Language, Gender, and Leadership Communication in *The Apprentice Asia*

Jessica Lace G. Evangelista
Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines
jessicalacege@gmail.com

Abstract
Language and gender are two widely researched topics in sociolinguistics. However, only a few studies dealing with the relationship of the two in natural workplace communication and in media can be found. Leadership is a gendered concept and most literature associate it with the male gender as the standard norm. This study looks at some of the strategies implemented by one male and one female finalist in the first airing of The Apprentice Asia television show on practicing leadership. The study explores the way both finalists open their meetings, give instructions, manage their meetings, and evaluate the performance of their co-workers. The results of this research study show that leaders make use of various styles of leadership that range from feminine or relational to masculine and transactional. More positively regarded leaders, however, are able to combine these strategies more adeptly in one conversation.

Keywords: Language; gender; leadership; sociolinguistics; media; semi-authentic workplace; reality TV

1.0 Introduction

The relationship of language and gender has been a widely researched topic in sociolinguistics. Robin Lakoff's study in 1975 entitled "Language and Woman's Place" pioneered studies on language and its relationship to gender. Lakoff (1975) demonstrated how women's language differed from men's by showing a basic set of assumptions on how women talked. However, she provided no explanation for how the term "women's language" was used (O'Barr & Atkins, 1980). Lakoff highlighted a set of features that are often found in women's speech, such as the use of hedges, (super) polite forms, tag questions, speaking in italics, empty adjectives, hypercorrect grammar, lack of a sense of humor, direct quotation, special lexicon, and question intonation in declarative contexts (O'Barr & Atkins, 1980). Lakoff's work showed why women's speech differed from men's speech as it "theorizes women's divergent speech patterns as a byproduct of male dominance" (Hall, 2003, p. 353). Hall (2003), further noted that Lakoff's study had shown that women's speech had much in common with the speech of "homosexuals, hippies, and academics: specifically, all of these

identities share a marginality determined by their exclusion from institutionalized male power" (p.362).

The study of O'Barr and Atkins (1980) changed the view on women's language as automatically powerless and redefined the view of gender from a biological construct towards a social construct. This realization emerged from O'Barr and Atkins's findings, which showed that some of the features thought to be part of "women's language" were also used by males who were in a subordinate position. In order to conduct the study, both researchers observed an American trial courtroom and recorded over 150 hours of trials during a ten-week period in a North Carolina superior criminal court. They made use as a baseline for their investigation Lakoff's women's language features, and discovered that the differences that Lakoff (1975) attributed to women's speech were not necessarily the result of their gender but of their being powerless in society. O'Barr and Atkins said, "…variation in WL [women's language] features may be related more to social powerlessness than to sex" (p. 166). Romaine

(2003) noted the importance of power rather than gender per se as a significant factor in the use of "women's language." This shows that male and female categories are biological constructs, while masculine and feminine discourses are social constructs. Women display masculine discourse and men display feminine discourse depending on their status in society. This then challenges the notion that men and women automatically speak in a certain way since there are other factors that may affect talk, such as one's status in society. Therefore, the term "women's language" may be better associated with "powerless language," as it corresponds to the speaker's social status and does not necessarily link his/her language to biological sex (O'Barr & Atkins, 1980).

Putting the constructs of women and power together, Lakoff (2003) once again examined the complex relationship between the two, which other researchers viewed as though they were independent from each other. Lakoff noted that people have various expectations of how men and women should conduct themselves linguistically, which often times serves as a double-bind for women. Holmes (2006, p. 5) further said that contextual appropriateness is one of the aspects used by people for judging one's behavior.

Based on the foregoing, it is then interesting to discover the role of gender when it comes to attitudes regarding talk. One relevant field to look at is professional or workplace communication where "Communication in the workplace is still guided by familiar sociocultural stereotypes of men's and women's roles" (Thimm, C., Koch, S., & Schey, S., 2003, p. 536). In line with the study of O'Barr and Atkins (1980), it is relevant to understand if "powerless language" or "feminine language" will still be present in the speech style of people who are in a high position and if such discourse style will be positively or negatively regarded.

This study aims to understand the leadership style of one male and one female finalist in the reality television show *The Apprentice Asia*, specifically, the communication styles employed by both finalists. The analysis will be grounded on the relationship of gender and language use. The study also hopes to explore the possibility of double standards experienced by both genders through an investigation of how masculine and feminine discourses in leadership communication are evaluated. The study will also explore what qualifies as a good discourse strategy for leaders.

2.0 Language, Gender, and Leadership

Currently, there is a lack of research available that looks at the relationship among language, gender, and natural workplace communication. There is, therefore, a lacuna in research work that is focused on how leaders accomplish their roles based on their communication style and gender.

Holmes' (2006, 2003) work on language, gender, and workplace communication has been highly significant in understanding the factors and patterns that come into play in workplace communication, especially leadership discourse strategies.

Holmes, Schnurr, Chan, & Chiles (2003) referred to leadership as "the ability to influence others" (p. 32), and "doing leadership" as a discursive achievement that entails the integration of transactional and relational objectives of the workplace. According to Dwyer, transactional behaviors "focus on the task to be achieved, the problem to be solved, or the purpose of the meeting" and relational discourse as oriented to "fostering relationships or 'creating team'" (as cited in Holmes, Schnurr, Chan, & Chiles 2003, p. 32). This definition highlights the significance of communicative behavior since it focuses on the linguistic aspect used by leaders to enact their role as leaders.

