

COMMUNICATING GENDER IN CONTEXT

Edited by

HELGA KOTTHOFF

University of Konstanz

RUTH WODAK

University of Vienna

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

The interactional achievement of expert status

Creating asymmetries by
"Teaching conversational lectures"
in TV discussions¹

Helga Kotthoff
University of Konstanz, Germany

Abstract

The subject of this article is the negotiation of expert status in television debates. In these competitive media situations men more often than women negotiate a high expert status for themselves, even if both are invited to participate because of expert knowledge of a certain topic. A central conversational activity hereby is "lecturing." The features of lecturing will be outlined. It is also shown how conversational lecturing influences group dynamics, i.e., how it increases competitiveness. Most women discussion members communicate knowledge in less authoritative formats. In the case of TV debates, the communicative ranking order is a component of the arrangement between the sexes (Goffman 1977) which goes beyond local conversational practice. "Doing gender" is analyzed as situated practice with variations. There are also symmetrical gender arrangements in some TV debates. The article favors a social-constructivist view on gender.

1. Introduction

In interactional gender studies, the focus of analysis lies on reconstructing the relevance of social difference in context. The concept of gender, asserted, for example, by Goffman (1977), Connell (1987), West/Zimmerman (1987),

Günthner (1992a, b) and Kotthoff (1993a, 1994), takes gender as a relevant category of accomplishing an interaction order. Gender is primarily seen as a category of the social order, not of the person.

All cultures produce, in one way or another, a gender difference that more or less actualizes itself in everyday activities. Not all cultures, however, do this in the same way.² In most cultures, a rank order is integrated into the gender difference, but this rank order is not equally important everywhere. Male behavior and activities are more highly valued. This assessment manifests itself in our culture implicitly, but perceptibly. For example, in public contexts, more powerful situational identities are often negotiated for men. "TV host and assistant hostess" is such a typical asymmetric gender arrangement that mostly appears in this constellation on Austrian, German, and Swiss television.

In a television discussion, for example, experts are only then recognized as experts if they present themselves as such, and if this situational identity is conversationally confirmed by their interaction partners. If it is the case that in certain contexts expert roles are more often created for men, and roles of the "affected" or "concerned" for women, then a solidly asymmetrical relationship between the sexes is established. Experts are normally given more talking time; they define the problems; they transmit their knowledge in lengthy turns; other participants frequently address questions to them, and they instruct their discussion partners on the "right" way to act. Thereby they gain conversational dominance. In contrast, women often communicate their expert knowledge in more explorative ways (Holmes 1991) which do not lead to dominance. Since gender is not the only social identity category which plays a role in interaction, the above-outlined pattern is far from being the only one found.

This analysis of Austrian/German/Swiss television discussions indeed indicates that many men, even if invited by the producers because they are "concerned" about a certain problem (e.g., suffering from a certain illness), attempt to present themselves, at the very least, in terms of a minor expert status (e.g., being an expert for that illness). For many women experts (not for all!), on the other hand, it is more difficult to negotiate this situational identity for themselves. They seldom try to act as authorities on the topic at hand from the beginning of the debate. The men who gain dominance in the course of discussion are ones who behave as experts and compete for this status from the start. Presumably, the role of an "affected" person is considered by many men to be a role with little social prestige.

The focus will be on the negotiation of expert status in TV group discussions. A distinction is made here between TV discussions and talk shows. TV discussions are strongly centered around topics and do not contain personal interviews, as do talk shows.

The main interest remains centered on how a status order is established conversationally in the context of openly structured media debates on social, cultural, and political topics, and how this process is related to gender. Conversational "lecture" formats which many men employ and also sequences in which women successfully or unsuccessfully communicate expert knowledge will be analyzed in detail. I shall also pay attention to the contextualization properties (Cook-Gumperz/Gumperz 1976) of "lecturing" and of explorative ways of transmitting knowledge.

This qualitative conversation-analytic study of group debates concurs with Leet-Pellegrini's (1980) quantitative variable analysis of dyadic interactions. She had 70 same-sex and mixed-sex pairs debate the dangers of television for children; fifty percent of the men and women participants had been made "experts" by being given special background information. Generally, the uninformed persons asked the informed ones more questions and gave them more positive minimal responses. This was seen as a confirmation of the knowledge asymmetry and an acceptance of the partner's expert role. The experts spoke more often, had lengthier turns, and interrupted their partners more often. The general structure of expert-layperson discourse did not appear in one constellation: Uninformed men in conversation with female experts were the exception. A comparison of the male/male, female/female and male (expert)/female (lay) discourses with the female (expert)/male (lay) discourse shows that the female experts supported their uninformed male partners to the extent that they compensated for their differences in knowledge. In this constellation of female expert and male layperson, the women and men developed conversational activities in order to balance the knowledge asymmetry. This study shows that men tend to assert themselves as experts, and that they are confirmed in this role by both women and men. However, men seem to have problems accepting women experts and women seem to have problems communicating their expert status to men.

Unfortunately, her study does not discuss subtle differences in the general enactment of knowledge asymmetries. It can very well be the case, however, that there are further differences between male/male and female/female conversations, for example, in the degree of the negotiated asymmetry

or the speech activities which lead to it. As is typical for quantitative studies, the analytical categories remain quite broad and general. In interactional sociolinguistics, scholars are quite sceptical concerning the value of context-free quantification of discourse phenomena. For example, Tannen (1993b) discusses several linguistic strategies (indirectness, interruption, silence versus volubility, topic raising, and adversativeness) which have widely divergent potential meanings. All of the strategies used to mark both power and solidarity in face-to-face interaction are strongly dependent upon context.

2. The type of television discussion

Ten television discussions were analyzed from the Austrian TV discussion "Club II," which are quite openly structured. They are always broadcast live and are open-ended late into the night. These discussions on social, psychological, cultural, scientific, and political themes are very popular in Austria, Switzerland and southern Germany. The discussions normally last about three hours. One factor that makes them so attractive is that both celebrities and 'ordinary' people are invited to appear together, so that there is always a high degree of spontaneity.³ It quite often happens that late at night politicians say things they never intended to say or actors reveal dimensions of their personality which they had hidden from the public. The atmosphere is usually quite relaxed. The discussions are moderated, but the moderators sometimes do not participate very much. These are some of the reasons why the debate shows are so popular.⁴ The first hour of each discussion was transcribed and the focus will remain on this first hour.

The discussions represent a microcosm in which the negotiation concerning points of view, conversational styles, status orders, interactional frames,⁵ and the face work of participants strongly depend on their own conversational activities. Negotiations of conversational dominance can therefore be pursued as processes in the group.

In media discussions participants present an image of themselves which they consider to be positive. If they exercise power, they do it in a way which does not threaten their public reputation (see also Felderer in this volume). People display more socially acceptable behavior in front of TV cameras than in private situations. By analyzing TV debates we also witness public forms of gendered behavior which are seen as displaying 'normality'.

3. Dominance and asymmetries: some conceptual remarks

The discussions, which were broadcast in the late eighties and early nineties, are analyzed in a discourse and conversation-analytic way focusing on the negotiation of dominance and subordination. Generally, there is variation in societal dominance structures. A particular dominance relation can be due to superior knowledge, institutional status hierarchies, symbolic capital, physical power, conversational styles, personal relationships, and/or all of these factors together. Many factors are, of course, involved in creating a certain social order for an event. Those who gain a high intrinsic status often talk a lot (and are tolerated or even supported by others); they are asked questions by others (and contribute extensive information); they define and steer subtopics (in which others collaborate); they establish their opinions as the most important, and they joke about others' opinions (and are rewarded with laughter), to mention just some features which are often discussed in the literature (Bales 1950, Coser 1960, Fishman 1983, Trömel-Plötz 1984, Thimm 1990, Tannen 1990, 1995, Linell/Luckmann 1991, James/Drakich 1993).⁶ Intrinsic situational status is, however, not linked to extrinsic in a straightforward way.

Most of the Club II TV discussions are debates on pro and con issues. In controversies, it can be the case that the person with the most hotly debated position gains the greatest amount of speaking time. The most controversial person can very well be the most dominant. A dominant person is not always a person with high social acceptance by the group. For example, there are two TV discussions in the current data with the reactionary Catholic Bishop Kurt Krenn. Krenn has caused many problems for the Austrian Catholic Church by fighting democratic tendencies in the basically undemocratic institution of that church. He wants women to play no official role in the church; for example, he prohibited girls as ministrants and he is absolutely against allowing women to become priests. The interactional style of Bishop Krenn is very authoritarian. Although his position is not accepted by the majority of the discussion participants, he is often addressed. But since nearly all the contributions addressed to him are critical, the high status which he gains in the discussion is a special case. Although Krenn is verbally attacked most of the time, having a large amount of speaking time nevertheless means, in this context, that he has the most opportunity to influence the TV audience in favor of his way of thinking. The power of the Catholic Church is thereby acted out.

There is considerable disagreement in discourse analysis as to what extent analysts should bring contextual, extrinsic information to bear on the process of identification and interpretation of intrinsic discourse patterns. Some researchers (e.g., Schegloff 1987) opt for an approach based more or less exclusively on intrinsic textual data, while others (e.g., Cicourel 1992, Philips 1992) argue for the use of complementary sources of information, such as ethnographies, data about actors, and self-interpretations of particular encounters.

