National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Talk, Television, and Tannen:
Assessing an Academic/Expert in Popular Culture

Rona Davis

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Communications

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

September 1993

ISBN 0-315-97645-4

Canada

ABSTRACT

Talk, Television and Tannen:

Assessing an Academic/Expert in Popular Culture

"Self-help" is a paradoxical misnomer that suggests individuals are independently capable of attaining self-modification, while simultaneously eliciting trust in a qualified expert to guide them. This thesis is a case study of contemporary sociolinguist, Dr. Deborah Tannen, whose popular discursive analysis on the differences of gender communication has become part of popular culture. Reframing her academic theories into hard and soft cover commercial "self-help" texts, Tannen also uses the medium of the television talk show to disseminate her messages.

An investigation of Tannen's basic sociolinguistic concepts and the readership of her books precedes an analysis of media production, the process that leads up to and includes a television talk show in which Tannen has appeared. Focusing specifically on Tannen and her theories on gender communication, in an attempt to clarify the role of the expert in the development of social beliefs, this thesis demonstrates how Tannen's teachings offer "self-help" strategies in gender conversation yet maintain the hegemonic parameters of gender differences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"Thank you" hardly expresses my gratitude to all the individuals who have supported me throughout this three year endeavour. For their gifts of time and wisdom I would like to thank: my thesis supervisor, Dr. Kim Sawchuk, whose knowledge strengthened me and whose encouragement sustained me, Dr. Jody Berland whose excellent direction and eruditeness helped me focus a very discursive thesis proposal, and Dr. Bill Gilsdorf who has selflessly shared his scholarship, his insights on this and other topics, and his general love of learning with me. I would especially like to thank Dr. Marty Allor who has kindly agreed to sit as a member of my examining board in lieu of Dr. Berland, who is unable to attend my oral defense. I am deeply appreciative of Dr. Deborah Tannen for her input and her time during our recent telephone interview. She truly epitomizes the warm and friendly accolades lauded her by her audiences.

Others were helpful in many vital ways. My thanks to Nancy Keane who helped me research video data, to Communications Reference Librarian Melinda Reinhart for her exhaustive "on-line" searches, to the Concordia University Interlibrary Loan staff for their assistance and support, and to Sheelah O'Neill of the Department of Communications, for her administrative guidance and congeniality.

I certainly could not have endured nor enjoyed this experience without the support of all members of my family. I am especially indebted to my children Caroline, Joanne and

Bryan for their love and support. They have been an invaluable part of this project, commenting on earlier drafts, challenging my concepts, offering me illuminating and insightful perspectives as well as some very sound general advice. To my husband Robert, who has put his dreams on-hold for the past several years so that I could fulfill mine, thank you for your encouragement, sustenance, and for being computer-literate. More than all of that, thanks for your love and understanding.

Of course, I must acknowledge our golden retriever, Nugget, who spent many long, cold winter nights serving as my foot-warmer and constant companion, casting doleful glances my way as the clock struck 3 A.M. and I pressed on with my research...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Probing "The Expert"

An overview of this thesis illustrates the impact of Glynis M. Breakwell's (1990) study. Defining "an expert", tracing the origin, and assessing the criteria associated with expertise promotes a greater understanding of the significance of sociolinguist's Dr. Deborah Tannen's internationally acclaimed status as an academic expert/author. Tannen is appropriately situated within her field of specialization, gender communications. Its relationship to the "self-help" culture, a sub-genre of pop psychology is also discussed.

What is most significant with the entire framework of today's ideology of interpersonal rapport, often referred to as the age of "user-friendly relationships"[1] is, that despite many attempts to reunite women and men within a new social doctrine called "equality", behaviourally and communicatively, heterosexual relationships have never been so far apart. It is precisely this dichotomy that challenges today's academic/expert/authors and contributes to a steady proliferation of "self-help" or "relationship" discourses. As powerful instruments of cultural commerce, "self-help" publications are linked with a proliferation of buyable therapy, in which the expert/author's messages become a commodity for cultural consumption. Scholars of cultural studies (e.g., Simonds, 1992; Starker, 1989) contend that "self-help" is too pervasive and influential to be ignored or lightly dismissed. "Self-help" is a part of popular culture and its signficance is an important reflection of enduring human concerns and changing social beliefs.

The "self-help" academic/expert/author has come to occupy a very prominent niche in American popular culture, dispensing advice on virtually all aspects of living. The goal of this thesis is to study one such individual, Dr. Deborah Tannen, a forty-seven year old sociolinguist born and raised in Flatbush New York, who has ascended the ranks of professor at Georgetown University, Washington D.C., to be acclaimed a "guru of the 1990s ("self-help") recovery movement",[2] sought after as "an expert" by televised journals such as "ABC World Today", "CBS This Morning", CNN's "Sonya-Live," as well as PBS's "Charlie Rose", and popular talk shows such as "Phil Donahue" and "Oprah". Prior to focussing on Dr. Tannen, this chapter traces the origin of the expert, the criteria associated with an academic's expertise, and sites Tannen within the movements of popular psychology and gender communications.

The impetus for this thesis originated with a reading of Tannen's 1990 national best seller, You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men In Conversation. It is a text that claims that communicating with people of the opposite gender is often analogous to engaging in cross-cultural communication, compounding..." the confusion that already exists in this era of shifting and reforming relationships between men and women" (1990:16). It is a book that is easy to empathize with regardless of one's age, gender or status, for Tannen extends the boundaries of the study of language out of its scientific realm, placing it within the world of the "personal and particular". For Tannen, the most encompassing form of discourse is everyday conversation.

In gazing beyond the impact of Tannen's work, the issue for this researcher became the academic/expert herself, more specifically, her popularity. What is it about Tannen that distinguishes this academic/expert from those of her professional colleagues, who themselves have published numerous texts on similar issues, but whose work has not received international acclaim.

A literature survey led to a reading of social psychologist, Glynis M. Breakwell's (1990) work. Breakwell claims that each group within society has its own set of social beliefs organized in systems which justify its action. Social beliefs "are commonly held interpretations of socially important phenomena" that are "charged with emotion": those that are deemed good are positively valued, while those that are not are modified and/or deleted.[3]

Breakwell evaluates the social beliefs about the difference between women and men. Distinguishing "sex differences" from "gender differences" -the former having a biological connotation, the latter a sociological one -Breakwell maintains that these terms are acceptable explanations for the truth they create.[4] Breakwell contends that dominant "social beliefs about the psychological differences between men and women act to reify the gulf between the sexes."[5] Such social beliefs not only glorify the dualism, but they demean women: i.e., if the aggressive, independent man is the breadwinner, while the woman is deemed passive, dependent and nurtured, then the woman is less likely to attempt to subvert the power of masculine dominance.

Breakwell questions the ability of psychologists or other social scientists to actually change social beliefs.

> When they discover facts which challenge social beliefs they are largely ignored.... Where their findings support popular conceptions, they are accepted, popularized and used to bolster dominant rhetorics.[6]

In other words, social beliefs are not transformed, but supported.

The "experts" connection to the major agencies of social influence, namely television is discussed in Glynis Breakwell's work. This medium features the "expert" messages, but also distorts them: as Breakwell notes, inquiries into the notion of the expert and how her/his messages effect the notion of social beliefs have yet to be conducted. Subsequent investigations by this researcher revealed that, to date, there has been no investigation of how an individual effectively communicates logical and rational advice to a multitude of media

audiences and successfully "markets" her/his persona as an internationally acclaimed academic/ expert.

Attention to the development of social beliefs requires an examination of television as an exerting influence and how experts work within its perameters. Sociolinguist Deborah Tannen, whose communicative goal is not to glorify the communication differences between wo/men, but to interpret and explain why each gender says what they do, when they do, and why they do it, appears to be a perfect candidate for Breakwell's study: but the process is more complicated. The intent is to demonstrate how Tannen effectively transmits her knowledge into book form and televisual format. By participating in the popular culture of the "self-help" movement and the TV talk show, Tannen influences the dominant social beliefs of our culture about gender differences. This knowledge offers advice to those concerned with gender differences, yet maintains the parameters of the beliefs about gender differences. In other words, a study of social influence entails an understanding of Gransci's notion of hegemony[7] - "moral and philosophical leadership; leadership which is attained through the active consent of major groups in society".

For many years, cultural theorists have investigated the ways in which mass media have influenced the social beliefs of the North American society, i.e., the ways in which agencies such as television - in all its pervasiveness - contribute to the binding or homogenizing of society. This thesis looks at television, in particular, the daytime talk show. Television has been accused of everything, from manipulating the masses, of producing a mediocre and trivial culture, of contributing to the disintegration of the family, of creating intellectual passivity among its viewing audiences, of directing the masses into consumerism, and the list of negative effects goes on endlessly. Conversely, television has been praised for educating the public, broadening an individual's personal horizons, and altering attitudes in

pro-social ways. In essence, what this signifies is that television is sufficiently powerful to make a difference to the hegemonic ideologies of a society.

Media theorist Stuart Hall (1974) analyzes the power of television vis-a-vis class relations and the process of hegemony, advocating that television is so powerful and pervasive that it binds its viewers in ways that enable the prevailing social order to be maintained. While Hall (1974) analyzes the power of television and its interconnectedness to class relations and the process of hegemony, this thesis will specifically address the influence of the television talk show upon gender communications and hegemony. This is done through an assessment of the work and media performance of Dr. Deborah Tannen; that is, how this academic/expert, through the medium of television, communicates with her audiences.

Deborah Tannen received her Ph.D in sociolinguistics from the University of California-Berkeley in 1979, and began teaching at Georgetown University, Washington D.C., in the early 1980s, dividing her time between pedagogy, writing and research. She is the author of more than a half dozen scholarly texts and two popular books. Dr. Tannen has been published in numerous scholarly journals as well as in the popular press. Deborah Tannen professes that understanding the basic mechanism of conversation is invaluable in elucidating how language operates, and in understanding how problems could be the result of miscommunication. Chapter two appraises the style and content of Tannen's writings.

Numerous reviews and critiques rendered by colleagues, friends and foes in academic and popular press laud Deborah Tannen's professional expertise. Chapter three conducts an analysis of the responses to Tannen's texts, investigating her readership and why they distinguish this pedagogue above other experts who espouse similar suppositions. Delineating her sociolinguistic theories enables one to see how Tannen repackages her textual strategies for practical application at her televised guest appearance.

Within a period of a little more than one decade, Dr Tannen has transcended the "lecture halls" at Georgetown University to be recognized as an internationally acclaimed gender communications expert, not only sought after by book publishers, but producers of electronic media. Tannen joins other "Rolodex" experts on TV talk shows, dispensing conventional wisdom in well-tuned sound bytes, addressing the core of communal issues; discussing these in a way that is both entertaining and enlightening to audiences.

Chapter four conducts an analysis of a "news-work" framework of media production. Data is based on information obtained from a telephone interview with Dr. Tannen on June 17, 1993, at Stanford California, where she was completing a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. In addition, the instructional manuals of Mincer (1982) and Blythin and Samovar (1985) are incorporated into this analysis. A chronology of the television talk show is conducted in order to situate the programme selected for this case study in its appropriate context. An analysis of Tannen's televised appearance illustrates the interconnectiveness of Tannen's academic teachings with her appearance. This thesis concludes by returning to Breakwell (1990) and a brief examination of hegemony in relation to gender differences in communication.

In order to obtain an appreciation of what Tannen's expertise signifies, it is necessary to first begin this investigation by defining and distinguishing an expert.

1.1 Origin of the Expert

At one time or other all of us consult the authority of the experts. In a society of specialized occupations and advanced technologies, when the conduct of daily living requires us to hold so many opinions and make so many decisions that we cannot possibly base them all on the personally examined evidence, logic, and moral reasoning, we yield to the knowledge of others, adopting their beliefs in hopes of gaining vicariously from their experience and skills and compensating for the limited extent of our own.

Trust in experts depends on the consensus of two sectors of our population: the experts themselves and their audiences. If a split occurs in any one, or both of these two communities, then the ideal, issue or theory in question is somewhat shaken, as is one's faith in that authority. Conversely, if these same concerned parties share a mutual understanding, i.e., a sense of being on the same wave length, then a sense of trust in the expert is apt to prevail. Credence in the expert is often strengthened by such information as: where the expert-in-question has been educated; where and with whom s/he has gained working experience; and how well s/he is regarded within and without her/his respective professional communities. These issues will be addressed within the case study of this paper.

An academic/expert in whom many have placed their trust, to whom both women and men are turning to for enlightenment and guidance with their interpersonal communications skills, is Dr. Deborah Tannen. By way of an introduction to Dr. Tannen, it is important to first define who her audiences are, and determine why they, as consumers of do-it-yourself emotional repair or "self-help", are turning to Tannen for advice on communicating within and between genders. "Audience" within the context of this case study has several connotations. It recognizes that our social system comprises a myriad of individuals of divergent classes, races, ages, nationalities, religions, etc., all with very distinct cultural differences.[8] The term "audience" herein acknowledges the heterogeneity of society. Hall

(1974) contends that television, as a hegemonic force, tends to "bind" individuals. What this thesis suggests is that within the context of television, as a central hegemonic power, it is such genres as the daytime talk show that "binds" or "connects" a very definitive group of heterogeneous individuals. The term "audience" also implies the "reader" of Tannen's texts and theories, while the "viewer" applies to those who engage in the active process of viewing Tannen on television.

In addition to the above, "audience" refers to individuals who participate in the "self-help" movement, a sub-genre of popular culture. Fiske (1989) contends that popular culture:

> ...is made primarily by subordinated people out of the resources ... that are provided by the social system that disempowers them. The resources - television...video games, language - carry the interests of the ideologically and economically dominant.[9]

It is important that people make their own meanings out of these resources. Usually resources that support the dominant hegemonic thinking are successful. As will later be demonstrated, Dr. Tannen's two commercial "self-help" books do stimulate cognition and emotions within its various audiences.

Wendy Kaminer (1992) claims that, for many North Americans, the notion of "self-help" implies that within each individual there lies the independency, the capability of achieving emotional self-modification, even recovery, on one's own.[10] Paradoxically, this tradition encourages its followers to rely on the credentials of the expert who, in turn, asks each convert to look without oneself (as opposed to within), to comply with, and conform to the expert's standard prescription on "how-to" be. Choice is considered one of the most significant liberties of today's popular culture. Individuals, as seekers of "self-help", hold the right to search for and choose personal development experts in whom they can put their trust; individuals whose modification techniques and maxims one can both internalize and utilize: experts to whom one looks to dispense sound, practical advice. As consumers, individuals

choose from a myriad of brand names in food, clothing, housing, furnishings, music, books. Why shouldn't these same individuals have the right to choose personal development experts?

The history of social development states that personal judgement was suspended in the face of authority probably no less often four centuries ago than it is today, however the individual to which our ancestors deferred was infrequently that of an "expert". People's lives moved in smaller orbits, where the alternative to individual common sense was not expert advice, but tradition: that is, one did things the way they had always been done, and believed what had always been believed.

It was the empirical study of science that first gave the endless ranks of experts visible today their legitimacy; it was science that gave them audiences for their ideas and markets for their skills; it was science and the scientific expert that itself was to became the authority. It was the scientist, who, in her/his role of "professional" expert, symbolized all that was rational, calculative, and most importantly, all that was true.[11]

Under the banner of "science" a proliferation of specialized, university skills emerged. Students graduated from educational institutions equipped not only with masterful skills, but with acknowledged credentials, a title, and recognition as a "professional expert".

1.2 What Distinguishes a Professional Expert

Although the literature regarding the professional expert is somewhat scant, it is defined in Haskell's Authority of Experts, (1984):

> A "professional", according to Freidson (1984), is most often a "full time, life long specialist, in a particular identifiable occupation, who is committed to her/his work as his/her source of income rather than being either a part-time dabbler or amateur, or a person who works at one job one year and another the next".[12]

Any task which requires extensive training or experience or both, requires true specialists with skills and knowledge, and credentials testifying to training considered necessary to work in a specialized area; i.e., with an expertise which is distinctly theirs and not part of the normal competence of individuals in general. This is not to say that others could not learn that occupation, but in order to learn a particular set of skills and knowledge, those outside must take the time to go through the training and practice necessary for adequate performance. Typically, ordinary people without prior training or experience cannot expect to do such "specialty" work effectively.

As stated earlier on, there is too much to know to be able to know everything directly; one has no alternative but to rely on the credentials of an expert. Credentialism often presupposes some organized system of conventional training, some method of certifying and titling, certifying the expert's capacity to perform a given, "special" kind of work.[13] Within this structure there are various qualitative levels to be considered, because these various forms of credentialism produce marked differences in the careers and conditions of work of the professional. For example, medicine, as a very self-contained, autonomous body, and through its research and training institutions, creates and transmits its own knowledge and skills, selecting those that it will train. Supporting its credentials are licensing laws which the profession has successfully persuaded the government to institute and enforce.

Accordingly, only members of the medical profession have the right to evaluate each other's work and set standards for performance.

The justification for credentialism in other professions is also linked to that of expertise, in that there are some genres of specialty which are so valuable, so complex, or so esoteric, that lay persons are unable to choose competent experts without the aid of formal testimonials to competence and reliability. Therefore, along with the expertise, comes the most elementary source of such identification claimed by the authority, the occupational title. This is why expertise is inseparable from some form of credentialism.

The most powerful boost to the notion of expertise was provided with the emergence of the university. The creation of universities provided an immediate compelling setting where intellectuals could meet, confer, debate.

> Even today, the belief is that generating knowledge is not an individual activity, but a collective one, and that the individual, if s/he is to make an effective contribution, must do her/his thinking within a matrix of intellectual traditions and sustained social institutions that confer authority and concentrate attention on selected ways of perceiving and interpreting experience.[14]

It was this axiom that precipitated a shift from one kind of intellectual community to another at the close of the nineteenth century.

The twentieth century university came to replace a network of urban institutions that had originally been established for the advancement of learning; organizations such as library companies, philosophical societies, private colleges, and salon-gatherings of the learned were popular both in Europe and the United States. But under the impact of the Industrial Revolution this network was swamped by changes in the scale and tone of urban life.

Intellectuals began to ask something radically new of higher education. Private pre-industrial colleges, which had been one of many urban cultural institutions held together by an interlocking leadership supplied by society, prompted the reformers' vision of the urban

university to place this institution of higher learning at the centre, with a coordinating and directing role in the city's intellectual life. Educators felt that a university would enable the public to comprehend what scholarship meant; i.e., it distinguished and honoured those who demonstrated advanced scholarship. Larson (1984) reinforces the perpetuity of this claim, by stating that even today

> the university is the centre from which ideological legitimation radiates, not only because its credentials validate the authority's knowledge claims, but also because it asserts the transcendence of science as a knowledge system.[15]

Many academic experts and professions emanate from the universities, and from the empirical study of science. The concept of empirical objectivity associated with science is an important component of many disciplines. It can be found in sociology, history, anthropology, sociolinguistics and psychology - to cite a few. Many disciplines interrelate. For example, although sociolinguistics is the study of language upon cultures, it does adopt many psychological principles. By inter-relating semantics with pragmatics, Tannen's goal, as a discourse analyst (a sub-division of sociolinguistics), is to offer a legitimate new way of comprehending the psychology of human interaction.[16] That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships (1986) and, You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation (1990) profiles, for the reader, Tannen's associations with "the National Science Foundation" and "the National Endowment for the Humanities", etc. Acknowledging these affiliations not only lends additional validity to Tannen's knowledge claims, but gives further credibility to the arguments she presents in her texts; many based on actual empirical evidence.

When Ballantine released That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships (1986) it classified it as a "self/help/communications" text[17]. A visit to any book store or library presently locates Tannen's work in the "self-help",

"relationships", or "pop psychology" section. The following segment locates this analyst's work within the genre of popular psychology and its sub-genre, "self-help".

1.3 "Self - Help" as a Sub-Genre of Pop Psychology

Unlike other disciplines, pop psychology does not base its hypotheses only on scientific analyses and/or laboratory data. Pop psychology's primary focus is on life and people, for it represents the ideology of middle-class America. Its expert voices bear tantalizing messages for the consumer, of unlimited human potential and individual rights, of self-actualization and self-expression.

The supremacy of the self has been hailed, echoed and amplified through various avenues of communication. Published in "user-friendly" paperback guidelines for daily living, "pop psychology" is guidance that enlightens its readers with a minimal effort and expense, aimed at anyone who cares to avail themselves. The marketplace has been inundated with a plethora of "self-help" experts espousing their ideologies. For example, "sexperts" dispense advice to both genders on what techniques to learn in order to gain sexual fulfilment. By the early 1970s, sexual "self-help" publications were among the leading non-fiction works, re-electing and reinforcing a dramatic liberalization of moral standards and modifying social values.[18] For many individuals, the study of sexology has awakened in them an awareness of the significance of gender differences.[19]

1.4 Role of the Expert in Gender Communication and Interpersonal Relationships

Throughout the 1980s, sexology stressed the urgent need for gender equality and respect.[20] Experts' such as Paul Olsen (1982), Carol Klein (1984), or Susan Forward and Joan Torres (1986) who, respectively, published Sons and Mothers: Why Men Behave as They Do; Mothers and Sons; and, Men Who Hate Women & The Women Who Love Them, focused on women who they accused of being the culprits in failed interpersonal relationships, as well as contributors of failed gender identities. Barbara Katz Rothman poignantly writes, every so often...

> someone discovers that children are raised by women, and writes a book... The point of that book is to blame mothers.. for the evils of the world, most especially the evils that men do. The basic argument is that males are caught in a psychological conflict, i.e., boy children, because they are reared by mothers, have to separate themselves, consequently rejecting the mother and the womanliness in themselves, while attempting to dominate women and the world.[21]

According to the sexperts, it is the mother-child relationship that presents behaviourial conflicts, for "mother" is the source of life and its problems. Some claim that men who exhibit macho behaviour are only defending their vulnerability - behaviour that has resulted from their mothers' inability to successfully assist their sons in achieving a proper separation and identity. In another context, Forward and Torres asserts that misogynists judge their women by comparing them to the first woman in their lives, their mother. Caught "in the conflict between his need for the woman's love and his deep-seated fear of her.....man feels emotionally annihilated. In an effort to assuage these fears, the misogynist sets out to make the women in his life less powerful....i.e., if he can strip her of her self-confidence, then she will be as dependent on him as he is on her."[22] If, as the experts claim, women are so omnipowerful, then it is relevant to ask oneself why they are historically denounced as being powerless victims? Why are 'self-help' studies directed mainly at the female population? According to Simond (1992):

> while many males learn to exert power from the mothering they receive, they are simultaneously fed with the rhetoric that women are the powerful ones. It is these confusions that reinforce the dissention that exists among the various authors' recommendations for behaviour modification. While acknowledging that men are different, the professionals believe that men may be unmodifiable. So experts turn to women who are perceived to be flexible and malleable. This is why women are urged to readapt their behaviour. The final outcome is that women... are asked to emulate the behaviour of a gender whose behaviour in heterosexual relationships they do not respect.

Ann Landi, (1987) a freelance writer for Mademoiselle magazine submitted that, the bottom line (in all gender-related 'self-help' texts) is that women are in charge of relationships:

> it's their responsibility to (a) find a man, and then, (b) alter his behaviour or leave him if he is not satisfactory. With all the other commands and messages society hurls (at women) - have a good career, have a baby, have it all - it seems that assuming the full responsibility for their relationships is one thing women can do without...[23]

Other gender dissimilarities pertinent to this thesis involves the manner in which females and males perceive their interpersonal communications.[24] Dale Spender's text, Man Made Language (1990) states that it is:

> males, who have created the world, invented the categories, constructed sexism and its justification and developed a language trap that is in their interest.[25]

Spender contends that women have become male-identified, centering their lives on others, while men are self-centred - a result of their development. Other experts propose a viable solution by suggesting that women should emulate men in the application of their affections by de-emphasizing the importance of their personal relationships with men, i.e., practising more self-involvement and being less other-directed.[26] Jean Baer's How To Be An Assertive (Not Aggressive) Woman (1976) counsels that, "women don't think themselves as equal to men so they don't act as equals; consequently males - employers, relatives, friends, society does not treat them as equal."[27] Journalist Elayn Bernay (MS magazine, June 1977:80) supports this claim, imploring women never to "show emotion" or "cry in front of

a male co-worker. Men have spent their lives learning to repress tears; women have a lot of catching up to do." Many experts claim that what inhibits many women in their involvement with the opposite sex is that they are emotional rather than cognitive. In her book Men Who Hate Women & The Women Who Love Them (1987), Susan Forward advocates that women should rule with their heads and not with their hearts, because thoughts are easier to control than emotions, and "proper thought-control can lead to power over dangerous or dysfunctional feelings". The supposition is that self-love becomes self-control, and control over the self offers the illusion of order. The self is like wealth waiting to be uncovered. The notion that people have the ability to gain control over their lives has endured as the cornerstone of the "self-help" genre.

> One can change self-fulfilling prophecies by changing one's perception of the self, and thus changing the self-itself. In other words identity becomes a kaleidoscope of possibility.[28]

Although "self help" is an umbrella term to describe numerous topics, a common denominator exists: you-can-do-it-yourself, and probably less expensively than if you hired the services of others. A plethora of "self-help" texts offering advice about managing or improving relationships and about achieving psychologically "healthy" modes of behaviour are presently bought by millions. According to Simonds (1992):

> 'self-help' authors demonstrate their reliability or expertise in two ways - and commonly through a combination of both: they present themselves as well educated, practised, and even scientifically sound professionals and/or as authorities who are especially enriched by life changing personal experiences...

Whole sections of book stores, drugmart and supermarket shelves are devoted to subgenres of the "self-help" culture: "recovery", "self-realization", "relationships", "co-dependency" and more. This genre is both symbolic of social ideology (concealed within the covers of the books), while simultaneously serving as a potential thespian in the future of the American cultural landscape.

While the "self-help" culture constitutes the basic infrastructure of this paper, the central theme converges on a selected and distinguished author - an academic/expert who, through her books and television appearances, dispenses "how-to" advice within popular culture. As a transmitter of ideas, Dr. Deborah Tannen, a recognized expert in gender communications, has had a tremendous impact on audiences worldwide. Tannen's utilizes many of the theories mentioned in this segment - the stress for gender equality and respect; female assertiveness; macho (independent) behavior; and gender relationships. But there is a significant difference to Tannen's approach. Tannen's overall recognition of gender differences, unlike those experts cited herein frees her audiences from the ominous implications of individual pathology. Tannen does not accuse or condemn anyone's behavior as being wrong, or crazy. It is her ability to explain why women and men communicate in the manner they do that distinguishes Tannen as a leader in the "self-help" field of gender communications. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation (1990), a text that has earned Tannen prominence on the New York Times bestseller list for more than two years lends testimony to this claim. This book has sold over a quarter of a million paperback copies (350,000) and has been translated into more than fifteen different languages[29]. The following chapter will investigate Dr. Deborah Tannen's various hypotheses and findings. A summary of Tannen's academic and popular work is conducted to ascertain its similarities and differences, and to demonstrate the relationship of Tannen's tenets to the "self-help" culture.

CHAPTER TWO

Deborah Tannen as a "Popular" Academic

Tannen's contemporary approach to the study of sociolinguistics is distinguished from its traditional form. Delineating Tannen's sociolinguistic theories enables one to see how she repackages the strategies she discusses in her texts for practical application at her televised guest appearance.

2.1 Modifying Empirical Science In Favour of the Personal and the Particular

Many physicians, psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists have staked their future in the scientific method. As previously stated, the notion of empirical objectivity has permeated many disciplines including the study of language, known as "linguistics". The study of linguistics has been heralded as the "science of language," and many traditionalists in the field feel it is crucial to maintain the rigorous methods of scientific investigation. In fact as recently as the 1970s, communications expert, Noam Chomsky, reinforced his abstract concept of "transformational grammar" using empirical methods - where the limit of his data was the sentence, and the limit of his inquiry was syntax.[30] Conversely, there are more progressive linguists and sociolinguists (those who study the effects of language upon cultures) who are intent upon broadening the scope of language investigations beyond its traditional, scientific parameters. Their goal is to link the surface level of talk - the message and the metamessage - with the meaning, and what people are seeking to do, or show, by speaking in a particular manner, and at a particular time. Called the "study of discourse", it

is the most popular new subdiscipline in linguistics, but one that has received mixed emotions within its field.

Traditionalists are uneasy, perceiving discourse analysis to stretch the limits beyond the scope of scientific inquiry, to the point of weakening it. In contrast, the contemporary linguists perceive the application of linguistic analysis to the basic mechanisms of conversation as being invaluable in elucidating how language operates in the "real-world."

This thesis converges on the more contemporary approach to sociolinguistics, illustrating how one of its notable experts, Dr.Deborah Tannen, delivers this discipline out of the narrow world of scientific inquiry into the arena of human associations and actual communication problems, thereby offering a genuinely innovative way of understanding human interaction. Tannen believes that "there is no reason that scientific... disciplined, and systematic investigation must exclude "the personal and particular" instances in discourse as they naturally occur in human and linguistic context."[31] "Language should be studied in its natural settings."[32] For Tannen, the most encompassing form of discourse is everyday conversation; more specifically, feminine/masculine differences in language use, because such issues "strike at the heart of everyone's everyday experience..."[33]. Her approach offers the reassurance that experiences of frustration in communicating across genders is both explainable and universal. Alleging that it is a waste for the insights of linguists to be hidden in scholarly journals,[34] Dr. Tannen's style of writing makes her theories accessible to anyone who is interested. Unlike most scholarly authors who aim only for a particular audience, Tannen writes successfully for both the academic elite as well as the non-elite. Therefore it is no surprise that throughout cities and towns of North America, in fact throughout many developed areas of the world, in the "relationship" and/or "self-help" sections of book stores and supermarkets, Tannen's publication on gendered communications entitled, <u>You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation</u> (New York:

Ballantine, 1990) is both offering advice to its audiences and, as C. Wright Mills (1956) suggests, "celebratizing"[35] it's author.