Leadership is a gendered concept and most studies show that the typical portrayal of a good leader is male oriented (Holmes, 2006). This can probably be attributed to the higher number of men who occupy high positions in the workplace as compared to women, which has institutionalized men's way of speaking in the workplace (Holmes,

2006). Thus, the standard measure is typically authoritarian and masculine where "leaders are typically characterized as authoritative, strong-minded, decisive, aggressive, competitive, confident, single-minded, goal-oriented, courageous, hard-nosed, and adversarial" (Holmes, 2006, p. 34). Tannen (as cited in Holmes, 2006) has said that authority is often associated with maleness. Women, therefore, are less likely to be considered as potential leaders. Holmes' study, however, showed that both male and female draw from a wide variety of discourse strategies depending on the context or situation they are involved.

In the study of Thimm, Koch, & Schey, (2003) men and women were interviewed to understand their communication experiences and expectations in the workplace setting, as well as their verbal strategies. The results showed that men equally made use of relationship and task-oriented statements while women focused more on relationship-oriented talk. Both groups also acknowledge that the workplace setting constitutes a gendered world.

The same study also suggested that men use a wider variety of speech styles and make use of "powerless language" in order to attain their interactional goals (Thimm, C., Koch, S., & Schey, S., 2003, p. 546). Similar to Holmes' (2006) findings, the data showed that "female register" is accessible to both genders and is highly dependent on the context or situation. However, women are more constrained with their style because they are sanctioned to behave in specific ways due to the standards applied to them.

3.0 The Study

The corpus for this study was derived from the first Asian version of the original American hit television show *The Apprentice*. It is a popular reality television game show that debuted in the United States in 2004, and was hosted and co-produced by multi-billionaire businessman Donald Trump. The show revolved around 16 to 18 business people who competed with each other in order to secure a spot as an apprentice to Trump.

An Asian spin-off of the show was created in 2013 with Air Asia owner Tony Fernandez as host. Contestants of *The Apprentice Asia*, which was broadcasted from May to July 2013 on the AXN channel, competed for a chance to work as an apprentice for Fernandez. The game show featured contestants from various parts of Asia such as Philippines (2 contestants), India (2), Singapore (1), Indonesia (2), Malaysia (3), and China (1).

The purpose of this study is to look at the leadership style, in terms of discourse strategies, employed by the two finalists in the show namely, Jonathan Yabut from Philippines and Andrea Loh Ern-Yu from Singapore. The data from this study shows how male and female "do leadership" as portrayed in the media, and how their styles were evaluated in the show by their co-workers, advisors, and future boss, Fernandez. The study focuses on episodes three, six, ten, and eleven since these were the shows where Andrea and Jonathan served as project managers.

Following, Holmes' (2006) research on leadership and discourse, this study focuses on how these leaders open and plan their meetings, manage meeting discourse, give instructions to their colleagues, and evaluate the performance of their team members.

This study also aims to update existing literature and shed light on gender and leadership styles as employed by different nationalities working together. This can add relevant information on leadership discourse in an Asian context since Holmes's (2003, 2006, 2009) study was centered on Maori, European/Pakeha and Sung's (2007, 2012, 2013a, 2013b) on Americans.

At this point, it is important to note that *The Apprentice* should not be considered to be an accurate depiction of real-life circumstances reflective of the business world, notwithstanding the fact that its original producer, Trump, had been enthusiastically stating otherwise. Moreover, the analysis made in this study focuses only on one participant per gender. However, the significance of this study cannot be understated since the show

is being used extensively as a resource for students and professionals.

Clifton (2009) noted that it is ideal to present authentic or real communication to students; however, in reality, it is difficult to make such communication public due to issues regarding confidentiality. In order to solve this problem, college professors have decided to make use of semi-authentic communication in the workplace, such as those seen in *The Apprentice*, as a substitute. Eisner's (2006) literature review revealed that *The Apprentice* U.S. and U.K. versions had been used as pedagogical tools in universities such as The University of Washington at Seattle, Northern Illinois University, University of San Francisco, University of Pittsburgh, Brandeis University, and Ohio State University. Noughton (as cited in Eisner, 2006, p.19) also noted that Trump made the show mandatory in the Harvard and Wharton Business Schools. It was also used by Oxford Cambridge and RSA for its English General Certificate of Secondary Education (OCR GCSE).

Aside from students, professionals were also benefiting from the show through media outlets that chronicle and provide analysis for each episode. Moreover, American Management Association President Edward Reilly (2005) provided regular analysis for episodes two and three of the U.S. version regarding the skills, abilities, and knowledge that professionals could take from *The Apprentice*.

This study is also relevant to business and communication students, teachers, and practitioners who would like to make use of the show as an instructional or case study material to shed light on what constitutes an effective leadership communication strategy, as well as how gender plays a role in discourse.

The study employs the transactional and transformational leadership styles that Holmes and Marra (2006, p. 123) illustrated (Table 1) in their study on leadership and humor. Transactional strategies are perceived as masculine oriented and transformational strategies as feminine oriented.

Table 1 Transactional vs. transformational leadership Holmes & Marra (2006)

Transactional	Transformational
Focus on goals and related rewards	Charismatic, inspirational, visionary
Focus on contractual obligations	Intellectually stimulating
Monitors mistakes, deviations from norms	Encourages creativity and questioning
Corrective response to errors, problems	Reliable, trustworthy, ethical model

To compliment this, Holmes and Stubbe's (2003) description of masculine and feminine interactional styles (Table 2) is also used. Although there are criticisms about such a simplification and dichotomizing of styles, it is still enduring since it "…captures quite well the components people typically have in mind when they refer to 'masculine' and 'feminine' workplaces," and it serves to summarize the distinct male and female styles gathered from previous research, as well as research in workplace interactions that have confirmed such patterns (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003, p. 575).

