

**Ana V. Kocić\***

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy  
Serbia

**Dušan M. Stamenković\*\***

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy  
Serbia

**Miloš B. Tasić\*\*\***

University of Niš, Faculty of Mechanical Engineering  
Serbia

**GENDER DIFFERENCES REFLECTED IN FRIENDS' CONVERSATION –  
DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DIALOGUES FROM THE TV SERIES *COUPLING***

Originalan naučni rad  
UDC 81'42:305-055.1/.2

Starting from various theoretical positions in regard to discourse analysis, language and gender, the paper attempts to examine two samples of all-female and all-male conversation between friends extracted from the TV series *Coupling*. It represents a small scale study which aims at comparing male and female conversational styles against different criteria proposed by various authors – deficiency, dominance, powerful or powerless language, power and solidarity, competitiveness, cooperativeness, etc. The analysis leads us towards concluding that it is almost impossible to draw a clear-cut border between male and female talk, as far as our corpus is concerned and this is due to the fact that conversation features characteristic of either of the genders seem to overlap.

**Key words:** discourse analysis, conversation analysis, gender, dialogue, conversational styles.

**1. Introduction**

The influence of the mass media, especially television, on the shaping of our culture(s) and everyday lives cannot be stated enough. However, it is also true that most of what we see on television is a reflection of cultural tendencies in modern societies. This paper will be an attempt to investigate the issue of gender differences reflected in the language of male and female characters in the TV series *Coupling*. While it is true that the data used for spoken discourse analysis in this essay is not a genuine representation of real speech, in the sense that the dialogues are scripted, the paper will try to illustrate that some features of all-male and all-female everyday conversations can be observed in scripted TV dialogues as well, so as to show that we can establish links between fictitious and real-life dialogues. Besides authors' personal interest, another major reason for the choice of data is the fact that in the

---

\* Faculty of Philosophy, Ćirila i Metodija 2, 18000 Niš, Serbia; e-mail: ana.kocic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

\*\* Faculty of Philosophy, Ćirila i Metodija 2, 18000 Niš, Serbia; e-mail: dusan.stamenkovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

\*\*\* Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Aleksandra Medvedeva 14, 18000 Niš, Serbia; email: baulkarea@gmail.com

Serbian ELT context, the first, and very often the only 'encounter' of learners with native speakers is via broadcast shows. Therefore, the authors set out to investigate the relatedness of everyday speech and TV dialogues.

## **2. Theoretical background – discourse analysis, language and gender**

McCarthy (1991: 5) defines discourse analysis as "the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used", conducted on both written texts and various types of spoken data. He identifies better understanding of the features of natural spoken and written discourse as the main aim of discourse analysis. The American tradition of discourse analysis goes in the direction of conversation analysis (e.g. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974; Sacks, 1995; Schegloff, 2007; Sidnell, 2010; Sidnell and Stivers, 2012), which closely examines the main features of verbal and non-verbal language used for interaction (McCarthy, 1998). Eggins and Slade (1997: 33) use the term 'sociolinguistic approaches' to signify the approaches to discourse analysis which deal with "the use of language in the social contexts of everyday life". These authors subcategorise the above mentioned approaches based on whether the importance for discourse description and interpretation is ascribed to the social context, grammatical and prosodic features of a spoken discourse or a structure consisting of stages which may vary only to a certain degree. Among the approaches which emphasise the role of social context in discourse analysis, Tannen (1992) distinguishes various *styles* of conversation, which depend on cultural elements such as race, ethnicity, social class, and especially *gender*.

