A Comparative Study of Linguistic Features in Gender Communication in Moroccan televised Political Panels

Une étude comparative des caractéristiques linguistiques dans la communication du genre dans les panneaux politiques télévisés marocains

SADOUK LAILA

Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences , Fez

Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University , Morocco

laila.sadouk@usmba.ac.ma

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine whether Moroccan men and women communicate differently. The current study seeks to produce a report on face-to-face communication in MED1 TV's broadcast political interviews. To determine the variations in the usage of linguistic elements such as hedges, intensifiers, super polite forms between men and women, data was obtained by recording and transcribing excerpts from two interviews. According to the findings of the study, there are no differences between men and women in the use of linguistic characteristics in their communication. In addition, the results indicate that the usage of linguistic elements is influenced by other variables, such as the skill of the participants in a particular location and context of interaction. This research is limited to describing gender communication in a certain formal setting. The study suggests that language behavior related with gender stereotypes can be challenged if such behaviors are investigated in a variety of contexts.

Keywords: Communication, Gender difference, Political Interviews, Linguistic features, Linguistic Behaviors, Stereotypes

Résumé

L'objectif de cette étude est de déterminer si les hommes et les femmes marocains communiquent différemment. L'étude actuelle cherche à produire un rapport sur la communication en face à face dans les interviews politiques diffusées par MED1 TV. Pour déterminer les variations dans l'utilisation des éléments linguistiques tels que les hausses, les intensificateurs, les formes super polies entre les hommes et les femmes, les données ont été obtenues en enregistrant et en transcrivant des extraits de deux interviews. Selon les résultats de l'étude, il n'y a pas de différences entre les hommes et les femmes dans l'utilisation des caractéristiques linguistiques dans leur communication. En outre, les résultats indiquent que l'utilisation des éléments linguistiques est influencée par d'autres variables, telles que la compétence des participants dans un lieu et un contexte d'interaction particuliers. Cette recherche se limite à la description de la communication entre les sexes dans un certain cadre formel. L'étude suggère que les comportements linguistiques liés aux stéréotypes de genre peuvent être remis en question si ces comportements sont étudiés dans une variété de contextes.

Mots-clés : Communication, Différence de genre, Interviews politiques, Caractéristiques linguistiques, Comportements linguistiques, Stéréotypes.

1 – Introduction

Many researchers have found disparities in gender communication between men and women. The current study aims to investigate the differences in the use of linguistic elements by men and women, as well as the purpose of such utilization in gendered communication in a formal communicative situation.

Tannen (2001) claims in her book that conversational approaches of men and women have different sets of norms and explanations of communication, and that cross gender communication may be compared to cross culture communication, which is prone to disputes. Gender communication may be defined as the process through which people socialize, build, and maintain their relationships. Men and women communicate differently in terms of form, subject, substance, and usage.

Different communication styles, such as debating vs. relating, reporting versus establishing rapport, or being competitive versus cooperative, characterize interactions between men and women. Men want quick fixes when it comes to addressing problems and offering advice, but women are socialized to be the ones who preserve relationships via open communication. According to research by Coates (1986), when women talk, they tend to stick to a single issue for a long period and reveal more about their own lives. Men, on the other hand, are often heard bragging about how much more knowledgeable they are than women and discussing their intimate sentiments and connections. Most of the time, they'll shift gears and go on to something fresh and informative, all while trying to cut down on their chatter overall.

Austin (1998), Coates (2015), Fishman (2019), Lakoff (1973), Tannen (1993) have shown that men and women communicate differently. In other words, women and men adopt different linguistic behaviors to transmit messages in a specific conversational context. For instance, the use of specific linguistic features by women (like hedges, tag questions, intensifiers, color terms, super polite forms etc). Those linguistic features were claimed to make her language sound "like a woman" because and according to West (1987) a woman is assigned the gender she has to display; she has to "do it". West and Zimmeramn argued that:

> "Gender is something that humans created. As humans, we have categorized and defined many aspects of life. If someone was not in favor of their gender role or did something that was not deemed "correct" for that gender this person would be committing an act of social deviance." (West ,1987, p. 127)

