Spoken Discourse Analysis for Feminist Interviews: Movement towards a Gender Equality Era?

Yogeeta Sharma

PhD Scholar, Department of English, Galgotias University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh 203201, Email Id: sharmayogeeta07@gmail.com

Vijay Kumar

Associate Professor, Department of English, Galgotias University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh 203201, Email Id: vijay.kr@galgotiasuniversity.edu.in

Abstract

According to contemporary research, discourse analysis, sometimes known as DA, is an interdisciplinary technique for studying languages outside of sentences or within lines. The goal is to eliminate prevailing discourses that inform academics on how language is used to create reality socially. Discourse analysis "developed out of studies in numerous fields, notably linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology", McCarthy (1991, P. 6) described the interdisciplinary nature of discourse analysis. Language has traditionally been researched in other fields of study by concentrating only on words and sentences. However, this sector of linguistics concentrates on facilitating the practitioners to go in-depth within lines and prolong the thinner philosophies that are not verbalized through the text. Exploring the implications of the discourse helps to understand the use of specific language by stressingthe cohesive schema of text evaluation to help scientists recognize meaning from various perspectives.

Keywords: Discourse analysis, spoken discourse, feminism, language, and linguistics

Language and feminism

Coates warned that feminism significantly affects linguistic and sociolinguistic practices (Coates, 1998: 195). It has to do with sexist language, which is perceived, stated, and written based on the distinction between male and female language.While sociolinguistics asserts that language is related to social status and employment allocation among the sexes, women are viewed as having a lower social status. Compared to theprofound feminist exegesis and theology, feminist linguistics is a smaller area of exploration. (Hidayatullah, 2009, 2011, 2014, 2016); (Seedat, 2013), (Pritchard, 2009), and (Suyoufie, 2008), Scholars studying the issue from the perspective of language will include Sandra M. Gilbert, Susan Gubar (1985: 515–543),Jennifer Coates (1998: 195–199), and

Cameron (1993, 1998). They studied the idea of "perceptions" and "personal basis speech" (linguistics), "social scale (sociolinguistics)", and gender formation based on scholarlywritings.

In Indonesia, researchers have used discourse analysis to improve argumentation style in writing essays. The research was conducted by R. Panca Pertiwi Hidayati and SaeedEsmaeili. It combined discourse analysis with structuralism analysis to develop a critical thinking map of the mind R. Panca Pertiwi Hidayati (2017). Additionally, SaeedEsmaeili (2015) completed a study on "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family and Friends Textbooks: Genderism Representation". However, the studies differ from those conducted in the past. The researchers investigate the feminist linguistics viewpoint in Arabic literature as spoken discourse and social practice interpretation (AWK) from text to text in MudzakkirtThobbah's novel. In addition, the fundamental distinction of this study is that it proposes Indonesian feminist language education. With principles of feminist linguistic learning with Eastern and Indonesian characteristics, the novel MudzakkirtThobbah will frame education and feminist linguistics. As a result, the thesis of this study integrates the theories of Cameron, Coates, Seedat, and Hidayatullah concerning Nawl Al-feminism Saadw in the novel MudzakkirtThobbah.

According to Leeuwen (2009:277), spoken discourse analysis is a crucial component of speech that protects and legitimizes oppression, injustice, and inequality in society. In order to identify the white and black American authors of an unidentified fictitious story, Figuera (2010) employs critical discourse analysis using language. Mooji makes the case that there is a need for a new method of feminism text analysis, one of which is post-structuralist analysis. According to linguists, this research's critical discourse analysis is an ongoingendeavor to analyze and understand the textual meaning of Nawl Al-novel Saadwi'sMudzakkirtThobbah in a post-structural manner (2006). Critical discourse analysis will not only highlight linguistic issues but the use of socio-culturalwritings as one of the post-structural methods. Thus, using the tools of sociolinguistic analysis as well as socio-cultural traditions embracing the textual context within the literature work, acritical analysis of the discourse illustrates the principles of feminist thoughts by studying the features of the language. The analysis of the feminist discourse studies how linguistic features such as vocabulary, tone, sound, and written texts are used to denote ideas related tofeminist understanding (Fairclough, 2001: 92-93).

Language is a social construction that positions men's and women's language differently, and so is the idea of gender. The language and the logical structure used to express various ideas in the novel are an outcome of this social construct. Since gender and language, in general,are constructed

through social interventions, it has faced criticism from several scholars since long, especially Cameron, on different occasions: 1993, 1998, Coates (1998), Hedley (1992), Barzilai (1991), Gallaway and Bernasek (2004). These social practices and discourse have disappeared in the last two decades. As a result, the studies on the field of critical literary analysis retreated in Indonesia. The researchers would incorporate specific values to inculcate diversity and linguistic impartiality to portray the work of literature in this situation.

