Title of the thesis:

‘*Exploring collaboration in men’s and women’s talk*’

Yoshihiko Yamamoto
(BA Victoria University of Wellington, MA University of Canberra)

This thesis is submitted for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy (Education)

University of Canberra

March 2010

Supervisors: **Dr. Eleni Petraki**
Dr. Jeremy F. Jones
Dr. Nicolette Bramley

Abstract

Many studies of gender interactions have discussed differences in masculine and feminine conversational styles. Collaborative talk has been regarded as a feminine conversational style. Recent research shows that collaborative talk occurs in male and female conversations. Thus, this present study investigates collaborative talk between men and women to see: 1, whether collaborative talk is a characteristic of women's talk or it is found in male conversations only; 2, if men show collaborative features in their conversation, whether men use collaborative features in their talk similarly or differently to women.

This present study was undertaken using mainly qualitative methodology complemented with some quantitative analysis. In order to identify trends of collaborative features, the quantitative approach was adopted. The qualitative approach was used to discuss how collaborative features were delivered by both male and female participants in this study. In the qualitative approach, Discourse Analysis (DA) and Conversational Analysis (CA) were adopted. DA was used to accommodate gender questions in interactions. CA was used to examine how each collaborative feature was employed by participants. The data for this present study was collected in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) and included including male and female participants, aged between 25 and 35 years. A total of 12 everyday conversations were collected for the analysis including five men only conversations, three women only conversations and four mixed gender conversations.

The results of this study show that both male and female participants employed three collaborative features: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition. Both men and women showed both similar and different ways of incorporating these

collaborative constructions. This result suggests that collaborative talk is not only women's feature in talk but also it can be a men's feature in talk.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank following people who supported my journey since I started this degree. First of all, I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. Jeremy Jones, Dr. Eleni Petraki, and Dr. Nicolette Bramley. They guided me from the beginning to the end of my thesis. Without their supervision, I would not have been able to complete this project. Secondly, I would like to thank all participants of this study who allowed me to record their everyday conversations and to use their conversations as data for this present study. Without their co-operation, this project would not be possible. Thirdly, I would like to thank Dr. Louise Skelt, Ms. Beth Barber and Mr. Andrew Hunter. They revised all transcriptions of the data, the structure of the thesis and my writing. Fourthly, I would like to thank members at DAG group which regularly meets at the Australian National University. They gave me an opportunity to learn what CA was and how to use CA to analyse the data which I used in particular for the data analysis. Finally, I would like to specially thank my family and friends who supported my journey in this project. They mentally supported and encouraged me. Without their support and encouragement, this project would never have been completed.

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

This study explores everyday talk between men and women in Australia, focusing particularly on specific collaborative features. Past studies of gender talk (for instance, Holmes, 2006b) have mostly found that women tend to be collaborative while men tend to be challenging ineveryday communication. Coates (1996), however, finds that both men and women display collaborative features in their talk but with some variation. Coates (2004) goes even further to point out that the recent research on gender talk suggests that gender roles are changing and we are experiencing 'a crisis in the modern gender order'. The starting point of this study is, therefore, an investigation into the use of collaboration by men and women in everyday talk, by way of expanding Coates' research.

This chapter has five sections. It starts with a discussion on the aims of this study. The results of much of past research into gender and interactions show that women tend to be collaborative while men tend to be challenging in talk but there are some studies (for instance, Coates, 1996) that show that both men and women collaborate in talk. It is the aim of this study to investigate the apparent disparity. The second section raises four research questions and presents two related hypotheses based on the discrepancy discussed in the first section. The third section presents justifications of this study. This study is original research into three collaborative features of talk, comparing these features of men's and women's talk. The research is conducted solely in Australia. It also provides the most up to date data on the use of collaborative talk by both men and women. The fourth section presents an overview of methods used in this study. Feminist researchers in the past were criticised by scholars of Conversation Analysis (CA) when they attempted to adopt CA into their analysis. However, recently scholars (Jefferson, 2004; Holmes, 2006b) demonstrate the use of a combination of CA and

Discourse Analysis (DA) within the DA framework. This study attempts to adopt this same dual approach. The final section provides an overview of the entire study by means of a brief summary of each chapter.

1.1: Aims of this study

The aim of this study is to investigate whether collaborative features in talk are confined to only women's talk or if they are also apparent in men's talk. Holmes (2006b) mentions that, to some extent, people are always aware of whether they are talking to a woman or man, and they bring to every interaction their familiarity with the gender stereotypes and gender norms to which men and women were expected to conform. Holmes' point suggests that when people talk, they apply their gender stereotypes in their talk, so that both men's and women's talk is influenced by their gender stereotypes. Holmes (2006b:3) summarised the findings of her research into gender stereotypes as presented below.

Masculine	Feminine
direct	indirect
aggressive	conciliatory
competitive	facilitative
autonomous	collaborative
dominates talking time	talks less than men
interrupts aggressively	has difficulty getting a turn
task-oriented	person-oriented
referentially oriented	affectively oriented

This summary suggests that people still hold the beliefs that men adopt aggressive, dominating roles in conversations while women show collaborative and facilitative behaviour. While the goal of this study is not to re-evaluate gender stereotypes in conversations, this picture of gender stereotypes suggests that people hold strong views about gender behaviour and which can have negative influences in the interactions if

these stereotypes are not representative of the actual linguistic behaviour of men and women. This study, therefore, aims to investigate the reliability of those stereotypes by investigating the actual use of collaborative strategies by both men and women in everyday talk.

Studies of gender interactions conducted in the past offer conflicting findings in the male and female talk and this will be discussed in more depth in Chapter 2. Firstly, gender studies have concluded that collaborative features are characteristic of feminine conversational styles whereas Coates' studies (1996 and 2003) show that both men and women employ collaborative features in talk. Coates also argues about the converging nature of male and female talk drawing on the changes of the roles women and men play in society. In addition, Coates' studies (1996 and 2003) point out that men and women show different types of collaborative features in their talk: men use repetition and women use co-producing utterances. Leung (2009), however, finds that girls used repetition to collaborate in their talk. Drawing on this research, this study aims at investigating the nature of the collaborative features evident in both between men' and women's talk in the Australian context, as there is limited research in Australian male and female interactions.

1.2: Research questions and hypothesis

Based on past studies of gender interactions, two important points were identified:

1. Collaborative features were considered to belong to feminine conversational styles but men's collaborative features have also been found.

2. Men's collaborative style in talk is different from women's collaborative talk style.

These two points raise three following questions for investigation.

1: Do women employ collaborative strategies in every day talk?

2: Do men employ collaborative strategies in every day talk?

As discussed in the previous section, both men and women seem to use collaborative features in their talk. Thus, a hypothesis for these research questions is that both men and women show collaborative features in their talk.

3: What collaborative strategies do men and women employ in everyday talk? Are they similar or different?

As discussed in the previous section, Coates (1996 and 2003) found that repetition was a collaborative feature in men's talk while a co-producing utterance was a feature of women's talk. However, Leung (2009) found that girls used repetition to collaborate in their talk. Thus, the hypothesis for the third research question is that both men and women possibly show similar collaborative features in talk. This study will focus specifically on Australian casual talk, to advance the studies in this area.

1.3: Contributions of this study

This study is original research conducted to investigate gender interactions. It explores three collaborative features in talk: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion

and repetition between men and women. Studies examining one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition solely have been undertaken previously (Lerner, 1991, 1992, 2004, Coates, 1996, 2003, and Tannen, 2007). However, this study is possibly the first study investigating these three collaborative features together, directly comparing men's and women's conversations.

Also, most of the past studies investigating collaborative features were undertaken in United States or the United Kingdom. Very little work has been undertaken on these issues in the Australian context. Thus, for this project speakers of Australian English were chosen as participants for the investigation of the three aspects of collaborative talk and so this investigation offers a contribution of the data and analysis from the Australian context to this field of study.

Third, this study attempts to bring a possible solution to the debate between feminist researchers who have tried to utilise the framework of CA for their analysis and CA researchers who have strictly followed the CA discipline for analysis (see the detailed discussions in Chapter 3). Feminist researchers earlier struggled to combine CA with their approaches and were criticised by a CA researcher who strictly follows CA discipline. However, this study demonstrates utilisation of the ways CA researchers analyse their data within a DA framework. In this study CA is used to analyse how the three collaborative features are delivered and CA is used to accommodate the gender issue. Thus, this study employs a mixed analytical framework drawing on conversation analysis and discourse analysis, which is an eclectic approach in the study of gender talk.

Thirdly, the results of this study attempt to extend gender based research on what both men and women actually do in their talk. For instance, collaborative features in talk have been thought to be a feminine conversational style (Holmes, 2006b). However,

Coates (1996) points out that men actually use collaborative features in their talk. This study will also demonstrate both men's and women's collaborative features which are observed in everyday conversations instead of only relying on gender stereotypes, and thus the results bring new insights to gender stereotype in talk.

1.4: Overview of research methods

In order to examine how both male and female participants use collaborative features in their talk, this study adopts the DA approach along with the CA approach. Investigating gender and interaction within the CA framework is a controversial issue. CA scholars avoid making assumptions about the social status or roles of participants. Any claims about this aspect must be supported by evidence found in the data. As opposed to CA, in DA the social status or roles of participants are pre-existing and are used as a tool for explaining elements of the data (Nevile, 2004). Because the analysis of CA and DA is different, feminist researchers who have tried to adopt CA for their analysis (for instance, Wetherell,1998, Speer, 2002, Kitzinger, 2000, Kitzinger and Frith, 1999) have been criticised by CA researchers, in particular Schegloff (1997b). Since CA researchers regard such data as evidence in their analysis, labelling a participant's gender as a male or female speaker cannot be used as evidence in the analysis within CA. Using participants' background information for analysis is not accepted in CA practice (Schegloff, 1997b).

In order to solve this issue, this study is undertaken based on DA for the analysis but it will also adopt the ways CA scholars look at their data. There are several studies undertaken using a combination of DA and CA. For instance, Jefferson (2004) and Holmes (2006b) adopted the CA approach in their studies of gender interactions. In these studies participants were labelled as male and female speakers but the analysis of

the data followed the manner of CA researchers. Thus, utilising the approach of CA scholars to their data within a DA framework is a possible approach for investigating gender interactions.

1.5: Chapter overviews

This section aims to show readers a brief summary of each chapter of this study.

1.5.1: Chapter 2

This chapter has two main sections. The first section highlights past research on gender and interaction. Jespersen's study (1922) was, perhaps, the first formal study of gender and language. Robin Lakoff's study (1972) has been widely cited in gender and literature studies as the model study demonstrating the dominance approach. Debora Tannen's study (1989) has also been widely cited as a model study showing the different approach for gender interactions. The second section discusses studies on collaborative talk. It focuses on what collaborative talk is and whether genders affect collaborative talk. In particular, Jennifer Coates' studies (1996 and 2003) reveal that there are two different forms of collaborative talk between men and women: one sentence construction for women and repetition for men. This study examines three collaborative features but also investigates another strategy, not previously examined in gender research: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition.

1.5.2: Chapter 3

Chapter 3 discusses and justifies the theoretical framework for studies of gender and language. It begins by discussing Discourse Analysis (DA) and Conversation Analysis

(CA). These two approaches seem to be widely used for studies of conversations. Each approach follows a different method of data analysis and how researchers can utilise both approaches to investigate gender and language is discussed.

This chapter then considers the methodological issues relevant to studies of conversation. Two main issues are discussed. The first involves benefits and drawbacks in using a quantitative approach or a qualitative approach in studies of conversations. The qualitative approach is often adopted for studies of conversation because it is believed that every person is unique when each person talks to the other, so that coding conversational features with numbers does not always strongly support or indicate trends of the conversational features occurring in conversations (Schegloff, 1993). However, in order to usefully do the qualitative analysis, a quantitative analysis is also often adopted since the sample for qualitative investigation is often not randomly selected (Perakyla, 2004). Thus, this study not only adopts the qualitative approach for the data analysis but it also uses the quantitative approach as the first step in the data analysis.

The second important methodological issue is how the data is transcribed. Transcriptions can vary depending on transcribers and the process of transcription can be a subjective one. Therefore, the same data, when transcribed, can appear as a completely different version depending on who transcribes it. In order to solve this issue, there are several possible ways for transcribers to decide which style of transcripts can be used. The justification for the approach employed in this study is given.

1.5.3: Chapter 4

Chapter 4 discusses how this study is conducted. The starting point is an exploration of participants' background information. Some details are provided of participants'

background such as their first language, nationality, age group, and social class. This is done since, within the DA framework, participants' background information is believed to influence their speech production. The next section shows how the data of this study is collected. In particular, the researchers' absence while collecting data, and data collection without using a prompt to encourage participants to talk, are discussed since these two factors are believed to have an influence on the data (Cameron, 2001, Speer, 2002 and Kitzinger, 1990). Then the description of the recording device and details of the recording is given followed by a discussion of the settings of the conversations for this study. Conversations are collected from everyday talk of participants during lunchtime or dinnertime. There are three different conversational settings: men only, women only and mixed gender conversations. The next two sections discuss how the data is analysed in this study. As is discussed earlier, the combination of DA and CA is adopted and detailed discussions of how these two approaches are combined for this study is given. Also, the method of selecting samples for the qualitative analysis is explained. The last two sections discuss transcriptions for the data and issues of this study. In this study a simple version of CA transcription is adopted and this section explains the reasons for it.

1.5.4: Chapter 5

This chapter shows how the number of occurrences of the three collaborative features observed in all conversations recorded for this study, are coded. Although this study is mainly undertaken qualitatively, coding the numbers of collaborative features helps in selecting samples for qualitative examination. Thus, this chapter shows readers how samples of the data are selected for qualitative analysis. This chapter also supports Schegloff's claim (1993) that the qualitative approach seems to be the best approach for studies of conversations.

1.5.5: Chapter 6 and 7

Chapters 6 to 11 show the qualitative analysis of each of the three collaborative features: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition. Chapter 6 and 7 discuss several cases of one sentence construction between men and women. The cases include several models of one sentence construction that are commonly seen in conversations between men and women. Firstly, cases of one sentence construction that follow Lerner's basic model of one sentence construction (2004) are observed. The original speaker delivers a syntactically incomplete discourse unit and then the next speaker provides the rest of the discourse unit to complete the original speaker's utterance. Secondly, cases of one sentence construction that include overlap features are commonly seen in both male and female conversations in this study. The next speaker's utterance is overlapped with the original speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004). Thirdly, cases of one sentence construction presented as a question are observed. The next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance with a rising intonation and he/she is asking a question to the original speaker (Lerner, 2004).

1.5.6: Chapter 8 and 9

Chapters 8 and 9 show several cases of one sentence expansion, a phenomenon which needs to be distinguished from one sentence construction. Male and female participants both show several instances of one sentence expansion which are commonly found in conversations between male and female speakers. Firstly, cases of one sentence expansion that follow the model of a three part structure (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991) are commonly seen in both male and female participants in conversations in this study. In this model of one sentence expansion the recipient often monitors the third component as a sign of turn completion and the recipient delivers the final list as an

expansion. Secondly, a case of one sentence expansion that follows Lerner's reformulated model (1991) is discussed. In this type of one sentence expansion the original speaker provides a clue for the next speaker, a characterisation of what will be taken up in a subsequent turn unit. Then, the next speaker delivers an expansion component.

1.5.7: Chapter 10 and 11

Chapters 10 and 11 show cases of repetition carried out by both male and female speakers in their conversations. Tannen (2007) explains that there are several types of repetition, for instance there is repetition delivered by the same speaker, and repetition delivered by the other speaker. This study investigates repetition delivered by the other speaker. Similar to the other two chapters on collaboration both male and female participants show several instances of similar types of repetition. For instance, there are cases of repetition used as an acceptance for one sentence construction are observed. The next speaker's affiliating utterance to complete the original speaker's in progress utterance was indicated as accepted by the repetition. Cases of repetition followed by laughter which brings a sense of humour into the story are also observed.

1.5.8: Chapter 12

Chapter 12 is the conclusion of this research thesis that has five sections. It begins with showing the outcomes of this study and responding to the original research questions. The two research questions are answered. Chapter 5 answers the first research question and Chapters 6 to 11 answer the second research question. Then, Chapter 12 moves to explaining the limitations of this study. Like all research, limitations of this research exist. The third section discusses directions for future research following this study. The

fourth section makes some recommendations that arise from this study. The author believes that the results of this study can be utilised not only by those who investigate gender interactions, but also by those who work in the other fields such as education and the commercial airline industry. There is then a final comment that concludes the whole thesis.

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1: Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to give readers an overview of studies of gender and language. Thus, there is no detailed discussions in this chapter of the three collaborative features in talk which form the main focus of this thesis: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition. Detailed discussions of these three collaborative features will be found in the relevant qualitative chapters.

This chapter discusses two main elements. First, attention is focused on early influential studies of gender and language. Within the Discourse Analytic framework, Otto Jespersen (1992) and Robin Lakoff (1975) conducted their work based on the theory that women's language was inferior to men's. Dale Spender (1980) developed the dominance theory that women were literally dominated by men in their talk. Deborah Tannen's study (1990) proposed that the gender differences that are noticeable between the talk of men and women resulted from men and women belonging to different cultures. In the Conversation Analytic (CA) framework, Zimmerman and West (1975) examined interruptions by men and women in conversations. Pamela Fishman (1983) investigated conversational features such as minimal responses, topic initiations and questions. Kitzinger and Frith (1999) examined how women prevent from being a victim of a case of date rape. Stokoe (2003) and Kitzinger (2000) investigated gender reference terms in conversations.

The second part of this chapter discusses the features of collaborative talk. Collaboration in talk is one of the important factors used in order to achieve conversational goals (Chang and Wells, 1987). Past gender stereotype studies suggested that women were

collaborative, facilitative or conciliatory while men were aggressive, competitive or autonomous. Although men were labelled aggressive, competitive or autonomous, this did not mean that men did not collaborate in talk. Some studies show that men also use collaborative features in their talk, though in different ways.

2.2: Past studies of gender and language

Several past studies of gender and language have influenced studies of gender interactions today. In the first part of this section, four such studies are discussed: Otto Jespersen's *Language*, Robin Lakoff's *Language and women's place*, Dale Spender's *Man Made Language*, and Deborah Tannen's *You just don't understand*. These four studies are widely cited in studies of gender and language and have had a great influence, particularly on the investigation of gender and language in the Discourse Analytic (DA) framework. In the second part of this section, studies in the CA framework are discussed: studies by Zimmerman and West, Fishman, Kitzinger and Frith, and Stokoe and Kitzinger.

Otto Jespersen is probably the first researcher who studied women's language closely. In 1922, he published the book, *Language: It's Nature, Development and Origin* which contains a chapter titled, *The women*. Although Jespersen claimed women's language is more polite and more 'refined' than that of men, Jespersen described women's language as having limited vocabulary, using simpler sentence structures and incomplete sentences. His study has been, however, criticised by feminist scholars on the grounds that it is sexist, self- serving and patronising (Speer, 2005a and West, 1995).

Lakoff's book, *Language and women's place* published in 1975, was widely regarded as the first book in feminist linguistics. It has had a significant impact on the field of

language and gender studies. Her study was conducted within a deficit framework, a term which refers to any approach that interprets male and female linguistics differences as evidence of women's powerlessness and subordinate status. Lakoff believed that women's inferior language did not come from their nature but was a result of women being trained to be so (Speer, 2005a). Both Jespersen and Lakoff's studies, however, failed to give evidence to support their conclusions. They did not conduct empirical research and depended on informal observations to draw their conclusions (West, 1995).

Dale Spender developed the dominance theory which was that women were quite literally dominated by men in their talk, in terms of both the amount of they talked and their control over the topic of the conversation. Her book *Man Made Language* published in 1980 is often cited in explanations of the dominance theory of gender interactions (Speer, 2005a). For instance, studies of interruptions by male speakers often concluded that men interrupted women in talk by adopting the stance of male dominance in talk (Zimmerman and West, 1983 and Smith-Lovin and Brody,1989). Studies of the amount of talk also showed that men tended to talk longer than women in talk (Edelsky, 1993, Holmes, 1992, Mulac, 1989, and Kollock, Blumstein and Schwartz,1985).

In 1985, Deborah Tannen published her book, *You just don't understand*, which was based on her Ph.D thesis, and it became very popular. Unlike Jespersen and Lakoff, Tannen adopted a new approach, one of cultural difference to explore both men's and women's language. This approach was based on the pattern of children's socialisation within single gender playgrounds. Boys and girls belong to the different cultures and therefore they prefer to play with the same gender group (Hall, 2005). Tannen's popular book is perhaps most widely known to sociolinguists as an example of a study which adopts the cultural difference approach for the study of gender and language. She sees conversations between men and women as cross-cultural communication, seeing boys

and girls as growing up in different cultures which influence their talk. She also claims to refute studies which adopted the dominance approach. She agrees with the view that men in general seek to dominate women but believes this is not sufficient reason to conclude that this is necessarily the case in conversations between men and women. Tannen used empirical research for her study to support her claims, instead of depending only on her impressions, which is in contrast to the approach of Jespersen in 1922 and Lakoff in 1975 (West 1995).

So far four influential studies of gender and language in the DA framework have been discussed. There have also been studies of gender interactions in the CA framework. However, unlike DA, CA does not allow researchers to use participants' characteristic such as 'male speaker' or 'female speaker' to discuss conversational features unless the data of the study shows evidence of these characteristics (Schegloff, 1997b). This CA principle caused a debate between CA scholars, in particular Schegloff (1997b), and feminist scholars who tried to utilise CA for exploring gender interactions. The detailed debate on this issue is discussed in the methodology chapter of this study and therefore this section will not discuss this issue further. However, there were some earlier studies which tried to utilise CA for investigating gender interactions. These studies are perhaps not considered to be as examples of CA studies by CA scholars since they label participants in their studies as 'a male speaker' and 'a female speaker'. However, they tried to utilise the ways in which CA scholars see the data for the analyses of gender interactions. The author of this study believe that scholars, who tried to utilise CA for exploring gender interaction in the past, have brought a great contribution to studies of gender interactions, and therefore that it is worth of discussing these past studies here.

Zimmerman and West are influential researchers who adopted the CA framework in order to investigate gender and language (Bucholtz, 2005). Their study (1975) examined

interruptions and overlaps in men's and women's conversations. However, their study was mainly conducted quantitatively by coding instances of interruptions and overlaps by men and women. They concluded that men tended to interrupt more than women did by on the basis of their coding and counting of numbers of interruptions.

Pamela Fishman is another researcher who tried to adopt the CA framework to explore gender and language (Bucholtz, 2005). Fishman (1983) investigated some conversational features between men and women, such as asking questions, minimal responses, topic initiations, making statements, and attention beginnings such as '*this is interesting*'. Her study, however, did not provide transcripts of the data to show her evidences although she stated in her study that she made some transcripts of the data.

More recently, several feminist researchers have adopted a CA framework for their analysis. Celia Kitzinger and Hannah Frith (2000) adopted a CA framework to investigate how women refusal to prevent being the victim of a case of date rape. They interviewed women to find how they felt when they were with their partners and when their partners asked to have sexual relationships. Stockill and Kitzinger (2007) also adopted the CA framework in order to study of gender and language. They investigated gender pronouns such as '*girls*' or '*women*' in conversations. They tried to find why these gender terms were used by speakers instead of other terms such as '*lady*'. Their study clearly demonstrated how an analysis of gender features in conversation could be conducted in a CA framework. They showed evidence of their analysis in their transcriptions, which is usually practice for CA instead of using participants' and researchers' background knowledge.

In short, some influential studies of gender and language have accounted for the ways both men and women talk with different theories. Early studies such as Jespersen,

Lakoff and Spender analysed women's language based on the society to which women belonged at that time. Tannen approached men and women's talk on the basis of culture differences. She conducted that men and women belonged to different cultures and therefore they talked differently. The above studies were conducted within the DA framework. Researchers tried to link speech productions to the societies to which men and women belonged. In contrast to the DA framework, studies of gender and language within the CA framework, focused their analysis on men's and women's speech productions rather than using background information. Zimmerman and West analysed interruptions in a quantitative way. Fishman analysed the use of questions, minimal responses and so forth. Recent feminist researchers for instance, Stockill and Kitzinger analysed the use of gender pronouns by speakers in conversations.

2.3: Studies of gender stereotypes in talk

In the previous section, several influential past studies of gender and language were discussed. In particular, the analysis carried out in Jespersen's and Lakoff's studies depended on their perceptions of looking at women's language without showing evidences to support their conclusions. Their studies suggest that even scholars of studies of gender and language bring some kinds of gender stereotypes into their analysis. Holmes (2006b) supports the notion of using gender stereotypes in talk. To some extent, people are always aware of whether they are talking to a woman or man, and they bring to every interaction their familiarity with gender stereotypes and the gender norms to which men and women are expected to conform. Although this present study does not aim to revisit past gender stereotypes of male and female talk, as Holmes (2006b) claims, gender stereotype are one of factors that influence conversational styles between men and women. Thus this section summarises the findings of research studies in gender

stereotypes as this is an important field of of gender literature. It also has provided a motive for this present research to probe further into the reliability of those stereotypes.

A number of sociolinguists have investigated gender stereotypes in talk. For example, men swear and use slang more than women do. Men tell jokes and women do not. Women can smooth over difficult social situations while men find this more difficult. Men tend to talk about competition, sports, and doing things. They also tease more and are more aggressive than women. Women tend to talk about themselves, feelings, affiliation with others, home and family (Lakoff,1975, Poynton,1989, Tannen,1993, and Wardhaugh,1992). Women were commonly described as adorable, charming, sweet, lovely and divine (Lakoff, 1975), heated, sentimental, talkative, gentle, fussy, dreamy and emotional (Archer and Lloyd, 1985), less aggressive, less assertive, less dominant, more emotional and more timid (Drass, 1986). Women were often described as cheerful, dependent, and attractive (Hegstrom and McCarl- Nielsen, 2002). In contrast, men were described as self-confident, forceful, enterprising, assertive, confident, rational and tough (Archer and Lloyd, 1985). Men were described as strong, sturdy, big, and tall.

Holmes (2000) summarised gender stereotypes which were commonly mentioned in the past studies of gender stereotypes below.

Masculine	**Feminine**
direct	indirect
aggressive	conciliatory
competitive	facilitative
autonomous	collaborative
dominates talking time	talks less than men
interrupts aggressively	has difficulty getting a turn
task-oriented	person-oriented
referentially oriented	affectively oriented

(Holmes, 2000: 3)

As the table shows, studies of gender stereotypes showed that collaborativeness is considered a feature of female interaction. These gender stereotype studies above, however, do not always apply to conversations. Eckert (1993), for instance, disputes the reliability of evidence of the past studies. One obviously can not conclude from the available evidence of gender differences in conversation that men do not engage in cooperative personal revelation, or women in impersonal competition. Holmes (2000 and 2001) claims that studies of gender stereotype in talk ignore many sources of diversity and variation such as age, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation and so forth. In addition, researchers need to take account of the stylistic variation which arises from contextual factors, including the social and discourse context of an interaction.

Although methodological issues exist for studies of gender stereotypes, the summary of gender stereotypes provided above, suggests that men do not tend to collaborate, or use collaborative mechanisms, in their conversations in the way women do. However, there are studies which prove that it is not only women who show collaborativeness in their talk. These studies show that men also use collaborative features in their talk. The next section discusses collaborative features in talk but before discussing gender-linked collaborative features in talk in depth, several reasons why collaborative features are important in talk are discussed below.

2.4: Collaborative talk

To begin with, what is collaborative talk needs to be defined. Chang and Wells (1987: 6) provide a definition for collaborative talk. Collaborative talk is 'talk that enables one or more of the participants to achieve a goal as effectively as possible'. The goals may vary since each conversation has a different purpose but has at least some level of specificity, in that one of participants has a goal that he or she wishes to achieve and the other

participant engages in talk that helps the first to achieve that goal. Nevile (2007: 251) argues that, in collaborating for work, participants interact to create and coordinate their contributions, and they attend to one another's conduct to complete tasks and goals for the setting in ways that they themselves treat as acceptance.

Thus, collaborative talk means that participants try to help one another in achieving their conversational goals. In order to achieve their conversational goals, it is important for participants to co-operate with each other and try to accept other participants' directions. Collaborative talk is also important in everyday conversation not only because it can achieve conversational goals and actions (Chang and Wells, 1987) but also to avoid arguments or conflicts among participants. Through collaborative talk, people can convey a similar point of view, including shared attitudes and perceptions of a person or an experience. This leads in turn to a greater perception and feeling of solidarity (Eder, 1988).

2.4.1: Collaborative features

The term 'collaborative floor' is often used to account for collaborative features in conversations. It was introduced by Edelsky (1993) and it is where two or more people either take part in an apparent free-for-all or jointly build one idea. The concept of collaborative floor contrasts with Sacks' rule (1992, v1) of turn taking which is one speaker at a time. Coates (1997) explains that the construction of collaborative floor symbolises what friendships mean particularly for women. As women create utterances together, and as they say parallel things on the same theme at the same time, they are demonstrating in a concrete way the value they place on sharing and on collaboration.

In order to achieve their conversational goals, participants of conversations are required to do several tasks. First of all, each participant needs to know other participants' understanding and intentions. Secondly, participants need to take the appropriate steps to ensure that mutual understanding is kept. In order to explain the matter sufficiently and clearly for the other participant to make an informed response, each participant is forced to construct a more coherent and detailed formulation than would be necessary if a participant was working on the problem alone (Chang and Well, 1987:9). These formulations/constructions are the focus of this study and the ways they are employed by men and women.

2.4.2: Collaborative forms and functions in talk

There are many features in talk that can function collaboratively. Humour (Holmes, 2006a), sentence co-production, sentence expansion and repetition (Tannen, 2007) have been found to be used collaboratively in conversations. However some of these features have also been found to employ several other functions such as distancing the participants, or conveying irony.

Co-producing an utterance has been used as a collaborative feature in conversation and Coates (2007) explains its function. Coates (2007: 49) points out that co-producing an utterance helps to develop the speakers' idea or story by adding just a single word or entire clause to an utterance. Sacks also (1992, v1: 652) calls it '*co-producing an utterance*' in talk. '*Co-producing an utterance*' occurs when a party produces what could become a sentence and another speaks and produces a completion to that sentence.

Here is an example from Sacks:

A: They make miserable coffee.

B: -across the street?

(Sacks 1992, v1: 652)

Sacks explains the above example on top of A's sentence '*they make miserable coffee*', B delivers '*across the street?*' which contains a prepositional phrase and gives the sentence a question form. Thus one sentence was produced by two persons. When one sentence is produced by two or more persons, each speaker shows collaboration to construct a single sentence together.

Collaborative talk is also seen in '*repetitions*'. '*Repetitions*' can occur at a word, phrase or sentence level in talk. Tannen (2007) explains that '*repetitions*' enable a speaker to produce language in a more efficient, less energy-draining way, and facilitate the production of more language, more fluently. '*Repetitions*' also facilitate comprehension by providing semantically less dense discourse, and show how new utterances are linked to earlier discourse and how ideas presented in discourse are related to each other.
For instance, an example from Tannen (2007:71) is provided below.

1: Peter Just to see if we say anything interesting?

2: Deborah No. Just to see how you say nothing interesting.

3: Peter Oh. Well I – I hardly ever say nothing interesting.

Tannen explains that Peter in line 1 says '*say anything interesting*' and then Deborah says '*say nothing interesting*' in line 2, a statement in which Peter's '*anything*' has been changed to '*nothing*'. Then Peter in line 3 again repeats '*say nothing interesting*' which

shows that the two are telling a joke and playing with words based on a repetition of Peter's first utterance '*say anything interesting*'.

Utterance co-constructions and *repetition*s however do not always successfully work as forms of collaboration. For instance, *co-producing an utterance* is not always successfully delivered by the next speaker.

D: .h and they do thi:ngs

(1.2)

C: ta hurt th'm (0.2) huh huh=

D: =no:no: I'm saying that ugh ugh (0.7) that's the compromise

They have ta do with themselves

(Lerner, 2004:247)

Lerner (2004) explains that sometimes a co-produced utterance' elicits a rejection by the previous speaker. In the example above, C is trying to deliver a sentence completion for D's utterance. C's utterance is however rejected by D with '*no:no:*'. C's utterance '*ta hurt th'm (0.2) huh huh*' is not recognised by D as an utterance which was expected to be delivered by the original speaker.

'*Repetition*' is sometimes used as part of repair sequence. For instance,

(62) Ken: 'E likes that waider over there,

Al: → Wait-er?

Ken: Waitress, sorry,

Al: 'At's bedder,

(Schegloff et al, 1977: 377)

Schegloff et al (1977) treat a case of repetition above as a case of repair. Al repeats '*Wait-er?*' with a rising intonation. Al corrects Ken's '*waider*' by delivering '*Wait-er?*' and Ken admits Al's correction by delivering '*Waitress, sorry,*' after Al's repetition '*Wait-er?*'.

In addition, a speaker can simply show a problem of hearing or understanding by delivering a repetition of the prior turn. For instance,

(b)

A:		I have a:-cousin teaches there
D:		Where.
A:		Uh:, Columbia.
D:	→	Colombia?
A:		Uh huh.
D:		You mean Manhattan?
A:		No. Uh big university. Isn't that in Colombia?
D:		Oh in Columbia.
A:		Yeah.

(Schegloff et al, 1977: 369)

Schegloff et al (1977) explains that after A's '*Uh:, Columbia.*', D delivers a repetition '*Colombia?*' with a rising intonation. A's '*Uh huh.*' is inserted before D delivers '*You mean Manhattan?*' which suggests that D shows a problem of hearing or understanding by delivering a repetition. This case of repetition shows speaker's problem of hearing or understanding of the prior turn rather than is used as part of repair.

In short, features such as '*co-producing utterance*' and '*repetition*' can be used as both collaborative and non-collaborative features. In co-producing utterances, when the second speaker delivers an utterance which can be considered an appropriate completion of that delivered by the original speaker, one discourse unit is collaboratively formed by two speakers. However, there are cases where a co-producing utterance is rejected by the original speaker. The second speaker's attempt to complete the original utterance is then repaired by the original speaker. Repetitions are often delivered as a feature of collaboration. Speakers often deliver repetitions with humour which supports collaborative talk. A repetition is, however, sometimes used as a problematic feature. A speaker sometimes repairs a problem of hearing or grasping of what the original speaker said by delivering a repetition.

2.5: Collaborative talk between men and women

Studies on gender interactions which were discussed earlier demonstrated that men and women employ certain conversational styles in casual talk. Many studies concluded that women were collaborative or cooperative while men were aggressive or interruptive in their conversations which was perhaps one of the most significant gender differences in conversational style (Hay, 2000). Howden (1994:53) supports these gender stereotypes in talk. She explains that compared to Japanese men, American men do not overlap but they do interrupt more in conversations. Men's interruption changes the subject in talk and attempts to dominate the floor of conversations. Without sympathy and support, without a sense of being heard, women gradually stop talking and sit back, while men enjoy arguing and debating in front of an audience in a mixed gender group.

However, more recent findings and changes in the methodological framework in the study of interactions suggests that men and women adopt different conversational styles

dependent on the conversational context, purpse of conversation and /or presence of participants.(Coates, 2004) A few studies have found that it is not only women who use collaborative features in their talk. Men also use collaborative features in their conversations. Thus this section discusses research findings on the collaborative techniques employed by men and women.

Howden (1994) finds some similarities of conversational styles between Japanese men and American women. Japanese men's conversational style is indirect. They seek sympathy and show support for close friends in a way which is often seen in American women's conversations.

Jennifer Coates (1996 and 2003) has found that collaborative features are used by both men and women but that they use different styles of collaborative feature. Men use repetitions to collaborate in their talk while women use one sentence constructions by two or more than two persons in their talk. For instance, Coates (1996) gives the following example to explain that repetitions are one of men's features of collaborative talk:.

1:		this bloke called Phil at work
2:		lives in <u>Taunton</u>
3:	Craig	<u>Taunton</u> yeah Phil [Craig]
4:		and he calls his mum
5:		'strap' er on' [Craig]
6:		and he calls his mum y- <u>our Gladys</u>
7:		<u>our Gladys</u>
8:	Jeff	<u>Gladys</u> [Jeff]
9:		and he s-he se- we went our for a drink

10: and he goes –yeah

11: he said-yeah 'that kid with the gert big long arms' <Laughs>

12: 'gert big thin arms'

13: Craig yeah 'gert big think arms'

14: I said to him 'how can you have gert big think arms?'

15: they're either big or they're thin. (Coates, 1996: 61)

Coates explains that the names: Phil, Taunton, and our Gladys are repeated by different speakers. Also the phrase '*gert big long arms*' is repeated by a different speaker. Participants in this conversation achieve through this collaboration a very strong sense of being an in-group.

In contrast to her example of men's repetition, Coates (1996:138-139) shows in an example from an interview setting that two female speakers collaborate to produce talk.

Becky: I mean I've got friends that- … sometimes I feel

Becky: like I have to put on a bit of a – you know say the –

Becky: you know [say the right words and things you know/

Hannah: [say the right things/ yeah/

Hanna says '*say the right things*' at the same time as Becky says '*say the right words and things*'. The delivery of joint constructed utterances such as that above can only occur when speakers pay extremely close attention to each other, at all linguistic levels: the meaning of what the other speaker is saying, the grammatical of structure of what is being said, and the intonation pattern and rhythmic quality (Coates, 1996).

As for repetition, although Coates claimed that repetition was a collaborative feature among men, Leung (2009) found that girls used several cases of repetition to collaborate with each other in their talk. For instance,

14: Nadia:	Yvonne has # I mean #
	Ashely has # a Rottweiler
15: Yvonne:	what?
16: Nadia:	Yvonne has #I mean # <u>WHOA</u>
	Ashely has a Rottweiler=
17:	= I know # so does Courtney
18: Nadia:	it ate their cat
19: Lisa:	it ate their cat
20: Yvonne:	=no # I thought it smuushed it

(adopted from Leung, 2009:1347)

According to Leung, girls in this conversation are talking about the topic of dogs. In lines 18 and 19, there is a case of repetition where Lisa repeats Nadia's '*it ate their cat*' in line 18. Leung explains that Nadia and her friends use linguistics strategies such as the repetition seen in this part of the conversation as a means of collaborating in conversations.

In short, although past stereotype studies have suggested that collaborative features in talk were likely to be characteristic of women's talk, Coates' study (1996) in particular found not only that women used collaborative features in talk but also that men used a collaborative feature in their talk by using repetition. Coates' finding that men also used collaborative talk suggests that collaborative feature in talk could possibly be a feature of men's conversation as well as a feature of women's conversation. These findings can be

ascribed to the fact that gender roles are changing and both men and women adopt different styles dependent on the context and purpose of conversation. Moreover, attention to context, to the community of practice in which people are participating, awareness of the dynamic and negotiated nature of interaction are contributing factors to the changing male and female conversational styles (Coates, 2004; Eckert, 2008; Holmes, 2007)

2.6: Summary of this chapter

Several past influential studies for gender and language were discussed. Within the DA framework, Jespersen (1922), Lakoff (1975), Spender (1980), and Tannen (1995) in particular had a big influence on studies of gender and language. In the CA framework, earlier studies by Zimmerman and West (1975), and Fishman (1983) tried to adopt a CA approach. However, Zimmerman and West's study relied heavily on a quantitative approach and Fishman's study did not actually show the data to support the findings. After the millennium, feminist CA researchers started nicely combining CA with gender and language research. For instance, Stockill and Kitzinger's study (2007) clearly demonstrated how gender features could be analysed within a CA framework.

Gender stereotype studies have revealed that people tended to apply their gender stereotypes in their talk (Holmes, 2006b). Past gender stereotypes suggested that collaborative features in talk tended to be only seen among women. In contrast to women, men's conversational feature was labelled as aggressive.

Collaborative talk was an important factor in the achievement conversational goals (Chang and Wells, 1987). Speakers' use of several forms of collaborative talk was discussed, including co-producing utterance (Sacks, 1992, v1), repetition (Tannen, 1990)

and humour (Holmes, 2006b). Gender differences were seen in collaborative features in talk. Coates' studies (1996 and 2003) in particular found that both men and women showed collaborative features in their talk but that men used repetition to collaborate in their talk while women used co-producing utterances to collaborate in their talk. These studies by Coates' disproved gender stereotypes that women were collaborative while men were interruptive in talk. The next chapter discusses methodological perspectives for studies of conversation.

Chapter 3: Methodological perspective

3.1: Introduction

This chapter discusses in detail two methodologies that are generally used for the study of gender interactions, namely Discourse Analysis (DA) and Conversation Analysis (CA). These two approaches will be employed for the analysis of the data in the present study. It starts with a discussion of the definition of DA, followed by a discussion of the varieties of DA. DA includes several approaches which have their roots in different disciplines and this section discusses four popular approaches: the ethnography of communication, Pragmatics, Critical discourse analysis and interactional sociolinguistics. Then a section on social variables is presented. In DA, scholars believe that participants' social variables influence their speech productions, and the ways in which these social variables influence talk will be discussed. The next section examines how gender and language studies in the past were conducted in DA. Several past influential studies of gender and language will be presented.

A discussion of CA follows. The first two sections examine how CA was developed and what CA is. Then the distinction between institutional and non-institutional talk is discussed. Feminist CA is also examined. Feminist CA is possibly the only method which allows researchers to investigate gender and language within CA, and it is discussed in depth.

Then this chapter moves on to discuss methodological issues for the study of conversation. Two major issues are discussed. Firstly, quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of conversation are considered. Each approach has both advantages and disadvantages, and thus a discussion of which approach is most

appropriate for this study is included. The second methodological issue is how to transcribe the audio data. Transcriptions of audio data can vary depending on transcribers and how much details the transcribers record. Detailed transcripts can be less reader-friendly, but transcripts without details might miss necessary information for the analysis. Therefore researchers need to decide what type of transcripts they adopt for their study. The last section gives a summary of this chapter.

3.2: Discourse Analysis (DA)

This section will offer a definition of discourse analysis, followed by the varieties of DA which are widely used for the studies of interactions and which underlie various definitions of DA. It will conclude with the discourse analysis variety to be used in this study.

3.2.1: Definitions of Discourse Analysis (DA)

The term DA was first introduced by Zelling Harris in 1952 (Paltridge, 2006). He taught Chomsky and used DA to discover descriptive patterns of language beyond the sentence (Widdowson, 1995). Wooffitt (2005) explains that sociologists in the past tended to believe that scientific knowledge was accurate and therefore it was unaffected by such matters as culture, context, the personalities or motivations of scientists. During the 1970s, however, some sociologists began to argue about sociologists' theories and findings which were believed to be true and they began to explore culture, contexts, the personalities or motivations in relation to scientific knowledge. Potter (2004) explains that DA does not focus on investigating a lexicon and grammar rules but it focuses on investigating what people do in interaction. Bhatia et al (2007:1) explains DA as 'Dating back to the 1960, it has been defined as the analysis of linguistic behaviour, written and

spoken, beyond the limits of individual sentences, focusing primary on the meaning constructed and interpreted as language is used in particular social contexts.'.

3.2.2: Varieties of DA

There are some approaches within DA which have their roots in a different field of study. This section briefly discusses four varieties of DA: the ethnography of communication, pragmatics, critical discourse analysis and interactional sociolinguistics.

3.2.2.1: The ethnography of communication – anthropology root

The ethnography of communication roots in anthropology and is sometimes called as the ethnography of speaking (Cameron, 2001). The aim of this approach is to investigate how members of a particular community group show their discourse styles. Within the ethnography of communication, scholars try to avoid importing their knowledge for their analysis but they try to focus on analysing discourse genre through speakers' speech production (Bucholtzs, 2005). Elinor Keenan's study in Madagascar is an example of classic study adopting the ethnography of communication (cited in Bucholtzs, 2005). She found that women's speech styles were direct while men's speech styles were indirect. Her finding suggests a contradict result found by gender stereotype studies that men tended to be direct while women tended to be indirect (see the more discussions in chapter 2). She concluded that since women engaged in activities such as confrontation and bargaining which were considered to be politically and economically powerful, their speech styles were directive. Men, however, did not involve in such activities: politically and economically powerful activities and thus their speech styles were indirect.

3.2.2.2: Pragmatics – philosophy root

Pragmatics is another branch of DA, one which has its roots in philosophy and aims to interpret utterances in discourse (Cameron, 2001). For example, when you are standing at the bus stop and a stranger asks you '*have you got a light*', you can just simply say to him '*yes*'. In this case, you are operating on the principle of 'what is said is what is meant'. The stranger, however, perhaps meant that he needed a light to smoke, and so if you understand what he means, you perhaps hand him a cigarette lighter. In this case, you are operating on the principle of 'say what you mean and mean what you say' (Cameron, 2001).

Yule (1996:3) explains that pragmatics has four main areas to cover: it is the study of speaking meaning, the study of contextual meaning, the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and the study of the expression of relative distance. In the first definition, it explores how meaning of discourse by a native speaker is interpreted by a hearer. In the second definition, it examines what a speaker means in a particular context and how the context influences speakers' utterance. In the third definition, it explores how a hearer's influence about what is said by a speaker in order to interpret the speaker's meaning. In the last definition, it investigates what determines the choice between the said and unsaid

Although pragmatics allows researchers to investigate many topics, politeness is perhaps one of the most popular topics. The most influential theory of politeness is the Face Threatening Act (FTA) developed by Brown and Levinson in 1978 (Thomas, 1995). According to this theory, people have the potential to cause damage to the positive or negative face of the speaker, the hearer, or both (Cameron, 2001).

3.2.2.3: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA comes from a number of disciplines such as geography, sociology and psychology (Cameron, 2001). Bhatia et al (2007:11) explains the aim of CDA is to challenge inequality, injustice, unfairness and lack of democracy in society by exploring social practices through a critical analysis of discourse and social actions. CDA analysis differs from other DA varieties of DA in that CDA researchers normally see social issues or problems before they start to analyse their data. In this approach, CDA scholars are often criticised in that the analysis can be subjective. The issue for the analysis identified by a scholar might not be the issue for the other (Cameron, 2001).

3.2.2.4: Interactional sociolinguistics – linguistics root

Interactional sociolinguists explore language use in heterogeneous and multicultural societies that are often highly industrialised, concentrating on how language is used across linguistic and cultural groups within a single society (Bucholtzs, 2005). Interactional sociolinguistics was founded by linguistic anthropologist John J. Gumperz (1982). The analysis focuses on linguistic and paralinguistic elements, *cues* such as prosody and register that signal contextual presupposition. These contextualization cues are culturally specific and are employed by participants from different cultural backgrounds. When participants in a conversation come from different cultural backgrounds they may not recognize these subtle cues in one another's speech which can lead to misunderstanding (Gumperz, 1982).

Within interactional sociolinguistics, two popular approaches were used in gender research. The dominance approach was popular with researchers to explore gender and language in the 1970's and 1980's (Cameron, 2005b). This is the approach that claims

women's language is different from men's because women have been denied access to the powerful language which is men's language (Tanaka, 2005). In this approach, researchers proposed that because women were disadvantaged in society, their speech production differed from that of men, and problems in interactions between men and women arose. Researchers within this approach suggest that women must eliminate inequality between men and women to solve problems in interaction (Cameron, 1995). Within this approach, women's language is often described negatively. Women's language is considered inferior to men's. This approach does not seem applicable to women in many countries today.

A cultural difference approach (it is also called as a difference approach in some literatures) was based on a theory that men and women belong to different subcultures. For example, boys and girls learn different ways of speaking in the same-gender peer groups where their main socialization takes place (Cameron, 2005a). Girls are socialised in ways that emphasise interdependence, communality, and cooperation. Boys, on the other hand, are socialised in ways that emphasise independence, separation, and competition (Reid et al, 2003, and Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992). As opposed to the dominance approach, in a cultural different approach, researchers see that men and women were positioned not unequally, but symmetrically as outsiders to each others' spoken cultures (Cameron, 1995).

This research study will be employing the concepts of interactional sociolinguistics in the understanding of the notions of men and women and their talk in interaction. It is the most appropriate subsection of discourse analysis as this has been employed in gender research and deals with naturally occurring interactions.

3.2.2.5: Social variables

Within the DA framework, participants' social variables are often invoked, since social variables are believed to influence speech production. For instance, participants' ethnicity is believed to affect linguistic behaviour. Trudgill (1983) says that ethic group appears that people are influenced linguistically much more by members of the social networks to which they belong than by anybody else. Holmes (2001) shows two examples of how ethnicity influences the languages people use. In America, the English spoken by African Americans (known as African American Vernacular English) has a numbers of features which do not occur in standard mainstream English in America. One feature is the complete absence of the copula verb 'be'. In standard English, people use shortened or reduced forms of the verb 'be' such as 'she's very nice'. As opposed to standard English, African American Vernacular English speakers tend to say 'she very nice' instead of saying 'she's very nice'. In New Zealand, Maori people tend to use Maori words in their English more than European-origin New Zealanders do. Holmes concludes that people's language may signal and contribute to the dynamic construction of ethnic identity and particular groups develop ways of speaking which are distinctive to their culture.

Participants' social class is another variable which is believed to influence speaker's productions. Social class can be measured on several scales. Sociolinguists use a number of different scales for classifying people. For example, classification can be by an occupational scale such as professionals, executives, technicians, skilled-workers. It can be an educational scale such as post graduate, undergraduate, college diploma, high school graduation, and completion of compulsory education. It can also be an income scale. Researchers use any or all of the above criteria to decide the social class of people (Wardhaugh, 2002). Two classic studies done by Trudgill and Labov are described

below. Trudgill (1983) investigated the pronunciation of the suffix '*-ing*' in present participles such as '*walking*' and '*going*' in Norwich English. He classified his participants into five social groups: middle class, lower middle class, upper working class, middle working class and lower working class on the basis of their occupation, income, education, father's occupation, housing and locality. Trudgill found that working class people did not pronounce '*-ing*' clearly, and that they produced '*-in*' instead of '*-ing*'. Labov's classic study shows different speech production by people who belong to different classes. Labov (1972) studied how /r/ was pronounced among people in New York city. He visited three different department stores which he categorised as three different social classes when he collected his data. He asked questions of people in each department store in order to collect /r/ sounds in the words '*fourth floor*'. He found that people in the higher class department store used most /r/ but people in the lowest class department store used less /r/.

Age is another factor that has an influence on speech production. Wardhaugh (2002:10-11) says that young children speak differently from older children and, in turn, children speak differently from mature adults. Fujimura-Wilson (2007) claims that the age factor has a strong influence on speech production. She examined repetitions in Japanese conversations and found that young Japanese used more repetitions than the elderly Japanese. She concluded that young people showed enthusiasm and empathy by using repetitions. Thompson, et al (2004) studied interactions between younger and older patients when they talked to physicians. They found that younger patients tended to ask questions more frequently and with more precision than older patients. Younger patients also tended to talk about their problems more, give information in more detail and be more sensitive than older patients. There was only an exception about older patients that they tended to ask more questions than young ones only when the older patients had longer interactions with physicians. Physiological factors including sensory deficits,

cognitive impairment, functional limitations and multiple medical problems may affect elderly people's communication skills.

3.3: Gender and DA

DA has been widely used for gender and language studies. Interactional sociolinguistics was perhaps the most popular approach for such studies. As discussed above, two major theories, the dominance and cultural approaches, were adopted for data analysis by the early interactional sociolinguists. Robin Lakoff (1972) and Deborah Tannen (1985) analysed their data mainly by relying on their own background knowledge and the speaker's background knowledge. In the dominance approach, researchers believed that women were dominated by men in their societies and therefore women's language was seen as inferior language compare to that of men. In the cultural difference approach, researchers believed that because men and women belonged to a different culture, conversational styles between men and women were found to be different.

Earlier interactional sociolinguists also paid attention to conversational settings in their studies. They often separated participants into three different groups: a men only group, a women only group and a mixed gender group. Two theories seek to explain the observation that men and women show different conversational strategies when they are in mixed and single gender groups. The speech accommodation theory explains that people often change their speech styles in order to converge towards the behaviour of a member of another social group (Mulac eta al, 1988). In this theory, both men and women are expected to use different ways of speaking depending on whether they are talking to someone of the same or of the other gender (Athenstaedt et al, 2004). Mulac et al (1988) examined interactions among university students in both single and mixed gender groups looking at linguistics features such as interruptions, directiveness and so

forth. They found that both men and women showed differentiations of language use in both single and mixed gender groups. The differences were, however, greater in the same gender groups than in mixed gender groups. They concluded that this result was because participants acted in a more gender stereotypical fashion towards the opposite sex when they engaged in conversation.

The social role theory also explains why gender differences occur in both single and mixed gender groups. In this theory, gender differences occur as a result of role-related differences between men and women. Both men and women tend to play their roles, either consciously or unconsciously, when they interact within groups. Feminine gender roles are expressive and social-emotional while masculine gender roles are instrumental and non-emotional (Athenstaedt et al, 2004). Athenstaedt et al (2004) studied gender stereotyped behaviours (men's interruptions and defectiveness, and women's smiling and nodding) in both single and mixed gender groups. They found that more gender stereotyped communication behaviours were seen in same gender interactions than in mixed gender interactions in their study. They concluded that both men and women tended to accommodate their behaviours to their partners.

There is, however, a trend for recent researchers of gender and language in DA to adopt or favour CA (see the details of CA in the next section in this chapter) while using a DA framework for their analysis. In contrast to earlier interactional sociolinguists, recent interactional sociolinguists generally try to use evidence from male and female speakers' speech productions in their discussions. In other words, they tend to adopt the ways CA researchers see their data into a DA framework. For instance, Holmes (2006b) studied gender talk in the workplace in New Zealand. She recorded many conversations in business meetings, small talk among colleagues and so forth. Holmes analysed several features in workplace talk such as gender humour in talk, gender telling stories and

leadership talk. She was able to nicely combine the DA framework and a CA framework for her analysis.

1. Tes: where's my mouse?
2. Sam: ([laugh])
3. Tes: /(er)\
4. Don: /(no well)\ you're sitting too far away from the /reciever\
5. Tes: /oh for\ goodness shakes how am I going to be able to do this
6. Don: eh? Oh well I'll do it if you want [laugh]
7. Tes: well f- just tell me from there
8. Don: no I can't do that
9. Jil: okay well while while Tessa and Donald [laugh]: have a moment [laugh]…
10. um so I'll go for a quick flick through the agenda

(Holmes, 2006b: 121)

The above is an example taken from Holmes' study. The way she analyses this part of the conversation is shown below.

> 'Tessa and Donald engage in a little skirmish, with Tessa complaining about the placing of the computer (lines 1, 6) and Donald dishing out advice (lines 4-5) and offering to come and help (line7), which Tessa irritably rejects (line8). Jill is about to start the meeting. Instead of ignoring the skirmish, asserting her professional identity, and authoritatively taking the floor, Jill takes the opportunity to re-establish a pleasant tone and pour oil on the troubled material waters by humorously adopting the role of 'mother' or at least 'understanding older adult' rather than 'boss…'

(Holmes, 2006b:122)

Holmes's analysis of the example above shows that the first part of her analysis reflects the analytic practice of CA researchers. Holmes gives evidence – she shows lines of turns by speakers and describes what each speaker is doing when supporting her claims. In the latter part of her analysis she adopts the analytic practice of DA researchers. Holmes uses background information about the speaker, here the role of '*mother*', '*boss*' and '*understanding older adult*'. These pieces of information do not appear in her transcription but Holmes knows and uses them for her analysis.

Another example is a study undertaken by one of the pioneer of CA, Gail Jefferson (2004). Although she is not a DA researcher, one of her studies demonstrates her approach to analysis which mainly adopts CA but shows how she used background knowledge of participants – she labelled participants as 'a male speaker or a female speaker' in her study – which is something CA does not do. Jefferson (2004) examined a phenomenon related to laughing, observing that when a man laughed, a woman would join in laughing but when a woman laughed, a man would not join in. Jefferson is well known as a CA researcher and she has published many articles which adopt CA. In her study, there are two sections in which she has used the quantitative method, showing numbers of incidents of male and female laughter, but this approach did not support her hypothesis. In the second section of her study, which she describes as a case by case analysis, she examined each case in the way CA researchers normally examine such data by focusing on turn taking features for her analysis.

In this new trend of discourse analysts adopting a CA type analysis into a DA framework, researchers do not pay much attention to gender conversational settings, that is men only

conversations, women only conversations or mixed gender conversations. Instead, researchers pay attention to what kind of conversations they are researching, for instance, whether they are researching everyday conversations or institutional conversations such as business meetings. This is possibly because of the CA flavour added to the DA framework.

3.4: Conversation Analysis (CA)

This section moves on to exploring CA, as this is an important methodology for the present study. CA allows the researcher to see the data in considerable depth and is able to show evidence of what each participant is doing in conversations instead of relying on background knowledge which is not often observable in the conversational data. CA is sometimes considered to be a part of DA. In a broad sense, this is true but in a narrow sense, CA is different from DA. Nevile (2004) briefly explains a difference between CA and DA. In CA, scholars avoid making assumptions about the social status or roles of participants such as 'father', 'child', 'teacher' or whatever. Thus claims must be supported by evidence in the data. As opposed to CA, in DA, the social status or roles of participants are pre-existing and used as a tool for explaining something in the data. One of the reasons for this is that CA has its roots in a different field of study. CA's roots are in sociology.

3.4.1: CA – sociology root

CA has its roots in sociology and there were two influential people for the early development of CA, namely Erving Goffman and Harold Garfinkel. Erving Goffman developed a rather distinctive personal style of sociological analysis based on a qualitative approach to studying social interaction, as opposed to much work that has

been done in sociology and social psychology based on a qualitative approach to hypothesis testing (Liddicoat, 2007 and Ten Have, 1999). Harold Garfinkel developed ethonomethodology which is a field of sociology; he was concerned with the common social knowledge of members of society and the forces that influence how individuals interpret the situations and messages they encounter in their social world (Liddicoat, 2007).

3.4.2: Development of CA by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson

In the early 1960, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson developed (Paltridhe, 2006, and Goodwin and Heritage, 1990) and viewed talk as an activity through which speakers achieve things in interaction (Liddicoat, 2007). In the beginning, Sacks and Schegloff did not pay particular attention to the settings of conversations. For instance, the data used by Sacks in his books *Lectures on conversation* (1992) were mostly collected when he became a fellow at the Centre for the Scientific Study of Suicide in Los Angeles in 1963. Schegloff explored conversations from a disaster centre in his Ph.D thesis. Both Sacks and Schegloff, therefore, started investigating institutional talk but they gradually turned to investigating ordinary talk among people because they assumed that ordinary conversations provided better examples of the local functioning of conversational devices and interactional formats such as turn taking, and opening and closing features. Since the late 1970's however, CA researchers have again started looking at institutionally based interactions (Ten Have,1999).

3.4.3: Aims and definition of CA

Tanaka (2004:6) explains that the aim of CA is to study the order and organisation of social action. Heller (2001:253) points out that CA allows researchers to do three things:

to discover how interaction contributes to the construction of a social order, to examine how the relationship between social action and social structure constrains how individuals can come to know and act in their world, and to identify the interactional manifestations of social problems.

The definitions of CA shown below explain the conversation analytic approach:

> "Conversation analysts view talk-in-interaction as an ordered social activity that it is not reduced to individual character, mood, and so on. …. Importantly, CA examines how utterances link together to form an identifiable sequence of conversation. Thus, crucial to CA is an examination of how one conversational turn follows on from another, as conversation analysts believe that this pattern reveals participants' own interpretations within the conversation, even if these are unconscious."
>
> (Lills and McKinney, 2003:23)

> "Methodologically, CA seeks to undercover the practices, patterns and generally the methods through which participants perform and interpret social action. … At the most basic level CA seeks to discover patterns in social interaction in order to find evidence of *practices* of conduct, in the systematic design of turns at talk."
>
> (Drew and Curl, 2007: 23)

> "CA studies of these practices describe how people take turns at talk in ordinary conversation and negotiate overlaps and interruptions; how various kinds of basic action sequences are organised and different options are activated inside those sequences; how various kinds of failures in interaction – for example, of hearing and understanding – are dealt with; how conversations are opened and closed; how

> gaze and body posture are related to talk; how laughter is organised; how grammatical form and discourse particles are related to turn taking and other interactional issues; and so on."
>
> (Heritage, 2004: 222)

When using CA, researchers analyse conversation by focusing on how conversational turns are designed by participants in conversations. In order to do so, researchers seek evidence in their data, which is transcribed, rather than using researchers' or participants' background information. This is a primary difference from the way DA researchers approach their data analysis. DA researchers bring researchers' and participants' background information into the data analysis, whereas CA researchers rely on their data alone to show evidence.

In CA, researchers focus on several areas of analysis in particular: turn taking organisation, sequence organisation, repair organisation (Ten Have, 2004). In turn taking organisation, CA researchers often see how speaker's turns in the conversation are formed in a way that is consistent with the rule of one speaker at a time (Sacks, 1992, v1). CA researchers believe that turn units in conversation are systematically organised. For example, the next speaker can be selected by the previous speaker, a speaker can self-select or a present speaker can continue speaking. In order to examine turn taking features, CA researchers often pay attention to what is termed the Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) and also the Transition Relevant Place (TRP) which is the place where turn changes often occur.

The category of sequence organisation is broader than that of turn taking features. CA researchers often observe that utterances are sequentially organised. For instance, when a speaker delivers a question, an answer would normally follow. Thus, a question unit

and an answer unit are seen as a pair in the conversation. This kind of pair in the conversation is called an 'adjacency pair'. CA researchers examine how these adjacency pairs are organised in conversation (Liddicoat, 2007).

