T.C.
ERCİYES ÜNİVERSİTESİ

SOSYAL BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

TÜRKÇE KONUŞMALARDA SÖZ KESENLERİN AMAÇLARI VE CİNSİYETLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Tezi Hazırlayan
Huriye MANNASOĞLU

Tezi Yöneten
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Doğan BULUT

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Ana Bilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Eylül 2006
KAYSERİ

T.C.
ERCİYES ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

TÜRKÇE KONUŞMALARDA SÖZ KESENLERİN AMAÇLARI VE
CİNSİYETLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Tezi Hazırlayan
Huriye MANNASOĞLU

Tezi Yöneten
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Doğan Bulut

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Ana Bilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Eylül 2006
KAYSERİ

ERCIYES UNIVERSITY

THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

A STUDY ON INTERRUPTERS' ENDS AND GENDERS IN TURKISH

MA Thesis

Prepared by

Huriye MANNASOGLU

Supervised by

Assist. Prof. Dr. Dogan BULUT

A Thesis

Submitted to the Institute of Social Sciences

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master's Degree in English

Language and Literature

Erciyes University

Kayseri

September 2006

KAYSERI

Yrd.Doç.Dr. Doğan BULUT danışmanlığında Huriye MANNASOĞLU tarafından hazırlanan "Türkçe Konuşmalarda Söz Kesenlerin Amaçları ve Cinsiyetleri Üzerine Bir Çalışma" adlı bu çalışma jürimiz tarafından Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalında Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

JÜRİ:

Danışman   : Yrd.Doç.Dr. Doğan BULUT

Üye   : Prof. Dr. Nevzat ÖZKAN

Üye   : Yrd.Doç.Dr. A. Serdar ÖZTÜRK

ONAY:

Bu tezin kabulü Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun .17.11.2006 tarih ve
........25.......... sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof.Dr. Kerim TÜRKMEN
Enstitü Müdürü

TÜRKÇE KONUŞMALARDA SÖZ KESENLERİN AMAÇLARI VE CİNSİYETLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÇALIŞMA

Huriye MANNASOĞLU

ÖZET

Bu araştırma, fiziksel/kültürel ortam, geçişe uygun noktaların tanınması ya da göz ardı edilmesi, sözü kesilenin cinsiyeti gibi iletişimsel unsurları da ele alarak kadın ve erkek katılımcıların Türkçe konuşmalar sırasında gerçekleştirdikleri söz kesmelerdeki amaçlarını belirlemeyi ve karşılaştırmayı hedeflemektedir.

Çalışmanın katılımcıları bir ailenin üyelerinden ve Erciyes Üniversitesi'nin personel ve öğrencilerinden oluşmaktadır. 16'sı erkek, 17'si bayan olmak üzere 18–70 yaş arasında, Türkçeyi ana dili olarak konuşan 33 kişinin farklı ortamlarda kaydedilmiş söz kesmelerini içeren 40 iletişim durumu sözü geçen değişkenler açısından incelendi. Elde edilen sıklıklar yüzdeye çevirilip nitelik ve nicelik açısından birbiriyle karşılaştırıldı.

Sonuçlara göre geçişe uygun noktalar en çok resmi ortamlarda, erkek katılımcıların söz kestiği ve sözü kesenin "konuşmadaki sırasını başlatmak" amacını taşıdığı durumlarda göz ardı edilmektedir. Gayri resmi durumlarda resmi olanlardan daha çok söz kesildiği ve söz kesmelerde en çok kullanılan amacın katılımcının "konuşmadaki sırasını başlatmak" istemesi olduğu da bu çalışmadan çıkan sonuçlar arasındadır. Bayanlar ve erkekler karşılaştırıldığında ise, bayanların hem en sık söz kesen hem de sözü en sık kesilen olduğu, bayanların gayri resmi, erkeklerin ise resmi durumlarda daha çok söz kestiği, farklı cinsiyetten katılımcıların konuşmalarında daha çok söz kesildiği, erkeklerin bayanların sözünü kesmesinin bayanların erkeklerin sözünü kesmesinden

daha sık gerçekleştiği, hem bayanların hem de erkeklerin söz keserken "konuşmadaki sıralarını başlatmak" ve "açıklama istemek" amaçlarını sık kullandığı, ancak kadınların "konuşmacıyı desteklemek" ve ona "daha fazla bilgi sunmak" amaçlarını erkeklerin ise "konuşmacının sırasını sona erdirmek" amacını daha sık kullandıkları ortaya çıktı.

Anahtar Kelimeler:
1. Sosyodilbilim 2. İletişim 3. Söz kesme 4. Cinsiyet farkları 5. Amaçlar

A STUDY ON INTERRUPTER'S ENDS AND GENDERS IN TURKISH

Huriye MANNASOGLU

ABSTRACT

This study aims to discover and compare male and female interrupters' ends during conversations in Turkish focusing on such components of communication as setting/scene, acknowledging or disregarding transition-relevant points, and interrupted speaker's gender.

Among the subjects are members of a family and staff and students from Erciyes University. Forty communicative situations with interruptions of 33 native speakers of Turkish aged between 18 and 70, 16 of whom are male and 17 of whom are female, tape recorded in various circumstances were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively in terms of the variables mentioned. The frequencies were converted into percentages and compared with each other.

According to the results, transition-relevant points are most disregarded in formal situations, male participants' interruptions, and interruptions aimed to "start one's turn." More frequent interruptions in informal rather than in formal situations and in situations in which they are aimed to "start one's turn" are also among the results. When women and men are compared, the study reveals that women both interrupt and are interrupted most; women interrupt more in informal but men do so in formal situations; there are more interruptions in mixed-sex conversations; men's interruptions of women outnumbers vice versa; both male and female interrupters frequently pursue the ends "to

start their turns" and "to require clarification" but women use the aims "to support the current speaker" and men "to end the current speaker's turn" more often.

Key Words:

1. Sociolinguistics 2. Communication 3. Interruption 4. Gender differences 5. Aims

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

SPEAKING	Setting/scene, Participants, Ends, Act Sequence, Instrumentalities, Norms of Interaction and Interpretation, Genre
P	Participant
(?)	Inaudible utterance
//	Interruption
⌐	Overlap
f	Frequency
%	Percentage
f-f	A female interrupter and another female participant
f-m	A female interrupter and a male participant
m-m	A male interrupter and another male participant
m-f	A male interrupter and a female participant

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In many cultures, people tend to have an aversion to interruptions since it is regarded as defiance of respect. Especially in Turkish culture, listening to the current speaker, particularly if this person is older, and waiting one's turn to speak patiently are highly valued, which is clearly stated in the famous saying that can be translated as "It is the younger to drink water first but the older to speak first." Hence, inspecting Turkish society, which also has a male dominant culture (Ecevit, 1991), for interruptions seems of interest.

Within the sociolinguistic perspective on interruptions, such researchers as West and Zimmerman (1998), Wardhaugh (1985), and Pschaid (1993) regard them as violations of rules for turn-taking put forward as ''(i) one speaker speaks at a time and (ii) speaker change recurs'' (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974, cited in Coates, 1995, p. 20) or as a kind of rejection of the current speaker's right to speak (Coates, 1986; Wardhaugh, 1985; Pschaid, 1993; West & Zimmerman, 1998). Moreover, in mixed-sex conversations male participants are reported to interrupt more frequently (Spender, 1980; Abu-Haidar, 1995; West, 1998; DeFrancisco, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1998; Li, Krysko, Desroches, & Deagle, 2004) while females are reported to interrupt to show support and interest rather than to grab the floor (Coates, 1996).

Hymes (1974), the first to start ethnography of communication, placed a great deal of emphasis on the way language is used and put forward eight components of communicative events mnemonically abbreviated as SPEAKING for convenience: setting/scene, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms of

interaction and interpretation, genre. Ethnography of a communicative event means a description of all the factors necessary to understand the way that event realizes its objectives (Wardhaugh, 1986), which is possible by either employing all these factors or focusing on some.

Thus, how the components of communicative events affect the relationship between genders of the participants and the interrupter's aim seems to deserve consideration while discussing interrupters and their aims, and the purpose of the study is to investigate such an effect with an ex post facto design. Several studies analyzed interruptions like Pschaid (1993), Lindroos (1995), Abu-Haidar (1995), Sen (1997), DeFrancisco (1998), West (1998), West and Zimmerman (1998), Li et al. (2004), and Shi (2005) or components of some communicative events like Saville-Troike (2003) and Schiffrin (1994) in various ways. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, none of them focused on the variables specified in this study.

The thesis includes four more chapters. The following chapter covers detailed background information on theory and practice, which constructs the fundamentals necessary to investigate the research questions to be mentioned below. Hence, it begins by defining basic concepts and issues and then continues with approaches to analysis of communicative events and review of studies in the area. The third chapter introduces the methodology for the study by describing who participated and how the data were collected and analyzed. Next, in order to present the data and examine the results the fourth chapter deals with interruptions in terms of transition-relevant points, setting/scene, ends, and gender focusing on relationships between them. As for the final chapter, it includes a summary, discussion of the research questions, conclusion, and suggestions for further research.

1.2 Research Questions

There are seven research questions to be investigated in this study:

Research Question One: Is there a relationship between genders of the participants and the interrupter's end?

Research Question Two: Does setting/scene influence the interrupter's end?

Research Question Three: Does setting/scene influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?

Research Question Four: Do genders of the participants influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?

Research Question Five: Does the interrupter's end influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?

Research Question Six: Is there a relationship between setting/scene and genders of the participants?

Research Question Seven: Is there a relationship between the gender of the interrupter and the gender of the interrupted speaker?

1.3 Limitations of the Study

This study had some limitations that could have influenced the quality of conversations of the participants. To begin with, the participants who were told that they were going to be tape recorded might have failed to act and speak naturally. Next, such variables difficult to control as the kind of relationship between the participants, their psychological and socio-economic status, personalities, and the topic of conversation might have affected the participants' interruptions. Finally, as the study was limited to a small sample of participants the results cannot be generalized to all speakers of Turkish.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

Like use of speech, norms of linguistic behavior varies among speech communities and thus understanding the relationship between a language and the society using it requires understanding how these people use the language, that is, the principles which regulate speaker changes, interruptions, and closings by arranging ''who can say what to whom, when, and how'' (Wardhaugh, 1985, p. 63).

Hence, this chapter first defines and explains such basic concepts and issues in the study of communication as communicative functions, situations, events, and acts and components of communication and then presents approaches to analysis of communicative events like ethnography of communication and studies on gender, turn-taking, and interruptions in order to facilitate understanding and examination of interruptions.

2.2 Basic Concepts and Issues

As interruption is part of communication, starting with fundamental concepts and issues would provide background and, thus, prove to be helpful in understanding and exploring it.

2.2.1 Communicative Functions

Communicative function is defined as "the extent to which a language is used in a community": Some languages are only for such specific purposes as religious services

while others can be used for all the communicative purposes of the speech community (Richards, Platt, & Platt, 1992, p. 66).

Hymes (1974) suggests a grid that has eight components to introduce communicative functions. It includes focus on the addressor, addressee, channels, codes, settings, message-form, topic, and the event itself. First, focus on the addressor refers to ''identification of the source, expression of attitude toward one or another component or toward the event as a whole, excogitation (thinking aloud), etc'' while focus on the addressee points to ''identification of the destination, and the ways in which the message and event may be governed by anticipation of the attitude of the destination''. Second, focus on channels involves functions related to ''maintenance of contact and control of noise, both physical and psychological in both cases''. Third, focus on codes includes ''such functions as are involved in learning, analysis, devising of writing systems, checking on the identity of an element of the code use in conversation, and the like''. Next, focus on settings is not only about location in time and space, but also about everything contextual. As for focus on message-form, it refers to ''proofreading, mimicry, aspects of emendation and editing, and poetic and stylistic concerns''. Sixth, focus on topic points to functions related to reference and content. Finally, focus on the event itself involves ''whatever is comprised under metacommunicative types of function'' (pp. 22-23). These components are closely related with each other and can be specific to individuals and cultures.

2.2.2 Communicative Situation

The communicative situation is defined as ''the context within which communication occurs'' (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 23). Religious services, court trials, holiday parties, auctions, train rides, and classes at school are examples of communicative situations. As in a reconvened committee meeting or a court trial, there may be no change in the situation when the location changes. On the other hand, as in a room in a university building it may alter if various activities take place there at different times. A consistent general configuration of activities and the same overall ecology within which communication takes place characterize a single communicative situation despite the variety of interactions there (Saville-Troike, 2003).

2.2.3 Communicative Event

A single communicative event involves the same general purpose of communication, the same general topic, the same participants, the same tone or key, the same rules for interaction, the same setting, and generally the same language variety. With a change in the major participants, their role-relationships, or the focus of attention, the communicative event changes. Hence, a change in the major participants, their role relationships, the focus of attention, or body position or a period of silence shows the boundary between two events. To be more specific, an interrupted conversation between a student and a professor by a telephone call and the one between the professor and the caller are two separate communicative events (Saville-Troike, 2003).

2.2.4 Communicative Act

The communicative act is usually equivalent to a single interactional function. A referential statement, a request, and a command are all examples. Communicative acts can be verbal as in ''I'd like a pen'' or nonverbal as in raised eyebrows, a questioning look, or a longing sigh. They also change from culture to culture; that is, while a behavior, e.g. a belch at the end of a meal, is considered a communicative act in one culture, it may be meaningless in another (Saville-Troike, 2003).

2.2.5 Components of Communicative Events

Writers classify components of communicative events in various but similar ways. To begin with, Biber (1994) lists them as communicative characteristics of participants; relations between addressor and addressee; setting; channel; relation of participants to the text; purposes, intents, and goals; and topic/subject. Second, Saville-Troike (2003) includes genre, topic, purpose or function, setting, key, participants, message form, message content, act sequence, rules for interaction, and norms of interpretation. Next, Jakobson (1953, 1960, cited in Hymes, 1974) suggests participants, channels, codes, settings, forms of messages and their genres, attitudes and contents, and the events themselves. Finally, in order to make them convenient Hymes (1974) uses SPEAKING as a mnemonic code word which represents setting and scene, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms of interaction and interpretation, and genre.

Although not all the components may be prominent altogether in each event or community (Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 2003), they comprise a frame (Bateson, 1955 cited in Saville-Troike, 2003) within which significant differences may exist. Schiffrin (1994) maintains that the SPEAKING grid divides social context into different components that both define a particular communicative situation, event, and act as a closed and bounded unit (Hymes, 1972, cited in Schiffrin, 1994), and "provide a way to systematically differentiate from one another those situations (events and acts) that comprise the communicative repertoire of a given community" (p. 371). Hymes (1972) suggests focusing on relations among components rather than focusing on the code only since it provides description and comparative analysis of patterns of speech events and generalizations about rules of speaking generally develop into statements of relationship among components. Nonetheless, the priority of a component over the others relies on the case even in a single community (Hymes, 1974).

To start with the first component, "setting" is related with the time and place of a speech act and generally with the physical circumstances and "scene" refers to the 'psychological setting,' or the cultural definition of an event (Hymes, 1974). Participants may change scenes in a particular setting by changing the level of formality, for instance, from serious to joyful, or the kind of activity in which they are involved, for instance, by beginning to drink or recite poetry (Wardhaugh, 1986). Saville-Troike (2003) regards "setting" as a part of scene as well as "genre," "topic," and "purpose/function," none of which are directly observable and suggests the following questions to define and explain "setting" and "scene":

- Where and when, does it occur?
- What does the setting look like?
- How do individuals organize themselves spatially in groups for various purposes (e.g. in rows, circles, around tables, on the floor, in the middle of the room, around its circumference)?
- What geospatial concepts, understandings, and beliefs exist in the group or are known to individuals?
- What is the knowledge and significance of cardinal directions (north, south, east, west)?

. What significance is associated with directions or places (e.g. heaven is up, people are buried with heads to the west, the host at a meal should sit facing the door)?

. What beliefs or values are associated with concepts of time, day or season, and are there particular behavioral prescriptions or taboos associated with them (e.g. not singing certain songs in the summer time lest a snake bite, not telling stories until the sun has set)? (pp. 112-113)

The second component, "participants," involves combinations of speaker-listener, as in a two-person conversation or a dressing down; addressor-addressee, as in a political speech; or sender-receiver, as in a telephone message. Interpreters, spokespersons (Jakobson, 1953, 1960, cited in Hymes, 1974), the deity in a prayer, and the rest of the class listening to a student's answer to a question (since they are involved as audience expected to benefit from the exchange) (Wardhaugh, 1986) are also considered as "participants." The following questions mentioned in Saville-Troike (2003) may help to define and explain "participants":

. Who has authority over whom: To what extent can one person's will be imposed on another? By what means?

. What roles within the group are available to whom, and how are they acquired?

. What forms of address are used between people in various role-relationships?

. How is deference shown? How are insults expressed?

. Who may disagree with whom? Under what circumstances?

. How do the characteristics of "speaking well" relate to age, sex, or other social factors?

. How does speaking ability, literacy, or writing ability relate to achievement of status in the society?

. Who may talk to whom? When? Where? About what?

. What is the role of language in social control? (pp. 114-115)

The third component, "ends," refers to both ends in view (goals) and ends as outcomes. Hymes (1974) separates the conventionally expected or ascribed ends from the purely situational or personal ones and from the latent and unintended ones. Whether or not the

expected outcome is attained may depend on the interactions of a particular speech event (Hymes, 1974). Moreover, for Wardhaugh (1986) "ends" refers to both the expected and likely outcomes of an exchange, and personal goals of participants. For instance, similar to a marriage ceremony, as well as its recognizable social end a trial involves various personal goals of each participant such as the judge, jury, prosecution, defense, accused, and witnesses.