It seems indisputable that men and women have different conversational styles; however, the explanations for this difference appear to be a much more debatable issue. The main theoretical directions explain variation in language use depending on the gender of the users as: a) *deficiency* of women's language when compared to men's language; b) reflection of men's *dominance* over women; c) the result of the *difference* between women's and men's socialization patterns or d) constant, *dynamic* variation depending not solely on male-female dualism, but rather on local and cross-cultural linguistic practices of groups (Bergvall, 1999). Tannen (2001) points out the notions of *power and solidarity* as central to the theory of language and gender. According to her, linguistic strategies used by men and women are ambiguous, as well as culturally and contextually dependent: what may be seen as a dominating strategy in one context (for example, it is often claimed that men

dominate women in conversation by interrupting and taking over the conversational floor), may also be interpreted as a solidarity strategy in a different situational context (collaborative overlapping in friendly conversation to show support). Coates (1986) uses the terms *powerful* and *powerless* language to describe the linguistic behaviour of men and women. Her claim is that men tend to use more of 'powerful' language (interruptions, topic control strategies, swearing, imperatives), whereas women are more prone to 'powerless' language (greater use of minimal responses to show support, polite forms, hedges, tag questions), which, in mixed conversations, tends to deprive them of their conversational floor. However, in women-to-women conversations, this supposedly powerless language, when used reciprocally, becomes a powerful means of providing support and solidarity. Gardiner (2000) claims that research suggests that men tend to behave *competitively* in conversations (i.e. they tend to interrupt, show disagreement, neglect other interlocutors' utterances and often avoid pursuing topics initiated by other speakers), whereas women's tendency in conversations is *cooperative* behaviour (i.e. asking more questions and giving feedback to show support, involving more speakers in conversation and following up on the topics initiated by other interlocutors). Such findings are often interpreted in terms of women's socialisation into powerlessness or insecurity, but can also be seen as a reflection of different approaches to conversation by men and women (Cameron, 1992). Another view of gender differences expressed in language use is provided by the theory of communities of practice, which is based on the premise that the so-called 'gendered discourses' (discourses which reflect gendered social practices regardless of the sex of the speakers, such as gender differences, heterosexuality or self-disclosure discourses) are a result of men's and women's participation in multiple communities of practice, "as they define themselves in relation to other women and men" (Litosseliti, 2006: 58). In the following section, two samples of men's and women's TV dialogues will be analysed and compared with reference to theoretical considerations of language and gender issues.

### **3. Coupling dialogues analysis**

Before proceeding to analysis, it is necessary to point out some advantages and disadvantages of not analysing real spoken data. McCarthy (1998) argues against using a large amount of broadcast data for assembling the spoken language corpus due to its limited usefulness for pedagogic purposes. On the other hand, comparing dramatic dialogues with real-life conversations can contribute to raising

learners' awareness regarding conversational behaviour and its rules and conventions (McCarthy and Carter, 1994). On the issue of real-life and dramatic discourse relationship, Herman (1995) points out that the underlying principles and norms of everyday conversation are the ones exploited by script-writers and dramatists in order to construct the dialogues which represent different versions, variations and alternatives to communication in everyday contexts. Coulthard (1985: 182) also suggests that scripted conversations can be successfully approached with techniques originally developed to analyse natural discourse, although some of the rules and conventions governing these conversations differ to a certain degree.

### 3.1. All-female *Coupling* dialogue

#### *Coupling* – Season 2, Episode 'Naked' (©BBC 2001)

- 1 <Susan> So who is it?  
2 <Julia> I'm not saying  
3 <Susan> But it's someone from the office then?  
4 <Julia> I'm not telling you [laughs]  
5 <Susan> Oh describe him  
6 <Julia> He's ... edible [<Susan> <Julia> chuckle]  
7 <Susan> Nothing?  
8 <Julia> [laughs] Absolutely nothing ... ish  
9 <Julia> and .hh ... I just thought I could kiss this man [chuckles]  
10 <Jane> And did you?  
11 <Julia> Well you know how sometimes you just don't  
12 <Susan> L No  
13 <Sally> L No  
14 <Jane> L No  
15 <Julia> Okay ... but you know it's someone at work and someone really junior to me  
16 I mean is it ever really acceptable to kiss someone in those circumstances?  
17 [laughs nervously]  
18 <Susan> L Yeah  
19 <Sally> L Yeah  
20 <Jane> L Yeah  
21 <Julia> Okay  
22 <Sally> Kevin from the photocopy place  
23 <Jane> Oh Kevin yes put him down  
24 <Julia> Sorry?  
25 <Susan> Different conversation.  
26 .hh so who is this guy? tell us  
27 <Julia> No way am I telling you  
28 <Susan> All right well at least tell us if you kissed him or not  
29 <Julia> Well ...  
30 <Susan> That's terrible!  
31 <Jane> That's awful!  
32 <Sally> That exact thing happened to me once and it was lasagna with me too  
33 Oh it's my worst ever memory  
34 <Susan> He just went off laughing?  
35 <Jane> L Oh my God  
36 <Julia> L No! [<Jane> ooh] none of that actually *happened* ... I I never  
37 kissed him  
38 <Susan> ↑ Oh  
39 <Julia> [laughs] That was what was going through my mind That's *why* I didn't kiss him  
40 <Susan> Oh I see  
41 <Jane> L Of course

