TURN-TAKING BEHAVIOUR AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN SPEECH:
A Case Study of a Group of Educated Sudanese

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in English Language

By:
Naglaa Mohammed Abdelrahim

Supervised by:
Dr. Gubara Abdalla M. Al-Hassan

DEDICATION

To my parents, the most respectful, the soul of love and peace,

To my husband, with love and respect,

To my beloved son, Mu’min and Daughter Baraa.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Contents</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract (English)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract (Arabic)</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter One: INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Need for the Study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Significance of the Study</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Hypotheses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Limitation of the Study</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Structure of the Study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Two: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part One: Conversational Turn-Taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Introduction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Conversation as a Discourse Type</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 What is Turn-Taking System</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Interactional Strategies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Taking the Turn</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Holding the Turn</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Yielding the Turn</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Turn Types</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Two: Conversation and Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Introduction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Language and Gender</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Women as Cooperative Conversationalists</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Three: Literature Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Introduction</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1 The Sudanese Situation</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Topic and Topic Development</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Hedges</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Turn-taking Rules</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Summary</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Four: METHODOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Introduction</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Instruments</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Naturally Occurring Data</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION
5.0 Introduction ...................................................... 51
5.1 Methods of Data Analysis ........................................ 52
5.2.1 Experiment (1) Same-sex group : Females ................. 52
5.2.2 Experiment (2) Same-sex group : Males ................... 54
5.2.3 Experiment (3) Mixed-sex Conversation .................... 55
5.2.4 Hedges .............................................................. 57
5.2.5 Minimal Responses .............................................. 59
5.2.6 Turn-taking Mechanisms ...................................... 62
5.3 Summary of Findings .............................................. 69

Chapter Six: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
6.1 Summary ............................................................ 71
6.2 Implications .......................................................... 72
6.3 Recommendations ................................................ 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................................ 74
Appendices ................................................................. 81
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Dr. Gubara Abdalla M. al-Hassan who has provided wise guidance and encouragement. Without his valuable advice and help, this work would have not been achieved. Thanks are also extended to Dr. Albusairi for his encouragement, comments and advice.

Thanks to Dr. Mohammed Alfatih Braima for his support and comments. Thanks are also extended to Ustaz Taha Mohd. Zein, University of El Neilein for helping me to use the university library and borrow some references. My thanks are also forwarded to my sisters and brothers, my husband’s family, who were patient and helpful throughout the period of my study.
ABSTRACT

Turn-taking Behavior and Gender Differences in Speech:
A Case Study of a Group of Educated Sudanese

This study focuses on the conversational differences between males and females in a group of educated Sudanese speakers. The main purpose is to investigate conversational conventions such as ‘topic' and 'topic development’, ‘hedges’, ‘minimal responses’, ‘turn-taking mechanisms’, ‘interruptions’ and ‘overlaps’, in educated Sudanese Arabic conversations. The reason why Arabic is selected is that students and educated class people are not acknowledged with the conversational techniques in Western societies, generally and English societies, specifically.

The total number of the subjects who have undergone the experiments in this study were twenty-two. They constitute four groupes of speakers, three groups were students in their first year of an M.A. (English) course of study, the fourth group are educated Sudanese speakers from a Sudanese T.V. channel.

The researcher has reached to the following findings:

1- Females used ‘question-asking’ more in their conversation which shows that they faced a problem in developing and discussing topics.

2- Males took the part of ‘decision-makers’ as they succeeded in choosing, developing and discussing their topics.

3- In ‘mixed-sex conversation’ of the M.A. students, where a married couple have participated in the experiments, the
husband infringed his wife’s right to speak, and he dominated the whole conversation.

4- In the presence of males, females remained silent and shy. In contrast, men dominated the conversation.

5- Males tended to use ‘you know’ more frequently than women, when it expresses uncertainty, but less frequently when it expresses confidence.

6- In ‘mixed-conversation’, from a Sudanese T.V. channel, the women used ‘minimal responses’ more than men and in appropriate moments.

7- In the ‘mixed-sex group’, males interrupted and overlapped females more. Females did overlap each other about 110 times and interrupt each other about 128 times. The number of overlaps and interrupts in males conversation is the same (i.e. 200 times).

The study concludes that gender differences and conversational conventions that were in the present study have influenced speech and interaction greatly. It emphasizes that turn-taking mechanisms vary from culture to culture and from language to language.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Gender, i.e. male – female linguistic differences, a division found in all human societies and therefore it is of enormous significance to human beings. Being born male or female affects how we act in the world, how the world treats us. This, as Talbot (1998) argues, includes the language we use and the language used about us. The language we use helps us to do our daily interactional domain and the language used about us describes us and our gender and identity.

Conversation is an important structured activity, and this idea is clarified by Eckert & Mc Connell (2003). ‘Turns’ at talk are one way that show how conversation is structured. Where they say that:

“The structure of talk allows complete strangers to enter into conversations without negotiating how to go about exchanging words; on the other hand, it leaves room for strategy galore – for people to trick and foil each other, to give each other the floor or to rob each other of words” (P:109).

They continued to say, conversational practice has been intensely examined in the study of language and gender.

Studies of conversation confirm that it is a highly structured activity, and that participants in a conversation follow some conventions in a co-operative way. ‘Taking turn’ at speaking is one
of these conventions. But the distribution of talking among speakers is not random; it is governed by ‘turn-taking’ norms and conventions which determine who talks, when, and for how long. A speaker who has not a good knowledge of ‘turn-taking’ rules and techniques is one who does not let others get a word in any conversation.

Conversational conventions such as turn-taking mechanisms, minimal responses, hedges, etc. govern how people take their turns and how many people can talk at once and for how long. They include signals that show ways of letting others speak and – ways of getting the floor. Conversational conventions handle some of this work by providing routines for such things as initiating and ending conversations and for signaling that one is coming to the end of one’s turn – that one is at a “transition-relevant” place, a point where there might be transition to another speaker.

To conclude, ‘turn-taking’ and gender differences vary from culture to culture and from language to language. There is no specific rules for ‘taking turns’ for each language but there are general rules for all languages all over the world. One of these general rules is that one must or should listen when another one is speaking, because if this does not happen there will be a kind of miscommunication between the two speakers. For this reason the researcher has chosen Arabic to be the medium for the experiment.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Conversational conventions and turn-taking mechanisms cause some problems for speakers to organize them in a perfect way. However, Sudanese university students fail to do so. They face
problems in “processing” and developing conversation. These problems are like who talks, when and for how long. Thus, the study attempts to investigate how ‘turn-taking’ rules are organized due to gender differences? In other words, how does gender affect conversational conventions such as topic and topic development, hedges, minimal responses, etc. thus, the researcher selects Arabic to be the medium for the experiment.

1.3 Need for the Study

Differences between males and females in conversation is an important approach in the study of spoken discourse. So, for any conversation to be a real matter of interaction, and to avoid miscommunication between participants (especially males and females), we need to know the differences between them.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Conversation is an important activity in our daily life which we can not do without. Students and speakers use it to convey information, to have contact with each other, to chat or gossip, etc. We can not live without conversing, without signaling and interpreting others' talk. To reach all that, participants encounter difficulty in processing conversation, a difficulty resides among other things, in their failure to select who talks, when and for how long. The aim of the study is to find whether these students or educated speakers in general succeeded in organizing turn-taking techniques and other conversational tactics in respect to their gender. Furthermore, it is hoped to help speakers to improve their conversation techniques, in Arabic.
1.5 Objectives

This study aims to achieve the following objectives:

1- To compare and find differences between males and females in their use of conversational rules and mechanisms.
2- To investigate males – females conversational interactions.
3- To find out to what extent gender affects conversation, in an Arabic Islamic society.

1.6 Hypotheses

1- ‘Turn-taking’ rules are not well-organized between male and female Sudanese university students.
2- Males interrupt females more.
3- Females are good conversationalists, since they always cooperate in developing the conversation.
4- Females are shy in the presence of men, and speak little.
5- Males in ‘mixed-conversations’ dominate the conversation which is due to their power and status in the society.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The study is not intended to investigate conversational rules and techniques particular to English native speakers. In fact, it concentrates on those tactics and techniques which are general to conversation types occurring almost in all living languages. Arabic is being one of them. Hence, it is imperative that the researcher’s conversational sessions were run in Arabic. The fact that the subjects are Arabic native speakers, guarantee a satisfactory degree of
fluency which help the stream of their thinking and speech, thus guarantee agreeable results.

1.8 Structure of the Study

This study consists of six chapters. In this chapter we introduced the topic and its significance and limitation. Chapter two provides intensive theoretical framework for the study. It has two parts, part one is about conversational turn-taking, what turn-taking is, and types of turn-taking. Part two focuses on conversation and gender. Chapter three is literature review. Chapter four is about the method that used in the research. Chapter five is data and discussion. Chapter six is a summary of the research, implications and recommendations. And finally there is a sample of the recorded conversations in Arabic.
CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Part One: Conversation Analysis

2.0 Introduction

Conversation analysis, which is sometimes regarded as a distinct form of discourse analysis (Levinson 1983:286), is a branch of the study which sets out to discover what order there might be in this apparent chaos. This section deals with conversation and turn-taking. Firstly, it gives full details about conversation, its definition and how people interact with each other. Secondly, it goes so far inside conversation to see how turn-taking system works; turn-taking strategies, and finally turn-taking types.

2.1 Conversation as a Discourse Type

According to Snaith (2001), the word ‘conversation’ comes from the Old French word ‘converser’ (‘con’ means ‘together’), which means ‘to keep company with’, and this implicit meaning is important – conversation is keeping company through words. It is the heart of social interaction. The first part of conversation ‘con’ is defined in the Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language as: ‘Con’ means: with, together. The rest of the word is defined in Origins as follows: ‘Vers’ means: to turn about in a given direction. Thus, to engage in conversation literally means, to turn about with others. Cook (1989:51) defines conversation in terms of talk. He says 'talk' may be classed as conversation when:

1- It is not primarily necessitated by a practical task.
2- Any unequal power of participants is partially suspended.
3- The number of participants is small.
4- Turns are quite short.
5- Talk is primarily for the participants and not for an outside audience.

These definitions are not clear, because there is no fixed number of participants at which conversation becomes impossible, but it also has a limited number, it can not take place between hundred people. Also, there is no fixed length for turns in conversation, one can speak for sometime. Another word we use to describe conversation is ‘dialogue’, which comes from the Greek word ‘dialogos’, a word made up of two parts: ‘dia’, which means ‘between two’, and ‘logos’, which means ‘word’. Dialogue then means the speaking that passes backwards and forwards between two or more people (Snaith, 2001).