Table 2 Widely cited features of "feminine" and "masculine" interactional style (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003)

Feminine	Masculine
Indirect, conciliatory, facilitative, collaborative, minor contribution (in public), supportive feedback, person/process-oriented, affectively oriented	Direct, confrontational, competitive, autonomous, dominates (public) talking time, aggressive interruptions, task outcome-oriented, referentially oriented

The transcription convention used for this study is the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) markup convention.

4.0 Results and Discussion

This section will present an analysis of the discourse strategies used by the two finalists in *The Apprentice Asia* in the course of performing leadership roles. The analysis will first focus on two significant managerial discourse skills, which are opening of meetings and giving directives. It will then proceed to analyze the ways both leaders run meetings and evaluate the performance of their team members.

4.1 Opening Meetings

Holmes (2006) said that "meeting openings are highly structured, and thus prime sites for both enacting and contesting power" (p. 43). At the same time, it is a crucial point in establishing one's authority as a leader, showing one's control in the group, and making sure that members orient themselves to the leader (Holmes, 2006, p. 44).

Example 1

Context: Meeting of Team Mavericks, Andrea is Project Manager. The team is discussing the Taiwanese products that they will pitch to two large retailers in Malaysia, namely Giant Hypermarket and Sogo (Episode 3)

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Jonathan, Nazril, and Sam

```
1   Andrea:  First thing, let's just go through all three products because we're gonna pitch
2            <1> the same </1> products with whoever we're going large or small
3       X:   <1> Yeah </1>
```

Andrea is the only female member of Team Mavericks, she was transferred to this team by Tony Fernandez and was tasked by him to lead the group for this team project in order to establish her authority as a project manager in this task. The use of "first thing" indicates that Andrea is establishing her authority and would like to get the group focused on the task at hand, but the use of "let us just" mitigates the strength of her opening since this is her first time to work with these people. Andrea showed her directness in managing the agenda of the team.

Example 2

Context: Meeting of Team Mavericks, Jonathan is Project Manager. The team is discussing their roles in managing the Hilton Kuala Lumpur (Episode 6).

Participants: Andrea, Dian, Jonathan, and Nazril

```
1   Jonathan:  <fast> I would like to volunteer as a project manager for this
2   one </fast>
3   Nazril:    Okay
4   Jonathan:  <fast> In our training a while, they've mentioned you know,
5              the 30-minute rule, make it right, when it needs to be done
6              right.
7              You guys might be the front-liners if t-t-the issue happened in
8              the rooms while you were there please raise it immediately to
9              me so we can make a decision, there has to be a balance
10             between what the customer wants and what's also good for
11             Hilton. </fast>
```

There was no project manager when the meeting started, so Jonathan immediately opened the meeting by volunteering as team manager. This shows Jonathan's directness and his task

or outcome-orientation. It could also signify his competitiveness since during the solo interview, he said that there were only two people in their team who had not been project managers and he did not want to let that opportunity pass. Jonathan's use of "would" softens his aggressive pronouncement of his intention to be a project manager. The use of "volunteer" also gives others room to react. However, his fast announcement and his readiness to proceed immediately towards the allocation of tasks shows that he is confident and did not doubt that they would give him the position.

Jonathan's way of giving directives is also very fast, which leaves no room for others to comment. Although he made use of the word "please" and "might" to soften his authoritativeness, as well as the burden that would be placed on his team members who would be in charge of room service. He also used "we" to show that the team would work together if something happens but this "we" could also have a double meaning and signify "I".

Example 3

Context: Meeting of Andrea's team. They are discussing the charity black-tie fundraiser for the AirAsia Foundation (Episode 10)

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Dian, and Ningku

```
1   Andrea:    Okay guys, so I just want to go straight to the event itself.
2   Jonathan:  I think as far as unique selling proposition is concerned this is the
3              50th anniversary
```

In opening the meeting, Andrea made use of the standard marker "okay" to get the attention of her team members, which signals a low-key opening move and can be attributed to the small size of the group. She then goes straight to talking about her intention to discuss the agenda, but softening it with the discourse marker "just" in order to put the meeting on track and avoid irrelevant conversations (Holmes & Marra, 2004). Her softening could be ascribed to her newness in the team, and this was also the first time she became a project manager for a formerly all-male group.

Example 4

Context: Meeting of Jonathan's team. They are discussing the charity black-tie fundraiser for the AirAsia Foundation (Episode 10)

Participants: Celina, Jonathan, Sam, and Nazril

1	Jonathan:	Alright, first of all I would like to thank you guys for being part of my
2		team and you guys know exactly the reasons why I chose you.
3		Sam, I need a guy to bounce off the creative ideas here.
4		Nash, you know that you're my bro in team Mavericks.
5		You believe in me and I believe in you.
6		And I want the people who will work with me people who believe.
7		{to Celina} And you know exactly the reasons the entire banquet
8		hospitality thing is your league <1> and there </1> is no other honor
9		that can be than working with my fellow Filipina.
11	Celina:	<1> thank you </1> <nod>
12		Of course we got your back don't worry let's do this

Jonathan's use of the opening "alright" is a standard marker to get the attention of the team. His whole opening statement is charismatic and inspirational; it is done in order to build rapport in the team and show his gratefulness towards his co-workers who will ultimately help him win the apprenticeship. This shows a feminine orientation that is marked with openness of feelings, and supportive social relationship (Holmes, 2006). Jonathan orients the team towards a collaborative atmosphere and he provided a high level of interpersonal dimension by using "bro" and mentioning that it is an honor to work with a Filipina. His compliments made use of a combination of the members' ability to accomplish job related tasks and their personal relationship with him.