42 <Julia> L [laughs]  
43 <Sally> Oh hang on ... that lasagna thing didn't happen to me either [laughs nervously]  
44 It was ... somebody else I remembered it by mistake  
45 <Susan> So you didn't kiss him what did happen?  
46 <Julia> Well ...  
47 <Julia> I'm so hopeless at all this. I'm fine in real life  
48 <Susan> You certainly are you've got half the office terrified of you  
49 <Julia> hhh The moment I see a guy I like I'm complete rubbish I'm like a different  
50 person my brain melts and my breasts stick out  
51 <Jane> Breasts?  
52 <Julia> Every time can't stop them see a nice bloke and whom there they are  
53 like man-activated air bags if I ever meet my ideal guy I'll flatten him against a  
54 wall  
55 <Jane> I know! nice arse bloke from the coffee place  
56 <Sally> Oh nice arse yes  
57 <Jane> You ask him. You know what he looks like from the front  
58 <Susan> Guys we're trying to organize a party not bloke market  
59 <Sally> Susan ... you really are in a relationship now aren't you  
60 <Jane> You said we could bring people  
61 <Susan> hhh Yeah a couple of people maybe even *women people*  
62 <Sally> No we don't want too many women people  
63 <Jane> Mhm don't want too much competition  
64 <Sally> Bad party ecology too many predators grazing the herd  
65 <Jane> L Exactly  
66 <Susan> What do you mean your brain melts?  
67 <Julia> Well I open my mouth and complete rubbish comes out men can't get anywhere  
68 near me for all the rubbish I'm talking in the world of romance I'm an impenetrable  
69 fortress no chance of invasion  
70 <Jane> Julia can come to the party!  
71 <Julia> Thing is you know I'm bound to see this guy again how do I handle it? hhh  
72 what do I say?  
73 <Sally> Naked  
74 <Julia> Sorry?  
75 <Sally> You can program any man's libido by careful use of the word naked  
76 Just slip it subtly into the conversation every now and then. It's a scientific  
77 fact that if you say the word naked three or more times to *any man* he has to  
78 cross his legs  
79 <Susan> And at the other end of the female insanity spectrum Jane pretends to be  
80 bisexual with much the same result

The setting of this conversation is a restaurant: four women in their thirties are having a drink and chatting. Most of the conversational floor is held by Julia who recounts her personal experience and asks for advice. What becomes obvious is that the three other women know each other very well and are already in a group, whereas Julia is yet to become a group member. Susan, Sally and Jane already have some shared knowledge (lines 58 and 59; 79 and 80), but Julia shows misunderstanding of the group's attitudes (lines 11-14, 15-20, 74). This fact could account for the lack of some common features of all-female friendly conversation, such as jointly constructed utterances, incomplete utterances followed by minimal responses or nodding as a sign of understanding or a joint search for the right word (Coates, 1996). These features, as well as overlapping and collaborative floor construction can be noticed in the communication among the three friends who

