

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ КИЇВСЬКИЙ  
НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології  
імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики

на тему: «ПЕРЕБИВАННЯ МОВЛЕННЯ В ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОМУ  
АСПЕКТІ: НА МАТЕРІАЛІ СУЧАСНОГО АНГЛОМОВНОГО  
ДІАЛОГІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ»

Допущено до захисту

« \_\_\_ » \_\_\_\_\_ року

студента групи Мла 52-19  
факультету германської філології  
освітньо-професійної програми  
Сучасні філологічні студії (англійська  
мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та  
перекладознавство  
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія  
**Олексійчук Вікторії Вікторівни**

Завідувач кафедри  
германської і фіно-угорської  
філології

Науковий керівник:  
Кандидат філологічних наук, професор  
**Волкова Лідія Михайлівна**

Національна шкала \_\_\_\_\_  
Кількість балів \_\_\_\_\_  
Оцінка ЄКТС \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(підпис)

\_\_\_\_\_

(ПБ)

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE**  
**KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY**  
**Professor G. G. Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian**  
**Philology**

**Master's Qualification Paper**

**LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF SPEECH INTERRUPTION: A**  
**STUDY OF MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE**

**OLEKSIICHUK VIKTORIIA**

Group MLa 52-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Professor

**LIDIYA M. VOLKOVA**

(Ph.D. Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2020

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE. SPEECH INTERRUPTION AS THE PHENOMENON OF COMMUNICATION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1. Conversation basics. Turn taking.....	8
1.2. Speech interruption: a concept and essence in modern linguistics .....	11
1.3. Classification of speech interruptions. Intonation cues. ....	12
1.3.1. Competitive Interruptions .....	15
1.3.2. Cooperative interruptions.....	16
1.4. A Corpus-Based Evidence of Interrupted speech .....	17
1.5. Interruption as a means of control in conversation .....	20
<b>Conclusions to Chapter one.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO. INTERRUPTIONS IN MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE .....</b>	<b>27</b>
2.1. Interruptions and politeness. Parameters of acceptability for interruptions. ...	27
2.2. Conversational dominance and interruptions.....	38
2.2.1. Grabbing the floor: interruptions .....	39
2.3. Interruptions and simultaneous speech in families .....	43
2.3.1. Interruptions while interaction at school.....	44
2.3.2. Interruptions while interaction at job interviews .....	45
2.3.3. Interruptions at meetings.....	46
2.3.4. Clinical encounters of interruptions.....	47
2.4. Analysis of interruptions in Modern English dialogues .....	48
<b>Conclusions to Chapter Two .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>RESUME.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>REFERENCE LITERATURE.....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS .....</b>	<b>82</b>

## INTRODUCTION

Social interaction, very often through conversation, is one of the most distinctive characteristics of humans as species, and at the same time, it is a great privilege that we should never take for granted. Interviews, arguments, forums, debates, discussions, etc. are the context-specific types of verbal interaction; however, one of the most basic forms of conversation organization is a dialogue, which is a verbal exchange between two or more people. Obviously, the speaker is putting meaning into their words, but in addition to that, they are also trying to achieve some purpose with what is being said. Therefore, the utterance can only be considered understood if the hearer has perceived both the literal meaning and its purpose (Power, 1979).

Numerous researches have been conducted by prominent linguists, who laid a lot of focus on the analysis of conversation. According to the researchers, turn-taking is a term used to describe the manner in which a well-organized conversation takes place as a rule, and one can get a clear idea straight from the term itself: the concept is that the participants of a conversation take their turns in speaking. Besides, there is a sociologists' point of view, their analysis goes further into more deep topics such as how the interlocutors know when it's their turn to speak, how much of an overlap there is between the speakers when it's relatively OK to have an overlap, and how to consider ethnic or gender differences (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson, 1974).

**The object** of this Diploma Paper is interruptions in Modern English dialogical discourse.

**The subject** of the Diploma Paper is functional characteristics of interruptions in Modern English dialogical discourse.

The main **aim** of the Diploma Paper is to detect, study, and systematize the situations when speech interruptions occur in everyday communication and to evaluate them.

To achieve the aim, the following **objectives** should be fulfilled:

- to study a concept and essence of interruptions in modern linguistics;
- to identify and differentiate the notions of competitive and cooperative interruptions;
- to develop a classification of interruption reasons;
- to study gender aspect on the interruptions in dialogues;
- to investigate factors influencing recognition of interrupted speech in Modern English dialogical discourse;
- to evaluate the role of the interruptions in conversations.

This Paper's **methodology** presumes the application of several research methods. We use the generalization method to examine the literature and the transcribed dialogues. The descriptive method is used to explain the main properties of speech interruption in general and in dialogical discourse and describe the position of this phenomenon in language.

The Narrative analysis method is used in the theoretical part of the Paper, where we analyze the data coming from a number of different sources, including already existing surveys and corpora. Content analysis is used in the final part of the Paper to study the verbal data, in this case, it consists of documents or communication artifacts – dialogues, which makes it possible to observe and collect the repeated patterns of our interest in communication.

In a similar manner, we use conversational and contextual methods to study the forms in which the phenomenon exists in various contexts in dialogical discourse. Different discourse analysis methods are used to investigate the reasons for interruptions in everyday communication, for example the analysis of sound recordings, which helped extract acoustic and articulatory data and analyze the speakers' reasons for interruptions in dialogical discourse, their impact on the conversation.

**Theoretical significance** of the Paper lies in the fact that its practical results may contribute to the study of interruptions in Modern English dialogical discourse.

**Practical value** of the work manifested in the importance of application of its findings and conclusions in the courses of theoretical and practical grammar and speaking practice. It is of great value for those who strive for perfection in the process of everyday communication, trying to be more conscious about interrupting and being interrupted.

The research itself and the findings can be used by scholars working in the field of discourse analysis as the basis for further studies interruptions in dialogical discourse. It can be also useful for researches in gender studies.

**Materials** for the research have been taken from Modern English literature texts and TV-episodes which present the examples of interruptions in conversations.

**Structurally** the Diploma Paper consists of the Introduction, two Chapters, and conclusions to each chapter, General Conclusions, Resume, the List of references and the List of illustration materials.

**Chapter One** deals with theoretical background of speech organisation manifested in turn-taking model, its main characteristics and the irregularities in speech organization, interruptions, in particular. The concept and essence of this phenomenon in modern linguistics is discussed in Chapter one. It aims to present the existing classifications of interruptions and provides the evidence of occurrence frequency of interruptions in dialogical discourse which, therefore, determines the significance of the phenomenon of interruptions in everyday communication and the need for future researches.

**Chapter Two** focuses on the discourse manifestation of interruptions in more particular instances in Modern English dialogue. Numerous communicative situations in which interruptions occurred were identified and deeply studied.

Particularly a lot attention is paid to the role of interruptions in communication between men and women and its importance for speech dominance and control.

**General Conclusions** part offers the summary of the results of our investigation.

## CHAPTER ONE. SPEECH INTERRUPTION AS THE PHENOMENA OF COMMUNICATION

### 1.1. Conversation basics. Turn taking

Before we dive into the deviations from the conversation norms, it is only logical to dwell on the conventions. According to Sacks et al, the fundamental form of organization of any dialogical social interaction is turn-taking, and it presupposes that a change of the speaker occurs and reoccurs in a conversation. Turn order is not fixed, but varies according to the situation, while two turn taking techniques are regularly used. So, the turn allocation can be managed in two following ways:

1. Current-selects-next (the current speaker picks and tags the next speaker);
2. Next speaker selects themselves (or self-selects). (Sacks et al., 1974)/

In the situation when the current speaker selects the next one, the way they do so also varies: they may directly address the current speaker; they may use the so called initiating action, for example, a question followed by a gaze, which is also a type of explicit addressing (Lerner 2002, p. 230); and they may use tacit addressing, which may be a question that limits the number of people who may potentially reply.

In the second case, the next speaker should “start as early as possible at the earliest transition-relevance place” (Sacks et al. 1974, p. 719). To do so, the next speaker is free to use one of the following strategies:

1. Overlap. Which in its turn can be classified into:
  - Transitional (it is oriented to the syntactic wholeness of an utterance and takes place close to the point when it is probably completed),
  - Recognitional (takes place when a potential next speaker acknowledges the push or result of the current talk),

- Progressional (it is oriented to the progression or further development of the current utterance and takes place when that utterance begins to show some sort of disfluency, in other words, the next speaker helps the first one finish their utterance).

2. Turn-entry device. It is an item that helps on initiate their turn such as *well, but, and, so, you know, or yeah*, which does not project the exact plan of the turn's construction and can be also called a pre-start.

3. Recycled turn beginning is a strategy that implies that the next speaker repeats the part of the beginning of a turn that gets absorbed in overlap

4. Non-verbal start. An early start can be also achieved by means of various pre-beginning nonverbal cues including a gaze direction, head turning, a range of facial expressions, lip parting, cough or throat clearing etc. (Schegloff, 1996).

In attempt to develop this crucial observation, various researches have proved that turn-taking is not solely a function of speech that consists of prosodic and grammatical features (Barth-Weingarten et al., 2010; Local and Kelly, 1986; Local & Walker, 2005) but of diverse multimodal practices (Streeck & Hartge, 1992).

As an example, the participants of a conversation cautiously coordinate their look and reveal their involvement as speakers and hearers in the existing dialogue. They are truing to create a mutual gaze at the beginning of the conversation just like at the beginning of each turn. Therefore, it is possible that there exists a tradition or a convention that the listeners look as current speakers (Goodwin, 1981; Heath, 1984).

In an official setting, e.g. a meeting, turn-taking representations that include turn allocation, turn transition, and speaker selection “take specific shape and direction” (Boden, 1994).

In formal meetings, the next speaker can be easily allocated by the meeting manager, who is also and be responsible for monitoring the length of a turn,

relevancy of what is being said, and its constructiveness. In short, the manager takes on the role of either encouraging or deferring a speaker's input (Pomerantz & Denvir, 2007). At the same time the hearer, who wants to take a turn often shows his willingness to the manager (Boden 1994, p. 83–89; Ford 2008, p. 53–91; Mondada, 2013).

On the other hand, during informal meetings, turn-taking can resemble casual everyday conversations; self-selection may occur more frequently and next turn allocation is done by the current speaker who is not necessarily the manager. The manager's role in turn allocation in formal meetings may vary but taking a turn and establishing a positive and productive communication is a joint achievement of the participants (Ford and Stickle, 2012, Mondada, 2007).

For this achievement, multimodal assets such as audible inbreath, pointing, palming, and preparing for articulation often work as turn-entry devices for potential next speakers (Mondada, 2007; Mondada, 2013). Using these assets, the speaker claims the floor and their right to speak before they actually acquire a vocal turn (Mondada, 2007). As per all above mentioned, a wide variety of interactional assets allow the speakers and the listeners to take turns in an orderly manner, and therefore, for the most part, only one speaker talks at a time (Sacks et al., 1974).

It is only natural that overlaps often occur in conversations, however, they are normally short and non-problematic (Sacks et al., 1974). As an example, temporary overlaps, phrases that are meant to help the current speaker finish their utterance, and choral answers lead to overlaps that rather help than impede the transition from a current speaker to the next one (Schegloff, 2000).

Nevertheless, overlaps can become complicated and problematic in turn-taking and conversational partners may see them as interruptive or invasive. For example, the speaker may directly ask for a permission from the other party (e.g. "May I interrupt you?"), while the speaker who is being interrupted may

reproach the interrupting speaker (e.g. “May I ask you not to speak when I’m speaking?”) (Hutchby, 1992; Hutchby, 2008).

While the manager may assign turns to participants of the formal meeting, turn-taking is neither prearranged nor directed by the manager. Instead of that the interlocutors thoroughly monitor each other’s turns and try to eliminate the speech gaps and overlaps. Also they refer to only a few of many overlapped turns as interruptions.

## **1.2. Speech interruption: a concept and essence in modern linguistics**

Interruptions of interlocutors and reactions to them have been a subject of numerous researches in the field of linguistics and psychology. In many of the mentioned researches interruptions are seen as impoliteness, display of rudeness, aggressiveness or anger towards the other speaker, violations of principal rules of conversation, for example, the rule that only one interlocutor speaks at a time. They are also believed to indicate the power, the willingness to control or dominate or in some cases it may show the lack of interest, hostility and violence towards the speaker (Goldberg, 1990).

On the other hand, there are other scientists, who claim that while interruptions can be competitive, they can also be and often are neutral if not positive, and the term that describes them is collaborative interruptions. The simplest example for these is a request for clarification, or they can also be used to convey understanding and solidarity with the interlocutor. In such instance a listener may as an example assist their interlocutor (the speaker), by helping them finish their utterance.

They can be presented in a form of supportive remarks or short commentaries and clarifying questions. Coordination and alignment of the conversation are the most obvious indicators that the interruptions are

collaborative. There are also phonetic and gestural features that help differentiate from competitive interruptions from the collaborative ones (Goldberg, 1990).

### **1.3. Classification of speech interruptions. Intonation cues**

Having analyzed various researches and the data from spontaneous discourse researches, one may come to conclusion that dialogical discourse is abundant in interruptions, and normally neither of the of cooperative and competitive interruptions prevails, and that the complexity and the combination of interruptions frequently becomes more evident with the complexity of the discourse relationships.

The particular nature of each interruption is a manifestation of the principal motivation of the interrupter. The content of interruptions and the time when it takes place are directly connected with to the interrupter's immediate and extreme and essential emotional need for an urgent resolution. That means that it is the seriousness of the emotion that is triggers the interrupter to communicate the necessity to address a specific and important for them topic immediately at this particular time (Streeck and Hartge, 1992).

Another factor that contributes greatly to this complexity is that competitiveness and cooperativeness are not at all polar opposite characteristics of interruptions, however, they should be seen as parts of a gradient process. Analysis of the researches shows that the proportion of competitiveness that is presented in a dialogue depends on the strength of the emotions causing the interruption. The intensity of the expression may also influence how the current speaker would responds. An intense expression frequently creates an urgent need for an immediate response, and speakers are more likely to stop and address the question asked by the interrupter, in consequence such interruptions are seen as more competitive (Couper-Kuhlen and Selting, 1996).

The level of competitiveness or cooperativeness is also impacted by the nature of relations of the interruption to the current topic, and by the amount of time the interrupter is going to take the floor for. The specific firmness of the signal needed to sufficiently overcome the current topic may differ by the changing interruptability or resistance level of the topic.