Conversation is a type of discourse: it is a spoken dialogic discourse. Thus, conversation analysis may be seen as a sub-field of discourse analysis (Schiffrin, 1988:253). Conversation is a branch of study associated with a group of American scholars known as ethnomethodologists because, says Cook (1989:52), they (-ists) setout to discover what methods (-methodology-) people (ethno-) use to participate in and make sense of interaction. Rather than try to impose large structures on what is happening from the outset, they begin at the most local level, trying to see how participants in a conversation interact with each other, how they judge who can speak, and when. They view discourse as a developing process, rather than a finished product. Werth (1981:129), argues that
conversation analysis involves close examination of internal evidence within the (spoken) text. One type of conversation analysis is conversational ethnomethodology: “Ethnomethodologists are primarily concerned with the tacit rules which regulate the taking-up by speakers of the running topic, and hence the change-over from speaker to speaker”. Furthermore, conversation involves two or more participants taking turns and feel comfortable with each other. It is much more than exchange of information in that when people converse they shared a lot of common principles of conversation that make them understand each others’ utterance. Lane (1978) describes some of the concerns of conversation as ‘exchanging information’, maintaining social bonds of friendship, kinship, etc., negotiating statuses and roles and deciding and curring out joint action’. (P:58).

Studying conversation in different cultures at different historical moments can tell us much about those societies: where, when and why people converse, and what they talk about as (Snaith, 2001) says. She continues, there are societies in which people are not allowed to converse freely due to dictatorial governments. Some members of Amish community in the United States, for example, use a silent discourse, communicating through signs, symbols and actions rather than words. They wish to reach a higher level of spirituality by avoiding the ambiguities and conflicts potentially caused by language and conversation.

Thus, conversation has different functions. Its fundamental aim is to show how participants interpret what others intend to say or convey.
2.2 What is Turn-Taking System?

Turn-taking is one of the basic facts of conversation: speakers and listeners change their roles in order to begin their speech (Coulthard, 1985:59). To take a turn is one of the hardest lessons for children under five years to learn … without much experience the child can not know that it is his turn to take. Now let us know what a turn is. Stenström (1994:4) defines a turn as follows:

A turn is everything the current speaker says before the next speaker takes over. Some turns are very short and consist of a single word, other turns are very long and resemble short monologues.

Turn-taking is the most fundamental organizational feature of conversation. There is a set of rules that govern the turn-taking system, which is independent of various social contexts (Saks, Scheglof & Jefferson, 1974:704): (a) when the current speaker selects the next speaker, the next speaker has the right and, at the same time, is obliged to take the next turn; (b) if the current speaker does not select the next speaker, any one of the participants has the right to become the next speaker. This could be regarded as self-selection; and (c) if neither the current speaker selects the next speaker nor any of the participants become the next speaker, the current speaker may resume his/her turn. Rules for turn-taking, says Richards and Schmidt, (1983:141) differ according to the type of speak event. In classrooms, a child raises a hand to talk. In some families, ‘Don’t talk unless you’re spoken to’ is a maxim of table etiquette for children. Turn-taking is one way in which roles of speaking are involved in conversation. In formal conversation, turn-taking is not complex, teachers in classroom control it. In informal
settings, it is quite complex, it depends on power and status, who is the leader of the group or the chairman, who can speak at any time. Sacks (1974) suggests that there is an underlying rule in American English conversation – ‘at least and not more than one party talks at a time’ (in Coulthard, 1977:58). Coulthard (ibid) says that “turns to speak are valued and sought and thus the majority of turns in any conversation consist of only a single sentence unless permission has been sought for a longer turn, perhaps to tell a story or a joke”. Turn-taking rules may vary from culture to culture and may cause problems for the non-native speaker to engage in conversation. Take for example, early in northern Sudan a girl was not allowed to speak with a boy outside her own family. Lien and Brenneis (1978) compared the turn-taking behaviour of American black and white children with Fiji Indian children and found that when arguing both black and white American children were very strict in their attention to each other’s turns, with minimal overlapping. The Fiji Indian children displayed a considerably different attitude towards turn-taking. Taking a turn is something risky, as a speaker turns may usually contain various kinds of hesitation, such as silent and filled pauses, verbal fillers (well, I mean, sort of) interruption, false starts, repetitions and incomplete utterances. Thus, there are some mechanisms and strategies for taking a turn. So the next section is going to deal with turn-taking strategies.

2.3 Interactional Strategies

As we have mentioned before, turn-taking is the most fundamental organizational feature of conversation. Turn-taking
strategies vary between cultures and languages. In our Sudanese community, for example, looking away when someone speaks to you seems impolite and you have to listen when old people talk.

Duncan (1972) has dealt with various behaviours of turn-taking mechanism. According to him, in conversation we use turn-yielding cues, back channel cues, and turn-maintaining cues. Stenström (1994) argued that the turn-taking system involves three basic strategies taking the turn, holding the turn, and yielding the turn. He gives a lot of details about each strategy. As he said these three strategies seem to form a smooth and tidy system where one party speaks at a time, while the other party waits for his turn. In fact, it is not as it appears to be, sometimes the current speaker may be overlapped or interrupted by another speaker.

2.3.1 Taking the Turn

Sometimes the speaker may not plan for what is s/he going to say or is not ready to go ahead. Stenström again makes a distinction between turns involve: starting up, taking over and interrupting. A speaker who has not planned before taking the turn may either hold the turn for time or give up the turn at once. In other words, starting can involve: a hesitant start and a clean start. Most speakers do not give up the turn at once, they use filled pauses (ðm, ð:m) and verbal fillers (eg. Well, I mean, you know) when he takes the turn without being fully prepared. The use of filled pauses and verbal fillers show that the speaker wants to say something but needs more time to be ready and to utter a word. Sometimes to begin a conversation, speakers use lexical items like actually and obviously:
The above example from Stenström (1994:70) shows the use of ‘actually’ as a way of showing unplanned idea and also the use of verbal fillers and filled pauses. On the other hand, to start a clean one, speakers use an introductory starter and the typical starter is realized by ‘well’. To take over means to use uptakes and links. By an <uptake>, which occurs in [response] and [follow-up] moves, the next speaker acknowledges receipt of what the previous speaker said and evaluates it before going on, (ibid). Examples of uptakes such as, ah, no, oh, well, and yes. Links are lexical items (conjunctions) like and, but, so, and cos.

2.3.2 Holding the Turn

To hold a turn means to carry on talking (Stenström, 1993:75). According to Duncan (1972), holding the turn has the same meaning of turn-maintaining cues, which as he defined ‘turn-maintaining cues are used by speakers to keep their speaking turn’. The speaker uses vocal cues such as more filled pauses (with some form of vocalization, e.g. ‘Ah …’) than silent or unfilled pauses. But since the plan of speaking the speaker uses at the beginning is not enough for him to continue the whole turn, he may stop and try to replan to continue for the next turn. Filled pauses (Stenström, 1993) says, can usually be taken to indicate that the speaker has no intention to yield the turn but is actually planning what to say next:
(2) A: ….everyone was. PROMISED their LEAVE # {AND} GOT it # on the DAY # and there was no MONKEYING {ABOUT#}#
- δ : m – so we were REERRRING # …

2.3.3 Yielding the Turn

Turn-taking cues are used by speakers to let the listener know that they have finished what they want to say and that another speaker can take a turn (Duncan, 1972). Stenstrom (1994) defines it as giving up. He says “giving up involves either that the speaker realizes that s/he has no more to say or that s/he thinks that it is time the listener said something. If for any reason the listener does not take the hint, there will be a long pause, and this longer pause demands the listener to say something. Duncan (ibid) identified six turn-yielding cues in conversation. Five are verbal or paralinguistic and transmitted via the auditory channel. These include:

A) Intonation.
B) drawl on the final syllable, or on the stressed syllable, of a terminal clause.
C) Sociocentric sequences, e.g. “but ah”, “You know”, etc.
D) Syntax.
E) Pitch / loudness.

The sixth turn-yielding cue involves gesticulation.

2.4 Turn Types
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One kind of turn-taking which is described by the ethnomethodologists is an adjacency pair (Cook, 89:53). These turns are closely related to each other than other kinds of turns. This occurs when the utterance of one speaker makes a particular kind of response very likely. A greeting, for example, may be answered by another greeting, a summons by an answer. Adjacency pairs are utterances produced by two successive speakers such that the second utterance is identified as related to the first as an expected follow-up (Richards and Schmidt, 1983:128).

According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), the basic rule of adjacency pair operation is that when a speaker produces a recognizable first pair part, that speaker should stop talking and the conversational partner should produce a recognizable second pair part. Sacks (1967) observes that a conversation is a string of at least two turns. He isolates a class of sequences of turn called adjacency pairs which has the following features: they are two utterances long; the utterances are produced successively by different speakers; the utterances are ordered – the first must belong to the class of first pair parts, the second to the class of second pair parts; the utterances are related, not any second pair can follow any first pair part, but only an appropriate one; the first pair part often selects next speaker and always selects next action – it thus sets up a transition relevance and expectation which the next speaker fulfills, in other words the first part of a pair predicts the occurrence of the second; ‘Given a question, regularly enough an answer will follow’. Coulthard (1977) describes adjacency pairs as ‘the basic structural unit in conversation.’ They are used for opening and closing
conversations and very important during conversations because they enable a speaker to select the next action and next speaker, too. Some examples of adjacency pairs are:

(a) Greeting – Greeting
   A: Hello.
   B: Hi.

(b) Summons – Answer
   A: Jimmy!
   B: Coming mother.

(c) Question – Answer
   A: Is that what you mean?
   B: Yes.

(d) Farewell – Farewell
   A: OK, see ya.
   B: So long


Adjacency pairs have some properties: They have what Sacks calls ‘the conditional relevance’ of the second part on the first, and ‘the sequential implicitness’ of the first on the second. Sometimes the second part of an adjacency pair can be omitted by an alternation of turns occurring within it (Q (Q – A) A) in which one question and answer pair contains another. Cook (1998) gives an example to justify this kind:

A: Did you enjoy the meal?
B: (Did you?)
A: Yes.)
B: So did I.

This known as Cook says, an insertion sequence. Sometimes speakers shift from one topic to another unrelated topic, and then back to the first one. This known as ‘a side sequence’. Insertion and side sequence show that conversation is discourse constructed and
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negotiated in time (1998:54). He continues, there is no going back or restructuring. The evidence for this is the term known as repair in which participants correct their words or others’ words. A further kind of turns (Cook, ibid) is the gist or the up shot of what is being said. In the former, the speaker summarizes, the literal (Locutionary) meaning of what has been said using phrases such as ‘I’ll just go over the main points again’. In the latter, it’s the illocutionary or prelocutionary force, it is what the speaker is trying to do with his or her words which is made clear, such as ‘I was only trying to be friendly’.

The last type of turn is known as pre-sequences in which participants in conversation prepare for the next turn that they are going to take. They are like the markers teachers use to signal transitions in lessons: ‘Right!’ or ok’.

Part Two: Conversation and Gender

2.5 Introduction

If we are looking at the ways in which conversation has changed historically, we need to look at gender and conversation (Rebecca, 2001). Women were not allowed into Socrates’ discussion groups or the eighteenth-century coffeehouses, and the porch in African-American communities was dominated by male speech. Women’s experience of conversation, says Rebecca (ibid), therefore, is historically and socially different from that of men. This has meant that women had been, and still are, associated with idle talk and gossip, whereas men’s conversation are on serious matters.
Women’s conversation is linked to the home, people daily lives and emotions.