CA researchers also look at repair in conversational organisation. They examine how repair sequences are dealt with when there are various kinds of trouble in the interaction's progress. Repairs can occur, for instance when there is a mishearing or misunderstanding by the next speaker the original speaker tries to correct the next speaker's mishearing or misunderstanding. CA researchers try to ascertain how speakers in the conversation deal with these repairs in the conversation (Liddicoat, 2007).

3.4.4: Everyday interaction and institutional interaction

Within CA, it is important to note two major different conversational settings: everyday interaction and institutional interaction. Cameron (2001) explains that ordinary talk is described as talk which happens in casual contexts such as with family and friends. Institutional talk is described as talk in which people interact as, or with, professionals, as in teacher-student and doctor-patient interactions. Drew and Heritage (1992:22) characterise institutional talk in depth:

1: Institutional interaction involves an orientation by at least one of the participants to some core goal, tasks or identity (or set of them) conventionally associated with the institution in question. In short, institutional talk is normally informed by goal orientations of a relatively restricted conventional form.

2: Institutional interaction may often involve special and particular constraints on what one or both of the participants will treat as allowable contributions to the business at hand.

3: Institutional talk may be associated with inferential framework and procedures that are particular to specific institutional contexts.

Schegloff (1999) also differentiates ordinary conversation, which he calls talk-in-interaction, from institutional interaction, which he calls speech-exchange systems. Firstly, sequence organisations are different between talk-in-interaction and speech exchange systems. For example, question/answer sequences in speech exchange systems such as those in classrooms, courtrooms and television studios can be different from those in ordinary conversations. Secondly, repair sequences differ between talk-in-interaction and speech exchange systems. For example, in broadcast news interviews, the interviewer often intervenes during the response of a guest in order to identify a figure mentioned by the interviewee but not widely known to the viewing public, or to identify an organisation referred to by the interviewee by its acronym. Thirdly, the overall structural organisation of single episodes of interaction differs between talk-in-interaction and speech exchange systems. For example, ordinary business conversations do not include a '*how are you*' exchange as part of an opening sequence on the phone.

3.4.5: Feminist CA

Feminist CA was developed in England and aims to investigate sexism in society (Stokoe and Smithson, 2001). Therefore feminist researchers often explore talk on topics such as sex, infidelity, sexual harassment, rape and so forth (Speer, 2002). Feminist researchers have focused on analysing speech styles, and such matters as whether men and women

talk differently since feminist language and gender research began in 1970s as part of feminism's second wave (Speer, 2005a).

Early feminist CA researchers faced a dilemma: how could they adopt CA for analysing gender interactions? As their aim was to research sexism in their society, they tended to impose their experience, cultural backgrounds and values on their analysis. For example, Kitzinger and Frith (1999) adopted CA in order to find how women can prevent themselves from being the victim of date rape. Female participants in Kitzinger and Frith's study were interviewed to find how they felt when they were with their partners. In addition, female participants were asked how they would respond to their partners when their partners asked them to have sexual relations. They found that women found it very difficult to just say '*no*' to men, and men tended to misunderstand what exactly women meant when they said '*no*'. However, within CA, an analysis of the data should be unbiased, with all evidence which is discussed appearing in the data (Stoke and Smithson, 2001). This is one of the methodological issues in conducting gender and language research within a CA framework. Within the CA framework, when the gender of participants in conversations is considered for their analysis, evidence for participants' gender should be seen in the data.

Kitzinger and Frith's study (1999), for instance, did not clearly adopt usual conversation analytic practice. There are two major differences in Kitzinger and Frith's study compared to a standard CA analysis. Firstly, their transcriptions did not contain as much detail as CA researchers normally include. CA researchers often put detailed symbols into their transcripts, indicating features such as falling or rising intonations, extended sounds for some words, the length of pauses, whether some sounds are emphasised or not. By doing so, CA researchers will be able to show as many aspects as possible of production by participants in conversations.

The example below is taken from Kitzinger and Frith (1999: 296)

Tara:	My male friends are always thinking, you know, that I've… I've got that sort of problem where somebody's keen, I just can't… I just can't say to somebody, 'look, sorry, I'm not', and I'll end up… I'll avoid in the end, but I'll quite often end up speaking to them for hours and hours, and I'm just thinking like, 'I really don't want to be here; I want to be doing something else' […] I just can't drop it.
Int.:	Why?
Pat:	You don't want to hurt their feelings. […] I really try and avoid ever having to be in the situation if having to say to somebody, 'look, no, I'm sorry' […] I wouldn't really risk to have a sort of a flitry jokey sort of conversation with someone that I don't know very well in case they suddenly just say, 'okay, how about it?', and then it would just be like 'uuuuhhhhh!'

In contrast to CA transcripts, this transcript does not have numbers identifying each line. It does not have the detailed symbols which CA researchers normally use. Although transcripts can vary depending on the transcribers, some CA symbols such as those denoting falling intonation and the length of a pause are crucial to understanding the actions of participants in conversation.

Secondly, Kitzinger and Frith labelled participants' gender without showing evidence in their data. Participant's gender is not evident in some parts of the conversations. There is actually a phrase *My male friends* in the beginning, spoken by Tara, which tells us that Tara is talking about friends who are male. However, without using researchers' background information about participants, within the CA framework, the gender identity of Tara and Pat remains unknown and it can not be proven in their transcript.

Earlier feminist researchers were also criticised by some CA researchers who said that they did not seem to understand what CA was. There was a debate between Schegloff (1997b), who wanted to follow CA rules strictly, and feminist CA researchers (Wetherell,1998, Speer, 2002, Kitzinger, 2000, Kitzinger and Frith, 1999, Ohara and Saft, 2003, and Weatherall, 2002) who wanted to adopt CA techniques for their analysis of gender conversations.

Schegloff (1997) argues that CA does not allow researchers to use participants' background information such as 'a male speaker' or 'a female speaker' to discuss conversational features unless the data of the study shows evidence. In particular, a feminist researcher, Wetherell (1998), argues with Schegloff (1997) that although she admits the great contribution made by CA to examining interaction, CA has only a narrow understanding of participants' orientations and relevance to the field as a whole. Speer (2002) explains that CA researchers try not to impose their own formulations on their data but instead, consider what is going on from a participants' perspective. Feminist researchers try not to impose a relationship between researchers and participants based on hierarchies of power.

This debate seems to have resulted from the failure of early feminist researchers who tried to adopt CA for their analysis to truly understand the method of CA. Schegloff (1997) did not exactly state that gender interactions were not able to be examined within the CA framework. In other words, gender conversational features can be examined within the CA framework as long as the study is able to show evidence of gender features in the data. In fact, feminist CA allows researchers to examine gender features in conversation within a CA framework. Stockill and Kitzinger (2007) for instance, examined the use of gender terms such as '*girls*' in conversation.

As opposed to earlier feminist CA, recent feminist CA researchers adopt CA for studies of gender interaction and demonstrate clearly that it is possible to do analysis of gender interaction within CA. The key approaches within feminist CA are the use of Membership Categorisation Analysis (MCA) and gender indexing. These two approaches are often jointly used by feminist CA researchers.

MCA was introduced by Sacks (1992, v1: 40-48) in order to deal with categories of terms which speakers use in conversation. The term 'membership' does not necessarily refer to membership of groups, organised groups or organisations. It refers to membership of a range of sets whose categories can be used: *a woman* from the set of sex, *a Negro* from the set of race, *a Catholic* from the set of religion, *a psychiatric social worker* from the set of occupation and so forth. Each of these categories could apply to the same person and members use one set's categories for some statements and another set's categories for other statements (Sacks, 1992, v1: 40-48). The categories are used to describe members' activities, and the way they produce activities, see activities and organise their knowledge about them, will determine how they go about choosing among the available sets of categories to describe some event (Sacks, 1992 v1: 40-48).

Sacks (1992, v1: 46) illustrates MCA in the example below.

A: Is there anything you can stay interested in?

B: No, not really.

A: What interests did you have before?

B: I was a hair stylist at one time, I did some fashion now and then,

things like that

(they go on for a couple of minutes, then)

A: Have you been having some sexual problems?

B: All my life.

B: Uh huh. Yeah.

B: Naturally, You probably suspect, as far as the hair stylist and, uh, wither one way or the other, they're straight or homosexual, something like that.

(Sacks, 1992, v1: 46)

In the example above, while it might not be proper for B to say about himself that he's troubled by possible homosexual tendencies, he finds a way to invoke a subset of occupational categories '*hair stylist*', '*fashion*' which constitutes an adequate basis for inferring homosexuality.

Gender indexing is used to investigate how and why speakers use gender terms such as *a woman* instead of *a lady* or *a girl*. For instance, Speer (2005b) examined gender references in conversation within feminist CA framework.

Example 1

3.	Kate:	I think she's (.) hugging him or [s-]=
4.	Jo:	[hehh]=
5.	Kate:	=platonic friend really that to me says (.)
6.		[( )]
7.	Helen:	[It's a] bit surreal that photo isn't it

Example 2

1.	Sue:	what's going on there?
2.		(1.8)
3.	Ben:	Ah (h) h (h) (0.8) ru (h) gby (h)
4.		(1.6)
5.		She looks like Caz actually

Example 3

1.	Sue:	Right (0.2) What's going on there?
2.	Melanie:	Oo:h [I know exactly]
3.	Elizabeth:	Gay boy in a club
4.	Melanie:	Yep!
5.	(0.4)	
6.	Angie:	A what?
7.	Elizabeth:	[Gay boy in a club]
8.	Melanie:	[Gay boy in a club] (.) I spent a lot of time with those guys on Saturday nights
9.		actually.

(Speer, 2005: 71-72)

Speer analyses these three examples. The first example contains two gender pronouns '*she*' and '*him*' which are used as part of the initial identification turn. The second example contains '*she*' which is used as part of prompt-related commentary. In these two examples, gender terms were not indexed explicitly. In other words, participants did not treat these gender terms as relevant to the prompt 'what's going on there'. The last example, however, contains a gender term '*gay boy*' which is used as the relevant factor in response to the prompt. In this case, '*gay boy*' is treated by participants as a non-normative example of all possible cases. In other words, if participants see boys as

normatively or commonly gay, then they wouldn't necessarily use the marked term '*gay boy*' in this case.

Stockill and Kitzinger (2007) adopt feminist CA for their analysis which jointly uses gender indexing and MCA.

48: Sta:	"You can't get o- you can't accept it." =It's like
49:	(.) ((mimics)) "Only gi:rls have long hai:r".
50: Pen:	huh!
51: Sta:	.hh "Girls have long hair boys have
52:	short hair", that's what they think

(Stockill and Kitzinger, 2007:226)

In the example above, Stockill and Kitzinger explain that the speaker Stan is showing a sexist view of people who take issue with the fact that he (as a male) has long hair, thereby expressing a judgment with which Penny can align, thus seeking to heal the breach that has opened up between them in a prior complaint sequence. This action contains the cultural understanding which is displayed in talk that having long hair is category-bound (Sacks 1992, v1) to '*girls*' but not to '*boys*'.

The term '*girls*' in line 49 in '*only girls have long hair*' could have as its contrast class the category '*women*'. It is evident, however, that '*only girls have longr hair*' is delivered by Stan as reported speech or thought. '*only girls have long hair*' is perhaps designed to express disapproval or to insult a known-to-be male person, thus drawing attention to Stan's gender non-conformity. In responding with disapproval, Stan is challenging the relevance of '*sex*' as a membership categorisation device for the attribute of '*long hair*'. Stan is contrasting the membership categorisation device '*girl*' which has

long hair, against '*boys*' which includes himself. He displays his own distance from the belief – '*only girls have long hair*'- and disavows sexist stereotypes for himself.

3.5: Summary of DA and CA

So far, both DA and CA have been discussed. Both DA and CA were popularly used for the study of gender interactions. Within the DA framework, sociolinguists often pay attention to social variables such as ethnicity, age and gender of participants in their studies and how they influence their speech production. Interactional sociolinguistics was particularly popular for the analysis of gender and language within the DA framework and it is the approach to be employed in this thesis. Stubbe et al (2003) points out that the discourse analytical framework of interactional sociolinguistics attempts to 'bridge the gap between top down approaches which privilege macro-societal conditions' and bottom up approaches' (p. 358).

In contrast to DA, CA often relies on the investigation of turn taking features for analysis. CA researchers try to find evidence in their data rather than using the background knowledge of participants or researchers. This strict CA approach has caused problems for those who try to utilise CA within a DA framework in order to examine gender aspects of conversations. However, as recent interactional sociolinguists demonstrate with their analysis (for instance, the work of Holmes, 2006b), from the point of view of a DA framework, the boundary between what is DA and what is CA is not clear. Recent DA researchers adopt many of the approaches of CA researchers and still see their data as falling within a DA framework. Stubbe et al explain that in gender research most researchers 'described taking an eclectic approach to their analysis, applying elements of one or more models as relevant to their research objectives' (Stubbe, et al., 2003, p. 352).

In order to avoid issues relating to participants' social variables, this present study uses participants who share similar characteristics, such as age, social status and ethnicity (see the details of participants in the next chapter). The author of this present study intends to adopt mainly DA methodology, but will attempt to see the data in the ways CA researchers see it, adopting as a model studies such as those by Holmes (2006b) and Jefferson (2004) – see the discussions earlier in this chapter. Adopting mainly DA allows participants to be labelled as male and female. At the same time, adopting CA methods of seeing the data will provide evidence to explain why and how participants in this present study deliver three collaborative features: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition.

3.6: Methodological issues

One methodological issue has been discussed already in this chapter. It has been demonstrated that within the CA framework it is possible to examine gender and language by adopting the feminist CA and MCA approach. If gender variables – participants' gender status – need to be shown on the data, then feminist CA and MCA are the only possible CA methods which can be adopted. There are also other issues for the study of conversation which need to be resolved. As this present study investigates gender in conversation, the issues discussed below will inevitably arise. The first issue is whether the study is quantitatively or qualitatively conducted. The second issue is how transcriptions are made to show the audio data.

3.6.1: Quantitative or qualitative analysis for the study of conversation

Quantitative analysis is an approach in which researchers rely on counting of instances for analysing their data. Many researchers collect many samples to generalise their

conclusions within this approach. It is rooted in a scientific and objective approach in which particular descriptions are categorised so as to provide a basis for aggregate data and a foundation for generalisations about the shared properties (Schiffrin, 1987). Some scholars have given definitions of the quantitative approach. Schwartz and Jacob (1979), for instance, say that within sociology, the quantitative approach is based on looking at numbers for qualitative observation. Researchers see their data by counting and measuring things such as individual persons, groups, whole societies, speech acts and so forth. Ten Have (2004) explains that the quantitative approach focuses on summary characterisations and statistical explanations. Jacqueline and Yu (2005) note that the quantitative approach uses numerical or statistical information and is a common approach for all branches of social science including sociology, economics, psychology, political science, social anthropology, education and so forth.

As opposed to quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis allows researchers to focus on interpreting the meanings of their data. Qualitative researchers do not often collect larger samples to draw conclusions about their data, unlike researchers doing quantitative studies. When doing their analysis, they often look at a single case in depth (Schffrin,1987). Schwartz and Jacob (1979) say that the qualitative approach doesn't normally count numbers for its analysis, but researchers report observations of natural language at large. The qualitative approach leads researchers to look at the life-world of individuals, examining motives, meanings, emotions, daily actions, behaviour in ordinary settings and situations, together with the structures of those actions. Ten Have (2004) explains that the qualitative approach offers complex descriptions and tries to explicate webs of meanings.

Researchers doing conversation studies are often criticised by those who are in favour of quantitative analysis. Their claim is that many studies of conversation do not provide

sufficient data to produce convincing results. Schegloff (1993), for instance, gives as an example an episode which occurred when he was delivering his class in his literature. He was questioned by one of his students as to why researchers doing studies of conversation did not adopt the quantitative analysis. Answering the student's question is not easy because it very much depends on the purpose of the study.

Many past studies have in fact adopted quantitative analysis for the study of conversation. For instance, Labov (1992) studied how /r/ was pronounced among people in three different department stores in New York city. His study relied on counting numbers of /r/ pronunciation by people in the different department stores. Zimmerman and West (1975) and Simih-Lovin and Brody (1989) investigated which sex interrupted more by counting incidents of interruptions in conversations. They concluded that men interrupted more than women in general by showing numbers of interruptions made by both men and women. More recently, Bayard and Krishnayya (2001) and Sapolsky and Kaye (2005) examined which sex used swear words more. Their studies adopted quantitative analysis to code incidents of swear words which appeared in conversations and TV shows. They concluded that, in general, men used more swear words than women. Moreover, some studies of conversation combine both quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis. For instance, Jefferson (2004) studied a phenomenon in which, when men laughed, women joined in laughing, but when women laughed, men did not join in. In her study, she adopted both quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis which she called 'case-by-case' study. Although she was disappointed with the results quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis allowed the detailed analysis of her research topic.

As the past studies above show, researchers who have studied conversations do not avoid quantitative analysis where it is useful. Quantitative analysis, however, does not always

strongly support the generalisation of the results of studies of conversation. Schegloff (1993), for instance, argues with those who adopt quantitative analysis for the study of conversation. He examined some studies which explored the amount of laughter and back channels from participants. According to Schegloff, these studies counted variables such as how many occurrences of laughter or back channels occurred per minute among participants. Schegloff, however, notes that people do not laugh per minute. Therefore it occurrs only at certain points in conversation. In addition, some people may have always laughed, whatever they heard, but others hardly laughed at all. Schegloff suggests that adopting the quantitative approach does not seem to be the best way to explore conversation. On the other hand, Crawford (1995) admits that quantitative research for the study of gender interactions has important advantages, within its limitations. Crawford acknowledges the difficulty of quantifying and generalising conclusions from discourse analytic work. Even if a study finds that a speaker uses a particular speech strategy or rhetorical device in a transcript, qualitative study can give little sense of how often that speaker uses that device or how common it is among others.

Another issue arising from the adoption of quantitative analysis for the study of conversation is the reliability of coding numbers of incidents of conversational features. As Schegloff (1993) and Crawford (1995) noted, each person has unique ways of talking, thus it seems hard to make a generalisation for one particular feature in conversation even when the study shows quantitative data to support the evidence. In order to enhance the reliability of quantitative data in studies of conversation, researchers need to treat their data as an indication of possible uses of conversational features, instead of making generalisations.

Perakyla (2004: 297) for instance, claims that all conversation analytic case studies on interactions in particular institutional settings aim to see ‘social practices that are

possible' in other words, 'possibilities of language use'. She raises the possibility that various practices can be considered generalisable even if the practices are not actualised in similar ways across different settings. For example, if a study examines interactions between a counsellor and patients in a hospital in England, the results of this study are not generalisable as descriptions of what other counsellors or other professionals do with their clients, but they are generalisable as descriptions of what any counsellor or professionals can do with their clients, given that they have the same array of interactional competencies as the data in the study shows. Heritage (2004) also supports the possibility of a quantitative approach to the study of conversation for a single case study which can be applied to other studies. Heritage admits that his studies of institutional talk within a CA framework are based on qualitative observations. However, these qualitative observations should have an impact and significance that are also quantitatively measurable when these studies are extended in the future. Bramley (2001:18) states that for the purpose of the study of talk-in-interaction, a single case study is indeed useful for finding particular features of the interactions because it leads to general principles about the interaction.

So far, the reliability of quantitative analysis for the study of conversation has been discussed. Some studies claim that the use of quantitative analysis for the study of conversation could be applied to the identification of possible phenomena in talk that participants might adopt in other conversations. There is also another factor that needs to be considered when researchers undertake studies of conversation and adopt a quantitative analytic method. In order to adopt qualitative analysis, researchers need to select samples to investigate in depth. Perakyala (2004: 288) explains how samples for qualitative analysis are chosen. Samples for qualitative analysis are not randomly selected by researchers. Indeed, the analysis of the data in conversation analytic studies often produces inductivity. Researchers normally do not know at the outset of the

research exactly what the phenomena are that they are going to examine. Thus it may turn out that they want to analyse events that do not occur very many times in each single recording. In order to be able to achieve a position where researchers can observe the variation of the phenomenon, they may need to have access to large enough collections of the data, and then short sections from the data can be transcribed and analysed.

Coding the numbers of conversational features which will be examined by the qualitative analysis might not be used as a supportive evidence for the occurrence of conversational features among participants in conversations. In order to undertake qualitative analysis for the study of conversation, researchers will need to adopt quantitative analysis to some extent. Schffrin (1987) explains that qualitative and quantitative analysis make complementary contributions to the study of discourse in general. Qualitative analysis allows researchers to uncover the idea structures of arguments, to interpret speakers' use of evaluation in their arguments, and to identify particular interactional moves. Quantitative analysis, on the other hand, allows researchers to show speakers' preferences for the use of one option rather than another.

3.6.2: Transcriptions

Researchers of conversation often use both transcripts and audio data together for their analysis to enhance the reliability of what the researchers have heard (Hutchby and Wooffitt,1998). However, many researchers still make transcriptions from their audio data since transcripts are considered a representation of the data while the data itself is viewed as a reproduction of a determinate social event (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998: 74). Transcriptions of audio data are also considered to be a rather convenient way to capture and present the phenomena of interest in written form (Ten Have, 1999). Transcribers, however, often face the dilemma of how they should transcribe their data. Below are

three transcriptions taken from three different types of conversational studies: interactional sociolinguistics, discursive psychology, and CA. Each uses a different form of transcription. Nevertheless, whatever transcription convention is adopted for the study of conversation, the use of both audio data and transcripts for the analysis enhances the accuracy of the data.

Example 1

1.	Ron:	but comfortable and warm and + part of the place ++
2.		for any Pakeha who er ++ part of the ( ) that we talked about
3.		in the concept of we're trying to + develop
4.	Cli:	there are two main fields that have to be explored
5.		and er + the one that is most important is it's customary role in the first
6.		Place because marae comes (on) and comes from + who the
7.		Tangatawgenua
8.		who are Maori + + / to change it \
9.	Ron:	/ but it's not just \ for Maori
10.	Cli:	/ no \
11.	Ron:	you you must get that if it is a Maori institution and nothing more
12.		this marae has failed + and they must get that idea
13.	Cli:	/ how \

(Holmes, 2006: 156)

Example 2

Bashir:	The Queen described nineteen two as
	her (.) annus <u>hor</u>ribilis, .hh and it was in <u>th</u>at year that

Andrew Morton's book about you was published.

Princess: Um hm. (nods)

Bashir: .hh Did you ↑ ever (.) meet Andrew Morton or

personally (.) help him with the book?

Princess: In never- I never met him, no.

(1.0)

Bashier: Dis you ever (.) personally assist him with

the writing of his book.

(0.8)

Princess: A lot of people .hhh (clears throat)

saw the distress that my life was in. (.)

And they felt (.) felt it was a supportive thing

to help (0.2) in the way that they did.

(Potter, 2004: 208)

Example 3

1. Cli: Oka:y. Righ[t]
2. Meg: [(ri]ght)W'l (.) ba:sically I really
3. would like a home bi:rt[h]
4. Cli: [Mm] hm,
5. Meg: But my GP isn't- (.) that kee:n.
6. (0.2)
7. Meg: I've just been to see him toda:y.=So just wondered
8. (.) you know how would I go about it [if my GP]=
9. Cli: [Mm hm]
10. Meg: =isn't really keen.

11. Cli: [mm You don't have to have a GP you know that do you.

12. Meg: Yeah.

13. Cli: You only need a midwife.

(Shaw and Kitzinger, 2007: 209)

Example 1 above comes from an interactional sociolinguistics study. It is transcribed in idealized language which is more reader friendly and has fewer symbols, but it loses details of exactly what speakers said. Example 2 comes from a study using DA with discursive psychology. It is similar to a CA transcription, using some symbols which CA uses, but it does not have numbers for each line. Example 3 is a typical CA transcription. It contains more details of exactly what speakers said and has more symbols but often it is not easily readable for non-CA people.

As the three examples above show, transcripts vary depending on what analytic principle is adopted for data analysis. Therefore, transcripts can not be made at random. Studies of conversations are often shaped by the ways in which the audio data is presented. However, the rules determining the way transcriptions should be presented for different analytic approaches are often becomes unclear. For instance, within the CA framework, transcribers still face a dilemma when they try to transcribe their data. Liddicoat (2007) explains that transcribers often need to decide whether to use standard orthography or phonetic representations. Standard orthography is a set of established conventions for representing the words of a language and it is easily understandable by non-specialist readers of the transcripts. It does not, however, present the natural sounds and units of what participants say (Liddicoat, 2007: 13-50). For instance,

A: Why don't you take a break?

Sentence A above is considered a standard orthography transcript. Instead of the standard orthography, some might prefer a transcription that focuses on the sounds of the speakers, as in a phonetic transcription. A phonetic transcription may show how things were said, but it is often hard to see what was said.

B: Whyncha take a break?

B is considered a phonetic transcription which is a more accurate representation of what a speaker actually says (Liddicoat, 2007: 13-50). The use of standard orthography provides a reader friendly version of transcripts, while the use of phonetic transcriptions provides accurate transcriptions of the audio data. However, even if transcribers chose to use phonetic transcriptions, there is another issue which they need to face. Decisions about how to transcribe are subjective and are influenced by how the transcribers hear the talk (Liddicoat, 2007). Therefore, there can be two different transcripts by different transcribers using the same audio data.

So far, several issues associated with the making of transcriptions have been discussed. Transcriptions vary between transcribers and depend on the principle of data analysis adopted. However, there are some guidelines available as to what style of transcription is most useful. For instance, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 76) identify two important features of CA transcriptions: stretched syllables and basic intonational features. Both features are closely related to issues of turn taking, which is the basis for data analysis in CA. For example, stretching a sound at the possible boundary of a turn, or possible transition relevant place, can be a way of holding the floor or preventing another speaker from starting a turn at that point. Different intonation contours used at the boundaries of turn construction units can indicate whether the speaker may be intending to continue, or, if the intonation is markedly falling, possibly coming to the end of a full turn.

Liddicoat (2007) suggests three possible ways of dealing with orthographic issues when transcribing, as follows:

1: Using standard orthography only and ignoring spoken language characteristics found in the speech. This means representing spoken language in a written language form and could possibly means that features of talk which are interactionally salient are not included in the transcript. Such a transcript would usually depart too far from the actual spoken form to be useful for conversation analysis.

2: Using standard orthography for most of the transcript but using modified spelling where the spoken language is noticeably different from what is presented by the standard orthography. This means making a decision about whether a word or phrase should be represented using standard orthography or using a modified spelling. However, as the difference between standard written forms of language and non-standard or spoken forms is actually a continuum, it may be difficult to decide exactly what to modify when transcribing a particular piece of talk. The result may be that there is a great deal of variation within the transcript and that the variation in writing does not always reflect the variation in the talk itself.

3: Using modified orthography throughout the transcript as consistently as possible to reflect actual use. This is a very good approach for the researcher, as it helps to promote noticing of the language features in the interaction and requires the transcriber to make careful decisions in representing the spoken language. However, such transcriptions can be very difficult for readers who have not been trained in transcription.

(Liddicoat, 2007:18-19)

In short, researchers will face some issues, whatever style of transcription they adopt for their studies of conversations. Transcriptions allow researchers to analyse their data more quickly and easily by scanning a written transcript rather than reviewing and replaying the audio data (Cameron, 2005). The author of this study will, as far as possible, adopt a standard orthography since it makes transcripts s easier to read and shows the evidence more clearly for features which this study discusses. Transcripts used in this study, however, use symbols which are adopted by CA since they allow the author to see the details of conversations.

3.6.3: Selecting samples

Selecting samples for the qualitative analysis is also another methodological issue. CA analysis is often called a 'bottom up' or 'unmotivated looking' approach. Have (1997) explains a reason why it is called as a 'bottom up' or 'unmotivated looking' approach.

> '…One can say that the various traditions in social research differ from each other in the kinds and contents of their leading ideas, in the character of the evidence used, and in the manner in which the dialogue of ideas and evidence takes form in their practices and public presentations. CA tends to be very skeptical of abstract ideas about human conduct in general, and action, language use and verbal interaction in particular. Established ideas in these areas are considered to be misleading, not doing justice to the complexities of human interaction, because they tend to be too individualistic and rationalistic, and in any case too simple. They do play a 'negative' role, however, as simplifications to be avoided
>
> While in many traditions the starting point for any project is to deduce an analytic framework from the general repertoire of ideas, ideally codified in a systematic

> theory, such deductions are treated with suspicion in CA. This does not mean that CA does not have any 'ideas' or 'analytic frames', but rather that these are produced in a different, one could say more 'inductive' manner. It makes sense, in this respect, to differentiate the early phase of CA, leading to a coherent research tradition, and its later, secondary, elaboration.'
>
> (Have, 2004)

This study has also followed an inductive approach in the analysis of the data. Initial observations of the interactions have revealed an abundance of collaborative features in cross gender and same gender interactions. A closer and in-depth examination of the data has generated multiple instances of those collaborative features, and found specifically the prominence of three collaborative features, (one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition). These have then formed the basis of my qualitative analysis chapters.

3.6.4: Summary of the issues

Three methodological issues were discussed above. The first was the adoption of a quantitative approach which appears to be problematic for the study of conversation in general, since every person speaks differently. Also the quantitative approach does not seem to support strong evidence for the generalisation of results. Coding numbers of incidents, however, could be used as potential resources for future studies. Statistical data in studies of conversation can be used to indicate a trend in the use of features in conversation. Moreover, although a qualitative approach has often been adopted for the study of conversation, a quantitative approach has also often been used as the first process of data analysis. The examples which are examined using a qualitative approach

are not selected randomly by researchers. They are often selected from the data when researchers found some trend of features which they set out to explore. A quantitative approach must therefore be adopted to some extent in order to undertake qualitative analysis.

The second issue was the question of how to make transcripts. Transcripts vary by transcribers and according to the purpose of the study. When a study attempts to adopt the methods of CA researchers, the details of how utterances are delivered are possibly needed for the analysis. CA researchers try to find evidence in their transcriptions and audio data for their analysis. However, the present study adopt mainly DA, so a simple version of transcripts will be satisfactory for the analysis of the data, since DA researchers often use background knowledge of participants or researchers.

In the present study, the author adopts a qualitative approach for the analysis since, as Schegloff (1993) pointed out, coding numbers of incidents does not strongly support generalisation of data for the study of conversation, since each speaker is unique. However, a quantitative approach is used as the first step of the analysis in this study to examine trends, especially with respect to whether collaborative features appear in both men and women's conversations.

For transcription, the present study adopts standard orthography, as well as an approach that uses symbols which are adopted by CA. By adopting this method, the author aims to make transcriptions reader-friendly, but transcripts will still show the details of how participants deliver their utterances.

The third issue discussed was how the selection of samples for the qualitative analysis was done. This study adopted an inductive approach to the analysis of interactional

data. It has used the quantitative approach to see if there are any collaborative features in the data when the data was transcribed. Then the three collaborative features were notably observed in the data and therefore the three collaborative features were selected for this study to investigate in depth.

3.7: Summary of this chapter

This chapter discussed methods of analysis, mainly DA and CA. These two methods have been widely used for the studies of the conversations. The significant difference between DA and CA is whether analysis included background information of participants or rely on using conversational data without using participants' background information. In the DA framework, since the analysis includes participants' background information, DA scholars examine how social variables of participants such as gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, educational background and so forth influence speech production. As opposed to DA, CA is a method in which analysis relies heavily on conversational data and therefore CA scholars base their evidence on participants' speech productions.

This significant difference in approaches to data analysis caused problems when gender and language was explored within the CA framework. Although feminist scholars tried to utilise the methods adopted by CA scholars to analyse their data for exploring gender conversations, they were criticised by CA scholars. This was because CA did not allow the use of participants' background information, such as labelling speakers as female speakers or male speakers for the analysis. Within the CA framework, these gender features should be evident in the data.

However, from the DA perspective, utilising a CA approach to the analysis of data was a possible approach for investigating gender talk. Within DA, scholars were allowed to label participants' gender since it allowed them to use participants' background information. In particular, Jefferson's study (2004) used this approach in that she labelled participants' gender in her study but she also adopted CA approaches to the data for her analysis. Jefferson demonstrated that utilising a CA framework for investigating gender conversations was a fruitful approach, and the present study also adopts this approach.

Three further issues were discussed in this chapter: the issue of whether a qualitative or quantitative approach is adopted, the issue of how to transcribe audio data and how to select samples for the qualitative approach. The quantification of conversational features does not strongly support the generalisation of results, since every person is unique when he/she talks (Schegloff, 1993). However, quantification is still useful in detecting possible trends in language use. Also, even though a study may be mainly qualitative, it often adopts a type of quantitative analysis in order to see a trend and to select samples for qualitative analysis (Perakyla, 2004). Thus this study is mainly conducted qualitatively but it adopts quantification to discuss and generalise possible trends in conversation.

The other issue was how to transcribe the audio data. When transcribers include many details of what speakers say in n their transcripts, although they help to promote the noticing of language features in conversations, they may make the transcripts very hard for readers. In contrast, when transcriptions do not include many details of what speakers said, although they are reader-friendly transcripts, they may miss evidence for the analysis, and may not be reliable (Liddicoat, 2007). Thus this study used a modified

standard orthography version of transcripts for readers' sake, and at the same time transcripts show enough details of what speakers said to allow detailed analysis.

The third issue was the feature selection for the qualitative analysis. An intial observation of the data revealed the dominant presence of three collaborative features. This led the author of this study to investigate the three collaborative features in greater depth in the analysis chapters.

Chapter 4: Data collection

4.1: Introduction

This chapter shows how the data for this study was collected. It begins by describing the participants in this study, giving details including nationality, first language, age group and socio-economic status. The next section discusses procedures for the data collection in depth, including how the conversations used for the analysis were recorded. This is followed by a section discussing the recording device used for recording conversations for the analysis. The next section discusses three issues relating to data analysis in this study including: 1, adopting both qualitative and quantitative approaches for the data analysis, 2, adopting DA to accommodate gender issues, and 3, utilising a CA approach analyse conversational data for gender interactions. A discussion of the selection of samples of conversations for qualitative analysis follows. The selection of samples for qualitative analysis is not random. In order to select samples for qualitative analysis, researchers often quantitatively assess their data before they analyse their data qualitatively (Perakyla, 2004). Thus the section explains how samples of this study were selected. Finally a section on transcription of audio data is included, showing symbols used for transcripts in this study.

4.2: Participants

DA researchers believe that social variables of participants influence their speech production. The social network in which participants belong is an important factor that affects their talk. For example, political discussions among friends who are interested or are active in politics can help people learn about the reasons for participating (McClurg, 2003). Also social networks among participants not only provide opportunities for the

exchange of information but also impose constraints on behaviour for those who might wish to innovate (Kohler et al, 2001:45). In order to minimise the influence of participants' social variables for the data analysis, this study included only participants with similar social variables. Participants in this study were recruited by the author using his friends' network. The recording of conversations among friends and relatives enhanced the authenticity of the everyday conversations collected since the participants were familiar with and accustomed to talking to each other.

4.2.1: Participants' first language

All participants in this study are native speakers of English including Scottish English and a mixture of New Zealand English and Australian English. Participants fit into the following categories.

- Those who were not born in Australia, but in a country where English is spoken as an official language, and who have lived most of their life in Australia
- Those whose parents are not Australian citizens, whose parents speak English as a first language, and who have spent most of their life in Australia.
- Those who were born in Australia and are native speakers of English.

This group of native speakers of English are seen as a relatively homogeneous group despite the different varieties of English included.

4.2.2: Participants' age group

All participants are in their mid twenties to their mid thirties. The author of this study believes that this age group would be representative of the way Australians speak today. This seems a suitable age group to explore everyday talk in the Australian context.

4.2.3: Participants' social status

All participants in this study are categorised as 'educated middle class' since they have reached at least a tertiary education level in Australia, including TAFE (Techinical and Further education) or CIT (Canberra Institute of Technology which is the similar institution as TAFE) and university. Some participants hold university degrees and others hold TAFE or CIT diplomas. This study also includes some participants who are still completing courses at tertiary institutions. In addition it includes some participants who attended either a university or TAFE/CIT but did not complete their courses. The participants in this study are listed below:

Male participants in this study:

- Aa: a man in his early thirties, J's sister's husband, he was born in New Zealand but his family moved to Australia when he was about 10 years old, working as a nurse.
- Al: a man in his early thirties, born in Scotland but holds Australian citizenship, works for a company, married to A (a female participant).
- E is a man in his early thirties, born in Australia and C's boy friend
- F is a man in his early thirties, born in Australia, who is J's friend
- G: J's grandfather, retired farmer.
- J: a man in his early thirties, born in Australia, works fulltime as an IT engineer but does casual DJ work on weekend nights

- L: a man in his early thirties, born in Australia and A's brother, does casual DJ work.
- Ku: a man in his late twenties, born in Australia, J's relative, works for a company.

There is one member of an older generation. G is J's grandfather and appears in only one of the conversations. However, this study ignores G's speech production and focuses on examining speech production by two younger participants J and Aa. G did not participate in the part of the conversation which is analysed.

Female participants in this study:

- A: a woman in her late twenties, born in Australia, married to Al, works as a chef.
- C: a woman in her late twenties and E's (a male participant) girl friend
- E: a woman in her late twenties, born in Australia, J's (a male participant) girl friend
- K: a women in her early thirties, born in Australia married to Aa, has two children, relative of A, works as a nurse (part time basis)
- L: a woman in her early thirties, born in Australia, works as a secretary, and K's older sister
- S: K's baby

4.3: Procedures for data collection

All participants were informed that their conversations would be recorded at the time they were recruited. In addition, in order to protect participants' privacy, they were informed that their personal information such as their actual names, their actual friends'

names, and the names of their actual workplaces would be replaced by other names created by the researcher.

All participants in this study were asked to record their own conversations and they were guided in how to use the audio recording device before they started recording their conversations. The author of this study was not present while the conversations were being recorded to avoid any authors' influence on participants' conversations. Cameron (2001) explains that researchers influence the data collection. Researchers' absence while the conversations were being recorded brings an advantage for researchers especially if researchers are trying to investigate the behaviour of a group the researcher does not belong to and can not easily get into. For example, one of Cameron's students tried to analyse his mother's talk with her friends who had been holding a weekly 'knitting bee' for 25 years. Since Cameron's student was a young man who didn't belong to the 'knitting bee' meeting, his presence would have influenced the 25 year long 'knitting bee' group's speech productions. Therefore Cameron's student, as a researcher, put a recorder in the room and left the room leaving the recorder to record conversations without him. The author of this study takes a similar position to the one Cameron's student took. In order to avoid any researcher's influence, the author of this study was not present while the conversations were being recorded.

Since participants were relied on to record conversations in this study, participants decided when to start and when to finish recording their group conversations. One participant in each group was in charge of recording their group conversations and he/she would decide when to start and stop recording conversations. Participants were told that they should try to talk for at least 20 minutes for each conversation. However, once they started their recordings, they forgot this instruction and therefore the length of each

conversation differed (Chapter 5 shows the length of each conversation used for the analysis).

In order to avoid researcher's influence on participants' conversation, participants were not given topics as a prompt to talk. Speer (2002) explains that participants may not understand how to respond when they given a topic as a prompt to talk. Because this study aims to explore everyday talk all participants in this study were invited to talk freely while their conversations were recorded.

After the participants finished recording their conversations, their recordings were given to the author of this study and he transcribed the conversations. All transcriptions of the data used for the analysis were then double checked by two native speakers of English.

4.4: Recording device

The author of this study used a digital audio recording device to record conversations for this study. It only allowed the researcher to record participants' voices and did not record visual images of participants. Using a video recorder might have been another option for collecting the data for this study. This would have allowed the researcher to look at physical activities such as eye contact or facial expressions during talk. However, the aim of this study was to analyse collaborative conversational features, focusing on turn taking features. Thus the audio recording device satisfies the needs for this study. All conversations were digitally recorded and were then transferred to the computer. The audio data was used for transcriptions undertaken by the author of this study.

4.5: Settings for the data collection

Participants were engaged in everyday situations during the recordings including the following:

- Participants having dinner, lunch, snacks with tea or coffee in participant's place.
- Participants having a break or having lunch (including dinner when they were working late) at work and talking.
- Participants having a party in participants' place.

The settings above do not constitute institutional settings in which there is some kind of control over participants (Drew and Heritage, 1992): in these settings, participants could be expected to provide the ordinary talk which is normally seen when participants talk with friends or family in casual settings (Cameron, 2001). Thus by recording conversations in these settings, the author of this study was able to collect data relating to ordinary conversations among participants.

Three groups of participants were used for recording their conversations for this study below.

1. Mixed-gender conversations
2. All women conversations
3. All men conversations

Some past studies, for instance Mulac et al (1988) and Athenstaedt et al (2004), showed that both men and women had different ways of speaking when they interacted in groups which included participants of the opposite gender (see the discussions in the Methodology chapter) . Thus in order to avoid the possible influence of differing conversational strategies of men and women when they participate in conversation with a

mixed-gender group, this study examines the three different conversational settings shown above.

4.6: Data analysis

This study was mainly conducted qualitatively to explore how male and female speakers delivered three collaborative conversational features in conversations: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition. The qualitative analysis was used to investigate how these three collaborative features were delivered by both male and female participants in their conversations. This study was also conducted quantitatively to some extent. In this study, the three collaborative features occurred frequently in some conversations among men and women. A quantitative approach was adopted for the data analysis in this study to explore the incidence of these collaborative features in men's and women's talk and in the three conversational settings outlined above. Thus, although this study was conducted mainly qualitatively, some quantitative analysis was also conducted in order to identify trends in conversations between men and women. Schffrin (1987) supports the idea of using both qualitative and quantitative approaches for one study since they make complementary contributions to the study of discourse. The qualitative approach provides researchers with a means to identify particular interactional moves, such as to see when an utterance perform a challenge. The quantitative approach, on the other hand, provides researchers a foundation for generalisations about shared properties of talk.

Within the qualitative analysis, this study adopts DA in order to label participants' gender as male and female. In addition, it adopts CA as a tool to identify turn taking features in conversations and to make refined transcriptions of the data. Cameron (2001: 51) supports the idea of using a combination of different approaches for analysing

interaction. For instance, pragmatics has been combined with the ethnography of communication as a tool for the analysis in one study. Although these approaches have their historical roots in distinct academic disciplines, they have not remained hermetically sealed within those disciplines. These approaches have influenced and mixed with one another to produce a field –discourse analysis – that can not be claimed as the 'property' of any single discipline.

However, as was discussed in the methodology chapter, there has been a debate between feminist researchers and Schegloff on whether gender interactions could be conducted within CA. The author of this study acknowledges that from the CA point of view, CA is not a discipline which can be combined with another analytic principle. In order to resolve this issue, this study adopts Gail Jefferson' study (2004) as a model to explore three collaborative features in talk: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition between male and female speakers. Although Gail Jefferson is well known as a CA researcher, in this particular study, she labelled participants in conversations as male and female speakers in order to investigate whether men would laugh once another started laughing, as women often do, or not. Then her case by case analysis, which is how she refers to qualitative analysis in her study, is conducted by utilising CA scholars' view of their data, in particular looking at turn taking features by both male and female participants. This particular study by Jefferson proves that CA can be combined with other approaches for the analysis of conversation. Although from the CA point of view a combination of CA and another discipline does not seem to be possible, from the DA point of view, combining DA and another discipline can be very productive, as Jefferson's study demonstrated.

In short, this study is mainly conducted using a qualitative approach to examine selected examples of collaborative features in talk. In order to select examples of conversations, a

quantitative approach is adopted. For the qualitative approach, this study adopts DA along with CA. In order to accommodate gender issues, DA is adopted. CA is used to analyse how both male and female participants deliver the three collaborative features.

4.7: Selecting examples for the qualitative approach

For this study, 12 conversations in total were collected which included five men-only conversations, three women-only conversations and four mixed gender conversations. The length of each conversation varied. Perakyla (2004) claims that there is a limit to how much data a single researcher or a research team can transcribe and analyse. The total of 12 conversations in this study should be enough to allow the observation of tendencies in the use of the three collaborative features, thus supporting selection for qualitative analysis.

This study also adopted 'unmotivated looking' in the exploration of collaborative features in conversations. After the three collaborative features (one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition) were significantly observed in the data, they were selected for in-depth qualitative examination.

To select examples of the three collaborative features (one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition), the author of this study has chosen two conversations in particular. These are men's conversation 5, which lasts 12 minutes and 45 seconds, and women's conversation 1, which lasts 38 minutes. In these two conversations, the three collaborative features were observed more frequently than in the other conversations. Therefore, many of the examples of collaborative features discussed in this study were selected from these two conversations.

4.8: Transcriptions for this study

4.8.1: Procedures for making transcriptions

As discussed in the previous chapter, transcription can vary depending on the transcriber of the data. However, the author of this study has tried his best to follow Jefferson's (2004) transcription recommendations. In particular, all samples used for the qualitative analysis were carefully transcribed using the symbols listed below. In this study, all examples used in the discussion chapters were transcribed using the symbols adopted by CA. In addition, all transcriptions were made with a standard orthography. All transcriptions used in the qualitative analysis were also double checked by two native speakers of English after they were transcribed by the author of this study. One of the two native speakers is highly trained in CA. Thus the first drafts of transcriptions for the qualitative analysis was done by the author of this study. These were then passed on to the first native speaker of English to check. He mainly checked words and sentences. Then all transcripts were sent to the trained CA researcher, who checked details which were necessary for the qualitative analysis, including intonation and overlap.

4.8.2: Symbols used in transcripts

This study adopts symbols often used by CA researchers since these symbols allow researchers to closely examine the details of talk. All symbols used for transcriptions in this study were adopted from Gail Jefferson (2004, 24-31), and are listed below.

[A left bracket indicates the point of overlap onset.

] A right bracket indicates the point which two overlapping utterances end and it also is used to parse out segments of overlapping utterances.

= Equal signs indicate no break or gap. A pair of equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next, indicate no break between the two lines.

(0.0) Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time by tenths of seconds.

__ Underscoring indicates some form of stress, via pitch and/or amplitude. A short underscore indicates lighter stress than does a long underscore.

:: Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound. The longer the colon row, the longer the prolongation.

˚word˚ Degree signs bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicates that the sounds are softer than the surrounding talk.

>< Right/Left carats bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate that the bracketed material is speeded up, compared to the surrounded talk.

<> Left/right carats bracketing an utterance or utterance-part indicate that the bracketed material is slowed down, compared to the surrounding talk.

. falling intonation

, intonation between '.' and '¿' and thus weaker than falling intonation and also weaker than slightly rising terminal

¿ slightly rising terminal

? rising terminal

(( )) double parentheses contain transcriber's descriptions.

(word) parenthesized words and speaker designations are especially dubious

.hhh A dot-prefixed row of 'h's indicates an in-breath. Without the dot, the 'h's indicate an outbreath

4.9: Summary for this chapter

This chapter has discussed how the data for this study was collected. The first section discusses the characteristics of participants in this study, including their first language, age, social backgrounds. This study selected similar categories of participants in order to minimise the influence of the participants' background on the data analysis.

Procedures for data collections were also discussed. There were two important strategies for collecting data: the researcher's absence from the actual recording, and the decision not to use a prompt for participants to talk. In order to avoid the researcher's influence, participants in this study were told to self-record their conversations without the presence of the researcher (Cameron, 2001). Also participants were let talk freely without being given any topic to discuss in order to collect authentic everyday talk (Speer, 2002). Conversational settings were also examined. In the CA framework, there are two major categories of talk: everyday talk and institutional talk. As this study aimed to examine

everyday conversations, all conversations were recorded when participants were gathered together for lunch, dinner, tea, or a party at home. This study also covered three conversational settings (men-only talk, women-only talk and mixed gender talk) in order to control for gender influences on participants' speech productions.

Then the analysis of the data was discussed. This study was conducted both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantification was used to see whether collaborative features were seen in conversations and to select samples for qualitative analysis (Perakyla, 2004). The qualitative approach was used to investigate how the three collaborative features were delivered by both male and female participants. This study adopted DA to accommodate gender issues and CA was used for analysing how participants delivered the three collaborative features.

Finally, transcriptions for this study were discussed. The first section explained the procedures for making the transcriptions. Two native speakers double checked all transcriptions after the first draft was made by the author in order to enhance the reliability of transcriptions. This study adopts CA transcription conventions since they allow researchers to undertake close examination of conversation. All symbols used in transcriptions were shown in this section.

Chapter 5: Coding numbers of three collaborative features

5.1: Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to quantify incidents in the data of the collaborative features that will be discussed in a qualitative way in the following chapters: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition used by men and women. Showing the actual numbers of incidents of the three collaborative features observed in this study will help readers to see how frequently these features occur in the conversations of the participants. It also helps readers to know how the samples of collaborative features are selected for the qualitative analysis.

This chapter includes seven sections. It starts with discussion of quantitative and qualitative approaches taken by this study. The two approaches are often combined in research. The author of this study acknowledges Schegloff's claim (1993) that coding numbers of conversational features does not strongly support generalisation of the data. The results of this study support his claim. However, this chapter does not seek to generalise the results of the quantitative analysis of collaborative features observed in this study. Instead, the numerical results of each collaborative feature should be treated as an indication of possible trends in men's and women's use of collaborative features in talk (Perakyla, 2004).

Sections 5.5 to 5.7 below give a brief summary of the three collaborative features seen in this study, with three illustrative examples from the data. It is notable that in this study, each collaborative feature is seen in both male and female conversation. Coates (1996 and 2003) found that women use one sentence constructions to collaborate in their talk while men use repetitions to collaborate in their talk. While this study partially supports

Coates' general observations, it contradicts Coates' gender-specific findings, in that both men and women use one sentence constructions and repetitions to collaborate in their talk in these data. Sections 5 to 7 below show quantitative results for each collaborative feature by both men and women. Each section includes one transcription and a table which shows actual incidents seen in this study. Section 5 shows the results for one sentence construction. Section 6 shows the results for one sentence expansion and section 7 shows the results for repetition used by both men and women. The last section concludes this chapter.

5.2: Qualitative and quantitative approaches for this study

Although the discussion of whether a qualitative analysis or a quantitative analysis should be used for this study was undertaken in the methodology chapter, further discussion is needed to explain in detail the application of quantitative analysis to instances of the three collaborative features examined in this study.

Schegloff (1993) claims that counting examples of such phenomena as laughter in talk does not provide sufficiently strong support for making generalisations about conversation. Some might laugh all the time, he points out, but others might not laugh at all, since each person is unique when they talk. Thus even if researchers show numerical data as evidence for their findings, it is not reliable as evidence for generalised conclusions in studies of conversation.

However, researchers involved in studies of conversation often count the features which they want to analyse in order to see their data qualitatively. Perakyla (2004) explains that selections of conversation for analysis are not randomly made by the researchers. In fact the analysis of data in conversation analytic studies often progresses inductively.

Researchers normally do not know at the outset of the research exactly what phenomena they are going to examine. Thus, it may turn out that they want to analyse events that do not often occur in each single recording. In order to be able to achieve a position where researchers can observe the variation of the phenomenon, they may need to have access to a large collection of data from which short sections can then be transcribed and analysed.

Heritage (2004) discusses the possibility of using a quantitative approach in the study of conversation for a single case study which can later be applied to other studies. He admits that studies of institutional talk in the CA framework are undertaken by qualitative observations. These qualitative observations, however, should have an impact and significance that are also quantitatively measurable when these qualitative studies continue and develop in the future. Perakyla (2004:297) also supports the notion of the possibility of using a quantitative approach in the study of conversation. She explains that various practices can be considered generalisable even if the practices are not actualised in similar ways across different settings. For example, if the study examines interactions between a counsellor and patients in a hospital in England, the results of this study are not generalisable as descriptions of what other counsellors or other professionals do with their clients but they are generalisable as descriptions of what any counsellor or professionals can do with their clients given that they have the same array of interactional competencies.

Researchers in the study of conversation often prefer to adopt qualitative approaches, as Schegloff (1993) noted. The reason is that they often have limited time to transcribe their data and deal with a massive amount of conversation (Perakyla, 2004) and therefore they often rely on qualitative observations for their analysis. However, adopting qualitative observations for the data analysis does not mean that researchers refuse to

adopt quantitative observations for their analysis. As Heritage (2004) and Perakyla (2004) explain, in order to make qualitative observations, it is necessary to undertake quantitative observations to some extent. This theory applies to the present study. The aim of this study is not to generalise about the features of collaborative talk between men and women in Australia but rather to use a quantification of features as a basis for qualitative observations.

5.3: Participants in conversations in this chapter

This chapter includes three examples of conversations from the data; one for each collaborative feature discussed: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition. These examples are taken from women's conversation and the three speakers below will be seen in this chapter.

- K: a woman in early thirties
- L: a woman in early thirties
- A: a woman in late twenties

5.4: Results

12 conversations were recorded in total in this study. Five men-only conversations, three women-only conversations and four mixed sex conversations were included. Table 1 shows the frequency of appearance of the three collaborative features in same and cross gender conversations and Table 2 shows the length of each conversation. The tables demonstrate that both male and female participants in this study have used all three collaborative features in their talk. In the case of one sentence construction, nine cases in total were used by men in both men-only and mixed sex conversations. 10 cases in

total were used by women in both women-only and mixed sex conversations. In the cases of one sentence expansion, 23 instances in total were used by men in both men-only and mixed sex conversations. 12 instances in total were used by women in both women-only and mixed sex conversations. In the case of repetition, 36 instances in total were used by men in both men-only and mixed sex conversations. 23 instances in total were used by women in both women-only and mixed sex conversations. The counting is indicative of the dominant presence of the collaborative features in both same and mixed gender conversations. A review of the tables shows that there is a difference in the women only and men only conversations compared with mixed gender conversations, as all three index that collaborations are lower in mixed gender cvonversations. This could suggest that closeness and solidarity building is characteristic of same group conversations than in mixed conversations.

Table 1

Type of collaborative strategy	Male only	Female only	Mixed both genres	Mixed male initiated	Mixed female initiated	All male initiated	All female initiated
One sentence construction	8	9	2	1	1	9	10
One sentence expansion	16	10	9	7	2	23	12
Repetitions	28	16	15	8	7	36	23
Total	52	35	26	16	10	68	45

Table 2

Time	Male only	Female only	Mixed both	All male talk	All female talk
Minutes	2781	3075	3610	6391	6685
Hours	46.35	51.25	60.17	106.52	111.42

5.5: One sentence construction

The term adopted in this study, '*one sentence construction*' refers to a phenomenon that has been described in various ways by different scholars. For example, Coates (1996) uses '*to produce one sentence cooperatively*'. Sacks (1992, v1) uses '*completing as-yet-*

incomplete utterances with syntactically coherent parts', Szczepek (2000) adopts the term '*duetting*' and Lerner (1991) calls it as '*a collaborative turn unit*'. Whatever term is used, there is one thing in common: that the previous speaker's in-progress utterance is either developed or completed by the next speaker. As a result, one complete discourse unit is formed by two or more than two speakers. Lerner (1991) explains this conversational feature in depth and it is worth citing his definition of a collaborative turn unit below since he seems the most influential scholar for the study of one sentence construction.

> 'The turn taking system for conversation organizes talk into turns in a series, where each speaker that gets a turn is then entitled to talk at least until a possible unit completion. This report describes the syntactic features of turn constructional units in progress that provide a systematic opportunity for talk by another participant before a possible completion has been reached.'
>
> (Lerner, 1991:442)

Lerner (2004) also describes one further aspect of collaborative sentence construction. The next speaker's attempt to complete the previous speaker's utterance is called an affiliating utterance. Once the affiliating utterance is delivered by the next speaker, it is then normally inspected by the original speaker as to whether it can be treated as a turn completion device or not. Normally the original speaker shows either an acceptance or rejection for the next speaker's attempt. For example,

Ken: insteada my grandmother offering him a drink, of beer she'll
say [wouldju-
Louise: [wanna glass milk? [hehhh

Ken: [no wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?

(Lerner, 2004: 228)

In the example above, Ken's utterance '*insteada my grandmother offering him a drink, of beer she'll say*' is an in-progress utterance which offers the next speaker, Louise, a systematic opportunity to complete. Louise then delivers '*wanna glass of milk?*' to complete Ken's utterance which is an affiliating utterance. However, Ken in the last line rejects Louise's affiliating utterance by saying '*no*'.

This study adopts Lerner's example above as the basic model of one sentence construction. Thus, for this study, a case of one sentence construction which is counted as a case should include the following features:

1. the original speaker delivers an as yet syntactically incomplete utterance, in other word, an in-progress utterance

2. The next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance as a candidate completion of the original speaker's utterance.

For instance,

Example 1 (women only conversation)

32: K: the lady in the house wants (1:0) two friends to move in or something?=

33: A: =oh really?

34: K: yeah Tony was saying¿

35: A: mm,

36: K: an' I was saying (.) oh (.) just so long as if they (.) you know she tells the (1.0)

37: ah: (1.0) the landlord.

38: A: mm.

39: → K: or whoever's looking after (1.5) the thing tht- because it's uh breach in the um: (1.0)

40: → A: contract,

41: K: contract. but (.) she was >one a the ones< that didn't know she was meant to be

42: paying for an electricity bill. .hhh cos we got a phone call from the[: um

43: A: [ye::ah,

44: K: builder.

45: A: yeah.

46: K: did you hear about that?

47: A: no:::,

48: K: saying that um (0.7) o:ur- our unit and mum'n'dad's unit,

49: A: mmm,

50: K: u::m the builders were still getting an electricity bill.

51: A: oh really?

52: K: cos they haven't changed [over.

53: A: [ah::::

54: K: yep

Example 1 above is taken from one of the women-only conversations in this study. In line 39, the original speaker K delivers a syntactically incomplete utterance '*...because it's uh breach in the um: (1.0)*' which satisfies the first condition. Then the next speaker A delivers an affiliating utterance in line 40 '*contract*' which satisfies the second condition. In the end, one complete discourse unit is produced by both K and A: '*...because it's a breach in the contract*'. K accepts A's affiliating utterance by

repeating it in line 41.

The total numbers of cases of one sentence construction observed in this study are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1

	Instances of one sentence constructions by Male participants	Instances of one sentence constructions by Female participants
Men's conversation 1 20 mins long	2	
Men's conversation 2 7.54 mins long	2	
Men's conversation 3 3.52 mins long		
Men's conversation 4 1.50 mins long		
Men's conversation 5 12:45 mins long	4	
Women's conversation 1 38 mins long		9
Women's conversation 2 8.15 mins long		
Women's conversation 3 5.00 mins long		
Mixed gender conversation 1 17:00 mins long	1	1
Mixed gender conversation 2 27:00 mins long		
Mixed gender conversation 3 5.35 mins long		
Mixed gender conversation 4 9.35 mins long		

The numbers in the columns display actual incidents of one sentence construction seen in each conversation. Men used nine cases in total and women used ten cases in total.

There are several things to be discussed here. Firstly, the result supports Coates' conclusion (1996) that one sentence construction occurs in women's talk. As Table 1 shows, women in this study showed 10 cases of one sentence construction in total.

Secondly, however, the result contrasts Coates' conclusion (2003) that men don't tend to use one sentence construction to collaborate in talk. As Table 1 shows, male participants used at least nine cases of one sentence construction while women used 10 cases of one sentence construction.

Thirdly, cases of one sentence construction are not evenly distributed. This supports Schegloff's claim (1993), discussed in the methodology chapter in depth. In studies of conversation, coding numbers of cases does not support any generalising of trends of the feature examined. For instance, in the three women's conversations, nine cases of one sentence construction were only seen in Women's conversation 1. No case was seen in the other two women's conversation. Similarly, in the mixed sex conversations, mixed sex conversation 1 shows one case each for male and female participants but the other three mixed conversations have no case.

This is why, as Schegloff claimed (1993), it is hard to generalise quantitative data for studies of conversation. Since cases of one sentence construction are not seen constantly through all conversations, it is hard to conclude that one sentence construction is a collaborative feature of both men's and women's talk. However, the results of this study can be used as an indication of a possible trend, providing evidence for the possibility of one sentence construction as a collaborative feature of both men's and women's talk (Perakyla, 2004).

5.6: One sentence expansion

One sentence expansion can be categorised as a form of one sentence construction in a broad sense since both the previous and next speaker collaboratively make what amounts to one discourse unit. However, in a narrow sense and within the CA perspective (Lerner, 1991), it needs to be treated differently from one sentence construction. Lerner (1991) explains that it is a feature in which the original speaker provides a syntactically complete sentence and the next speaker expands the original speaker's discourse unit with some kind of expansion device such as '*and*'. Thus the previous speaker's utterance can stand alone and need not be developed, but the next speaker develops it anyway. For instance,

Louise: first of all they hit rain then they hit hail

Roger: n then they hit snow.

(Lerner, 1991: 448)

The example above is adopted by Lerner (1991) which shows that the first speaker Louise provides a syntactically complete sentence which can stand alone and therefore need not be completed by the other speaker. However, the next speaker, Roger, then expands the first speaker Louise's utterance.

Thus, for this study, a case of one sentence expansion which is counted as a case should include the following features:

1. The original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance, in other words, it does not need to be developed but it can stand alone.

2. The next speaker develops the original speaker's syntactically complete utterance.

For instance, the example below is taken from Women's conversation 2 in this study.

Example 2

156. L: huhuhuhu

157. K: we went to the airport just before¿ and checked out the airplanes¿

158. L: m↑mm↓m.

159. K: there aren't many happening because it's a public holiday (0.3) I guess.

160. L: why were you out there?

161. K: to look at the PLANES haha[hahahahahahahhahahahah

162. L: [Oh cool hahahahahahahah

163. L: now <u>that</u>'s a clever activity. huhuhuhu

164. K: cause there's this <u>hu::ge</u> car park near brand depot I think it's for a car exchange

165. [thing?]

166. L: [yeah, yeah,]

167. → K: you just park in the::re, like =

168. → L: = and watch them take [off and land.]

