

## Turn Taking Signals within Iranian Context

**Jaleh Hassaskhah, Ph.D.**

University of Guilan, Rasht, Guilan, Iran

**Masood Khalili Sabet, Ph.D.**

University of Guilan, Rasht, Guilan, Iran

**Mohammad Tarang \***

University of Guilan, Rasht, Guilan, Iran

### Abstract

Turn-taking is a systematic process by which interlocutors organize their speech in a conversation and every successful conversation needs a development in turn taking skills. That is, skills that enable interlocutors to listen, consider the information and contribute the flow of conversation. This paper argues the need for an analysis of the signals used by Persian speakers of English while taking turns in debate-based courses. For halting the eventuality of such a matter verbal and non-verbal signals of turn-taking of a debate-based class were analyzed. Results showed that gaze behaviors and hand gestures were important non-verbal turn-taking and attempt suppressing signals and asking questions and using intonation were among the most prominent linguistic signals within Iranian context.

**Keywords:** turn-taking, verbal and non-verbal signals, Iranian context

### INTRODUCTION

A turn can be defined as the talk of one speaker bounded by the talk of other speakers (Goodwin, 1981). Within the process of conversation always one person is speaking and the others aren't, each conversant take turns to grasp the floor from the current speaker. Within the process of turn-taking there are gaps that last about less than a second and if participants do not follow the rules of turn taking overlaps are imminent.

Turn-taking can be identified as one of the key factors in conversation and timing plays a crucial role within this regard ; if turns are not taken at the correct time or with the correct manner the flow of conversation will be hindered or terminated(Tannen, 2012). The way conversants take each turn will also affect their interlocutor's perception of their emotions, personality and social status (king, 2011). The effect of turn-taking on human cognition shouldn't be ignored; turn-taking behavior is one of the most essential parts of conversation that controls our verbal communication (Tannen, 2012).

Ozieblo (2013) did a research on non-verbal behaviors of Spanish learners in Hong Kong at the time of turn-taking. He concluded that language these learners fail to make use of non-verbal behaviors as turn-taking signals within their second language; he claimed that these differences are caused by socio-cultural patterns and suggested that attention rising about these variables can be fruitful for learners who are eager to learn a second language so providing an explanation for these behaviors at the time of taking each turn can be a great help for second language learners too. Investigating turn-taking behavior and providing specific information about this behavior within different cultures and contexts can help children who face disabilities within the process of acquiring conversational skills; researches has shown that there are many children who face serious problems for conducting turn-taking in elementary levels of acquiring conversational skills. These children may get depressed and/or isolated because of these inabilities and explicit teaching and attention rising exercises can be of great help for these children (Fussel, Macias and Saylor, 2005; Parson, Leonard and Mitchell, 2006).

In order to teach these skills and provide exercises for reinforcing them we are in dire need of models and patterns which can provide us with inalienable data about these skills. In a research which was done in 2011, two scholars named Chapman and Snell provided a pattern of turn-taking and proposed it to be used for children who face problems conducting turn-taking within the process of conversation; they also claimed that attention rising about non-verbal behaviors can be of great help for these children in pre-elementary levels. These models and patterns of non-verbal behaviors are very important for children who are capable of speaking but have problem hearing speech sounds.

Creating a humanoid robot which is capable of having conversation with human beings has been one of the most popular areas of researches in recent years. It is obvious that for providing such a robot turn-taking is of utmost importance; other than being capable of pulling off turn-taking this robot should be able to predict turns that are about to be taken. In an interesting study which was done in 2012, Chao and Thomaz tried to make such a robot; for doing this they provided a number of algorithms and patterns for turn-taking. Their patterns included time of silence and paralinguistic signals within the process of taking each turn. Kimset is one of the most important communicative robots which have been built before (Breazeal, 2002) and within the process of building this robot simple algorithms and patterns for turn-taking were used but most of these patterns were primitive codes to insure that the flow of conversation is not hindered. Providing a detailed model of turn-taking which takes into account subtle differences of taking turns within different contexts and cultures seems to be important for the next generation of these communicative robots.