In spontaneous speech, discourse interruptions may occur to different degrees of intensity and different degrees of competitiveness and cooperativeness, because of the intentions of participants.

Cooperative and competitive overlaps in speech can be also classified using cues from the context, overlapper, and overlappee. Numerous studies have shown that prosody can play a crucial role in analysing overlapping speech and the surroundings of overlapping speech. Although in some researches it is not directly stated that there is an explicit distinction between competitive and cooperative overlaps, and whether their definition of an interruption is similar to what we call a competitive overlap, most studies indicate pitch and intensity as two main factors in the analysis of overlaps.

In Shriberg et al., it was researched whether overlapping speech can be predicted based on prosodic features. Their main concern was to find out whether or not there is any correlation between the beginning of overlaps and prosodic features of both the overlappee ('jump-in-points') and the overlapper ('jumpin-words'). They have used decision trees and achieved an accuracy of 64% for the task to classify each word borderline as to whether or not the other speaker barged in.

Their results claim that overlappers do not interrupt at arbitrarily chosen points in the speech, rather there are certain points when it is more likely that the speaker will jump into. The analyzed features demonstrate that the hearers jump in at those points that sound similar to sentence boundaries but they are not in fact sentence boundaries. The results also suggest that speakers raise their voice and

sound more energetic when they are trying to interrupt the main speaker (Shriberg, Stolcke & Baron, 2001).

P. French and J. Local (French and Local, 1983) claim that the phonetic design of the current turn is more likely to constitute the overlap as turn-competitive rather than its precise location. They argue that a competitive interruptions are raised in pitch and loudness. Support for this hypothesis was also provided by Yang (Yang, 2001) just like Wells and Macfarlane (Wells, Macfarlane, 1998) who examined the prosodics of competitive and cooperative interruptions. Oertel et al. (Oertel, Wlodarczak, Tarasov, Campbell & Wagner, 2012) uses prosodic features (presented by the overlapper) and body movement features (presented both by overlapper and overlappee) to analyze the context surrounding overlaps.

Multimodal indications, for example speech intensity, hand motions, and disfluencies have been used by Lee et. al. as a means to classify overlaps into competitive and cooperative. However, the main goal of these scientists is to predict interruptions rather than classify overlaps. They have analyzed acoustic features of the interruptee and facial features together with the head movements of the interrupter, and came to the same conclusion as Shriberg et al., that is that interruptions do not occur at random locations, they are made in specific situations and can be easily predicted. (Lee, Lee & Narayanan, 2008)

Gravano and Hirschberg drew a similar conclusion: having analyzed the prosodic features, they found that interruptions can not just be made at random points in speech but they are more likely to happen after certain types of inter-pausal units. Moreover, the beginning of interruptions produce crucial discrepancies in speech rate, intensity, and pitch level compared to other types of turn.

Speech rate was also checked by Kurtic et al. who, by contrast, did not encounter any evidence that overlappers tend to use faster speech rate to make the beginnings of their incomings seem turn-competitive.

To sum it up, pitch and intensity are the prevailing features of speech that are used analysing overlaps, however, physical features like mimics, body and head movements, hand gestures etc., are also used in latest studies. The contexts in which interruptions take place are not just random contexts, on contrary, they have certain characteristics that can be helpful to predict overlaps.

### **1.3.1. Competitive Interruptions**

Normally, competitive interruptions are high in pitch and amplitude. In spontaneous speech, the participants of the conversation frequently compete to take over the floor and dominate the conversation. In competitive situations speakers need a clear and instant signal that may draw the attention away from the ongoing utterance without hesitation and ambiguity. The speakers who are willing to compete understand that the more recognizable this signal is, the more powerfully and effectively it can be used in conquering the current focus and efficiently gaining the floor and attention.

When it comes to the intonation, this competitiveness and willingness to send a strong explicit signal are displayed in such vocal cues as high pitch and high amplitude. Competitive interruptions are more often than not closely connected with urgency, relevance, interest in the current topic, and degree of importance. In a casual conversation, its participants have a need or desire to express something that is of great emotional value to them. Speakers often find themselves in situations that are filled with uncertainty or ambiguity, therefore, they have an urgent need for immediate response, information or attention at a critical for them moment.

According to Truong's study the overlapper normally disrupts the speech or breaks the flow of the speech of the overlappee to take their turn and add something. The overlappee may see it as an offence because they were not able to finish their sentence. Although the overlappee does not need to show that they are

offended, the overlap is almost never comprehended as intrusive and/or competitive by the overlappee. The need or desire to add something comes from the overlapper's own wants and/or needs.

This immediacy and importance are the essential characteristic features of interruptions and are directly connected with the relevance of the topic in the current conversation. The listeners (potential next speakers) quite often take advantage of the opportunity while the current topic is still valid to clarify something, add an appropriate fact or a persuasive example, share their feedback, or express their immediate opinion. And on many occasions such intonation cues as the high pitch and loud amplitude in competitive interruptions are motivated by the emotions causing these situations.

### **1.3.2. Cooperative Interruptions**

As have been mentioned before, very often, competitive interruptions can be recognized by a high pitch level, and by loud amplitude, which helps the conversation participants express their desire to compete for the focus of attention. In contrast to that, cooperative interruptions are less intrusive and more supportive of the current speaker's rights to have the floor, and their intention is usually not to steal the attention from the current speaker's point.

In Truong's study, the intention of the overlapper is to defend their right for the flow of the conversation, to coordinate the development and/or content of the current conversation, and to provide help to the speaker if/when needed. The overlap does not unanticipatedly disrupt the flow of the speech of the overlappee. It is very likely that the overlappee will not see this overlap as intrusive.

This difference in the invention of interruption has a corresponding impact on the intonation patterns of such supportive interruptions. As we have already mentioned, they have a nondisruptive nature, and for that reason they are often represented by low or medium pitch levels, although there are cases when they are

high for emotional involvement, however, even than they are mostly lower in pitch than competitive interruptions. Talking about the amplitude of cooperative interruptions, we should mention that they can vary. For example, the amplitude is low for the most part in cases of acknowledging and prompting, but they can also be high when an interruption is used to express strong, often opposing opinion or emphasis.

#### **1.4. A Corpus-Based Evidence of Interrupted speech**

The acoustic/prosodic properties of interruptions have been examined in numerous studies. According to Yang, competitive interruptions are high in pitch and intensity levels, at the same time collaborative interruptions have a relatively low pitch level. There was a series of machine learning experiments conducted by Lee and Narayanan that report that intensity-based features from the main speaker, just like the gestures from the interlocutors' side (e.g. as eyebrow movement, a frown and mouth opening) may serve as explicit predictors of the occurrence of interruptions in a dialogue.

Speech overlaps are closely related to interruptions, when either of them takes place both speakers are trying to verbally express themselves at the same time, and therefore may compete for the conversation floor for a brief moment. Schegloff supports the view that speech overlaps are normally resolved within two or less syllables. They can be resolved by means of such devices as a higher pitch level or intensity and by making a speaking rate faster or slower.

There is a special type of overlaps called initiative conflicts, it occurs when both speakers are trying to start speaking at about the same time after silence. Initiative conflicts have been extensively researched by Yang and Heeman, who came to a conclusion that it normally takes no more than two syllables to sort them out and the tendency is so that overlaps are sorted out in favour of that speaker who displays a higher intensity level.

Let us dive into the study and find out when and where are interruptions most likely to take place and what are the characteristics of interruptions? To do so, one will have to analyze the acoustic, phonetic, lexical and syntactic features of the utterances or their parts that immediately precede and follow interruption points and compare them to so called non-interruptions.

The data was taken from the Columbia Games Corpus, it is a collection of 12 spontaneous task-oriented casual conversations extracted from 13 native speakers of Standard American English . In each session, two people were paid to play various computer games that require verbal communication to achieve common goals of finding and shift pictures on the screen (Raux, 2006).

The participants were recorded in a soundproof booth that was divided by a curtain to make sure that all the communication was exclusively verbal. The participators' speech was not restricted in any way, and the game sessions were not time-limited. This corpus includes 9 hours of dialogue, which were orthographically transcribed, the transcription was manually time-aligned to the source (Beckman, 1994).

For this turn-taking research, an inter-pasual unit is defined as a maximal sequence of words surrounded by silence longer than 50 ms. A turn is defined as a maximal sequence of inter-pasual units that are coming from one speaker, so that the gap between any two inter-pasual units contains no verbal contribution from the interlocutor.

As a result of this research all turn transitions in the corpus were classified as in the following scheme:

Smooth switch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition from the first speaker to the second speaker, in which the first one completes their utterance, and no overlapping speech happens between the two turns.</li> </ul>
Overlap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as a smooth switch but with a brief overlapping speech.</li> </ul>
Pause interruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transition from the first speaker to the second speaker, in which the first speaker does not complete their utterance, however no overlapping speech happens.</li> </ul>
Simple interruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as a pause interruption but some overlapping speech takes place.</li> </ul>
Butting-in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This type of interruption can be described as a failed attempt from the second speaker to interrupt the first one, who therefore continues their turn.</li> </ul>

Moreover, each pause interruption and simple interruption transition was considered a collaborative completion when the speaker completes, or tries to complete their interlocutor's utterance, as an attempt to help them. Finally, all continuations from one inter-pausal unit to the next inter-pausal units within the same turn were automatically considered as hold transitions. In this particular study only successful interruptions were considered (pause interruption or simple interruption), and therefore butting-ins were excluded from the analysis.

Agustin Gravano and Julia Hirschberg have presented the evidence that interruptions supposedly do not take place randomly, but rather than that, they are very likely to happen during or after certain types of inter-pausal units. By definition, the pause interruptions occur during a pause after the current speaker's

utterance. The probability of an interruption correlates somewhat but significantly with the speaking rate of the first word and of the entire inter-pausal units, which means that, if a pause continues, a continuation from the current speaker becomes more likely. This is the reason why the interlocutor is in a hurry to finish their contribution and avoid an initiative conflict.

The beginning of simple interruptions always overlaps the current speaker's turn. And according to this study, this overlap lasts just enough to support Schegloff's claim that utterance overlaps in conversation are normally resolved within two or less syllables. As mentioned before, intensity is one of the important factors for sorting out initiative conflicts. And just like that during prolonged overlaps, interrupters tend to raise their voices to strengthen the possibilities of success of their interruptions.

### **1.5. Interruption as a means of control in conversation**

Tannen (1989, 1993) describes interruption as an instance of vagueness and polysemy. Beginning the utterance, when the current speaker has the floor, looks like (and has been proven in various researches to be such) an undeniable demonstration of dominance in a conversation, taking over another speaker's speaking rights, although, there are quite a few people who do not consider talking-along to be an interruption but what researches label as "cooperative overlaps", especially when they use it as a means of demonstrating interest and excitement in listeners just like eager parttaking (Tannen, 2005).

In case one party anticipates some cooperative overlapping, but at the same time the other party, especially the current speaker, anticipates that only one person speaks at a time, there may be some frustration. The second one may see the expected cooperative overlapping as an intrusive interruption of their turn and stop speaking. In this instance, the interruption produces the sense of control and

domination, that rather comes from the double meaning of simultaneous speaking than from a willingness of the interruptor to control the discussion.

The context of the double meaning is achieved when the speakers who see simultaneous speaking as a sign of active partaking, start interrupting as an attempt to steal the current speaker's spotlight. In this case, they are certain or expect that their communication partner are going to follow their example and try to gain the floor back, and, therefore, this so-called speaking-along means control over the conversation and at the same time solidarity. In essence, this approach works both ways: the result and influence of dominance can be reached by interrupting, but at the same time the dominance may sometimes may come from an intention to gain control, the reason for that is that the same linguistic characteristic can be used both to reach control and connection.

Other researches show that the awareness of differences in women's and men's dialogical rituals, that stem from their diverse dialogical aims, may often result in one of them (a man mostly) taking over in family interactions. There has been a study aiming to identify peculiarities of the dinner-table communication in several typical American families. As a part of the experiment, the family members were sharing their impression of the day and what has happened to them.

The researchers discovered that kids's assessment of their day was the most commonly judged by the adult listeners. And the ones to criticise others' behavior were most commonly fathers, moreover, their own behavior was the least criticized or judged. On the other hand, mothers' assessment of what they have done or how they behaved was judged as often as the children's assessment.

As a result, we can imagine a hierarchy in the typical American family with a father on top on it, a mother in the middle, and children at its bottom. It was also observed that if a mother shared the information about some casual issues or troubles expecting empathy, the men regularly misunderstood it for a request of advice. And if we look at it this way, the power imbalance that occurs as

a result, may be coming to some extent from the existence of polar conversational rituals connected with gender (Ochs, Taylor, 1992).

The complexity of conversation control was also studied within workplace conversation, where linguistic tactics are proven to be used by individuals having authority not only as means of showing and executing power but also as means of reaching harmony in the potentially conflicting situation with the individual demanding authority but also understanding. These methods are often described as connected to “sex-class”. Simply put, those that correlate with the class or position of women and the class or position of men.

To exemplify it, Tannen, for example, examined the contrast between two cases of small talk between individuals, unequal in their position. In the first instance, there is a dialogue between two men, they are having a discussing about a computer glitch and teambuilding through challenges and also bonding against women; they take turns in the demonstration of readiness to help, knowledge, and self-sufficiency (men explicitly show that they do not require help).

The dialogical discourse between women took place when a woman in the highest position was telling an anecdote to two colleagues with a lower position. When another female with an even lower position entered the room, the high-ranking speaker paused and complimented the newcomer on her blouse, and the other speakers joined in. The complimenting part worked as a reason to include the woman in the conversation and helped create connection; although, it displayed the dominance of the the highest-rank person, as it was her who controlled the discussion, and the lowest-position person became the focus of attention.

In this instance, dominance was reproduced and strengthened by the rules the speakers unconsciously followed through talk, the rules or conventions that were traditionally associated with the belonging of the speakers to certain sex or rather gender classes. For example, women cannot discuss their position or create connection through mocking, insults, and challenging their interlocutors like men did. They could easily do so with the help of the exchange of compliments and

talking about some casual things like shopping and fashion, however this resource is less available for the men.

A similar theoretical view is provided by Ochs (1992), who argue that certain ways of speaking traditionally related to gender do not exclusively indicate gender, it is more likely that they “index” gender by creating patterns that are connected in a each particular culture with women or with men behaviour. Simply put, the connection between language and gender is ambiguous and can be indexically negotiated: language characteristics directly deliver information in a particular situation (instructing somebody on what should be done) and simultaneously displaying the attitude (this may depend on how the order is worded).

