

Discursive Strategies in Negotiating Power: The Case of a Female Radio Show Host

Claudette Baluran and Nancy Surmieda
West Visayas State University
claudiabph@yahoo.com

Abstract

Language as a major contestation site for power can manifest linguistic behavior between sexes to negotiate their power. Framed within the poststructuralist framework, this study explored a female radio host's discursive strategies to negotiate power in the context of Philippine media. Dominant discourse strategies identified include topic control, utterance length, minimal response, and overlapping. Topic control was utilized to dominate the flow of discourse while utterance length was used to minimize turns thereby allowing the female host to establish dominance during the live conversations. Although considered a weak discourse strategy, minimal responses were used not solely for the purpose of solidarity but to introduce the female radio show host's ideas. Overlapping was another strategy identified to control and negotiate power. On an interesting note, prosodic elements were found to be likewise used to negotiate power. The study sheds light on previously claimed weak discourse strategies identified with women. Weak language in this study as well as discourse strategies associated with men has been found to be used by women as means to an end—as a strategy to negotiate positions of dominance within power relations involving the opposite sex.

Keywords: *discourse strategies, media discourse, power, solidarity*

1.0 Introduction

Gender and language according to Litosseliti (2013) is a diverse and rapidly developing field, which has both academic and popular appeal. The 'turn to language' across the humanities and social sciences, and the impact of critical linguistics and discourse analysis, have contributed to a reframing of questions on gender and language. The representation of gender in

language has long been a source of academic argument. Many of these discourses include the concept of dominance between males and females. In 1975, Lakoff stirred controversy with her work on women's language termed as "weak language". One of the provocative ideas presented was that there is a weak language and this was attributed to the speech styles of women. Her work was highly influential in the study of language

and gender and launched numerous researches in the area.

Language and Power

Fairclough (1989) defines language and power as connections between language use and unequal relations of power...and how language contributes to the domination of some people by others. Two major aspects of the power/language relationship according to him is power *in* discourse, and power *behind* discourse.

For poststructuralists, language remains to be the major contestation site for negotiations involving power relations. Of special interest to this study is women language which studies of Lakoff (1975, 2002) and Tannen (1999, 1989) showcase as “weak language”. In the current era, some of these observations may be refuted. This study was initiated with the intent to explore how a woman uses linguistic strategies to negotiate power in discourse.

Weedon (2003) points out that in post-structuralist models, language creates rather than reflects or expresses the meaning of society, experience and the individual’s sense of self. Subjectivity for the poststructuralist is theorized as an effect of language. Competing and often contradictory discourses exists in language. Discourses establishes our subjectivity through material practices, shaping our bodies, minds, and that shape bodies as much as minds and comprise of power relations as understood by Foucault. This idea takes the observation that some discourses, and the subject positions and modes of subjectivity that they constitute, have more power than others. For Foucault, power is not held by a particular group. It is a relationship which inheres in discourses.

For discourses, Tannen (1993) states that although linguistic strategies are potentially ambiguous, power governs unequal relationships where one is subordinate to another while solidarity governs equal relationships as shown by social equality and similarity. The power-solidarity dynamic according to her is one central source of ambiguity. What may appear to be attempts to dominate a conversation (an exercise of power) may actually be intentional in establishing rapport (an exercise of solidarity). This occurs because power and solidarity are bought with the same currency: The same linguistic means can be used to create either or both (Tannen, 1999).

However, there are times when people are engaged in power relations during discourse that exhibit both power and solidarity as not only ambiguous but polysemous as well; thus, the discourse may signal power and solidarity at the same time.

Language and Gender

Labov (2001) and Romaine (1994) in Cunha et al. (2014) state that one of these relevant social factors is the speakers’ gender: it is known that men and women express themselves differently, mirroring the patterns of behavior that are associated with their roles in the social groups. Many studies point to the correlation of gender to linguistic variation and in the last 50 years significant differences between morphology, pronunciation, lexicon, syntax, speech organization and language interaction of female and male speakers have been found.