The other application of turn-taking models is in providing translation soft-wares; most of these soft-wares lack the ability to consider paralinguistic and non-verbal variables at the time of taking each turn and their effect on the conveyed meaning. Regarding these

factors and variability of turn-taking signals within different languages and cultures was the reason for halting the procedures of this study.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### Linguistic variables

A study of preliminary literature indicates that many of these researches were interested in the role of linguistic and paralinguistic factors in determining TRP and turn completion point (TCP). The fore-mentioned study by Harvey Sacks and colleagues was an example of these literatures; other scholars tried to explain turn-taking from another aspect of verbal behavior and they focused on prosody.

Schegloff (1998) and Fox (2001) are among those scholars who focused on the pitch pattern as the most important factor of determining turn structures. Schegloff published an article in 1998 named "reflection on studying prosody in talk in-action" and within this study he claimed that pitch peaks can be deployed as a projection of the next syntactic completion point at the end of each turn; this claim meant that pitch patterns were better signifiers for anticipating the end of each turn and all of the languages share this trait.

Stephen Crowley (1989) was another scholar who worked on the effect of timing and pitch matching on turn-taking. He concluded that the way of changing pitch at the time of turn taking has an extreme effect on interlocutor's understanding of the meaning and attitudes and the attitudes are perceived based on the culture that the interlocutors belong. Other than attitude he claimed that these prosodic features are the most important factors in determining the end of each turn.

Fox (2001) examined Schegloff's claims about prosody and reported that there are many differences between different accents within this regard and she differentiated "non-last" accents from "last" ones; claiming that some accents have a peak of pitch to show the end of each turn but others lack such a characteristic. Investigating these researches can show us that both grammar and prosody are used for identifying the end of each turn but the priority of these two differs from one accent to another. Casper (2003) criticized these researches focusing on the role of prosody and claiming that syntax is much more important than intonation and pitch pattern for predicting TRPs and the end of speaker's turns.

Auer (1996) proposed an interesting model for anticipating the end of each turn; he proposed filter model. This model expresses that intonation is the filter by which a listener decides whether a syntactic completion point is the part that speakers want to hand their turn or not. In 2006 Mitterer et al. conducted a comprehensive study over different conversations identifying three types of completion points in German language; they stated that there are syntactic, intonational and pragmatic completion points within this language. They also claimed that completion points which are attributed to lexicosyntactic information determine turn-taking in German and intonational information is neither necessary nor sufficient for taking a turn.

As it is obvious from fore-mentioned studies there has been a ceaseless struggle between scholars to identify either grammar or intonation as the most effective factor in determining the turn-taking point but as time went by the scholars came to the conclusion that different languages possess various morphophonemic characteristics and these features determine the value given to grammar or intonation within the process of turn-taking.

## **Non-verbal variables of turn-taking**

### ***Proxemics***

These variables are related to the distance between interlocutors at the time of conversation. Hall et al. (1968) divides personal space to four zones; two of which are more important than others. They called the first zone, the intimate zone, and which is used for hugging and whispering during the conversation and it is used by friends at the time of conversation. The second zone is called the social zone and it is perceivable in conversations at a public areas. Proxemics are defined by the culture within which the conversation is taking place but it should be noted that gender, social classes and environmental variations can affect these distances drastically. Baxter (1970) was the other scholar to work on proxemics and he tried to provide a pattern for different cultures. He provided an analysis of differences between Anglo-Saxons and Mexican-Americans proxemics in different contexts. Grave and Watson (1966) were the other scholars to analyze proxemics differences among different cultures. They analyzed Arab and American participants in order to find out differences between these cultures in terms of proxemics and they concluded that Arab culture differs significantly from its American counterpart in terms of proxemics. They claimed that Arab participants tend to interact closer and more direct than their American interlocutors. In a similar study Watson (1970) tried to examine the differences between Arab and Latin cultures and understood that Latin American speakers show less closeness than their Arab counterparts but they interact closer than American interlocutors. Within this study Iranian participants took part in discussions which were held in a class environment, therefore there wasn't any chance of analyzing proxemics.