Example 5

Context: Black-tie charity event for the AirAsia Foundation (Episode 11, Finale)

1	Jonathan:	Good EVENING.
2		Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name is Jonathan.
3		Southeast Asia is a country of rich and diverse region of culture,
4		of people, and sadly to say a lot of these communities are in danger
5		of either being destroyed or forgotten in the pages of history.

Jonathan's welcome speech for the charity event is marked by a high volume and emphasis to ensure that he captures the crowd's attention right away. In lines 3-5, after greeting the crowd

and introducing himself, he went straight to discussing the agenda. Jonathan showed that he is transactionally oriented by focusing on his goals and, thereby, achieving his reward of getting a high turnout from the auction.

Example 6

Context: Black-tie charity event for the AirAsia Foundation (Episode 11, Finale)

1	Andrea:	Umm. Good evening everybody (3)
2		Hi everyone good evening, if you could just umm (2)
3		Could I just have your attention for a while please? (3)
4		Umm. My name is Andrea, umm and tonight I'd like to welcome you
5		to our event (2)
6		Umm this evening marks the first year of the Air Asia Foundation's
7		operations, so I'm really excited to welcome you this evening.

Andrea's opening speech is marked by a lot of long pauses and numerous uses of "umm," and she also failed to use a louder tone in order to get the attention of the crowd. In line 2, after greeting the crowd, she made use of polite form "if you could just" to direct the crowd's attention to her, which did not effectively do its job. Moreover her use of emphasizers such as "really excited" is relatively feminine. Her opening can be viewed as feminine and unassertive, which is in contrast with the way Jonathan welcomed the crowd.

These examples show that in terms of opening meetings both Jonathan and Andrea adapt a fairly low-key style. However, Jonathan's use of a faster speech rate leaves little room for comments from the members and allows him to dominate the group in order to lead them straight to the tasks that he would lay out for the team. Although Andrea also went on to discuss the agenda of the meeting right after getting the attention of her team, her use of hedges and softeners mark her speech as more normatively female. Jonathan's style, on the other hand, is more masculine since he dominated most of the talking time through his fast speech rate. His decisiveness was also evident in the way he issued his directives right after volunteering as a project manager. Holmes (2006) said there can be differences in how leaders open their meetings based on the size of the group, and such a difference

can be seen in the formality that was adapted in the opening of Jonathan and Andrea's speeches for the black-tie event, which is more high-key.

4.2 Giving Instructions

Issuing directives is a significant part of leadership, and the way that a leader gives instructions can show his/her ability to be decisive and authoritative (Holmes, 2006).

Example 7

Context: Team Andrea's meeting for the black-tie charity event of the AirAsia Foundation. Andrea is discussing the tasks of her group members (Episode 11, Finale)

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Dian, and Ningku

1	Andrea:	I I'm very concerned about itinerary because it's it's thirty minutes
2		I've not been for one of this I know you some of you guys may have
3		do you have any ideas at this point?
4	Alexis:	How do we organize ourselves for this event?
5	Andrea:	What I have in mind for the graphics and the standees, I'm thinking
6		of Ningku?
7		For catering umm I've put down Alex?
8		Banquet and decor I've put down Dian?

Andrea's way of giving directives is very indirect and normatively feminine, which Holmes (2006) described as involving features that are interrogative rather than imperative. In line 1-3 Andrea showed her discomfort and uncertainty about the even by saying that she has not taken part of anything similar to this task. She also showed her reliance on her members whom she thinks are more adept with holding an event. When she issued her directives, it was in interrogative form and made use of linguistic forms that may soften the directive, such as "what I have in mind," "I'm thinking," and "umm I have put down," which attenuate the directives.

Example 8

Context: Meeting of Team Mavericks, Andrea is Project Manager. The team is discussing the Taiwanese products that they will pitch to two large retailers in Malaysia, Giant Hypermarket and Sogo (Episode 3)

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Jonathan and Sam

1	Andrea:	Who's gonna pitch large and who's gonna pitch sma:ll?
2	Sam:	I would like to be one among the high retail you know sales team
3	Andrea:	Are you comfortable small if it came down to that?
4	Sam:	I think number one is if I have to cope up with small
5		I have to step up to small definitely no doubt about that.
6		Uh secondly, I also recommend Nash be on the small team
7		we need somebody like Nash with local knowledge
8		to help us out to <snap fingers> quickly get in some <1> you know </1>
9	Andrea:	<1> Okay </1> <looking at Nazril> What do you think <laugh>
10	Nazril:	I can, I can do that if you want me to be out there <2> okay quickly,
11		I can do that </2>
12	Andrea:	<2> You're comfortable? </2>
13	Sam:	Alright (fist bump)

Example 8 shows that Andrea consistently conforms to the feminine way of giving directives. When Sam said that he wanted to be part of the team that will pitch for the high retailers, Andrea, instead of saying no to Sam's request (line 3) placed her directive in interrogative form. Andrea already had Sam in mind to pitch for the smaller retailers but instead of stating this directly to him, she made use of a conciliatory way of giving her instructions. Andrea also shows that she is person-oriented because she asked Sam and Nazril if they are both comfortable with the tasks that they would face.