This is to say those women were assigned codes and constructions during childhood that are considered the foundation of everyday activities regardless of the context (intimate, professional). I argue that West and Zimmerman's notion of "gender doing" could find its validity just to a certain very young age. In other words, when we start growing, we tend to go against rules and guidelines given to us by "indicators," as West and Zimmerman called them. We tend to find our appropriate comforting box, adopt the social identity (e.g. sexual orientation) we feel we are, and communicate this identity via a dynamic discourse without feeling imprisoned by "biased approaches" such as femininity or masculinity. Same argue goes for the use of language, West and Zimmerman argued that the child is assigned even the type of language, and if men didn't respect the "norms", they are accused of being "effeminate", i.e that person is seen as a female and vice versa for girls. They simply see it as "irrespective of genital markers". Thus, Men and women communicate differently regarding style, issue, content, and use (Kendall, 2001). What if we take a professional setting as politics? Will women speak "like a woman," or her gender will be as fluid as the setting requires?

1.1. Research Questions

Question 1: In what ways do men and women communicate in various ways based on the language they use?

Question 2. How do linguistic characteristics relate to gender in conversation?

1.2. Objectives

(1) To find out whether men and women differ in their use of language in gendered interactions.

(2) The second goal is to dig into the function of gender-specific language traits.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Over 105 gender communication differences are stated by Glass (1992) in her book, and she comes to the conclusion that men speak louder than women and do not talk about their private lives, whereas women talk more about their private lives; these results are related to the results of Coates's research, which was conducted in the same time period (1986). In addition to this, she said that women tend to increase the pitch of their voices and talk slowly and monotonously, while males tend to speak loudly in order to demonstrate their authority. According to the other findings, women tend to ask less questions during conversations, but

males have a tendency to interrupt more often. Additional gender inequalities among Cantonese speaking youngsters were demonstrated by Tse et al. (2002). They listened to the children's utterances as they were engaged in free play and watched youngsters aged 3 to 5. He discovered a significant gender difference in the syntactic distinctions that exist between girls and boys.

Numerous explanations of the role that language plays in gender communication may be found in the domain of sociolinguistics. According to Zimmerman and West (1975), males are characterized as having speaking styles of interaction that are competitive and challenging, whereas females are characterized as having speaking styles of interaction that are cooperative, facilitative, and smooth. This finding is consistent with a significant amount of research that has been conducted on the topic of language and gender. Their approaches focus mostly on the characteristics of the relationships they have with other people. They generally communicate in a courteous way, avoid fights, use more hedges, and as a supporting feedback they use minimum answers in communication. Additionally, in the construction of the floor for conversation, they engage in dialogue, they cooperate. On the other hand, it is important to note that conversation, in general, avoids both cooperative and competitive elements, and it must, by definition, contain at least some degree of collaboration as well as some level of rivalry among the speakers (Cameron, 1998).

The differences in the ways men and women use language may be rather subtle and are impacted by a variety of factors that act as mediators (Leaper and Ayres, 2007). Because language both reflects and transmits the differences in society, it should not be difficult to locate the gender inequalities that are reflected in language in the various societies. The difference in gender is not just an indicator of the speeches, but also of the varied ways in which people of different genders live their lives and the views they have. Leaper and Ayres (2007) discovered that the language of college students, in particular, is inherently parallel. They also discovered that specific contextual and conversational moderators illuminate the case of variations in communication between men and women.

According to the findings of the research conducted by McMillan and colleagues (1977), males are more likely to interrupt often than females are. However, when they are speaking with one another in a cross-cultural setting, women are more likely to interrupt than males. Women tend to communicate using a style that emphasizes cooperation, while males are more prone to establish power dynamics. According to Tannen (1990), women often utilize words of address to encourage their speaker, such as hmm, smiling, nodding, and uh huh.

The Meta Analysis of Leaper and Ayres (2007) has investigated previous description of men and women differences using a series of representatives, as well as gender of a group, size of group, familiarity of participants and interview setting. They observed both language creation and perception studies. The results of the study suggest that naturally men are more confident and talkative than women. These findings spread uncertainty on earlier conclusion about men and women language explained above. Considering on mediating variables, the gender effects were commonly changed. For example, in non-special communication men were more talkative, whereas women converse more with classmates, in parent children relations and with partners.