### ***Kinesis variables***

These variables include body motions and/or behaviors that are used for communication and transferring information. Kenden (1967) claimed that gaze behavior within the flow of conversation provides visual feedback and regulates conversational flow in a way that facilitates emotional communications. Argyle and Cook (1976) reported that the number of participants within the process conversation affects the gaze behavior of the participants so gaze behavior in different contexts differs drastically.

Justin Cassel et al. (1998) were among the first groups to work on the relationship between turn-taking and gaze behavior; they proposed a simple algorithm for gaze behavior and they used it to build a humanoid agent. They claimed that gaze is related

to the propositional content of the conversation and the structure of turns taken within the process of conversation. They concluded that conversants look at each other at the end of each turn and they look away at the beginning of each one, other than that the propositional data is affective within this process. The conversants look away when theme or known knowledge is being transferred and they look at each other when rheme or new information is being transferred; these scholars designed their humanoid based on this method. The point which is worth noting here is that they ignored the effect of culture on these conversants actions at the time of taking the turns and their model didn't take these factors in to account.

Masumoto (2006) reported that speakers who belong to Arab culture gaze longer and more direct than speakers who belong to American culture. Gaze behavior among speakers of different languages within different contexts has been the subject of many researches; in one of these researches gaze behavior of the bilinguals was investigated. Andrew Reviere (2009) investigated the speakers of French and English and reported that the French culture of gaze behavior is followed by the speakers within French speaking area even by those speakers who didn't speak French at all. He concluded that the culture of gaze behavior at the time of turn-taking remains the same even when the interlocutors are speaking a different language.

Duncan (1972) was among the first scholars to propose hand gestures as one of the turn-taking signals; he proved that termination of hand gestures is a turn yielding signal. Dusan Jan et al. (2007) proposed a model for culture specific behaviors of different languages including Arabic, Spanish and English. They concluded that the speakers of these languages portray different non-verbal behaviors and they provided a graphic model for non-verbal behavior at the time of taking each turn. Their graphics showed that the culture of each language determines a specific proximity for speakers and within that proximity interlocutor's gestures are predetermined and if conversants do not obey the pre-existing rules of body movement which are determined by their culture, misunderstanding is imminent to happen.

Mondada (2011) worked on the embodied dimensions of interaction; he concluded that body movements and hand gestures affect the perceived meaning of each interaction. Renia Lopez-Ozieblo (2013) worked on the non-verbal behaviors of the EFL learners of Spanish in Hong Kong he claimed that in early stages of foreign language learning gestures learners fail to use non-verbal gestures as a signal of turn taking. The researcher proposed socio-cultural differences as the cause of this inability and proposed that when the learners reach a comprehensive understanding of the target language's culture they will be able to use non-verbal behaviors more. All in all hand gestures, head nods, body movements and gaze behavior are among the non-verbal behaviors that are investigated by scholars as signals of turn-taking and they have been also proved to convey different meanings within the process of conversation (Sacks & Schegloff 1974, Cassel et al. 1998, Duncan 1972).considering fore-mentioned researches; in order to provide a comprehensive investigation of different non-verbal behaviors at the time of turn-taking these factors should be taken into account.

## THIS STUDY

This investigation will prevent and clarify misunderstandings that are imminent in the probable case of conversation between an Iranian speaker of English and interlocutors who belong to other cultural communities. On the other hand having a comprehensive investigation can help teachers to raise their learners' attention in the course of learning in order to get them familiar with the differences of these languages in case of turn-taking behavior. In order to do such things the context is limited to discussion based classes which turns happen a lot within their process and turns are analyzed within different perspectives.

Considering the aforementioned literature and models this paper is trying to answer the following questions:

- What are the most prominent non-verbal and verbal signals of turn-taking within Iranian context?
- Is there a difference between turn-taking in Iranian context and other contexts?