Men and boys have been associated with behaviors exhibiting power and are not censured for it; in fact, it is celebrated, whereas women and girls who take a

masculine stand are often reproved and met with raised brows. Lakoff (2003) affirms this observation with her discussion that men are more comfortable with power than are women; that it is right and natural for men to seek and hold power; that for a woman to do so is strange, marking her as un-feminine and dangerous.

In the case of women speak versus men speak, a plethora of researches on discursive strategies used by both male and female suggest a disparity in style and strategies. Cunha et al. (2014) support prior researches that men and women use linguistic strategies according to their expected roles in social groups which were also evident in an online social network.

Theorists posit that language is a ground where contestation of power is evident. Early researchers suggest that women's use of powerless speech is highly contributory to their subordinate place in society while men's dominance is preserved through linguistic practices attributed to "maleness". Robin Lakoff's influential and pioneering book *Language and Woman's Place* (1975) lists ten linguistic features characterizing women's speech:

- words related to the specific female interests or occupations
- avoidance of stronger expletives
- empty adjectives
- tag questions
- interrogative intonation in declaratives and statements
- various kinds of hedges
- hyper-correct grammar and pronunciation
- super polite forms
- absence of jokes
- using intensifiers

Differences in the linguistic behavior between genders according to (Cunha et al., 2014) may vary from society to society, since across distinct communities, the roles played by individuals of each gender are also different. In this study, the linguistic behavior associated with power relations of a female radio host in the Philippine context is investigated.

Media Discourse

The current study utilizes media as a source of authentic discourse. Fairclough (1989) contends that a considerable proportion of discourse in contemporary society actually involves participants who are separated in place and time. This is true of written language generally, but the growth area for this sort of discourse has been the mass media—television, radio, film, as well as newspapers. Mass-media discourse is interesting because the nature of the power relations enacted in it is often not clear, and there are reasons for seeing it as involving *hidden* relations of power.

He further asserts that media discourse is one-sided; it has a sharp divide between producers and interpreters. It is designed for mass audiences, and there is no way that producers can even know who is in the audience, let alone adapt to its diverse sections. Media discourse has built into it a subject position for an ideal subject, and actual viewers or listeners or readers have to negotiate a relationship with the ideal subject.

Women's language have been previously described as a weak language and used to confirm to social norms of womanhood which according to Kendall and Tannen (2015) denies women access to power, thus reinforcing social inequality. However, Baxter offers a different perspective in poststructuralist discourse:

power is not static. It cannot be held by one at a fixed place and time; rather, a speaker can be simultaneously positioned and be positioned as powerful or powerless within the nexus of power.

Objectives of the Study

Using the premise offered in the previous discussion, the study explored discourse strategies used by a female radio host to negotiate power during a mixed-in interaction with a male radio host. The research is guided by the following goals: (1) to identify specific discourse strategies used by a female radio host to negotiate power and (2) to ascertain the strategies used to negotiate power.

The study offers an alternative linguistic evidence to negate the argument that woman language is parallel to weak language. Despite a significant corpus of scholarships on discourse strategies between genders, the study offers views in the Philippine context. Likewise, the research may (1) help build faculty resource and (2) engage students with meaningful scholarship on language studies in the Philippine context.

2.0 Methodology

The study investigates discourse strategies used by a female radio host in mixed-sex interactions. Approaching the text within the framework of poststructuralist discourse analysis using conversation analysis as a methodology, three (3) selected segments of the show *Tambalan Nicole Hyala at Chris Tsuper*, Love Radio 90.7FM which is a talk radio station based in Metro Manila were used as material of the study. The station airs the show from 8:30a.m. to 9:00a.m., transmits

nationwide, and offers worldwide access over the internet.

Conversation analysis (CA) – the study of talk-in-interaction – was used since it is a theoretically and methodologically distinctive approach to understanding social life [8]. The show offers varied topics and offers authentic conversation using Tagalog-English as a medium between a male and a female; thus, the choice of material. Extracts of the mixed-in interactions where the strategies used by the female host are highlighted were translated into English, taking into consideration cultural context.