According to the findings of Shen (1997)'s research, males engage more than women in conversations pertaining to love, politics, and economics. Men tend to keep the floor for longer periods of time, speak more often on social issues, take longer turns, and do so with greater self-assurance. Women, on the other hand, are kind and encouraging, but in some contexts, like the home, they might be more self-assured. A research on conversational assertiveness found that when there were more male participants present, males were more competitive and expressed more traits. This was particularly true in situations when there were more male participants. Women are often relegated to the position of listener when males seem to be more difficult to communicate with.

Women are mostly responsible for establishing and maintaining their intimate relationships (James and Drakish, 1993). In comparison to males, it is always reasonable to anticipate that women will advance to higher positions. In most cases, women are more gracious in their interactions with others and are more charitable. In addition, women had a greater expectation than men that men would reveal their own sentiments when it came to matters of interpersonal relationships.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The qualitative content analysis is the backbone of the current study's methodology. Hedge phrases, the use of intensifiers and super polite forms are some of the linguistic variables that are used to categorize linguistic variables that occur during communication. These characteristics are studied to see whether or not there is a difference in the ways in which men and women make use of these categories.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

The "Dominance theory" proposed by Spender serves as the theoretical foundation for the current investigation (1980). Spender (1980) describes dominance theory as being about a state in which men and women are molded differently by the cultural and language environment in which there is disparity in the allocation of power and position in society.

This idea, which is also known as the "power-based hypothesis," places an emphasis on male superiority and the separation of the sexes. This approach of gender difference in communication is a hypothesis that demonstrates the impact of environment and culture on the speech of men and women in a variety of circumstances or areas. The 'dominance' hypothesis of gender differences focuses on the distribution of power in society and says that women's speech reflects their inferior status. This idea is sometimes referred to as the power theory. It makes possible the investigation of the means through which unequal power relations are maintained in everyday contact.

To comprehend the linguistic characteristics and speech actions that result in a gender difference is the primary focus of this method, which is based on the core notion that gender differences are produced by language. Spender is interested in male domination, and he stated that men hold the majority of the authority in society. According to Spender's research from 1980, women are shown in a submissive posture when making speech, while males are depicted in a superior one.

Pamela Fishman's research, which argues that women provide the conversational support work that allows the discussion to start and continue, are included in the work that is done within this approach (Fishman, 1983). This may be accomplished by initiating subjects, asking questions, and generating active listening signals with your body language. Fishman found that males in her experiments were more likely to interrupt their partners, hold the floor for far longer periods of time than women, reject subjects proposed by women, and delay or eliminate back channel assistance. The effectiveness of this method lies in the fact that it provides an explanation of how power is 'done' in talks. For instance, it describes how patriarchy may be acquired and maintained in the private sphere by examining how married couples interact with one another. Children are taught how to speak in a way that is gender-appropriate, which in turn teaches them the 'proper' role they should play in society, which may be either one of two extremes: dominance or submission. This phenomenon can also be used to explain the replication of patriarchy. According to this paradigm, it is possible for women to modify the ways in which they engage with others in order to undermine the power

dynamics that already exist. The fact that the 'dominance' model does not have any provisions for appreciating the manner of communication that is often associated with women has been noted as the primary flaw in the theory. It is considered an indication of surrender or a lack of assertion to employ all of the characteristics that have been identified. The dominance hypothesis is one of the most important reasons for the popularly held notion that women are more courteous than men while having cross-sex interactions. This view is based on the observation that women tend to exert more authority than males. Men have a greater propensity than women have to take the lead role in a discussion. The reflections of women's powerlessness in relation to their social status are shown in the fact that there are less pauses in cross-sex interactions. The "dominance approach" offers a conventionally pessimistic assessment of women's communication, which is a direct result of women's subordination to males in political and cultural spheres. As a result, the shortcomings in women's verbal abilities are linked to the socioeconomic disparities that exist between men and women, in which men's conversational superiority seems to represent the larger political and cultural dominance of males over women (Freeman and McElhinny, 1996). Lakoff (1975) contends that women's ways of speaking are distinct from those of males and that these differences are a reflection of women's disadvantaged standing in society. As a result, the language of women, which is characterized by impotence and tentativeness due to the employment of mitigation and inessential qualifiers, effectively disqualifies women from positions of power and authority. Lakoff's ideas on women's language are broken down into three categories by Freeman and McElhinny (1996). The first idea is that women are able to express themselves forcefully and to speak as an authority. The second category is language that encourages women to talk about trivial subjects. The third category is language that encourages women to talk about serious subjects. Last but not least, language that encourages women to talk more carefully.

