



WORKING PAPERS

ON

LANGUAGE,

GENDER

AND

SEXISM



VOLUME 3

NUMBER 1

APRIL 1993

Control and development of conversation: the parts of men and women

CATHERINE DEGAUQUIER AND AGNESA PILLON

Université de Mons-Hainaut, Belgium

ABSTRACT

Previous studies of gender differences in interactional style focused on variables (like interruptions) supposed to be a reflection of dominance and power. The experiment presented here aims to avoid the methodological flaws of that approach by considering a large range of conversational variables. These variables are related to the social organisation of the dialogue and the discursive functions of turns. The results show very similar patterns between men and women in the way they take the floor and get involved in dialogue.

1 THE STUDY OF GENDER DIFFERENCES IN LANGUAGE USE : A REVIEW OF STUDIES

Some 30 years ago, studying the impact of speaker sex on language use became part of sociolinguistics. In fact, the relationship between gender and linguistic variation was first identified in an article by Shuy (1969). Lakoff's paper in 1973 *Language and woman's place* was also a mile stone in stimulating language and gender research. Lakoff identified a 'woman's style' in American English, i.e. a set of linguistic forms used more often by women than men. She claimed for example that, because of social disparities between the sexes, women have learned to be deferent and passive as far as speech is concerned. A whole set of linguistic variables were then connoted in a specific way. Women's speech was also presented as more sentimental than informative, more expressive than instrumental. In fact this presentation concurs with the dominant representations and stereotypes about language, including the notions of masculinity and femininity. There are plenty of proverbs, idioms, books on etiquette and ideas on women's gossiping that reflect this image of women's speech. Kramer's (1975) analysis of humorous phylactery published in the *NEW YORKER* shows a stereotyped picture of that language : women speak a lot, often in a confused manner and emotionally. Men's speech is represented as logical and concise and deals with interesting matters. In a further study, Kramer (1977) asked students to evaluate in what way 51 language features could characterise both sexes. She noticed among other things that men's speech is considered more attractive, direct, dominant, authoritarian and aggressive

while women's speech was seen as more pleasant, enthusiastic, grammatically correct but dealing with common matters.

Those works not only give us information about the representation of men's and women's speech, but also focus on the possible influence those perceptions might have on data analysis, - for instance the weaknesses in approaches which give a passive or non-accurate value to some particular linguistic units just because they are more often used by women. Many studies related to the interactional aspects of speech present these weaknesses.

Important in the study of interactional style is not so much an analysis of linguistic variables or parts of speech but the investigation of interactional variables : how do individuals behave in face-to-face encounters ? How do they start speaking ? How do they keep the floor ? How long and how often do they speak ? How do they direct conversation ?

There are at least two approaches to the study of the sex differentiation in interactional styles. A first set of studies is based on the distinction between *task-oriented* and *socio-emotional* functions. Parsons & Bales (1955) analysed family interactions and came to the conclusion that the father is the instrumental leader and the mother the socio-emotional leader in the family. Strodbeck & Mann (1956) as well as Strodbeck, James & Hawkins (1957) came to similar conclusions in their study of interactions between jury members : men propose solutions to problems; women react to contributions by agreeing passively. The studies by Soskin & John (1963), Rosenfeld (1966), Glezer, Gottschalk & Watkins (1959), Bernard (1972) and Barron (1971) had similar findings. More recently Edelsky (1981) analysed the interactions between university colleagues during departmental meetings. She found that when the discussion was organised in independent sequences of turns, men produce more direct interventions than women : they suggest, argue and ask for the other's opinion. Women on the other hand speak more than men when the interaction is less formal (when more than one person speaks at the time).