Example 9

Context: Team Mavericks, Jonathan is Project Manager. The team was tasked to manage the Hilton Kuala Lumpur for a day. Jonathan incorrectly took the order of the guest, instead of serving a pizza, the guest was served salad. Andrea is informing Jonathan that the mistake had been rectified.

Participants: Andrea, Dian, Jonathan, and Nazril

1	Andrea:	We've just given the lady the pizza. Just to update you.
2	Jonathan:	Prioritize the cake.
3		We have an issue about timing with this customer so make sure we
4		put it on time.

This example shows that Jonathan was not fazed by what happened with his wrong order even though he was the one at fault. He immediately gave a command to Andrea to prioritize the cake, which will be given to their guest who was celebrating her birthday. Jonathan made use of imperatives "prioritize" and "make sure," which are masculine

in form to issue his directive. However, he also made use of "we" instead of "you" to mitigate the command even though Jonathan is clearly saying that he wants Andrea to deliver the cake on time. Here, Jonathan tried to balance his masculine style with a more relational or solidarity-oriented pronoun "we."

In giving instructions, Andrea made use of a normatively feminine style because of the presence of indirect forms of giving orders that are mitigated and hedged. On the other hand, Jonathan's way of giving directives has also feminine components but he combined this with masculine directives. Therefore, Jonathan showed a combination of both styles in the way he issued his tasks unlike Andrea who maintained a more feminine stance.

4.3 Running Meetings

The construction of a gendered leadership style can be manifested when managing a meeting discourse. Power or dominance is associated with higher amounts of talk and greater number of disruptive interruptions; therefore, a masculine meeting involves more talking time by the leader and is marked by numerous interruptions (Holmes, 2006).

Example 10

Context: Meeting of Team Mavericks, Andrea is Project Manager. The team is discussing the Taiwanese products that they will pitch to two large retailers in Malaysia, Giant Hypermarket and Sogo (Episode 3)

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Jonathan, Nazril, and Sam

1	Sam:	Can I say something?
2		So Andrea uh in this particle uh task we're being tested on
3		negotiating skills more
4	Andrea:	Sure, that's why the <1> USB </1>
5	Sam:	<1> What's the discount you're going to <1> <2> give </2>
6	Andrea:	<sighing> <2> Sa:m </2> </sighing>, that's why the USB
7		need to be talked about coz these thing are no:t in here.
8		<looks at Sam> We're looking at the product now
9	Sam:	Tell me how I should buy this, how many quantity <3>
10		what what is the pricing? </3>
11	Jonathan:	<3> Okay I was thinking we will discuss this later
12	Alex:	Yeah yeah we discuss this later.
13		No point to discuss
14	Andrea:	<hands waving up and down> <loud voice> N:o Sam listen to m:e.
15		What this discussion is about is highlighting these things

In this whole episode the meeting of this team could be seen as very masculine because it was marked by a lot of disruptive interruptions, especially by Sam. The way Andrea handled the interruption of Sam is also masculine in style. Holmes (2006) said that at the more feminine spectrum, leaders tend to deal with challenges from members by using non-confrontational strategies such as humor, which was not evident in this interaction. Andrea was very straightforward in correcting Sam especially in lines 14-15. At the same time, Andrea had clearly set the agenda for the meeting and she wanted everyone to focus on the features of the products rather than the price, which Sam was suggesting. She showed that as she was in control of the meeting, her agenda should be followed, and any digression would not be tolerated, as exemplified in lines 6-8.

Example 11

Context: Team Jonathan's meeting for the black-tie charity event of the AirAsia Foundation. Jonathan is discussing the tasks of his group members (Episode 10)

Participants: Celina, Jonathan, Nash, Sam

1	Jonathan:	<fast> I would like to get out of the way the assignment.
2		Catering and banquet, I think Celina's strength is all about this.
3		For the standee if I would like to ask Sam and Nash if you can work
4		on that </fast>
5	Sam:	Yeah

In Jonathan's case, there were no interruptions in his team's meeting and he had full control of the group. The discussions were mostly dominated by him, which place them more on the masculine side of the spectrum. However, when giving the agenda and directives, he made sure that he mitigated this through the use of a hedging device such as "I would like." Jonathan also complimented his teammate's ability in line 2, which is relationally-oriented and allows the team to have a productive working environment by uplifting the morale of its members.

Example 12

Context: Team Andrea is opening the auction for the AirAsia Foundation (Episode 11, Finale).

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Dian, Ningku,

1	Andrea:	Hi a very good evening again ladies and gentle:men.
2		Distinguished guests, Mr. Fernandez umm the trusties of the Air Asia
3		foundation.
4		Okay so let's get this show on the road
5		umm is every:one ready to do umm do some charity?
6		Awesome.
7		We're going to start with our first item tonight.
8		This is from Mr. Fernandez's personal watch collection.

Andrea's way of running the auction is transactional-oriented and formal. After greeting the important guests, she went straight to the auction. There were hedging devices in lines 4-5, but the main orientation of her speech was focused on the task of getting the auction rolling.

Example 13

Context: Team Jonathan is opening the auction for the AirAsia Foundation (Episode 11, Finale).

