

Interruption as Power Ploy in Women's Conversation

Jariah Mohd. Jan^{1*} and Leila Mohajer²

¹*Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

²*Asia-Europe Institute, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the concept of power in women's conversation. It also investigates how power is practised among Iranian women's speech through interruptions. A group of educated upper middle class Iranian women was chosen due to their ability to communicate effectively in English. The group's speech was audio recorded and then transcribed using a modified version of Gail Jefferson's (1978) transcription convention. The conversation recorded was analyzed based on the turns and the interruptions that women made and also the way that they exerted power through their use of interruptions. It also attempts to demonstrate the extent to which Iranian women use power and how they manage their turns in face-to-face interaction. The findings of this study indicate that the participants constantly interrupt each other to voice their ideas. They have the tendency to vie for the floor and jockey for turns in their quest to dominate the conversation and in turn prove that they are more powerful than the others. This study suggests that the female participants tend to dominate the conversation in order to demonstrate the power and control that they possess over their peers.

Keywords: Power, Women's Conversation, professional women, interruptions, Iranian society

INTRODUCTION

It is widely believed that interruption is associated with power and dominance (Zimmerman & West, 1975), and when

power is observed in an interaction, it is perceived that the participants, regardless of their gender, have adopted a masculine behaviour. Considering interruption as an opportunity for both genders to demonstrate power and assertion, it is expected that men interrupt more than women (Zimmerman & West, 1975; Jariah Mohd. Jan, 1999) and in so doing, they aim to assert their ideas and appear more powerful. On the other hand,

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 6 June 2012

Accepted: 30 April 2012

E-mail addresses:

jariah@um.edu.my (Jariah Mohd. Jan),

topazleos@yahoo.com (Leila Mohajer)

* Corresponding author

women interrupt to show their solidarity and support and ultimately maintain their friendship (Coates, 1989). Generally speaking, the language that women use to interact is considered weak and mitigating in nature (Lakoff, 1975). O'Barr and Atkins (1980) label the language that women use as "Powerless Language" since they lack power and assertion. However, they argue that these elements can be used by both genders depending on their social situation and status. As a result, it can be assumed that language, and specifically interruptions, provide the opportunity for the interlocutors to practice either their power or solidarity.

Men, Women and Conversation

It is evident that men and women have different communicative competence and what is perceived by men may be perceived differently or otherwise by women (Coates, 1998). It is believed that the differences between genders can be considered as cross cultural miscommunications which naturally exist between interlocutors in every society (Gumperz, 1982). As a result, the way that they speak is the reflection of these social differences. For instance, men have more tendencies towards power demonstration than women (Zimmerman & West, 1975; Leet-Pellegrini, 1980). Women, on the other hand, welcome solidarity more than power and prefer a collaborative interaction (Coates, 1989). In the following sections, the different linguistic elements which exert power or solidarity are highlighted.

Power, Dominance and Control

The elements that men use in their speech are interconnected with their dominant role that they possess in society. For instance, men's talk usually lacks supportive elements such as minimal responses and instead, long pauses exist between the utterances. However, men unlike women can continue their interaction without receiving these supportive feedbacks. Furthermore, since men are more into competition (Aries, 1976; Coates, 1989) and power demonstration, they tend to interrupt more frequently (Zimmerman & West, 1975).

Moreover, the topics that men usually discuss are mostly impersonal such as sports, cars and technology (Coates, 2004). By favouring impersonal topics, men do not need to 'self-disclose' or engage in private talk while interacting. Holmes (2001) also argues that men's talk is naturally based on facts and information and men generally adopt an abrupt way of changing topics and there is no unity observed between their topic changes (Tannen, 1990; Pilkington, 1998). Their talk is also affluent with direct criticism, disagreement and conflict. However, men enjoy and do not consider them as serious (Pilkington, 1998).

All in all, it is inferred that men would rather maintain their power by avoiding the elements which are associated with cooperation and ultimately feminine. It is inferred that they practise their masculinity at all times.

Solidarity and Cooperation

Women are always associated with the concept of solidarity and cooperation as they favour and encourage friendship more than men (Coates, 1989; Aries, 1976; Tannen, 1992), and their conversation is tilted towards cooperation and demonstrating solidarity. Women, in order to demonstrate their cooperation, try to build on each other's speech and tend to support each other vigorously in different ways while they are interacting.