The second approach is based on concepts developed by the micro-sociology of conversation and studies the regulation of what is produced through the distribution of speech turns and the thematic development of what is produced. Conversation is analysed as an activity through which power relationships are established. In order to identify the speaker's activity, the amount of speech and the frequency of interruptions were examined. Some studies have recorded the subjects without their knowing it (Zimmerman & West 1975, Pillon 1986), others have been done in experimental settings where the subjects had to discuss a given topic (Duncan & Fiske 1977, Hilpert, Kramer & Clark 1975). Whatever the situation, most of the studies showed that men speak more often and for longer. As for Hirschman

(1973, 1974), she did not find any significant gender difference as far as talking time was concerned.

With regard to interruptive behaviour, the clearest results have come so far from the study of Zimmerman & West (1975). They covertly recorded dyadic conversations between men and women in various public places in a university campus. They showed that men were responsible for 98% of the interruptions. In a similar study Pillon (1986) found that 61% of the interruptions were caused by men and that women's attempts to interrupt were more often unsuccessful. The experimental studies came up with similar results : West & Zimmerman (1977) recorded that 73% of all interruptions were made by men; according to those authors this behaviour is significant of the way men establish their dominance, and compare it to the dominance-submission relationship that exists between adults and children. Most studies of interruptive behaviour show that it is a predominantly male characteristic. There are only a few exceptions, e.g. Hirschman's studies (1973, 1974) which found no gender differences or the study by Kennedy & Camden (1981, 1983) which showed that women interrupt more frequently.

This research evidence could be conceived as disconcerting in the way that it fits the most traditional clichés on the parts played by men and women. In our view, the theoretical and methodological frameworks of those studies are at least partially responsible for that. Analysing conversational behaviour of men and women through the instrumental/socio-emotional distinction or the dominance/submission opposition applied to speech turns, might easily produce a methodological bias. Indeed the purpose -explicit or not- of such an approach, is to look into the conversations for the image of the parts men and women play in society. In other words, the aim is not to describe the behaviour but to look for the differences which are supposed to exist between the two sexes. Moreover, very few other variables other than interruptions and the amount of speech have been selected as revealing those differences. Yet, general conclusions about women's and men's conversational behaviour have been drawn on this basis. Further, those conclusions are based on questionable interpretations : the interruption by itself may not be related to dominance. For example, Aleguire (1978) noticed that interruptions may characterise an enthusiastic approval or a support to what the speaker is saying. For Gallois & Markel (1975) the frequency of the interruptions might be related to the degree of involvement in the conversation. It seems that the relation between interruption and dominance has been made precisely because men were seen to interrupt women more often than the reverse; in accordance with stereotyped social values, being interrupted has become, ipso facto, a sign of submission.

We can thus question the idea that the number of speech turns and the number of

interruptions are valid cues of the speaker's dominance on her/his addressee. Beattie (1981) investigated interactions in university tutorials. He found that the frequency of interruption was not related to the sex of the speaker but to his/her status : the students interrupted more than the tutors. This is by the way a counter-example of the idea that interruptions are mainly present in the behaviour of high-status individuals.

In fact, several other factors are in interaction with gender in all conversational situations, and behavioural differences can be explained without reducing the whole explanation to gender. Some studies have shown the importance of situational variables like the number of participants (Beattie 1981, Beattie & Barnard 1979), the degree of familiarity of the participants (Kramer 1977), the knowledge of the topic discussed (Leet-Pellegrini 1980), or the sex of the addressee. For this last element, there are opposite data : Brouwer (1982) has recorded more than 500 people buying a train ticket at the Amsterdam station. She found that travellers, men and women, were more polite at the window with men than with women. Zimin (1981) noticed a difference in the degree of courtesy according to the sex of the speaker; but this time, both women and men were more polite to women.

In the study presented here, we investigated the interactional style of men and women through a large range of conversational variables. Instead of focusing on those variables supposed to be relevant for establishing dominance or power, we chose to analyse the way people take or give the floor in order to see how women and men participate in the organisation of the dialogue. Further, in order to avoid as much as possible stereotyped interpretations, we also studied the discursive function of each intervention.