The selected segments were recorded from June 20 to 24, 2016 and a 23,955 word corpus was transcribed using Jefferson's transcription convention. Discourse strategies identified by Lakoff as weak women's language (1975) were identified and analyzed according to how the female radio host used them as strategies to negotiate power.

3.0 Results and Discussion

From the varied linguistic strategies used by the female radio host, four (4) dominant strategies used to negotiate power were found: topic control, affirmative minimal response, duration of utterance, and overlapping. On an interesting note, prosodic elements were found to be likewise utilized by the female host to negotiate power by raising the voice or adjusting to a higher pitch when emphasizing a syllable or a point in the discussion.

Topic Control

Shuy's (1982, in Tannen, 1999) mainstream observation is that the speaker who raises the most topics is controlling a

conversation. However, in a study by Tannen (1999) where she conducted videotaped conversations among friends of varying ages, it emerged that the speaker who raised the most topics was not always dominant. In turn, this is refuted by Yieke (2002 in Yieke, 2007) who explains that topic organisations and topic control within the turn taking process are deemed as examples of discursive resources that may place constraints on the discourse options that are available to actors/agents/speakers in a discourse situation. The more powerful people/speakers in a workplace situation in terms of professional status may employ the use of topic organisation and control, which may suppress and/or oppress their less powerful interlocutors. However, the

less powerful interlocutors in most cases, in the corporate world, are women.

A case shown in the Figure 1 below challenges Tannen's and Yieke's observations since data in the following extracts suggests otherwise. It can be observed that in the process of their interaction, the female radio host (hereafter referred as NH) has the most frequent topic control during her interaction with the male radio host (hereafter referred as CT). It can be observed that in the process of the talk-in interaction, NH introduces a different topic regarding a planned travel to Malaysia. To show solidarity, CT affirms NH by using minimal responses but it is NH that usually controls the topic.

48	NH:	at the mountains planting
49	CT:	[laughter]
50	NH:	[laughter]
51	NH:	Ooo::hh dear. Wait NO but we're going to MalaySIA::↓
52	CT:	=uuu::yyyy
53	NH:	=Where there are <i>tamabalistas</i> *↑(.) Fellow <i>kabisyo</i> ** there in
54		Kuala Lumpur. ↓Th[ere]
55	CT:	[There]

* listeners to the show *Tambalan Nicole Hyala and Cris Tsuper*
 **the radio station's nomenclature for fans of the said station

Figure 1. Transcript from Program 1 Page 2

Another case shown in the extract in Figure 2 shows how NH controls the topic after it has veered away from the previous one talked about. Prior to the conversation in the extract, NH introduced a topic about her experience checking in at a hotel. The talk later deviated to different types of

hotels. To regain control, NH used the discourse marker 'so' and 'anyways' (line 881) to signal a connection to the topic. The extract shows that NH has full control of the topic shift as affirmed by the solidarity exhibited by CT in his use of minimal responses (lines 888 and 890).

876	NH: it's the motel's design the one YOU↓ patronize=
877	CT: =aa::hhh↓=
878	NH: = A five-star hotel is different↓=
879	CT: =So(,)The one I saw just looked like you ↓=
880	NH: = You just mistook her for me↓ we probably had the same nose, partner↓=
881	CT: = Yes↓ The guy she was with was not tall↓ quite small↓=
882	NH: =aa::hhh↓ Not everyone with big noses(,)would be me↓
883	CT: (laughter)
884	NH: Don't <u>assume</u> ↓ [laughter]
885	CT: [laughter]
886	NH: = This is it when↓ we checked in so↓ when I was at the counter↓
887	waiting for my room like that↓=
888	CT: = °↓uh::hm::°=
889	NH: = (laughter) this girl behind me↓ probably excited to check in=
890	CT: = °↓uh::hm::°=

Figure 2. Transcript from Program 2 Pages 27-28

Utterance Length

Majority of the conversations feature female dominance where NH (female radio host) control the conversation with lengthy utterances (lines 32 and 34) that were delivered in a rate where there is not enough pause to give CT (male radio host) enough time to take his turn. The extract below features the utterance length of NH which does not give enough time for CT to interrupt. Prosodic features like high pitch were likewise used

to retain the advantage during the conversation. If CT wants to get the turn, he has to negotiate using other linguistic strategies. In this case however, CT uses minimal responses like "right" and "that's it" to show affirmation and solidarity.