One of the characteristics of women's talk which is associated with support and cooperation is the frequent use of minimal responses which are collaboratively transferred between female friends. These items are usually well placed in women's conversation to indicate their active listenership (Zimmerman & West, 1975; Fishman, 1980; Coates, 1989; Holmes, 1995).

Another way of demonstrating cooperation and support is via the topic of conversation. Women typically talk about people and feelings rather than things (Coates, 1996, 2004) and they concentrate on personal, emotional aspects of their topic (Estaji, 2010). The topics that women talk about have a sense of self-disclosure and it is mainly to the virtue of the fact that women hope to give support and receive support in turn as a reciprocal act of exchanging favours. In terms of changing topics, women have also proven that they follow a gradual collaborative strategy of building on each others' utterances to change from one topic to another (Coates, 2004, 1996, 1989; Maltz & Borker, 1982).

Interruption: the Allocation of Power and Solidarity

Many studies on interruption and gender have found marked asymmetries between men and women. Men interrupt more often than women in order to hold the floor (Zimmerman & West, 1975; Bohn & Stutman, 1983; West & Zimmerman, 1983; Jariah Mohd. Jan, 1999). Interruption is mainly coupled with power and dominance in conversation. In a study on Iranian men and women, Ghafar Samar & Alibakhshi (2007) found out that the most powerful person interrupts and holds the floor more than the other parties who are less powerful. In their study, the connection between power and interruption is clearly revealed.

On the other hand, there are some other studies that show interruptions entail solidarity and support (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1988; Coates, 1989). In this regard, James and Clarke (1993) assert that not all the interruptions or overlaps are signs of dominance. Instead, interruption can show the interrupter's supportive attitudes rather than disruptive behaviour. They believe that "...the extent to which an interruption is interpreted as negative and disruptive is probably not a black and white matter, but rather a matter of degree" (1993, p. 241).

In another contradictory study, Shaw and Sadler (1965) showed that women interrupt men more than the reverse and that they are more dominant in conversation compared to men. It appears that it is not always men who get the control of conversation via the interruptions. There is also a research by Beattie in 1981 on

interruption which contradicts the idea of men interrupting women more. In her research, she examined interruptions among the participants of university tutorials. She also introduced two main categories of interruptions such as the following:

1. Successful Interruptions

- **Overlap:** simultaneous speech present and utterance complete
- **Simple interruption:** simultaneous speech present but incomplete utterance
- **Smooth speaker switch:** simultaneous speech not present but utterance complete
- **Silent interruption:** neither simultaneous speech present, nor utterance complete

2. Unsuccessful Interruptions

- **Butting-in interruption:** simultaneous speech present

Her classification of interruption also considers the presence of simultaneous speech and utterances that are “intentionally, syntactically and semantically” complete in both verbal and nonverbal level (Beattie, 1981, p. 20).

In her study, Beattie (1981) noticed that there is no significant difference between men and women in the number of interruptions. Students, in her study, interrupted the tutors more than the reverse, although the tutors are considered as the powerful parties compared to the students. As a result, she concluded that there is no gender difference in either the frequency or

the type of interruptions that females and males make.

This paper benefits from Beattie’s classification since it demonstrates power and cooperation within the interruptions (Jariah Mohd. Jan, 1999). However, it should be regarded that as the focus of this paper is on power, the elements that evoke power more than the rest are depicted from Beattie’s classification to introduce a clear reflection of power in women’s talk. These elements are butting-in interruptions, silent interruptions and simple interruptions.

According to Beattie’s interruption model (1981), butting-in interruption is an unsuccessful attempt to grab the floor. The person, who interrupts, butts into the current speaker’s utterance while he is still speaking, and makes an overlapping statement in order to take the turn and express his idea. However in this type of interruption, he is not allowed to own the floor and the current speaker moves on. Despite butting-in interruption which is an unsuccessful attempt to seize the floor, silent interruption is a successful effort where in an interaction the current speaker is interrupted before he is able to complete his utterance. In this type of interruption, there is no overlapping speech observed and the interrupter seizes the floor forcefully. Another type of interruption, which is used in this study, is simple interruption when the current speaker is interrupted by another speaker successfully. The speaker who interrupts manages to seize the floor by making an overlap, without considering the completion point in the current speaker’s

utterance. All these three selected types of interruptions explain power play and dominance between the interactants in various degrees and levels.