Experts of social development perpetually claim behavioral differences between men and women of the same culture. What distinguishes Tannen's (1990) teachings from others who profess this, is that she not only identifies and defines conversation between women and men of the same society as being "cross-cultural communication", she extends this to include men and women of the same household. It is Tannen's belief that each individual has her/his own style of communicating, which on its own terms is valid, yet can be the source of serious misunderstanding and dissatisfaction in conversation.[36]

Compared to many of her professional colleagues who, as stated earlier, admonish women as the source of all interpersonal problems, or conversely, reprimand men as the empowered patriarchs in a masculinist society, Tannen's approach to "relationships" enables her to explain dissatisfactions without accusing either gender of being "deranged", incorrect, or empowered. This is what distinguishes her perspectives from a more radical analysis. What she does advocate is that recognizing and comprehending the differences between genders raises one's level of awareness. Awareness, Tannen suggests, will lead to tolerance, and an acceptance of one another, and hopefully, to improving relationships.

Reports from the publishing industry indicates that Tannen's advice has touched the nerve-endings of North Americans. The paperback publication of <u>You Just Don't Understand</u> (1990) has consecutively placed "number one" on "The New York Times" and "The National Bestseller's" lists for more than one hundred and fifty-six weeks.[37] Striking in its glossy jacket of bold white and gray lettering, contrasted by a background of dark navy (a photograph of a man's facial profile is super-imposed on the left side of the front cover, a woman's facial contour is shown on the right), Ballantine markets these paperbacks in its own sturdy, black, free-standing cardboard bookshelves, thus distinguishing Tannen's text

from other books of similar themes, usually located on nearby, fixed, store shelving. Featured in more muted tones, and stacked alongside shelved academic and commercial publications of similar themes, Tannen's hard covered version of the same title, published by William Morrow & Sons, in June of 1990, ranked first on the aforementioned best sellers' lists for more than 42 weeks.[38]

Within little over a decade Deborah Tannen has evolved from being a virtually "unknown" academic, respected by colleagues within her own and related fields, to an internationally renown interpersonal communications expert, acclaimed for her ability to reflect and shape, through her pedagogical writings certain cultural forces in our society. Tannen's work has captured and "recruited" audiences throughout the world, legitimating her as a bonified academic/expert in gender communications. The following is a profile of Deborah Tannen and her teachings.

2.2 A Profile of Dr. Deborah Tannen: The Academic

Dr. Deborah Tannen obtained a master's degree in English Literature at Wayne State University in 1970, but it was not until 1976 that she returned to pursue a second master's degree in Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley, and thereafter - at the age of thirty-five - obtained her doctorate in Linguistics from the same university in 1979. Tannen's resume reveals that her love of English literature has inspired her to create lyric poetry and short stories, for which she has earned several awards of distinction.

Dr. Tannen holds a full professorship in sociolinguistics at Georgetown University, Washington D.C., but is currently on sabbatical, taking a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, California. In the past twenty-four months she has worked with the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton New Jersey (spring, 1992), and resided as the McGraw Distinguished Lecturer in Writing, Council for the Humanities and Department of Anthropology at Princeton University (fall,1991). Since 1970, Tannen has held various teaching posts at the post-secondary level and has been the recipient of numerous research fellowships in conversational and literary discourse.

Tannen is a very well-versed, erudite scholar, whose strength lies in her ability to strategically elicit, align, but more often, cognitively reframe the research of others to legitimate her own analytic inquiries.

2.3 Tannen's Mentors

A glance at any of Tannen's academic writings clearly demonstrates her strength as a researcher. Literature surveys listed within her texts are both extensive and complete. There are several scholars whose teachings have had a tremendous impact on Tannen's theories and whose findings are frequently cited in Tannen's publications. Among the many notables are, W. Labov (1977, 1972) who experimented in "evaluative" practices in conversation, R. Scollon (1982) whose investigations led to expanding G. Bateson's (1972) definition of the "double bind" in messages, J.D. Sapir (1977, 1958) and Hymes (1974a) who are noted for their work in "conversational strategies", H. Sacks (1971) who studied

"repetition and sound". In addition there is M. Bakhtin (1981, 1975) and P. Friedrich (1986), whose analysis contributed to defining the "construction of dialogue", and H. Rosen's (1988) research into "storytelling".

Tannen's theories embody the empirical research style of anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1979, 1972) and sociologist Erving Goffman (1974). Along with these distinguished academics, Tannen (1986) pays homage to the work of her educators at Berkeley, A. L. Becker, Wallace L. Chafe, John J. Gumperz and Robin Tolmach Lakoff, who, she (1986) acknowledges, gave "selflessly the insights of their work to form the foundation of mine." More specifically, Tannen has distinguished John Gumperz's, Discourse Strategies (1982), and Robin Lakoff's Language and Woman's Place (1975) as being highly instrumental to her own work. [39]

Tannen is a very prolific writer who, within this past decade, has published five texts. Two of these are popular publications - You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation (1990), - hereafter referred to as You Just Don't Understand. This was preceded by That's Not What I Meant!: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relations With Others, (1986) - which will subsequently be referred to as That's Not What I Meant.[40] The 1986 text represented a desire she once had to "one day write a book," and is unofficially dedicated to her mother, who Tannen recalls, "never fully understood what I did."[41]

Her academic texts include: Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse, (1989) - hereafter entitled Talking Voices; Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends, (1984) - to be referred to in this essay as Conversational Style; and Lilika Nakos, (1983). In addition, Dr.Tannen has also edited and contributed to another eight scholarly publications, among those are Perspectives on Silence (1985), Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse (1984), Spoken and Written Language:

Exploring Orality and Literacy (1982) - hereafter referred to as Spoken and Written Language. With the exception of Lilika Nakos, all of the above publications have been researched and reviewed for this essay.

2.4 Discoursing Deborah Tannen : The Author and Her Writings

Tannen's penmanship pragmatically reflects strategies she herself advocates; syntactic strategies such as the use of formulacity, narrative writing, the use of imagery, the application of dialogue. In particular, there is one strategy that is both prominent and pervasive throughout all her work, and that is her use of "repetition". Garnering from the research of Halliday and Hansan (1976) Tannen contends that in communications, the "repetition" of words and phrases demonstrates how new utterances are linked to earlier speech, and how ideas presented in the discourse are related to each other. Clearly qualifying that "repetition" is a resource by which the same word or phrase can be used in a different way, Tannen maintains that reiteration gives discourse a character of familiarity, coherence and legitimacy - for each time an item reappears, it metacommunicatively involves the audience by forcing her/him to, once again, re-interpret the meaning.

Tannen uses this "repetition" strategy in conveying several of her fundamental written concepts, that is, she will often repeat notions that she has discussed in one particular text, in a subsequent publication, "reframing" the identical concept to conform to the new topic-in-question. This summary of her work does not reflect the degree to which Tannen consistently reiterates and paraphrases her suppositions. For Tannen, the most significant interactive

function of "repetition" - whether written and/or spoken - is that it is a resource by which individuals together create a conversation, a relationship, and a world. Repetition is the most dominant linguistic meaning-making strategy, an absolute resource for individual creativity and interpersonal involvement.

> The pattern of repeated and varied sounds, words, phrases, sentences and longer discourse sequences gives the impression, indeed the reality, of a shared universe of discourse.[42]

The remainder of this chapter summarizes both the scholarly and popular writings of Dr. Tannen, as she expounds and builds on such themes as "genderlect" - the differences in conversational style amongst genders; "indirectness" - a strategy whereby the message is circuitously delivered to the listener, leaving the speaker with options for meaning; "frames" - a subordinate message, or metamessage about how communication is intended, and others. The intent of this overview is to comprehend what it is about her style and suppositions that enables her audiences to experience "a shared universe of discourse" with her, and laud Tannen as "an expert" among academic and non-academic audiences.

2.5 A Textual Summary of Tannen's Academic Works

Initially induced by her doctoral research,[43] and further inspired by her work with Wallace Chafe (1980)[44] in cross-cultural studies, Tannen's Spoken and Written Language:.. (1982) hypothesizes that language is an oral/literate continuum, where an utterance is not separate and distinct from the written word. Rather people use strategies associated with both traditions in various settings.

As early as 1982 Tannen demonstrated her goal to bring the study of language out of the realm of science into everyday situations. By situating language in its natural everyday setting, Tannen (1982) demonstrates that in orality, individuals make use of strategies (i.e., the use of words or actions to convey something about the relationship), devices that are common to both the speaker and the audience engaged in conversation. Hence the production of a message also carries with it, a "metamessage". Building upon Gregory Bateson's [1972:206] process, known as the "metacommunicative function of language"; Tannen recodifies this as "conversational style" (Tannen, 1979b, 1981b, 1981c) - a concept similar to what sociolinguist, J. Gumperz (1977) terms as "conversational inference." The literate tradition, by comparison, relies on the "communicative function" of language, i.e., the sole use of words to convey information or content.

Tannen's (1982) investigation converges on the use of "formulaicness", briefly outlining the notion of "frames", and analyzing the external versus internal evaluation of messages in both oral and written practices, and how prosodic and paralinguistic channels are applied in everyday conversation. Tannen's appraisal of the basic mechanisms of discourse illuminates how language operates, but as consequential, it provides the infrastructure upon which Tannen constructs her communication theories in ensuing texts.

Tannen's (1982) objective was to label and "interpret" for literary audiences the interconnectiveness of the surface level of language - "the message" - with its meaning -"the metamessage." In a subsequent investigation of Chafe's (1980) research on Greek and American conversational strategies, Tannen's Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse (1984), builds upon her earlier findings, focusing on re-evaluating the effects of "framing the spoken and the written narrative".[45]

"Frames are structures of expectations, or, sets of associations based on prior experience."[46] Tannen claims that the written narrative conventionally demands that the

writer presume a "frame" or "footing" (a narrative stance) at the onset of the discourse, which then constrains linguistic choices. Converging on the information, or the "message", is the writer's way of acknowledging the audiences' needs. Tannen's definition of "frame" parallels Erving Goffman's (1981a) oral concept of "footing" (which he defines as "the actual and metaphorical stance of the speaker toward the hearer").

Comparatively, in oral narratives, the speaker is permitted more flexibility. S/he first needs to perceive the actual, externally constrained "frame" and then act accordingly, so that everything in the conversation contributes to a point or the theme of the story. An astute observer will note that speakers are constantly mediating between themselves, their material, and the audience. The manner in which the speaker "frames" a narrative furnishes the basis upon which the audience can externally (information) and internally (paralinguistics) evaluate the context. "Evaluative devices" (or strategies) such as sequencing, timing, choice of adjectives and adverbs, quotations, etc., are used to help the listener interpret the message. "Interpretation", Tannen purposes, is the way of acknowledging the interpersonal involvement of the speaker and her/his audience. "No message can be interpreted except by reference to a subordinate message, or metamessage, about how the communication is intended."[47]

Having defined and established the foundation for analyzing discourse in these two earlier texts, Tannen then applies these linguistics strategies to the microanalysis of a taped conversation made amongst several of her friends - data that comprised her Ph.D dissertation.

For Tannen, Conversational Style (1984) denotes a marked shift in emphasis from the mechanics of language to comprehending the humanness - the emotion - behind the interaction, i.e., what accounts for the impressions made when speakers use specific linguistic strategies, and what contributes to the mutual understanding, or lack of it, in conversation.

Tannen's (1984) analysis of "talk among friends" originated at a Thanksgiving dinner held in Berkeley California on November 23, 1978. It was this study, taken among

six speakers, tape-recorded in two-and-one-half hours of talk at the dinner table, that formed the research data for her doctoral thesis in 1979,[48] and, subsequently, for her 1984 text entitled, Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends. Tannen's inquiry reveals diverse conversational styles among the six participants - three New Yorkers, two Californians, and one who hailed from Britain. Constructing upon earlier work, Tannen contends that formulaic language and paralinguistic features, uttered in certain settings, establishes conventionalized ways of speaking, reaffirming that a shared knowledge of background and context among people of the same socio-economic group does indeed contribute to the rapport value of conversation. Her recount of the interactive behaviour of the three New Yorkers with the other participants, prompts Tannen to state that, "rapport" is a relative process that has different meanings, depending on the speaker and the context and the relationship among the participants.

The process by which people communicate their concepts and emotions is known as their distinct form of "conversational style" (Tannen 1979b, 1981b, 1981c). Tannen's contention - one th . she often reemphasizes throughout her scholarly as well as popular publications - is that an awareness of conversational style can help individuals see themselves, and others, as unique and distinct mortals, responding to the basic human needs of involvement and independence. Paradoxically, it is these same individual conversational styles, constrained by overriding strategies, serving the universal human needs of involvement and independence, that presents individuals with dilemmas, or "double binds" (Bateson's 1972, Scollon 1982). This results in people often not saying what they mean in the service of a higher objective defined as "politeness" (a strategy referred to earlier as "indirectness"). According to Tannen, "politeness", as an "indirectness" strategy in conversations is determined by the importance of the message (Grice's,1967 "Maxims of Clarity"), and its emotional aspect between the speaker, audience, and subject matter (Robin Lakoff's, 1973

notion of "camaraderie"). People (Lakoff's" Rules of Rapport", 1976) favour rapport to clarity, preferring not to say exactly what they mean in so many words because, over and above the ideas they are expressing, they are concerned with the positive effect their words will have on those they are verbally addressing.

Conversely, there are other genres of "indirectness" that serve as a defense; where the message is ambiguously delivered to the listener, leaving the speaker with the option of retracting or denying that s/he meant what s/he said. This is accomplished through the strategic uses of "irony" and "humour". Building upon Bateson's (1972) concept of "complementary schismogenesis",[49] Tannen demonstrates how "pragmatic synonymy", another form of "indirectness", commonly occurs in asymmetrical relationships where one or more partners exhibits dependent behaviour while the other tends to be more independent.[50]

Citing the various conversational signals of pitch, pacing, pausing, and tone used at that Thanksgiving conversation, Tannen defines their usage in verbal discourse, maintaining that individuals can change these devices, leading to major results. The degree to which cultural background is shared is reflected in the degree to which the "contextualization cues" cited above are congruent, i.e., one's ability to participate appropriately in a conversation, is directly related to one's ability to signal as well as comprehend the relations "between elements, within and across utterances"[51]. "Conversational styles" are the ways of signalling how any utterance is intended, in that the system of cues is not random but based on strategies for serving the paradoxical needs of "involvement" and "independence". Just as "conversational style" results from the speaker's need to serve basic human needs in interaction, the linguistic strategies that comprise a speaker's "conversational style" arise in response to strategies used by the audience/listeners in interaction. Tannen claims that conversational strategies, or "style" can be successful, if and when the interactants share the

same expectations about the meaning and use of the mechanisms used; and conversely, miscommunications occur if and when these are not shared. Tannen's microanalysis of the conversational styles observed at the Thanksgiving Dinner reveals several findings:

a) that there are two types of conversational participant - the "high-involvement" participant who enjoys verbally contributing to the conversation and who often feels awkward with silence, and, the "high-considerateness" participant, who is reticent to verbally enter the conversation and who does not mind silence;

b) that people who regularly interact with one another create their own special dialoguing between and among themselves;

c) that shared ethnic expressions among participants in a conversation contributes to bonding;

d) that in conversation, participants often show rapport by offering reinforcing and supportive comments; and that,

e) mutual feelings and observations between participants in a conversation contributes to bonding.

Tannen debates the merits of other metacommunicative devices used by speakers at the dinner - features such as rhythm, sound and structural patterns - which she alleges, sweeps the audience towards "subjective knowing" (Haverlock 1963); that is, through these "indirectness" devices, the listener is required to fill in unstated meaning, thus contributing to a sense of involvement through mutual participation in sense making. Hence, the processes of producing and understanding discourse involves matters of human feeling and human interaction:

> ... experiencing a perfectly tuned conversation is like an artistic experience. The satisfaction of shared rhythm, a shared appreciation of nuance, mutual understanding... goes beyond the pleasure of having one's message

> understood. It is a ratification of one's way of being human and proves connection to other people. It gives a sense of coherence in the world.[52]

Understanding "conversational style" then involves identifying and linking the linguistic system to other aspects of human behaviour and consciousness. It is in this context that Tannen labels the "study of.. style" as the "study of coherence".

The notion of "silence", alluded to in Conversational Style [53] becomes the central issue in Perspectives On Silence. Tannen (1985) demonstrates a range of functions of silence, postulating that silence serves three distinct functions in human interaction:

a) a positive purpose - as a chance for personal exploration;

b) a negative role - as a failure of language; and,

c) as an ambiguous function - what is assumed to be evidenced, or from what is assumed to be omitted.

Some practical examples of its positive purpose are reflected in the silence of a quiet countryside when tranquillity is sought; an exchange of glances in the silence of a perfect rapport between two intimate partners; the reward of silence when a reprimand is expected. Instances of negative silence occur in displeasure, the intended omission of a "greeting" (formulaic expression) which signifies a snub, the silence of the doorbell when one has been overlooked or forgotten.

If "indirectness", as a conversational device, "is a way of saying one thing and meaning another, 'silence' can be a matter of saying nothing and meaning something."[54] A comparison of these two devices reveals its similarities. Just as other forms of "indirectness" have benefits in rapport and defensiveness, the same applies for silence. In the most profound sense, the rapport value in silence comes from being understood without putting one's meaning on record, that is, it is not just the understanding of a shared meaning, as in formulaic expressions used by people of the same culture, rather a deep understanding

of shared viewpoints, experience and intimacy, of being on the same wavelength. Paradoxically, the defensive value of silence comes from omitting to say something negative, not confronting information that might create discord or dissention, or denying having meant what may not be received well. As in "indirectness", the meaning of "silence" in interaction develops from the two goals of human interaction - the need to be connected to other people (rapport), and the need to be independent (defensive).

The scope of Tannen's discussion on "silence" oscillates between two distinct paradigms. That is, consideration is given to the functions of "pausing" (short silences) in cognitive processes: silence as contributing to impression formation; and, the kind of silence that is responsible for cultural stereotyping. She suggests that "pausing", while allowing the speaker time to think, also gives the hearer more time to comprehend. Pausing sometimes allows the speaker to reframe her/his style for the purpose of appearance (e.g., as a "payoff in rapport", a phenomenon which Robin Lakoff (1975) suggests is adopted by more women than men). Conversely, there are the functions of silence as the background against which talk has meaning, or as a nonverbal activity which structures interaction. Silence alone can be a communicative device in interaction. Tannen defines how the three "high-involvement" speakers (New Yorkers), engaged in conversation at the Thanksgiving dinner, found politeness to be a non-issue. They perceived silence to be an outgrowth of a negative attitude, whereas the "high-considerateness participants (two Californians, one British), preferred to follow "notions of politeness", i.e., to risk saying too little was valued more than involvement.

Conversational style is a relative process, where one person's silence is another's pause. A pause becomes a silence-of-negative-value when it is too long or appears at what seems like the inappropriate time and place. Similar to other features of conversational style, silence is differentiated from a pause "only by the intentions and conventions of the speaker...

and distinguished only by reference to prior experience."[55] As a corollary to Spoken and Written Language (1982), Talking Voices (1989) demonstrates how conversation provides the foundation for linguistic strategies that are shaped and explicated in literary discourse. Tannen (1989) explores the image and sound basis of both textual meaning and interpersonal involvement in oral and written discourse, this time observing how strategies such as repetition establishes rhythm and meaning, how dialogue and imagery promotes creativity and develops cognizance and involvement in conversation, and other forms of spoken and written dialogue:

> Perceiving meaning through the coherence of discourse constraints as well as perceiving oneself as coherent in interaction, constituted by the discourse, creates an emotional experience of insight (of the text) and connectedness (to the other participants, to the language, to the world). This enables both participation in the interaction and also understanding of meaning."[56]

Tannen states that involvement strategies are established by their sound and sense patterns, aspects of language that Friedrich (1986) refers to as "music and myth." Whereas sound involves the audience with the speaker and the conversation "by sweeping them up in what R. Scollon (1982) calls 'rhythmic ensemble'"...,[57] sense patterns create involvement through audience participation in sense-making. Introducing the concept of "constructed dialogue" in conversation, Tannen denotes the simultaneous operation of sound and sense in language. Through its rendering of meaning by framing it as the speech and/or the animated voice of another, a speaker creates a rhythm and sound that suggests speech at the same time that they shape the meaning s/he has presented. This is analogous to Gregory Bateson's (1972) "metamessage", the level on which the speaker's relationship to the context and to the participants of the conversation are negotiated. In addition to sound and sense, Tannen illustrates how images combine with dialogue to create scenes, and how dialogue combines with repetition to create rhythm. In this manner, Tannen demonstrates how "dialogue creates a scene auditorially".[58]

All language, Tannen asserts, is a repetition of previously learned language, and all expressions are relatively fixed in form, in fact language is also relatively fixed in context and time. Culturally, individuals and groups of individuals develop a language through the use of collocations that signify for them associations and consequences accumulated through past interactions. Defining the various functions of repetition in conversation, Tannen claims that it "enables a speaker to produce language in a more efficient, less energy-draining way"; as well, repetition facilitates the production of more fluency in language.[59] Tannen reframes the auditory function of linguistics as it pertains to repetition, demonstrating how this process results in rhythmic patterns that create ensemble. With each repetition of an utterance, its connotation is changed, juxtaposed, broadened, as the listener reinterprets its meaning in an effort to make sense of the message. Through sense-making the listener becomes involved. Defining "linguistic prepatterning" as a means by which speakers create "spaces" that listeners can recreate in their own imaginations, Tannen illustrates how this method serves to involve the listener. Repetition expedites comprehension by semantically reducing the discourse, thus enabling the speaker to contemplate her/his next utterance, and the listener - in the same space - to assimilate what was said. On a social and interpersonal level, repetition provides a resource to keep talk going, where conversation itself is a demonstration of involvement, of a willingness to interact. Tannen demonstrates that "ritualized speech" such as public speaking, oratory, and drama, use many of the same repetitive strategies present in conversation.

Demonstrating that sound and sense-making create involvement in narratives leads this author to attribute contextual meaning to the mutual participation of the speaker - who describes an image in words, and the hearer or reader - who creates an image based on that description or suggestion. The particularity and familiarity of details makes it possible for

both parties to refer to their memories for the recall of images of scenes, people, and activities.

> ...images work through the individual imagination to create involvement. The invoking of details, specific, concrete, familiar, makes it possible for an individual to recall and a hearer to recreate a scene in which people are in relation to each other, and to objects in the world. In this way, and by a kind of paradox, the individual imagination is a key to interpersonal involvement, and interpersonal involvement is the key to understanding language.[60]

Dialogue, Tannen claims, provides the details by which listeners and speakers, as well as readers, collaborate in envisaging and entering into similar worlds. The remaining twenty-five pages of Tannen's (1989) text are an application of the involvement strategies she has professed, and one that evidences her ability to transpose abstract theory into popular notions - shared meanings that audiences can "interpret". This Tannen accomplishes through the use of anecdotes and analogies.

Calling "reported speech.. a creative act", Tannen claims that much of what an individual repeats in conversation as dialogue should not be described as such, because it has never been uttered by anyone else in any other form. Rather, it is "dichromatic dialogue", or dialogue that has been "reconstructed" and framed to convey information that communicates and creates involvement. Speakers use "reconstructed dialogue" for its "rapport" value, when relating a narrative, as a means to feel connected to the audience. Giving voice to a story, creates a theatrical atmosphere, heightening active participation on the part of the listener(s). The construction of the dialogue represents an active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship, "not between the quoted party and the topic of talk, but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation was delivered."[61] Delineating the "deference" value of reported speech in dialogue, Tannen discusses "reported criticism" as another form of "reconstructed dialogue".

Drawing upon the political oratory of the Reverend Jesse Jackson (1984,1988), Tannen applies the conversational strategies detailed within - repetition, figures of speech, dialogue and imagery, drawing parallels in strategy between Jackson and the late Reverend Martin Luther King's oratory, "I Had A Dream..". In microanalyzing the content and context of Jackson's speeches, Tannen demonstrates that:

> the persuasive power of oratory lies in the artful elaboration of involvement strategies - the same linguistic strategies that create involvement and make understanding possible in everyday conversation.[62]

In ritualized, oral discourses (e.g. political speeches, sermons, etc.), Tannen asserts that involvement strategies - as evocations of thought and emotion - can, and do, play a paramount role in the life of both the nation and the individual. Reverend Jesse Jackson, a major force in American politics, Tannen claims, is a living testimony to this fact.

The themes of Tannen's scholarly works focus on enlightening her readers as to the differences/similarities among interpersonal communication. Tannen first introduces the notion of gender in That's Not What I Meant (1986), where she cites the clinical studies of Maltz and Borker (1982),[63] conducted with young, as well as adolescent boys and girls, behind one way mirrors. The first text devoted in its entirety to issues of gender-specific communication occurs in You Just Don't Understand (1990), where Tannen acknowledges in a Detroit Free Press newspaper interview (May 23, 1991: F1 & F7), that her 1990 book is an amended response to That's Not What I Meant, which, she realized too late, should have addressed the topic of gender communication. A subsequent review of her popular works will substantiate this.

2.6 Popular Texts

As a contemporary sociolinguist, Tannen's popular work does reflect her aspirations to bring sociolinguistics out of its empirical confines into the domain of human interaction and communications problems. For several years Tannen devoted her work to the fact that "the study of discourse," a discipline that provides a concrete way of comprehending how relationships are made, maintained and broken through daily interactive conversations. After collating several of her theories into accessible language targeted to a wider audience, Tannen published That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships (1986). It is a very lucid account of the basic communications strategies detailed in her scholarly work, reframed with a lot of "personal and the particular" anecdotes.

The thesis of That's Not What I Meant (1986) is analogous to much of the content presented in Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends (1984). Restating identical notions and employing the same format used in 1984, Tannen (1986) restates her earlier hypothesis, that, in conversations, a "human's dual needs of involvement and independence is served simultaneously in all that one says and does". She also discusses how "indirectness" contributes to a rapport value, by allowing a person to control others without outwardly appearing to. Citing actual communication problems, That's Not What I Meant offers the reader innovative ways of comprehending human interaction. This text is segmented into four sections:

a) linguistics and conversational style;

b) conversational strategies;

c) talking at home: conversational style in close relationships;

d) why one can't do without conversational style.

The first two sections of the book defines the theory (e.g. conversational signals, devices and strategies), while the latter half reframes these suppositions as practical, interactive applications.

Through anecdotes of human everyday interactions Tannen demonstrates that conversational signals and devices send metamessages about "involvement and independence" that work indirectly to frame people's talk, express and negotiate their relationships to each other, including juggling the asymmetrical, independent strategy of power and the symmetrical, involving approach of solidarity entailed in those relationships. Discussing the intertextuality of conversational "frames", Tannen points out that, at any point in a conversation, each person is both reacting to and causing a reaction to others. "Most of us tend to see ourselves as responding to what others say without realizing that what they are saying is a reaction to us." By "framing" or "reframing" or "breaking the frame" of one's pitch, tone of voice, intonation, and facial expressions, a speaker can change the meaning of each utterance, thereby changing the "footing" (the relationship between speakers) of one's conversation.

In this text, Tannen investigates how relationships with intimates, family members, friends and foes often fall short of one's expectations. Attributing "complementary schismogenesis" as one contributing factor in interpersonal disputes, Tannen observes:

> ...trying harder.... doing more of whatever you're doing - intensifying the style that is causing the other to react...each unintentionally drives the other to do more and more of the opposing behaviour, in a spiral that drives them both up the wall. Part of the reason this mutual aggravation of style differences is so disturbing is that we want so badly for communications to be perfect at home.... Primary relationships have replaced religion, clan, and mere survival as the foundation of our lives, and many....have come to see communication as the cornerstone of that foundation.[64]
>
> The belief that sitting down and talking will ensure mutual understanding and solve personal as well as world problems is based on the assumption that we can say what we mean, and that what we say will be understood as we mean it. This is unlikely to happen if conversational styles differ. Furthermore when

> saying what we mean, we often think only of the message. But listeners respond strongly to the metamessage. So our expectations of the benefits of honesty are unlikely to match the reality of communication.... reality often lies in the face of our expectations.[65]

In the concluding section, Tannen refers to conversation between women and men as a form of "cross-cultural communication." Tannen notes that risks are compounded in talks between genders because each has a different way of talking things out, and different assumptions about the significance of what s/he is saying.

> Why are women more attuned to metamessages? Because they are more focused in involvement, ...on relationships among people, and it is through metamessages that relationships among people are established and maintained.[66]

Tannen depicts the effects of metamessages on adult relationships - complaints from wives that their husbands don't listen and/or talk to them; the notion of the silent-strong man who is a "lure as a lover, and a lug as a husband".[67]

Tannen professes that all adult conversational styles originate in childhood. Citing clinical experiments with children, conducted behind one-way mirrors, Tannen analyzes how men and women differ - girls place their emphasis on bonding friendships and sharing secrets, while boys focus on jockeying for status and engaging in or discussing activity. In casual relationships small misunderstandings are often inconsequential, but in the context of a primary relationship, conversational differences can lead to major misunderstandings. Women often want their partners to be like a best friend they had in childhood, and for them, the relationship is working if they can talk things out with that individual. To many men, the relationship is not working when they have to keep talking things out (if you love me, then you'll know what I want without my having to say so).