Minimal responses are categorized as a weak language (Lakoff, 1975) utilized by women to backchannel but they are obviously more frequently used by the male host.

32	NH: That's how it really is in life partner there are [disappointments right?] ↑
33	CT: [CORRECT]
34	NH: It's not always happiness (,) It's not always good VIBES ↑ (,) There are people
35	who just sometimes or when there are opportunities give off bad vibes (laughter) ↑
36	For example in your calendar it's Ja [pan right]
37	CT: [That's it]

Figure 3. Transcript from Program 1 Page 1

Another example shown in the extract in Figure 4 shows NH controlling the interaction with lengthy utterance duration

affording little opportunity for CT to take the turn. Lines 30-32, 34, 36, 38, and 40 showcase the discourse strategy used by

NH to negotiate control over the conversation. NH obviously demonstrates

success in the strategy with CT's direct responses in lines 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 43.

29	CT: Even when it's not obvious↓ there are those who try to get younger↓ =
30	NH: =You know it's really funny (.) and in fairness ↓ it's getting funny
31	these guys are funny ↓ (laughter) they're not singers↓ so they force
32	their voice to sound wavy↓ =
33	CT: =[Right↓]
34	NH: =[There's] this friend that's like↓ that at church↓]=
35	CT: =[Okay↓] =
36	NH: =[and so↓ the song is Glory to God in the HIGHEST↑ there↑]=
37	CT: =°↓uh::hm::°=
38	NH: =[Then her voice is really loud↓]
39	CT: =°↓uh::hm::°=
40	NH: and peace to people on EA::RTH↑ [she does it like that↓]=
41	CT: =(laughter)
42	NH: Glory to God in the HIGHEST↑=
43	CT: =(laughter)

Figure 4. Transcript from Program 2 Pages 1-2

This phenomenon is quite interesting in that it deviates from prior observations that women do more minimal responses during conversations to affirm other speakers and nurture affiliation and solidarity. In the previous extracts presented, minimal responses were adopted by the male show host more. The extracts exhibit the female host in a more dominant position in the conversation. The two cases presented likewise counter claims of previous researchers cited by Tannen (1999). In their studies, they have counted numbers of words spoken or timed length of talk in order to demonstrate that men talk more than women and thereby dominate interactions. Extracts 3 and 4 apparently disprove that.

Affirmative Minimal Response

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003) cited researches revealing that several

American studies have found women providing more backchanneling than men. Why this is so remains unclear. It has been claimed by Maltz and Borker (1982 in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 2003) that women and men use backchanneling differently -- specifically that women use the minimal responses *yeah* and *uh-huh* to signal attentiveness, and that men use them to signal agreement. It is further claimed that in male--female conversations, therefore, men tend to mistake women's attentiveness for agreement. While this is an interesting idea, there is, to our knowledge, no evidence beyond the most anecdotal that this particular gender difference really does exist.

In the case of the female host, she utilized minimal response as backchanneling to control the insertion of ideas and claiming the upper hand during several conversations; whereas, the male

host used minimal responses most of the time to signal agreement.

In their discussion about childhood memories of toys, NH uses positive minimal response to validate CT's observation; however, she also uses this strategy to take her turn in the interaction and negotiate a more powerful position by controlling the

topic. The extract in Figure 5 demonstrates how NH uses this type of backchanneling in her third attempt to negotiate her position in line 584. We see that she succeeds in overturning the conversation to her favor with CT's affirmative minimal response in line 586.