The fourth one, "act sequence," refers to the ordering of communicative acts in an event. Goffman (1971, cited in Saville-Troike, 2003) clarifies this as follows: "We deal with the sequencing of action in which the move of one participant is followed by that of another, the first move establishing the environment for the second and the second confirming the meaning of the first" (p. 122). While communicative acts are described at a level of abstraction, which forms regular patterns in recurring events, verbatim examples are of assistance (Saville-Troike, 2003). A description of an act sequence involves analysis of the message form and message content. Message form refers to how things are said, as revealed in "He prayed, saying '…' " . On the other hand, message content refers to what is said, as in "He prayed that he would get well." It is not only closely related with topic and change of topic but also conditioned and sometimes controlled by means of expression (Hymes, 1974).

The fifth component, "key," refers to "the tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done… Acts otherwise the same as regards setting , participants, message form, and the like may differ in key, as e.g., between mock: serious or perfunctory: painstaking'' (Hymes, 1974, p. 57). Moreover, nonverbal signals conveyed through certain kinds of behavior, gesture, posture, deportment (Wardhaugh, 1986), choice of language or variety, or a combination of elements (Saville-Troike, 2003) might mark the "key." Nevertheless, "key" is not necessarily related with "genre"; for example, a joke may be sarcastic or a condolence may be threatening; but with a particular function of language use, role-relationship between participants, or message form and content. The "key" outweighs other components when it conflicts with them. For example, a compliment made in sarcastic key shows a different relationship between participants than one made in sincere key. Additionally, it is culture-specific. (Saville-Troike, 2003).

The next one, "instrumentalities," refers to choice of channel and forms of speech. Saville-Troike (2003) illustrates "instrumentalities" as follows:

CHANNEL

		Vocal	Nonvocal
CODE	**Verbal**	Spoken language	Written language (Deaf) Sign language Whistle/drum languages Morse code
	Nonverbal	Paralinguistic and prosodic features Laughter	Silence Kinesics Proxemics Eye behavior Pictures and cartoons

Choice of channel denotes choice of oral, written, telegraphic, semaphore, or other medium of transmission of speech. Speaking, writing, printing, drumming, blowing, whistling, singing, face and body motion as visually perceived, smelling, tasting, and tactile sensation are examples of channels. Modes of use are also of importance as in the example of using oral channel to sing, hum, whistle, or chant features of speech as well as to speak them. On the other hand, forms of speech refer to organizations of linguistic means at the level of languages, dialects, and common varieties rather than that of persons, situations, and genres. They can be in linguistic, paralinguistic, kinesic, musical, interpretative, or interactional form (Jakobson, 1953, 1960, cited in Hymes, 1974). Formal, written, legal language, spoken Newfoundland English, code-switching between English and Italian in Toronto, and the use of Pig Latin are all instances of "instrumentalities." Additionally, a speaker can employ various instrumentalities without changing the topic, for example, when s/he first reads something, then tells a dialect joke, then quotes Shakespeare, then uses an expression from another language, and so on (Wardhaugh, 1986).

As for the seventh component, "norms of interaction" refers to "the specific behaviors and proprieties that attach-that one must not interrupt, for example, or that one may freely do so; that normal voice should not be used, except when scheduled, in a church service (whisper otherwise); that turns in speaking are to be allocated in a certain way" (Hymes, 1974, p. 60). Reactions to their violation by others, and feelings that contrary

behavior is 'impolite' or 'odd' in some respect generally reveal these rules. Thus, "how, and the degree to which, this ideal is indeed real is a part of the information to be collected and analyzed" (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 123). On the other hand, Hymes (1974) maintains that as communities vary in social structure and relationships, putative universals would be spurious in analysis. Additionally, "norms of interaction" is not itself sufficient to construe communication and therefore necessitate "norms of interpretation," which entail the belief system of a community and are thus of importance in analysis of especially intercultural communication. For instance, the meanings of such interactional norms between Arabic and American speakers are open to the participants as Arabic participants use less proxemic distances, which often causes misunderstandings (Kanso, 2001).

The final component, "genre," refers to such categories as sonnets, sermons, salespersons' pitches, myths, tales, proverbs, riddles, curses, prayers, orations, lectures, commercials, editorials, and any other organized routines and styles. Although the number and explicitness of formal markers vary, they are easy to identify. Despite the correspondence between genres and speech events, genres may exist in or as different events. For instance, sermonizing may occur in other situations for serious or humorous effect (Hymes, 1974).

In analyses of communicative events, ethnographers of communication used these components in various ways. For instance, Saville-Troike (2003) introduced information on both theory and practice. In giving the relationship between the ethnographer and the speech community, she mentioned the difficulty but necessity of developing objectivity and relativity. She also touched on identification of communicative events, and elicitation within a frame. Components of communication were presented with detailed explanation and practical questions to define them. Besides such theoretical background, she introduced a large number of different ways of speaking and of controlling communicative behaviors by utilizing various language communities in analyses of communicative events. She was interested in "topic", "function/purpose", "setting", "key", "participants", "message form", "act sequence", "rules for interaction", and "norms of interpretation" but contributed much in examination of especially "message form" and "message content".

In addition, Schiffrin (1994) analyzed questions in two different varieties of interviews: questions during interviews at a library reference desk and questions during sociolinguistic research interviews. To describe the two kinds of speech events as a native informant rather than an ethnographic researcher she made use of Hymes' SPEAKING grid and showed how questions were normatively situated within them and related to their communicative properties. Afterwards, she analyzed questions within these speech events with focus on "act sequence," "participants," and "ends." Examination of the first kind of interview resulted in three kinds of questions: questions that make offers, issue queries, and request clarification about queries. This led to the conclusions that the distribution of these questions among participants revealed both asymmetric and symmetric participant roles, and that both kinds of participants shared ends, which justified the act sequence as a series of questions and answers "that work cumulatively toward fulfilling the main task of the interview" (p. 160). Next, three types of questions were found in sociolinguistic interviews: questions seeking information, checking the information being provided, and requesting clarification. She also found out that the ends and participants in the speech event influenced the norms underlying the use of questions during both kinds of interviews. Nonetheless, whereas reference interviews focused on the joint resolution of a query, sociolinguistic interviews integrated questions and answers within other kinds of talk that sometimes seemed like conversation rather than interview. Finally, in this study, she showed how the relationship between form and function realized in single utterances was related to specific aspects of context, which is an important feature of the ethnography of communication. The study concluded that all the questions under consideration shared the general function of seeking "a response that facilitated the transmission of information in line with the overall goal of the speech event" (p. 182).

2.3 Analysis of Communicative Events

The following is an account of key points in analysis of communicative events, which would facilitate inspecting interruptions in the following chapters.

2.3.1 Ethnography of Communication

Ethnomethodologists deal with how people make sense of the world around them, how they interact with it, and the categories and systems they use in this process. To be more specific, they focus on the way people use language, commonsense knowledge, which refers to such knowledge as how to make a phone call or how to pay on a bus, and practical reasoning, which refers to how people employ their commonsense knowledge in everyday existence, in their relationships with each other. Thus, they are interested in "various bits and pieces" of everyday life to show how people deal with them rather than large-scale surveys of populations (Wardhaugh, 1986).

Ethnomethodology is criticized in some aspects. For Dimitracopoulou (1990), it does not contribute much to the development of conversational skills; instead, it deals with "the management of conversations" rather than "general or inherent qualities of individuals" (p. 19).

For Hymes (1974) "it is not linguistics, but ethnography, not language, but communication, which must provide the frame of reference within which the place of language in culture and society is to be assessed" (p. 4). He suggests ethnography of communication defining it as "a science that would approach language neither as abstracted form nor as an abstract correlate of a community, but as situated in the flux and pattern of communicative events" (p. 5). Hence, the ethnography of communication was launched by his proposal of components of communicative events (mentioned in Chapter 2.5) based on Roman Jakobson's model of communication (Spolsky, 1998). Unlike Chomsky, Hymes gives priority to how and why language is used rather than what it is (Saville-Troike, 2003).

The question "What does a speaker need to know to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community, and how does he or she learn to do so?" reveals the area of the ethnography of communication clearly and its relationship with communicative competence, which requires mastering the cultural rules and knowledge basic for the context and content, rules for communication, and shared rules for interaction (Saville-Troike, 2003). The ethnography of communication deals with the speech event rather than the sentence examining natural speech in social context. Thus, such aspects of conversation as the nature of service encounters, the rules for turn-taking and interruptions, the organization of invitations, the normal patterns of social intercourse in

casual conversations have been areas of study in the ethnography of communication (Spolsky, 1998). For Goddard and Wierzbicka (1997) the weakness of ethnography of communication is lacking a principled method to describe cultural norm.

The ethnography of communication approaches setting generally socially but also geographically (Spolsky, 1998) since Hymes also deals with discourse phenomena in terms of the emic (cultural-specific) and etic (cross-cultural generalizations) nature. Therefore, ethnographers of communication study diverse communities varying from tribes of Africa to highly industrialized peoples in Europe (Saville-Troike, 2003). They collect data by observing participants, consulting native speakers, joining group activities, and "testing the validity of [their] perceptions against the intuitions of natives" (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 3).

2.3.2 Language and Gender

As Wardhaugh (1986) mentions, studies in this area mainly investigate whether there is a difference in language use of male and female speakers of that language. If there is, they study whether it results from the structure of that language or reveals how the sexes interact with each other in that society; whether a language or speakers of that language can be described as "sexist"; and "what could and should be done" (p. 302).

Different languages (one having obvious sex-based characteristics rather than being very different) spoken by male and female Caribs are cited as the most well-known example. There is also an example of different forms of use by men and women in the language of Dyirbal people; despite the normal daily language, they use respective varieties when their in-laws of the opposite sex are present. Furthermore, some phonological differences are illustrated in palatalized velar stops by women and palatalized dental stops in Gros Ventre (an Amerindian language). Another example is intonation patterns of speakers of English as women's patterns reveal more surprise and politeness. There are also morphological differences as in "actor-actress" example in English. Studies on such differences led to revision of vocabulary choice (for instance, using e.g. "chairperson" rather than "chairman") in two ways: indicating inequities and presenting changes with new categories like "Ms" and alterations to old terms like "policeman" (Wardhaugh, 1986).

Belenky et al. (1988, cited in Coates, 1995) maintains the epistemological fact that feminine orientation focuses on the relationship and connection whereas the masculine one focuses on the self and separateness. For Coates (1995) this is the reason why women and men have different approaches to conversation and problems in mixed-sex conversations. To be more specific, in communication female speakers tend to agree, support, and make suggestions avoiding to express contradictory opinions in order to maintain relational connections (Payne, Fuqua & Cangemi, 2001). Furthermore, Goodwin (1998) found out that girls avoided distinctions and showed a more egalitarian approach. Thus, listening is important for women, which they show by using minimal responses and avoiding interruptions that aim to deny the current speaker the rights in turn-taking, and they encourage participation of others (Coates, 1986). On the other hand, Payne et al. (2001) maintain that American males' aims in speaking are "to establish who is [the] best, strongest, smartest, toughest, and ultimately most powerful" (p. 124). Hence, men use more competitive, aggressive forms of communication (Payne et al., 2001) and language strategies generating status distinctions rather than supportive ones (Kendall & Tannen, 1997). Moreover, these participants try to gain and keep the turn throughout conversation, which they see as a competition to seize the floor, and interrupt frequently (Coates, 1986).

Because of these differences, in terms of conversational behavior men perceive women as unable to claim their rights to speak rather than active listeners whereas women perceive men as indifferent to their rights both to speak and to listen and "often complain that they feel men ignore their contributions to conversation" (Coates, 1986, p. 154). Moreover, based on their study in 1975, West and Zimmerman (1998) maintain that "these females' rights to complete a turn were apparently abridged by males with impunity, i.e., without complaint from females … and that women can be treated conversationally as 'non-persons' " (p. 169). Montgomery (1995) also concludes that "men are more assertive and impolite than women when engaged in cross-sex conversation… (and) it is not women but men who seem to override them" (p. 166). Coates' (1986) conclusion is that by interrupting women frequently men deny these participants their rights in turn-taking while women avoid doing this. What is more, with frequent interruptions of their parents and boys, girls are taught "that they are more

interruptible and that their right to speak is less than that of boys" (Coates, 1986, p. 130).

2.3.3 Turn-taking

There is a similarity between sequences of speakers in conversations and those of phonemes in phonology and of words in syntax in terms of being systematic and orderly (Sacks et al., cited in Duranti, 1997). Duranti (1997) and Edmondson (1981) state that while there are some pre-allocated systems in turn-taking which determine sequence of speakers beforehand as in courts, political meetings and debates, interviews etc., when a speaker takes and gives a turn is usually determined through negotiation during conversation. However, forms of turn-taking depend on culture and even on the social occasion (Denny, 1985, cited in Pschaid, 1993).

McCarthy (1991) and Montgomery (1995) state that smooth turn-taking in a natural conversation includes little overlaps and interruptions and very short silences between turns. On the other hand, Duranti (1997) summarizes the general principle of turn-taking as "no gaps no overlaps.'' Like many others, Coates (1995) rewords from Sacks et al. (1974) rules for turn taking as follows: ''(i) one speaker speaks at a time and (ii) speaker change recurs'' (p. 20). Nonetheless, DeFrancisco (1998) and Murray (1998) maintain that such a turn-taking model is not universal. For instance, in intercultural communication, smooth turn-taking can be difficult to achieve or the participants can have completely different interpretations of silence or interruptions, which would defy the first rule (Murray, 1998). In addition, McCarthy (1991) indicates that some problems in turn-taking can occur when a domineering speaker tries to have too many turns or when speakers have different culture-specific conventions.

Sacks et al. (1974, cited in Duranti, 1997) present the turn-constructional component and the turn-allocation component as components of rules for turn-taking. The first one refers to the kinds of units, in other words utterances, which can be used in a conversation and helps the listener predict when to take the turn, which is called transition-relevant point. The second one refers to the way another speaker takes the turn. How speakers take turns can be explained as the current speaker continuing to speak unless s/he gives the turn to another speaker (for example with a question) or

another speaker chooses to speak him/herself (Sacks et al., 1974, cited in Coates, 1986). In any case, Pschaid (1993) regards taking the turn to speak as a deliberate act. Graddol and Swann (1989), McCarthy (1991) and Montgomery (1995) all state that as well as transition-relevance points, which are usually indicated by grammatical completeness, a listener should look for such cues as the speaker's body language, eye contact, gesticulation and intonation to take the turn. In addition, the listener can also use various linguistic devices to take the turn (McCarthy, 1991) and signal that s/he wishes to take the turn by increasing bodily tension, using some body movements to attract attention or inhaling remarkably (Wardhaugh, 1985). On the other hand, a speaker can indicate the end of the turn by decreasing intonation at the end of the utterance, just stopping without any change in intonation, using such body language as relaxation or verbalizing the fact that s/he has finished, usually in formal situations, and choose the next speaker by looking at that person towards the end of the turn (Wardhaugh, 1985).

There is a relationship between gender and compliance with rules for turn-taking. For instance, Corson (1997) states that girls follow these rules more carefully than boys do depending on the fact that turn-taking is part of collaborative pastimes girls have unlike competitive ones boys do. In addition, as it is discussed in detail in the following section, men interrupt more frequently than women do (Abu-Haidar, 1995; West, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1998).

2.3.4 Interruptions

As Pschaid (1993) states, interruptions are "instances where the hearer abruptly cuts off the present speaker, when no indication of a transition relevance place is given"; that is, a participant stops the current speaker at a point when this speaker is not willing to give the turn (p. 56). However, such expressions as " Yes, Mmm, Surely, Quite, I see, Yeah, and OK" are not seen as interruptions since they are means of showing the listener's attention (Wardhaugh, 1985).

Pschaid (1993) mentions reasons for interruptions as lack of language competence, defined as failing to understand transition-relevance points or different speaking styles, and valuing one's utterance or topic more than the current speaker's. Nevertheless,

Graddol and Swann (1989) conclude that interruptions are not results of interactional incompetence but signs of power in conversation.

Interrupters usually use some expressions like 'Can I interrupt for a moment?', 'Hang on a minute, I've got something to tell you', 'Sorry to butt in, but …' (McCarthy, 1991, p. 129), 'Can I add to that er …', 'Can I ask organization-wise why …', 'We've got two people in sales if I can just come in here …', 'If I could ask a question again …', 'Look – look – let me – let me – make it patently clear …' (Stubbs, 1983, p. 186). Stubbs (1983) also adds that these are characterized by terms of address, forms of mitigation like 'can I / could I / I must / let me' and self-referential metastatement and that the speaker usually repeats the first few syllables (p. 186).

An interrupted speaker reacts in two ways. This participant either agrees to give up the floor or attempts to regain it by interrupting the interrupter (Aries, 1996). Nevertheless, a speaker can avoid being interrupted by looking around rather than gazing at just one person (which is a way of choosing the next speaker) or even ignoring the presence of others, raising the hand to either a potential interrupter or an actual interrupter, using such expressions as " I just have a few comments, There are three points I want to make, I have a couple of observations about that", producing compound clauses, preferring periodic rather than loose sentences or raising his/her voice to drown out another (Wardhaugh, 1985, pp. 85-87).