In order to evaluate whether or not the statements made by Lakoff (1975) are accurate, different researchers have been experimentally and critically investigated on the aforementioned characteristics. As a consequence of this, many of the assertions were shown to be false. In their study on male dominance in interaction, Zimmerman and West (1975) added the characteristics of interruptions and quiet to the list that was previously presented. They asserted that interruptions are intended to quiet people and that males interrupt women more often than women interrupt men. They also claimed that women interrupt men more frequently than men interrupt women. The study of interruptions also demonstrated that the

topic is more complicated than West and Zimmermann initially believed it to be. West and Zimmermann maintained that interruptions are "a device for exercising power and control in conversation" (p.103), but the research demonstrated that this is not the case.

As was said previously, the dominance theory suggests that the approach to the study of gender is not completely free of its restrictions. Women are represented as "weak, helpless victims of a patriarchy that pushes them to behave in weak, submissive, illogical, or ineffectual ways" according to this theory, which is almost entirely founded on the idea that males hold the dominating position in society (Freeman and McElhinny, 1996). The portrayal of women as being devoid of power, authority, or influence and as being inconsequential members of society is carried out quite well (Uchida, 1998). According to Jaggar (1983), the dominance method "depreciates the amount of power women have achieved in acquiring and reduces the possibility of additional resistance." This view of the dominance approach may be considered as a distortion of reality (p.115).

3.3. Research Participants

The current study adopts qualitative content analysis design. The study has focused on the linguistic practices and linguistic features of Moroccan speakers in a political interviews aired on the Moroccan channel MD1 TV entitled **"دقيقة للقناع 90".** There are three participants in this televised TV show, two journalists and a politician who is the head of a Moroccan Political party. The overall focus of this study is to examine whether gender interfere in the linguistic practices of the speakers in the chosen TV political interview.

Guest :Nabila Mounib : Moroccan Politician , the Head of PSU political party

Journalist: Youssef Balhaissi , a journalist on MD1 TV.

3.4. Data Collection & Research procedure

The data is taken from the Moroccan TV station MD1. The talk was recorded on tape and afterwards transcribed for the purpose of analysis.

To conduct the study, the selected interviews of the politicians were searched and downloaded from the official online platforms on which they were initially broadcasted. Since no search engine does allow searching by word count, counting the frequency of both Lakoff's and Tannen's linguistic aspects was done manually. As explained earlier, this research analyzes the use of women's language features of two Moroccan politicians within different political panels discussing various political issues based on Lakoff and Tannen's theories. In

conducting the research, the researcher applied mixed method research by combining content analysis and discourse analysis. Mixed method research generally represents studies that involve collecting, analyzing, and interpreting quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or in a series of studies that investigate the same underlying phenomenon. Moreover, Creswell (2011) states that the focus of these quantitative and qualitative approaches, in combination, provides a better understanding of research problems than using one method alone. The research applied quantitative research and qualitative research together to gain a more complete understating of the research questions and meets up the leading objectives.

3.5 Quantitative analysis of the data

The results of counting the frequency of each linguistic feature were presented in tables and charts. The main questions to be answered by the quantitative analysis are: Is there a difference between the female and male speakers using the pre-defined linguistic features assigned by Lakoff? Is the difference statistically significant? Is there any linguistic correlation between the speakers?

3.6 Qualitative analysis of the data

The main aim of the qualitative data analysis is to look for the motivation behind the linguistic and communicative similarities and the differences used by male and female Moroccan speakers in a political setting. To achieve that, the following questions are to be answered: Why do the female or male politicians use a particular linguistic feature or behaviors equal to or more than the other gender group? How can we interpret the statistically significant differences in gender communicative context? What is the difference between these research findings and previous research findings in the respective field of research of this paper? Which conclusions can we draw about language use and gender in political discourse? Qualitative research covers various approaches for exploring human experience, perceptions, motivations, and behaviors.