577	CT: =they will remember more=
578	NH: =[the]=
579	CT: =[the bonding moments↓]=
580	NH: =Yes(.)=
581	CT: =those↓ those right(.).↓ Those memories that↓=
582	NH: =right↓=
583	CT: =[they have↓]=
584	NH: =[right↓ right↓] attention really makes a a difference(.).↓
585	=like the one who messaged us first↓=
586	CT: =°↓uh::hm::°=

Figure 5. Transcript from Program 2 Pages 18

The extract in Figure 6 demonstrates another case of NH using an affirmative minimal response to take a turn. Here, NH uses minimal responses to affirm and a symmetrical discourse with CT in lines 260, 262 and 264 and lastly as an overlap in line

266. The minimal response in line 266 was used to take her turn in the discourse, negotiating her position to control successfully with CT affirming her with a minimal response.

257	CT: =so THAT's true (.). One those who may bring you disappointment
258	<i>kabisyo</i> (.) like thay you will receive a text:(.) there's
259	someone who will tweet <u>you</u> ↓
260	NH: =CORRECT↑=
261	CT: =someone will message <u>you</u> ↓=
262	NH: =RIGHT right↓=
263	CT: =that you don't LIKE↑=
264	NH: =TRUE ↑ =
265	CT: =REALLY(.) the way they bash just like [that]↑=
266	NH: = [yes] ↑
267	and you know <u>partner</u> (.) it's like thi::s(.) as said
268	by Bob Marley(.)=
269	CT: =°↓uh::hm::° =
270	NH: =what was that that Bob Marley said↑
271	CT: =(laughter)

Figure 6. Transcript from Program 1 Page 7

Overlapping

Taking a turn prematurely is also fraught with interactional meanings. 'Interrupting' means launching a turn at a point where a speaker's TCU (transition relevance place) is *not* possibly complete (Wilkinson and Kitinger, 2011). In this study, overlapping is seen as an interruption to the conversation and used as an element to secure power during interactions. The female host interrupts so that CT does not complete his turn. In line 665, the male host is interrupted through an overlap by the female host in line 666

but seems to lose the turn with CT completing his utterance until line 667. The male host probably interpreted NH's interruption as an act of solidarity. NH's attempt in negotiating her position of dominance continued at line 668 until she saw an opportunity to continue her utterance at line 671 with CT affirming her with a minimal response in 672 and possibly waiting for his turn to talk; thus, establishing the successful use of overlaps to regain control and take her turn in the interaction.

660	NH: =I reached 122 (laughter) now↓(.) just 2 pounds shy↓(.) =
661	CT: =°↓uh::hm::°=
662	NH: =partner eh(.) I got complacent↓ only 2 pounds↓(.) before reaching the ideal weight, partner<↓(.) before I knew it↓ 132 ako ulit ↓(.)
663	CT: [laughter]
664	NH: [laughter]
665	CT: [that's irritating, right↓] =
666	NH: [Oh YES:::↓ SO ANNO:::YING]
667	CT: = [something you've worked hard on] to minimize then in a split [second
668	NH: not really]
669	CT: =[but you ate]=
670	NH:=[not really] in just a second PARTNER(.)it took months(.) when you really
671	enjoy your life like you don't care anymore.
672	CT: =°↓uh::hm::°=

Figure 7. Transcript from Program 3, Page 21

Another case featuring an overlap used by NH is seen in the extract in Figure 8 during a conversation involving dieting. In line 685, it can be observed that CT takes an overlap at line 686 but NH is able to take her turn at a slight hesitation on the part of CT. She takes the opportunity to lengthen her utterance with CT affirming at line 691. Again, NH utilizes an overlap to negotiate her position and maintain her control over the interaction.

Tannen (1989) has maintained that conversation is a joint production:

Everything that happens is the doings of the participants. She further notes that some conversations may have cooperative overlapping but in the case of NH and CT, although they have developed camaraderie being friends and partners in the show for a long time, the exchange shows that NH, even if it may not be intentional, negotiates the discourse in her favor if factor in with some cultural prosodic features (change of tone and pitch) that goes with the overlap.