Writers classify interruptions in different ways. First, Kendon (1990) distinguishes between interruptions resulting from mistakes in predicting the current speaker's behavior and those aiming to end the current speaker's turn. Next, Wardhaugh (1985) shows the difference between interruptions changing the current topic and those delaying it and adds that the latter can be indicated by phrases like 'By the way', requests for clarification and comments or observations about what the current speaker has said. Finally, Tainio (1989, cited in Lindroos, 1995) classifies interruptions as follows:

  - simple interruption: when the turn changes and the speakers speak at the same time, but the first speaker's turn is unfinished;

- overlapping: when the turn changes, the speakers speak at the same time and the first speaker's turn is finished;
- butting-in interruption: when the turn does not change and the speakers are speaking at the same time; and
- silent interruption: when the turn changes, the speakers are not speaking at the same time, but the first speaker's turn is unfinished (p. 143).

Nevertheless, others distinguish overlaps from interruptions. Graddol and Swann (1989) find overlaps likely in a turn-taking system in which speakers try to predict transition-relevance points. In the same way, for Coates (1986) overlaps result from mistakes in predicting the end of the current turn. Like overlaps, interruptions arise before the current participant's turn ends, but what makes interruptions different is that they stop the current speaker before s/he reaches the last part of the turn and that the interrupter gains the turn rather than speaking simultaneously (Coates, 1986). That is, in the case of overlaps, the next speaker's turn is allowed to end grammatically, but in that of interruptions, it is not (Montgomery, 1995). Another difference between them is that interruption is regarded as "a 'deeper' intrusion into the internal structure of the speaker's utterance, i.e., prior to a possible transition place" (West & Zimmerman, 1998, p. 167). They also indicate that while overlaps are in harmony with the rules for turn-taking interruptions defy them, which Coates (1986) and Montgomery (1995) agree with. To speak generally, positive attitudes towards overlaps and negative ones towards interruptions also differentiate them. Coates (1986) regards overlaps as "instances of slight over-anticipation" (p. 99). Coates (1996) likens overlaps to ''several instruments playing different tunes which fit together harmonically'' and adds that they provide "a more multilayered development of topics" (p. 133). On the other hand, the negative attitude towards interruptions is indicated by the fact that Wardhaugh (1985) and Pschaid (1993) see interruptions as a kind of rejection of the current speaker's right to speak. Another difference between overlaps and interruptions is aims of participants. Coates (1996) found out that when women overlap, they aim to join in together and to share the floor rather than to grab the turn. Additionally, the participant may predict the current speaker's utterance and attempt to complete it by means of an overlap (McCarthy, 1991). On the other hand, interrupters usually aim to gain the floor (Beattie,

1983, cited in Graddol & Swann, 1989) and to establish power in conversation (Coates, 1995; Aries, 1996).

Even though many authors take negative attitudes towards interruptions by regarding them as "violations of the normative organization of the transition from one to a next," Schegloff (1984) states that it is possible for interruptions to be quite precisely placed so that they "redo invitation" to the current topic (p. 40). Interrupters also get negative reactions in conversation. For instance, Spender (1980) maintains that while men punish women interrupters by trying to be neutral or providing neither support nor rebuff, interruptions of men result in silence of women (Coates & Cameron, 1988, cited in Montgomery, 1995). On the other hand, when they are aimed to support the current speaker (Graddol & Swann, 1989) or when they take place in the form of rapid questions to reflect the listener's interest (Tannen, 1984), interruptions can even be regarded positive by the interrupted speaker. For example, DeFrancisco (1998) found out that wives did not complain about the frequent interruptions of their husbands because what was important for them was 'getting a response at all,' that is, maintaining the interaction (p. 179).

2.3.4.1 Ends in Interruptions

Ends in interruptions can be generalized as cooperative and intrusive (Li et al., 2004). Ends in cooperative interruptions are to express support, interest, concern, and agreement (Aries, 1996), to request clarification, to correct what the current speaker has said or a misunderstanding (Wardhaugh, 1985), to give more information when the current speaker shows what was said is not clear for him/her (Tannen, 1984). On the other hand, an intrusive interruption can be the result of a wish "to usurp the turn space of another and to assert dominance" (Aries, 1996, p. 99), to disagree with the current speaker (Wardhaugh, 1985), "to prevent interaction from becoming too personal and to create impersonality" at a point where the current speaker begins to give too many private details (McElhinny, 1998, p. 321), to complete the current speaker's statement, or to change the topic (Pschaid, 1993).

On the other hand, interruptions can serve functions different from the ends (Aries, 1996). For instance, an interruption aimed to show agreement may usurp the turn space

of the current speaker or an interruption aimed to express disagreement may not cause disruption. Hence, she suggests inspecting conversations for the interrupted speaker's reaction to being interrupted.

Li et al. (2004) examined the two kinds of aims according to status and gender in a formal setting involving male physician-male patient and male physician-female patient interviews in a clinic in Canada. Their subjects included physicians aged between 30 and 49, being in practice from 1 to 19 years, and enjoying their profession "very much, most of the time or sometimes" and regular patients aged between 16 and 78 speaking English as their first language (except one who spoke it fluently as a second language) with various demographic qualities in terms of education level, employment and health status.

Li et al. (2004) first investigated whether the interruptions were successful or unsuccessful, that is, whether the interrupter was able to complete his/her turn and then classified successful ones as cooperative and intrusive. The results showed that the physicians used significantly more intrusive interruptions than the patients did, who interrupted more cooperatively. In terms of gender, the female patients' both intrusive and cooperative interruptions outnumbered the male patients'. Furthermore, in interviews with the female patients, the male physicians' intrusive interruptions occurred more frequently than in those with the male patients. The researchers showed its reason as the physicians' impatience with the female patients talking more than the males did and concluded that "female patients face particular difficulties in participating in a medical consultation, especially when the physician is male" (p. 152). Another result of the study was that both the male and female patients became much more unsuccessful in their interruptions than the physicians did, which showed that the physicians were responsible to control the process and/or content of the conversation even if the patients wished to take part in the interview. As for the demographic variables tested in the study, the physicians interrupted patients that were more educated more intrusively (despite having longer interviews with them) than less educated ones. Healthier patients interrupted less intrusively and more successfully than the very sick patients did, but the physicians interrupted them more intrusively. Additionally, the fact that patients interrupting more intrusively were less successful showed that the physicians did not like being intrusively interrupted, and stopped the interrupter when

this was the case. Li et al. (2004) ended the study concluding that there was a discrepancy between the styles, not frequencies, of physicians and patients' interruptions (the former being more intrusive and successful and the latter being more cooperative and unsuccessful) and suggesting training patients how to interrupt physicians successfully.

2.3.4.2 Power and Interruptions

Dominance and control are two of the communicative acts interruptions fulfill (West & Zimmerman, 1998); hence, interruptions are ways of establishing power in conversation (Aries, 1996). Although interruptions are seen natural in informal conversation of equal participants (Coates, 1986), differences of status between speakers in terms of parenthood, fluency in speaking, and/or expertise generally result in frequent interruptions and make a speaker more powerful than others. For instance, West and Zimmerman (1998) reveal that parents interrupt children more often. Similarly, Wardhaugh (1985) maintains that hesitant speakers are more likely to be interrupted than fluent speakers are. Contrary to what has been suggested so far, DeFrancisco (1998) found out that husbands preferred silence to interruptions to establish power in conversation.

Since gender is another feature that gives a participant dominance in conversation (Leet-Pellegrini, 1980, cited in Coates, 1986), as the subordinate participants in conversation women are more frequently interrupted than men are (Abu-Haidar, 1995; West, 1998; Lindroos, 1995; West & Zimmerman, 1998; Li et al., 2004). Another reason why men interrupt women more often is that the participant who talks more cuts in more and dominates the conversation (Spender, 1980). Spender (1980) resolves the contradiction between this result and the common belief that women are more talkative by stating that in this belief women's talk is compared with what is expected from them (silence) not with men's talk. On the other hand, DeFrancisco (1998) found out that wives talked more but interrupted less and thus failed to dominate the conversation. Holmes (1992) illustrates the relationship between gender and interruptions in the following dialogue:

Wanda:	Did you see here that two sociologists have just proved that men interrupt women all the time? They –
Ralph:	Who says?
Wanda:	Candace West of Florida State and Don Zimmerman of the University of California at Santa Barbara. They taped a bunch of private conversations, and guess what they found. When two or three women are talking, interruptions are about equal. But when a man talks to a woman, he makes 96 per cent of the interruptions. They think it's a dominance trick men aren't even aware of. But –
Ralph:	These people have nothing better to do than eavesdrop on interruptions?
Wanda:	– but women make 'retrievals' about one third of the time. You know, they pick up where they left off after the man –
Ralph:	Surely not all men are like that Wanda?
Wanda:	– cuts in on what they were saying. Doesn't that –
Ralph:	Speaking as a staunch supporter of feminism, I deplore it Wanda.
Wanda:	(sigh) I know, dear. (p.325)

Because interruptions are seen natural in informal conversation of equal participants, they are regarded as signs of the listener's attention in single-sex conversations between women. Nevertheless, in mixed-sex conversations interruptions of men are regarded as attacks on the current speaker's rights in turn-taking, which originates from the different approaches of the two sexes to conversation (Coates, 1986). To conclude, Montgomery (1995) maintains that there is not a set of universal differences between the language of men and women and the interaction of gender with such other dimensions as age, class, ethnic group etc. should be considered. Moreover, Aries (1996) adds the topic of conversation, the setting, the relationship between the participants, and the personalities of the participants as variables to be considered in the analysis of interruptions.

One of the most frequently cited studies on gender (thus power) and interruptions in the field is by West (1998). The study aimed to compare the effects of gender and status in interruptions through physician-patient encounters, which are generally asymmetrical in terms of status and power. The data in the study were actually recorded to be used in medical education of residents, therefore lack of control over some factors led to a non-

standardized corpus of materials. She examined 21 actual encounters in a family practice center in the southern United States involving four female and seventeen male white doctors in their late twenties to early thirties and 16 to 82-year-old patients from various backgrounds. Five of the 21 encounters involved black female, six of them white female, four of them black male, and six of them white male patients.

The encounters were analyzed separately according to the doctor's gender. On the one hand, male physicians interrupted the patients more frequently than their co-participants did in all their encounters, except one with a patient that was hard of hearing and one with a mentally retarded patient. On the other hand, female physicians were interrupted more frequently than both their own and male physicians' patients were.

The inspection of male physicians' frequent interruptions for the underlying reasons showed that the asymmetry of the physician-patient relationship resulted from physicians' legal responsibility for treating patients and thus patients' situational dependency on them. She illustrated this with a dyad in which a male doctor resolved a disagreement with a (female) patient by interrupting her. She discovered and disapproved the fact that male doctors interrupted patients to ask a new question while they were just answering the current question since they not only violated their rights to speak but also missed essential information for diagnosis. Hence, she concluded that such interruptions might have important consequences, as the patient's health is the case.

As for the interactions with female doctors, in encounters with female patients, distributions of interruptions almost revealed symmetry whereas male patients employed most of the interruptions (92 % in one case) in all. She mentioned a dilemma over whether to treat them as "women" or "physicians" concluding from Hughes (1945), who maintained that the auxiliary characteristics of American physicians were "white," "Protestant," and "male" and that lack of one of them might lead to "status contradiction" or even "status dilemma" (p. 405). An example showing a male patient's repeated interruptions to resist the physician's solution for a problem can also be found in the study. Thus, it was concluded that male patients disrespected female physicians' authority ignoring their technical qualifications and personal assurances.

Shi (2005) also examined the relationship between language and power through such conversation techniques as language styles, turn-taking, gaining floor, and interruptions as employed in a live television interview. The program involved one interviewer and six guests of different social status, race, and gender: a white female communication professor, a white female senior vice president of *U.S. news*, a white male Labor Union official, a white male actor/activist, a white male entrepreneur, and an African-American male pastor.

The study investigated the following:

 a) the relationship between interviewees' linguistic features and their socio-cultural backgrounds,

 b) how they interact with each other in terms of speaking turns, talking time, and interruptions,

 c) the interviewer's role in terms of his influence on the respondent's speaking turns, control of topics, and evaluative comments.

In order to achieve this, the researcher measured some linguistic variables. These are disclaimers (e.g. "I guess", "I mean", "I don't know"), hedges (e.g. "like", "sort of", "kind of", "you know"), tag questions, speaking turns divided into three categories as rightful turns (turns with transition markers or topic shading devices), turns initiated by the interviewer by directing a question, and interruption turns (unlike the current speaker the interrupter manages to complete his/her utterance), talking time, being interrupted and losing the floor, being interrupted but resisting it by continuing the utterance, and interviewer's intervening statements.

The three research questions revealed the following results. To begin with, the two females, in accordance with their professional backgrounds, used fewer powerless language markers than the males did. Next, the Labor Union leader talked the most time despite his few speaking turns. Additionally, he was the most interrupted participant in spite of not interrupting often; however, he successfully resisted them and continued to talk keeping the floor. On the other hand, the female senior journalist was the least interrupted and interrupting participant even though she spoke the second longest time confidently. Another result was that the female professor was the one who interrupted most, which was not significant compared with the others. The participants having the

most speaking turns were the actor/activist and the African-American pastor, whose talking times were about average. When the three categories of speaking turns were compared, interruption turns were the most frequent followed by turns initiated by the interviewer and rightful turns. The findings in terms of interruptions revealed that there was no significant difference between males' and females' interruptions, more than half of the total was employed by the interviewer, almost all the participants were interrupted, and the Labor Union official and the African-American pastor were the ones who were most frequently interrupted by the interviewer. In examining the interviewer's role, the researcher reported that he had three ways of controlling the topic: highlighting one of its aspects, shifting it, and further probing it by asking others to respond, and two attitudes in making evaluative comments: a questioning/confronting and a consulting attitude.

2.3.4.3 Setting in Interruptions

Interruptions display difference in different settings. In informal conversations, especially of women, interruptions are usually intended to complete what is being said and express agreement (Aries, 1996).

Clinics and classrooms tend to be the preferred formal settings in research. For instance, West (1998) found out that men interrupted female participants more frequently even when these participants had a higher status as doctors. Li et al. (2004) also studied physicians and patients' interruptions and found the former more intrusive and successful and the latter more cooperative and unsuccessful. Furthermore, Pschaid (1993) investigated interruptions in the office focusing on abrupt topic changes and found out that a participant interrupts aiming to change the topic because of valuing his/her own topic more than the current one. Besides, Lindroos (1995) examined teacher-student talk during a lesson in terms of interruptions and gender and found out that the female teacher provided two different discourse spaces by interrupting girls more often than boys and encouraging the rest of the class to interrupt them.

Nonetheless, there are few studies in informal settings. Tannen (1984) analyzed interruptions in the form of "machine-gun questions" in her conversations with friends. She examined timing of the interruptions and the interrupted speaker's reactions to them

and discovered that she had interrupted to give more information because the other participant's surprise and hesitation caused by her abrupt questions had made her feel the need to do so. In addition, DeFrancisco (1998) investigated conversations between husbands and wives and found out that men interrupted more besides violating turn-taking rules by giving more minimal responses, delayed responses or no response at all.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

After providing a description of data and subjects of the study, this chapter justifies and explains data collection procedure and presents data analysis procedure and information sheet.

3.2 Participants of the Study

The subjects of this study included 33 native speakers of Turkish from a variety of socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds whose ages varied between 18 and 70. These people were chosen randomly and some of them were from Kayseri, some were from another part of Turkey but were in Kayseri at the time of speaking because they lived there or came there for educational purposes. The subjects, 16 of whom were male while 17 were female, also included a family, staff and students from the School of Foreign Languages of Erciyes University, and other students (undergraduate and graduate) from Erciyes University.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

The data collected for this study were in Turkish. One rationale behind this was that the research questions under consideration necessitated speakers with communicative competence and the number of speakers of another language having such competence in this speech community would be limited. Being native speakers and at least at the age of 18, the subjects were presumed to qualify as competent speakers in this respect. The researcher's nationality was another factor since natural data in another language would

have been difficult to collect and its analysis would have lacked the cultural rules and knowledge basic for the context and content, rules for communication, and shared rules for interaction.

Interruptions were collected by tape-recording naturally occurring conversations in daily life rather than by employing other elicitation methods for some reasons. To start with, the use of this method in recent studies like Schiffrin (1994), Abu-Haidar (1995), West (1998), Li et al. (2004), and Turjoman (2005) proved to be useful. Next, such written forms as in plays, surveys, questionnaires, or discourse completion tasks would not have reflected reality and, most importantly, they would have involved a limited number of interruptions, if any. Furthermore, participants in conversations on television or radio have different ends than those in everyday conversations. Another reason is that such methods as observing the participants could have contained serious errors.

3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

In order to practice conversational analysis and determine which components of communicative events to focus on, I conducted a pilot study on interruptions in discussion programs on television, which involved eight communicative events. These events were analyzed in terms of the eight components of communicative events suggested by Hymes (1974) and compared with each other. The pilot study indicated that communicative events in one type of setting/scene involved similar instrumentalities, keys, and genres and implied that focusing on participants and their ends in further research would be useful.

This study involved 40 communicative situations each of which involved an interruption. In these situations, there were such different types of communication as female-female, female-male, male-male, and male-female in formal and informal setting/scene. Since the research was aimed at investigating differences in ends, it included various types of relationships between participants such as friends, sister-brother, daughter-father, daughter-mother, student-teacher, student-informant, and student-officer and settings such as a family gathering in a flat, an office, a school canteen, a lesson in a classroom, and a cultural center.

I tape recorded the subjects' conversations in two ways assuring them that these conversations would be used if they included the focus of the study (without telling what it is) and that their voices or identities would never be revealed. The first way was to record them while talking naturally and then ask for their permission to use the conversations in the study. In such cases, I usually put the tape recorder on a table in its cover with a microphone on the edge. The alternative way was to ask them in various settings to volunteer in the study by talking about whatever they wished. Placing the recorder in its cover with the microphone on the edge in a position that would not have disturbed, I recorded them myself or demonstrated how to use the tape recorder and took no further part.