## METHODOLOGY

### Collecting conversational data

In order to gain conversational data, 18 sessions of a free discussion class in an institution in Iran was videotaped to be analyzed. These classes were videotaped between June and May of 2015. Regarding the fact that recording conversation within a studio could affect the flow and the reactions at the time of conversations (Manyard, 1989; Tannen, 1984; McGregor, 1994) it was decided to record the conversations within a natural setting. Natural setting was chosen over studio setting to convey a feeling to the participants that these conversations are natural not based on guidelines or limited scripts.

Holding up these sessions in a studio might have conveyed the feeling that these conversations are artificial because of the artificial environment and background. The other problem regarding these video-tapings was permission; most of the time it is hard to get conversants permission within a natural setting and knowing the fact that the conversations are being recorded also can affect participants' behavior at the time of conversation.

Regarding these factors the participants' consent was obtained before video-taping these sessions and then the participants were asked to talk to each other. The participants talked freely for about 45 minutes each session; it is worth mentioning that most of their topics had a sociopolitical trend. In order not to distract participants, they were left alone at the time of conversation. All in all 18 sessions of these classes and all of them were recorded completely.

The participant's awareness of being video-taped which was mentioned in previous paragraph can be a theoretical issue within this research; because conversants may shift

their conversational style from normal to conservative. All of the conversation analysts face such a problem at the time of analyzing conversations (Stubbs, 1983).

Participant's awareness within the present study can't be an important issue because this study tried to focus on the nature of conversational cues rather than certain forms in conversation. Other than this in 1989, Drew claimed that conversants aren't able to think about their detailed behavior at the time of conversation and if we consider basic systems of turn-taking as these details it can be claimed that being video-taped can't change the findings drastically.

The debates were recorded without changing the sound, focus or zoom and the camera began recording participants before they began the conversation and it ended after the termination of conversation. The camera was placed in a way that it could record small details of the conversation. A comprehensive explanation of the participants, instruments and procedures are brought in the following sections.

## **Participants**

All in all 18 participants took part in these classes and the number of participants was set by the availability of the participants which were eager to participate within this study. Eleven male and seven female participants took part in these classes all of these participants were between 18 and 26 years old. The participants were different each session and the topics were selected from philosophical issues which were proposed by the participants.

All of the participants were informed that the aim of study was to investigate different aspects of verbal conversation and they agreed to participate. There participants weren't related to each other and they these classes were their first meeting. There weren't any difference between the participants and all of them shared the same rank as the others and none of the participants had a superiority compared to other participants.

## **Instruments**

All of these classes have been recorded by a cannon camera in a way that only the upper- body part of participant's can be seen and their sound can be heard easily. The transcription approach and conventions which was used for this study was on the basis of those provided by Breiteneder, Angelika, et al. in 2006. Voice is the short form of Vienna- oxford international corpus of English and the aim of them is to provide a foundation for analyzing English conversations on all levels and their keys for transcribing conversational data has been used by many researchers before ( Seidlhofer, 2009 ; Klimpfinger,2009; Pickering,2009). This type of transcription provides an opportunity for transcribing both verbal and non-verbal signals in the flow of conversation. After transcribing all of the selected portions a kind of video-pad software, named NCH, were used to slow down the video at the time of taking each turn. Non-verbal cues which led to successful turns and turn suppressing signals at the time

of overlaps were transcribed carefully. SPSS 16 was used for analyzing and interpreting quantitative data that has been gathered through transcriptions.

### **Data transcription**

Audio-visual recording was chosen as the way of transcribing this conversation. Audio-visual transcription can be compared with audio transcription and within this study the first type is chosen for three main reasons. The first reason is that this study both focuses on verbal and non-verbal cues of turn-taking and audio-recordings are not able to consider non-verbal behaviors (Burns, 1999). Moreover Masumi-Su (1999) claimed that non-verbal behaviors are important for the flow of conversation and they must be transcribed even if they aren't being analyzed.