169. K: [cathy can't] go anywhere because it's all just car park,

170. L: yep,

171. K: and you just stand there and watch the planes.

172. L: hahaha that's cool.

173. L: actually up on Mt majura ? there's walking tracks up there?

174. K: mm,

175. L: an that's really cool because the the flight- path is straight up alongside that

176. mountain?

177. K: yep.

178. L: and so that's- that's a fantastic view as they come up.

In line 167, K delivers '*you just parked in the::re like*' which is an in-progress utterance. L in line 168 delivers a component '*and watch them take off and*' to expand K's utterance in line 167.

The total numbers of cases of one sentence expansion observed in this study are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2

	Instances of one sentence expansions by Male participants	Instances of one sentence expansions by Female participants
Men's conversation 1	10	
Men's conversation 2	1	
Men's conversation 3	1	
Men's conversation 4	1	
Men's conversation 5	3	
Women's conversation 1		6
Women's conversation 2		2
Women's conversation 3		2
Mixed gender conversation 1	4	1
Mixed gender conversation 2	1	
Mixed gender conversation 3	2	

Mixed gender conversation 4		1

In contrast to cases of one sentence construction, each conversation showed at least one case of one sentence expansion. Men used 23 cases and women used 12 cases in total. Men used nearly twice as many cases of one sentence expansion as women in this study. However, it is important to note that the length of each conversation is different, which might affect the numbers of cases seen in each conversation. Also it is important to note Schegloff's claim (1993) mentioned earlier that coding numbers of cases of a conversational feature does not provide strong supporting evidence for generalisation on the use of the feature which is discussed. For instance, in men's conversation 1, ten cases were seen, while in men's conversations 2 to 4 each conversation shows only one case. Nevertheless the results support a possible trend for both men and women to use one sentence expansion as a collaborative feature (Perakyla, 2004).

5.7: Repetition

Tannen (2005) identifies two major types of repetition. One type is repetition which is produced by the next speaker and the other type is repetition produced by the same speaker. The repetition which is examined in this study is the first type, where the next speaker repeats the previous speaker's utterance; it can be either a repetition of part of the previous speaker's production or it can be a repetition of the full utterance.

For instance,

A: Where are you staying.

B: Pacific Pallisades.

A: Oh. Pacific Pallisades.

(Sacks, 1992, v2:141)

Sacks observes that B's utterance '*Pacific Pallisades*' in the second line is repeated by A in the third line. Thus for this study, a case of repetition which is counted as a case should be all or part of an utterance which is repeated by the next speaker. For instance,

Example 3 (women only conversation)

((K's child came into the room and screamed))

93: K: volume, (.) pl:ease, can you turn it down?

94: L: it's a::ll too exciting.

95: K: huhu she just looks at me what:: (.) are you talking about (.) mother.

96: L: did you see the girls' hats?

97: K: yeah they're nice,

98: L: they're cute aren't they-

99: K: where d'you get them.

100: L: Target¿

101: K: ((were)) you- ↑oh on the sale.

102: →L: on the sale¿

103: K: bet they were a- (.) good price.

104: L: Target on sale they are probably about four fifty¿ each.

106: L: ˚could be in here.˚

107: K: ˚umm.˚

Example 3 above is taken from the women-only conversation in this study. Both K and L are talking about hats which L bought for her daughter. In line 101, the original speaker K delivers '*...↑oh on the sale.*'. Then in line 102, the next speaker L repeats K's utterance and delivers '*on the sale¿*'.

The total numbers of cases of repetition observed in this study are shown in Table 3 below. There is one thing to note that Table 3 includes a case of repetition which can be treated as a repair. For instance,

(37)

A: Well Monday, lemme think. Monday, Wednesday, an' Fridays I'm home by one ten.

B: → One ten?

A: two o'clock. My class ends one ten.

(Schegloff et al, 1977: 368)

Schegloff et al (1977) treats the example above as a case of repair since A has been corrected by B. However, the above example includes a case of repetition. A's '*one ten*' is repeated by B '*One ten?*' with a rising intonation. Thus, this study includes a case of repair as a case of repetition.

Table 3

	Instances of repetitions by Male participants	Instances of repetitions by Female participants
Men's conversation 1	9	

Men's conversation 2	4	
Men's conversation 3	1	
Men's conversation 4	2	
Men's conversation 5	12	
Women's conversation 1		8
Women's conversation 2		1
Women's conversation 3		
Mixed gender conversation 1	3	7
Mixed gender conversation 2	2	1
Mixed gender conversation 3	4	2
Mixed gender conversation 4	2	4

In contrast to the previous two cases of one sentence construction and one sentence expansion, repetitions are relatively evenly observed in men's and women's conversations, except that women's conversation 3 shows no case of repetition. These results are in contrast to Coates' conclusion (2003) that repetition is a feature of only men's collaborative talk. Women in this study also used repetition in their talk to collaborate with each other.

However, as with previous results from one sentence construction and one sentence expansion, it is important to note Schegloff's claim (1993) that in studies of conversation, coding numbers of cases does not strongly support any generalisation regarding features in talk. For instance, Women's conversation 3 showed no case of repetition but Women's conversation 1 showed eight instances of repetition. In men's conversations,

Men's conversation 5 displays twelve instances of repetition while Men's conversation 3 displays only one instance of repetition.

Although cases of repetition are not consistently observed in each conversation, the result suggests a possible trend in the use of repetition by men and women (Perakyla, 2004). In other words, both men and women possibly use repetition as a collaborative feature in talk.

5.8: Summary

This chapter showed numbers of instances of three collaborative features: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition among participants. Both men and women used these three collaborative features in their conversations. This quantitative analysis supports Coates' claim (1996 and 2003) that one sentence construction is a feature of female talk, and that repetition is a feature of male talk. At the same time, the data contradict Coates' claim that only women use one sentence construction and only men use repetition, in that men showed several instances of one sentence construction and women showed several instances of repetition.

The occurrence of each collaborative feature varied from conversation to conversation. For instance, in some conversations, both male and female speakers showed several instances of each collaborative feature. In other conversations, they did not show any instance of these collaborative features at all. In naturally occurring data, consistency can not take be taken granted. Although Schegloff (1993) stated that a quantitative approach was not reliable for generalisation, this chapter at least demonstrates that both male and female participants showed several instances of the three collaborative features: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion and repetition. Coding the numbers

of these three features raises the possibility that all three may function as collaborative features for both men and women (Perakyla, 2004).

It is important to highlight here that the results of this study are characteristic of the sample of the participants selected for this study. In other words, the presence of collaborative features are mostly applicable to participants who are engaged in close relationships and have close knit networks. They are also participants who are middle class and have a university education. In this study, the variables of gender or social status do not represent static categories, but rather 'constitute a field of potential meanings – an *indexical field*, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of the variable. The field is fluid, and each new activation has the potential to change the field by building on ideological connections' (Eckert, 2008, p. 454).

The next chapter examines cases of women's one sentence construction qualitatively, and is followed by a further chapter examining men's one sentence constructions.

Chapter 6: Women's one sentence construction

6.1: Introduction

This chapter discusses one sentence construction by two or more female speakers. Coates (1996) found that one sentence construction was a feature of women's conversations and was used as a collaborative device. Female participants in this study indeed showed one sentence constructions as Coates found. This chapter presents a qualitative analysis of some selected examples of one sentence constructions which were delivered by women.

6.2: One sentence constructions by two or more persons

The term, '*one sentence construction by two or more persons*' has been adopted for this study. Other researchers have used different terms to refer to similar phenomena. For example, Coates (2007:41) uses '*co-constructed utterances*'. Sacks (1992, v1: 647) uses '*utterance completion*', Szczepek (2000:2) adopts the term '*collaborative productions in duets*' and Lerner (2004:225) refers to '*a collaborative turn sequence*'. All of these different terms share one thing; that the previous speaker's in-progress utterance is either developed or completed by the next speaker. As a result, one complete discourse unit is formed by two or more speakers.

Past studies have examined talk in which one sentence is constructed by two or more persons, and have often described this phenomenon as an example of collaboration in talk. For example, Coates (1996) points out that women may produce a single sentence cooperatively. Coates (1996, 138-139) gives an example from an interview setting, shown below.

Becky: I mean I've got friends that- … sometimes I feel

Becky: like I have to put on a bit of a – you know say the –

Becky: you know [say the right words and things you know/

Hannah: [say the right things/ yeah/

Hannah says '*say the right things*' at the same time as Becky says '*say the right words and things*'. As a result of this overlap, Becky's utterance '*you know say the right words (things)*' is completely constructed by both Becky and Hanna in the example above.

Lerner (1991: 442) examines one sentence construction by two or more persons within a CA framework. He describes the construction of a single sentence across the talk of two speakers:

> 'The turn taking system for conversation organizes talk into turns in a series, where each speaker that gets a turn is then entitled to talk at least until a possible unit completion. This report describes the syntactic features of turn constructional units in progress that provide a systematic opportunity for talk by another participant before a possible completion has been reached.'

In short, in order to produce a single sentence which is constructed by two or more persons, one speaker produces talk which provides the syntactic opportunity for completion, and another speaker completes that talk. For instance,

Ken: insteada my grandmother offering him a drink, of beer she'll

say [wouldju-

Louise: [wanna glass milk? [hehhh

Ken: [no wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?

(Lerner, 2004: 228)

In the example above, which is adopted from Lerner (2004: 228), Ken's utterance '*insteada my grandmother offering him a drink, of beer she'll say*' is an in-progress utterance which offers the next speaker, Louise, a systematic opportunity to complete. Louise in this example delivers '*wanna glass of milk?*' to complete Ken's utterance, although Louise's attempted completion is rejected by Ken.

Lerner (2004:226) explains this aspect of one sentence construction further. The next speaker's attempt to make the previous speaker's utterance is called an affiliating utterance, and has several functions. Lerner (2004: 226-227) says

> 1: Affiliating utterances used in a wide range of interactional environments and with various types of compound TCUs. What is common to all of them is their use of the constructional format of the ongoing turn as a method to propose a version of the current speaker's projected talk prior to its occurrence (or in the case f teasing or heckling, the affiliating utterance will use the constructional format to pointedly mis-project the content of the turn's completion)
>
> 2: Affiliating utterances are built to be contiguous with the preliminary component of the TCU-in-progress, and are placed in the ongoing turn in a way that displays this contiguity (i.e., through placement at an opportunity space). Thus, affiliating utterances maintain the progressivity of the talk (or at least display an orientation to maintaining progressivity) across a change in speakers. It is this feature that distinguishes a bid for conditional access to that on-going turn (for pre-emptive

> completion) from a bid for next speakership at the same point which is a bid to begin a new turn. With pre-emptive completion, the projected turn-constructional format remains unchanged, achieving a syntactically unmarked speaker transition…
>
> 3: Affiliating utterances are produced to bring the turn to completion, and to bring it to completion at the next possible completion. Further, affiliating utterances are oriented-to by their recipients as taking the already-projected turn unit to its next possible completion, and no farther. Massively, affiliating utterances go only to next possible completion. They are built as a continuation of the turn-in-progress and as a completion to that turn. The initiation of an affiliating utterance is not a bid for continued talk; it is a conditional entry device. What is projectable from the preliminary component of a turn-in-progress is a component type that will bring the turn to the next possible completion…
>
> (Lerner, 2004: 226-227)

Sacks (1992, v1) suggests two reasons why people tend to engage in this phenomenon. Firstly, English grammar allows speakers to do so. In the grammar of English, prepositional phrases come towards the end of a sentence. This allows other speakers to extend the utterance or sentences. Sacks, however, does not see this first explanation as a strong reason for the occurrence of one sentence construction by two or more persons. Sacks emphasises the second reason, that hearers are constantly engaged in syntactically analysing a speakers' utterances, and that their syntactic analysis of utterances is available as something which they can use immediately. For example, at the point in a speaker's in-progress utterance where an incomplete sentence has been produced, an opportunity may arise for a listener to complete the sentence, even if the speaker goes on to produce a complete sentence as well.

One sentence construction by two or more persons can only occur when speakers pay extremely close attention to each other, at all linguistic levels: the meaning of what the other speaker is saying, the grammatical structure of what is being said, and the intonation pattern and rhythmic quality (Coates, 1996).

However, one sentence construction by two or more persons, in which a syntactically incomplete sentence is completed by another speaker, needs to be viewed as distinct from one sentence expansion by two or more persons. Lerner (1991) notes that in some cases, some forms of complete sentences by the original speaker can be developed unlimitedly by the recipient.

Louise: first of all they hit rain then they hit hail

Roger: n then they hit snow.

(Lerner, 1991: 448)

Lerner explains that the sentence in the example above by the first speaker, Louise, can be seen as a syntactically complete sentence. However, the next speaker, Roger, expands the sentence, since there is no grammatical limit to the size of the sentence in the example above. As Lerner's example shows, in one sentence expansion by two or more persons, the next speaker is adding more information instead of trying to complete the original speaker's sentence.

In short, one sentence expansion differs slightly from one sentence construction. In one sentence expansion, the original speaker delivers an utterance which can stand syntactically alone. In one sentence construction, however, the original speaker's utterance is in progress and can be syntactically completed. This chapter discusses

examples of one sentence constructions by female participants in this present study. One sentence expansion will be discussed in a later chapter.

6.3: One sentence construction as a feature of women's conversation

Coates (1996 and 2003) claimed that one sentence constructions were one of several feminine features in talk. She concluded that while men in her study showed one sentence constructions in conversation with women, men did not show co-constructive features in all-male groups. Coates (2003) also suggests that one sentence constructions by two or more people form contributions to collaborative narrations, which display strong 'togetherness' among participants in conversation. This is often described as a feminine style of talk (Coates, 1996 and 2005, Leung, 2009, Eder, 1988, and Holmes, 2006b).

In this present study, female participants showed one sentence constructions, which supports Coates' finding. Whereas Coates (2003) did not provide close examination of each case of one sentence construction, this chapter closely examines and explores some selected examples of one sentence construction which were observed in this study.

In this study, one particular women's conversation which lasted 38 minutes and 57 seconds is a rich source of collaborative features including one sentence constructions and one sentence expansions. This chapter therefore selects most examples of women's one sentence constructions from this particular conversation to discuss closely.

6.4: Participants in this chapter

For this chapter, the following participants appear in examples below.

- K: a women in early thirties, married, has two children, relative of A
- A: a woman in late twenties, married to Al (another participant)
- Al: a man in early thirties, born in Scotland but holds Australian citizenship
- S: K's baby

Although this chapter focuses on women's talk, three men Al, A and J appear in some parts of the conversations. This is because in order to record ordinary conversation, participants were told not to stop their recordings even if speakers of the opposite sex joined in while they were recording. Therefore, some men's talk is included in this chapter, but men's conversations are not analysed here.

6.5: Discussions

As is discussed in the quantitative analysis chapter (chapter 5), female participants in this study showed a total of 10 instances of one sentence constructions. Nine instances were seen in women's conversation 1 and one instance was seen in mixed sex conversation 1. In this chapter, six instances of one sentence constructions are examined since they provide rich resources to be discussed. There are some features which recur. For example, there are three instances which are delivered in overlap. While the original speaker continued talking beyond the place where an opportunity for the next speaker to complete occurred, the next speaker tried to syntactically complete the original speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004). There are also instances which include a minimal response token '*yeah*'. These '*yeah*'s are delivered by the speaker who attempts to complete the previous speaker's utterance and positioned at the end of the utterance.

Common features are seen in several instances of one sentence construction in this chapter. One instance which follows Lerner's basic model is also observed. According to

Lerner's model (1991 and 2004), the original speaker delivers an utterance, and at a point where the original speaker's utterance is syntactically incomplete the next speaker completes the original speaker's utterance. In the end, both speakers collaboratively form a single syntactically complete discourse unit. There is also a more complex case in which the original speaker delivers an in-progress utterance, the next speaker tries to complete the original speaker's utterance, and then the original speaker tries to complete the next speaker's affiliating utterance.

6.5.1: A case of one sentence construction following Lerner's basic model

In Example 1, two female speakers are involved. Both K and A have just finished their lunch and are having tea with some sweets in K's house. The case of one sentence construction shown here follows Lerner's basic model of collaborative one sentence construction (1991 and 2004). The original speaker delivers an in-progress utterance and then the next speaker completes the previous speaker's utterance.

Example 1

```
255:  A:  ˚That's cool˚.
256:  K:  yeah.
257:  (1.0)
258:  A:  yeah bt I'm ↑thinking (0.5) yeah at the moment we pay about sixty dollars, (0.3) for
259:        ten gig, .hh but I'm thinking of actually upgrading to twenty? cause the twenty::(0.4) is:
260:        [probably ten dollars more?]
261:  K:  [  it's   probably    only-   ]  exactly [yeah.   ]
262:  A:                                           [I'm  like] psh:::::hew
263:  K:  it's usually only like piddly squat more [um you may as well have it.    ]
```

264: A: [yeah and I'm like I didn't even] realise I'm
265: like ph::: ten dollars more ↓I could go on.
266: K: =and it's a month yeah (.) so what's that a day like hh. cents.
267: →A: well it's like it'ss:::::::=
268: →K: =so: cheap.
269: A: yeah it's like a hundrednn:::::::::: (1.0) hundredn' eighty a quarter ? y'know so it'd
270: only be like (0.3) you know two hundred'n ten. (1.0)
271: K: [yeah,]
272: A: [yeah] well it was like six hundred dollars a ye:ar.
273: K: yeah,
274: A: ↑I just thought you know y- you got to pay ((a name of a company)) for the phon-=
275: like I didn't even use the phone (0.5) half the time [you know.]
276: K: [why do y]ou have to pay them.
277: A: because you gotta have the phone connection like (.)
278: K: with them still¿
279: A: yeah. In order to get the broadband like (.) they
280: [have to go through ((a name of a company)) because ((a name of a company))]
281: K: [oh::]
282: A: owns all the:: bloody::- phone networks.

* ((name of a company)) in line 274, 281 are the same company.

A is telling a story about the cost of using internet in her house in this part of the conversation. A in line 267 tries to answer K's question in line 266: '*...so what's that a day like hh. cents*' In line 267, A repeats '*it's*' twice which suggests that A is doing a self repetition. It is a self repair (Liddicoat, 2007), which addresses a problem in talk (Schegloff et al 1977). A's '*it's*' possibly shows a problem with word finding or access

to the correct answer. The '*s*' of A's '*it'ss:::::::*' is significantly lengthened. This lengthened '*it'ss:::::::*' is perhaps understood by K as an indication of A's word-finding difficulty. A's '*it'ss:::::::*' gives an opportunity for the next speaker K to attempt a completion of A's utterance.

Although the next speaker K delivers her attempt to complete the previous speaker A's utterance, there is a possibility that the previous speaker A could hold her turn and complete her utterance by herself just after her '*it'ss:::::::*'; indeed she does so belatedly in line 269, *'it's like a hundredn eighty a quarter?'* However, before she can do so, the next speaker, K delivers her affiliating utterance '*so: cheap.*' to complete the previous speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004) and the previous speaker A accepts K's attempt in line 269 by delivering an acknowledgement token '*yeah*' (Gardner, 1998). In the end, one syntactically and semantically complete discourse unit '*it's so cheap*' is collaboratively formed by two female speakers.

A's in-progress utterance '*it'ss:::::::*' in line 267 is cut off by the next speaker K. This suggests that K is showing her enthusiastic participation into A's story. Tannen (1993) points out that an interruption can be used to show the next speaker's enthusiastic participation rather than to aggressively stop the previous speaker's in-progress utterance. Since K's '*so: cheap*' serves as an affiliating utterance to complete the previous speaker A's in-progress utterance '*it'ss:::::::*', K is showing her enthusiastic participation into A's story and supporting the completion of A's utterance.

This instance follows Lerner's basic model of collaborative one sentence constructions (Lerner, 1991 and 2004) in that the talk of the original speaker gave the next speaker an opportunity to complete her in-progress utterance. The next speaker's affiliating utterance was accepted by the original speaker. Thus one syntactically complete

discourse unit was collaboratively formed by two speakers as Lerner (1991 and 2004) demonstrated.

6.5.2: A case of one sentence construction with an overlap

The previous example showed an example of one sentence construction by two women without overlaps. The next example below includes an overlap feature. In this example, the next speaker's affiliating utterance is produced in overlap with the previous speaker's in-progress utterance. Both K and A are talking about K's new tenant for her unit. K has recently built a new unit as an investment and she has found a new tenant for her unit. K's new tenant, however, has not told the electricity company to change the billing name for the unit although they have already moved in and used electricity. As a result of this, the builders of K's unit are still getting electricity bills although the builders do not use electricity there any more.

Example 2

46: K: ↑did you hear about that?

47: A: no:::,

48: K: saying that- um (0.7) our (0.3) our unit and mum'n'dad's unit,

49: A: mmm,

50: K: u::m the builders were still getting an electricity bill.

51: A: oh <u>re</u>ally?=

52: K: =cause they hadn't changed [over.

53: A: [ah::::.

54: K: yep.

55: A: y<u>o</u>u ↑would've thought rent would have to be paid before all that happens you

56: know [always

57: K: [yep

58: K: you'd think so [oh:: that's what I'd tell Jacob] [yeah but um:::

59: A: [I don't know] [it' uh:::

60: (3.0)

61: K: yeah you'd think they' d be told.

62: A: yeah:.

63: K: or they'd work out <u>oh</u> I'm meant to be paying for electricity?

64: A: ye:ah,

65: (2.0)

66: K: s- I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.

67: A: [ye:ah.]

68: A: oh okay.

69: →K: =so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what]ever before.

70: →A: [had to pay for anything.(0.2)yeah.]

71: (1.0)

72: A: ph:::ew.

In line 66, K guesses why this may have happened: '*just I guess she's never rented before I think her family's quite well off.*'. In line 68, A then delivers '*oh okay*' which contains a surprise token '*oh*' (Schiffrin, 1985). In line 69, K delivers '*=so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what] ever before.*' which is a complete utterance. K's utterance is overlapped by the next speaker A in the middle of K's '*...had...*'. A's utterance in line 70 is an affiliating utterance to complete K's utterance as '*=so they've probably neve:r (.) had to: pay for anything .*'. Thus one syntactically and semantically complete discourse unit is collaboratively formed by both female speakers.

In this instance, there is neither confirmation nor rejection of the next speaker A's affiliating utterance by the previous speaker K. Lerner (2004) notes that the original speaker often shows either an acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt at completing the original speaker's utterance. However in this case the original speaker K in line 68 does not deliver either a confirmation or rejection of the next speaker's attempt. Instead there is a very long pause '*(1.0)*' after the next speaker A's affiliating utterance, and the story is not expanded after the long pause.

However, in line 70, the next speaker A's utterance contains '*yeah.*' at the end. Gardner (2001) explains that '*yeah*' with a falling intonation often is used as an acknowledgement token. A's '*yeah.*' ends with a falling intonation and is possibly showing A's acknowledgment for the previous speaker K's utterance '*=so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what] ever before.*' in line 69.

A's affiliating utterance in line 70 '*[had to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]*' overlaps with K's utterance in line 69. An overlapping affiliating utterance occurs when the previous speaker continues talking beyond the opportunity space for the next speaker to complete the previous speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004). In this example, A's overlap occurs in the middle of K's '*had*'. A is perhaps trying to deliver her '*[had to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]*' just after K's '*...never...*' in line 68 but A's '*[had to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]*' is delivered slightly delayed.

Overlapping talk can be treated either as problematic talk which is often seen as an interruption, or as unproblematic talk which may be of short length and is not normally treated as a problem by participants (Liddicoat, 2007). A's overlap in line 70 has a relatively long length which could potentially be treated as a problematic overlap.

However, Sacks (1992, v2) explains that when problematic overlapping talk (or interruption) occurs one speaker will often stop talking. Since neither A nor K stops during the course of the overlapping talk, it can be argued that the overlap is unproblematic, and that A is therefore not interrupting K by initiating talk in overlap. This example does not meet Sacks' criteria for problematic overlapping talk or interruption.

Jefferson (1986) describes another kind of overlap which she calls '*oops sorry overlap*'. While the previous speaker is continuing his/her talk, the next speaker starts to talk, and this talk overlaps that of the previous speaker since the previous speaker keeps talking. Then the next speaker realises that the previous speaker has not stopped his/her talking and drops out, as if he/she is saying '*oops sorry*' by dropping out. In lines 69 and 70, neither speaker drops the turn and neither appears to meet the criteria of Jefferson's '*oops sorry overlap*'.

Tannen (1993) explains that a type of interruption can occur when the listener shows his/her interest in engaging in the speaker's talk. The next speaker A's overlap in line 70 '*[had to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]*' appears to be the type of overlap described by Tannen. The next speaker A in line 70 is possibly showing her enthusiastic participation in K's story. The original speaker K in line 66 delivers '*I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.*' which is possibly a clue for the next speaker A to project the original speaker's likely talk after '*probably never*' in line 69. Also the original speaker K's utterance in line 69 '*=so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what] ever before.*' is recycled from her utterance in line 66 '*I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.*'. The next speaker A in line 68 delivers a minimal response token '*oh okay*' which shows her understanding of what K's tenant is like. A's minimal response token '*oh okay*' and the overlapping segment '*[had*

to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]' in line 70 suggest that A is showing her enthusiastic engagement in the original speaker K's story.

This instance of one sentence construction can be explained as an example of Lerner's 'choral co-producing' (2002). Lerner sees 'choral co-producing' as a type of repetition in which a recipient projects from an earlier part of a speaker's talk the likely completion of that talk. In Lerner's 'choral co-producing' a recipient hears what the other speaker is saying, and then the recipient produces what will possibly be said next by the other speaker.

Lerner (2002:11-12) gives an example of 'choral co-producing', as shown below.

1.	B:	One of those Kay Sweets brought him a cake. =
2.	C:	=O:h.=
3.	B:	=Oh, let's not talk about it through ahuh huh
4.		(1.2)
5.	A:	why: [no:t ((smile voice))
6.	C:	[(you don't 0 one of those sisters.
7.	A:	Oh you mean (.) one of the sweethearts=
8.	B:	=the ( ) Kappa [sweethearts]
9.	C:	[Yea:hs:] = (mo:re)
10.	B:	brought him a cake.
11.		(0.7)
12.		Yep.
13.		(0.3)
14.		[it was a ni-]
15.		[( )] ((A looks to C))

16. B: = It was a nice cake, you kno:w

17. C: [you, you just have to

18. → E:x::p[erience them

19. → B: [perience that

((B & C laugh))

Lerner explains that the recipient B in line 19 hears the beginning of C's '*experienc*e' and uses that, along with what came before in the turn and the rest of the context and structure of the talk, to project what is possibly being said. Thus she co-produces '*experience*'.

K in line 69 and A in line 70 deliver something like Lerner's 'choral co-producing', as shown below.

66: K: s- I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.

67: A: [ye:ah.]

68: A: oh okay.

69: →K: =so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what]ever before.

70: →A: [had to pay for anything.(0.2)yeah.]

71: (1.0)

72: A: ph:::ew.

A in line 70 is hearing the beginning of K's utterance '*=so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what] ever before.*' as a recipient and then A starts to deliver her utterance '*[had to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]*'. A in line 70 is possibly attempting to project what the previous speaker K is going to say. A's overlapping utterance in line 69 is not only used as an affiliating utterance for one sentence construction but also it

follows Lerner's model of 'choral co-producing'. It differs from Lerner's model in only one respect: it is not the same as K's own completion. It might be viewed as an attempt at choral co-producing.

In short, a single sentence construction in Example 2 is collaboratively formed by two speakers. The original speaker K delivered '*I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.*' which was recycled in her next turn as '*=so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what] ever before.*'. The next speaker A showed her understanding of the original speaker's first utterance '*I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.*' by delivering a minimal response token '*oh okay*'. The next speaker A then delivered an affiliating utterance '*[had to pay for anything. (0.2) yeah.]*' which is overlapped. A's overlapping affiliating utterance was treated as showing her enthusiastic participation into K's story, rather than as an attempt to interrupt K's story. Therefore one discourse unit was collaboratively formed by two speakers in Example 2.

6.5.3: A case of one sentence construction with an overlap

Both K and A in this part of the conversation are talking about the use of the internet by A's boss. A's boss received huge bills from the internet provider and A is telling a story of why this happened in this part of the conversation. A case of one sentence construction is seen in lines 128 and 129 which include an overlap feature.

Example 3

109: A: and he was like >y'know< he doesn't really know anything about it and (1.0) he'd

had broadband with somebody .hh and he said that he got a phone call from ((a name of a company))?(1.0) and this sales rep'd convinced him to s- to sign u.hh on ((a name of a company))? and like he'd said what've you currently got and rick was like o::h I think we currently get.hh he doesn't ↓know (.)he's totally↓clueless .hh and this guy said oh well we can get like ah (.) five hundred .hh <megabit download> a month which is n::[:othing.]

K: [is that ( )-] [ye:ah::]

A: [It's ti:ny like] (1.0) cos=

K: =how much is a movie.

(1.0)

A: oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.

K: [((unable to hear this))]

((A is asking to her husband Al who is in the other room and Al is answering her question from the other room at this point))

Al: oh a couple of gig [coupla gigabits.]

A: [couple of] [gigs.]

K: [yeah,]yeah so[:o you're not down-]

A: [y'know we're talking] gigabits.

K: so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]

A: [yeah I] mean and that's the thing like

→ yeah [you browse browse websites] and look at email.

→ K: [download your emails. (.) ye::ah.]

(0.5)

A: .hh n'even then you might wanna turn [the pictures off.]

K: [that's not f- definitely not] for downloading.

A: ye[ah.]

K: [yeah.]

135: A: so:: he is doing this and like this guy was like yeah it'll be just like the one

136: you've currently got and blah blah blah and you'll pay this much per month, (0.5) .hh

137: and he said you know sort of like you beauty an- and rick wasn't aware of what- he

138: doesn't know anything about it like- (0.7) I was talking to him and he goes yeah

139: NOW I REALISE-

K in line 126 delivers an in-progress utterance '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' which is overlapped by the next speaker A's '*[yeah I] mean and that's the thing like*'. The overlap by A in line 127 is a short length overlap which is often not a problematic overlap (Liddicoat, 2007). However, because of A's overlap, K's in-progress utterance in line 126 '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' is cut off and K drops her turn. This is explained by the interruption rule of Sacks (1992, v2). K's utterance in line 126 ends with '*and*' which also supports the notion of an interruption. K seems to try to continue her utterance but she drops her turn because of A's overlap in line 127. After A's overlap '*yeah I*' in line 127, K lets A to take a turn. Thus A's overlap is treated as an interruption here rather than Tannen's enthusiastic participation into talk.

In line 127, A takes her turn and delivers '*[yeah I] mean and that's the thing like*' which contains a minimal response token '*yeah*'. It shows A is agreeing with the previous speaker K's utterance, in which K is explaining the things people can do with only a small amount of data on the internet. Then A tries to expand the account by agreeing with and building on K's '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' with her '*that's the thing like*' in line 127. A's '*...like*' therefore is used as a new information marker which often has the meaning of '*for example*' and it could be replaced by '*for example*' (Underhill, 1988).

A's '*you browse browse websites.*' in line 128 is overlapped by K's '*[download your emails]*' which is an affiliating utterance to complete A's '*that's the thing like*' in line 127. K's affiliating utterance '*download your emails*' makes A's '*that's the thing like*' a syntactically and semantically complete utterance. Therefore one syntactically and semantically complete discourse unit is collaboratively formed by two female speakers.

Lerner (2004) notes that in some examples of one sentence construction the next speaker's affiliating utterance overlaps the original speaker's utterance. The original speaker continues talking beyond the opportunity point space for the next speaker who tries to complete the original speaker's utterance. The next speaker also starts delivering his/her affiliating utterance and tries to complete the original speaker's utterance. However, both speakers continue their utterance and therefore the next speaker's affiliating utterance is overlapped with the previous speaker's utterance which is still in progress.

The affiliating utterance '*download your emails*' by K in line 129 in this example is overlapped with the original speaker's utterance '*you browse and browse websites.*'. The original speaker A continues her talk, that is, A talks beyond the opportunity space for the next speaker K to deliver her affiliating utterance '*download your emails (.) ye::ah.*'.

After the original speaker A's '*yeah*' in line 128, the next speaker K in line 129 perhaps treats this as the place where she can deliver her affiliating utterance to complete A's utterance. The original speaker A, however, does not stop talking while the next speaker, K completes her in-progress utterance '*...and that's the thing like yeah*' in lines 127 and 128. The original speaker, A continues to complete her in progress utterance by delivering '*you browse browse websites*' which is overlapped by K's '*download your emails (.) yeah*'. Once again, the overlap appears unproblematic.

K's '*download your emails*' also serves as a delayed completion for K's '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' in line 126. K's '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' ends with a conjunction '*and*' which suggests that K could deliver further segments after '*and*'. K's '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' is, however, interrupted by A in line 126 and K drops her turn. As a result of A's interruption, K's '*so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]*' remains as an incomplete in-progress utterance.

This example does not contain any overt acceptance or rejection by the original speaker of the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's utterance. Lerner (2004) explains that the previous speaker often delivers either an acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt at the completion. However, in this example, the next speaker K's affiliating utterance in line 129 contains '*ye::ah.*' in the end. K's '*ye::ah.*' contains a falling intonation which suggests that K is possibly trying to show her acknowledgment for the previous speaker A's '*you browse browse websites*' (Gardner, 2001).

This phenomenon was also seen in the previous example below.

```
66:   K:    s- I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.
67:   A:                                                       [ ye:ah. ]
68:   A:    oh okay.
69: →K:    =so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d  to:  rent  or- (.)  or   what]ever before.
70: →A:                                      [had to pay for anything.(0.2)yeah.]
71:   (1.0)
72:   A:    ph:::ew.
```

The extract above is taken from Example 2. A's '*yeah.*' contains a falling intonation and is possibly showing A's acknowledgment for the previous speaker K's utterance '*so they've probably never have to pay for anything*' in line 68.

Both example 2 and example 3 show speakers adding '*yeah.*' with a falling intonation to their completions of other speakers' in progress talk. Both '*yeah.*'s are possibly acknowledging the previous speaker's utterance.

Similarly to Example 2, in Example 3, the instance of one sentence construction is also delivered with an overlap and therefore this case can be also explained in terms of Lerner's model of 'choral co-producing'. The next speaker A says '*...and that's the thing like yeah*' in lines 127 and 128 and the original speaker K produces a possible projected completion of what is being said by A, that is '*you browse browse websites*'.

As explained earlier, K's affiliating utterance also functions as a self delayed completion of K's previous utterance in line 126. That utterance ends with '*and*' but because of A's interruption, K gives up her turn and lets A take her turn. K in line 128 is possibly trying to complete her previous utterance as well as trying to complete A's utterance in line 129 by delivering '*download your emails (.) yeah*'. Thus, K's affiliating utterance '*download your emails (.) yeah*' in line 129 is positioned to complete A's in-progress utterance and is overlapped with A's utterance. As a result, this case resembles Lerner's 'choral co-producing'.

However, K's affiliating utterance '*download your emails (.) yeah*' does not have the same meaning as A's '*you browse browse websites*'. The action of downloading emails is different from the action of browsing websites.

A in line 128 also delivers '*and look at email.*'after her '*you browse browse websites*', which may suggest that A is possibly making a distinction between the two actions of browsing websites and looking at email. Thus, in terms of meaning, K's affiliating utterance does not satisfy the criteria of Lerner's 'choral co-producing', since K and A do not produce the same completion of A's in-progress talk. The same is true of example 2.

In short, this example showed a one sentence construction with an overlap sequence. Within an overlapping one sentence construction, the original speaker A continued her talk beyond the opportunity point space for the next speaker K who tries to complete the original speaker's utterance. The next speaker K starts delivering his/her affiliating utterance in which she tries to complete the original speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004). This example also contained a feature in which the next speaker K delivered an acknowledgment token '*yeah*' in acknowledgement of the original speaker's utterance. In one sentence constructions, the original speaker often delivers either an acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004). However, in this example, the original speaker did not deliver a token for the acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's utterance.

6.5.4: A case of one sentence construction with a minimal response 'yeah'

In Example 4 both A and K are talking about the availability of the internet when they were younger. A is telling a story about her very slow internet connection at home, and comments that when they were younger people did not use the internet as much as they do today. A case of one sentence construction by two persons is seen in lines 398 and 399. This example includes a two-part one sentence construction. First, the original

speaker's utterance is partly completed by the next speaker. Then the next speaker's affiliating utterance is further completed by the original speaker. This example also includes a specific form of one sentence construction: '*yeah*' + '*affiliating utterance*'.

Example 4

380: A: it's like ah as soon as you get a fast one it's like there's no way I can go back, .hh >y'

381: know and it's ↑really weird< because you put up with it for so long, (.) and then it's

382: just y'need to have something once and you're like- ↑oh:: I can't stand that any more.

383: K: =that's right It's like you wonder what uh::m (1.0) like our kids won't be able to

384: imagine life probably without a mobile pho::ne or uh::m

385: A: yeah.

386: K: I dunno a computer I mean ↑when .hhh when did we get a computer =

389: I remember it ws when we were in:: our two story house (1.0) [we got that,]

390: [you guys]

391: A: you guys had (.) a commodore.

392: (0.8)

393: K: mmm.

394: A: back when you were still living at (.) that old place on a hill¿

395: K: ye::ah. [(uum,)]

396: A: ye::ah that was that was [ages ago] that would have been like nineteen

397: eighty si[x or seven.]

398: K: [but it never] did anything=the internet was around then wasn' it, but it wasn't=

399: →A: =yeah you guys it was it was not connected ˚like˚ =

400: →K: =yeah because people just didn't connect back then [did they.]

401: [(no)]

402: (2.0)

403: K: mmm.

404: (1.5)

405: A: you guys just used to play games [which] were loaded from a tape.

406: [mm.]

407: A: [hahahaha hahahaha .hhh]

408: K: =[I remember yeah I remember manic miner,]

409: A: =yep,

The original speaker K in line 398 delivers '[*but it never] did anything=the internet was around then wasn' it, but it wasn't*'. K's utterance in line 398 is an in-progress utterance since the last segment of K's utterance '*...but it wasn't*' is syntactically incomplete. A in line 399 delivers '*...it was not connected...*' which suggests that K's utterance, if complete, might have been delivered as '*it was not connected*'. However, the next speaker A's utterance in line 399 '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like°* =' is launched without a gap just after the original speaker K's utterance in line 399 '*...but it wasn't=*'. Therefore, K's utterance in line 398 '[*but it never] did anything=the internet was around then wasn' it, but it wasn't*' is treated by A as an in-progress utterance to be completed.

Thus the next speaker A delivers an affiliating utterance in line 399 '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like°* ='. At the same time, A's '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like°* =' adds to the original speaker K's utterance in line 398 delivers '[*but it never] did anything=the internet was around then wasn' it, but it wasn't*' to form a continuing in progress utterance (Lerner, 1991). The next speaker A's affiliating utterance in line 399 does not complete the original speaker K's in-progress utterance. Instead A's affiliating utterance in line 399 '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like°* =' is expanded by the original speaker K in line 400: '*=yeah because people just*

didn't connect back then did they.'. Thus the next speaker A's affiliating utterance in line 399 becomes an in-progress utterance by virtue of the original speaker's expansion in line 400. Because of the originals speaker K's expansion of the next speaker A's attempted completion, a very long discourse unit is formed by both speakers, as seen in the extract below.

398: K: 'but it never did anything the internet around then wasn' it, but it wasn't'

↓

399: A: 'yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected like'

↓

400: K: 'yeah because people just didn't connect back then did they'

In the end, one discourse unit is formed by both K and A which is '*but it wasn't connected because people just didn't connect back then, did they*'. There are several features which need to be discussed in this example. Firstly, the next speaker A's attempt to complete the original speaker K's utterance is discussed. For ease of reference, this is shown in the extract below.

398: K: [but it never] did anything=the internet was around then wasn' it, but it wasn't=

399: →A: =yeah you guys it was it was not connected ˚like˚ =

400: →K: =yeah because people just didn't connect back then [did they.]

401: [(no)]

402: (2.0)

A's utterance in line 399 above begins with '*yeah*'. This suggests that A is acknowledging the original speaker K's comment that the internet was not connected at

that time although it existed (Gardner, 1998). A's '*yeah*' also appears to be used as a shift from recipiency to speakership (Jefferson, 1984).

Jefferson (1984) explains that '*yeah*' sometimes serves as a shift into being the speaker from being the recipient, as in the example below.

1. L: I didn't have five minutes yesterday.
2. E: I don't know how you do i:t.
3. (0.3)
4. L: I don't kno:w. nh hnh
5. E: You wuh: work all day toda:y.
6. (0.3)
7. L: Ye:ah.
8. (0.2)
9. L: Just get Well I'm (.) by myself I'm kind of cleaning up
10. from yesterday.
11. Mm: hum,
12. (0.2)
13. E: ˚t˚hhh [hhh
14. L: [˚A-and˚ (.) ˚I was just g-washing the dishes,˚
15. E: Yeah we're just (.) cleaning up here too:.

(Jefferson, 1984: 7)

Jefferson explains that E's '*Yeah*' in line 15 serves as a shift into a speakership. E in line 13 indicates her availability to further talk by delivering '*˚t˚hhh [hhh*' but this indication is interrupted by L in line 14. E in line 15 then delivers '*Yeah*' to take her turn to speak.

In the present study, the next speaker A's '*yeah*' in line 399 serves a similar function to that of Jefferson's '*yeah*' above. A's utterance in line 399 is also launched with no gap just after K's '*but it wasn't*'. This suggests that A is possibly showing her enthusiastic participation to engage in K's story. It also stands in the initial position of A's utterance. Thus A's '*yeah*' is not only used to acknowledge the original speaker K's utterance but it also serves as a shift into the speakership from being the recipient.

So far the first part of the one sentence construction in this example has been discussed. The second part of this example also has several features which need to be discussed. Once again, for ease of reference, the relevant section is shown below.

398: K: [but it never] did anything=the internet was around then wasn' it, but it wasn't=

399: →A: =yeah you guys it was it was not connected °like° =

400: →K: =yeah because people just didn't connect back then [did they.]

401: [(no)]

402: (2.0)

A's utterance in line 399 '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like° =*' is an affiliating utterance which follows the original speaker K's utterance in line 398. A in line 399 is trying to complete K's utterance in line 398. However, A's utterance in line 399 does not ultimately complete K's utterance. The original speaker K in line 400 delivers '*=yeah because people just didn't connect back then [did they.]*' with no gap just after A's '*... °like°*' in like 399. Thus, the original speaker K's utterance in line 400 makes A's utterance in line 399 an in-progress utterance (Lerner, 1991).

K's utterance in line 400 starts with '*yeah*' which is delivered similarly to A's '*yeah*' in line 399. K's '*yeah*' is delivered with no gap after the previous speaker A's utterance

which suggests that K is showing her enthusiastic engagement into A's talk. Thus K's '*yeah*' serves as a shift from recipiency to speakership (Jefferson, 1984). After K's '*yeah*' in line 400, K delivers a reason to explain why she did not have the internet connected at that time. This suggests that K in line 400 is accepting what A said in line 399. K's '*yeah*' in line 400 also serves to show K's acknowledgement of A's utterance in line 399 (Gardner, 1998).

A's utterance in line 399 contains '*... °like°*' which is delivered with quieter voice and therefore it is not known whether the next speaker K hears it or not. Since it remains unknown whether A's '*... °like°*' with quieter voice was heard by K, two possible analyses can be made. A's '*°like°*' can be treated as either a space filler (Tagliamonte, 2005) or a new information marker which often has the meaning of '*for example*' (Underhill, 1988). When A's '*°like°*' is treated as a space filler, A's utterance '*yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected*' can stand alone and A is perhaps making a space by delivering '*°like°*' until the next segment turns up. At the same time, by delivering '*like*' as a space filler, A is giving an opportunity for K to take a turn and deliver the rest of A's utterance (Lerner, 1992). When A's '*°like°*' is used as a space filler, it also shows that A's utterance '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like° =*' can be treated as a syntactically independent unit. Then the next speaker K's utterance '*=yeah because people just didn't connect that did they.*' can be treated as an expansion of the previous speaker A's utterance. Lerner (1991) claimed that in one sentence construction, the original speaker's talk provides a syntactically incomplete unit and then the next speaker delivers the completion of the original speaker's utterance.

However, when A's '*°like°*' is treated as a new information marker with the meaning of '*for example*', A's utterance can not then stand alone. A is showing her intention to continue to talk after her '*°like°*' rather than giving an opportunity for the other speaker

to fill the space. For example, some form of list could be delivered by A after her *like*'. If further talk can be expected after A's '*°like°*', then A's utterance '*=yeah you guys it was it wasn't connected °like° =*' is syntactically and semantically incomplete. Therefore, K in line 400 is completing A's utterance in line 399.

In short, this example contained a two-part one sentence construction. The original speaker K delivered an in-progress utterance in line 398. The next speaker A in line 399 then completed the original speaker's utterance. This was the first part of the one sentence construction. The next speaker A's attempt in line 399 at the completion of the original speaker's utterance was further developed by the original speaker K in line 400. This was the second part of the one sentence construction. However, the second part of the one sentence construction can be treated as a one sentence expansion, depending on how the next speaker A's '*like*' is treated.

This example contained two minimal response tokens ('*yeah*') which were used as acknowledgment (Gardner, 1998) and to shift to the speaker from being the listener (Jefferson, 1984). The next speaker A's affiliating utterance in line 399 was launched with no gap after the original speaker's utterance in line 398. The original speaker K's utterance in line 400 was also launched with no gap after the previous speaker A's utterance in line 399. This indicated that both speakers showed enthusiastic engagement in their conversation which suggested that they were showing collaboration in their talk.

6.5.5: Cases of one sentence construction with a recognition token 'oh' and with an overlap.

In this part of the conversation, K's baby came into the room where K and A were talking. A in line 79 starts to tell her story about water bills. This example contains two

instances of one sentence construction. The first instance is seen in lines 81 and 82. The second is seen in lines 94 and 95. The first example contains a minimal response token '*oh::*' before an affiliating utterance. The second example contains an overlap feature.

Example 5

((a baby came in and they start talking to the baby))

73: K: whatta-you got possum?

74: (1.0)

75: S: a yeah

76: A: another BASHING stick= a dangerous implement.

77: K: =yes

78: (4.0)

79: A: yeah well, ↑ I was actually on the phone with ((a name of a company)) an that

80: cos you know I had to transfer the electricity an- and the gas and the water (.)

81 → and I received the electricity and the gas bill .hhh and I was like (.)

82: → K: oh:: no: water.

83: A: so there's no: water so I phoned them you know just to double check and they

84: said o:h it's probably still .hhh getting changed over or something from the

85: builders and I'm thinking (0.2) .hhh

86: K: [but (.) how long had that been,]

87: A: [w'll:::, y'know, yeah::,]It's like that's (a-) really long time, (it's) July,

88: K: yeah.

89: A: and the guy was like ↑yeah yeah these things can (.) take a while=like o↓kay

90: obviously you know they h- they know that the date(which(1.0))I signed up but

91: it's so (1.3) I'll get billed accordingly and I just said to him oh I just wanted to

92: check you know because I didn't want .hh my ↑water to get cut off and he goes

93:		oh we don't cut the water off, (.)we would just charge you (.)ay- a::h,
94: →	K:	an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.
95: →	A:	[late fees.]
96:	A:	and it was like-
97:	(0.5)	
98:	A:	[yeah.
99:	K:	[yeah.
100:	A:	=well you know I don't wanna get that [either.]
101:	K:	[same] thing.
102:	A:	hehehehe I'd rather get my water turned off than get- a fee fi::ned for u::m you
103:		know.
104:	K:	↑oh ↓yeah

The first instance of one sentence construction by two women is seen in lines 81 and 82. A's utterance in lines 80 and 81 '*...I had to transfer the electricity an- and the gas and the water (.) and I received the electricity and the gas bill .hhh and I was like (.)*' is an in-progress utterance which ends with '*like (.)*'. Two minimal pauses are involved in A's in-progress utterance. The first minimal pause is seen between '*the water*' and '*and*' in line 80. The second minimal pause is seen at the end of A's utterance in line 81 just after '*like*'. Both minimal pauses can function as a TRP for the next speaker to talk (Liddicoat, 2007). A's second minimal pause '*(.)*' in line 81 suggests that her '*like*' may be used as a space filler token (Tagliamonte, 2005). By delivering '*like*' + '*(.)*', A in line 81 is potentially signalling an opportunity for the next speaker –in this case, K - to complete her utterance.

K in line 82 does not miss this opportunity and delivers her utterance '*oh:: no water*', an affiliating utterance which completes A's in-progress utterance in line 81. At the same

time, K's '*oh:: no water*' treats A's utterance '*the gas bill (.) and it was like (.)*' as an in-progress utterance, which is consistent with A's syntactically incomplete 'and I was like'. K's utterance '*oh:: no water*' in line 82 contains a minimal response token '*oh::*'. '*oh::*' can be considered a recognition display Schiffrin (1987). In lines 80 and 81, A's utterance '*I had to transfer the electricity an- and the gas and the water (.) ... I received the electricity and the gas bill .hhh and I was like (.)*' shows that A has received only two elements - the electricity and gas bills. Although she was supposed to receive three bills for gas, electricity and water, it is clear that the water bill is missing. In line 82 K then shows her recognition of this missing element with her extended '*oh::*'.

K's recognition token '*oh::*' proves that K has been actively listening to A's story, and this is possibly why K was able to deliver the missing element, '*no water*' (line 82) ,from A's story. K's affiliating utterance is then accepted by the next speaker A in line 83, where A delivers '*so there's no water...*' which contains a repetition of K's '*no water*'. A's repetition confirms that K's affiliating utterance '*no wate::r*' appropriately complete A's utterance '*it was like*'.

In the end, one syntactically and semantically complete discourse unit is collaboratively formed by both female speakers. This first instance of one sentence construction clearly fits into Lerner's model of one sentence construction (Lerner, 2004). When the next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance for the original speaker, then the original speaker often delivers an acceptance or rejection. In this first instance, the original speaker A showed an acceptance of the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's utterance by delivering a repetition.

In short, this example showed that the original speaker A provided a cue – the missing element of her talk, which was water bills - for the next speaker K to complete the

original speaker A's utterance '*the gas bill (.) and I was like (.)*'. The next speaker was actively listening to the original speaker A's story and did not miss the cue to attempt to complete the original speaker A's utterance. The next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's utterance was accepted by the original speaker. This suggested that both speakers were collaboratively engaged in their talk and therefore one discourse unit was collaboratively and smoothly formed by both two speakers.

6.5.5.1: The second instance of one sentence construction with an overlap

As opposed to the first instance, the second instance of this example shows that the next speaker K's attempt in line 94 is not overtly accepted by the original speaker A in line 95 below. The original speaker A in line 95 delivers a self completion which is delayed.

89:	A:	and the guy was like ↑yeah yeah these things can (.) take a while=like o↓kay
90:		obviously you know they h- they know that the date (which(1.0)) I signed up but
91:		it's so (1.3) I'll get billed accordingly and I just said to him oh I just wanted to
92:		check you know because I didn't want .hh my ↑water to get cut off and he goes
93:		oh we don't cut the water off, (.) we would just charge you (.) ay- a::h,
94: →	K:	an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.
95: →	A:	[late fees.]
96:	A:	and it was like-
97:	(0.5)	
98:	A:	[yeah.
99:	K:	[yeah.
100:	A:	=well you know I don't wanna get that [either.]
101:	K:	[same] thing.

* K in line 94 delivers '*an exceed amount*' but it possibly means as '*an excess amount*'. Audio data in this part of the conversation, however, shows that K in line 94 did say '*an exceed amount*' instead of saying '*an excess amount*'. In order to make the transcript precise, the author of this present study retained '*an exceed amount*' as spoken by K.

In line 93, A delivers the utterance '*...we would just charge you (.) ay- a::h*' which is a syntactically incomplete utterance. The object of the verb '*charge*' in A's utterance is missing and therefore the missing element can be provided by either the current speaker or the other speaker to form a syntactically complete utterance.

A's utterance ends with an extended '*...a::h.*'. A's extended vowel in line 93 '*...a::h.*' suggests that A is perhaps trying to search for words or phrases as an object for the verb '*charge*', to be produced after '*...a::h.*' in her utterance. A's utterance in line 93 also contains a minimal pause '*(.)*' just before her extended '*a::h*' which also supports the possibility that A is trying to fill a space in order to deliver further segments after '*a::h*'. This minimal pause '*(.)*' and extended '*a::h*' by A provide the next speaker K with an opportunity to complete A's in-progress utterance in line 93.

K in line 94 delivers '*an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.*' which is an affiliating utterance for A's in-progress utterance. K's attempted completion makes A's in-progress utterance syntactically complete, but it is not overtly accepted by A as an appropriate completion of her utterance. The original speaker A delivers further talk in line 95 '*[late fees.]*' which serves as a delayed self completion of her utterance. A's '*[late fees.]*' syntactically and semantically complete her previous utterance in line 93 '*we would just charge you (.) ay- a::h*'. A's '*[late fees.]*' has a different meaning from K's '*an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.*' Therefore, K's affiliating utterance in line 94 '*an*

[exc::::::::::]eed amount.' does not seem to represent what A was going to say in line 95. This may be why it is not overtly accepted by A.

This example also contains an overlap feature. K's affiliating utterance '*an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.*' in line 94 is overlapped by the previous speaker A's utterance '*late fees*' in line 95. This overlap does not appear to be problematic since it is a short length overlap. Liddicoat (2004) explains an overlap which is a short length overlap is not normally treated as a problematic by the speakers. K's '*an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.*' is overlapped with A's '*late fees*' but the overlap is brief - two words in length - which is can be considered a short length overlap. Thus it does not appear as problematic. Sacks (1992) explains that when an overlap is used as an interruption, the speaker who is overlapped often drops his/her turn. K does not drop her turn here – the ending of her utterance with a falling intonation signals its completion. Therefore, K does not seem to be interrupted by A's overlap.

The overlap feature in this example differs slightly from overlap features in previous examples in this study. In this example, A's overlapping utterance '*late fees*' serves as a delayed completion for A's '*we would just charge you (.) ay- a::h*'. However in the previous examples shown below the overlapping talk was initiated by the next speaker, in the form of an affiliating utterance, rather than being initiated by the original speaker.

Example2

66: K: s- I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.

67: A: [ye:ah.]

68: A: oh okay.

69: →K: =so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what]ever before.

70: →A: [had to pay for anything.(0.2)yeah.]

71: (1.0)

72: A: ph:::ew.

Example 3

126: K: so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]

127: A: [yeah I] mean and that's the thing like

128: → yeah [you browse browse websites] and look at email.

129: → K: [download your emails. (.) ye::ah.]

130: (0.5)

131: A: .hh n'even then you might wanna turn [the pictures off.]

132: K: [that's not f- definitely not] for downloading.

133: A: ye[ah.]

134: K: [yeah.]

Example 5

93: oh we don't cut the water off, (.)we would just charge you (.)ay- a::h,

94: → K: an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.

95: → A: [late fees.]

96: A: and it was like-

97: (0.5)

98: A: [yeah.

99: K: [yeah.

In both Examples 2 and 3, the next speaker A in Example 2 and the next speaker K in Example 3 deliver their affiliating utterances in overlap. In contrast, in Example 5, the original speaker A delivers her self completion in overlap with the next speaker K's affiliating utterance. Thus the beginning of the next speaker K's affiliating utterance in line 94 is inserted between the original speaker A's utterances in line 93 and in line 95. In Example, 5 both the original speaker and the next speaker are trying to deliver utterances to complete the original speaker's utterance at the same time. The original speaker A not only lets the next speaker complete her previous utterance but also delivers her contribution to complete her own utterance. At the same time, the next speaker K makes her own attempt to complete the original speaker's utterance. This shows that K has been actively listening to A's story in order to deliver her own attempt to complete A's utterance (Coates, 1996).

There is a last feature which needs to be discussed in Example 5. It does not contain an acceptance or rejection by the original speaker A of the next speaker's attempt to complete the previous speaker's utterance. The original speaker A is allowing the next speaker K to complete A's utterance by delivering an extended '*a::h*', which provides the place for the next speaker to deliver an affiliating utterance. Then the next speaker K takes this opportunity and tries to complete the previous speaker's utterance by delivering '*an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.*'. However, the original speaker A does not deliver any confirmation of whether she is accepting or rejecting K's attempt to complete her utterance. This example does not follow the pattern of one sentence construction proposed by Lerner (1991). In his model the next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance and then the original speaker often delivers either an acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt to complete. In this example, both speakers A and K completes A's utterance.

In short, this example showed one sentence construction by two women. This example showed that the next speaker K's attempt ('*an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.*') to complete the originals speaker's utterance conveyed a slightly different meaning from the original speaker's self-completion '*[late fees.]*'. However, K's attempt to complete the original speaker A's utterance occurred at the same time as the original speaker A's self-completion. Thus, both speakers were trying to complete one in progress utterance at the same time. This suggests that both speakers were collaboratively forming one discourse unit.

6.6. Summary of this chapter

This chapter discussed women's one sentence constructions and it showed several forms of one sentence constructions. This chapter confirmed Coates' finding (1996 and 2003) that women tend to employ one sentence constructions collaboratively in conversations.

In each example, the original speaker's in progress utterance was completed by the next speaker. The next speaker's affiliating utterance was sometimes then accepted by the original speaker who delivered some tokens for acceptance such as '*yeah*' or a repetition of words or phrases which were used in the affiliating utterance by the next speaker (Lerner, 1991). In order to provide an opportunity for the next speaker to deliver an affiliating utterance, the original speaker sometimes signalled the space where the next speaker could start his/her affiliating talk.

This chapter also showed two examples which differed from Lerner's model of one sentence construction. Lerner (1991) explained that it is usually the original speaker who indicates the acceptance or rejection of an attempted completion by next speaker. In examples 2 and 3 in this chapter it was the next speaker – instead of the original speaker

– who delivered acknowledgment tokens '*yeah*' to acknowledge the previous speaker's in progress overlapping utterance.

Signalling of the space for potential affiliating utterances was seen in several different conversational circumstances in this chapter. One example was an extended sound – for instance in Example 5, the original speaker's extended '*a::h*' in an in progress utterance was treated as the space for the next speaker to deliver the affiliating utterance. Such sound extensions can be one of the clues for the next speaker which indicate the opportunity space. A minimal pause '*(.)*' was another cue for the next speaker to deliver an affiliating utterance, as discussed in Example 1.

The original speaker, however, sometimes does not allow the next speaker to complete his/her in progress utterance alone despite having signalled the space for the next speaker to deliver an affiliating utterance. In this case, the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's in progress utterance is often overlapped with the original speaker's self completion segment. In this chapter Example 2 and 3 showed case of one sentence constructions with overlap features.

Overall, in line with the claims made by Coates's study (1996), all examples explored in this chapter demonstrated that women participants showed collaborative features in their conversation by delivering one sentence constructions by two speakers. In order to deliver an affiliating utterance to complete the original speakers' utterance, the next speaker needed to be actively listening to the original speaker's story (Coates, 1996). Women participants in this study showed that they were actively listening to the original speaker's stories by delivering affiliating utterances. Lerner (1991) also pointed out that one sentence construction was one of several collaborative features in talk. Although some different patterns of one sentence constructions were observed in this chapter, all

examples in this chapter showed that both female original and next speakers formed one in-progress discourse unit collaboratively.

The next chapter explores men's one sentence constructions. One sentence constructions are also observed in men's conversations in this present study. Coates (1996) described the one sentence construction as one of women's collaborative features in talk, but the next chapter will explore how male participants in this present study deliver one sentence constructions.

Chapter 7: Men's one sentence construction

7.1: Introduction

The previous chapter discussed one sentence constructions used by women in the conversation examples considered. Several varieties of one sentence constructions were shown, including examples with an overlap feature and with a possible repair by the previous speaker of the next speaker's affiliating utterance. In this chapter men's collaborative one sentence construction is discussed.

Coates (1996) found that one sentence constructions are mainly a feature of women's collaboration in talk whereas men use repetitions to show their collaboration. However, the analysis in this chapter of selected instances of one sentence construction delivered by male participants in the sample conversation examined demonstrates that the male participants show similar collaborative one sentence construction features to those shown by the female participants in their conversations. This could be part of the casual nature of the talk and the close knit relationships of the participants who know one another well.

Before exploring men's one sentence construction in depth, a brief summary of the results of previous research will be presented. As was noted in the previous chapter, one sentence construction needs to be distinguished from one sentence expansion. Two examples below demonstrate once more the difference between one sentence construction and one sentence expansion.

Becky: I mean I've got friends that- … sometimes I feel

Becky: like I have to put on a bit of a – you know say the –

Becky: you know [say the right words and things you know/

Hannah: [say the right things/ yeah/

(Coates, 1996:138-139)

Louise: first of all they hit rain then they hit hail

Roger: n then they hit snow.

(Lerner, 1991: 448)

The first example shows one sentence construction. In this example, the first speaker produces a syntactically incomplete sentence and then the next speaker tries to complete the first speakers' utterance. This completion is called an affiliating utterance (Lerner, 1991). This is the type of sentence construction which this chapter will explore.

The second example shows one sentence expansion. The first speaker's statement is a syntactically complete unit. It does not need to be completed. The next speaker, however, extends the previous speaker's utterance using the conjunction '*and*'. These additional expanding units often use such conjunctions. This is called one sentence expansion and it needs to be distinguished from one sentence construction. This phenomenon will be examined in later chapters.