In conversations, females focus on emotions, males alternatively focus on the solutions. It is the differences in the communicational style of men and women that contributes to their miscommunications, a concept Tannen labels as "troubles" talk (1990).

When women discuss their problems with men, often they are searching for compassionate responses to their difficulties. Men, trained to seek answers, offer solutions instead of sympathy. In her investigations of the "intimate critic" (a partner who takes the other's small indiscretions and enlarges its significance), Tannen alleges that criticism is often based on associations with past failings. Criticism is conveyed in conversations through such devices as "sarcasm" and "praise", and "solidarity-through-complaining"; and it is heard even when it is not intended. Tannen attributes continual criticism as an important failure of intimacy. Tracing its origins, she advocates that it begins in childhood and continues through adolescence, and involves the reproachment heaped on parents by teenagers. For example, perceiving the parent as inadequate makes it easier for the young adult to separate and become independent. Similarly, siblings are also prone to hand-me-down criticism, because their relationship to each other is a paradigm of competition-for-approval. The bonds established between members of the same family makes it likely that information will be repeated, since exchanging personal information is a means of strengthening those bonds.[68] Similarly, in adult relationships, seeing faults in the other allows each to feel more competent; it is a protection against becoming overwhelmingly close.

To many, the metamessage of criticism is incompetency. Whereas the critic is concerned with the validity of the message (the complaint), the criticized responds to the metamessage - disapproval. The problem with criticism is its "indirectness", for if it is not expressed directly, the complaint and the bitterness becomes a response that lives on, never having been confronted nor dismissed.

> When one does not have or take the chance to confront the source of criticism, a sense of bitterness towards a colleague, friend, or acquaintance can persist forever, souring an ongoing relationship or impeding the establishment of a new one...If repeated criticism can be an irritant in professional or friendly relationships, it can be a poison in families.[69]

Tannen suggests ways an individual might change her/his critical style. She counsels that "those who find it hard to keep from repeating what they hear may be wise to decline to hear what they sense will put them into a difficult position of deciding whether or not to repeat.[70]

Tannen maintains that criticism is a common by-product of closeness. When criticized, Tannen urges the individual to focus on the pain of being criticized, not on the validity of the message. She also advocates trying to de-escalate the criticism by reframing the response to it. Instead of retaliating, one should try to express how s/he is emotionally responding to the message. More profoundly, Tannen proposes that one try to extinguish and/or dismiss indirect criticism before it is totally uttered, reminding her reader that what is heard is not the real truth, but only the speaker's version of it.

Tannen advocates that comprehension of one's own communication strategies is of paramount importance. There are times when the antidote to over-involvement in conversation is stepping back and taking "an observer" stance. Tannen contends that, as one obtains a sense of one's own conversational style, adjustments can be made. For example, "high-involvement" speakers should pause long enough to permit "high-considerateness" participants an opportunity to speak. Slowing down one's conversation will encourage others to give the "high-considerateness" speaker a chance to express her/himself. When one's conversational style is putting others off, Tannen suggests changing one's approach. Doing something different will alter the interaction and arrest the "complimentary schismogenesis". Whereas being judgemental about the others' personality and behaviour limits one's ability to reframe a conversation, being cognizant of the fact that an individual's style is not absolute, allows the possibility of change to occur.

"Metacommunication" is a powerful device in conversation, for it "changes the frame without making it explicit." Tannen advocates the importance of being realistic in one's

expectations of how others will respond to insights that the speaker offers. Although metacommunicating can be effective in certain instances, Tannen warns that it may have the reverse effect in other situations, in that problems put forth may contribute to offending the other participants in the conversation, and possibly jeopardizing the relationship.

In an interview given to The Detroit Free Press (May 23,1991), Tannen stated that You Just Don't Understand (1990), her most recent "popular" text on gender communications was created:

> at the suggestion of her my agent, who... helped me see I could write a popular book about conversation between men and women that was intellectually satisfying to me. The agent echoed the advice of an editor who had worked on That's Not What I Meant and had realized toward the end of the revision process that a book on conversation style in general should have been a book on conversational styles used by men and women. Tannen says the editor left the publishing company before revisions were complete, so the book retained its original focus.

That's Not What I Meant demonstrates that people (because of their cultural, class or ethnic backgrounds) have different conversational styles, whereas You Just Don't Understand (1990), takes this notion one step further: Communicating with people of the opposite gender is often analogous to engaging in cross-cultural communications. As advocated among people of differing cultures, Tannen suggests that each gender must identify and understand the other's styles. "Denying real differences can only compound the confusion that is already widespread in this era of shifting and reforming relationships between men and women."[71]

Both genders are concerned with achieving status and avoiding failure; these are goals that people pursue under the guise of "connection and resistance". Reiterating the claim made in That's Not What I Meant (1986) and Conversational Style (1985), Tannen contends that communication is a balancing act, juggling both "intimacy" (connectedness) and

"independence" (distancing), defined [72] as "involvement and independence". Women tend to focus on the former, men on the latter.

Whereas That's Not What I Meant (1986) explores the dynamics of intimacy, it disregards the force of status. Once Tannen realized this she began to observe status and its adversarial effect in the workplace (she depicts a male co-worker who is very "involved" as a team leader, and very "distanced" once he is promoted to a boss); and in the home. "Involvement" and "status" are goals that produce gender differences in behaviour and conversation and send metamessages about how about the message is being conveyed. Metamessages can be paradoxical, for what appears to be the "obvious" may also signify the obscure. Looking at the actual dynamics of this issue, Tannen interprets how a man acting "chivalrous" (status) towards a woman could also be sending a message of control. Similarly, a man who is acting protective (status) could also be perceived by the women to be treating her as incompetent. Amongst many in our culture, speaking of someone one knows of to another is referred to as being "connective", whereas referring to someone only heard of is understood as seeking "status".

"Status and connection" are methods of interpersonal involvement. Tannen's analyses of conversation demonstrate that men are inclined to focus on the "status," whereas women are attuned to "connectiveness". Since both elements are always present in male-female conversations, and each gender has its own particular focus, therefore it is conceivable to think that women and men have different interpretations of the same conversation.

> If women speak and hear a language of connection and intimacy, while men speak and hear a language of status and independence, then communication between men and women can be like cross-cultural communication, prey to a clash of conversational styles. Instead of different dialects, it has been said that they speak different genderlects.[73]

Tannen cites the origins of conversational style - childhood - claiming that girls and boys grow up in different worlds of words. Using the same gender illustrations discussed in

her 1986 book, she describes how girls thrive on "connectiveness" through their friendships, whereas boys are always negotiating "status" in their play groups. These conversational styles originate in childhood and are brought to adult relationships.

Although each style is valid on its own terms, misunderstandings do arise between genders because men and women treat these features differently. As Tannen has so often claimed in her writings, "being able to understand why partners, friends, and strangers behave as they do is a comfort... It makes the world a familiar territory."[74]

While "women want the gift of understanding (rapport), generally, men like to give the gift of advice" (report) because, for men, knowledge implies control. Tannen acknowledges that, "... men see themselves as problem solvers; a complaint, a trouble is a challenge to their ability to think of a solution (e.g. a female with a leaky faucet or a stalled vehicle, poses a challenge to man's ingenuity in repairing it).

> Trying to solve a problem or fix a trouble focuses on the message level of talk. But for most women who habitually report problems at work or in friendships, the message is not the main point of their complaints. It's the metamessage that counts...."Troubles talk" is intended to reinforce the metamessage 'we're the same, you're not alone.....Women get frustrated when they not only don't get that reinforcement (from men) but, quite the opposite, feel distanced by the advice, which seems to send the metamessage, we're not the same. You have the problems, I have the solutions'.[75]

Often, in conversations amongst themselves, women tend to show an understanding of, and a compassion to, another women's feelings. For them "troubles talk" creates a sense of emotional bonding, a "connectedness", hence a community. For men, expressing sympathy is perceived as a form of condescension originating in their youth when, demonstrating weakness in front of peers could jeopardize a young boy's status amongst friends.

Women tend to judge others, including men, by their own conversational standards. Whereas women want to be asked probing questions about their situations, men perceive probing as disrespecting one's needs for independence. Therefore, when men and women

converse together about their problems, each gender is expecting a different kind of response, hence these misunderstandings lead to frustrations and create bad relations.

Asking for information or directions is another conversational task that men and women view differently. Within the paradox of intimacy and independence, there are two exacting and different metamessages suggested in inquiring of, and dispensing information. Women focus on one aspect, men on the other.

> When you offer information, the information itself is the message. But the fact you have the information, and the person you are speaking to doesn't, also sends a metamessage of superiority....to the extent that it is asymmetrical, it creates hierarchy: insofar as giving information frames one as the expert, superior in knowledge, and the other as uninformed, inferior in knowledge, it is a move in the negotiation of status.[76]

Because of the potential for "asymmetry", men often resist receiving information from others, (especially women) and women are guarded in conveying to men the information they have. To the contrary, women are encouraged by their actions to seek help, perceiving it as bonding and connecting. Since the goal of their relationships is "connection", then the sharing of knowledge, for many women (though not all), sends a metamessage of support. For women, having information or a skill is not the primary measure of power, rather "their power is enhanced if they can be of help (to others)."[77] This is not to suggest that men do not derive pleasure out of giving information. The giving and the receiving co-exist and feed each other; it is just that women and men place different emphasis on the status versus connection outcome that is associated with these tasks.

In addition to its gendered objectives, Tannen cites evidence to dispel the myth that women talk more than men. The fact is that men actually talk more than women, especially in public places:

> For most men, talk is ... a means to preserve independence and negotiate and maintain status in a hierarchal social order. This is done by exhibiting knowledge and skill...by holding centre-stage through verbal performance such as story-telling, joking, imparting information. From childhood, men

> learn to use talking as a way to get and keep attention. So they are more comfortable speaking in larger groups made up of people they know less well, in the broadest sense, "public-speaking." But even the most private situations can be approached like public speaking, more like giving a report than establishing rapport.[78]

Regardless of whether they are speaking with other women or men, women look to conversations to establish a rapport with others. Sharing secrets and intimate details with their best friends brings them great pleasure and satisfaction, for it is an activity that often bonds relationships. Women who speak in smaller, more private situations claim they don't experience the threat of intimidation or judgment from others that occurs when they have to speak in larger gatherings. It is evident then, that the settings in which talk transpires is another contributing factor to miscommunications. For men, the comfort of home means freedom from many requirements, including talk. For women, home is a place where they can feel free to express themselves without the fear of being judged by others.

When both genders do speak in a public setting, it is usually the men who appear to be dominating the event, while women limit their participation. Tannen maintains that this is not necessarily a man's intention. Tannen contends that a man should recognize that women are somewhat reticent to speak up in groups, and offer them the encouragement needed to overcome their feelings. Implying that changes in the status of women is not, in itself, a guarantee of equal treatment, Tannen states:

> ...being admitted as an equal is not in itself assurance of equal opportunity, if one is not accustomed to playing the game in the way it is being played. Being admitted to the dance does not ensure the participation of someone who has learned to dance to a different rhythm.[79]

In many respects people are becoming more private than public in orientation. Agencies of public communication, such as radio and television are adopting informalities in their style. Often, Tannen claims, media reporters and journalists remarks are comments appropriate for private, not public conversations. In addition, the private lives of public

people have become increasingly popular, as evidenced in the role of rumour, or "gossip" in public life.

Tannen states that utterances labelled as "gossip" reflects men's interpretation of women's ways of talking, associated primarily with women who speak with freedom and verbosity in private situations. As a function, it can contribute to intimacy or to distancing relationships. "Gossip" is not to be confused with women sharing secrets with others about their own lives - which is at the core of most female friendships. An individual who knows the secrets of others, also has power over them, for in telling a person's secrets to another, that individual can create trouble. "Gossip" occurs when the "third party" to whom these secrets are told conveys them to a "fourth party". Talking to someone about another person, when the latter is not present, establishes a rapport with the individual who is attending. "By agreeing about their evaluation of someone else, people reinforce their shared values and universal perspectives,[80] thereby strengthening the bonds of their relationship". Men's access to "status" is less a matter of who they are friends with, than their proficiencies and accomplishments in their activities. Therefore, generally, men do not seek "gossip", in respect of the other's independence, whereas girls and women are willing to take a risk and "gossip", because of the "payoff of rapport". The interest that many males demonstrate towards politics, news and sports is analogous to the interest shown by women in detailing the private lives of public figures. Individuals are interested in knowing details because it gives them a feeling of involvement, of being a part of something, of being connected to others; it sends a metamessage of "rapport".

A by-product of "gossip" is that we measure our deportment against the potential for "gossip" by others (i.e., what are others likely to think and say about us). That is why individuals practice "indirectness" in our conversations, masking, modifying, and displaying behaviour that precludes criticism and ensures praise.

Men, as discussed in "public-versus-private" speaking, generally enjoy imparting information to women - an activity women find frustrating - for often conversations turn asymmetrically into lectures, the lecturer being framed as the expert and the listener as the student. Irritation is brought on by the imbalance. What many fail to comprehend is that such behaviour symbolizes the differences in gendered habits. When women speak, they do not seek to display their knowledge; that would put them in a "one-up" situation, which is contrary to their goal of building a rapport. Conversely, when men speak, their objective is status, i.e., they seek to "position" themselves, as they did amongst their peers in their youth. Because women's goal is to reinforce connections and establish rapport, women are not keenly aware of the male's intent for status. By raising one's level of awareness, Tannen suggests that women who find themselves cast as listeners can reframe the conversation by becoming a more aggressive speaker and a less intent listener.

Women often accuse men of not listening when they are. Men have different ways to show that they are tuned into the conversation. Whereas women will often give listener responses such as "uh-ha" or "yeah", which they perceive emphasizes rapport and encourages more talk, men strategize by giving fewer responses, challenging rather than agreeing. An expressive "yeah" used by a woman indicates speaker/listener alignment; it's a response to the metamessage; whereas a man's "yeah" response indicates that he is in agreement with the message. Because of these differing patterns, women often get the impression that men are not listening when they are.

Pervasive in male conversational style is what Tannen labels, "ritualized combat". Relationships among men are based on friendly aggression; oral disputation often occurs in daily conversation with fellow peers and others - discussions, arguments, report-talks are all approached as if these were contests. Women misinterpret the adversativeness in men's speech, and miss the "ritualized" quintessence of friendly aggression. In turn, men can

become just as confused by women's verbal rituals of connectedness. One of the main contentions is that men value independence, whereas women appreciate interdependence. So while men are struggling to be independent through their conversations, women are simultaneously striving "to connect through talking..."[81] Hence style differences create the potential for compounded misunderstandings.

For many women, disagreement brings a metamessage of threat to intimacy and to their community. Therefore, they often use "indirectness" in their conversations, in efforts to maintain a rapport with their listeners. Conversely, men tend to perceive this genre of "indirectness" as manipulative, and are sceptical about its intentions[82]. They prefer to be direct, regarding expressions of disagreement as a sign of intimacy. For men (and boys), aggressive behavior is a good way to start interaction and create involvement."[83] Since the meaning of conflict and the strategies used to alter and/or alleviate it are fundamentally different for both genders, it is understandable why these differing styles can lead to confrontations. Tannen suggests that recognizing and accepting another's distinctive conversational style contributes to reducing one's stress and frustrations. Learning to be flexible in one's interactions, i.e., modifying one's conversational strategies, could be beneficial, in that it allows one to argue about conflicts of interest rather than contentious styles.

Based on the inaccurate American assumption that only one voice should be heard at a time, many men stereotypically label women as interruptors. The American belief, "one speaker .... at a time"[84] is more an ideology than a practice, Tannen contends. The fact that "interrupting" is frowned upon in North America results from applying the ethnocentric standards of the majority (white Americans), to the culturally diverse behaviour of minority groups (black Americans, New York Jews, Eastern Europeaners, etc.). A similar fallacy exists among genders. Tannen clarifies this inaccuracy by explaining that in "rapport" talk

amongst women, it is not uncommon for listeners to speak along with the speaker, thereby demonstrating "involvement and support". Paradoxically, men are more prone to engage in "report talk", a conversational style that emphasizes the one-speaker-at-a-time ethic. Reiterating that no one is right or wrong, Tannen suggests differences in conversational style.

> The key to understanding what is going on...is the distinction between rapport-talk and report-talk; (i.e.) the characteristic ways that most women use language to create community and many men use it to manage contest.[85]

Men who approach conversation as a contest are not supportive of other's talk, but instead, tend to redirect the conversation, and often towards themselves. Women generally are not as adept at refocussing the conversation back to its original theme, Tannen claims, choosing instead not to compete with the man for his "control" in the conversation.

Assertions have been made that women and men are gauged differently by society, even if they speak in the same manner. This, Tannen claims, is a manifestation of people's attitudes, referred to by some as "stereotyping". As man's conversational style is considered to be the societal norm, speaking in ways that are associated with women is regarded, by our male-dominant society, as negative. Despite the fact that feminists have fought tirelessly for equality over the past thirty years, a double-standard of values continues to exist. Tannen suggests that there are linguistic strategies, when used by a man, that immediately denote leadership and authority because these utterances are expressed by a man; but when these same words are used by a woman-of-comparative-authority, she is labelled as compromising her femininity.

> Nowhere is the conflict between femininity and authority more crucial than with women in politics. The characteristics of a good man and a good candidate are the same, but a woman has to choose between coming across as a strong leader or a good woman. If a man appears logical, direct, masterful, and powerful, he enhances his value as a man. If a woman appears forceful, logical, direct, masterful, or powerful, she risks undercutting her value as a woman.[86]

Similarly, a woman's "silence" is often perceived as an indication that she is powerless; while conversely, the "strong and silent" male (discussed in Perspectives On Silence) generally denotes power. Conclusively, gender distinctions are interwoven into rhetoric. The utterances available to describe women and men are not synonymous. It is such usage, or misusage of language that contributes to asymmetrical conjectures about genders.

Body language is another metacommunicative element wherein women's styles are dissimilar to men. Whereas women and girls tend to be indirect in their conversations, men and boys, when conversing together, are indirect in their physical alignment and in their expression of personal problems.

> Judged by the standards of women, who look at each other when they talk together, men's looking away is a barrier to intimacy, a means of avoiding connection. But if boys and men avoid looking directly at each other to avoid combativeness, then for them, it is a way of achieving friendly connection rather than compromising it.[87]

Tannen points out that men are far more direct then women in conversations that require negotiating decisions or preferences, but in conversations about relationships and/or about emotions, generally, men tend to be more indirect than women.

Tannen demonstrates how society has set up its own stereotypes or paralinguistic "frames" enacting and creating gender and inequality with every movement. For example, society choreographs male-female asymmetrical relationships by labelling the male who is taller than the female - the "protector", while woman is perceived as the "protected"; man is the embracer, while woman is the embraced; man is the extender of affection, while woman is the recipient, etc. These are "frames" that carry negative as well as positive connotations.

> ... with the privilege of being protected comes the loss of rights, ..respect. Being the protector frames someone as competent, capable, and deserving of respect. Being protected frames one as incompetent, incapable, and deserving of indulgence.[88]

Tannen's tenets point to an interesting observation: that unlike psychology and psychiatry, linguistics is a very unintimidating discipline that relieves individuals of the burden of psychopathology. Unlike psychology, linguistics does not accuse, rather it explains behaviour. Tannen concludes by stating that an understanding of conversational styles leads to narrowing the gap of miscommunication among genders. Labelling this as "genderlect" Tannen asserts that once there is a familiarity with gendered styles, individuals will quickly learn how to analyze their relationships, acknowledging that each partner is conversing in her/his own distinctive, "style", and from her/his own perspectives. It is Tannen's sincere hope that this enlightenment will lead to understanding, and that awareness will lead to the human acceptance of one another.

This chapter prefaced by characterizing Tannen as a linguist who wished to marry the scientific study of linguistics with "personal and particular" details. To a limited degree in her academic texts, and to a much greater extent in her commercial books, Tannen accomplishes this by citing numerous anecdotes to further depict and clarify her theories. Her ability to articulate the translation of the technical processes of linguistics into identifiable human applications for daily interactions has popularized her work and endeared her to many audiences - readers and television viewers alike. For example, in addition to her writings, Tannen's interpretative analysis of the Judge Clarence Thomas Hearings (October 1991)[89] and her evaluative summary of Hillory Rodham Clinton (June 1993),[90] during two recent independent television appearances, are instances where Tannen has been publically called upon to define the human aspect of linguistics. Although both issues encompasses the 1990s feminist ideology (i.e., sexual harassment, women in the workplace), the intent of Tannen's TV appearances, as an expert, is not to market a feminist perspective, rather to decode, for viewing audiences, the metamessages behind the messages communicated by these two women. In these instances, by raising her television audiences' levels of awareness of gender-

based communication styles, Tannen's objective is to enlighten others as to why Thomas, Hall and Clinton, and others, say what they say, when they say it.

An extensive analysis of Tannen's television appearances will be conducted further on in this essay. For now the concluding segment of this chapter investigates another agency that Tannen uses to disseminate her message, in the hopes of influencing her diverse audiences - the journal and the press.

2.7 Tannen's Contributions to Academic Journals and the Popular Press

Within this past decade, Tannen has published many articles on "genderlect", both in academic and popular journals, and in newspapers.[91] Calling for an approach to conversation which she labels, "the linguistics of the living,"[92] Tannen's articles on gender differences are "the most widely appealing outside of the (linguistic) discipline, but also particularly controversial within it..."[93]

Tannen's article, "Did You Say What I Just Heard?" appeared in The Washington Post, on October 12, 1986, and recapitulates the various gendered styles of "listening" and "indirectness" illustrated in Conversational Style (1984), That's Not What I Meant (1986), and Talking Voices (1989). The theme of this article converges on how, in conversations, men focus on "the message", whereas women respond to "the metamessage". Tannen suggests that, if a relationship is experiencing trouble, the offending behaviour should not be assigned to any one particular partner, for it takes two to interact. She reiterates the

importance of making the study of linguistics ecumenical, i.e., accessible to as many individuals as possible.

Tannen's subsequent article for The Washington Post (March 1, 1987), entitled "When You Shouldn't Tell It Like It Is" discloses a hypothesis similar to that published in the October 12, 1986 Post article: "indirectness". Instead of citing differences in women's and men's communicational styles, as she did in the previous text, Tannen centres on how "indirectness" is depicted in other cultures. Elaborating on the two universal but conflicting needs, "to be involved with others, and....to be independent", and citing the work of Erving Goffman, Tannen advocates that everyday talk is a compendium of rapport and distance strategies. She demonstrates how Lakoff's "politeness" phenomena translates into "indirectness" in conversations, thereby resolving the conflicting needs. Tannen simplifies and reframes applicable theory taken from the texts cited for the previous "Outpost" article. The narratives used here are direct excerpts taken from Conversational Style (1984), and That's Not What I Meant (1986).

Tannen concludes by drawing parallels between neurologist and essayist, Oliver Sacks' notion of Tourette's Syndrome (Talking Voices, 1989:93) and modern linguistics. In both cases, Tannen advocates that modern medicine and the study of language have become compartmentalized, resulting in a "real gain of knowledge, but a real loss of understanding...." Language, she contends, should not only be analyzed as a grammatical system, but as an intricate part of peoples' daily existence, reflecting "the reality of our existence." This is the same analogy she uses in the October 1986 article.

What is disconcerting about Tannen's work in both "OutPost" articles is her lack of anecdotal diversity, preferring instead to restate the identical narratives used in her texts. The only plausible explanation is that Tannen favours "repetition" as a strategy in that "it gives discourse a character of familiarity, and its audience a sense of shared meaning".

"Sex, Lies and Conversation" published in The Washington Post, (October,1990)[94] the same year as Tannen's most recent commercial text, parallels some of the principle concepts discussed in You Just Don't Understand. An examination of gender differences preludes the notion that a "viral epidemic of failed conversations" exists among men and women in the United States, citing the rate of divorce at more than fifty percent. Research indicates that most wives want their husbands to be conversational partners, but few husbands share this expectation with their wives (Hacker, 1978).

Thematically, in this article, Tannen focuses on the linguistic and paralinguistic discrepancies in woman/man conversations, with an emphasis on the notion of woman's "secrets" as the infrastructure of relationships, i.e., what the woman is looking for in a relationship is "involvement" -"evidence of a life shared, a sense of togetherness that emerges when two people share their emotions". Conversely, men's conversations are designed to negotiate "status" i.e., talk preserves "independence". Messages tend to be taken at face value for, in male relationships, it is the activity that binds, not the talking.

In addition to examining the "rapport" strategies alluded to above, Tannen analyzes variations in the designs of "listening", "silence" and "physical alignment" in women's and men's conversations, taking data from clinical experiments conducted by psychologist Bruce Dorval, of adults and children talking to their same-gendered best friends.

Tannen concludes by contending that the communication problems endangering marriages require a new conceptual structure about the role of conversation in human relationships, for many of the existing popular explanations are very general and accusational towards one, or both partners. Tannen advocates adopting the sociolinguistic approach, in which woman-man conversation is observed to be a genre of cross-cultural communication. Accepting this concept enables one to comprehend the problem and seek out solutions, or just accept the other's behaviour, without blaming each other.

Aside from writing for various journals, Dr. Tannen has given several press interviews. In an discussion with Peggy Taylor of the New Age Journal (December 1990), entitled, "Can We Talk?", Tannen suggests that society look to gendered styles of communication as they would cross-cultural studies, and learn to respect the diversity of all human beings.

It appears that the success of You Just Don't Understand has altered Tannen's life in many ways. Tannen indicated to Barbara Gamarekian of The New York Times (June 19, 1991:C1 & 8), that her busy schedule has forced her to reduce her submissions to popular journals, though she does continue to publish in scholarly chronicles. Since 1975, Tannen has written over 60 academic papers, some for private publication and others for academic periodicals. Her curriculum vitae cited two additional articles in press as of March 1992. Akin to her essays in popular journals, Tannen's pedagogical articles condense hypotheses discussed in her texts. The following reviews two samples of her journal writings.

"Teachers' Classroom Strategies Should Recognize That Men And Women Use Different Language," appears in The Chronicle of Higher Education . (June 19, 1991, 37:40),[95] a publication targeted at educators. Tannen reframes the conversational strategies addressed in You Just Don't Understand (1990), as these relate to a classroom setting:

> As I gained more insight into typically male and female ways of using language, I began to suspect some of the causes of the troubling facts that women who go to single-sex schools do better in later life, and that when young women sit next to young men in classrooms.....that a greater percentage of discussion time is taken by men's voices.[96]

Appraising the sociological research of Janet Lever, Marjorie Harness Goodwin, and Donna Eder (1990,1988), conducted on youths and teens (studies similar to those conducted by Dorval) Tannen demonstrates how girls' "secrets" with their best friends, and boys' ways of talking have stunning implications for classroom language interaction." The use of debate-like formats - as a learning tool - is far more acceptable to men than to women. Classroom

talk is more congenial to boys' language experience than to girls' since it entails putting oneself forward in front of a large group of people, complete with the ramifications of "report" talk. This is an activity that is intimidating for many women.[97] Gleaned from studies conducted by Ong (1981), Tannen asserts that the educational system is fundamentally male in its orientation and pursuit of knowledge. Learning is often achieved by "ritual opposition", i.e., "public display followed by argument and challenge." This is antiethical to the manner in which most females learn and like to interact. Females do engage in conflict, but not jestingly (i.e.,"ritualized opposition").

In this article, Tannen also comments on the women and men's perceptions of "troubles talk" in conversations. To illustrate, Tannen compares the critical lecturing strategies of a male colleague - who formats his class-time by having students criticize assignments and then discusses how to restructure them, with her own open-ended anecdotal approach to teaching. Her observations reveal that male students are more likely to be comfortable in attacking the readings, finding the "anecdote" approach too "soft". Paradoxically, women are more likely to avoid discussions they perceive to be argumentative.

Reiterating her goals of "rapport" versus "report" talk, Tannen states that many male students, who often speak in class, perceive it to be their obligation and responsibility to contribute to classroom dialogue, whereas some women who monitor their classroom participation do so not only in being heard, but in **not** being heard. Perceptions vary: those who are prone to speak freely assume that those who are silent have nothing to contribute, and those who are monitoring themselves, think the talkers to be selfish and controlling. Tannen maintains that with motivation, effort, and perseverance, an individual's conversational habits can be modified.

Over and above her role as a member of the editorial board of Text, Tannen has published several essays in this scholarly journal. In "Repetition in Conversation as

Spontaneous Formulaicity" (1987),[98] Tannen examines how repetition is a pervasive genre of spontaneous prepatterning in conversation. Many of the concepts stated here are also detailed in Tannen (1985, 1984, 1982) and subsequently in Talking Voices (1989). Incorporating the work of sociolinguists A. L. Becker (1984a, 1984b), Pawley (1986), Chafe (1968), and Fillmore (1982) into her own findings, Tannen suggests that repetition is a pervasive, spontaneous paradigm of prepatterning in talking. Her hypothesis states that, by means of prepatterning and automaticity, " speakers are highly interactive individuals who can use repetition as the basis for creativity and sense of self."[99]

In a cross-cultural analysis, Tannen compares the rigidity of certain routinized expressions of countries such as Greece and Italy to the versatility of the English language. Citing idioms and other prepatterned, fused expressions, pervasive in the American culture, Tannen contends that even these forms can be altered (e.g. cliches such as "the best of both possible worlds" could/and is often uttered as, "the best of all possible worlds", or "the best of both worlds"). Though there are the exceptions to the rule - namely shorter fixed expressions like "down and out", "thick and thin", that are not understood unless kept in their original form - it is Tannen's belief that there is enough evidence to substantiate that meaning is being derived from the expressions through associations with familiar sayings (Bateson, 1979).