Critical Discourse Analysis

This study's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) reflectsFairclough, N., (2001), Rogers, R., et al. (2005), Leeuwen's, T.V., (2009:277), Renée Figuera's (2010). Fairclough claims that critical analysis is the study of literary texts in a way that draws the connection between language, ideology, and power (Fairclough, 2001:23). According to Leeuwen (2009:277). The evaluation of the literary discourse to study its language use is quite significant, for these components represent the meaning of the speech.Often, the language is used to justify and support various discriminatory practices against women, such as inequality, tyranny, and societal taboo. In order to identify the white and black American authors of an unidentified fictitious story, Figuera (2010) employs critical discourse analysis using language. Mooji makes the case that there is a need for a new method of feminism in textual data, one of which is post-structuralist analysis. According to linguists, this research's critical discourse analysis is an ongoingendeavor to analyze and understand the textual meaning of Nawl Al-novel Saadwi'sMudzakkirtThobbah in a post-structural manner (2006). Critical discourse analysis, which not only highlights linguistic issues but also the use of societal and cultural discourse, is a post-structural method. Therefore, the tools of sociolinguistic analysis, social and cultural practices, and metaphorical linguistic elements, including tone, vocabulary, and text structures, highlight the idea of feminism (Fairclough, 2001: 92-93).

Due to the incomplete influence of each reader's comprehension capacity, knowledge, expertise, background, and situational relations on the road toward understanding meaning, coherence is an essential quality of DA that may vary to some extent. Coulthard introduces the following quote from Firth (2014, P. 25): "Linguists must ultimately be concerned with the linguistic method within the framework of a situation since language is primarily a method of acting and influencing others to behave." McCarthy (1991, P. 7) came to the same conclusion in his work, stating that discourse analysis is "a wide-ranging science which derives its coherence from the characterization of language just above the phrase and curiosity in the contextual and cultural forces that structure words in use."

In texts or vocal conversations, critical discourse analysis seeks to uncover the injustices or ideologies concealed or communicated by the language employed by a particular group (such as elites). According to Dijk (1995, P. 19) [7], "theoretically and descriptively, we need to explore which strategies and structures of text and speech to participate in to unravel the trend of elite supremacy or deception in texts; CDA must focus on the morally acceptable forms of discourse mind manipulation by the powerful. An effective CDA must be efficient: its connotations must be realized". Analyzing discourse through the lens of CDA is not an easy process, and it necessitates special knowledge in this field.

Conversational discourse analysis seeks to understand what is said and what is understood (the relationship between the speaker and listener). Because it recognizes social activity as achieved through the mode of communication, conversational analysis, or CA, is more closely tied to spoken speech. When CA calls for spoken speech interpretation, empirical discourse analysis is used. However, CA differs from DA in spoken speech interpretation asit has a strong affection for the speaker. CA will constantly be next to the speaker, putting what they say into the proper context. CA had established itself in various fields, including sociology, linguistics, business management, psychology, and others.

Additionally, CA, on the one hand, instructs us that language can be analyzed by considering how we engage in interpersonal activities and how these operations are organized socially. In contrast, DA, on the other hand, considers that descriptions cannot be treated as objective representations of a target social reality. Additionally, DA works with specific interpersonal activities and the chronological context, whereas CA concentrates on the layout and placement of utterances. Finally, in communication theory, the investigators typically listen to the discussion before transcribing it into text for further analysis.

The very idea of discourse is contested, and a wide range of definitions for it can be found in various academic traditions; some of these definitions go well beyond language-centered approaches. Formal is the most popular and widely accepted definition of discourse in linguistics. This is because the area is segmented into many levels of linguistic entities, including the study of sounds vis phonology. The study of the discourse is incomplete without understanding how words are combined into a meaningful statement, that is, morphology and the syntax of the sentence.Alternatively, the focus is less on the language structure and the function. This viewpoint maintains that discourse is the use of language, as opposed to the more idealized and detached linguistic forms that are the primary emphasis of a significant portion of applied linguistics. Instead,

this viewpoint focuses on language in the situations in which it is used socially. Due to its concentration on broader context employed with languages, the second assertion of discourse is the foundation holding the analysis on gender in terms of the use of language. However, these requirements are typically appropriate in practice becausemost contextual speech sociolinguists analyze more extensively than oneexpression. The formal analysis should understand the contextual implication.