In a paper written by Rabow and Wolfinger (1977) in which they examine gender differences and whether these differences extend to the interpretation of speech, they mentioned that the best selling work of Tannen (1986, 1990, see also 1993a, 1994a, 1994b) have brought renewed interest to a well-established finding: women and men often speak very differently. Much of the research on gender differences has focused only on speaking. Many researches have argued that gendered speech should be examined within the: context of interaction (see, interalia, Ochs, 1992; Tannen, 1993b). Many have examined gender differences speaking styles. For example, Lakoff (1975) notes that women use tag questions more than men, Johnstone (1993) suggests that men’s talk is more likely than women’s to include references to specific places, times, and objects.

Linguist Tannen (1992) argues that men and women do talk differently, not for any essential or innate reason, but because they are socialized differently. If they understand each other, they can avoid miscommunication and breakdown their relationships. She argues that in general women converse for the sake of communication, to connect with another person, to feel closer, whereas men view conversation as a means of conveying information, and so tend to be direct, often hearting their female partner. Gilligan (1997, 1962) argues that men and women have distinct voices, or models of expression. She claims that women often conceptualize moral dilemmas in terms of social relationships.
In contrast, men orient to moral standards or principles, with less reference to social relationships.

The next section is dealing with gender and language, what are the differences between women and men in speech.

2.6 Language and Gender

A common theme is that women talk, or gossip too much. It has been found that men talk more than women in meetings, television talk shows, and classrooms (Coates, 1993). The question then becomes: if men actually talk more than women, why are women stereotyped as the talkative sex? One explanation put forth by Spender (1985) is that society prescribes that girls and women talk very little, so even if girls and women talk less than men but go beyond the prescribed limits, they are seen as talking too much. In addition, the topics that women use are seen as trivial and negatively evaluated, because they always talk about (children, household tasks, relationships).

One of the earliest scholars to write about language and gender was Robin Lakoff who argues that if the female speaker does not learn how to speak like a lady, she will be criticized and osterized. On the other hand, if she does learn how to speak like a lady, she will not hold the floor in the presence of men or she will not be capable of holding it. She will be criticized for being unable to take part in a serious discussion. Lakoff’s ideas about women’s language can be divided into three classes: (1) it lacks the resources that enable women to express themselves strongly, (2) it encourages women to talk about trivial subjects, and (3) it requires women to
speak tentatively. The following is a complete list of her claims about women’s language:

1- Stronger expletives are reserved for men; weaker expletives are reserved for women (Gomm, 1981).

2- Women’s speech is more polite than men’s.

3- Topics which considered as trivial or unimportant are women’s domain.

4- Women use empty adjectives (adorable, charming, divine, nice, etc.).

5- Women use tag questions more than men (e.g., “The weather is really nice today, isn’t it?”) (Cameron Mc Alinden, & O’leary, 1988; Dubois & Crouch, 1975; Holmes, 1986).

6- Women use question intonation in statements to express uncertainty (“My name is Tammy?”) (Guy et al., 1986; Mc Lemore, 1991).

7- Women use hedges more than men do (“It’s Kinda nice”) (Holmes, 1984; O’Barr & Athins, 1980).

8- Women speak in “italics” (use intensifiers more than men); (e.g., “I feel so happy”).

9- Women use (heper-) correct grammar. (Cameron & Coates, 1988; Eckert, 1989a; Labov, 1972b).

10- Women do not tell jokes. (Jenkis, 1986; Painter, 1980).

The fact that most cultures mark gender as well as age differences, made gender differences in communication a topic for intensive research. According to social learning theorists, parents reward appropriate gender behaviours and punish inappropriate
gender behaviours. As Coates (1993) argues, it is not sufficient for the child to be linguistically competent; in order to function in the real world, s/he must also have learned when to speak, when to remain silent, what to talk about – and how to talk about it – in different circumstances. Girls and boys learn during childhood to identify with one group or the other. They demonstrate their membership of the group by their use of gender-appropriate behaviour (Coates, 1993:107).

Tannen (1995) believes that everything is said must be said in a certain way – in a certain tone of voice, at a certain rate of speech, and with a certain degree of loudness. How do you say what you mean differs from one person to the next. She defined linguistic style as a set of culturally learned signals by which we do not only communicate with each other what we mean, but also to interpret what others mean, and evaluate one another as people. The patterns that constitute linguistic style are different for men and for women. From childhood, girls tend to play with a single best friend or in small groups and they spend a lot of time talking. They use language to show how close they are to each other. They learn to play the ways in which one is better than the others and to emphasize the ways in which they are all the same. They learn that to be sure of themselves will make them unpopular with their peers. They criticize a girl who calls attention to herself, and they call a girl who tells others what to do “bossy”, says Tannen (1995:245).

On the other hand, says Tannen (ibid), boys tend to play differently. They usually play in larger groups, and boys with high status are not treated like the others and one of them is selected to be
a leader of the group. Boys learn to use language to negotiate their status, power and show their abilities by challenging others and to keep the high-status role, they give orders to the others. These childhood play groups are girls and boys learn their conversational styles. This emphasizes the fact that women and men have different ways of saying what they mean, and conversations between them can be like cross-cultural communication: you cannot assume that another person means what you would mean if you said the same thing in the same way.

Gender difference in communication also exist among adults. Aries (1976) found that conversational topics shifted as a function of the group’s sex composition. In same-sex groups, he says, females disclosed a significant amount of personal information whereas males discussed general topics like sports. In mixed-sex groups, females talk less and males talk more about themselves (e.g., feelings, attitudes). Fishman (1978) examined how topics are raised and initiated between women and men. From the transcripts, she found that there were seventy-six topics raised. The women initiated forty-seven of them, the men twenty-nine. That is, the women raised between one and a half and two times more topics than did the men. However, raising a topic does not mean that it gets talked about. Sometimes you can introduce or raise many topics in a limit of time, but it does not tell you that a conversation may occur. To keep the conversation going on, both participants must work hard to make it happen.

Several studies (Braid and Bradley 1979; Hall and Braundwall 1981; Lakoff 1975) found communicative style differences between
males and females. While females are viewed as attentive, supportive and friendly, males are found to be aggressive, direct and dominant. Key (1975) found that women use more tag questions, modifiers or hedges, intensifiers, modal constructions and imperatives. Mc Millan et al. (1977) found that women used more expressions of uncertainty and in addition, they viewed as using less assertive linguistic forms than men (Siegler and Siegler, 1976).

In their review of cross-sex conversations, Maltz and Borker (1982) noted that (1) women ask more questions than men. There are two interpretations of meaning of questions. Women see questions as a part of conversational maintenance, while men view them as request for information; (2) women do more to maintain the conversational flow in routine interactions. There are rules for beginning an utterance and linking it to the preceding one. Women’s rules call for an explicit acknowledgement of the preceding utterance and making a connection to it. Men, on the other hand, seem to ignore the preceding comments and have no such role; (3) women use more positive minimal responses. They interpret overt aggressiveness as personally directed, negative, and disruptive, while men view it as one conversational organizing structure for conversational flow; (4) women usually are silent after interruptions. There are two understandings of topic flow and topic shift. The literature of story telling in particular, say that men have a system in which topic is fairly narrowly defined and keep until finished and shifts between topics are abrupts. Women have a system in which topic is developed progressively and shifts gradually; (5) women use inclusive pronouns like ‘we’ more frequently than men. In problem
sharing and advice giving, women tend to discuss problems with each other, sharing experiences and offering reassurances. In contrast, men seem to hear women, and other men, who respond by giving advice, by acting as experts, lecturing to their audiences. (Maltz and Borker, 1982:213). Moreover, men interrupt more; dispute others’ statements more; ignore others’ comments more; use more conversational control mechanisms and make more direct declarations than women.

Thus, Maltz and Borker use the model of interethnic communication, arguing as does Guperz (1977, 1979, 1982a), that ‘systematic problems develop in communication when speakers of different speech cultures interact and these problems are the result of differences in systems of conversational inference and the cues for signaling speech acts and speaker’s intent’ (1982:201).

To sum up, women and men’s talk is considered to be the topic for intensive work. Women and men often speak very differently. Many researchers have shown this fact such as (Lakoff 1975; Tannen 1992, 1993, 1994; Johnston 1993; Zimmerman and West 1975; Stenström 1993, etc.).

Gender differences in conversational turn-taking is a fundamental issue, since there are a lot of believes about how women interact with social class? Women are stereotyped as talkative creatures, use a lot of tag questions, use gossip language, use hedges more than men. In contrast, men are considered to speak as authority, interrupt more, ask questions to gain information, dominate the whole conversation in mixed-sex conversations.
2.7 Women as Cooperative Conversationalists

Despite the widespread stereotype of women as the talkative sex, and proverbs which characterize women as garrulous (‘women’s tongues are like lambs’ tails; they are never still’), most of the research evidence points the other way (Holmes, 1992:293). There are many features of interaction which differentiate the talk of women and men.

Zimmerman and West, (1975); West and Zimmerman, (1977), examined irregularities in conversations where turn-taking did not follow the smooth pattern. They found differences between the conversations involving two speakers of the same sex and those involving one speaker of each sex. The two sorts of irregularity they identified are called overlap and interruption.

Overlaps are instances of slight over-anticipation by the next speaker: instead of beginning to speak immediately following current speaker’s turn, next speaker begins to speak at the very end of current speaker’s turn, overlapping the last word (or part of it). Interruptions on the other hand, are violations of the turn-taking rules of conversation. (Coates, 1993:109).

We define interruptions as violations of speaker’s turn at talk (West & Zimmerman, 1977; Zimmerman & West, 1975). This definition was based on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson’s (1974) model of turn-taking in which Sacks argues that ‘one party at a time’ is the preferred order of speakers. He represents the mechanism for speaker transition as an order set of rules. Interruption do not have a systematic basis in the provisions of the turn-taking model. An interruption involves a “deeper intrusion into the internal structure of
a speaker’s utterance” than an overlap, and penetrates well within the syntactic boundaries of a current speaker’s utterance (West & Zimmerman, 1977:523).

It has been found that men interrupt others more than women do. Below is a table of a study from Zimmerman and West (1975) which illustrates that in some gender interactions, interruptions were pretty distributed between speakers. In cross-gender interactions, almost all the interruptions were from males.

### Table (2.1) Average number of interruptions per interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>% Interruptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex interaction speaker 1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sex interaction woman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** From Zimmerman and West, 1975:116.

In exchanges between parents and children, fathers interrupt more, and daughters were interrupted most – both by their parents.

Edelsky (1981) found that women participate more actively when the ‘floor” of talk is not of the one – turn – at – a – time model described by conversation analysts, but is more informal and collaborative, with people often speaking at the same time (Thorne, Kramarae & Henley, 1983:17).
Another aspect of how women are cooperative conservationalists is the fact that they provide more encouraging feedback to their conversational partners than men do. One New Zealand study examined the use of positive feedback (noises such as mm and mhm) in casual interaction between young people found that women gave over four times of this type of supportive feedback than men.

One researcher noted that women students develop the ideas of previous speaker rather than challenge them.

Interaction requires at least two people. Every remark or turn at speaking should be seen as an attempt to interact, to open or close a conversation. But conversation is produced not only by the presence of these two people, but also by their continuing agreement to pay attention to each other and by the continual, turn – by – turn, efforts of the participants.