The presentation of this information in ways that produce attitude associated with sociocultural anticipations and stereotypes about gender therefore help create a speaker’s gendered identity. However, different individuals, may speak differently in different situations. Kendall (1999) has done an ethnographic analysis of a woman’s discourse that has been recorded at home and at their workplace and observed, that the woman made orders is different ways in these two situations. Her communication with the subordinates (she worked as a manager) was normally indirect, however while talking to her 10-year old daughter at a home setting, her orders were mostly direct.

Goodwin (2006) has made an extensive research in African American younger children where they have studied games of position, attitude and exclusion or inclusion among girls with diverse ethnical background. Their interaction has been as video- and audio-recorded in a school playground. It has been found that girls have a tendency to negotiate inclusion and exclusion in a group (as opposed from boys, who negotiate the position in the hierarchy), in addition they also dispute about the rank, for example when they doubt right of the boys to control the football field or declare their authority over younger girls.

These researches once again support the findings that connections between conversation, discursive practices, and social meanings are reached and expressed within communities of practice, that can be defined as alignment of individuals who “come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor.” And scientists claim that language practices and their social meanings are realized within these communities, because all the practices like the manner of doing things, the manner of talking, views and ideologies, values, hierarchy within the community appear in the course of this togetherness (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992: 464).

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2007) in their following researches on gender and discourse, inspire and encourage other scientists to extend the knowledge in this area by finding and identifying these “communities of practice” and discover their connections to the world beyond these communities, for example, links to other existing communities of practice, to social media, to educational and religion institutions etc., as well as to communities of minorities. A social constructivist paradigm corresponds to these theoretical frameworks while it has dominated in gender and language studies.

Scientists nowadays claim that this approach to gender as well as the ways of behaving connected with it present a result of processes connected with social and historical development. According to the performativity theory, this process can be labeled as a demonstration or performing of the gender. And the researches have shown that individuals tend to demonstrate gender “through the repetition or citation of a prior, authoritative set of practices” (Butler, 1990).

This view is similar to the one of Goffman’s (Goffman, 1976), whose work was one of the first ones to demonstrate how the gendered image was created in print advertisements with the help of the demonstration of gestures that both show women’s subordination, that is traditionally connected in our mind to their gender, such as requiring help and instruction, and smiling more commonly and widely than men.

## Conclusions to Chapter One

Chapter One we have started with discussing certain rules of conversation organization, the turn-taking model proposed by Sacks et al., following which is supposed to result in a successful conversation. Then we have discussed the strategies that the next speaker can use to start their turn after the current speaker. These include different kinds of overlap, turn-entry device, recycled turn beginning, and a non-verbal start.

Then we moved directly to the main topic of the Paper: we discussed a concept and essence of interruptions in modern linguistics, and found that in many researches interruptions are seen as impoliteness, display of rudeness, aggressiveness or anger towards the other speaker, violations of principal rules of conversation, for example, the rule that only one interlocutor speaks at a time. They are also believed to indicate the power, the willingness to control or dominate or in some cases it may show the lack of interest, hostility, and violence towards the speaker.

Results of this study demonstrate that interruptions are a complex combination of expressions of emotion, signals of attention-getting and signals of competitiveness, and their intonational manifestations are directly linked to these motivations. The pitch levels of interruptions occur at varying heights; the higher the intensity, the higher the pitch level. The specific pitch height of an interruption is found to be determined jointly by the need to attract attention, the intensity of the emotion present, and the strength of signal needed to overcome the attention and focus on the current topic.

Pitch and intensity are the prevailing features of speech that are used analysing overlaps. However, physical features like mimics, body and head movements, hand gestures etc., are also used in latest studies. The contexts in which interruptions take place are not just random contexts, on contrary, they have certain characteristics that can be helpful to predict overlaps.

In this Chapter, we have also discussed a corpus-based evidence of interrupted speech, and came to conclusion that there are several types of turn transitions, these are: smooth switch, overlap, pause interruption, simple interruption, and butting-in. Also, we discovered that the beginning of simple interruptions always overlaps the current speaker's turn, this overlap lasts just enough to support Schegloff's claim that utterance overlaps in conversation are normally resolved within two or less syllables. As mentioned before, intensity is one of the important factors for sorting out initiative conflicts. And just like that during prolonged overlaps, interrupters tend to raise their voices to strengthen the possibilities of success of their interruptions.

And finally, we have discussed how interruptions can be used to control the conversation and catch the interlocutor's attention. However, conversation dominance will be more deeply studied in our Chapter Two.

## **CHAPTER TWO. INTERRUPTIONS IN MODERN ENGLISH DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE**

### **2.1. Interruptions and politeness. Parameters of acceptability for interruptions**

Many recent researches in the pragmatics of natural language has focused on the characteristics of speech acts that resist the relatively uncompromising sort of formulation that attends present syntax and linguistic semantics. In particular, thanks to J. L. Austin, a great deal of attention has been drawn to the unconventional canons which carry out convincing and efficient conversation.

It is commonly accepted to think that it is always impolite and conversationally incorrect and even contra-productive to interrupt someone who is talking. Of course, we all can agree that in most easily imaginable speech situations, it may in the interest of most involved parties that the speaker gets interrupted. For example, one may imagine a situation in which the information that the interruptor shares is crucially important and urgent to everyone involved in the conversation, for example “The building is on fire!”

At the same time, we will agree again, that in this case the interruptor can be morally, and conventionally justified in interrupting and even excused for it. Nevertheless, his action was traditionally speaking impolite and not done according to conversation rules, even if we were prepared to put off our normal objection to this. Obviously, no one would ever say that the interruptor who screams “Fire!” to save everyone has done anything questionable or objectionable, or even remotely impolite.

Just like this, no one will ever judge an interruptor who leads up to his interruption with a clear and explicit acknowledgement of it, especially pair with an explicit or even implied apology for what they are going to do, often with an explanation of their ultimate reasons for that. Consider the following example:

“Excuse me, please. I swear, I hate to interrupt you, Mrs Banks, but your bag is on fire”. The forgiveness of many interruptions is very evident when the interrupted speaker is a non-stop talker, a person who can speak so long and often so fast that the only way to add anything to or during the entire passage is to interrupt.

According to William G. Lycan, there are 5 parameters of acceptability for interruptions.

**Parameter 1** or the first factor, is the most obvious one: the possibility to interrupt is produced by the interruptor’s action. Let us imagine that there are two possible courses of action, the first one is letting the speaker keep on talking uninterrupted, and the second one is interrupting him, and obviously the interruption produces tremendously more possibility of one kind or another than respectful silence would, therefore, we gravitate towards excusing or even demanding the interruption.

One of the most common situations that can illustrate it is when the interruptor has some crucial information that they have to share straight away. Or the interruptor may simply wish to announce an urgent command (“Careful!”), because of some vital information which has unexpectedly come into his possession.

Under relevant circumstances, an interruptor can be justified for their interruption simply for the reason they are in a hurry for an appointment and it seems like the current speaker, their companion, could keep on talking for another ten or even fifteen minutes without making a single stop. It is difficult to enumerate clear commonsensical rules to specify just how big or small a possible difference in the degree of interruption is needed to justify it, because, at the first place, it is difficult to measure and examine the contrast between these degrees; however people in everyday conversations have quite a reliable sense of feeling the difference.

So for Parameter 1, one should consider the situations, in which the need to interrupt may arise because of certain drastic alternation or development in the

immediate physical environment of the conversation. Also, there are circumstances in which an interruption can possibly maximize the effectiveness of the ongoing conversation, i.e., it will let the speaker and/or their audience realize the aim of their conversation faster and efficiently. Mostly, there will be no issues with the distributive justice here; it is generally assumed that all the parties of the conversation have identical goals in this very conversation, however, this is not always true.

Conversational efficiency can be divided into two main kinds:

1. Informational efficiency;
2. Dialectical efficiency.

Informational efficiency, on the speaker's side, refers to the speed and rate with which they are able to communicate the information to their audience. How can an interruptor maximize their informational efficiency? There are several possibilities:

1. They may try to point out to the speaker the fact that they have unintentionally skipped an important part of their narrative which is of highest importance to understanding of what they are saying at the time of interruption.

2. The interruptor may ask for some clarification of an unfamiliar concept or term used by the speaker without any explanation.

3. The interruptor may interject a minor addition or explanation of the information presented by the speaker, so the third party who is being informed can benefit from it.

4. In case the speaker pauses mid-sentence, due to an unexpected break of articulateness, for example, having to take a moment to think of a figure of speech or a term, the interruptor can smooth their way by providing the missing expression, or by helping the speaker complete their sentence. (In this particular case, far from being infelicitous or impolite, the interruptor's action may be explicitly and even enthusiastically welcomed by the speaker.

The list could go on and on. Dialectical efficiency sticks to the settling of disputes, or at least to the conversations that should be continued as dialogues governed by something like rules of opponent procedure. Since dialogues epitomize the transmission of information, it is clear that an interruptor can maximize their dialectical efficiency by maximizing the informational efficiency of a certain part of their contribution to the dialogue. What is more, they can assist the progress of the interchange and mutual exchange of beliefs that are supposed to occur in binary manner during a dialectical exchange.

For example, the interruptor may mention to the speaker that their audience is already aware of or believes in what the speaker is saying. This will give the speaker a chance to skip this part and proceed to something else, meanwhile saving time and preventing the irritation of the audience. At the same time informational efficiency is also increased in this case. In some situations, the interruptor may also anticipate and point out that the current speaker is talking past the listener. However, as bad as it sounds it is not a negative thing, as this may open the way to discussion regarding the meanings of the relevant to the topic terms etc, which can help the development of their mutual understanding and make the wasted words unnecessary and add energy to what follows.

Having listened to two or more other participants of the conversation arguing in such a way, so they acknowledge that both are baffled as to what exactly they are disputing about and what the other party is saying, the interruptor may use in their interruption to clarify the situation. As arrogant as this may sound (and not uncommonly turns out to actually be arrogant), but in many instances, especially in complicated technical discussions, an interruption, surprisingly, may be welcomed by both of the parties.

The interruptor, having noticed that the current speaker has unintentionally made a simple mistake of some kind and that they are going on to build up the rest of the speech objectively on this mistake, may interrupt to call attention to the mistake, expecting that the speaker will see that it had to be corrected, and will be

grateful that the interruptor has saved them the energy, effort and frustration of developing an argument that does not turn out to be successful.

It is understandable that this sort of issue may be delicate, as one person's simple mistake may become another's time to shine. However, a thoughtful interruptor should be familiar enough with their companion's general convictions and methods, so they are able to avoid offending them. Moreover, even if a similar situation does take place, the interruption may also serve as a beneficial dialectical purpose in helping both parties detect the actual cause of their argument; what they think to be an argument concerning one small detail can easily turn out to be a sign of a much deeper issue, and it may be much more effective to go to the core of the principal issue before one tackles the more superficial consequences.

Then again, the list of at the first sight justified interruptions can probably go on and on endlessly. But the main idea is clear; in many instances it can be an advantage for each conversation participant that the speaker is being interrupted. It seems to be a universal fact that no one would want to keep on talking if they are convinced that what they are saying may seem or may turn out to be conversationally useless or even obstructive.

And if no one wants to continue talking under such assets, then they will not mind being interrupted, therefore, interruptions which help prevent uncomfortable situations cannot be considered impolite, especially if they are justified and accepted interruptions as described above.

There is a problem connected with **Parameter 2** that is brought about by the difference between the applicability of interruptions as it is and the more specialized utility that can be calculated in terms of conversational efficiency. It is only logical that it may be useless to use interruptions for some particular conversations to achieve their communicative goal. This is exactly the reason for Parameter 1 to be split into two groups or factors that must be juxtaposed. The norms of polite conversation normally prefer conversational to nonconversational

account, except the comparatively uncommon cases when the nonconversational utility of the speakers to the conversation is to be influenced significantly.

Although one may have exceptional moral reasons to interrupt a speaker, it may still be considered impolite and conversationally infelicitous for them to do so; there are times when people are morally obligated to do or say something rude. And this shows that the norms of polite conversation are not themselves moral rules, even though they are based mainly on limited considerations of utility.

And the last quality of Parameter 2 is that there will be many borderline or perhaps in-between cases, even when we omit those which are blurry because of the status of one of the further parameters. For instance, there are times when an interruptor will justify their interruption, and yet this justification will not be quite honest. The sense of the interruption turns out to be only partially useful, and simply is not clear to what degree the interruptor takes it to make sure they helped. The justification gives a feeling of honesty and sincerity, but the content gives the other parties a reason to wonder what the interruptor is being honest about.

There are times when an interruptor will try to use this sort of tactic provocatively, maintaining his visible sincerity insincerely. They will make free use of apologetic justifications and hint that their interruptions are dialectically acceptable but will as a matter of fact use these situations as a justification to make speeches. This kind of thing is frequent in official situations, such as debates that follow the papers presentations by linguists or philosophers in which one is only supposed to speak when the lecturer or moderator recognized them.

When all the the audience and the speakers are respectfully waiting to be called on one after another, by interrupting an interruptor is claiming that the essence of their interruption is urgent and important that offers the annihilation of all other remarks and claims, including the lecturer's comment. But such a claim in such a context is almost always unacceptable. This kind of instance accentuates the evidence that the utility created by, what an interruptor does is a more important explanation of its acceptability than the actual manner in which he does it. It can be

gentle, agreeable, and most often apologetic. And still this manner definitely has something to do with how we assess of the action.

**Parameter 3** can also be described as the “obtrusiveness” of the interruptions, the extent to which the interruption disturbs the ongoing situation and changes the flow of the conversation. In general, other things being equal, an interruption that breaks into a dialogue just briefly, diverting attention just for a moment, is less unwelcome and more possible to be condoned or justified than is a dynamic and extraordinary interruption that by force adjusts the subject for the duration of the communicational episode. There is a somewhat smooth continuum of instances here, although it can (fairly arbitrarily) be split into rough groups.

Let us describe interruptions of the least obtrusive kind “tropes”. The least obtrusive members of this group itself will be one-syllable interjections, chuckles, gasps of surprise, etc.

Tropes of this kind are so mediocre in obtrusiveness that they are almost never labeled rude or infelicitous, unless

- the situation of a specific trope is rude itself;
- the speech context is such an official one that even the slightest trope is unacceptable.

A little longer and more obtrusive tropes may be injections of polysyllabic words, phrases, or even big sentences, without intention to break the current speaker’s train of thought but probably to encourage them.