7.2: One sentence construction as a feature of men's conversation

In the previous chapter, women's one sentence constructions were discussed. One sentence constructions have been identified as a 'women's feature' in talk (Coates, 1996 and 2005). Coates (2005:105) states that:

> '…the collaborative constructions of talk specifically of narratives, is not confined to female speakers. But male speakers, in the conversations I've collected, are more likely to construct talk collaboratively in mixed company rather than in all-male company. Perhaps the most significant finding to come out of my analysis of mixed talk is that male speakers only share the construction of narrative with female speakers: there are no examples in the mixed conversations of collaboratively constructed narratives involving two male speakers.'

Coates (2005) suggests that one reason why men do not tend to show collaborative narratives in all-male conversations is that they want to avoid displaying homosexuality in their talk. However, when men talk with women, men tend not to fear considerations of homosexuality since men see women as their partners, and also men may feel they can display their heterosexuality by simply talking with women.

However, men in this study did show collaborative features in their narrations, including the one sentence construction. It is important to say here that collaborative features are seen not only in the development of 'stories' by male speakers but in general report and accounting that is part of their casual conversations. The occurrence of one sentence construction in men-only talk contradicts the results of Coates' study (2005). Men's one sentence constructions occurred in a similar way to the one sentence constructions that occurred in the women's conversations discussed in the previous chapter.

7.3: Participants for this chapter

For this chapter, the following participants appear in examples below.

- Al: a man in early thirties, born in Scotland but holds Australian citizenship

- Aa: a man in early thirties, J's sister's husband
- J: a man in early thirties
- Ku: a man in late twenties, J' relative
- L: a man in early thirties, K's elder brother
- G: J's grand father

This chapter focuses on one sentence constructions which are delivered by young people, although part of one conversation includes an older person. In addition, although this chapter discusses men's conversations, in some examples, women's conversations are also shown in order to demonstrate that female participants showed a similar type of one sentence construction. Thus female participants also appear in this chapter.

- K: a women in early thirties, married, has two children, younger sister of L
- A: a woman in late twenties, married with Al

7.4: Discussions

As the quantitative chapter stated earlier, nine incidences of one sentence construction by male participants were observed in this study. In this chapter, seven out of nine samples are chosen to be discussed since these seven samples provide rich sources for discussion. These seven cases include several different features. The first, a case of one sentence construction follows the basic model of one sentence construction outlined by Lerner (1992). The original speaker delivers an in progress utterance and then the next speaker completes the original speaker's utterance. The second case of one sentence construction includes an overlap feature. The next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's in progress utterance is overlapped by the original speaker's utterance. Thirdly, a case is presented which includes a rising intonation. The next speaker's affiliating

utterance is delivered with a rising intonation which functions as a question for the original speaker. The fourth case is similar to the third case in that the next speaker's attempt includes a rising intonation. However, the next speaker's attempt is rejected by the original speaker in the fourth case. The fifth case includes the type of enthusiastic participation by next speaker that is sometimes seen as an interruption. The original speaker's turn is cut off by the next speaker and the next speaker complete the originals speaker's in progress utterance. This last case is followed by laughter.

7.4.1: A case of men's one sentence construction following a model of three part structure

Example 1 below is a part of the conversation which was recorded in J and L's uncle's house. J and L are talking in the living room with some drinks after dinner. J and L are talking about what they did when they were in school. A case of one sentence construction is seen in lines 70 and 71 which follows the model for a three part structure proposed by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991).

Example 1

45	J:	we did so many bad things to his car (.) what did we do to his seat belt or something?
46:		what did we do to his car? (0.4) we did some several things to his ca::r,
47:	L:	he [was getting hahaha really pissed with that one (0.4) he was getting really
48:	J:	[he was hahahahaha getting really pissed with us
49:	J:	hahaha cause every second or minute (.) we'd be doing [something]
50:	L:	[cause we are] just
51:		being dicks all weekend just doing stupid stuff to him ((unable to hear this))
52:	J:	haha it's funny

53: L: ((unable to hear)) to his car (.) I haven't ever seen seat belts in his car

54: (0.8)

55: J: (˚I have been˚) ↑doing a lot of things for his car I can't remember what it was.

56: L: I didn't have the indicators on the (shift) so as soon as he turned it on

57: J: oh we had a ha[zard on and random shift] turn on the hehehe wipers and

58: L: [fucking everything starts.]

58: (2.6)

60: J: It was like <u>what the fuck</u> are you guys doing ((J is producing sounds of the car here))

61: L: yeah that was funny something like [oooh

62: J: [oooh okay we'll wind back that one

63: (1.0)

64: L: cause it's like oh let's just keep going.

65: J: yeah fuck him (0.2) hahahahahahaha

66: (2.0)

67: J: u:m we even hid uh:: (0.5) a CB radio in one of his sho::es? (.) and we're in the other

68: room?

69: L hahaha

70:→ J: and like (.)

71:→ L: ˚talking.˚

72: J: talking heavy on it and shit (.) he is in there with his lady and we- we're going OH

73: YEAH and OH hhhehe and it was like what the fuck is that coming from.

74: L: oh yeah (.) yeah she likes that.

75: J: AH YEAH ah yeah (.) hehehe

76: (1.2)

77: L: it's like u::h funny guys

78: J: hehehehe heheh uh funny guys hehehe hahaha and he's got this sorta ↓I'm going to

79: kill you guys later look on his face.

80: L: ye:::a:::hi

81: J: ye:::a:::hi hehehahaha

82: (2.0)

J in lines 67 and 68 delivers '*u:m we even hid uh:: (0.5) a CB radio in one of his sho::es? (.) and we're in the other room?*'. J then expands his utterance in line 70 by delivering '*and like (.)*' which continues J's previous utterance in lines 67 and 68 as an in-progress utterance. Then in line 71, L delivers '°*talking*°' which completes J's utterance. In the end, one discourse unit is formed by two speakers: '*u:m we even hid uh:: (0.5) a CB radio in one of his sho::es? (.) and we're in the other room? and like(.) talking*'.

J's utterance in line 70 contains '*like*' and a minimal pause '*(.)*' which suggests that J may be providing an opportunity for the next speaker to complete his in progress utterance (Lerner, 1991). The next speaker L takes this opportunity to deliver his affiliating utterance '°*talking.*°' in line 71. L's affiliating utterance is accepted by the original speaker J in line 72 since J repeats L's affiliating utterance.

This case follows a model for a three part structure outlined by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991). They explain that although a sentence can be expanded unlimitedly with the use of conjunctions such as '*and*', speakers can anticipate how many conjunctions will be used to expand a sentence. In particular, when speakers list things in their conversations, speakers often finish their sentence within three listings. Thus, the third list item in a sentence is often predicted by speakers, as in the extract from example 2 below:

67: J: u:m we even hid uh:: (0.5) a CB radio in one of his sho::es? (.) and we're in the other

68: room?

69: L hahaha

70:→ J: and like (.)

71:→ L: ˚talking.˚

72: J: talking heavy on it and shit (.) he is in there with his lady and we- we're going OH

73: YEAH and OH hhhehe and it was like what the fuck is that coming from.

74: L: oh yeah (.) yeah she likes that.

75: J: AH YEAH ah yeah (.) hehehe

76: (1.2)

J in line 67 lists two components in his story. The first component listed is an account of having hidden a radio in his friend's shoe, as seen in '*we even hid uh:: (0.5) a CB radio in one of his sho::es?*'. The second component listed is an explanation of where J and L were at the time, as seen in '*we're in the other room?*'. Thus, J is listing two events – first, that J and L hid a radio in his friend's shoe and second that J and L were in the other room. The final listed detail is delivered by L in line 71 '˚*talking.*˚' explaining what L and J were doing in the other room as the third component of the list. L's '˚*talking.*˚' contains a falling intonation which suggests that L is trying to complete this part of J's story by delivering the third component.

This part of the conversation also contains humour. There is laughter in lines 69 by L and 73 by J which supports the evidence that both L and J are humorously making their story. Humour in this part of the conversation fits into a type of role play humour (Hay, 1985:76). It is humour that is quite specific mimicry of a particular person or just the general adoption of a stereotypical voice or attitude. J in lines 72 and 73 says '*OH YEAH and OH*', and in line 75 says '*AH YEAH ah yeah*'. J is mimicking a voice which came from the other room in this story. L in line 74 also mimics the voice '*oh yeah (.) yeah*

she likes that.' Both J's and L's mimic utterances have generated a humorous effect in this part of the conversation.

In addition, J in line 72 says '*shit*' and in line 73 says '*fuck*'. These swearwords suggest that J is showing his solidarity or in-group membership (Bayard and Krishnayya, 2001). They explain that swearing in particular by men is sometimes employed as a social mechanism. Swearing combined with laughter are often used as a solidarity marker or a way of reflecting in-group membership.

A possible third component, '*°talking.°*', is predicted by L in this example. J does not end either line 67 or line 68 with a falling intonation, which often indicates sentence closure (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006). Instead, J's utterance in these two lines ends with a rising intonation for each component: '*we even hid uh:: (0.5) a CB radio in one of his sho::es?*' and '*we're in the other room?*'. These two rising intonation features suggest that J is perhaps signalling that his story is not finishing yet. In addition, as discussed earlier, J's '*and like (.)*' in line 70 suggests that J is providing an opportunity space for the other speaker L to talk. This opportunity by J in line 70 possibly prompts the other speaker L to predict the third component of J's story.

In short, this case of joint one sentence construction showed Jefferson's (1991) and Lerner's (1991) three part structure model in an example of one sentence construction. The original speaker delivered two components of a potential three-part list and the last component was delivered by the other speaker. This case also included a basic feature of one sentence construction identified by Lerner (1992). The original speaker's utterance included '*like (.)*' which suggested that the original speaker was providing an opportunity for the other speaker to talk. The other speaker took this opportunity to deliver his utterance which completed the original speaker's in-progress utterance.

7.4.2: A case of men's one sentence construction with an overlap

Example 2 is part of the conversation recorded in J's sister's house and this is a multiple party conversation. All male speakers Al, K, Aa and J are having some snacks with drinks before Sunday lunch. In this part of the conversation, Al is telling a story about drinking with his friends. A case of joint one sentence construction is seen in lines 24 and 25. This case includes an overlap, in that the next speaker's affiliating utterance overlaps the original speaker's continuing utterance.

Example 2

1. Al: I was in a band with a guy who is u:m [the assistant] manager?
2. Ku: [in a band?]
3. Al: oh yeah [he is ((unable to hear))
4. Ku: [oh just pull up a seat]
5. Al: no shut up.
6. Aa: hh
7. Al: he was uh:: actually the the (.) the (.) stuff <u>not</u> about the band's much >more
8. interesting< but he was um the assistant manager, of a bar in Glasgow?=
9. Aa: =Ye::ah.
10. Al: that uh:: near George Square? (.) and after practice on Thursday
11. afternoons cause we didn't have anything on and he used to just do the
12. bar before it opened up (.) he would unlock and said just help yourself to free
13. <u>d</u>rinks.
14. Aa: yah [ha::::]
15. Al: [and he] would make us all cocktails like squash
16. [rocks 'n' stuff] like that?

17. Ku: [uh::::]

18. Aa: [oh yu::m]

19. K: [ah nice]

20. Al: so squash rocks was ah (.) midori there was a dot just

21. <brown (.) green (.) red>

22. (1:0)

23. Aa: ni:ce=

24. → Al: =and he would used to just make up (.) just like [random shot]

25. → J: [random shit.]

26. Al: random stuff like that.

27. Ku: yep.

28. Al: he he he wasn't one of those guys going (.) gin 'n' tonic do they mix?

29. Ku: hh

30. Al: then he was just like oh: d'you know what else we c'n do that's cos just like

31. that's what Michael's like cause basically Michael went through this period

32. ((unable to hear)) it's like um:

33. Ku: drinking?

34. Al d drinking but um:: we'll get a round of beers now. because you're (.)

35. none of you are man enough to keep up with me. we'll drink now. hurry up

36. >hurry< an you're like you you've drank tha that much in like two minutes

37. an' that's not enough DRINK (.) HURRY UP(.) but je just give me a

38. CHANCE I mean (.) not even the fact it's BOO::ZE it's just like it's just

39. LIQUID.

40. Aa: he sounds like my type of drinker. .hh hehehe

41. Al: he just won't stop and then he's like-

42. J: is this harry?

43. Al: [yeah.

44. Ku: [hmm

The first example of one sentence construction in this sequence is seen in lines 24 and 25. Al's utterance in line 24 '*and he would used to just make up (.) just like [random shot]*' can, syntactically, be an independent and complete discourse unit. Al's '*random shot*' in line 24 is, however, overlapped by J's '*random shit*' in line 25 which is an affiliating utterance that completes the previous speaker's utterance. J's '*random shit*' in line 25 fits perfectly with Al's '*random shot*', both semantically and syntactically, which suggests that J's '*random shit*' is an example of successful collaborative completion. J's '*random shit*' is then accepted by Al in his next turn in line 26, in which he rephrases his own '*random shot*' into '*random stuff*''. Thus in this example Al and J collaboratively deliver one discourse unit: '*he would used to just make up (.) just like random shot (random shit)*'.

Al's '*random shot*' in line 24 is overlapped by J's '*random shit*' in line 25. J's overlap '*random shit*' does not appear to be problematic. Although J's '*random shit*' in line 25 overlaps Al's '*random shot*' in line 24, Al does not drop his turn because of J's overlap. This overlap does not follow Sacks' rule of interruption, namely that when two people are talking at the same time in a single conversation interruption has occurred if one of them stops (Sacks: 1992, v2). Nor can J's overlap in line 25 be considered an example of Jefferson's '*oops sorry*' overlap. Jefferson (1986) explains that in examples of this type of overlap, while the original speaker is continuing his/her talk, the next speaker starts to talk in overlap with the original speaker's talk. When the next speaker realises that the original speaker has not stopped talking, he/she drops his turn as if to say '*oops sorry*'. Since J's overlap is apparently not interruptive or accidental, it may therefore be used as a means of displaying his enthusiastic participation in the talk (Tannen, 1993). J's affiliating utterance '*random shit*' shows that J is paying extremely close attention to

Al's story and is therefore able to produce an appropriately co constructed sentence, at all linguistic levels: the meaning of what the other speaker is saying, the grammatical structure of what is being said, the intonation pattern and the rhythmic quality (Coates, 1993).

J's affiliating utterance contains a swear word '*shit*' which can also be viewed as supporting his enthusiastic participation in the talk. Swear words are often described as offensive words because they are often used to insult others (Sapolsky and Kaye, 2005). They are, however, also used as a social mechanism such as a solidarity marker or way of reflecting in-group membership, particularly when they are adopted by male speakers in talk. By using swear words, men tend to emphasise shared attitudes and values (Bayard and Krishnayya, 2001). Although Al avoids using swear words – Al uses '*random shot*' in line 24 and '*random stuff*' in line 26 - J uses a swear word '*shit*' in line 25. J in line 25 is clearly not insulting others in this part of the conversation by saying '*random shit*' since other participants in this part of the conversation do not show any anger towards J's '*random shit*'. Rather, J's '*random shit*' supports Al's in progress utterance by completing it. It is a collaborative feature in the talk.

Al's utterance '*...make up (.) just like...*' in line 24 contains a minimal pause '*(.)*' and '*just like*'. Al's minimal pause makes a space before he produces the next segment. By following the pause with '*just like*', Al is signalling that his turn is continuing, thus indicating to the recipient that the sentence is not yet completed (Fung, 2007 and Norrick, 1987).

A similar pattern was also seen in one of the women's examples of one sentence construction in the previous chapter.

120: A: oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.

121: K: [((unable to hear this))]

((A is asking to her husband Al who is in the other room and Al is answering her question from the other room at this point))

122: Al: oh a couple of gig [coupla gigabits.]

123: A: [couple of] [gigs.]

124: K: [yeah,]yeah so[:o you're not down-]

125: A: [y'know we're talking] gigabits.

126: K: so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]

127: A: [yeah I] mean and that's the thing like

128: → yeah [you browse browse websites] and look at email.

129: → K: [download your emails. (.) ye::ah.]

130: (0.5)

The sequence above is taken from Example 3 in the women's one sentence construction chapter. This example also showed one sentence construction delivered in overlap. A's '*you browse and browse websites.*' in line 128 is overlapped by K's '*[download your emails]*' which is an affiliating utterance to complete A's '*that's the thing like*' in line 127. K's affiliating utterance '*download your emails*' makes A's '*that's the thing like*' a syntactically and semantically complete utterance.

In the men's one sentence construction example, J's '*random shit*' in line 25 overlaps the original speaker Al's '*random shot*' in line 24. Both the women's and the men's examples of one sentence construction share one thing, namely that the next speaker's affiliating utterance is delivered in overlap. In the women's conversation, the female next speaker's '*[download your emails]*' is in overlapp with the original speaker's '*[you browse and browse websites.]*', and in the men's conversation, the male next speaker's '*random shit*' is in overlap with the original speaker's '*random shot*' -. The only

difference between the women's and men's examples above is that in the women's example, the original speaker did not show an acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's in progress utterance. By contrast, in the men's example, the original male speaker accepted the next male speaker's affiliating utterance by repeating and expanding on it (Lerner, 2004).

In short, Example 2 showed that men's one sentence construction can be delivered in overlap. This overlapping talk delivered by the second speaker was used as a means of displaying his enthusiastic participation in talk (Tannen, 1993). The second speaker's affiliating utterance was accepted by the original speaker. This example clearly fitted Lerner's model of collaborative one sentence construction (Lerner, 2004) – the next speaker delivered an affiliating utterance and then the original speaker either accepted or rejected the next speaker's affiliating utterance. The second speaker's affiliating utterance included a swear word '*shit*'. Using swear words in men's conversations also supports the notion of collaborativeness in conversation since swear words are often employed by men to share their attitudes and values rather than to verbally attack others (Bayard and Krishnayya, 2001).

7.4.3: A case of men's one sentence construction with an overlap

In Example 3, L is telling his story about DJing (working as a 'disc jockey') at someone's wedding. This is a multiple party conversation. Four male speakers are involved in this conversation: A, L, K and J. L works as a DJ as his casual work. His story is about the songs he is going to play and the fact that he is planning to make CDs of the songs he plays at the wedding. The example of one sentence construction in this sequence shows the second speaker's affiliating utterance partly overlapping the original speaker's in-progress utterance.

Example 3

230: (0.3)

231: A: [hahahaha]

232: L: [hahahaha]

233: Ku: [hahahaha]

234: A: it's got THREE::: GU::::YS into die

235: Ku: no they all they all provide their own ((unable to hear)) for those guys.

236: L: no with they said they said bring uh: bring along a CD?

237: (0.4)

238: Ku: ↑alright of the[ir their favourite tu:nes.]

239: L: [o of (.)] no of songs that they wanna he:ar

240: and it's like normally (.) if (.) if I tell like a bride and groom or something to

241: bring along a CD. (0.7) if you're worried? whether they'll actually bring it

242: along?=

243: J: =yeah

244: L: and whether it'll actually work?

245: J: ye::ah

246: Al: and whether or not [they just] ((unable to hear)) you to find it anyway.

247: L: [nono]

248: →L: yeah but if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]

249: → Ku: [o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]

250: L: [>it's<] it's gonna

251: work they'll have four copies of it (.) just in case >the first one<

252: doesn't [work until] I get.

253: Al: [ye:ahhh]

254: Al: every date stamp[ed]

255: L: [eve]ry date is in it's one stage

256: J: and it'll be like [it'll be like (.)]

257: L: [how many tapes rapped up]

258: J: you know (0.3) pro professionally printed.

259: L: yeah.

In line 248, L delivers '*yeah but if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]*'. It contains an extended '*o::h*' at the end which provides an opportunity for the next speaker to complete his L's utterance. At the same time, L goes on to expand his utterance after his extended '*o:[:h]*'. At this point, any participant in this conversation can take this opportunity to speak but Ku in line 249 delivers his '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*'.

L's utterance in line 248 '…*o:[:h]*' is overlapped by Ku's '*[o:]h*' in line 249. This overlap has two possible functions. Firstly, this overlapping talk may function as an interruption. L in line 248 could have delivered further talk after his '*o:[:h]*' but instead of holding his turn, he drops his turn and lets the next speaker Ku in line 249 delivers his '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*'. This is consistent with Sacks' (1992, v2) rule defining what constitutes an interruption. As noted earlier, he states that when two people are talking at the same time in a single conversation and one of them stops, then an interruption has occurred.

Secondly, Ku's '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' in line 249 also could be treated in the way Tannen views some interruptions (1993) in that the next speaker is showing his enthusiastic desire to participate in the talk. L in line 248 perhaps sees Ku's overlap '*[o:]h*' in line 249 in this way. Although Sacks (1992, v2) gave the definition of an interruption above, he also points out that when the original speaker sees that he/she is being interrupted by the next speaker, the original speaker often displays his/her anger in

utterances such as '*you always interrupt me*'. After Ku's overlap '*[o:]h*' in line 249, L in line 250 shows no anger towards Ku. L in line 250 delivers a repetition of Ku's utterance '*[>it's<] it's gonna*' which accepts Ku's contribution and suggests that Ku's overlapping '*[o:]h*' in line 249 is being treated as Tannen's type of 'interruption', in that the next speaker is showing his enthusiastic desire to participate and to talk.

The overlap feature in this example differs slightly from Lerner's model of one sentence construction with an overlap. Lerner (2004) explains that when the next speaker's affiliating utterance is in overlap with the original speaker's in progress utterance, the original speaker also continues his/her talk beyond the opportunity space. In Example 3, the original speaker drops his turn when the next speaker's affiliating utterance begins and the original speaker allows the next speaker to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance. However, the original speaker's next turn in line 250 starts before the speaker Ku – who is delivering the affiliating utterance and trying to complete the original speaker's in progress utterance – can finish his affiliating utterance. Therefore the original speaker's next turn in line 250 is also in overlap with the speaker Ku's affiliating utterance, perhaps for similar reasons of enthusiastic participation.
Ku's utterance in line 249 contains '*[o:]h*' which serves a different function from L's extended '*o:[:h]*'. Ku's '*[o:]h*' is used as a recognition display token (Schiffrin, 1985:76). Schiffrin explains that progressive stages of information recognition can be marked by '*oh*' as below.

Freda: Sometimes he got a notice for staying out past curfew.

Recently. In August, that was.

Freda: A certain time that children have to be in.

Val: Oh your children. Oh I see. Oh it's personal. Oh I-. I. thought there

might be police or something

In this case, Freda triggers Val's recognition of the meaning of '*curfew*' with her '*a certain time that children have to be in*'. Each component of Val's recognition is marked with '*oh*'. Similarly, in the conversation being examined here, Ku's recognition token '*[o:]h*' in line 249 suggests that he has been actively listening to L's story and engaging himself in the conversation. In order to deliver an appropriate completion of the previous speaker's utterance, the next speaker needs to pay careful attention to the previous speaker's syntactic and semantic production (Coates, 1996 and Sacks 1992).

This example of one sentence construction also contains an acceptance by the prior speaker of the next speaker's completing utterance similar to that seen in Example 2. L in line 250 repeats '*it's gonna wo::rk.*' from Ku's '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*'. L's repetition indicates that he is not only accepting Ku's attempt to complete his utterance '*yeah but if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]*' but also that he himself is completing and continuing his own previous utterance using the words provided in Ku's affiliating utterance '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*'.

In short, Example 3 showed a case of one sentence construction in which the next speaker Ku's affiliating utterance overlapped the original speaker's in-progress utterance. The overlap appeared to display the next speaker's enthusiastic participation in the talk. The original speaker accepted the next speaker's attempt to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance by delivering a repetition. In the end, one discourse unit was collaboratively formed by both L and Ku. In order to form one discourse unit collaboratively, the next speaker Ku paid extremely close attention to what the original speaker L said (Coates, 1996).

7.4.4: A case of men's one sentence construction with a rising intonation and with an acknowledgment token

Example 4

Example 4 is the same sequence as was shown in Example 2 and it includes another case of one sentence construction seen in lines 33 and 34. This case of one sentence construction has a rising intonation by the next speaker which makes the completed utterance a question form.

1. Al: I was in a band with a guy who is u:m [the assistant] manager?
2. Ku: [in a band?]
3. Al: oh yeah [he is ((unable to hear))
4. Ku: [oh just pull up a seat]
5. Al: no shut up.
6. Aa: hh
7. Al: he was uh:: actually the the (.) the (.) stuff not about the band's much >more
8. interesting< but he was um the assistant manager, of a bar in Glasgow?=
9. Aa: =Ye::ah.
10. Al: that uh:: near George Square (.) and after practice on Thursday
11. afternoons cause we didn't have anything on and he used to just do the
12. bar before it opened up (.) he would unlock and said just help yourself to free
13. drinks.
14. Aa: yah [ha::::]
15. Al: [and he] would make us all cocktails like squash
16. [rocks 'n' stuff] like that?
17. Ku: [uh::::]
18. Aa: [oh yu::m]
19. Ku: [ah nice]
20. Al: so squash rocks was ah (.) midori there was a dot just

21. <brown (.) green (.) red>

22. (1:0)

23. Aa: ni:ce=

24. Al: =and he would used to just make up (.) just like [random shot]

25. J: [random shit.]

26. Al: random stuff like that.

27. Ku: yep.

28. Al: he he he wasn't one of those guys going (.) gin 'n' tonic do they mix?

29. Ku: hh

30. Al: then he was just like oh: d'you know what else we c'n do that's cos just like

31. that's what Michael's like cause basically matt went through this period

32. ((unable to hear)) it's like uh:

33. → Ku: drinking?

34. → Al d drinking but um:: we'll get a round of beers now. because you're (.)

35. none of you are man enough to keep up with me. we'll drink now. hurry up

36. >hurry< an you're like you you've drank tha that much in like two minutes

37. an' that's not enough DRINK (.) HURRY UP(.) but je just give me a

38. CHANCE I mean (.) not even the fact it's BOO::ZE it's just like it's just

39. LIQUID.

40. Aa: he sounds like my type of drinker. .hh hehehe

41. Al: he just won't stop and then he's like-

42. J: is this harry?

43. Al: [yeah.

44. Ku: [hmm

Al in line 32 finishes '*…it's like uh:*' which is an in-progress utterance. Al's '*uh:*' is extended which indicates that Al is possibly engaged in a word search in order to

continue his in-progress utterance. Al's extended '*uh:*' also provides an opportunity for a next speaker to complete his in-progress utterance. Ku in line 33 takes this opportunity to deliver '*drinking?*' which makes Al's in-progress utterance a complete discourse unit '*it's like drinking?*'.

Ku's '*drinking?*' contains a rising intonation at the end of the speaker's utterance and therefore it transforms the in-progress utterance into a question. A similar example is given by Sacks (1992, v1:652) below:

A: They make miserable coffee.

B: -across the street?

(Sacks 1992, v1:652)

Sacks writes in regard to his example that on the top of A's sentence '*they make miserable coffee*', B delivers '*across the street?*' which contains a prepositional phrase with rising intonation that makes the sentence into a question form: *'they make miserable coffee across the street?*'. In this example, as in example 4 above, although two speakers collaboratively produce one sentence, the second component of the sentence develops is transformed into a question. In Sacks' example above, B expands A's sentence using a prepositional phrase, and at the same time forms a question which requires a response.

In a similar way, Ku's completion attempt '*drinking?*' in line 33 provides both a candidate completion and a requirement for response:

30. Al: then he was just like oh: d'you know what else we c'n do that's cos just like

31. that's what Michael's like cause basically matt went through this period

32. ((unable to hear)) it's like uh:

33.→ K: drinking?

34. Al d drinking but um:: we'll get a round of beers now. because you're (.)

Ku's affiliating utterance *'drinking?'* completes and transforms Al's in-progress utterance in line 32 *'it's like uh:'* into the form of a question, '*it's like drinking?*'. Al's '*d drinking*' in line 34 partially accepts Ku's attempt '*drinking?*' in line 33. However, a '*but*' occurs just after Al's repetition of '*d-drinking*'. Al's '*but*' shows that although Al accepts Ku's attempt at the sentence completion, it is a qualified acceptance. Al is trying to progress his story by using this '*but*' (Schffrin, 1989). After Al's '*but*' in line 34, he quotes Matt in lines 34 to 36 and provides the details of the period Matt went through, in which he drank competitively in a way that had an unwelcome impact on his friends. Ku's affiliating utterance '*drinking?*' in line 33 is delivered in the middle of Al's drinking story just after Al's '*it's like uh:*' in line 32. Al's extended '*uh:*' indicates that Al's talk is in progress but his attempt to produce his next segments is overtaken by the next speaker Ku who delivers the affiliating utterance '*drinking?*'.

Ku's '*drinking?*' performs two actions (Lerner, 2004). First, Ku continues and completes Al's turn by delivering '*drinking?*'. The second action is a request for a responding action by the original speaker – Ku requests Al to check Ku's understanding of Al's in-progress story. Since Ku's '*drinking?*' is delivered with a rising intonation, Ku is requiring the original speaker Al to answer his question.

In the men's conversation example, Ku's '*drinking?*' is followed by the original speaker Al's repetition '*d drinking*' an indication of acceptance of the next speaker's attempt, although that acceptance is slightly qualified by the *'but'* that follows. Both women's and men's examples share one thing. In the women's example, the female next speaker

delivers '*with them still?*' with a rising intonation and in the men's example, the male next speaker delivers '*drinking?*' with a rising intonation. In both cases, the next speaker's affiliating utterance transforms s the previous speaker's utterance into a question form by completing it with a rising intonation.

In short, this sample of men's one sentence construction showed that a one sentence construction can take a question form. The second speaker delivered the affiliating utterance with a rising intonation which transformed the collaboratively completed utterance into a question. Then the second speaker's question was answered by the original speaker. Although the completion transformed the sentence into a question, the original speaker and the second speaker collaboratively formed one discourse unit. This form – one sentence construction as a question form – was also seen in women's conversation. Thus, in this study, both men and women have showed a similar form of a collaborative one sentence construction.

7.4.5: A case of men's one sentence construction with a rising intonation

Example 5 is a men-only conversation including A and J. This part of the conversation was recorded in the living room of J's parents' house. Both A and J are looking at J's DVD collection while they are talking. This case of joint one sentence construction has several features to be discussed. First, as in the previous example, this example also includes a case of men's one sentence construction with a rising intonation by the recipient who tries to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance. However, in this example, the next speaker's attempt to complete the original in-progress utterance is repaired by the original speaker. Secondly, this case includes an overlap feature. The recipient's affiliating utterance overlaps the original speaker's in-progress utterance.

Example 5

65: A: the ↑funny thing I find like they ask you on the on the when you enter the web

66: site. are you over a certain age and you [just put on there

67: J: [yeah you just put on whatever you want.

68: A: yeah it's like-

69: J: well, they've got to for legal reasons I suppose.

70: A: I know but you know that doesn't stop a ten year old to-

71: J: I know but you know.

72: (3.0)

73: A: <u>revenge.</u>

74: (1.0)

75: A: what's shinobi again?

76: (1.0)

77:→ J: shinobi?(0.4) .hh a::h that's a::y [japanese] japanese movie,

78:→ A: [anime?]

79: J: no it's not anime (1.0) it's like action. (1.0) ((unable to hear)) further down the back

80: (3.0) so this is a two thousand six (.) hello dog? ((J's pet came here))

81: A: oh it's the <u>year.</u>

82: J: yeah (do them in) years. (2.0) it's chronological, an that's <u>al</u>phabetical in years.

83: A: for some reason- when you see chronology I think it was like

84: alphabet?

85: (1.5)

86: J: yeah and yeah [(I call it)] I said that it was alphabetic organised but chronologically first

87: A: [I feel silly for]

From line 65 to line 71, the two participants are talking restrictions on access to websites for young people. In line 73, A starts to talk about a movie, '*revenge*', which is the title of one of the DVDs they are looking at. Then A again asks a question of J in line 75: '*what's shinobi again?*'. After a one second pause in line 76, J starts to answer A's question: '*shinobi?(0.4) .hh a::h that's a::y [japanese] japanese movie,*' in line 77.

A's completion attempt '*anime?*' in line 78 contains a rising intonation. A's question in line 75 '*what's shinobi again?*' shows that A is not sure what kind of movie '*shinobi*' is. J has not yet answered A's question before A's '*anime?*' in line 78 is delivered. A delivers '*anime?*' with a rising intonation - at this point A is possibly guessing that '*shinobi*' is an animated movie. A's rising intonation '*anime?*' transforms the complete utterance into a question form, '*that's ah anime?*', as explained by Sacks (1992, v1:652) and discussed earlier in this chapter.

J's utterance in line 77 contains an '*a::h*' and a lengthened *'a::y'* as space fillers, and a self repetition '*japanese japanese*', possibly arising from the overlap. These features – space fillers and self repetition - suggest that J is trying to hold his turn, indicating to the recipient that the turn is not finishing yet (Fung, 2007 and Norrick, 1987). However A, in line 78 delivers his '*anime?*' just after J's '*a::y*' in line 77. It is treated as a possible opportunity space by A in line 78. As explained above, J in line 77 by delaying his talk, has provided an opportunity for the recipient – in this case, for A in line 78 – to complete J's utterance, although J is showing his continuation of delivering the rest of his utterance by producing a space filler and self repetition. A sees J's '*a::y*' as an opportunity space and delivers his affiliating utterance to make J's utterance complete.

A's affiliating utterance '*anime?*' in line 78 overlaps J's first '*japanese*' in line 77. Despite this, J holds his turn, which suggests that J is not treating A's overlap as an

interruption. If J had treated A's overlap as an interruption, then he would have dropped his turn and may have displayed anger towards A (Sacks, 1992, v2).

The overlap arises because the previous speaker J continues talking beyond the opportunity space provided for the next speaker to complete the previous speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004). The previous speaker J's '*a::h*' and '*a::y*'in line 77 are places where the next speaker can take his turn and, in fact, the next speaker A delivers '*anime?*' just after J's '*a::y*'. The previous speaker J, however, continues his talk while A's '*anime?*' is delivered.

This example also contains a rejection of the next speaker's affiliating utterance '*anime?*' in line 78 by the original speaker, J '*no it's not anime (1.0) it's like action.*' in line 79. A's completion attempt '*anime?*' is not accepted by J, the question it forms is answered in the negative, and J corrects A's affiliating utterance. Lerner (2004) includes a case of one sentence construction where the next speaker's attempt is rejected, as shown in the conversation below.

(41) [GTS]

Ken: she'll say//wouldja-

Louise: wanna glass milk?//hehhh

Ken: No. wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?

Louise: heh//ha ha

Ken: wouldja like something crekles

Louise: ehh ha ha ha ha

Ken: wouldja like a peanut butter an' jelly sándwich?

* // is the place the overlap occurs.

(Lerner, 2004:248)

Lerner explains that Louise's attempt '*wanna glass milk?//hehhh*' is rejected by the next speaker Ken '*No. wouldju like a little bitta he'ing?*'. This case, however, contains laugh tokens which shows the rejection by Ken has not been produced as asserted. Therefore it is still considered as a collaborative feature even though the recipient attempts to complete the previous speaker's attempt.

In contrast to Lerner's example, the men's conversation in this study in Example 6, does not contain laughter tokens but even so A's affiliating utterance '*anime?*' syntactically makes J's utterance complete.

75: A: what's shinobi again?

76: (1.0)

77:→ J: shinobi?(0.4) .hh a::h that's a::y [japanese] japanese movie,

78:→ A: [anime?]

79: J: no it's not anime (1.0) it's like action. (1.0) ((unable to hear)) further down the back

80: (3.0) so this is a two thousand six (.) hello dog? ((J's pet came here))

81: A: oh it's the <u>year.</u>

82: J: yeah (do them in) years. (2.0) it's chronological, an that's <u>al</u>phabetical in years.

83: A: for some reason- when you see chronology I think it was like

84: alphabet?

A's question in line 75 '*what's shinobi again?*' indicates that A does not know about the movie '*shinobi*' but in line 78, A attempts to guess what type of movie it is by producing '*anime?*' with a rising intonation in line 78. Although A's attempt was rejected, A's attempt nevertheless displays his collaboration in talk. A's attempt '*anime?*' makes J's

'*a::h that's a::y*' syntactically complete as '*a::h that's a::y anime?*' which has a question format. It also semantically makes J's '*a::h that's a::y*' complete, broadly speaking – if '*anime*' is seen as a category of movie - although A's '*anime?*' was not exactly what J was going to deliver. Thus, in this example, the next speaker A is trying to show his collaboration with the original speaker J but the next speaker A's attempt is not accepted as successful by the original speaker. A as the next speaker at least shows an attempt at collaboration to make the original speaker's utterance syntactically complete.

In addition, A's attempt '*anime?*' with a rising intonation makes the completed form of J's utterance into a question, and also contains two actions. A's '*anime?*' is addressed to the next speaker K and requesting K an answer (Lerner, 2004). At the same time, A's '*anime?*' constitutes a request for J to check A's understanding of the movie '*shinobi*' as '*anime*'. In other words, the previous speaker, J requires an action by the next speaker A, that is, to answer A's question '*anime?*'.

In this example, the single discourse unit which is collaboratively constructed by both the previous speaker, J and the next speaker, A, is formed as a question '*that's ah anime?*'. By delivering the affiliating utterance with a rising intonation – '*anime?*'- he is supporting the previous speaker J, by finishing his utterance as well as seeking an answer to the previous speaker. J's rejection in line 79, '*no it's not anime (1.0) it's like action.*' not only serves as a rejection for A's attempt but also serves as the answer for A's question '*anime?*'.

7.4.6: A case of men's one sentence construction with a case of interruption

This part of the conversation includes an example of interruption by an older male speaker and a case of men's one sentence construction by two young male speakers. G, J's grandfather, has just arrived from the country at J's parent's house and has joined J and A's conversation. G is a retired farmer. He still owns his farm but the farm has suffered from a long period of drought. Since G has joined the conversation, the topic has changed to drought. This sample shows that the next speaker's affiliating utterance appears to be used as a display of the speaker's enthusiastic participation in the talk.

Example 6

204: A: is it very dry out there at the moment?

205: G: <dry, ˚dry˚.>

206: A: yeah

207: J: it's drier that dry. It's gone past dry.

208: G: yeah

209: A: hhhhehehe.

210: J: hehehe it was dry five years ago.

211: G: yeah it w<u>a</u>s t<u>o</u>o. hh. yeah. (that ws when it ws dry.)

212: J: now it's even drier than th<u>a</u>t.

213: G: what we need now is oh a bit of a sharp shower (0.5) to run a bit of water in (0.8)

214: stop to see um-

215: → J: ˚to˚ stop the du:st.

216 G: ˚mn˚. (0.4) ˚stop˚ water.

217: L: ˚oh yeah. ˚

218: A: c'd uproot everything and take it down to um Tassie. They've got plenty of rain

219: down there. =>I got a mate< who's just come back from there and um he showed me

220: all his pictures and everyone was saying that it was a <u>drought</u> (0.5) and it was (0.5)

221: J: green [hehhhehehe (0.5) it's like what's wrong with you people.]

222: A: [beautiful and green ((unable to hear)) droughts] go on (1.0)

223: mate if that was drought I'd be happy. hhhahha

224: G: the- the real drought only comes as far as (2.0) oh (1.0) this side of sovereign dindy?

225: J: ah yeah

226: G: from there on it starts to get greenish.

227: J: ah.

228: G: yeah.

One sentence construction is seen in line 215. The original speaker G is explaining in lines 213 and 214 what his area needs at the moment by delivering '*what we need now is a bit of a sharp shower (0.5) to run a bit of water in*'. G's continuation of his in-progress turn '*stop to see um*' in line 214 is cut off by the next speaker J in line 215 by his delivery of '*°to° stop the du:st.*' which is an affiliating utterance intended to complete G's previous utterance. J's attempt '*°to° stop the du:st.*' makes G's in-progress utterance '*stop to see um*' a complete discourse unit '*to stop (to see) the dust*'. J's affiliating utterance '*°to° stop the du:st.*' is accepted by G in line 216. G's '*mn.*' in line 216 contains a falling intonation which suggests that G is acknowledging J's attempt at completing G's previous utterance in line 214 (Gardner, 2001).

G's utterance in line 213 and 214 contains a '*(0.8)*' pause which could be treated as an opportunity space by a next speaker to deliver an affiliating utterance for the completion of G's in-progress utterance. However, no other speaker initiates talk at this point, perhaps because of the possible syntactic completeness of G's utterance: *'to run a bit of water in'*.

G's utterance in line 214 contains '*...um-*' which suggests that G's talk is providing an opportunity for the next speaker to complete his utterance. The next speaker J takes this

action at this point and delivers '*°to° stop the du:st.*'. G's '*stop to see um*' in line 214 is cut off by J's '*°to° stop the du:st.*' which could be treated as a case of an interruption. An interruption is often described as a violation of speakers (West and Zimmerman, 1983) but J's interruption does not appear to be such a violation. J's utterance '*°to° stop the du:st.*' makes G's in-progress utterance a complete discourse unit. It constitutes a collaborative feature rather than a violation of the previous speaker. Also, when an interruption or violation occurs, it is often followed by an utterance displaying the original speaker's anger, such as '*you always interrupt me*', '*you never let me finish*', '*shut up I am still talking*' and so forth (Sacks, 1992, v2). The speaker who interrupts the original speaker then often delivers an apology for his/her interruption.

In this example, J's turn completion '*°to° stop the du:st.*' is followed by the original speaker's acknowledgement token '*°mn°*', and there is no utterance which indicates that the next speaker has noticed any violation by the original speaker in this example. Therefore J's potentially interrupting talk does not appear to be a case of a violation of the original speaker. Rather, it displays J's enthusiastic participation in the talk (Tannen, 1993). J's '*°to° stop the du:st.*' is accepted by G in line 216 as an appropriate completion of his talk, which suggests that J has been actively listening to G's story as a listener. In order to deliver an affiliating utterance which is accepted by the original speaker, the second speaker needs to pay extremely close attention to what the original speaker says, at all linguistic levels: the meaning of what the other speaker is saying, the grammatical of structure of what is being said, and the intonation pattern and rhythmic quality (Coates, 1996).

In short, the next speaker J's affiliating utterance was delivered as a display of his enthusiastic participation in the talk. The acceptance of J's affiliating utterance by the original speaker G suggests that J paid extremely close attention to what the original

speaker said (Coates, 1996). Therefore this example was treated as a collaborative one sentence construction.

7.4.7: A case of men's one sentence construction followed by laughter

Example 7

Example 7 comes from the same conversation as Example 6. In this example, a case of collaborative completion is seen in line 221. The original speaker A continues his turn to complete his utterance. However, the original speaker's completion is slightly delayed. The next speaker J delivers an affiliating utterance just before the original speaker's completion is delivered. This example also contains humour by J and A, which supports the notion of collaborative talk.

204: A: is it very dry out there at the moment?

205: G: <dry, ˚dry˚.>

206: A: yeah

207: J: it's drier that dry. It's gone past dry.

208: G: yeah

209: A: hhhhehehe.

210: J: hehehe it was dry five years ago.

211: G: yeah it was too. hh. yeah. (that ws when it ws dry.)

212: J: now it's even drier than that.

213: G: what we need now is oh a bit of a sharp shower (0.5) to run a bit of water in (0.8)

214: stop to see um-

215: J: ˚to˚ stop the du:st.

216 G: ˚mn˚. (0.4) ˚stop˚ water.

217: J: ˚oh yeah. ˚

218: A: c'd uproot everything and take it down to um Tassie. They've got plenty of rain

219: down there. =>I got a mate< who's just come back from there and um he showed me

220: all his pictures and everyone was saying that it was a drought (0.5) and it was (0.5)

221: → J: green [hehhhehehe (0.5) it's like what's wrong with you people.]

222: A: [beautiful and green ((unable to hear)) droughts] go on (1.0)

223: mate if that was drought I'd be happy. hhhahha

224: G: the- the real drought only comes as far as (2.0) oh (1.0) this side of sovereign dindy?

225: J: ah yeah

226: G: from there on it starts to get greenish.

227: J: ah.

228: G: yeah.

A's utterance in line 213 '*...and it was (0.5)*' is part of an in-progress utterance which offers an opportunity space for completion by the next speaker. The next speaker J delivers '*green*' in line 221 which is an affiliating utterance that completes A's '*and it was (0.5)*'. J's completion attempt '*green*' is accepted by the previous speaker A in his next turn in line 222 by a repetition in his '*beautiful and green*'. A single sentence is collaboratively formed by both male speakers.

A's utterance '*and it was (0.5)*' in line 220 contains a half-second pause. This pause signals an opportunity for the next speaker to complete '*and it was*' by providing an opportunity space. The next speaker J in line 221 takes the next turn after A's pause and tries to complete A's in-progress utterance '*and it was*'.

A's utterance in line 222 '*beautiful and green ( ) droughts*' not only shows his acceptance of J's attempt '*green*' in line 221 but also shows A completing his previous in-progress utterance '*and it was (0.5)*' by delivering '*beautiful and green*'.

This example of one sentence construction was also similar to one observed in women's conversation as discussed in Example 5 of the previous chapter, an extract from which is shown below:

94:		he goes oh we don't cut the water off (.) but we just charge you (.) a::h.
95: →	K:	an [exceed amount.]
96: →	A:	[late fees.] (0.4) and I was like
97:	(0.5)	
98:	A:	[yeah.
99:	K:	[yeah.

For case of contrast with the women's example above, the men's example is shown below:

218:	A:	c'd uproot everything and take it down to um Tassie. They've got plenty of rain
219:		down there. =>I got a mate< who's just come back from there and um he showed me
220:		all his pictures and everyone was saying that it was a <u>drought</u> (0.5) and it was (0.5)
221: →	J:	<u>green</u> [hehhhehehe (0.5) it's like what's wrong with you people.]
222:	A:	[beautiful and green ((unable to hear)) droughts] go on (1.0)
223:		mate if that was drought I'd be happy. hhhahha
224:	G:	the- the real drought only comes as far as (2.0) oh (1.0) this side of sovereign dindy?
225:	J:	ah yeah

The women's and men's examples above both show that the original speakers are trying to complete their utterance but the original speakers' completions are slightly delayed. The next speakers' affiliating utterances are delivered before the original speakers deliver their completion. The place where the overlap begins is similar in both examples

in that both the female and male original speakers deliver their delayed completion just after the other speaker's first word – '*an*' in line 95 in the women conversation and '*green*' in line 221 in the men's conversation - is delivered by the next speakers. The slight delay in completion by the original speakers is probably caused by the incoming of the second speakers.

Both women and men participants in examples above show similar ways of delivering collaborative one sentence constructions. The next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance after the previous speaker's opportunity space signals – in the women's example, a minimal pause '*(.)*' and an extended '*a::h*' are treated as signals while in the men's example, a relatively long pause '*(0.5)*' is treated as a signal of the space for the next speaker's affiliating utterance.

This instance contains humour and laughter within the one sentence construction which emphasises the highly collaborative nature of this talk (Holmes, 2006b and Davies, 2003). Both male speakers are delivering a collaborative one sentence construction and at the same time they joke and laugh. J's utterance in line 221 is an affiliating utterance which includes both laughter and a joke '*hehhhehehe (0.5) it's like what's wrong with you people.*'. J is joking about the Tasmanians' perception of drought – by comparison with G's farm Tasmania is '*beautiful and green*'. A in line 222 and 223 continues J's theme in line 221 by expanding J's utterance with '*mate if that was drought I'd be happy. hhhahha*', ending his turn with laughter. A and J's joint humour and laughter emphasise the collaborative nature of their talk.

Hay's research (1995:75) listed types of humour used in everyday conversations. According to her study, both J's and A's humour fits into the type of narrative humour. It is a humour that takes the form of a story. For instance, it often begins such as 'there was an English man and Irish man and a Scots man…'. As it is explained above, both J

and A are collaboratively developing a story about Tasmania; both J and A do not think Tasmania was in drought though A's friend told A that it was in drought. Both J and A are humorously making the story of Tasmania's plight initiated by A in line 218.

In short, this example showed a collaborative one sentence construction by male participants. The original speaker's talk provided the next speaker with an opportunity to complete his in-progress utterance. Then the next speaker delivered the affiliating utterance, which was accepted by the original speaker. This sample also fitted Lerner's model of collaborative one sentence construction (Lerner, 2004) in that the next speaker delivered an affiliating utterance and then the original speaker either accepted or rejected the next speaker's affiliating utterance – in this case, accepting it. This sample also showed humour by J and A. Both speakers' laughter was seen. The presence of humour and laughter also supports the notion of collaborativeness in the conversation (Holmes, 2006b and Davies, 2003).

7.5: Summary of this chapter

This chapter explored one sentence constructions by male speakers. One sentence constructions were considered to be a feature of women's collaborative talk (Coates, 1996). Coates (1996 and 2005) also claimed that men tended to avoid showing collaborativeness in their talk – particularly in a single sex group conversation – to avoid being seen as displaying their homosexuality. However, this chapter showed that male participants in this chapter jointly formed single discourse units, just as female participants did in the last chapter.

In contrast to Coates claims (1996 and 2005), this chapter was able to show examples of one sentence construction delivered by male speakers in the men's conversation

considered in this study. It was found that the one sentence constructions by male speakers have some similar features to the one sentence constructions which were delivered by female participants in the women's conversation considered in the previous chapter. Lerner (1991) explains that one sentence construction is a collaborative feature in talk. The finding in this chapter was that male participants showed several types of collaborative one sentence constructions in which two speakers jointly constructed a single semantically and syntactically complete utterance to achieve collaborative goals.

Two examples in this chapter showed men's one sentence constructions which formed questions. In example 2, the next speaker delivered his affiliating utterance with a rising intonation '*drinking?*' which completed the previous speaker's in-progress utterance as a question form. In this example, the next speaker's affiliating utterance was conditionally accepted by the original speaker. Example 3 also showed one sentence construction as a question form, but it was followed by a rejection by the original speaker. The next speaker delivered '*anime?*' as an affiliating utterance for the previous speaker but the previous speaker delivered '*no it's not that it's not anime it's like an action*' which is a rejection of the next speaker's attempt. The original speaker also repaired the next speaker's '*anime*' with '*it's like an action*'. Similar cases of one sentence construction as a question form were also seen in women's conversations in the previous chapter.

This chapter also showed cases of one sentence construction by two male speakers which were formed with overlap features. Example 3 showed an original speaker's in-progress utterance being overlapped by the next speaker's affiliating utterance. Lerner (2004) explained that this occurs when the original speaker continues talking beyond the opportunity space for the next speaker to deliver his affiliating utterance. Example 6 also showed overlap features. However, in Example 6, the original speaker did not continue his talk beyond the opportunity space for the next speaker to deliver his affiliating

utterance. Instead, the original speaker dropped his turn and let the next speaker to take his turn.

Another instance of one sentence construction by male speakers containing an overlap feature occurred in example 4. In this example the original speaker again continued talking beyond the opportunity space – in this case '*a::h*' provided the opportunity space for the next speaker to deliver the completion. However, the next speaker simulataneously delivered his affiliating utterance, giving rise to overlapping talk. This phenomenon was also observed in the women's one sentence construction in this study which was discussed in the previous chapter.

This chapter also showed that the signalling by the original male speaker of an opportunity space for the next speaker's affiliating utterances was similar to that seen in women's one sentence constructions. For instance, the male original speakers' extended sounds '*uh:*' in Example 1, '*o:h*' in Example 3 and '*a::h*' in Example 4 in-progress utterance were treated as the space for the next speaker's affiliating utterances. This was also seen in the women's one sentence constructions in the previous chapter. In another case, relatively long half-second pause by the previous male speaker in Example 2 was treated as the space for the next male speaker's affiliating utterances. This was also seen in the women's conversation in this study, although female participants used a minimal pause '*(.)*' instead of a relatively long pause.

This chapter examined in detail several examples of one sentence constructions by participants in men's conversation. It showed that male participants delivered one sentence constructions in a similar manner to female participants' one sentence construction discussed in the previous chapter. With a small number of examples, it cannot be definitively concluded that one sentence construction is also a feature of men's

collaborative features in talk. However, this chapter at least showed that male participants in this study used collaborative one sentence constructions which were similar to those used by female participants in the women's conversation examined in this study. These qualitative results can provide support for a future statistical study which may indeed demonstrate that one sentence construction is a men's as well as a women's collaborative conversational feature.

Chapter 8: One sentence expansion by women

8.1: Introduction

The two previous chapters examined one sentence constructions in conversations which were considered as collaborative features in conversations. It was found that in conversations one speaker would provide an as yet syntactically incomplete sentence and the next speaker would then make it into a syntactically complete sentence. Coates's studies (1996 and 2003) concluded that one sentence construction is a characteristic of female conversational styles while both men and women in this study showed several ways of jointly constructing one sentence. Coupled with the quantitative findings, this suggests that one sentence construction is possibly a collaborative feature for both men and women. For example, two possible features of one sentence construction are overlapping talk and minimal responses, as presented below.

66: K: s- I guess she's never rented before=I think her fam[ily's quite] well off.

67: A: [ye:ah.]

68: A: oh okay.

69: →K: =so they've probably neve:r (.) ha[d to: rent or- (.) or what]ever before.

70: →A: [had to pay for anything.(0.2)yeah.]

71: (1.0)

72: A: ph:::ew

The extract above is taken from Example 2 in the women's one sentence construction chapter. It shows that an affiliating utterance by the next speaker A overlaps the original speaker K's in-progress utterance. Also the next speaker A's affiliating utterance contained a minimal response token '*yeah*' in the end. In the example above, the original

speaker K was delivering an in-progress utterance which was, at the time of A's incoming, syntactically incomplete. The next speaker A then attempted to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance, in overlap with the original speaker. This is a common feature of collaborative one sentence constructions.

Another kind of one sentence construction by two or more than two speakers has already been introduced in earlier chapters. In this case, one speaker provides a syntactically complete sentence but it is developed by the next speaker. In this study this is referred to as one sentence expansion which needs to be treated differently from one sentence construction in this study. The example given in earlier chapters is re-presented below.

Louise: first of all they hit rain then they hit hail

Roger: n then they hit snow.

(Lerner, 1991: 448)

This example shows that the first speaker Louise provides a syntactically complete sentence which can stand alone and therefore does not require completion. However, the next speaker Roger, then expands the first speaker Louise's utterance.

This syntactic feature of one sentence expansion is different from that of one sentence construction. In one sentence construction, the original speaker delivers an in-progress utterance which is as yet a syntactically incomplete utterance. The next speaker then makes the original speaker's in-progress utterance a syntactically complete utterance. It is also important to note that the original speaker is the person who delivers an in-progress utterance for one sentence construction. As opposed to one sentence construction, a one sentence expansion occurs when the original speaker delivers a

syntactically complete utterance which is often semantically complete as well. The next speaker then expands the original speaker's utterance. The next speaker is, however, the person who makes the original speaker's utterance an in-progress utterance although the original speaker's utterance is delivered by the speaker as a syntactically complete utterance. There is an exception. If the original speaker expands his/her utterance – what in this study called a self expansion - then the original speaker is the person who makes his/her own utterance an in-progress utterance.

There are several forms of one sentence expansion. Firstly, Sacks (1992, v1) explains one sentence expansion is formed as a question. The original speaker's syntactically complete utterance can be expanded by the next speaker as a question form as can be seen the example below.

A: They make miserable coffee.

B: -across the street?

(Sacks, 1992, v1: 652)

Sacks (1992, v1) explains that, in the above example, on the top of A's sentence '*they make miserable coffee*', B delivers '*across the street?*' which contains a prepositional phrase at which point it makes the sentence into a question form. Thus one sentence was produced by two persons. In the production of one sentence by two or more persons, each speaker shows collaboration, constructing a single sentence together.

Another aspect of one sentence expansion is that a one sentence expansion can appear as a three part structure which often contains three lists of events or actions. Lerner (1991) explains that a sentence can be theoretically expanded with no limit with the use of

conjunctions such as '*and*' but in conversations, speakers may anticipate how many conjunctions will be used to expand a sentence. Jefferson (1990) finds that speakers in conversations often deliver a three part structure when they list things in their conversations. The recipient often sees the third component as a sign of turn completion. Lerner (1991: 448) adopts Jefferson's three part structure into the idea of one sentence expansion. He provides two examples as shown below, one of which has already been seen above.

Louise: first of all they hit rain then they hit hail

Roger: n then they hit snow

J: Well, it's a, it's a mideastern yihknow it's – they make it in Greece, Turke::y,

B: Armenia

(Lerner, 1991: 448)

In these two examples above, the last components – the third component: '*n then they hit snow*' by Roger and '*Armenia*' by B – are delivered by the next speakers and these components expand upon or complete the previous speakers' utterance. In the second example, the first speaker J provides two components: '*Greece*' and '*Turke::y*'. The next speaker B then delivers the third component '*Armenia*'.

There is another feature evident in one sentence expansion. The expanded components are sometimes reformulated in the process of developing the story. Lerner (1991: 415) explains that speakers can reformulate a compound turn constructional unit.

Kerry: you have two different types of decisions. That means that every time a teacher

wansa tell a kid to take a pee' e doesn't have ta ask the principal to open the bathroom

Dad: but if they send a kid home

(Lerner, 2001: 415)

The reformulation '*you have two different types of decisions.*' by Kerry provides a characterisation of what will be taken up in a subsequent turn unit. '*types of decisions*' and '*two different types*' are providing the form of the second turn component which is a contrast. Dad's utterance begins with '*but*' which expands Kerry's utterance. Two devices by Kerry, '*types of decisions*' and '*two different types*', provide the recipient, Dad, with the resources for issuing an utterance that can be recognised as a completion at just the place the contrastive component could occur.

Lerner (2004) also explains the actions of speakers when one sentence is expanded as a question form. When the next speaker delivers his/her utterance with a rising intonation – to make the previous speaker's utterance into a question – either to make the previous speaker's utterance complete or to expand that utterance, the action of the next speaker's utterance is addressed to the previous speaker who is required to take an action to answer the question. For instance

Roger: They make miserable coffee

Ken: hhhh hhh

Dan: Across the street?

Roger: Yeh

(Lerner, 2004: 160-161)

In the example above, Lerner (2004: 160-161) explains that Dan's '*Across the street*' serves as a check of the current speaker's – in this case, Dan's - understanding of the unexplicated pro-term '*They*' which is delivered by Roger in the first line. Thus Dan's '*Across the street*' expands not only Roger's '*They make miserable coffee*' into '*They make miserable coffee across the street*' but it is also the case that Dan is checking his understanding of Roger's '*They make miserable coffee*'.

However, when the next speaker delivers an utterance that does not make the previous speaker's utterance a question form, the action of the next speaker's utterance is addressed to him/herself.

Joe: I went- I went to, uh Escondido Friday

Edith: with Jo:hn

(Lerner, 2004: 160)

In regard to the example above Lerner explains that Edith delivers '*with Jo:hn*' which expands Joe's '*I went- I went to, uh Escondido Friday*' as '*I went- I went to, uh Escondido Friday with Jo:hn*'. Edith's '*with Jo:hn*' serves to expand Joe's utterance, which is addressed to Edith, and therefore the action of her utterance is addressed to Edith herself.

There is another distinctive feature which is often seen in one sentence expansions but not in one sentence constructions. When the original speaker's utterance is expanded, the next speaker often uses a device to expand the original speaker's utterance. It can be a preposition such as '*to*', '*for*' or '*with*' and so forth. It also can be a conjunction such as '*and*', '*but*' or '*because*' and so forth. Lerner (2004) refers to such a device as an *increment* initiator. The device encompasses a range of grammatical practices that can

be used to explicitly connect a next turn constructional component a possibly completed turn constructional unit. This appears to be a distinct feature for one sentence expansion.

8.2: One sentence expansion as a possible women's conversational feature

Coates (1993) found that one sentence construction was a feature of women's conversation, and the chapter of women's one sentence construction in this study also showed that women use one sentence constructions to collaborate in their conversations. It is possible that Coates' theory – that one sentence construction is a female conversational feature – can also be applied to one sentence expansion. Lerner (1991) explained that one sentence expansion is a collaborative feature in talk. Thus one sentence expansion can be a female collaborative feature in conversations. This chapter thus focuses on examining women's one sentence expansions and then the next chapter examines men's one sentence expansions.

8.3: Participants for this chapter

In this chapter, four women appear in the examples discussed. Brief information on each participant is given below.

- K: a women in early thirties, married, has two children, relative of A
- A: a woman in late twenties, married with Al (another participant)
- L: a woman in early thirties, married, K's elderly sister.
- E: L and K's brother's girl friend in late twenties.

8.4: Discussions

As Chapter 5 showed, twelve instances of one sentence expansions were observed among women in this study. Seven instances out of twelve instances are discussed in this chapter since these seven instances have rich sources for discussion. In total, a one sentence expansion with an increment initiator, a one sentence expansion delivered as a question form, a one sentence expansion with an overlap, a one sentence expansion which is reformulated, and a one sentence expansion which follows a three structure pattern are shown. All of these one sentence expansions are delivered by women participants, and are similar to Lerner's examples of one sentence expansions (1991 and 2004). However, an example of one sentence expansion which does not include an increment initiator is also observed in this chapter. To begin with, an example of one sentence expansion which includes an increment initiator and which follows a three part structure pattern (Lerner,1991 and Jefferson,1991) is discussed below.

8.4.1: A case of women's one sentence expansion follows a three part structure by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991)

Example 1 is a women-only conversation that was recorded in K's house. K and A have just finished their lunch and having tea with some sweets. Example 1 includes several features. Firstly, an increment initiator '*and*' is used to expand the original speaker's utterance. Secondly, a small length overlap occurs when the next speaker tried to expand the original speaker's utterance. Lastly, this instance follows the three part structure pattern outlined by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991).

Example 1

556: K: [have you got- have you got] times on how long she will stay maybe?

557: A: [((unable to hear)) she knows?]