There are a variety of strategies of interaction between women and men. Fishman (1978) suggests that there is inequality in talk between sexes. Conversation is more problematic for women, who work harder to make it happen. On the other hand, it is less problematic for men, who exert control over it. Despite this fact, it has been found that women are more actively engaged in insuring interaction than men. They ask questions and they do active and continuation work in conversations. Men, on the other hand, do less active work when they begin or participate in interactions. They much more often discourage interactions initiated by women than vice versa.
In general, research on conversational interaction reveals women as cooperative conversationalists and men as less supportive and more competitive of others.
CHAPTER THREE
LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

Conversation is a technique that involves two or more people exchanging information and sharing conversational strategies such as who starts talking, when and for how long. However, human beings spend a large part of their lives engaged in conversation. In current literature, the term 'conversation' is used to refer to any spoken discourse or interaction. It is governed by 'turn-taking' rules which regulate norms of talking among speakers.

The emphasis on communicative competence led to the concept of these conversational rules. Hymes (1972) argues that the child must learn when to speak, when to remain silent, what to talk about – and how to talk about it – in different circumstances. He also believes that the Chomskyan notion of the child having a set of rules which enables him to produce grammatical sentences is not sufficient. It extends to both knowledge and expectation of who may or may not speak in certain settings, when to speak and when to remain silent, how one may talk to persons of different states and roles, what nonverbal behaviors are appropriate for various contexts, what the routines of 'turn-taking' are in conversation, etc. Lane (1978) describes some of the concerns of conversation as 'exchanging information, maintaining social bonds of friendship, kinship, etc., negotiating statuses and rules and deciding and carrying out and joint action' (p:58).
Until very recently most of the work in conversational analysis had been made by three sociolinguistics: Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, who worked with conversational materials "not because of a special interest in language", but because they saw conversational analysis as a first step towards achieving a 'nationalistic observational discipline" to deal with details of social interaction in rigorous, empirical and formal way, (cited in Coulthard, 1977:59). Those sociolinguistics, including Goffman (1974, 1976), view conversation as social interaction within a social frame, and those who were labeled 'ethnomethodologists' (e.g. Grafinkel 1971, Psathas 1979, Sacks 1972a, Schegloff 1988, Schenkien 1978a, b, Sudanow 1972 & Turner, 1974) divide conversation into two principles: ethnomethodological principle and cooperative. For ethnomethodologists, the social world is an achievement, and its content is not as interesting as the character of work that social members do to maintain it. Ethnomethodologists are interested in societal members' knowledge of their ordinary affairs and everyday practices (Richards and Schmidt, 1983: 118). All of these are viewed as accomplishments; so, ethnomethodologists frequency frequently speak of "accomplishing ethnicity', 'doing talk' (Turner 1974), or doing 'topicalization work' (Winskowski 1977: 77), as opposed for example to 'taking about a topic'.

Goffman (1976) points out that all talk is grounded on its surroundings, but what we call conversation is more loosely anchored to the world than other kinds of utterances. Moreover, he continues, in everyday terms we often orient to 'a conversation' as a kind of event. Hymes (1977a) uses the term 'speech event' for
activities that are directly governed by the norms for the use of speech.

The second approach to conversation is that conversation is more than exchanging information. When people converse, they bring to the conversational process shared assumptions and expectations about what conversation is, how conversation develops, and the sorts of contribution they are each expected to make (Richards & Schmidt, 1983: 120). The second principle of conversation which is the cooperative principle deals with Grice's four maxims of Cooperative Behaviour. Below are these maxims:

1. Maxim of Quality: Make your contribution just as informative as required.
2. Maxim of Quantity: Make your contribution one that is true.
3. Maxim of Relation: Make your contribution relevant.

The principles and maxims of cooperative behaviour illustrate some of the assumptions people bring to conversation.

Coulthard (1977) states that all communities have an underlying set of non-linguistic rules which govern, when and how often speech occurs. French children, for example, he adds, are encouraged to be silent when visitors are present at dinner; Russian children are encouraged to talk. Among the Arucanian, men are encouraged to talk in all occasions, while women are to be silent and a new wife is not permitted to speak for several months.
Watson and Graves (1966) report that compared with Americans, Arab students confront each other more directly when conversing, sit closer, are more likely to touch each other and speak loudly, a behaviour which is often interpreted as aggressive or over-friendly by Americans. Even in Europe there are surprising differences. One ethnographer reports how, when he was researching in Iceland, neighboring Eskimos would visit one a day for an hour to check that all was well. During the hour there would be no more than half a dozen exchanges, and all the rest of the time was spent in silence. Polgar (1960) discovered that Mesquaki Fox children interpreted the normal loudness of voice and directness of American English teachers as 'meanness' and 'getting mad', and even more serious, has been the misinterpretation of the behaviour of thousands of Negro children in New York schools. Bereiter and Engelmann (1966) working with four – years – old in Urbana, claimed that they communicated by gestures, 'single words' and 'a series of badly connected words or phrases' such as 'they mine' or 'me got juice'. They concluded that these children must be treated as if they had no language at all, and therefore they devised a pre-school programme using formal language drills to teach the children English.

3.1.1 The Sudanese Situation

What Watson and Graves' (1966) report about Arab students, is almost the same in our Sudanese community. There are general rules which are common to all Sudanese people. Remaining silent when old people speak is one of the basic rules in our community. Moreover, kids are not allowed to speak in the presence of old
people until they get permission. Women in same-sex group tended to speak loudly and at the same time, raising topics such as fashion, kids and their education, home, furniture and sensitive talk, etc. On the other hand, men also tended to speak loudly, but not at the same time. They listen to each others' opinions carefully and raise topics such as politics, sports, religion, financial issues, etc. In the presence of men, women do either remain silent or speak very little.

Earlier Sudanese families used to live all together in large houses. Three or four families used to stay in one big house. Thus, their children were surrounded with a lot of care, love and protection. All old people were around those children, taking care of them correcting their behaviors towards each others and directing their talk, when to start talk, when to let others talk and when to remain silent. Therefore, there were many cultural associations where educated people develop their ideas and organize their talk. Moreover, at schools there were parents council in which the parents discuss their children’s needs and problems and other issues concerning with their children. All these societies and discussion meetings help these people to learn how to make a real conversation and how to organize and develop these conversational rules and techniques.

These activities are still present nowadays, but there is no much care about them. There are no active members to carry on this work and this is why our children and students had no any idea about these conversational rules.

Very early and in urban areas in Sudan, especially on northern and eastern areas, males had control over females. Males had the
right to order females to do things for them. For example, to bring them a glass of water. Males had the right to learn and got well education while females had to stay at home doing home stuffs as cooking, washing dishes and cleaning houses, farming, bringing water and wood, etc. Females always remain silent in the presence of males. Silence very early was considered as a sign of accepting offers, especially wedding offers. Females did not say anything when someone offers them a wedding proposal, their husbands were chosen by their fathers.

Nowadays, after education, civilization, technological development, etc. everything has changed. Women now have the right to have good education, good positions at the government offices, share males almost in everything.

3.2 Topic and Topic Development

The way topics are selected, discussed, developed and changed is important for the organization of conversation. Coulthard (1977) argues that topics are not relevant to particular conversation – and that they depend on the person one is talking to. Schegloff and Sacks (1973; cited in Richards and Schmidt 1983), point out that the participants select a topic as first topic through a process of negotiation. Which however, may be raised and developed until it reaches a point where it can be introduced. Winskewski (1977&1978) refers to 'topicalizing behaviours', as bringing up topics, responding to others' topics, mentioning something, avoiding the mention of something and discussing something.
Control of topics in conversation is shared between participants, especially in same-sex conversation, while in mixed–conversations, male speakers tend to dominate. Conversational dominance is the focus of research by Leet–Pellegrini (1980) which looked at the interaction of the independent variables of speakers' gender and expertise. He found that speakers who are both male and well-informed tended to dominate conversation. They talked more and infringed the other speakers' turns more. On the other hand, speakers who were both female and uniformed talked less and used more minimal responses and other supportive linguistic behaviour.

In contrast to Leet–Pellegrini's findings, more recently, De Fransisco (1991) found that the women in her study talked more than the men and introduced more topics, which was not due to dominance, but because their topics were not accepted by men. In a study which extends Fishman's (1983) work, De Fransisco got seven married couples to tape themselves at home for a week or more, and then she interviewed each of the participants and asked them to comment on extracts from their recorded speech. Table 3.1 gives the detailed results of the study.

Table 3.1 Turn-taking violations in the daily interaction of seven couples (based on De Fransisco, 1991:416)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed response</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In adequate response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De Fransisco concluded that the men's strategies allowed them control over domestic interaction. This finding is supported by Sattel (1983), who argues that silence is used by men to show another kind of male's dominance.

Women and men differ in their success of raising topics. Finally, there were marked differences in whether conversational topic initiated by women and men succeeded. Fishman (1983) examined the initiation of topics between men and women, and her findings show marked differences. Below are the results of her study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Fishman, 1983:97)

All the topics initiated by men succeeded, and all failure at initiating topics were women's. Fishman also found that men's statements were more likely to get responses than women's.

3.3 Hedges

The description of women's speech as 'tentative', is linked to the claim that they use more hedges. 'Hedges' are linguistic forms such as 'I think, I'm sure, you know sort of and perhaps' which express a speaker's certainty or uncertainty about the position under discussion. One of the early claims about women's language, Lakoff (1975) states that women used hedges more than men is linked with
unassertiveness, and this is because women are socialized to believe that asserting themselves strongly is not nice or lady like, or even feminine (Lackoff, 1975:54).

Very early, in 1973, and 1974, Hirchman examined male-female differences in conversational interaction. The first experiment was on 1973. Two male and female while college students were taped in dyadic conversation, in all possible pairs of the four, with topic controlled. There were no sex differences in speaking time or proportion of qualifiers (e.g., I think). Women used more fillers (e.g. uhm, you know), more pronouns involving the other speaker, and more of the 'mm hmm' response, especially with each other. The two women interrupted or overlapped each other more than any other pair; they tended to elaborate on each other's utterances, while the men tended to argue. Hirchman's second experiment (1974), was a study of four single sex and eight mixed-sex pairs conversing about love, sexuality, and marriage. There is no sex differences on the amount of speech. The only difference: women outnumbered men to 53 to 8 in the use of 'mm hmm'; women used more 'mm hmm's' in same-sex than in mixed-sex conversation. Men used almost twice as many as 'I think' as women.

Few researchers had carried out empirical studies on women's use of hedges and Lakoff's claims about them. These few studies suggest the need of knowing the different functions of hedges.

Relatively research focusing on the expression of tentativeness was carried out by Preisher (1986). He recorded groups of four people (both single-sex and mixed) discussing conversational subjects such as violence on television or corporal punishment for
children. His sample consists of women and men from two different age groups (20-25 and 45-50), and from three occupational groups. All the informants worked and lived in Lancaster. The result showed that the women in his sample used significantly more hedges than the men.