The Role of Women in Iranian Society

Iranian society is believed to be patriarchal and it encompasses unfairness when it comes to women's right (Azari, 1983). Iranian women are positioned as inferior whose rights come second compared to men's. However, Iranian women have never accepted this inferior role and tried hard to achieve equal rights. Although women's demands are often voiced by many Iranian feminists and institutions, men still prefer to maintain their powerful status. Despite men's attempts to discourage women from advancing in their careers, women have played important roles in almost every domain which includes politics and economics as well.

Iranian women have formed many institutions and communities supporting women and they also place education as one of their main goals to be achieved (Encyclopedia of Iranian Woman, 2003). In the early days, education was a privilege granted to men but not to women. As such, the feminist communities tried to elevate women's knowledge and awareness in order to create a refuge, freedom, financial independence and also a respectable position for women in society (Shavarini, 2005). In other words, they consider education as a gate which ultimately leads them to win over social discriminations and gain power and authority. Today, women in Iran have

gained access to higher education and more than half of the population of students at colleges and universities in Iran consist of women (Moghadam, 2005).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study investigates the ways in which women interrupt each other in order to gain control of the face-to-face interaction and to appear more powerful in single sex groups. In particular, the concept of power is challenged through the change of turns among professional women. The linguistic elements that exist within the interaction, which demonstrate power, authority and control, are discussed.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The sample of this study consisted of four Iranian professional educated women aged between 25 and 36, who knew each other for at least three years since they worked as English teachers in a language institute. As professionals in the academia, these participants are considered proficient in English and so, they are able to effectively interact with other participants in the all female group. This study focused on a small number of participants (N=4) so as to be able to observe and trace the occurrences of interruptions. The setting of this study is informal and this was done to create a friendly and comfortable environment and to obtain a naturally occurring interaction. As such, the participants were gathered in the living room of one of the participants and they freely helped themselves with snacks and drinks which appeared to be a ritual

amongst them.

The presence of these professional women in this gathering is an indication of their consent in participating in this study. These women interacted in English and their interactions were recorded for a period of fifty minutes. The recorded data were then transcribed using a modified version of Gail Jefferson's 1978 transcription convention (see Appendix). In this convention, not only the words are transcribed, but some paralinguistic features (such as laughter, sighs and other sounds) are considered as well. Pseudonyms and letters are used to refer to the proper names of the participants for the purpose of confidentiality.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Qualitative approach was used in order to discuss the interruptions made by the interactants. Nevertheless, the frequency counts of each type of interruptions assisted in giving some general information. The analysis was entirely based on Conversation Analysis (CA) since the study dealt with the naturally occurring conversation. In order to analyse the interruptions, a selected part of Beattie's interruption Model (1981) was depicted to best fit the purpose of this study. The types of interruptions selected for this

study are butting-in interruptions, silent interruptions and simple interruptions, as indicated earlier.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, there are many instances that describe how women interrupt each other to demonstrate their power and dominance. The elements to be analyzed are Simple Interruptions, Silent Interruptions and Butting-in Interruptions. In Table 1, the frequency counts of these three elements are tabulated to show the number of times that each type of interruption is used by women during the interaction.

TABLE 1
The frequency counts of three types of interruption

Types of Interruption	Numbers	Percentages
Butting-in interruption	182	51.7
Silent interruption	112	31.8
Simple interruption	58	16.4
Total	352	99.9

As shown in Table 1 above, butting-in interruption is the most frequent type, with 182 times of occurrence followed by silent interruption (112) and simple interruption (58). The following section discusses the analysis of each type.

Example 1

- [95] F2: can you really listen to opera for an hour?
- [96] F1: not every opera /and I / I / I may * be ~
- [97] F2: [whatever *
- [98] F1: ~ selective/ I may be selective /about * EVEN Pavarotti's operas / not all of them
- [99] F2: [but *
- [100] F2: whatever / can you listen to it ...

Butting-in Interruption

In this type of interruption, the interrupter plans to seize the floor and insert her ideas as such she barges into the current speaker's utterance and makes a simultaneous speech. Her attempt to take a turn, however, is in vein because the current speaker does not give in her turn easily and moves on. The following examples illustrate the way in which butting-in interruptions are distributed and also how the female participants in this research dominate the conversation.