558: well ↑I don't know I don't I think she might hang around for a bit because she:: (1.0)

559: she seems to get along quite well and we're treating her quite well because (0.5)

560: y'know she's good and we want her stay, .hhh and >compared to the other people I've

561: got< (.)she's brilliant=I couldn't believe it like(.)she was there on the weekend workin wth

562: this guy mike(1.0)the (English) guy (0.9) and um she actually asked kate(.)she's

563: going .hh is it mike's first day? n'kate's like no he's been here for at least a month =

564: cause she couldn't believe how incompetent this guy was and she picked it all up you

565: know like tha:t and-(0.3)yeahso she should've>(collect it)< huhuhahahah but she's going

566: to siberia (.) at the end of the year so the [(chess or)]

567: K: [yeah so]yeah she's she has got money.

568: A: ye:ah.

569: K: yeah right.

570: A: but she's studying here in canberra at the university so

571: K: what's she studying?

572: A: ↑ah: some sort of <multicultural> (.) studies, or something or [other?]

573: K: [o::h] gee:z,

574: A: she's a real go getter,

575: K: ah that's really interes[ting isn' it?]

576: A: [I couldn't be]lieve it though I was like(.)

577: A: this [(is)]

578: K: [just for someone like that]

579: K: to wa[lk in]your do:[or,]

580: A: [↑yeah] [yeah] I kno::w and like have a jo[:b,]

581: K: [a:]n:

582: K: =actually when- (.) when (0.3) word gets out or whatever or people

583: r- recognise er or something that'd be good >for [the restaurant obvious[ly< bt yeah

584: A: [yeah, [yeah,

585: A: WIl I just said t'the boss I said make sure we treat her well because y'know she's .hh

586: she knows pe::ople. hahahaha

587: K: hahahaha [ye::ah.

588: A: [I don't wanna be getting on a thing and then someday they're asking her

589: about her experiences and she goes I worked for this café (in) n'the people there

590: were horrible. [hahahhaha]

591: K: [hahahaha]

592: → A: and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]

593: →K: [they] spit

594: in the fo::od.

595: A: yeah.

596: K: hahahahahaha

Both K and A are talking about a new staff member who has just started working at A's workplace as a waitress. A does not know who the new staff member is but she has found out that the new staff member was on TV and both K and A are very surprised that she has come to work in A's work place. In line 585, A starts telling of her concerns about the new staff member including whether she might spread rumours about the café where A works.

A's utterance in lines 589 and 590 '*…I worked for this café (in) n'the people there were horrible. [hahahhaha]*' is expanded by the same speaker A in line 592 by adding '*and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]*'. A's utterance in 592 '*and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]*' was delivered with a delay, since laughter tokens by both A in line 590 and K in line 591 were inserted

in A's self expansion of her original utterance in lines from 588 and 590. A's utterance in line 592 contains a conjunction term '*and*' at the beginning which syntactically combines her previous utterance '*…I worked for this café (in) n'the people there were horrible. [hahahhaha]*' in lines 589 and 590 with the rest of her utterance in line 592 '*and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]*'.

K's utterance in line 593, '*they spit in the fo::od*' expands A's self expanded long utterance to produce '*I worked for this café (in) n'the people there were horrible and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.] they spit in the fo::od*'. Lerner (1991) explained that one sentence expansion is a collaborative feature in talk. In this instance, the original speaker's discourse unit is expanded by the next speaker K. It shows both A and K are collaboratively forming one discourse unit.

This instance has another feature to support collaboration by both A and K. Laughter tokens are seen in the last bit of this part of the conversation in lines 590, 591 and 596 which suggests that both A and K see A's story as humorous.

Although jokes have the potential of offending others (Norrick, 2003), humour is often used to index solidarity (Holmes, 2006a). Both A and K in their talk are imagining a situation of the very competent woman discussing the difficulties shw encountered in the cafe. They are jointly inventing a list of things that went wrong at A's café: Staff working for the café is horrible, their food is disgusting, and they spit in their food. Both A and K imply that these things should not and do not happen in the café in reality but want to convey that there are some problems in the café which could easily escalate. However, laughter tokens by both A and K indicate the humorous interpretation of this part of the conversation. According to Hay's lists of humour, (1995:68) A and K's humour fits into a fantasy humour which is the construction of humorous, imaginary

events. This humour is usually framed as a collaborative activity in which the participants jointly construct a possible series of events.

The next speaker K's attempt to expand the original speaker A's utterance has an overlap feature. It does not appear to be problematic. The next speaker K in line 593 delivers '*[they]*' which overlaps with A's '*[fo::od.]*' in line 592 which is a very short length overlap. Liddicoat (2007) explains that overlapping talk can be treated either as problematic overlap, which is often seen as an interruption, or unproblematic overlap which normally has short length and is not normally treated as a problem by participants. Since K's overlap is a very short length overlap, it does not appear to be a problematic overlap. A's falling intonation '*fo::od.*' in line 592 also suggests that A is completing her utterance and therefore A's utterance is not interrupted by the next speaker K. A's utterance is, in the end, formed by herself alone as '*I worked for this café (in) n'the people there were horrible and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.].*'. This long utterance of A contains a falling intonation at the end '*...fo::od.*'. Fletcher and Loakes (2006) explain that rising tunes have open meanings signalling discourse incompleteness while falling tunes have a more closed meaning which signals discourse completion or finality. In line 592, A's falling intonation suggests that A is possibly signalling the completion of her utterance.

Apparently, K's overlap is used as a display of K's enthusiastic participation in A's story (Tannen, 1993). Tannen (1993) explains that an interruption can occur when the speaker shows his/her interest in engaging in current talk. K's '*[they] spit*' in line 593 is launched before the original speaker A finishes her utterance in line 592. It shows K's enthusiastic participation in A's story. If K's overlap '*[they] spit*' in line 593 constituted an interruption, the original speaker A in line 592 might show her anger at being interrupted. Sacks (1992, v2) points out that the speaker who is interrupted delivers an

utterance such as '*you always interrupt me*' which shows his/her anger at being interrupted. However, A in line 595 delivers a minimal response token '*yeah*' rather than showing any anger. A's '*yeah*' shows that she is acknowledging K's '*[they] spit in the food.*' in line 593 and accepting K's attempt to expand A's utterance. In addition, in lines 590, 591 and 596, both speakers laugh which supports the conclusion that A is not upset by being interrupted by K when K delivers her expansion component '*they spit in the fo::od*'.

The instance of expansion in this example also follows a three part structure in that the speakers list three components in order to end the story (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991). The extract below shows these three components:

588: A: [I don't wanna be getting on a thing and then someday they're asking her

589: about her experiences and she goes I worked for this café (in) n'the people there

590: were horrible. [hahahhaha]

591: K: [hahahaha]

592: → A: and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]

593: →K: [they] spit

594: in the fo::od.

595: A: yeah.

596: K: hahahahahaha

A's utterance in line 589 contains the first component '*the people there were horrible*'. A in line 592 then delivers the second component '*they do disgusting things with their fo::od*'. The third component is then delivered by K in lines 593 and 594 '*they spit in the food*' which completes A's utterance. All three components in this example produce a single discourse unit which is in a process of expansion by both the original speaker A

and the next speaker K. This supports the notion that both speakers are collaboratively forming one long discourse unit.

In short, this instance showed one sentence expansion by two female speakers. It had four features. Firstly, the expansion component by the next speaker K '*they spit in the food*'. Secondly, the small length of overlap resulting from K's expansion. This overlap by the speaker K suggested that K was displaying her enthusiastic participation in the talk (Tannen, 1993). Third, A's minimal response token '*yeah*' after K's expansion of A's utterance confirmed that A accepted K's expansion. Lastly, this instance followed the three part structure described by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991). The previous speaker A listed two components: '*people there were horrible*' and '*they do disgusting things with their food*'. Then the next speaker K delivered the last component '*they spit in the food*'. All four functions support the notion of collaborative talk.

8.4.2: Cases of women's one sentence expansion following Lerner's reformulated model without including an increment initiator

Example 2 is a conversation involving only women. Both K and A are talking about A's boss's internet provider which has asked for payment of over 3000 dollars. The sales person from the provider had not explained the details of the plan for A's boss when he made the contract with the provider. A is telling K the story of how this happened. This part of the conversation contains two examples of one sentence expansions. The first case is seen from line 142 to line 147. It follows the pattern of Lerner's reformulated one sentence constructions (Lerner, 1991). The second example is seen in lines 158 and 159, and does not use an increment initiator to expand the originals speaker's utterance.

Example 2

132: A: yeah so:: he is doing this and like this guy was like yeah it'll be just like the one you've

133: currently got and blah blah blah and you'll pay this much per month. (1.0) and he

134: said you know sort of like you beauty an- an- rick wasn't aware of what- ↑he doesn't

135: know anything about it like (0.7) I was talking to him he goes yeah NOW I

136: REALISE-

137: K: he was like sort of [suckered into a dodgy deal.]

138: A: [yeah well he's got two teena]gers,

139: A: and you know- I- I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games

140: [through the console,

141: K: [↓ah::::

142: →A: and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.

143: K: [hhhh.]

144: K: =Aaargh::::

145: A: and I was like [OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d.]

146: →K: [cause he was so far over] his download.

147: →A: yeah because he would have been downloading at least twenty gig, .hh you know

148: and it's like fifteen cents per every megabit (.) that you're over.

149: K: AH::

150: A: and I was like oh my [god

151: K: [he should've rung them up and contested it n said look you

152: didn't explain this [properly.]

153: A: [wellyeah] he's sent them a letter now because he's received yet

154: another bill it's like it's- it's totalled to like five thousand dollars now so he's sent them

155: a letter saying you know I'm not paying this and (.) [you know your] your sales rep

156: [all they were] try'na

157: [definitely] [misleading]

158: A: do was get us- get the sale they didn't bother to explain to me what was what and

159: A: whatever (1.0) so:-

160: →K: or to check wha what [kind of downloading they did]

161: A: [yeah and I said an I said] that's shocking I said the

162: people I'm with ((a name of the product)) (.) like (.) if we (.) if we go ↓we're capped at

163: ten gigabit a month and we we're paying less than him as well he's paying like (.)

164: umm ninety dollars a ↑month or something.

165: K: what?

166: A: and I said ↑geez we only pay like sixty and we get ten gig .hh and we get capped it's

167: like if we go-

168: K: that's still a lot [to pay]

169: A: [yeah]and I said

170: K: you can't get ((a name of a company)) out there?

171: (2.0)

172: A: oh:: no it's something not too bad like it's (.) we get ten gig limit and once we hit the

173: ten (.) gigabits (.) they don't charge you extra but they just slow you down [to]

174: K: [yeah]

8.4.2.1: The first case of one sentence expansion follows Lerner's reformulated model of one sentence expansion

The first example contains two expansions. The current speaker A in line 142 delivers '*and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.*' which is a syntactically independent discourse unit. It also ends with a falling intonation which suggests that A's utterance is complete (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006). A's utterance in

line 145 begins with '*and*', showing that A is self expanding her previous utterance of line 142.

The next speaker K in line 146 delivers '*[cause he was so far over] his download.*' which expands A's '*and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.*'. K's expansion in line 146 of A's utterance of line 142 makes A's syntactically complete utterance an in-progress utterance (Lerner, 1991).

K's '*[cause he was so far over] his download.*' in line 146 is then expanded by the original speaker A in line 147 '*yeah because he would have been downloading at <u>lea</u>st twenty gig, .hh you know*'. K's utterance in line 146 contains a falling intonation which suggests that she is signalling the end of her utterance (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006). A's utterance in line 142 and K's utterance in line 146 form one syntactically complete discourse unit. However, A's utterance in line 147 makes K's utterance in line 146 an in-progress utterance.

In the end, a whole discourse unit has become a very long discourse unit as below.

142: A: '…he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.'

↓

146: K: 'cause he was so far over his download.'

↓

147: A: 'yeah because he would have been downloading at <u>lea</u>st twenty gig, .hh you know'

In this case of one sentence expansion, there are two components of surprise: '*Aaargh::::*' by the next speaker K and '*so I was like OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d*' by the original speaker A. These two components are inserted before the next speaker K

delivers her expansion. K in line 144 '*Aaargh::::*' shows her surprise that A's boss has received a bill for three thousands dollars. A's '*so I was like OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d*' in line 145 also describes her surprise when she heard the story from her boss. Because these two components of surprise by both K and A are inserted, K's attempt to expand in line 146 is delayed.

K's utterance in line 146 '*cause he was so far over*' is overlapped with A's surprise '*OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d*' in line 145. Lerner (2004) explains that an overlap by the next speaker in one sentence construction can occur when the original speaker continues talking beyond the opportunity point space for the next speaker who tries to complete the original speaker's utterance. Both speakers continue their utterances and therefore the next speaker's affiliating utterance overlaps the previous speaker's utterance which is still in progress. In this instance, the original speaker A continues her utterance while the next speaker K expands A's previous utterance.

K's expansion of A's utterance in line 146 '*[cause he was so far over] his download.*' begins with '*cause*' which is used to explain a possible reason why A's boss was asked to pay such a huge bill (Schiffrin, 1987). It is accepted by the original speaker A in line 147. A's attempt to expand K's utterance in line 146 contains a minimal response '*yeah*' at the beginning. This A's '*yeah*' is used as an acknowledgement token (Gardner, 1998). In line 147, just after '*yeah*' A gives builds on K's utterance in line 146, which suggests that A is further acknowledging K's utterance. A mentions '*twenty gigabits*' which describes exactly how much A's boss would have used, while K in line 146 says only that he was '*so far over his download*'.

K's '*[cause he was so far over] his download.*' is possibly a reformulation of A's previous utterances (Lerner, 1991).

139: A: and you know- I- I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games

140: [through the console,

141: K: [↓ah::::

142: →A: and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.

143: K: [hhhh.]

144: K: =Aaargh::::

145: A: and I was like [OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d.]

146: →K: [cause he was so far over] his download.

147: →A: yeah because he would have been downloading at <u>lea</u>st twenty gig, .hh you know

148: and it's like fifteen cents per <u>every</u> <u>me</u>gabit (.) that you're over.

149: K: AH::

150: A: and I was like oh my [god

151: K: [he should've rung them up and contested it n said look you

152: didn't explain this [properly.]

In lines 138 and 140, A delivers '*and you know- I- I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games [through the console,*' which functions as a cause component of A's next utterance in line 142 '*...he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.*'. A's utterance in line 140 tells K why A's boss received a 3000 dollar bill from his internet provider. A's utterance in line 140 is then followed by Ks' '*ah:::*' which indicates that K at this point seems to start realising how much A's boss's son spends on his father's internet. A's utterance in line 142 '*and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.*' follows from A's previous component '*and you know- I- I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games [through the console,*' in lines 139 and 140. These two '*cause*' and '*result*' components made by the previous speaker A possibly prepare the recipient K prepare formulate her utterance '*cause he was so far over his download.*' in line 146.

In short, two features were discussed in this first instance of one sentence construction. A's utterance '*I was like okay he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.*' was expanded by the next speaker K including an increment initiator '*cause*' to expand. Then the original speaker A further expanded the utterance using an increment initiator '*because*'. In the end, a very long utterance was formed by both speakers which was a highly collaborative feature. This instance of one sentence expansion also followed Lerner's reformulated model of one sentence expansion. The original speaker A gave two clues for the next speaker K to expand A's utterance before K expanded the utterance further. In order to use previous speakers' utterance as clues for expansion, the next speaker K must have been actively listening to the original speaker's story. This provides further support for reformulation as a collaborative feature. Coates (1996) explained that one sentence construction occurred only when speakers paid extremely close attention to each other. Although this instance was a case of one sentence expansion, both speakers A and K paid extremely close attention to each other to expand each other's utterances, and by so doing they were able to collaboratively form a very long discourse unit.

8.4.2.2: The second case of one sentence expansion with increment initiator *'or'*

153: A: [wellyeah] he's sent them a letter now because he's received yet

154: another bill it's like it's- it's totalled to like five thousand dollars now so he's sent them

155: a letter saying you know I'm not paying this and (.) [you know your] your sales rep

156: [all they were] try'na

157: [definitely] [misleading]

158: A: do was get us- get the sale they didn't bother to explain to me what was what and

159: A: whatever (1.0) so:-

160: →K: or to check wha what [kind of downloading they did]

161: A: [yeah and I said an I said] that's shocking I said the

162: people I'm with ((a name of the product)) (.) like (.) if we (.) if we go ↓we're capped at

163: ten gigabit a month and we we're paying less than him as well he's paying like (.)

164: umm ninety dollars a ↑month or something.

165: K: what?

166: A: and I said ↑geez we only pay like sixty and we get ten gig .hh and we get capped it's

167: like if we go-

The second incident of sentence expansion is seen in lines 159 and 160. A's utterance in lines 158 and 159 is an account of the contents of her boss's letter: '*all they were try'na do was get us- get the sale they didn't bother to explain to me what was what and whatever (1.0) so:-* '. Towards the end of this utterance there is a one second long pause before A's production of '*so:*' which can be treated as a possible transition relevance place, since A's utterance is potentially syntactically complete at that point. The other speaker, however, does not start her turn at this point. The current speaker A then commences a self-expansion with an extended '*so:*' which may indicate an intention to continue her talk. However, A's '*so*' in line 159 may also function as a turn transition device which marks a speaker's readiness to relinquish a turn (Schiffrin, 1987). Schiffrin (1987: 218) gives the following example of the use of '*so*' as a turn transition device:.

Jack: We're considered the… more or less: the oppressors. So eh….take it from there.

Jack has been describing the challenging role of America in the world. After '*so*', Jack indicates his willingness to end his current turn and open the conversation to others' initiatives with '*take it from there*'.

A's utterance in line 159 contains '*so:*' at the end which may function as a turn transition signal by the speaker. The preceding one second pause coupled with possible syntactic completion, which indicates a possible transition relevance place for the next speaker, also supports the possibility that A's '*so:*' is used as a turn transition signal. A's '*so:*' also contains an extended vowel, which further suggests that there is an opening for the other speaker K to speak.

A's utterance in line 158 '*they didn't bother to explain to me what was what and whatever*' is then expanded by the next speaker K. K in line 160 delivers '*or to check wha what kind of downloading they did*' which includes an increment initiator '*or*' to expand the previous speaker's utterance.

K's utterance in line 160 '*or to check wha what kind of downloading they did*' is accepted by A in line 161 '*yeah and I said an I said*'. It contains '*yeah*' which acknowledges K's '*or to check wha what kind of downloading they did*' in line 160 (Gardner, 1998). In the end, a single discourse unit '*they didn't bother to explain to me. what was what and whatever or to check what kind of downloading they did*' is collaboratively produced by both A and K.

This second case of one sentence expansion follows Lerner's model of one sentence expansion (Lerner,1991). Lerner explains that the next speaker often delivers an increment initiator such as '*and*' to expand and to connect his/her utterance to the original speaker's utterance. In this example, the next speaker K deliver an increment initiator '*or*' to initiate her expansion. The original speaker A's '*so:*' and a long pause '*(1.0)*' in line 159 also signal an opening for K to join in. K in line 160 delivers an utterance which expands A's previous utterance. This suggests that both speakers are showing collaboration to form and expand one discourse unit together.

8.4.3: A case of one sentence expansion with a minimal response token *'yeah'* and an increment initiator '*cause*'

Example 3 is a women-only conversation and is recorded in K's house. As in example 1, A and K are talking about a new staff member at A's work place. This example of one sentence expansion includes an increment initiator '*cause*' with a minimal response token '*yeah*'. Example 2 also showed the use of the increment initiator '*cause*' by the next speaker to expand the original speaker's utterance. However, '*cause*' in this example is used differently from the way it was used in Example 2.

Example 3

509: A: so I get half way through typing the name, .hh and it comes up with suggestions

510: for her full name and I'm like (0.2) <well it's never happened before> it's like

511: how can the computer recognise what I am looking for so I hit enter and it comes

512: up with ALL these hits for this gi::rl .hh and it's things like (.) ((a name of TV

513: show)), an::: seventh rated most beautiful chess player in the world and it's kind

514: of a coincidence that there would be another ((a name of a person)) or whatever

515: so I click on the ((a name of TV show)) thing and it pops up with the profile of the

514: celebrity and there's her face,

516: K: o:::h

517: A: and it's [↑ like ((unable to hear))

518: K: [like whe where from

519: A: what ah ((a name of tv show)) you know. ↑((a name of tv show)), fifth series,

520: K: ((unable to hear) what?

521: A: in australia and I was like oh OKA:::y and I was there like looking this thing about

522: this night club brawl over in Europe because .hh she was dancing with one chess

523: master and then another chess master saw it got jealous and they got into punch

524: up

525: K: o:::h my [goodness.]

526: A: [andIwaslike] absolute-celebrity she's FAmous and hehehe wh:y she

527: working here hehehe [and it's so]

528: K: [oh my goodness] and and she's even (.) like said what

529: she does so it's not like she's trying hide it [or anything?]

530: A: [no I know and] we were just kind of

531: like >well< she didn't mention this- the ((a name of the show)) ↑thing but (.)

532: K: but she mentioned the chess bit.

533: A: (yes) the chess bit and >we were just like < ↑yeah you know whatever hehehe

534: hehehe [she (works these days)

535: K: [so she's gonna work there? or

536: A: ↑yeah she was ↑there on the weekend and she seems perfectly nice and

537: she yeah she's very smart nn >we were js< an I went like cause I went to work

538: the next day and I told rick, and I'm like but I'm not gonna mention it to her or to

539: anybody else and like rick was like nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.

540: →K: yeah cause you'd lose her¿

541: A: yeah she was like

In lines 536 to 539 inclusive, A talks about the new staff member at her work place. A has told her boss that she has just discovered some personal details about her new workmate through her research on the internet, but that she does mot intend to mention it to her or to others. In line 539, A reports her boss Rick's response to this: '*... and like rick was like nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*' which is a syntactically complete unit. K in line 540, however, delivers '*yeah cause you'd lose her¿*' which expands A's reported speech '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*'. Also K's

'*yeah cause you'd lose her¿*' makes A's '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*' an in-progress utterance, although A's '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*' is a syntactically and semantically complete utterance.

K's attempt to expand A's '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*' in line 539 contains a minimal response token '*yeah*' which shows K's acknowledgement and agreement with what A's boss Rick said (Gardner, 2001). K then delivers a reason why A's boss said '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*' by using '*cause*' at the beginning of her utterance (Schiffrin, 1987). K's expansion is confirmed and accepted by the original speaker A in line 541. A delivers '*yeah*' to acknowledge K's attempt (Gardner, 2001). Thus the whole discourse unit is collaboratively formed by A and K as '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea cause you'd lose her*'.

K's attempt in line 540 contains '*cause*' but it is used in a different format from the '*cause*' delivered by the same speaker K in Example 2.

Example 2

139:	A:	and you know- I- I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games
140:		[through the console,
141:	K:	[↓ah::::
142:	→A:	and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.
143:	K:	[hhhh.]
144:	K:	=Aaargh::::
145:	A:	and I was like [OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d.]
146:	→K:	[cause he was so far over] his download.
147:	→A:	yeah because he would have been downloading at least twenty gig, .hh you know

148: and it's like fifteen cents per every megabit (.) that you're over.

149: K: AH::

150: A: and I was like oh my [god

151: K: [he should've rung them up and contested it n said look you

152: didn't explain this [properly.]

'*cause*' in Example 2 is used as a reason why A's boss was asked to pay such a huge bill for the use of internet. It is also possibly delivered as a reformulation of A's earlier talk by the recipient K. The original speaker A delivered two components '*I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games*' in line 139 and '*I got this bill for three thousand dollars.*' in line 142 which provide the recipient K with an account of why A's boss received such a huge bill.

Example 3

536: A: ↑yeah she was ↑there on the weekend and she seems perfectly nice and

537: she yeah she's very smart nn >we were js< an I went like cause I went to work

538: the next day and I told rick, and I'm like but I'm not gonna mention it to her or to

539: anybody else and like rick was like nononono that's probably- (.)a good idea.

540: →K: yeah cause you'd lose her¿

541: A: yeah she was like

Compared with the situation in Example 2, '*cause*' in Example 3 is being used to suggest a possible consequence of A's telling her new workmate and her other fellow workers what she knows, and to suggest why her boss agrees that she should not - namely that the new staff member might leave the work place. K in line 540 is showing her agreement

with A's boss's advice by delivering '*yeah cause you'd lose her¿*'. A's report of her boss's speech '*nononono that's probably- (.) a good idea.*' does not specifically state that the new staff member might leave, but K in line 540 guesses at a future consequence if the personal information is released.

In short, this instance showed one sentence expansion by the next speaker K. It contained a minimal response token '*yeah*' and an increment initiator '*cause*'. K's expansion was accepted by the original speaker A which suggested that both speakers were collaboratively forming one discourse unit. The same increment initiator '*cause*' was used for both Example 2 and 3 but each '*cause*' functioned differently. In Example 2, '*cause*' was used as to explain why A's boss received a huge bill for the use of the internet. In Example 3, '*cause*' was used as to suggest a possible future consequence if A tells the others about the celebrity status of the new staff member.

8.4.4: A case of one sentence expansion following Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion with an increment initiator '*except*'

Example 4

In Example 4, two female speakers, K and L, are talking about Easter eggs which K has bought, while both of them are taking care of K's baby. They are talking in their parents' house. They are also trying to plan a treasure hunt activity for their children as an event for the approaching Easter holiday. They are planning to hide the Easter eggs which are sitting on the table. This example follows a basic model of Lerner's one sentence expansion (Lerner, 1991) in that the original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker delivers an expansion component with an increment initiator. This instance includes an increment initiator '*except*' by the next

speaker. It also contains some laughter tokens which are thought to be a collaborative feature in talk.

123: K: and these ones. ((showing goods which K bought)) but they're all u:m not

124: wrapped.

125: L: where did you find them?

126: K: they are in K mart.

127: L : gre(h)eat,

128: K: I mean big w.

129: L: ˚does ((unable to hear this segment K was making noise with her

130: goods while they were talking))˚

131: K: they're cool aren't th[ey?]

132: L: [mm.]

133: K: =cause they got no wrapping on them.

134: L: mm.

135: K: oh cool.

136: (1.2)

137: L: ˚can't hide˚ I can't hide any of them can I?

138: → K: ha? (.) no, can't hide em,

139: L: mm.

140: K: you gotta eat[em.]

141: → L: [exc]ept on the dining table.

142: K: yeahahahaha

143: L: huhuhu

144: K: ↑oh look it was under my fork hahaha. ((K has just found something which she

145: was missing earlier))

146: (6.0)

The case of one sentence construction is seen in lines 140 and 141. Up to line 135, both K and L are talking about easter eggs bought by K. There is a long pause of 1.2 seconds in line 136 and L delivers '*°can't hide° I can't hide <u>a</u>ny of them can I?*' in line 137. In line 133 K has noted that the easter eggs are unwrapped, which leads L to remark that they are not really suitable for hiding, presumably since they would be hidden in the garden or around the house.

K's '*ha?*' in line 138 may be a repair initiation, suggesting a problem of hearing or understanding by K of L's '*°can't hide° I can't hide any of them can I?*'. However, after a minimal pause '*(.)*' in line 138 K delivers '*no, can't <u>hi</u>de em*' which shows that K has now understood what L has said in line 137, and is answering L's tag question in '*°can't hide° I can't hide <u>a</u>ny of them can I?*' and agreeing with L. K's utterance in line 138 is then acknowledged by L in line 139 '*mm*'.

In line 140, K delivers '*you gotta <u>ea</u>t[em.]*' which is followed by L's '*[exc]ept on the dining table.*'. K's utterance in line 140 is a self expansion of her prior utterance '*no can't hide em*' in line 138. Then L in line 141 delivers '*[exc]ept on the dining table.*' which is expanding K's '*no, can't hide em, you gotta <u>ea</u>t[em.]*' in line 138, but is not expanding K's '*you gotta <u>ea</u>t[em.]*' in line 140. Thus, both K in line 140 and L in line 141 are expanding K's utterance '*no can't hide em*' in line 138.

L's '*except on the dining table*' also makes K's '*no, can't hide em, you gotta <u>ea</u>t[em.]*' an in- progress utterance. In the end, one discourse unit '*no can't hide em, (you gotta eat them) except on the dining table.*' is collaboratively formed by both K and L. This instance follows the basic model of Lerner's one sentence expansion (Lerner, 1991) discussed earlier in this chapter.

L's '*[exc]ept on the dining table.*' in line 141 contains '*except*' which functions as an increment initiator that can be used to formulate an exclusion or exception to something proposed in the (now) first part of a TCU (Lerner, 2004:155). L's '*except*' in line 141 makes a humorous exception of '*can't hide em*', which is delivered by the previous speaker K, suggesting that the eggs can only be 'hidden' on the dining table. The original speaker K accepts L's humorous expansion with her '*yeah*' immediately followed by laughter, is consistent with Lerner's (2004) finding that the next speaker often delivers either a rejection or acceptance for the expansion. This is followed by L's own laughter in line 143.

Hay (1995:74) explains K's and L's humour as observational humour. Observational humour consists of quips or comments about the environment, the events occurring at the time, or about another person's event. L in line 137 follows up a comment about the unwrapped eggs with an observation: '*°can't hide° I can't hide any of them can I?*'. Then K in line 138 agrees with L by repeating her difficulty in hiding them: '*ha? (.) no, can't hide em*'.. At this point K jokingly delivers '*you gotta eat[em.]*' in line 140, implying that due to the difficulty in hiding easter eggs there is only one option available: eating them. However, L finds a chance to expand her previous agreement with an addition 'except for the table", which is followed by laughter by both participants.

In short, this example showed one sentence expansion. The original speaker K delivered a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker L expanded the original speaker's utterance with the increment initiator '*except*'. Thus one discourse unit was collaboratively delivered by both K and L. The original speaker accepted the expansion by the next speaker, and laughter by both speakers followed. The presence of humour

and laughter tokens supports the idea that both speakers were displaying solidarity in their talk.

8.4.5: A case following Lerner's reformulated model of one sentence expansion with an increment initiator '*and*'

Example 5

In this part of the conversation, two female speakers K and L are talking. K is telling L that she took her children to the airport. Her children liked looking at airplanes there. A case of one sentence expansion is seen in lines 167 and 168. It follows Lerner's reformulated model of one sentence expansion, and includes an increment initiator '*and*'.

156.		L:	huhuhuhu
157.		K:	we went to the airport just before¿ and checked out the airplanes¿
158.		L:	m↑mm↓m.
159.		K:	there aren't many happening because it's a public holiday (0.3) I guess.
160.		L:	why were you out there?
161.		K:	to look at the PLANES haha[hahahahahahahhahahahah
162.		L:	[Oh cool hahahahahahahah
163.		L:	now <u>that</u>'s a clever activity. huhuhuhu
164.		K:	cause there's this <u>hu::ge</u> car park near brand depot I think it's for a car exchange
165.			[thing?]
166.		L:	[yeah, yeah,]
167.	→	K:	you just park in the::re, like =
168.	→	L:	= and watch them take [off and land.]
169.		K:	[cathy can't] go anywhere because it's all just car park,

170. L: yep,

171. K: and you just stand there and watch the planes.

172. L: hahaha that's cool.

173. L: actually up on Mt majura ? there's walking tracks up there?

174. K: mm,

175. L: an that's really cool because the the flight- path is straight up alongside that

176. mountain?

177. K: yep.

178. L: and so that's- that's a fantastic view as they come up.

In line 167, K delivers '*you just park in the::re like*' which is an in-progress utterance. L in line 168 delivers a component to expand K's utterance: '*and watch them take off and land*'. Here, one discourse unit is collaboratively formed by both K and L.

K's utterance in line 167 contains '*...like*' which appears to be used as a space filler (Tagliamonte, 2005). It suggests that K's '*you just parked in the::re like*' is produced as an in-progress utterance. K's '*like*' suggests that K is perhaps trying to self-expand her current utterance '*you just park in the::re*'. At the same time, K provides an opportunity for the next speaker to expand her '*you just park in the::re*' by delivering '*like*'. L as the next speaker in line 168 delivers her '*and watch them take [off and land.]*' without any gap just after K's '*like*'. This suggests that L possibly considers K's '*like*' to be an opportunity space for an expansion of K's '*you just park in the::re*'. L's expansion of K's utterance contains an increment initiator '*and*' which connects K's '*you just parked in the::re*' with L's '*and watch them take [off and land.]*'.

The original speaker K does not deliver either an acceptance or rejection for the next speaker L's attempt when L's expansion is delivered. Lerner (2004) explains that the

original speaker often delivers either an acceptance or rejection for the next speaker. In this instance, the original speaker K in line 169 delivers '[*cathy can't] go anywhere because it's just all car park.*' which is a continuation of her previous utterance. K's utterance is line 169 is explaining why K gors to the car park to view planes.

This instance follows Lerner's (1991) reformulated one sentence construction. By delivering the expansion component '*and watch them take [off and land.]*' in line 168, L is describing K's activity for her daughters through the process of developing K's story. Having already produced '*we went to the airport just before and checked out the airplanes*' in line 157, K delivers '*there aren't many happening because it's a public holiday (0.3) I guess.*'in line 159. L in line 160 then asks a question for K '*why were you out there?*' which shows that L does not seem to understand why K took her daughters to the near airport.

K in line 161 delivers an answer for L's question by saying '*to look at the PLANES*'. The last word '*PLANES*' by K in line 161 is emphasised. It suggests that K is perhaps wondering why L asked such a question, since K has already given a full account of the reason for their visit to the airport. This is reinforced by K's laughter at the end of line 161, which L joins in line 162.
L in line 163 assesses K's activity as '*now <u>that's</u> a clever activity*'. L's assessment '*now <u>that's</u> a clever activity*' suggests that L in line 163 now understands the answer to her question in line 169 '*why were you around there?*'. Thus L has been given further information about K's activity near the airport for her daughters in these conversational turns. These turns – L's question '*why were you around there?*' and K's answer '*to look at the PLANES*' - occur before L in line 168 delivers an expansion component for K's utterance in line 167. This piece of information possibly allows L to reformulate K's account in line 168 to expand K's syntactically complete utterance '*you just parked in*

the::re' as '*you just parked in there and watch them take off*''.

In short, L in this part of the conversation remains a listener, but she shows her active listening to A's story not only by giving feedback but also by asking a question to confirm what K is talking about. L's question yields an answer which is reformulated by L to expand K's utterance in line 167. Thus, one sentence expansion is collaboratively delivered by both speakers in this example. However, the next speaker's expansion of the original speaker's utterance form part of a continuing in-progress utterance.

8.4.6: A case of one sentence expansion formed with a question

Example 6

The sequence provided below also appears in Example 1 in the chapter on women's one sentence construction. Lines 267 and 268 were exam one there as an example of one sentence construction. This part of the conversation, however, also contains a case of one sentence expansion which is seen in lines 277 and 278. The next speaker delivers her expansion component for the original speaker with a rising intonation. It functions as a question.

255: A: ˚That's cool˚.

256: K: yeah.

257: (1.0)

258: A: yeah bt I'm ↑thinking (0.5) yeah at the moment we pay about sixty dollars, (0.3) for

259: ten gig, .hh but I'm thinking of actually upgrading to twenty? cause the twenty::(0.4) is:

260: [probably ten dollars more?]

261: K: [it's probably only-] exactly [yeah.]

262: A: [I'm like] psh:::::hew
263: K: it's usually only like piddly squat more [um you may as well have it.]
264: A: [yeah and I'm like I didn't even] realise I'm
265: like ph::: ten dollars more ↓I could go on.
266: K: =and it's a month yeah (.) so what's that a day like hh. cents.
267: A: well it's like it'ss:::::::=
268: K: =so: cheap.
269: A: yeah it's like a hundrednn:::::::::: (1.0) hundredn' eighty a quarter ? y'know so it'd
270: only be like (0.3) you know two hundred'n ten. (1.0)
271: K: [yeah,]
272: A: [yeah] well it was like six hundred dollars a ye:ar.
273: K: yeah,
274: A: ↑I just thought you know y- you got to pay ((a name of a company)) for the phon-=
275: like I didn't even use the phone (0.5) half the time [you know.]
276: K: [why do y]ou have to pay them.
277: → A: because you gotta have the phone connection like (.)
278: → K: with them still¿
279: A: yeah. In order to get the broadband like (.) they
280: [have to go through ((a name of a company)) because ((a name of a company))]
281: K: [oh::]
282: A: owns all the:: bloody::- phone networks.

* ((name of a company)) in line 274, 281 are the same company.

In line 277, A is delivering an answer to K's question in line 276, *'why do you have to pay them.'*. A's utterance in line 277 explains the reason: '*because you gotta have the*

phone connection like (.)'. A's utterance in line 277 contains the term '*because*' which shows that she is giving a a reason, in order to explain (Schiffrin, 1987).

A's utterance also contains the term '*like*' which has two possible functions. It can be used as '*for example*' and in this way is sometimes used as a new information maker which often has the meaning of '*for example*' and therefore can be replaced by '*for example*' (Underhill, 1988). It can be also used as a space filler to hold a turn and indicate to the next speaker that the utterance is not finishing yet (Tagliamonte, 2005). A's '*...like (.)*' includes a minimal pause which suggests that A's *like*' may be used as a space filler rather than used as an equivalent of '*for example*'. A's space filler '*like*' and minimal pause '*(.)*' gives an opportunity for the next speaker to complete A's utterance. At the same time, A is signalling an intention to hold her turn to deliver the next segment.

K in line 278 delivers '*with them still?*' just after A's minimal pause which is an utterance designed to expand A's utterance. K's utterance '*with them still?*' contains a rising intonation which makes A's utterance a question form. K's utterance '*with them still?*' in line 278 completes A's in-progress utterance '*because you'd have to get phone connection like (.)*' but also it turns A's in-progress utterance into a question form. Thus the next speaker in line 278 is asking the previous speaker a question as well as trying to completing the previous speaker's utterance.

A's utterance in line 279 contains '*yeah*' which is answering K's question '*with them still?*' in line 278. A's utterance in line 279 contains '*yeah. In order to get the broadband like (.) they*' which explains a reason for A's response to K's question. K's affiliating utterance '*with them still?*' is delivered and by making A's utterance a question provides an opportunity for A to expand her story. Although the one discourse

unit thus produced takes a question form, a single discourse unit is collaboratively formed by two female speakers.

In this example, K's expansion is produced with a rising final intonation which forms a question. The next speaker K's rising intonation shows a different form from an expansion produced with a falling final intonation in that the latter is formed as an affirmative unit, rather than as a question. The action of the speakers in these two different productions is also different (Lerner, 2004). K's '*with them still?*' is delivered as a question and therefore it serves not only to complete A's utterance in line 277 but also to address to the original speaker A who is required to answer for the next speaker K. As a result, the next speaker K is taking two actions at the same time. The first action is addressed to K herself by delivering the affiliating utterance '*with them still?*' as a completion of the previous speaker's utterance '*because you'd have to get phone connection like (.)*'. The second action is addressed to the original speaker A as a requirement for a response to K's question.

In short, in this example, a one sentence expansion is formed as a question by the next speaker K. By delivering her utterance with a rising intonation, the action of her utterance is addressed to the original speaker A to answer K's question. In addition, the action is addressed to K herself in completing A's utterance. The original speaker A provided and answer and explanation for K. Because K had been actively listening to A's story K was able to deliver her question '*with them still?*'. Then A delivered her answer for K. These actions suggest that both K and A were collaboratively forming A's story.

8.4.7: A case of one sentence expansion with an overlap

Example 7

In this conversation, three young women are involved. They are at K's parents' house and are having a conversation before they eat dinner. Both L and K are originally from a regional town in New South Wales (NSW). L tells her story of when she was a university student in Canberra and K joins in and tells her story of when she had her first job in Canberra. One sentence expansion in this example is seen in lines 92 and 93. In this instance, both the original speaker and the next speaker are expanding the original speaker's utterance at the same time. However, this instance does not show the use of an increment initiator to expand.

75: L: do you remember that when I first came home first term at easter? from uni?

76: K: no::.

77: L: =I remember- I saw my friends on the train and they were coming down from sydney

78: and further and higher north coast unis?

79: K: yeah

80: L: and we were all on the same train coming home? (0.4) and I nearly burst into tears

81: when I saw them an I remember getting off at the platform and cr::ying and cry(h):ying,

82: K: I remember yeah going to (0.3) we'd all go and pick you up from (.) the train,

83: L: mm.

84: K: yeah [every now and then.]

85: L: [it was such a <u>sho:ck</u> ¿]

86: E: mm,

87: L: yeah I wasn't expecting it at all (0.4) I thought it would be y' know fantastic and great

88: not a problem like [everything else.] =

89: E: [o::::::::::h.]

90: K: = well. I guess (.) I guess it's similar to when I: came over here and started working

91: here even though (my relatives) were here and <u>you</u> were here, (0.5)

92: → K: [it ws still s::::::::::::o:::] lonely.

93: → L: [it's a bi::g change isn't it.]

94: L: yeah.

95: (0.2)

96: K: ˚so:: lonely. ˚

97: E: I've done (0.5) three full uproots [I moved] s-

98: K: [yeah.]

99: E: cause I moved to wollongong,

100: K: yeah.

101: E: and I moved to Sydney,

102: K: yeah.

103: E: and then I moved down here.

104: L: mm.

In this part of the conversation, L is telling a story about when she was a university student in Canberra but the rest of her family lived in a regional town in NSW. L came to her parents' house during university break, but she had to go back to her university when the break was over. In line 90, K starts telling a story which is similar to L's university story. When K started her job in Canberra, she felt lonely although her relatives were in Canberra.

K's utterance in lines 90 and 91 is a syntactically complete utterance '*well. I guess (.) I guess it's similar to when I: came over here and started working here even though (my relatives) were here and <u>you</u> were here, (0.5)*'. K's utterance in line 91 includes a relatively long half-second pause which suggests that K in line 92 may be giving an opportunity for the other speaker to talk. In line 91 after the long pause '*(0.5)*', K

delivers *'[it ws still s::::::::::::o:::] lonely.*' which expands her story. At the same time, the next speaker L also delivers her utterance in line 93 '*[it's a bi::g change isn't it.]*' which expands the previous speaker K's story.

This instance of one sentence expansion shows a slightly different form from the basic model of one sentence expansion provided by Lerner (1991). First, L's attempt to expand K's utterance '*[it's a bi::g change isn't it.]*' does not contain an increment initiator, which is often used by the next speaker (Lerner, 1991). Second, the original speaker K is also expanding her previous utterance in the same line 92. K's expansion component'*[it ws still s::::::::::::o:::] lonely.*' also lacks an increment initiator to expand her utterance '*I guess it's similar to when I came over here and staying here even though my relatives were here and you were here. (0.5)*'.

Since neither speaker delivers an increment initiator to expand K's utterance, both K's '*[it ws still s::::::::::::o:::] lonely.*' in line 92 and L's '*[it's a bi::g change isn't it.]*' in line 93 do not syntactically connect with K's '*I guess it's similar to when I came over here and staying here even though my relatives were here and you were here, (0.5)*' in lines 90 and 91. However both K's '*[it ws still s::::::::::::o:::] lonely.*'and L's '*[it's a bi::g change isn't it.]*' semantically expand K's '*I guess it's similar to when I came over here and started working here even though my relatives were here and you were here. (0.5)*'.

K's '*[it ws still s::::::::::::o:::] lonely.*' adds an extra piece of information – how K felt when she came to Canberra – onto her '*I guess it's similar to when I came over here and staying here even though my relatives were here and you were here. (0.5)*'. L's '*[it's a bi::g change isn't it.]*' compares life in their hometown and life in a new city for both K and L.

K's utterance in line 93 '*it ws still s::::::::o:::* ' is overlapped with the next speaker L's '*[it's a bi::g change isn't it.]*'. The overlap does not appear to be problematic. The previous speaker K keeps her turn through the overlap which suggests that the overlap is not treated as an interruption (Sacks, 1992, v2). If L's overlap were treated as an interruption, K would drop her turn and L would take over the turn to talk. L in line 93 also keeps her turn and delivers her utterance to follow K's '*I guess it's similar to when I came over here and staying here even though my relatives were here and you were here. (0.5)*'. This suggests that the overlap does not constitute an example of Jefferson's '*oops sorry*' overlap (Jefferson, 1986).

This overlap therefore shows L's enthusiastic participation in the talk (Tannen, 1993). L was telling her story of moving to Canberra from NSW when she started her university degree from the beginning of this part of the conversation. K in line 91 then starts telling of her similar experience when she started her job in Canberra. Because both L and K shared a similar lonely experience when they moved to Canberra, L in line 93 is perhaps able to share how K felt when K moved to Canberra and underlines this by delivering an affiliating utterance for K's utterance in line 92.

The next speaker L's attempt to expand K's utterance '*it's a bi::g change isn't it*' contains a tag question '*isn't it*' possibly showing that L is trying to share what L experienced in the past when she had to leave her home town for university after the break, as seen in lines 75, 77, 78, 80 and 81 – to show her understanding of K's story in lines 91 and 92. The next speaker L then delivers '*yeah*' in line 84, which is acknowledging K's utterance '*it ws still s::::::o::: lonely* '.
In short, this instance showed one sentence expansion by the next speaker L. L's attempt to expand the original speaker's utterance overlapped K's own continuation of her story.

The overlap feature showed L's enthusiastic participation in K's story. This suggests that L was showing her collaboration in her talk.

8.5: Summary of this chapter

This chapter discussed seven examples of women's one sentence expansions. In chapter 6, cases of women's one sentence constructions were discussed which confirmed Coates's claim (1993) that women tended to use one sentence construction to collaborate in conversations. Similarly to chapter 6 in this study, this chapter showed one sentence expansion as a women's collaborative feature in conversations. Thus it is possible to conclude one sentence expansion as women's collaborative features in conversations. However, the cases of one sentence expansion examined in this chapter needed to be distinguished from the cases of one sentence constructions since one sentence expansion contained several different features which did not share with cases of one sentence constructions.

Most examples in this chapter contained increment initiators such as '*and*', '*cause*' and so forth which connected and expanded the original speaker's utterances. However there was an example which did not contain an increment initiator to connect and expand the previous speaker's utterance.

Example 1 showed an instance of three part structure (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991) which often contains three components of a list. In this instance, the original speaker delivered the first two components '*n the people there were horrible*' and '*they do disgusting things with their food*'. The third component '*and he spits on the food*' was then delivered by the next speaker and it completed and expanded the original speaker's utterance. Thus both speakers were collaboratively expanding the original speaker's

story by delivering a three-part structure one sentence expansion.

In Example 2, one sentence expansion was delivered as the form of a reformulated sequence (Lerner, 1991). The next speaker's '*cause he was so far over his download*', which was the expansion component, appeared to be a reformulation of information already given by the original speaker: '*I was like okay he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars*' and '*I knew that mike was always on his PS3 playing online games*'. These utterances by the original speaker gave the next speaker cues to guess at a possible next segment which might be delivered by the original speaker, in order to provide an appropriate expansion. In order to reformulate sequences, a listener needs to be actively participating in the story to deliver such a contribution to the story. This suggests a collaborative feature in talk.

There was also an example which contained a one sentence expansion in a question form. The next speaker delivered '*with them still?*' with a rising intonation. By delivering it so, the next speaker constructed an expansion component which required an answer from the original speaker, although it was delivered as an expansion of the original speaker's utterance.

The last example showed one sentence expansion with no increment initiator. Both the original speaker and next speaker tried to expand the original speaker's utterance at the same time. Their expansion components semantically expand the original speaker's utterance. This example contained an overlap feature which showed the next speaker's enthusiastic participation in the story. The overlap suggested the next speaker was showing her collaboration in their talk.

Although Lerner (1991) explained that one sentence construction was different from one sentence expansion, the examples discussed in this chapter show collaborative one

sentence expansions which follow similar patterns to Coates' (1993) findings on women's use of one sentence constructions to collaborate in their talk. Female participants in this chapter also used one sentence expansions to collaborate in their talk. Lerner (1991 and 2004) dealt with one sentence expansions as collaborative features in talk. Thus, one sentence expansion could be another collaborative feature of women's talk.

The next chapter explores men's one sentence expansions to see whether men in this present study deliver one sentence expansions in similar ways or in different ways from the women in this present study.

Chapter 9: One sentence expansions by men

9.1: Introduction

The previous chapter explored women's one sentence expansions. It showed several types of one sentence expansion. For instance, one case followed a three part structure (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991). In this model of one sentence expansion, because speakers generally produce three components in a list, the last component can sometimes be predicted by the other speaker. There was also a case followed Lerner's reformulated model of one sentence expansion (Lerner, 1991). In this model, the next speaker expands on the original speaker's utterance with a reformulation of the original speaker's earlier talk.

The previous chapter also concluded that a one sentence expansion was possibly a feature of women's collaborative feature in conversation. As chapter 5 quantitatively examined the incidence of three collaborative features: one sentence construction, expansion, and repetition, male participants in this study also showed cases of one sentence expansions and thus a one sentence expansion could also be men's collaborative feature in conversations. This chapter explores whether male participants in this study deliver one sentence expansions in similar ways to female participants. Although earlier studies of one sentence expansions were discussed in the previous chapter, some important features of one sentence expansions are reviewed before each example of men's one sentence expansion is discussed below.

One sentence expansions shares features with one sentence constructions in that the original speaker and the next speaker collaboratively form one discourse unit. However,

in one sentence expansion, one speaker provides a syntactically complete sentence which is developed by the next speaker.

Louise: first of all they hit rain then they hit hail

Roger: n then they hit snow.

(Lerner, 1991: 448)

The example above, from Lerner (1991), shows that the original speaker Louise delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker Roger expands Louise's utterance. This is one of the differences between one sentence expansions and one sentence constructions. In one sentence construction, the original speaker delivers an in-progress utterance which is completed by the next speaker. In one sentence expansion, however, the original speaker's utterance can syntactically stand alone without a completion by the next speaker.

There is another difference between one sentence constructions and one sentence expansions. When either the original speaker or the next speaker tries to expand the original speaker's utterance, increment initiators (Lerner, 2001) are often used by the speaker who is expanding. These are devices such as '*and*', '*but*', '*because*' and so forth, which join two discourse components.

One sentence expansion can also be produced in question form by the next speaker as below.

A: They make miserable coffee.

B: -across the street?

(Sacks, 1992, V1:652)

Sacks (1992, v1) explains in the above example that after A's sentence '*they make miserable coffee*', B delivers '*across the street?*' which contains a prepositional phrase and an upward final intonation. This transforms the sentence into a question form.

When a one sentence expansion is formed as a question, two speaker actions are occurring at the same time. The first action by the next speaker is addressed to the original speaker who is required to answer the next speaker's question. The second action is that the next speaker is transforming the original speaker's syntactically complete utterance into an in-progress utterance by delivering increment initiators such as '*and*', '*across*' and so forth.

9.2: Participants in this chapter

Five male speakers appear in this chapter and brief background information on them is provided below.

- Aa: a man in his early thirties, J's sister's husband
- J: a man in his early thirties, does DJing as a casual job
- L: a man in his early thirties, K's elder brother
- E: a man in his late twenties, J's friend, does DJing as a casual job
- F: a man in his early thirties, L's friend.

This chapter discusses men's conversations but in some examples, women's conversations are inserted in order to demonstrate that female participants showed a similar model of expansions. Thus female participants also appear in this chapter:

- L: a women in her early thirties, married, has three children, sister of K
- K: a women in her early thirties, married, has two children, younger sister of L
- A: a woman in her late twenties, married to Al

9.3: Discussions

This chapter shows several instances of one sentence expansions by male speakers. The quantitative chapter (Chapter 5 in this study) counted 23 incidents of one sentence expansion by male participants in this study. The present chapter deals with eight cases of men's one sentence expansion, since these instances provide rich data sources for discussion. Two major types of one sentence expansion among male participants in this study are observed. Firstly, some instances of one sentence expansion follow the basic model of one sentence expansion proposed by Lerner (1991). In this model, the original speaker's syntactically complete utterance is expanded by the next speaker with an increment initiator. Secondly, other instances of one sentence expansion follow the pattern of a three part list outlined by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991). In this model of one sentence expansion, the original speaker delivers two components of a list of items or events. Then the next speaker adds a third component to complete the original speaker's utterance. These two models of one sentence expansions were also commonly seen in women's one sentence constructions in the previous chapter.

9.3.1: Cases of one sentence expansion follow Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion

Example 1 below is taken from a men-only conversation. This part of the conversation contains many pauses since Aa and J are looking at J's DVD collection while they are talking. This example includes two case of one sentence expansion. Both cases follow

Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion (1991). The original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker uses an increment initiator to expand the original speaker's utterance. The first case also includes humour. In the second case, the next speaker's expansion unit is further expanded by the original speaker. Thus this case follows the model of one sentence expansion outlined below.

The original speaker delivers a word

↓

The next speaker expands the original speakers' syntactically complete utterance (using 'yeah but')

↓

The original speaker expands the next speaker's expanded utterance (using 'which')

Example 1

1.		Aa:	star wars (2:0) ↓always.
2.			(4:0)
3.		J:	no they just sort of fall out.
4.			(1.0)
5.	→	J:	it's a shitty bloody case.
6.	→	Aa:	but it does the trick.
7.		J:	cost me ten ↑<u>bucks</u> so of c<u>our</u>se it does the trick.
8.		Aa:	<u>bargain.</u>
9.			(5:0)
10.		J:	uh:: [that must be one of my colleagues.
11.		Aa:	[that'd be (1:0) what's that like in HD.
12.		J:	˚brehhases fucking amazing˚
13.		Aa:	is it?

14. J: yeah it's pretty cool (.) [notice- (.) you] notice this?

15. Aa: [two parts↓yeah::.]

16. (1:5)

17. Aa: very nice.

18. (1:0)

19. J: yeah it's pretty fucking ridiculous?

20. (4:0)

21. J: ˚ just this one˚. let's do this one.

22. (2:0)

23. J: I got half way through doing em before I went ↑o:h, crap, I gotta get in the car an

24. drive.

25. (1:0)

26. J: uh. No you do that one.

27. (5:0)

28. J: phew

29. → Aa: ˚shize ˚

30. (1:0)

31. → J: yeah but it's a trick to it.

32. (1:0)

33. → Aa: which I don't have. t-t- ha:::[ha ha ha ha ha]

34. J: [you don't have the ma-]

35. J: you don't have the mad skills. what's going on.

36. here you go.

9.3.1.1: The first case of one sentence expansion following Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion with an increment initiator '*but*'

In line 5, J says '*it's a shitty bloody case.*', probably describing the DVD case from which DVDs *'just sort of fall out.'* (line 3). Then in line 6, Aa delivers '*but it does the trick*' which expands J's '*it's a shitty bloody case.*' in line 5 . Thus a one discourse unit '*it's a shitty bloody case but it does the trick*' is collaboratively formed by both J and Aa. This case follows Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion and contains an increment initiator '*but*'.

J's utterance in line 5 '*it's a shitty bloody case.*' ends with a falling intonation which suggests that J has finished his utterance (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006). However, Aa in line 6 expands J's syntactically complete utterance using '*but*'. Aa's utterance in line 6 '*but it does the trick.*' also prompts the original speaker J to engage in some humorous talk. J in line 7 responds to Aa's utterance '*but it does the trick*' with a story about buying the DVD for ten dollars. J implies, with his emphasis on *'bucks'*, that ten dollars is a substantial amount, so must buy a functioning DVD case. J in line 7 delivers '*... of course it does the trick.*', playing on the words delivered by Aa in line 6 '*... it does the trick.*'. However, both participants know that ten dollars is in fact cheap, and J's playful talk in line 7 is understood by Aa in line 8 when he says '*bargain*'.

A case of one sentence expansion follows Lerner's basic model discussed above is similarly seen in women's conversation discussed in the previous chapter. The extract of conversation below is taken from Example 4 in the previous chapter.

137: L: ˚can't hide˚ I can't hide any of them can I?

138: K: ha? (.) no, can't hide em,

139: L: mm.

140: → K: you gotta eat[em.]

141: → L: [exc]ept on the dining table.

142: K: yeahahahaha

143: L: huhuhu

144: K: ↑oh look it was under my fork hahaha. ((K has just found the thing which she

145: was missing at this point))

In line 140, K delivers '*can't hide em, you gotta eat[em.]*' which is followed by L's *'[exc]ept on the dining table.*'. L's '*[exc]ept on the dining table.*' is expanding K's '*can't hide em, you gotta eat[em.]*'. In the end, one discourse unit '*can't hide em, (you gotta eat them) except from the dining table*' is collaboratively formed by both K and L.

In short, this first case of one sentence expansion followed Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion (Lerner, 1991). The original speaker J delivered a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker Aa delivered an expansion component. This case also included humour based on next speaker Aa's words by the original speaker J.

9.3.1.2: The second case of one sentence expansion which is expanded twice

The second incident of one sentence expansion is seen in lines 29 to 33. This second incident includes two expansion components. The original speaker delivers a word and then the next speaker expands the original speaker's word with an increment initiator. Then the original speaker expands the next speaker's expansion component.

23: J: I got half way through doing em before I went ↑o:h, crap, I gotta get in the car an

24: drive.

25: (1:0)

26: J: uh. No you do that one.

27: (5:0)

28: J: phew

29: → Aa: ˚shize ˚

30: (1:0)

31: → J: yeah but it's a trick to it.

32: (1:0)

33: → Aa: which I don't have. t-t- ha:::[ha ha ha ha ha]

34: J: [you don't have the ma-]

35: J: you don't have the mad skills. what's going on.

36: here you go.

In line 29, Aa delivers a word '*˚shize ˚*'. This may accompany some difficulty with performing an action, such as opening or closing a DVD case. Aa's '*˚shize ˚*' could be taken to signify an utterance such as 'this is difficult', for example. After a long pause '*(1.0)*' in line 30, J in line 31 delivers '*yeah but it's a trick to it.*'. J's '*yeah but it's a trick to it.* ' expands Aa's '*˚shize ˚*' using an increment initiator '*but*'. As a result, Aa's utterance is expanded by the next speaker J as '*˚shize ˚ but it's a trick to it.*'.

In this part of the conversation, both Aa and J are looking at J's DVD collection while they are talking, as explained at the beginning of this example, and therefore both of them are possibly engaged with the DVDs. This may be the cause of the one second long pause. It may also be that Aa is continuing to try to complete an action during this time. J's utterance in line 31 contains '*yeah*' and '*but*'. J's minimal response token '*yeah*' suggests that J acknowledges Aa's utterance '*˚shize ˚*' in line 29 (Gardner, 1998). J's

'*but*' is used as an increment initiator.

Although the next speaker J apparently expands the original speaker's utterance, the original speaker does not deliver a syntactically complete sentence in this first part of the case. Instead, the original speaker Aa delivers a single word. Then the original speaker's word is expanded by the next speaker. This does not exactly follow the basic rule of one sentence expansion explained by Lerner (1991), however it is likely that Aa's single word conveys a meaning which may be the equivalent of a syntactically complete utterance.

However, the second part of the expansion in this instance does follow Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion. The expanded discourse unit by both Aa in line 29 and J in line 31 '*°shize ° but it's a trick to it*' does not end there. This expanded unit is then expanded by the original speaker Aa who delivers '*which I don't have. t-t- ha::::[ha ha ha ha ha]*' in line 34. Aa's expansion component '*which I don't have…*' contains '*which*' as an increment initiator and it connects and expands J's '*yeah but it's a trick to it*'. In the end, the whole discourse unit '*°shize ° but it's a trick to it which I don't have*' is collaboratively formed by both Aa who delivered the original discourse unit and the second expansion unit and J who delivered the first expansion discourse unit.

Aa's expansion in line 33, '*which I don't have. t-t- ha::::[ha ha ha ha ha]*' contains laughter tokens which suggests that Aa is making this part of his talk humorous.

Both Aa's and J's humour in this part of the conversation fits into a type of observational humour (Hay, 1995:74). Aa in line 29 starts the new section of the story by delivering '*°shize°*'. There is a long pause in line 30 which gives J time to assess Aa's '*°shize°*'. In

other words, J is possibly observing Aa's utterance and J in line 31 delivers '*yeah but it's a trick to it.*'. J's utterance in line 31 expands Aa's utterance as a humours sentence.

Humour or joke sequences in conversations are collaborative features (Holmes, 2006a). Aa is not insulting others by making a joke in this part of the conversation (Norrick, 2003), instead he laughs at his own inability to master the '*trick*'.

In short, this example showed the form of one sentence expansion '*yeah*' + '*expansion component*' by male speakers. This was also seen in female speakers in this study, as discussed in the previous chapter. However, in this sample, the next speaker's expansion of the original utterance did not, in the end, complete it. The original speaker also expanded the next speaker's expansion component. In the end, the original speaker delivered a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker expanded the original speaker's utterance. Then the original speaker again expanded the expansion by the next speaker.

9.3.2: A sense follows Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion with an increment initiator '*because*'

Two male speakers are involved in Example 2. J and G are talking about beers which J experienced when he travelled in England. J is telling how the taste of a particular beer in the U.K. was different from the same brand of beer which he can get in Australia. J in line 16 delivers a syntactically complete sentence and then G expands J's utterance by using a conjunction '*because*' in line 17.