Gender is such an extrinsic category, as Schegloff (1987) contends, that its relevance should only be shown in the data. It will also be maintained here that conversational processes should form the center of the analysis, but in order to meet the research needs of gender studies it is necessary to go beyond the analysis of local productions of asymmetries. Conversation analysis mostly sticks to local asymmetries and should therefore be extended by other methods, as is the case in interactional sociolinguistics. We need at least ethnographic information about the interlocutors.⁷ Otherwise we tend to think that a person's dominance depends only on her/his conversational style without taking into consideration that a style has to be legitimate. The conditions of felicity of conversational styles are primarily social conditions, imbued with power and authority.⁸

The focus here will be on one speech activity, "conversational lectures," which often create a high rank for those who carry them out. But "conversational lectures" (they will be analyzed and defined later) do not play an important role in every discourse type. If the talk is more about likes and dislikes (as is the case in one TV discussion in my data on the topic of 'motorbikes'), "teaching sequences" are not very common. The same holds true for pure exchanges of personal experiences. The topical context of the speech activity of "lecturing" is very relevant for its evaluation. But in debates, where knowledge plays an important role, we can see in the conversational data that "lectures," suspending turn-taking procedures, often lead to a dominant position. In comparing several TV discussions it was recognized that it is mainly female participants who are discouraged by the group from carrying out these status enhancing activities of "lecturing." Oftentimes, they are just at the point of starting a "lecture" only to be interrupted by a man who is already competing to gain a high expert status for himself. This man then completes the "lecture" his way (see also Tannen 1990: 123-148).

The gendered power structure observed in the data goes beyond the local textual level. It started already at the conferences where the producers of Club II decided whom to invite for a certain topic. For scientific and political subjects, women always form only a small minority (typically just one woman is invited in a round of six or seven men). Thereby, these topics are habitually redefined as belonging to the male world. It does not make sense to separate conversations from their institutional surroundings. Power relations have a history which is habitualized in institutional as well as conversational politics (Bourdieu 1990, 1991). Generally, the contextually enacted roles of the sexes in institutions (here: television discussions) and their styles of communication should not be separated from each other. In interactions, the social identities of the sexes are produced, reproduced and actualized through gender differentiated activities; these are reflected on the institutional level and work their way back and forth between institutional levels and those of concrete interactions.

It appears that intrinsic status interacts with extrinsic status in a complex way. For men, having a high extrinsic status means that they use this resource to make it interactionally relevant. For women, the relation between extrinsic and intrinsic status is less linear. There are women with a high extrinsic rank for whom this is made relevant interactionally, but there are also those for whom this is not the case.

4. Topics, participant structures, and short characterizations of the discussions

It is impossible in an article to analyze the power structure of 10 discussions in detail. Since it appears that in only two discussions was a symmetrical status order negotiated for the participating women, some information will be provided about the latter and about those persons who played the dominant roles in the discussions.

The first discussion (I) of the present corpus dealt with the topic "Mama's Boys." Five men and two women participated, and the discussion was also chaired by a woman. The women were the psychoanalyst Dr. Gisela Rieß (R) and Maria Schell von Noe (S), mother of five famous actors and herself an actress. The discussion was extremely asymmetrical, with the author Volker Elis Pilgrim (P) remaining in the center throughout most of the talk. His major

opponent was the psychoanalyst Prof. Dr. Harald Leupold-Löwenthal (L). In this discussion a clear participation hierarchy was established. The author, P, whose book provided the title for the discussion, talked much more than anybody else (273 transcript lines during the first hour). The other author, the psychoanalyst L, made the second most contributions (111 transcript lines); another man, professor of fine arts Enzensberger, the third most (99). All the others talked much less.

The topic for the second discussion (II) was "Fathers as Sexual Abusers." Four women, two men (after 50 minutes three), and a female chairperson participated. During the first hour, the women spoke a lot about their experiences; speaking times were quite balanced. Two of the women (Liane Dirks and Christl Dorpat) are authors of books on child abuse; both were personally affected, one as the wife of a sexual abuser and the other as a child. The third woman, a shop assistant, was also a victim as a child. The fourth woman was a social worker and founder of an initiative to help the sexually abused. During the rest of the discussion, the three men (a psychologist, an actor, and a man who was sexually abused as a child) debated general theses about sexuality.⁹ The two female authors played only minor roles in the debate. The male psychologist turned out to be the participant recognized as the best authority on child abuse.

The conversational gender politics of discussions I and II are examined in detail in Kotthoff (1992). From an outsider's point of view, participants in both discussions have different levels of competence concerning the topic at hand. For the women, this factor of knowledge is not made relevant; for the men it is. In each of the TV talks there are participants who have a higher potential status than the others because as authors they are experts.¹⁰ But only with the male experts is this role really conversationally enacted. As Leet-Pellegrini has already shown, the expertise of men and that of women are not the same.

Discussion (III) dealt with the importance of "Ötzi," the 'ice-man', whose 5,000-year-old remains were discovered in the Austrian Alps. In this discussion, six men, one woman, and a male moderator took part. As a professor of archaeology, the woman had the highest extrinsic status. However, she did not gain a high intrinsic rank. Judging by speaking times, in fact, she was not even among the top two.

Discussion (IV) was about the August 1991 attempted coup in the Soviet Union. In this discussion there were seven men, one woman, and a male

moderator. All of them were experts on the former Soviet Union. The female author, Lois Fisher-Ruge, spoke least. The male author, Wolfgang Leonhard, was asked the most questions, spoke most of the time, and gave the most lengthy political assessments. He won the status of the central authority on Russian politics in the group.

Discussion (V) was about higher taxes for motorcyclists. Four men, a male moderator, and three women participated. Knowledge transfer and the negotiation of expert status were not relevant here. Story-telling was much more important. The men who argued for motorcycling merely told stories about the joys of conquering the world on a motor bike. Those who held contra positions told stories about accidents and the dangers of motorcycling. Gender politics in this case is demonstrated by the fact that not one active female motorcyclist was invited, only three men who abandoned themselves to enthusiastically raving about motorcycling.

Discussion (VI) dealt with celibacy in the Catholic Church. The conservative Bishop Kurt Krenn took part. His opponents were professor of theology Uta Ranke-Heinemann; Gisela Forster, mother of three children fathered by a Catholic priest; Martin Krexner, a former priest who decided to marry and had to give up his ecclesiastical office; Leopold Ledl, an author critical of life in the Vatican; another Catholic priest, and a female moderator. The intrinsic power structure was extremely hierarchical, with Bishop Krenn talking most of the time, being attacked by most of the others, taking much time to defend himself and counter-attack Ranke-Heinemann, Forster, Krexner, and Ledl. Krenn denied that the female professor, Ranke-Heinemann, had theological expertise.

Discussion (VII) had the title "fundamentalism in the Catholic Church" and again Bishop Krenn was a guest. The discussion had a male moderator. The other guests were: the feminist theologian Veronika Prüller, the liberal professor Erwin Ringl, the right-wing religious publicist Herbert Lindner, the moderate-conservative religious publicist Pia Maria Plechl, the Jesuit and professor Jozef Niewiadomski, and the liberal journalist and expert on the Vatican Hans-Jacob Strehle. Again, Bishop Krenn occupied the center of the debate throughout the discussion. His major opponent was Professor Ringl. The authors Veronika Prüller and Pia Maria Plechl played only minor roles and made very few contributions. Krenn especially denied Prüller's theological expertise.

Discussion (VIII) was about the artist Otto Mühl, who was a hotly debated figure in the German-speaking countries in 1991. He was imprisoned

that year for sexual experiments with children. Otto Mühl was the founder of the anti-bourgeois commune 'Friedrichshof' in Vienna. Among the invited "Club" guests there were two friends of Otto Mühl, fine arts professor Oswald Oberhuber and the art critic Regina Wyrwoll, who defended Mühl's 'progressive' ideas; the other participants strongly criticized them as inhumane. Three former members of the commune, Nikolaus Helbich, Wencke Mühleisen, and Nadja Reyne, were among the critics, along with ethics professor Robert Prantner. Among the former commune members, Helbich presented himself very much as an expert. So did Oberhuber, who did not primarily act as a friend of Mühl but only as an expert on Mühl's art.

Discussion IX was about the politics of the Austrian FPÖ, a formerly liberal party with strong nationalistic tendencies. Only one woman participated among six men: the famous German politician Hildegard Hamm-Brücher. She gained a high situational status, which was interactively created by the whole group. Hamm-Brücher was, for example, asked many questions and was granted a large amount of speaking time. The status of a leading authority was thus negotiated for her.

Discussion X dealt with problems of the Austrian and German health care systems. A female professor of linguistics and a female medical journalist participated as guests, along with five men; a female physician moderated the discussion. The two women acted only as experts and were not put at a disadvantage. In conversation X, a more symmetrical rank ordering came into being than in the majority of the TV conversations. Gender stereotyping was not evidenced in discussions IX and X, for which there were different reasons.

In comparing the discussions, we can detect differing degrees of everyday gender politics. Gender politics are already manifest in the invitation politics of the broadcasters. Women are only allowed to form the majority in television conversations when the topics deal with "women's issues." In political discussions on German-speaking television there is usually only one woman as a discussion participant.

Prototypical episodes from different debates will be examined more closely later in this text. The following analysis of gender asymmetry generally applies to seven discussions. The discussion about motorcycling was an exception because speech activities of transmitting knowledge and presenting oneself as an expert were not important for that topic.