Transcribing communicative events in which an undergraduate or graduate student interrupted another participant followed inspecting the recordings for interruptions that involved instances in which a participant cut in before the current speaker signaled a transition-relevant point by means of intonation. Such back channel cues as "evet, yani, tamam" were regarded as overlaps and thus excluded. A complete transcription of the interruptions analyzed is presented in Appendix and their translations into English are presented in sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.

These interruptions were first noted on an information sheet and then their frequencies were converted into percentages. As some of the cells had less than five for expected frequencies, Chi-square could not be used. Hence, in order to examine the research questions, the percentages were compared descriptively. First, the interruptions were grouped according to transition-relevant points and the effects of setting, gender, and ends were examined. Second, they were investigated in terms of setting/scene and the effects of gender and ends were examined. Third, the nine ends in the interruptions were identified and the effects of setting/scene and gender were examined. Finally, the interruptions were investigated in terms of gender and the effects of setting/scene and ends were examined.

Speaking time was not measured since it seems to be related with individual speaking styles and the main point in the study was "why participants interrupt" rather than "how long or how much they speak" or "ratio of interruptions to speaking time". Of the eight components of communicative events suggested by Hymes (1974) only setting/scene,

participants, and their ends were the focus of attention since they proved to be the most important dimensions to study interruptions as the pilot study indicated.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines relationships among transition-relevant points, setting/scene, ends, and gender and introduces the results of analysis of interruptions in terms of them. To begin with, the interruptions are classified in terms of transition-relevant points, and the effects of setting, gender and ends on them are investigated. Then, the interruptions are examined in terms of setting/scene, and its relationship with gender and ends is investigated. The next step is to identify the ends in the interruptions and investigate their relationship with setting/scene and gender. Finally, the interruptions are examined in terms of gender, and the effects of setting/scene and ends on it are investigated.

4.2 Interruptions in Terms of Transition-Relevant Points

The interrupters in the study cut in at two types of points syntactically. Whereas some interruptions in the study occurred just as the current speaker completed his/her utterance grammatically but implied a tendency to continue the turn via intonation, the others did not take place before the utterance or the turn was completed.

All situations in the study classified according to acknowledging or disregarding grammatically transition-relevant points are presented below, and English translations of the utterances follow them in quotation marks.

4.2.1 Interruptions in Accordance with Transition-Relevant Points

In the situations transcribed below, the interrupters acknowledged transition-relevant

points, so they cut in when the speakers' utterances were grammatically completed.

Situation 11: To require clarification P2 interrupts P1, who then interrupts P2 without waiting for the utterance to be grammatically completed in order to give further information.

P1: *....bu inşaatın hemen yanındaki bina. Tamam? Or'daki binaya gidiyo'sunuz//* '...it's the building next to the faculty under construction. Right? You're going to that building//'

P2: *Ben şimdi bi' yıl İngilizce hazırlık//* 'You mean prep class for a year is//'

P1: *Bi' yıl İngilizce hazırlık göreceksiniz sonra fakültenize dağıl'caksınız.....* 'Prep class for a year is compulsory for you after that you're going to start your faculty'

Situation 12: To support her with a joke P2 interrupts P1, whose response is expressing agreement.

P1: *Ya valla işte okey oynayaca'z .. her zamanki yaptığımız gibi gezeriz piknik yaparız voleybol oynarız işte (?)//* 'Well we're going to play "okey" .. as usual we're going to walk around have a picnic play volleyball and things like that (?)//'

P2: *Rabia'ya dikkat etmek lâzım taş çalar o.* 'We should be careful with Rabia as she steals pieces'

P1: *Evet!* 'Yeah!'

Situation 16: P2 interrupts P1 to support her by agreeing.

P1: *Kim kimi taşıyabilir ki dört yıl yani arada bi' bağ olmadan çünkü evlilikle böyle gezip tozmak başka şeyler//* 'Who can stand whom for four years without a tie as marriage and flirtation are different things//'

P2: *Bi' de evliliğe hiçbir şey kalmıyo' hiçbir heyecan kalmıyo* 'Also nothing I mean no exhilaration remains for marriage'

Situation 17: P2 cuts in to correct a misunderstanding.

P1: *Ya hem mantık ol'cak ama arada sevgi ol'cak yani düz sadece kuru kuruya mantık işte şu böyle değil yani//* 'Well there should be reason but also love I mean not just circular reasoning//'

P2: *Hayır mantık derken şöyle benim burcumun da özelliğini çok taşıyorum merak ettiğim insanı seviyorum merak ettiğim insana âşık oluyorum* 'No what I mean by reason is that I also have the characteristic of my zodiac I love the person I'm intrigued by I fall for the person I'm intrigued by'

Situation 18: P2 interrupts to change the topic.

P1: *Zamanında olması gerekiyo' ve evlilikle sonuçlanması gerekiyo//* 'That must be at the right time and end in marriage//'

P2: *Bi' de en çok düşündüğüm konu ben bur'da babamın parasıyla okuyorum di'il mi onun istemediği bi' şeyi onun parasını yiye yiye yapamam ben* 'Also what I think about a lot is that I study here with my father's financial support right I can't do something he doesn't like with his own money'

Situation 21: P2 interrupts P1 to end her turn.

P1: *Ya vardı o zaman birikim vardı sende//* 'Then you had it you had background//'

P2: *Yo hocam ben meslek lisesi mezunuyum zaten* 'No ma'm I'm just a vocational high school graduate'

Situation 22: P3 interrupts P2 to support him.

P2: *Ya meselâ kelime konusunda hani kelimenin yanına anlamı altına da kendi bi' cümle kur'cak örnek kelimeleri öğrenebilirsin (?)//* 'Well for example for vocabulary you can write the definition next to the word your own sentence below that you can learn example words//'

P3: *Bi' de günlük tekrar var* 'And daily revision'

Situation 25: P2 interrupts to give more information.

P1: *Tamam* 'Okay'

P2: *Tamam mı? Ondan sonra//* 'Right? Then//'

      P1: *Kız o şeyde kaldı kadında//* 'The girl stayed with that er woman//'

P2: *Ama o aynı kadın bu kadın oğlunu adam almış kızı da bunda kalıyo'muş* 'But that's the same woman this woman the man got her son and her is staying with her'

Situation 26: P2 cuts in to start her turn.

P1: *Şeylerimiz de efendime söyle'yim şişmiş (?)//* 'Anyway my things are also swollen (?)//'

P2: *İyice kilo almışsın de' mi baba? Ne olacak bu halin bilmiyo'm ki?* 'Haven't you put a lot of weight dad? You have a lot on your plate'

Situation 27: P2 interrupts P3 to express her disagreement with him.

P3: *Olur mu canım girsin KPSS'ye (?)//* 'Why dear she should take KPSS//'

P2: *Hayır o zaman kurumlar arası geçiş olur zaten gerek kalmaz* 'No then I'll have a chance to change institution so there'll be no need for that'

Situation 28: P2 cuts in to support P4.

P4: *Mola yerinden aldıydık iyi çıktı yani//* 'We bought it in a supermarket in a petrol station//'

P2: *Bi' de mola yerinden ha!* 'And in a supermarket in a petrol station!'

Situation 29: P2's aim in her interruption is to start her turn.

P3: *Benim bildiğim saatler çalıştıkça geri kalır bu da çalıştıkça ileri gidiyo'//* 'As far as I know clocks go back as they work but this one goes forward as it works//'

P2: *(?) fazla geliyo* '(?) is too much for it'

Situation 30: P2 cuts in to require clarification.

P3: *Ben de şeye gittiğimde öyle olduydu sınava gittiğimde en son beni aldılar içeri sinir oldum Ramazan zaten orucuk//* 'When I went to that thing exam the same happened they took me in as the last candidate I went crazy it was Ramadan and I was fast//'

P2: *Hangi neyin sınavı?* 'What which exam?'

Situation 31: P2 aims to start her turn.

P3: *Giren çıkmıyo' açlıktan öldük oturuyok kalıkıyok//* 'The candidates were staying in too long I was starving to death and killing time//'

P2: *Ay ne iğrenç bi' durum o ya üf bu da öyleydi* 'Oh what a revolting situation this one was also like that'

Situation 32: P2's aim is to express her disagreement with P1.

P1: *Dikkatsizliğimiz sonucu biz şampiyonluğu size verdik ciddi söylüyorum yoksa sizin şampiyon olmanız mümkün değil biz size (?) fark atardık yani ve sizi tüm dönemin maçlarını aldık biz//* 'We gave championship to you as a result of our carelessness I really mean that otherwise you can't be the champion there would be a (?) difference between us and we won all the matches in the season//'

P2: *İyi de hocam futbol sadece yani kaliteli futbolcuları içeren bi'şey değil ki dikkat her şeye yani gerekiyo' demek ki biz dikkatliyiz biz olduk* 'OK sir but football isn't something that requires only well qualified footballers that is carefulness is necessary for everything so we're careful and we clinched it//'

Situation 33: P2 cuts in to give more information.

P1: *Yani aslında çalışsan geçersin sen çünkü yıl içi ortalaman yüksekmiş senin//* 'Actually if you study you can pass as your in-term average was high//'

P2: *Bi' de hocam bu benim ikinci hazırlığım* 'And it's my second prep sir'

4.2.2 Interruptions Disregarding Transition-Relevant Points

In the following situations, the interrupters ignored transition-relevant points; that is, they had started their turns before the current speakers completed their utterances grammatically not to mention their turns.

Situation 1: Even though P2 interrupts P1 to start her turn, later he completes his utterance.

P1: *'Zoom'lamayı biraz//* 'Zoom out and//'

P2: *Dur dur dur dur dur… İçme sakın içme!* 'Stop stop stop stop stop… Don't drink!'

P1: *'Zoom'lamayı biraz geri al da* ⌈ *çıkalım.* 'Zoom out and let me appear properly'

P2: *İç iç, tamam iç! İç!* 'Drink drink OK drink it! Drink!'

Situation 2: P1 interrupts to start her turn and then lets P2 complete her utterance.

P1: (knocks the door and comes in) *Ay çok özür dilerim* ⌈ *geç kaldım.* 'Oh I'm so sorry I'm late'

P2: *Yok rica ederiz biz yani//* 'That's OK we just//'

P1: (to the others in the office)*Selâm!* 'Hi!'

P2: *…kayıt yapıyo'san durdurmayayım diye* '...didn't want to interrupt in case you were recording'

Situation 3: P1 cuts in to give more information and afterwards P2 gets a chance to complete her utterance.

P2: *Kimi kullanıcaksın meselâ? Büyük ihtimalle şey... aa... anket sonucu mesela beni gösteriyo'sa//* 'For instance who are you going to use? Most probably er… if the results of the questionnaire indicate me//'

P1: *Yapıca'm zaten anketi vermeye ben kendim gelice'm.* 'I'm already going to do that I'm going to come here to give the questionnaire myself//'

P2: *Ha, yani o zaman bana göre hazırlanırsın.* 'I see then you get ready according to me'

Situation 4: P1 interrupts P2, who has also cut in before a grammatically transition-relevant point, to end her turn.

P1: *Bu, bunların içinde geçer diye düşündüm yani mesela//* 'I thought this is included in these I mean for example//'

P2: *Şimdi bak//* 'Now look//'

P1: *tuttuğunu koparmak ve güçlü olmak zeki olmak dikkatli olmanın (?) diye düşündüm* 'I thought being resolute and strong being intelligent are (?) of being careful'

Situation 5: P2 interrupts P1 while she is talking to P3 to start his turn. Responding to this interruption with rejection of attention, P1 is interrupted again.

P1: (to P3) *Hayatın önemi dediğinde yani… hayatın önemi dediğin zaman hayatı alıp önemsizdir, biraz önemlidir, önemlidir gibi//* 'When you say the importance of life I mean… when you say the importance of life you take life and such concepts as it's not important, a bit important, important//'

P2: *Hocam sonuç cümlemi yazdım* 'Ma'm I've written my concluding sentence'

P1: *Ona biraz sonra bakayım, şimdi//* 'Let me check it later now//'

P2: *Hocam onunla alâkalı* 'Ma'm it's related with that'

Situation 6: P1 is interrupted by P2 to complete what she is saying and then responds to this by accepting P2's completion and clarifying what she means.

P1: *Piknikte mi konuşuyorsunuz .. gelecek hakkında yoksa//* 'Do you talk about the future during picnic or//'

P2: *Bir araya geldiğimizde* 'When we get together'

P1: *Ha bir araya geldiğinizde. Peki .. daha doğrusu şey .. Her hafta sonu olan şey, pikniğe gitmeniz mi, plan .. geleceğe yönelik plan yapmanız mı, yoksa ikisi de mi her hafta sonu oluyor?* 'Right when you get together. Then.. in fact.. is the thing that happens every weekend going on a picnic, planning.. planning the future, or both?'

Situation 7: P2's aim in her interruption is to require clarification.

P1: *İki tane sınav var, bi' tanesi muafiyet sınavı hazırlığı atlama sınavı eğer (?)//* 'There are two exams one is the proficiency exam an exam to pass the prep if (?)//'

P2: *Yok atlamak istemiyorum hazırlığı da. Atlamasam olur mu?* 'No I don't want to pass the prep. Is it OK if I don't pass it?'

Situation 8: When P2 cuts in to require more information, P1 provides it.

P1: *O zaman bur'daki kayıt işlemlerini bitirdikten sonra Yabancı Diller binasına gidiyo'sunuz, or'da yapıyo'sunuz kayıtla ilgili başvuruyu ve//* 'Then when you finish the registration here you're going to School of Foreign Languages applying for registration there and//'

P2: *Şey, on milyon lira para yatırdım ben* 'Well I put ten million liras in'

P1: *Tamam, o dekontu oraya götürüyo'sunuz* 'Ok you're taking the bank slip there'

Situation 9: P2 interrupts to end P1's turn.

P1: *Yani şimdi şöyle muafiyet sınavına .. eğer girip de ben hazırlık sınavını geçerim//* 'That is if you think I can take the proficiency exam and pass it//'

P2: *Bur'da hazırlık okumak istiyorum* 'I want to study the prep here'

Situation 10: P2 cuts in to require more information.

P1: *Sınav giriş kartınızı alıyo'sunuz ve ayın on dördünde zaten kâğıtta yazıyo' dokuz buçukta Yabancı Diller binasında//* 'You're taking the entrance card and on the fourteenth it's already written on that paper at half past nine in the School of Foreign Languages//'

P2: *Yabancı diller binası (?) mühendisliğin ilerisi mi?* 'Is School of Foreign Languages (?) next to engineering? '

Situation 13: P1 interrupts so that she can end P2's turn and the ongoing discussion.

P2: *E beş kızla yani ne faaliyeti olabilir ki?* 'Well what kind of activity can be done with just five girls?'

P1: *Ya Yahyalı'ya nasıl gidiyoruz ya?* 'But how can we go to Yahyalı?'

P2: *Ama Yahyalı'ya biz her zaman kendimiz//* 'But we can always//'

P1: *İyi canım sınıftakilere bi' söyle konuş kabul ederlerse ben varım yani* 'OK then talk to our classmates if they accept I'll say yes'

Situation 14: P1 interrupts P2 to start her turn.

P2: *Yani en samimî arkadaşın bile seni bi' çok konuda çekemezler* | *o yüzden ben o insana hiçbi' sırrımı vermem vermek istemem* 'Even your best friend | is jealous of you most of the time so I don't tell I don't want to tell any of my secrets to | her'

                                                                        P1: *Yani* 'Of course'

P1: *Ya bi' de insanlar belli oluyo' hiç//* 'And people reveal//'

P2: *Çünkü onu yeterince tanımıyorum sadece okulda görüşüyoruz* 'I don't know her enough we just see each other at school'

Situation 15: P2 cuts in to support P1, who then continues to talk about the topic.

P1: *Ya işte bak bu bende çok var biliyo' musun? İşte ben bi' karşımdaki insana ısınmayım bitti yani ben sana söylerim ya hep ya ama işte//* 'You know it's very typical of me once I'm not favorably impressed it's over I mean you know I always tell you but'

P2: *Evet negatif elektrik alıyo' insan bazen o kişiyi bi' de* *(?)* 'Yeah sometimes one gets unfavorable impression and that person (?)'

P1: *Ama hep doğru çıkar benim ön yargılarım* 'But my first impressions are always right'

Situation 19: P1 interrupts P2 to start his turn.

P1: *Hocanın tezi varmış da* 'The teacher has a thesis'

P2: *Tez mi? Ne tezi?* 'Thesis? What thesis?'

P1: *Profesör ol'cakmış!* 'She wants to be a professor!'

P2: *Şey mi yapmış .. konusu//* 'Has she … is it about//'

P1: *(?) konuşmaları istiyo' .. kaydedip onlar hakkında yazı yazıcak* '(?) she wants conversations.. she's going to record and write about them'

Situation 20: P3 cuts in to give more information.

P1: *Masaya koydun mu yani?* 'So did you put it on the table?'

P2: *Bıraktım* 'I laid it'

P1: *Tamam (?) Tamam 'İndirdim' diyince ben de şey//* 'OK (?) OK when you said "I deposited it" I er//'

P3: *O da benim gibi ben söyleyemediğim kelimeler yerine uyduruyorum* 'He's like me I make something up for words I can't say'

Situation 23: To start his turn P2 interrupts the speaker.