More recently is Holmes analysis (1987) which is more delicate than Preisher's, because she distinguishes between the different functions of hedges. For example, the hedge 'you know' in her data has two functions: to express the speaker's confidence or certainty and to express the speaker's uncertainty. She isolates three different ways that 'you know' can be used to express certainty. For emphasis, to attribute knowledge about a general situation to another speakers whether or not one knows they have it, and to refer to conjoint knowledge that one is certain an interaction shares. She found that women use 'you know; more frequently than men when it expresses confidence, but less frequently when it expresses uncertainty. Moreover, her findings challenge Lackoff's assertion that women use more hedges, because they lack confidence, since female used 'you know' more in its confident sense. Table 3.2 summarises the distribution of these two different function of 'you knows' in women's and men's speech.

Table 3.2 Distribution of 'you know' by function and speaker's gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of you know</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressing confidence</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37 (P=0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing uncertainty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much more recently is Houghton (1995) who examined a group therapy session conducted among young women. Although in the particular utterance she highlights 'you know', it does not technically occur as a 'discourse marker' (because it is syntactically integrated into the sentence produced and thus not grammatically parenthetical), its use by the young woman 'client' and the therapists response to it shed considerable light on the discourse particle use of 'you know'.

### 3.4 Turn-taking Rules

Sacks et al (1974) made a model of turn-taking in naturally occurring conversation which represents the way turns are taken in conversation. The current speaker in conversation may select the next speaker (by asking them a question, for example, or addressing them by name), in which case the person selected must speak next. If the current speaker does not select the next speaker, then one of the other participants in the conversation can speak next. If none of them does speak, the current speaker has the right to continue.

Later came Zimmerman and West (1975; West and Zimmerman 1977) who taped thirty-one conversations involving two participants in 'coffee shops, drug stores and other public places' on the campus of the university of California. Ten conversations took place between two women, ten between two men, and eleven between one woman and one man. They analysed these conversations using Sacks et al's model, because they were
interested in the mechanisms of 'Turn-taking'. They examined irregularities in the transcribed conversations, and they identified two sorts of irregularity which they called overlaps and interruptions. Tables 3.3 and 3.4 show the number of overlaps and interruptions occurred in their experiment.

Table 3.3: Turn-taking irregularities in twenty same-sex pairs (based on Zimmerman and West 1975:175).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st speaker</th>
<th>2nd speaker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Turn-taking irregularities in twenty same-sex pairs (based on Zimmerman and West 1975:115).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Female speaker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that in mixed-sex conversations men infringed women's right to speak, especially women's right to finish a turn. Conversely, the fact that women used no overlaps in conversation suggests that women are concerned not to violate the man's turn, but to wait until he's finished.

Tannen (1994) points out that overlap is often a supportive conversational strategy, enhancing rather violating a speaker's turn. Reinsman (1974), for example, observes that conversations on the island of Antigua commonly involve multiple speakers. Edelsky (1981) looked at mixed-sex conversations during faculty meetings
and found that both women and men are participating roughly equally in informed portions of the meetings where there were multiple speakers "on the floor", whereas women's participation was significantly less than men's when the meeting was proceeding in the more canonical single-speaker at a time fashion.

Turn-taking rules may vary from culture to culture. Lein and Brenneiess compared the turn-taking behaviour of American Black and White children with Fiji Indian children and found that when arguing both black and white American children were very strict in their attention to each others' turns, with minimal overlapping. The Fiji Indian children displayed different attitudes towards turn-taking.

While overlap can clearly be supportive, interruption is another way of showing dominance. As Tannen (1994) emphasizes, an interruption takes more than one participant and that it is not complete until the first speaker ceases talking. Fishman (1983) made a study on private conversations of several graduate student heterosexual couples. This study depicted men dominating their partners through the strategic use of both silence and interruption. These men not only interrupted their partners during conversations, but they also did not take up their partners' topics in conversations. The result is that women often failed in trying to start a conversation on a topic that they choose.

Quantity of speech between males and females is another way that shows who speaks more. There is a common believe that women are talkative creatures and that all Western societies, as recently Eckert and Mcconnel (2003) stereotyped women as talking excessively and trivially.
In 1975, Swacker did an experimental study in which men and women were given a line drawing of a room to examine, and were then asked to describe the picture from memory. She found two differences in the responses of the male and the female subjects. One item in the picture was a bookcase with a number of books on it. The participants were equally inaccurate in saying how many books were on the shelves the men were more precise in their statements while the women tended to hedge. The other difference was that men talked overwhelmingly longer than the women, on occasion having to be stopped by the experimenter as the tape ran out.

Research on amount of speech shows that not only do men talk more than women, but that women and men tend to talk more in different kinds of situations (Eckert and McConnell, 2003). On a recent review of the literature on amount of speech, Deborah James and Janice Drakich (1993) found that out of 56 studies of adult mixed-gender interaction, 34 (6) percent showed males talking more than females overall, while only 2 studies showed female talking more overall. The remaining 20 studies showed either no gender differences (16) or sometimes males and sometimes females talking more (4).

3.5 Summary

This chapter reviewed some of the related literature. It focused on how conversational conventions or techniques were established among different societies, generally and the Sudanese society, specifically.
CHAPTER FOUR
METHODOLOGY

4.0 Introduction

For any research to be valid and reliable, the researcher should use the method applicable to her topic. For the fact that the research is a case study of a group of Sudanese educated speakers, the researcher has adopted the case study as a method of research. As Nunan (1993:79) states that ‘a case is a single instance of a class or entities, and a case study is the investigation of that single instance in the context in which it occurs. It examines a facet or particular aspect of the culture or subculture under investigation. Adelman et. al. (1976) suggest some advantages of adopting case study as a method of research. In contrast with other research methods, it is ‘strong in reality’. It can represent a multiplicity of viewpoints, and can offer support to alternative interpretations. It also provides a database of materials which may be reinterpreted by future researches. Finally, case study data are usually more accessible than conventional research reports, and therefore capable of surving multiple audiences.

Accordingly, a detailed description of the data (naturally – occurring spoken discourse), the subjects, techniques of data analysis and procedures used in the study were explained. Moreover, the study is designed to find answers for some questions about ‘turn-taking’ behavior and gender differences. First, how do males and females choose their topic, and how do they develop it? Do they shift to another topic or they just keep on one topic? Second, who
interrupts who? Third, do females and males use ‘minimal responses’ to express confidence or do they use them to express uncertainty? Four, how do speakers take their turns? Do they follow any rules or techniques? Finally, who uses hedges more: males or females?

4.1 Instruments

Four different tapes of scripts were used to collect the data for the study. Two tapes were recordings of ‘same sex group’ of males and females. The other two tapes were recordings of ‘mixed-sex’ groups. One of them was recorded from a T.V programme on a Sudanese channel. The recordings show natural conversation and real interaction between participants. These recordings are going to be translated in English.

4.1.1 Naturally Occurring Data

There are various kinds of data collection techniques, such as naturally-occurring data, role play, completion discourse tasks, verbal report interviews, field notes, etc. For the reason that the research focuses on spoken discourse, the researcher has adopted naturally occurring spoken discourse for collecting data. Each of these data collection techniques has its own advantages and disadvantages. Silverman (2004), noted that audio and video recordings are an increasingly important part of qualitative research. Transcripts of such recordings, he continued, based on standerized conventions, provide an excellent record of ‘naturally occurring’ interaction and compared to field notes of observational data, recordings and transcripts can offer a highly reliable record to which
researchers can return as they develop new hypotheses. Other advantages that have been noted are cited in Bardovi & Hartford, (1993), these may be mentioned below:

1- The data are spontaneous.
2- The data reflect what the speakers say rather than what they would say.
3- The speakers are reaching to a natural situation rather than to a contrived and unfamiliar situation.
4- The communicative event has real – world consequences.
5- The event may be a source of rich pragmatic structures (structures as they are used in communicative functions in the real world).

Hartford and Bardovi – Harlig (1992) compared naturally occurring data with discourse completion data and they found that discourse completion task did not promote the turn-taking and negotiation strategies found in natural conversations.

Furthermore, the discourse completion task allowed students to be less polite because of the absence of face-to-face interaction and despite the respondents’ lower status in the discourse task. Finally, the respondents were able to opt out with the discourse completion task, which was not the case in the natural situation. Field notes seem to be more practical tool but may not be suitable for comparative studies.

As mentioned before, the researcher has adopted recording as the main instrument for collecting data. One reason why the researchers used recordings is that the aim of the study is to
investigate the differences in speech between males and females and recordings are the best tool for doing so.

From the recordings one should have the whole discourse. Moreover, we can not remember such events at the time as pauses, overlaps, interruptions, minimal responses and the like. The investigator found that all writers (Sacks, Coates, Tannen, to mention (a few) who wrote on conversation use this methodology. To understand why audio tapes of naturally occurring talk are useful, we must return to the work of Sacks (1974) who believes that, we can not rely on our notes or recollections of conversations, to say that one can usually summarize what different people say. But to remember or take notes for such events ,like in breathes,pauses,etc.,is difficult.

The researcher found that tapes are available to the scientific world and by returning to transcripts, one can find unlimited data to analyze and can study them again and again. But despite all these advantages, the researcher has been faced by some difficulties. First, collecting and analyzing the data are time-consuming. Gathering the participants took a lot of time, since they were all employees and they usually leave immediately after work. Second, some of the participants speak quickly and some mumble words which made it difficult for the researcher to analyze.

4.2 Subjects

The total number of subjects in this study is twenty-two of both sexes. All of them are Sudanese, educated adults (their ages range from 25-45). The subjects were divided into 4 groups. The
first three groups are M.A. students at the University of Khartoum, Faculty of Arts, Department of English. All of them are native speakers of Arabic and have studied Arabic fifteen years as a school subject. The first group (experiment 1) consists of six males. Their ages are between (25 – 35). The second group (experiment 2) is ‘same-sex’ group of females. They are also six and their ages are between (25 – 30). The third group (experiment 3) is ‘mixed-group’, consists of seven participants (three girls and four boys). Their age-group is between (25 – 35). Some of them were the same participants of the two previous groups, because the whole number of M.A. students were not enough. The choice of the subjects is due to the fact that these students have a better knowledge of how research is done than undergraduate students. Also, they know that they will get some benefits from this real experience since they are going to do a complementary research, too. The reason behind the choice of Arabic language to be the media of communication between participants is that it is easy for the subjects to express themselves well in their mother tongue rather than using a second language. The focal point is that the study aims to investigate gender differences in conversation not the kind of language participants use. Thus, the medium is not the focus of the study, it is gender differences in speech. Moreover, some students are afraid of talking in English because they always find themselves searching and struggling to find the exact word to say. This difficulty will obstruct the whole discourse. The fourth group of participants (experiment 4) consists of two interviewees, men and a woman beside the interviewer who is a man. The subjects are highly-educated people.
One of them is a minister, another is a translator and a women is a linguistic researcher. Their age group is about (35 – 45). The conversation was on a Sudanese TV channel. These groups were labeled as experiments (1 – 4) The table below summarizes the information about the subjects.