2 METHOD

The participants

The corpus consisted of 20 male/female dyadic conversations, each of them lasting 11 minutes. The 40 participants were between 19 and 26 years old; they were students at the Université de Mons-Hainaut (Belgium) whose their mother tongue was French. They had never met the other participants before the experiment and were randomly paired. They were asked to discuss the Chernobyl nuclear catastrophe, which was a current topic, chosen because it was easy to discuss at the time without favouring one sex or the other. Besides, the participants had been told that they could change topics if they had finished with that particular one. The study was presented as being a linguistic investigation which was not focused on the participants' opinions of the topics discussed. The researchers did not participate in the conversations but the participants knew that they were recorded.

Analysis

The conversations were transcribed¹ and the analysis included two parts : (A) the social organisation of the dialogue, (B) the communicative intentions.

(A) The social organisation of the dialogue

The scheme for analysing the conversational behaviours was designed by Pillon (1984). It was used to examine each speaker's turn and to see the influence of each turn on the structure of the discourse.

The analysis of the way turn-taking occurred was based on the following categorisation. Each category is illustrated by the turn of speaker 2 (S2).

(1) Turn following a pause

S1 : (...) there are once again decisions which are going to be made at a um:: European level
[5 seconds]
S2 : yes though Thatcher is certainly going to (...)

(2) Turn-taking occurring at a legitimate place of speaker switch

(2.1) Adjacent turn

S1 : (...) they will bury this into the ground =
S2 : = yes so that we pollute a little bit more ! =

(2.2) Anticipative interruption

S1 : (...) because in fact many things occurred with, with:: =
S2 : = with children sent somewhere else (...)

(2.3) Anticipative overlap

S1 : (...) I think there must be some money business in all that and also diplomatic matters, because when you see Gorbachov's attitude
S2 : /that's for sure ! just think about (...)

(3) Turn-taking occurring at an illegitimate place of speaker switch

(3.1) Non-anticipative overlap

S1 : (...) I may go at the end of July for a week in the south of::
S2 : /and after that, again the parties
for the beginning of the academic year so I'm going to (...)

¹ Transcription key = symbolises contiguous turns; / indicates when a turn begins to overlap the first speaker's one; =+ connects the different lines transcribing a same speaker's turn; : or :: indicates a lengthening of the last syllable.

(3.2) Adjacent interruption

S1 : = the Russians are said not to be very able I mean:: competent for high =
 S2 : = but there have been troubles also in:: Germany because the radioactivity (...)

(4) Borderline cases

We have classified in this category the cases for which it is impossible to determine whether or not it constitutes an interruption.

The minimal responses like *yes, ummm, that's it* are classified in a distinct category, because they do not amount to a turn. Those *back-channel utterances* are positive feed-backs, typical of the careful listening of the speaker.

As for the thematic development, the characterisation of the speech turns was made on the basis of their place in the 'conversational sequences'; these were defined as a set of turns strongly related by structural relationships. We can thus distinguish :

(1) Speech turns within a conversational sequence (-*-)

The speech turn replies to the previous turn and is a stimulus for the next one.

(2) Speech turns beginning a chain (*-)

When the new turn does not reply to the preceding one, there is a shift in the thematic development; this is a turn starting a new conversational sequence.

(3) Independent speech turns (*)

A turn might be 'isolated', i.e., it is neither a reply to the previous turn nor the cause of a reaction. It is an independent turn which can be considered as an unsuccessful attempt to redirect the dialogue.

Examples :

- *- S1 : I love South America, I'd like to go there to go to Brazil and Argentina, listen to their music the tango and so on =
- S2 : /huhum
- *- S2 : = yes, Gardel ! =
- *- S1 : = yes the famous Gardel that's it ! =
- *- S2 : = and jazz do you like it ? =
- *- S1 : = umm yes:: I do =
- *- S2 : = I do listen a lot =
- * S1 : = anyway it's very rare to find someone who knows about tango =
- *- S2 : = have you seen that famous film that was with umm: well music from Miles Davis I think but I'm not sure =
- *- S1 : = no that doesn't ring a bell =

(B) The communicative intentions

Besides the analysis of the way speakers seize the floor and get involved in discourse structuring, we wanted to characterise the speakers' utterances on a more functional criterion, i.e., on the basis of their communicative purposes.