P1: *Sadece or'da mı çalışıyo' başka bi' okulda//* 'Does he only work there in another school//'

P2: *Özel ders (?) zaten çok çalıştı da* 'Tutoring (?) he has worked a lot'

Situation 24: P2 cuts in to start her turn.

P1: *N'apıyo'sunuz yazın peki? Dersler bitiyo' haftaya gitcek misiniz finalde//* 'Then what are you doing in the summer? The lessons are ending are you leaving next week in the final//'

P2: *Benim ailem bur'da hocam* 'My family is here ma'm'

Situation 34: P2 interrupts aiming to start her turn.

P1: *Valla şimdi bunlar önceden basıldığı için kurları yazmica'z ama bu sertifikalar bittikten sonra kurları da belirten bi' sertifika zaten düşünüyoruz bunlar yani//* 'In fact as these were published earlier we're not going to write the groups but when these certificates are finished we're already planning to prepare a certificate indicating the group that is these are//'

P2: *Çünkü C D kurunda hepsinin ortalaması doksan B'ler zavallılar bizler yani altmışta* 'Because in C and D groups all their averages are ninety those poor guys in B I mean us have sixty '

Situation 35: P2's aim is to require more information.

P1: *İngilizce'de her'alde biraz eksiğim oldu ondandır yani bu sene öyleydi normalde iki sene hazırlık okudum ama//* 'I think that was because I missed some things about English I mean it was like that this year actually I studied prep twice but//'

P2: *Yeteri kadar çalışmıyo' musun ondan kaynaklanabilir mi?* 'Could it be because you don't study enough?'

Situation 36: To start her turn P2 interrupts P1, who answers P2's question and then completes his utterance.

P1 : *Tabii ki .. Sonra//* 'Sure.. Then//'

P2 : *(?) kaç şekerli içiyo'sun?* '(?) how many sugars do you want for that?'

P1: *Fark etmez o zaman beş dört şeker alıyım yeter sonra...* 'That doesn't matter then four or five would be enough then…'

Situation 37: P1 aims to complete what P2 is saying, who then responds by accepting P1's completion.

P1: *İngilizce yönünden kendini hiç geliştirmek istemiyo'sun yani* 'So you don't want to improve yourself in English at all'

P2: *İstemiyorum çünkü//* 'No I don't because//'

P1: *Lâzım olmaz* 'It won't be necessary'

P2: *(?) bana lâzım olacağını zannetmiyorum* '(?) I don't think I'll need it'

Situation 38: P2 cuts in to give more information.

P2: *(?) bana lâzım olacağını zannetmiyorum* '(?) I don't think I'll need it'

P1: *Şimdi bu aslında//* 'Now in fact//'

P2: *Dış ülkeye gidersem belki lâzım olacak* 'I might need it if I go abroad'

Situation 39: P2 interrupts so that she can require more information.

P1: *Yani bi' de (?) bi' macera işi gibi bi' şey bence İngilizce de pek ama bunun için de okul//* 'I mean I think (?) English also seems something like an adventure but for this the school also//'

P2: *Turistlerle konuşmayı mı düşünüyo'sun yazın?* 'Are you planning to talk to tourists in summer?'

Situation 40: P1 interrupts P2 to start his turn.

P3: *Basitti (?)* 'That was easy (?)'

P2: *Hiç de basit değildi* *'writing'den de//* 'That wasn't easy at all and in writing//'

P1: *Çalışmayana basit olmaz tabiî ki insan çalışmayınca her şey zor* 'It wouldn't be easy for those who didn't study of course everything is difficult when one doesn't study'

4.2.3 Relationship between Transition-Relevant Points and Setting/Scene, Gender and Ends

Examination of the interruptions classified as acknowledging and disregarding transition-relevant points in terms of setting/scene, gender, and ends of the participants reveals different results. To begin with the most general one, in 24 of the 40 situations, which makes 60 %, interrupters ignored transition-relevant points and in 16 of them, that is, 40 %, they acknowledged such points.

Table 1 presents the relationship between transition-relevant points and setting/scene. Transition-relevant points were disregarded rather than acknowledged in both types of setting: 52 % of the interrupters in informal situations and 73.3 % of them in formal situations did not wait for the current speakers to complete their turns, which also reveals that transition-relevant points were disregarded more often in formal than in informal situations. Inspecting types of situations shows that it was in informal female-male situations where interrupters acknowledged transition-relevant points most often (24 %). On the other hand, the situations in which transition-relevant points were most disregarded were formal male-female situations (46.6 %).

Table 1

Transition-Relevant Points in Terms of Setting/Scene

	Acknowledging transition-relevant points		Disregarding transition-relevant points		TOTAL	
Informal						
Type of situation	f	%	f	%	f	%
f-f	5	**20**	5	**20**	10	**40**
f-m	6	**24**	5	**20**	11	**44**
m-m	1	**4**	1	**4**	2	**8**
m-f	-	**-**	2	**8**	2	**8**
Total	**12**	**48**	**13**	**52**	**25**	**100**
Formal						
f-f	-	**-**	3	**20**	3	**20**
f-m	2	**13.3**	1	**6.6**	3	**20**
m-m	-	**-**	-	**-**	-	**-**
m-f	2	**13.3**	7	**46.6**	9	**60**
Total	**4**	**26.6**	**11**	**73.3**	**15**	**100**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

Table 2
Transition-Relevant Points in Terms of Gender

	Acknowledging transition-relevant points						Disregarding transition-relevant points						TOTAL	
Female														
	Informal		Formal		Total			Informal		Formal		Total			
	f	%	f	%	f	%		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
	11	**40.7**	2	**7.4**	13	**48.1**		10	**37**	4	**14.8**	14	**51.8**	27	**100**
Male														
	1	**7.6**	2	**15.3**	3	**23**		3	**23**	7	**53.8**	10	**76.9**	13	**100**

According to Table 2, which presents the relationship between transition-relevant points and gender, both male (76.9 % vs. 23 %) and female interrupters (51.8 % vs. 48.1 %) disregarded these points rather than acknowledging them, which also indicates that men disregarded them more. Besides, in informal situations women both acknowledged (40.7 % vs. 7.4 %) and disregarded (37 % vs. 14.8 %) them more than they did so in formal ones whereas on the contrary men did so in formal situations (15.3 % vs. 7.6 % acknowledging and 53.8 % vs. 23 % disregarding).

Table 3 presents acknowledgment and disregard of transition-relevant points according to the aims of interrupters. Interrupters acknowledged transition-relevant points most when they aimed to support the current speakers (10 %) and disregarded them most when they aimed to start their own turns (25 %). When they aimed to change the topic (2.5 %), to support the speaker (10 %), to correct a misunderstanding (2.5 %), or to express disagreement (5 %) they preferred to wait for the current speaker's turn to finish. However, when they wanted to start their turns (25 %), to require clarification (12.5 %), to end the current speaker's turn (7.5 %), to complete what the speaker is saying (5 %), or to give more information (7.5 %) they tended to disregard transition-relevant points.

Table 3

Transition-Relevant Points in Terms of Ends

Ends	Acknowledging transition-relevant points		Disregarding transition-relevant points	
	f	%	f	%
To correct a misunderstanding	1	2.5	-	-
To express disagreement with the current speaker	2	5	-	-
To start his/her turn	-	-	10	25
To give more information	3	7.5	3	7.5
To require clarification	2	5	5	12.5
To change the topic	1	2.5	-	-
To support the speaker	4	10	1	2.5
To end the current speaker's turn	1	2.5	3	7.5
To complete what the speaker is saying	-	-	2	5

Note. Dashes indicate there were no responses.

4.3 Interruptions in Terms of Setting/Scene

The participants in the study showed different tendencies in different settings/scenes. Thus, inspection of interruptions in their respective settings/scenes follows their overall review.

Table 4 displays the interruptions taken from 40 situations examined in this study by showing their frequencies and percentages in formal and informal situations. As it indicates, there were more interruptions in mixed-sex (62.5 %) than in single-sex situations (37.5 %). In addition, more interruptions were observed in informal (62.5 %) than in formal situations (37.5 %) under all conditions except formal male-female situations (22.5 % vs. 5 %). The most frequent interruptions in the study occurred in informal female-male situations (27.5 %) while no interruptions were observed in formal male-male situations.

Table 4

Overall Comparison of Interruptions in Terms of Setting/Scene

Type of situation	Informal		Formal		TOTAL	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
f-f	10	**25**	3	**7.5**	13	**32.5**
m-m	2	**5**	-	**-**	2	**5**
f-m	11	**27.5**	3	**7.5**	14	**35**
m-f	2	**5**	9	**22.5**	11	**27.5**
TOTAL	**25**	**62.5**	**15**	**37.5**	**40**	**100**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

Table 5 presents interruptions in informal situations. Female participants were the frequent interrupters (84 %) interrupting both men (44 %) and women (40 %) more frequently than males did (8 % for both sexes) and it was the male participants (52 %) who were interrupted the most. While male interrupters cut in equally while talking to

both males and females, female participants interrupted males more often than females but not with a big difference.

Table 5

Gender in Informal Setting/Scene

Interrupted Speaker	Interrupter					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Male	2	8	11	44	**13**	**52**
Female	2	8	10	40	**12**	**48**
Total	**4**	**16**	**21**	**84**	**25**	**100**

The interrupters' ends in informal situations are illustrated in Table 6. Female participants interrupted male speakers in 44 % of informal situations, which made this type of communication the most frequent. The most frequently used aim was "to start his/her turn" (32 %) followed by "to support the speaker" (20 %). Both of them were more often used by females (the former being 24 % and the latter 16 %), but what makes the latter different is that it was only used in single-sex conversations while the former was employed in all types of communication. In their informal interruptions, male participants aimed "to start their turns", "to support the speaker" or "to complete what the speaker was saying" (4 % for all). As for the relationship between gender and ends in informal situations, female interrupters preferred the two common ends and used all the ends in the list except "to complete what the speaker was saying." On the other hand, male interrupters used "to start their turns" in both single- and mixed-sex conversations, "to support the speaker" only in a single-sex conversation, and "to complete what the speaker was saying" only in a mixed-sex conversation.

Table 6

Ends in Informal Setting/Scene

	Type of Communication								Total	
	f-f		f-m		m-m		m-f			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
To start his/her turn	2	8	4	16	1	4	1	4	8	32
To require clarification	-	-	3	12	-	-	-	-	3	12
To change the topic	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
To support the speaker	4	16	-	-	1	4	-	-	5	20
To end the current speaker's turn	1	4	1	4	-	-	-	-	2	8
To complete what the speaker is saying	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	1	4
To correct a misunderstanding	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
To express disagreement with the current speaker	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	1	4
To give more information	1	4	2	8	-	-	-	-	3	12
TOTAL	10	40	11	44	2	8	2	8	25	100

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

Table 7 presents interruptions in formal situations. Unlike Table 5, it shows that male participants (60 %) interrupted more often than females (40 %) did and the female participants (80 %) were interrupted the most. The male participants interrupted only females in formal situations whereas the females interrupted both kinds of participants equally (20 % or each).

Table 7 shows that male participants interrupted more in formal than in informal situations (60 % vs. 16 %) while it is the reverse for females (84 % in informal but 40 % in formal) when it is compared with Table 5. Furthermore, male speakers were interrupted more often in informal situations (52 %) than in formal ones (20 %);

however, females were interrupted quite frequently in both (48 % in informal and 80 % in formal).

Table 7
Gender in Formal Setting/Scene

	Interrupter					
	Male		Female		**Total**	
Interrupted Speaker	f	%	f	%	**f**	**%**
Male	-	**-**	3	20	**3**	**20**
Female	9	60	3	20	**12**	**80**
Total	**9**	**60**	**6**	**40**	**15**	**100**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations.

Table 8 not only provides the ends in formal setting/scene, but also makes it possible to compare the two types of setting. First, it reveals that most of the interruptions occurred in male-female conversations (60 %); therefore, when compared with Table 6   the result is that interruptions are widespread in mixed-sex conversations. Besides the popular end in informal situations (to start his/her turn), "to require clarification" also had a higher percentage (26.6 %). In terms of gender, male interrupters in formal situations preferred "to require clarification" and "to end the current speaker's turn" (20 % for each) but never interrupted to "to change the topic", "to support the speaker", "to complete what the speaker is saying", "to correct a misunderstanding" or "to express disagreement with the current speaker". On the other hand, females interrupted "to start their turns", which they used more frequently than others with a percentage of 13.3 %, "to require clarification", "to complete what the speaker was saying", "to express disagreement with the current speaker" and "to give more information" with a

percentage of 6.6 % for each, but they never tried "to change the topic", "to support the speaker", "to end the current speaker's turn", or "to correct a misunderstanding".

Table 8

Ends in Formal Setting/Scene

	Type of Communication								Total	
	f-f		f-m		m-m		m-f			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
To start his/her turn	1	6.6	1	6.6	-	-	2	13.3	4	26.6
To require clarification	1	6.6	-	-	-	-	3	20	4	26.6
To change the topic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
To support the speaker	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
To end the current speaker's turn	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	20	3	20
To complete what the speaker is saying	1	6.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6.6
To correct a misunderstanding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
To express disagreement with the current speaker	-	-	1	6.6	-	-	-	-	1	6.6
To give more information	-	-	1	6.6	-	-	1	6.6	2	13.3
TOTAL	3	20	3	20	-	-	9	60	15	100

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

4.4 Interruptions in Terms of Ends

Since ends are also an important component in communicative situations, the results of a mere examination of interruptions according to the gender of participants might be misleading as can be seen in Table 9. Females were not only the most frequent

interrupters (67.5 %) but also the most frequently interrupted speakers (60 %) by both men and women. Moreover, the examination of the speakers interrupted by men shows that most of them were female (27.5 %). As to the speakers interrupted by women, they seem almost equal in terms of gender (35 % of them are male and 32.5 % of them are female). To summarize, women interrupted both male and female speakers more frequently than men did but men interrupted females more frequently than males; therefore, examination of their ends in these interruptions seems essential.

Table 9

Interruptions in Terms of Gender

Interrupted Speaker	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	**f**	**%**
Male	2	5	14	35	**16**	**40**
Female	11	27.5	13	32.5	**24**	**60**
Total	**13**	**32.5**	**27**	**67.5**	**40**	**100**

Study of the interrupters' ends resulted in nine aims listed in Table 10. The most frequent one is "to start his/her turn" (32.5 %) and the least frequent ones are "to change the topic" (2.5 %) and "to correct a misunderstanding" (2.5 %). When they are viewed in terms of type of communication, "to support the speaker" (10 %) is the most frequent end in female-female, "to start her turn" (15 %) in female-male, "to start his turn" (2.5 %) and "to support the speaker" (2.5 %) in male-male, and "to start his turn" (7.5 %), "to require clarification" (7.5 %) and "to end the current speaker's turn" (7.5 %) in male-female situations.

Table 10

Ends in Interruptions

	Type of Communication								Total	
	f-f		f-m		m-m		m-f			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
To start his/her turn	3	7.5	6	15	1	2.5	3	7.5	**13**	**32.5**
To require clarification	1	2.5	3	7.5	-	-	3	7.5	**7**	**17.5**
To change the topic	1	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**2.5**
To support the speaker	4	10	-	-	1	2.5	-	-	**5**	**12.5**
To end the current speaker's turn	1	2.5	-	-	-	-	3	7.5	**4**	**10**
To complete what the speaker is saying	1	2.5	-	-	-	-	1	2.5	**2**	**5**
To correct a misunderstanding	1	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**2.5**
To express disagreement with the current speaker	-	-	2	5	-	-	-	-	**2**	**5**
To give more information	1	2.5	3	7.5	-	-	1	2.5	**5**	**12.5**
TOTAL	**13**	**32.5**	**14**	**35**	**2**	**5**	**11**	**27.5**	**40**	**100**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

Table 11 presents ends in terms of informal situations. "To start his/her turn" (36 %) was the most frequent aim. To start with, for female-female situations, the most frequent end was "to support the speakers" (16 %). Second, for female-male situations, the most frequent end was "to start her turn" (20 %). Next, "to start his turn" and "to support the speaker" were the preferred aims in informal male-male situations (4 % for

both). Finally, for male-female situations, the most frequent ends were "to start his turn" and "to complete what the speaker had been saying" (4 % for both).

Table 11

Ends in Informal Setting/Scene

Ends	Type of Communication								Total	
	f-f		f-m		m-m		m-f			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**f**	**%**
To start his/her turn	2	8	5	20	1	4	1	4	**9**	**36**
To require clarification	-	-	3	12	-	-	-	-	**3**	**12**
To change the topic	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**4**
To support the speaker	4	16	-	-	1	4	-	-	**5**	**20**
To end the current speaker's turn	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**4**
To complete what the speaker is saying	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	**1**	**4**
To correct a misunderstanding	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**4**
To express disagreement with the current speaker	-	-	1	4	-	-	-	-	**1**	**4**
To give more information	1	4	2	8	-	-	-	-	**3**	**12**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

Table 12 examines interruptions in formal situations. Being used in 27 % of such situations, "to start his/her turn" was as common as "to require clarification." For female-female situations, the most frequent end was "to start her turn", "to require clarification" and "to complete what the speaker had been saying" (7 % for all). Second, for female-male situations, the most frequent ends were "to express disagreement with the current speaker" and "to give more information" besides "to start her turn" (7 % for all). Next, in male-male situations, no interruptions were observed in formal situations.

Finally, for male-female situations, the most frequent ends were "to require clarification" and "to end the current speaker's turn" (20 % for both).