Finally, the interruptor might interject tropic as a whole sentence or even two that they want to say (at the point that works for them) «for the record»; they may not care if anyone pays attention to them or not. As a rule, a trope is a fleeting interruption that needs no struggle on the current speaker’s part; the current speaker is not going to reply to the interruptor’s comment or even to make pause in their narrative.

The second group is that of fairly more obtrusive interruptions, and the speaker is welcome or expected to respond them (label these «interpolations»).

Interpolations are normally questions or introductory objections injected into a discourse context to promote speech efficiency; it is anticipated that the current speaker may give a fast response to the interrogation or argument in the interest of explicitness and polished exposition, and then proceed right away with what they were saying.

Such instances move gradually into more and more obtrusive ones, until the moment we reach these in which the current speaker is expected by the interruptor to stop, and listen to what the interruptor wants to say. The interruptor may try slightly to adjust the flow of the discussion, or they may attempt to deviate substantially or even alter the topic slightly. More obtrusively yet, they may just try to win the floor for some aims of their own. This is a comparatively irregular action that is nearly at all times disrespectful when it is performed on purpose. One may label a more obtrusive interruption an “interruption proper”.

The most obtrusive kind of interruption proper, is an “important and immediate» one that ends the dialogue at once, prevents any opportunity of reaching that communication’s aims. Some «important and immediate” interruptions are acceptable, others are not. In any instance, it appears to be obvious that the eligibility of an interruption differs depending on its obtrusiveness. The obviousness of an interruption slightly accustoms the utility outset, which means that the more obvious an interruption is the more utility must create to be acceptable and avoid being labelled impolite or demaging to the conversation.

**Parameter 4** is openness of the speaker. It is more common to interrupt somebody who speaks fast and for a long time, not caring for other speakers’ natural desire to contribute to the conversation, than to interrupt a current speaker who makes pauses and welcomes remarks every now and then. In the first instance, interruption is a listener’s single option to add something, particularly if the current speaker begins to repeat themselves and it seems that they have as a matter of fact already reached the end of the essence of their conversation; in the last instance,

the interruptor gained very little if any at all utility, even if the essence is vital for the conversation, so they could wait a sentence or two.

So, if we look at it like this, Parameter 4 is closely related to Parameter 1. It may simply be a modified instance of Parameter 1. However, it is listed separately because the degree of the acceptability of an interruption can be explained by the current speaker's openness and the phenomenon itself is clear enough to just be accepted. There can be a list of the aspects that add to or take away from a current speaker's openness. The most clear example is the time during which the current speaker has been talking without a pause. The longer they have been talking, the more possible it is that somebody else has something to add, and that something they (the current speaker) have said may provoke a response or a discussion; as a rule, the probability of nearly any kind of utility-producing addition on somebody else's part is getting higher, and the interruptions made after a long pause are more likely to be useful enough to be acceptable.

A second example is the speed rate with which the current speaker speaks, that is closely connected with their tolerance of questions and remarks — signified by suitable silence and looks at their audience asking for confirmation or other comments. If the current speaker makes themselves seem unapproachable by talking fast and making very few pauses, the more likely a listener is to interrupt them in order to add something.

A closely connected example is the current speaker's desire to make a pause at particular structural points in their discourse. Especially, they are anticipated to make a pause before they change the subject; if they do not do so, they may in all typical instances be interrupted with freedom (however, there are still some official contexts in which it may differ).

The fourth example is the novelty of the information the speaker's is sharing. If the current speaker starts to repeat themselves (as the majority of speakers do), it becomes easier for an interruption to be accepted simply for the reason of informational efficiency. Most people have no desire, from the view of

politeness, to let a current speaker repeat something they have already said . (It is still normally disrespectful to interrupt on a first or even second repetition with the words “Yeah, yeah, you said that before”, as an example.)

In short, the function of openness of the Parameter 4 (like that of obtrusiveness) is to raise the level of the reasonings required to condone an interruption.

Let us continue with the last parameter. **Parameter 5** describes the acceptability of the current speaker’s point of entry. If a listener is going to interrupt anyway, it is better to do so at the end of a utterance than in the middle, and it is much better to do so at the end of the paragraph, when they can at least pretend that the current speaker has made a pause for a remark.

As a rule, it is more acceptable to interrupt during a silence, even when it is obvious the current speaker wants to maintain the floor through the silence and they even signify it by pronouncing “uh” or something of the kind. Note, that the ones who taught us never to use “uh”, our parents and teachers for example, have not appreciated the communication value of “uh” as a traditionally accepted placeholding signal.

The propriety of a point of entry does not appear to have much to do with utility. It has more to do with the looks; the more a current speaker’s behaviour seems like they are finished (even if it is clear that they have not, in fact, finished their utterance), the easier it is to interrupt them and get away with the interruption. Probably this can be best explained by the fact that the more a current speaker’s behaviour approximates being through talking, the easier it is to help the listeners forget, that they were not finished, after the interruptor has started their turn.

But to let it happen appears to be cynical, as there is a feeling of acceptance that a current speaker that makes a pause for too long should lose the floor. Perhaps this happens because a blank space or the silence, normally has no valuable discourse function, and will, mostly be considered as wasted time and time is a utility. In any instance, some aspects in a discourse are much easier than

others to interrupt politely and efficiently. The clear values here depend to some extent on other characteristics of the interruption, mostly on its obtrusiveness.

One has to wait longer to make an interruption, when the current speaker is making a pause, if one expects to alter the topic than if one expects to slightly interpolate, especially if the point of interruption is anything less than acceptable than the end of the entry. However, there are certain rules of how long the pauses can be to be taken as a polite interruption, no matter what the syntactic point of entry is (Lycan, 1977).

A current speaker who makes a pause for more than a few seconds will lose the floor by default, even if they have made a pause in the middle of the sentence looking for a word. (It is assumed, that if it is vital to them that they should not be interrupted, they will stop looking for a word, put themselves together to articulate themselves even sloppily, just to get on with their utterance as fast as possible.)

There are still some ambiguity in the nature of an interruption that follows a long (let us say, yielding) silence. Unless the silence occurs at a big break in the structure (wide point of entry), for example, the end of a paragraph, the interruptor is still anticipated at least to keep the subject, and it is considered that they have acted disrespectfully if they change the subject too dramatically. This is especially so in the instance of very small points of entry, for example, in the middle of the sentence, when the current speaker is looking for a word or to paraphrase their sentence.

For them to change the topic would be to signify that the interruptor is not interested in what the current speaker is saying, and wishes to take any chance to forget about it, interchanging some subject of their own. If we put these variations aside, it is safe to say that the ultimate propriety of point of entry slowly can become considered a noninterruption, not just a slightly acceptable or excusable interruption. If a current speaker makes a long pause, a listener who then starts their turn is no longer considered an interruptor.

## 2.2. Conversational dominance and interruptions

It is a well-known fact that certain conversational strategies could be used to achieve dominance in a conversation. The term ‘Conversational dominance’ is commonly used to describe the phenomenon when one speaker is dominating others in verbal interaction. Many researchers focusing on mixed talk in numerous social contexts have been conducted and as a result revealed asymmetrical patterns: men tend to have wider range of usage of certain strategies, which is associated with male dominance in conversation. Interruptions are probably the most explicit linguistic strategy using which one can achieve dominance, while interrupting someone means to deprive them, or at least make an attempt to deprive them of their right to have the floor.

However, there are quite a few linguistic strategies that can be used to achieve dominance in a conversation. But before one can shed the light upon conversational dominance, they need to investigate the way conversation is organised once again, as we have already done in the first chapter, however from a little different perspective.

As it has been already mentioned in the first chapter, the turn is the fundamental unit in the turn-taking conversation model and each turn is conceptualised as tied to the individual speaker. As the well-known proverb says: “One speaker speaks at a time, and speaker change recurs”. For the reason that turns and speakers follow and change each other in an orderly manner, without any gaps and any overlaps inbetween, this very model is also known as the ‘no gap, no overlap’ model.

The term itself – “no gap, no overlap” – attracts attention to both significant claims made by the model. ‘

“No gap” is connected with the claim that participants of the conversation understand syntactic, semantic and prosodic clues so accurately that they can easily predict the final part of the current speaker’s turn. As a result, there is no explicit

or even perceptible gap between the end of the first speaker's turn and the beginning of the next one. And the 'no overlap' part complements this by asserting that the end of the current speaker's turn can be so accurately predicted by the next speaker that they start to speak right when the current speaker finishes and not before.

In many cases a speaker can be described as 'dominating' in a conversation, which usually means that they are breaking the underlying rules of the turn-taking model in some way.

First, the next speaker may easily break the 'one speaker speaks at a time' rule when they interrupt the current speaker to grab the floor.

Secondly, the next speaker may contravene the norm of 'speaker change recurs' if they take an extremely long turn, ignoring other speakers' rights to have the floor, and encroaching the floor.

Thirdly, which may sound ironic, the speaker may talk too little, which leads to taking away from conversational interaction; it can't be also described as non-cooperative behaviour that often leads to the breakdown of conversation. If we examine the research evidence for each of these disruptions of the normal conversational pattern, it will show that it is most commonly male speakers who are responsible for such disruption.

### **2.2.1. Grabbing the floor: interruptions**

If all conversations matched the ideal turn-taking model described above, then there would be no cases of overlap (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). Although in spontaneous communication, speakers seldom stick to the 'one-at-a-time' norm. In 1983 Zimmerman and West (West and Zimmerman, 1983), used Sacks et al.'s model of turn-taking, to conduct a study, they recorded thirty-one verbal exchanges that involved two participants in public places like cafes, or

pharmacies on the University of California campus; ten dialogues occurred between two females, ten between two males, and eleven between one female and one male.

The scholars concentrated on irregularities in the recorded dialogues; these were the points in the dialogues where they were not built according to the polished pattern presupposed by the turn-taking model. They discovered drastic distinctions between the same-sex dialogues and the cross-sex dialogues.

They named the two kinds of abnormality they found as overlaps and interruptions. As it has been described previously, overlaps are cases of insignificant over-anticipation of the next speaker. The next speaker starts to speak at the very end of the current speaker's sentence, overlapping the last word or its syllables rather than beginning their utterance right after the current speaker finishes their turn (Boden & Zimmerman, 1991).

On the other hand, interruptions are clear violations of the turn-taking norms of dialogues. The current speaker is still speaking, however, the next one also begins to speak, and this point in their (current speaker's) turn cannot be seen as the last word. Interruptions destroy the harmony of the turn-taking conversational model: the interruptor keeps the current speaker from finishing their turn, and by doing so, they "steal" a turn for themselves.

So, in twenty of the recorded dialogues, there were twenty-two cases of overlaps, twelve involving the first speaker and ten involving the second one; there also occurred seven interruptions, of which three coming from the first speaker and four coming from the second one. For the aims of the research, the person called 'first speaker' is the one speaking first in this very stretch of dialogue; it does not necessarily mean that this speaker started the dialogue.

These conclusions stand in complete contrast to the dialogues involved a female and a male speaker. In the eleven dialogues nine overlaps and forty-eight interruptions occurred. The male speaker caused all the overlaps, and forty-six of the forty-eight interruptions were instances of the male speaker interrupting the female one. The results of the research have been studied to make sure that they

were not caused by an atypical dialogue of some kind: the interruptions took place in each dialogue except one. Moreover, the quantity of interruptions was very high considering the fact that there were just seven in total in the twenty same-sex dialogues. This fact leads us to the conclusion that the ratio of interruptions to dialogue is 0.35:1 (seven out of twenty) for same-sex dialogues, and 4.36:1 (forty-eight out of eleven) for mixed-sex dialogues.

Secondly, male speakers seldom interrupt other male speakers; it is almost exclusively when they are talking to the female speakers that they interrupt. These conclusions signify that in mixed-sex dialogues male speakers violate women's right to speak, and especially women's right to finish their turn. On the other hand, the fact that female speakers used no overlaps in dialogues with the male ones (they did interrupt and overlap in conversations with other women) implies that women are less likely to violate the male speaker's turn and wait until they are finished.

West and Zimmerman (1998) report that females just like children have restricted rights to speak, in contemporary American society, and that interruptions can be used both to show and to reach socially accepted connections of dominance and submission. These conclusions are supported by other study looking at interruptions (e.g. Eakins and Eakins 1979; Leet-Pellegrini 1980; Mulac et al. 1988; Schick Case 1988; Holmes 1995; Gunnarsson 1997).

It was found that men are be more likely to interrupt other speakers, women for instance, disruptively; in addition, it was found that men are much more likely to interrupt female speakers than they were to interrupt men. And this tendency for men to interrupt women can take place even where the woman is of a higher position.

It was also found that, in the interaction between a doctor and a patient, there is a tendency that doctors interrupt their patients much more often than patients interrupt their doctors. However, ther is an exception when the doctor is female. In the interaction between a male doctor and a patient, the interruptions from the

doctors' side were higher in number than the ones coming of the patients (there were twice as many interruptions made by doctors in fact). By contrast, in the interaction between a female doctor and a patient, the interruptions were made by male patients, and they were higher in number than made by the doctors (West, 1998).

Other researches demonstrated that, even in a situation when a woman has a high position at, for example, the workplace, it is more likely that she will be interrupted by a male subordinate than that he will interrupt her (Woods 1989). These researches also demonstrated that male speakers use interruptions as a means of gaining the floor, and in 85 times out of 100 they do this successfully.

The same tendency exists again in a research based on broadcast Australian TV interviews (Winter 1993). Joanne Winter juxtaposed two political interviews, one of them involved a male interviewer and another one involved a female interviewer. The interviewees were both the politicians of high rank in the Australian government back then: the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Treasurer) and the Prime Minister. This research shows that the male interviewer's style was aggressive: they interrupted the interviewee more than the interviewee interrupted them, in 4:1 ratio, to be precise.

At the same time, the female interviewer was not interrupting at all, however, they were interrupted five times by the interviewee. (It is very common in radio programmes such as ones on the BBC Radio 4 that even nowadays male members try to control the interaction and female members are often interrupted by the male host.) Interruptions appear to be to function as a way of managing subjects. Subjects choice is typically shared equally between parties in a dialogue, but H. Leet-Pellegrini (1980) found that, in dialogues, where one speaker is a man and the other – a woman, male speakers tend to have the control.

By researching various linguistic characteristics including interruptions and overlaps, Leet-Pellegrini has managed to find out that the variables of gender of

the speaker and their expertise in the subject under discussion are good predictors of dominance (Leet-Pellegrini, 1980).