Table (4.1) Classification of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiments</th>
<th>Groups of Subjects</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>Age – group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Same-group / females</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(25 – 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same-group /males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(25 – 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mixed-group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(25 – 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mixed-group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(35 – 45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Procedure

All the administration of the recording was done by the investigator. This enabled her to observe carefully the linguistic and non-linguistic features such as body language. The subjects were told that they have to choose any topic and talk about it and they have the choice to change it and shift to another topic when ever they wanted. The subjects were gathered in a small room to make sure that the recorder will pick up every uttered word clearly. No one of the subjects showed any sign of discomfort. They were asked to talk naturally and to take no care of the recorder. The whole hours of recordings were about two hours. First, the subjects started speaking slowly and in a way trying not to interrupt each other, but when the topic became serious, they started to interrupt and overlap each other. After collecting the data, some conversational features
such as ‘topic and topic-development’, ‘hedges’, ‘minimal responses’, ‘interruptions’ and ‘overlaps’ and ‘turn-taking mechanisms’ were studied and analyzed due to gender differences between participants.

4.4 Techniques of Data Analysis

There are different methods to be used for analyzing data. In fact, the choice between different research methods should depend on what the researcher attempts to find out. As Silverman (2001:25) argues, if one wants to discover how people tend to vote, then a qualitative method seem to be the most appropriate choice. On the other hand, if one is concerned with exploring people’s life histories, or everyday behaviour, then qualitative methods may be favoured. He also points out, that the audio-taped data is qualitative. There are four major methods used by qualitative researchers: observation, analyzing texts and documents, interviews and recording and transcribing. These methods, as Silverman (2001) says, can be used in quantitative and qualitative research. Transcripts of audio or video recordings are rarely used in quantitative research, because of the assumption that they are difficult to quantify.

As mentioned before, the researcher used transcripts of audio recordings to collect the data. These tape recordings were transcribed and then analyzed to look at some conversational tactics between males and females. Each of these tactics was analyzed separately. These tactics are ‘topic and topic development’, ‘hedges’, ‘minimal responses’ and ‘turn-taking mechanisms’ which include ‘interruptions’ and ‘overlaps’.
Below is a description of the steps the researcher followed in the process of analyzing the differences between males and females in speech.

1- The researcher transcribed the tapes, so that she could focus directly on these gender differences.

2- The researcher started with how topics were handled between ‘males’/‘females’ and in ‘mixed-sex’ group? How did they start, choose, develop and discuss their topics? What kinds of conversational devices such as ‘question-asking’ did they use?

3- The researcher used Holmes’ distribution of the hedge ‘you know’. She counted the frequencies of ‘you know’ for each group of subjects.

4- The number of ‘minimal responses’, interruptions and overlaps used by the subjects, were counted and tabulated. The researcher used Zimmerman and West’s (1975) table which counted the frequencies of the irregularities of ‘turn-taking’ in conversation.

5- The analysis of the data led to the results of the study, which were the frequencies of conversational ‘turn-taking’ differences between males and females. Thus, the researcher used techniques of counting and tabulation to analyze the data.

4.5 Summary
The aim of this chapter is to describe the methods and tools used in this study. A detailed description of procedure and the subjects was made. Moreover, a full description of the use of recordings and why the researcher has adopted this method of data collection was also discussed. Techniques of data analysis were written in details.
CHAPTER FIVE
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.0 Introduction

The following chapter deals with data analysis and discussion. First, the researcher attempts to find answers to the following questions:

- Who starts the conversation? How does he/she start the topic?
- Who interrupts more? Males or females?
- Who uses ‘minimal responses’, such as ‘well’, ‘you know’, etc.? Do they use ‘minimal responses’ in an appropriate way or not?
- Who uses ‘you know’ to express confidence? And who uses it to express uncertainty?
- How do participants use ‘turn-taking’ rules? Do they know when to start and when to finish and when to give others chance to speak? Who dominates the conversation?
- Who uses ‘hedges’ more? Males or females?

Since the purpose of the study is to investigate conversational conventions between males and females, these conventions are going to be discussed separately. The conventions in questions include: ‘topic and topic development’, ‘hedges’, ‘minimal responses’, ‘Turn-taking’ mechanisms which also include ‘interruptions’ and ‘overlaps’.
5.1 Method of Data Analysis

Writing speech transcripts is extremely hard, because topics are open and each speaker tries to participate and sometimes three or four talks are going on at the same time. However, not all the stuff written is useful. For this reason, only certain units of analysis may be identified and each unit will be discussed alone with respect to the kinds of conversations recorded for the test. These units include ‘topic and topic development’, ‘hedges’, ‘turn-taking mechanisms’, ‘interruptions’ and ‘minimal responses’. The examples of the data will be translated from Arabic to English for people who are interested in English language.

5.2 Experiment (1) Same-Sex group/Females

Several studies show that women always raise topics that go with their interests such as home, children, furniture, fashion and make-up, etc. They always like to feel sympathy and talk about topics that touch their hearts. Before females started taking, they raised ‘love’ as the topic to be conversed about, but immediately it was changed or exactly dropped and instead ‘polygmy’ was raised up as the main topic. The conversation started with conversational devices like question-asking and attention beginnings such as: (figures between brackets indicate a pause for one second or less).

(1) A: Religion, and what religion (1) I don’t know.

B: You either agree or disagree (1) Is it right?

Females use this kind of question-asking a lot in their conversation and this according to Fishman (1978 in Coates, 1983), is one sign that a topic is in trouble. This sort of question-asking is
clearly seen from the beginning of the conversation, since the speakers know that this topic is ‘distinctive’ as the first speaker mentioned this in her turn. She closed the conversation by saying, this topic (she means polygmy) is clear cut and no way for discussion. In addition to her use of the word ‘distinctive’, she, again, used the English word ‘given’ in her second turn in which she meant that its ‘given’ in our Islamic teachings:

(2) A: No, it isn’t a matter of agreement or disagreement (1) it is almost given.(2)

The structure of pauses in the conversation is another sign of the failure of the topic. Fishman (1978; in Thorne, Kramarae and Henley, 1983) argues that in a developing conversation, the pauses between one person’s utterance and the other person’s response are often a second or less and are seldom more than three seconds. The researcher observed that there are more than two seconds throughout the transcripts. Thus, this supports my claim that the topic is in trouble. Four of the females are Muslims and one is Christian. She first remained silent and held her turn when they mentioned that Christian people marry only once. The fact that Christians get married only once, attracted the females’ attention, and they started asking the Christian female some questions, and each time they express their surprise. Then suddenly the first speaker (the one who dominates the conversation) raised a new topic and get their attention by asking the question:

(3) A: And now, which do you think is nicer wedding or engagement?
Again, the topic has been started by a question to show that it is again in trouble. Hence, they failed to continue discussing the first topic, so they changed it to another topic. Unfortunately they again failed to continue on discussing it.

5.2.2 Same-Sex Group/Males

In contrast to females, males are interested in topics like sports, politics, industry, etc. One of the speakers suggested a political topic and at once all agreed to discuss it. The topic was about ‘Peace Agreement in Sudan and the Problem of Darfur’. Because half of the speakers were from Western Sudan, the topic was of interest to them and they participated successfully. Unlike females, males made up their decision quickly and choose a topic which supported the claims that men are decision-makers, and that they have the status of power to take decisions. ‘Doing power’ is often a way of ‘doing gender’ too, Zimmerman and West (1983) say.

Speakers keep on talking for about half an hour without changing the topic or asking more questions like females. Because of the same status of the speakers (all of them are teachers), they more actively involved in the conversation. One of them seemed to dominate the conversation, as he had a great deal of knowledge about politics and, especially this political issue. He was a well-informed young man who tended to dominate the conversation. Most of the examples support Leet-Pellegrini’s (1980) claims that speakers who were both male and well-informed tended to dominate the conversation. They talked more and infringed the other speakers’ turns more. The one who dominated the conversation is an expertise,
married, older than others and he used a style of interaction based on power.

It is clear from the above example, that males are more successful in developing topics than females. They seem to be more confident and more acknowledged. Again, the terms they seemed to have taken are more uniform which reflect coherence of the topic and continuity of the discussion.

5.2.3 Mixed-Sex Conversation

The group consists of eight students, four males and four females. They are all studying English as their second language. Two of them were married. They were young and were colleagues. The husband is a teacher who seemed to be confident and quite man. The couple seemed to be happy and well-informed. The other three males are also teachers.

The first topic to be raised was ‘education’, but all wanted to get out of education’s atmosphere to a topic that get their attention and interest. So they dropped ‘education’ at once and raised marriage as a main topic. The participants found their chance to attack the couple by asking them questions about how they get married. The conversation started with a direct question by naming the next speaker (the married man):

(4) A: ok, Hytham. We want to know the obstacle.

The whole conversation was directed to this married couple, but the husband always dominated the conversation and spoke using long statements and gave samples from the Sudanese society. The wife
had much to say, but she was interrupted more by her husband and others: (A the wife, B her husband).

(5)   A: But it isn’t a great obstacle I wa
      B: By the way

(6)   A: Something that let him make a deci sion.
      B: the matter is that you have a good job.

As I have mentioned before, conversational dominance is the focus of research by Leet-Pellegrini (1980) which looks at the interaction of the independent variables, speaker’s gender and expertise. Findings of this study show that the husband infringed his wife’s right to speak. The other females participated less, sometimes by accepting what other say or by asking the couple questions. In addition to that, females seemed to be shy and more conservative than when were talking with their own sex. When women talk to each other they discuss the same topic ‘marriage’ or ‘polygmy’, speak freely and express their attitudes and feelings by using English words and telling stories. Now, in the presence of men, some of them remain silent, just ask questions or make minimal responses agreeing with what has been said. There is a wide spread belief in the Sudanese society and other oriented societies that women are talkative creatures and they speak more than men. The findings contradict this belief. The researcher found that in ‘mixed-group conversation’, men dominate the conversation and talk more. However, this will be discussed later in interruptions.
5.2.4 Hedges

Hedges are linguistic forms such as **I think, I’m sure, you know, sort of** and **perhaps** which express the speaker’s certainty or uncertainty about the proposition under discussion (Coates, 1993:116). Hedging is helpful, it may be a speaker does not know an exact word or expression, or may be s/he think the listener is not acquainted with what s/he wants to say or the whole topic. As such, it helps the speaker avoid going straight to the point, avoid being blunt, avoid appearing authoritative, and avoid committing him/herself (Stenström, 1994: 129). Hedges are common in expressing opinion or attitude to someone or something. The assertion that women’s speech is often described as ‘tentative’ is linked to the fact that women use more hedges than men. Lakoff claimed that women’s speech contains more hedges, and argued that this is, because women “are socialised to believe that asserting themselves strongly isn’t nice or ladylike, or even feminine” (Lakoff, 1975: 54). But her claims were based on no empirical evidence. Few studies show that, in some situations women do use more hedges, but we need to know, says Coates (1993), the different functions of hedges (expressing confidence or expressing uncertainty). Coates mentioned that one of the researchers focusing on the expression of tentativeness was carried out by Bent Preisler (1986). His sample consisted of women and men from two different age groups (20-25 & 45-50) and from three occupational groups. His analysis showed that, women, in his sample, used more hedges than men.
Holmes (1984; 1987) distinguishes between different functions served by hedges. ‘You know’ in her data, for example, has two expressions: the speaker’s confidence or certainty, and expressing uncertainty. Her analysis shows that women use ‘you know’ more frequently than men when it expresses confidence, but less frequently when it expresses uncertainty. The researcher uses Holmes distribution of ‘you know’ by function and speaker’s gender to find that who uses ‘you know’ to express certainly and uncertainty. Table 5.1 shows the distribution of the two functions of ‘you know’ among the three groups:

**Table (5.1) Distribution of you know by function and speaker’s gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of you know</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Mixed-sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing uncertainty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* (Holmes, 1987:64)

This table above shows that the males use ‘you know’ more frequently than women when it expresses uncertainty, but less frequently when it expresses confidence. For example, in males conversation, one of the speakers used ‘you know’ four times either when it expresses confidence or uncertainty, and there was one use of ‘you know’ by one of the eight speakers in which the speaker seemed to be confident. Example:

(7) A: You know, my opinion is that.
In contrast to this speaker, the speaker who used ‘you know’ four times, used it only one time to express confidence and the rest of the use of ‘you know’ to express uncertainty. Example (8) below shows the use of ‘you know’ to express confidence and (9) shows the use of ‘you know’ when it expresses uncertainty.