5. The exceptions: Gender symmetries

We come across cultural conceptions of gender not as "pure" categories, but rather as elements of stereotyped and habitualized activities and identities. However, it is not always the case that people act out stereotypical gender identities. Other identity categories may prevail (Kotthoff, 1993a, Hirschauer 1994). On the concrete level of conversation, gender stereotyping can very well be challenged and changed. Furthermore, cultural notions of gender allow a certain scope for behavioral differences. On the one hand, normative gender expectations are not acted out in every context to the same degree; and on the other hand, not every person conforms to them to the same extent. The differences in the production of gender asymmetries must be considered important for future research. Although one should be conscious of the limited possibilities for "undoing gender" (Hirschauer 1994), it is still necessary to pay attention to it.

Two of the 10 discussions are exceptions regarding culturally ongoing gender politics. In these political discussions (IX and X), all participants were conceded expert status.

In the present corpus, these are the only cases that did not follow stereotypical gendered power politics. Although I shall not discuss in detail the conversational strategies of the women and men who negotiated a symmetrical situational gender arrangement, I mention them in order to avoid suggesting a simplistic black-and-white picture.

Concerning her extrinsic status, the liberal German politician Hamm-Brücher (a former cabinet minister) is the highest in the round. She represents the International Forum of Liberals and was once the liberal (FDP) candidate for president of Germany. During the discussion, she explained what political liberalism is; she formulated fundamental points of criticism concerning the politics of the ultra-nationalist Austrian FPÖ. Three male participants formed a coalition with her against three men from the FPÖ. These three allies referred to her comments quite often ("as Frau Hamm-Brücher already pointed out..."), and the moderator asked her topically important questions, which she answered quite exhaustively. She also taught her opponents a lesson. She received a large amount of speaking time. All these features point to the fact that a high intrinsic status was negotiated for her.

All participants in discussion X had high professional status, the male Austrian Minister of Health enjoying the highest. The majority of the partic-

ipants were interested in reforming the health system for several reasons. One male physician defended the status quo and was quite often attacked by other participants. Besides this, many points of controversy concerned minor questions. No one was constantly at the center of attention. Debates between two persons often shifted among participants in the group. Everybody presented knowledge and acted as an expert on the topic. Speaking times were quite balanced. The two women presented their opinions in expository ways (the notion will be explained below).

6. Experts and "concerned"

In the following the activities that play an important part in creating the asymmetrical arrangements between the sexes in media discussions are isolated and described in greater detail. Some people are invited as experts and some as "concerned" laypersons. These situational identities are important in many TV discussions and also constitute a guideline for selecting invitees. Gender politics thereby already begin before the talk and define a frame for it that need not, however, be actualized as such. Normally predominantly male experts and female laypersons are invited by the producers. With social themes, both categories intertwine with each other, because people can become experts — even writers of books — on problems they have themselves. However, the way in which a certain situational identity is realized is an interactional event.

Let us again look at the distribution of invited experts:

In discussion I (mama's boys) Herr Pilgrim, Frau Rieß and Herr Leupold-Löwenthal were introduced as professionals working in the chosen problem area to be debated. Herr Pilgrim has written a book on "mama's boys" and Dr. Rieß and Dr. Leupold-Löwenthal are psychoanalysts. The role of expert for psychoanalysis and psychology, however, was actualized for and with the man, Leupold-Löwenthal (L). Dr. Rieß (R), the female psychologist, later addressed psychological questions to the author Pilgrim. The asymmetry which was confirmed by this is evident. The female moderator spoke with both female guests in a way that gave the impression they were not experts but rather concerned laypersons; the men were treated more as experts on the problem. The first woman (the actress), who was directly addressed by the moderator, was asked to personally respond to "How was it with your sons?"

In discussion II (fathers as sexual abusers) the majority of the participants had somehow been personally affected by the problem. Two persons are introduced as 'unaffected' experts, the psychologist Herr Picker (P) and the social worker Frau Zöchling (Z). Two other persons are introduced as 'affected' experts, the women authors L. Dirks (L) and C. Dorpat (D). Herr Picker came out as the first expert. In this debate it is very interesting to compare those participants who were introduced as personally 'affected' by the problem at hand. Three women and one man (who joined the group 50 minutes after the start) had had horrifying experiences of physical abuse by a male relative in their childhoods. By telling the audience about their experiences in a moving style, the three women provided deep insights into how a child is shocked and hurt by such experiences. The man, however, downplayed his childhood years of torture and expressed very general and abstract theses about sexuality as such. His conversational behavior and that of the artist Contra (C) helped to restructure the whole conversation from an exchange of experiences to a debate on abstract theses about sexuality and society.

In the debate III about "Ötzi," one can differentiate between the concerned politicians¹¹ and the academic experts. An artist, named Tilly, behaved eccentrically and with regard to his situative identity was hard to define. The only woman present is a professor for archaeology. In this debate the men present compete very heavily in the display of knowledge. Prof. Osterwalder does not take part in this competition for the first 40 minutes. Later, Dr. Osterwalder is presented as an expert, because she is asked frequently by the host, Nagiller, to make expert statements. The moderator succeeds against tendencies in the group and also against her own self-presentation in anchoring the situative identity of expert authority for Prof. Osterwalder.

In the discussion about the Soviet Union (IV), everyone had been invited as an expert, but there were, as will be seen, high and low levels of expertise. Lois Fisher-Ruge, who talked only about everyday problems in Moscow, received a lower rank than those who analyzed political issues and made prognoses. Fisher-Ruge, author of several books on the former Soviet Union, was not given the opportunity to go beyond telling about everyday life in Russia; however, the political assessments were produced by the men. They never addressed their elaborate political comments to her. Questions were directed to her only when personal experiences became relevant. Most questions concerning political evaluations were addressed to Wolfgang Leonhard.

Discussions VI and VII were special cases because the other participants had no real chance to stand their ground against Bishop Krenn. Krenn interrupted most speakers, devalued their experience and competence, and consistently claimed the right to define today's situation in the Catholic Church himself. Regarding the experts with high extrinsic status, Uta Ranke-Heinmann, a professor of theology, was attacked by him in the sharpest manner. Krenn even expressed doubt about her being a professor.¹²

In discussion VIII we can compare Oswald Obermüller and Regina Wyrwoll as outside experts on Otto Mühl's art and life, and Nikolaus Helbig, Wencke Mühleisen and Nadja Reyne as inside experts on Otto Mühl's art and life and as personally affected by his behavior. The status of the most competent experts was negotiated for Oswald Oberhuber and Nikolaus Helbig.

Let us have a look at some first turns of women experts:

7. The disadvantaged female expert

What can happen if a woman is addressed as an expert can be seen in discussion III on "Ötzi."

In all conversations in which only marginal roles were negotiated for the women, they hardly spoke at all during the first half hour. It looks as if the social micro-order of the group is settled within the first minutes of the discussion. The men had already debated 40 minutes before the following sequence took place. During the first 40 minutes, the Swiss professor Christin Osterwalder participated with only one short question, which was hardly reacted to. The men debated the background of the "Frozen Fritz" among themselves. Then the moderator addresses her with her own question about the reconstruction of the man's past (1-3).

Data 1

(N = moderator Nagiller, O = archaeology professor Osterwalder, S = doctor of forensic medicine Szillvassy)

- 1 N: I would like to turn again to Frau Osterwalder,
ich möchte jetzt nochmal zur Frau Osterwalder,
- 2 you asked a question before,
Sie hat vorhin eine Frage gestellt,
- 3 (- -) which cannot be answered.
(- -) auf die es keine Antwort gibt.

- 4 (0.5)
- 5 O: well I mean (-) the man was passing through up there.
ja ich mein (-) der Mann war unterwegs da oben.
- 6 he couldn't live there.
der konnte nicht dort leben.
- 7 N: yes
ja
- 8 O: and for us of course the question is very important,
und für uns ist natürlich die Frage sehr wichtig,
- 9 [where he came from.
[woher kam er.
- 10 N: [for us? what does it mean for us?
[für uns? was heißt für uns?
- 11 O: for archaeology, let's put it like that.
für die Archäologie, sagen wirs mal so.
- 12 I suppose other people could also be
ich nehme an, andere Leute könnte es auch
- 13 interested in that,
interessieren,
- 14 but for archaeologists it would at any rate
aber die Archäologen würde es jedenfalls schon im
- 15 be very much interesting, in connection with his possessions
Zusammenhang mit seiner Ausrüstung enorm interessieren,
- 16 to know where he came from. because the Alps region is
wo er herkam. denn das Alpengebiet ist ja
- 17 (- -) mm how can I put it,
(- -) mm wie sagt man dem,
- 18 in a paleoethnological perspective
paläoethnologisch gesehen
- 19 immensely exciting.
ungemein spannend.
- 20 so much is confused, especially in the Bronze Age,
da mischt sich soviel durcheinander, und gerade in der Bronzezeit,
- 21 thus roughly two thousand years before Christ,
also grob im zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christus,
- 22 so much was happening in this region
hat sich in diesem Raum so viel getan
- 23 in terms of mass migrations,
an Bevölkerungsverschiebungen,
- 24 cultural developments, and so on,
an kulturellen Entwicklungen, und so weiter,
- 25 that one would naturally very much like to know, (-)
daß man also natürlich furchtbar gern wissen möchte, (-)