The following table shows the frequency of the hedges , instensifiers and superpolite forms by Nabila Mounib.

Linguistic Feature	The frequency of each Linguistic feature	Percentage of each Linguistic feature
Hedges	10	28.57%
Instensifiers	05	14.28%
Superpolite Forms	20	57.14%

The table showed the statistical results of the frequency of using hedges, super polite forms, intensifiers, empty precise color terms, and avoidance of solid words. In this first interview, Nabila Mounib used up to 40 hedges, representing 44% of her overall use of the above-mentioned linguistic features.

e.g : شبابية قوات يعني تدخل يستوجب يعني هادشي

hādšy yʿny ystwǧb tdẖl yʿny qwāt šbābyة

This requires, I mean, an urgent intervention of youths

Mounib tends to make her speech more polite regarding the political status and that's what explains the use of super polite forms that were used 30 times throughout Mounib's responses.

e.g: اتقدم بشكر

bškr ātqdm

Allow me to thank you

Intensifiers took the most negligible part among the two first mentioned linguistic features that represented just 10% of the features that have been reinforced by mounib to account for her political ideas in this first interview.

سنجتاج لبدل جهد كبير

snǧtāǧ lbdl ǧhd kbyr We need to do more efforts

The second table shows the frequency of the three Linguistic features namely ; hedges, intensifiers and super polite forms used by the male speaker throughout the interview.

The Linguistic Feature	The frequency of the Linguistic feature	The percentage of the Linguistic Feature
Hedges	13	55%
Intensifiers	05	13%
Super polite forms	09	32%

As presented in the table above, out of the six examined linguistic features, the journalist used Hedges 13 times throughout the procedure of his reflection upon Mounib's response on his question. Hedges were used to rethinking what the speaker wanted to say or to find a better way to express it powerfully and efficiently.

e.g: اظن ان المغاربة في حاجة الى نفس جديد

āẓn ān ālmġārbᵗ fy ḥāğᵗ ālى nfs ğdyd

Hmmm, I think that Moroccans are in need of fresh beginnings.

The journalist found the need to use more than just one intensifier to strengthen a few ideas linked to the political context he was reflecting upon. Only 13 % of intensifiers were used, which kept his language as strong as any journalist desires.

e.g : الشيء كنعاني من وبشكل كبير

ālšyʾ knʿāny mn wbškl kbyr

The thing that we suffer a lot from

The use of super polite forms was a dominant feature in the journalist intercations. He used more than 09 forms of super polite expressions differently to strengthen the formality characterizing formal' language.

e.g اسمحلي نقول بانه

āsmḥly nqwl bānh …….

Allow me to say that……

4- The use of hedges

According to Lakoff "The use of hedges or fillers indicates unnecessary and intensive devices to persuade their audience to take them seriously". According to the findings neither Nabila Mounib nor The journalist Belhaissi Youssef used hedges over their conversational

interactions. They used lexical hedges such as:كنضن / kndn / I think,يعني / yʿny / mean , بطبيعة الحال / bṭbyʿة ālḥāl / of course. In both Nabila Mounib and Youssef Belhaiss's statements, the feature of hedging was used almost equally for the sake of softening the hardship of a specific utterance.

Through the interview, the two speakers used hedges as a chance to pause to consider what he or they intended to communicate to the audience. The two speakers' use of fillers didn't necessarily reflect the uncertainty about their assertions but rather the tendency to take more time to think and reflect upon the issue discussed before giving an answer that may not be in their favor. Holmes (1987) claims that hedges are devices used to modulate the power of sentences to make the actual interaction more polite, and they also express the speakers attitude within the context of the interview. In this case, the two speakers exert power over the audience. According to Dixon (1997), Hedges are used to show sympathy towards the listener and convey agreement and non-obligation. Dixon's notion was proven through the two selected interviews. Both the interviewer and the interviewee used hedges to avoid putting the addressee under undue stress. Here are two extracts where each speaker used hedges and speech fillers throughout the interviews.

Nabila Mounib said in her first interview on Med1 TV:

استغلال مقلق وهدا يستوجب **يعني** واحد مبادرات استعجالة

Istirlal moqliq wa hada sha'a kaystwajab **yaa'ani** wahd mobadarat istiaa'jaliya

This is an issue that we should worry about, **I mean**, urgent solutions must be adopted.