(8) A: The problem in this country, you know Mutwakil..

(9) A: You know, I want to say something to you ...brothers

In mixed-sex conversation as table 5.1 shows, females used ‘you know’ twice when it expresses confidence and they did not use it when it expresses uncertainty. Example (10) shows the twice use of ‘you know’ by one speaker and in one sentence:

(10) A: You know if you want to buy a new (toub), you can not, because you know your husband’s financial condition.

Table 5.1 shows that, in mixed conversations, males used ‘you know’ four times while the females used it just two times. Also, in females conversation there was no use of ‘you know’. Thus, the finding challenges Lakoff’s assertion that women use more hedges than men, as well as her claims that women’s use of hedges is related to lack of confidence, which supports Holmes’ (1987) findings that women use ‘you know’ more frequently than men when it expresses confidence, but less frequently when it expresses uncertainty.

5.2.5 Minimal Responses

Studies on the use of ‘minimal responses’ agree unanimously that women use minimal responses more and at appropriate
moments. That is, at points in conversation the listener supports the current speaker (Strodtbeck and Mann 1956; Hirchmann 1974; Zimmerman and West 1975; Fishman 1980a; Coates 1989a; 1991).

‘Minimal responses’ such as yeah or mhm do not constitute a turn; They are a way of showing that the speaker has got the listener’s attention and interest. Zimmerman and West (1975), argue that there are two irregularities or violations of normal turn-taking in conversation. They are interruptions and overlaps which after them speakers tend to fall silent. According to their data, in mixed-sex conversations, average silence in single sex conversations lasted for 1.35 seconds, while the average silence in mixed-sex conversations lasted for 3.21 second. Silences in Zimmerman and ‘Wests’ data resulted not from interruptions and overlaps, but also from delayed minimal responses (Coates, 1993: 111). The listener has an active role in the conversation, not a passive one. If the listener does not use these minimal responses, the speaker may seem as if he is talking to himself.

In our Sudanese community, giving no response to the speaker, means that you ignore what he is saying to you. Zimmerman and West (1975) found that in mixed-sex conversations male speakers often delay their minimal responses (they said mhm or yeah at an appropriate point but only after a pause. Just as a well-placed minimal response shows the active role of the listener.

**Experiment (4)**

This experiment was taped from a TV program on a Sudanese channel. The subjects were one woman, two men and the
interviewer. Their age is between (40-50) and they were highly-educated. One of the men is a minister. He is from Southern Sudan and he is Christian. The other man has Ph.D. in English (he is a translator). The woman is a teacher and she is making some studies on linguistics.

The conversation began by the interviewer asking the minister a question. During the minister’s turn which lasted for about five minutes, the interviewer used inadequate minimal responses such as ‘mhm’ and ‘yeah’.

The following example illustrates this (figures between brackets were the interviewer’s inadequate minimal responses):

(11) Speaker A: we wish (mhm) the arrival of Southern people (mhm) to the north to be (yeah) a good sign for the unity.

Supporting De Fransisco (1991) and Sattel’s (1983) findings that men made no responses and inadequate responses, because of their part of dominance, the transcripts showed that the two men interviewees did not make any minimal responses when any of them spoke, or when the woman spoke. In contrast, the woman used minimal responses when the minister was speaking. This finding supports the researchers claim (Strodtbeck and Mann1956; Hirchmann1974; Zimmerman and West 1975; Fishman 1980a; Coates 1989a; 1991), that women use minimal responses more than men and in appropriate moments in conversation supporting the current speaker. Example (12) illustrates this:

(12) Male : I said that I am Sudanese
Female : mhm
Male : I talked to him in English  
Female : mhm  

Most of the use of minimal responses was made by the interviewer only.

5.1.4 Turn-taking Mechanisms

Conversation is based on give and take. Turn can flow naturally and smoothly. There are rules that organize our talk and without them misunderstanding may occur. Take, for example, if two persons speak at the same time, they will not understand each other until one of them listens to hear the other. As we have mentioned in chapter two that turn-taking is a fundamental organizational feature of conversation. It is a complex technique and hard to distinguish in informal discourse. It depends on power and status, who takes the first turn, who interrupts more and who falls silent. An interruption occurs when the interrupter does not know when to enter a conversation: i.e. at ‘Transition Relevance Places’ (TRPs).

All these strategies and techniques vary from culture to culture and from language to language. As we have mentioned before that some members of the Amisch community in the United States communicate through signs, symbols and actions rather than words (Anna, 2001). Now let us see how turn-taking mechanisms are organized due to gender differences.

Experiment (1) Same-Sex/Females

From the beginning of the conversation, females took the topic seriously. The first speaker seemed as if she found some problems in
the topic as she started using ('I don’t know') and then repeated one word ('distinctive'). She tried to express her feelings towards the topic and she was in need of some kind of support from others to continue. The second speaker interrupted her turn by asking her a direct question. Example (13) explains this:

(13) Speaker A: So, I don’t know, it is religion and not religion, it is something distinctive, …distinctive …very
dis  tin  citive
Speaker B: not distinctive, you just agree or disagree, right?
Speaker A: No, it is not to agree or disagree, it is something already given
Speaker B: No, some agree and others disagree. I agree

Then a new speaker entered the conversation asking B (‘why she agreed with polygmy?’). Speaker B always took long turns, she dominated the conversation since she has some features that help her such as: a loud voice and she is a teacher at the university. She was the group leader and most of the interruptions were made by her. The third speaker held the turn, but there was an overlap (= to show the overlap):

(14) Speaker B: ….for example, today I eat salad, I eat it today, tomorrow and after tomorrow, I will feel bored. I need to change, this is a woman, he sees her everyday, in the morning, in the afternoon =
Others: = Not always, seldom.
Table 5.2 shows the number of overlaps and interruptions that occurred between females and between males.

Table (5.2) Turn-taking irregularities in same-sex groups
(Females/Males)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females speakers</th>
<th>Males speakers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our Sudanese community, women are seen as talkative and speak at the same time when they meet each other, men used to describe them as (‘they speak as if they are at the yoghurt market’), i.e. in the market no one can easily understand what the others say. Interruptions were also too much between them and that is because, as I think, the topic is very exciting.

Experiment (2) Same-Sex/Males

The current speaker was the group leader who started his turn by asking a question to all participants, but before he finished his utterance, he was interrupted by one of the participants:

(16) Speaker A: O brothers, what do you think about the problem of Da
      Speaker B: Darfur our country
      Speaker A: Darfur.

Speaker A continued his talk and he waited for them to participate, but no one spoke and he stopped for one or two seconds and then continued. Example (17) illustrates this. (figures between brackets
indicate seconds and tenths of seconds between turns; (#) indicates a silence of one second or less.):

(17) Speaker A: what do you think about Darfur problem which affects the peace march in the country (#), what do you think. (3) Because in Nevasha it starts to reach that peace becomes real in Sudan, but Darfur will burn again and again war will start.

Speaker B: Darfur will not burn, it is already burned, it was burned and will burn the whole country.

Again, speaker A was interrupted by the same speaker who seem to be an expertise and interrupted more. A new speaker took the floor and directed his talk to speaker A excusing him to talk (‘ok. Haytham, sorry.’). Participants sometimes spoke using turn-taking rules. Example (18) shows how this new speaker selected speaker A by naming him and then speaker A mentioned his name and directed his talk to him:

(18) Speaker A: you know Mutwakil the problem is …. Mutwakil: yes

These examples shows clearly the effect of interruption on a speaker, and demonstrates why interruptions can be viewed as displays of dominance and they support Zimmerman and West’s (1975) findings. The first minutes of the conversation were dominated by the first three speakers and then one of the rest tried to speak asking them to listen to him (‘sorry, sorry, listen to me….’), but he was interrupted by the fifth speaker. There were also some examples of overlaps (= show the overlap):
(19) Speaker A: you know brothers what is our problem is = that a rule …

Speaker C: = minute, look Hytham you do not admit western sitzen unless they take up arms.

Speaker B: = unless you take up arms, why?
= because you find yourself forced.

Speaker A: = ok. ok. Now the regime understands the lesson.
There is a lesson, people got it that no way to control the country alone. Ok. there is a transitional period.

They continued speaking and the discussion became serious. The sixth speaker arrived late and immediately the group leader attempted to involve him in the discussion and choose him as the next speaker:

(20) Speaker A: Look Muhsin, these people were complaining and chatting about Darfur problem, Mutwakil said that we must cancel the peace agreement.

Another speaker took the turn quickly, he selected himself. When speaker A succeeded again in holding the floor, he tried to involve Muhsin in the discussion for the second time:

(21) Speaker A: The solution, Mutwakil, I , I will give you my opinion, so that Muhsin will know what we have said.

The conversation was a hard talk, no one wanted to leave the floor for the others and each one wanted to dominate, but again Muhsin could not succeed in getting a chance to speak. At last he clapped his hands using a way to get their attention and said (‘the
problem is a democratic one’). For the third time, no one listened to him and then he said (‘brothers, give me a chance’). The first three speakers dominated the whole conversation, they interrupted each other and overlapped each other, too.

The previous table (Table 5.1) shows the number of interruptions and overlaps that occurred between males. The idea of power and dominance which is one of the characteristics of our Sudanese males, controls their ideas and makes each one try to take the floor, sometimes by raising up their voices, clapping their hands or nocking on the table.

**Experiment (3) Mixed-Sex Conversation**

In a mixed-sex group, the first speaker was a male who selected the next speaker by naming him (‘ok Hytham, …’). In this group there was a couple to whom the whole conversation was directed. The first to speak was the husband since he was expertise. He told them how he got married. A female entered the conversation asking him to explain the steps that he took to get married. The females tried to participate but they could not. The only female who spoke more was the married one. The other females agreed with what others say, either by nodding their heads or by uttering minimal responses such as ‘yes’, ‘mhm’.