Example 2

1. J: yes. yes. so anyways yes. you need to go to each one of the bars.
2. G: yeah I think I only saw two of them.
3. J: yeah okay. ↑well when I went there the first time, (0.3) u:m, (1.0) like in in like the first
4. bar that you get to, (.) um myself (.) my sister was there (.) and um (0.2) her husband,
5. G: yep,
6. J: who is (.) he's not here at the moment=
7. G: =oh right
8. J: and his sister ↓yeah (anyway) ↑and then um his sister? so all three of us we- ↓oh four
9. sorry and um we all had a guinness? and as you do because you have to have a
10. Guinness when you are at st jame's gate, and um (1.8) ah you know I– polished mine
11. off, ((J is talking to the other person at this point since the other speaker asked J to do
12. something)) ↑um oh you don't want- (0.4) yeah oh I'll have yours yeah no worries. .hh
13. and because I was (.) at (.) guinness I had to have a Kilkenny, cause Kilkenny is
14. actually my favourite beer.
15. G: I thought that they made ˚it here before˚
16. J: yep it's not quite Guinness in any way shape or form.
17. →G: because it's an ale.
18. J: yeah yeah that's right but it's it's smo::oth the same way that guinness make
19. guinness, (1.0) right?
20. G: yeah
21. J: cause it's still (.) guinness and um (0.5) man those things are so thick, creamy, it's just
22. like o:::h, ((unable to hear)) o:::hohoh,
23. G: I was tempted to get one to bring over but (.) I just wanna try one.
24. J: yeah you gotta have it off tap can't have it out of a can because it doesn't do it
25. justice. .hh and I've had Kilkenny here in Australia, and it was all well and good, but

26. when I went over there it was just like

27. G: yeah

In lines 8 to 11, J is telling a story about drinking Guinness in a bar in the U.K. In lines 13 to 14, he states that he also tried his favourite beer, Kilkenny. In line 16, J is telling G '*yep it's not quite Guinness in any way shape or form.*', emphasising the difference between Kilkenny and Guinness. J's '*yep it's not quite Guinness in any way shape or form.*' is a syntactically complete discourse unit. J's utterance has a falling final intonation which indicates that J is signalling the closure of his utterance (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006).

The next speaker G in line 17 delivers '*because it's an ale.*' which expands the previous speaker J's utterance into '*yep it's not quite Guinness in any way shape or form because it's an ale.*'. G's expansion '*because it's an ale.*' also makes J's syntactically complete utterance '*yep it's not quite Guinness in any way shape or form.*' as an in-progress utterance. G's expansion is accepted by the original speaker J in line 18 which contains two '*yeah*'s as agreement tokens (Gardner, 1998), as well as *'that's right'*. This example follows Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion in that the original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker delivers an expanded component with an increment initiator (Lerner, 1991).

G's expansion in line 17 of J's utterance in line 16 contains '*because*' as an explanatory marker (Schffrin, 1987). G's expansion in line 17 '*because it's an ale.*' explains why J found Kilkenny different from Guinness, since Guinness is a stout, and Kilkenny, as G explains, is an ale. J accepts and agrees with G's explanation in line 19, but goes on to outline the similarities between Guinness and Kilkenny, saying '*...but it's it's smo::oth the same way that guinness make guinness, (1.0) right?*' which contains '*but*'. '*but*' is a contradiction marker (Schiffrin, 1987) which suggests that although J found Kilkenny

different from Guinness, (a difference which G was able to account for) he found similarities too.

In short, this sample showed a collaborative one sentence expansion by two male speakers. The original speaker's utterance was expanded by the next speaker. Then the original speaker acknowledged the next speaker's expansion. This sample followed Lerner's basic model of collaborative one sentence expansion in that the original speaker delivered a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker delivered an expansion component with an increment initiator (Lerner, 1991). Thus, both male speakers collaboratively produced a single discourse unit.

9.3.3: A case following Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion with an increment initiator '*across*'

In Example 3, three speakers, J, F and E are talking at a party. They start to talk about when and where F will be playing that night..

Example 3

115: J: what time you gotta kick off?

116: F: uh seven? I gotta go home and have a shower, (0.6) pick up my gear and then get there

117: and set up.

118: J: you-

119: F: start at eight.

120: E: you- you're- DJ as well, are you? (0.8) where are you playing?

121: F: ((a place name for F's DJ play))

122: E: uh okay where is that at?

123: F: you know where the um (.) [((name of another shop near F's workplace))]

124: J: [do you know where fight house is?]

125: → E: yeah I know fight house yeah.

126: → J: across the car park.=

127: F: =yep just up there.=

129: E: =↑oh okay, (1.2) is it a e:::r rough sort of place or is it alright?

130: F: no it's ↑good.

131: E: yeah,

132: F: it's got um (0.6) uh what do you call it um (2.0) oh shit (1.2) I'll think of the name of it in

133: (.) just a second. (.) <u>coc</u>ktail bar.

In line 120, E has just found out F is also working as a DJ as a casual job (E already knew that J was a DJ.). In line 121, F answers E's question and tells him the name of the place where he performs as a DJ. However, F's answer in line 121 does not provide E with enough information to identify the place. E in line 122 then asks another question '*uh okay where is that at?*'. Then F in line 123 starts providing a possible place reference for E, a shop near his work place which E might know, by saying '*you know where the um (.)…*'. However, F's '*you know where the um (.)*' is followed by J's '*[do you know where fight house is?]* ' in line 124, which overlaps F's '*[((a name of the other shop near F's workplace))]*'.

J's '*[do you know where fight house is?]*' is possibly delivered because F in line 123 delivers '*um*' and a minimal pause '*(.)*'. This '*um*' and the minimal pause '*(.)*' that follows are possibly understood by J as an opportunity space for J to initiate talk. However, despite this possible opportunity space, F does not stop talking and he continues his talk when J's talk starts (Lerner, 2004). Thus, at this point, overlapping talk occurs.

J's overlap appears to constitute Tannen's (1993) enthusiastic participation into talk. As is discussed above, F's '*um*' and minimal pause '*(.)*' are signalling that F is trying to produce the rest of his turn, which will include the answer to E's question '*uh okay where is that at?*' in line 122. However, F's '*um*' and minimal pause '*(.)*' signal that he appears to have a problem producing this upcoming utterance. J's overlap component '*[do you know where fight house is?]*' also provides place information for E. E then acknowledges J's utterance by delivering his repetition '*yeah I know fight house yeah.*' in line 125. The question by E in line 122 '*uh okay where is that at?*' was originally addressed to F since F is the person who will be working at this place. E, however, is given the answer by the other speaker J in the end.

J's '*across the car park.=*' in line 126 contains an increment initiator '*across*' which expands E's '*yeah I know fight house yeah.*' in line 125. It also contains the increment initiator '*across*', making E's '*yeah I know fight house yeah.*' an in-progress discourse unit. J's '*across the car park.=*' also functions as self-expansion at the same time. Since E in line 125 delivers a repetition '*yeah I know fight house yeah.*', J's '*across the car park.=*' is actually expanding his previous utterance '*[do you know where fight house is?]*' in line 124. In other words, E's repetition '*yeah I know fight house yeah.*' is inserted before J delivers his expansion component '*across the car park*'.

In short, this sample showed a case of one sentence expansion by male speakers. It included an increment initiator '*across*' by the next speaker J to expand the previous speaker E's utterance. This sample also showed that the original speaker J simultaneously self-expanded his previous utterance since the next speaker E's utterance was delivered as a form of repetition. This sample showed highly collaborative features throughout a case of one sentence expansion. The speaker E asked where F was going to work as a DJ. F started to give E the answer but his production of hesitation markers

suggested that F was struggling to give E the location of his work place. Then, the other speaker J supported F by showing his enthusiastic participation into talk, which was demonstrated by his overlap. In the end, three male speakers reached their conversational goal, that is, they answered E's question successfully. They achieved this collaboratively though one sentence expansion.

9.3.4: Cases of one sentence expansion following Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion

This sequence is recorded late at night and both speakers are drinking at their uncle's house, and telling stories of their past. Example 4 contains two cases of one sentence expansion. The first instance is seen in lines 30 to 34 where a discourse unit is expanded not only once but three times by both the original and next speaker. The second instance is seen in line 42, and includes an increment initiator '*and*'.

Example 4

17: L: when I (.) when we were at wagga? when we got our room it was as cold as it goes (.)

18: an so we'd go into ron's room next door, and put it up as hot as it goes?

19: J: and we've got adjoining rooms so [we- (0.3) we shut] the door, (.) and we also like dead

20: L: [it was fucking hot]

21: J: latched his door? so he couldn't open it from the outside? so he had to come through

22: our room? so we're in bed watching tv like in bed both of us,

23: L: yeah an [when he comes into ours ((unable to hear))]

24: J: [with the covers up, (0.3) it's frosty as hell he's gone oh man it's cold and he's

25: shivering and he's going] what are you guys doing in bed and I'm like (.)

26: J: [it's cold.]

27: L: [it's cold.]

28: J: hehehe and he goes (0.5) ↑why the fuck's my door shut. =and we're like meh? anyway

29: cause he went to go an to go in there and he didn't came back around us, .hhh and he

30: walks in, and the heat wave that came through-

31: → L: cause he saw the heat wave coming out of his fucking room

32: → J: and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah,

33: → L: because it was beautiful because he was all cold in ours, and then he walked into the

34: next room ws a sauna.

35: J: we also (hid)-

36: L: and he's like oh no fuck ↑hahahaha

37: J: we were (.) also that night (.) that's right he was busy looking for the iron to iron his shirt?

38: and I hid it in his luggage [and he he he couldn't] find it

39: L: [he he he he he]

40: J: he's like (.)↑ hey there is no iron in my room. hehehe oh USE OURS. anyway so he was

41: busy ironing away,

42: →L: and he's just looking at his ironing like [((unable to hear)))]

43: J: [hahahaha he was like hehehe he was]

44: why is there a fucking iron in my luggage.

45: o:::h, we did so many bad things to his car. =↑what did- what

46: we do with his seat belt or something. what did we do with his ca::r. (0.4)

47: L: ˚u:::m˚

48: J: we did some several things to his car

49: L: you did [you did hahahaha that one he's giving really]

50: J: [you get hehehe you just sort of (1.8)]

9.3.4.1: The first instance is expanded three times by both speakers

28: J: hehehe and he goes (0.5) ↑why the fuck's my door shut. =and we're like meh? anyway

29: cause he went to go an to go in there and he didn't came back around us, .hhh and he

30: walks in, and the heat wave that came through-

31: → L: cause he saw the heat wave coming out of his fucking room

32: → J: and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah,

33: → L: because it was beautiful because he was all cold in ours, and then he walked into the

34: next room ws a sauna.

35: J: we also (hid)-

36: L: and he's like oh no fuck ↑hahahaha

The first instance is seen in lines 31 to 34. J's utterance in line 30 '*walks in, and the heat wave that came through-*' is cut off by the next speaker L. L in line 32 then delivers '*cause he saw the heat wave coming out of his fucking room*'. J in line 30 talks about the 'heat wave'. The next speaker L expands L's talk to provide details of where the heat wave was coming from, and how it was seen by their friend. Therefore, J's utterance in line 30 '*walks in, and the heat wave that came through-*' is interrupted and, at the same time, expanded by the next speaker L in line 31. L's expansion component in line 31 '*cause he saw the heat wave was coming out of his fucking room*' contains '*cause*' as an increment initiator.

L's expansion in line 31 does not end J's story. It is further expanded by the original speaker J in line 32. J in line 32 delivers '*and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah,*' which contains an increment initiator '*and*'. J's utterance describes both J and L's reactions to their friend's having been a victim of their practical joke. Thus, so far, a discourse unit is collaboratively formed by both J and L: '*he walks in and the heat wave that came*

through cause he saw the heat wave was coming out of his fucking room and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah, '.

J's expansion in line 32 '*and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah,*' is then expanded by L in lines 33 and 34 by delivering '*because it was beautiful because he was all cold in ours, and then he walked into the next room ws a sauna.*'. L's expansion contains two uses of the increment initiator '*because*'. The first '*because*' by L is used to expand the previous speaker, J's utterance in line 32 '*and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah,*'. The second '*because*' by L expands his first component '*because it was beautiful*'.

In the end, the original speaker J's utterance in line 30 '*...heat wave came through-*' is expanded by both the original speaker J and the next speaker L as a long discourse unit as described below.

Line 30: '*...heat wave came through-*' (by J)

↓

Line 31: '*cause he saw the heat wave coming out of his fucking room*' (by L)

↓

Line 32: '*and it was ju- we're both like ↑ye:::ah*' (by J)

↓

Line 33: '*because it was beautiful because he was all cold in ours and then he walked into the room*' (by L)

As the above shows, this instance is a highly collaborative one sentence expansion by male participants. Both speakers J and L are contributing to the expansion of their story using increment initiators '*cause*', '*and*' and '*because*'.

This multiple expansion model is also similarly seen in women's conversation, as shown below.

139: A: and you know- I- I knew tht mike was always on his PS3 playing online games

140: [through the console,

141: K: [↓ah::::

142: →A: and I was li:ke [okay] he goes I got this bill for three thousand dollars.

143: K: [hhhh.]

144: K: =Aaargh::::

145: A: and I was like [OH::::M:::::Y go:::::d.]

146: →K: [cause he was so far over] his download.

147: →A: yeah because he would have been downloading at least twenty gig, .hh you know

148: and it's like fifteen cents per every megabit (.) that you're over.

149: K: AH::

150: A: and I was like oh my [god

151: K: [he should've rung them up and contested it n said look you

152: didn't explain this [properly.]

The extract above was taken from Example 2 in the women's one sentence expansion chapter. Both A and K are expanding the original speaker A's utterance. The next speaker K's expansion component does complete the original speaker A's utterance, but the original speaker A further expands K's expansion component.

In short, these instances of multiple expansions show that both speakers are highly engaged in the topic of their talk. They are also highly collaborative in their joint formation of a story using repeated expansions of previous speakers' utterances.

9.3.4.2: The second instance following Lerner's basic model of expansions with an increment initiator '*and*'

37: J: we were (.) also that night (.) that's right he was busy looking for the iron to iron his shirt?

38: and I hid it in his luggage [and he he he couldn't] find it

39: L: [he he he he he]

40: J: he's like (.)↑ hey there is no iron in my room. hehehe oh USE OURS. anyway so he was

41: busy ironing away,

42: →L: and he's just looking at his ironing like [((unable to hear)))]

43: J: [hahahaha he was like hehehe he was]

44: why is there a fucking iron in my luggage.

45: o::::h, we did so many bad things to his car. =↑what did- what

46: we do with his seat belt or something. what did we do with his ca::r. (0.4)

47: L: ˚u::::m˚

48: J: we did some several things to his car

49: L: you did [you did hahahaha that one he's giving really]

50: J: [you get hehehe you just sort of (1.8)]

The second instance is seen in line 42. The original speaker J in lines 40 and 41 delivers '*... so he was busy ironing away,*'. J's utterance does not end with the falling intonation which often signals the closure of the utterance (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006). J's utterance in lines 40 and 42 is a syntactically complete utterance but it could be treated as an intonationally incomplete utterance as J did not use a falling intonation. However, the next speaker L in line 42 takes his turn just after J's '*...away,*' in line 41 and delivers '*and he's just looking at his ironing like...*' which expands J's '*... so he was busy ironing away,*'.

L's expansion in line 42 contains an increment initiator '*and*' to expand. Once L starts his utterance in line 42, the original speaker J stops talking and lets L expand his utterance. Both J and L are jointly describing what their friend was doing with his ironing. In the end, J's utterance in lines 40 and 41 '*anyway so he was busy ironing away*' is expanded by L in line 42 '*and he's just looking at his ironing like…*'.

L's utterance in line 42 after his '*…like*' is overlapped by the next speaker J's initial laughter in line 43. Although the part of L's utterance in line 42 which is overlapped by J in line 43 was not able to transcribed, J's overlap in line 43 '*[hahahaha he was like hehehe he was]*' contains laughter throughout. J also delivers some laughter in line 40 which suggests that J is trying to underline the humour of the story. The other speaker L participates in J's humour by delivering an expansion for J's utterance. A sense of humour or joke sequence in conversations can be employed collaboratively (Holmes, 2006). In this instance, the sense of humour by J and the participation in J's humour by the next speaker L support and emphasise the collaborative nature of the one sentence expansion.

This humorous story which is told by J and L can be explained as a type of narrative humour (Hay, 1995: 73). Narrative humour takes the form of story which often begins such as 'there was an Englishman, an Irishman and a Scotsman…'. Both J and L are developing a story of what they did for their friend. Their friend is the main character of this part of the story and both J and L are making their story humorous.

In short, this example showed two similarities to women's examples of one sentence expansion which was discussed in the previous chapter. Firstly, all instances followed Lerner's basic model of expansions (1991). Secondly, the third instance contained

laughers as a collaborative feature. Through this example, both male speakers were collaboratively developing the story by using one sentence expansions.

9.3.5: A case following Jefferson's and Lerner's three part structure

The sequence shown in Example 5 below has already been seen in Example 7 of the men's one sentence construction chapter. However, it includes a case of one sentence expansion, which can be seen in line 246. In this part of the conversation, L is talking about his work. L is in charge of DJing for a wedding, and participants are treating L's story ironically.

Example 5

230: (0.3)

231: A: [hahahaha]

232: L: [hahahaha]

233: K: [hahahaha]

234: A: (it's got) THREE::: GU::::YS **(**into die)

235: K: now they'll- they'll- provide their own entertainment, those guys.

236: L: no with they <u>said</u> they <u>said</u> bring uh: bring along a CD?

237: (0.4)

238: K: ↑oh right, of the[ir their favourite tu:nes,]

239: L: [o of (.)] no of songs that they wanna h<u>e</u>:ar

240: and it's like <u>norm</u>ally (.) if (.) if I tell like a bride and groom or something to

241: bring along a CD. (0.7) you're <u>worrie</u>d? whether they'll actually bring it

242: along?=

243: J: =yeah.

244: L: and whether it'll actually work?

245: J: ye::ah.

246: →Al: and whether or not [it'll actually be just] stuff for you to find anyway.

247: L: [nono]

248: L: yeah but if it's the marine guys it's just like o:[:h]

249: K: [o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]

250: L: [>it's<] it's gonna

251: work they'll have four copies of it (.) just in case >the first one<

252: doesn't [work (or not)]. It's all ↑good.

253: Al: [ye:ahhh]

254: Al: every date stamp[ed.]

255: L: [eve]ry date and time stamped

256: J: and it'll be like [it'll be like (.)]

257: L: [how many tapes wrapped up]

258: J: you know (0.3) pro professionally printed,

259: L: yeah.

This instance of one sentence expansion has several features discussed below. Firstly, Al's expansion of L's previous utterance in line 246 *and whether or not [it'll actually be just] stuff for you to find anyway.*'contains an increment initiator '*and*' (Lerner, 1991). L's utterance in line 244 '*and whether it'll actually work?*' which ends with a rising intonation, is followed in line 245 by J's delivery of a minimal response token '*yeah*' which precedes Al's expansion component. Nevertheless, Al's utterance in line 246 is actually expanding L's utterance in line 244 since it includes an increment initiator '*and*'.

Secondly, Al's attempt to expand L's utterance is partially accepted by L in line 248. Lerner (2004) explains that the original speaker often delivers either an acceptance or rejection for the next speaker when the next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance for one sentence construction. Lerner's claim can also apply to the speaker who delivers an expansion component in a case of one sentence expansion. In this instance, L in line 248 delivers a minimal response token '*yeah*' which shows that L is partially agreeing with Al's utterance in line 246 '*and whether or not [it'll actually be just] stuff for you to find anyway.*'. However, L delivers '*but*' after '*yes*' which is a contradiction marker (Schiffrin, 1987) and L continues his story. Thus L in line 248 is showing partial agreement with Al in line 246 but L does not show full agreement with Al's expansion.

Thirdly, this case of one sentence expansion follows a three part listing explained by Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991). Lerner (1991) explains that a sentence can be theoretically expanded with no limit with the use of conjunctions such as '*and*' but in conversations, speakers might predict how many conjunctions will be used to expand a sentence. Jefferson (1991) founds that speakers in conversations often deliver the three part structure when they list things in their conversations. The recipient often monitors the third component as a sign of turn completion.

In this example, L's utterance lists two things he could be worried about when he tells a bride and groom to bring along a CD: '*whether they'll actually bring it along?*' in lines 241 and 242, and '*and whether it'll actually work?*' in line 244. Then in line 246 Al delivers '*and whether or not [it'll actually be just] stuff for you to find anyway.*' as the third component of L's list. Al's utterance in line 246 is presented as a completion of L's possible three-part list.

A one sentence expansion providing a third component of a three-part list was also seen in women's conversation in this study. The extract below is taken from Example 1 in the women's one sentence expansion chapter.

585: A: WIl I just said t'the boss I said make sure we treat her well because y'know she's .hh

586: she knows pe::ople. hahahaha

587: K: hahahaha [ye::ah.

588: A: [I don't wanna be getting on a thing and then someday they're asking her

589: about her experiences and she goes I worked for this café (in) n'the people there

590: were horrible. [hahahhaha]

591: K: [hahahaha]

592: → A: and never go eat the:re=they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]

593: →K: [they] spit

594: in the fo::od.

595: A: yeah.

596: K: hahahahahaha

A's utterance in line 592 contains the first list component '*people there were horrible.*'. A in line 592 then delivers the second component part '*they do disgusting things with their[fo::od.]*'. The third component is then delivered by K in line 593 and 594 '*[they] spit in the fo::od*' and it both expands and completes A's utterance of line 592.

As explained above, this instance in men's conversation shares similar features, in that three list components are produced: '*whether they'll actually bring it along?*' and '*and whether it'll actually work?*' by L, and '*and whether or not [it'll actually be just] stuff for you to find anyway.*' by Al. This list is collaboratively developed by two male speakers L and Al.

In short, this instance showed one segment of discourse collaboratively developed by two male speakers. It followed the three part listing pattern of one sentence expansion (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991) which was similarly observed in women's conversation. In this instance, two male speakers collaboratively developed the original speaker's story.

9.4: Summary of this chapter

Male participants in this study showed several collaborative one sentence constructions in their conversations. Like female participants in this study, male participants use one sentence expansions to collaborate in their talk. Male participants in this study in fact showed several cases of one sentence expansions in their conversations which were discussed in this chapter.

Two major kinds of one sentence expansion were seen in this study among male participants. Some instances of one sentence expansion followed Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion (1991). The original speaker delivered a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker delivered an expanding unit with an increment initiator. Male participants in this study used several kinds of increment initiators to expand the original speakers' utterance: '*and*', '*because*' ('*cause*'), '*across*' and '*but*'. Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion was also seen among female participants, as discussed in the women's one sentence expansion chapter.

The other kind of one sentence expansion among male participants in this study followed Jefferson's (1991) and Lerner's (1991) three part structure of one sentence expansion. Jefferson (1991) explained that speakers' lists frequently contain three components. In this particular type of one sentence expansion, the original speaker delivers two out of three list components and then the next speaker delivers the final component, thus

completing the list. Male speakers in this study showed this kind of one sentence expansion. Female participants in this study also commonly showed this kind of one sentence expansion.

In addition, there was an instance of one sentence expansion which was delivered with some laughter by male speakers in this chapter. Male participants in this instance conveyed a sense of humour in their story, which is considered a collaborative feature in talk. Shared humour is one way to show collaboration in talk (Holmes, 2006a). Some female participants in this study also showed laughter in association with one sentence expansions, as discussed in the women's one sentence expansion chapter.

The present chapter explored several selected examples from men's one sentence expansions which were also similar to those seen among female participants in this study. By using one sentence expansions, male participants collaboratively formed longer discourse sequences and stories. One sentence expansions were used as a tool to achieve conversational goals, that is to collaboratively develop a story among participants. Thus, as this chapter has discussed, men may use one sentence expansion as a collaborative feature in their conversations.

Chapter 10: men's repetition

10.1: Introduction

Previous chapters discussed collaborative one sentence constructions and expansions as they are used by men and women. It was evident that both men and women in this present study showed various ways of producing collaborative one sentence constructions and expansions in their talk. This chapter explores repetitions by male participants in this present study. According to Coates' study (1993), while one sentence constructions are used by women as collaborative conversational features, repetitions are used by men as collaborative conversational features. Chapter 5 in this study quantitatively showed that male participants in this study used 36 cases of repetitions in total and thus, as Coates' claimed (1993), repetitions is possibly men's collaborative feature in conversations. Coates' study (1993), however, did not explore repetitions further to see in what conversational circumstances male repetitions occur. This present study, therefore, explores whether repetitions are used by men as collaborative features in conversation. It also explores the functions of repetitions among male participants of this study.

Tannen (2007: 58) proposes several functions of repetitions in conversations. First of all, repetition enables a speaker to produce language in a more efficient, less energy draining way. Secondly, it facilitates the production of more language more fluently. Thirdly, it is a resource for producing ample talk. Fourthly, it allows a speaker to set up a paradigm and slot in new information where the frame for the new information stands ready, rather than having to be newly formulated. Lastly, it enables a speaker to produce fluent speech while formulating what to say next.

CA researchers have examined the functions of repetitions as well. Sacks (1992, v2) outlines three functions of the repetition. For instance, the example below is given by Sacks (1992, v2:141).

A: Where are you staying.

B: Pacific Pallisades.

A: Oh. Pacific Pallisades.

B's utterance '*Pacific Pallisades*' is repeated by A in the third line. Speaker B has answered speaker B's question '*Where are you staying.*' in the first line with '*Pacific Pallisades.*'. Speaker A in the third line repeats '*Pacific Pallisades*', which shows that speaker A has understood where speaker B is staying.

The second function of repetition proposed by Sacks can be seen when it is used to create a joke. Sacks (1992, v2) does not give an example of repetition as a joke, so here an example taken from Tannen (2007:71) is provided below.

1: Peter Just to see if we say anything interesting?

2: Deborah No. Just to see how you say nothing interesting.

3: Peter Oh. Well I – I hardly ever say nothing interesting.

Tannen explained that Peter in line 1 says '*say anything interesting*' and then Deborah says '*say nothing interesting*' in line 2, a statement in which Peter's '*anything*' has been changed to '*nothing*'. Then Peter in line 3 again repeats '*say nothing interesting*' which shows that the two are telling a joke based on a repetition of Peter's first utterance '*say anything interesting*'.

The third use of repetition described by Sacks is complex. Sacks referred to this repetition as '*gist preserving errors*'.

B: Now you told me were you are. And you're uh, Palos- uh,

A: Uh no. In La Maria

B: La Maria. Oh La Maria. Yeah

(Sacks, 1992, v2: 143)

In the example above, Sacks explains that B says '*Palos*-', relying on her memory of what she has been told, and this is corrected by A in the next turn. B in the third line then corrects her own utterance and repeats A's utterance '*La Maria*' twice. This example is similar to the first type of repetition shown above, in which the next speaker B shows understanding of the previous speaker A's utterance '*La Maria*'. This example, however, also involves a correction by another speaker before the speaker produces the repetition.

Liddicoat (2007) notes the repetition component of a pre-telling sequence which is often seen in a question format such as a '*guess what*' and '*what*' sequence.

D: .hh oh guess what.

R: What

D: Professor Deelies came in, 'n he-put another book in' is order'.

Liddicoat (2007: 137)

In this example, D raises a question '*guess what*' in the first line. R then repeats '*What*' in the second line which means '*go ahead*'. D in the last line then starts to tell his story.

R's repetition in the second line '*What*' is used as a prompt for D to tell his story and it functions as a pre-telling sequence.

Oelschlager and Damico (1998) have studied the use of repetition by people who have aphasia and they have discovered four types of repetitions in their study. First they identified a form of repetition which they call '*uncertainty*'. This is used in clarification sequences. For example,

1:	M:	Saturday afternoon, the, what, the twenty-third, twenty-fourth one of
2:		those days. The twenty-fourth. Okay. Radio Shack has adult (price
3:		ones). There's two. One is fifity dollars each and the other is seventy
4:		for the pair. And they both go about a quarter of a mile.
5:	E:	quarter of a mile?
6:	M:	Ra-range.

Oelschlager and Damico (1998: 976)

Oelschlager and Damico (1998) explained that in line 4, the speaker M says '*a quarter of mile*'. The speaker M's '*a quarter of mile*' in line 4 is repeated by the next speaker E in line 5, '*a quarter of mile?*'with a rising final intonation. The speaker E is indicating some uncertainty about what the previous speaker M is saying in line 5.

The second type of repetition described by Oelschlager and Damico (1998) is called '*agreement*'. This type of repetition is often seen in a question and answer sequence such as that given below.

372:	Ed:	Yeah, From here to one there, one mile, one (2.0), no (2.1), can't 373:
373:		think of the name of it.

374: M: Hour?

375: Ed: Hour.

376: MG: Hmmm.

Oelschlager and Damico (1998: 977)

In lines 372 and 373 the speaker Ed does not complete his sentence since he is having word retrieval difficulty as is indicated by his engaging in several attempts to say the desired word by pausing and employing metalanguage. Then in line 374 the speaker M says '*hour?*', with a rising intonation, offering a possible word to Ed as a solution to his retrieval difficulty. In line 375, the word '*hour*' is repeated by the speaker Ed as an agreement with and acceptance of M's suggested word.

The third type of repetition described by Oelschlager and Damico (1998) is called an '*alignment*'. This type of repetition shows that the original speaker agrees with another speaker.

286: M: Well, you don't get rid tied up in the family messes.

287: MG: Yeah, that's true.

288: Ed: That's true.

289: MG: That's true, and you can go visit and that's very nice and then you

299: can go home.

Oelschlager and Damico (1998: 981)

In line 287, MG produces '…*that's true*' which is repeated by Ed in line 288. In line 287, MG is showing her agreement with M's prior turn in line 286 which talks about an advantage of living away from home. In line 287, MG is showing her agreement as well as aligning herself with M as she verifies M's assessment by saying '*that's true*',

meaning '*I think the same thing as you*'. In line 288, Ed is doing the same thing as MG has done by repeating '*that's true*'. Ed talks from the same perspective as both M and MG, resulting in a display of alignment with both M and MG.

The last type of repetition described by Oelschlager and Damico (1998) is used to show acknowledgement. This is often used in a continuation sequence since it is embedded in an extended narrative by another conversational participant.

181: M:	and they had a couple, probably a professional dance crew or
182:	couple that danced the Italian dances.
183: Ed:	Dances.
184: MO:	Oh nice.

Oelschlager and Damico (1998: 981)

Ed in line 183 repeats M's '*dances*' in line 182. Ed in line 183 is showing his attention to and understanding of M's story about attending a festival. In this part of the conversation, M is taking the conversational floor and Ed is displaying his active attention to what M is saying.

So far, several varieties of repetition have been discussed. Sacks (1993) showed a simple model of repetition and two other types of repetition: joking and '*gist preserving errors*'. Later Oelschlager and Damico (1998) showed four varieties of repetitions: uncertainty repetition, agreement repetition, alignment repetition and acknowledgement repetition.

However, there are other types of repetition which are shown by Schegloff (1997a) and Lerner (2004). Schegloff (1997a) explains the repetition which is used in response to a

problem with the talk. The previous speaker repeats his/her talk in the next turn to repair the recipient's problem of either hearing or grasping of what the previous speaker said.

1:	Eddy:	Oh I'm sure we c' get on at San Juan Hills.
2:		That's nice course, I only played it once.
3:	Guy:	Uh huh.
4:		(1.0)
5: →	Guy:	It's not too bad,
6:	Eddy:	Huh?
7: →	Guy:	'S not too bad,
8:	Eddy:	Oh.
9:	(1.0)	
10:	Eddy:	What time you wanna go.

(Schegloff, 1997a: 507)

Schegloff explains that after Eddy's '*Huh?*' in line 6, Guy in line 7 repeats his statement of line 5. This is because Eddy's '*Huh?*' in line 6 possibly indicates a problem in hearing or grasping what Guy said in line 5. In this example, the same speaker Guy repeats '*it's not too bad*' in line 7. In contrast, in the other examples of repetition discussed earlier in this study it was the other speaker who repeated the original speaker's utterance.

Lerner (2002) describes a form of repetition which he calls 'choral co-producing'. It is slightly different from the repetitions discussed so far. Lerner compares his 'choral co-producing' with Tannen's shadowing which she also describes as a form of repetition. In Tannen's shadowing, a recipient hears what someone is saying, syllable by syllable, and then quickly reproduces or copies it in an automatic fashion. However, in Lerner's

‘choral co-producing’, a recipient hears what the other speaker is saying and then the recipient produces what is possibly being said by the other speaker. Lerner gives the following example of ‘choral co-producing’.

```
1.        B:  One of those Kay Sweets brought him a cake. =
2.        C:  =O:h.=
3.        B:  =Oh, let’s not talk about it through ahuh huh
4.            (1.2)
5.        A:  why: [no:t ((smile voice))
6.        C:  [(you don’t 0 one of those sisters.
7.        A:  Oh you mean (.) one of the sweethearts=
8.        B:  =the (   ) Kappa [sweethearts]
9.        C:  [Yea:hs:] = (mo:re)
10.       B:  brought him a cake.
11.           (0.7)
12.           Yep.
13.           (0.3)
14.           [it was a ni-]
15.           [(    )] ((A looks to C))
16.       B:  = It was a nice cake, you kno:w
17.       C:  [you, you just have to
18.   →       E:x::p[erience them
19.   →   B:        [perience that
20.           ((B & C laugh))
```

Lerner explains that the recipient B in line 19 hears the beginning of C’s ‘*experienc*e’ and uses that hearing, along with what came before in the turn and the rest of the context

and structure of the talk, to project what is possibly being said. Thus B co-produces '*experience*'.

Lerner's example of 'choral co-producing' above can be also considered a form of one sentence construction, although Lerner distinguishes between these two forms of collaborative talk. The speaker B is also trying to complete C's in progress utterance in overlap (see earlier discussion of this practice in Example 2 of the women's one sentence construction chapter in this study).

10.2: Participants for this chapter

For this chapter, the following participants appear in the conversation examples provided below.

- Al: a man in his early thirties, born in Scotland but holding Australian citizenship
- Aa: a man in his early thirties, J's sister's husband
- J: a man in his early thirties
- Ku: a man in his late twenties, J' relative
- L: a man in his early thirties, K's brother
- G: J's grandfather
- C: a woman in her late twenties and E's boy friend
- E: a man and C's boy friend

Example 4 is an exception since it is a mixed sex conversation in which two women are involved. However the repetitions in this example were delivered by the male speaker Ku. Therefore the repetitions in this example are treated as men's repetition in this study.

- K: a women in her early thirties, married, has two children, relative of A
- A: a woman in her late twenties, married with Al

As noted above, although this chapter focuses on men's talk, two women K and A appear in some parts of the conversations. This occurs because the participants were told not to stop their recordings even when speakers of the opposite sex joined in while the conversations were being recorded. This was necessary in order to record ordinary conversations. Therefore, some women's talk is included here, but women's conversations are not analysed in this chapter.

10.3: Discussion

As is shown in the quantitative analysis chapter, male speakers used repetitions to collaborate in their conversations. A total of 39 instances of repetitions were seen by male speakers in this study. In particular, men's conversation 1 included nine instances and men's conversation 5 included 12 instances of repetitions. In this chapter six examples are selected for discussion since these examples provide rich data sources to be discussed. In contrast to the other two collaborative features discussed previously, one sentence constructions and expansions, many cases of repetitions seen in this study have several functions. This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section discusses cases of repetition which serve a single function. The second section discusses cases of repetition which have multiple functions.

Although many cases of repetition in this chapter will show multiple functions, the distinctive features discussed earlier are briefly summarised here. Firstly, repetitions can be delivered with overlap. The next speaker delivers a repetition while the original speaker is still continuing his utterance (Lerner, 1992). Overlap features in this chapter

are used as a display of the speaker's enthusiastic participation in the conversation (Tannen, 2007) which supports the notion of collaborative talk. Secondly, there is a form of repetition which is used as a prompt for expanding the current part of the conversation (Tannen, 2007). Thirdly, there is repetition followed by laughter. This type of repetition creates and supports humour in the talk. Fourthly, there is a type of repetition which follows a minimal response token. This type of repetition acknowledges the original speaker's utterance. It also supports the minimal response token and shows the next speaker's understanding of the original speaker's utterance. Fifthly, there are repetitions with a rising intonation used in the same way as a question to the original speaker (Schegloff, 1997a and Oelschlager and Damico, 1998). Lastly, there is repetition used as a part of one sentence construction. In this type of repetition, repetition is used to acknowledge the previous speaker's affiliating utterance.

The first part - repetitions which serve a single function

In this first part of the chapter, Examples 1 to 3 are discussed. All examples in the first part have a single function. Cases which have multiple functions are discussed in the second part of this chapter. Examples 1 and 2 include one instance of repetition each. Example 3 includes two instances of repetition.

10.3.1: A case of repetition '*[you get] it in a proper glass.*': to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance

The part of the conversation provided below is recorded at one of J's relative's parents' house. J and G are friends who are in their early thirties. J is telling about his experience of drinking authentic beer in British pubs. An instance of repetition is seen in

line 32. In this instance, a case of repetition is used as a response to one sentence construction and is used to acknowledge the next speaker's attempt at completion.

Example 1

19:	J:	cause it's still (.) guinness and um (0.5) man those things are so thick, creamy, it's just
20:		like o:::h, ( ) o:::hohoh,
21:	G:	I was tempted to get one to bring over but (.) I just wanna try one.
22:	J:	yeah you gotta have it off tap can't have it out of a can because it just doesn::'t do it
23:		justice. .hh and I've had um Kilkenny here in Australia, and it was all well and good, but
24:		when I went over there it was just like
25:	G:	yeah.
26:	J:	↑oh my god so many flavours (0.5) wha-?
27:	G:	yeah.
28:	J:	so if:: um:: (1.2) yeah so while I was there?
29:	G:	yeah,
30:	J:	every guinness:: that you buy, (0.3) you get in a gui[n[ness::]
31: →	G:	[in a] proper glass.=
32: →	J:	[you get] it in a proper glass. so I actually brought home with me(.)seven glass[es of]
33:	G:	[yeah.] [oh::.]
34:	J:	guinness?
35:	G:	see I-
36:	J:	and I- I ay- a::h ↓two of them got cracked in the car on the way home
37:	G:	yep

J is talking about a particular beer brand which tasted different when he drank it in the pub in the U.K. G is listening to J's story. J in line 30 says, '*every guinness:: that you buy, (0.3) you get in a guin[ness::]*' which is overlapped by G in line 31 '*[in a]*'.

G's '*[in a] proper glass.=*' in line 31 overlaps J's '*... guin[ness::]*' in line 30. This overlap seems to function differently from G's point of view and from J's point of view. From G's point of view, it occurs toward the end of J's utterance in line 30 which suggests that this overlap does not seem to be problematic (Liddicoat, 2007). Rather it shows the next speaker G's enthusiastic participation into J's story (Tannen, 1993). Also the original speaker J does not display any anger by saying something like '*you always interrupt me*' (Sacks,1992, v2). This suggests that this overlap does not cause any problem between the original speaker and the next speaker.

However, from J's point of view, G's utterance '*[in a] proper glass.=*' in line 31 can be treated as a case of interruption. J in line 30 says '*…you get in a guin[ness::]*' and J in line 32 repeats his previous utterance as '*[you get] it in a proper glass.*'. J in both lines 30 and 32 continues telling his story, but G's utterance in line 31 '*[in a] proper glass.=*' is inserted between J's utterances in lines 30 and 32. As a result, J's in-progress story was interrupted by G, and J resumes his telling of the story in line 32.

G in line 31 tries to complete J's in-progress utterance in line 31 '*you get in a guin[ness::]*'. However, G's completing utterance '*[in a] proper glass.=*' is launched before J's utterance is finished. Then J in line 32 repeats G's utterance in line 31 as '*[you get] it in a proper glass.*'. J's repetition is used to acknowledge and accept G's attempt to complete J's prior talk '*[in a] proper glass.=*' (Lerner, 1991), as well as to provide the basis for further expansion of his story.

In short, in this part of the conversation, the case of repetition was used as an acknowledgement of G's completion of a one sentence construction. G tried to complete J's in-progress utterance, and then J delivered a repetition to acknowledge and accept G's attempted sentence completion. In addition, J's repetition of G's utterance provides J with the opportunity to expand and continue his story.

10.3.2: A case of repetition'*potato and garden*': to prompt a story expansion

Example 2 was recorded at L's birthday party and it is a mixed sex conversation. J asks E a question about the kind of salad he is eating and E answers. Then J repeats E's answer. J's repetition may be intended to prompt an expansion but ultimately it does not work in this way, because of J's own action.

Example 2

70: C: did you taste my fancy salad?

71: E Oh, that was lov-(.) ↓oh I barred that one actually, I had the potato salad ↑but I-

72: E: I uh, I wanted to just have (1.2) limit to myself two types of salad (2.0) for starters,

73: C: oh okay,

74: E: but- you know, you tend to r- revisit your salads-

75: J: is that Mediterranean or (0.8) pasta in

76: E: (I went) the pota- the potato and the garden salad actually¿

77: J: oh right okay.

78: E: <u>ye:::s.</u>

79: → J: potato and garden.

80: E: ye:::s.

81: (5.0)

82: E: yes::(2.0) I wanted to uh-

83: J: I'm always concerned when they have the cesar salad that's fresh(ly tossed)

84: (4.4)

85: E: yes

86: (4.5)

J in line 75 asks the question '*is that Mediterranean or (0.8) pasta in*' and then E in line 76 answers with '*(I went) the pota- the potato and the garden salad actually¿*'. J in line 77 delivers '*oh right okay.*' which suggests that J accepts E's answer. After E's '*ye:::s.*' in line 78, J delivers a repetition '*potato and garden.*', which was a part of E's utterance in line 76. E in line 80 then delivers another '*ye:::s.*' which acknowledges and confirms the content of J's repetition.

J's repetition of '*potato and garden.*' does not seem to show a problem of hearing or understanding what the previous speaker E has said, since it does not contain a rising intonation which would mean it is being used as a question or clarification request. In fact, J has already delivered a minimal response token in line 77 '*oh right okay*' to show his understanding of the type of salads E is eating.

Instead, J's repetition '*potato and garden.*' appears to be used as a prompt for an expansion of the conversation (Tannen, 2007). Tannen (2007: 73) explains that repetition can be used as a prompt to expand a part of the conversation, as shown below.

1: Deborah	Do you read?
2: Peter	Do I read?
3:	Do you read things just for fun?
4: Peter:	Yeah.

5: Right now I'm reading

6: Norma Jean the Terminate Queen

Tannen explains that in line 2, Peter repeats Deborah's '*Do you read?*' as '*Do I read?*' which prompts Deborah's second, expanded question in line 3. Then Peter himself, from line 4, starts expanding this part of the conversation by answering the question.
J's repetition '*potato and garden.*' in line 79 below is used similarly to Tannen's repetition example above.

75: J: is that Mediterranean or (0.8) pasta in

76: E: (I went) the pota- the potato and the garden salad actually¿

77: J: oh right okay.

78: E: <u>ye:::s.</u>

79: → J: potato and garden.

80: E: ye:::s.

81: (5.0)

82: E: yes:: (2.0) I wanted to uh-

83: J: I'm always concerned when they have the cesar salad that's fresh(ly tossed)

84: (4.4)

However, J's attempt to expand this part of the conversation by a repetition of '*potato and garden.*' is curtailed by J himself. E in line 80 delivers '*ye:::s*' to acknowledge J's '*potato and garden.*' in line 79 instead of expanding this part of the conversation, followed by a long pause in line 81. During this very long pause, E is possibly busy eating his salad. However, in line 82 E says '*yes:: (2.0) I wanted to uh-*' which suggests that E is indeed commencing an expansion of this part of the conversation. Yet E's expanding utterance '*yes:: (2.0) I wanted to uh-*' is cut off by J in line 83.

J's utterance in line 83 is apparently treated as an interruption since E drops his turn when J's utterance begins and allows J to continue his talk (Sacks, 1992, v2). J in line 82 starts to talk of his concern about Cesar salads although both E and J have been talking about potato and garden salads. It is E's own initiation of talk in line 83 that cuts off E's expansion. J's utterance in line 82 is not expanded by E. There is another long pause in line 84.

In short, this example showed that the next speaker J may have delivered a repetition to prompt an expansion of this part of conversation, but did not allow this expansion to proceed. The next speaker E initially acknowledged the original speaker's repetition without expanding the conversation, as seen in Tannen's example. It is only 5 seconds later that he commences a possible expansion, only to be cut off by J's own initiation of talk. Nevertheless, this type of repetition can perform a collaborative function by prompting the expansion of a conversational sequence to achieve a conversational goal.

10.3.3: Cases of repetition '*shinobi¿*' and '*yeah years*'

Example 3 is part of the conversation between J and A. J has brought his DVD collections to his parents' house and both J and A are looking at it. This part of the conversation contains many pauses since they are talking and looking at J's DVD collection at the same time. Example 3 contains two cases of repetition. The first instance is seen in line 77, delivered with a rising intonation, and the second instance is seen in line 82, including a minimal response token 'yeah'.

Example 3

65: A: the ↑funny thing I find like they ask you on the on the when you enter the web

66: site. are you over a certain age and you [just put on there

67: J: [yeah you just put on whatever you want.

68: A: yeah it's like-

69: J: well, they've got to for legal reasons I suppose.

70: A: I know but you know that doesn't stop a ten year old to-

71: J: I know but you know.

72: (3.0)

73: A: revenge.

74: (1.0)

75: A: what's shinobi again?

76: (1.0)

77:→J: shinobi¿(0.4) .hh a::h that's a::y [japanese] japanese movie,

78: A: [anime?]

79: J: no it's not anime (1.0) it's like action. (1.0) ((unable to hear)) further down the back

80: (3.0) so this is a two thousand six (.) hello dog? ((J's pet came here))

81: A: oh it's the year.

82: →J: yeah (do them in) years. (2.0) it's chronological, an that's alphabetical in years.

83: A: for some reason- when you see chronology I think it was like

84: alphabet?

85: (1.5)

86: J: yeah and yeah [(I call it)] I said that it was alphabetic organised but chronologically first

87: A: [I feel silly for]

10.3.3.1: The first repetition: '*shinobi?*' with a rising intonation: used as a question.

In line 75, A asks J about a movie on DVD '*what's shinobi again?*' with a rising intonation at the end, which normally shows the speaker is asking a question. J in lines

77 and 79 delivers an answer for A in line 75. J in line 77 and 79 is explaining what '*shinobi*' is.

A's question '*what's shinobi again?*' does not interrupt Al's story, in contrast to the interruptions shown in previous examples. In this example, A's question provides the opening of a new topic. Liddicoat (2007) explained that a question such as 'guess what' can be used to introduce a new story. A's question '*what's shinobi again?*' is similarly used to launch a new topic, rather than to interrupt a story in progress.

There is a long pause '*(1.0)*' just before J's '*shinobi¿*' in line 77. This long pause is possibly made because both A and J are looking at J's DVD collection while they are talking. After a long pause in line 13, J in line 14 repeats A's word '*shinobi¿*' with a slightly high rising intonation. J's slightly rising intonation in line 14 may suggest that J has a problem of hearing or grasping A's question in line 12 '*what's shinobi again?*' (Schegloff, 1997a). If so, then J in line 14 is perhaps trying to check the topic of A's question, by delivering a repetition with a slightly high rising intonation. Alternatively he may deliver his repetition of '*shinobi¿*' as a re-statement of the new topic of the talk.

In line 77, there is another relatively short pause '*(0.4)*' just after J's repetition '*shinobi¿*'. This short pause '*(0.4)*' possibly shows that J is struggling to produce his next segments after his repetition '*shinobi¿*'. There is a hesitation marker '*a::h*' in J's line 77, and a self-repetition of the same hesitation marker: '*a::h that's a::h*'. This supports the possibility that J's short pause '*(0.4)*' in line 77 shows that J may be struggling to produce his next segment.

This relatively short pause '*(0.4)*' after J's repetition '*shinobi¿*' in line 77 could also be the place for A to confirm to J that J has grasped or heard A's question correctly. A however, does not deliver a confirmation for J in this spot and J continues his turn.

10.3.3.2: The second repetition: '*yeah years*' with a minimal response '*yeah*': used to show understanding of what the previous speaker has said.

Example 3 also contains another case of repetition which is seen in line 82. This contains a minimal response token '*yeah*'.

79:	J:	no it's not that (1.0) it's not anime (1.0) it's like an action (1.0) further down the back
80:		sort out of (3.0) so this is a two thousand six (.) hello dog? ((J's pet came here))
81:	A:	o:::h it's in the <u>year</u>
82:	→J:	yeah years (2.0) it's chronological that's <u>al</u>phabetic in years
83:	A:	for some reason when you see chronology I think it was like
84:		alphabets?
85:	(1.5)	
86:	J:	yeah and yeah [I said that it] was alphabetic organised but chronologically first
87:	A:	[I feel silly for]

A in line 81 displays his recognition of the fact that J's DVD collection is organised in the box by the year of the movies. A's utterance '*o:::h it's in the <u>year</u>*' contains '*o:::h*' which shows A's recognition of the order of J's DVDs in the box (Schiffrin, 1987). A in lines 83 and 84 says '*for some reason when you see chronology I think it was like alphabets?*'. This suggests that A possibly thought that chronological order was the same as alphabetical order. However, he finds that they are organised in years. A's utterance in line 81 '*o:::h it's in the <u>year</u>*' is repeated by J in line 82 '*yeah years*'. J's

repetition '*yeah years*' contains a minimal response '*yeah*' which acknowledges and agrees with A's description of J's DVD arrangement (Gardner, 1998). Then J's repetition '*years*' after his '*yeah*' shows his understanding of what the previous speaker A has said (Sacks, 1992, v2).

J in line 82 provides more information about how he organises his DVD collection '*it's chronological that's alphabetic in years*' after J repeats part of A's utterance '*o:::h it's in the year*'. A in line 83 then develops this topic by telling his expectation of the order for things like DVDs or CDs, '*for some reason when you see chronology I think it was like* '. Thus, in this case, J's repetition is used as a prompt to develop the story (Tannen, 2007).

In short, the first repetition in this example showed a possible problematic repetition, as indicated below.

75: A: what's shinobi again.

76: (1.0)

77:→ J: shinobi ¿ (0.4) a::h that's a::h [japanese] japanese movie,

78: A: [anime?]

79: J: no it's not that (1.0) it's not anime (1.0) it's like an action (1.0) further down the back

80: sort out of (3.0) so this is a two thousand six (.) hello dog? ((J's pet came here))

J's repetition in line 77 showed that J was possibly having a problem hearing or grasping A's question in line 12. Despite this possible problem both speakers were trying to achieve a conversational goal – in this case, the previous speaker A raised a question and the next speaker J was trying to find an answer for A – which suggests that this type of repetition is a collaborative feature in talk.

The second repetition in this example was collaboratively done as shown below.

81: A: o:::h it's in the year

82: →J: yeah years (2.0) it's chronological that's alphabetic in years

83: A: for some reasons when you see chronology I think it was like

84: alphabets?

J in line 82 repeated part of A's utterance '*years*'. J's repetition showed his acknowledgement and agreement with A's description of J's DVD collection arrangement in the box. Then the talk was expanded after J's repetition. This second repetition supports the notion of collaborative features in talk as well. By delivering his repetition, J demonstrated that he was listening to the previous speaker A's utterance very carefully to reproduce what the previous speaker said as well as delivering a minimal response token to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance.

The second part of this chapter

In this second part of the chapter, three examples which perform two functions are discussed. Example 4 has three cases of repetitions. All three repetitions are followed by a contradiction marker '*but*' and have more than one function. Example 5 also includes three cases of repetitions. Although one of these three cases has only a single function, two have more than one function. Example 6 has five cases of repetition, most of which have more than two functions.

10.3.4: Cases of repetitions: '*they are challenging*' and '*yeah don't have time*'

Example 4 below is mixed gender talk which was recorded in K's house. A and K are female speakers but Ku is a male speaker. The female speaker A has been talking about a computer game with the female speaker K. This conversation was intended to be a women-only conversation and participants were instructed to record only women's talk. The male speaker K, however, joined the sequence already initiated by A. Therefore the part of the conversation below is categorised as mixed gender talk. This example contains three cases of repetition by the male speaker Ku. The first case is seen in line 427 '*they are challenging*'. The second one is seen in line 434 '*it's really good*' and the third one is seen in line 442 '*no ti::me*'.

Example 4

417: A: I still can't get past like the second level. hahahhhhahaha

418: K: on manic minor?

419: A: yeah. [hahahaha ha ha ha]

420: K: [I remember Lisa used to be able to do] it the best, [(0.5) that]game.

421: Ku: [I mean::(.)]

422: Ku: you play those old games and (.) you realise you must need some attention span

423: to play this for more than (.) half an hour.

424: A: ↑ I don't know, [not really-]

425: K: [cos they're::] crap?=

426: A: [=↑they're really challenging.]

427: Ku: [=↑yeah but they- the- (the thing like)]

428: →Ku: they're challenging but you realise (0.8) like you play ((name of game)) again.

429: A: mm hmm,

430: Ku: you should go to [ice level (.) remember that

431: K: [umm::: I used to and you are slip'n around.

432: Ku: It's like (.) [it'd take us like hours and]

433: →A: [but it's really go::od.]

434: →Ku: yeah it's really go:::od,

435: A: yeah.

436: (4.0) ((participants are disturbed by others who were talking in the other room))

437: Ku: but like (0.3) you don't realise I e e e e used to play it for like maybe like what

438: eight hours a day?

439: A: mm hmm.

440: Ku: you ju (0.2) you just can't do it.

441: →A: you just don't have ti::me these days. .hh [hu hu ha ha ha ha]

442: →Ku: [y'don't have° ti:::me b't(.)]

443: Ku: you can't be a[mu::sed for that long. Y'can't-]

444: K: [yeah we're not kiddies any more. Huhuhuhu]

445: Ku: you can't be amused for that long with it as well, (.) [you can't] have the

446: K: [ye::ah,]

447: ku: dedication to go (.) I'm not frustrated by the controls, and I'm just going to keep

448: trying.

449: K: yeah but ↑I want to know what's different now (.) like games these days don't

450: really (.) draw me in. [(.) like] the old [games used] to.=

451: Ku: [( )] [o::h, .hhh]

452: K: =an another thing is back then you couldn't sa:ve (0.3) save your progress like

453: A: yeah

10.3.4.1: The first repetition '*they are challenging*': a partial acknowledgement, reducing impact of disagreement, displaying listenership, and engaging in the story

In this part of the conversation, participants are talking about a game which they used to play. The first instance of repetition is seen in line 428. In line 426, A delivers '*[=↑they're really cha<u>l</u>lenging.]*' in which A is describing older computer games like the one they have been discussing. Then A's '*[=↑they're really cha<u>l</u>lenging.]*' is repeated by Ku in line 426. Ku's repetition in line 428 '*they're cha<u>l</u>lenging*' is acknowledging A's '*[=↑they're really cha<u>l</u>lenging.]*' in line 426 instead of delivering an acknowledgement token '*yeah*' (Gardner, 1998).

However, Ku's repetition '*they're cha<u>l</u>lenging*' is followed by a contradiction marker '*but*' (Schiffrin,1987) which suggests several functions. First, it suggests that Ku does not fully acknowledge A's utterance in line 426 '*[=↑they're really cha<u>l</u>lenging.]*'. Ku's arguments start after his '*but*' in line 428. He says:

In line 428: '*but you realise (0.8) like you play ((name of game)) again.*'

In line 430: '*you should go to [ice level (.) remember that*'

In line 432: '*It's like (.) [it'd take us like hours and*'

Ku in these lines displays his more negative view towards the old games. Thus, Ku's repetition '*they're cha<u>l</u>lenging*' is used as a partial acknowledgement for A's utterance in line 426 '*[=↑they're really cha<u>l</u>lenging.]*'. At the same time, Ku's acknowledging repetition '*they're cha<u>l</u>lenging*' is reducing the impact of his subsequent arguments seen in lines 428, 430, and 432.

Secondly, Ku's acknowledging repetition '*they're challenging*' reduces the impact of his overall disagreement with A. There is a disagreement between A and Ku about the old games which they used to play in this part of the conversation. A seems to like and defend these old games, since she sees them as good and challenging, as in her line 426 '*[=↑they're really challenging.]*' and line 433 '*[but it's really go::od.]* '. However, Ku seems to see these old games negatively and to try to argue with A. Ku sees that these games had limitations although he acknowledges A's point about the old games by repeating A's *[=↑they're really challenging.]*.

Thirdly, Ku's repetition '*they're challenging*' displays that Ku not only has been actively listening to A's story but also has been actively engaging in A's story. These two functions of Ku's repetition follow the pattern of cases of repetition observed by Tannen (2007). Tannen's (2007: 61) observations about the functions of repetition are shown below:

> '… Some functions observed in transcripts I have studied… include: getting or keeping the floor, showing listenership, providing back-channel response, stalling, gearing up to answer or speak, humour and play, savoring and showing appreciation of a good line or good joke, persuasion, linking one speaker's ideas to another's, ratifying another's contributions and including in an interaction a person who did not hear a previous utterance. In other words, repetition not only ties parts of discourse to other parts, but it bonds participants to the discourse and to each other, linking individual speakers in a conversation and in relationships.'
>
> (Tannen, 2007:61)

Tannen (2007: 61) points out that repetition serves both to show listenership and to bond participants in conversation. Although Ku in this part of the conversation does not fully agree with A's opinion of the old games, he displays his active listenership and his engagement in A's story by delivering his repetition '*they're challenging*'.

In short, Ku's repetition '*they're challenging*' was used to partially acknowledge and agree with A's utterance *[=↑they're really challenging.]* which suggests a collaborative usage. Ku's repetition displayed his active listening to A and his participation. However, Ku's repetition is also used to reduce the impact of Ku's disagreement with A about the old games. Ku in this part of the conversation acknowledged A's positive point. However, Ku's repetition was followed by a contradiction marker '*but*', and Ku presented some negative aspects of these old games.

10.3.4.2: The second repetition '*it's really good*' with a minimal response '*yeah*': a partial acknowledgement, reducing impact of disagreement, displaying listenership, and engaging in the story

In the second case of repetition, a minimal response token '*yeah*' is delivered before the next speaker repeats the previous speaker's utterance. Like the first instance, it is followed by a contradiction marker '*but*'. The next speaker intends to express his disagreement with the previous speaker.

420: K: [I remember Lisa used to be able to do] it the best, [(0.5) that]game.

421: Ku: [I mean::(.)]

422: Ku: you play those old games and (.) you realise you must need some attention span

423: to play this for more than (.) half an hour.

424: A: ↑ I don't know, [not really-]

425: K: [cos they're::] crap?=

426: A: [=↑they're really challenging.]

427: Ku: [=↑yeah but they- the- (the thing like)]

428: Ku: they're challenging but you realise (0.8) like you play ((name of game)) again.

429: A: mm hmm,

430: Ku: you should go to [ice level (.) remember that

431: K: [umm::: I used to and you are slip'n around.

432: Ku: It's like (.) [it'd take us like hours and]

433: →A: [but it's really go::od.]

434: →Ku: yeah it's really go:::od,

435: A: yeah.

436: (4.0) ((participants are disturbed by others who were talking in the other room))

437: Ku: but like (0.3) you don't realise I e e e e used to play it for like maybe like what

438: eight hours a day?

439: A: mm hmm.

Ku in line 431 points out that playing the game consumes a lot of time, but Ku's utterance in line 431 '*It's like (.) [it'd take us like hours and]*' is overlapped by A's utterance in line 432 '*[but it's really go::od.]*'. Ku in line 431 is developing his previous utterance made in lines 422 and 423 '*you play those old games and (.) you realise you must need some attention span to play this for more than (.) half an hour.*'.

A's overlap in line 433 starts just after Ku's minimal pause '*(.)*' in line 432. Ku's minimal pause '*(,)*' is perhaps understood by A as an opportunity space, so that A takes her turn. A's overlap can be treated as an interruption since it fits into Sacks' rule of an interruption (Sacks,1992, v2). A in line 433 '*[but it's really go::od.]*' has made Ku cut off his talk after his '…*and*' in line 432. Ku does not continue his arguments until line 437.

Ku's repetition '*yeah it's really go:::od,*' in line 434 contains '*yeah*' just before the repetition '*it's really go:::od,*'. Ku's '*yeah*' in line 434 is used as an acknowledgment token (Gardner, 2001). By delivering '*yeah*', Ku in line 434 is showing his acknowledgement for A's utterance '*[but it's really go::od.]*'

Ku's repetition '*it's really go:::od,*' displays his understanding of what A has said. Sacks (1992, v2) explains that such repetition shows the current speaker's understanding of what the previous speaker said. Then A in line 435 says '*yeah.*' which acknowledges Ku's repetition and establishes mutual agreement. Ku's repetition in line 434 also displays his active listening to A's story and engaging in A's story (Tannen, 2007).

However, like the first instance of repetition by Ku in line 428, Ku's second case of repetition '*it's really go:::od,*' in line 434 is followed by a contradiction marker '*but*' in line 437 (Schiffrin,1987). It is also notable that Ku's repetition here ends with a continuing intonation, implying that there is more talk to come. Ku's '*but*' suggests that while Ku acknowledges and shows his understanding of A's utterance in line 433 '*[but it's really go::od.]*', but he is also continuing his own argument by delivering '*but like (0.3) you don't realise I e e e e used to play it for like maybe like what eight hours a day?*' in lines 437 and 438. Ku displays his negative view towards the old games in these two lines. However, Ku's repetition '*it's really go:::od,*' in line 434 has the effect of reducing the impact of his disagreement with A – indeed it actually achieves a point of mutual agreement between the two speakers before Ku relaunches his own arguments.

In short, this case included '*yeah*' + repetition by a male speaker Ku. Ku used '*yeah*' to acknowledge the female speaker A's utterance '*[but it's really go::od.]*'. Ku's repetition '*it's really go:::od,*' displayed his understanding of what A has said. In addition Ku's

repetition played a collaborative role in that he showed his active listening to A's talk and his active engagement. It also reduced the impact of his argument with A.

10.3.4.3: The third example '*y'don't have° ti:::me b't (.)*' with a contradiction marker '*but*': a partial acknowledgement, reducing impact of disagreement, displaying listenership, and engaging in the story

The third case of repetition is also followed by a contradiction marker. The next speaker shows a partial acknowledgment of the previous speaker's utterance by delivering a repetition, but he also expands on his own argument by delivering the contradiction marker.