Using transcripts of the Thanksgiving dinner conversation (Tannen, 1984, 1985, 1989) as data for microanalysis, Tannen demonstrates the versatility of repetition in dialogue, illustrating that the re-experiencing of-the-something-identical is, in itself, very pleasurable. Tannen draws analogies to the work of Norrick (1985) and Mieder (1978), who observed that emotion is associated with fixity, and thus explains why newspapers and magazines often use proverbial phrases: to " attract attention and arouse emotional interest".[100] In reference to

the production function of repetition as an automatic and spontaneous way to participate in conversation (paraphrased from Talking Voices,1989:46-52), Tannen maintains that:

> ...linguistic prepatterning is a means by which speakers create worlds that listeners can recreate in their own imaginations, recognizing the outlines of the prepatterning. Through prepatterning, the individual speaks through the group, and the group speaks through the individual.[101]

The emotional involvement that one experiences in speaking and listening to language contributes to her/his interactions, that is, language is the balancing between the individual and her/his social environment.

> Paradoxically, it is the individual imagination that makes possible the shared understanding of language. Imagery created by the imagination of a listener. Images....are part of dramas staged in the speech of one individual and enacted in the imagination of another.[102]

"The view of language as prepatterned is humanistic" in the sense that it strengthens the holistic view of language and the individual's experience. Tannen's findings lend support to her own conviction that a genre of linguistics is required that enhances, rather than limits, a vision of linguistics as a living, personal discipline.

By identifying and analyzing issues of interpersonal communications that exist in our culture, Tannen's academic theories reinforce the status quo. Packaged as everyday human interactions, these suppositions have had an impact on her audiences. The next chapter investigates who Tannen's publics are, and why some of them are turning to this expert for "self-help", i.e., for answers to their gender communications problems.

CHAPTER THREE

Tannen's Readerships

Based on the research of Simonds (1992), Starker (1989), Wood (1988), and Spender (1980), a prototype of Tannen's "self-help" readerships is constructed. Similarly, an archetype of Tannen's television audiences is shaped through the findings of White (1992) and Morse (1978). Critics representing diverse publications form part of this mosaic of audiences. Delving into the reasons why individuals read and view "self-help" contributes to defining who Tannen targets her textual strategies to, and why they distinguish her work above other academic/experts.

A Detroit Press journalist (May 23, 1991) inquired whether Tannen would classify You Just Don't Understand as a "self-help" book. She replied that while it suggests that men and women could benefit from becoming a little more like each other, its intention was not to advise, as most "self-help" texts do, but to offer objective information and suggestions. In spite of her own evaluation, book outlets throughout the continent are classifying this text as a "self-help" and/or "relationships" publication, whose discourses address specific interpersonal communications problems. Book stores have been unable to keep their shelves stocked with Tannen's most recent popular publication, for the demand has been too great.[103] Visits to Barnes and Noble's main book store in New York city in December 1991, and to Dartmouth's Book Shop, New Hampshire in November 1992, as well as to several Montreal book outlets, throughout the past two years, find empty bookshelves in lieu of where this "self-help" "relationships" text ought to be. In a telephone interview, Tannen

admits that middle-class audiences, regardless of their culture, are identifying with her most recent work. Since its successful paperback release in North America, Tannen (1990) has been published in Spanish, Dutch, Italian, Hebrew, French, Chinese, Swedish, Greek, Japanese, Portuguese, plus eight additional languages - and is equally popular in these countries.[104] Regardless of whether individuals' lives are changing or splitting, reforming or disintegrating into new partnerships and blended families, or whether these people just want answers to their "interpersonal" problems, it is evident that Tannen's particular genre of communications has become a panacea for bad gender relationships.

Correspondence was faxed to the editorial department of Random House Publishers, the parent corporation of Ballantine (the company that published Tannen's (1990) paperback edition), on July 23, 1992, in the hope of obtaining both quantitative and qualitative "sales" data for You Just Don't Understand. They did not respond. Another copy was sent to Ms. Diana Dulaney, Promotional Manager of the ABLEX Publishing company (the publisher of Tannen's academic texts), on the same day, requesting the identical information - no reply was received. In September 1992, a distributor of Ballantine Books, New York, was telephoned in efforts to obtain information regarding the number of purchased copies of You Just Don't Understand. It was learned that the distribution territories are run independently, and that the central office in New York city - who collates sales data - would not divulge any information. A Montreal book store manager[105] continued this pursuit, approaching Ballantine as their client. Another attempt was made on February 26,1993. A telephone call to Tannen's publicist. Ms. Malka Margolies at Ballantine (New York) affirmed that it is company policy not to disclose book sale numbers nor, more significantly for this thesis, any details pertaining to "the genre of reader...." Ms Margolies did acknowledge that Tannen's 1990 publication has been one of Ballantine's all-time best sellers, far exceeding the publisher's and the writer's personal expectations. Information regarding the actual number

of purchased paperback copies of You Just Don't Understand came from Dr. Tannen during a telephone interview, June 17th, 1993.

During visits to book stores to inquire and/or follow up on the popularity of Tannen's "relationship" texts, potential buyers were observed, browsing through Tannen's work, and a plethora of other "self-help" literature. Book store managers[106] were questioned as to the number of "self-help" books sold within the past twelve months; it soon became evident to this researcher that "self-help" comprises an large industry of distinct publics who manifest interest, support, and enthusiasm for its teachings. Aside from "the reader", these audiences include: the critics, professional colleagues and adversaries, whose reactions and reviews provide the catalyst for transforming a virtually unknown author, Deborah Tannen, into what C.Wright Mills (1956) defines as "the celebrity". In an effort to comprehend Tannen's popularity, the balance of this chapter investigates who Tannen has attracted and cultivated as her various readership and television audience and why they are drawn to her sub-genre of "self-help".

3.1 A Prototype of Tannen's Self-Help Readerships

Initially the intent of this chapter was to construct a definitive paradigm of Tannen's reader, based on obtainable data. Unfortunately, this information cannot be released to the public. Therefore this chapter disregards Tannen's contention that it is "offensive to reduce an individual to a category"[107]. In lieu of specific, quantifiable information, a general

prototype of Tannen's "reader" has been constructed from the research findings of sociologists Simonds (1992), Starker (1989), Wood (1988) and Spender's (1980).

Simond's (1992) inquiry into "self-help" literature asserts that individuals read texts such as Tannen's, to find information that would help them work on certain personal characteristics that they believe need altering; or they read hoping to attain self-knowledge, or to gain instructive knowledge on psychological matters:

> Reading self-help books helps to identify what the issues are: that the behaviour has certain sources, and that there are reasons - (it is a) look at the underpinnings of behaviour....once you begin to examine your own behaviour, then through experience, and hopefully, positive reinforcement in those experiences, you're more willing to take.... risks.[108]

The 1988 Gallup survey on "self-help" audiences also demonstrates some interesting differences in reading behaviour. The findings of that study indicated that "self-help" books are often written in response to its audience's needs.[109] Most persons who read Tannen's texts do so because they tend to respect what comes to them in this genre of discourse, figuring that a professional or an academic/expert, such as Tannen, knows more than some of their friends do. As stated in chapter one, this gives the text "authority", especially if the author, as Tannen has, shows her/himself to be one to whom the reader can relate to on a personal level.

Starker (1988) conducted a survey on 186 randomly selected individuals in Portland Oregon and concluded that women were more frequent readers of "self-help" books. Women found their reading gave them "a feeling of being helped".[110] Similarly, a Gallup survey taken by Wood (1988) indicates that women (especially those employed outside the home), are more likely to buy books dealing with "relationships," stress, and anxiety, whereas men were generally attracted to "self-improvement" and "motivation" texts.[111] Women are taught to nurture and connect, or as Tannen claims "involve" themselves with others,

therefore it is not surprising that, within this context, women would look for ways to cultivate and improve their relationships.

Extensive research on gender preferences for "self-help" books reveals that women read texts on "relationships" for several reasons:

a) because they are dissatisfied with the men that they have;

b) because they want to better comprehend a problem in a relationship;

c) because a certain relationship has ended, or ended abruptly, and they do not understand the reasons leading up to the breakup.

According to Simond (1992) "reading self-help manuals makes one feel less overwhelmed and helpless, less 'orphaned.'"[112]

"Self-help" readings also provide outlets for relieving unhappiness, which, for many women, were once addressed through their affiliations with community organizations, religious institutions, and, in certain cases, in feminist groups. Spender (1980) recognizes that "bars" and "pool halls" serve as effective "meeting places" for men to dialogue with their male friends.[113] Comparatively, Spender's studies have shown that the emphasis placed on friendship in women's lives has diminished since they have entered the labour force. In the marketplace, women are beginning to move into positions of authority, which demand more physical time; large families ties are no longer the norm, reduced in size and somewhat isolated. Whereas many women once turned to other female friendships for advice and direction, or sought help through professional therapy, the absence of time has made women rely on distanced professionals - such as Tannen - to enlighten them through other women's occurrences, and/or research.

Additional studies conducted to determine what attracts audiences to seek "self-help" books reveal that the impetus lies in:

(a) the low cost of the text - Tannen's paperback editions range from $5.95 (Canadian funds) to $12.50;

(b) the availability of the texts;

(c) the relevance of the content to daily experiences;

(d) the lack of viable alternatives - therapeutic sessions with a psychologist/psychiatrist are considered, by many, to be too costly to pursue on a long-term basis.[114]

"Self-help" texts allow audiences to feel a part of an invisible, and somewhat illusory community of other readers who share the same concerns and problems; or as Tannen's research validates, "self-modification" texts "connects" and "bonds" the reader to others through shared experiences. There are other types of readers who, fearing disapproval and condescension, are not inclined to discuss their "self-help" readings with others, preferring instead to confront painful problems through deciphering the issues presented in the text, hoping that it might lead to a strengthened self-conception.[115]

Simonds (1992) asserts that many "readers see the activity of reading "self-help" books as a serious and self-reflective one in which they seek a deep connection with the material they read, hoping to read themselves."[116] She labels this "individuation", i.e., discourses assist the reader to discover where that individual's centre is, and provides a manner in which to appreciate oneself. An individual reads "self-help" in an effort to try to gain control over certain aspects of one's life; it is an avenue in which to bolster one's self-esteem. Similarly theoretician Catherine Belsey's contends that "self-help" discourses (such as Tannen's) provides the reader with a "subject position", that is, the individual, through reading the text, learns to recognize her/himself. In this manner, the text "recruits the audience", i.e., recognition leads the reader to adopt and internalize what the author has intended.[117]

There is evidence to support the fact that texts on "relationships", aside from endowing the reader with more self-tolerance, have contributed to more tolerance of husband's/wife's/ partner's differences, encouraging a willingness to compromise with one's partner in a relationship. As Tannen so articulately states:

> If we can sort out differences based on conversational style, we will be in a better position to confront real conflicts of interest - and to find a shared language in which to negotiate them.[118]

Conversely, reading "self-help" books can also be viewed as a means of not changing. That is, it is a way of defending the integrity of one's views by aligning them with one's actions. As Tannen purports in the final analysis of her 1990 text:

> Can people change their conversational style? If they want to, yes ... to an extent. But changing one's own style is far less appealing because it is not just how you act but who you feel yourself to be.[119]

In addition to enlisting her publics directly through her own writings, a survey of the available data indicates that Tannen notions of conversational style and gendered discourse has received citations in more than 129 journals and texts written by other authors.[120] This information serves to further substantiate the fact that Dr. Deborah Tannen's concepts are indeed relevant to many. As an astute observer of life, Tannen demonstrates, through her writings, how attuned she is to today's culture. The following segment of this chapter investigates other audiences that Tannen attracts - her critics and her colleagues, and how they have appraised both her popular and academic publications.

3.2 Critiques From Tannen's Critics and Colleagues

Generally, the critics' reactions to You Just Don't Understand are positive. While many praise her work as insightful, there is the occasional critic, such as Jenny Diski of the New Statesman And Society, who contends that Tannen's book is too limiting in its target, too general in its references, "too anecdotal, and conceptually very rehashed.....offering not one piece of new information."

> It is possible that social and psychological research has to be presented anew to each upcoming generation - a kind of reverse Lamarckism.... If so, and if information we have received over the past twenty years has really not filtered down to the school leavers,then I will not only apologize but ...will crawl away deeply depressed at the prospect of a world incapable of learning what it already knows.[121]

By contrast, The Economist condones Tannen's style of writing, applauding her use of anecdotes and excerpts from conversations to illustrate (insightful) arguments, noting that "she is scrupulously careful to avoid generalizations...[122]

In a parody of Tannen's style, Sean French of The New Statesman and Society [123] recounts how he was seated next to Tannen at a dinner party, during, what French described as, a one-way conversation, with Tannen as soloist. "I maintained a silence that I hoped would be both respectful and interesting ... there won't be anything in her book about me, I silently promised myself". To obtain a more complete version of this incident, he advised his readers to, "turn to Tannen's subsequent publication, 'You Still Haven't Got The Point, Have You.'"("It will be in the index under: New Man, catatonic stammering of").[124] In spite of the spoof, one gleans that French is impressed by Tannen's astuteness of life.

David Finkle of Redbook magazine is complimentary in his comments about Tannen's 1990 book, claiming that her perceptive analysis of conversational style has enlightened people nationwide. According to Tannen, the volume of responses to both her commercial books (Tannen 1990, 1986) has been overwhelming, with 75% of the letters sent

from men. Tannen claims that many have written to her claiming that her commercial text has finally made them grasp why their relationships failed. "Some men ask Tannen for a date, claiming, 'at last a woman who understands me!'"[125] Tannen's reframing of her theories into accessible and articulate anecdotes of everyday experience enables the public to identify with her discourse.

Critiques written for That's Not What I Meant (1986) mirror those just described. Best Sellers observed that Tannen's ideas were "not new" but convincing, "common sense notions put into black and white..."; praising Tannen's authorial style as one that allows her audience "to support her arguments because the easy reading makes the reader feel like an old friend used to the metamessages..."[126] Fisher of Best Sellers lauds Tannen for being concise and practical in her logic, and for motivating the reader to reflect her/his own conversational style. As a popular text that reframes theory into everyday experience, this composite of psychology, sociology and anthropology "even goes so far as to show readers how to save their marriages and triumph in job interviews".[127] Psychology critic Beryl Lieff Benderley criticizes Tannen for falling short in That's Not What I Meant (1986) - "a scholar of her (Tannen's) standing should have provided more documentation and fewer generalizations about men and women";[128] while a staff writer at the Christian Century[129] lauds Dr. Tannen's same efforts, acknowledging that Tannen's book defies the norm of pop books, in that the mention of a "Ph.D" degree in the byline usually signals "that the author has to prove her credentials". This, the critic claims, does not apply to Tannen, who communicates with her readers in their own dialect, about some very sophisticated intercultural communications theories. "The accent is on man/woman, interviewer/interviewee encounters. Common sense, informed and practically set forth, marks the whole project."

Appraisals of Tannen's academic texts appear to be as favourable as those for her popular books. As a scholarly text Conversational Style (1984) was highly acclaimed by

Martin Malone of Contemporary Sociology. He praised the reframing of Tannen's doctoral dissertation as an enlightening analysis of ethnic conversational style that defines the methodology behind contextualization cues, "articulately demonstrating how this can lead to misunderstandings in communications". Malone claims that Tannen's interconnecting text and commentaries provides convincing evidence "that the complexity of interpersonal interaction is designed in foreseeable and redeemable ways, where payoffs far outweigh the means".[130]

A review given by Peter M. Gardiner of the American Anthropologist, on Tannen's Perspectives On Silence (1985) criticizes Tannen's contribution as being narrow, possessing a lack of innovativeness, depending on the work of other researchers in the book.[131] He renounces the book as containing many "cursory presentations needing substantiative editing". Mr. Gardiner does credit the analysis Tannen gives of culturally - preferred speech rate, and duration of pauses, claiming that her conclusions "about relative speech pace are productive." Contemporary Sociology [132] evaluates Conversational Style (1984) as more practical than scholarly, but nevertheless "good...." Singling out the uniqueness of two "introductions", this critic has particular praise for the linguistic prelude, which, despite its exclusive inference, holds interest for everyone - especially those who have familiarity with Erving Goffman's work.

Deborah Tannen's work has been open to some diverse opinion from the critics, but for the most part, accolades far outweigh the criticism. Her articulate, concise style of communicating with her readers serves to enhance her goal of bringing the study of linguistics out of its empirical discipline into the arena of human interactions and comprehension. According to book critics, Tannen has successfully attained this through the use of insightful anecdotes and logical arguments, or, as Tannen claims, " by using the personal and the particular."

3.3 Praise From Tannen's Professional Colleagues

Still other critics have appraised Tannen's work. An on-line computer search was conducted in attempts to locate reviews from Tannen's professional colleagues. The following is representative of some of those comments.

Elizabeth Stone, a former associate of Tannen's, is complimentary in her comments of this pedagogue's 1986 popular text, claiming that reading Tannen was like "having a metacommunicative meditation with her..". Stone recognized herself in one of the anecdotes Tannen uses to depict "indirectness" in That's Not What I Meant[133] . Stone finds it most comforting to "come upon a set of paradigms that makes coherent order of what has so often seemed ... chaotic and random."[134]

Similarly positive in her assessment of Dr. Tannen's work is Dr. Joy Peyton, a linguist at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D.C., who critiques You Just Don't Understand (1990) as solid work, ".. well researched, well backed up and well thought out." Tannen writes in a style that is "accessible" to everyone. Dr. Peyton acknowledges Tannen as a recognized scholar who possesses the ability that few academics have, i.e., "to write in another context which the public understands and appreciates. Tannen knows how to get right to the core... of the issue, and discuss it in a way that people find interesting and informative."[135]

For those who adhere to the ideals of truth in advertising, a glance at the jackets of Tannen's popular best-selling paperbacks may illicit some intense feelings about what some of the critics promise, and what can actually be delivered.

3.4 Commercial Blurb

Commentaries on the jackets of Tannen's 1986 and 1990 texts appear as friendly endorsements of her work. What is interesting to note is that the plaudits quoted here are given by laypersons, not professional colleagues, whose presence might lend credibility to the text. For example, That's Not What I Meant quotes Jack Rosenthal, an editor at the New York Times, who states that Tannen will " *show* us how different we are, and how to speak the same language." (Tannen maintains that her books do not advise, or show, only suggest). Another citation *promises* (but offers no concrete evidence) that the reader, upon perusing the work of this "internationally acclaimed *expert* of communications", will not only learn to adjust her/his "pacing or phrasing to save the conversation", but will also save "a relationship". Acclaims on the jacket of You Just Don't Understand(1990), written by Jonathan Kirsch of the Los Angeles Times *guarantees* that this text offers rewards (unstated) "for taking the trouble to listen more carefully to what others are saying, to be more sensitive to what others are hearing;" while Judy Mann of The Washington Post *claims,* "people" (no actual numbers cited) are telling" Tannen that her 1990 book, "is saving their marriages."

"This book," Ruthe Stein of the San Francisco Chronicle *promises*, on the back-jacket review, is written by a linguistics *expert*, so you have to believe she knows what she s talking about-". The context in which Ms.Stein has framed Tannen as the "expert", appears to empower Tannen with an asymmetrical, masculine, perception of the superiority of knowledge ("..you have to believe she knows what she's talking about..."); it practically imbues Tannen's message with the metamessage of status and independence. Tannen contends that "..... the stance of expert as more fundamental to our notion of masculinity than to our concept of femininity":[136]

> When you offer information, the information itself is the message. But the fact that you have the information, and the person you are speaking to

> doesn't, also sends a metamessage of superiority.....the one who has more information is framed as higher up on the ladder, by virtue of being more knowledgeable and competent. From this perspective, finding one's own way is an essential part of the independence that men perceive to be a prerequisite for self-respect..... ..it is a move in the negotiation of status.[137]

Tannen's ideal of "expert" knowledge, in contrast to Stein's, denotes a sharing of information, and knows no gender boundaries. More importantly, it is a symmetrical connectiveness to others. "To the extent that giving information.. is of use to another, it reinforces the bonds between people".[138] This is not to say that women have no desire to feel knowledgeable or powerful. But "...having expertise is not the primary measure of power for most women. Rather, they feel their power enhanced if they can be of help. ... they feel stronger when the community is strong".[139]

The critics are not the only individuals to review Tannen's penmanship. Dr. Tannen, through various interviews, has disclosed what, she perceives, distinguishes her authorial work from other "relationship" experts.

3.5 Tannen Appraises Her Own Popularity

Since the release of You Just Don't Understand, first published in hardcover by William Morrow & Company in June of 1990, then republished in 1992, in softcover, by Ballantine, Tannen has been "celebritized" by many. In comparing herself to other authors who disseminate similar messages, Tannen attributes her popularity to the fact that other scholars, in their desires to affirm that men and women are equal, are hesitant to point out

their differences, "because differences can be used to justify unequal treatment and opportunity..... Research... and experience says it just isn't so. "There are gender differences in ways of speaking, and it is imperative that these are identified and understood.[140]

> Pretending that women and men are the same hurts women, because the ways they are treated are based on the norms for men. It also hurts men who, with good intentions, speak to women as they would to men, and are nonplussed when their words don't work as they expected, or even spark resentment and anger.[141]

As illustrated in several of her texts, Tannen demonstrates that miscommunications result from gender differences in conversational style that originate in childhood. Patterns are established in the formative years, between five and eleven years of age, when girls and boys, who grow up in the same culture, are spoken to as if they were growing up in different cultures. Therefore talk between the genders result in what Tannen labels as "cross-cultural" communication. Her "cross-cultural" approach to communications differs from other gender and language studies, in that it does not blame or accuse man of controlling or dominating woman. Tannen acknowledges that men, as a group, are dominant in our society, but that "the effect of dominance is not always the result of an intention to dominate."[142] Tannen hypothesizes that comprehending each other's conversational style enables individuals to find a "shared language" in which to negotiate "real conflicts of interest."[143]

So great has the response been to Tannen's tenets, that invitations to lecture arrive at her office at a rate of several per day. Tannen has stated in The New York Times (June 19, 1991), that she has had to forgo her research and writing in favour of the lecture circuit. Since the popularization of her books, Tannen the academic, has herself become a popular commodity, invited to appear on numerous radio and television talk shows.[144] In addition to her appearances, Tannen is featured on audio cassettes, produced by Simon and Schuster (1992), quoting highlights from That's Not What I Meant and You Just Don't Understand.[145] Adopting sociologist's Shirley Heath's (1986) hypothesis that "literate

knowledge depends ultimately on oral reformation of that knowledge,"[146] Tannen asserts that people want to see experts face to face rather than encounter them only through their writings: i.e., they want to interact with them:

> Like images, dialogue provides particulars by which listeners and speakers collaborate in imagining and participating in similar worlds.[147]

It is apparent from the number of times Tannen has appeared on television's soft news programmes and tabloid talk shows that this expert welcomes the opportunity to discuss her theories before audiences, although she admits that she does so with some trepidation:

> Perhaps I am unusual in being completely at ease in this mode of display. But perhaps I am not unusual at all, because although I am comfortable in the role of invited expert, I have never called in to a talk show I was listening to, although I have often had ideas to contribute.[148]

> (As an authority)....my position...is granted before I begin to speak. Were I to call in (to a talk show, without this authority), ... I would have to establish my credibility by explaining who I am, which might seem self- aggrandizing, or not explain who I am and risk having my comments ignored or not valued.[149]

The methods Tannen uses to connect with her media publics is similar to the strategy she addresses in her popular texts. It is the power of telling the "personal" and the "particular" - the sharing of details (that originates in childhood friendships), a concept that manifests itself in adulthood with the increased interest in the private lives of public and private individuals.[150] For example, Tannen cites the success of People magazine to demonstrate her point; and to articles such as that written by Jimmy Breslin, entitled, "A Death in Emergency Room One," a journal piece that vividly described the late President John Kennedy's dying moments at Parkland Hospital in Dallas Texas in 1963. In other exerpts of her work, in recounting various "personal and private" aspects of her own life, Tannen alludes to her first marriage, which ended in divorce, brought on by irreconcilable cultural and communication-style differences with her husband. On other occasions, Tannen has related an incident in which her "great-aunt," an arthritic woman in her seventies, wept

as she confided to Tannen that her "sweetheart", a man in his seventies, always took the time and the interest, during their telephone conversations, to inquire what she was wearing that day. " Do you know how many years it's been since anyone asked me what I wore?"[151] Tannen believes that such intimate details imbues people with a pleasurable sense of involvement, "just as gossip does for women who talk about the details of their own and others' lives".[152]

Beyond the written word, certain talk shows provide an excellent therapeutic venue for sharing the kinds of private information with their audiences that Tannen alludes to. Although significant similarities exist among all media talk shows in their production of meaning, the particular focus herein will be on the therapeutic or "advice" television talk show, a site that Tannen has often participated in. Television operates as a therapeutic apparatus dispensing self-modification theories, on talk show forums, commodified through celebritized experts such as Dr Deborah Tannen. Recognized by her host/ess and audiences as an internationally acclaimed "expert" in interpersonal communications, as a successful author of millions of books,[153] Dr. Tannen's television appearance must influence the lives of many of the viewers who watch this format (see chapter 4, introduction). Journal and newspaper articles [154] support this notion, contending that with the increase of television therapists, engaging in diagnoses and offering individuals suggestions and advice ("public" therapy), conventional therapies (e.g. visits to the psychologist's or psychotherapist's office) are losing their force in contemporary culture, especially in this culture dominated by television consciousness.

> .... we find manifestations of therapeutic discourse permeating the medium. Therapy .... is situated as a strategy of engagement. It is a way to attract viewers. (This is analogous to Belsey's (1980) notion of "reader recruitment").[155]

A psychiatrist who lives in the central United States prescribes television therapy to help patients augment their self-appreciation and cultivate more constructive ways of coping with problems. In his therapy sessions, he usually discusses the content of the televised program, often supporting his analysis with video replays of the talk show. This physician contends that "we can learn a lot about ourselves by watching our TV twin."[156]

TV therapy is engaged towards finding out how one fits into society, as an individual and a social subject, even as it is mediated through this agency called "television". Just who is the "self" Tannen has targeted by her television appearances? The concluding segment of this chapter attempts to form an archetype of the talk show viewer, with a particular focus towards Deborah Tannen's audience.

3.6 Tannen's Television Audience

As with book sales information, an investigation into viewer statistics yielded nothing. A telephone call to the assistant-to-the-executive-producer of the syndicated "Oprah", on April 16, 1992, proved to be unsuccessful. Another call to Karen Lipper (assistant producer) of the "Donahue" show rendered nothing. The only available statistic Ms. Lipper could provide was an NBC rating survey on who watches "Donahue", one that had been conducted in the New York city region that week. It targeted audiences eighteen and over: of the 586,000 viewers, 393,000, or 68%, were female; validating this researcher's assumption that television's therapeutic discourses are implicitly associated with specific, gendered audience.[157] This also substantiates Tannen's (1990) claim that "women not only feel

comfortable seeking help (and information), but feel honour-bound to seek it...".[158]

Other talk show sources were contacted, in the hope of obtaining specific details as to who comprises Deborah Tannen's television audience - the search proved to be unproductive. Tannen's numerous appearances on TV talk shows qualifies her television audiences to be included among these followers. Therefore, the succeeding segment is a composite sketch of the paradigmatic viewer of television talk shows.

For the audience, fascinated by the psychology and emotions of the "self", the television talk show accomplishes more than an interpretation of who the "self" is and how s/he fits into today's culture. Television, as a popular medium, works in two ways: as communication and as reflection. Aside from mediating the messages, in many ways, the TV talk show is like a gigantic mirror that holds up what society wants to see of itself, or what the producers and directors think about what people in today's North American culture think. Laypeople and experts alike, expose their personal lives and beliefs to broad audiences. Regardless of whether it is through recognition, identification, or empathy, viewers connect with these media personalities, for there is comfort in the "presence" of others who share in one's predicaments and problems.

In the History of Sexuality (1978:58-62), Michel Foucault examines the importance of confession as an agent of truth and power in Western society. Truth has become a virtue to westerners. Authenticity has permeated this culture's existence, lending credibility to the "self", to interpersonal relationships, to the judicial system, to medical expertise, and to scholarship. Daily existences are enhanced and enriched by confessing the truth, by pouring out one's soul in private or public, to friend or foe. The talk show telecast provides a forum for congregating individuals to discuss intensely emotional issues with one another, within a confined physical space - the studio. As a liberating force, truth becomes a new form of power to the home and studio participants alike, relieving the conscience of its constraining

forces, imbuing it instead with honesty and integrity. For the television talk show home audience, self-confession becomes a means of secret admittance.

Television, as a connector or extension of that space, serves as "part partner, part spectacle", [159] a companion with whom the home viewer often reacts. This is a reaction to TV as social imagery, "television is our prisoner... providing stories without pause and without demand for reciprocity."[160] Whereas actual interpersonal dialogue requires individuals to assume responsibility for the statements they verbalize, and thereby become accountable for the consequences, television in general, but talk shows in particular, make no such demands on its home viewers. As a one-way confessional, television's electronic images permits viewers the "impression of subjectivity" even if it only occurs in the mind's imagination.

The television talk show enables "lonely" viewers to develop an illusory sense of community with the personalities on the programme, as substitutes for real human relationships. It eases the pain of self-pity, of feeling all alone in the world. To help individuals feel that they are not alone, that others are having the exact or similar experience is a very comforting aspect to the television talk show.