- 26 where this man lived with his possessions.
wo der Mann mit seiner Ausrüstung zu Hause war.
- 27 N: co could you tell us a bit
kö können Sie uns a bissel
- 28 this is your special field, [what was
des is ja Ihr Spezialgebiet, [was da
- 29 O: [bit more concrete
[bissel konkreter
- 30 N: tell us a bit about this epoch in general.
a bissel was erzählen über diese Zeit im Allgemeinen.
- 31 in the Alps. thus the Bronze Age. the early Bronze Age.
im Alpenraum. die Bronzezeit also. die frühe Bronzezeit.
- 32 O: well (-) you must take into consideration one thing,
also (-) eines muß man sich vergegenwärtigen,
- 33 if you think about the Bronze Age, (-)
wenn man an die Bronzezeit denkt, (-)
- 34 the climate was a bit better than today.
das Klima war ein bißchen besser als heute.
- 35 well [it was
also [es war
- 36 N: [does that mean warmer.
[heißt das wärmer.
- 37 O: warmer and drier. I cannot tell you exactly,
wärmer und trockener. ich kann Ihnen nicht genau sagen,
- 38 how many average degrees per year,
wieviel Durchschnittsgrade im Jahr,
- 39 but archaeologically it is recognizable from the fact,
aber wir merken das archäologisch daran,
- 40 that obviously the Alps were treated,
daß offensichtlich Alpen bestoßen wurden,
- 41 and acres, wheat was cultivated in higher regions,
und Äcker, Weizen gezüchtet wurde in Hohenlagen,
- 42 where today that is no longer possible.
wo das heute nicht mehr möglich ist.
- 43 thus they had more opportunities
also man hatte mehr Möglichkeiten
- 44 to really use the Alps economically,
die Alpen wirklich wirtschaftlich zu nutzen,
- 45 and uh to treat them [than later.
und eh zu durchdringen [als später.
- 46 N: [may I give a short translation.
[darf ich a kleine Übersetzung sagen.

- 47 we in Austria say alms. so that people understand
wir in Österreich sagen Almen. daß die Leute
- 48 correctly,=
richtig,=
- 49 O: alms.
Almen.
- 50 N: =to treat the Alps means to develop alm economy.
= Alpen bestoßen heißt Almwirtschaft betreiben.
- 51 O: exactly.
genau.
- 52 N: yes.
ja
- 53 O: yes HEHEHEHEHE
ja HEHEHEHEHE
- 54 N: Alps are only the mountains.
Alpen sind bloß die Berge.
- 55 O: problem of different languages. exactly.
Problem der Fremdsprachen. genau.
- 56 S: if I may add something to this.
wenn ich dazu etwas bemerken darf.
- 57 the question where this man came from,
die Frage woher dieser Mann kam,
- 58 can possibly be answered
die kann vielleicht vom
- 59 from a scientific standpoint,
wissenschaftlichen Standpunkt aus,
- 60 from an anthropological standpoint.
vom anthropologischen Standpunkt aus beurteilt werden.
- 61 in the Bronze Age three groups of people lived there
in der Bronzezeit lebten drei Gruppen von Menschen,
- 62 three population types.
drei Populationstypen.
- 63 on the one hand there were highfaced uh human beings,
einmal waren es hochgesichtige eh Menschen,
- 64 with a slim, long skull, like this Similaun man,
mit einem schmalen, langen Schädel, wie dieser Similaunmann,
- 65 and those of medium body size, and they are
und die von mittlerer Körpergröße waren, und diese
- 66 often called band ceramics.
Menschen werden oft Bandkeramiker bezeichnet.
- 67 besides there were also (-) more broadfaced,
daneben gibt es aber dann auch noch die (-) breitgesichtigeren,

exhaustive assessments. During the first hour of this debate, Fisher-Ruge was conceded only three very short turns. Her longest turn does not even make up a third of the average length of the men's. Data 2 contains Fisher-Ruge's longest turn, occurring after 55 minutes of debate, at which point Boris Groys had just finished a long assessment of the Soviet army.

Data 2

(S = professor of political science Seiffert, R = author Lois Fisher-Ruge, L = author Wolfgang Leonhard, M = moderator Paul Lendvai)

- 1 S: well the situation is possibly not as academic
also die Situation ist vielleicht nicht so akademisch
 2 as we make it. [instead
wie wir diskutieren. [sondern
 3 ?: [mhm
 4 ?: [exactly
[genau
 5 M: [exactly. uh Frau uh Frau uh
[genau. eh Frau eh Frau eh
 6 how how do you see, Frau Ruge. the [the (? ?)
wie wie sehen Sie, Frau Ruge. die [die (? ?)
 7 R: [(? ?)
 8 M: regarding the people. [not regarding
von den Menschen her. [nicht von der
 9 R: [I can only admire your
[ich kann nur bewundern Ihr
 10 knowledge, and I talk about life,
Wissen, und ich spreche vom Leben,
 11 M: yes
ja
 12 R: everyday life, and that is a bit more banal,
im Alltag, und das ist ein bißchen banaler,
 13 but it is a fact.
aber das ist eine Tatsache.
 14 ?: exactly.
richtig.
 15 R: and we shall unfortunately begin with the stomach.
und wir werden anfangen leider mit dem Magen.
 16 M: yes.
ja.
 17 L: yes.
ja.

- 18 R: and with the stomach, not with words, words have
und mit dem Magen, nicht mit Wörtern, Wörter haben
 19 no calories. I do not talk about what I think,
keine Kalorien. ich spreche nicht wie ich denke,
 20 I talk only about experiences in the countryside. (H)
ich spreche nur von Erfahrungen im Lande. (H)
 21 and the population is very discontented,
und die Bevölkerung ist sehr unzufrieden,
 22 because of the worsening living conditions,
wegen dieser Verschlechterung der Lebensbedingungen,
 23 the empty shops, we had that already,
die leere Läden, wir hatten das schon,
 24 empty shops, no shoes and so on.
leere Läden, keine Schuhe undsoweiter.
 25 because of this there was a support action.
deswegen gab es eine Hilfsaktion.
 26 and what I fear, (-) Wolfgang, is,
und was ich befürchte, (-) Wolfgang, ist,
 27 if this putsch group, I can only say,
wenn diese Putschgruppe, kann ich nur sagen,
 28 is able to offer something else,
etwas anderes anbieten könnte,
 29 L: food
Ernährung
 30 R: for example full shops, shoes and clothing.
zum Beispiel volle Läden, Schuhe und Kleidung.
 31 they'll publicize this choice,
sie werben für diese Entscheidung,
 32 because it means law, order, guarantees, peace.
weil das bedeutet Gesetz, Ordnung, Garantien, Ruhe.
 33 I do not speak about our group of intellectuals,
ich spreche nicht von unserer Gruppe von Intellektuellen,
 34 about our closest friends. I speak only about the population,
von unseren engsten Freunden. ich spreche nur von der Bevölkerung,
 35 and because I was in the countryside,
und weil ich auf dem Land war,
 36 how much they have, how much they can decide,
wieviel sie haben, wieviel sie entscheiden können,
 37 but based on what I feel. the question is just,
aber vom Gefühl her. die Frage ist nur,
 38 will will the decision be made in the big cities
werden wird die Entscheidung gemacht sein in großen Städten

- 39 such as Sverdlovsk, Leningrad Saint Petersburg or
 40 wie Sverdlovsk, Leningrad Sankt Petersburg oder
 Moscow or from outside. or only with workers,
 41 Moskau oder außerhalb. oder nur mit Arbeiter,
 miners, and other workers. we don't know that yet.
 42 Bergarbeiter, und andere Arbeiter. das wissen wir noch nicht.
 but [the question
 43 L: aber [die Frage
 [no doubt. I am exactly of your opinion.
 [zweifellos. ich bin genau Deiner Ansicht.
 44 thank God, for us it is clear that the eight gentlemen
 Gott sei Dank, für uns ist es klar, daß die acht Herren
 45 from the committee will NOT solve this problem. ...
 vom Komitee dieses Problem NICHT lösen werden. ...

Frau Fisher-Ruge is asked to de-academicize the conversation. Her start in line 9 contains subtle ironic aspects. She contrasts (general) knowledge and everyday life. She claims to talk about banal facts (but they are in fact the contrary of banal). In lines 19 and 20 she focuses on a contrast between her topic (experiences) and the topics so far (thoughts). She thereby tries to create prestige for her own statements. From line 21 to 25 she characterizes the situation in the countryside. From this report she develops her assessment of the possibilities of the putsch group. She uses a rhetorical strategy similar to that used by Osterwalder in data 1. She first formulates the relevant questions, which is typical for an exploratory argumentative style. She cannot, however, develop her line of thinking about the situation in the Soviet Union, because Wolfgang Leonhard interrupts her at this point to answer the questions in a very definite manner. The same happened to Dr. Osterwalder. Some men seem to exploit the women's explorative, rhetorical questions as hitching posts for their own expositions. In the speaking style of the two women these questions contextualize an orientation to the topic which the speaker is going to explore herself. They are not meant to be answered by another participant, but can be reinterpreted in such a way. We are possibly dealing with a case of female/male miscommunication here, but surely also with a case of male power politics.