Table 12

Ends in Formal Setting/Scene

Ends	f-f		f-m		m-m		m-f		**Total**	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**f**	**%**
To start his/her turn	1	7	1	7	-	-	2	13	**4**	**27**
To require clarification	1	7	-	-	-	-	3	20	**4**	**27**
To change the topic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
To support the speaker	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
To end the current speaker's turn	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	20	**3**	**20**
To complete what the speaker is saying	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**7**
To correct a misunderstanding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
To express disagreement with the current speaker	-	-	1	7	-	-	-	-	**1**	**7**
To give more information	-	-	1	7	-	-	1	7	**2**	**13**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations. f-f = female-female, f-m = female-male, m-m = male-male, m-f = male-female.

4.4.1 To Start His/Her Turn: As seen in Tables 11 and 12, this was the most frequent end in both informal (36 %) and formal (27 %) situations. Female interrupters pursued this end more often than males did in informal setting/scene (28 % vs. 8 %) and more often in informal (28 %) situations than in formal (14 %) ones. When their interruptions to start their turns are examined in Table 14, they reveal that women interrupted male

speakers (22.2 %) more than they interrupted females (11.1 %). As for male interrupters, in spite of the fact that they pursued this end less frequently in informal (15.2 %) than females did and in informal than in formal (15.3 %) setting/scene as can be seen in Table 12, they had it more frequently in their interruptions of the opposite sex (22.9 % of females vs. 7.6 % of males), as did the female interrupters. Even though men interrupted two female participants in formal situations to start their turns, they did not do this to any males in the same kind of setting/scene. In short, this aim was generally preferred in mixed-sex and in informal situations, and was the first choice of female interrupters.

Besides, as Table 3 indicates transition-relevant points were most frequently disregarded (25 %) when interrupters pursued this aim.

There might be various reasons why a participant interrupts the current speaker to start his/her turn. In this study, the most obvious one took place especially when a participant rushed to express something s/he found urgent to be said like a joke, opinion or comment. For example, in Situation 26 below, a daughter (P2) wants to make a joke about just what her father (P1) is saying at that moment because it might be too late when he gives the turn. Situations 1, 2, 5, 29, 31, 34, 36 and 40(see the appendix) are other examples of such a reason.

P1: Şeylerimiz de efendime söyle'yim şişmiş (?)//
P2: İyice kilo almışsın de' mi baba? Ne olacak bu halin bilmiyo'm ki?

Situation 24, quoted below, illustrates another prevalent reason that originated from envisaging the rest of the current speaker's question. As P1 seems to assume that P2's family lives in another city, P2 understands that P1 is asking about visiting her family and immediately starts her turn to keep P1 from asking an irrelevant question. This is also the case in Situations 19 and 23 (see the appendix), where the interrupters begin to answer the speaker's question at once since they foresee the remainder and do not want to let him/her bother to express it.

P1: N'apıyo'sunuz yazın peki? Dersler bitiyo' haftaya gitcek misiniz finalde//
P2: Benim ailem bur'da hocam

A wish to add something to what s/he had just said, which can be seen in Situation 14 below, was another reason why a participant interrupted to start his/her turn.

P2: Yani en samimî arkadaşın bile seni bi' çok konuda çekemezler ⌈o yüzden ben o

P1: Yani

insana hiçbi' sırrımı vermem vermek istemem.
P1: Ya bi' de insanlar belli oluyo' hiç//
P2: Çünkü onu yeterince tanımıyorum sadece okulda görüşüyoruz.

4.4.2 To Require Clarification or More Information: When a participant missed or wanted to ascertain some information, s/he interrupted the current speaker to require clarification or further information. As Table 12 indicates, in terms of setting/scene, it was widespread in formal situations (27 %). As for gender, female participants in the study interrupted only males in informal situations and only females in formal ones aiming to require clarification or more information as can be seen in Table 16. Similarly, as Table 14 indicates male participants interrupted only females in formal situations but no males in either type of setting/scene. Thus, it was more common in mixed-sex than in single-sex situations. In terms of transition-relevant points, participants pursuing this aim tended to cut in before the current speaker's utterance was grammatically completed as seen in Table 3.

For instance, in Situation 11 below while P1 is giving directions, P2 cuts in to understand the general system. Other examples of this end can be found in Situations 7, 8, 10, 11, 30, 35 and 39 (see the appendix).

P1: ....bu inşaatın hemen yanındaki bina. Tamam? Or'daki binaya gidiyo'sunuz//
P2: Ben şimdi bi' yıl İngilizce hazırlık//
P1: Bi' yıl İngilizce hazırlık göreceksiniz sonra fakültenize dağıl'caksınız

4.4.3 To Change the Topic: As seen in Table 11 and the quotation from Situation 18 below, only one female participant interrupted another in an informal setting/scene to change the topic acknowledging the transition-relevant point.

P1: Zamanında olması gerekiyo' ve evlilikle sonuçlanması gerekiyo//'

P2: Bi' de en çok düşündüğüm konu ben bur'da babamın parasıyla okuyorum di'il mi? Onun istemediği bi' şeyi onun parasını yiye yiye yapamam ben...

4.4.4 To Support the Speaker: Table 10 presents that the participants in the study interrupted only the speakers of the same sex with the aim of supporting them. Nevertheless, as can be seen in Tables 14 and 16, females' use (14.8 %) of this end outnumbered men's (7.6 %). In addition, like the previous end this one was also used only in informal situations. Besides, as seen in Table 3, transition-relevant points were most frequently acknowledged when interrupters pursued this aim (10 %).

A participant's interruption can support the speaker by means of a joke as in Situation 12, agreement as in Situations 15 (quoted below) and 16 (see the appendix) or an echo as in Situation 28 (see the appendix).

P1: Ya işte bak bu bende çok var biliyo' musun? İşte ben bi' karşımdaki insana ısınmayım bitti yani ben sana söylerim ya hep ya ama işte//
P2: Evet negatif elektrik alıyo' insan bazen o kişiyi bi' de (?)

         P1: Ama hep doğru çıkar benim ön yargılarım

4.4.5 To End the Current Speaker's Turn: Even though this end seems quite similar to interrupting to start one's turn, they are in fact different in terms of intention. When cutting in to start his/her turn, a participant intends to express something immediately as it might be too late if the current speaker starts to talk about something else. However, when an interrupter aims to end the current speaker's turn, s/he intends to "stop" the speaker since s/he may find what he wants to say more important than what is being said as in Situation 4 (see the appendix), foresee what the speaker is going to say and find it unnecessary as in Situations 9 (see the appendix) and 21 (quoted below) or wish to bring a discussion to an end as in Situation 13 (see the appendix). Overall, for an interrupter aiming to start his/her turn it is not important whether the current speaker continues from the point s/he was interrupted; on the other hand, an interrupter aiming to end a turn does not want this as his/her intention is to stop the speaker.

Table 10 indicates that this was the only end that male interrupters (7.5 %) pursued more frequently than females (2.5 %). Moreover, the female interrupter pursued this end in an informal single-sex situation while the male participants did this in a formal mixed-sex situation. Furthermore, Table 3 reveals that when interrupters aimed to end a turn they tended to disregard transition-relevant points.

For example, in Situation 21 below P2 foresees what she is going to say and stops her because it will be irrelevant.

P1: Ya vardı o zaman birikim vardı sende//
P2: Yo hocam ben meslek lisesi mezunuyum zaten

4.4.6 To Complete What the Speaker is Saying: In the study, only one male and one female participant interrupted the current speakers to complete what they were saying. Not only the female but also the male interrupter disregarded transition-relevant points as seen in Table 3. Whereas the female interrupter pursued this end in a single-sex formal situation, the male did so in a mixed-sex informal situation. The reason why participants aimed to complete what the speaker was saying may be foreseeing the rest of the utterance and wishing to help the speaker with her hesitation as in Situation 6 (see the appendix) or to compare his prediction with the utterance before the speaker produces it as in Situation 37 (see the appendix).

4.4.7 To Correct a Misunderstanding: This end was used by only one female participant to interrupt another in an informal setting/scene acknowledging the transition-relevant point as seen in Table 3. As in Situation 17 (see the appendix), realizing a misunderstanding in the current speaker's utterance, a participant can interrupt him/her to correct it.

4.4.8 To Express Disagreement with the Current Speaker: In the study, two female participants interrupted two male speakers to express their disagreement acknowledging transition-relevant points as seen in Table 3. One of these interruptions took place in an informal setting/scene (see Situation 27 in the appendix) and the other in a formal setting/scene (see Situation 32 in the appendix).

4.4.9 To Give More Information: Like most of the other ends examined in Table 10, this one was also used more often by female participants (10 %) than by males (2.5 %). While the male participant cut in to give more information in a formal mixed-sex setting/scene as in Situation 20 (see the appendix), females did so in both single-sex (see Situation 3 in the appendix) and mixed-sex informal situations (see Situations 25 and 38 in the appendix), and only in mixed-sex formal situations (see Situation 33 below). The interrupters tended to disregard transition-relevant points as seen in Table 3.

P1: Yani aslında çalışsan geçersin sen çünkü yıl içi ortalaman yüksekmiş senin//
P2: Bi' de hocam bu benim ikinci hazırlığım

4.5 Interruptions in Terms of Gender

As one of the main factors in the study, both types of gender are examined in terms of setting/scene and ends of the interrupters.

4.5.1 Male Interrupters

Male participants in the study revealed various results in their interruptions in different setting/scene, when they talked to members of the same or opposite sex, and when they pursued different ends.

Table 13
Interruptions of Males

Interrupted speaker	Setting/Scene				Total	
	Informal		Formal			
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Female	2	15.3	9	69.2	**11**	**84.6**
Male	2	15.3	-	-	**2**	**15.3**
Total	**4**	**30.7**	**9**	**69.2**	**13**	**100**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations.

Table 13 examines interruptions of males in terms of gender of the interrupted speaker and types of setting/scene. They interrupted both male and female speakers equally (15.3 %) in informal situations but only females in formal ones, which means that females (84.6 %) were more often interrupted. Nevertheless, males' interruptions in formal situations (69.2 %) outnumbered those in informal ones (30.7 %).

Table 14

Ends of Male Interrupters

	Interrupted speaker								Total	
	Male				Female					
	Informal		Formal		Informal		Formal			
Ends	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**f**	**%**
To start his turn	1	7.6	-	-	1	7.6	2	15.3	**4**	**30.7**
To require clarification	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	23	**3**	**23**
To change the topic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
To support the speaker	1	7.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	**7.6**
To end the current speaker's turn	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	23	**3**	**23**
To complete what the speaker is saying	-	-	-	-	1	7.6	-	-	**1**	**7.6**
To correct a misunderstanding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**
To express disagreement with the current speaker	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**	**-**

To give more information	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7.6	**1**	**7.6**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations.

Besides, the most frequently used end by male interrupters was to start their turns (30.7 %), which was observed in only informal single-sex but both formal and informal mixed-sex situations; however, as Table 14 indicates to correct a misunderstanding, change the topic or express disagreement with the current speaker were never pursued by male interrupters. In terms of setting/scene, they pursued to complete what the speaker was saying and support the speaker only in informal situations, and to end the current speaker's turn, require clarification and give more information only in formal situations. Furthermore, they aimed to start their turns in not only informal but also formal situations. In terms of gender of the interrupted speaker, only when they interrupted females theyed aim to require clarification, to end the current speaker's turn, to complete what the speaker was saying, and to give more information and only when they interrupted males they aimed to support the speaker. Moreover, they aimed to start their turns in their conversations with not only females but also males.

In informal situations, the male participants in the study interrupted men and women equally (15.3 % for both) with comparable ends.

They aimed to complete what the speaker was saying and to start their turns when they interrupted female speakers. In Situation 37 below, the interrupter guesses the rest of the current speaker's expression and wants to complete it immediately in case his guess is not the same as what she is going to say.

P1: İngilizce yönünden kendini hiç geliştirmek istemiyo'sun yani
P2: İstemiyorum çünkü//
P1: Lâzım olmaz
P2: (?) bana lâzım olacağını zannetmiyorum

In Situation 40, the interrupter rushes to start his turn to give his opinion about what the current speaker has just said because she is beginning to mention something else.

P3: Basitti (?)

P2: Hiç de basit değildi ⌐ 'writing'den de//
　　　　　　　　P1:⌊Çalışmayana basit olmaz tabiî ki insan çalışmayınca her şey
zor

As seen in Table 14, the male participants in the study interrupted male speakers with similar ends. First, in Situation 19, quoted below, the interrupter's end is to start his turn, which originates from envisaging the rest of the current speaker's question. P1 foresees that P2 is going to ask about his own guess as to the topic of the thesis and answers without letting him bother to find a way to express that.

P1: Hocanın tezi varmış da
P2: Tez mi? Ne tezi?
P1: Profesör ol'cakmış!
P2: Şey mi yapmış .. konusu//
P1: (?) konuşmaları istiyo' .. kaydedip onlar hakkında yazı yazıcak

Second, the interrupter in Situation 22 aims to support the speaker by adding something P2 should mention.

P2: Ya meselâ kelime konusunda hani kelimenin yanına anlamı altına da kendi bi' cümle kur'cak örnek kelimeleri öğrenebilirsin (?)//
P3: Bi' de günlük tekrar var

As for formal situations, even though there were various communicative situations in the study that enabled male-male communication, the male participants interrupted only female speakers aiming to start their turns, to end the current speaker's turn, to require clarification or more information and to give more information. In the following example quoted from Situation 5, P2 interrupts to start his turn as he is trying to attract the teacher's attention immediately. Similarly, in Situation 23 (see the appendix) the interrupter rushes to start his turn because of predicting the rest of the speaker's question.

P1: (to P3) Hayatın önemi dediğinde yani… hayatın önemi dediğin zaman hayatı alıp önemsizdir, biraz önemlidir, önemlidir gibi//

P2: Hocam sonuç cümlemi yazdım.

P1: Ona biraz sonra bakayım, şimdi//

P2: Hocam onunla alâkalı.

In Situations 4, 9 and 21 the interrupter aims to end the current speaker's turn since he values what he wants to say more than what is being said. For instance in Situation 4, the male participant finds his explanation essential and so reacts to being interrupted by interrupting.

P1: Bu, bunların içinde geçer diye düşündüm yani mesela//

P2: Şimdi bak//

P1: tuttuğunu koparmak ve güçlü olmak zeki olmak dikkatli olmanın (?) diye düşündüm

As the listener needs more information or clarification than the current speaker provides, he interrupts her in Situations 8, 10 and 11. In the following example quoted from Situation 10, the interrupter does not know the place the speaker is talking about and cuts in to get the directions.

P1: Sınav giriş kartınızı alıyo'sunuz ve ayın on dördünde zaten kâğıtta yazıyo' dokuz buçukta Yabancı Diller binasında//

P2: Yabancı diller binası (?) mühendisliğin ilerisi mi?

Finally, in Situation 20 the interrupter intends to give the current speaker further information about what is happening.

P1: Masaya koydun mu yani?

P2: Bıraktım.

P1: Tamam (?) Tamam. 'İndirdim' diyince ben de şey//

P3: O da benim gibi ben söyleyemediğim kelimeler yerine uyduruyorum

4.5.2 Female Interrupters

Being the frequent interrupters in the study as can be seen in Table 9, the female participants interrupted both male and female speakers in both types of situations as

indicated in Table 15. To begin with, their interruptions in informal situations (77.7 %) outnumbered those in formal (22.2 %). In addition, whereas the female participants interrupted both men and women equally in formal situations (11.1 %), they interrupted men more often (40.7 % vs. 3 %) in informal situations, which reveals that men (51.8 %) were more frequently interrupted by female participants than women (48.1 %) were.

Table 15

Interruptions of Females

| Interrupted speaker | Setting/Scene | | | | Total | |
| | Informal | | Formal | | | |
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Female	10	37	3	11.1	**13**	**48.1**
Male	11	40.7	3	11.1	**14**	**51.8**
Total	**21**	**77.7**	**6**	**22.2**	**27**	**100**

As seen in Table 16, all the ends observed in the study were used by female interrupters and "to start their turns," which they used in all kinds of conversations but seemed to prefer in mixed-sex informal situations (22.2 %), was the most frequent one (33.3 %). In terms of setting/scene, they aimed to complete what the speaker was saying only in formal setting/scene but pursued the other aims in both. As for gender of the interrupted speakers, only in single-sex conversations did they aim to change the topic, to support the speaker, to end the current speaker's turn, to complete what the speaker was saying and to correct a misunderstanding, and only in mixed-sex conversations did they wish to express disagreement with the current speaker. They intended to start their turns, to require clarification and to give more information in both types of conversations.

In informal situations, they interrupted females aiming to start their own turns, to end the current speaker's turn, to change the topic, to give more information, to correct a misunderstanding or to support the speaker.

The female participants in Situations 2 and 14 (see the appendix) interrupt the current speakers in order to start their turns. In Situation 2 below, since P2 is in a hurry she interrupts the speaker to give the people there a belated greeting.

P1: (knocks the door and comes in) Ay çok özür dilerim ⌐geç kaldım.

P2: Yok rica ederiz biz yani//

P1: (to the others in the office)Selâm!

Table 16
Ends of Female Interrupters

	Interrupted speaker									
	Male				Female					
	Informal		Formal		Informal		Formal		**Total**	
Ends	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	**f**	**%**
To start her turn	5	18.5	1	3.7	2	7.4	1	3.7	**9**	**33.3**
To require clarification	3	11.1	-	-	-	-	1	3.7	**4**	**14.8**
To change the topic	-	-	-	-	1	3.7	-	-	**1**	**3.7**
To support the speaker	-	-	-	-	4	14.8	-	-	**4**	**14.8**
To end the current speaker's turn	-	-	-	-	1	3.7	-	-	**1**	**3.7**
To complete what the speaker is saying	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.7	**1**	**3.7**
To correct a misunderstanding	-	-	-	-	1	3.7	-	-	**1**	**3.7**
To express disagreement with the current speaker	1	3.7	1	3.7	-	-	-	-	**2**	**7.4**

To give more information	2	7.4	1	3.7	1	3.7	-	-	**4**	**14.8**

Note. Dashes indicate there were no observations.