In this statement, Mounib tended to raise the audience's awareness of her political concern concerning the common good of the Moroccan citizens. Through this and other similar words, she displayed her role as a politician regardless of the gender identity she is expected to show as a woman. Mounib used hedging to pause to think and weigh up her critical answer.

The use of hedging was omnipresent in the journalist's statements too; one can notice following expert from his speech:

الا تكلمنا على الاحزاب الاكثر تمثيلية **اقصد** الحاضرة بقوة في المجلس الحكومي نجد ان حزب ديالكم شبه غائب

ālā tklmnā ʿىا ālāḥzāb ālāktr tmtylyة **āqṣd** ālḥāḍrة bqwة fy ālmǧls ālḥkwmy nǧd ān ḥzb dyālkm šbh ġāئb

If we tend to talk about the most representative political parties, **I mean** the ones that are present strongly in the Moroccan government; one can notice that your political party is dull.

In this statement, the journalist used hedging to soften the harshness of his statement. He reinforced his vision towards the lack of Mounib's contribution to the political arena.

According to Lakoff, males don't use this feature as frequently as women do since they tend to connote hesitation, which goes against the norms of men's speech. Lakoff's model is invalid here as both speakers used hedges for the same purposes and are not linked to powerlessness. Even though the results of this part disprove Lakoff's claim that women's language use is inferior to men's, some linguists still agree with her. However, because today's women play a more active role in society than in the past, it's logical that their influence and power have expanded in various sectors, including politics; as explained in the introductory section, women are now represented in occupations that men formerly dominated. Politics is the best example of those men's highly dominated sectors, where female politicians are now virtually as frequent as male politicians. Based on the findings introduced in the tables, I can say that Lakoff's claim that women use hedging more than men to signal uncertainty considerably is denied in the context of politics. Thus, there is no asymmetry between the language used and the use of power.

5 – The use of Intensifiers

As explained in the previous section of the literature review, intensifiers are "a linguistic term that adds to the emotional context of the word it modifies but does not contribute to the propositional meaning of the clause. "Intensifiers tend to boost the impact of a verb by adding an adverb that emphasizes the word's emotional content. Intensifiers are used to imply how the audience is supposed to feel subtly. This linguistic feature was one of the linguistic characteristics that Lakoff included in her deficit theory. She claimed that women use intensifiers more than men, which reinforces her low social status (Sardabi, 2015).

Intensifiers refer back to words like just, so, significantly, the Arabic equivalent of " بشكل , كبير ."/ bškl ,kbyr ."/ Hugely. These terms are referred to as intensifiers by Lakoff and are used to soften the speaker's strong feelings. As indicated in the tables and the figures above, the two speakers used equally intensifiers in their conversational interactions. Mounib used them with a total number of 19.23% in different statements like:

كبير بشكل السياسة عن ابعد المغربي الشعب

Asha'ab mareribi ob'da aa'ni siyasa **bishaklin kabir**

The Moroccan population was kept **very** far from politics

المشاكل ديال **بزاف** من كنعانيو باقي

Baqi kan'aniw min **bzzaf** dyal mashaakil

We are still suffrering from **so** many problems

On the othet hand the jounalist used them with a total number of 13 % .

يجب مناقشة مجموعة من القضايا التي تؤثر على المجتمع المدني **بشكل كبير**

yǧb mnāqšة mǧmwʿة mn ālqḍāyā ālty tʾtr ʿ ى ālmǧtmʿ ālmdny bškl kbyr

A number of national issues , that has a huge impact on the civil society, should be discussed

The above randomly selected statements are extracts from other instances where the two speakers used various forms of intensifiers. They tended to use intensifiers to increase the effect of a verb by using an adverb that strengthened the emotional content of the word. Mounib tended to use the intensifier "bzzaf" the Arabic equivalent of the word "very," to reinforce her emotional energy about the issue she raised. The same thing is valid when it comes to the use of the intensifier "katiran" the Arabic equivalent of "very or so," by the journalist to attain the same goal as Mounib's.