In Example 1, the participants discussed about their taste in different types of music. In line [95], F2 poses a question and when F1 is trying to answer her, F2 makes intrusive interruptions. She interrupts her friend to make challenging comments because her friend's answer is not in line with her ideas. However, she is not so successful to gain the floor because the current speaker, F1, does not relinquish her turn easily.

On the other hand, F1, whose floor is threatened by F2, raises her voice in line [98] immediately after F2's intrusion and says "...EVEN Pavarotti's operas...". We can observe that F1 shows powerful attitude in not allowing F2 take her floor away easily and she strongly holds her own turn till her idea is fully expressed. Similarly, it can be inferred that F2, despite her failed butting-in attempts, is a powerful interlocutor because of being intrusive and determined in expressing her idea. Here, it is obvious that the turns are not so collaboratively changed.

Another instance of butting-in interruption is illustrated in the following example. In this instance, the powerful role of the participants can be significantly observed.

In Example 2, F2 is presenting an anecdote about one of her friends who is so rich but her husband has a strong body odour. In line [1462], she manages to finalize her story "but I don't know why her

Example 2

[1462] F2: but I don't know why her *husband* was always smelling / *horribly*
 [1463] F1: but you see * F2 ~
 [1464] F2: you know *
 [1465] F1: ~ it is some * bodies
 [1466] F2: and every * no no no / listen //
 [1467] F1: // some bodies / but some * people they ~
 [1468] F2: no no no *
 [1469] F1: ~ even know that they smell
 [1470] F2: no no //
 [1471] F1: // they don't understand *
 [1472] F2: he never used this * / he never used any
 deodorant and once we went to their house and I told my husband / he didn't know
 what to do / he said how can I tell him / I said I will tell you what to do / next time
 when we go to their house / buy //

husband was always smelling/ horribly". F2, who does not agree with her friend's point of view, takes the opportunity in [1463] to state her contradictory idea but she is interrupted unsuccessfully by F2, the story teller. F2 eventually gets frustrated because of not being able to get the floor and in line [1466], she begs "no no no/ listen". However, F1, who has already shown a dominant behaviour in not relinquishing the floor easily, does not pay attention to F2's attempt and interrupts her in [1467] to reiterate her own opinion and despite F2's another butted-in intrusion in [1468], she continues to move on. Eventually in [1472], F2 is able to seize the floor successfully and make her point.

It is evident that the turns exchanged between F1 and F2 are competitive and forceful in nature. They are constantly trying to dominate the conversation in order to convey their own ideas. In this instance, F1 and F2 try to gain the floor in order to assert their own views, but neither of them relents to proceed.

In Example 3, the participants are talking about movie stars when suddenly F2, in line [320], criticizes F1 for being contradictory at all times. Whilst F1, in [321], is trying to defend herself, F2 raises her voice and butts in unsuccessfully to assert the opposite. F2, however, manages to take a successful turn in [322], but after uttering a single word, she is interrupted by F1 in [323]. As can be observed, F1 and F2 do not build on each others' utterances and instead, each of them tries to stress her own idea. In other words, their turns do not demonstrate any collaboration. F1 appears to be a powerful participant as she does not let the others seize her floor easily.

The participants in Example 4 are talking about books and the films which are produced based on the books. F2, in line [836], is comparing a character in the book and the movie and unexpectedly, she raises her voice and aggressively defends herself and at the same time accuses the others "...I DIDN'T LEAD THE TOPIC OF THE CONVERSATION TO MOVIES/ you did".

Example 3

[320] F2: why do you always want to contradict with every one?
 [321] F1: it is not contradicting with
 [322] F2: any one * / it is my IDEA
 [323] F1: IT I :::S * so your idea is always contradictory *
 [323] F1: PAUL NEWMAN IS GREAT / but * I like Al Pacino

Example 4

[836] F2: ... / you know in the book the character is totally different / I DIDN'T LEAD
 [839] F4: THE TOPIC OF THE CONVERSATION * TO MOVIES / you did /
 [840] F1: I didn't read the book but I watched it *
 [841] F3: so?
 [841] F3: what is that
 finger to me? / I did?

In the meantime, F4, despite F2's raised voice, butts in to add something relevant to the topic and continues till her utterance is fully worded out though it appears that she is not successful in gaining the floor. F2, who is the current speaker, does not pay attention to F4's intrusion and proceeds. This example is significant as it shows both the interrupter (F4) and interuptee's (F2) powerful attitudes in their trials to hold the floor and express their ideas.