If specific language conceptions in dialogue limit the needs of linguistic and gender studies, then more or less non-linguistic conceptions that originated from the post-structuralist theory have been too vague. To comprehend discourses from Michel Foucault (1972), they are social phenomena or cultural frameworks of knowledge, belief, and power, not essential consideration to the particulars of language form. However, discourse research within a Foucauldian perspective frequently looks at how language alludes to the knowledge bases of specific institutions, such as medical or judicial speech. The idea that "Foucauldian discourses" (cultural and historical methods of organizing knowledge) may and should be included in the evaluation of "discourse" by certain discursive analysts is not widely accepted by others (contextually specific ways of using language). An integrated approach might increase the application of understanding and critically evaluating the literary discourse and employing it to deeply understand the feminist perspective and gender studies. There has been less effect on non-linguistic feminist studies than Foucault and related concepts from these studies,which require a degree of technical accuracy,scaring away the individuals who are not field experts.

A particular method considers different genres of the dialogue used by females without a deep comparison with how males utilize gender discourse. Women and men are examined in ethnographic research of communication primarily through the lens of gender differences. A significant part of the ongoing study is dedicated to the"African American women's discourse". The study contrasts with the focus of scholars to emphasize forms of speech in African American males. For instance, Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1971) expands the notion of"signaling"; initially, it was defined as a ceremonial insult game played in public by guys (e.g., Abrahams 1962). According to Mitchell-Kernan, adult female speakers are exceptionally skilled in the discourse type known as conversational signaling, which involves indirect criticism. Linguistic scholars, researchers, and philosophers in the field of gender studies recently added to Claudia's findings by classifyingdistinct discourse genres and research into analyzing gender-related discourse by"African-American"females in their social, cultural, and political activism. Some of the most common genres entailreproving someone else for chattering (Goodwin 1980), story-telling, reading

dialect, and comparing African American Vernacular English with other languages. The difference between male and female speakers may be examined, but it is not the emphasis of this work. Instead, the focus is on assessing how well women and girls can express themselves in their own words.

Aspects of Language

Discourse is the language being used (Brown & Yule 1983; Cook 1989). This means the study of language in action is called discourse analysis. "language in use." refers to the collection of expectations, favorites, and norms that connects languages to context. Alternatively, discourse analysis can be described as an organization of language at a level above a sentence. The term "text" occasionally replaces "discourse." Rather than only studying a language's standard features, discourse analysis looks at how that language is utilized in various social and cultural settings. Discourse analysis is used to understand better how language (written, spoken, and institutionalized) interacts with its surroundings in various circumstances.

Cohesion is critical to the overall impression of the piece. Gus Cook (1989:6-7) defines dialogue as "language used to convey something perceived as coherent but which does not necessarily correlate with a correct sentence" (p. 7). According to him, the goal of discourse analysis is to discover what factors contribute to the coherence of a given speech. He argues that communication does not have to be formal; it may be as informal as a grunt or a curse or as formal as a book, a lengthy court case, a few conversations, or a few scribbled notes. Instead of clinging to a set of standards, its ability to communicate and be recognized as coherent is what counts. Furthermore, discourse analysis is seen by Stubbs (1983:1) as "an aggregate of efforts to analyze the organization of a language as well as to evaluate larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written material". When studying discourse as a form of communication, it is essential to remember that what counts is how language is organized to convey information to its intended audience.

Discourse analysis emerged in the 1960s and 1970s due to work in several disciplines, including linguistics, semiotics, anthropology, psychology, and sociology. Discourse analysis may trace its roots back to several influential scholars and publications, including the ones listed below: J.L. Austin's 1962 book, "How to Do Things with Words". It is dedicated to the concept of speechacts and performativity. Scholars and linguists utilize the idea of performativity to study "gender performativity". Speech-acts is the term given to the act of "doing something by saying something," which means that a person in describing something is also doing a linguistic activity that has further

implications. Dell Hymes (1964) provided an insight into social norms and practices. Searle built on Austin's ideas and made them better in 1969. According to the functional approach to language, linguist M.A.K. Halliday had a considerable effect on discourses' linguistic properties (for example, see Halliday 1961). (e.g., Halliday 1973). Conversational maxims and the development of social semiotics were both impacted by H.P. Grice (1975) and Halliday (1978). (1978). Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) research provided a framework for characterizing teacher-student conversations. A critical discourse approach was born out of the study. Some research on conversation analysis has helped discourse analysis. Ethno-methodological efforts like Gumperz and Hymes' 1972 research stand as an example. Conversational norms and turn-taking, as well as other aspects of spoken contact, have been studied extensively by Goffman (1976, 1979), Sacks (Segloff), and Jefferson (Jefferson) (1974). A glance at some of the numerous methods to express oneself is provided in the next section showing multiple ways to do so.