> Since lonely people feel they are not part of anything larger than themselves and have no sense of belonging, television can give them a common language and a common set of references at times...[161]

Further direction and advice are offered by the programme's guest "expert" celebrity, an authoritative figure who interprets, and often redefines problems and dilemmas, who confirms suspicions, and offers suggestions, and, at times, perhaps strategic solutions to predicaments. The talk show audience:

> is a therapeutic relation that is sceptical of too much authority, yet (is) attracted to the celebrity aura that accrues to people on television (as the therapeutic expert or patient), that introduces more voices in a less hierarchical therapeutic transaction yet infuses all relations with the commodity and consumer effects of the television apparatus..[162]

It is apparent that strong parallels exist between the "self-help" readership and television audiences. Both the reader and the viewer hope to gain self-knowledge through their media activity. Whereas the reader engages in "self-help" in the hope of seeking a deeper meaning with the material read, hoping to read her/himself, the TV viewer perceives television talk shows to be a mirror for both the self and society. Whereas the reader finds trust and authority in the author, the viewer considers the host/ess of the talk show to be a "dimensional friend" and/or a trusted relative, and perceives the guest expert as having the authority. Both the reader and the viewer look to their respective media for self-knowledge. Many of the "self-help" readers and viewers feel connected with their illusionary community of readers and viewers, as individuals who share the same problems as they do. Just as the reader feels less overwhelmed and helpless, less orphaned by her/his reading, the viewer finds that listening to others share their private lives with television audiences eases the pain of self-pity, or being alone in their problems. And of course, both audiences hope to glean from the relevance to daily experiences.

For those audiences who do not conform to the criteria set above, the television talk show has, to a certain extent, redefined the concept of entertainment. Audiences have found that concepts and experiences do not have to be put into literary form to excite one's interest. Stories of people abused or triumphant, jilted or loved, dominated or dominant: the excitement becomes due to empathy, not to interpretation.

The talk show also possesses the ability to convert anything into some form of cultural politics. Individuals on talk shows do not discuss matters in a vacuum. Talk show guests are selected because they hold specific, and often, opposing views. Talk show producers choose issues for debate with the full knowledge that a real life issue is pending on comparable worth. For example, as cited earlier, in October of 1991 the United States Senate held congressional hearings regarding Judge Clarence Thomas' potential appointment

to the Supreme Court. As an "expert" in gender communications, Dr. Tannen was invited to appear as a guest on the PBS talk show, "Sonya-Live"[163], (which dovetailed with the actual hearings), to render her interpretation of Judge Thomas and Dr. Anita Hill's testimonies. Such political events triggered another prominent talk tabloid to devote a programme to women who have been harassed by males in the workplace. Such evidence substantiates the fact that the talk show depends on the news to give it energy and issues to confront its adversaries, i.e., news and therapy are the basic functions.

In the following chapter, this inquiry will specifically focus on how television talk shows, as therapeutic forums, produce meaning. Adopting Dr. Deborah Tannen as my case study, this inquiry will consider how this academic, author and international expert on gender communications, repackages and reframes herself for the television medium. The process leading up to and including Tannen's televised appearance will be outlined. Where pertinent to this study, segments of the actual televised transcript will be analyzed.

CHAPTER FOUR

An Academic as a Television Talk Show Personality Therapist:

How Deborah Tannen Disseminates Her Messages

The television "advice" talk show is investigated using an analysis of the "news-work" framework of media production, based upon an interview with Tannen (1993), and information gleaned from talk show manuals published by Blythin and Samovar (1985), and Mincer (1982), an executive producer of the "Donahue" show. The various components of the talk show are examined, and Tannen's debut on the "Oprah" show is analyzed in order to demonstrate the interconnectiveness of her scholarly teachings with the practical application of her televised appearance and her role as an expert in gender communications. Foucault's therapeutic "confession" is assessed in relation to Tannen's television audiences.

North Americans love to talk. We are a "talk" culture in every sense of the word. What we love to do in person we also adore watching and listening to. Talk and its various agendas is very much prized as a spectator sport. One intent of this study is to attempt to demonstrate that electronic media discourses do enlighten, entertain, and more often than not, effect the ideals of people today.

This essay converges on a very specific genre of media interview - the television talk show. The television talk show, as Phil Donahue so succinctly states, "is the ultimate colloquium of the... high-tech world: its the Town Crier and its the Lamplighter".[164] This investigation focuses on this genre of programming because it is perceived to be the most effective agency not only for disseminating information, but for transmitting personality.[165]

Just viewing and listening to an individual on television has some power to make another believe that what s/he sees is exactly what one has said. When a television camera does a close-up on an individual, the viewer is given a perspective s/he could never attain in other forms of media, i.e., clues to the person's state of mind. Television is the necessary stage for making celebrities out of ordinary people, and this selected case study supposes that this agency has helped one such individual - an expert - Dr. Deborah Tannen, to further enhance her popularity as an educator and author.

The significance of the television interview should not be underestimated, for these have been known to alter beliefs, change personal philosophies, and modify lives. Ponder for a moment the individuals who decide to go on a diet, stop smoking take in a movie, buy a book, or leave an abusive spouse, based on the knowledge that they gleaned from an interview. Some of the advice and discussion on such TV discourses offer a very progressive social viewpoint, and perhaps set the agenda for what North Americans will discuss subsequent to viewing the programmes. This chapter uses a "news-work" framework of media production to evaluate the talk show. Information is gleaned from a telephone interview with Dr. Tannen (June 17, 1993), and is reinforced by two television talk show manuals written by Blythin and Samovar (1985), and Mincer (1982). It traces the events leading up to and including Dr. Deborah Tannen's guest appearance on a daytime television talk show known as "advice-talk." This chapter will demonstrate how the televised text, "Oprah", paradigmatic of many other "advice" talk shows, provides a therapeutic arena for Tannen to disseminate her messages to studio and at-home audiences.

Television talk formats have evolved greatly over the past forty-five years. A chronology of the talk show is conducted in order to situate the programme selected for this case study in its appropriate context.

4.1 A Chronology of Television's Talk Shows

Television talk show formats emanated from radio because of its relatively minimal cost and high audience appeal. The transition from one medium to another was a difficult one, because the added dimension of "the visual" did not conform to the pre-written, pre-rehearsed interviews conducted by radio personalities. A new procedure was required. The networks proceeded to experiment with various formats in efforts to enhance this genre's popularity on the small screen.

"Meet the Press", the first TV talk show, aired on NBC in 1947, was political in its focus: a panel of journalists interviewed government officials and other public figures on some current event or fiscal trend. In 1954, CBS introduced "Face the Nation", a programme whose text provided the NBC endeavour with some healthy competition. In addition, a programmer at NBC, Pat Weaver[166], recognizing the potential appeal of television interviewing, merged news and current events with "the interview" and created a programme that was to become an institution for that network, the "Today" show.

Throughout the late fifties and early sixties, most morning and early afternoon talk shows were locally produced.

> The programs featured local personalities discussing local events with which the viewers could identify. Small town advertisers loved the time slot and format. Moreover, local television executives saw talk programming as a sound investment. It was cost-efficient as well as a strong image-maker for the station.[167]

Among the local talk shows there emerged "The Mike Douglas Show", a weekday entertainment telecast, produced by KYW in Cleveland Ohio, devoted to both entertainment and social issues. Its host combined his talents as a singer together with his conversational skills and congenial manner, providing his audience with what is now termed, "infotainment." In 1963, two years after its first airing, it was syndicated and distributed nationwide. [168]

Today, talk show programming can originate from a network or be syndicated. Network talk shows are telecast only on the network station and its affiliates, and are usually seen at the same time across the country; whereas syndicated shows can be aired on any station that purchases that particular program, at any time the local station elects to telecast them. The fact is, that many more syndicated talk shows reach more people than their network counterparts.[169]

By the mid-1960s and throughout the 1970s talk/variety shows were very much the trend during the viewing day. Celebrity host/esses such as Merv Griffin, Dinah Shore, Phil Donahue, Dick Cavett, John Davidson, Johnny Carson, and David Letterman competed for the Nielsen ratings. Only Griffin, Carson, Donahue, and Letterman survived into the eighties, the others were either cancelled or restructured.

There exists a plethora of television talk shows in the nineties that mirrors our daily lives. Just as the different times of each real day tend to demand different elements of each individual's personality to emerge, so do the talk and information shows that follow one through her/his schedule.

> (TV) makes us at home no matter what we are doing by doing the same things in the same manner. It is a neighbour, a friend, a national comforter...[170]

Commencing in the early morning, there are the talk-news/magazine shows, watched by over 10 million people.[171] Realizing that in most households the whole family is home, the producers of the early A.M. talk shows recognize that a psychological shift is required to get people started in their day. Coffee, small talk, an air of cheeriness, and comfort are the order of this hour of the day, coupled with the necessity to get ready to face the pending problems.

Morning shows are programmes that impart news but also use numerous brief interview segments to enliven this daily information. Hard news and its analysis are kept to

a minimum. Interviews feature authors, celebrities, academics, anyone with a message that the show's producers thinks will be of interest to their viewers. Featuring a diversity of topics - womens' concerns, sports, weather and local traffic reports, the financial news - all approached in a somewhat light fashion.

Producers determine their early-morning (7-9 AM) show agendas cognizant of the fact that women outnumber men as morning news-talk show audiences, and that older viewers predominate the second hour of the programme while the audiences of the first hour are younger and more information-oriented: NBC's "Today" claims to have a viewing audience that comprises 54% women and 36% men; with 10% non-adult; while ABC's "Good Morning America" has 61% female to 33% male.[172] Women over age 50 make up 53%+ of ABC's morning viewers, while men past the half century comprise anywhere from 51% to 65%, depending on the programme.[173] Talk-news morning shows will almost never have a studio audience or take phone calls. But subsequent A.M. programmes that follow the network's morning talk-news usually do.

From mid-morning until late afternoon "advice"-talk shows dispense a multitude of "how-tos" and "how-not-tos", constituting most of the daytime programming. It is primarily social, psychological, but most of all educational in its content. It's target is women, for, as earlier implied, they are the ones who still continue to tend and cope with relationship crisises.

> Women... must walk a fine and confusing line between liberation and reaction -a contradiction not yet officially solved by the media. Daytime's view of sexual issues - and other matters raised in the aftermath of feminism - is an ideological jumble of contradiction.[174]

Panels of victims and experts come together to exchange stories and viewpoints, to discuss and share common problems, in the hopes of assisting studio and home television audiences and themselves to solve the difficulty that exists in their own lives. The impact of

these discourses upon cultural thought is so significant that it warrants consideration. One of the goals of this thesis is to evaluate its outreach and importance to popular cultural thinking. This will be addressed following this overview of televised talk shows.

Evening talk-specialty shows feature panels of experts discussing politics and/or the economy. Shows such as PBS's "Wall Street," or "Washington Week" or CNN's "Moneyline" illustrates this genre. Politicians and economists are featured as guests, discussing the politics and the economy of the country. These formats are aired mid-evening; its target are business people, re-energized from dinner, who are not quite ready to put the marketplace to bed for the day.

There are increasing overlaps with daytime talk television as talk shows continue to invade late-evening programming, featuring such notable talk-variety telecasts as NBC's the "Tonight Show", now hosted by Jay Leno, but originally emceed by Steve Allen, and subsequently by Jack Paar - an emotional and opinionated host who made the show a national institution. From 1962 to 1992 Johnny Carson served as its host. In the same time-slot, competing for viewer ratings, is CBS's "Arsenio" Show, a relatively new addition to the syndicated segment. Portraying himself as the "Johnny Carson of the nineties", Hall attracts a younger audience than the "Tonight Show".[175] Other similar formats include "Late Night With David Letterman" whose format is similar to Jay Leno's. The common denominator for all these late-night talk shows is that their primary goal is to entertain its audiences. As Tannen suggests in her book You Just Don't Understand (1990), knowing the "personal and particular" details of public personalities imbues people with a sense of involvement. Audiences become engrossed with the inside "scoop" of celebrities' lives, responding to TV personalities they can relate to emotionally and to charisma and humour that they can share nationally. As the day comes to an end, free from work and the children, audiences relax with Leno, Letterman, and Hall. These talk masters bring celebrities to their shows, whose

dialogue and experiences makes everyone giddy for a while. These late night shows are user-friendly formats that often bridge the span between the tangible world and the world of dreams; when "we're in bed, lying down, tired," says Brian Rose, director of Media Studies at Fordham University's Lincoln Centre Campus. Anthropologist, Edmund Carpenter[176] professes that late night talk shows "extend the dream world."

Today both daytime and evening television talk shows comprise a considerable component of many stations' schedules, steadily rising in viewer popularity and advertising sponsorship. In essence what talk shows do, is to display the tensions that exist in North American society, forces such as conformity and deviance, mediocrity and genius, the collective and the individual. As an agency of information, TV talk show formats provide a way of relating to others, as well as serving as a vehicle for reaffirming values. This genre of programme functions as a melting pot device for today's culture, bringing many of the issues listed above into the mainstream of life, contributing towards a currency of discussion for countless viewers.

Occasionally, a debate arises about the potential influence of the talk show, especially if it has been controversial in content. Whereas confrontational themes might be new to television, the appeal of this material is not new to other media. Consider the National Inquirer, an international newspaper tabloid that has been published for years, dramatizing and personalizing the lives of the celebrity and non-celebrity. Even radio has featured talk shows characterized by the host/hostess's controversial interchanges with guests.

There are some critics who very strongly condemn talk-tabloid, or as they prefer to call it, "trash TV". The following segment attempts to illustrate that TV talk tabloids (i.e. "advice talk"), contrary to some opinions, are not worthless drivel, but are actually confessional and therapeutic discourses.

4.2 Daytime "Advice" Talk Formats

Guests are often chosen to appear on programmes such as "Oprah" and "Donahue" from ads that are run in the local media, while guest-experts are selected due to a myriad of reasons: some previous media acclaim, that is, they have recently received news coverage because of their affiliation with, or association to an important event; or they have - as academic/expert, Dr. Deborah Tannen - published a best-seller on the topic-in-question. The general perception about experts, as outlined by the criteria discussed at the onset of this thesis, is that they are both trustworthy and credible: couple this with a specialist who is adept at putting some sparkle in her/his articulate presentation and whose books have been or are on the best-seller lists, and one has the profile of a potentially good television talk show guest-expert.

Daytime talk shows such as "Donahue", "Regis and Kathy Lee", "Geraldo", "Sally Jesse Raphael" and "Oprah" target women ages 18-49 as the majority of their viewers.[177] Rapping argues that the themes of television's daytime advice-talk shows are primarily associated with the rhythms of women's daily lives and are paragons of feminine textuality[178]. Traditionally, audiences look for drama, while for others, part of the fascination is the shock value, the voyeurism. But the principal criteria is infotainment (information interspersed with entertainment). For audiences, no topic selected for a daytime talk show is ever too personal or too mundane.

While some feminist critics, such as Joyrich (1988:146), suggest the need to reassess the structural conditions of some of television's "advice talk" programming, because of their gender stereotyping, others, particularly those involved with the media, will maintain that, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"! One supporter in favour of leaving the format as it is, has served as a celebrated daytime talk show host for more than thirty years. This next segment

will investigate what factors contribute to his, and other daytime TV talk show host/ess's popularity.

Formats such as Phil Donahue's syndicated morning show have dominated the daytime "advice" talk programmes for over three decades. Initially referred to by his audiences, as "an intelligent person's talk show host," Donahue's particular and successful blend of entertainment and social issues respond to his in-studio and at-home audiences' needs, combining a salient mixture of entertainment with social issues. At one time Donahue's talk show format overshadowed all its competitors. That lasted until the mid-1980s when another syndicated talk program challenged Donahue's popularity, changing the course of talk tabloids forever.

The "Oprah" Winfrey Show competes with Donahue.[179] This Chicago-based TV talk show features a black, charismatic woman who projects an added dimension into her topics - high emotional fervour. From the moment it hit the airwaves, audience response to the "Oprah" show has been overwhelming. Nielsen ratings taken in the fall of 1989 for the New York region, gave "Oprah" a 10.9 rating, which translates to 26 shares of the viewer market, whereas Phil Donahue had a 5.8 rating, or 14 shares.

In a recent effort to keep up with "Oprah's" top Nielsen ratings, competitive daytime talk shows have become more spectacular. Syndicated programmes, such as "Geraldo" Rivera, have appeared on-air, emphasizing emotion over intellect (on one very controversial "Geraldo" telecast, physical fighting actually broke out between guests on that show while the camera captured the act in its entirety). Whereas Oprah's issues tend to stretch the boundaries of traditional thought, Geraldo's themes traverse taboos such as conflict and violence. Still others, such as Sally Jesse Raphael joined the forces of talk show host/esses in 1983, in the hope of introducing topics that Phil Donahue could never empathize with, but only appreciate: womens' issues. She has since brought new definition to the word

"sensationalism", discussing issues on female sexuality never before entertained on television.

Despite their efforts to undo Oprah's popularity, the 1989 Nielsen ratings earned Sally Jesse Raphael and Geraldo Rivera, respectively, a 4.9 rating (20 shares) and a 3.84 rating (16 shares).[180] As a result of this competition, Donahue has been compelled to alter his style from moderateness to the extra-ordinary in order to gain more media attention. Although generally conservative in appearance, he has appeared "on-air" in a dress to demonstrate one programme's theme-of-the-day, "cross-dressing". Though he has yet to regain his former frontrunner position, Donahue continues to keep a strong share of the viewers' market.

Journalist, Johnette Howard of the Montreal Gazette (1992) reports that TV's daytime talk show audiences love sensationalism! The reason is that:

> All the daytime (talk) shows are basically mining the same staples; relationships, sex, true crime, lifestyle choices and 'self-help'. But today's glut of talk shows has heightened the need to be different, outrageous, even more sensationalistic than the next guy.[181]

More significantly than turning audiences into voyeurs, daytime TV talk enables audiences to "connect" and bond with the on-air media personalities, for there is comfort in the 'presence' of notable "others" who share in one's self-confessions. The self-identity and social recognition that viewers experience upon witnessing the testimonials (or public confessions) of any televised individual is, in itself, both liberating and reassuring.

> Confession and therapy are engaged toward finding one's "proper place" as an individual and a social subject....The study of the proliferation of therapeutic and confessional discourse also suggests that "communication" - understood as the injunction to participate in confessional discourse within the highly mediated channels of contemporary technology - has become a dominant paradigm of social, interpersonal, and commodity relations.[182]

This study will soon conduct a thorough appraisal of the value of the confession as therapy, as a buyable cultural product for its audiences, but initially it is best to consider the human elements that comprise television's daytime talk show.

4.3 Talk Show Host

Practically all the television talk shows have one identifiable objective: a strong interview. The goal of a successful host/ess/interviewer is to put the guest(s) at ease in order to illicit from them information that they may never have shared elsewhere. The host/ess's attentiveness encourages this disclosure. A successful host/ess, or, as they are often referred, a "talk show master" must be focused enough to redirect the guest to the pertinent information, should s/he become evasive. Although in-studio and at-home viewers often have the opportunity to ask the guest questions, this occurs well into the telecast. Initially, it is the host/ess who becomes the spokesperson for the audiences, therefore it is his/her responsibility to ask the celebrity the obvious and necessary questions the audience would raise, were they in a position to do so at that time.[183]

It is mandatory that a host/ess is also very attuned with the times and knows how to stir an audience, picking issues out of the normal stream of television subjects. When all participants, including the audience, are invited to engage in discussion, control is the important attribute of a successful host/ess. S/he must control the pace, and focus on the goals of the programme, directing questions at the experts, guests, and the audience, while subtlety interjecting with her/his own comments. Over and above the guest(s) s/he must encourage the audience, whether they be in-studio or at-home, to state opinions, discuss their own personal experiences, share their confessions, and challenge the statements and concepts of the guest(s).

What differentiates TV talk show host/esses is not the content of the interview, for often the content is accidental. What tends to stay with the studio and at-home audiences is the interviewer's style, for it is the host/ess's manner that is recursive, thus reassuring. There are only a few who can hope to compete with Oprah Winfrey.

> She thunders against secrets, against skeletons in the closet, against putting a good face on things. In a one-woman crusade against hypocrisy, she acquaints and reacquaints us with the hidden corruption in so-called normal family life. There are no guilty victims she counsels to disrupt complacency and live. Real salvation is not only saving yourself from perverse fate, but others.[184]

Long after controversial themes such as "mothers who stole their daughter's boyfriends", or "women who have remarried their husbands" have been aired, the majority of the audience will remember very little of the detail of these accounts, however there will be vivid recall of the way a host/ess, such as Oprah Winfrey, Sally Jesse Raphael, or Phil Donahue sympathetically handled these guests; the manner in which each host/ess exuded sentiments of trust, sorority/fraternity, camaraderie, and empathy.

For many television audiences, the talk show host/ess is symbolic of the fictional close relative or best friend, who, within the parameters of a limited time frame and the power of television images, initiates and achieves resolutions to dilemmas.

> Oprah (the queen of daytime talk) sings of violation, abandonment, betrayal, death, and how people cope with the perversity that accompanies these life-arias. As with the soap opera stars of old, she has the kind of intimate celebrity that allows fans to accost her like a pal.[185]

Another factor that distinguishes a successful talk show host is her/his hands-on, or hands-off approach. A non-producing host or hostess leaves most of the decision-making to staff members. A producing host or hostess (e.g. Oprah, Donahue) actively participates in all programmes' decisions. They search for ideas for the show, debate the prospects with staff members, veto and/or encourage potential agendas. During a recent telephone conversation with Dr. Deborah Tannen[186], she attributed her guest appearance on the "Oprah" show to Ms. Winfrey herself. Oprah noticed that Dr. Tannen's book <u>You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation</u> (1990) had placed number one on the best-seller's list for several weeks, and suggested that the producer contact Dr. Tannen's agent, inviting her to appear on the show.

4.4 The Producer

The producer is the individual who officially arranges for the talk show guest's appearance, is the visitor's contact to the programme, lays out the ground rules for the guest, compiles research material for the host/ess, forwards subject information to the appropriate program promotion representative, and is the one ultimately responsible for the content of each individual programme. Where does s/he find the guest(s) to fill the slots? What sources and techniques does s/he use to attain the most appropriate celebrity? The answers lie with the publicists, agents and talent coordinators - the latter more popularly referred to as "bookers". Getting booked on a TV talk show requires research, strategy and tactical planning. An examination of the booking procedures of talk tabloids uses the "Oprah" show as a paragon for other daytime "advice" talk programmes.

4.5 The Agent Publicist

To a producer, a good agent and a respected publicist are often fertile sources for bookings. Agents and publicists fully appreciate that, by virtue of audience numbers, appearances on television talk show formats can further promote, or sometimes create best-selling books, popularize movies, and raise the ratings of television specials.

Tannen's book publicist at Ballantine works with an agent who, in turn, is responsible for booking Tannen into her television appearances.[187] It is this agent's responsibility to notify the producer(s) of "Oprah", and/or the "booker" (see below) of the availability of Dr.

Tannen, by telephone or, if necessary, by mail, or in-person. Tannen's public relations package is sent to TV producers; it comprises her book, tour schedules, newspaper and magazine clippings, press releases, data that update the show's producers and their talent coordinators of her most recent activities and accomplishments. The publicist/agent will also see to it that Dr. Tannen's latest popular text is put in the hands of the producer/booker, and make the necessary follow-up calls in an attempt to book Dr. Tannen.

Harpo Studios first contacted Dr. Tannen's agent and learned that Dr. Tannen was available to appear on the "Oprah" telecast. The show's producer advised Tannen's agent of the airing date. They discussed the details of her appearance - whether she would be appearing alone, or with others on a panel. Among the questions the agent/publicist would ask is if the programme accepts on-air telephone calls from at-home audiences. Information may also be required concerning the host/ess style; whether s/he interviews from prepared questions or extemporaneously.

Oprah's programme is widely known to many audiences, and is self-explanatory; such is not the case for other talk shows. For less-known talk shows the agent inquires about audience demographics; and/or whether the studio audience participates in the show. The agent/publicist often asks to have a list of the geographic locations in which the talk show programme will be televised. Prior to Tannen's telecast, a good marketing agent ensures that Tannen's best selling popular texts are stocked in the book stores of towns and cities where she will be aired.

Monetary expenses would be another area for discussion and negotiation. Syndicated talk shows normally provide transportation and accommodations for their guests. The names of selected hotels and airlines, and other suppliers appear in the credits at the conclusion of the telecast.

In her telephone interview, Dr. Tannen implied that for her, organization, commitment and enthusiasm are the characteristics of a good agent. Possessing good contacts in the field, and having a respected reputation is the difference between a good and a mediocre agent. The agent must know the booking procedure inside-out. But this is only part of the equation. The other half is that this individual is both comfortable and familiar with those making guest selections, namely, the "booker".

4.6 The Booker

Individuals in the TV industry who handle the ever-increasing appetite of talk shows are known as "bookers". Their job is to procure a constant supply of timely personalities to the programme. "Oprah" (and "Donahue") needs about thirty guests per week.[188] The task is harder than it looks, for people who yearn to be on a talk show are sometimes inappropriate. Those in the news, in the know, and in demand, are more likely than not to be pressed for time, or booked by a rival show.

"Bookers" are officially referred to as "talent coordinators", labelled as "associate producers" or "talent executives". They also include staff members of the talk show, better known as "associate producers," even "producers", whose job it is to suggest, research and track down and, at times, interview prospective guests.[189] The ultimate goal of a talk show "booker" is to get to the guest before their competition does. As journalist, Joanne Kaufman of The New York Times claims (May 31, 1987), "Bookers must have the instincts of a bloodhound and the tenacity of a terrier". In fact talk shows bookers can be ruthless in their

pursuit. Geraldo Rivera's staff has been known to lure guests away from the competition[190] with gifts of $1,000, over and above the air fare, hotel accommodations, and expenses.

Guided by the audiences' need to see new people, bookers - there may be several that work for one show, especially the highly successful syndicated programmes - have specific beats and spheres of influence. The major tools of booking are the telephone and the Rolodex; bookers collect phone numbers as if they were gold, but the phone is not always enough. "Bookers" need their feet. They often try to wheedle some time with a celebrated personality at a public appearance; trail people from airports and train stations, or wait outside their homes. Each "booker" has a complete and diverse roster of people to get on-the-phone and on-the-air.

Programmes such as "Oprah" advertise for guests, running on-air promos with an "800" phone number, or running a local spot in Chicago, during the show. The show receives up to 200 calls per day in response to an ad.[191] Some bookers sharpen their skills by monitoring other talk shows to see which types of guests work well for the competitor and which don't. Talk shows sometimes act as clearinghouses for the rivals. While a guest appears on one show, s/he could be seen or heard by other "bookers", who will then consider whether the rival's guest will be a good candidate for their telecasts.

Browsing and scanning printed matter in search of issues and ideas are other ways "bookers" keep informed, relying on book reviews, movie and television reviews, celebrity activities, new statistical and research material as some of their sources. Programme ideas come from best-selling book authors, or celebrities covered in magazine articles and/or trade publications. Aside from the agents who routinely make their pitches, bookings can also result from recommendations, i.e., letters and telephone calls directed to the talk show and its staff, or sent in by audiences. "Oprah," as the daytime talk show rating leader, receives 4,000 letters a week, all read by staffers, categorized, cross-referenced in a computer file.[192]

(Up to 35-40 percent of the topics discussed on TV's talk programming comes from viewer mail).[193]

In addition, "bookers" must concern themselves with imposters. They must check the backgrounds of the relatively unknown guests and consult references to verify the authenticity of these individuals. This process has intensified since the summer of 1988 when two actors from Chicago admitted misrepresenting themselves on three talk shows: "Oprah", "Geraldo", and "Sally Jesse Raphael", where they impersonated sexual surrogates and sufferers of sexual dysfunction.[194]

There are also publications that bookers and producers can refer to, that list hundreds of people hungry for publicity, as well as more topics for discussion. The Directory of Experts, Authorities and Spokespersons, known more informally as the "Talk Show Guest Directory" is a thick paperback, similar to the telephone directory's yellow pages, filled with the names of experts and the topics they wish to expound on.

> Many would-be talk show guests offer testimonials. A woman calling herself "Laura X" - a professional rape victim who apparently seeks publicity and anonymity at the same time.... (There is) Nancy Friedman, "the telephone Doctor", who notes that a local TV station called her "bubbly and sharp on the air".[195]

The "Talk Show Guest Directory" lists an abundance of available issues in alphabetical order capturing "both the diversity of American life and the moral and intellectual agnosticism of the talk show culture." [196] Listed topics-for-discussion include: bulimia, bunions and burning feet, or, for variations of a theme - pregnancy, unmarried pregnancy, pregnancy in politics, pregnant career women; including the Shroud of Turin, sibling relationships, etc. It is unknown whether Dr. Tannen is listed in this directory, though, in all likelihood, her reputation is its own advertisement.

Dr. Tannen is a great talker: that is, she is an articulate speaker who is both knowledgeable and entertaining, and is very much in demand. Add to that the impressive

credentials in interpersonal relations, her astuteness of life, and her proficiency as an academic and author. Journalist, David Finkle, has crowned Tannen a "self-help guru of the '90s"[197] - a celebrity. The forthcoming segments examines just who a celebrity is, then appraises celebrated author, Deborah Tannen's televised appearance on "Oprah's" "How To Communicate with your Spouse..(10080A..OWS). "Oprah" is a syndicated production of Harpo Studios.

4.7 Celebrity Selection

> The term "celebrity" is often loosely defined. Many celebrities are not in show business, the arts or sports, though these fields seem to contain the largest percentage. Some people seek notoriety and win it. Others, by being in the right-or even wrong place, achieve headline fame. One can become a celebrity through inadvertent circumstances.