It is a strategic mistake to address Wolfgang Leonhard so exclusively as she does in line 26. Thereby she facilitates his taking over the turn. In line 29 Leonhard already gets a word in edgewise. Fisher-Ruge goes on for some time explaining the situation outside Moscow. Leonhard interrupts her very

enthusiastically. He strongly agrees with her. Nevertheless, he develops the political assessment of the putsch group-himself, which she was also about to outline. By strongly agreeing he frames his interruption in a polite way.

For an explorative style it seems typical first to outline the questions of relevance for the topic at hand. This style can only be successful in a cooperative atmosphere where assessments are presented carefully and many facets of the topic can be presented. In the context of a competitive debate the style fails to develop its potential. It makes it easier for others to intervene.

In discussion VIII it was also the case that Professor Oberhuber (O) was the first person asked to give a general assessment of the artist Otto Mühl.¹⁵ Then the moderator asked Wencke Mühleisen (M) how she felt about Mühl's artistic activities. Oberhuber is addressed as the expert on Otto Mühl, and Mühleisen, as one affected by Otto Mühl's activities.

Data 3

Wencke Mühleisen (M), moderator (G)

- 1 G: ... You, Frau Mühleisen, you were first attracted by
 Sie, Frau Mühleisen, sind durch die künstlerischen
 2 the artistic activities.
 Aktivitäten zunächst einmal angezogen worden.
 3 by the theater and the self-performances,
 durch das Theater und die Selbstdarstellung,
 4 how did you feel [about that.
 wie kam Sie [das empfunden.
 5 M: [yes my my interest was the theater.
 [ja mein mein Interesse war das Theater.
 6 and uhm I have to say
 und ehm ich muß auch sagen,
 7 that as long as the self-performance uh (-) at Friedrichshof
 daß eh solange die Selbstdarstellung eh - am Friedrichshof
 8 was still so to speak free, uh should, I find,
 noch sozusagen frei war, eh muß finde ich,
 9 that one cannot refuse to acknowledge that Friedrichshof,
 daß man dem Friedrichshof nicht aberkennen kann,
 10 was an an artistic experiment.
 eine ein künstlerisches Experiment gewesen zu sein.
 11 the self-presentation, that was a a a very exciting thing,
 die Selbstdarstellung, das war eine ein eine sehr spannende Sache,
 12 a mixture of psycho-drama, therapy, psychoanalysis, free role play,
 von Psychodrama, Therapie, Psychoanalyse, freies Rollenspiel,

- 13 uh actionist elements, u:h that was for me very fascinating.
 14 *eh aktionistische Elemente, e:h was eh für mich sehr faszinierend war.*
 15 and I also think that one must say
 16 *und ich glaube auch, daß man sagen muß,*
 17 that there was a great potential for personal development there.
 18 *daß da lag ein großes Potential an persönlicher Entwicklung.*
 19 communication. ('H) many of us were people,
 20 *Kommunikation. ('H) viele von uns waren Leute,*
 21 who came from the sixties and seventies,
 22 *die kamen von den sechziger, siebziger Jahren,*
 23 and were looking for an alternative.
 24 *und haben eine Alternative gesucht.*
 25 we were people who were very critical of authoritarian systems.
 26 *wir waren Leute, die sehr kritisch waren, autoritären Systemen gegenüber.*
 27 we very well already at the beginning saw a seed (-) in Otto's role.
 28 *wohl sahen wir schon am Anfang einen Keim (-) in Ottos Rolle.*
 29 but we chose to overlook this.
 30 *wir wählten aber das zu übersehen.*
 31 because of our idealism so to speak.
 32 *unseres Idealismuses wegen sozusagen.*
 33 and besides one must also be able to acknowledge,
 34 *und außerdem muß man ja auch anerkennen können,*
 35 that this dominant role of Otto's
 36 *daß diese dominante Rolle Ottos*
 37 uh uh was important at the beginning.
 38 *eh eh wichtig war am Anfang.*
 39 in order to put the whole thing on stage. uh
 40 *um das Ganze zu inszenieren. eh*
 41 I would like to say, however, that uh, at the end
 42 *eh ich möchte aber sagen, daß eh am Ende*
 43 I would claim, that Friedrichshof developed
 44 *würde ich behaupten, daß der Friedrichshof zu*
 45 into a very ordinary sect.
 46 *einer sehr gewöhnlichen Sekte geworden ist.*
 47 'H and in a sense one can almost say as well
 48 *'H und eigentlich kann man das fast also auch sagen,*
 49 that where the presentation of self stopped being FREE,
 50 *daß wo: die Selbstdarstellung aufhörte FREI zu sein,*
 51 where you were also free to criticize Otto as much,
 52 *wo man also auch Kritik anbringen konnte genauso an den Otto,*
 53 as his parents, or whatever the subject of self-performance was.
 54 *wie auch an seine Eltern, oder was das Thema der Selbstdarstellung war.*

- 34 then the presentation of self became a ritual,
 35 *dann wurde die Selbstdarstellung ein Ritual,*
 36 a group-dynamic ritual for members who were rebellious
 37 *ein gruppendynamisches Ritual für Gruppenmitglieder, die aufsässig waren*
 38 or were to be disciplined.
 39 *oder die zu disziplinieren waren.*
 40 so it became a a ritual as is typical in sects actually, actually.
 41 *also ein ei:n: Ritual was: ja üblich ist in Sekten eigentlich eigentlich.*

Mühleisen gives a complex and differentiated account of Friedrichshof. The moderator asks her about her feelings (4), but instead she informs the round of what was happening there during the early years and what this meant to her. She characterizes her group and its point of view. From line 26 onwards she presents a critical assessment of the later years of Otto Mühl's commune. She belonged to this commune for many years and was an artist herself who took part in the art that was developed in the commune. Mühleisen uses many markers of subjectivity, such as "I have to say" (6), "I find" (8), "for me" (13), "I also think" (14), "one must also be able to" (23), "I would like to say" (27), "I would claim" (28). This is functional, on the one hand, because she talks about her own impressions. However, on the other hand, her concrete experiences are assigned a narrower scope than Prof. Oberhuber's abstract assessments.

Before Mühleisen received her turn from the moderator, he had already asked Prof. Oberhuber to assess Mühl as an artist. For comparison, I shall present the first turn of his contribution, which is immediately followed by a second:

Data 4:

Oswald Oberhuber (O), moderator (G)

- 1 G: ...and to introduce us to this topic,
 2 *...und uns in dies Thema einzuführen,*
 3 how do you assess Mühl as an artist and his further
 4 *wie Sie Otto Mühl als Künstler einschätzen und seine weitere*
 5 artistic development. is the whole of it a
 6 *künstlerische Entwicklung. ist das Ganze ein*
 7 synthesis of the arts and should it be seen as such.
 8 *Gesamtkunstwerk und als solches zu betrachten.*
 9 O: yes. Mühl is indeed a multidimensional man.
 10 *ja. Mühl ist eben ein vielseitiger Mensch.*

6 that is firstly (-) the starting point for Otto Mühl,
das ist schon mal (-) die Ausgangsbasis für Otto Mühl,
 7 I mean, (-) he has a knack for painting as well
das heißt, (-) es liegt ihm die Malerei genauso,
 8 (-) as for experimenting with human beings. (-)
(-) wie das Experiment am Menschen. (-)
 9 I say that with a question mark, okay? and thereby he had
mit Fragezeichen sag ich jetzt mal, nicht? und dadurch hatte
 10 a quite different path than many uh artists,
er ja auch einen ganz anderen Weg als wie viele eh Künstler,
 11 whom we otherwise experience so directly, as one-dimensional persons,
die wir sonst so unmittelbar erleben, als geradelinige Personen,
 12 who are interested in only one specific thing.
die sich nur für eine bestimmte Sache interessieren.
 13 well, your average just-sculptors. God knows. (-) how
 I got acquainted with Mühl,
also normalen Nur-Bildhauern. weiß Gott. (-) wie ich Mühl
kennengelernt habe,
 14 he was very intensely active in art pedagogy,
war er ja sehr stark: in der Kunsterziehung tätig,
 15 hence a man who already had gained influence here,
also ein Mensch der hier schon Einfluß genommen hat,
 16 concerning people. hence he put art in reference to people,
in Bezug auf Menschen. also die Kunst in Bezug gestellt zu Menschen,
 17 but in a different form. that means hence
aber in einer anderen Form. das heißt also
 18 he employs uh art, in a media::tion (-)
er verwendet eh die Kunst, in eine Vermittlu::ng hinein (-)
 19 in the, I don't know, states, mental states I would say or
in die, weiß ich, Zustä:nde: seelische Zustände würd ich sagen oder
 20 other or psych (H'H) psychic states, and in this sense
andere oder psych (H'H) psychische Zustände, und in diesem Sinn
 21 his path was already outlined, I should like to say
war sein Weg schon gezeichnet, i möchte sagen
 22 that is also a certain Austrian path.
das ist auch ein gewisser österreichischer Weg.
 23 because we know uh Schiele or Kokoschka or already Klimt, okay?
weil wir kennen eh Schiele oder Kokoschka oder auch schon Klimt, nicht?
 24 uh thinking apart from this psychological viewpoint, what he,
eh von dieser psychologischen Seite wegdenken, was er
 25 he actually takes the Austrian path,
er geht eigentlich den österreichischen Weg,
 26 which absolutely leads in a certain direction.
der ganz absolut in eine bestimmte Richtung führt.