already know each other (lines 22, 23; 55–65). Tannen (1992) defines women's conversation as a negotiation for closeness and establishing connections. Julia makes an effort to 'fit in' and seeks support by using the discourse marker 'you know' (lines 11, 15, 71) to signal that she assumes that her listeners understand the situation (Carter and McCarthy, 1997). Furthermore, she also uses the strategy of avoiding playing an expert (Coates, 1996) and often hesitates (lines 6, 8, 9, 16 ('I mean'), 29, 46, 67, 71), stammers or repeats her words (lines 36, 49, 67–69). Her talk has the aim to decrease the distance between her and her interlocutors and that is why she avoids using powerful language. Even though it is claimed that women tend to show support during conversation, Jane and Sally interrupt Julia's story twice (lines 22, 23; 55–57) and continue their own conversation about the party. Furthermore, Susan's response to Julia (line 48), as well as Jane's and Sally's remarks (lines 62–65) can be analysed as competitiveness towards Julia. This may have to do with the fact that Julia identifies herself as a successful business woman, a senior manager (line 15), thus positioning herself above the rest of the speakers. It is not until Julia declares herself openly as not trying to be their rival (she uses humour (lines 52–54) to create solidarity within the group (Coates, 2006)) that they accept her and invite her to the party (lines 67–70). Besides occasional signals of partial exclusion, most of the time, the three friends show support for Julia's account and try to include her in the conversation. Susan, probably because she is Julia's colleague, constantly encourages Julia to talk about her feelings and shows interest (lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 28, 34, 38, 66); furthermore, she tries to create a balance in the conversation by diverting the floor back to Julia when the other two women interrupt (lines 25, 26, 45, 79). Another means of showing support and appreciation are emphatic exclamations used for evaluation (lines 30–35), by which the three women actively take part in the conversation as listeners (Carter and McCarthy, 1997). Two other powerful means of creating the solidarity atmosphere are personal disclosure and laughter (including chuckling and giggling). Sally offers her own personal experience (lines 32–33), similar to Julia's, with the aim of strengthening the bonds within the group. Also, there is constantly laughter in the conversation, so that a non-threatening and supportive environment should be established (Cameron, 1992).

### **3.2. All-male *Coupling* dialogue**

*Coupling* – Season 2, Episode 'My Dinner in Hell' (©BBC 2001)

1 <Jeff> No!  
2 <Patrick> Disaster

3 <Steve> I know  
4 <Jeff> I can't believe they put stuff like that on television  
5 <Patrick> L It's irresponsible  
6 <Steve> Yeah it's like all those sex scenes when you were a kid  
7 they were always timed for maximum embarrassment...  
8 BBC bastards!  
9 <Patrick> You thought the BBC were trying to embarrass you with sex scenes?  
10 <Steve> Yeah I swear I thought the TV was plotting against me  
11 ah I'd be in my bedroom watching a film  
12 and it's just uhm a couple having dinner  
13 or ... or a detective solving a crime  
14 it's all perfectly innocent and as soon as my dad comes up the stairs  
15 suddenly it's all ... baby oil and nipples *every time!*  
16 yeah I thought every actress in the country was programmed to expose her  
17 breasts the moment my father reached a certain altitude  
18 <Jeff> Did she ask  
19 you know ...  
20 uhm ask [laughs nervously]  
21 <Patrick> If you still ... you know ...  
22 <Jeff> Frostrup ...  
23 <Patrick> Frostrup?  
24 <Jeff> Yeah Steve's whole fantasy life revolves around Mariella Frostrup  
25 <Steve> Jeff [<Jeff> <Patrick> [laugh]] please  
26 <Jeff> If he ever meets Mariella Frostrup in person his right hand will shout Mother!  
27 [<Jeff> <Patrick> [laugh]]  
28 It'd be like, you know, the end of E.T. when he saw the spaceship  
29 There'll be organ music you know  
30 <Steve> L Thank you for clearing that up Jeff  
31 <Jeff> Hey... *organ* music! [<Jeff> <Patrick> [laugh]]  
32 <Steve> Yes Jeff  
33 <Patrick> So did she ask about your ... Frostruping?  
34 <Steve> She didn't have to ask the actual question did she it was just there  
35 <Jeff> Of course it was it's out there it's circling  
36 <Steve> We're sitting there in silence and there it is just throbbing in the air between us  
37 <Patrick> Wasn't that a bit tactless?  
38 <Steve> The *question* was throbbing Patrick  
39 <Jeff> Like an accusation  
40 <Steve> Exactly  
41 <Jeff> L You're choking the chicken  
42 <Patrick> L You're strangling the python  
43 <Jeff> L You're shaking the caravan Jeffrey  
44 Uhm, sorry I uhm ... drifted off a bit there  
45 Family holidays eh? God they went on a bit didn't they? [laughs nervously]  
46 <Steve> Have you ever been so self-conscious you've forgotten how to breathe regularly?  
47 <Jeff> Oh yeah sure yeah  
48 It's like when you're sitting on a bus and there's this woman...that's the worst  
49 <Steve> I can't move! Yeah I'm totally clenched!  
50 Yeah if I'd have stood up I'd have taken the sofa  
51 ↓ I was just trying to seem relaxed I had a moment of madness  
52 <Patrick> What did you do?  
53 <Steve> Oh  
54 <Patrick> What's so bad about her parents?  
55 <Jeff> Wednesday? that's tonight  
56 <Steve> I'm just getting up the courage mate  
57 <Patrick> Why? What do her parents do?  
58 <Steve> They talk about *sex*  
59 <Patrick> No!  
60 <Steve> Yeah uh they're incredibly open about everything the whole family is Susan too  
61 They talk about sex like it's a completely normal thing  
62 <Jeff> Are they insane?  
63 <Patrick> Parents have no business talking about sex it's not their area  
64 <Jeff> L It's disgusting /wow/ it's like when you find your dad's