Mounib discusses, through her statements where an intensifier is needed, her massive concern about Moroccan youths' lack of political participation. I can conclude that both the interviewer and the interviewee used this linguistic pattern similarly. I can reassure the absence of gender communicative or discursive differences by saying that. Despite countless studies examining the use of intensifiers in gender communication, regrettably, this linguistic feature is one of the aspects for which there are insufficient conclusive and consistent outcomes (Rasekh, 2015). As a result, more research into the male and female variations in intensifier research is required to produce more conclusive and consistent results.

Regarding the use of intensifiers in the context of politics, I can draw a few conclusions concerning the analysis I've provided at the beginning of this section. Lakoff's deficit theory has been challenged in a powerful setting like politics. The style of the chosen language is based on socio-political power, and each speaker's leading political identity tends to display. Earlier studies examined the "powerless" language juxtaposed with using more intensifiers to reconcile the emotional intensification with the rest of the person's talk. The social class and political dominance controlled a variety of intensifiers concerning the emotional status of the speaker. I discovered that neither gender nor culture significantly impacted who is supposed to use this linguistic pattern.

Different duties and positions are prescribed for men and women in every community. As a result, different expectations are placed on each gender regarding how they behave and speak. Women are frequently denied access to power in society; according to Lakoff and her fellows, they use several linguistic methods to express and maintain their social status, one of which is the intensifiers examined in this part. Women may use intensifiers to emphasize their points

with their interlocutors and increase their chances of being accepted and affirmed, keeping in mind their powerless status in social interactions. It was discovered that both male and female politicians use intensifiers in the same way and for the same reason.

6- The use of super polite forms

Lounis (2014) defined politeness as "the term we use to describe the extent to which actions, including how things are said, match addresses' perceptions of how they should be performed." Holmes (2013) argued that politeness is defined as demonstrating positive concern for others, avoiding interference, and emphasizing connection and appropriation. In some cultures, polite people respect others' emotions and thoughts, give compliments, and express gratitude. It is also considered courteous to employ formal terminology. Politeness, according to Lakoff, can be conveyed in various ways. It is linked to verbal communication in terms of linguistics. It is linked to other kinds of transmission such as body language or a combination of both in para- linguistics.

Lacking what has been said to my thesis's theoretical framework, Lakoff's accounted, through her deficit model, for this linguistic pattern stating that "Super polite forms" is considered female speech characteristic. She argued that the use of linguistic qualities like lexis, phonology, syntax, and pragmatics make women's speech sound more polite. This was also confirmed by other sociolinguists who investigated the grammatical constructions used in a specific social setting. Among those sociolinguists is Ariffin (2004), who investigated language used in peer group discussion and found that women used polite forms more often than men. In this case, obligatory polite forms such as "please" and "thank you" was added to statements that women produced.

This discussion can't be well detailed without discussing politeness theory (Brown, 1987). This theory dealt with the idea of face-saving in social interactions. It was the basis of several studies that examined the link between language and politeness use. In their view, there are two types of face, which push the person not to block one's actions. The latter expresses a welcoming sense of being appreciated and approved by others. On the other hand, people tend to save a different person's face by avoiding overlapping and interrupting others. The aspect of gender and politeness is not well talked about. However, several academic papers have fallen this gap.

Through this paper, I examined how the two selected speakers use super polite forms to save their positive faces. Going back to the quantitative study conducted above, one can notice that

the two politicians used super polite forms at an equal rate, with a total percentage of 35% for Belhaissi and 34% for Mounib. The frequency of this linguistic feature in the two speakers' interactions doesn't indicate the view of Lakoff and her counterparts. It was proven that not only female speakers use super polite forms, but also men tend to convey a sense of politeness. Below are a few examples of super polite forms that the two speakers used

اسمحلي اناتقدم بشكرالجزيل:

āsmḥly ānātqdm bškrālǧzyl

Allow me to thank you

الى اسمحتولي بغيت نتكلم عل وواحد النقط

ālى āsmḥtwly bġyt ntklm ʿl ى wāḥd ālnqṭ

Please allow me to highlight one idea

The reason behind the equal use of super polite forms by the two speakers is the tendency to keep one's face positive. They pave the way for a positive basis for displaying the speaker's ideology. My conclusion is considered one of the few that deny the difference or deficit existence. These two models were reassured by many sociolinguists and language analysts in general. One of them is Holmes (1993), who claims that women are more likely than males to display positive politeness and to use softening methods to avoid putting their addressees' faces in danger. Women, for example, are more likely to interrupt less in conversations, pay greater attention to speakers, and seek to allow others to join a discussion, pay greater attention to speakers, and enable others to join a conversation.