We first classified each utterance into one of the following types of discourse : the *argumentative* utterances (the speaker gives his/her opinion during the discussion), the *informative* ones (the speaker speaks about some facts or pieces of information), the *personal* ones (in which self-expression is dominant), the *phatic* ones (made to keep in touch), the *meta-conversational* ones (whose content is the speech situation itself).

Inside these large categories, we distinguished 21 language functions in order to deal with the functional diversity of the speech turns and to reflect the links between the utterances :

ARGUMENTATIVE UTTERANCES

- A1 Repeats in other words the partner's statement
- A2 Doesn't agree
- A3 Argues in accordance with the partner
- A4 Argues against the partner's opinion
- A5 Argues on a new matter
- A6 Favours the expression of the partner's opinion
- A7 Expresses his/her opinion when has been asked to do so
- A8 Expresses his/her inability to make his/her mind

INFORMATIVE UTTERANCES

- I1 Asks for more information
- I2 Gives the asked information
- I3 Brings more information spontaneously

PERSONAL UTTERANCES

- P1 Puts a personal question
- P2 Answers a personal question
- P3 Brings personal facts spontaneously

PHATIC UTTERANCES

- Ph1 Agrees, approves
- Ph2 Checks the partner's awareness of a fact
- Ph3 Answers to confirm his/her awareness of a fact
- Ph4 Expresses spontaneously his/her knowledge of a fact
- Ph5 Expresses spontaneously his/her ignorance of a fact
- Ph6 Supports personally his/her partner

META-CONVERSATIONAL UTTERANCES

- M1 Talks about the speech or the situation

UNCLASSIFIED INTERVENTIONS

It is impossible to consider here the speech turn as a unit of measure, because various functions can be expressed within a single turn and vice versa. Moreover, counting the occurrences of each function would not be appropriate either to characterise the nature of the speech : a function does not have the same interactional value if expressed by 10 or 200 words. This is why the number of words expressing a function was chosen as a measure.

3 DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT IN CONVERSATIONS: RESULTS

The results related to the measures of involvement in conversations (mean number of words, mean number of turns and mean length of turns for both sexes) are presented in Table 1.

	Mean number of words	Mean number of turns	Mean length of turns
Men (n=20)	1085.7	42.8	25.4
Women (n=20)	975	43.7	22.3

Table 1: *Mean number of words, of turns and mean length of turns produced by men and women*

For the analysis of the results, we calculated an index which firstly takes into account the pairing of men and women within each pair and secondly, which lends the same weight to the different pairs, whatever the total number of words produced. We calculated the following weighted difference index $[D(X)_i]$:

$$D(X)_i = [F(X)_i - M(X)_i] / [F(X)_i + H(X)_i]$$

$F(X)_i$, being the value of the X variable for the woman of pair_i;

$M(X)_i$, being the value of the X variable for the man of pair_i.

We used a t-test to check whether any mean weighted difference is significantly different from zero, taking the inter-pair variance as error term. We found no significant difference between male and female speakers for the number of words ($t=1.60$; $p > .12$) nor for the number of speech turns ($t=1.28$; $p > .21$). Furthermore, the difference did not reach significance for the mean length of turns ($t=2.06$; $p < .06$). It thus appears that the differences are due to the differences between the pairs and not due to the differences between the sex groups.

4 TURN-TAKING: RESULTS

Table 2 shows the mean number of turns produced by men and women for each category of turn-taking.