1	Jonathan:	Good evening ladies and gentlemen.
2		Are you all ready for a GOOD cause tonight?
3	Tony:	Yeah
4	Jonathan:	Alright!
5		Tonight team Jonathan, well that's me, umm has prepared for you a
6		fine selection of really good cause items.
7		In the mean time I would also like to introduce to you my colleagues
8		who have helped me along the way in this journey.
9		On my right side is the very beautiful Celina also from the
10		Philippines.
11		Unfortunately, Celina has been fi:red by Mr. Tony Fernandez
12	Tony:	@@@
13	Jonathan:	But isn't she on fire tonight? Right?
14		Please welcome Mr. Nazril from Malaysia and Mr. Sam the man from
15		India.
16		Our first bid is something close to Mr. Tony Fernandez's heart,
17		we are talking about a his and hers Caterham shirt autographed by the
18		team drivers themselves.

Jonathan's way of running the auction is more transformational, charismatic, and person-oriented. Although in line 5 he set his agenda right away, he delayed the auction proper by first introducing the people who have helped him through giving approval, commending his teammates in lines 7-8, and strengthening collegiality. He also made use of humor and was able to adapt a low-key style for the event even if his opening was formal.

In running meetings, Andrea showed a more transactional orientation by getting things done by following certain routines or agenda. On the other hand, Jonathan's style is also goal-oriented but he combined this with a transformational orientation. This shows that Jonathan is more adept in combining both styles in a situation.

4.4 Evaluating the Performance of Members

Gendered talk can be manifested in the way leaders evaluate their team members, such as the amount of emphasis they give on either transactional or transformational strategies. The way team members evaluate their leader can also illustrate what they consider as an acceptable leadership style and whether those leaders are performing based on their expectations.

Example 14

Context: Boardroom meeting, Tony Fernandez is asking Jonathan how he decided to choose his team members (Episode 11, Finale)

Participants: Andrea, Jonathan, and Tony Fernandez

1	Tony Fernandez:	What was your strategy in picking the teams?
2	Jonathan:	I picked two things.
3		One is who will root for me to win the Apprentice?
4		And definitely these three people vocalized those for me even from
5		the very start.
6		Naz for example when he left he gave me this note telling I want you
7		Jonathan to win the apprentice because I believe in you and that
8		really boost my confidence.
9		Sam approached me and said, Jonathan I want you to be the
10		apprentice.
11		Celina obviously from the very start.
12		If you look at these three people, I couldn't have chose the perfect A
13		team to execute the perfect event for the Air Asia Foundation sir.
14	Tony:	Okay. Celina, it's interesting that although Jon and you have never
15		worked Jonathan you still picked Celina over Dian.
16	Jonathan:	You know I felt that she at so many moments she was my right hand.
17		In this task when it's all about food, beverage, hospitality, and I think
18		she was the best pick.
19		And I just have to add the reason why I chose her as my third
20		because none in this team will probably want to pick her.
21	Jonathan:	I chose Sam first because he was in danger of being taken by Andrea,
22		that was my entire logic and I think it was a very smart decision in the
23		end.

In evaluating his team members, Jonathan showed that he is goal-oriented by suggesting that he chose the people whom he knew wanted him to win. His way of choosing and evaluating his teammates is transactional in its orientation since he focused on rewarding or complimenting them based on their performance, such as in lines 12-13. At the same time, he showed that he is affectively-oriented by stating that he chose Celina because Andrea will not get her; by doing this, he was able to motivate and compliment her while also appealing to his self-interest. His reason for choosing Sam in line 22-23 was focused on his goal and its related reward, which is to win *The Apprentice Asia.*

Example 15

Context: Boardroom meeting, Tony Fernandez is asking Andrea how she decided to choose her team members (Episode 11, Finale)

Participants: Andrea, Jonathan, and Tony Fernandez

1	Tony:	Okay. Andrea, maybe you can give me insights on why you said
2		absolutely you have the best team
3	Andrea:	Jonathan obviously put a lot of thought into umm what he was going
4		to say.
5		For me it was very simple throughout this process there's always been
6		a very deep personal connection to each of them.
7		With Dian honestly I call her mom,
8		I think that maternal side of her was something that I could really
9		count on in the task you know.
10		We have left off previously not on the best of terms but that was not
11		even an issue just because I knew we had that personal relationship.
12		Umm with Ningku and Alex not even a question, I knew I wanted
13		them right from the very beginning.
14		There's a lot of mutual respect and there's a lot love all in the team.
15		And It was very very clear for me it wasn't just about talent and
16		ability, I think they have already proven that
17		so umm and these are people who will come through for me
18		and that's all that I need.

Andrea's way of evaluating her teammates is relationally-oriented, and the reasons she gave were all focused on her relationship with these people. Her style is more feminine, person-oriented, and affectively-oriented. At the same time, she made use of face-saving strategy because even though Dian was the last person she chose for her team, since there was no other person left to be chosen, she made sure that she compensated for this in lines 7-9 by saying that she refers to Dian as "mom." This also allowed her to reduce their previous misunderstanding as mentioned in lines 10-11.

Example 16

Context: Phone conversation. Andrea is asking the progress of her members on pitching the Taiwanese products to small retailers (Episode 3).

Participants: Alex, Andrea, Sam, and Nazril

1	Andrea:	Hey guys how's it going?
2	Nazril:	We managed to close uh one for out of uh ten.
3	Andrea:	You closed one deal <rolls eyes>?
4		Next question, do you have appointments that you set up that you
5		cannot make?
6	Nazril:	Yeah, one at Sri Hartamas
7	Andrea:	Okay Nash, we're on our way to one shop now
8		once we're done with that we'll head back to Hartamas and talk to
9		hem

Andrea was disappointed with Nazril's progress, however, instead of confronting him, she simply rolled her eyes and did not express her displeasure. She prevented a conflict by changing the topic and delegating the task to herself, which is a face-saving strategy and more associated with the feminine style.