The second reason for choosing such a style of transcription was that it can entail ethnographic information. This type of transcription enables the scholar to record happenings during a conversation (Burns, 1999). In 1994, McGregor claimed that lack of visual information will make understanding the conversation difficult.

The last reason for choosing such a transcribing style is that those recordings can be used as teaching materials (Erickson, 1996). These recordings can help further studies and they can come handy if there are other rounds of analysis about a different subject. In 2001, Tateyamana claimed the same and added that the using of the videos can be fruitful at the time of studying routine expressions.

Transcribing a conversation is a hard task, that needs a lot of time and it is always problematic for the researcher. The process of transcribing is important but it is through repeated analysis that the researcher acquires the capability of understanding the complicated procedure of conversation. As Cumming and Paolino put it in 1993 conversation transcription is "the process of creating a written representation of a speech event so as to make it accessible to discourse research" (p.95).

The conversational data selected for the present study is the result of more than a 400 page transcription which was done on the part of researcher. The keys and conventions used for transcribing these conversations were developed based on Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) which was provided by Breiteneder, Angelika, et al. in 2006.

### **Procedures**

For understanding the contribution of non-verbal and verbal behaviors to turn-taking and the flow of conversation, information was gathered from Persian speakers who were participating within a debate based free discussion class and their conversations were analyzed regarding variables of interest. Particularly, speech, turns taken, linguistic turn yielding signals, intonation, grammar, overlaps, gaze, body movement and hand gestures that occurred within 18 sessions of these debates were transcribed (each session's duration was about an hour). All of these classes have been recorded by a cannon camera and participants were teachers of different language institutions who



were strangers to each other. All of the participants were informed about aims of the study.

Only the upper- body part of participant's was recorded and their sound can be heard easily. The debate was recorded without changing in sound, focus or zoom and the camera began recording participants before they began speaking and it ended recording after the termination of conversation. The camera was placed in a way that it could record small details of the conversation.

The other important factor within the process of gathering conversational data was the way by which relevant data was being selected by the researcher and for selecting these parts the researcher has gone through several stages; stage1- the researcher selected the data based on previous literature. Stage2- researcher tried to identify turn taking signals by playing it in a silent mode. Stages 3-at the time of transcribing parts with contextual clues were marked and they were analyzed deeper. At the end of the selection process 30 parts which lasted about 1 hour were selected to be analyzed.

The data was transcribed in different steps, within the first step the verbal behavior was transcribed after this step non-verbal behavior of the participants was inserted and at the final phase back channels and overlaps were transcribed. Audio-visual transcription was used instead of audio transcription because the study is trying to provide information about non-verbal behavior and it is impossible to provide such information by audio transcription. Transcribing audio-visual data has been used widely for conversational analysis in previous studies (Heath, 1997; Liddicoat and Crozet, 2001; Miller, 1991).

After transcribing all of the selected portions a kind of video-pad software were used to slow down the video at the time of taking each turn. Non-verbal and verbal cues which led to successful turns and turn suppressing signals at the time of overlaps were transcribed carefully. After gathering multiple regressions was used to identify the important non-verbal variables within these contexts.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Linguistic signals of turn-taking**

After analyzing the conversations regarding linguistic items it became obvious that Iranian speakers use different linguistic signals for yielding different turns within the process of conversation; they use questions, intonation changes, differences in pitch pattern, completion of grammatical point, repetition of previous sentences and silence for yielding their turn and/but they use these signals with different frequencies and various patterns.

One of the most effective ways of handing turns within these conversations was asking questions. The participants asked used both YES/NO and WH/ questions for handing their turn but the use of YES/NO questions was seen more frequently within the process of their conversations.

Some examples of these questions are brought in the following section; within this part of conversation a number of turns were taken consequently by the use of asking questions;

S1: Islam said that necessity will justify anything".

S2: really "?"<Looking at the speaker>

S3: necessity justifies anything?"