In Situation 13, the interrupter wants to end the current speaker's turn, as she wants to end their discussion.

P2: E beş kızla yani ne faaliyeti olabilir ki?
P1: Ya Yahyalı'ya nasıl gidiyoruz ya?
P2: Ama Yahyalı'ya biz her zaman kendimiz//
P1: İyi canım sınıftakilere bi' söyle konuş kabul ederlerse ben varım yani

As mentioned previously, the female participant interrupts the current speaker to change the topic in Situation 18.

P1: Zamanında olması gerekiyo' ve evlilikle sonuçlanması gerekiyo//'
P2: Bi' de en çok düşündüğüm konu ben bur'da babamın parasıyla okuyorum di'il mi? Onun istemediği bi' şeyi onun parasını yiye yiye yapamam ben.

The interrupter's end in Situation 3 is to give more information about what the current speaker is talking.

P2: Kimi kullanıcaksın meselâ? Büyük ihtimalle şey... aa... anket sonucu mesela beni gösteriyo'sa//
P1: Yapıca'm zaten anketi vermeye ben kendim gelice'm.
P2: Ha, yani o zaman bana göre hazırlanırsın.

In Situation 17, the participant cuts in so that she has a chance to correct the speaker's misunderstanding.

P1: Ya hem mantık ol'cak ama arada sevgi ol'cak yani düz sadece kuru kuruya mantık işte şu böyle değil yani//

P2: Hayır mantık derken şöyle benim burcumun da özelliğini çok taşıyorum merak ettiğim insanı seviyorum merak ettiğim insana âşık oluyorum

A female interrupter's end can also be to support the current speaker by making a joke as in Situation 12, agreeing as in Situations 15 and 16 or repeating what was said as in Situation 28 below.

P4: Mola yerinden aldıydık iyi çıktı yani//
P2: Bi' de mola yerinden ha!

When women interrupt a male speaker in an informal setting/scene, they can have some ends the same as the ones they had when they interrupted a female in an informal setting/scene like to start her turn or to give more information. They can also aim to express disagreement with the current speaker or to require clarification or more information.

In Situations 1, 26, 29, 31 and 36, the participants interrupt in order to start their turns. For instance in Situation 36 quoted below, the interrupter rushes to start her turn because it will be too late to ask about sugar when he finishes his turn.

P1 : Tabii ki .. Sonra//
P2 : (?) kaç şekerli içiyo'sun?
P1: Fark etmez o zaman beş dört şeker alıyım yeter sonra...

In Situations 25 and 38, the interrupters aim to give the speaker more information about the topic they are talking. For instance, in Situation 25 P2 realizes that P1 needs clarification and interrupts him to tell more.

P1: Tamam.
P2: Tamam mı? Ondan sonra//
       P1: Kız o şeyde kaldı kadında//
P2: Ama o aynı kadın bu kadın oğlunu adam almış kızı da bunda kalıyo'muş

The end of the interrupters, which is akin to the one above, in Situations 30, 35 and 39 is to get further information or clarification about what the speaker is saying. The

following example taken from Situation 35 illustrates how a participant stops the speaker to get details.

P1: İngilizce'de her'alde biraz eksiğim oldu ondandır yani bu sene öyleydi normalde iki sene hazırlık okudum ama//

P2: Yeteri kadar çalışmıyo' musun ondan kaynaklanabilir mi?

As in Situation 27 quoted below, a female participant can also interrupt the speaker to express her disagreement.

P3: Olur mu canım girsin KPSS'ye (?)//

P2: Hayır o zaman kurumlar arası geçiş olur zaten gerek kalmaz

Since the female participants interrupted less frequently in formal situations, their ends are not as various as they are in informal ones.

 When a female participant interrupts another in a formal setting/scene, her end can be to start her turn, to complete what the speaker is saying or to require more information.

As mentioned previously, the interrupter in Situation 24 immediately starts her turn to keep the speaker from asking an irrelevant question.

Situation 6 below is an example of an interruption resulting from an aim to complete what the speaker is saying. P2 foresees what the speaker is trying to ask and completes it.

P1: Piknikte mi konuşuyorsunuz .. gelecek hakkında yoksa//

P2: Bir araya geldiğimizde.

P1: Ha bir araya geldiğinizde. Peki .. daha doğrusu şey .. Her hafta sonu olan şey, pikniğe gitmeniz mi, plan .. geleceğe yönelik plan yapmanız mı, yoksa ikisi de mi her hafta sonu oluyor?

The interrupter in Situation 7 below cuts in because she needs more information about the general system before getting some about the exams.

P1: İki tane sınav var, bi' tanesi muafiyet sınavı hazırlığı atlama sınavı eğer (?)//

P2: Yok atlamak istemiyorum hazırlığı da. Atlamasam olur mu?

Aiming to start her turn or to express disagreement with the current speaker, a woman can interrupt a male speaker in a formal setting/scene. In Situation 34 below, the participant interrupts the speaker so that she can add her opinion about the topic immediately.

P1: Valla şimdi bunlar önceden basıldığı için kurları yazmica'z ama bu sertifikalar bittikten sonra kurları da belirten bi' sertifika zaten düşünüyoruz bunlar yani//
P2: Çünkü C D kurunda hepsinin ortalaması doksan B'ler zavallılar bizler yani altmışta

Finally, Situation 32 quoted below is an example of how a female participant dares to interrupt a male speaker to express disagreement with him.

P1: Dikkatsizliğimiz sonucu biz şampiyonluğu size verdik ciddi söylüyorum yoksa sizin şampiyon olmanız mümkün değil biz size (?) fark atardık yani ve sizi tüm dönemin maçlarını aldık biz//
P2: İyi de hocam futbol sadece yani kaliteli futbolcuları içeren bi'şey değil ki dikkat her şeye yani gerekiyo' demek ki biz dikkatliyiz biz olduk

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Summary

In order to discover and compare male and female interrupters' ends during conversations in Turkish this study focused on such components of communication as setting/scene, acknowledging or disregarding transition-relevant points, and interrupted speaker's gender. The study involved seven research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between genders of the participants and the interrupter's end?
2. Does setting/scene influence the interrupter's end?
3. Does setting/scene influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?
4. Do genders of the participants influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?
5. Does the interrupter's end influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?
6. Is there a relationship between setting/scene and genders of the participants?
7. Is there a relationship between the gender of the interrupter and the gender of the interrupted speaker?

In order to answer these questions the data of interruptions collected by tape-recording naturally occurring conversations in daily life were transcribed. First, they were inspected for grammatically transition-relevant points. Both interruptions in accordance with transition-relevant points and those disregarding them were investigated in terms of setting, gender, and ends. Then, interruptions in formal and informal setting/scene were examined in terms of gender and ends. Next, the interruptions were inspected for

the ends that the participants in the study employed, and the effects of setting/scene and gender were examined. Finally, interruptions of male and female participants were examined in terms of setting/scene and ends. The results, presented in relation to the research questions in the following section, were in percentages and, thus, they were compared descriptively.

5.2 Discussion of the Research Questions

This study examined interruptions in Turkish focusing on transition-relevant points, setting/scene, gender, and ends depending on seven research questions.

1. Is there a relationship between genders of the participants and the interrupter's end?

The interrupters in the study pursued nine aims: to start his/her turn, require clarification, change the topic, support the speaker, end the current speaker's turn, complete what the speaker is saying, correct a misunderstanding, express disagreement with the current speaker, and give more information. Examination of their ends reveals that "to start his/her turn" is the most frequent one in both types of sex followed by "to require clarification" and "to end the current speaker's turn" for male interrupters and "to require clarification", "to support the speaker" and "to give more information" for females.

The nine ends in the study were also mentioned in literature. Some interrupters aimed to gain the floor by ending the current speaker's turn or starting their turns like the university students in Beattie (1983, cited in Graddol & Swann, 1989). In addition, some cut in to support the current speaker as (Aries, 1996) mentioned. Some aimed to request clarification, to correct what the current speaker has said or a misunderstanding or to disagree with him/her as Wardhaugh (1985) suggested. Moreover, some wanted to give more information as Tannen (1984) discovered in her conversations with her friends, and the others tried to complete the current speaker's statement or to change the topic because of valuing his/her own topic more than the current one as Pschaid (1993) found out in his study on language in the office. Nevertheless, none aimed to prevent interaction from becoming too personal and to create impersonality as McElhinny (1998) discovered in conversations of police officers.

As for the ends of the interrupters, some results are similar to those suggested in the literature. To be more specific, as Li et al. (2004) found out females' interruptions were aimed to be cooperative seeking to show support and interest rather than to grab the floor while males aimed to gain the floor by ending the current speakers' turn or starting their own turns as stated by Coates (1986). On the other hand, examination of the ends revealed some results that differ from the literature. Female interrupters did not only pursue the stated aims but also interrupted to start their own turns and it was these participants who pursued this aim most frequently. Similarly, male participants interrupted to require clarification as often as they did to end the current speakers' turn or start their own turns. To conclude, such differences could be results of their respective approaches to communication, which is also implied by frequency of interruptions to require clarification by both sexes.

2. Does setting/scene influence the interrupter's end?

The most frequently used aims were "to start his/her turn" and "to support the speaker" in informal setting/scene; the latter is parallel to what Aries (1996) put forward as interruptions informal conversations aiming to show agreement. Moreover, in formal situations "to start his/her turn" and "to require clarification" were the most common ends. Females interrupted often in informal "to start their turns" and "to support the speaker," and in formal "to start their turns", "to require clarification", "to complete what the speaker was saying", "to express disagreement with the current speaker," and "to give more information." For males, such aims as "to start their turns", "to support the speaker" and "to complete what the speaker was saying" were common in informal conversations. In addition, the common aims in formal situations were "to start their turns", "to end the current speaker's turn" and "to require clarification," the first two of which are similar to the result presented by Li et al. (2004) as male physicians interrupting more intrusively than cooperatively. These results lead to the conclusion that while the general aim in interruptions is maintaining communication in informal situations (especially for females), it is providing and getting information in formal ones. Unfortunately, there are not enough studies in literature that investigated interruptions in both formal and informal conversations in terms of ends.

3. Does setting/scene influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?

The study indicated that in general and in both formal and informal situations, most of the interrupters disregarded the grammatically transition-relevant points in the current speaker's utterance. The examination of transition-relevant points in terms of gender shows that both male and female participants ignored such points. To mention the ends, these points were acknowledged most when the current speakers were interrupted to be supported and disregarded most when the interrupters aimed to start their own turns. Unfortunately, there are no related results in literature since none of the studies compares interruptions in formal conversations with those in informal ones or inspects for transition-relevant points in different settings.

4. Do genders of the participants influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?

Frequent disregard of grammatically transition-relevant points by male interrupters is in parallel to the result revealed by West and Zimmerman in 1975, mentioned in their study in 1998 as men interrupting women more often at points much nearer the beginning of their partner's turn, and to the fact that females follow rules for turn-taking more carefully than males do as stated by Corson (1997).

5. Does the interrupter's end influence acknowledgement or disregard of transition-relevant points in interruptions?

Interrupters acknowledged transition-relevant points most when they aimed to support the current speakers and disregarded them most when they aimed to start their own turns. When they aimed to change the topic, to support the speaker, to correct a misunderstanding, or to express disagreement they preferred to wait for the current speaker's turn to finish. However, when they wanted to start their turns, to require clarification, to end the current speaker's turn, to complete what the speaker is saying, or to give more information they tended to disregard transition-relevant points.

6. Is there a relationship between setting/scene and genders of the participants?

More interruptions were observed in informal than in formal setting/scene under all conditions except in formal male-female situations. The most frequent interruptions in the study occurred in informal female-male situations. In informal situations, women were the frequent interrupters and the opposite sex was the commonly interrupted participant. In formal situations, it was just the opposite; that is, women were interrupted more while men were the frequent interrupters. To conclude, interruptions were common in informal mixed-sex situations. The fact that male participants interrupted females more frequently in formal situations in the study is similar to the result reported by West (1998) when he examined physician-patient encounters.

7. Is there a relationship between the gender of the interrupter and the gender of the interrupted speaker?

As indicated by West (1998) when he investigated physician-patient encounters and West and Zimmerman (1998) when they examined parent-child interaction, in mixed-sex situations there were more interruptions than in single-sex situations, especially by male participants. Nonetheless, the fact that females were the frequent interrupters in the study disagrees with the results reported by Kendall and Tannen (1997) in their study on gender and language in the office, Abu-Haidar (1995) in her study on children, West (1998) in her study on physician-patient encounters, West & Zimmerman (1998) in their study on parent-child interaction, Li et al. (2004) in their study on physician-patient encounters. On the other hand, in this study women were more often interrupted than men were, which was also mentioned by Corson (1997) in his study on boys and girls and by West (1998) in her study on physician-patient encounters.

5.3 Conclusion

To speak generally, the female participants in the study interrupted and were interrupted the most whereas the males interrupted females more often than they were interrupted even in formal situations and usually ignored the transition-relevant points. Nevertheless, the study also shows that setting/scene and ends of the interrupters are as important as gender in interruptions. To conclude, an analysis of interruptions should depend on not only their statistical results but also components of communicative

events. My personal view is that it is not the (gender or) frequency that is important in interruptions but aim as it is revealed by women's frequent but "supportive" interruptions, therefore they should not be regarded negatively.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

Since the kind of relationship between the participants, their psychological and socio-economic status, levels of self-esteem and power, and the topic of conversation are the limitations of the present study, these variables can be considered in further research. Such aims as "support the speaker", "require clarification", "to correct a misunderstanding", "to give more information" are considered to be cooperative, and such aims as "to start his/her turn," "change the topic," "to end the current speaker's turn," "to complete what the speaker is saying," and "to express disagreement with the current speaker" are considered to be intrusive. Nonetheless, the interrupted speaker might not react positively to all cooperative interruptions and negatively to all intrusive ones. Hence, reactions to interruptions might also be of interest in further research: What is the aim of the interrupter and what kind of reaction does s/he get to this interruption?

REFERENCES

Abu-Haidar, F.; "Dominance and Communicative Incompetence : The Speech Habits of a Group of 8-11 Year-Old Boys in a Lebanese Rural Community". In S.Mills (Ed.), Language and Gender: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Longman, Essex 1995, pp. 181-193.

Aries, E.; Men and Women in Interaction: Reconsidering the Differences. Oxford University Press, New York 1996.

Biber, D.; "An Analytical Framework for Register Studies". In D. Biber & E. Finegan (Eds.), Sociolinguistic perspectives on register, Oxford University Press, New York 1994, pp. 31-56.

Coates, J.; Women, Men, and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language, Longman, London 1986.

Coates, J.; "Language, Gender and Career". In S. Mills (Ed.), Language and Gender : Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Longman, Essex 1995, pp. 13-30.

Coates, J.; Women Talk : Conversation between Women Friends, Blackwell, Oxford 1996.

Corson, D.; "Gender, Discourse and Senior Education : Ligatures for Girls, Options for Boys?" In. R. Wodak (Ed.), Gender and Discourse, Sage, London 1997, pp. 140-164.

De Francisco , V. L.; "The Sounds of Silence : How Men Silence Women in Marital Relations". In J. Coates (Ed.), Language and Gender : A Reader, Blackwell, Oxford 1998, pp. 176-184.

Dimitracopoulou, I.; Conversational Competence and Social Development, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990.

Duranti, A.; Linguistic Anthropology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997.

Ecevit, Y.; "Shop Floor Control: The Ideological Construction of Turkish Women Factory Workers". In N. Redclift & M. T. Sinclair (Eds.), Working Women:

International Perspectives on Labour and Gender Ideology, Routledge, London 1991, pp. 56-78.

Edmondson, W.; Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis, Longman, London 1981.

Garfinkel, H.; "Remarks on Ethnomethodology". In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1986, pp. 301-325.

Gleason, J. B.; "Sex Differences in Parent – Child Interaction". In S.U. Philips, S. Steele, C. Tanz (Eds.), Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987, pp. 189-199.

Goddard, C.; A. Wierzbicka; "Discourse and Culture". In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), Discourse as Social Interaction: Vol. 2, Sage, London 1997, pp. 231-257.

Goodwin, M. H.; "Cooperation and Competition across Girls' Play Activities". In J. Coates (Ed.), Language and Gender: A Reader, Blackwell, Oxford 1998, pp. 121-146.

Graddol, D.; J. Swann; Gender Voices, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1989.

Hymes, D.; "Toward Ethnographies of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events". In P. Giglioli (Ed.), Language and Social Context, Penguin Books, Middlesex 1972, pp. 21-44.

Hymes, D.; Foundations in Sociolinguistics : An Ethnographic Approach, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 1974.

Kanso, A.; A. K. Sinno; W. Adams; "Cross-Cultural Public Relations: Implications for American and Arab Public Relations Practitioners", Competitiveness Review, Vol. 11, Issue 1, 2001, pp. 65-82.

Kelly, E. M.; "Speech Rates and Turn-Taking Behaviours of Children Who Stutter and Their Fathers", Journal of Speech & Hearing Research, Vol. 37, Issue 6, 1994, pp. 1284 – 1295.

Kendall, S.; D. Tannen; "Gender and Language in the Workplace". In R. Wodak (Ed.), Gender and Discourse, Sage, London 1997, pp. 81-105.