Example 17

Context: Boardroom meeting. Dian lost a folder while they were managing the Hilton Kuala Lumpur. Jonathan is the project manager (Episode 6).

Participants: Andrea, Dian, Jonathan, Nazril, and Tony Fernandez

1	Tony:	That folder was pretty crucial wasn't it?
2	Nazril:	It was sir, because it was the Hilton standard.
3	Tony:	It's completely screwed up Dian.
4		You screwed up by missing the folder. Very, very key.
5	Jonathan:	If I were just to put some truth to it as far as integrity is concerned.
6		My concern is that, now that this story has been established
7		I clearly remembered Dian calling me and she said and Andrea was
8		there, that the folders were actually "missing" {quotation mark hand sign}.
9		So I didn't get a sense, actually, it was forgotten.
10		And I remember that Andrea was there and she
11	Tony:	That's a fairly heavy accusation
12	Dian:	Yes, it is sir.
13	Tony:	He's saying you're saying it went missing
14		and you're saying you left it there.
15		Who's telling the truth?
16	Dian:	It wasn't a big area to search, sir. Literally <1> it was </1>
17	Jonathan:	<1> We couldn't </1> find it
18	Andrea:	N:o
19	Dian:	No, it was too small of <2> an area </2>
20	Tony:	<2> Disaster, disaster </2>, <3> disaster </3> <head shaking>
21	Andrea:	<3> The point </3> is the wrong information was given to us
22	Tony:	There's no excuse, don't make excuses
23		Jon, who's at fault having head all this?
24	Jonathan:	For me, the biggest issue was about integrity.
25		The missing {quotation mark hand sign} the use of that word for me
26		was misleading to the front desk.
27		I would have to fire Dian unfortunately.

This example shows that Jonathan's way of evaluating his teammate is masculine-oriented since it was marked by an interruption in lines 5-10 and 17 that showed his displeasure towards what Dian did. He also was confrontational and very direct in line 27 when he said that he would fire Dian although he mitigated this through the use of a hedging device. Although Andrea seconded Jonathan's evaluation, it was still Jonathan as the leader or project manager who initiated the confrontation and this could be attributed to his position.

Example 18

Context: Boardroom meeting of Team Mavericks. Andrea was a project manager (Episode 8)

Participants: Andrea, Dian, and Jonathan, Tony Fernandez

1	Tony:	If you were PM would you have done differently?
2	Jonathan:	Definitely, sir
3		I have a different style
4	Tony:	What would you have done?
5	Jonathan:	One thing maybe, as far as just the ability of personality is concerned
6		I could be more positive in my outlook in managing my team
7	Tony:	Andrea wasn't positive?
8	Jonathan:	She has a tendency to be negative sometimes in her outlook
9		She can probably strike a smirk
10		<1> Like if planning </1>
11	Tony:	She's cynical
12	Jonathan:	You can say that sir as a fair adjective, probably
13		As far as corporate maturity is concerned,
14		That may be something she can learn more from you
15		Maybe Andrea is not conscious about her face when she reacts to it
16	Tony:	Heavy statement,
17		He says you're cynical and immature

Jonathan, in this instance, tried to mitigate his negative evaluation of Andrea by using hedges such as "one thing maybe," "I could be," "she can probably," "maybe," and "that may be something". Moreover, he also assigned the adjective "cynical" to Andrea but by first stating that it was Fernandez who attributed it and it is a fair description. In this sense, Jonathan is feminine in his way of evaluating Andrea as a project manager.

The examples provided show that leaders make use of various linguistic forms within the masculine and feminine orientations, and what allows them to strategically choose these orientations is the context or situation. Both leaders made use of a low-key opening style for their group meetings, however, Jonathan was the only one who made use of a high-key style for the large event for AirAsia Foundation, which is congruent with what Holmes (2006) said that "More formal opening statements and higher volume were generally required to bring large groups to order at the beginning of a meeting" (p. 46). This strategy contributed in making his event more positively regarded by Fernandez and his two advisers. When giving directives, Andrea was more feminine oriented and made use of hedges and interrogatives, while Jonathan combined the feminine style with a masculine orientation. In running the meeting, Andrea is transactional-oriented and is very focused on the goal, however, this placed her in a negative light since some of her group members said that she could sometimes be negative.

Example 19:

Context: Boardroom meeting of Team Mavericks. Andrea was a project manager (Episode 8)

Participants: Andrea, Dian, Jonathan, Tony Fernandez

1	Tony:	I think they're trying to say you can be a bit demoralizing
2		I think they're trying to say that you're a little bit bossy sometimes

This example is similar to what Thimm, C., Koch, S., & Schey, S. (2003) said that "it seems, then, that men are allowed to use an explicitly powerful style, but similar behavior by women does not elicit the same kind of approval, a case of 'double standard' for men and women" (p. 536). It is the more masculine style that is highly valued in workplaces, however, when women display or conform to such a style they tend to be regarded negatively. The way Andrea was assessed by her co-workers was similar to the findings of Sung (2013a, 2013b) on how Omarosa Manigault, from the debut season of *The Apprentice U.S.*, was judged. Both Andrea and Omarosa were perceived as aggressive and bossy even when their male counterparts were praised for their ability to be both relational and transactional in their leadership roles.