Oberhuber starts by defining a unique and exclusive perspective for assessing Otto Mühl and then interprets what that means. The modal particle "indeed" in line 5 presupposes that this claim cannot be questioned. Oberhuber then defines the "starting point" for the whole evaluation of Mühl. He presents a very subjective opinion (that Mühl has a knack for painting as well as experimenting with human beings) without any marker of subjectivity. Thus, highly debatable claims are explicitly presented in the most straightforward manner (without question intonation); The phrase, "I say that with a question mark," does not weaken the force of the statement. Before saying anything concrete and comprehensible (or even personal) about Mühl he develops the thesis that there is an Austrian way of art and that Mühl belongs to the famous tradition of the painters Klimt, Schiele, and Kokoschka. This statement has aspects of a lecture because it identifies one impersonal perspective as correct to the exclusion of possible others. The assessments are highly generalized. Oberhuber outlines the right way to see Mühl as opposed to possible others.

Both Oswald Oberhuber and Regina Wyrwoll are art experts. Both hold a positive perspective on Otto Mühl. The other participants are very critical. In contrast to Oberhuber, Wyrwoll outlines her point of view on Otto Mühl as being very subjective and talks about her own positive experiences with him. Nadja Reyne talks about her very negative experiences with him. Wencke Mühleisen presents the most sophisticated analysis of the whole phenomenon of Otto Mühl, the communes, and the happenings. She is, however, only addressed as a former member of Friedrichshof, never as an expert on the phenomenon. It is mostly Oberhuber who acts out his extrinsic expert status and thereby also gains a high intrinsic one.

8. Conversational lectures

One central speech activity of communicating expert knowledge can be called "a conversational lecture." The 'keying' (interaction modality) usually remains serious. Lecture monologues help to negotiate the situative status of an expert for the debated question. At times these expert roles remain stable throughout the entire duration of conversation; at other times they are only temporary.

A conversational lecture is a special form of "conversational teaching," an activity about which Keppler and Luckmann (1991: 145) write:

Whenever a teaching sequence is in progress, the 'egalitarian' style which characterizes informal dialogue is temporarily replaced by a 'hierarchical' one . . . conversational teaching remains an enclave within conversation.

For the duration of the teaching sequence the normal turn-taking procedure is modified (Keppler 1989). If the speaker pauses, recipients "normally" just give positive or negative feedback tokens. "Lectures" are "big packages" in Sacks' terms (1974). We have already shown that this "normality" is gender based; it is often a man anxious to increase his own status who interrupts a female "teacher."

Keppler and Luckmann write that any knowledge asymmetry can lead to conversational teaching. They do not, however, differentiate between teaching and explaining, as is done here. Teaching, especially in a conversational lecture format, devalues the knowledge of others (which is already manifest) and demands an authoritative status for one's own knowledge. Explaining lacks the competitive and corrective aspect. We explain things about which we think others do not know, but we teach them things about which we think they hold wrong or deficient opinions.

Lectures frame the TV conversations as debates about theses. If a conversation is framed as a debate on theses, a competence hierarchy is likely to arise. Theses are uttered with an inherent claim of objectivity, knowledge and generalizability. Theses often form the center of little lessons which the protagonists exchange.

Let us have a look at another debate. Discussion I is mostly framed as a debate over Pilgrim's theses about male violence — as published in his book. Although the topic "mama's boys" stems from everyday social life, the exchange of personal experiences does not gain any importance.¹⁶ Only the two women and the two young men participating describe personal experiences in their few contributions — the two most important men do not. They take their examples from history, psychoanalysis and theories about child development. Their utterances are framed as general instructional statements. Their turns are long monologues with a clear structure consisting of introduction, main part, and ending.

In data 5 we see a prototypical turn format of a non-institutional "teaching" or "instructing"-activity.

Data 5

Leupold-Löwenthal (L)

- 1 L: [no they cannot give information, because the material you use
[na: sie können ja nicht Auskunft geben, denn das
Material, das Sie verwenden
- 2 is inadequate. I MUST reject using material
ist ein unbrauchbares. ich MUß es ablehnen, mit einem Material,
- 3 that tells us nothing at all
das uns überhaupt nix sagt,
- 4 about the MOST important developmental period of a human being
über die WICHTIGste Entwicklungszeit eines Menschen
- 5 to draw such broad conclusions.
so weitreichende Schlüsse zu ziehen.

The introduction consists of an attack on what the previous speaker said, here author Pilgrim. P is criticized and his position is claimed to be deficient. From line 6 to line 22, Leupold-Löwenthal instructs the audience about the mother-child relationship in general. This is the kernel of the conversational lecture.

- 6 (-) the most important basis for the relationship
(-) die entscheidende Grundlage der Beziehung
- 7 with the mother is formed during the first year of life. (-)
zur Mutter entsteht nämlich im ersten Lebensjahr. (-)
- 8 in the first year it is decided WHAT KIND OF mother a child has.
im ersten Lebensjahr entscheidet sich, WELCHE Mutter ein Kind hat.
- 9 a good relationship cannot, however, be based on
es kann nämlich nicht nur eine gute Beziehung darauf beruhen,
- 10 satisfying all the child's wishes,
daß alle Wünsche des Kindes befriedigt werden,
- 11 that's as destructive as when no wish is satisfied, (-)
das ist genauso verheerend wie wenn kein Wunsch befriedigt wird, (-)
- 12 Winnicott, one of the great English psychoanalysts has said
Winnicott, einer der großen englischen Psychoanalytiker hat gemeint
- 13 what children need is an average good mother,
was Kinder brauchen, ist eine average good mother,
- 14 a good enough mother. a good enough mother.
eine gut genuge Mutter. eine good enough mother.
- 15 P: yeah mhm
ja mhm
- 16 L: and the good enough mother (-) does not spoil her child,
und die gut genuge Mutter (-) verzärtelt das Kind nicht,

- 17 which is also a form of aggression,
was auch eine Form der Aggression ist,
- 18 P: yeah
ja
- 19 L: she does not satisfy all its wishes, she also frustrates
sie erfüllt nicht alle seine Wünsche, sie frustriert auch,
- 20 she also lives her own life,
sie lebt auch ihr eigenes Leben,
- 21 and at the same time is nurturing, supportive, warm,
und ist gleichzeitig fürsorgend, haltend, warm,
- 22 in order to attentively help her child.
um dem Kind aufmerksam zu helfen.

At the end, from lines 23-27, he formulates the conclusion.

- 23 if this function fails, and that's not so uncommon,
wenn diese Funktion schiefgeht, und das ist ja nicht so selten,
- 24 it is a very difficult function, THEN disturbances arise,
das ist eine sehr schwierige Funktion, DANN entstehen Störungen,
- 25 but they need not all lead to brutality or sadism,
aber die müssen nicht alle in die Brutalität und in den Sadismus gehen,
- 26 they also lead to turning aggression against one's own person
die gehen auch in die Wendung der Aggression gegen die eigene Person
- 27 and that then populates our [insane asylums].
und das bevölkert dann unsere [Irrenanstalten].

Leupold-Löwenthal did not express just one of many possible views on the question about mother-child relationships, but rather what he saw as the only possible view. In spontaneously teaching the group, he presupposed a knowledge hierarchy and enacted it communicatively. An asymmetry is created between the "teacher" and the "taught." Instructions can of course be asked for — "other-initiated" in the terminology of conversation analysis. In the debates at hand these instructions are self-initiated. The prologue of the instruction claims the knowledge of the partner to be deficient, here author L's; in the kernel phase L teaches him better knowledge and at the end formulates conclusions. In instructing someone, knowledge and greater competence are displayed. Listeners can accept the presented instruction, but are only some do, while others do not. The main addressee of the "lesson" is not. He not only rejects, but later counters by teaching an alternative lesson. The woman psychologist, Rieß, accepted the lesson, thereby allying herself with L against P and constituting for herself the role of L's best student.

The lecture format is a special type of teaching. It consists of a clear order of introduction, main part and closing. Lecturers correct statements of other speakers. They often cite authorities to support their points ("Winnicott"). They adopt a superior point of view and communicate content in the interaction modality of factuality.

The first 50 minutes of discussion II about "fathers as sexual abusers" are an example of a quite unusual type of problem talk on TV. Four women converse in a sensitive manner about their childhood and their family life. The conversational style is very exploratory. They tell each other stories, ask many questions, formulate hypotheses about children's feelings and power structures in patriarchal families and societies. They also develop strategies for coping with the drama of sexual violence. The artist Peter Contra (C) tries several times to reframe the personal conversation into a debate on general theses about sexuality as such. After 50 minutes he succeeds in presenting a lengthy lecture about sexuality in Central Europe in comparison to Indonesia.