Therefore, studies on the feminist critical discourse aim to highlight the nuanced, often unseen, and complex ways that gendered preconceptions and hierarchical power dynamics are formed, maintained, negotiated, and overturned in various contexts and communities. This interest stems recognizing that the topics discussed (hoping to bring about social change) have practical and phenomenological repercussions for certain groups of women and men. It is not only an academic deconstruction of texts and discourse for its own sake. The CDA, from a feminist perspective, is undoubtedly interdisciplinary. On the one hand, it adds a feminist perspective to (critical) language and discourse studies. On the other hand, it shows how imperative language and discourse studies are for gender and women's studies research that looks at feminism.

One of the most frequent ways to acquire data for gender studies and discourse analysis studies is through interviews (Figueroa-Domecq et al., 2015). It may not be surprising given that interviews and qualitative research have long been linked to feminist research (Oakley, 1998). Additionally, a more participatory method might have improved the data within the critical constructionist research model. "Participatory approaches", "co-operative inquiry", and "participatory action research" are all common in the action research paradigm (Brgold& Thomas, 2012). Participatory research involves including the public in all phases of the research process, from extrapolating the research topic to devising the means of gathering and analyzing the data (Wicks, Reason, and Bradbury, 2008).

Semi-structureddialogues form a basis of the ongoing research for allowing members to focus on their situational knowledge and comprehension (Hesse-Biber&Leavy, 2006; Creswel,

2014; Neuman, 2014). According to this study, this was a vital strategy in interacting with CDA criticisms (see the section on CDA), as well as adhering to a "postcolonial feminist perspective" (Spivak, 1988), which requires me to seemyself as an impartial observer "who does not experience being female in the same way as my participants" (see reflexivity) (Mohanty, 1991).

Semi-structured dialogues outperformed structured and unstructured ones as a research strategy for various reasons. First, the open-ended questions in semi-structured interviews may provide insight into the participant has lived experiences without inhibiting creativity or spontaneity, in contrast to structured interviews (Hesse-Biber&Leavy 2006).

"CDA", or "multimodal critical discourse analysis", is commonly necessary since communication has become "multimodal and non-linguistic" media like images are utilized to convey a wide range of thoughts and concepts (MCDA). Like CDA, MCDA seeks to expose concealed discourse components and emphasize these omissions' political and social ramifications (Machin, 2013). Although this methodology is still in its nascent stage concerning the study of gender, it provides a path to a more comprehensive understanding of gender and modern society (Lazar &Kramarae, 2011). However, new analytical methods may be required since the Internet provides a platform for comprehensively monitoring and exchanging still photographs, moving images, and visual imagery in addition to written text (Herring, 2010). This may have unintentionally established anobstacle for the "CDA" approach to a range of semiotic tools since traditional CDA usually favors linguistic texts over non-linguistic ones.

References

1. Abrahams, Roger D. 1962: Playing the dozens. *Journal of American Folklore* 75: 209–20.
2. Hidayatullah, "Claims to the Sacred". Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion, Vol. No. 2, Fall 2016.
3. Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis:* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bergold, J. and Thomas, S. (2012). Participatory Research Methods: A Methodological Approach in Motion. F*orum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 13 (1). Art. 30. Available at: http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1201302.
5. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*(4th ed.). London: Sage.
6. Coulthard, M. *An introduction to discourse analysis* (Routledge, 2014).

_____

7. Cook, G (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

8. F. Seedat Islam, "Feminism, and Islamic Feminism: Between Inadequacy and Inevitability" Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Fall 2013), pp. 25-45

9. Figueroa-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Pérez, M., Morgan, N. J. and Villacé-Molinero, T. (2015). Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research, 52*, pp. 87-103.

10. Foucault, Michel 1972: *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

11. Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language.* London: Edward Arnold.

12. Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning.* London; Edward Arnold.

13. Halliday, M.A.K. (1983). Foreword to M. Cummings and R. Simmons' *The Language of Literature: A Stylistic Introduction to the Study of Literature.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

14. Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

15. Halliday, M.A.K.andMatthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.

16. Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 1980: "He-said-she-said": Formal cultural procedures for the construction of a *Mary Bucholtz*

17. gossip dispute activity. *American Ethnologist* 7: 674–95.