685	NH: [Stressful↓]=
686	CT: =[that's] how difficult it is with that↓ like=
687	NH: =the STRUGGLE is <u>REAL</u> (.)that's what I've been saying then
688	partner EH↓(.) just like (.)you over indulge↓(.) you over eat↓(.)
689	You just leave it at that↓(.) before you know it↓(.) you've gotten so fat↓(.)
690	You'd find it hard to go down again↓(.)
691	CT: =RIGHT [RIGHT]=
692	NH: =[THAT'S IT](.) might as well↓(.) really↓ because ↓the
693	only KEY↓(.) Whatever we say↓(.) don't take CARBS↓(.)
694	Do away with SUGAR↓(.) like that↓ whatever↓(.)if you don't
695	really have discipline↓(.) getting slimmer will
696	not happen↓(.)

Figure 8. Transcript from Program 3, Page 22

Prosodic Features

Gumperz (2002) has observed that prosodic phenomena have been examined as elements of syntactic and lexical as well as pragmatic competence. Linguists and phoneticians have discovered a great deal about the conventions of English prosodic usage, and about the nature of the semantic information conveyed by prosody. An interesting feature found in the female host's negotiation of power are the prosodic features used like pitch and tone for emphasis corresponding to the male host's use of high pitch and volume. Interestingly, the female host only used these elements when the male host used them to seemingly copy her pitch and volume.

The extract in Figure 9 demonstrates the negotiations during the

interaction involving a topic on dieting. The high sounding note used by NH can be seen at the start of line 558 while she overlaps CT. The male host takes this as a cue and does the same at line 559 with an additional utterance. However, NH seems to negotiate her position by adapting a high tone at line 560 but CT does an overlap that affirms her but with the same high note at line 561. This continues with CT affirming with a high note at line 564 with NH doing an overlap to again negotiate her position at line 565. The interaction repeats the sequence with high tones to affirm and/ or overlap until NH's utterance at line 571. The negotiation using the prosodic element of high tones and pitches reaches its peak with NH's utterance at line 571. Finally, CT concedes with a minimal response to affirm and establish solidarity with NH.

555 CT: =So you'll try looking for the tastiest meal(.) that one filled with=
 556 NH: =the one's that's really:(.) in oil partner=
 557 CT: =with with [spices]=
 558 NH: [THA::T's IT]=
 559 CT: =[THA::T's IT]= that oily adobo*
 560 NH: =[RIGHT]=
 561 NH: =because that's the tastiest that oily adobo*(.) the one where the meat really sticks
 562 with the fat
 563 CT: =[THA::T's IT]=
 564 NH: =[MY::GOD::] that's really the yummiest=
 565 CT: =then you'd gulp the broth right=
 566 NH: =OOhhh=
 567 CT: =that lard from bulalo* [MY::GOD::]=
 568 NH: =[Oh(.) RIGHT] Well of course partner(.) that's BORING right(.)
 Then you'd drink soda
 570 CT: =[THA::T's IT THA::T's IT]=
 571 NH: =[THA::T's IT then] RIGHT(.) So=
 572 CT: =those fats then start sticking to your veins
 573 NH: = Oh(.) that's true(.)so it's okay to indulge yourself in that=
 574 CT: =°↓uh::hm::°=
 *local Filipino dish

Figure 9. Transcript from Program 3, Page 22

4.0 Conclusion

Women's language have been previously described as a weak language and used to confirm to social norms of womanhood which according to Kendall and Tannen (2015) denies women access to power, thus reinforcing social inequality. However, recorded data indicate that the female radio host in the study used key linguistic features that do not seem to signal a subordinate position but allows her to negotiate power. Despite contrasting but sometimes similar speech styles with that of her male co-host, findings support that manifestations of woman speech did not indicate a less powerful position for the female host. To negotiate her turns and control during talk-in interactions, she utilized four dominant strategies like topic control, utterance length, minimal response, and overlapping. Minimal response as a strategy is linked to weak

language (Lakoff, 1975) that most women use but linguistic evidence in the study showcase the particular event where the strategy was actually used to her advantage when negotiating power. Topic control, utterance length and overlapping as linguistic strategies mostly employed by men have likewise been used to the female host's advantage.