Data 6

- 1 C: shouldn't one in this connection pose the question,
muß man nicht in diesem Zusammenhang die Frage stellen,
- 2 (-) of whether the real issue is not
(-) ob es nicht viel eher daran liegt,
- 3 that here in Central Europe we all have a disordered relationship
daß wir alle hier in Mitteleuropa ein gestörtes Verhältnis
- 4 in our education to our own corporeality.
in unserer Erziehung zur eigenen Körperlichkeit haben.
- 5 (-) that we live with an image of sexuality
(-) daß wir in einem Bild über Sexualität leben,
- 6 that was given to us in early childhood by our parents,
daß uns von früher Kindheit an auch von unseren Eltern vermittelt wird,
- 7 (-) which doesn't correspond to reality at all.
(-) das mit der Wirklichkeit überhaupt nicht übereinstimmt.
- 8 (- -) and that through this adaptive situation,
(- -) und daß durch diese Anpassungssituation
- 9 on the one side, the nature of man defends itself,
auf der einen Seite, die Natur des Menschen sich wehrt,
- 10 searches for channels, then realizes these channels,
sich Kanäle sucht, diese Kanäle dann realisiert,
- 11 (-) and, on the other side, the patriarchal system
(-) und, auf der anderen Seite, das patriarchale System
- 12 of society today strikes back and presents itself
der Gesellschaft heute zurückschlägt und sich jetzt hier

- 13 in a peculiar sort of ordered situation.
in einer eigenartigen Art von Ordnungssituation anbietet.
 14 in reality, though, the problems lie in an entirely different location.
in Wirklichkeit aber liegen die Probleme ganz woanders.
 15 one would have to, please, get down to business,
man müßte ja doch bitte hergehen,
 16 if one raises these these questions,
wenn man diese diese Fragen aufwirft,
 17 and if one thus speaks of morality and immorality,
und wenn man also von Moral und Unmoral spricht,
 18 of valuableness and non-valuableness, our so-called society
von Wertigkeit und Unwertigkeit, unsere sogenannte Gesellschaft
 19 which we as, or which quite often also by those people,
die wir als oder die des öfteren auch von jenen Leuten,
 20 of whom you previously spoke,
von denen sie vorhin gesprochen haben,
 21 who act like they are status-conforming and more of that sort,
die sich als so standeskonform und dergleichen mehr geben,
 22 who portray themselves as the supreme judges and guardians
die sich als die obersten Richter und Hüter
 23 of some kind of morality and speak of our
irgendeiner Moral ausgeben und sprechen von unserer
 24 society as of a natural one,
Gesellschaft als einer natürlichen,
 25 one should indeed, for one thing,
man müßte doch einmal diese Gesellschaft
 26 compare this society with other societies
vergleichen mit anderen Gesellschaften
 27 (-) in Indonesia. or with cultures,
(-) in Indonesien. oder mit Kulturen,
 28 which have not taken this civilizing path
die nicht diesen zivilisatorischen Weg gegangen sind
 29 and see, how man and woman there treat,
und sehen, wie gehen dort Mann und Frau,
 30 or how people there treat, or how children there treat
oder wie gehen dort Menschen, oder wie gehen dort Kinder,
 31 or how the totality there (-) of the people treat
oder wie geht dort die Gesamtheit (-) der der Menschen
 32 one another in their new generational situation.
in ihrer Nachwuchssituation miteinander um.
 33 (-) in order to determine where we are.
(-) um eine Ortsbestimmung vorzunehmen.
 34 naturally we can also now carry on this discussion
natürlich können wir auch jetzt diese Diskussion

- 35 here so that each (-) oh, I don't know,
hier so führen, daß jeder (-) eh was weiß ich,
 36 from his position provides descriptions of this relationship,
aus seiner Position Beschreibungen zu diesem Zusammenhang abgibt,
 37 then it will probably become a war of positions,
dann wirds wahrscheinlich ein Stellungskrieg,
 38 where each shoots at the other from his hole,
wo jeder aus seiner Grube heraus auf den anderen schießt,
 39 I thus believe that in this context it would
i glaub es wär also gscheiter in diesem Zusammenhang
 40 probably be wiser for once to look at the
vielleicht amal auf die grundsätzlichen
 41 underlying causes.
Ursachen zu gehen.
 42 M: I don't see any hole.
ich seh keine Grube.
 43 D: [HAHAHAHAHAHAHA]

Contra would like to leave the personal level and analyze the relationship to corporeality on a general societal level. From line 1-4 his contribution is posed in a question format, but the question syntax is so expanded that it imperceptibly changes into a statement of position. A new topic is introduced with the question. He begins to lecture. Typical of such lecturing are sentences which define the topic as "in reality, though, the problems lie in an entirely different location" (14) or "one would have to, please, get down to business" (15). Hitherto the speakers each touched on different aspects of the topic and talked about them from the viewpoint of personal experiences. No one previously undertook a global definition of the topic. In the literature it has occasionally been argued (e.g., Tannen 1990a, Schmidt 1992) that topics are dialogically negotiated by girls and women. Alone the subjectivations which women often use offer very different possibilities for cooperatively developing a topic.

If one does not want to ratify monological problem definitions such as the one C is introducing, one must respond to them confrontationally. Frau Z, a coworker in a study of child sexual abuse, does this after C spoke (not included in the transcript). With a high level of directness, she says that she does not wish to discuss the topic of "societal roots" defined in the sense Contra suggests. Positional statements containing explicit topic definitions and lecturing impose a more oppositional format of disagreement than do subjectified statements. From line 5 on C makes a transition to direct lectur-

ing, which is afterward countered by Frau M and Frau Z. Also typical of lecturing are "one would have to" or "one should indeed" or "it would probably be wiser" formulations (15, 25, 40), thus suggestions which strongly steer the discussion of a topic. Although the content of Contra's lecture is quite confusing it is clear that he, the artist, presents himself as an expert on sexuality and society. He devalues the subjective statements made previously by the women. He also tries to reframe the debate from one of experiences to one of abstract theses.

The moderator (M) reacts ironically to Contra's speech and his bizarre examples, which is responded to by one of the women. However, they do not succeed in keeping the frame of a personal exchange of experiences.

There are gendered trends in these TV debates. Men are more active than women in negotiating an expert status. Men of high extrinsic rank always also gain a high intrinsic one. Male laymen with a low extrinsic rank sometimes gain a high intrinsic situative status. Women with a high extrinsic expert position sometimes also realize this position in the TV round. Women with the low status of 'affected' consistently act out this identity in the debates, and they are only addressed by the others as 'concerned' about the question at hand.

In seven of the TV discussions, some men clearly hold conversational lectures more frequently than women. All these men gain a high intrinsic status. The status orders that arise in the discussions are interactional achievements. But these achievements do not come about arbitrarily; there are resources, such as professional competence and gender, which influence the ways conversations progress. Moreover, identity categories such as these are linked. The category of gender seldom plays its role independently. It merges with other categories and shapes them. Men are not only more often addressed as experts than women and more often conversationally confirmed in this role, but people think of political or scientific experts as men. When the production staff of "Club II," for instance, started planning a debate about Russian politics, the many women experts on Russia¹⁷ were not (or seldom) considered.

9. Concluding Remarks

In most of the conversations, expert status is made more relevant for the men, as well in the roles of authors or psychologists, health experts, political

experts, or anthropologists. However, this special status is not only enacted by the person him- or herself, but also by the other men and women participating. This asymmetrical arrangement between the sexes has a history which influences our perceptions of women and men in many respects. The mental gender pattern is reflected in the invitation policies of the producers.

A social-constructivist approach to the analysis of communication has the advantage of doing without any kind of essentializing gender. In this research tradition, in which this article also stands, regarding gender differences we do not deal with constant differences of "being," but rather with differences in "doing"; the focus is on processes of social typification and their relevance structures (Berger/Luckmann 1967; Schütz 1982).

Feminist research on communication has never taken a fixed female or male nature as a starting point from which it would have to distance itself today.¹⁸ Gender research in the form proposed here always attempts to uncover construction processes of gender typification, as well as of other processes of typification, such as age, race or social status.

A central interest of this approach is to bind the theory to empirical research. Communication processes are thus analyzed with respect to the real order of events, since one starts from the fact that historically developed social relations are communicatively constructed, reconstructed and changed.

10. Transcription conventions

(-)	a single hyphen indicates a short pause
(- -)	two hyphens indicate a longer pause (less than half a second)
(0.5)	pause of half a second; long pauses are counted in half seconds
(?war das so?)	indicates uncertain transcription
(? ?)	points to an incomprehensible utterance
..[.....	
..[.....	shows overlap; two simultaneous voices
=	latching of an utterance by one speaker; no interruption
HAHAHA	laughter
HEHEHE	weak laughter
(H)	audible outbreathing
('H)	audible inbreathing
'	slightly rising intonation and high onset
?	high rising intonation
.	falling intonation

,	ongoing intonation ("more to come")
:	indicates that preceding vowel sound is elongated
°blabla°	lower amplitude and pitch
COME ON	emphatic stress
((sits down))	non-verbal actions or comments

Notes

1. I wish to thank Barbara Röckl for comments on an earlier version of this article and the Baden-Württemberg Ministry of Science for financing a research project on gender asymmetries in communication. Thanks to James Brice for help with the English.
2. The articles in Günthner/Kotthoff 1991 center around cultural differences in the communicative display of femininity and masculinity.
3. In Kotthoff 1993 I discussed the policies of the production staff of Club II, how and why they invite certain people for certain topics.
4. Several linguists have already used discussions of this broadcast for discourse analytic studies of group processes, e.g., Gruber, Linke, Trömel-Plötz, Wodak.
5. See Tannen 1993a on the topic of framing in discourse.
6. All of these authors cite an abundance of further literature on the subject of power and asymmetry in discourse.
7. Günthner/Kotthoff 1991 and Kotthoff 1993c discussed methodological problems of a conversation analytic approach within gender studies.
8. Bourdieu 1991 discusses the social conditions for the effectiveness of discourse.
9. In Kotthoff 1992 I discussed in detail how it could happen that the whole interactional frame of this discussion changed from an exchange of concrete experiences to a debate about abstract theses. The women were very actively exchanging their own experiences, but after 50 minutes two men succeeded in restructuring the conversation to expert discourse. These men shifted the topic from "what happened to us and how did we survive" to "society and sexuality in general."
10. A differentiation of expertise by education and expertise by experience does not rule out gender categories, since men are allowed to make both sorts of expertise more relevant to gain a high situational status.
11. "Ötzi" was found directly on the border between Italy and Austria, and both countries claimed ownership of the famous and scientifically important find.
12. Krenn's dominance in these discussions reflects the role of the Catholic Church in Austria and Germany. The broadcasters want him to participate in TV debates because he is such a controversial and prominent church official. Less well-known persons with a similar authoritarian conversational style would not be invited a second time to a TV debate (see Kotthoff 1993b for the politics of the broadcasters).