> Celebrity does not require nobility, honesty, significance, constructiveness, kindness nor positive ethics. Without any or perhaps with only one of these characteristics, a society can still hold an individual in awe.....scandal creates celebrity..... As Andy Warhol once stated: We do indeed have five-minute celebrities.[198]

Actors and actresses are another genre of celebrity that appear on "advice" talk shows. Although they will give a good surface interview, performers will often go to great lengths to protect their private lives. But there are some who will let the public past the "star" facade, sharing with audiences their struggle with various addictions, relationships, as well as their various "pet" projects. Here the public is given an opportunity to see the celebrity on a more human level and to share "the personal and particular."[199] For

example, comedienne, Carol Burnett has spoken candidly on talk shows about how alcohol abuse ravaged her parents, and Roseanne Barr has shared with television audiences the sexual and childhood abuse she received by her parents. Though celebrities, such as those just cited, are valued guests, "real-life" people are increasingly appearing on television talk shows because they routinely match or better the ratings earned by notable celebrities.[200] Almost anyone who has a story to tell on television becomes a celebrity: panels of laypersons relating their experiences to the studio and home television audiences, while professional experts offer their interpretations and analyses of these often intimate disclosures. On any day, in any week, in any city, psychologists, social workers, therapists, family professionals, as well as other professionals in human service can be found o· "Oprah" discussing such topics as parenting, incest, rape, and physical abuse, or other topics of relevance in the family area. This popularization may be the primary means in which family professionals can communicate their collective wisdom to their publics.

Not only are professionals in human services guest-appearing on "Oprah", pedagogues and academics, such as Deborah Tannen, are being asked to come to the programme to give their expert opinions. Although universities may not officially endorse the media appearances of these educators, they do encourage them to market themselves whenever possible. Gone are the affluent 1960s and 1970s when post-secondary schools had waiting lists of student applicants. School administrators are subtle but direct in advising their teaching staff and researchers that media opportunities can benefit both the academic and the university s/he represents.

> In a contemporary version of "publish or perish", some faculty members feel they must now "get on the media or perish", says one university information director.[201]
>
> Mr. M. Frederic Volkmann, director of public relations at Washington University in St. Louis says professors realize that if their university is better

> known the chances of attracting both better students and greater financial support will improve.[202]

Talk show criteria requires more than the academic credentials of an pedagogue/expert". Earlier on, the notion of sensationalism was discussed as a talk tabloid criterion. This is not to imply that the academic who appears on Ms. Winfrey's programme, or any other "advice" talk tabloid must exhibit shock value. Neither can a programme such as Oprah's afford to bring an expert - or any other guest for that matter - to the panel who will freeze and say nothing at all, or say dreadfully dull things. At the very least, the challenge is to find a pedagogue who can talk engagingly and succinctly while staring into a camera. A certain element of showmanship is a key asset in an academic guest expert, as it is with other talk show celebrities. Some have terrific minds but they make terrible television. Regardless of whether the guest-celebrity is an expert or not, an alert mind coupled with the gift of enthusiastic gab are still the most desirable attributes of a guest.

Dr. Tannen has been a "favourite" talk shov guest-celebrity, bringing her expertise to such programmes as "The Today Show," "Phil Donahue", the "Steve Roberts Special", the "Charlie Rose" show and more. The televised "Oprah" text chosen for this thesis is representative of its genre and best illustrates the various hypotheses of Tannen's work.

Oprah's producer was reluctant to divulge the details of any celebrity's guest-appearance, therefore, the following discourse has been gleaned from an interview with Dr. Deborah Tannen, conducted on Thursday, June 17, 1993 from Stanford California, and from Mincer's (1982) The Talk Show Book, and Blythin and Samovar's (1985) Communicating Effectively on Television.

4.8 Awaiting Her Televised Appearance

Upon arriving at the studio, talk show guest celebrities are met by a production assistant, then taken to the make-up room for some "finishing touches" (i.e., some facial powder to cut the glare and reflection of the studio lights). A pre-telecast video-and-sound check is conducted in the television studio. When this has been completed, the guest is taken to the "Green Room" close to the studio.

The "Green Room" originated in theatre, where it refers to the bare, seedy, airless room which acts as a buffer zone for performers "to and from their hour of strutting and fretting on the stage." For TV organizations it is perceived as being a much more important site. People from all walks of television life enter and exit the Green Room: famous faces - newscasters, guest-celebrities, producers. The Green Room baptizes newcomers to the world of the television celebrity while simultaneously maintaining its theatrical role as a mid-way station in adjusting for one's actual televised appearance. This would be where Dr. Deborah Tannen awaits her "on air" call. Tannen confessed, in a recent telephone interview, that despite her numerous appearances on a variety of talk shows, she continues to have pre-interview jitters prior to her appearance. She added that shortly after she is "on-air" the nervousness vanishes as she becomes totally absorbed in the actuality of the event.

During a recent conversation, Dr. Tannen described how she has awaited her interview in the Green Room of other talk show programmes, only to be "bumped" off those telecasts, prior to her appearance: though this did not occur on Oprah's "How To Communicate With Your Spouse"(10080A..OWS), the televised text chosen for analysis. Getting "bumped" happens for a variety of reasons (heated dialogue amongst participants who are "on-air" - "high involvement" speakers, etc). Availability on her/his part, and future interest on the studio's part would determine whether an expert returns at a later date. If, at

some future time, that programme intends to air a topic similar to the one the guest expert has been asked to originally guest-appear on, then a new date is arranged.

Every guest on every talk show brings a different message. However, the same guest may appear on several talk shows, expounding on the same messages. In a initial videotaped viewing of several of the other "advice" talk programmes Tannen has appeared on, it was noted that Tannen's responses appeared pre-rehearsed. In the telephone interview, Dr. Tannen (June 17, 1993) denied that she was ever sent a list of potential questions well before her televised appearance. In viewing those tapes a second time, it then became apparent that each talk show host/ess had questioned Tannen on the same issues, or variations of the same theme, i.e., topics extracted from her 1990 popular text. Tannen conveys her televised messages regarding gender communications in an articulate, informative, insightful, comfortable and charming manner. When asked who she targets her textual and televisual messages to, Tannen's replied "to middle-class America."

The following analysis of the "Oprah" transcript illustrates the interconnectiveness of Tannen's teachings with her televised guest appearance.

4.9 An Analysis of Tannen's Guest-Appearance on the "Oprah" Show

Just as conversations have a beginning, middle and end, so are these present in contemporary television speaking. In talk shows, the introductions seize the attention of both studio and home audiences, reveal the purpose, and offer a preview of the ensuing material. To illustrate: Oprah's theme music and logo signals the lead-in to her show. As the opening

instrumental fades into the background, the "lead-in" features a head-and-shoulders frame of a middle-class, well-suited man stating that every evening he comes home from work and his wife asks him the same question, "How was your day?" His reply, "fine!"

The next frame then switches to a head-and-shoulders shot of this man's wife, chiding her husband, whose response, she states, is unacceptable.

> Fine isn't good enough! I want to know who he saw, what he did, where he went, what he had for lunch!

She claims that the reason she asks how his day is, is because she cares about him, and cares about what happens in his day. What she wants to know are the "details" (an issue Tannen has postulated on in several of her academic and popular texts).

Subsequent footage features Oprah Winfrey, neatly tailored in a vibrant yellow suit, standing in front of her studio audience, holding a microphone. Her opening line signifies the purpose of this telecast (Oprah's following comments refer to the opening televised remarks made by the husband and wife):

> What we have here is the failure to communicate, and it's something that's been going on since the beginning of time...

The panelists are two married couples: Wife (Stormy) claims that her husband (Bill) never gives her the details she wants to know in a conversation; the other female panelist (Elizabeth), the wife whose remarks opened the programme, claims that every time she tells her husband (Dan) about a problem, she wishes he would offer her comfort instead of a logical solution. (Both of these issues are investigated at length in Deborah Tannen's (1990) text). Both couples are then welcomed to the programme with hearty applause from the studio audience.

During the introduction, the visuals that accompany Oprah's voice-over focuses alternatively on each couple. At first glance, both female panelists appear to be "high involvement" speakers, while their husbands are "high considerateness" participants (Tannen,

1984,1989). Husband and wife are seated next to one another on a small oval stage; the camera catches each spouse paralinguistically communicating with his/her mate. The metamessage accompanying their eye-contact signifies to the viewer, that, at present, these marriages are not in jeopardy, nor are their lives falling apart. Their problem lies solely in their inability to communicate with one another.

Ms. Winfrey takes the next few seconds to plug her guest and this celebrity's latest popular text. "Dr. Deborah Tannen will be here later on. She has written a great book called, You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. " Redirecting her subsequent remarks back to the panelists: "This is typical you know, it's happening all over America!" With this remark, Oprah illustrates that she recognizes and identifies the existence of the issue-in-question. Oprah's verbal acknowledgement reassures the panelists, as well as the studio and television audiences, that they are an illusionary community, all sharing this same problem: the communication gap between genders.

During this opening segment of the programme, Elizabeth admits that her husband is generally not a "detail person." Elizabeth establishes the "footing" (Goffman, 1974) of this televised discourse when asked what her biggest "irritation" with her husband is. "What she thinks is important he does not think is important...(pause).. communication". "Commun-i-ca-tion," Oprah slowly enunciates each syllable, previewing the ensuing theme of the programme. "We hear it a lot."

For the next few televised minutes, the panel of participants share their experiences with the studio and home audience, numerous instances where communications among spouses duplicates and reinforces Tannen's work. Under Oprah's direction, members of the studio audience dialogue with the panelists. Testimonies and confessions attest to the various problems these couples encounter in their communications with one another. Prior to the

commercial break, Oprah once again announces Tannen's impending guest-appearance, referring to her as "an expert in communications".

An assessment of Tannen's televised appearance conveys how much she enjoys her role as Oprah's guest-expert; embodying well the prototype of H.M. Leet-Pellgrini (1980) "female expert" (under the section entitled, "I'll Explain It To You: Lecturing and Listening") cited in Tannen's 1990 text. Her accessible and approachable style enables Tannen to share her knowledge with others while simultaneously promoting a sense of rapport and community with her audiences.

A study of how Tannen's messages are disseminated on TV "advice" talk shows, reveals the interconnectiveness between her academic teachings (conversational strategies), and her talk show dialogue.[203] Since both processes are interpersonal, the same conventions and rituals involved in conversations are also applicable to televised rhetoric. As media experts Gumpert and Cathcart contend, "it is misleading to study interpersonal communications and pretend that media do not influence this phenomenon."[204] In this case, it is misleading to study the media without noting how it is influenced by conversational strategies.

The ease with which Tannen so articulately identifies and defines the issues discoursed on "Oprah" - taken sequentially from her 1990 book - helps to facilitate the dissemination of her messages. Putting her own theories on conversational strategies into practice during air-time, Tannen employs such devices as 'direct speech', which helps to create a scene of a familiar world for her audiences. This is demonstrated through her sharing of personal anecdotes (e.g., a story about her parents is told to illustrate how genders differ in their perception of detail); this enables Tannen to bring her audiences into her "personal and particular" world, and to help as many publics as possible to understand that the

processes of producing and comprehending conversational discourse are basically matters of human awareness and human interactions:

> My mother started with all the details - which city should they start with, what day should they leave, who should they visit, should they drive, should they fly.. and she was going on like this; my father was just sitting there. She finally just looked at him and said, 'we have to make a decision.' And he replied, ' how can we make a decision if you keep talking.

The text of the "Oprah" show moves from point to point through a process Tannen (1989) refers to as "bridging". As an effective hostess, Oprah covers the agenda established by her producers, leading her guests through it. She generally begins each segment of her show with a lead-in question or statement intended to help stimulate discussion among her guests. Similarly, prior to each commercial break, Oprah issues a statement about the ensuing segment intended to "bridge" the commercial break, and to verbally entice the audience back for the next segment of the programme; e.g., "Why women seem to always be apologizing to men in their conversations. We'll find out when we come back, after this commercial!"

Shortly into the telecast, Tannen demonstrates that she, too, is adept at "bridging" issues for debate. In acknowledging a response from a male member of the studio audience who is perplexed as to why women prefer talk to activity, this "communication's expert"[205] identifies:

> this (as) the real basic difference in what women and men think they should do when they are home. Women feel, 'all day I've been out in the world and I've had to watch what I say. If I talk too much people are going to think I'm too aggressive, if I disagree with someone I'll start a conflict, and they don't like confrontation'. We (women) feel now that we're home, with someone we are close to, this is really the place to start talking.. Men feel 'I have been out in the world all day, using language in the struggle, I've had to stick up for my rights, make sure I don't get pushed around, make sure people have the right respect for me, and now that I'm home, I want to relax, and I don't want to talk.

Tannen's comment is intended to "bridge" discussions from the "report versus rapport" issue to what it means for each gender to have "a best friend" Her strategy contributes to the flow of the programme.

> So its this different idea about what it means to be friends. Women and men are both trying to be best friends with their partner, but we have different ideas about what it means to be best friends. If you think of two little girls, they got a best friend, and they are sitting and talking and telling each other secrets, and that's what makes them best friends. So now we've grown up and we want to be best friends (with men), and we think that we're going to tell you everything and you are going to tell us everything...

Analogous to conversations, televised talk show formats are built around a basic theme whose principal concepts are reiterated several times throughout the telecast. Restating central themes as well as variations of them is pervasive; with each exposure, the utterance becomes part of a unified discourse, and thereby contributes to the point of the discourse. Reiterating the central concepts also gives this TV discourse a character of familiarity, analogous to what one would get with familiar surroundings. Tannen (1989)[206] claims that reiteration "gives the impression, indeed the reality, of a shared universe of discourse" between speakers and listeners alike.

Throughout the one - hour televised programme, discussion converges on variations of the "communication-gap" theme: "details" - where Tannen explains that each gender has a different way of negotiating, women being deductive reasoners, men, inductive: "gossip" - where she tells her audiences that gossiping is not gender-specific, rather women talk about others for a sense of involvement, whereas men gossip in order to establish where they are in the hierarchy scale: "report versus rapport" speech - where men feel that home is their inner sanctum "where they are free to relax and see talk as an imposed activity, while women perceive their home as a place to relax and share their thoughts and emotions with their mate, etc. Interwoven throughout this dialogue is the principle notion that a communications gap exists between the genders, one that needs more identification and understanding.

Tannen articulates her central supposition only in the closing moments of the show, exhibiting her "meta-goal," that language is an intricate part of our daily existence:

> The most important thing is to understand that women and men have different ways of having conversations, and conversations mean different things to most women and men. So, if women are expecting a lot of 'uh-huhs' and aren't getting them, then we get the feeling that he isn't listening; if you understand that, for him, this doesn't mean not listening, we can start to accept that.
>
> The most painful thing is the accusation and the blame - accusing each other of not caring... feeling that we are in a bad relationship - that he doesn't care about us as much as we care about him - we want something from him that doesn't make any sense.... It's the mutual accusation, the frustration, the not-knowing-what-is-going-on that is hurtful. So you (women) have two choices: you can accept them (men). You can say that 'I'm not going to get that kind of talk from him, I am going to get it from my friends' or you can start to make adjustments.

A reiteration of this central hypothesis, in the closing moments of the "Oprah" telecast, serves as a double-binding function; for it demonstrates how dialogue links discourses, and how concepts presented throughout this televised text are interconnected. Reiterating also helps to leave Tannen's studio and home audiences with an afterimage. As a strategy, repetition is very involving in that talk show discussions are not a matter of two or more individuals alternatively taking the role of speaker(s) and listener(s), rather, all participants are speaking and listening. Listening is an active enterprise, requiring interpretation analogous to that required in speaking, and visa versa. Bakhtin ([1975], 1981) asserts that all language use is dialogic. Therefore the audiences become a co-authors, while the speaker is also the co-listener.

Repetition, as a clarifying and reinforcing device in both conversation and televised discourses, occurs in a variety of ways. F. r example, throughout the telecast Oprah often repeats the concluding sentence of Tannen's and/or a panelist's statement. This type of repetition is called "shadowing"[207], and in this context, ratifies that Oprah is listening. Repeating also permits all listeners to absorb and comprehend what has been said. This is

illustrated when Tannen defines what is meant as "negotiating" talk. Oprah reframes Tannen's explanation by paraphrasing it into a question. Tannen, in turn, acknowledges that Oprah has indeed understood what has been discussed by again repeating her explanation:

> Tannen: When a woman asks a man for his opinion in the beginning of a conversation, he thinks that she is asking him for a decision.
>
> Oprah: And so the woman is only asking for his opinion?
>
> Tannen: Right! As the first step in the negotiation...

Similarly midway through the programme, Tannen refers back to an anecdote that panelist Elizabeth cited earlier on in this telecast. Although there has been a time lapse between the original comment and Tannen's reference to it, repetition in this framework is used as an evaluative strategy. Tannen's reference to Elizabeth's remark contributes to her point of the dialogue. Repetition, in this case, contributes to the recalling of prior texts - a paradigm in which to slot in new information.

Matelski (1991) claims that daytime TV talk show audiences respond well to texts that provide both information and entertainment ("infotainment"). Entertainment that provides laughter is favoured. A replay of "How To Communicate With Your Spouse" evidences this claim. For example, Elizabeth professes that she and her husband do communicate: "we just have to do it twice, the first time we get nowhere, the second time, somewhere". This comment sends the audience into tirades of laughter. Through intonation, pace, voice quality and other paralinguistic features, Elizabeth has framed a literal utterance that entertains. Laughter also possess a rapport benefit. Aside from its sensual pleasure, laughter denotes that the speaker and listeners are sharing the same wavelength. It signifies a sense of symmetry.

> How much more interesting to say (what's on our minds) in a way that is funny or cryptic or subtle or stylized. And if someone else understands the humour, the style, the implications - breaks the code - it is pleasurable for both and sends a metamessage of rapport.[208]

Laughter can also reflect an asymmetrical rapport, as it did with Stormy, the other female panelist. In response to Elizabeth's comment, she emphatically states that she "has to repeat things six times" to her husband. Oprah interjects, inquiring as to whether television addiction plays an important factor in the need to repeat. Stormy agrees. "We'll be sitting there watching TV, and I'll just be rattling on, rattling on like all women do..." The studio audience responds with laughter at Stormy's stereotypical remark. A televised close-up of Stormy illustrates that she is puzzled by the audience's reaction, unaware of the impact her statement has made. Oprah's expression is one of disbelief at what she has just heard this woman say. The camera pans to the studio audience, where a choir of male voices enthusiastically cheer in support of Stormy's remark. "You didn't mean rattling on, did you?" asks Oprah. A woman from the audience bolts to the microphone shouting,"rephrase that please, there are too many men here who are going to go against us...so its not rattling, its...." (pause).. the audience laughs again. In her own defense, Stormy redefines "rattling" to mean her husband's interpretation of what she is saying. Oprah then asks Bill why he doesn't hear a word his wife has said? His retort is poignant and well-timed, "because she was 'rattling on'. The audience is, once again, consumed with laughter. In this context, laughter signifies a one-up, one-down situation, directed against Stormy. Whether symmetrical or asymmetrical, laughter is not the only contributor in establishing rapport amongst all participants of the "Oprah" show.

Another rapport strategy used in daytime TV talk shows is referred to as "thematic cohesion,"[209] i.e., this is a device whereby a speaker expects her/his statement of personal experience to elicit a similar statement from the other participant. Thematic cohesion prevails throughout television "advice" talk show dialogue, where the "how-to" topics provide a handy basis for this strategy. Exigencies exist in talk show formats - i.e., situations of need that demands attention and a response, providing a conducive forum for most talk show guests

who have stories of personal experiences, and/or solutions to, or suggestions for particular problems.

Another example of asymmetry is illustrated, which Tannen refers to as "community and contest" communication,[210] acknowledging that men's interpersonal relations are based on a hierarchical system. There is a perception among many, that most men do not like to stop and ask for directions. For most men, having to stop and ask for directions implies that he is in a one-down relationship to the individual he is asking. Therefore, rather than be looked upon condescendingly by others, he would rather drive around lost. The male members of the studio audience respond defensively to Tannen's observation. One asks her how one really knows whether the person to whom directions are being asked really knows the way. Another responds by claiming that he was a truck driver who never loses his way. A third male participant retorts that, if his wife claims to know her way, then he let's her drive. Each man's subsequent response to this issue appears to reinforce the prior claims and to produce meaning. This is how thematic cohesion in conversations promotes participant involvement.

J.D. Sapir (1977) labels strategies that produce meaning as "tropes". These include paralinguistic devices such as tone, pitch, gesturing, facial features, etc., that serve to enhance meaning. However, the pertinent trope in this study is the "metaphor" (i.e. saying one thing in terms of another).[211] Metaphors are very powerful and pervasive in everyday language. Generally, there are two metaphoric processes that occur in any discourse - inductive and deductive reasoning. Bateson (1979:158) claims that "abduction - the lateral extension of abstract components of description" is a less popular process. Through "abductive" reasoning:

> we can look at the anatomy of a frog and then look around to find other instances of the same abstract relations recurring in other creatures, including...ourselves.[212]

Abduction is the type of reasoning exhibited through the narratives of TV's advice-talk show speakers, and is demonstrated through two metaphoric processes: the analogy and the anecdote.

During the hour-long telecast, Tannen conveys her theories through analogies and anecdotes. One example of an analogy she uses pertains to the inter-relationship of conversations in dating and marriage to the status ("report") of boys versus the rapport of girls. An anecdote is used to describe the same concept of "report versus rapport" talk. Tannen describes how men, during a social occasion, will be chatty and full of detail, while practically non-communicative with their wives while at-home. It is Tannen's belief that the use of analogies enables the audience to identify with what is being said. It is a familiarity with one's past that enables both the studio and television audiences to convert the most complex things to simple ideas, and thus understand what is being said. That is, material is compared and contrasted so that common categories emerge and some sense is made of what would otherwise be a barrage of experience. Audiences tend to compare what they do not know with what they know in an attempt to comprehend the unknown. This is how one experience is differentiated from another. Analogies alone do not fully answer the questions a studio or at-home audience may have. Audiences expect evidence that the speaker - regardless of their role - fully comprehends what s/he is talking about. Analogies accompanied by some form of anecdote helps to corroborate messages, lending additional credibility to the subject.

Anecdotes, such as those that contribute to "thematic cohesion" entertain, inform and persuade. Its effectiveness is prevalent in two ways: it reflects a common understanding about the issue-at-hand and substantiates, or lends truth, to the particular point being made. Narratives (anecdotes) related on television's "advice" talk shows, by guest and/or audience participants, filled with details and imagery about one's or another's personal experiences

creates emotion, thus enabling the others in the studio and at-home to identify with the source of the information. This genre of narrative is referred to as "expert testimony,"[213] one which lends substance to the issue. This is an evaluative process, where the listener becomes the "judge and jury" and is thus involved in the conversational process. Anecdotal testimony establishes firsthand credibility to the topic-in-question, and as Dr. Tannen contends, contributes to bonding the participants in the discourse:

> ... If the point of someone else's story is expected by the receiver, because of a similarity or mutual observation (or shared feeling),..... that the mutually and repeated reinforced attitude contributes to bonding.[214]

The interconnectedness of conversational devices with television discourse strategies enables Tannen to "practice what she preaches" when sited as a guest expert on daytime talk shows. The following segment investigates the substance of Tannen's television talk show discourse: her messages.

4.10 An Analysis of a Talk Show Topic

There is no end to the subjects from which "advice" talk show producers and staff can choose. Some are tried-and-true topics that merit a new twist because of a current interest, updated research, or an interesting spokesperson; other themes are new and innovative.[215] The pertinent talk tabloid topic for this thesis is the desire to know why we say what we say, and how to say more of it, or to eliminate saying some of it. The participants on the "Oprah" show are often ordinary people who have undergone extraordinary experiences, who are asked to come forth to share and relive, with talk show

audiences, the details of these events. Victims of sexual abuse, victims of parental abuse, victims of date rape, victims of violence, victims of incest, victims of divorce, and the list goes on. People come together to talk, to render testimonies, to discuss and share a common topic and/or a problem. As described in chapter three, "Tannen's Audiences", such narrations are supportive and thus therapeutic in nature.

> Confession is immediately understood as a therapeutic process, promoting expiation, a release of tension, or the narrative constructions of a psychoanalytic cure.[216]

White (1992) contends that as liberating as these issues are for the "confessors", these narrations offer profound assistance and support to studio audiences and TV home viewers by helping them solve the problems in their own lives. It is through selected topics that "self-help", or "advice" telecasts such as "Oprah" offer advice and information on where to find help: often directing audiences to social service agencies and/or support networks. Television's daytime "advice" talk programmes respond to the fact that people want to be in touch with other human beings, to get some sense of contact and participation in a social world which has meaning, which is real and significant.

In a recent interview, Tannen staunchly maintains that her popular text (1990) is objective both in content and context, and is not, she claims, a "self-help" discourse.[217] Her ultimate goal, through her messages, is to enlighten and help as many publics as possible to understand that the processes of producing and understanding discourse are matters of human feeling and human interactions.

Interestingly, the hypotheses of Tannen's 1990 popular text have been debated by several other authors, at other times. Psychologists, Julius and Barbara Fast expounded on this issue back in 1979,[218] and more recently Dr. James Dobson (1991),[219] and Dr. Lillian Glass (1992)[220] have made similar authorial claims, explaining "how" people can change their communication habits by being aware of gender differences. But it is Dr. Tannen whose

popular text You Just Don't Understand (1990) has sold well over a million copies (see Chapter 2), and it is Tannen who, unlike the Fasts, Dobson and Glass, has been distinguished from her professional colleagues, to guest appear on "Oprah", and many other talk shows.

Dr. Tannen was asked if That's Not What I Meant:. (1986) (a text focusing primarily on interpersonal, not gender, communication) would have been as popular if it had been written five years earlier. Although Tannen answered this question in the affirmative, this researcher tends to disagree. Her work was timely: the post-industrial "me" generation has, within the past decade, undergone a shift to a postmodern "we" generation. Disintegrated families and friendships have become integrated and extended. By the mid-1980s, individuals were in a state of flux with respect to their altered roles in society; roles that were hardly questioned in 1979 (Fasts); roles that had been over-exposed by 1991 (Dobson) and 1992 (Glass). By the late 1980s individuals began questioning all aspects of interpersonal relations - family, community, business, and other; individuals needed answers to their interrelationship problems. Readers were ready for change. Deborah Tannen's work makes communication central. It is how she says what she says, but it is also what she says. Tannen tells her readers that more talk is not enough, analyzing and offering advice on how to talk. Tannen's 1986 text responded to popular needs by offering solutions to the public audiences' communications dilemmas. Analogously, television's daytime talk discourses also filled a void in the marketplace by providing public therapy.

4.11 Daytime "Advice" Talk Tabloids as Therapeutic Discourses

Haraway (1989) contends that a radically new world order is occurring, i.e., a shift from the post-industrial society - where relations of power were strong, but identifiable - to the new network of postmodernism.

> We are living through a movement from an organic, industrial society to a polymorphous, information system - from all work to all play, a deadly game.[221]

Such a shift is very frightening to many people. Haraway perceives the media (i.e., daytime "advice" talk shows) as organizing new forms of power, facilitating what she labels as the "informatics of domination."[222] Information and communication are significant components of control. The therapeutic ideal is an incitement to talk, to talk continually of oneself, to others. It is a way of regenerating communication. Daytime television talk tabloids, as an ethos of therapy, invites one literally into the dominant networks of postmodern entertainment.

Earlier on, the format of "advice"- talk shows was outlined. It comprises a host/ess, either one individual and/or a panel of individuals - perpetrators and victims alike; an expert(s) - a singular or multiple site of authority - who come together in a television studio setting to discuss a common problem of a psychological and/or social nature.

Initially, each member of the guest panel is given a limited time to share with the audiences her/his personal experiences surrounding this problem. Such narratives seem to conform to Michel Foucault's notion of "confession" (see Chapter 3:3.6):

> The confession is a ritual of discourse in which the speaking subject is also the subject of the statement; it is also a ritual that unfolds within a power relationship, for one does not confess without the presence (or virtual presence) of a partner who is not simply the interlocutor but the authority who requires the confession, prescribes and appreciates it, and intervenes in order to judge, punish, forgive, console, and reconcile; a ritual in which the truth is corroborated by the obstacles and resistances it has had to surmount in order to be formulated ...a ritual in which the expression alone, independently of its external consequences, produces intrinsic modifications

> in the person who articulates it.....it unburdens him of his wrongs, liberates him....[223]

Through "advice" talk show narratives, each participant on the televised talk show panel has an opportunity to liberate her/himself through the telling of her/his story to the talk show's host, guests, studio and at-home audiences. When the speaker speaks about her/his subject, s/he also becomes the subject of the speech, i.e., the "I" one uses in telling the narrative implies myself. Moreover, an "I" in verbal discourse usually presupposes a "you" as an interlocutor. Therefore, it is not only the lay speakers who relate their stories; the guest expert offers her/his narratives as well.

For Foucault, it is not the content of the secret that is liberating as much as its process. It is the release of tension, the notion of expiation that accompanies each speaker's story (confession) that is significant. It is helpful to investigate how the confessional and therapeutic discourses of television's daytime "advice" talk tabloids alter and reconfigure the very character of confessions and therapy as practices for producing social identities and enlightening its audiences. Confessions, as a way of producing truth through a particular strategy of speech, also links knowledge and power. For example, in religion, the individual who listens to another's confession has the "authority" to prescribe the means of atonement leading to expiation. In a psychotherapeutic situation, the therapist carries that weight of transference, as well as its interpretation. What this research suggests is that televised "advice" talk shows have their own professional expert, capable of offering those who relate their narratives, who confess, the same kind of understanding and attentiveness that one might derive from a session with a psychotherapist and/or a visit to a confession booth. Dr. Deborah Tannen, in her position as the guest-expert on "Oprah" becomes this authorial figure, a public therapist.