18. Goodwin, Marjorie Harness 1990: *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as SocialOrganization among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

19. Goffman, E. (1976). 'Replies and Responses.' *Language in Society*, 5,257-313.

20. Gumperz, J. J., and D. Hymes. (1972). *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

21. Herring, S. C. (2010). Web content analysis: Expanding the paradigm. In J. Hunsinger and M. Allen (Eds.), *International handbook of internet research*. London, New York: Springer, pp. 233-249.

22. Hesse-Biber, S. and Leavy, P. (2006). In-depth interview. In Hesse-Biber, S.N. and Leavy, P., 2010. *The practice of qualitative research* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 119-145.

23. Hymes, D. (1964). 'Towards Ethnographies of Communication Events' in Giglioli (1972)(ed). Language, and Social Context Harmondsworth; Penguin Books.

24. J. Coates, "Feminist Future and Linguistics", Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS), Vol. 4, No. 1/2, 1998.

25. Kress, G. R. and Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design.* Oxon: Routledge.

26. Machin, D. (2013). What is multimodal critical discourse studies? *Critical Discourse Studies, 10*(4), pp. 347-355.

27. McCarthy, M. *Discourse analysis for language teachers* (Cambridge University Press, 1991). [2].

28. Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia 1971: *Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community*.Berkeley, CA: Language Behavior

29. Research Laboratory.

30. Mohanty, C. T. (1991). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses in C.T. Mohanty, A. Russo and L. Torres (Eds.), *Third world women and the politics of feminism Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press,* pp 51-80.

31. Lazar, M.M. and Kramarae, C. (2011). Gender and power in discourse. In Van Dijk, T.A. ed., 2011. *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. London: SAGE, pp.217-241.

32. Oakley, A. (1998). Gender, methodology and people's ways of knowing: Some problems with feminism and the paradigm debate in social science. *Sociology, 32*(4), pp. 707-731.

33. D. Cameron. Is There an Anglo-American Feminist Linguistics? Author(s): Source: Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Autumn, 1993)

34. E. Pritchard. "JFSR : A Dissenting View". Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion, Vol. 25, No. 1, Spring 2009.

35. F. Suyoufie. "The Appropriation of tradition is Selected Works of Contemporary Arab Women Writers", Journal of Arabic Literature, Vol. 39, No. 2, 2008.

36. F. Seedat Islam, "Feminism, and Islamic Feminism: Between Inadequacy and Inevitability" Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Fall 2013), pp. 25-45

37. R. Figuera, "Convention, Context, and Critical Discourse Analysis "Jim the Boatman" (1846) and the Early Fiction of Trinidad", NWIG: New West Indian Guide/Nieuwe West-IndischeGids, Vol. 84, No.3/4, 2010.

38. R. Panca Pertiwi Hidayati, "Improving Students" Argumentation Style Ability in Writing Essay through Discourse Analysis Model Critical *Journal of Education, Teaching and Learningp-ISSN: 2477-5924 e-ISSN: 2477-8478* 71 Thinking Map Oriented" Journal of Education and Learning, Vol. 2, No. 1, March 2017.

39. S. Esmaeili and A. Arabmofrad, "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family and Friends Textbooks: Representation of Genderism" International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, Vol. 4, No. 4, July 2015.

40. S.M. Gilbert and S.Gubar, "Sexual Linguistics: Gender, Language, Sexuality", New Literary History, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 515-543, Spring, 1985.

41. Sinclair, J. McH., and R. M. Coulthard (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

42. Spivak, G. C. (1981) French feminism in an international frame. *Yale French Studies*, (62), pp.154-184.

43. Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In P. Williams and L. Chrisman (Eds.),

44. *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 66–111.

45. Spivak, G.C. (1996). Diasporas old and new: Women in the transnational world. *Textual Practice*, *10*(2), pp.245-269.

46. Spivak, G.C. (2000). A Moral Dilemma, *Theoria*, *47*(96), pp. 99-120.

47. Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

48. S. Khoja-Moolji, "Poststructuralist Approaches the Teaching about Gender, Islam, and Muslim Societies", Feminist Teacher, Vol. 24, No. 3, 2014.

49. T. van Leeuwen, "Critical Discourse Analysis" Dalam Jan Renkema (eds), Discourse of Course: An Overview of Research in Discourse Studies (Amsterdam: JhonBenjamins Publishing Company, 2009.

50. Van Dijk, T. A, Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, *1(1)*, 17-28.

51. Wicks, P.G., Reason, P., and Bradbury, H. (2008). Living inquiry: Personal, political and philosophical groundings for action research practice. *The SAGE handbook of action research. Participative inquiry and practice*, pp.15-30.