment, with high speakership incipiency.

2.1.2.2 Hedges

Contrary to other researchers in the previous explanation about hedges, Holmes did not simply link the usage with women or tentativeness. It can be said that hedges are not always used frequently by women and the frequent usage of hedges does not always convey uncertainty. Holmes categorized hedges *you know* in two groups, confidence *you know* and unconfidence *you know*. Confidence *you know*
expresses the speaker’s confidence or certainly in the proposition asserted. Meanwhile, unconfidence *you know* reflects uncertainly of various kinds. (cited in Coates, 2004).

A possible reason for male speakers’ apparently lower usage of hedges is their choice of topics: unlike female speakers, male speakers on the whole avoid sensitive topics. They only rarely self-disclose and prefer to talk about impersonal subject. When sensitive topics are under discussion, then hedges become a valuable resource for speakers, because they mitigate the force of what is said and thus protect both speaker’s and hearer’s face.

**2.1.2.3 Tag Questions**

Such tags can describe as speaker-oriented since they ask the addressee to confirm the speaker’s proposition. Tags whose primary function is affective express the speaker’s attitude to the addressee. They do this either by supporting the addressee. Women and men do not differ greatly in total usage. However, the important point to notice is that 59 per cent of the tags used by women are facilitative, while 61 per cent of the tags used by men are modal, expressing uncertainty.

Moreover, women are more likely than men to use tags when acting as facilitators. The significance of Holmes’s
finding will be taken up in discussion of women and politeness 
ad women and powerless language.

2.1.2.4 Questions

Questions in such contexts are categories as supportive, 
critical or antagonistic, analysis revealed that male and female 
speakers asked a similar proportion of supportive and critical 
questions. What varied was their use of antagonistic questions, 
with men challenging the presenter twice as often as women.

It is certainly true that questions are powerful linguistic 
form: they give the speaker the power to elicit a response from 
the other participants. This characteristic of questions is 
exploited by powerful participants in asymmetrical situation; it 
is also exploited by women speaker relatively powerless 
participants in many contexts – to keep conversation going.

2.1.2.5 Directives

The aim of giving a directive is to get someone to do 
something. Every words of directive use difference function. 
Let's explicitly includes the speaker together with the 
addressee(s) in the proposed action, gonna is one which makes 
a suggestion for future actions action, can and could are use to 
suggest rather than demand action.
2.1.2.6 Swearing and Taboo Language

Using of taboo language has a symbolic association with masculinity, not femininity (Coates: 2004). With regard to the functions, Djatmika (2007) did not provide any additional information other than those proposed by Crystal (1997), that is, emotive and expressive functions. He also documented the conditions in which a speaker uses four letters words: 1) being annoyed, being frustrated, and being disappointed on oneself, 2) being angry with somebody else/ the other speaker, 3) underestimating someone or challenging something conducted or stated by someone, 4) being too happy (see Yazid Basthomi).

2.1.2.7 Compliments

Compliments seem to function as positive politeness strategies, that is, they attend to the positive face needs of the addressee. Compliments can be face-threatening, because they ignore the negative face-needs of the addressee. Cross-sex compliments are clearly more face-threatening than same-sex compliments, and compliments seem to be more face-threatening to men than to women.
2.2 Related Studies

Actually there are some studies conducted previously that quiet helpful for this study. The first is conducted by Lucky Setyorini (2013) entitled *An Analysis of Conversational Strategies in an Interview Article of O’ the Oprah Magazine* show that she found the conversational strategies are used in an interview article of O’ Oprah Magazine. Her object was O’ Oprah magazine that containing interview between Oprah Winfrey and Maya Angelo. In her study, she used Coates’ theory (2004) to analyze different strategies used in an article of Oprah magazine and Corpus as method approaches. The result of the study shows that she found in the speakers’ utterances in same-sex conversation in the interview article of O, The Oprah magazine.

Other studies are conducted by Mega Anindyawati (2012) entitled *A Study Conversational Strategies in Mixed-Gender Conversation among English Department Students Airlangga University.* it shows that male and female’s speakers are different in the way talk. In her study, she also used Coates’ theory (2004) to analyze the different strategies used in the mixed-gender conversation and she use Qualitative as the method approach. The result of the study shows that male and female students used conversational strategies which imply different functions in mix-gender conversation.

Another is article that written by Nancy Washburn and Kiel Christianson (1995) that *Analysis Teaching Conversation Strategies through Pair-taping.* It shows that there are conversational strategies used among teachers and students in the classroom. The researchers use theory by Ellis (1985), the
strategies are selecting salient topics, checking comprehension, requesting clarification, repeating utterance, stressing keyword, and switching topics.

Three studies used conversational strategies theory in analyzing data, but two studies use theory by Coates and one of them uses Ellis theory. Their purpose are same, they want to know what the conversational strategies that use and the function of using them. Although are different, Lucky’s object is O, Oprah magazine, Mega’s object is English department students Airlangga University and Nancy and Kiel’s object is among students and teachers in the classroom.

This study can be called continuance from these related studies. This thesis talks about conversation strategies used between Oprah Winfrey and Lance Armstrong in The Oprah Winfrey Show. Different with others, the object of this thesis is mix gender conversation in English. It means the writer analyzes conversation between native male and female. The writer uses same with Mega and Lucky, Coates’ theory.