Symbolically, Tannen's role as guest academic/expert is to hear the confessions of the other panelists, and by the same authority invested in the clergy and/or therapist, suggest a solution, or a "cure" to the problem. As a process, this enables the participant to feel a sense of relief and comfort. (The kaleidoscope of opinions represented by all TV "advice" talk show participants is no accident. By including representatives from all sides of the issue, no side can accuse the programme of being unfair).

Tannen's (1989) research suggests that confessions comprise many involvement strategies, and are speakers' ways of shaping their verbal discourse. A conversational strategy, such as a narrative, is filled with what Tannen labels as "sense patterns";[224] these are evaluative in that they contribute to the point of the discourse, presenting the subject of discourse in a way that shapes how the hearer will comprehend the message. As Tannen[225] acknowledges, conversational strategies establishes a "frame" (Bateson, 1972), which contributes to the metamessage, the level on which a speaker's relationships to the subject of talk and to the other participants in talk are negotiated. Tannen's suppositions suggest that sense patterns create involvement through audience participation in sense making. By doing some of the work of making meaning, hearers or readers become participants in the discourse.

> Communication takes place because the dialogue, details, and images conjured up by one's person's speech inspire others to create sounds and scenes in their minds. Thus, it is in the individual imagination that meaning is made, and there that it matters. And it is the creation of such shared meaning - communication - that makes a collection of individuals into a community, unites individuals in relationships.[226]

Narratives, as an "involvement" device of talk show formats, are determined by multiple levels of confession and representation within which proper subjectivity is defined. The speakers on the panel confess to the host/ess, to the expert, to each other, to the audiences (studio and television), in the hopes that these individuals will also confess. The

television viewer is implicitly situated on both sides of the confessional process; for s/he both confesses and hears confessions within this trajectory. Through the pervasive agency of television, therapy is therefore extended beyond the physical parameters of the studio, into the television rooms of North America, into the central core of our communities.

As Elayne Rapping (1987) contends:

> (The talk show) is the bible...in a world of overwhelming change and responsibility. They may be the only places to turn to when traumatic problems come up which are difficult to talk about. ...[227]

Although some say that it is regretful to think that society has to turn to TV's daytime television talk shows for "self-help", studies are continually demonstrating that social networks for expressing anxiety and obtaining support are mandatory to one's psychological health.

> Politically, the open acknowledgment that problems are shared, that one's suffering is neither freakishly unique or entirely one's own fault, is liberating..... the realization that "the personal is political" brings relief and power, at least potentially.[228]

Over and above its confessional and therapeutic value, ideologically, talk show audiences glean some very avant garde notions from these programmes, concepts that are subsequently discussed with relatives and friends. Each programme becomes a testing ground for social and psychological mores. Each programme analyzes, and often extends, the limits of what is currently acceptable in issue and cultural practice, stretching the boundaries of traditional thought, that for many, have never before been contemplated. Critics who originally labelled daytime advice-talk programming as "trash" or "tabloid" are slowly changing their opinions. Television critic, Van Gordon Sauter, who once publicly despaired about the agendas of television's talk shows reconsiders the effects these discourses are having on it audiences:

> ...they are relevant. And sometimes they are even - brace yourselves - good journalism. With the correct topic and motivated guests, the talk master can

> reveal the dimensions of significant human issues with a clarity and reality beyond the grasp of print journalism.[229]

Academic/expert, Dr. Deborah Tannen uses the agency of television and the talk show format to disseminate her very "relevant" messages on the differences in gender communication. As a form of popular entertainment and information, several theorists perceive television as being a most pervasive "binding" popular element in North American society. The connotation of "binding" suggests that it connects distinct audiences who share a common interest in a particular genre of programming, e.g., "advice" talk shows. Using the latter reference is to suggest that television's "advice" talk shows are a central component in the process of hegemony.

This thesis concludes by returning to Breakwell (1990) and a brief examination of hegemony in relation to Tannen's theories about gender differences in communication.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Academic as an Agent of Social Influence

A brief examination of hegemony in relation to gender differences in communication supports Breakwell's (1990) study. An analysis is conducted into Tannen's televised appearance to determine how her "self-help" teachings offer strategies for gender conversations yet continue the hegemonic parameters of gender differences.

As we approach the twenty-first century, in place of the extended family once held together by rituals of work, worship and community, we have a new family unit headed by the television set; an agency that is altering our world and becoming part of our lives. One attribute of television is its ability to bind; i.e., to take the different fragments of North American life and homogenize those fragments into more consolidated units. This is not to imply a total homogenization of our culture. On the contrary, as was illustrated in Chapter Three of this inquiry, there are distinct audiences who are influenced by, and also selectively enjoy certain genres of programming. Therefore, when television is referred to as the most pervasive "binding" popular medium in North America - designed to correct fragmentation - it is stated in a broad sense of the term. The fact that television is perceived as a binding element contributes to the notion of hegemonic centrality (i.e. TV connects all its viewing audiences with some international events, while very diverse genres of programming connect those popular audiences who share a common interest in a particular format).

Hegemony is about ideology. Ideologies are concepts which articulate the ambitions, concerns and deliberations of the dominant social groups as "they struggle to secure and maintain their position of domination".[230] Ideology represents ideas that do not depict the nature and relative positions of the classes concerned, i.e., it misrepresents these relations in a way which concurs with the interests of the dominant class. " Ideology" signifies "the ways in which meaning serves to establish and sustain relations of domination."[231]

Hegemony recognizes the role of the subordinate groups in producing a means of making sense of, or rationalizing the world. It suggests that the power of the dominant groups can only be maintained through tensions established between dominant and subordinate groups. Out of these tensions, rationalizations are produced which both groups contribute to and can agree with. What this implies is that although the interests of these two distinct groups are basically opposed, they have found a way of co-existing in accord, or consent, because the subordinate groups have won enough concessions to appease them, thus allowing them to accept their domination while the dominant groups' overall structural power base is maintained. As long as this remains unchallenged, the subordinate groups can continue to win more and more concessions and have an effect on the constitution of the resulting state of hegemony. Therefore, in the establishment and negotiations of the hegemony of the dominant groups there is constant conflict between the contradictory desires of all groups which finds areas of consent and consensus.

"Popular culture" identifies those everyday things that are mass produced and successful, things that all individuals share through agencies such as mass media and industrial technology. It has its own means of enlightenment; it offers communities ways of understanding their society and therefore contributes to the awareness they have of the world.

Popular culture's stress is on pleasure and entertainment, addressing everyone across class, age, gender, and thus becoming one of the most crucial sites in which our 'consciousness' is constructed, through which ideologies are constructed, and by which hegemony is established.

What is pertinent to this thesis is that television, a form of popular entertainment as well as information, serves as a central agency for the process of hegemony. If ideology and hegemony are put within the context just described, then "popular culture" can never again be perceived as being just entertaining or socially insignificant. The following will appraise television as a central agency in the notion of hegemony.

5.1 Television as a Central Agency in the Process of Hegemony

Television programmes, as stated earlier, win hegemonic support through offering their viewer the information they require and enlightening them through entertainment (i.e. "infotainment"). For example, television programmes such as "after school" children's specials, offer today's adolescents information, options and solutions to intensifying social and emotional difficulties. Through the pervasiveness of this medium, individuals learn about such issues as domestic violence, divorce, modern marriages, drug abuse and much more, in the privacy of their homes. As has been demonstrated adults, too, can educate themselves through viewing such texts as "Oprah" or "Donahue" - formats that intersperse therapeutic discourses with laughter and tears.

Though television is not the cause of social problems, some social critics impute and condemn this medium for the very social problems it seeks to ameliorate. To the contrary, Rapping (1983) argues that one of TV's principle goals is to attempt to salvage what remains of a disintegrating social fabric.[232] Those who seek to minimize the effect of television see it as an unchanging monolith, instead of appreciating the impact it makes to our changing social structure, and to the different interests and needs of its audiences. Others condemn this medium, arguing that we are drowning in a sea of popular culture promulgated and perpetuated by television. To the contrary, popular culture has become so much a part of television technology that distinctions between them have become increasingly blurred.

It is obvious that those who stand in critical judgement have not noticed what this medium is capable of doing; that its objective is to broaden the visual horizons of viewers, not to limit them. A strong link does indeed exist between television and popular culture. Though television doesn't create popular culture, it has become the core of communal life in a mediated society. That is, television creates and maintains the hegemonic values of society by giving most individuals' a sense of what is real, what is right, and what is possible. Unless people can recognize themselves, their aspirations, and their fantasies in television, it means nothing to them. Research for this inquiry has revealed that television does connect with individuals' actual experiences, both in terms of their real and illusionary lives, which is one reason why it receives viewer support. Within the context of popular culture, television is relevant, drawn to issues and problems of the moment.

In general, social theorists have been less concerned with what the media provides to its audiences and how the audience adopts media to its own uses. The manner in which television interlaces with peoples' lives is rarely discussed. In the social sciences, a new strategy is presently emerging, one that considers such everyday interactions as televised gossip, personal and/or family TV integration, and how they relate to social roles, the

maintenance of family systems and subculture. The daytime talk show is a relevant component of this strategy.

5.2 What Impact Television's Daytime Talk Shows Have on Process of Hegemony

The role of television in the achievement of hegemony, Stuart Hall asserts:

> is a systematic tendency, not an incidental feature - to reproduce the ideological field of a society, in such a way as to reproduce, also, its structure of domination.[233]

As illustrated in Chapter Three, television is so pervasive, it can play the traditional role of gossip, providing television surrogates for the equivalent of friends and neighbours to observe, laugh at, or admire. Within this context, television provides a currency of discourse, a way of relating to others, and as was mentioned above, a vehicle for reaffirming, or modifying values. Cluett (1990)[234] contends that television programming provides the "gossip of society", citing a recent New York Times article in which a vivid account was provided of a woman whose long-distance telephone relationship with her daughter consisted primarily of sharing and debating daytime soap operas and talk show formats. For them, the pleasure was in recreating the viewing experience and sharing commentary on what was seen on a programme such as "Oprah". Although we tend to think of television as an isolating act, the reality of family life is that most viewing is done with others and becomes part of the bond that maintains a family, extending, at times, to the community and the world.

Daytime programming is still the most blatant sexual ghetto on TV. As illustrated throughout this text, daytime talk shows are geared for women, because, as David Finkle

(Redbook, January 1992) contends, primarily it is women who cope with almost every emotional, social, and physical crisis of modern life. It is apparent through this research that "advice", or "self-help" makes up most of the daytime programming between 10AM and 5PM.

Many are concerned with what has been labelled "trash" or television's "talk tabloid", embracing such programmes as "Donahue", "Sally Jesse Raphael" and "Oprah." Producers of this genre of programming vehemently deny this inclusion, claiming that the dialoguing and sharing of problems and concerns serves the public interest. Times are changing and the need for psycho-social talk shows is increasing. Individuals' personal agonies and confusions have multiplied. In the privacy of their homes, and through the pervasiveness of television, predominately female audiences maintain the emotional life of "the family". What these television audiences are responding to are the new values and perspectives being communicated and metacommunicated through the messages of experts, host/esses, guest panelists and studio audiences.

Most of these syndicated daytime talk shows are enjoying excellent viewer ratings. That this genre of programme is now more prominent than ever on television raises a couple of interesting questions:

a) Is daytime television talk just a present day trend, wherein its producers are capitalizing on the fact, or do texts such as "Oprah" "Donahue" and "Geraldo" genuinely represent an actual shift in society towards modifying its ideals?

b) Are we taking television too seriously, where media content is mainly treated as an opportunity for hand wringing on the state of our culture?

As chapter one demonstrates, the sixties sexual revolution heightened our cultural awareness of sexual inequity, but it did little more than that. Veiled under such jargon as "job

equity", "gender equality", "sexual equality", etc., our North American society still remains predominately patriarchal in its ideologies. Though practised in more subtle ways, sexual repression still reigns. In light of this, what TV's daytime talk shows do achieve, is to keep patriarchy under interrogation, while legitimating feminine values, and promoting self-esteem among its female audiences.

Far from the concerns of the more traditional, televised daytime talk texts, "tabloids" are sites where women and their families can and do participate. Often, televised texts, such as "Oprah," push the limits of what is acceptable in topic and approach. The introduction of new concepts and the inclusion of regular people in these formats are the two principle features. Initially what may seem to some as titillating becomes quite common when frequently discussed by host(ess)s, experts, participants and audiences of TV's daytime talk shows. From this researcher's perspective, daytime talk formats broaden our awareness of issues such as sexual variation and lifestyle differences. In essence, what television talk shows have done is to debunk the mystique of these concerns, thus acknowledging them, within the framework of the hegemonic debate, as valid social issues.

Daytime television talk shows play a progressive role in our North American culture; whether individually and/or collectively, these televised texts do possess a great deal of social influence. They set the agenda for what Americans will be discussing in the subsequent days and weeks because they are widely seen. They act as a study guide for casual discussions, since the issues raised and the drama with which certain features are presented, focus attention and help in determining ways of thinking for their studio and at-home audiences. Daytime talk shows are the most dynamic and elastic of all nonfiction on TV and, as a genre, serve as a testing ground for changing social beliefs. It is the agency of television which enables this type of programming to be telecast, raising both issues and possibilities never before contemplated by its audiences, stretching the boundaries of traditional thought.

Typically, it is academics/experts such as Deborah Tannen who generate the information necessary to help daytime television talk show audiences alter their existing beliefs and ostensibly push the limits of hegemony beyond its present parameters. But can agents of social change, using the medium of television to disseminate their useful messages actually alter hegemony, or is this a process that simply reinforces hegemonic thinking?

5.3 An Academic as an Agent of Social Influence

Breakwell (1982) believes that social beliefs are "commonly held interpretations of socially important phenomena,"[235] that come to exist because a group of individuals wishes to delineate the meaning or establish information about a phenomenon. The establishment and interpretation is self-serving in that it suits the interests and purposes of the group concerned.

> Framing social beliefs.... indicates that they should not be seen as value free. Social beliefs have an emotional charge. The social beliefs of one's group are deemed good and are positively valued. Failure to accept a social belief important to the group can be a heinous offence. Rejection of the social belief itself will clearly modify its power to influence both attitudes and action.[236]

Since the advent of the feminist critique of the social sciences in the 1960s, symbolically, "sex differences" have connoted biological differences between men and women whereas, "gender differences" refer to distinctions attributed by society.[237] Here is an instance where matters of terminology are plunged immediately into matters of belief and ideology. The explanation of "gender differences" in communications means distinctions

between men and women primarily in terms of societal process and socialization pressures. "Sex differences" proposes a biological, even socio-biological explanation. It is Breakwell's contention that these labels carry with them undercurrents of implications for action which might bring about changes in the differences between men and women. It is her opinion that 'gender difference' is ultimately malleable, open to large-scale eradication. The 'sex difference' conversely, is a biological imperative, irreversible and, "what's more, its reversal would be considered undesirable in the existing patriarchal domination".[238]

It is evident from the textual deconstruction of the "Oprah" show (chapter four), that Dr. Tannen initially accomplishes two objectives in her quest to convey her social beliefs:

a) she establishes what the differences in gender communication are; and,

b) she states why those differences exist by offering acceptable explanations for the truth they create.

Dr. Tannen's messages contain shifts between the description and explanation of gender communication differences with consummate ease. What is a description of conversational differences at one level becomes an explanation of its differences at the next. In her explanations, Tannen often alludes to the psychological differences in gender to explain why there should be differences in male/female ways of communicating with one another (i.e., "community versus contest", where Tannen explains why males dominate in social roles which have power or social standing); or the anthesis, why in our culture, social stereotyping produces distinct psychological characteristics in each gender (i.e., "independence versus rapport"). Perhaps the reason why stereotyping survives is because it is a product of a social structure which continues and in which it serves a valuable purpose.[239] Ashmore (1986) postulates, as Tannen supports, that social beliefs about the psychological differences between men and women act to reify the gulf between the sexes.

This researcher investigated several studies in attempts to evaluate Tannen's media popularity, i.e., beyond her theoretical discourse and style; what distinguishes Dr. Deborah Tannen from many of her professional colleagues. Conrad Lodziak's The Power of Television: A Critical Appraisal (1986) noted the research of critical media theorist Stuart Hall. He contends that in achieving the ideological phenomenon of "hegemony", the dominant beliefs are modified without compromising the essential interests of dominant groups, to incorporate some populist sentiments. Dr. Tannen's information supports Hall's claim, for it does not, in any way confront, or threaten, the existing dominant ideologies. Conversely, her suggestions for comprehending gender differences in communication provides a conservative function in that it maintains the present status quo. What she does "suggest"[240] with her messages is that recognizing and comprehending the differences between genders raises one's level of awareness, and allows individuals to consider, comprehend, and hopefully modify their style of speaking. It is through this process that Tannen hopes individuals will improve their interpersonal relationships. Tannen's findings are a product of an ongoing history of relations between men and women that generates a polemical context within which individual men and women contextualize their identities and shape their actions.

Unlike theorists M.S. Horner (1970)[241] or C. Dowling (1982)[242] whose explanations of women's actions actually generated a new social belief, what Tannen's information in gender communications does is to identify, define, and explain the existing popular conceptions; her theories are accepted, popularized, and used to sustain the dominant discourse. Because her findings do fit easily into the existing conceptual schemata, people accept Tannen's messages more readily. More succinctly put, Tannen is in demand as a talk-show guest expert because her messages reinforces the status quo. More pragmatically, what

Deborah Tannen television talk show messages vis a vis gender do is heap fodder on the existing belief systems of today's popular culture.

What Dr. Tannen's discourse does promote, along with notions of enlightenment and tolerance for one another, is a vehicle for extending the parameters, and enriching today's present hegemony within the context of Stuart Hall's definition described herein. In doing so, Tannen creates a fascinating paradox: her ability to win the support of her studio and television audiences, while simultaneously maintaining the power of the dominant groups. However, this is only one facet of Tannen's role as a guest "expert" on "Oprah". Siting Tannen as a TV "therapist" also allows her to turn her academic knowledge into commodities for popular consumption.

5.4 Therapeutic Discourse as a Means to Convert Tannen's Knowledge Into Cultural Commodities

Television and therapy share a common denominator in that they both offer something for everyone, with the capacity to be tailored to meet a variety of requirements and dreams. TV talk shows can transform their participants into experts who become "celebrities" because their narratives are aired nationwide. In their own voices, participants produce the texts of the show, their voices and confessions dispersed through the technology of television. As a distinct strategy of discourse, therapy is recognized as a means of generating narratives by setting in place a sequence of symbolic interpersonal exchanges. In

therapy, the cure is often less important than the process. Strategies of negotiation to assist clients manage problems and emotions prevail over the final cure. Through the vehicle of daytime television talk shows, "self-help" takes on a new dimension. During this inquiry, the terms "community" (an illusionary community created by the host, guests, studio and television audiences), media (television), and therapy (that is, the confessions and testimonies of daytime television talk show participants) have become interwoven and mutually implicating.

Tannen purports that in human communications, "strategies associated with oral tradition place emphasis on shared knowledge and interpersonal relationships between the communicator and the audience". Through the medium of television, the panelists, experts and audience of daytime "Oprah" share many secrets with home audiences. Through personal revelations and confessions by talk show participants - regardless of their position in the discussion - at-home audiences can connect with the televised personalities, for comfort is found in the presence of others who share one's concerns. There is a sense of a community, with the personalities on the program substituting for real human relationships. Hearing others' stories eases the pain of feeling all alone in the world. Whether it is recognition, identification, empathy, or all three, there is type of symbolic bonding that occurs between those who are viewers and those who are studio participants. Tannen (1990)[243] contends that:

> ..the stories we hear and tell in conversation shape our views. Through hearing people tell what happened to others, we form assumptions about the right way to behave. And the ways that women and men talk about events in their lives reflect and create their different worlds.

Telling what is happening in your life and the lives of those who you talk to is an adult version of telling secrets, "the essence of girls' and women's friendships."[244] This

is a phenomena that is highly appealing to TV talk show audience, which is largely comprised of women.[245]

Confession becomes the subject of media programming and its mode of narration. As illustrated earlier on in this essay, problems are narrated through analogies and anecdotes, framed as confessions. Personal advice is sought after and won by individuals who demonstrate a willingness to confess on camera and in public. Studio and at-home television audiences become involved with these media personalities through the identification and/or empathy of their televised confessions. Television provides the venue whereby Tannen can provide this genre of therapy, and in the process TV promotes a significant shift in terms of transforming the very nature of truth thereby produced.

Significantly, through these confessional narratives, the speaker experiences a freedom, or liberation, which is, in itself, therapeutic. There is pleasure in not having to hide something, and being able to talk about what's really on one's mind. In fact, so profuse and prolific are the plethora of confessions from the audience participants on the "Oprah" show that the atmosphere in the television studio takes on the air of a "religious revival": members of the audience come to the microphone to chastise panelist Dan for not taking the time to talk to his wife Elizabeth. "If she wants you to ramble brother, you had better ramble!" This is infotainment at its best! One can hardly hear Dan's response through the din of laughter and audience ovation. Dan calls out to the speaker, "I hear you brother, I hear you!" Another audience participant, proclaiming himself a "Christian man" publicly confesses that, "he has been found guilty of neglecting his wife's needs....

> When I got married, I got comfortable, and I began to neglect her (his wife's) feelings.

This man's recognition, acknowledgment and confession of his problem plays a crucial role in the process of therapy. This practice has come to refer to processes of negotiating and

working through one's social subjectivity.[246] Feeling somewhat exonerated by his confession, this same individual then adopts a virtuous, almost pontifical overtone to his next message. "I agree with what this brother (points to the male member of the audience who advocated "respect" for women) said, that we have to learn how to talk to our women and treat our women better (a resounding ovation from the audience)." Turning to the panelists on stage he contends that, "God gave her to you brother! That's not your enemy, that's your companion, that's your friend..." With this public admission the speaker has not only liberated himself, but therapeutically, by admitting that a problem does exist, he has taken steps in modifying his own situation, as well as offering "advice" or "self-help" to others who have experienced his situation. Psychologists maintain that, for many, it is easier to admit problems publicly - i.e., in front of a live studio and televised audience - than privately. Tannen's concept of "report" talk might well substantiate this claim, particularly in the case of the male speaker just quoted. According to Tannen (1990:76), most men prefer to talk publicly because it preserves their independence.

It is evident from the arguments presented herein that the therapeutic strategy of daytime television talk shows invites its at-home audiences to participate in a number of ways. In itself, the infotainment value of TV talk shows, and viewers' loyalty to these daily formats constitute therapeutic strategies. Simultaneously, in many diverse ways, televised talk shows are tied up with the functioning of consumer culture. Consumerism exists in the content and context of the TV talk show and the lifestyle images it projects, as well as in its metamessages. As alluded to earlier, traditions have been broken. The "confession booth" in the places of worship and the "therapist's couch" has become re-configured as a public event, presented by the technological and signifying conventions of the television apparatus. As illustrated above, the therapeutic function of the confession adopts a new dimension as a "series of discursive positions in relative and unstable hierarchies of competing truths,

powers and judgements."[247] In the context of North American television, such discourses are circulated within networks of consumption and commodity exchange that include guest - celebrities, the host/ess, the studio and television audiences, commercials, as well as the issues for discussion.

Dr Tannen is sited as an expert authority who has the power to hear and interpret the confessions of a television audience. As the talk show's acknowledged "therapist," Tannen's principle role is to listen to the problems of participants, to encourage them to confess, to interpret, define and diagnose the issues-in-question, and then to suggest a cure, or solution. From the layperson's perspective, her recognized expertise in this area of discussion grants her the required credibility to publicly postulate without having her authority questioned.

Commodities advertised in the commercials that segment the "Oprah" show profess to have the ability to transform one's lifestyle, one's taste in food, choice of laundry detergent, etc.; no one actually expects them to fulfil their alleged promises. As White (1992) contends,

> Consumer fulfilment has less to do with any one product than with the narrative fantasies it instigates. The value of advertising is that it sells fantasies as much as it sells the products; in purchasing the product one is also buying a lifestyle image and values that advertisements project.[248]

> The creation of this context enables consumption itself to proliferate even when individual products fail to perform as promised, or implied by the advertisement. Therapeutic ethos, whose ability to generate narrative extends beyond advertising, pervades almost all modes of mass mediated culture that include a significant narrative or interpersonal discourse. The confessional voice has played an important role in American consumer culture.[249]

The therapeutic relations and positions of confession that constitute it, offer the appearance of a stable structure: one talks while the other listens. In addition, the therapeutic relation readily endorses the traditional roles of the parents and siblings. In its current formation, the family is, in turn, enlisted within consumer culture, through its link to the information/ telecommunications culture. All of this becomes apparent through the analysis

of therapeutic discourse on television, explaining one of the dominant discursive practices in contemporary culture.

Over a century and a half ago, in Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville formulated his famous paradox: that in its Constitution and laws the United States had conferred upon its citizens more liberty, more vested right to deviance, than any other polity in history, but that in its actual social behaviour American society has a similarly high and equally unprecedented level of conformity.[250]

The intent of this thesis has been to demonstrate that it is television's daytime texts, whose discourses and dialogue gathers up the poles upon which the tensions and contradictions of conformity and deviance, mediocrity and genius, the collective and the individual operates. On behalf of our collective selves, daytime talk show formats bring deviance, genius, and individuality into the mainstream - sometimes by putting them on display, and sometimes by demonstrating the "how-tos" and why people say what they say and do what they do. Through the medium/agency of television, and the influence of such "celebrities" as Deborah Tannen who influence TV audiences, this genre of discourse becomes the ultimate melting pot device of today's culture, holding a mirror up to individuals, offering ways of comprehending themselves, and thereby contributing to the awareness people have of the world. Is it not possible that the talk show practitioners have, through their choices of experts, participants, and topics developed an instrument of the collective will more subtle than legislation, more visible than the law keepers, and more powerful than democracy itself.

ENDNOTES

1. Lisa Ann Marsoli and Mel Green, Smart Women, Stupid Books: Stop Reading and Learn to Love Losers (Los Angeles: Price, Stern, Sloan, 1987) 1.

2. David Finkle, "The Gospel of the '90s," Redbook January 1992: 48.

3. Glynis M. Breakwell, "Social Beliefs about Gender Differences," The Social Psychological Study of Widespread Beliefs, eds. Colin Fraser and George Gaskell (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1990) 210-211.

4. Ibid., 212.

5. Ibid., 214.

6. Ibid., 215.

7. Robert Bocock, Hegemony (London & New York: Tavistock Publications, 1986) 11.

8. John Fiske, Television Culture (London and New York: Routledge, 1987) 16-18.

9. John Fiske, Reading The Popular (Boston, Mass.: Unwin Hyman, 1989) 1 & 2.

10. Wendy Kaminer, I'm Dysfunctional - You're Dysfunctional (New York and Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1992) 6-9.

11. Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women (Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1978) 2.

12. Eliot Freidson, "Are Professions Necessary?" The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory, ed. Thomas L. Haskall (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980) 8-10.

13. Ibid., 16.

14. Thomas L. Haskell, The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984) xxiv.

15. Magli Sarfatti Larson, "Expertise and Expert Power," The Authority of Experts, ed. Thomas L. Haskell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984) 53.

16. Deborah Tannen, "Linguistics: Did You Hear What I Just Heard?" in "Outposts," The Washington Post, 109:1, 12 October 1986, D3.

17. This is found, in small print, on the front cover of the paperback edition of Deborah Tannen's That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships (New York: Ballantine, 1986).

18. Bestsellers such as David Reuben's, Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Sex* But were Afraid to Ask (New York: Bantam, 1969), or Alex Comfort's The Joy of Sex: A Gourmet Guide to Love Making (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972) are but a few titles that come to mind.

19. The most famous report of all was the A.C. Kinsey et al. report of Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia, Penn: Saunders, 1948); with a follow-up study conducted in 1953, entitled, Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. William H. Masters and Virginia E. Johnson paved the transference of sexual behaviour from the romanticist's view of sex as a procreative measure to sex as a pleasurable activity.

20. Shere Hite, The Hite Report: A Nationwide Study of Female Sexuality (New York: Dell, 1976).

21. Barbara Katz Rothman, Recreating Motherhood: Ideology and Technology in a Patriarchal Society (New York: Norton, 1989) 211.

22. Susan Forward Ph.d and Joan Torres, Men Who Hate Women & The Women Who Love Them (New York: Bantam, 1986) 99-100.

23. Ann Landi, "Smart Women, Foolish Books," Mademoiselle October 1987, Vol. 93: 247.

24. Alexandra Penney's second commercial publication entitled, How To Make Love To Each Other (New York: Putnam's, 1982), based on the popular response to her 1981 book, professes that women and men seem to have different basic concerns about each other: women's intent is to focus on the relationship, while the male's preoccupation is with sex. She encouraged both genders to respond to the other's needs, contending that romance appears to have disappeared with the onset of women's quest for equality.

25. Dale Spender, Man Made Language (London: Pandora, 1990) 142.

26. Steven Carter and Gaily Sokol, Men Who Can't Love: When a Man's Fear Makes Him Run From Commitment (and What a Smart Woman Can Do About It (New York: Berkeley, 1987); Robin Norwood, Women Who Love Too Much: When You Keep Wishing and Hoping He'll Change (New York: Pocket, 1985) 255.

27. Jean Baer, How to Be An Assertive (Not Aggressive) Woman (New York: American Library, 1976) 12.

28. Wendy Simonds, Women and Self-Help Culture: Reading Between the Lines (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992) 145-148.