According to the transcripts, the researcher found that men with expertise talked longer than women with expertise. The husband and wife are both experts but the husband talked longer than his wife and he often interrupted her:
Leet-Pelligrini (1980) establishes that speakers who were both males, and well-informed tended to dominate conversation. They talked more and infringed the other speakers turns more. He says, males who were well-informed dominated conversation because they used a style of interaction based on power (asserting an unequal right to talk and to control topics) while well-informed female speakers preffered interactional style based on solidarity and support (Coates, 1993:113). The findings support this claim.

Table 5.2 shows the number of overlaps and interruptions occurred in mixed-sex conversation. The number of overlaps and interruptions was not too much. Most of interruptions were the husband to his wife and from males to females. Males did overlap and interrupt each other more than females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females speakers</th>
<th>Males speakers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interruptions were so thick and fast that the interrupted speaker, Hytham, forgot what he wanted to say. (‘Ah, Ah, what do I want to say?’)
5.5 Summary of Findings

Four tape-recordings have been transcribed and analyzed to see how far gender affects conversation. The study has arrived to the following results:

1. Females use ‘question-asking’ a lot in their conversation which shows that they faced some troubles in the topic and they failed in developing and discussing it.

2. Unlike females, males succeeded in choosing and developing their topics. This supports the claims that men are ‘decision-makers’ and that they have power of decision making more than women.

3. In ‘mixed-sex conversation’ of M.A. students, the husband infringed his wife’s right to speak. Moreover, in the presence of men, females remained silent and shy. In contrast, men in the same conversation dominated the conversation and talked more than women.

4. Males use the hedge ‘you know’ more frequently than women when it expresses uncertainty, but less frequently when it expresses confidence.

5. In ‘mixed-sex conversation’ females used ‘you know’ twice when it expresses confidence. They did not use it when it expresses uncertainty. On the other hand, males used ‘you know’ five times.

6. In ‘mixed-conversation’, from a Sudanese channel, the woman used minimal responses more than men in appropriate moments in conversation.
7. Females did overlap each other about 110 times and interrupt each other about 128 times. The number of overlaps and interruptions in males conversation is the same (200).
8. In ‘mixed-sex group’, males interrupted and overlapped females more.
6.1 Summary

The present study aimed to investigate gender differences and conversational features in speech. These conventions are ‘topic and topic development’, ‘hedges’, ‘minimal responses’ and ‘turn-taking mechanisms’ which also include ‘interruptions’ and ‘overlaps’. To achieve this objective the conversational conversations were analyzed and discussed, and the analysis has shown important findings. That is, conversational conventions vary between males and females. These differences were analyzed and discussed in details in chapter five. The subjects who have participated in the experiments were twenty-two. They were Sudanese who speak Arabic as their mother tongue. The subjects were labeled into four experiments. Three experiments were M.A. students at the University of Khartoum, Faculty of Arts, Department of English. The fourth experiment is a ‘mixed-group’ from a Sudanese TV channel. To collect data for the study, the researcher used tape-recordings. The data were analyzed carefully to find out the objectives and goals of the study. From the description and analysis of data the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Males are ‘decision-makers’ as they succeeded in choosing, developing and discussing their topics. In contrast, females fail in doing so.
2. Males use ‘you know’ more frequently than women when it expresses uncertainty, but less frequently when it expresses confidence.

3. Females use ‘minimal responses’ in appropriate moments. They are co-operative conversationalists.

4. Males interrupt females more and seem to dominate conversation in ‘mixed-conversations’.

5. Females remained silent and shy in the presence of males in ‘mixed-conversations’.

6.2 Implications

The results of this research seem to have some important implications for students and for further research studies

1. ‘Minimal responses’ were not used in the right places and in appropriate moments, which indicates that listeners use them to support the speakers talk.

2. Furthermore, the use of the hedge ‘you know’ is wide spread in our Sudanese community especially in informal settings. But in formal settings it has two indications, if the speaker uses ‘you know’ and continues without hesitation, so it means that he/she is confident. On the other hand, if the speaker uses it and s/he stops during his/her talk for two or three seconds, this means that s/he is uncertain of what s/he is saying.

6.3 Recommendations

The research believes the following recommendations may prove to be useful for further researc
1. Due to the great importance of conversation as our daily life interaction, an intensive work and studies should be done on this area.

2. The researcher recommends further research on women’s language to be compared with men’s language.

3. Since the present study analyzed males and females spoken discourse at University, it is recommended to make research on children’s spoken discourse and compare adults language with children’s language. Are gender differences the same between adults spoken discourse and children’s spoken discourse? Or there are some differences?

4. Further studies should be conducted on a larger sample on areas of conversation in order to include large groups of participants and individual differences.
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Appendix 1
Transcript 1: Mixed – Sex Conversation
Recorded: 2/2005
Approximate length of conversation: 25 minutes
Description of setting: four girls and four boys

 Egyptians usually try to share, to share feelings. I will go ahead.

Egyptians usually try to share feelings. I will go ahead.
ابتغاء الله 

أعطى من تكنولوجيا الأجهزة لاب توب صغيرة كيف يمكنني أن أكتب عن هذا المسألة. أعيش في حي صعب في الحياة. لا يوجد من يثق بي.

"System" يا أبي 

أعطى من تكنولوجيا الأجهزة لاب توب صغيرة كيف يمكنني أن أكتب عن هذا المسألة. أعيش في حي صعب في الحياة. لا يوجد من يثق بي.
Communication in "Dājākh! 🐠 pneumonia your only and you'll have to pay. Is it true? The entire body. This is a technique.

...I am not sure if it's true...
Appendix 2
Transcript 2: Sample of Same – Sex Conversation
Recorded on: 2/ 2005
Approximate length of Conversation: half an hour
Description of Setting: six girls

[Transcript]
"Commit by him"

("Commit by him")

25-20 أردن، فلسطين

...لقد قدموه مثل أن تكون أبنك، فكنت نقول

<NA>

<NA>
Appendix 3
Transcript 3: Sample of Same – Sex Conversation
Conversation/ Males
Approximate length of Conversation: half an hour
Description of setting: six boys

86
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعى من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص الشفهي الذي تم جلبته.
Appendix 4
Transcript 4: Sample of Mix – Sex Conversation
Recorded on: 2/ 2005
Approximate length of Conversation: half an hour
Description of setting: Two men and a woman

iardsى: the interviewer
ب: Professor: Ibrahim
ج: Ustaz: Rabah
د: Aminster

ﺱ: ﻹﻤﺟروا ﻓﻘﻁ ﻲﺍﻟﻤﺴﺄﻟﺔ ﻓﻴﺭﺎﻫﻴﻡ، ﺃﺴﺘﺎﺫ... ﻭﻻ ﺲﻴﺎﺴﻴﺔ ﺍﺯﻤﺔ... ﻣﺎﺧﺩﻩ ﺑﺭﻀﻭ

ﺏ: ﻭﺍﷲ ﺍﻟﺸﱠﻐﻠﻪُ ﺑﻌﺘﻘﺩ ﻣﻨﺎ، ﻋﻨﺼﺭ ﻓﻴﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﺜﻘﺎﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﻌﻨﺼﺭ ﻣﻨ، ﺑﻌﺘﻘﺩ ﻣﻨﺎ ﻋﻠﻰ ﺟﺎﺩ ﺷﻐل ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﻥ ﺑﻴﺸﻐﻠﱠﻪُ ﻣﻨ ﻗﺠبة ﺍﻻﻨﻔﺼﺎل ﻭﺯﻱ ﺍﻟﻭﺤﺩﺓ ﺑﺯﻱ ﺩﻱ، ﺑﺠﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﻥ ﻋﺎﺱ، ﻓﺌﺭ ﻲﻨﻅﺭ، ﻭﻋﻬﺎ ﻋﻨﻓﻭﺍ ﻭ ﻋﺌﺩﻭﺍ ﻤﻥ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﻕﺩ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﺑﺭﺘﺸﺎﻙ ﻹﺩﻋﻤﻯ ﺍﻝﻨﻔﻁ ﻭﺯﻱ ﺍﻟﻭﺤﺩﺓ ﺑﺯﻱ ﺩﻱ، ﺑﺠﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﻥ ﻋﺎﺱ، ﻓﺌﺭ ﻲﻨﻅﺭ، ﻭ ﻋﺌﺩﻭﺍ ﻤﻥ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﻕﺩ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﺑﺭﺘﺸﺎﻙ 

ﺱ: ﻹﻤﺟﺭﻭﺍ ﺑﻌﺜﺘﻡ، ﻓﻴﺭﺎﻫﻴﻡ، ﺃﺴﺘﺎﺫﺓ

ﺏ: ﻭﺍﷲ ﺍﻟﺸﱠﻐﻠﻪُ ﺑﻌﺘﻘﺩ ﻣﻨﺎ ﻋﻨﺼﺭ ﻓﻴﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﺜﻘﺎﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﻌﻨﺼﺭ ﻣﻨ، ﺑﻌﺘﻘﺩ ﻣﻨﺎ ﻋﻠﻰ ﺟﺎﺩ ﺷﻐل ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﻥ ﺑﻴﺸﻐﻠﱠﻪُ ﻣﻨ ﻗﺠبة ﺍﻻﻨﻔﺼﺎل ﻭﺯﻱ ﺍﻟﻭﺤﺩﺓ ﺑﺯﻱ ﺩﻱ، ﺑﺠﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﺤﺍ ﻋﺎﺱ، ﻓﺌﺭ ﻲﻨﻅﺭ، ﻭ ﻋﺌﺩﻭﺍ ﻤﻥ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﻕﺩ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﺑﺭﺘﺸﺎﻙ ﻹﺩﻋﻤﻯ ﺍﻝﻨﻔﻁ ﻭﺯﻱ ﺍﻟﻭﺤﺩﺓ ﺑﺯﻱ ﺩﻱ، ﺑﺠﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﺤﺍ ﻋﺎﺱ، ﻓﺌﺭ ﻲﻨﻅﺭ، ﻭ ﻋﺌﺩﻭﺍ ﻤﻥ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﻕﺩ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﺑﺭﺘﺸﺎﻙ ﻹﺩﻋﻤﻯ ﺍﻝﻨﻔﻁ ﻭﺯﻱ ﺍﻟﻭﺤﺩﺓ ﺑﺯﻱ ﺩﻱ، ﺑﺠﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﺤﺍ ﻋﺎﺱ، ﻓﺌﺭ ﻲﻨﻅﺭ، ﻭ ﻋﺌﺩﻭﺍ ﻤﻥ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﻕﺩ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﺑﺭﺘﺸﺎﻙ ﻹﺩﻋﻤﻯ ﺍﻝﻨﻔﻁ ﻭﺯﻱ ﺍﻟﻭﺤﺩﺓ ﺑﺯﻱ ﺩﻱ، ﺑﺠﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﺜﻘﻔﻴﺤﺍ ﻋﺎﺱ، ﻓﺌﺭ ﻲﻨﻅﺭ، ﻭ ﻋﺌﺩﻭﺍ ﻤﻥ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﻕﺩ ﻋﻭﺍﻤل ﺑﺭﺘﺸﺎﻙ 
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لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي المكتوب بالخط العربي من الصورة.
لا يمكنني قراءة النص الذي نقلته.