Furthermore, women are said to use specific discursive components differently than males. One example of those components Holmes talked about is apologizing more often than males; she added that women apologize more often than males, and their apologies are mainly used to cope with space and prevent offending. My current study denied all that Lakoff and Holmes accounted for, in the sense that the two speakers were equally polite to politically reflect upon and develop the highlighted issues in the interview.

Conclusion

Choosing to examine political interview over political speeches was driven by the fact that discussions are naturally occurring discourse where speakers interact and show their true conversational identities. The absence of biased linguistic practices between the two politicians made me conclude that there is nothing as gender language that each sex adopts as the previous theories of gender claim. Still, there is what I chose to name "common language." I used the term to refer back to the contextualized language used in a specific context and through which speakers switch from one discursive practice to another. Nabila Mounib didn't use "men linguistic features" to sound more powerful; instead, she used a language that fits the context and the nature of the field she belongs to, politics. In other words, if she will be examined within another context, for instance, an informal one, she will adopt what I call "common language" to meet the discursive goals of that specific social setting. Thus, suggesting two different languages, namely the biased dualities of "masculine language" and "feminine language," will keep intensifying stereotypically the social conflict between the two sexes and reinforce the separations and misunderstanding; in addition to that, social oppression against women will be doubled and so is the double-binding effect.

References

Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words.* Oxford university press.

Brown, P. L. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge university press.

Cameron, D., 1998. Performing gender identity. Language and gender: A reader. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Coates, J., 1986. Women, men and language. Longman

Creswell, J. W. Klassen, A. C. Plano Clark, V. L.,& Smith, K. C. (2011). *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences.*Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Health

Dixon, J.A. and D.H. Foster, 1997. Gender and hedging: From sex differences to situated practice. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 26(1): 89-107.

Fishman, P., 1983. Interaction: The work women do. Santa Barbara: University of California.

Freeman, R. and B. McElhinny, 1996. Language and gender. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), Sociolinguistics and language teaching. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp: 218-280.

Glass, D.L., 1992. He says, she says: Closing the communication gap between the sexe. Perigee Books.

Holmes, J. (1993). *New Zealand Women are Good to Talk to: An Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Interaction.* Journal of pragmatics, 91-116.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.

Holmes, J. &. (1997). *Good listeners: Gender differences in New Zealand conversation. Women and Language*, 7.

Holmes, J. &. (1999). *The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research.* Language in society, 173-183.

Holmes, J. (2001). *A Corpus-based View of Gender in New Zealand English. Gender Across Languages:* The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men, Amesterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, vol.1, pp. 115-36.

James, D., & Clarke, S. (1993). *Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review.* In D. Tannen (Ed.), Gender and conversational interaction. pp. 231–280. Oxford University Press.

Kendall, S. & Tanne, D. (2001). *Discourse and Gender.*in D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E.

Lakoff, R., 1975. Language and women"s place. New York: Harper and Row.

Lakoff, G. (1990). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind* .London: Library of Congress.

Tannen, D., 1990. You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York: Morrow.

Tannen, D., 2001. Sex, lies and conversation: Why is it so hard for men and women to talk to each other? Conflict, order and action. Readings in Sociology: 244-248.

Tse, S., S. Kwong, C. Chan and H. Li, 2002. Sex differences in syntactic development: Evidence from Cantonese-speaking preschoolers in Hong Kong. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26(6): 509-517.

Uchida, A., 1998. When „difference" is „dominance": A critique of the „Anti-power based" cultural approach to sex differences". In D.Cameron (Ed.), The Feminist Critique of Language. USA & Canada: Routledge

West, C., 1979. Against our will: Male interruptions of females in cross-sex conversation. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 327(1): 81-96.

West, C., 1979. Against our will: Male interruptions of females in cross-sex conversation. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 327(1): 81-96. *View at Google Scholar | View at Publisher.*

Zimmerman, D.H. and C. West, 1975. Sex roles, interruptions, and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), Language and sex: Difference and dominance. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.