TURN-TAKING CATEGORIES	MALES (n = 20)	FEMALES (n = 20)
After a pause	4.2	3.3
Adjacent turns	28.5	27
Legitimate interruptions (anticipative interruptions and overlaps)	4.9	6.7
Borderline cases	2.4	3.1
Illegitimate interruptions (adjacent interruptions and non anticipative overlaps)	2.1	2.6
Unsuccessful interruptions	0.8	1.1
Back-channel utterances	16.3	16.3

Table 2: *Mean number of turns produced produced by men and women for each category of turn-taking*

In order to examine the way men and women take the floor, we calculated, for each category, the following weighted difference index $[D(i)]$:

$$D(i) = [F(i) / FT(i)] - [M(i) / MT(i)]$$

$F(i)$ being the number of turns classified in this category of turn-taking produced by the female speaker of the (i) pair;

$M(i)$ being the number of turns classified in this category of turn-taking produced by the male speaker of the (i) pair;

$FT(i)$ being the total number of turns taken by the female speaker of the (i) pair;

$MT(i)$ being the total number of turns taken by the male speaker of the (i) pair.

As above, we used a t-test on the data obtained for each category. No significant difference appeared ($.095 < p < .59$).

As for the back-channel utterances, they are produced equally by men and women ($t = .07$; $p > .94$).

5 THEMATIC DEVELOPMENT: RESULTS

Table 3 presents the mean number of turns produced by men and women for each category of thematic development.

THEMATIC DEVELOPMENT CATEGORIES	MALES (n=20)	FEMALES (n=20)
Turns starting a sequence	12.6	9.9
Turns within a sequence	25.6	29.4
Independent turns	4.6	4.4

Table 3: *Mean number of turns for each category of thematic development produced by men and women*

We tested the influence of men's and women's turns on discourse structuring by calculating, for each category, a difference index for each pair, weighted by the respective total number of turns taken by each subject in the pair. This analysis reveals that women produce more turns within the conversational sequences than men ($t=3.08$; $p < .01$); men start sequences more often than women ($t=2.93$; $p < .01$). There is no significant difference concerning the independent turns ($t=.042$; $p > .65$).

6 COMMUNICATIVE INTENTIONS: RESULTS

Table 4 presents the mean number of words for each kind of utterance produced by men and women.

FUNCTIONS	MALES (N=20)	FEMALES (N=20)
ARGUMENTATIVE UTTERANCES		
<u>A1</u> Repeats in other words the partner's statement	39.6	21.6
<u>A2</u> Doesn't agree	4.7	2.3
<u>A3</u> Argues in accordance with the partner	214.9	249.7
<u>A4</u> Argues against the partner's opinion	75.1	95.6
<u>A5</u> Argues on a new matter	220.5	149.1
<u>A6</u> Favours the expression of the partner's opinion	16.4	20.5
<u>A7</u> Expresses his/her opinion when asked to do so	65.4	42.8
<u>A8</u> Expresses his/her inability to make his/her mind	16.3	6.1
INFORMATIVE UTTERANCES		
<u>I1</u> Asks for more information	15.1	8.6
<u>I2</u> Gives the asked information	21.9	29.9
<u>I3</u> Brings more information spontaneously	44.7	24.1
PERSONAL UTTERANCES		
<u>P1</u> Puts a personal question	35.3	28.3
<u>P2</u> Answers a personal question	78	69.6
<u>P3</u> Brings personal facts spontaneously	126.8	118.5
PHATIC UTTERANCES		
<u>Ph1</u> Agrees	10.4	15.5
<u>Ph2</u> Checks the partner's awareness of a fact	7.7	7
<u>Ph3</u> Answers to confirm his/her awareness of a fact	4.2	4.8
<u>Ph4</u> Expresses spontaneously his/her awareness of a fact	2.1	1.3
<u>Ph5</u> Expresses spontaneously his/her ignorance of a fact	5.3	6.6
<u>Ph6</u> Supports personally his/her partner	12.1	7.1
META-CONVERSATIONAL UTTERANCES		
<u>MC1</u> Talks about the situation	8.3	9
Unclassified utterances	44.1	40.6