29. Barbara Gamarekian, "Men. Women. Talk. Talk. Talk. Tank. Talk. Hear? No." The New York Times 23 October 1991.

30. Deborah Tannen, "Linguistics" in "Outpost" The Washington Post 109: 1, 12 October 1986: D3.

31. Deborah Tannen, Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 196.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. According to C. Wright Mills, "The Celebrities," in The Power Elite [London, Oxford, New York, New York: Oxford University Press, (1956)] 71-2, these are individuals where "those who know them so exceed those of whom they know as to require no exact computation."

36. Deborah Tannen, You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation (New York: Ballantine, 1990) 47.

37. Ms. Malka Margolies, Dr. Tannen's publicist at Ballantine first gave these statistics. This was subsequently reconfirmed by Dr. Tannen in a telephone conversation she had with this researcher, from the Centre for Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California, on June 17, 1993 at 6:30 P.M.

38. Lisa Failer, "Writer Hits the Best-Selling Jackpot by Explaining Why." Detroit Free Press 23 May 1991: F1.

39. Deborah Tannen, telephone interview, 17 June 1993.

40. Respective store managers at "The Dartmouth Bookstore," Dartmouth, New Hampshire, and "Coles" Bookstore, Montreal, Quebec, both confirmed that Tannen's books have been properly classified and situated, though I mentioned to them that Tannen took exception to being labelled a "self help" authority. According to Tannen, "self-help" books 'advise'; Tannen claims that she 'suggests' to her audiences.

41. Deborah Tannen, telephone interview, 17 June 1993.

42. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1989) 52.

43. Tannen's doctoral dissertation involved the analysis of an audio-taped, two and one-half hour, Thanksgiving dinner conversation among six friends, (of whom Tannen herself was one participant). Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends (Norwood: Ablex, 1984).

44. Wallace Chafe enlisted Tannen to assist him with an experiment he conducted on 40 individuals - 20 American subjects, and 20 Greeks. They were instructed to view a seven minute, soundless film entitled, "The Pear Tree", and were subsequently called upon, individually, to evaluate the text, both orally and in writing. Tannen's work is an analysis of that data.

45. Deborah Tannen, "Spoken and Written Narrative in English and Greek" in Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse Processes ed. by Deborah Tannen, (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1984) 23.

46. Ibid., 24.

47. Ibid., 23.

48. Deborah Tannen, Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1984).

49. Deborah Tannen, That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships (New York: Ballantine, 1986) 121; and Deborah Tannen (1984) 21.

50. Ibid., 22.

51. Ibid., 26.

52. Ibid., 152.

53. Ibid., 92, and Deborah Tannen. Perspectives On Silence, ed. by Deborah Tannen and Muriel Savill-Troike, (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1985) xi.

54. This quotation is taken from p.97 of Perspectives On Silence (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1985), however, the identical quote appears on p.157 of Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1984) with one slight modification, the terminology has been substituted. This is one illustration that demonstrates how Tannen quotes and paraphrases from one text to another.

55. Ibid., 107.

56. Deborah Tannen, Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery In Conversational Discourse (Cambridge, Mass: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 13.

57. Ibid., 17.

58. Ibid., 29.

59. Ibid., 48.

60. Ibid., 166.

61. Ibid., 109.

62. Ibid.

63. Deborah Tannen, That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships (New York: Ballantine, 1986) 134.

64. Ibid., 114.

65. Ibid., 116.

66. Ibid., 128.

67. Ibid., 134.

68. Ibid., 161.

69. Ibid., 160.

70. Ibid., 163.

71. Ibid., 16.

72. Ibid., 18.

73. Deborah Tannen, You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversations (New York: Ballantine, 1990) 42.

74. Ibid., 47.

75. Ibid., 52.

76. Ibid., 63.

77. Ibid., 68.

78. Ibid., 77.

79. Ibid., 95.

80. Ibid., 107.

81. Ibid., 152.

82. Ibid., 158.

83. Ibid., 162.

84. Ibid., 195.

85. Ibid., 210.

86. Ibid., 241.

87. Ibid., 269.

88. Ibid., 287.

89. Sonya-Live, PBS @ 1:00 PM weekdays, devoted to prominent social issues. where Dr. Deborah Tannen guest appeared on Monday 14 Oct.1991.

90. PBS Charlie Rose Show, where Dr. Deborah Tannen guest appeared on 22 June 1993 and discussed a variety of topics, including the public's perception of Hillory Clinton.

91. Dr. Tannen sent a list of these publications along with her C.V. in March 1992.

92. Deborah Tannen, "Linguistics: When You Shouldn't Tell It Like It Is," in "Outpost" The Washington Post 1 March 1987, Vol. 110: D3.

93. Ibid.

94. Deborah Tannen, "Sex, Lies and Conversation" in "OutPosts" Washington Post, 24 June 1990, Vol. 113: C3.

95. Deborah Tannen, "Teachers' Classroom Strategies Should Recognize That Men and Women Use Language Differently", The Chronicle of Higher Education 3-40 (19 June 1991): B1 & 3.

96. Ibid.

97. Although this researcher's experience is limited - I have chaired several co-ed administrative meetings for a private day school in Montreal; given a couple of classroom lectures on "media-literacy" at Dawson College, Montreal, Quebec in the spring of 1991, as well as at Concordia University in November 1992. In retrospect, I did not get a sense of what Tannen is describing.

98. Deborah Tannen, "Repetition in Conversation as Spontaneous Formulacity," Text (1987), 7: 3.

99. Deborah Tannen, "Repetition in Conversation as Spontaneous Formulaicity," Text 7-3 (1987): 217.

100. Ibid., 234.

101. Ibid., 236.

102. Ibid.

103. On Friday, October 16th, 1992 I visited the "McGill Book Store", Montreal, where I purchased the last copy of that particular shipment for a friend. From there I went to "Coles" main book store located in downtown Montreal; they were "sold-out" and waiting for another shipment. A visit to "Bibliophile", Montreal revealed the same situation as the previous book store. In November 1992 a visit to "Dartmouth Book store", Dartmouth New Hampshire exposed a free-standing black painted bookshelf, empty of Tannen's books, but featuring a large ad displaying the jacket of "You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation". The section manager claimed that the store could not keep Tannen's books in stock very long, that they had reordered and sold-out countless times.

104. Deborah Tannen, telephone interview, Thursday, 17 June 1993, Stanford, California at 6:30 PM.

105. Anne Kallis, "The Book Centre", Montreal.

106. Managers at "McGill Book Store", "Coles", "Bibliophile," "The Book Center", "Dartmouth Book Store", "Barnes and Nobles" of New York City and Burlington, Vermont were questioned by this researcher. Although they did not have definite sales numbers available, each assured me that "self-help" and "relationships" books are among the most popular items in their stores.

107. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 15.

108. Wendy Simonds, Women and Self-Help Culture: Reading Between the Lines (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992) 35.

109. Ibid., 27-8.

110. Steven Starker, Oracle at the Supermarket (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1989) 152-4.

111. Leonard Wood, "The Gallup Survey: Self-Help Buying Trends," Publishers Weekly 14 October 1988: 33.

112. Ibid., Simonds (1992) 36.

113. Ibid., Dale Spender, (1990) 107-8.

114. James J. Forrest, "Self-Help Books," American Psychologist: Journal of the American Psychological Association 43-7 (July 1988): 599.

115. These are some of Simonds' findings in interviews she conducted with thirty female subjects ("self-help" readers) and five "self-help" editors in New York, from May 1988 until February 1989.

116. Ibid., Simonds (1992) 47.

117. Catherine Belsey, Critical Practice (London England: Methuen, 1980) 59.

118. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 18.

119. Ibid., 297.

120. A "on-line" library computer search was conducted, using "sociofile" and "psychlit", December 1992, Concordia University, Montreal.

121. Jenny Diski, "Crosstalk," New Statesman and Society 7 June 1991: 44-45.

122. "Genderlects: Books and Art," The Economist 20 July 1991: 107.

123. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1984) 130.

124. Sean French, "Diary," The New Statesman and Society 31 May 1992: 60-61.

125. Ibid., David Finkle, (January 1992): 48. A telephone call was placed to Ms. Catherine Censor, who serves as an editor at Redbook 8 October 1992 in the hope of questioning Mr. Finkle, who is a free-lance journalist, about his reference to Dr. Tannen as a "guru of the '90s'. A fax was forwarded to Ms. Censor the following day with the information that I required from Mr. Finkle. A copy of this correspondence was mailed to his address in the hope that he would respond. No answer came.

126. Annette M. Fisher, "Non-Fiction," Best Sellers June 1986, Vol. 46-3: 103.

127. Genevieve Stuttaford, "PW Forecasts," Publisher's Weekly 6 December 1985.

128. Beryl Lieff Benderly, "Failed Conversations," Psychology Today 20 (April 1986).

129. Christian Century, Vol. 103, 21 May 1986: 531.

130. Martin Malone, "Book Reviews: Culture, Leisure and Language," Contemporary Sociology 20 -4-6 (July 1986): 575-576.

131. Peter M. Gardiner, "Book Reviews," American Anthropologist 88, 1-2 (June 1986): 509-510.

132. "Culture, Leisure, and Language," Contemporary Sociology 15, 4-6, ed.Barbara Laslett (July, 1986): 576-577.

133. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1986) 70.

134. Elizabeth Stone, "Are You A Talk Hog, A Shouter or a Mumbler," MS , January 1986: 88-90.

135. Dr. Peyton is quoted in Barbara Gamarekian, "Men. Women. Talk. Talk. Talk. Talk. Talk. Hear? No." The New York Times, 19 June 1991: C8.

136. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 69.

137. Ibid., 62.

138. Ibid., 63.

139. Ibid., 68.

140. Ibid., 17.

141. Ibid.

142. Ibid., 18.

143. Ibid.

144. Ibid., The New York Times 19 June 1991: C1.

145. Copies of these two tapes are available upon request.

146. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1989) 173.

147. Ibid.

148. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 88.

149. Ibid.

150. Ibid., 105.

151. Ibid., 113.

152. Ibid.

153. Dr. Tannen, telephone interview, 17 June 1993; and cited in several press reports and journals such as The New York Times Wednesday 19 June 1991: C1&8; The Detroit Free Press Thursday 23 May 1991, Section 1: F3&7; Redbook, February 1993.

154. Leafing through some of the talk show data collected, reveals such titles as "Where do talk shows find these people?" The Gazette, (Montreal), 1 August 1985; "Steinem on Shirley is an hour of great TV." The Gazette, (Montreal), 19 February 1992; "Oprah's Opera", Vogue, 10 March 1991; "Mornings on TV: Fine-Tuning a Sweet Formula." New York Times, 21 January 1990; and the list goes on.

155. Mimi White, Tele-Advising: Therapeutic Discourse in American Television, (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992) 34.

156. Teresa Kochmar Imbues, "Your Therapy Could be Watching Dallas or Dynasty", TV Guide 14 December 1985: 14-18.

157. Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 35.

158. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 65.

159. Margaret Morse, "Talk, Talk, Talk: Margaret Morse Examines the Space of Discourse in Television News, Sportcasts, Talk Shows and Advertising," Screen (1983) 26: 2, 5.

160. Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 14.

161. Louise Bernikow, "Is TV a Pal - or a Danger - for Lonely People?" TV Guide 25 October 1986: 4-6.

162. Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 34.

163. This show occurred on Monday, October 14, 1991 at 1:00 P.M. The Senate hearings had been televised throughout that weekend, and one day prior to a televised summation and vote taken by the US Senate.

164. Richard and Dianne Mincer, The Talk Show Book (New York, New York: Facts on File Publication, 1982) ix.

165. Ibid., 120-1.

166. Ibid., 16.

167. Ibid.

168. Ibid., 17.

169. Ibid., 4.

170. Elayne Rapping, The Looking Glass World of Nonfiction TV (Boston Mass.: South End Press, 1987) 132.

171. Ibid., Walter Goodman (21 January 1990) 2:1.

172. Ralph Tyler, "If Talk Is Cheap, Big Apple Must Be Bargain Heaven." Variety 19-25 April 1989: 174.

173. Ibid.

174. Ibid., Elayne Rapping (1987) 134.

175. Richard Ziglin, "Video: And Now, Nice-Guy Talk Hosts: Two Smiling Hopefuls Are The Latest Challenge To Carson." People 9 January 1989: 74.

176. Steven Stark, "Hereee's Johnny - Whoever He Is: The Tonight Show Thrives On Its Host's Inscrutability," New York Times 27 September 1987: F33.

177. Marilyn J. Matelski, Daytime Television Programming (Boston: Focal Press, 1991) 13.

178. Ibid., Elayne Rapping (1987) 133.

179. Ibid., 17.

180. Ibid., Ralph Tyler (19-25 April 1989) 174.

181. Johnette Howard, "Where Do The Talk Shows Find These People?" The Gazette, (Montreal) 1 August 1992: E7.

182. Dr. Joyce Brothers, "How TV Adds Spice to Your Life," (US) TV Guide 10 February 1990; Dr. Willard Gaylin, "Prime Time On a Couch:..." (US) TV Guide 4 October 1986; Ibid., Mimi White, (1992) 11.

183. Edgar E. Willis and Camille D'Arienzo, Writing Scripts for Television, Radio and Film (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981) 141-2; Ibid., Marilyn J. Matelski (1991) 15.

184. Emily Prager, "Oprah's Opera," Vogue 10 March 1987: 45.

185. Ibid., 45 & 48.

186. Ibid., Dr. Deborah Tannen, telephone interview, 17 June 1993.

187. Ibid.

188. Ron Givens, "Talking People Into Talking: As Interview Shows Get Hot, It's Bookers Who Sweat," Newsweek 17 July 1989: 44-45.

189. Joanne Kaufman, "Hello, Can You Be A Talk-Show Guest?" New York Times 31 May 1987, Sec. 2: 25 & 31.

190. Ibid., Ron Givens (17 July 1989) 45.

191. Ibid., Emily Prager (10 March 1987) 45.

192. Ibid., Johnette Howard (1 August 1992) E7.

193. Ibid., Ralph Tyler (19-25 April 1989) 175.

194. Ibid., Ron Givens (17 July 1989) 45.

195. "I Hear America Chatting: Television, Radio Broadcasting," The New Republic (1988) 4.

196. Ibid.

197. Ibid., David Finkle (January 1992) 48.

198. Ibid., Richard and Dianne Mincer (1982) 24.

199. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 153.

200. Ibid., Johnette Howard (1 August 1992) E7.

201. Beverley T. Watkins, "Experts From Academe: Increasing Numbers of Professors Are Appearing In The Media," The Chronicle Of Higher Education (1984) 25.

202. Ibid.

203. In addition to Oprah's "How To Communicate With Your Spouse"...10080A, research included several viewings of The Charlie Rose Show, PBS, California, 22 June 1993; as well as a live viewing of Sonya-Live, PBS, New York, 12 October 1992.

204. Gary Gumpert and Robert Cathcart, ed. Inter/Media: Interpersonal Communication in a Media World (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979) v.

205. Throughout How To Communicate With Your Mate, Oprah continually refers to Dr. Tannen as "an expert in communications". The credit that appears several times during "air-time" acknowledges her as a "specialist in communications".

206. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1989) 52.

207. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1988) 88.

208. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1986) 61-2.

209. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1984) 103.

210. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 149-187.

211. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1989) 24.

212. Ibid.

213. Evan Blythin and Larry A Samovar, Communicating Effectively On Television (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1985) 44.

214. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1984) 115.

215. Ibid., Richard and Dianne Mincer (1982) 25-30.

216. Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 8.

217. She was quoted in the Detroit Free Press (23 May 1991:7F) as claiming that You Just Don't Understand was not intended as a "self-help book". In a telephone interview (17 June 1993) with this researcher, she restated her dismay at being classified as a "self help" author, though she appreciates that this "non-fiction" text has to be categorized for marketing purposes. Her wish (though infeasible) is to have this latest best-seller labelled "just a book".

218. Julius and Barbara Fast, Talking Between The Lines: How We Mean More Than We Say (New York: Viking, 1979).

219. Dr. James C. Dobson, Ph.d., Straight Talk: What Men Need To Know, What Women Should Understand (Vancouver: Word Publishing, 1991).

220. Lillian Glass, Ph.d., He Says: She Says: Closing the Communication Gap Between the Sexes (New York, N.Y.: G.P. Putman's Sons., 1992).

221. Ibid.

222. Donna Haraway, "A Manifesto for Cyborgs," Coming to Terms: Feminism, Theory, Politics ed. Elizabeth Weed (New York: Routledge, 1989) 173-204; Mimi Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 22.

223. Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality Vol. 1, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978) 61-62.

224. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1989) 17.

225. Ibid., 29.

226. Ibid.

227. Ibid., Elayne Rapping (1987) 135.

228. Joel Kovel, The Age of Desire (New York: Bantam, 1981).

229. Van Gordon Sauter, "In Defense of Tabloid TV," TV Guide 5 August 1989: 4.

230. Conrad Lodziak, The Power of Television: A Critical Appraisal (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986); and John B. Thompson, Ideology and the Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication (Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1990).

231. Ibid., John B. Thompson (1990) 56.

232. Elayne Rapping, "The Magic World of Nonfiction Television," Monthly Review December 1983: 30-31.

233. Ibid., Conrad Lodziak (1986).

234. Robert Cluett, "Telegenic Colloquies: Paradigms of Society In The TV Talk Show;" Katherine Usher Henderson and Joseph Anthony Mazzeo, Meanings of the Medium Perspectives On Art Of Television (New York: Praeger, 1990) 152.

235. Ibid., Glynis M. Breakwell (1990) 210.

236. Ibid.

237. J. Archer and B. Lloyd, Sex and Gender (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1982).

238. Ibid., Glynis M. Breakwell (1990).

239. R.D. Ashmore, F.K Del Boca and A.T. Wohlers, "Gender Stereotypes," The Social Psychology of Female-Male Relations eds. R.D.Ashmore and F.K. Del Boca (New York: Academic Press, 1986).

240. Tannen contends that her popular publications are not manuals on "how-to", rather, they offer suggestions.

241. M.S. Horner is a researcher who developed the theory of why females fear success. "Femininity and Successful Achievement: A Basic Inconsistency," Feminine Personality and Conflict ed. J. Bardwick et al. (Belmont, C.A.: Brooks/Cole) 1970.

242. C. Dowling, The Cinderella Complex: Women's Hidden Fear Of Independence (Glasgow, Scotland: Fontana, 1982).

243. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 176.

244. Ibid., Deborah Tannen (1990) 97.

245. Ibid., Elayne Rapping (1987) 134.

246. Judith Frank, M.SW., a prominent Montreal psychotherapist, contends that the process of therapy far outweighs the cure. It is not the act, but the perception of the act that matters, and this is what therapy addresses.

247. Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 1-24.

248. Ibid., Mimi White (1992) 13.

249. Ibid.

250. Ibid., Robert Cluett (1990) 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christian Century. 103: 21-28 May 1986: 531.

"Genderlects: Books and Art." The Economist 20 July 1991:107.

"I Hear America Chatting: Television, Radio Broadcasting." The New Republic 3 October 1988: 4.

Archer, J., and B. Lloyd. Sex and Gender Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.

Ashmore, R.D., and F.K. Del Boca, and A. T. Wohlers, "Gender Stereotypes". In The Social Psychology of Female-Male Relations Eds. R.D. Ashmore and F. K. Del Boca. New York: Academic Press.

Baer, Jean. How To Be An Assertive (Not Aggressive) Woman. New York: American Library, 1976.

Belsey Catherine. Critical Practice. London: Methuen, 1980.

Benderly, Beryl Lieff. "Failed Conversations." Psychology Today, 1986.

Berne, Eric. Games People Play. New York: Ballantine Books, 1973.

Blythin, Evan and Larry A. Samovar. Communicating Effectively On Television. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1985.

Bocock, Robert. Hegemony. New York: Tavistock Publications, 1986.

Boone, Mike. "Steinem on Shirley is hour of great TV." The Gazette. [Montreal] 19 February 1992, B:1.

Breakwell, Glynis M. "Social Beliefs about Gender Differences", in The Social Psychological Study of Widespread Beliefs. In Colin Fraser and George Gaskell (Eds.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Brothers, Dr. Joyce. "How TV Adds Spice to Your Life." TV Guide. (USA), 10 February 1990.

Carter, Severn and Julia Sokol. Men Who Can't Love: When a Man's Fear Makes Him Run From Commitment (and What a Smart Woman Can Do About It). New York: Berkeley, 1987.

Cluett, Robert. "Telegenic Colloquies: Paradigms of Society in the TV Talk Show." In Katherine Usher Henderson, and Joseph Anthony Mazzeo (Eds.), Meanings of the Medium: Perspectives on Art of Television. New York: Praeger, 1990.

Comfort, Alex. The Joy of Sex: A Gourmet Guide to Love Making. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.

Crout, Teresa Kochmar. "Your Therapy Could be Watching Dallas or Dynasty." TV Guide. (USA), 25 October 1986: 4-6.

Davis, Kenneth C. The Paperbacking of America: Two-Bit Culture. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984.

Diski, Jenny. "Crosstalk." New Statesman and Society 7 June 1991: 44-45.

Dobson, Dr. James C. Straight Talk: What Men Need to Know, What Women Should Understand. Vancouver: Word Publishing, 1991.

Dowling, Collette. The Cinderella Complex:Women's Hidden Fears of Independence. Glasgow: Fontana, 1982.

Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Deirdre English. For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women. Garden City: Anchor Press/ Doubleday, 1978.

Failer, Lisa. "Writer Hits the Best-Selling Jackpot by Explaining 'Why'." Detroit Free Press. 23 May 1991, F:1.

Fast, Julius and Barbara. Talking Between The Lines: How We Mean More Than We Say. New York: Viking, 1979.

Finkle, David. "The Gospel of the '90s" Redbook January 1992: 48-52.

Fisher, Annette M. "Non-Fiction" Best Sellers. 3 June 1986, 48: 103.

Fiske, John. Television Culture. New York: Routledge, 1987.

Fiske, John. Reading the Popular. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Forrest, James J. "Self-Help Books." American Psychologist: Journal of the American Psychological Association (7 July 1988) 43:599.

Forward, Dr. Susan, and Joan Torres. Men Who Hate Women & The Women Who Love Them. New York: Bantam, 1986.

Freidson, Eliot. "Are Professions Necessary?". The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory. Ed. Thomas L. Haskall. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980, 8 -10.

French, Sean. "Diary." The New Statesman and Society. 31 May 1992: 60-61.

Sonya/Live. Vermont ETV/PBS, 14 October 1991.

Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality. New York: Pantheon, 1978.

Gamarekian, Barbara. "Men. Women. Talk. Talk. Talk. Talk.Talk. Hear? No." The New York Times. [New York] 19 June 1991, C: 1 & 8.

Gardiner, Peter M. "Book Reviews". American Anthropologist 1-2 June 1986, 88: 575-576.

Gaylin, Dr. Willard. "Prime Time On a Couch:..." TV Guide. (USA), 4 October 1986.

Givens Ron. "Talking People Into Talking: As Interview Shows Get Hot, It's Bookers Who Sweat." Newsweek Magazine. 17 July 1989: 44-45.

Glass, Dr. Lillian. He Says: She Says: Closing the Communication Gap Between the Sexes. New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1992.

Goodman, Fred. "Oprah and Madonna and the Companies They Keep." Working Woman. December 1991, 52-56.

Goodman, Walter. "Mornings on TV: Fine-Tuning a Sweet Formula." In The New York Times. 21 January 1990, sec. 2, P:1

Gross, Martin L. The Psychological Society. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Gumpert, Gary and Robert Cathcart, eds. Inter/Media: Interpersonal Communication in a Media World. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Haraway, Donna. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs." Coming to Terms: Feminism Theory, Politics. Ed. Elizabeth Weed. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Haskell, Thomas L. The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory. Bloomington: Indiana University Press,1984.

Hite, Shere. The Hite Report: A Nationwide Study of Female Sexuality. New York: Dell, 1976.

Horner, M.S. "Femininity and Successful Achievement: A Basic Inconsistency." Feminine Personality and Conflict. Eds. J. Bardwick et al. Belmont: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Howard, Johnette. "Where Do The Talk Shows Find These People?" The Gazette. [Montreal], 1 August 1992, E:7.

Katz, Barbara Rothman. Recreating Motherhood: Ideology and Technology in the Patriarchal Society. New York: Norton, 1989.

Kaufman, Joanne. "Hello, Can You Be A Talk-Show Guest?" The New York Times. 31 May 1987, Sec. 2: 25 & 31.

Kinsey, A.C. et al. Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948.

Kovel, Joel. The Age of Desire. New York: Bantam, 1981.

Landi, Ann. "Smart Women, Foolish Books." Mademoiselle. October, 1987: 93.

Larson, Magli Sarfatti. "Expertise and Expert Power". In The Authority of Experts. Ed. Thomas L. Haskell. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984, 53.

Laslett, Barbara, (Ed). "Culture, Leisure, and Language" Contemporary Sociology 15 (4-6 July 1986) 576-577.

Lodziak, Conrad. The Power of Television: A Critical Appraisal. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.

Malone, Martin. "Book Reviews: Culture, Leisure and Language". Contemporary Sociology. (4-6, July 1986) 575-576.

Maltz, Maxwell. Psycho-Cybernetics. New York: Pocket Books, 1969.

Marsoli, Lisa Ann and Mel Green. Smart Women, Stupid Books: Stop Reading and Learn to Love Losers. Los Angeles: Price Stern Sloan, 1987.

Masters, William H. and Virginia E. Johnson. Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953.

Matelski, Marilyn J. Daytime Television Programming. Boston: Focal Press, 1991.

Mills, C. Wright. "The Celebrities" The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

Mincer, Richard and Dianne. The Talk Show Book. New York: Facts on File Publication, 1982.

Morse, Margaret. "Talk, Talk, Talk: Margaret Morse Examines the Space of Discourse in Television News, Sportcasts, Talk Shows and Advertising." Screen 26 (1983): 2-5.

Newman, Mildred and Bernard Berkowitz. How To Be Your Own Best Friend. New York: Ballantine, 1971.

Norwood, Robin. Women Who Love Too Much: When You Keep Wishing and Hoping He'll Change. New York: Pocket, 1985.

Peck, M. Scott. The Road Less Travelled: A New Psychology of Love, Traditional Values, and Spiritual Growth. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Penny, Alexandra. How To Make Love To Each Other. New York: Putnam, 1982.

Prager, Emily. "Oprah's Opera". Vogue. 10 March 1987: 45 & 48.

Rapping, Elayne."The Magic World of Nonfiction Television". Monthly Review. December 1983.

Rapping, Elayne. The Looking Glass World of Nonfiction TV. Boston: South End Press, 1987.

Reuben, David. Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Sex* But Were Afraid to Ask. New York: Bantam, 1969.

Sauter, Van Gordon. "In Defense of Tabloid TV." TV Guide. (USA), 5 August 1984: 4.

Simonds, Wendy. Women and Self-Help Culture: Reading Between the Lines. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992.

Spender, Dale. Man Made Language. London: Pandora, 1990.

Stark, Steven. "Hereee's Johnny - Whoever He Is: The Tonight Show Thrives On Its Host's Inscrutability." New York Times. [New York] 27 September 1987, F:33.

Starker, Steven. Oracle At The Supermarket. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1989.

Stone, Elizabeth. "Are You A Talk Hog, A Shouter or a Mumbler". MS Magazine. January 1986, 88-90.

Stuttaford, Genevieve. "PW Forecasts". Publishers Weekly. 6 December 1985.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk Among Friends. Norwood: Ablex, 1984.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. "Spoken and Written Narrative in English and Greek." Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse Process. Ed. Deborah Tannen. Norwood: Ablex, 1984.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. Telephone interview, June 17, 1993 @ 6:20 PM, Stanford, California.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse. Cambridge, Mass.: University of Cambridge Press, 1989.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. New York: Ballantine, 1990.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d "Linguistics" in "Outposts". The Washington Post.(Washington) 12 October 1986: 109.

Tannen, Deborah. Ph.d. That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships. New York: Ballantine, 1986.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d., and Muriel Savill-Troike, Eds. Perspectives On Silence. Norwood: Ablex, 1985.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. "Linguistic: When You Shouldn't Tell It Like It Is." In "Outposts," The Washington Post. [Washington] 1 March 1987, 110, D:3.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. "Sex, Lies and Conversation". In "Outposts", Washington Post. 24 June 1990, 113,C: 3.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. "Teachers' Classroom Strategies Should Recognize that Men and Women Use Language Differently." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 37, (19 June 1991): 40.

Tannen, Deborah, Ph.d. "Repetition in Conversation as Spontaneous Formulaicity." Text. (1987), 7:3.

Thompson, John B. Ideology and the Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

Tyler, Richard. "If Talk Is Cheap, Big Apple Must Be Bargain Heaven." Variety 19-25 April 1989: 174.

Warner, Sam Bass Jr. The Private City: Philadelphia: Philadelphia in Three Periods Of Its Growth. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1968.

Watkins, Beverley T. "Experts From Academe: Increasing Numbers of Professors Are Appearing In the Media." The Chronicle of Higher Education. (7 May 1984): 25.

White, Mimi. Tele-Advising: Therapeutic Discourse in American Television. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Willis, Edgar E., and Camille D'Arienzo. Writing Scripts for Television, Radio and Film. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.

Wood, Leonard. "The Gallup Survey: Self-Help Buying Trends." Publishers Weekly. 14 October 1988: 233-34.

Ziglin, Richard. "Video: And Now, Nice-Guy Talk Hosts: Two Smiling Hopefuls Are the Latest Challenge To Carson." People. 9 January 1989: 74.