In other words, the speakers who are both male and knowledgeable tend to prevail in the dialogue. They talked more and interrupted the turns of the other speakers more. However, female speakers who were not knowledgeable tend to talk less and use more minimal replies and other types supportive linguistic behaviour. Speakers who were male and well-informed control the dialogue as they use a power- based style of interaction (claiming an unequal right to have the floor and to handle subjects) when knowledgeable female speakers preferred a solidarity- and support-based interactional style.

### **2.3. Interruptions and simultaneous speech in families**

Several studies on interruptions and simultaneous speech have discovered no crucial distinctions between younger girls and boys. However, at the age of 15, boys start using interruptions to control interaction (Gilbert 1990). In addition, parents' approaches in terms of both interruptions and simultaneous speech differ. Greif (1980) studied sixteen middle-class children, aged between 2 and 5, in dialogues with (1) their mothers and (2) their fathers.

Her conclusions demonstrate that fathers tend to interrupt more than mothers (however, this distinction is not big enough to be significant for statistics), and that both parents interrupted girls more than boys.

Talking about simultaneous speech which means that both parties start their utterance at the same moment, parents were more likely to continue their utterance than children, pairs with the father were more likely to speak simultaneously than pairs with the mother, and both fathers and mothers were more likely to participate in simultaneous speech with daughters than with sons.

So, the usage of simultaneous speech just like interruptions can be seen as a way of having authority over a conversation. It appears to be so that fathers attempt

to have authority over a conversation more than mothers (that fits the study conclusions for “grown up” dialogues), and both mother and father have less authority over conversation with sons than with daughters. The hidden message to girls is that they are more likely to be interrupted and that the boys have more rights to speak.

When equal pairs, (opposed to unequal pairs like a father with a child), participate in simultaneous speech, such behaviour is very likely to be a symbol of solidarity and cooperation, not dominance. There has been a research of the gender politics conducted in an elementary school in San Diego, California, which describes how the girls’ ability to speak simultaneously can be used as a powerful tactic for displaying to the boys the coalition of the girls. Provided that talking simultaneously is not easy to achieve, we cannot help but admire the girls’ interactive skills that clearly precondition women’s later skills in talk (Streeck, 1986).

### **2.3.1. Interruptions while interaction at school**

There has been an experiment conducted by Millman with the goal to investigate male-female interaction at school, which describes uneven roles assigned to girls and boys at school age. Pupils were split into the pairs involving same-sex and mixed-sex children for a science experiment. The dialogues have been filmed and their analysis has shown that the pairs with the same-sex members worked cooperatively, but in the pairs mixed-sex members boys had a dominant role that was accepted by the girls: the boys conducted the experiment (as a part of the class) and delivered the conclusions to the teacher and other listeners while the girls were assisting and then cleaning up afterwards (Millman, 1983).

Other scientists in their researches also came to conclusion that boys have a tendency to dominate in small groups or at least try to do so, as there is a limited number of “leading positions” in their immediate environment. Researchers in

sociolinguistics also demonstrate tendencies of the boys in secondary school to interrupt others more often than girls do, even if it is a person who has authority in their eyes, and especially of boys interrupting each other (Gilbert, 1990).

What is more, girls tend to use short replies (“mhm”, “yeah”, “well”) in a supportive and encouraging way, while boys regularly use them as a form of interruption to get the floor in the dialogue and not at all support the current speaker. In comparison to them, boys are much more likely to be impatient and to disagree aggressively, without any attempt to be polite or tolerant to their interlocutors (Fisher, 1994).

### **2.3.2. Interruptions while interaction at job interviews**

Job interviews have also been the subject of discourse analysis on many occasions. For example, Kerekes (2006) has conducted a research during which they observed and video-recorded 48 job interviews in Canada, where they have identified discursive evidence on how trust and distrust were mutually built up between the participants, and demonstrated the importance of these concepts for success or failure of the candidates’.

Similarly, a research of the communication in work environment has been made in the UK, where 60 job interviews in seven organizations in London and Birmingham have been video recorded and analyzed by candidates (2007).

They demonstrated that those candidates who did not perform successfully did not appropriately create personal and professional atmosphere in their communication to present a convincing professional identity. To this research candidates have also looked at the issue from the intercultural perspective, and by doing so, they identified twice as many misalignments, and almost four times as many wrongly communicated questions in interviews with the candidates who had outside of Britain background.

Bogaers (1998) also contributed to the examination of the interactional style in job interviews, and their research demonstrated the interaction within status and gender discourse norms. They report that in official interviews, male participants, both interviewers and interviewees are more likely to have a more dominant and controlling interactional style with more interruptions. At the same time, female participants who have the same status and positions tend to show empathy and let the other speaker finish their turn.

In this research, therefore, the dimension of power is of highest importance, and the researches examine the variety of ways in which dominance of the control over the conversation is presented by different participants (Holmes, 1992).

### **2.3.3. Interruptions at meetings**

In workplace discourse analysis at official meetings, no matter big or small, have drawn much attention; since business conversations researchers claim that senior managers tend to spend up to 80 percent of their work time in meetings. Discourse investigators have researched quite a few different characteristics of conversation in meetings, for example meeting management, decision-making, and problem-solving, with focus laid on each detail of the conversational means through which issues were identified and admitted, as well as solved.

Workplace meetings are an understandable place for establishing institutional power, just like for keeping and cultivating team spirit, corporate relationships and carrying out “togetherness” management.

Meetings are a favourable place for researching the demonstration of gendered behavior too. As an addition to characteristics of meeting arrangement, such as program management and subjects dominance, discourse researches have found a wide range of quite specific tactics through which power is demonstrated in meetings, these include disruptive interruptions, the amount of talk added by both

speaking parties, and the use of questions to dominate the interaction in interviews, and have power, or as a “nonprimary” party to declare power (Tannen, 1994).

#### **2.3.4. Clinical encounters of interruptions**

The conversation researchers have been examining how power connections in encounters in clinical environment are realized through tactics of asking questions, turn-taking, and interruptions. By contrast to many sociologists who study medical settings, and view dominance in medical encounters as a result of conventional social roles and hierarchy at the institution, and to cultural analysts who see it as an end effect of the order nature of biomedical discourse, dialogue researchers claim that power and dominance in medical environment are effectively described as micro-political achievements, created in and through real turns (West, 1984).

One of the first and most powerful researches of interaction during medical consultations, for instance, was conducted by Byrne and Long (1976) as a result, it was found that in three out of four cases in more than 2000 medical interviews that they have recorded, doctors performed all of the initiating moves have been performed by doctors and all of the responding moves by patients. All the following researches have proved that conversational moves like questions, requests, orders, and offers are mostly made by doctors and do not appear to be approved when made by patients (West 1984).

Physicians keep conversational dominance by means of questions they ask too and the way they react to the answers from the patients' side using “third turns”. Moreover, some researches have demonstrated that doctors commonly interrupt patients, and in such cases, their patients seldom try to gain back the floor if doctors do not make a further welcoming move (Beckman and Frankel 1984). The inconsistency in dominance relations in medical encounters, is not simply a question of the conversational behavior of doctors. Other researches have

demonstrated that patients add to this inconsistency by declining invitations by doctors too to make welcoming moves.

Other researches point out that the patients use their own tactics for reaching conversational dominance in medical settings by, for example, using indirect questions (West, 1984), and other clever and hidden tools to gain or gain back the authority over the subjects and to prevent the doctors from making so-called questioning interventions.

In addition, interactional sociolinguistic researches of medical environment have provided new observations of the problem of power in interaction between physicians and patients built on critical views from frame analysis and politeness studies and theories. It has been discovered that interruptions from the doctors' side, are seen in most studies of conversations as evidence of inconsistency, that regularly functions as a display of empathy and cooperation rather than attempt to gain control and power (Tannen, Hamilton, and Schiffrin, 2015).

#### **2.4. Analysis of interruptions in Modern English dialogues**

It is rather common that we interrupt and get interrupted. No matter the topic of the conversation, the gender of the interlocutors, or their age, interruptions are inevitable – they are an essential and, what may come as a surprise, informative part of the communication.

Also, it is not always the second speaker, that interrupts, the third one may barge right in. What do the speakers do in case of interruption? The reactions and responses may vary: one would stutter for a moment and then continue the story, another one would get annoyed, and the third one gets confused and we never find out what they were meaning to say.

Let us discuss all the above mentioned points in more detail and look deeper into the interruption reasons. Having made a research based on the modern American and British movies and series, that represent the up to date culture and

language situation, one may come to conclusion that the following are the most common reasons, why we do interrupt. They can be also roughly classified as positive and negative.

Let us have a look at the first example, taken from once one of the most popular modern American series called “The Big bang Theory”. The situation is observed in a canteen of the university where the participants of the conversation work. They are all close friend, which to some extent determines the development of the conversation. This example has to do with **mockery** and in some cases borders on blatant bullying.

Raj: *Mmm, gentlemen, I put it to you, the worst tapioca pudding is better than the best pudding of any other flavour.*

Sheldon: *First off, that is axiomatically wrong, because the best pudding is chocolate. Secondly, the organic structure of tapioca makes it a jiggling bowl of potential death. It is extracted from the plant... (int.)*

Howard: *Hey, I'm thinking of growing a mustache.*

Leonard: *Ah, no kidding! A Fu Man Chu? A handlebar pencil?*

Sheldon: *It is extracted from the plant... (int.)*

Howard: *I'm not sure yet. You know, George Clooney has one now!*

Raj: *Really? I once saw him shopping at Ralph's. He was buying tequila.*

Howard: *Oh, you'd think a guy like that would have some kind of booze lackey.*

Leonard: *Alright this is cruel, we better let him finish before his head explodes.*

Howard: *Alright Sheldon, why is tapioca... (int.)*

Sheldon: *Tapioca is extracted from the root of the plant Manihot Esculenta. Due to a high concentration of cyanide it is poisonous in its raw form and lethal if prepared improperly.*

Raj: *Feel better now? (int.)*

Sheldon: *It is also indigenous to Brazil, as is the Cocoa Bean, from which we get chocolate, the best pudding. And you promised you wouldn't do that anymore!*

(C. Lorre, 2009)

Sheldon is being interrupted on several occasions. He is being made fun of as his friend know very well about his need to share the 'fun facts' with them. They are interrupting him on purpose and enjoying his reaction, the interrupted speaker finds it to be rude and feels offended. This is one of the cases discussed in the subchapter concerning the politeness. But at the same time it is closely connected with the fact that it is a conversation between men, acting like boys, neither of them having an opportunity to become a "real" acknowledged leader in a group, they choose an easy victim and take it out on them. However, as they are not purely evil, and there is still friendship between them, it is done as softly as possible in the given situation.

This is exactly what is meant there when it was claimed that it is difficult to measure the degree and the moment when the interruption gets impolite, as on one hand it is a conversation between close friends, which means that one can deviate from the regular politeness and conversation rules. However, at the same time, we can almost unconsciously sense that perhaps they took this joke far enough for it to become a violation. And this is clearly not a case of a cooperative and positive interruption.

Speaking about the second instance, this interruption is different from the first one at least because the one who interrupts does not have any bad intentions against the listeners and the current speaker; they are filled with excitement and want to make their contribution to the conversation. However their action can also be considered impolite, they could be more discreet and wait for their turn, as per the conversation conventions and basic politeness, it is still a cooperative interruption that signals that the listener is actively involved.

One more dialogue is taken from the American series “How I Met Your Mother”. The setting the marriage registry office, which could be considered a serious governmental institution, if it were not in Las Vegas. The group of friends gathered there, as two of them (Marshall and Lily) decided to get married, and they are trying to get the permission to do that, as they have not registered in advance as they should have.

We will see that this one deals with **mockery** and even **irony** again. In addition, we can see here a genuine **surprise**.

Marshall: *Hi. Hello. Uh, we need a marriage license, but we need to skip the waiting period because... We're in love.*

Woman 2: *Aw. I'm gonna waive this waiting period right now... (int.)*

Lily: *Oh, really?!*

Woman 2: *Is what I would say if I could waive the waiting period, but unfortunately, only a judge can do that.*

Lily: *Oh. Well, so can we see a judge?*

Woman 2: *Absolutely... (int.)*

Lily: *Really?!*

Woman 2: *Is what I would say if there was any chance of you seeing a judge today, which there isn't.*

Marshall: *Why are you doing this to us?!*

Woman 2: *'Cause you're on Candid Camera!... (int.)*

Robin: *Really?!*

Woman 2: *Is what I would say... (int.)*

Marshall: *You know what? We get it.*

(C. Bays, 2005)

Here we see a proper interruption which is actually **expected** by the speaker. She deliberately says things she knows they would be excited about, then lets them interrupt her only to disappoint them with **sarcastic** comments. So, from the interrupters side, it is an innocent act, caused by pure emotions and excitement,

however from the speaker's side it is a manipulation which totally has to do with the power that she has. She is not trying to compete and win the floor, she already has the control of the situation, she knows and uses that.

We shall proceed with the example that has been taken from the series called *Lucifer* (just like two following this one), mixing both British and American English, however representing the culture and the speaking situation of the latter one. In this case it is a conversation between a male and a female speaker and has to do with the **irrelevance of what is being said in a critical situation**. Here we can see a man being interrupted by the superior to him lady detective.

Lucifer: *Hey, now if you'd just give that gun I'd asked for...*

Detective: *Stop talking.*

Lucifer: *Okay.*

*(T. Kapinos, 2016)*

The speakers are close enough and know each other long enough to be able to stop each other from talking in an impatient and even rude manner. And despite the overwhelming majority of cases of men dominating conversations with women, here we see the exact opposite.

However, it also has to do with the status of the speakers. The man, who is being interrupted is the subordinate. And even though women are not likely to interrupt, as the researches prove, the situation was calling for it, as they were in a dangerous setting, and what Lucifer was trying to say was both irrelevant to the situation and ridiculous in any other environment (he was by no means allowed to carry a weapon – neither legally, not morally).

The interruption is disruptive and successful, however only for the interrupter, not the conversation itself. The first speaker's turn is cut.

The next example was found in the American series "Lie to Me". It continues the set of reasons where what is happening is more **urgent** than what is being said at the moment, however, it is also one of the cases when a listener

finishes the speaker's turn, because what they are going to say is **obvious** or easily **predicted**.

Elias: *Hey, Lightman's back on line.*

Foster: *He needs our eyes and ears for this next part.*

Agent: *We never had...*

Foster: *Never had this conversation. I got it.*

(S. Baum, 2009)

This interruption is actually cooperative. The interruptor send a signal to the speaker that they have been heard and understood, even if the urgency of the situation is not letting them finish their turn.