Table 4: *Means of the number of words produced by men and women for each kind of utterance*

The functional analysis of the utterances was also led on the basis of intra-pair difference indexes weighted by the total number of words produced by each individual. No significant difference was noticed between the sex groups for the 21 functional categories ($.04 < t < 1.73$; $.10 < p < .97$ according to the category). Besides, in the five main categories

of discourse (argumentative, informative, personal, phatic and meta-conversational), no significant difference appeared between male and female speakers ($.24 < t < .68$; $.50 < p < .75$ according to the category).

7 DISCUSSION

The linguistic behaviour of the men and women in our sample is certainly less clear-cut than the usual stereotypes relating to the conversational habits of both sexes. The results show very similar patterns in relation to the use of speaking time, turn-taking, thematic development and communicative intentions.

The degree of participation in a dialogue by women and men, measured by the number of words, the number of speech turns and the mean length of turns, is quantitatively comparable. As far as the way of taking the floor is concerned, no notable difference was noticed. For the 21 categories of communication purposes, men and women once again behave in a similar way.

The only difference concerns the thematic development of the conversation : women start less conversational sequences and speak more in relation to what has been said before; men initiate sequences more often than women. At first sight, we could think that female behaviours are more like 'responsive acts' and male behaviours more like 'directive acts'; yet, that would be too crude an analysis because it neglects other starting behaviours for which there are no differences between men and women. Remember that both sexes do not differ when starting a conversation after a pause, interrupting at an illegitimate place of speaker switch, and when starting independent turns. Besides there are other behaviours that show a tendency to stick the speech turns (in)to the interlocutor's ones, that might be considered as responsive acts, for which there is no sex differentiation (A1, A3, A4, A7, I2, P2; anticipative interruptions and overlaps).

So, if we can speak of some preferences or some tendencies in the interactional style of men and women, there is nevertheless no true sex difference; therefore, speaking in terms of dominance or submission, or in terms of control and passivity would be absolutely inadequate.

We can question this similarity between the conversational behaviours of both sexes in our sample. It could be the result of the formal aspect of the experimental situation : the subjects knew that they were watched, and were meeting for the first time, so they might have controlled their attitudes consciously or not, and paid more attention to politeness and interactional norms. It is interesting to notice that our results, obtained in a formal set up,

concur with those obtained by Hirschman (1973, 1974) in a similar situation : the people had never met before, were paired at random and had to discuss a given topic. Nevertheless, there are other results, also collected in an experimental set up, that show significant differences between male and female behaviours (West and Zimmerman 1977). But in that study, the purpose was less formal (the people had to introduce themselves to each other), which might have had an impact on the interaction.

So, the diversity of determining factors in the conversational situation allows only partial comparisons of the data. If these three studies share some situational parameters (sex, age, status, degree of privacy, length and set up of the interaction), we cannot exclude the hypothesis that, in the study of West and Zimmerman, another parameter, the interaction purpose, has interfered with the others in such a way that some sex differences have appeared.

Therefore, the gender variable cannot be isolated from the influence of situational factors on the speakers' behaviours. We must recognise that there is a lack of information to explain the differences between the data obtained when the people knew they were recorded or not, when the situation was formal or not, and according to the task and the speaker's characteristics. In conclusion, if we want to be more precise about when, how, and for which variables there are sex differences, we will have to analyse the mechanisms of interactions between those variables.

Finally, it has to be mentioned that most studies on the conversational behaviour of men and women are American ones, which could explain - among other things - the specificity of the data. In these different cultural settings, the conversational dynamics might be ruled by slightly different interactional norms.