13. There is no technical interruption at this point with a noticeable overlap as usually discussed in the literature (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson 1974). In Kotthoff 1993c I argued that it is necessary to go beyond technical ways of describing turn-taking if forms of turn-taking are to be integrated in an analysis of the negotiation of conversational asymmetries. I developed a context-sensitive approach to distinctive categories of intervention. See also Edelsky 1993 and James and Clarke 1993 on gender and turn-taking.
14. Otto Mühl is the founder of artists' communes in many parts of Europe. One commune was the Friedrichshof in Vienna. It lasted for more than ten years and was known for its unusual lifestyle and experimental art. Many women, men, and children lived there. The year the TV discussion took place Otto Mühl was sentenced to jail for sexually abusing young girls.
15. But the moderator says at the beginning that the TV discussion is not meant to be about Pilgrim's book. It is meant to deal with the topic of everyday life.
16. There are many high-ranking female German journalists in countries of the former Soviet Union. There is no "objective" reason for inviting a majority of men to debate the putsch attempt in 1991.
17. As is often done in poststructuralist literary criticism, Cameron (1993) criticizes linguistic gender studies (e.g., Tannen) for essentializing gender identities and for claiming that a gender identity is first given and then produces a certain speech style. I consider this line of criticism incorrect. I do not know of any researcher in linguistic gender studies (especially not Tannen) who ever had such a non-interactionist way of thinking as Cameron claims. For a valuable criticism of early linguistic gender studies see Gal 1989.

References

- Bales, Robert
1950 *Interaction Process Analysis: A Method for the Study of Small Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Berger, Peter/Luckmann, Thomas
1967 *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1979/1988 *Die feinen Unterschiede*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. (Engl. title: *Distinction*).
- 1990 "La domination masculine." *Actes de la recherche en science sociales* 84 (masculin/feminin 2), 2-31.
- 1991 *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. and introduced by John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cameron, Deborah
1993 Language and gender studies: How do we move forward? Reflections on the 1993 COWSL and AILA conferences. *Working Papers on Language, Gender & Sexism* 2: 19-31.

- Cicourel, Aaron V.
1992 "The interpenetration of communicative contexts: examples from medical encounters." In: Charles Goodwin/Alessandro Duranti (eds.) *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 291-311.
- Connell, Robert W.
1987 *Gender and Power. Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Cook-Gumperz, Jenny/Gumperz, John
1976 "Context in children's speech." *Papers on Language and Context*. Working papers No. 46. Berkeley: Language Behavior Research Laboratory.
- Coser, Rose L.
1960 "Laughter among colleagues. A study of the social functions of humor among staff of a mental hospital." *Psychiatry* 23: 81-95.
- Edelsky, Carole
1981 "Who's got the floor?" *Language in Society* 10: 383-421. (Reprinted in Tannen (ed.) 1993b).
- Fairclough, Norman/Wodak, Ruth
"Critical Discourse Analysis." In: Teun van Dijk (ed.) *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. (forthcoming)
- Gal, Susan
1989 "Between speech and silence: The problematics of research on language and gender." *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 3, 1: 1-38.
- Goffman, Erving
1977 "The Arrangement between the Sexes." *Theorie & Society* 4: 301-331.
- Gruber, Helmut
1993 "'Wir san Skinheads, wir kennen kane Vereinbarungen'. Subkulturelle Normenunterschiede und Konfliktaustragungen." *Linguistische Berichte* 146: 283-311.
- Günthner, Susanne
1992a "The construction of gendered discourse in Chinese-German interactions." *Discourse & Society* 3, 2: 167-191.
1992b "Sprache und Geschlecht: Ist Kommunikation zwischen Frauen und Männern interkulturelle Kommunikation?" *Linguistische Berichte* 138: 123-143.
- Günthner, Susanne/Kotthoff, Helga
1991 "Vorwort." In: (eds.) *Von fremden Stimmen. Weibliches und männliches Sprechen im Kulturvergleich*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 7-52.
- Hirschauer, Stefan
1994 "Die soziale Fortpflanzung der Zweigeschlechtlichkeit." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 4: 668-693.
- Holmes, Janet
1992 "Women's Talk in Public Contexts." *Discourse & Society* 1: 131-150.
- James, Deborah/Clarke, Sandra
1993 "Women, Men, and Interruptions: A Critical Review." In: Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 231-268.

- James, Deborah/Drakich, Janice
1993 "Understanding Gender Differences in Amount of Talk: A Critical Review of Literature." In: Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 281-313.
- Keppler, Angela
1989 "Schritt für Schritt. Das Verfahren alltäglicher Belehrungen." *Soziale Welt* 4: 538-556.
- Keppler, Angela/Luckmann, Thomas
1991 "'Teaching': a conversational transmission of knowledge." In: Ivana Markova/Klaus Foppa (eds.) *Asymmetries in Dialogue*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 143-166.
- Kotthoff, Helga
1992 "Die konversationelle Konstruktion von Ungleichheit in Fernsehgesprächen. Zur Produktion von kulturellem Geschlecht." In: Susanne Günthner/Helga Kotthoff (eds.) *Die Geschlechter im Gespräch*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 251-287.
1993a "Kommunikative Stile, Asymmetrie und 'doing gender'. Fallstudien zur Inszenierung von Expert(inn)entum in Gesprächen." *Feministische Studien* 1993, 2: 79-96.
1993b "Du Trottel, warum hast Du sowas nicht während der Sendung gesagt? Fernsehdiskussionen, Kontextforschung und Intertextualität." In: Werner Holly/Ulrich Püschel (eds.) *Medien als Aneignung*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 173-193.
1993c "Unterbrechungen, Überlappungen und andere Interventionen. Vorschläge zur Kategorienunterscheidung und kontextorientierten Interpretation." *Deutsche Sprache*, Heft 2: 162-185.
1994 "Geschlecht als Interaktionsritual? Nachwort." *Erving Goffman: Interaktion und Geschlecht*. Frankfurt: Campus, 159-194.
- Leet-Pellegrini, Helena
1980 "Conversational dominance as a function of gender and expertise." In: Howard Giles et al. (eds.) *Language. Social Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Linell, Per/Luckmann, Thomas
1991 "Asymmetries in dialogue: some conceptual preliminaries." In: Ivana Markova/Klaus Foppa (eds.) *Asymmetries in Dialogue*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1-21.
- Linke, Angelika
1985 *Gespräche im Fernsehen*. Bern/Frankfurt/New York: Lang.
- Philips, Susan U.
1992 "The routinization of repair in courtroom discourse." In: Charles Goodwin/Alessandro Duranti (eds.) *Rethinking Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 311-323.
- Sacks, Harvey
1974 "An analysis of the course of a joke's telling." In: Richard Bauman/Joel Sherzer (eds.) *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 337-353.

- Sacks, Harvey/Schegloff, Emanuel/Jefferson, Gail
 1974 "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation." *Language* 50: 696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A.
 1987 "Between micro and macro: contexts and other connections." In: J. Alexander/B. Giesen et al. (eds.) *The Micro-Macro-Link*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 207-234.
- Schmidt, Claudia
 1992 "Dieser Emil immer destruktiv." Eine Untersuchung über weibliches und männliches kommunikationsverhalten in studentischen Kleingruppen. In: Susanne Günthner/Helga Kotthoff (eds.): *Die Geschlechter im Gespräch*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 73-91.
- Schütz, Alfred
 1982 *Das Problem der Relevanz*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Tannen, Deborah
 1990a "Gender Differences in Topical Coherence: Creating Involvement in Best Friend's Talk." *Discourse Processes* 13: 73-91.
 1990b *You Just Don't Understand. Women and Men in Conversation*. New York: Ballantine.
 1993a (ed.) *Framing in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 1993b "The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance." In: Deborah Tannen (ed.) *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 165-189.
 1995 *Talking from 9 to 5. Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex and Power*. New York: Avon Book.
- Thimm, Caja
 1990 *Dominanz und Sprache. Zur Beschreibung strategischen Handelns im Alltag*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.
- Trömel-Plötz, Senta
 1984 "Die Konstruktion konversationeller Unterschiede in der Sprache von Frauen und Männern." In: Senta Trömel-Plötz (ed.) *Gewalt durch Sprache*. Frankfurt: Fischer, 288-323.
- West, Candace/Zimmerman, Don
 1987 "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1, 2: 125-151.
- Wodak, Ruth
 1983 (ed.) "'Hier darf jeder alles!' Diskursanalytische Untersuchungen zum Diskussionsstil im österreichischen Fernsehen." *Wiener linguistische Gazette* 31/32.