437: Ku: but like (0.3) you don't realise I e e e e used to play it for like maybe like what

438: eight hours a day?

439: A: mm hmm.

440: Ku: you ju (0.2) you just can't do it.

441: A: you just don't have ti::me these days. .hh [hu hu ha ha ha ha]

442: →Ku: [y'don't have° ti:::me b't(.)]

443: Ku: you can't be a[mu::sed for that long. Y'can't-]

444: K: [yeah we're not kiddies any more. Huhuhuhu]

445: Ku: you can't be amused for that long with it as well, (.) [you can't] have the

446: K: [ye::ah,]

447: ku: dedication to go (.) I'm not frustrated by the controls, and I'm just going to keep

448: trying.

449: K: yeah but ↑I want to know what's different now (.) like games these days don't

450: really (.) draw me in. [(.) like] the old [games used] to.=

451: Ku: [( )] [o::h, .hhh]

452: K: =an another thing is back then you couldn't sa:ve (0.3) save your progress like

453: A: yeah

A, in line 440, with the utterance '*you just don't have ti::me these days. .hh [hu hu ha ha ha ha*' explaining the reason why they cannot play the game for long periods of time as they used to. Ku in line 442 then repeats A's utterance in line 441 '*you just don't have ti::me*' as '*[y'don't have° ti:::me b't (.)]*'. Like the first and second instances, Ku's repetition '*[y'don't have° ti:::me b't (.)]*' has several functions. Firstly, Ku's repetition '*[y'don't have° ti:::me b't (.)]*' displays his active listing and engaging in A's story (Tannen, 2007). Ku's '*ti:::me*' in line 442 by is extended as A in line 441 did which may suggest that Ku has been carefully listening to what A has said. This careful listening and engagement serves a collaborative function.

Secondly, Ku's repetition in line 442 ends with a contradiction marker '*b't (.)*' (Schiffrin, 1987). This suggests that while Ku is agreeing with what A has said in line 441 he has further arguments of his own to put forward. Ku admits that they do not have as much time for playing games as they used to do. However, Ku in line 443 gives a different reason for not spending a lot of time playing the old games. Ku in line 443 says '*you can't be a[mu::sed for that long. Y'can't-]*'. Thus Ku acknowledges A's reason, that is, that they do not have time to play the old games, but he proposes another reason, that those games could not now keep him amused.

Thirdly, Ku's repetition '*[y'don't have° ti:::me b't (.)]*' has the effect of reducing the impact of Ku's rather different reason for not enjoying the old games any more, a reason which contradicts his earlier partial agreement with A's assertions that they are '*really good*' and '*really challenging*'.

In short, in this repetition, Ku repeated A's utterance to show his partial acknowledgement and agreement. Ku's repetition is a collaborative feature in that it displayed his active listening to and his active engagement in A's talk. It was also used to reduce the impact of his disagreement with A, which was indicated by his use of the contradiction marker '*b't*' which followed his repetition.

10.3.5: Cases of repetitions:'*[o:] h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*', '*every date*', and '*label on it*'

Example 5 contains three instances of repetitions. The first instance is seen in lines 250 and 251. The speaker Ku delivers '*it's gonna work*' and it is repeated by the next speaker L. The second repetition is seen in lines 254 and 255, where '*every date*' by the speaker Al is repeated by the speaker L. The last one is seen in line 262 and 263. L's '*label on it*' is repeated by J. All participants are in A's house and they have just had their lunch. L is telling his story about working as a DJ at a wedding. L's story is collaboratively developed by the other participants in this part of the conversation. Repetitions in this example contribute to the collaborative development of L's story.

Example 5

230: (0.3)

231: A: [hahahaha]

232: L: [hahahaha]

233: Ku: [hahahaha]

234: A: it's got THREE::: GU::::YS into die

235: Ku: no they all they all provide their own ((unable to hear)) for those guys.

236: L: no with they said they said bring uh: bring along a CD?

237: (0.4)

238: Ku: ↑alright of the[ir their favourite tu:nes.]

239: L: [o of (.)] no of songs that they wanna he:ar

240: and it's like normally (.) if (.) if I tell like a bride and groom or something to

241: bring along a CD. (0.7) if you're worried? whether they'll actually bring it

242: along?=

243: J: =yeah

244: L: and whether it'll actually work?

245: J: ye::ah

246: Al: and whether or not [they just] ((unable to hear)) you to find it anyway.

247: L: [nono]

248: L: yeah but if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]

249: → Ku: [o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]

250: →L: [>it's<] it's gonna

251: work they'll have four copies of it (.) just in case >the first one<

252: doesn't [work until] I get.

253: Al: [ye:ahhh]

254: →Al: every date stamp[ed]

255: → L: [eve]ry date is in it's one stage

256: J: and it'll be like [it'll be like (.)]

257: L: [how many tapes rapped up]

258: J: you know (0.3) pro professionally printed.

259: L: yeah.

260: (0.5)

261: J: the whole works

262: →L: heheheverything has a label on it.

263: →J: ˚oh˚ label heh on it oh shit

264: L: there it'll it'll=

265: Al: =it should be typically only on these dates

10.3.5.1: The first instance '*[o:] h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' : with an overlap feature and used as a part of one sentence construction

The first repetition in this example is seen in lines 250 and 251; it is spoken by L. Ku's '*[o:] h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' in line 249 is repeated by L in lines 250 and 251. L's utterance in line 248 is not a syntactically complete unit since L's '*if...*' unit implies a '*then...*' unit that would normally follow (Sacks, 1992, v1). The '*then...*' unit for the original speaker L is delivered by the next speaker Ku in line 249 '*[o:] h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' which syntactically and semantically completes L's in-progress discourse unit '*if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]*'. L in lines 250 and 251 then repeats Ku's utterance '*[o:] h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*'.

This instance of repetition is delivered by the original speaker L. This is because the next speaker Ku has produced a one sentence construction by providing a completion for the original speaker's utterance '*if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]*'. The original speaker L is acknowledging and accepting the next speaker Ku's completion of L's in-progress utterance by delivering the repetition '*[>it's<] it's gonna work*'.

Moreover, L's repetition '*[>it's<] it's gonna work*' in lines 250 and 251 is not only used as a repetition of the next speaker's utterance but is also used as a delayed self-completion. L's '*[>it's<] it's gonna work* ' perfectly fits as the '*then...*' unit for L's '*if...*' unit in line 248: '*if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]*'. Thus, L in line 250 is acknowledging Ku's utterance in line 249 '*[o:] h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' as well as self-completing his previous in-progress utterance '*yeah but if it's ah marine guys say just like o:[:h]*' in line 248.

This part of the conversation, between lines 248 and 251, is highly collaboratively developed by both speakers. Two overlaps are evident in this part of the conversation. The first overlap is seen in lines 248 '*o:[:h]*' by L and 249 '*[o:]h*' by Ku. L's extended '*o:[:h]*' in line 248 is overlapped by Ku. L's extended '*o:[:h]*' may indicate that L is trying to hold his turn and to produce the rest of his utterance. In this sense, the overlap by Ku in line 249 complies with Sacks' rule for an interruption (1992, v2). Sacks (1992, v2) states that an interruption occurs when two people are talking at the same time in a single conversation and one of them stops when this happens.

However, L in line 248 drops his turn when Ku's '*[o:]h*' is launched in line 249. L in line 248 allows the next speaker Ku to deliver an affiliating utterance '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' to complete L's utterance. Since K's utterance '*[o:]h it's gonna [wo::rk.]*' is used as an affiliating utterance to complete L's in-progress utterance, K's overlap appears to be the type of overlap which shows Ku's enthusiastic participation in talk (Tannen, 1993). In addition, L in line 250 does not display his anger or complain to K, which supports the idea that this overlap is not treated as an interruption by L. Sacks (1992, v2) explains that when an interruption occurs in conversation, the speaker who is interrupted often shows his/her anger in word such as '*you always interrupt me*' to the interrupting speaker. In this example, the original speaker L does not show any anger after Ku's overlap occurs. The original speaker L in lines 250 and 251 delivers his repetition to acknowledge Ku's utterance in line 249.

The second overlap occurs in lines 249 and 250, where Ku's '*wo::rk*' is overlapped by L's '*[>it's<]*'. Again, this overlap does not seem to be treated as an interruption. The overlap by L in line 250 '*[>it's<]*' does not follow Sacks' rule of an interruption (1992, v2) that one of the speakers stops talking since L's '*[>it's<]*'in line 250 is launched towards the end of Ku's utterance, overlapping only '*wo::rk.*' in line 249. The falling

final intonation of Ku's utterance shows that it is potentially complete. L in line 250 does not show any anger towards Ku (Sacks, 1992, v2). The occurrence of this second overlap by L at the end of K's utterance supports the claim of Liddicoat (2007) that an overlap at the end of an utterance is not normally treated as problematic. Thus, this second overlap should not be considered problematic talk but rather as showing L's enthusiastic participation into the conversation (Tannen, 1993).

10.3.5.2: The second instance: '*every date*' to acknowledge the original speaker's utterance, to be used as a prompt to develop a story, and to support a sense of humour

250: L: [it's it's gonna]

251: work they'll have four copies of it (.) just in case >the first one<

252: doesn't [work until]l get.

253: Al: [ye:ahhh]

254: → Al: every date stamp[ed]

255: → L: [eve]ry date is in it's one stage

256: J: and it'll be like [it'll be like (.)]

257: L: [how many tapes rapped up]

258: J: you know (0.3) pro professionally printed.

259: L: yeah.

260: (0.5)

Al's '*every date*' in line 254 is repeated by L in line 255. This second repetition also contains a small overlap when Al's '…*ed*' in line 255 is overlapped by L '*eve*…'. Al does not seem to be interrupted by this overlap. After L's overlapping initiation, '[eve]' in line 255, Al does not show any anger or drop out prematurely, which suggests that Al

does not treat L's overlap as an interruption. The overlap is small and occurs at the end of the previous speaker Al's utterance '…*ed*' and beginning of the next speaker L's turn '*eve*…'. This suggests that the overlap is not a problematic overlap (Liddicoat, 2007). Rather, it is a display of enthusiastic participation in talk.

L's repetition '*every date*' in line 255 has several functions. Firstly, it is acknowledging Al's '*every date*' in line 254 (Oelschlager and Damico, 1998). L's repetition '*every date*' is delivered without any minimal response token, but nevertheless appears to acknowledge Al's '*every date*'. This acknowledgement function shows that L has been listening very carefully to what the previous speaker says in order to deliver his repetition. Coates (1996) explains that one sentence construction by two or more persons can only occur when speakers pay extremely close attention to each other, at all linguistic levels: the meaning of what the other speaker is saying, the grammatical of structure of what is being said, the intonation pattern and rhythmic quality. Although Coates refers to one sentence construction here, the principle can also be applied to this type of repetition, and supports the claim that L has been actively listening to the previous speaker's talk in order to deliver repetition.

Secondly, L's repetition '*every date*' is also used as a prompt to develop the story (Tannen, 2007). L in line 255 adds extra information '*is in it's one stage*' after the repetition '*every date*'. Then J in line 256 tries to further expand the story, starting with a conjunction '*and*', although J's attempt is overlapped by L in line 257. J's question in lines 257 and 258 '*how many tapes wrapped up you know (0.3) pro professionally printed.*' also develops the story of the wedding CDs.

Finally, the repetition '*every date*' by L is used as support for a sense of humour in the story. In this part of the conversation, participants are collaboratively developing L's

story and they are using irony. The participants in this part of the conversation are ironically constructing a list of the several ways in which the CDs provided by 'marine guys' to the DJ at a wedding differ from those provided by other couples – the 'marine guys' provide multiple copies of their CDs, labelled and dated, and sometimes provide originals 'wrapped up'. In doing so, the participants are humorously poking fun at 'marine guys'.

Holmes (2006b:112) explains that collaborative humour is humour that may be a cooperative distinctive achievement, jointly constructed by participants. When people work together to produce a humorous sequence, with each person contributing to and building on the contributions of the others, the overall effect is clearly cooperative. Holmes describes this kind of collaborative humour as a feature of women's talk. L's repetition of Al's utterance, '*every date*', in line 255, joins in with Al's ironical sense of the humour of the jointly constructed sequence. L's repetition '*every date*' in line 255 is efficiently working to support Al's utterance which contributes to the ironical sense of humour in the sequence.

10.3.5.3: The third case: '*label on it*': used to support ironical sense of humour

250: L: [it's it's gonna]

251: work they'll have four copies of it (.) just in case >the first one<

252: doesn't [work until]I get.

253: Al: [ye:ahhh]

254: Al: every date stamp[ed]

255: L: [eve]ry date is in it's one stage

256: J: and it'll be like [it'll be like (.)]

257: L: [how many tapes rapped up]

258: J: you know (0.3) pro professionally printed.

259: L: yeah.

260: (0.5)

261: J: the whole works

262: L: heheheverything has a label on it.

263: → J: ˚oh˚ label heh on it oh shit

264: L: there it'll it'll=

265: Al: =it should be typically only on these dates

The third repetition is seen in line 263 and is produced by J. L's '*a label on it*' is repeated by J in line 263 '*˚oh˚ label heh on it*'. J's repetition contains '*oh*'. Schiffrin (1987) explains that '*oh*' is sometimes used as a backchannel token that alternates with other signals or hearer attention-getters such as '*yeh*' or '*mmhmm*'. '*oh*' as a backchannel token often occurs at turn transition spaces. J's '*oh*' in line 263 occurs at the beginning of his utterance just after L's utterance in line 262 '*heheheverything has a label on it.*' which contains a falling intonation. L's falling intonation indicates that his utterance is closing at this point (Fletcher and Loakes, 2006) and so it is perhaps recognised by J as a turn transitional signal.

Secondly, the repetition in line 263 contains a laughter token '*heh*' by J which suggests that the repetition is used here as a humorous repetition (Sacks, 1992, v2 and Tannen, 2007). Tannen (2007: 71) gives the example below of a repetition as humour:

1: Peter: Just to see if we say anything interesting?

2: Deborah: No. Just to see how you say nothing interesting.

3: Peter: Oh. Well I – I hardly ever say nothing interesting.

Tannen explains that Peter in line 1 says '*say anything interesting*' and then Deborah says '*say nothing interesting*' in line 2 in which Peter's '*anything*' has been changed to '*nothing*'. Then Peter in line 3 again repeats '*say nothing interesting*' which shows that they are constructing a joke by repeating the first of Peter's utterances '*say anything interesting*'.

L in line 262 includes some laughter tokens at the beginning of his utterance. As noted above, J's utterance in line 263 also includes a laughter token. Laughter by L and J displays the humour of their talk. It is also important to mention Sacks' claim (1992, v2) that that although jokes can be constructed by a repeat, there is not any evidence in the repeat that the person who makes the repetition understands the sense of ironical humour. For example, sometimes children have no idea why something is funny but they still laugh while at other times they may have a perfectly good idea of why it is so funny.

Participants L, J and Al in this part of the conversation seem to understand the ironically humorous sequence that they are constructing. The participants are not children; they are mature enough to grasp the joke which is jointly constructed in this part of the conversation. The third feature of L's repetition is that it supports the ironical sense of humour in this part of the conversation which is understood by all the participants.

J's repetition in line 262 contains '…*oh shit*' which is a combination of a minimal response '*oh*' and a swear word '*shit*'. A swear word is often used to insult people but it is not always used in this way. Bayard and Krishnayya (2001) note that swear words are employed as humour, observing that often laughter will follow after swear words. J in line 262 has used a minimal token + swear word: '*oh shit*'. J's statement in line 262 contains some laughter before the swear word. The previous speaker L also shows some laughter in the beginning of his sentence. Laughter by both L '*hehehever*' in line 262

and J '*heh*' in line 263 suggests that J's swear word '*shit*' is not used as an insult to the others but rather as a contribution to the humour in the talk.

In short, three cases of repetitions were discussed in this part of the conversation. The first case was used to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance as well as being used as a self-completion by the original speaker of his previous utterance. The second case of repetition performed three functions. It was used to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance, to develop the next part of the conversation, and to support a sense of humour. The third case was used to support the ironical humour in a story. It was followed by a swear word which was also employed to support the sense of humour. By using these repetitions, participants collaboratively developed a humorous sequence in this part of the conversation.

10.3.6: Cases of repetition '*in a band?*', '*random stuff*', '*d drinking*', '*random stuff*', and '*[big tall guy.]*'

This part of the conversation was used in men's one sentence construction chapter – the cases of a men's one sentence construction were seen in line 25 and in line 34. However, it contains five instances of repetitions. The first instance is seen in line 2 delivered with a rising intonation. This case has multiple functions: a question, an affiliating utterance, and an overlap. The second case is seen in line 26 which has two functions: an acknowledgement and a self-repair. The third case is seen in line 34 which is served as to partially accepting the previous speaker's utterance and to reduce an impact of argument. The fourth instance is seen in line 50 and it has two functions: to partially agree with the previous speaker's utterance and to reduce an impact of argument. The last instance is delivered with a rising intonation and it serves as a question to the previous speaker.

Example 6 is multiple party talk and four male speakers are involved in this part of the conversation: Al, Ku, Aa, J and L. Al is telling his story about drinking with another member of his band. This part of the conversation is recorded in J's sister's house and they are talking just after they have finished Sunday lunch.

Example 6

45. Al: I was in a band with a guy who is u:m [the assistant] manager?

46. → Ku: [in a band?]

47. Al: oh yeah [he is ((unable to hear))

48. Ku: [oh just pull up a seat]

49. Al: no shut up.

50. Aa: hh

51. Al: he was uh:: actually the the (.) the (.) stuff <u>not</u> about the band's much >more

52. interesting< but he was um the assistant manager, of a bar in Glasgow?=

53. Aa: =Ye::ah.

54. Al: that uh:: near George Square? (.) and after practice on Thursday

55. afternoons cause we didn't have anything on and he used to just do the

56. bar before it opened up (.) he would unlock and said just help yourself to free

57. <u>d</u>rinks.

58. Aa: yah [ha::::]

59. Al: [and he] would make us all cocktails like squash

60. [rocks 'n' stuff] like that?

61. Ku: [uh::::]

62. Aa: [oh yu::m]

63. Ku: [ah nice]

64. Al: so squash rocks was ah (.) midori there was a <u>do</u>t just

65. <brown (.) green (.) red>

66. (1:0)

67. Aa: ni:ce=

68. Al: =and he would used to just make up (.) just like [random shot]

69. J: [random shit.]

70. → Al: random stuff like that.

71. Ku: yep.

72. Al: he he he wasn't one of those guys going (.) gin 'n' tonic do they mix?

73. Ku: hh

74. Al: then he was just like oh: d'you know what else we c'n do that's cos just like

75. that's what Michael's like cause basically Michael went through this period

76. ((unable to hear)) it's like um:

77. Ku: drinking?

78. → Al: d drinking but um:: we'll get a round of beers now. because you're (.)

79. none of you are man enough to keep up with me. we'll drink now. hurry up

80. >hurry< an you're like you you've drank tha that much in like two minutes

81. an' that's not enough DRINK (.) HURRY UP(.) but je just give me a

82. CHANCE I mean (.) not even the fact it's BOO::ZE it's just like it's just

83. LIQUID.

84. Aa: he sounds like my type of drinker. .hh hehehe

85. Al: he just won't stop and then he's like-

86. J: is this harry?

87. Al: [yeah.

88. Ku: [hmm

45: Al: [oh we'll get a

46: J: [he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.

47: Aa: which guy was that?

48: J: a big tall guy.

49: Aa: [↑oh::: ↓yeah.]

50: → Al: [big tall guy.] >˚and I was standing there˚< and just like (.) get more beers and

51: then we'll get a round of RANDOM shots.

52: L: Ho:::[::::::::::

53: Al: [an' I'm like (.) you're only suggesting the round of random shots when

54: it's not your friend.

55: Aa: he hh [hahahaha]

56: Al: [you you dick]

57: Al: you make us drink this stuff and you won't pay for it?

58: (1:0)

59: Al: oh ↑yeah it just would be cold ((unable to hear)) with a tree (.) like (.) So::

60: much bigger than ˚anything˚ it is hard to show you (.) like (.) the

61: circumference of a wok (0.5) like [by ((unable to hear this part))]

62: J: [how big is that.]

63: → Al: how big is that¿ (.) filled with little shot glasses.

64: J: holy shit.

65: Al: and you just didn' know what it was.

66: J: is like-

67: Al: it was like a russian roulette with like alcohol it just like

68: Aa: are [they coming back in any time shortly? or

69: J: [and and an an three of them ((unable to hear)) wonder why

70: Al: uh bit early next year.

71: Aa: uh ni:ce.

10.3.6.1: The first repetition: '*in a band?*' with a rising intonation and an overlap

In line 1, Al delivers '*I was in a band with a guy who is u:m [the assistant] manager?*' which is a syntactically complete utterance. Al is introducing the person who will be the subject of his story.

In line 2, the next speaker Ku takes his turn and delivers '*[in a band?]*', repeating a part of the original speaker Al's utterance '*I was* ***in a band*** *with a guy…*'. Ku's repetition has several features to be discussed. First of all, Ku's utterance '*[in a band?]*' in line 2 is delivered in the place where a one sentence construction may possibly be attempted. In line 1, Al's '*I was in a band with a guy who is u:m [the assistant] manager?*' has '*u:m*' in the middle of his utterance. Al's '*u:m*' may be providing a possible opportunity space for the other speaker to take a turn. Ku's '*[in a band?]*' is delivered just after Al's '*u:m*', and might be an affiliating utterance for the original speaker's utterance. Thus it might appear that one syntactically complete discourse unit is formed by the next speaker Ku as '*I was in a band with a guy who is u:m in a band?*' although Ku's utterance '*[in a band?]*' is delivered as a repetition.

However, Ku's utterance '*[in a band?]*' is not an affiliating utterance for Al's in-progress completion. It does not make Al's in-progress utterance semantically complete. Ku's '*[in a band?]* ' has coincidentally occurred in the place where a sentence completion might occur. In addition, in line 3, Al's '*oh yeah*' in line 3 is not used as to acknowledge and accept Ku's '*[in a band?]* as an affiliating utterance. It is used instead to respond to Ku's utterance '*[in a band?]* which has a rising intonation indicating a possible question. Al's utterance in line 7 '*he was uh:: actually the the (.) the (.) stuff not about the band's much more interesting…*' seems to respond to Ku's singling out and topicalisation of 'a band' in his question.

Secondly, as noted above, Ku's utterance '*[in a band?]*' in line 2 is delivered with a rising intonation. Ku's rising intonation possibly shows that Ku is indicating a problem of grasping or hearing what the original speaker said (Schegloff, 1997a). Al in line 3 delivers '*oh yeah*' which provides an answer for Ku's question '*[in a band?]*' in line 2. Al's '*oh yeah*' suggests that Al perhaps sees Ku's '*[in a band?]*' as a question for Al to answer.

Thirdly, Ku's '*[in a band?]*' is overlapped with the original speaker's utterance '*[the assistant]*'. This overlap is not a case of an interruption since the original speaker Al does not drop his turn when Ku's '*[in a band?]*' is launched. Instead, Al keeps hold of his turn to deliver his rest of utterance. This does not follow the notion of an interruption as explained by Sacks (1992, v2). Sacks explains that an interruption occurs when two people are talking at the same time in a single conversation and one of them stops when it happens. In addition, the original speaker Al does not show any anger to the next speaker Ku who initiates the overlapping talk. Once again, this does not follow the notion of an interruption as explained by Sacks (1992, v2). Sacks also explains that the original speaker often shows his/her anger towards the original speaker when the original speaker is interrupted by delivering utterances such as, for example, '*you always interrupt me*'.

Nor does Ku's overlap follow the model of overlap named '*oops sorry*' overlap by Jefferson. Jefferson (1986) explains that in this type of overlap the original speaker is continuing his/her talk, the next speaker starts to talk, and this talk of course overlaps that of the original speaker since the original speaker keeps talking. Then the next speaker realises that the original speaker is not stopping his/her talking, and drops his turn as if to say '*oops sorry*'. Ku's overlap in line 2 contains a rising intonation and is

complete, rather than cut off. Thus he is asking a question of Al rather than showing his realisation that this is not the right space to start a turn.

Ku's overlap therefore appears to show his enthusiastic participation in the talk (Tannen, 1993). Ku is perhaps carefully listening to what the original speaker Al has said and therefore Ku is able to find the opportunity space to deliver his '*[in a band?]*'. However, Ku's '*[in a band?]*' in line 2 is overlapped with the original speaker Al's '*[the assistant]*' in line 1. This happens because the original speaker Al continues his talk beyond the opportunity space for the next speaker Ku to speak (Lerner, 2004). The original speaker Al is continuing his utterance even after the next speaker Ku's affiliating utterance occurs.

In short, this repetition occurred in the space where one sentence construction and completion may occur. In this sample, the next speaker Ku may have seemed to deliver an affiliating utterance to complete Al's utterance. However, Ku's utterance was delivered as a repetition to check his understanding of what the original speaker said. The original speaker then answered the next speaker's question. Ku's utterance was delivered in overlap which showed his enthusiastic participation into the talk. That suggested that Ku was actively listening to Al's story, which suggested that both Al and Ku were collaboratively engaging in Al's story.

10.3.6.2: The second repetition: '*random stuff*' with a minimal response '*yeah*': used as an acknowledgment and a self-repair

20: Al: so squash rocks was ah (.) midori there was a dot just

21: <brown (.) green (.) red>

22: (1:0)

23: Aa: ni:ce=

24: Al: =and he would used to just make up (.) just like [random shot]

25: J: [random shit.]

26: → Al: random stuff like that.

27: Ku: yep.

28: Al: he he he wasn't one of those guys going (.) gin 'n' tonic do they mix?

29: Ku: hh

The second repetition is seen in line 26. Al has been telling his story from the beginning of this part of the conversation. Al in line 24 delivers '*and he would used to just make up (.) just like [random shot]*'. Al's last part of the utterance in line 24 is overlapped by J's '*random shit*' in line 25 which makes Al's utterance syntactically complete (see the detailed discussions about one sentence construction in the 'men's one sentence construction' chapter in this study). Then Al in line 26 delivers '*random stuff*' which is a near-repetition of J's '*[random shit]*' in line 25 as well as of Al's '*[random shot]*' in line 24. Thus Al in line 26 is not only repeating the next speaker J's utterance '*[random shit]*' but also self-repeating his previous utterance as '*random stuff*'.

Al's repetition '*random stuff*' is acknowledging J's attempt to complete Al's in-progress utterance in line 24 (Gardner, 1998). J in line 25 is trying to complete Al's utterance in line 24 and he delivers the affiliating utterance '*random shit*'. Al's repetition in line 26 '*random stuff*' is acknowledging J's attempt '*[random shit]*' instead of using a minimal response token such as '*yeah*' to acknowledge it.

In addition, Al's repetition '*random stuff*' also changes its form. J's utterance '*[random shit]*' includes a swear word '*shit*' but Al in line 26 avoids using the swear word used by J. In line 26, Al's repetition functions as a self repair. Al in line 24 says '*just like*

[random shot]' and Al in line 26 delivers his repetition '*random stuff*' in which Al is possibly both self-correcting his previous utterance and other-correcting J's completion (Schegloff et al, 1977).

In short, Al's repetition '*random stuff*' is used as to acknowledge J's attempt at sentence completion. At the same time, Al is self-repairing his previous utterance '*[random shot]*' by delivering his repetition '*random stuff*'.

10.3.6.3: The third repetition: '*d drinking*': used to partially acknowledge the original speaker and a part of one sentence construction

30:		Al:	then he was just like oh: d'you know what else we c'n do that's cos just like
31:			that's what Michael's like cause basically matt went through this period
32:			((unable to hear)) it's like uh:
33:	→		Ku: drinking?
34:	→	Al	d drinking but um:: we'll get a round of beers now. because you're (.)
35:			none of you are man enough to keep up with me. we'll drink now. hurry up
36:			>hurry< an you're like you you've drank tha that much in like two minutes
37:			an' that's not enough DRINK (.) HURRY UP(.) but je just give me a
38:			CHANCE I mean (.) not even the fact it's BOO::ZE it's just like it's just
39:			LIQUID.

The third case of repetition '*d drinking*' is seen in line 34 delivered by Al. It is delivered just after an example of one sentence construction formed by Ku's attempted completion in line 33. Ku in line 33 is trying to complete Al's utterance in line 32 '*...it's like uh:*' (see the detailed discussion of Ku's one sentence construction in men's one sentence

construction chapter). Al in line 34 delivers '*d drinking*' which is a repetition of Ku's '*drinking?*' in line 33.

This case of repetition is similar to the previous case of repetition '*random stuff*' by the same speaker Al. Both cases involve one sentence construction by the next speaker and the original speaker has used a repetition to acknowledge the next speaker's attempt at sentence completion. However, the repetition '*d drinking*' in this example is followed by a contradiction marker '*but*' (Schiffrin, 1987) while the repetition '*random stuff*' is not followed by a contradiction marker. Al in line 34 is partially accepting Ku's '*drinking?*' by repeating Ku's utterance but Al qualifies his acceptance of Ku's attempt after his '*but*'. Al continues his story after his contradiction marker '*but*' to point out that Matt was not simply drinking, but drinking in a competitive and uncontrolled manner.

Al's repetition '*d drinking*' in line 34 also reduces the impact of his partial acceptance and subsequent qualification of Ku's attempt at sentence completion. A similar use of repetition was also seen in Example 4 in this chapter. For instance,

422:	Ku:	you play those old games and (.) you realise you must need some attention span
423:		to play this for more than (.) half an hour.
424:	A:	↑ I don't know, [not really-]
425:	K:	[cos they're::] crap?=
426:	A:	[=↑they're really challenging.]
427:	Ku:	[=↑yeah but they- the- (the thing like)]
428:	→Ku:	they're challenging but you realise (0.8) like you play ((name of game)) again.
429:	A:	mm hmm,

Ku in line 428 is repeating A's utterance in line 426 but Ku's repetition is followed by a contradiction marker '*but*'. Ku does not entirely agree with A's point about the old games but Ku's repetition reduces the impact of his subsequent criticisms of the games. Similarly, Al's repetition of '*d drinking*' is used to reduce the impact of his qualification of Ku's attempt at sentence completion.

In short, the case of repetition '*d drinking*' was used to acknowledge the next speaker's attempt at one sentence construction. However, this case was followed by the contradiction marker '*but*' and therefore Al did not fully acknowledge the next speaker's completion attempt.

10.3.6.4: The fourth repetition: '*[big tall guy.]*' to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance, answer a question, and prompt for the story

40: Aa: he sounds like my type of drinker. .hh hehehe

41: Al: he just won't stop and then he's like-

42: J: is this harry?

43: Al: [yeah.

44: Ku: [hmm

45: Al: [oh we'll get a

46: J: [he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.

47: Aa: which guy was that?

48: → J: a big tall guy.

49: Aa: [↑oh::: ↓yeah.]

50: → Al: [big tall guy.] >˚and I was standing there˚< and just like (.) get more beers and

51: then we'll get a round of RANDOM shots.

52: L: Ho:::[::::::::::

53: Al: [an' I'm like (.) you're only suggesting the round of random shots when

54: it's not your friend.

In line 47, Aa delivers a question '*which guy was that?*' which suggests that Aa believes he may know who Al and J are talking about but does not recognise him. The man whom both Al and J are talking about is the person mentioned by Al in line 1 '*a guy who is…*'. Throughout his story Al has been talking about the same person.

In line 42 however, J takes a turn and asks the question '*is this harry?*'. J's question is treated as an interruption since Al's cuts off his turn in line 41 just after he says '*…like*' (Sacks, 1992, v2). Al in line 45 possibly tries to take his turn back by delivering '*oh we'll get a*', but this is overlapped by J's '*he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.*' in line 46. J's '*he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.*' suggests that J knows the person who is the subject of Al's story. This is possibly why J in line 48 is able to answer Aa's question '*which guy was that?*'. J's answer, '*a big tall guy.*' is then repeated by Al in line 50.

J's '*he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.*' in line 46 is also treated as a case of interruption of Al's story. J's '*he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.*' is overlapped with Al's '*oh we'll get a*'. This overlap is described by Sacks' rule (1992, v2) stating that an interruption occurs when two people are talking at the same time in a single conversation and one of them stops when it happens. Al tries to continue his story in line 45 but because Al's turn in line 45 is overlapped by J in line 46, Al stops talking and lets J speak.

Al in line 45 probably intends to say '*we'll get a round of RANDOM shots*', providing the quote projected by Al's interrupted line 41 '*…and then he's like*'. In line 51, Al delivers '*we'll get a round of RANDOM shots*' which supports the likelihood that Al's full utterance may have been '*we'll get a round of RANDOM shots*' in line 45. Instead,

he only delivers '*oh we'll get a*' before he is interrupted by J's '*he FUCKIN' destroy:yed me.*'

The repetition by Al of '*[big tall guy.]*' in line 50 has three possible functions. First, it is answering Aa's question in line 47 '*which guy was that?*'. J in line 48 is directly answering Aa's question '*which guy was that?*' but Al in line 50 also answers Aa's question immediately after J does. Al, as the teller of the story, is the authority on its subject, and therefore has the right to answer Aa's question himself. Second, Al's '*[big tall guy.]*' is used in a similar way to an acknowledgement token such as '*yeah*' (Gardner, 1998). Although Al in line 50 does not include '*yeah*', Al is acknowledging J's '*a big tall guy.*' in line 47 by delivering a repetition. Third, Al's repetition '*[big tall guy.]*' is followed by '*and*' which suggests that it is used as a prompt for expanding his story (Tannen, 2007). Al's story is interrupted by both J in lines 42 and 46, and Aa in line 47 but Al's '*[big tall guy.]*' has given him an opportunity to restart the telling of his story.

In short, Al in this part of the conversation tried to continue his story but was interrupted several times by the other speakers. His repetition had three functions: answering the question, acknowledging the other speaker's answer for the question, and expanding the rest of his story.

10.3.6.5: The last repetition: '*how big is that¿*' with a rising intonation

59:	Al:	oh ↑yeah it just would be cold ((unable to hear)) with a tray (.) like (.) So::
60:		much bigger than ˚anything˚ it is hard to show you (.) like (.) the
61:		circumference of a wok (0.5) like [by ((unable to hear this part))]
62: →	J:	[how big is that.]
63: →	Al:	how big is that¿ (.) filled with little shot glasses.

64: J: holy shit.

65: Al: and you just didn't know what it was.

66: J: is like-

The last repetition in Example 2 is seen in line 63. Al is repeating J's '*how big is that.*' in line 62. Although J's utterance '*how big is that.*' in line 62 does not have a high rising tone at the end of his sentence, J's utterance is structured as a question. In line 63, after his repetition of J's utterance '*[how big is that.]*', Al says '*...filled with little shot glasses.*'. However, this does not give a relevant answer to J's possible question, since it gives no information about either the size of the tray Al is describing or the circumference of a wok. It is also possible that J's utterance '*how big is that.*' is intended as a comment on the tray's size, rather than as a question, and J's repetition may acknowledge and agree with J's comment. Alternatively, it is possible that Al gives some visual indication of size with his hands as an answer.

J's '*how big is that*' in line 62 overlaps Al's '*[by...]*' in line 61. Although Al's utterance '*by...*' is not clear and was not able to be transcribed, Al is probably continuing his story. Al restarts his story in line 63 *'filled with little shot glasses'*. Al in line 61 perhaps sees J's overlap '*[how big is that]*' in line 62 as an interruption because Al stops his talk when J's overlapping '*[how big is that.]*' occurs, just after Al's '*…like*' in line 61. This is explained by Sacks' rule describing interruption. An interruption occurs when two people are talking at the same time in a single conversation and one of them stops when it happens (Sacks, 1992, v2).

The repetition by Al '*how big is that¿*' in line 63 may suggest that Al in line 61 is possibly not able to hear or grasp J's '*[how big is that.]*'. Al's repetition '*how big is that¿*' in line 63 contains a slight rising intonation as opposed to J's '*[how big is that.]*'

in line 62. This also suggests that Al in line 63 is possibly showing his problem of not grasping or hearing J's '*how big is that?*' (Schegloff, 1997a). Al in line 63 may be trying to confirm J's possible question in line 62 by delivering a repetition with rising final intonation.

After Al's repetition '*how big is that¿*' in line 63, there is a minimal pause '*(.)*' which could provide a place for the other speaker to confirm Al's '*how big is that¿*'. As is explained above, Al in line 63 is possibly showing his problem of not grasping or hearing the previous speaker's question in line 62 '*[how big is that]*'. The other speaker could have confirmed that Al had heard J's '*[how big is that]*' correctly. However, Al does not get such a confirmation by the other speaker just after his minimal pause.

In short, this second repetition of '*how big is that¿*' by Al was delivered as a possible question form. J's utterance in line 62 overlapped Al's utterance in line 61 and was treated as a case of interruption. Although Al stopped telling his story because of J's question in line 62, by delivering his repetition '*how big is that¿*', Al is trying to achieve his conversational goal that is, in this case, to continue his story. After Al's repetition, both speakers collaboratively developed Al's story. Therefore Al's repetition '*how big is that¿*' was used as a prompt for collaborative talk.

10.4: Summary of this chapter

This chapter discussed 15 cases of repetitions among men. Coates (1993) found that repetition was a feature of men's talk, and this chapter proved and supported Coates' claim that men showed repetitions in their talk. Some cases described in this chapter served a single function but other cases had multiple functions. There were cases of repetitions to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance, such as those seen in

Examples 1, 5 and 6 (Oelschlager and Damico, 1998). The next speaker showed his acknowledgment of what the previous speaker said by delivering his repetition.

Also cases of repetition with a minimal response token were seen, as discussed in Examples 4 and 6. In these cases, there was a minimal token '*yeah*' before a repetition was delivered. The next speaker acknowledged the previous speaker's utterance by delivering a minimal response token (Gardner, 1998) and then he showed his understanding of what the previous speaker said by delivering a repetition (Sacks, 1992, v2).

There were also cases with a rising intonation discussed in Examples 3 and 6. In these types of repetitions, a speaker possibly showed his/her problem of hearing or grasping what the previous speaker said (Schegloff, 1997a). Thus these cases of repetition were used as questions for the original speaker by the next speaker. The original speaker's answers followed in these examples.

Thirdly, there were cases of repetition used to expand that part of the conversation (Tannen, 2007), as discussed in Example 2. By delivering this type of repetition, speakers in the conversation tried to expand their stories. There were also cases of repetition used as a part of one sentence construction, discussed in Examples 1 and 5. One sentence construction was discussed in detail in Chapters 6 and 7. In these cases of repetition, the next speaker tried to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance and then the original speaker delivered a repetition of that completion. The original speaker was acknowledging the next speaker's attempt to complete.

There were cases of repetition used to support humour in that part of the conversation, as discussed in Example 6. This use of repetition was noted by Sacks (1992, v2) and

Tannen (2007). In this type of repetition, laughter was also involved which suggested that speakers were creating and responding to humour in their talk (Sacks, 1992, v2). Also swear words were used to support humour in talk. Bayard and Krishinayya (2001) found that using swear words to support humour was a feature of men's talk. In the case of repetition explored in this chapter, male participants used swear words to support humour in the manner described by Bayard and Krishinayya (2001).

In Example 4, cases of repetition were followed by a contradiction marker '*but*'. In this part of the conversation, the original speaker only partly agreed with the next speaker's utterances. The original speaker repeated the next speaker's utterance to show his acknowledgment for the next speaker. However, all cases were followed by the contradiction marker '*but*', and in each case the original speaker delivered his counter arguments to the next speaker after that repetition. The original speaker's repetition functioned to reduce the impact of his disagreement as well as to partially acknowledge the next speaker.

The next chapter explores the use of repetitions in women's talk. According to Coates' study (1993), repetitions were characterised as one of men's collaborative features in talk while one sentence constructions were characterised as one of women's collaborative features in talk. As in the previous four chapters of this study – women's one sentence constructions and expansions and men's one sentence constructions and expansions - repetitions were expected to be seen among women's conversations as well as men's conversations. Therefore, the next chapter explores women's repetitions to ascertain whether women deliver repetitions similarly to or differently from men.

Chapter 11: Women's repetitions

11.1: Introduction

The previous chapter explored men's repetitions and it showed several different types of repetition in men's talk. Coates (1993) described repetition as one of the collaborative features in men's talk, but in this present study several types of repetition were also observed in women's conversations. This chapter therefore explores selected examples of repetitions among women to see whether their repetitions are different from or similar to those of men.

Before the examples are discussed, a brief literature review is presented. The previous chapter discussed several functions of repetition in talk. It showed that there were two main categories of repetition: collaborative repetition and repetition used in problematic conversational sequences. In the case of collaborative repetition, repetition was often used to show the speaker's understanding of the previous speaker's utterance (Sacks, 1992, v2). Another type of collaborative repetition was that used to make a joke or convey a sense of humour (Tannen, 2007 and Sacks, 1992, v2). Speakers in conversation often develop their stories as humorous stories by delivering repetitions. This use of repetition is similar to the use of a minimal response token such as '*yeah*' which is used to either acknowledge or agree with the previous speaker's utterance (Oelschlager and Damico, 1998). The last form of collaborative repetition discussed was the use of repetition as a prompt to expand a story (Tannen, 2007). A speaker sometimes delivers a repetition to allow further development of a story. The second major category of repetition is that dealing with problematic conversational sequences, such as when it is used as a question. In this form of repetition, a speaker delivers a repetition with a rising

intonation. It often shows that the speaker has a problem in hearing or grasping the previous speaker's utterance (Schegloff, 1997a).

11.2: Participants for this chapter

Eight participants appear in this chapter and brief information about each participant is given below.

Female participants:

- K is a woman in her early thirties
- A is a woman who is in her late twenties
- S is K's baby
- L is a woman in her early thirties and K's and J's sister
- C is a woman in her late twenties and J's friend

Male participants

- J is a man in his early thirties and K's and L's brother
- F is a man who is J's friend and in his early thirties
- E is a man in his early thirties and C's boyfriend
- Ku: a man in his late twenties, J's relative
- Al: a man in his early thirties, born in Scotland but holds Australian citizenship
- L: a man in his early thirties and A's brother

Although this chapter explores women's repetitions, some examples are taken from mixed gender conversations so that male participants appear in some examples. The

examples of repetition which are discussed in this chapter are, nonetheless, delivered by female speakers.

11.3: Discussions

A total of 23 cases of repetitions by female participants were observed, as shown in Chapter 5. Seven conversations including eight cases of repetitions by female participants are discussed in this chapter. Female speakers in this study showed some similar types of repetition to those which were seen among male speakers in this study. There are types of repetition commonly seen in both men's and women's conversations, but also there are also types which are seen only in women's conversations.

The first type of repetition commonly seen in both men's and women's conversations is used as an acknowledgement (Lerner, 2004). This type of repetition involves a case of one sentence construction. The original speaker delivers an in-progress utterance and then the next speaker tries to complete the previous speaker's in-progress utterance. The original speaker then repeats the next speaker's completion attempt, both to acknowledge it and to take his turn back to continue telling his story. In addition, a case of repetition with a rising intonation is observed. Schegloff (1997a) explains that this kind of repetition is used when the speaker is possibly showing a problem of either grasping or hearing what the previous speaker has said.

There are also types of repetition seen only in women's conversation. There is a type in which the next speaker is summarising the previous speaker's utterance by delivering a repetition. This type of repetition suggests that the next speaker is actively engaged into the original speaker's story.

11.3.1: A case of repetition '*contract*': a confirmation of the previous speaker's utterance

Example 1 below is a part of the conversation between K and A. It is an example of women-only talk and is the same example as was analysed in Chapter 6. Both K and A are talking about K's tenant for her unit. K has built her unit as an investment property and she has just got a new tenant for her unit.

Example 1

32: K: the lady in the house w<u>a</u>nts (1:0) two friends to move in or something?=

33: A: =oh really?

34: K: yeah Tony was saying¿

35: A: mm,

36: K: an' I was saying (.) oh (.) just so long as if they (.) you know she tells the (1.0)

37: ah: (1.0) the landlord.

38: A: mm.

39: K: or whoever's looking after (1.5) the thing tht- because it's uh breach in the um: (1.0)

40: A: contract,

41: → K: contract. but (.) she was >one a the ones< that didn't know she was meant to be

42: paying for an electricity bill. .hhh cos we got a phone call from the[: um

43: A: [ye::ah,

44: K: builder.

45: A: yeah.

46: K: did you hear about that?

47: A: no:::,

48: K: saying that um (0.7) o:ur- our unit and mum'n'dad's unit,

49: A: mmm,

50: K: u::m the builders were still getting an electricity bill.

51: A: oh really?

52: K: cos they haven't changed [over.

53: A: [ah::::

54: K: yep

In line 39, K is delivering the in-progress utterance '*or whoever's looking after (1.5) the thing tht- because it's uh breach in the um: (1.0)*'. Then in line 40, the next speaker A tries to complete K's in-progress utterance in line 39 '*...the thing tht- because it's uh breach in the um: (1.0)*'. However, A's attempt at sentence completion does not seem to follow exactly the models of one sentence construction outlined by Lerner (2004), Coates (2007), Sacks (1992, v1) and Sacks (1992, v1) which were seen in both Chapter 6 and 7. Lerner (2004) explains that once the affiliating utterance is delivered by the next speaker, it is then normally inspected by the original speaker to determine whether it is to be treated as a turn completion device or not. Normally the original speaker shows either an acceptance or rejection of the next speaker's attempt. In this respect, the example shown here follows Lerner's model. However, it differs from his model in another feature.

In this instance, K's '*um:*' and '*(1.0)*' in line 39 display that she is possibly searching for a word at this point. Then A in line 40 delivers her '*contract,*' which ends with a slightly rising intonation. Thus at this point, A in line 40 delivers her '*contract,*' as only a possible completion of K's in-progress utterance, and shows her uncertainty intonationally. A's '*contract,*' is launched at the place where one sentence construction normally occurs. K's repetition '*contract.*' in line 40 occurs after A's utterance, and seems to be used as an acceptance of the next speaker's attempt at completion. Thus A in line 40 seems to deliver the sentence completion of K's in-progress utterance.

However, A's attempt in fact seems to function as 'a candidate (or possible) completion' rather than as a case of one sentence completion as shown by Lerner (2004), Coates (2007), Sacks (1992, v1) and Sacks (1992, v1).

K in line 41 repeats A's '*contract,*' as '*contract.*' with a falling intonation which suggests that K is confirming A's '*contract,*'. K's repetition '*contract*' is also followed by a possible contradiction marker '*but*' which may suggest that K does not fully acknowledge A's '*contract,*' (Schiffrin, 1987). Similar cases are seen in some male conversations in Chapter 10. For instance,

Example 4

437: Ku: but like (0.3) you don't realise I e e e e used to play it for like maybe like what

438: eight hours a day?

439: A: mm hmm.

440: Ku: you ju (0.2) you just can't do it.

441: A: you just don't have ti::me these days. .hh [hu hu ha ha ha ha]

442: →Ku: [y'don't have° ti:::me b't(.)]

443: Ku: you can't be a[mu::sed for that long. Y'can't-]

444: K: [yeah we're not kiddies any more. Huhuhuhu]

445: Ku: you can't be amused for that long with it as well, (.) [you can't] have the

446: K: [ye::ah,]

As discussed in Chapter 10, Ku's repetition in 442 includes a contradiction marker '*b't*' and Ku is partially acknowledging A's utterance in line 439. Then Ku suggests a different reason why he does not like old games anymore. However, this example

differs from the women's example above in that Ku's repetition does not have a falling intonation.

In the women's conversation below, K's repetition is followed by a possible contradiction marker '*but*' similar to that in the men's example above.

36:		K:	an' I was saying (.) oh (.) just so long as if they (.) you know she tells the (1.0)
37:			ah: (1.0) the landlord.
38:		A:	mm.
39:		K:	or whoever's looking after (1.5) the thing tht- because it's uh breach in the um: (1.0)
40:		A:	contract,
41:	→	K:	contract. but (.) she was >one a the ones< that didn't know she was meant to be
42:			paying for an electricity bill. .hhh cos we got a phone call from the[: um
43:		A:	[ye::ah,

However, K in line 41 uses her '*but*' to start telling the rest of her story. It is therefore possible that here '*but*' functions not as a contradiction marker but as an increment initiator (Lerner, 2001). Thus K in line 41 acknowledges K's utterance by repeating A's '*contract,*' with a falling intonation. Her '*but*' functions differently from that of Ku in line 442 of the earlier extract, where the repetition had a continuing intonation.

In short, the case of repetition in this example was used to confirm the previous speaker's utterance. In addition, it was followed by '*but*' which was also observed in a male conversation, but which performs a different function in this example, allowing K to continue her story.

11.3.2: A case of repetition '*so there's no water*': used as an acknowledgment of one sentence construction and as a prompt to expand the story.

Example 2 contains a case of women's repetition which is seen in lines 82 and 83. It is a slightly more complicated version of the type of repetition which was discussed in Example 1. This example is taken from the same conversation several minutes after the sequence provided in Example 1. Both K and A are still in the same place (K's house) but they are talking about something different in Example 2. A is telling a story about she and her husband having a problem with a water supply company for her house.

Example 2

((a baby came in and they start talking to the baby))

73: K: whatta-you got possum?

74: (1.0)

75: S: a yeah

76: A: another BASHING stick= a dangerous implement.

77: K: =yes

78: (4.0)

79: A: yeah well, ↑ I was actually on the phone with ((a name of a company)) an that

80: cos <u>you</u> know I had to transfer the electricity an- and the gas and the water (.)

81 and I re<u>cei</u>ved the electricity and the gas bill .hhh and I was like (.)

82: K: oh:: no: <u>wa</u>ter.

83: → A: so there's no: <u>wa</u>ter so I <u>phoned</u> them you know just to double check and they

84: said o:h it's probably still .hhh getting changed over or something from the

85: builders and I'm thinking (0.2) .hhh

86: K: [but (.) how long had th<u>at</u> been,]

87: A: [w'll:::, y'know, yeah::,]It's like that's (a-) really long time, (it's) July,

88: K: yeah.

89: A: and the guy was like ↑yeah yeah these things can (.) take a while=like o↓kay

90: obviously you know they h- they know that the date(which(1.0))I signed up but

91: it's so (1.3) I'll get billed accordingly and I just said to him oh I just wanted to

92: check you know because I didn't want .hh my ↑water to get cut off and he goes

93: oh we don't cut the water off, (.)we would just charge you (.)ay- a::h,

94: K: an [exc::::::::::]eed amount.

95: A: [late fees.]

96: A: and it was like-

97: (0.5)

98: A: [yeah.

99: K: [yeah.

100: A: =well you know I don't wanna get that [either.]

101: K: [same] thing.

102: A: hehehehe I'd rather get my water turned off than get- a fee fi::ned for u::m you

103: know.

104: K: ↑oh ↓yeah

A has been telling her story from line 79 to 81 and A's utterance ends with '*and it was like (.)*' which shows that her utterance is still in progress. In line 82 K is delivering her affiliating utterance '*oh:: no wate::r.*' which makes the original speaker A's in-progress utterance a syntactically complete utterance. In line 83 the original speaker A takes her turn and delivers her repetition '*so there's no: water*'.

A's repetition is accepting K's affiliating utterance for the completion of A's in-progress utterance in line 82 '*oh:: no: water.*' (Lerner, 2004). The form of A's repetition in line

83 is slightly changed. A in line 83 is not delivering an exact repetition of what K has said in line 82 as below.

81		and I received the electricity and the gas bill .hhh and I was like (.)
82:	K:	oh:: no: water.
83: →	A:	so there's no: water so I phoned them you know just to double check and they

Rather, A's repetition contains '*so*' at the beginning and it appears to be a transitional signal from being the hearer to being the speaker (Schiffrin, 1987). A's '*so*' in line 83 takes the initial position in her utterance. A is telling her story from line 79 to 81 but A's utterance is completed by the next speaker K in line 82. A's story, however, does not end with K's completion because A in line 83 continues telling her story again. A is saying that she phoned the company to double check whether the issue was a result of the company's mistake or not. Thus A in line 83 starts telling the rest of her story again by delivering her '*so*' in line 83.

A's repetition '*so there's no: water*' in line 83 is followed by her second '*so*' which suggests that her repetition is used as a prompt for the expansion of her story (Tannen, 2007). A delivers her second '*so*' which has a different function from her first '*so*' in the beginning of her utterance. A's second '*so*' is used as a marker of fact-based cause and result relations (Schiffrin, 1987). A in line 83 is explaining that because she did not received the water bill, she phoned the company to double check the water bill. Thus, A's second '*so*' connects '*there's no: water*' as a cause component and '*I phoned them you know just to double check…*'as a result component.

In short, the repetition in this example serves two functions. Since it occurs just after a one sentence construction, the original speaker is showing her acceptance of the next speaker's affiliating utterance. It is also used as a device to expand the story.

11.3.3: A case of repetition '*the chess bit*' with a minimal response token '*yeah*': showing understanding of what the previous speaker has said, and expanding the story.

In Example 3, A is recounting that her work place recently has engaged a new staff member who is on a TV show. A's boss has not generally told people in A's work place about the new staff member being on TV. However, A has been suspicious about the new member of staff so has carried out a search about her on the internet. A has found that the new staff member was one of the celebrities on a TV show and she is now wondering why such a celebrity is working in A's workplace. Example 2 below shows a repetition containing a minimal response token '*yes*' which acknowledges the original speaker's response.

Example 3

509: A: so I get half way through typing the name, .hh and it comes up with suggestions

510: for her full name and I'm like (0.2) <well it's never happened before> it's like

511: how can the computer recognise what I am looking for so I hit enter and it comes

512: up with ALL these hits for this gi::rl .hh and it's things like (.) ((a name of TV

513: show)), an::: seventh rated most beautiful chess player in the world and it's kind

514: of a coincidence that there would be another ((a name of a person)) or whatever

515: so I click on the((name of TV show)) thing and it pops up with the profile of the

514: celebrity and there's her face,

516: K: o:::h

517: A: and it's [↑ like ((unable to hear))

518: K: [like whe where from

519: A: what ah ((a name of tv show)) you know. ↑((a name of tv show)), fifth series,

520: K: ((unable to hear) what?

521: A: in australia and I was like oh OKA:::y and I was there like looking this thing about

522: this night club brawl over in Europe because .hh she was dancing with one chess

523: master and then another chess master saw it got jealous and they got into punch

524: up

525: K: o:::h my [goodness.]

526: A: [andIwaslike] absolute-celebrity she's FAmous and hehehe wh:y she

527: working here hehehe [and it's so]

528: K: [oh my goodness] and and she's even (.) like said what

529: she does so it's not like she's trying hide it [or anything?]

530: A: [no I know and] we were just kind of

531: like >well< she didn't mention this- the ((a name of the show)) ↑thing but (.)

532: K: but she mentioned the chess bit.

533: →A: (yes) the chess bit and >we were just like < ↑yeah you know whatever hehehe

534: hehehe [she (works these days)

535: K: [so she's gonna work there? or

536: A: ↑yeah she was ↑there on the weekend and she seems perfectly nice and

537: she yeah she's very smart nn >we were js< an I went like cause I went to work

538: the next day and I told rick, and I'm like but I'm not gonna mention it to her or to

539: anybody else and like rick was like nononono that's probably- (.)a good idea.

540: K: yeah cause you'd lose her¿

541: A: yeah she was like

In line 530, A is explaining to K that the new staff member at her workplace was on the TV show. A's utterance in line 531 ends with '*...but (.)*'. Schiffrin (1987) explains that '*but*' marks an upcoming unit as a contrast with a prior unit. A's utterance also contains a minimal pause '*(.)*'. A's '*but*' together with her minimal pause '*(.)*' suggests that A is trying to produce the rest of utterance. However, before A can produce the rest of her utterance in line 531, the next speaker K in line 532 delivers an attempted completion of the original speaker A's utterance. K in line 532 delivers '*but she mentioned the chess bit*'. A's minimal pause '*(.)*' is possibly understood by K as an opportunity space, and therefore K delivers her completing utterance in line 532 '*but she mentioned the chess bit*'. K's '*but she mentioned the chess bit*' is then repeated by A in line 534 '(*yes) the chess bit*'.

A's repetition contains two components, '*yes*' and '*the chess bit*'. The first component '*yes*' is being used to show her agreement with K's '*but she mentioned the chess bit*' (Gardner, 2001). A is agreeing with K that the new staff member has mentioned her involvement in chess to her fellow workers. K in line 532 '*but she mentioned the chess bit*' refers to A's utterance in lines 512 and 513, and uses A's '*but*' to project a likely contrasting completion of her utterance. A in line 533 accepts K's '*she mentioned the chess bit*'. The second component of A's repetition '*the chess bit*' shows her understanding of K's utterance '*but she mentioned the chess bit*'. It follows Sacks model (1992, v2) of repetition which shows the next speaker's understanding of what the previous speaker has said.

A's repetition is also used as to expand her story (Tannen, 2007). In line 533, A delivers '*and*' just after her repetition '*the chess bit*' and she goes on to expand her story after this '*and*'. Then in line 534, K asks a question '*so she's gonna work there? or*' which is

another prompt to develop A's story. In line 535, A starts answering A's question with a minimal response token '*yeah*'.

This type of repetition was also seen in men's talk in the previous chapter. Example 4 in the chapter on men's repetition contained the form of the repetition '*yeah*' (a minimal response token) + '*repetition of words*'. The example below is taken from Example 4 in the previous chapter.

439:	Ku:	you ju (0.2) you just can't do it.
440:	A:	you just don't have ti::me for these days huhu hahahaha
441: →	Ku:	yeah >˚don't have˚< ti:::me but (.) you can't be in you can't be used to it any more
442:	K:	[yeah we are not kiddies any more. huhuhuhu
443:	Ku:	[you can't even be used to for that long? with it and dedication go (.) I'm not
444:		frustrated out of control? and I'm just gonna keep trying.

As the example above shows, Ku's repetition in line 441 contains a minimal response token '*yeah*' which acknowledges A's previous utterance '*you just don't have ti::me for these days huhu hahahaha*' (Gardner, 2001). The repetition by Ku '*>˚don't have˚< ti:::me*' supports the minimal response '*yeah*' and shows Ku's understanding of A's utterance '*you just don't have ti::me for these days huhu hahahaha*'. In addition, the men's example contains '*but*' after the repetition indicating that Ku is explaining a contrasting reason.

In the women's example, the repetition by the original speaker A comprises a minimal response token '*yeah*' + a repetition '*chess bit*', a structure similar to that seen in the men's example above. This suggests that women also use repetition to collaborate in their talk in a way similar to that in which the male participants in this study use it.

In short, the repetition '*yes the chess bit*' by A contained two components: '*yes*' used as an agreement and '*the chess bit*' used as an acknowledgement. In addition A's repetition is also used to expand her story since it is followed with '*and*'. Through A's repetition, both A and K collaboratively develop A's story. Similar examples were seen in men's conversation.

11.3.4: A case of repetition '*three of each?*': used to summarise the original speaker's utterance

Example 4 is taken from a mixed gender conversation recorded in J and L's parents' house. Both J and L came to the house for dinner and this part of the conversation was recorded just before dinner. J is telling the story of the Sydney Easter show that he attended with his girl friend. J is talking about a family he saw at the show and J is guessing how much this family spent in total for one day at the show. The case of repetition is seen in line 43 delivered by a female speaker L.

Example 4

34:	J:	u::m well we were dropin sm- (0.3) some stuff after we shop for some- show bags
35:		and stuff,
36:	L:	uh huh,
37:	J:	so I was just dropping some stuff off in the car before we went off and had some
38:		dinner and whatever it is,
39:	L:	uh huh,
40:	J:	walked back to the car and I was following this family unit (.) obviously leaving for
41:		the da:y, (1.0) two adults, four kids. (0.3) each kid had at least two <u>large</u> show
42:		<u>three</u> large show bags,

43: → L: =oh my goodness [three of each?]

44: J: [plu::s the]wife was holding one of those big (.) teddy

45: bear thingy whatever plush toys whatever,

46: L: uh huh,

47: J: so I' m thinking okay let's add this up. = entry and (1.0) two to three show bags

48: each hundred bucks per kid.

49: L: yep, I reckon (continues)

J's utterance in lines 41 and 42 '*the da:y, (1.0) two adults, four kids. (0.3) each kid had at least two large show three large show bags,*' describes the family J saw at the show. The family has three children and the parents bought two or three show bags for each child, as confirmed by J's self-repetition in line 47: '…*two to three show bags*…'.

L in line 43 delivers '*=oh my goodness [three of each?]*' which includes a repetition '*[three of each?]*'. Her repetition '*[three of each?]*' changes the form of the previous speaker J's talk in lines 41 and 42. Tannen (2007) explains that forms of repetition can vary. Self repetition is different from the repetition that occurs when the other speaker repeats the previous speaker's utterance. Exact repetition, when the same words are uttered in the same rhythmic pattern, is different from paraphrase which is repeating the same idea in different words. J in lines 41 and 42 delivers '*the da:y, (1.0) two adults, four kids. (0.3) each kid had at least two large show three large show bags,*'. L in line 43 delivers a short phrase '*[three of each?]*' rather than repeating J's long utterance '*at least two large show three large show bags,*'. L's repetition '*[three of each?]*' is summarising J's utterance '*each kid had at least two large show three large show bags*'. Therefore the repetition by L in line 43 '*[three of each?]*' is used as a means of summarising the previous speaker's utterance.

L's repetition contains '= *oh my goodness*' which shows her surprise at what J has said. Schiffrin (1987) explains that '*oh*' signifies a shift in subjective orientation. Speakers evaluate the information given by the previous speakers. Speakers respond affectively and subjectively to what is said, what they are thinking of, and what happens around them. By using '*oh*' speakers can display shifts from subjective orientation to objective orientation.