The goal of the interruption was reached and both participants of the conversation are satisfied with the result.

The next dialogue occurs between the same two speakers. However, the setting is quite similar, and the interruption reason has to do with the position of the speakers, their gender and conversation dominance.

Lucifer: *You know, as a Master of Punishment, I completely understand your desire to make Viper pay for the tragic death of your cousin...*

Detective: *Lucifer, you do remember that bullets hurt, right?!*

(T. Kapinos, 2016)

One cannot argue that it is not appropriate to make a long, emotional, and ridiculously detailed speech when someone's life may be in danger, especially when it is the life of the speaker. Sometimes one has no other choice but to stop the speaker mid-sentence and attempt to solve more urgent issues. As mentioned above, it has to do with the male-female interaction and conversational dominance again. A more put together and serious woman can easily take the floor or just cut the speaker's turn, even if that speaker is a man. However, it will most likely happen only given that a man is not taken seriously.

The interruption is disruptive and successful and final, the interrupter has no intention to start speaking instead, they reach their goal – the first speaker loses the floor.

The next reason for interruption is a desire of the interrupter to create a **dramatic effect, draw the attention** of the audience and perhaps distract it from something else. The following fragment is taken from the same series and includes the already mentioned man, called Lucifer and the priest, who is about to marry a couple.

Priest: *If there is anyone here that would oppose this holy union, speak now or forever hold your pea...*

Lucifer: *Excuse me! Yeah, I have a problem. Has-has anyone else noticed how incredibly, jaw-droppingly, loin-stirringly beautiful this young woman is. And how short, sweaty, and altogether fungly this homunculus is? I mean what is this – a wedding or kidnapping?*

*(S. Elwood, 2016).*

The setting of this conversation is a wedding, which allows the interrupter to gain a big audience. They are fully aware, that they are disrupting something important, and yet they still decide to do so, because they consider their contribution to the ongoing discourse important enough to break into.

In this case both speakers are male, so it is not only about the information that must be shared, it is also about men competing over the authority in this particular group – the one who holds the floor the longest has the attention of the majority of the present listeners and therefore, dominates the conversation.

The interruption is disruptive and successful. The first speaker not only loses the floor, they are left speechless.

The following example has to do with creating the **dramatic** air too. Here we see Lucifer again and a religious fanatic, screaming in the street, trying to get people to listen.

Man: *Look at this world! The sin, the lust! It is the devil's touch.*

Lucifer: *N-n-no! Don't give me credit for all that. You humans do plenty all on your own.*

*(S. Elwood, 2016)*

But in this case, it is not only the interruption itself that dazzles the speaker and the witness of the conversation, it is more about what they say. And the aim of what they say is to make the listeners believe that he is the Devil himself, which could only make them roll their eyes, made them laugh or created no effect at all. It has to be mentioned that it was not an interruption proper, as intended by the second speaker, it was rather an overlap. Willingly or not, the second speaker let the first one finish their turn.

This overlap was not that successful, as the dramatic effect that was intended by the man was only reached for a truly short time. They did not gain the floor and the audience continued listening to the first speaker, who was more persuasive and dominated the conversation.

Man: *Repent! The Devil...*

Lucifer: *Isn't finished with you yet.*

*(S. Elwood, 2016).*

This is the continuation of the dialogue. The first speaker continues their speech that is, to be more precise was meant to be a monologue and they did not intend to share the attention of the audience. However, the interrupter keeps on insisting to be the Devil, which finally annoys the first speaker.

Communicational goal is not reached, they must resolve the conflict resorting to physical violence.

The next example is taken from the American movie “The Devil wears Prada”. The setting is an office of the multimillion company, so the expectations to the interlocutors are extremely high. It mostly has to do with the communication in the **work environment** and in this situation, specifically with the boss, willing to see actions and not willing to hear the excuses.

Miranda: *I don't understand why it's so difficult to confirm an appointment.*

Emily: *I'm so sorry, Miranda. I did confirm last night, but... (int.)*

Miranda: *The details of your incompetence do not interest me.*

*(W. Finerman, 2016)*

This one is connected to **authority** and **conversational dominance**. This dialogue occurs between two women, a boss, and her subordinate. Although, many researches claim that women tend to be understanding and let the other speaker finish their turn, it is not the case with Miranda or at least not in this situation. She is a woman of the highest position in the company, she is famous and a couple years older than her assistant, and clearly more experienced, moreover, everyone is afraid of her.

The combination of all these factors makes it possible for her to interrupt the current speaker without any hesitation. The interruption was successful though it was impolite and too open up.

The following situation takes place in the same office, during a meeting of Miranda and her subordinate designers, who by the way, are much higher in position than the assistant in the previous example. They discuss the new collection and once again, the boss is waiting for actions and new ideas.

Miranda: *Perfect. What about the accessories pages for April?*

Jocelyn: *One thought was enamel - bangles, pendants, earrings... (int.)*

Miranda: *We did that two years ago. What else?*

Jocelyn: *Well, they're showing a lot of florals for spring and so... (int.)*

Miranda: *Florals. For spring. Groundbreaking.*

*(W. Finerman, 2016)*

Once again, even working on the same project and, roughly speaking, doing the same job, at least in this particular situation, Miranda finds it acceptable to cut the turns of her subordinates, as she finds them **irrelevant** and has a feeling that listening to their “nonsense” is just a **waste of time**. Even their attempts persuade her do not work, they only irritate the boss.

Paul: *But we thought about shooting them in an industrial space.*

She looks at him.

Paul: *We thought the contrast between the femininity of the florals ... and the um, the more raw, rough-hewn nature of the backdrop would create a tension which... (int.)*

Miranda: *No.*

Paul: *... which... (int.)*

Miranda: *No.*

*(W. Finerman, 2016)*

This is the continuation of the same conversation. Clearly in both cases, the boss is not trying to gain the ground, she is trying to stop the subordinates from finishing the current thought and to make them proceed to the next one. However, while in the first case, she is still trying to make some remarks, in the second one, she cuts the speaker's turn with a simple "No". Maybe she is done and is no longer willing to keep the conversation going, but maybe it has also to do with the **gender** of the speakers. She is ready to tolerate the female speaker but would not let a man in a **subordinate** position tell her what to do. She knows very well, how much power and authority she has and will not tolerate any disobedience or disrespect, even when she clearly disrespects others.

At the end, the goal of the interruption is reached – the speakers' turns have been disrupted.

The next dialogue is taken from the American series "How I Met Your Mother" too. It takes place in a restaurant and the interlocutors are a man and a woman, who are or were dating, it is Natalie's birthday, and they are celebrating. The conversation was going smoothly, however at some point, the emotions, **anger** in particular, took over and there has been a series of interruptions.

Ted: *Look, Natalie, there's something I have to say and there's no good way to say it. I wanna break up. I don't think you're the one for me. I don't want to waste your time because I really like you. I wanna do right by you, and I think the best way to do that is just to be honest. I'm sorry.*

(Natalie covers her face)

Ted: *Just let it out. They're only tears.*

(Throws her spaghetti on him)

Ted: *Aah!*

Natalie: *I'm not the one for you?*

Ted: *I'm sorry. I just thought the mature thing to do would be...* (int.)

Natalie: *It's my birthday!*

Ted: *Yes, I know I didn't realize that it was...* (int.)

Natalie: *It's my birthday and you're telling me I'm not the one for you?*

Ted: *It's really not such a big deal. I mean it's the odds. It's like you lost the lottery.*

(C.Bays, 2006)

The main focus of this one is not even a male-female interaction or the question of dominance. It is more about pure and uncontrollable human emotions, the interrupter was really surprised by what the first speaker has said that she could not help but start speaking before the other party finished the turn, especially when her surprise changed to anger.

However, this interruption cannot be described in a negative way, as both speakers are actively involved in the conversation and despite minor conversation rules violations, they both still manage to share their main idea and hear the one from the other speaker. Thus, this interruption can also be labelled **productive**.

The following example was taken the American movie called “The Fault in our Stars” and unlike all the other examples, this one is a **phone conversation** and a very **emotional** and filled with **excitement** one. Two close friends are talking and one of them (Gus) is trying to impress the other, he shares the information that she would never expect to hear but is very excited about.

Gus: *So, I read it again. And I just kept feeling like... like it was a gift. Like you'd given me something important.*

Hazel: *You're welcome.*

Gus: *On the other hand... we need closure, don't we?*

Hazel: *What we need is a sequel.*

Gus: *Yes. We need to know what happens to Anna's family after she dies.*

Hazel: *That's what I kept asking Van Houten for in my letters.*

Gus: *But he never wrote back.*

Hazel: *That's correct.*

Gus: *Because he's a recluse.*

Hazel: *Yeee-up.*

Gus: *Utterly unreachable.*

Hazel: *Unfortunately so.* Gus clears his throat, smiles. Hazel waits.

Gus: *"Dear Mr. Waters... I am writing to thank you for your electronic correspondence received this 6th of April.* Hazel sits up.

Gus: *"I am grateful to anyone who sets aside the time to read my book..."*  
 ...(int.)

Hazel: *Augustus!?*

Gus: *I found his assistant. I emailed her. She must have forwarded it to him.*

(Hazel is stunned) *Shall I continue... (int.)*

Hazel: *Keep reading, keep reading!*

Gus: *"I am particularly indebted to you, sir, both for your kind words about 'An Imperial Affliction' and for taking the time to tell me that the book, and here I quote you directly, 'meant a great deal' to you."* Hazel pays attention to every word.

Gus: *"To answer your question: No, I have not written anything else, nor will I. I do not feel that continuing to share my thoughts with readers would benefit either them or me. However thank you again for your generous email. Yours most sincerely,*

Hazel: *Van Houten.*

(M. Bowen, 2014)

As we can see, it clearly not about who has the floor or who does not, both speakers are really involved and happy to have this conversation, the interruption is cooperative and productive – it encourages the current speaker to continue their turn while the second one gets the opportunity to express how they feel about what is being said.

Here we see the continuation of the same dialogue.

Hazel: *You're making this up?*

Gus: *Hazel Grace, could I, with my meager intellectual capabilities, make up a letter from the great Peter Van Houten?*

Hazel: *Holy hell.*

Gus: *Indeed.*

Hazel: *Can I... would you mind...(int.)*

Gus: *(smiling) Go check your in-box.* Hazel jumps up as fast as her lungs will allow.

*(M. Bowen, 2014)*

In this part we see an interruption of the same kind – a **supportive** one, however it occurred for a different reason. The current speaker is so shocked, in a positive way, that she loses the ability to speak and the listener assists her, not by finishing her turn, but by replying to what she was going to say, as the question was **obvious** for him.

The following one is taken from the movie “The Fault in Our Stars” too. It is an emotional conversation between two close friends again. However, their emotions are exactly the reason why an **interruption is needed**.

Gus: *You do realize... trying to keep your distance from me will in no way lessen my affection for you. (Hazel says nothing.) All efforts to save me from you will fail. (Hazel looks at him. He's sure not making this easy.) Is this about Amsterdam? Cause we...*

Hazel: *It's not about Amsterdam. It's about me. It's about...*

Gus: *Grenades. (Hazel nods.) I get it. One day you're going to explode in a huge ball of fire and everyone close to you will die in your wake.*

Hazel: *Exactly.*

Gus: *There's already two people in your life you're going to destroy. Why add a third to that list. Am I right?*

Hazel: *That's why I don't have a hamster.*

Gus: *We have got to do something about this frigging swing set.*

*(M. Bowen, 2014)*

Once again, the interruption is rather **supportive**. Yes, the next speaker cuts the current speaker's turn, however, they made it to help the current speaker, and finished the turn instead of them. First of all, what she was going to say, was easily **predictable**, as they know each other very well. And second of all, it was not done in a patronizing manner, that would offend Hazel, she was grateful he did it, because she was risking becoming too emotional.

The next one is from the American series "Kominsky Method", the acting teacher is in the studio/classroom with his students, it is a beginning of their first lesson, so the teacher is making a small introductory speech. We shall see that this example simply deals with blatant **impoliteness**.

Sandy: *The answer, my dear colleagues, is that, like God, we must love our creations. We must imbue them with life, with character, with hope and dreams and fatal flaws, and then... Then we must let them go. Because in the end... true love... God's love... is letting go. (int.)*

Sandy's student: *Yeah, uh, Sandy? Uh, I have an audition tomorrow for a shampoo commercial. How do I love that?*

Sandy: *Wash your hair before you go. Okay, love of character, not the pursuit of fame or money, is what separates the great actor, the true artist... (int.)*

Sandy's student: *Yeah, uh, Sandy, one more question. Uh, it's for Pantene.*

Sandy: *Doesn't matter what the shampoo is, okay? Just wash your hair.*

Sandy's student: *Thank you.*

(C. Lorre, 2018)

It may seem that the reason for the interruption is the desire of a man to get the attention of the audience, as there are many listeners in the room and therefore, dominate this conversation. However, it is only done, because the student does not know a better way to ask the question that is so important to him. In the first instance, they only overlap the last word of the current speaker's utterance. But not having received enough clarification, that interrupt the speaker for the second time.

This interruption was successful, however, as it is directly linked to what was being said, it only indicates that the interruptor was **genuinely interested** in the topic and was looking for the way to implement the theory in their own experience, therefore, the interruption can be considered cooperative.

This one is taken from "The fault in Our Stars" too. It is a dialogue between Hazel and the author of her favourite book, who turned out to be different than she expected. He was rude and cantankerous, and so negative – exactly the opposite of what the person, who wrote such a wonderful book should be. So, this one has to do with **uncontrollable human emotions** and conversation dominance.