Kendon A.; Conducting Interaction: Patterns of Behavior in Focused Encounters, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990.

Li, H. Z.; M. Krysko; N. G. Desroches et al; "Reconceptualizing interruptions in physician-patient interviews: Cooperative and intrusive", Communication and Medicine, Vol. 1, Issue 2, 2004, pp. 145-157.

Lindroos, M.; "The Production of 'Girl' in an Educational Setting", Gender & Education, Vol. 7, Issue 2, 1995, pp. 143-456.

Maltz, D. N.; R. A. Borker; "A Cultural Approach to Male-Female Miscommunication". In. J. Coates (Ed.), Language and Gender: A Reader, Blackwell, Oxford 1998, pp. 417 – 434.

McCarthy, M.; Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

McElhinny, B. S.; " 'I don't Smile Much Anymore': Affect, Gender, and the Discourse of Pittsburgh Police Officers". In J. Coates (Ed.), Language and Gender: A Reader, Blackwell, Oxford 1998, pp. 309-327.

Montgomery, M.; An Introduction to Language and Society, Routledge, London 1995.

Murray, S. O.; American Sociolinguistics: Theorists and Theory Groups, John Benjamins, Amsterdam 1998.

Payne, K.; H. E. Fuqua, Jr.; J. Cangemi; "Gendered Differences in Language and Aggressive/Argumentative Communication". In K. E. Payne (Ed.), Different but Equal: Communication between the Sexes, Praeger, London 2001, pp. 115-130.

Pschaid, P.; Language and Power in the Office, Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, Tübingen 1993.

Richards, J. C.; J. Platt; H. Platt; Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (2nd ed.), Longman, Essex 1992.

Saville–Troike, M.; The Ethnography of Communication : An Introduction, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 2003.

Schegloff, E. A.; "On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversation". In M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1984, pp. 28-52.

Schiffrin, D.; Approaches to Discourse, Blackwell, Massachusetts 1994.

Sen, M.; Speech Accommodation and Interactional Power Differences between Females and Males in Same and Cross-Gender Conversational Dyads: A Social Psychological Approach, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey 1997.

Spender, D.; Man Made Language, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1980.

Shi, X.; The Dancing of Language and Power: A Case Study of a Live Television Interview, Conference Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of International Communication Association, New York 2005.

Spolsky, B.; Sociolinguistics, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1998.

Stubbs, M.; Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1983.

Tannen, D.; Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends, Ablex, Norwood 1984.

Tanz, C.; "Introduction". In. S.U. Philips, S. Steele, C. Tanz (Eds.), Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1987, pp. 163-177.

Turjoman, M. O.; Saudi Gender Differences in Greetings and Leave-Takings, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana 2005.

Wardhaugh, R.; How Conversation Works, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1985.

Wardhaugh, R.; An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1986.

West, C.; "When The Doctor is A 'Lady': Power, Status and Gender in Physician-Patient Encounters. In J. Coates (Ed.), Language and Gender: A Reader, Blackwell, Oxford 1998, pp. 396-412.

West, C.; D. H. Zimmerman; "Women's Place in Everyday Talk: Reflections on Parent-Child Interaction". In J. Coates (Ed.), Language and Gender : A Reader, Blackwell, Oxford 1998, pp. 165-175.

Wolfson, N.; Perspectives : Sociolinguistics and TESOL, Heinle & Heinle, Boston 1989.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIBED SITUATIONS

Situation 1: This situation is an informal family gathering in the living room of a flat involving P1 (elder brother, sitting), P2 (sister, graduate student, standing and videotaping the event) and other relatives (sitting around). P2's aim in interrupting is to start her turn.

P1: 'Zoom'lamayı biraz //

P2: Dur dur dur dur dur… İçme sakın içme!

P1: 'Zoom'lamayı biraz geri al da ⌐çıkalım.

            P2: İç iç, tamam iç! İç!

The following informal situations involve P1 (female graduate student), P2 (female friend) and two other female friends (not as close as P2) in an office during lunch break.

Situation 2: P1's aim is to start her turn.

P1: (knocks the door and comes in) Ay çok özür dilerim⌐geç kaldım.

                P2: Yok rica ederiz biz yani//

P1: (to the others in the office)Selâm!

P2: …kayıt yapıyo'san durdurmayayım diye.

Situation 3: P1 cuts in to give more information.

P2: Kimi kullanıcaksın meselâ? Büyük ihtimalle şey... aa... anket sonucu mesela beni gösteriyo'sa//

P1: Yapıca'm zaten anketi vermeye ben kendim gelice'm.

P2: Ha, yani o zaman bana göre hazırlanırsın.

The following are formal teacher-student dialogues involving a female teacher and different university students during a writing lesson. There are also other students in the class.

Situation 4: P1 is a male student, who interrupts P2 (female teacher) to end her turn.

P1: Bu, bunların içinde geçer diye düşündüm yani mesela //
P2: Şimdi bak //
P1: tuttuğunu koparmak ve güçlü olmak zeki olmak dikkatli olmanın (?) diye düşündüm

Situation 5: P2 (a male student) interrupts P1 (a female teacher) while she is talking to P3 (a male student) to start his turn.

P1: (to P3) Hayatın önemi dediğinde yani… hayatın önemi dediğin zaman hayatı alıp önemsizdir, biraz önemlidir, önemlidir gibi //
P2: Hocam sonuç cümlemi yazdım.
P1: Ona biraz sonra bakayım, şimdi//
P2: Hocam onunla alâkalı.

Situation 6: P1 is the female teacher interrupted by P2 (female student) to complete what she is saying.

P1: Piknikte mi konuşuyorsunuz .. gelecek hakkında yoksa //
P2: Bir araya geldiğimizde.
P1: Ha bir araya geldiğinizde. Peki .. daha doğrusu şey .. Her hafta sonu olan şey, pikniğe gitmeniz mi, plan .. geleceğe yönelik plan yapmanız mı, yoksa ikisi de mi her hafta sonu oluyor?

The following formal situations involve female teachers giving information and different freshmen all of whom meet each other for the first time in a cultural center during enrolment.

Situation 7: P1 is a female teacher and P2 is a female student, whose aim is to require clarification.

P1: İki tane sınav var, bi' tanesi muafiyet sınavı hazırlığı atlama sınavı eğer (?) //
P2: Yok atlamak istemiyorum hazırlığı da. Atlamasam olur mu?

Situation 8: P1 is a female teacher and P2 is a male student, who aims to require more information.

P1: O zaman bur'daki kayıt işlemlerini bitirdikten sonra Yabancı Diller binasına gidiyo'sunuz, or'da yapıyo'sunuz kayıtla ilgili başvuruyu ve //
P2: Şey, on milyon lira para yatırdım ben.
P1: Tamam, o dekontu oraya götürüyo'sunuz.

Situation 9: P1 is a female teacher and P2 is a male student, who interrupts to end P1's turn.

P1: Yani şimdi şöyle muafiyet sınavına .. eğer girip de ben hazırlık sınavını geçerim //
P2: Bur'da hazırlık okumak istiyorum.

Situation 10: P1 is a female teacher and P2 is a male student, whose aim is to require more information.

P1: Sınav giriş kartınızı alıyo'sunuz ve ayın on dördünde zaten kağıtta yazıyo' dokuz buçukta Yabancı Diller binasında //
P2: Yabancı diller binası (?) mühendisliğin ilerisi mi?

Situation 11: P1 is a female teacher interrupted by P2 a male student to require clarification.

P1: ....bu inşaatın hemen yanındaki bina. Tamam? Or'daki binaya gidiyo'sunuz//
P2: Ben şimdi bi' yıl İngilizce hazırlık//
P1: Bi' yıl İngilizce hazırlık göreceksiniz sonra fakültenize dağıl'caksınız.....

The following informal situations involve two female university students in a room.

Situation 12: P2 interrupts P1 to support her.

P1: Ya valla işte okey oynayaca'z .. her zamanki yaptığımız gibi, gezeriz, piknik yaparız, voleybol oynarız işte (?) //

P2: Rabia'ya dikkat etmek lazım ⌈taş çalar o.

⌊P1: Evet!

Situation 13: The participants are discussing about organizing a social activity. Then P1 interrupts to end P2's turn.

P2: E beş kızla yani ne faaliyeti olabilir ki?

P1: Ya Yahyalı'ya nasıl gidiyoruz ya?

P2: Ama Yahyalı'ya biz her zaman kendimiz//

P1: İyi canım sınıftakilere bi' söyle konuş kabul ederlerse ben varım yani

Situation 14: P1 interrupts P2 to start her turn.

P2: Yani en samimi arkadaşın bile seni bi' çok konuda çekemezler ⌈o yüzden ben o

⌊P1: Yani

insana hiçbi' sırrımı vermem vermek istemem.

P1: Ya bi' de insanlar belli oluyo' hiç//

P2: Çünkü onu yeterince tanımıyorum sadece okulda görüşüyoruz.

Situation 15: P2 cuts in to support P1.

P1: Ya işte bak bu bende çok var biliyo' musun? İşte ben bi' karşımdaki insana ısınmayım bitti yani ben sana söylerim ya hep ya ama işte //

P2: Evet negatif elektrik alıyo' insan bazen o kişiyi bi' de ⌈(?)

⌊P1: Ama hep doğru çıkar

benim ön yargılarım

Situation 16: P2 interrupts P1 to support her.

P1: Kim kimi taşıyabilir ki dört yıl yani arada bi' bağ olmadan çünkü evlilikle böyle gezip tozmak başka şeyler//

P2: Bi' de evliliğe hiçbir şey kalmıyo' hiçbir heyecan kalmıyo

Situation 17: P2 cuts in to correct a misunderstanding.

P1: Ya hem mantık ol'cak ama arada sevgi ol'cak yani düz sadece kuru kuruya mantık işte şu böyle değil yani//

P2: Hayır mantık derken şöyle benim burcumun da özelliğini çok taşıyorum merak ettiğim insanı seviyorum merak ettiğim insana âşık oluyorum

Situation 18: P2 interrupts to change the topic.

P1: Zamanında olması gerekiyo' ve evlilikle sonuçlanması gerekiyo'//

P2: Bi' de en çok düşündüğüm konu ben bur'da babamın parasıyla okuyorum di'il mi? Onun istemediği bi' şeyi onun parasını yiye yiye yapamam ben.

Below are some informal situations involving two male university students in a room where there are also some other boys and girls.

Situation 19: P1 interrupts P2 to start his turn.

P1: Hocanın tezi varmış da

P2: Tez mi? Ne tezi?

P1: Profesör ol'cakmış!

P2: Şey mi yapmış .. konusu //

P1: (?) konuşmaları istiyo' .. kaydedip onlar hakkında yazı yazıcak

Below are some situations involving P1 (a female teacher), P2 and P3 (male university students) in an office.

Situation 20: P3 cuts in to give more information in a formal setting/scene.

P1: Masaya koydun mu yani?

P2: Bıraktım.

P1: Tamam (?) Tamam. 'İndirdim' diyince ben de şey//

P3: O da benim gibi ben söyleyemediğim kelimeler yerine uyduruyorum

Situation 21: P2 interrupts P1 to end her turn in a formal setting/scene.

P1: Ya vardı o zaman birikim vardı sende//

P2: Yo hocam ben meslek lisesi mezunuyum zaten

Situation 22: P3 interrupts P2 to support him in an informal setting/scene.

P2: Ya meselâ kelime konusunda hani kelimenin yanına anlamı altına da kendi bi' cümle kur'cak örnek kelimeleri öğrenebilirsin (?) //

P3: Bi' de günlük tekrar var

Situation 23: To start his turn P2 interrupts in a formal setting/scene.

P1: Sadece or'da mı çalışıyo' başka bi' okulda //

P2: Özel ders (?) zaten çok çalıştı da

Below is a formal situation involving P1 (a female teacher), P2 and P3 (female university students) in an office.

Situation 24: P2 cuts in to start her turn.

P1: N'apıyo'sunuz yazın peki? Dersler bitiyo' haftaya gitcek misiniz finalde //

P2: Benim ailem bur'da hocam

The following are informal family conversations including P1 (father), P2 (daughter, a graduate student), P3 (elder brother) and P4 (mother) in the living room at home.

Situation 25: P2 interrupts to give more information.

P1: Tamam.

P2: Tamam mı? ⌈Ondan sonra //

P1: Kız o şeyde kaldı kadında //

P2: Ama o aynı kadın bu kadın oğlunu adam almış kızı da bunda kalıyo'muş

Situation 26: P2 cuts in to start her turn.

P1: Şeylerimiz de efendime söyle'yim şişmiş (?) //

P2: İyice kilo almışsın de' mi baba? Ne olacak bu halin bilmiyo'm ki?

Situation 27: P2 interrupts P3 to express her disagreement with him.

P3: Olur mu canım girsin KPSS'ye (?) //

P2: Hayır o zaman kurumlar arası geçiş olur zaten gerek kalmaz

Situation 28: P2 cuts in to support P4.

P4: Mola yerinden aldıydık iyi çıktı yani //

P2: Bi' de mola yerinden ha!

Situation 29: P2's aim in her interruption is to start her turn.

P3: Benim bildiğim saatler çalıştıkça geri kalır bu da çalıştıkça ileri gidiyo' //

P2: (?) fazla geliyo'

Situation 30: P2 cuts in to require clarification.

P3: Ben de şeye gittiğimde öyle olduydu sınava gittiğimde en son beni aldılar içeri sinir oldum Ramazan zaten orucuk //

P2: Hangi neyin sınavı?

Situation 31: P2 aims to start her turn.

P3: Giren çıkmıyo' açlıktan öldük oturuyok kalıkıyok //

P2: Ay ne iğrenç bi' durum o ya üf bu da öyleydi

Below is a formal situation involving P1 (a male officer in his forties), P2 (a female university student), P3 (a male university student) in an office.

Situation 32: P2's aim is to express her disagreement with P1.

P1: Dikkatsizliğimiz sonucu biz şampiyonluğu size verdik ciddi söylüyorum yoksa sizin şampiyon olmanız mümkün değil biz size (?) fark atardık yani ve sizi tüm dönemin maçlarını aldık biz//

P2: İyi de hocam futbol sadece yani kaliteli futbolcuları içeren bi'şey değil ki dikkat her şeye yani gerekiyo' demek ki biz dikkatliyiz biz olduk

The following are formal situations involving P1 (a male officer in his forties), P2, P3 and P4 (female university students) in an office.

Situation 33: P2 cuts in to give more information.

P1: Yani aslında çalışsan geçersin sen çünkü yıl içi ortalaman yüksekmiş senin //

P2: Bi' de hocam bu benim ikinci hazırlığım

Situation 34: P2 interrupts aiming to start her turn.

P1: Valla şimdi bunlar önceden basıldığı için kurları yazmica'z ama bu sertifikalar bittikten sonra kurları da belirten bi' sertifika zaten düşünüyoruz bunlar yani //

P2: Çünkü C D kurunda hepsinin ortalaması doksan B'ler zavallılar bizler yani altmışta

Below are some informal situations involving P1 (a male university student) and P2 (a female university student) sitting in the school canteen.

Situation 35: P2's aim is to require more information.

P1: İngilizce'de her'alde biraz eksiğim oldu ondandır yani bu sene öyleydi normalde iki sene hazırlık okudum ama //

P2: Yeteri kadar çalışmıyo' musun ondan kaynaklanabilir mi?

Situation 36: To start her turn P2 cuts in.

P1 : Tabii ki .. Sonra //

P2 : (?) kaç şekerli içiyo'sun?

P1: Fark etmez o zaman beş dört şeker alıyım yeter sonra...

Situation 37: P1 aims to complete what P2 is saying.

P1: İngilizce yönünden kendini hiç geliştirmek istemiyo'sun yani

P2: İstemiyorum çünkü //

P1: Lâzım olmaz

P2: (?) bana lâzım olacağını zannetmiyorum

Situation 38: P2 cuts in to give more information.

P2: (?) bana lâzım olacağını zannetmiyorum

P1: Şimdi bu aslında //

P2: Dış ülkeye gidersem belki lâzım olacak

Situation 39: P2 interrupts so that she can require more information.

P1: Yani bi' de (?) bi' macera işi gibi bi' şey bence İngilizce de pek ama bunun için de okul //

P2: Turistlerle konuşmayı mı düşünüyo'sun yazın?

Situation 40: In this situation P3, a female friend who is also a university student, approaches them and later P1 interrupts P2 to start his turn.

P3: Basitti (?)

P2: Hiç de basit değildi ⌈ 'writing'den de //

P1: ⌊ Çalışmayana basit olmaz tabiî ki insan çalışmayınca her şey

zor

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Huriye Mannasoğlu 1978 yılında Kayseri'de doğdu. İlk ve orta öğrenimini bu şehirde tamamladı. 1996'da girdiği Erciyes Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümünü 2000 yılında birincilikle bitirip Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümüne yüksek lisans öğrencisi olarak girdi. 2001 yılında Erciyes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda başladığı okutmanlık görevine halen devam etmektedir.

Adres: Erciyes Üniversitesi

      Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu

      KAYSERİ

Telefon: 03524374901- 42067

E-posta: hmannasoglu@hotmail.com

CURRICULUM VITAE

Huriye Mannasoglu was born in 1978 in Kayseri. She completed her elementary and secondary education in this city. In 2000 she graduated from Erciyes University English Language and Literature Department, where she entered in 1996, as the top student and became a graduate student at Erciyes University Institute of Social Sciences English Language and Literature Department. She has been working as a lecturer at Erciyes University School of Foreign Languages since 2001.

Address: Erciyes University

School of Foreign Languages

KAYSERI

Telephone: 03524374901- 42067

E-mail: hmannasoglu@hotmail.com