For example,

Debby:	he found out that um the kid had been killed in a gang fight
	[thenighthhbefore.] So=
Henry:	[sharp intake of breath **Oh** Go:d]
Denny:	=it just ended like [that.]
Henry:	[Tsk.] Tsk. Pshew.

(Schiffrin, 1987: 96)

Schiffrin explains that the '*oh*' by Henry shows his strong emotional reaction to be a shift in his expressive orientation, because it is a shift in his evaluative involvement.

L's '= *oh my goodness*' in line 43 is used similarly to the '*oh*' in Schiffrin's example above. L is responding to J's utterance in line 42 subjectively by delivering '*oh my goodness*'. In this part of the conversation L remains a listener to the story and she is delivering minimal responses as continuer tokens to allow J to keep telling his story: '*uh huh*' in lines 36, 39 and 46, and '*yeah*' in line 49 (Gardner, 2001). L in line 43, however, delivers a repetition '*oh my goodness three of each*' instead of delivering a continuer token. L in line 43 is perhaps showing her enthusiastic participation in J's story telling by delivering her repetition instead of just being a recipient and letting J keep telling his

story by delivering acknowledgment tokens such as '*yeah*' or '*uh huh*'. Tannen (1993) explains that overlaps are sometimes used as a means of showing enthusiastic participation instead of being used as interruptions. L's utterance in line 43 is not overlapped with J's utterance in line 42 but L's repetition '*oh my goodness three of each*' is performing a similar function to that explained by Tannen's overlap theory, namely showing the recipient's enthusiastic participations.

In this part of the conversation, a female speaker L remains a listener of the male speaker J's story. L has five turns in this part of the conversation in total: in lines 36, 39, 43, 46, and 48. J remains as a story teller and dominates in telling his story. Out of five turns by a female speaker L, her repetition '*=oh my goodness [three of each?]*' in line 43 is the only turn in which she overtly responds to J's story. In other words, her repetition in line 43 is used as a form of affiliative work. The rest of her turns, except line 43, in this part of the conversation are used as continuer tokens since all of them have the same intonation ',' at the end.

Most of the male speaker J's turns in this part of the conversation end with a continuing intonation ',' which suggests that his story is in progress. Moreover, J's response in line 44 to L's repetition '*=oh my goodness [three of each?]*' in line 43 has neither an acknowledgment token nor an agreement token such as '*yeah*' to acknowledge the female speaker's utterance. J seems to treat L's repetition as another continuer token rather than as a repetition token, since he keeps telling his story.

In short, the repetition by L '*= oh my goodness [three of each?]*' contains two components: '*oh my goodness*' and '*three of each*'. '*oh my goodness*' shows L's subjective evaluation in response to J's previous utterance '*each kid had at least two <u>large</u> show three large show bags*'. '*[three of each?]*' is used to summarise J's utterance

'*each kid had at least two large show three large show bags*'. In order to deliver a summary of what the previous speaker has said, the female speaker L must be actively engaging in the talk. Coates (1996) explains that the delivery of one sentence construction by two or more persons can only occur when speakers pay extremely close attention to each other, at all linguistic levels: to the meaning of what the other speaker is saying, the grammatical structure of what is being said, the intonation pattern and the rhythmic quality. Coates' claim can also be applied to the delivery of a repetition. L's repetition '*[three of each?]*' summarises what the previous speaker has said. It suggests that L is paying close attention to the previous speaker's utterance.

11.3.5: A case of repetition with a rising intonation '*[a bone][to chew?]*': used as a question

Example 5 is a mixed gender conversation which was recorded in L's parents' house where L's birthday party was being held. F and J are male participants but C is a female participant. The participants are having dinner outside. In this part of the conversation, F is telling his story about his work colleague. In his story, F is telling a humorous story about something the work colleague had said, and F's own reponse to it. There are actually two repetitions in this example. Both a female speaker C and a male speaker J deliver repetitions '*a bone to chew with you?*'. The repetition is used both as a question and an interruption.

Example 5

48: F: not really obsessed I just like joke a bit but I'll tell you the other story. Three
49: guys are at the help desk and it's our L and (3.2) all the other guys got fired recently J
50: and then Jo (.) now Jo is a Kenyan he's a (.) black Afr[ican] from Kenya,

51: J: [yeah,]

52: F: [I messed up with um]

53: J: [put a glass on more of an angle]

((J is talking to the other person here))

54: F: I messed up (.) on the service and the help desk [(kept)] getting calls

55: J: [yep,]

56: F: cause no one can print for some reason. =so they ask me what's going on

57: J: mm.

58: F: (an it's) oh sorry my bad I'm sorry guys you know it's my fault , so

59: J: start angling it up again? ((J is talking to the other person here again))

60: F: Jo comes up to me and says- and pulls me aside and he goes look man I've got a 61: bone to chew with you hehehe and [I said-]

62: → C: [a bone] [to chew?]

63: → J: [I've got a] boner to chew [with you?]

64: F: [↑I said to Jo]

65: ↑hang on a second mate you wanna che(h)ew my bo(h)one? you wanna chew a bone,

66: J: hehe

67: F: you go outside and chew a bone on your own I am not a part of this at all.

68: J: hehe

69: F: and Jo said nono I mean I need to talk to you I said- oh but you wanna chew a bone

70: ↓so I started jokin y'know brought in a bone put it on his desk, so he can chew a bone

71: whenever he feels like it and when L's there I js go 'hey L who is your daddy who is

72: your daddy L who is your daddy'

73: J: heheheha

74: (1.8)

In lines 60 and 61 F is explaining what his friend has said to him: '*Jo comes up to me and says- and pulls me aside and he goes look man I've got a bone to chew with you hehehe and [I said-]*'. F's utterance in line 61 is then cut off by C in line 62. C's utterance contains a repetition '*[a bone] [to chew?]*' and J's utterance in line 63 also repeats '*[I've got a] boner to chew [with you?]*'.

The repetitions by both C in line 62 and J in line 63 show different forms. C's repetition in line 62 '*[a bone] [to chew?]*' is delivered as a phrase, not a sentence, and as a partial repetition of F's utterance '*I've got a bone to chew with you*' in lines 60 and 61. J's repetition, however is delivered as '*[I've got a] boner to chew [with you?]*' which repeats F's exact words in lines 60 and 61 with one exception - that J replaces '*bone*' with '*boner*'. Both C and J's repetitions here contain a rising intonation which suggests that the two speakers are perhaps showing that they have a problem understanding what F's colleague Jo meant by saying '*a bone to chew with you?*' (Schegloff, 1997a).

The repetitions by both C and J are also similar to those seen in the men's example of repetition discussed in Chapter 10.

1.	Al:	I was in a band with a guy who is uh: [the assistant] manager?
2.	→ Ku:	[in a band?]
3.	Al:	oh yeah [he is ((unable to hear))
4.	Ku:	[oh oh oh it's good you did like what I said.
5.	Al:	no shut up.
6.	Aa:	hh
7.	Al:	he was uh:: actually the the (.) the (.) staff not about the band's much >more
8.		interesting< but he was um the assistant manager, of a bar in Glasgow?=
9.	Aa:	=Ye::ah.

10. Al: that uh:: near George Square (.) and after ((unable to hear)) on Thursday

11. afternoons we didn't have anything on so we went to ((unable to hear)) the

12. bar before I walked the dog, (.) he would unlock the fridge and serve us free

13. drinks.

14. Aa: yah [ha::::]

This part of the conversation is taken from Example 7 in the chapter on men's repetition. Ku in line 2 delivers the repetition '*in a band?*' with a rising intonation. K's rising intonation possibly shows that Ku is having a problem of grasping or hearing what the original speaker said (Schegloff, 1997a). Al in line 3 delivers '*oh yeah*' which is used as an answer for Ku's question '*[in a band?]*' in line 2

Both C's '*[a bone] [to chew?]*' and J's '*[I've got a] boner to chew [with you?]*' follow the same pattern as the men's example provided above. Both C and J are possibly showing a problem of grasping what F has reported that his colleague Jo said.

60: F: Jo comes up to me and says- and pulls me aside and he goes look man I've got a

61: bone to chew with you hehehe and [I said-]

62: → C: [a bone] [to chew?]

63: → J: [I've got a] boner to chew [with you?]

64: F: [↑I said to Jo]

65: ↑hang on a second mate you wanna che(h)ew my bo(h)one? you wanna chew a bone,

66: J: hehe

67: F: you go outside and chew a bone on your own I am not a part of this at all.

68: J: hehe

69: F: and Jo said nono I mean I need to talk to you I said- oh but you wanna chew a bone

70: ↓so I started jokin y'know brought in a bone put it on his desk, so he can chew a bone

71: whenever he feels like it and when L's there I js go 'hey L who is your daddy who is

72: your daddy L who is your daddy'

In addition, since both C's and J's repetitions end with a rising intonation, indicating that both of them ask the same question of F, F is required to answer their question about the expression '*a bone to chew with you*' delivered by Jo. Lerner (2004) explains that when the next speaker delivers his/her utterance with a rising intonation, the action of the next speaker's utterance is addressed to the previous speaker, who is required to take an action to answer the question.

However, F in line 64 does not confirm or explain Jo's '*a bone to chew with you*'. Instead, F continues his story. F's utterance in line 64 starts with his self repetition '*[↑I said to Jo]*' which he has said in his previous turn in line 61 '*and [I said-]*'. F's utterance in line 61 '*...bone to chew with you hehehe and [I said-]*' is overlapped by C in line 62 '*[a bone]*'. F's utterance in line 61 is cut off by this overlap. F therefore restarts his story, in overlap with the end of J's utterance, by recycling his '*[I said-]*'.

F is making fun of Jo's '*look man I've got a bone to chew with you*' which is evident from his turns in this part of the conversation. Jo's utterance was perhaps meant to be '*a bone to pick with you*' (a common English expression) instead of '*a bone to chew with you*'. The female speaker C in line appears to pick up the 'mistake' in this utterance by Jo, hearing that that he used '*chew*' instead of '*pick*', and C in line 62 shows a problem of understanding of Jo's expression. However, the male speaker J in line 63 seems to pick up the likely point of F's joke since J in line 63 has used the term '*boner*' instead of '*bone*' in his repetition. By doing this he develops both C's repetition in line 62 and F's original quotation of Jo's words.

In addition, there are laughter tokens in this part of the conversation in line 61 and 65 by F, in lines 66, 68 and 78 by J. By delivering these laughter tokens, F and J in this part of the conversation display their appreciation of their humorous talk. Holmes (2006b) explains that when participants in conversations work together to produce a humorous sequence, with each person contributing to and building on the contributions of the others, the overall effect is collaborative.

Humour in this part of the conversation fits into the role play type of humour listed by Hay (1985: 76). It includes specific mimicry of a particular person, or just the general adoption of a stereotypical voice or attitude. This is very much performance-based humour and it is relatively common in spoken discourse. F in lines 60 and 61 starts to mimic what his friend, Jo said to F. F's reported speech of what Jo said has brought about a humorous effect in this segment of the conversation.

In short, the repetitions by both C and J functioned as a form of question. C and J sought confirmation of their hearing of '*a bone to chew with you*' by delivering their repetitions with a rising intonation. At the same time, J humorously developed F's quotation of Jo's talk by delivering '*boner*' instead of '*bone*'. Through repetition, the participants in this part of the conversation try to understand each other and collaboratively develop the story.

11.3.6: A case of repetition '*on the sale¿*': used as a means of acknowledgment

Example 6 is a women-only conversation which is recorded at L's mother's place. L and K are talking about L's daughter's hat. L delivers a repetition '*on the sale¿*' to acknowledge K's attempt at retrieving old information and bringing it into the

conversation. A case of repetition by L is seen in line 102. This repetition is used as a means of acknowledgement of and agreement with the original speaker's utterance.

Example 6

((K's child came into the room and screamed))

93: K: volume, (.) pl:ease, can you turn it down?

94: L: it's a::ll too exciting.

95: K: huhu she just looks at me what:: (.) are you talking about (.) mother.

96: L: did you see the girls' hats?

97: K: yeah they're nice,

98: L: they're cute aren't they-

99: K: where d'you get them.

100: L: Target¿

101: K: (were) you- ↑oh on the sale.

102: →L: on the sale¿

103: K: bet they were a- (.) good price.

104: L: Target on sale they are probably about four fifty¿ each.

106: L: ˚could be in here.˚

107: K: ˚umm.˚

K in line 99 asks L where she bought the hats for her daughters and L in line 100 provides the answer for K. K in line 101 delivers '*(were) you- ↑oh on the sale.*'. L in line 102 then delivers a repetition '*on the sale¿*' which is used in a similar way to an acknowledgement token '*yeah*' (Gardner, 2001) although L's repetition does not contain such a minimal response token. K in line 101 delivers '*oh on the sale*' which contains '*oh*'. This K's '*↑oh*' is perhaps used as a marker of recognition of familiar information

(Schiffrin, 1987). Schiffrin explains that the speaker's recognition of familiar information may result from the speaker's own cognitive search for a particular piece of known information.

> Zelda: And uh-Oh! We-when we go to the kids, we always eat out. We eat at the F1-Blue Fountain.
>
> (Schiffrin, 1987: 93)

In the example above, Zelda is about to add another restaurant to her list of favourites, the initial '*and*' indicating that the speaker has more to add. Zelda then delivers '*oh*', indicating that the speaker seems suddenly to recall her memory of the name of the restaurant. This may also be the type of '*oh*' used by K in this example.

K in line 101 delivers her '↑*oh*' after '*(were) you-*'. The name of the shop which L mentions in lines 100 and 104 mention is well known to local Australians in that it often has a sale and at these times sells products at cheaper prices. K in line 101 perhaps recalls the shop's sales and realises that L bought the hats for her daughters during a sale, and this is perhaps why K uses '*oh*' in line 101. L in line 102 then acknowledges K's '↑*oh on the sale.*' by repeating K's '*on the sale¿*'.

L's repetition in line 102 contains an emphasised '*s<u>a</u>le*' as if L is saying '*yes of course I bought it on the sale*'. L's '*on the sale¿*' in line 102 is used to acknowledge K's '*oh on the sale*' in line 101 but it is done without delivering a minimal response token such as '*yeah*' for the acknowledgement. L in line 104 again repeats '*on sale*' which supports the emphasised 's<u>a</u>le' in line 102 by L. '*s<u>a</u>le*' is perhaps an important factor for L when buying hats and therefore L's first '*s<u>a</u>le*' was emphasised. The slightly rising intonation of L's '*on the sale¿*' mimics that of her previous '*Target¿*', suggesting that it functions

as another form of emphasis. L's repetition is delivered collaboratively rather than as a means of handling a problematic episode. The flow of this part of the conversation goes smoothly before and after L's repetition. L's repetition is not used as a question, which supports the view that L's repetition is used as collaborative repetition. When a repetition is used as a question it suggests that participants do not understand the previous speaker's production, as discussed in the previous example of the repetition '*a bone to chew with you*'.

In short, the repetition by L '*on the sale*' was used to acknowledge and agree with the previous speaker's utterance. Thus, it may be said that the repetition in this example was delivered collaboratively.

11.3.7: A case of repetitions '*[↑how much would a] movie be,*' and '*[couple of] [gigs]*': as a question and showing understanding of the previous speaker's utterance

Example 7 is taken from the women's one sentence construction chapter and is discussed there in association with Example 3. In Example 7 both A and K are female speakers but Al is a male speaker. However, Al is in another room and is talking with other men. Therefore Al is not a primary participant in the conversation between A and K. However, when a repetition occurs in line 120, A directs a question to Al who is in the other room and talking with other men. Then Al answers A's question. Thus the repetition in this example is delivered by a female speaker. There are actually two repetitions seen in this sample. The first repetition is used to ask a question and the second repetition is used to show an understanding of what the previous speaker has said.

Example 7

109: A: and he was like >y'know< he doesn't really know anything about it and (1.0) he'd

110: had broadband with somebody .hh and he said that he got a phone call from ((a

111: name of a company))?(1.0) and this sales rep'd convinced him to s- to sign u.hh on

112: ((a name of a company))? and like he'd said what've you currently got and rick was

113: like o::h I think we currently get.hh he doesn't ↓know (.)he's totally↓clueless .hh and

114: this guy said oh well we can get like ah (.) five hundred .hh <megabit download> a

115: month which is n::[:othing.]

116: K: [is that ( )-] [ye:ah::]

117: A: [It's ti:ny like] (1.0) cos=

118: K: =how much is a movie.

119: (1.0)

120: → A: oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.

121: K: [((unable to hear this))]

((A is asking to her husband Al who is in the other room and Al is answering her question from the other room at this point))

122: Al: oh a couple of gig [coupla gigabits.]

123: → A: [couple of] [gigs.]

124: K: [yeah,]yeah so[:o you're not down-]

125: A: [y'know we're talking] gigabits.

126: K: so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and]

127: A: [yeah I] mean and that's the thing like

128: yeah [you browse browse websites] and look at email.

129: K: [download your emails. (.) ye::ah.]

130: (0.5)

131: A: .hh n'even then you might wanna turn [the pictures off.]

132: K: [that's not f- definitely not] for downloading.

133: A: ye[ah.]

134: K: [yeah.]

135: A: so:: he is doing this and like this guy was like yeah it'll be just like the one

136: you've currently got and blah blah blah and you'll pay this much per month, (0.5) .hh

137: and he said you know sort of like you beauty an- and rick wasn't aware of what- he

138: doesn't know anything about it like- (0.7) I was talking to him and he goes yeah

139: NOW I REALISE-

In this part of the conversation, the original speaker A has been talking about the use of the internet in Australia. Her boss at work received huge bills from the internet provider and A is telling K about it. In line 118 K delivers a question '*how much is a movie.*'. After K's question, there is a long pause '*(1.0)*' in line 119. Then the original speaker A in line 120 repeats K's question '*how much is a movie.*' in line 118 as '*oh::: how much would a movie be Al how many megabits.*'.

In line 120 A is self-repairing her repetition. A's first part of the utterance '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be,*' appears to be adopted as a repeat of K's question in line 118 '*=how much is a movie.*'. Then the second part of A's utterance '*Al how many megabits.*' is a rephrasing of the first part of A's utterance '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be,* ' which specifies the unit to be described by '*how much*' as '*megabits*'. This second part of A's utterance '*how many megabits.*' provides Al with the information he needs to answer A and K's questions in a relevant way.

A's repetition in line 120 '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.*' is delivered as a question to the other speaker Al. By delivering the repetition with '*...Al...*', A is selecting the person who should answer her question. In line 120, the

selected speaker Al answers A's question by delivering '*oh a couple of gig [giga bits.]*'. Thus A's repetition in line 120 '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.*' is used as a question addressed to the selected next speaker. A's repetition in line 120 contains '*oh:::*' which suggests that A is possibly trying to think of the answer to K's question '*=how much is a movie.*'. A's '*oh:::*' is extended which also supports the idea that A is trying to find the answer to K's question. However, A is apparently unable to provide the answer for K, and therefore in line 120 she seeks Al's help. By repeating K's question and directing it to Al, A draws Al into the conversation briefly.

Although the repetition by the original speaker A is used as a question, A's repetition in line 120 differs from the men's question-form repetition case which was discussed in the previous chapter, and is reproduced below:

9:		(3.0)
10:	A:	<u>revenge</u>
11:		(1.0)
12:	A:	what's shinobi again?
13:		(1.0)
14:→	J:	shinobi¿ (0.4) ah that's ah [Japanese]
15:	A:	[anime¿]
16:	J:	japanese movie, no it's not that (1.0) it's not anime (1.0) it's like an
17:		action (1.0) that is hang on sort out of (3.0) so this is a two thousand six
18:		hello dog? ((of J's mum's pet just came into the room))

The sequence above is taken from Example 3 in the men's repetition chapter. J in line 14 delivers a repetition '*shinobi?*' as a question and J is perhaps showing a problem of either grasping or hearing what the previous speaker A has said (Schegloff, 1997a).

In contrast to the example of men's question-form repetition above, in the women's repetition in Example 7 the previous speaker delivers a question in line 118 '=*how much is a movie.*' and then the original speaker in line 120 repeats the previous speaker's repetition '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.*'. The original speaker's repetition does not appear to be showing that she has a problem of either grasping or hearing what the speaker K has said. A's utterance in line 120 '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.*' shows that she has heard and understood K's utterance in line 118 and then passes the same question to the other speaker Al.

There is a second repetition by the original speaker A in this part of the conversation which can be seen in line 122 below.

```
117:     A:                                    [It's ti:ny like] (1.0) cos=
118: →   K:                                                      =how much is a movie.
119: →   (1.0)
120:     A:   oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.
121:     K:         [((unable to hear this ))]
              ((A is asking to her husband Al who is in the other room and Al is answering her
                question from the other room at this point))
122:     Al:  oh a couple of gig [coupla gigabits.]
123: →   A:                      [  couple     of  ] [gigs. ]
124:     K:                                    [yeah, ]yeah so[:o  you're  not down-]
125:     A:                                                    [y'know we're talking ] gigabits.
126:     K:   so all you can really do is look at an ema::[il and  ]
```

Al in line 122 answers A's (and hence K's) question seen in lines 118 and 120. In line

122, Al delivers '*oh a couple of gig [coupla gigabits.]*'. A in line 123 repeats '*[couple of] gigs.*'. A's second repetition in line 122 '*[couple of] gigs.*' is a different type of repetition from her first repetition in line 120 '*oh::: [↑how much would a] movie be, Al how many megabits.*'. A's second repetition '*[couple of] gigs.*' is used as a means of showing A's understanding of what the previous speaker Al has said (Sacks, 1992, v2) and of repeating Al's answer for the original questioner, K. In line 122, by delivering a repetition '*[couple of] gigs.*', A herself provides the answer for K's question in line 118 '*=how much is a movie.*'.

K in line 123 acknowledges the answer to her question of line 118 '*how much is a movie.*'. K in line 123 delivers '*[yeah,] yeah*' which acknowledges Al's '*oh a couple of gig [giga bits.]*' (Gardner, 1998). This K's acknowledgment of K '*yeah yeah*' suggests that K is also listening to Al's answer, since she commences her turn at talk before A has reached the end of her utterance, '*gigs*'. By delivering these two repetitions in lines 120 and 122, A is collaboratively trying to find the answer for K's question '*=how much is a movie.*' which was delivered in line 118.

In short, in Example 7, the first repetition was used as a question to the other speaker. The second repetition showed an understanding of what the previous speaker has said and relayed that answer to the original questioner. These two repetitions contributed collaboratively to finding the answer to the question '*=how much is a movie.*'.

11.4: Summary of this chapter

This chapter discussed 12 cases of women's repetitions. Coates (1993) explained that repetition was one of the collaborative features used by men in talk. Men used repetition for collaborative talk instead of delivering one sentence construction by two or more

people, which Coates identified as one of the collaborative features used by women in talk. However, this chapter showed that female participants used repetitions, and that some cases of repetition were similar in both men and women's conversations.

For instance, a case of repetition used to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance (Lerner, 2004) was discussed in Example 1, and was also seen in men's talk. In this model of repetition, one sentence construction was involved, as discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. The original speaker delivered his/her in-progress utterance and then the next speaker tried to complete the original speaker's utterance (Lerner. 1992). Then the original speaker delivered a repetition to acknowledge and accept the next speaker's utterance completion. Thus, repetition was used as an acknowledgement.

Another case of repetition commonly seen in both men's and women's talk was one in which the repetition was delivered with a rising intonation, as discussed in Examples 5 and 8 in this chapter. This kind of repetition showed that the speaker who delivered the repetition was possibly showing a problem of hearing or grasping what the previous speaker had said (Schegloff, 1997a). Although the speaker showed a problem through this type of repetition, participants in this part of the conversation tried to achieve their conversational goal, that is, to ask the question and to answer the question. This type of repetition was considered a collaborative feature (Chang and Wells, 1987).

There were also cases of repetitions seen only in women's conversations. For instance, there was a case in which the next speaker tried to summarise what the previous speaker had said, as discussed in Example 4. The original speaker delivered '*at least two <u>large</u> show <u>three</u> large show bags*'. The next speaker then delivered '*=oh my goodness [three of each?]*' in which she summarised the number of bags, of which the previous speaker was possibly unsure. Although the next speaker did not get an acknowledgement by the

original speaker of her repetition, this repetition showed that she was highly engaged in the story being told by the original speaker.

Chapter 12: Conclusion

This chapter provides a conclusion for the study. It includes five sections, starting with the outcomes of the research questions. The research questions of this study were:

1. Do women employ collaborative strategies in every day talk?
2. Do men employ collaborative strategies in every day talk?
3. What collaborative strategies do men and women employ in everyday talk? Are they similar or different?

The first two questions aimed to investigate whether men and women are collaborative in everyday conversations. The last two research questions examined the types of collaborative strategies men and women use in conversations in addition to whether there is a similarity or difference in collaborative features between men and women in conversation. The responses to these questions and the contribution of this research study will be reviewed in the first section of this chapter. We will also discuss the limitations of this study which are followed by directions for future research. The final section summarises recommendations for the field of discourse analysis and studies of gender and language.

12.1: Collaboration in male and female talk

The aim of this study was to investigate both men's and women's collaborative talk. Past studies of gender and language showed several gender based characteristics in talk. In particular, it was found that women tended to collaborate in their talk while men tended to be uncooperative or challenging (Holmes, 2006b). However, other studies found that men actually did show collaborative features in their talk. For instance, Howden (1994)

found that Japanese men's conversational style was indirect and similar to American women's conversational style. Coates' research (1996 and 2003) has highlighted that one sentence construction was used as a collaborative feature among women while repetition was used a collaborative feature by men. Leung's study (2009) found that girls also used repetition to collaborate in their talk, a result which contradicted Coates' finding. In summary, in contrast to earlier studies, both men and women have been shown to employ collaborative features in their talk. This study investigated collaborative features in talk among both men and women, focusing in particular on three collaborative features: one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition.

The research questions of this study were:

1. Do women employ collaborative strategies in every day talk?
2. Do men employ collaborative strategies in every day talk?
3. What collaborative strategies do men and women employ in everyday talk? Are they similar or different?

This study employed naturally occurring conversations of Australian men and women during lunch or dinner or snack times that varied in time. The conversations were transcribed using the CA conventions that provided a lot of technical detail.

With regards to the first two research questions, it was found that both male and female participants in this study actually used three collaborative features, one sentence construction, one sentence expansion, and repetition in their conversations. This result contradicted elements of Coates' findings (1996 and 2003) that women use one sentence construction as a collaborative feature while men use repetition to collaborate in their talk. It also supported Leung's finding (2009) that girls use repetition to collaborate in

their talk. The study also lends support to the research initiated by Coates (2004) who has argued about the changing roles of men and women and the breaking of barriers between men's and women's conversational styles. Thus, the answer for the first and second questions is that both men and women in this study used collaborative features in their talk.

However, it is important to note that the applicability of the findings in other contexts is constrained by the social network of participants. In other words, the interaction of the variables of age, middle class and close relationship among the participants might have had an influence on the presence of collaborative features in the interaction and the strengthening of social bonds. As Snell postulates, 'the micro-level choices that speakers make may ultimately help to (re)constitute macro-level social categories, but at the same time, these choices are influenced by existing social structure in what is essentially a cyclical process' (2010, p.651). The results of this study do not suggest that the findings could be replicated in all settings and all times, but should be treated as a possible trend of the use of collaborative features by both men and women (Perakyla, 2004).

12.2: Three collaborative features: one sentence construction, expansion and repetition.

The answer to the third research question is provided by the qualitative analysis chapters (Chapter 6 to 11) in this study and summarised here. This study examined three collaborative features qualitatively in order to see whether men and women use similar or different cases of each collaborative feature. This study adopted 'unmotivated looking', which is an inductive method in approaching the data anlysis to examine the presence of collaborative features in the recorded conversations. Three collaborative features were significantly observed in the data, and thus became the basis for organising the analysis

chapters. The analysis involved both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the three features, namely repetitions, one sentence expansions and one sentence constructions. It was pointed out that men and women employed similar collaborative strategies, as they all employed cases of one sentence construction, expansion and repetition. However, within these strategies, there was some variation in the way they employed the above collaborative features which is going to be explained below. Firstly, cases of one sentence construction are reviewed below.

12.2.1: Cases of one sentence construction

There were several cases of one sentence construction seen in both men's and women's conversations. The majority followed Lerners' categories of one sentence construction but the study pointed out some differences too. For instance, both men and women employed the basic model of one sentence construction given by Lerner (1991). In this case the original speaker delivers a syntactically incomplete discourse unit and then the next speaker provides the rest of the discourse unit to complete the original speaker's utterance. In the end, one syntactically complete unit is collaboratively formed by two speakers.

The use of overlap seemed to be prominent in the one sentence construction strategy. In this model, the current speaker provided an affiliating utterance and the affiliating utterance overlapped with the original speaker's in-progress utterance. This happens because the original speaker continued beyond the point where the current speaker could deliver an affiliating utterance (Lerner, 2004).

There were other types of one sentence constructions specifically found in the women's conversations that employed minimal tokens. In this case, the female next speaker

delivers an affiliating utterance with the recognition token '*oh*' (Schiffrin, 1987). Thus, the next speaker is positioned as actively listening to the original speaker's story; once she realises the missing element of the original speaker's story she is possibly able to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance. Other times, a minimal response token '*yeah*' was added to an affiliating utterance. This '*yeah*' was used by the next speaker as a means of shifting from being a recipient to becoming a speaker.

There were some models of one sentence construction found only in men's conversations. In the men's conversations there was the case where the next speaker delivers an affiliating utterance with a rising intonation. In this model the current speaker who delivers an affiliating utterance is requesting the original speaker to answer the question. At the same time, the current speaker is supporting the original speaker to complete the original speaker's in progress discourse unit (Lerner, 2004).

Finally men displayed the use of a one sentence construction that followed a three part structure in the men's conversations (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991). Both Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991) explained this as a case of one sentence expansion. When speakers list things in their conversations, speakers often finish their sentence within three listings. The third list in a sentence is often predicted by the other speakers, thus creating an affiliative utterance. The male original speaker delivers two lists of the event in his story and this is followed by the next speaker who delivers the third component as an affiliating utterance for the original speaker.

One sentence construction is one of the elements that demonstrates collaborative narration and displays strong 'togetherness' among participants of conversations (Coates, 2005). Both male speakers and female speakers in this study showed several cases of one sentence construction as discussed in both Chapters 6 and 7. They did not seem to

interrupt the flow of conversations or trigger competitiveness among the participants; rather they contributed to the progression of the narration and showed participant involvement. Some cases of one sentence construction were similarly seen between male and female participants in this study; it is therefore possible to conclude that one sentence construction is not only a feature of women's collaborative conversational style but it is also quite possibly a collaborative feature of men's conversational style.

12.2.2: Cases of one sentence expansion

The second collaborative feature analysed was one sentence expansion which resembles one sentence construction. However, it differs in that the original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker delivered an expanding discourse unit often including a device named increment initiator (Lerner, 1991 and 2004). Similar to the cases of one sentence construction, male and female participants showed several cases of one sentence expansion as shown in Chapters 8 and 9.

Cases of one sentence expansion that followed Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion were seen in both men's and women's conversations in this study. The original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the next speaker expands the original speaker's utterance with an increment initiator (Lerner, 1991) such as '*excep*t' or '*because*'.

Another case of one sentence expansion commonly seen in both men's and women's conversations was the case in which a three part structure was followed (Jefferson, 1991 and Lerner, 1991). Jefferson (1991) and Lerner (1991) explain that speakers in conversations they studied often delivered the three part structure when they listed things in their conversations. The recipient often saw the third component as a sign of turn

completion. This model was also seen in the one sentence construction here. In this case, the difference between one sentence construction and expansion was whether the original speaker delivered a syntactically complete utterance or an incomplete utterance.

In one type of one sentence expansion, Lerner's reformulated model (Lerner, 1991). The original speaker provides a clue for the next speaker, as a characterisation of what would be taken up in a subsequent turn unit. In this study this kind of one sentence expansion was commonly seen in both women's and men's conversations. The next speaker realises an expansion component in the process of the original speaker's story. Then the next speaker delivers her/his expansion unit for the original speaker.

There were also other types of one sentence expansion seen exclusively in the women's conversations. One included the next speaker's expansion component being delivered with a rising intonation as discussed in Example 6. This type of expansion was similarly seen in cases of one sentence construction in men's conversations. In this type of expansion, similar to the case of a construction, two actions are involved. The next speaker was not only trying to expand the original speaker's utterance but also was asking the original speaker to answer a question.

There was also the case where an increment initiator was used to expand the original speaker's utterance. In this type of expansion the original speaker delivers a syntactically complete utterance and then the female next speaker's expansion component starts without a conjunction word such as '*and*'. Although this model did not follow Lerner's basic model of an expansion, it did happen that one discourse unit was collaboratively expanded by both speakers in the end.

The last case of expansion discussed in women's conversation was an affiliate utterance, delivered with a minimal token, '*yeah*'. In this case, the female next speaker delivers an affiliate utterance '*cause*' in the example, but she produces a minimal token '*yeah*' before '*cause*'. The minimal response '*yeah*' showed an acknowledgement of the previous speaker's utterance.

In the men's conversation there was a case which was expanded twice. This case followed Lerner's basic model of one sentence expansion but the next speaker's attempt to expand the original speaker's utterance did not fully complete the original speaker's utterance. The original speaker expanded the next speaker's expanded component again. This model of expansion showed that the two male participants were highly involved in collaboratively trying to develop one discourse unit.

In all cases of one sentence expansion, the original speaker and the next speaker tried to collaboratively achieve their conversational goal; that is, they tried to develop one discourse unit together through the use of one sentence expansion. The form of one sentence expansion was different from that of one sentence construction as discussed. However, both male and female participants in this study collaboratively expanded discourse units produced by previous speakers. Some cases of one sentence expansion were common in both men's and women's conversations. However, variations of one sentence expansion were seen in each of the men's and women's conversations. Thus, similar to cases of one sentence construction, one sentence expansion is possibly a feature of both men's and women's collaboration in talk.

12.2.3: Cases of repetition

The last collaborative feature discussed in this study was repetition. Coates's study (1996) showed that men tend to use repetition to collaborate in their talk as opposed to women who tend to use one sentence construction for this purpose. However, this study showed both male and female participants using repetition in several instances in their talk. The results of this study supported Coates' finding (1996) in that men showed several instances of repetitions in their talk, and men used repetition for the purpose of collaborating in their talk. However, female participants in this study also employed repetitions to collaborate in their talk which contradicted the result of the study undertaken by Coates (1996). It is possible however that participants from different contexts and different backgrounds might generate different findings, therefore, the findings of the present research are possibilities of practice for men and women who might have similar characteristics with the participants in this study.

In this study, some cases of repetition were commonly seen in both men's and women's conversations. For instance, repetition was used as an acceptance of one sentence construction. In this type of repetition, the next speaker's affiliating utterance to complete the original speaker's in-progress utterance was accepted using repetition. This type of repetition was used as a part of one sentence construction. Both speakers collaboratively formed one discourse unit by delivering both one sentence construction and repetition.

Also, there was repetition used as a question. This type of repetition often was the result of a problem in grasping or hearing what the previous speaker said (Schegloff, 1997) which could be seen as a problematic feature rather than a collaborative feature. However, through this type of repetition both speakers tried to achieve their

conversational goal which was to find an answer to the question. Thus this type of repetition was still considered to be a collaborative feature in talk.

The third type of repetition commonly seen in both men's and women's conversations included a minimal response token such as '*yeah*' before a repetition was delivered. The minimal response token was used to acknowledge the previous speaker's utterance (Gardner, 1998) and a repetition was used to show the speaker's understanding of what the previous speaker said (Sacks, 1992).

In men's conversations other types of repetition which were not commonly seen in women's conversations, were discussed. For instance, there was a case of repetition followed by participants' laughter. This evidence suggested that repetition was used to convey a sense of humour into the story. Holmes (2006b) explained that a sense of humour is one of the collaborative features of talk.

There was also a case of men's repetition being used as a means of expanding the story. This type of repetition has been previously explained by Tannen (2007). In this study, a male speaker also used a repetition to expand the original speakers' story.

In the women's conversation, there was a case where a female speaker tried to make a summary of the story by producing a repetition. In this type of repetition the exact words were not repeated by the next speaker and so it was a different feature from the other types of repetition. In order to deliver this type of repetition the speaker was actively engaging in the conversation in order to summarise the story.

Coates' study (1996) found that repetition was a men's collaborative feature in their talk and in this study it was also evident that men used collaboration in their talk which offers

evidence supporting Coates' finding. However, women in this study also showed several cases of repetition in their conversations. This result supported the results of Leung's study (2009) that girls also use repetition to collaborate in their talk. Several cases of repetition were used to accept one sentence construction, as a story expansion or sometimes to inject humour in the story. Thus, repetition is possibly a collaborative conversational feature of both men and women.

12.3: Limitations of the study

As with all research, this study had some limitations in its capacity to form generalisations based on the data. Firstly, analysing selected samples in the qualitative analysis has its weak points. A generalisation of the result might not be strongly supported particularly when it is used for investigating language and interaction (Schegloff, 1987). Crawford (1995) discusses the difficulty of quantifying and generalising conclusions from discourse analytic work. If the study found that a speaker used a particular speech strategy or rhetorical device in a transcript, the study could still have little sense of how often that speaker used that device or how common it is for others to use it.

This study was conducted mainly using a qualitative approach to investigate how male and female participants delivered the three collaborative features: one sentence construction, expansion and repetition. Results showed that both men and women display some similarities in the use for each collaborative feature. However, since this study used sampling with specific social characteristics for qualitative analysis, it should be acknowledged that the results cannot be generalisable to all the population of men and women. In fact, although women and men in this study showed several cases of the three collaborative features in their talk, this result does not guarantee that they will show

these collaborative features in other conversations all the time, but what men and women can do if they are in similar circumstances.

The second limitation relates to the specific profile of the participants, Australian men and women in their 20s. Sociolinguistics suggest that participants' social variables such as their social class, ethnicity, and age influence speech productions (Trudgill, 1980). This study limited participants' social variables in order to avoid the influence of social variables on the data. Thus, the author acknowledges this point as a weakness of this study and that the results apply really to the participants who fitted into the categories which were discussed in Chapter 4.

12.4: Future study

This study could be developed further in several ways. First, this study limited social valuables of participants such as age group, language which participants used, participants' social status, and ethnicity. Within the DA framework, sociolinguists often believe that these social valuables seem to affect participants' speech productions (for instance, Labov, 1972, Trudgill, 1980, Fujimura-Wilson, 2007, Thompson, Robinson and Beisecker, 2004, Holmes, 2001). Thus, there is potential to investigate the same three collaborative features among male and female participants who belong to a different category of social variables. For instance, another study could be undertaken between men and women in Australia who belong to an older age group such as the over 50 year old age group.

A second possible further study might be to investigate the same three collaborative features in institutional settings. Collaborative features in talk can be an important factor in institutional settings. For instance, Nevile (2007) explained that collaborative conversations in an airline cockpit were critical for the safe operating of aircraft. Cheng

and Wells (1987) discussed the importance of collaborative talk in classrooms. Collaborative talk not only helped participants in conversations achieve their conversational goals but also it had the potential to enhance participants' learning ability when it was used in the classroom. Although this study explored everyday interactions to see three collaborative features, this type of study can be applied in the future to explore institutional interactions.

12.5: Recommendations

In this section, three recommendations were discussed. Based on the results of this study, the author believes that not only scholars who research gender and interactions, but also people who work in different fields, can utilise the results of this study to improve interactions in specific contexts. Three recommendations were made in this section. Firstly, the methodology adopted in this study offers a useful method for those attempting to utilise the CA framework for research into gender and language. Secondly, for those who teach a second language, collaborative activities in class could be offered to learners in class to enhance their language skills. Finally, those who work in the transport industry, collaborative talk, in particular repetition to check each other, can be a crucial factor in achieving best practice in terms of safety.

12.5.1: A possible new approach for gender and language adopting the CA framework into the DA framework

The first recommendation is specifically for those who try to utilise the CA framework within the DA framework for their research. This study has employed a combination of CA and DA for the analysis of gender and interaction which is not often undertaken. Few recent studies of gender and interaction have combined the DA framework and the

CA framework. For instance, Jefferson's study (2004) included two approaches: the quantitative approach and qualitative approach. Although her quantitative analysis did not show any clear difference between men and women in her study, her qualitative analysis demonstrated how male and female participants use laughter in conversations. Her analysis was undertaken in the CA framework but she labelled her participants as male and female participants for her analysis.

This study also adopted the CA framework for analysing three collaborative features following Jefferson's qualitative approach for data analysis. Using the combination of the DA and the CA framework in this study enabled the researcher to label participants' gender as male and female speakers for the analysis and also to show readers evidence of what speakers in conversations were doing. From the CA perspective, this present study might not be a model of CA study. However, from the perspective of the DA framework, this study has demonstrated successful analysis of gender interactions utilising the CA analytic techniques. Thus, utilising the CA framework within the DA framework is a possible method for investigating gender and interaction that adds validity to the findings.

12.5.2: A possible teaching method to enhance learner's speaking skill for learners of the second language

The second recommendation is for those who teach learners of a second language. Language teachers often create collaborative activities in class to enhance learner's language skills. For instance, small group activities or pair work are often used in the classrooms for teaching and learning the second language. These activities often enhance learners' speaking skills and negotiation of meaning (Storch, 2001). Therefore, the results of this study might be useful to teachers by showing them the value of introducing some types of activities to language learners to promote their language skills

in class. For example, this study has shown that both men and women used several cases of one sentence expansion as a collaborative feature in conversations. Both male and female speakers collaboratively developed their stories in their conversations. If language teachers utilised this finding for their lessons, they could prepare a learning activity for learners of the target language that allowed the learners to collaboratively build a story in small groups or pairs. These activities might be most appropriate for learners at an intermediate or advanced stage in their learning. For instance, teachers could possibly give learners, if they are in an advanced level class, the first sentence and some lists of increment initiators which join each sentence and thereby support learners.

Another possible activity for learners using this study, in particular for advanced level learners, is that language teachers could give excerpts from authentic transcripts of conversations to students, who would then be asked to identify and notice the ways that collaboration is achieved among participants. These transcripts could be modified for pedagogical purposes as the CA transcripts might appear too complicated for ESL/EFL learners. Other follow up class activities could include discussion of the ways the collaborative features are employed by different genders and then engagement of students in critical analysis by comparing and contrasting gendered interactions in their own speech communities.

12.5.3: Collaborative talk as an important factor in work places

The third recommendation is for those who work in specialty fields in which team work is an important factor in achieving a safe outcome, such as airline pilots, police officers and surgeons in the operating theatre. This study has explored everyday conversation which is often treated as a different category from institutional conversation such as airline pilot conversation. However, Nevile (2007: 236) argues '… while pilots' talk for

work is subject to professional constraints, as they talk, on real flights pilots vary these scripted wording in ways that situate them as part of ongoing interaction.'. Thus the results on the accomplishment of collaborative talk in every day conversations can have significance in the study and training of members of institutional talk.

Nevile (2004) noted the importance of sharing responsibility for safety and effective coordination of air traffic between airline pilots and air traffic controllers. Pilots and controllers are mutually dependent. They need each other to understand what information should be shared and when to allow the other to do their part in the working of the system. If they fail to do so, airline accidents are likely to occur. In his study Nevile introduces several examples of accidents that occurred as a result of a failure of collaborative work between pilots and controllers. One case of an airline accident that occurred as a result of a failure of collaborative work is given here.

> … Another accident occurred when one air traffic controller became confused about the callsigns and locations of flights approaching his airport and inadvertently instructed one incoming flight to turn towards a mountain. The crew of that flight was unsure if it was safe to turn as instructed, whether they would remain clear of terrain, but ultimately followed the controller's instruction and the plane crashed into the mountain killing all on board. The crew of another flight did not spell out clearly to a controller how their plane was critically low on fuel as it approached the airport, and the controller did not ask for elaboration on the plane's fuel situation. The crew failed to declare an emergency, accepted a number of instructions from the controller which delayed their landing, and ultimately the airliner ran out of fuel and crashed.
>
> (Nevile, 2004:149)

As shown above, the accident seemed to be the result of a failure in collaborative talk. It is possible that knowledge of collaborative conversations among the crew and air traffic controllers could have saved the situation. For example the use of repetition could have been used to elaborate and confirm the conversationalists' siuations (Nevile, 2004:149) in order to avoid the accident. Thus, as Nevile explains, collaborative talk, in particular using repetition to confirm what each person is saying, seems to play an important role for the airline industry as it is a means of operating airplanes safely and effectively. Hence the value of studying collaborative talk in the workplace is undeniable, not only in the airline industry but in all workplace situations that deal with human lives, such as those in the medical industry.

12.6: Conclusion to the study

This study has investigated the use of three collaborative features in Australian male and female talk: one sentence construction, expansion and repetition. Past studies of gender and language, in particular gender stereotype studies, described the collaborative feature in talk as being a feminine style. However, some studies such as those undertaken by Coates (1996 and 2003) found that both men and women use collaborative conversational features in their talk but in different ways. This study has demonstrated that both men and women can employe collaborative features in conversations of casual nature and among friends. This research continues the line of research that discusses the interactional nature of linguistic styles and the ways in which social categories affect language choice. Cases of each collaborative feature were similarly seen as being used by both male and female participants in this study. This result suggests that collaborative conversational features are possibly features of both men's and women's talk, at least these three collaborative features are.

This study also combined two approaches, discourse analysis and conversation analysis in the study of gender interaction. DA was used to deal with gender issues in conversations and CA was used to analyse conversational data in depth. This was another major contribution in the methodological field of gender interactions. Studies of gender interactions within the CA framework were often criticised by CA researchers since CA does not label participants' gender for their analysis (Schegloff, 1997 and Wetherell, 1997). However, this study has demonstrated that both DA and CA could be successfully and effectively combined and used for the analysis of gender interactions.

Although this study has methodological limitations, the results could still be utilised for investigating gender interactions in other social and instutitional settings; also to further our knowledge of gender styles in other fields such as education; to enhance learners' learning skills, and to enhance safety in the transport industry.

References

Archer, J., & Lloyd, B. (Eds.). (1985). *Sex and gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Athenstaedt, U., Haas, E., & Schwab, S. (2004). Gender role self-concept and gender-typed communication behaviour in mixed-sex and same-sex dyads. *Sex Roles, 50*, 37-52.

Bhatia, V. K., Flowerdew, J., & Jones, R. H. (Eds.). (2007). *Advances in discourse studies*. New York: Routledge.

Bayard, d., & Krishanayya, S. (2001). Gender, expitive use, and context: Male and female expletive use in structured and unstructured conversation among New Zealand university students. *Women and Language, 24*(1), 1-15.

Bramely, R. N. (2001). Pronouns or politics: The use of pronouns in the construction of 'self' and 'other' in political interviews. Ph. D thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness. strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-289). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M. (2005). Theories of discourse as theories of gender: Discourse analysis in language and gender studies. In J. Holmes, & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender studies* (pp. 43-68). UK: Blackwell.

Cameron, D. (1995). Rethinking language and gender studies: Some issues for the 1990's. In S. Mills (Ed.), *Language & gender interdiscipnary perspectives* (pp. 31-44). New York: Longman.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE.

Cameron, D. (2005a). Lanaguage, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(4), 482-502.

Cameron, D. (2005b). Gender and language ideologies. In J. Holmes, & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of langauge and gender* (pp. 447-467). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

Chang, G. L. & Wells, G. (1987). *The Literate of potential of collaborative talk*.

Coates, J. (1993). *Women, men and language* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk: Conversation between women friends*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Coates, J. (2003). Men talk: Stories in the making of masculinities. Oxford: Blackwell.

Coates, J. (2004). *Women, men and language* (3rd ed.). Great Britain: Longman.

Coates, J. (2005). Masculinity, collaborative narration and the heterosexual couple. In J. Thornborrow, & J. Coates (Eds.), *The sociolinguistics of narrative* (pp. 67-88). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Coates, J. (2007). Talk in a play frame: More on laughter and intimacy. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, 29-49.

Crawford, M. (1995). *Talking differences on gender and language*. London: SAGE.

Curl, T. S., Local, J., & Walker, G. (2006). Repetition and the prosody-pragmatics interface. *Journal of Pragmatics, 38*(10), 1721-1751.

Davies, C. E. (2003). How english-learners joke with native speakers' an interactional sociolinguistic perspective on humor as collaborative discourse across cultures. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1361-1385.

Drass, K. A. (1986). The effect of gender identity on conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 49*(4), 294-301.

Drew, p., & Curl, T. (2007). Conversation Analysis – Overview and new directions. In Bahatia, V. K., Flowerdew, J., & Jones, R. H. (Eds.). (pp22-35). *Advances in discourse studies*. New York: Routledge.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analysing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckert, P. (1993). Cooperative competition in adolescent "girls talk". In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 32-61). New York: Oxford University Press.

Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(4), 453–476.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthoropology, 21*, 461-490.

Eda, D. (1988). Building cohesion through collaborative narration. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 51*(3), 225-235.

Edelsky, C. (1993). Who's got the floor. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 189-227). New York: Oxford University Press.

Elinor O. Keenan. (1974). Conversational competence in children. *Journal of Child Language, 1*(2), 163-183.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In A. Mchoul, & M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional settings - A case book of methods* (pp. 25-38). New York: Continuum.

Fishman, P. M. (1983). Interaction: The work women do. In B. Throne, C. Kramarae & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (pp. 89-101). Rowely, Mass: Newbury House.

Fletcher, J., & Loakes, D. (2006). Patterns of rising and falling in Australian English. In *Proceedings of the 11th Australian International Conference on Speech Science & Technology*, ed. Paul Warren & Catherine I. Watson. 42-47. University of Auckland, New Zealand. December 6-8, 2006. Australian Speech Science & Technology Association Inc.

Fujimura-Wilson, K. (2007). Japanese exact repetition involving talk among friends. *Discourse Studies, 9*(3), 319-339.

Fung, L. (2007). The communicative role of self-repetition in a specialised corpus of business discourse. *Langauge Awareness, 16*(3), 224-238.

Garder, R. (1998). Between speaking and listening: The vocalisation of understandings. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(2)

Garder, R. (2001). *When listenrs talk*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gofman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthoropology, 19*, 283-307.

Goodwin, M. H. (1993). Tactical uses of stories: Participation frameworks within boys' and girl's disputes. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction* (pp. 110-143). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hall, K. (2005). Exceptional speakers: Contested and problematized gender identities. In J. Holems, & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 353-380). UK: Blackwell.

Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: Methods or paradigms? *Discourse and Society, 14*(6), 751-781.

Hannah, A., & Murachver, T. (1999). Gender and conversatioal style as predictors of conversational behaviour. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18*(2), 153-174.

Hay, J. (1995). Gender and humour: Beyond a joke. Master's thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

Hay, J. (2000). Functions of humour in the conversations of men and women. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 709-742.

Heller, M. (2001). Discourse and interaction. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 250-264). UK: Blackwell.

Hegstrom, J. L. & McCarl-Nielsen, J. (2002). Gender and metaphor: descriptions of familiar person. *Discourse Process, 33(3)*, 219-234.

Heritage, J. (2004). Conversational analysis and institutional talk: Analysing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research - theory, method and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 222-245) SAGE.

Holmes, J. (1992). Women's talk in public contexts. *Discourse and Society, 3*(2), 131-150.

Holmes, J. (2000). Women at work: Analysing women's talk in New Zealand workplaces. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*(2), 1-17.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Malaysia: Longman.

Holmes, J. (2006a). Sharing a laugh: Pragmatic aspects of humor and gender in the workplace. *Journal of Pragmatics 38*, 26-50.

Holmes, J. (2006b). *Gender talk at work: constructing gender identity through workplace interaction.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Holmes, J. (2007). Social constructionism, post modernism and sociolinguistics. *Gender and Language. 1*(1), 51-65.

Howden, J. C. (1994). Competitive and collaborative communicative style: American men and women, American men and Japanese men. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 4*(1), 49-58.

Hutchby, I. (2001). 'Witnessing': The use of first-hand knowledge in legitimating lay opinions on talk radio. *Discourse Studies, 3*(4), 481-497.

Jacquline, S., & Yu, X. (2005). Editors' introduction. In S. Jacquline, & X. Yu (Eds.), *Quantitative social science vol.1* () SAGE.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on a systematic development of the acknowledgement tokens "yeah" and " mm hm". *Papers in Linguistics, 17*(1), 197-216.

Jefferson, G. (1986). Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. *Human Studies, 9*, 153-183.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and resource. In G. Psathas (Ed.) *Interactional competence* (pp. 63-92). New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.

Jefferson, G. (1993). Caveat speaker: Preliminary notes on recipient topic-shift implicature. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*(1), 1-30.

Jefferson, G. (2004). A note on laughter in 'male-female interaction'. *Discourse Studies, 6(1)*, 117-133.

Kohler, H., Behrman, J. R., and Watkins, S. C. (2001). The density of social networks and fertility decisions: evidence from South Nyanza district, Kenya. *Demography, 38(1), February,* 43-58.

Kitzinger, C. (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism and Psychology, 10*(2), 163-193.

Kitzinger, C., & Frith, H. (1999). Just say no? the use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse and Society, 10*(3), 293-316.

Kitzinger, J. (1990). Audience understanding of AIDS media message: A discusssion of methods. *Sociology of Health and Illness, 12*(3), 319-335.

Kollock, P., Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1985). Sex and power in interaction: Conversational privileges and duties. *Amercian Sociological Review, 50*(1), 34-46.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic pattern*. America: The University of Pennsylbania Press.

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

Lerner, G.H. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society*, 20, 441- 458.

Lerner, G. H. (1992). Assisted storytelling: Deploying shared knowledge as a practical matter. *Qualitative Sociology, 15*(3), 247-271.

Lerner, G.H. (2002). Turn-Sharing: The choral co-production of talk in interaction. In C. Ford, B. Fox & S. Thompson (Eds.), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, pp. 225 - 256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, G. H. (2004). Collaborative turn sequences. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis studeis from the first generation* (pp. 225-256). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Leung, C. B. (2009). Collaborative narration in preadolescent girl talk: A saturday luncheon conversation among three friends. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*, 1341-1357.

Liddicoate, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.

Lillis, T., & McKinney, C. (2003). *Analysing language in context: A student workbook*. England: Trentham Books.

McClurg, S. D. (2003). Social Networks and Participation: the Role of Social Interaction in Explaining Political Participation. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(4), 448-465.

Mulac, A. (1989). Men's and women's talk in same-gender and mixed-gender dyads: Power or problematic? *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 8*, 249-270.

Mulac, A., Wiemann, J. M., Widenmann, S. J., & Gibson, T. W. (1988). Male/Female language differences and effects in same-sex and mixed-sex dyags: The gender-linked language effect. *Communication Monographs, 55*(December), 315-335.

Nevile, M. (2004). *Beyond the black box : Talk-in-interaction in the airline cockpit*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub.

Nevile, M. (2006). Making sequentiality salient: And prefacing in the talk of airline pilots. *Discourse Studies, 8*(2), 279-302.

Nevile, M. (2007). Action in time: Ensuring timeliness for collaborative work in the airline cockpit. *Language in Society, 26*, 233-257.

Norrick, N. R. (1987). Functions of repetition in conversation. *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 7(3), 245-264.

Norrick, N. R. (2003). Issues in conversational joke. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1333-1359.

Oelschlaeger, M. L., & Damico, J. S. (1998). Spontanious verbal repetition: A social strategy in aphasic conversation. *Apahsiology, 12*(11), 971-988.

Ohara, Y., & Saft, S. (2003). Using conversation analysis to track gender ideologies in social interaction: Twaord a feminist analysis of a japanese phone-in consultation TV program. *Discourse and Society, 14*(2), 153-172.

Otto, J. (1922). *Language: It's nature, development and origin.London:* Allen & Unwin.

Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Patrona, M. (2006). Conversationalzation and media empowerment in greek television discussion programms. *Discourse and Society, 17*(1), 5-27.

Perakyla, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research based on naturally occurring. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Quantitative research - theory, method and practice* - (2nd ed., pp. 283-304). London: SAGE.

Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis as a way of analysisng naturally occuring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research -theory, method and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 200-221) SAGE.

Poynton, C. (1989). *Language and gender: Making the differences.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reid, S. A., Keerie, N., & Palomares, N. A. (2003). Language, gender salience, and social influence. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 22*(2), 210-233.

Sack, H., & Emanuel, S. G. J. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Sacks, H. (1972). On the analysability of stories by children. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethonomethodology* (pp. 216-231) Penguin Education.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Saplosky, B. S. & Kaye B. K. (2005). The use of offensive language by men and women in prime time television entertainment. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 13(4)*. 292 - 303.

Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantitafication in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*(1), 99-128.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology, 102*(1), 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997a). Practices and actions: Boundary cases of other-initiated repair. *Discourse Processes, 23*, 499-545.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997b). Whose text? whose context? *Discourse and Society, 8*(2), 165-187.

Schegloff, E. A. (1999). Discourse, pragmatics, conversation, analysis. *Discourse Studies, 1*(4), 405-435.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H., (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language 53(2)*, 361-382.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, H., & Jacobs, J. (1979). *Qualitative sociology - A method to the madness*. NewYork: The Free Press.

Sears, D. O., Peplau, L. A., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social psychology* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice hall.

Sehulster, J. R. (2006). Things we talk about, how frequently, and to whome: Frequency of topics in everyday conversation as a function of gender, age, and marital status. *American Journal of Psychology, 119*(3), 407-432.

Smith-lovin, L., & Brody, C. (1989). Interruptions in group discussions: The effects of gender and group. *American Sociological Review, 54*(3), 424-435.

Shaw, R. & Kitzinger, C. (2007). V. problem presentation and advice-giving on a home birth helpline: A feminist conversation analytic study. *Feminism and Psychology, 17*(2), 203-213.

Snell, J. 2010. From sociolinguistic variation to socially strategic stylization.*Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 14(5), 630–656.

Speer, S. A. (2002). What can conversastion analysis contribute to feminist methodology? putting reflexivity into practice. *Discourse and Society, 13*(6), 783-803.

Speer, S. A. (2005a). *Gender talk feminisim, discourse and conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Speer, S. A. (2005b). The interactional organization of the gender attribution process. *Sociology, 39*(1), 67-87.

Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. London: Routledge.

Stapleton, K. (2003). Gender and swearing: A community practice. *Women and Language, 26*(2), 22-33.

Stockill, Clare. & Kitzinger, Celia. (2007). VII. Gendered people. *Feminism & Psychology 17(2)*. 224-236.

Stokoe, E H. (2003). Mothers, single women and sluts: Gender, morality and membership categorization in neighbor disputes. *Feminism Psychology 13(3)*, 317-344.

Stokoe, E H. & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society 12(2)*, 217-244.

Storch, N. (2001). How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. *Language Teaching Research, 5*(1), 29-53.

Stubbe, M., Lane, C., Hilder, J., Vine, E., Vine, B., Marra, M., Holmes, J., Weatherall, A. (2003). Multiple discourse analysis of a workplace interaction. *Discourse studies, 5(3),* 351-388.

Szczepek, B. (2000). Functional aspects of collaborative productions in English conversation. *InLiSt no.21 Konstanz,*

Tagliamonte, S. (2005). So who? like how? just what? discourse markers in the conversations of young canadiands. *Journal of Pragmatics, 37*, 1896-1915.

Tanaka, L. (2004). *Gender, language and culture*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tannen, D. (1987). Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of talk. *Language*, *63*(3), 574-605.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just' don't understand: Men and women in conversations* (1st ed.). New York: Morrow.

Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistics strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction.* (pp. 165-188). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices - repetition, dialouge, and imagery in conversational discourse* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ten, Have, P. (1997). *In the presence of data*: Conversation-analysis as 'empirical philosophy'. Paper read at the conference on 'Ethnomethodology, an improbable sociology?', Cerisy-la-Salles, France, June. Available on line http://www2.fmg.uva.nl/emca/presence.htm (retrieved on 3/Novemver/2010)

Ten, Have, P. (1999). Transcribing talk-in-interaction. *Doing conversation analysis - A practical guide* (). London: SAGE.

Ten, Have, P. (2004). *Understanding qualitative research and ethonomethodology*. London: SAGE.

Thompson, T. L., Robinson, J. D., & Beisecker, A. E. (2004). The older paitient-physician interaction. In j. F. Nussbaum, & J. Coupland (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and aging research* (). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, publisher Inc.

Trudgill, P. (1983). *Sociolinguistics – an introduction to language and society*. Penguin books.

Underhill, R. (1988). Like is, like, focus. *American Speech, 3*, 234-246.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics.* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An introduction to sociolinguistics.* (4th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Weatherell, A. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society, 9*(3), 387-412.

Weatherall, A. (2002). Towards understanding gender and talk-in-interaction. *Discourse and Society, 13*(6), 767-781.

West, C. (1995). Women's competence in conversastion. *Discourse and Society, 6*(1), 107-131.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross=sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In B. Throne, C. Kramarae & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (pp. 102-117). Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 4*(3), 157.

Wong, J. (2000a). Repetition in conversation: A look at "first and second sayings". *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*(4), 407-424.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token "yeah" in nonnative speaker English conversation. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33(1), 39-67.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis - A comparative and critical introduction*. Great Britain: Sage Publications.

Ylanne-McEwan, V., & Coupland, N. (2004). Accomodation theory: A conceptual resource for intercultural sociolinguistics. In O. Spencer (Ed.), *Culturally speaking* (pp. 191-214) Continuum International Publishing Group.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press. Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Throne, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Differences and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Throne, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Differences and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Massachusetts: Newbury House.