S1: yeah".<Head nod>

S3: do you believe in that?"

S4: you mean that you are going to your humanity just to survive?"

S2: there is a difference between an illegal act and a morally bad thing. There are times that you are not prohibited from doing them but if you think clearly you would understand that they are wrong".  
<Termination of hand gestures>

S3: but I don't believe in that".

S2: you mean necessity justifying everything".

S3: yeah; I mean urgent need for something".

As it is obvious from the above excerpts of the conversations the participants used both question forms and using rising intonation for handing the turn. The interlocutors use questions as an effective instrument of handing the turn within this classes; regarding the fact that these classes were debate oriented classes we can conclude that within different genres and situations Iranian use of question forms can vary drastically but at least we can come to the conclusion that asking questions is one of the instruments used by Iranian speakers at the time of taking different turns. The other important thing about this excerpt is the active use of intonation for making questions and as it is obvious from the fore-mentioned excerpt participants make use of intonation to ask questions by declarative sentences.

About the frequency of different questions it can be seen from the complete script that YES/NO questions are used more than WH/ questions for handing the turn; these questions were both made with the use of sentences and intonation. As it was stated in the Literature Lake off (1975), Fishman (1978), Holmes (1984), Tannen (1993) and others worked on the relationship between asking questions and power dominance; some of them proposed gender as another important factor in determining the way of asking different questions. Considering these classes, no difference was seen between different participants in terms of using tag questions and other types of questions and they used these questions similarly. These similarities can be a result of equal status that the participants possessed during these classes; consequently, we can perceive that when participants possess equal status both genders show similar patterns of turn-yielding and this conclusion is similar to that of Schwartz et al. (1985), Beatie(1998) and Rachel king(2011).

Using pauses and silence is the other prominent turn-yielding signal used by the participants who took part within this study; different scholars worked on the time of these pauses and silence between turns are determined by the culture of each language. Deborah Tannen (2012), Jack Sindell (2009) and Strivers et al. are among the scholars who confirmed the claim that the timing of the turn-takings are determined by the culture of each language. Regarding the fact that analyzing these timings need special equipment's and facilities the researcher was unable to analyze these timings and they can be investigated within future researches.

Duncan (1972) was one of the first scholars to work on turn-yielding signals and he proposed sentence repetition as an important signal of turn-yielding. This signal of turn-yielding was seen within these conversations too but the amount of these signals weren't as much as signals like asking questions and using silence at the end of completed grammatical sentences. The repetition of different phrases and sentences within these classes were usually used to ask for clarification or confirmation of the uttered sentences. Some examples of these repetitions are brought in the following section;

S1: I just feel like in a situation like that you have to do what you have to do to survive".

S2: you have to do what you have to do"?" <Rising intonation>, <repetition>.

S1 :yeah you've got to do what you've got to do .if you've been going 19 days without food um someone has to take the sacrifice and people can survive and become productive members of the society and start charities and this and that, I mean benefit everyone at the end". < Hand gestures>, < looking at>, <pitch drop>.

S1: yeah "?"< Rising intonation>

S2: I don't know what they did afterwards, maybe they killed more people".<Pitch drop>, <looking at>.

S3: what if they went home and turned to be assassins"?"

S1- What if they went back home and turned to be assassins"?"<Repetition>, <soft>, <pitch drop>

S2 -you don't want to know who they assassinated, Fair enough".

As it is obvious from the excerpt the second conversant asked for clarification by repeating the exact phrase again, most of these repetitions are used for these purposes and they are used for handing the turn to the previous conversant to clarify the meaning of the utterance, uttered previously.

The other point worth mentioning about linguistic signals of turn-taking is the priority of intonation or grammatical completion point for signaling the end of turns. Different scholars investigated this priority within their researchers; some of these scholars identified grammatical completion point as the most important signal of turn-taking

within the process of conversation, others put emphasis on intonation and there were a last group who claimed that both groups perform simultaneously to pinpoint the signal. Schelgloff (1989) and Steven Crowley (1989) were among the scholars who put emphasis on the role of pitch patterns as an important factor in determining the signals of turn-taking. Casper (2003) criticized these scholars claiming that the grammatical completion point is the most important factor in determining the turn-taking timing. Mitterer et al. (2006) and Fox (2001) criticized both of these lines of research claiming that different languages and accents differ in their way of using grammar and intonation as the most important element of yielding different turns in the process of conversation.