REFERENCES

- Aleguire, D. (1978). Interruptions as turn-taking. Paper presented at the 9th Congress of Sociology, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Barron, Nancy (1971). Sex-typed language: the production of grammatical cases. *Acta Sociologica* 14 : 24-72.
- Beattie, G. W. (1981). Interruptions in conversational interaction and its relation to the sex and status of the interactants. *Linguistics* 19 : 15-35.
- _____ & P. J. Barnard (1979). Contextual constraints on the floor-apportionment function of gaze in dyadic conversation. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 18 : 391-392.

- Bernard, Jessie (1972). *The sex game*. New York: Atheneum.
- Brouwer, Dédé (1982). The influence of the addressee's sex on politeness in language use. *Linguistics* 20 : 697-711.
- Duncan, S. & D. Fiske (1977). *Face to face interaction: research, methods and theory*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Edelsky, Carole (1981). Who's got the floor ? *Language in Society* 10 : 383-421.
- Gallois Cynthia & Norman N. Markel (1975). Turn taking : social personality and conversational style. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 31 : 1134-1140.
- Glezer, Goldine C., Louis A. Gottschalk & John Watkins (1959). The relationship of sex and intelligence to choice of words : a normative study of verbal behavior. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 15 : 182-91.
- Hilpert, Fred P., Cheri Kramer & Ruth A. Clark (1975). Participant's perception of self and partner in mixed-sex dyads. *Central States Speech Journal* 26 : 52-56.
- Hirschman, Lynette (1973). Female-male differences in conversational interaction. Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, December 1973.
- _____ (1974). Analysis of supportive and assertive behavior in conversations. Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, July 1974.
- Kennedy, C.W. & C. T. Camden (1981). Gender differences in interruption behavior : a dominance perspective. *International Journal of Women's Studies* 4 : 18-25.
- _____ (1983). A new look at interruptions. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 47 : 47-58.
- Kramer, Cheri (1975). Stereotypes of women's speech : the word from cartoons. *Journal of Popular Culture* 8 : 624-638.
- _____ (1977). Perceptions of female and male speech. *Language and Speech* 20 : 151 - 161.
- Lakoff, Robin (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society* 2 : 45-80.
- Leet-Pellegrini, Helena M. (1980). Conversational dominance as function of gender and expertise. Ph D Dissertation, Tufts University.
- Parsons, T. & R.F. Bales (1955). *Family, socialization, and interaction process*. New York: Free Press.
- Pillon, Agnesa (1984). Un outil pour analyser les échanges conversationnels. *Les Cahiers du Crelef* 19 : 63-80.
- _____ (1986). Hommes actifs et femmes passives : des rôles sexuels aux attitudes et aux conduites interactionnelles. In J. Creten, G. Geerts & K. Jaspert (eds) *Werk-in-*

uitvoering. Momentopname van de sociolinguïstiek in België and Nederland. Leuven-Amersfoort: Acco. 275-288.

Rosenfeld, Howard M. (1966). Approval-seeking and approval-inducing functions of verbal and non-verbal responses in the dyad. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 4 : 597-605.

Shuy, Roger W. (1969). *Sociolinguistic research at the center for applied linguistics: the correlation between language and sex.* Giornata internazionali di sociolinguistica. Rome, Palazzo Baldassini.

Soskin, William F. & Vera P. John (1963). The study of spontaneous talk. In R. Barker (ed.) *The stream of behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Strodtbeck, Fred L., Rita M. James & Charles Hawkins (1957). Social status in jury deliberations. *American Sociological Review* 22 : 713-19.

_____ & Richard D. Mann (1956). Sex role in jury deliberations. *Sociometry* 19 : 3-11.

West, Candace & Don H. Zimmerman (1977). Women's place in everyday talk : reflections on parent-child interaction. *Social Problems* 24 : 521-529.

Zimin, Susan (1981). Sex and politeness : factors in first- and-second language use. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 27 : 37-58.

Zimmerman, Don H. & Candace West (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversations. In Barrie Thorne & Nancy Henley (eds) *Language and sex : difference and dominance.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 105-129.