It is evident that the interrupter is not the only powerful person. The person who is interrupted can also appear powerful and dominant since she does not simply give in her turn and at the same time makes an effort to keep the floor. This point can be clearly observed in the examples above. We have shown that the interruptee can be powerful when she does not surrender easily and when she continues despite the interruptions. The interrupter, on the other hand, is a powerful person while she makes consistent attempts to convey her views despite being unsuccessful.

Silent Interruption

Silent interruption is another type of interruption which demonstrates the way in which the female interactants appear powerful in an interaction. The interrupter breaks in successfully with her ideas without considering the current speaker's completion point and also without leaving any overlapping utterances. In other words, this kind of interruption brings the present speaker's flow of speech to a sudden haul.

In Example 5, it is clear that F2 is telling a joke about politics. F1, who believes that her friend is not telling the joke right, suddenly barges in to correct her [1350]. F2, who is certain about her joke, takes a turn in [1351] in order to express her disagreement and at the same time tries to exert her claim. From this point onwards, silent interruption is observed, where there are quick competitive flow of turns between F1 and F2 in lines [1352-1354]. Eventually in line [1353], F2 gets quite desperate and interrupts F1 and demands her to "listen". In order to put an end into this jockeying of turns, F3 interrupts F1 in line [1355], and in

Example 5

[1349] F2: uh / he said I am the breadwinner of the family so I'm capitalism / your mother is the organizer / so she is the government *

[1350] F1: [no / no * / mother is a / working class

[1351] F2: no no no no //

[1352] F1: no// //no no

[1353] F2: // listen //

[1354] F1: // yes yes / yes [yes yes *

[1355] F3: [I HATE * when people wanna tell a joke and they don't know about the joke

a raised voice, she complains about people pretending to know about jokes when in fact they do not. This example illustrates the extent to which the participants are not willing to relinquish their turns easily in order to assert their ideas and ultimately prove their point.

F2, in Example 6, is talking about the time when she was sick and could not teach the students in her class. In line [626], she is trying to emphasize the period of time that she was away, but F3 interjects and makes fun of her in line [627]. In the midst of the cheers, F2 raises her voice [628], wanting desperately to be heard but again she is interrupted, and this time is by F1 [629].

In this instance, despite the opportunity that F2 thought she might have to convince her friends, it fell short because F1 and F3 are powerful and not willing to relinquish their turns, thus dominating the conversation. Silent interruption is seen in lines [627] and [629], in which F3 and F1 interrupt and deny F2 of her right to defend herself.

Example 7 is a short excerpt of silent

interruption. In line [131], F1 intends to criticize F2 for her frequent interruptions. However, she is not allowed to complete her complaint because F2 interrupts her to justify herself [132]. In this instance, F2 appears powerful since she does not let anyone criticize her and she defends herself by interrupting them. In the end, F2 manages to seize the floor and shows her dominance.

Simple Interruption

In a simple interruption, the person who interrupts appears to be in control and exerts power to seize the floor. In this instance, the interrupter is successful in grabbing the floor by making a simultaneous overlap before the current speaker completes her utterance. The following examples depict instances where the participants utilise this strategy to exert their power in the conversation.

The female participants in Example 8 appear to be arguing about a book called 'one hundred years in solitude', particularly about the extent to which it has been understood.

Example 6

- [626] F2: a month / I was //
- [627] F3: // well actually in that case if it was that serious you had a pretty brave face ((everybody laughs)) that you came to work every day ((every one cheers))
- [628] F2: I WAS / I WAS //
- [629] F1: // come on / not that one / the other one

Example 7

- [131] F1: THIS / this is one of her / uh //
- [132] F2: // I can't concentrate / it's my problems / I think I'm hyper active too / I have to take Ritalin

Example 8

[1277] F1: you mean you understand that?
 [1278] F2: NO / I DID / it's not a book to understand
 [1279] F1: aha
 [1280] F2: it's / it's not you know it's / unlike what people *
 [1281] F1: BECAUSE it's * different / you see some times *
 [1282] F2: no / * UNLIKE what people think you know / they think that there is something behind the story / but even he himself / why are you trying to make up something which is not there? / it's just a story ...