Hazel: *Can we please, maybe, talk about Anna for a sec? I mean, I understand that the story ends mid-sentence because she dies or she becomes too sick to continue ... (int.)*

Van Houten: *I'm not interested in talking about that book.*

Hazel: *- but that doesn't mean her family and everyone she loves doesn't have a future, right?*

Van Houten: *I said I'm not interested... (int.)*

Hazel: *(getting upset) But you promised! (calms herself) Mr. Van Houten, you said you would tell us what happens and that's why we're here. We... I need you tell me. Surely you've thought about it. I mean, as characters... (int.)*

Van Houten: *Nothing happens to them! They're fictions. They cease to exist the moment the novel is over. This is not what Hazel came all this way to hear. She won't accept it.*

Hazel: *They can't! (again, has to calm herself) I mean, I understand. In a literary sense. But it's impossible NOT to imagine some future... (int.)*

Van Houten: *I can't do this. Lidewij, get rid of them, please. (Lidewij doesn't move, he turns back to Hazel) I won't indulge your childish whims. I refuse to pity you in the manner in which you're accustomed.*

Hazel: *I don't want your pity... (int.)*

Van Houten: *Of course you do. Like all sick kids, your existence depends on it.*

Lidewij: *Peter!*

Van Houten: *You are fated to live out your days as the child you were when diagnosed, the child who believes there is life after a novel ends. And we, as adults, we pity this, so we pay for your treatments, for your oxygen machines. We give you food and water though you are unlikely to live long enough... (int.)*

Lidewij: *PETER!*

(M. Bowen, 2014)

So, having been offended on several occasions during their argument, they start interrupting each other, not to come to some logical conclusion or resolve the conflict, but because they both are just too angry to control themselves. The interruptions are not cooperative, they do not lead to any constructive ideas, but make this snowball of mutual **anger** and dislike bigger and bigger.

The following example is taken from an American movie “Birdman or (The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance)”. The listener interrupts because they already know what the question is going to be and want to **avoid** giving a clear answer.

Jake: *You have the press in your dressing room in a few hours. How are we... (int.)*

Riggan: *I'll make something up.*

(A. G. Iñárritu, 2014)

This interruption is neither cooperative, nor competitive. The listener cuts the speaker's question with the answer, to finish this conversation or to move to

the next topic. It is impolite, however, given that the speakers are friends and have a long history together, the interruption can be considered acceptable. Moreover, it turns out to be successful for the interrupter, as their goal is reached – they no longer discuss the topic.

The next dialogue occurs between the same people in the same setting, they are brainstorming what actor to hire for their next play. Same as in previous dialogue the second speaker knows what the first one is going to say, it is predictable, so they continue with the next question.

Riggan: *Find me an actor. A good actor. Philip Seymour Hoffman... (int.)*

Jake: *He's doing the third Hunger Games.*

Riggan: *Michael Fassbender?*

Jake: *Doing the prequel to the X-Men prequel. They arrive at Riggan's dressing room.*

Riggan: *What's his name? Jeremy Renner... (int.)*

Jake: *Who?*

Riggan: *The... the Hurt Locker guy.*

Jake: *Yeah. He's an Avenger.*

Riggan: *(With disgust.) They put him in a cape, too? Look, I don't care. Find me someone.*

(A. G. Iñárritu, 2014)

Here the interruption is not impolite or competitive, it is an essential part of the conversation about the **urgent matter**, that makes its flow faster, and therefore, it is successful for both the interruptor and interrupted.

The next example is a dialogue between the same two people. Their conversations always look like arguments; however in this case this really is one. It has to do with **negative emotions**, one of them is fed up with **not being heard**, that is why they must scream and interrupt another.

Riggan: *I want him gone.*

Jake: *No.*

Riggan: *What?*

Jake: *We can't do that.*

Riggan: *What are you... Of course we can do that. It's our show.*

Jake: *Riggan, listen to me... (int.)*

Riggan: *No. You listen to me. Get him the fuck out of my play. Did you see him out there?*

Jake: *It was a preview! Nobody gives a shit about previews. Nothing matters until that old bat from the New York Times is sitting in that audience on opening night.*

Riggan: *We're getting rid of him. I'm not going to stand up on that stage and... (int.)*

Jake: *Shut up! Just shut up for once and listen to me. As soon as we announced he was taking over, the advance doubled. We can't afford to lose a preview. We can't afford to lose money. We can't afford to lose Mike. This is about being respected, validated, remember? That's what you told me. That's how you got me into this shit. Now, you're the director. Get him under control. These are not the nineties anymore.*

(A. G. Iñárritu, 2014)

Jake **explicitly** cuts Riggan's turn, and this action is mimicked by the words (Jake says, "Shut up" and actually stops another one from speaking). This one is definitely **competitive** and has to do with conversation control; it is a battle for domination between male speakers.

This interruption was successful for the interrupter, they gained the floor and had the chance to share what he wanted to say for a long time already.

The following example is taken from a British series called "Good Omens". This is a conversation between two people who know each other for a very long time, and it follows the line of the "**helpful**" interruptions.

Gabriel: *Mind if I join you?*

Aziraphale: *Gabriel? What an unexpected pleasure. It's been...*

Gabriel: *Quite a while, yes. Why do you consume that?*

*(T. Pratchett, N. Gaiman, 2019)*

It may seem to be an overlap, but if we look closer, it is more intrusive. The current speaker takes a micropause, to recollect, for how long they have not seen each other. The listener uses this chance to “steal” the floor, he knows or may assume what the speaker is going to say, so he says it instead of them, which may also indicate that they want to display **confidence** and consider themselves the **leader** of the conversation.

On surface, the interruption may seem polite and done in a non-intrusive manner, and the micropause made by the first speaker is one more reason to justify it. However, if we consider the intentions of the second speaker, we will see, that this one is a competitive interruption.

The following example is taken from the same series, however, this time it’s a conversation between two old friends. Same as in a previous example, this interruption is made to **finish** the previous speaker’s turn.

Crowley: *It’s me. We have to talk. It’s the Big One.*

Aziraphale: *Crowley. “The Big One”. Really? Isn’t that a little melodramatic, even for you?*

Crowley: *Don’t be like that, Aziraphale. I’ll explain when I see you. Usual place. Usual time.*

Aziraphale: *What’s the usual time?*

Crowley: *Whenever I get up.*

Aziraphale: *Ten thirty?*

Crowley: *One-ish.*

Aziraphale: *When you say “The Big One..” you DO mean...?*

Crowley: *Armageddon. Yeah.*

*(T. Pratchett, N. Gaiman, 2019)*

Unlike the example before this one, the speakers here are close friends and they speak as **equals**. This is an interruption because the first speaker has not

finished their turn, however, it is cooperative, because Crowley (the second speaker), thanks to their long friendship, knew that Aziraphale (the first one) did not really want to pronounce the last word. So, they were kind enough to finish the turn instead of the first speaker and were actually helpful, without looking down at the first speaker.

The interruption was successful for both parties and completely justifiable.

The next conversation occurs between the same two men. Now they are in a different situation – more tense and urgent, and it has to do with **emotions**.

Aziraphale: *You've lost the boy.*

Crowley: *"We've" lost him.*

Aziraphale: *A child has been lost. But you still know his age... (int.)*

Crowley: *"We" know. His birthday. He's 11.*

Aziraphale: *You make it sound easy.*

Crowley: *Well, it can't be that hard.*

*(T. Pratchett, N. Gaiman, 2019)*

The second speaker keeps on insisting, that whatever happened, it was not entirely his fault, they both were involved. It was not done to compete or show their dominance, but a **clarification** had to be made.

While the interruption could make the interrupter feel relieved, it is still not absolutely successful, as the first speaker did not explicitly agree with what was being said.

The next conversation takes place between the same two people. As we can see, Aziraphale tends to take micropauses and Crowley used this one probably to show how well he knows Aziraphale.

Aziraphale: *I mean, Noah, up there, his family, and his sons, their wives, they're all going to be fine.*

Crowley: *But they're drowning everybody else? Not the kids? You can't kill kids.*

Aziraphale: *Mm-hmm.*

Crowley: *Well, that's more the kind of thing you'd expect my lot to do.*

Aziraphale: *Yes, but when it's done, the Almighty's going to put up a new thing, called a "rain bow", as a promise not to drown everyone again.*

Crowley: *How kind.*

Aziraphale: *You can't judge the Almighty, Crowley. God's plans are...(int.)*

Crowley: *Are you going to say "ineffable"?*

Aziraphale: *Possibly.*

*(T. Pratchett, N. Gaiman, 2019)*

This is an interruption proper, and to some extent it is made to show the dominance and **impatience**, however, it is not taken to extreme. However, we have to pay attention to the fact that this is a conversation between close friends, which makes this interruption more than acceptable, it is not made because the second speaker wants to grab the floor and start a more relevant for them topic, they contribute to what has been said. Still, it must be mentioned that the same interruption in a conversation between strangers, would be considered impolite.

In this dialogue we see the same people, and this one does not have to do with conversation dominance, it has to do with **negative emotions**.

Aziraphale: *Crowley... Crowley?*

Crowley: *Well...*

Aziraphale: *Fancy running into you here. Still a demon, then...(int.)*

Crowley: *What kind of stupid question is that "Still a demon"? What else am I going to be, an aardvark?*

Aziraphale: *Salutaria.*

*(T. Pratchett, N. Gaiman, 2019)*

Crowley would not let his friend finish the question because he found it ridiculous, his **impatience** or even **irritation** made him cut Aziraphale's turn and make his contribution to the conversation. The tone of his voice, and the emotion it conveyed makes this interruption sound **rude** even considering the fact that they

are friends, however, there has been no topic change and his friend is not offended, just confused.

The last example deals with emotions too, however, in this case, these are **positive emotions**.

*Aziraphale: Listen, back in my bookshop there's a book I need you to get.*

*Crowley: Oh, look, your bookshop isn't there anymore.*

*Aziraphale: Oh?*

*Crowley: I'm really sorry. It burned down.*

*Aziraphale: All of it?*

*Crowley: Yeah. What... what was the book?*

*Aziraphale: The one the young lady with the bicycle left behind. The Nice and Accurate Prophecies of...(int.)*

*Crowley: Agnes Nutter! Yes, I took it!*

*Aziraphale: You have it?*

*Crowley: Look, souvenir!*

*(T. Pratchett, N. Gaiman, 2019)*

The next speaker knows or can guess what the current one is going to say. They cannot help but finish the sentence instead of them because they are too **excited**. So, this is a cooperative, productive interruption, which is successful for both parties.

Having analyzed all these examples we can draw a conclusion that, naturally, all these reasons overlap, there are no clear-cut lines, where one reason ends and another one begins, and it is not something that can be measured. And still this classification deserves to exist. Obviously, as the human nature is a mystery, and the reasons and reasonings for our actions cannot be fully and completely covered within a table, the list is not exhaustive and can be added to at all times.

## Conclusions to Chapter Two

In this Chapter, we have discussed the cases in which an interruption may or should be justified and in which it is not excusable. We used and analyzed the classification proposed by William Lycan (Lycan, 1977), according to whom there are 5 parameters according to which we can judge if the interruption is acceptable or not. The important point here is that we should distinguish the politeness of an interruption from its conversational felicitousness, because while on surface it may seem polite, it may not contribute to the further development of the conversation and may hinder the implied “rights” of the participant of the conversation.

Some of the studies that have been under analysis in this Chapter demonstrated general features and specific characteristics of communication between men and women. To be more precise, they demonstrate how men dominate in the conversations in a wide range of settings and situations. Obviously, it is not at all true that all the cases of dialogues that involve both male and female speakers demonstrate the above-mentioned scheme. Of course, in certain environments and situations, both male and female speakers have conversation as equals, be that during the whole conversation or some of the time.

Although, a sociolinguistic study of mixed conversation presents the fact that male and female speakers do not, in fact, have equal rights to have the conversational floor, or equal opportunities to gain it. West and Zimmerman (1998), have investigated the similar features between male and female turn-taking just like the interaction between parents and a child or children (the research being conducted in the United States), and claimed that women in modern American society, have limited rights to speak, and in this they can be compared to children’s position in a conversation, however, their claim has been and is still considered controversial.

The same can be said about the encounters in medical environment, patients tend to be interrupted by doctors; however, the chances of female doctors to get

interrupted by both male and female patients are quite high. And see a similar picture in a work environment, where women of even the highest position are more likely to be interrupted than men, subordinate to them. West and Zimmerman also argue that interruptions occur in conversations both to demonstrate and to accomplish socially accepted relations of control and submission. If we assume that this claim has any foundation in real life, then the consequences for the society are pressing.

Finally, we have searched and investigated the fragments of dialogues, taken from American and British movies and series, as they represent the current state of language and the state of relations between the speakers at the time being. We came to conclusion that there are numerous reasons for interruptions and in each instance, there is most likely more than one factor, leading to or causing such deviation from the conversation norms. These reasons often have to do with a social hierarchy, conversation control and dominance, and emotions, be that excitement or boredom, outrage or a display of confidence and bossyness, interruptions are an inevitable part of our everyday communication, which in many cases, can be a positive thing.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Successful verbal interaction is based on a turn-taking conversation organization model. However, as any other convention, this one is almost never presented in real life communication in its perfect shape, and is commonly violated, through, for example, a speech interruption.

In this Diploma Paper we have searched and generalized main properties of verbal dialogical communication, described the linguistic essence of the phenomenon of “speech interruption” in modern linguistics. It presupposes the existence or presence of two or more speakers, while the current speaker’s turn is not properly finished because an overlap or an interruption occurs. The beginning of interruptions always overlaps the current speaker’s turn.

Despite the general negative attitude to interruptions in conversations, we found out that they are not at all times something negative, while in some instances (“stealing” the floor, showing dominance or impatience) they are indeed a display of rudeness, in many other instances, interruptions can be positive and serve as a push and encourage the further discussion. Considering this, interruptions can be divided into cooperative and competitive.

Following this thought, we can add that there are certain cases in which the interruptions can or cannot be justified, it depends on the situation itself, the relationship between the speakers (there is more space for interruptions in a conversation between close friends than between strangers, or people in unequal positions) and the manner in which interruption is made. Moreover, people tend to have a natural feeling that tells them to which extent the interruption is necessary or acceptable.

We have also studied interruptions and certain social environments and institutions. Having done so, we can clearly see that be that a school, a hospital or an office etc., interruptions are widely used to set the social scale between people, where the young tend to be interrupted by seniors, subordinates by the superior,

children by adults, and women by men. The last one is particularly interesting, as even women in high position are more likely to be interrupted than men in a lower one,

The dual nature of interruptions that we mentioned above has been proved, by the research made on the examples of dialogues carefully looked for and chosen from modern American and British series and movies. We discovered that interruptions most of the time have to do with emotions, both positive and negative. They can resort to mockery or bullying, excitement and genuine surprise, irony and sarcastic comments, one may try to create a dramatic effect or draw attention, it can be a display of politeness, support and interest. Many use interruptions to show that they are actively involved in a conversation or vice versa – find what is being said irrelevant, they can be used to show authority, impatience, irritation, or signal that the current utterance is predictable. However, in many instances, interruptions are needed to make an urgent addition.