It is interesting to note that a number of business and management literature still attribute effective workplace with masculine ways of interacting (Holmes, 2006). However, this study, similar to Holmes' (2006), showed that effective leadership style entails the integration of "authoritatively masculine with relationally feminine discourse strategies in ways that are responsive to the features of their particular workplace culture" (p. 63). It is evident that both leaders, Jonathan and Andrea, made use of different styles of leadership depending on the situation. Andrea was able to alternate from feminine to masculine style depending on the context. However, Jonathan was more adept in combining the transactional and relational styles in one conversation, and he is able to achieve his goals while also focusing on the relationship of the team and creating a positive atmosphere. This could have contributed to his success and to Tony Fernandez's choice to hand him the apprenticeship.

5.0 Conclusion

Through this analysis of *The Apprentice Asia*, it can be said that it is high time that the relationship between gender and communication in the workplace be reevaluated. Contextual appropriateness and the task at hand are highly significant factors in determining the use of masculine and feminine language. Based on this study, the use of women's language cannot be solely attributed to one's powerless status in society or in the workplace. It appears that women's language is used by people who are in leadership positions in order to foster relationships or attain interactional goals. Business and management literature has to reexamine the prejudice often associated with masculine ways of interacting where authority, competitiveness, and aggressiveness are often positively evaluated in men while the opposite is true for women. Pincus and DeBonis (as cited in Kinnick & Parton, 2005, p. 432) said that "leadership is at its heart a communication process because it seeks to strengthen human relationships

by increasing trust and understanding." This definition further supports the finding that in order to "do leadership" it is essential to incorporate both transactional and transformational strategies when communicating. However, if such a definition exists and shared by "leading organizational communication textbooks" (Conrad & Poole, 2002; Eisenberg & Goodall, 2004; O'Hair, Friedrich, & Dixon, 2002; Shockley-Zalabak, 2002 as cited in Kinnick & Parton, 2005, p. 432), the way women are evaluated in the workplace for mixing or making use of both transformational and transactional interactions also has to be examined since they are often placed in a negative light for doing so.

Although *The Apprentice Asia* is considered as semi-authentic communication, the results from this study can reveal significant information that can highlight how gender, leadership, and communication come into play in the workplace. It can also help reevaluate the dichotomy often placed in gender communication. The findings can then support pedagogical tools being developed that make use of semi-authentic business communication that emphasize the use of the English language in workplace settings. Lastly, it is important to examine how gender and communication are depicted in media as workplace portrayals consistently depicted on TV can be regarded as realistic representations by viewers.

References

Clifton, J. (2009). Getting real? Using reality TV as a memorable way of introducing semi-authentic business interaction to students of business communication. In P. Daley and D. Gijbels (Eds.), *Real learning opportunities at business school and beyond* (pp. 237-243). Dordrecht: Springer.

Eisner, S. (2006). Apprentice watch: Learning through reality TV. J*ournal of College Teaching & Learning,* 3(9), 19-37.

Hall, K. (2003). Exceptional speakers: Contested and problematized gender identities. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 353-380). Oxford: Blackwell.

Holmes, J. (2009). Discourse in the workplace literature review. In Language in the Workplace Occasional Papers (12). Retrieved from http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/centres-and-institutes/language-in-the-workplace/docs/ops/OP-12.pdf

Holmes, J. (2006) *Gendered talk at work: Constructing social identity through workplace discourse.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2006). Humor and leadership style. *Humor,* 19(2), 119-138.

Holmes, J. & Marra, M. (2004). Leadership and managing conflicts in meeting. *Pragmatics,* 14, 439-462.

Holmes, J., Schnurr, S., Chan, A., & Chiles, T. (2003). The discourse of leadership. *Te Reo*, 46, 31–46.

Holmes, J. & Stubbe, M. (2003). "Feminine" workplaces: Stereotype and reality. In J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoffer (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 573-599). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lakoff, R. (2003). Language, gender, and politics: Putting "Women" and "Power" in the same sentence. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 161-178). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lakoff, R. (1975) *Language and woman's place.* New York: Harper and Row.

Kinnick, N. & Parton, S. (2005). Workplace communication: What the Apprentice teaches about communication skills. *Business Communication Quarterly,* 68(4), 429-456.

Marra, M., Schnurr, S., & Holmes, J. (2006). Effective leadership in New Zealand workplaces. In J. Baxter (Ed.), *Speaking Out: The female voice in public contexts* (240-260). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

O'Barr, W. & Atkins, B. (1980). 'Women's language' or 'powerless language'?. In S. McConnell-Ginet et al. (Eds), *Women and languages in literature and society*, (pp. 93-110). New York: Praeger.

Reilly, E. (2005). Learning from the Apprentice: Opportunities for performance improvement. *Employment Relations Today* (Wiley) 31(4), 15-22.

Romaine, S. (2003). Variation in language and gender. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 98-118). Oxford: Blackwell.

Thimm, C., Koch, S., & Schey, S. (2003). Communicating gendered professional

identity. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 528-118). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sung, C. C. M (2013a). Media representations of gender and leadership: From a discourse perspective. *Brno Studies in English* 39(1), 89-105.

Sung, C. C. M. (2013b). Language and gender in a US reality TV show: An analysis of leadership discourse in single-sex interactions. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 12(2), 25-51.

Sung, C. C. M. (2012). Exploring the interplay of gender, discourse, and (im)politeness. *Journal of Gender Studies* 21(3), 285-300.

Sung, C. C. M. (2007). A discourse study of gender and leadership in The Apprentice. *eSharp* 9, 1-20.

VOICE Project. 2007. VOICE Transcription Conventions [2.1]. Retrieved from http:// www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice. php?page=transcription_general_information