Example 9

[993] F3: he plays there very dramatically *
 [994] F1: ok / anyway forget them / they are talking about movies *
 [995] F2: BUT / WHAT A GIRL WANT / WHAT A GIRL WANT * WHAT IS / WHAT A GIRL WANT? * I saw it on / uh / ~
 [996] F1: don't pay attention to her*
 [997] F2 ~ multimedia

In line [1280], F2 attempts to express her idea but before she could complete her utterance, F1 raises her voice and interrupts [1281], "BECAUSE it's different/ you see some times". F1, however, only manages to hold the floor for a short while because F2, just like F1 in [1281], also raises her voice and interrupts to seize her floor back from F1 in line [1282]. It appears that F2 manages to retain ownership of the turn and holds the floor much longer than F1. This indicates that F2 is more powerful than F1 for the mere fact that she was able to assert her ideas, hold the floor longer and thus dominate the conversation.

In Example 9, the participants are talking about movies and actors. In line [993], F3 compliments Collin Firth about his acting abilities but she is interrupted by F1, who is quite fed up about her friends

continuously talking about nothing else but movies. As such, F1 tells her other friend (F4, who is silent) to ignore F2 and F3 in [994]. But then in line [995], F2 dramatically raises her voice, interrupts F1 and repeatedly suggests another movie "... WHAT A GIRL WANT?". Even though it is clear that F1 tries to interject in line [996] by trying to persuade others to not listen to F2, her attempt at the turn fails because F2 denies F1 of her turn and continues in line [997] to discuss about the movie that she has initially suggested.

It can be summarised that the interruptions in Examples 8 and 9 do not illustrate any instances of cooperation at all but instead women compete for floors and exert their power in order to dominate the conversations.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have examined professional Iranian women conversation and also studied how power is manifested in their language. As shown in this study, power is exercised via the intrusive interruptions that the participants make to seize the floor. Through a careful analysis of females' interruptions, it is apparent that Iranian women are assertive and they utilise power in their interaction to achieve their goals. The participants in this study appear to frequently vie for the floor and jockey for the turns in their quest to dominate the conversation and in turn prove that they are more powerful than the others. In fact, their ability to interrupt, particularly when they bluntly disagree, aggressively assert their ideas, tactfully ploy, continuously complain and consistently control the flow of talk, shows that they are more powerful compared to the unequal positions they have possessed for a long time in the Iranian society.

On the other hand, there are also participants who manage to retain the floor despite others who make several attempts to seize the floor. These participants have demonstrated power by not relinquishing their turns easily.

In sum, the study reveals that the female participants wield power in their discussion amongst peers in private domain unlike previous studies which indicate that women practice solidarity in similar situation. In the case of the Iranian women, due to recent social success in embracing autonomy, they have gained

more confidence and consequently tend to dominate conversations. They have also been seen to constantly fight for equal rights in the society. It appears that in this study, the female participants have mirrored this behaviour and applied the same strategy in fighting for turns in their interaction amongst friends. In addition, it also appears that these professional women have great tendency to uphold their status, dominate the interaction and ultimately display power.

It would also be interesting to see whether such act of power prevails when Iranian female professionals interact with their male counterparts. Would they emulate powerful speech styles and dominate interactions in order to retain their powerful status? In this regard, more studies should be conducted to examine the distribution of power in women's talk.

REFERENCES

- Aries, E. (1976). Interaction Patterns and Themes of Male, Female, and Mixed Groups. *Small Group Behaviour*, 7, 7-18.
- Azari, F. (1983). Sexuality and women's oppression in Iran. In Azari, F. (Ed.), *Women of Iran: The conflict with fundamentalist Islam* (pp. 90-156). London: Ithaca Press.
- Beattie, G. W. (1981). Interruption in conversational interaction and its relation to the sex and status of the interactants. *Linguistics*, 19, 15-35.
- Bohn, E., & Stuntman, R. (1983). Sex role differences in the relational control dimension of dyadic interaction. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 6, 96-104.
- Booth-Butterfield, M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (1988). Jock talk: Cooperation and competition within a university women's basketball team. In Bate,