Therefore, we can make a conclusion that interruptions are an essential and inevitable part on human interaction, that most of the time they happen unconsciously. The provided paper is of great importance both for those, who are willing to continue their research in the given field and for the individuals willing to perfect their communication skills and become more conscious about the violation they make and face in everyday communication.

## RESUME

Спілкування за допомогою мовлення – це те що вірізняє людину з-поміж усіх інших істот, а діалогічне мовлення – це один із найпоширеніших способів вербального спілкування, який означає, що дві або більше людини обмінюються репліками, в яких закодована вербальна інформація, емоційне ставлення до сказаного, або до співрозмовників та мета (явна чи прихована) того, хто говорить. З цього виходить, що висловлювання можна вважати зрозумілим тільки в тому випадку, якщо слухач осягнув всі три перераховані пункти. В свою чергу, один із найпоширеніших методів організації діалогічного мовлення – це почерговість спілкування.

Це правило, яке забезпечує успішність спілкування, але як всі правила, його не завжди дотримуються. Дуже часто ми перебиваємо нашого співрозмовника, або додаємо щось, коли він ще говорить, те ж відбувається і з нами, тобто перебивання означає, що дві людини говорять одночасно. Не дивлячись на переважаючу думку, що перебивання – це суто негативне явище, як мінімум тому, що нам з дитинства прививають, що перебивання – це неввічливо, але воно може також мати позитивні причини та наслідки.

Дипломна робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів та висновків. У списку використаної літератури налічується 55 джерел теоретичного та 12 ілюстративного матеріалу.

У першому розділі надається опис правил та загальних норм, яким варто слідувати задля створення і підтримання успішного діалогу та стратегії, які може використати співрозмовник, щоб почати говорити. Далі ми перейшли безпосередньо до теми нашого дослідження – перебивання мовлення в лінгвістичному аспекті. Нами було виявлено, що в багатьох дослідженнях перебивання розглядаються як неввічливість, прояв грубості, агресивності чи гніву щодо співрозмовника, та як порушення одного з основних правил ведення розмови, наприклад, правила, що одночасно

говорить лише один співрозмовник. Вважається також, що перебивання можуть свідчити про владу, готовність контролювати розмову, або в деяких випадках це може свідчити про відсутність інтересу та ворожості щодо того, хто говорить.

Далі ми дослідили два типи перебивань – перебивання-співпраця та перебивання-конкуренція, та визначили, що вони різняться своїми фонетичними і граматичними ознаками. Перебивання-конкуренція зазвичай використовується з метою домінувати в розмові. Конкурентні переривання найчастіше тісно пов'язані з терміновістю, актуальністю, інтересом до поточної теми та ступенем важливості. Перебивання-співпраця, навпаки, менш нав'язливі та більше підтримують права поточного мовця.

В другому розділі ми обговорили випадки, в яких перебивання може або повинно бути виправданим, а в яких – ні. Деякі дослідження, які були проаналізовані в цій главі, демонструють загальну картину особливостей спілкування між чоловіками та жінками та показали, що незважаючи на ситуацію, в більшості випадків чоловіки контролюють розмову та їм властиво перебивати жінок.

Наприкінці цього розділу ми дослідили фрагменти діалогів, взятих з американських та британських фільмів та серіалів, оскільки вони відображають поточний стан мови та стан стосунків між мовцями. Ми дійшли висновку, що існує безліч причин для перебивань, і в кожному випадку існує, швидше за все, більше ніж один фактор, що викликає перебивання.

**Ключові слова:** англомовний діалогічний дискурс, перебивання, домінування, перебивання-співпраця, перебивання-конкуренція, прийнятність, комунікація, позитивні та негативні емоції, ввічливість, неввічливість, усне мовлення.

## REFERENCE LITERATURE

1. Карасик. В.И. (1996). Культурные доминанты в языке. *Языковая личность: культурные концепты*. Волгоград, Архангельск.
2. Кирилина А. В. (1998). Развитие гендерных исследований в лингвистике. *Филологические науки*, № 2, С. 51-58.
3. Кириченко Т.С. (2015). Класифікація інтрузивних перебивань у мовленнєвій взаємодії. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, III(10), Issue: 47.
4. Кобозева И.М. (2002). *Лингвистическая семантика*, С. 43. Москва.
5. Шелякин М.А. (2005). *Язык и человек. К проблеме мотивированности языковой системы*. Москва. 296 с.
6. Barth-Weingarten, Dagmar, Elisabeth Reber & Margret Selting (eds.). (2010). *Prosody in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
7. Beckman M. E. & Hirschberg J. (1994). *The ToBI annotation conventions*. Ohio State University.
8. Beckman, H. & Richard, F. (1984). The effect of physician behavior on collection of date. *Annals of internal medicine*.
9. Boden, D. (1994). *The business of talk: Organizations in action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
10. Boden, D., & Zimmerman, D. H. (Eds.). (1991). *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
11. P. Byrne and B. Long. (1976). Doctors Talking to Patients. *Psychological Medicine*, 7(4), 735-735. London: HMSO.
12. Coates, J. (2004). *Women, men and language* (3rd ed., P. 111-125). Harlow: Pearson Education.

13. Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Margret Selting (eds.). (1996). *Prosody in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Ford, Cecilia E. (2008). *Women speaking up: Getting and using turns in workplace meetings*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
15. Ford, Cecilia E. & Raclaw, J. (2015). *Meetings as interactional achievements: A conversation analytic perspective*. In Joseph A. Allen, Nale Lehmann-Willenbrock & Steven G. Rogelberg (eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of meeting science*, 247–276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Ford, Cecilia E. & Stickle, T. (2012). *Securing reciprocity in workplace meetings: multimodal practices*. Discourse Studies. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
17. Ford, Cecilia E. (2008). *Women Speaking Up: Getting and Using Turns in Workplace Meetings*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
18. French, P. and J. Local. (1986.) *Prosodic Features and the Management of Interruptions*. 157-180. In C. Johns-Lewis, ed., *Intonation in Discourse*. San Diego: College-Hill Press.
19. P. French and J. Local. (1983). Turn-competitive incomings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 7, pp. 17–38. Netherlands: Elsevier BV.
20. Goldberg, J. A. (1990). “Interrupting the discourse on interruptions,” *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 14, P. 883–903. Netherlands: Elsevier BV.
21. Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
22. Heath, Christian. (1984). Talk and reciprocity: Sequential organization in speech and body movement. In J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*, 247–265. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Hutchby, I. (1992). Confrontation talk: Aspects of ‘interruption’ in argument sequences on talk radio. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 12(3). P. 343–371.

24. Hutchby, I. (2008). Participants' orientations to interruptions, rudeness and other impolite acts in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 4(2). 221–241.
25. Kurtic, E., Brown, G. J., and Wells, B. (2010). Resources for turn competition in overlap in multi-party conversations: speech rate, pausing and duration. *Proceedings of Interspeech*, P. 2550–2553.
26. Lee, C. and Narayanan, S. S. (2010). Predicting interruptions in dyadic spoken interactions. *Proceedings of Interspeech*.
27. Lee, C.-C., Lee, S., and Narayanan, S. S. (2008). An analysis of multimodal cues of interruption in dyadic spoken interactions. *Proceedings of Interspeech*, P. 1678–1681.
28. Lerner, G. H. (2002). Turn-sharing: The choral co-production of talk-in-interaction. In C. Ford, B. A. Fox and S. A. Thompson (eds), *The Language of Turn and Sequence*, P. 225–256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Li, H. Z. (2001). Cooperative and intrusive interruptions in inter- and intracultural dyadic discourse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 20, P. 259–284.
30. Local, J. & Kelly, J. (1986). Projection and 'silences': Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human Studies*, 9(2). 185–204.
31. Local, J. & Walker, G. (2005). Methodological imperatives for investigating the phonetic organization and phonological structures of spontaneous speech. *Phonetica*, 62(2–4). 120–130
32. Mondada, L. (2007). Multimodal resources or turn-taking: Pointing and the emergence of possible next speakers. *Discourse Studies* 9(2). 194–225.
33. Mondada, L. (2013). Embodied and spatial resources for turn-taking in institutional multiparty interactions: Participatory democracy debates. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46. 39–68.
34. Murata, K. (1994). Intrusive or cooperative? A cross-cultural study of interruption. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 21, P. 385–400.

35. Ochs, Elinor and Taylor, Carolyn (1992) 'Science at Dinner', in Claire Kramsch and Sally McConnell-Ginet (eds) *Text and Context: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study*, P. 29-45. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
36. Oertel C., Wlodarczak M., Tarasov A., Campbell N., and Wagner P. (2012). Context cues for classification of competitive and collaborative overlaps. *Proceedings of Speech Prosody*. P. 721–724.
37. Park, I. & Margo, D. (2018). I'm sorry (to interrupt): The use of explicit apology in turn-taking. *Applied Linguistics Review*.
38. Pomerantz, A. & Denvir, P. (2007). Enacting the institutional role of chairperson in upper management meetings: The interactional realization of provisional authority. In François Cooren (ed.), *Interacting and organizing: Analyses of a management meeting*, 31–51. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
39. R. Power. (1979). The organisation of purposeful dialogues. *Linguistics*, P. 107–152.
40. Raux, A., Bohus, D., Langner, B., Black, A. W., and Eskenazi, M. (2006). Doing research on a deployed spoken dialogue system: One year of Let's Go! *Proceedings of Interspeech*.
41. Sacks, H., Schegloff E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4). 696–735.
42. Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society* 29(1). P. 1–63.
43. Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2002). Accounts of conduct in interaction: Interruption, overlap, and turn-taking. In Jonathan H. Turner (ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory*, 287–321. New York: Springer.
44. Schegloff, Emanuel A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

45. Schegloff, Emanuel A. & Harvey Sacks. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 7: 289–327.
46. Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1996). *Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place*. D. N. Sudnow (ed.) P. 75-119. New York: Free Press.
47. Shriberg, E., A. Stolcke, A. and Baron, D. (2001). Can prosody aid the automatic processing of multi-party meetings? evidence from predicting punctuation, disfluencies, and overlapping speech. *Proceedings of ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop on Prosody in Speech Recognition and Understanding Prosody*, P. 139–146.
48. Streeck, J., Hartge, U. (1992). Previews: Gestures at the transition place. In Peter Auer & Aldo Di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*, 135–157. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
49. Tannen, D. *Gender and Conversational Interaction*. (1993). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
50. Tannen, D. *Gender and discourse* (1996). pp. 53-73. New York: Oxford University Press.
51. Tannen, D., Hamilton, H., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. 2nd ed., P. 643-647. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
52. Tannen, Deborah. (1989). Interpreting interruption in conversation. In Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk, and Caroline Wiltshire, eds., *Papers from the 25th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Part Two: Parasession on Language in Context. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, P. 266–87.
53. Zimmerman, Don H. and West, C. (1975). pp. 105–29. Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley, eds., *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

54. Truong, K. P. (2013). Classification of cooperative and competitive overlaps in speech using cues from the context, overlapper, and overlappee. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Interspeech 2013*, P. 1404-1408. Baixas, France: International Speech Communication Association (ISCA).
55. Yuan, J., Liberman, M., and C. Cieri, C. (2007). Towards an integrated understanding of speech overlaps in conversation. In *Proceedings of International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*.
56. Yang, L. (2001). Visualizing spoken discourse: Prosodic form and discourse functions of interruptions. In *Proceedings of SIGdial*.
57. Yang, F., Heeman, P. A. (2007). Avoiding and resolving initiative conflicts in dialogue. In *Proceedings of HLT/NAACL*.
58. Zimmerman Don. H. and West, C. (1975). *Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in conversation*, P.105-129.
59. Wells, B. and Macfarlane, S. S. (1998). Prosody as an interactional resource: turn-projection and overlap. *Language and Speech*, vol. 41, no. 3-4, P. 265-294.
60. West, Candace. (1984). When the doctor is a "lady": power, status and gender in physician-patient encounters. *Symbolic Interaction*, 7, 87-106.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Bays, C., Thomas, C. (Writers), & Fryman, P. (Director). (2005). Return of the Shirt [Television series episode]. In Bays, C. (Executive Producer), *How I met your mother*. Los Angeles, CA: Columbia Broadcasting System.
2. Finerman, W. (Producer), & Frankel, D. (Director). (2006). The Devil wears Prada [Motion Picture]. United States: 20th Century Fox.
3. Iñárritu, A. G. (Producer & Director). (2014). *Birdman (The Unexpected Virtue of Ignorance)* [Motion Picture]. United States: Fox Searchlight.
4. Lorre C., Prady B. (Writers), & Cendrowski, M. (Director). (2009). The Friendship Algorithm [Television series episode]. In Aronsohn, L. (Executive Producer), *The Big Bang Theory* Los Angeles, CA: Warner Brothers.
5. Kapinos, T. (Writer), & Wiseman, L. (Director). (2016). Pilot [Television series episode]. In Bruckheimer, J. (Executive Producer), *Lucifer* Los Angeles, CA: Jerry Bruckheimer Television.
6. Elwood, S. (Writer), & Matheson, T. (Director). (2016). Sweet Kicks [Television series episode]. In Bruckheimer, J. (Executive Producer), *Lucifer* Los Angeles, CA: Jerry Bruckheimer Television.
7. Lorre, C., Higgins, A. J. (Writers), & Tennant, A. (Director). (2018). Chapter 1: An Actor Avoids [Television series episode]. In Douglas, M. (Executive Producer), *The Kominsky Method* Los Angeles, CA: Chuck Lorre Productions.
8. Baum, S., Cary, A. (Writers), & Zinberg, M. (Director). (2009). Secret Santa [Television series episode]. In Baum, S. (Executive Producer), *Lie to Me* Los Angeles, CA: Imagine Television.
9. Bowen, M. (Producer), & Boone, J. (Director). (2014). The Fault in Our Stars [Motion Picture]. United States: Fox 2000 Pictures.

10. Pratchett, T., Gaiman, N. (Writers), & Mackinnon, D. (Director). (2019). In the Beginning [Television series episode]. In Brown, R. (Executive Producer), *Good omens* Culver City, USA: Amazon Studios.

11. Pratchett, T., Gaiman, N. (Writers), & Mackinnon, D. (Director). (2019). The Book [Television series episode]. In Brown, R. (Executive Producer), *Good omens* Culver City, USA: Amazon Studios.

12. Pratchett, T., Gaiman, N. (Writers), & Mackinnon, D. (Director). (2019). Hard Times [Television series episode]. In Brown, R. (Executive Producer), *Good omens* Culver City, USA: Amazon Studios.