

# English Department Key Stage 5 Knowledge Organiser – Power and Gender (Diversity) Paper 2

AO1 linguistic terminology	AO2: POWER Critical concepts and issues	AO1 linguistic terminology	AO2: GENDER Critical concepts and issues
<p><b>Instrumental Power:</b> Power used to maintain and enforce authority.</p> <p><b>Influential Power:</b> Power used to influence or persuade others.</p> <p><b>Power asymmetry:</b> Unequal balance of power</p> <p><b>Political power:</b> Power held by those with the backing of the law.</p> <p><b>Personal power:</b> Power held by individuals as a result of their roles in organisations.</p> <p><b>Social Group power:</b> Power held as a result of being a member of a dominant social group.</p> <p><b>Constraints:</b> Ways in which powerful participants block/control the contribution of less powerful participants.</p> <p><b>Powerful participant/less powerful participant</b></p> <p><b>Small talk:</b> an interesting aspect when exploring language used at work.</p> <p><b>Epistemic modality:</b> express degrees of possibility e.g. shall, will.</p> <p><b>Deontic modality:</b> express degrees of necessity e.g. may, must.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>COULTHARD AND SINCLAIR (1975/1992):</b> Came up with their INITIATION-RESPONSE-FEEDBACK model which is a pattern of discussion between teacher/student. The teacher initiates, the student responds, the teacher gives feedback. Criticised by Van Lier (1995) as being restrictive.</li> <li>• <b>WAREING (1999):</b> Came up with the types of power as highlighted in the column to the left.</li> <li>• <b>FAIRCLOUGH (2001):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Power in discourse</b> (the way in which power is manifested in situations through discourse) and <b>Power behind discourse</b> (the focus on the social and ideological reasons behind the enactment of power).</li> <li>○ <b>Synthetic personalisation:</b> the artificial friendliness that powerful institutions use to reinforce their power, particularly evident in advertising.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>HOLMES AND STUBBS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Oppressive discourse strategy</b> – showing power by being direct.</li> <li>○ <b>Repressive discourse strategy</b> - showing power by being indirect.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>BROWN AND LEVINSON (1987):</b> Came up with Politeness Theory which centres on the idea of ‘face’ (i.e. self-esteem). You can either have a positive face or negative face. In everyday communication, there is the potential to threaten face by causing offence. These are called <b>face-threatening acts</b>.</li> <li>• <b>DYER (1982):</b> focused on power in advertising. “An advert’s main goal is to persuade. Adverts are taking over our lives and display an unattainable reality.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heteronormativity</li> <li>• Sex</li> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Marked term</li> <li>• Unmarked term</li> <li>• Lexical priming</li> <li>• Objectification</li> <li>• Tag questions</li> <li>• Linguistic discrimination</li> <li>• Subservience</li> <li>• Regulation</li> <li>• Social conditioning</li> <li>• Inequality</li> <li>• Overt and covert prestige</li> <li>• Subordination</li> <li>• Gender specific language</li> <li>• Stereotyping</li> <li>• Semantic derogation</li> <li>• Matriarchy</li> <li>• Patriarchy</li> <li>• Politeness</li> <li>• Hedges</li> <li>• Social network</li> <li>• Lexical priming</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Otto Jespersen (1922):</b> suggested women talk a lot; use half-finished sentences; use adjectives such as “pretty” and “nice” and have a smaller vocabulary than men.</li> <li>• <b>DEFICIT MODEL</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>LAKOFF (1975)</b> claimed that women: speak less, use empty adjectives, ‘speak in italics’, are super-polite, apologise more and use tag questions. Issues with research as it was limited to her department and reflected her own personal experiences.</li> <li>○ <b>JANET HOLMES (1992):</b> suggested tag questions aren’t just signs of uncertainty, they function to be polite and extend conversation. Hedging devices and boosting devices.</li> <li>○ <b>DUBOIS AND CROUCH (1975):</b> investigated Lakoff’s claim that women use tag questions in conversational situations more than men. They found in one context that men used tag questions, not women.</li> <li>○ <b>O’BARR AND ATKINS (1980):</b> Studied language in the courtroom to test Lakoff’s ideas. They found language use associated with women by Lakoff was exhibited by men and women in this context. They renamed these features of language ‘powerless language’ rather than ‘women’s language’.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>DOMINANCE MODEL:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>ZIMMERMAN AND WEST (1975):</b> Men are more likely to interrupt than women – in 11 conversations between men and women, men used 46 interruptions but women only two. They suggested women had restricted linguistic freedom. Sample of only 35 middle class students at University of California.</li> <li>○ <b>BEATTIE (1982):</b> critical of Zimmerman and West: “you may have one voluble man in the study which has a disproportionate effect on the total”. In his own study, Beattie found that women and men interrupted with more or less equal frequency.</li> <li>○ <b>SPENDER (1980):</b> radical view that language embodies structures that sustain male power. Women’s silence is a form of oppression. The standard is a male one, anything else is a deviation.</li> <li>○ <b>FISHMAN (1983)</b> suggested that men’s language dominates more than normal above women’s language use. Men use their language to dominate consciously or subconsciously. Fishman recorded 3 naturally occurring conversations between 3 couples and found men dominated and women asked more questions. When men started conversations, they were more likely to succeed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>DIFFERENCE MODEL</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>TANNEN (1990):</b> Men and women belong to different sub-cultures and preferences. Difference model avoids blaming men and instead looks at areas of difference. Suggested differences such as ‘status vs. support’ and ‘conflict vs. compromise’.</li> <li>○ <b>COATES (1989):</b> all female talk is cooperative: speakers negotiate discussions and support each other’s rights as speakers. These patterns are not found in mixed-sex talk.</li> <li>○ <b>PILKINGTON (1992):</b> Women in same-sex talk are more collaborative than men in all male talk. Men are less supportive and complimentary to one another.</li> <li>○ <b>KUIPER (1991):</b> Studied all male talk in a rugby team. Men pay less regard to the need to save face and use insults as a way of expressing solidarity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>