Results of the study offer an alternative linguistic evidence to negate the argument that woman language is parallel to weak language. It likewise counters the argument that women usually use weak language since the female host successfully incorporated linguistic strategies usually attributed with men to negotiate power relations during mixed-in conversations with her male co-host.

The argument that "women speak" equals weak language or that women in general are victims of oppression has since been contested by studies of Baxter (2003).

In the case of talks between genders, discursive power relations in these recent studies suggest that there are ways where power can be negotiated and in the traditions of poststructuralism, power is in a constant state of flux (Baxter, 2003) so that one may be powerful now but powerless in the next and vice versa.

The observations of Lakoff (1975) and Tannen (1989, 1999) regarding the place of women in conversations with males may need to be revisited. Findings of the current study offer linguistic data that should be reinforced with similar investigations either to find other ways

women use language to negotiate power or to affirm that women language may have actually changed. Furthermore, when studying women's language, cultural context may have to be considered since discourses and strategies involved are highly contextualized. Viewing women's language in the same frame may not be within the scope of common sense. As with any cultural fad and concept, women's language as weak language may be contested and studies that prove otherwise can offer new data and new understanding to cultural phenomena.

Legend adapted from Markee, N. (2015)

NH: [so	
CT: [how	simultaneous, overlapping talk by two speakers
]	points of overlapped speech across two turns
descr↑	an upward arrow denotes marked rising shift in intonation, while
iption↓	a downward arrow denotes a marked falling shift in intonation
go:::d	one or more colons indicate lengthening of the preceding sound;
	each additional indicates that there is no gap at all between the
	two turns
<u>partner</u>	underlined letters indicates marked stress
=	indicates that there is no gap at all between the two turns
°uhhmm°	degree sign indicates decreased volume, often a whisper
CORRECT	indicates strong tonal quality
(.3)	a pause of .1 second
(1.0)	a pause of 1 second

References

Baxter, J. (2003). *Positioning Gender in Discourse*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Cunha, et al. (2014). *He Votes or she votes? female and male discursive strategies*

in Twitter political hashtags. Retrieved June 12, 2016 from <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0087041>

Eckert, P. & Ginet-McConnet, S. (2003). *Language and Gender*. USA: Cambridge University Press, New York

- Gumperz, J. (2002). *Discourse Strategies*. UK: Cambridge University Press
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Kendall, S. and Tannen, D. (2015). *Discourse and gender*. in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2nd Edition, ed. by Tannen, D., Hamilton, H., and Schiffrin, D. UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper and Row, New York, N.Y.
- Lakoff, R. (2003). *The handbook of language and gender*, ed. by Holmes, J. and Meyerhoff, M. USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Markee, N (2015). *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*, First Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Romaine, S. (1994). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1989). Interpreting Interruption in Conversation. *Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Part Two: Parasession on Language in Context*, ed. by Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk, and Caroline Wiltshire, 266-87. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society
- Tannen, D. (1999). Women and men in conversation. In the R. S. Wheeler (Ed.), *The workings of language: From prescriptions to perspectives*. London: Praeger
- Wilkinson, S. and Kitzinger, C. (2011). *Conversation Analysis*. Continuum Companion to Discourse Analysis, ed. by Hyland, K. and Paltridge, B. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Weedon, Cris. (2003). "Subjects". in *A Concise Companion to Feminist Theory*. Ed. Eagleton, Mary. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2003. Print.
- Yieke, F. (2002a). 'Language, gender and power: The use of questions as a control strategy in workplaces in Kenya'. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette*, (70 – 71), 127 – 148
- Yieke, F. (2002b). *Language and discrimination: A study of gender and discourse in workplaces in Kenya*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Vienna, Austria.
- Yieke, (2007) *Gender and Topic Management in Discourse: The Glass Ceiling as a Reality for Women in Corporate Kenya*. *Stichproben. Wiener Zeitschrift für kritische Afrikastudien* Nr. 13/2007, 7. Jg. Retrieved June 12, 2016 from https://stichproben.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/p_stichproben/Artikel/Nummer13/Nr13_Yieke.pdf