65 magazines  
66 <Steve> L Exactly!  
67 <Patrick>Or you hear your parents doing it  
68 <Steve> Oh yeah I've been there  
69 <Jeff> Or your mother starts making enormous sculptures of erections and filling the  
70 house with them that's what I hate!  
71 <Steve> I'm sorry?  
72 <Jeff> Tons of the bastards all over the place! some of them were huge!  
73 We had to keep one of them in the garden shed  
74 <Steve> You grew up in a house full of erections?  
75 <Jeff> My mum said it was er a celebration of love  
76 <Patrick>Of love? that's a bit of a leap  
77 <Jeff> She used to keep the ones that had gone wrong in a box... under my bed  
78 Trust me you don't wanna know about my nightmares

Three close friends, men in their mid-thirties, are having a conversation in a pub. The topic of the conversation revolves around sex, but most of it is Steve's account of an embarrassing experience. Personal disclosure is usually not a very common topic among male friends (Eggins and Slade, 1997); therefore, a lot of hesitation and vague language is used by all speakers, with Steve dominating most of the conversation. He avoids explicitly telling what actually happened and uses a lot of details to describe similar experiences from the past (lines 6–8, 10–17) to ensure the support of his interlocutors (Coates, 2003). Furthermore, his speech is often interrupted by hesitation, stammering and pauses (lines 11–13, 15, 53), which clearly suggests uneasiness about disclosing his intimate feelings. His interlocutors follow the same pattern by using the hedge 'you know' instead of directly referring to masturbation (lines 18–21, 33). This shows embarrassment with the topic, sympathising with the main speaker and the need to sound non-threatening (Carter and McCarthy, 1997). Jeff and Patrick's response to Steve's story is somewhat ambiguous. On one hand, they show support and appreciation by using emphatic exclamations (lines 1, 2, 4, 5, 59). They also take part in collaborative story-telling: overlapping speech (lines 5, 64), following up on Steve's statements (lines 35, 39, 41, 42, 47, 62–64, 67) to show understanding. On the other hand, Jeff interrupts Steve, taking over the conversational floor and shifting the topic (lines 69, 70) and Patrick fails to understand one of Steve's statements and needs clarification (lines 36–38). Another strategy used by Jeff and Patrick is keeping emotional restraint by ridiculing Steve (lines 26, 27, 31). This strategy enables them to 'save' the image of masculinity (the stereotype of men not talking about their feelings), but at the same time, to establish the atmosphere of shared knowledge and support (Eggins and Slade, 1997). Humour and puns are also used to keep the tone of the conversation light (lines 22, 26–29, 31, 33) and to mitigate the general feeling of uneasiness with