Regarding these studies the researcher tried to investigate these classes and identify the important factor within these classes by analyzing the use of both of these signals; the result of this analysis shows that the participant who took part within this conversation used both grammatical completion point and intonation for handing their turn. This performance can be attributed to these participant's mother tongue, Persian, and this language's morphophonemic features. The first excerpt of these conversations which was brought in previous pages can be a good example of these features.

### **Non-verbal signals of turn-taking**

Non-verbal variables are the other signals of turn-taking and they have been the subject of many of the previous studies. These behaviors are claimed to be determined by the culture of different languages.

### ***Proxemics***

Hall et al. (1968), Baxter (1970), Grave and Watson (1966) and Cristiani et al. (2011) are among the scholars who worked on the proxemics at the time of conversation and all of the recent researches about this variable claimed that proxemics is determined by the culture of each language; some of these studies tried to provide a model of this variable and compared different languages within this regard. Within the present study this variable wasn't investigated because all of the participants were sitting on their seat. The point worth mentioning about this variable is that other factors can affect it too. Personality and the type of relationship was proposed by some of the scholars to be affective. Knapp and Hall (1972), Lotter and Sommer (1967) were the scholars who put emphasis on the personality as an important factor of determining proxemics within different situations. What seems missing in this line of research is the effect of discourse and mode of conversation on these proxemics; for example the way that interlocutors place their body in a meeting differs from that of a lecture which include the same participants who possess the same personality and share the same way of interacting. This claim cannot be proven within this research by these gathered data but seems to be a fruitful line of research for future researches.

### ***Kinesis and body movements***

Different body movements and non-verbal behaviors can carry different meanings; Duncan (1972) was among the first scholars to propose the termination of body

movements as an important signal for turn-taking. Different scholars worked on these kinesis behaviors and they are also claimed to be determined by cultural norms. In one of these studies Dusan Jan et al. (2007) proposed a model for these non-verbal behaviors, they analyzed three different languages and proved that each language possesses a set of special norms for these behaviors. Within this research different kinesis behaviors of the participants were transcribed during the transcription phase. The important findings about these behaviors are summarized within the following paragraphs.

Considering hand gestures it seemed that these gestures are mostly used for turn suppression signals and they are seen in the parts where interlocutors were uttering more than one sentence. Hand gestures didn't happen during short turns within the process of conversation and the participants performed these gestures in elongated turns. The other point about these gestures was about the people who performed them; Reina Lopez-Ozeilo (2013) worked on the non-verbal behaviors of the EFL learners and concluded that learners which are at the early levels of learning a second language fail to use non-verbal behaviors within the process of conversation. This conclusion seems to be confirmed by the data gathered during the process of this study but the important point about this conclusion is that there seem to be other factors at work to; this can mean that every individual interlocutor can have his or her understanding of these rules and these EFL learners at any level of their language learning can be affected by their first language culture of non-verbal behavior and/or their distorted beliefs and notions about these signals in the target language.

Fore-mentioned claims can be supported by Jenni Ingram's paper which was published in 2011; apart from these points another points seems to be important, some of the interlocutors who are aware of the norms of using these gestures and movements don't use them within the process of conversation even within their conversations in the first language. Considering these factors the example below tried to clarify the points made within these analyses; at this point of discussion the participants are discussing about the situation within which morality and family relations are contradictory.

S1: you have to act based on the general law. Even if mathematics an algebra when we want to derive an equation you come from the general point of view to the details. And then you can't get<1> result from details<1>..... <overlap>, <continuing hand gesture>

S2: <1> they are <1>anomalies you say"?"