- B., & Taylor, A. (Eds.), *Women Communicating: Studies of Women's Talk* (pp. 177-198). Norwood, NJ: Albex.
- Coates, J. (1989). Gossip revisited: Language in all-female groups. In Coates, J., & Cameron, D. (Eds.), *Women in Their Speech Communities* (pp. 94-121). London: Longman.
- Coates, J. (1996). *Women Talk: Conversation between Women Friends*. Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Coates, J. (1998). Gender Differences in Conversational Practice, Introduction. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and Gender: A Reader* (pp. 77-80). Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers.
- Coates, J. (2004). (3rd Ed.). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman.
- Encyclopaedia of Iranian Woman*. (2003). Organization of Danesh Nameh Bozorg e Farsi. Coordinated by Dr. Ejtehad, M.
- Estaji, A. (2010). *Review of Gender Differences in the Expression of Pain*. Retrieved on October 9, 2011 from Profdoc.um.ac.ir/paper-abstract-1016709.html.
- Fishman, P. (1980). Conversational insecurity. In Giles, H., & Robinson, P., & Smith, P. M. (Eds.), *Language and Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 129-132). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Ghafar Samar, R. & Alibakhshi, G. (2007). The Gender Linked Differences in the Use of Linguistic Strategies in Face-to-Face Communication. *The Linguistics Journal*, 3(3), 59-71.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). (Ed.). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (2ndEd.). Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- James, D., & Clarke, S. (1993). Women, men and interruptions: A critical review. In Tannen, D. (Ed.), *Gender and Conversational Interaction* (pp. 231-280). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Jariah Mohd. Jan. (1999). *Malaysian Talk Show: A Study of Power and Solidarity in Inter-Gender Verbal Interaction* (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis). University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Jefferson, G. (1978). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance declination. In Psathas, G. (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in Ethnomethodology* (pp. 79-96). NY: Irvington Publishers.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. NY: Harper and Row.
- Leet-Pellegrini, H. M. (1980). Conversational dominance as a function of gender and expertise. In Giles, H., Robinson, P., & Smith, P. M. (Eds.), *Language and Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 97-104). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Maltz, D., & Borker, R. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In Gumperz, J. J. (Ed.), *Language and Social Identity* (pp. 197-216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moghadam, V. M. (2005). *Modernizing Women: Gender and Social Change in the Middle East* (2nd Ed.). New Delhi: Viva Books.
- O'Barr, W., & Atkins, B. (1980). "Women's language" or "powerless language?" In McGonnell-Ginet, S., Borker, R., & Furman, N. (Eds.), *Women and Language in Literature and Society* (pp. 93-110). New York: Praeger.
- Pilkington, J. (1998). 'Don't try and make out that I'm nice' the different strategies women and men use when gossiping. In Coates, J. (Ed.), *Language and Gender: A Reader* (pp. 254-269). Great Britain: Blackwell Publishers.

- Shavarini, M. K. (2005). The feminisation of Iranian education. *International Review of Education*, 51(4), 329-347.
- Shaw, M. E., & Sadler, O. R. (1965). Interaction Patterns in Heterosexual dyads varying in degree of intimacy. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 66, 345-351.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand*. London: Virago.
- Tannen, D. (1992). *That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relations with Others*. London: Virago Press.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In Throne, B., Kramarae, C., & Henley, N. (Eds.), *Language, Gender and Society* (pp. 102-117). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Zimmerman, D., & West, C., (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silence in conversation. In Throne, B., & Henley, N. (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance* (pp. 105-129). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION

[A single left bracket indicates the point of overlap onset
*	An asterisk indicates the end of the overlapped utterance
CAPITALS	Capitals indicate the utterances which are uttered with loudness
?	Question marks show a question or the rising tone which signifies a question
(word)	the words or phrases in single parenthesis demonstrate uncertain speech
/	A slash indicates a short pause
Word	Words in italics indicate some sort of emphasis
:::	Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound
~	one at the end of an utterance and one at the beginning of an utterance in some lines below indicate the continuation of the same line
//	Double slashes, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next line indicate an interruption or latching without any simultaneous speech
...	Three dots are used to indicate the continuation of utterances within a turn which has been eliminated
((word))	Words in double parenthesis are used to explain any non-speech sounds and non verbal actions and any necessary information such as translation and the researcher's clarifying comments
[1], [2]	Arabic numerals indicate the lines of the transcription form the beginning of each transcription
F1, F2, F3, F4	Capital F indicates female speakers and the immediate number after each letter indicates the order of speakers appearing in conversation