laughter (Coates, 2006). When it comes to talking about problems, Tannen (1992) points out that men tend to act as problem-solvers and that, if unable to find a solution, very often change the topic. Steve's 'mates' listen to his story, but being surprised with the situation and unable to offer any practical advice, readily accept the shift of subject and talk about parents in general (lines 57–68). Steve himself, even though he ignores most of Jeff's interruptions throughout the conversation, in the end follows up on Jeff's story about his mother (lines 71, 74), thus signalling that the disclosure is over. A very significant and common feature of men's talk is using taboo language to confirm the image of masculinity and amplify group cohesion (Coates, 2003). This feature is almost missing from this conversation, apart from the occasions in which the word 'bastard' is mentioned, lines 8 and 72, which can be considered a very mild swearing word. The main reason for this is that the dialogue is from a broadcast TV show. However, there are many sexual allusions (for example, lines 26, 31, 41–43), which may contribute to the authenticity of the talk. Non-verbal behaviour also constitutes an important part of male talk (Coates, 2003). Laughter and mutual slapping on the back or the knee are features of this conversation as well. Their role is to emphasise mutual friendship, understanding and belonging to the group.

### **3.3. Is there all-male and/or all-female talk?**

The two dialogues, even though not being authentic spoken data, can still reveal some of the patterns of male and female friendly conversation. What both dialogues have in common is that the conversations mostly revolve around personal accounts of two characters who could be considered to be friends and group members (to a higher or lesser degree). Self-disclosure is more characteristic of women's conversations, whereas topics such as cars, business or football tend to dominate men's conversations (Coates, 2003). The analysis of the two dialogues proves that both men and women face difficulties when talking about personal issues. Both Julia and Steve have to overcome uneasiness, hesitation, stammering, pauses and lack of understanding within their peer group. Group belonging and establishing connections and positions within the group are also prominent issues in men's and women's conversations. Tannen (1992) separates the tendencies of male and female talk into those oriented towards defining and supporting hierarchy and hegemony (mostly men's conversations) and those aimed at reaching closeness and consensus (usually reflected in women's conversations). The analysis of the two

*Coupling* dialogues shows that such strict division is not always true and that women's and men's behaviour in conversations largely depend on the context. The two dialogues also demonstrate a range of linguistic means for showing support and appreciation and for establishing the role of an active listener in the conversation. The features common to both men's and women's talk are overlapping speech, using hedges and discourse markers and collaborative story telling. One noticeable feature of male talk is ridiculing and making jokes, whereas women seem to be more prone to emphatic evaluation and offering their own experiences and advice. Another point worth mentioning is sexism in conversation, which is often ascribed to male speakers, e.g. misogyny, using sexual stereotypes, etc. (Coates, 2003). In the analysed all-male dialogue, this feature seems to be missing; however, it can be noticed in the all-female conversation: Julia describing Jeff (line 6) and Jane and Sally talking about male party invitees as if they were sexual objects (lines 55–57). This may lead to a conclusion that not many conversation features can be related to one gender only, but rather are observable in the talk of both genders. Although, strictly speaking, this may not be the domain of discourse analysis, it should be mentioned that non-linguistic behaviour – laughter, chuckling, nodding, back-patting, etc. may play a major role in conversation in terms of establishing mutual confidence and a sense of friendship and appreciation. While laughter and humour seem to be universal means of creating a non-threatening atmosphere, chuckling and emphatic nodding appear to be more characteristic of women's behaviour, whereas patting and slapping are more often connected with male friendly conversation.

#### **4. Conclusion**

If one tries to draw tentative conclusions based on a small-scale analysis of broadcast data, then it has to be said that drawing a clear-cut line between male and female talk is neither advisable nor in accordance with reality. While it may be said that there are some features which are more often found in (fe)male conversations, this cannot be taken for granted as proof that men and women speak different languages. The analysis of the two dialogues has shown that many features which are considered to be characteristic of one gender, are in fact common to both genders to a greater or lesser extent. This may mean that the notions of gender and gendered discourses are prone to constant transformation, depending on social, cultural or interpersonal contexts.

As far as the practical implications of such analysis are concerned, raising teachers' awareness in terms of gender differences in language use may prove

useful. The authors believe that analysing dramatic discourse in the classroom, besides being a powerful motivational device, could bring at least some features of spoken English to Serbian classrooms, thus enhancing the learning process and making it more worthwhile. What is more, if we assume that the British mass media culture mirrors British cultural and social contexts to some degree at least, then analysing broadcast data by Serbian learners would also be an opportunity to have a more in-depth overview of the target language and culture.

## References

- Bergvall, V. (1999). Towards a comprehensive theory of language and gender. *Language in Society* 28 (2), 273–293.
- Cameron, D. (1992). *Feminism and Linguistic Theory* (second edition). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Coates, J. (1986). *Women, Men and Language*. London: Longman.
- Coates, J. (1996). *Women Talk: Conversation between Women Friends*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coates, J. (2003). *Men Talk: Stories in the Making of Masculinities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coates, J. (2006). 'It was so funny' – gender and humour in everyday talk'. In B. Beaven (ed.) *IATEFL 2006 Harrogate Conference Selections*. Kent: IATEFL, 16–29.
- Coulthard, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Carter, R., and McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Coupling*. 2001. Season 2, episodes 'Naked' and 'My Dinner in Hell'. BBC Copyright.
- Eggins, S., and Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Continuum.
- Gardiner, A. (2000). *English Language A-Level Study Guide*. London: Pearson.
- Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London: Routledge.
- Litosseliti, L. (2006). *Gender and Language: Theory and Practice*. London : Hodder Arnold.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- McCarthy, M., and Carter, R. (1994). *Language as Discourse*. London: Longman.

- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sidnell, J., and Stivers, T. (eds.) (2012).. *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (1992). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. London: Virago.
- Tannen, D. (2001). The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates (eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: a Reader* (pp. 150–166). London: SAGE.

## APPENDIX 1

### **Transcription Conventions based on Koester, A. J. 2002. The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. System 30: 167–184. The notion of 'key' is based on Brazil (1985)**

?	high rising intonation at end of tone unit
.	falling intonation at end of tone unit
!	animated intonation
...	noticeable pause or break of less than 1 second within a turn
<i>italics</i>	emphatic stress
↑	A step up in pitch (higher key)
↓	A shift down in pitch (lower key)
/ /	words between slashes show uncertain transcription
L	overlapping or simultaneous speech
[ ]	words in these brackets indicate non-linguistic information, e.g. pauses of 1 second or longer (the number of seconds is indicated), speakers' gestures or actions
.hh	inhalation (intake of breath)
hhh	aspiration (releasing of breath)

### **RODNE RAZLIKE U RAZGOVORU PRIJATELJA – ANALIZA DISKURSA DIJALOGA IZ TELEVIZIJSKE SERIJE *PAROVI***

Polazeći od više različitih teorijskih postavki vezanih za pitanja analize diskursa, jezika i roda, autori pokušavaju da analiziraju dva uzorka razgovora prijatelja iz televizijskog serijala *Parovi*, pri čemu su u jednom slučaju svi učesnici žene, a u drugom muškarci. Rad predstavlja istraživanje male razmere, a njegov glavni cilj jeste da uporedi stilove konverzacije muškaraca i žena u odnosu na više različitih kriterijuma koje predlažu razni autori – osiromašenost, dominacija, moćni i nemoćni jezik, moć i solidarnost, nadmetanje, saradnja, itd. Analiza nas vodi ka zaključku da je gotovo nemoguće povući jasnu granicu između muških i ženskih razgovora, bar onda kada je u pitanju korišćeni korpus i sve to zbog činjenice da se karakteristike konverzacije koje se vezuju za jedan ili drugi rod vrlo često preklapaju.

**Ključne reči:** analiza diskursa, analiza konverzacije, rod, dijalog, stilovi konverzacije.