S1: when we are talking about keeping the humanity at the highest level it means you are making no difference between your sister and some random girl in America. Would you do that? No; your sister is part of your family. It's not that much easy to say but humanity should be first".<Continuing hand gesture after the question to keep the turn>, <pitch drop>,<termination of hand gesture>,<looking at> at the end.

S2: should be. But it isn't first"?"

S1: maybe the people in the way of redemption did that".

Within this excerpt of conversation hand gestures were used as a turn suppressing signal and the interlocutor tried to keep his turn by using this kinesis behavior, however, he couldn't keep it within the first instance. Within the previous literature it was proposed that apart from the usage of these kinesis behaviors the quality of them can differ drastically, so in order to clarify the manner of using hand gestures and the quality of terminating them pictures are provided from the main video of these classes from which the conversations were transcribed.

Other body movements like head nods and the movements of other body parts were seen during the conversations; head nods were always used as confirmation signals and they were used to reassure current speakers to keep their turn, within this regard we can count them as a kind of feedback. The other body movements were not wide spread among speakers and it can be concluded that using these movements within the process of conversation was totally related to the interlocutor who was taking part in the conversation.

### ***Gaze***

Gaze behavior has been the subject of many researches within the field of conversation analysis; the important point about these researches is that all of the recent researches claimed that this behavior is a byproduct of culture. Mastumoto (2006) and Andrew Reviere (2009) are among the scholars who have done a wide range of researches on the manner of gaze behavior; they analyzed the gaze behavior within different languages and different cultures but the focus of this study is totally different from those researches. Justin Cassel et al. (1998) analyzed the relationship between gaze behavior and turn-taking; they concluded that interlocutors look at each other at the end of each turn and they look away at the beginning of each one; other than this they claimed that there is a relationship between propositional information and gaze behavior.

The analyses of the transcriptions of these classes confirmed Cassel et al. conclusions about the algorithm of turn-taking in the sense that participants looked at each other at the beginning of each turn and they looked away at the end of each one. The point worth mentioning here is that the manner of gaze seemed to be different in cross gender conversations. These differences existed within the sense that interlocutors who belonged to different genders gazed less directly at the end of each turn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Asking both WH and Yes/No questions are used equally for yielding turns. Gender didn't have an important impact on participants' usage of turn-taking signals and turn-taking signals proved to be constant in terms of both genders. Both genders use turn-taking signals in the same way to yield their turns but the manner of these signals should be go over further analysis. About the grammar/intonation dichotomy that has been investigated within different studies; the result of this analysis showed that the participant who took part within this conversation used both grammatical completion point and intonation for handing their turn. This performance can be attributed to these participants' mother tongue, Persian, and this language's morphophonemic features.

## REFERENCES

- Argyle, M., & Cook, M. (1976): *Gaze and Mutual Gaze*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Argyle, M., & Ingham, R. (1972): *Gaze, mutual gaze, and proximity*. *Semiotica*, 6(1), 32-50.
- Auer, P. (1996). On the prosody and syntax of turn-continuations. *Prosody in conversation*, 57-100.
- Baxter, R. J. (1970). Ornstein-Zernike relation and Percus-Yevick approximation for fluid mixtures. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 52(9), 4559-4562.
- Breazeal, C. 2002. *Designing Sociable Robots*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Breazeal, C.; Brooks, A.; Gray, J.; Hoffman, G.; Lieberman, J.; Lee, H.; (Thomaz), A. L.; & Mulanda, D. 2004. *Tutelage and collaboration for humanoid robots*. International Journal of Humanoid Robotics.
- Breiteneder, A., Pitzl, M. L., Majewski, S., & Klimpfinger, T. (2006). VOICE recording-Methodological challenges in the compilation of a corpus of spoken ELF. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 161-87.
- Caspers, J. (2003). Local speech melody as a limiting factor in the turn-taking system in Dutch. *Journal of Phonetics*, 31(2), 251-276.
- Cassel, J., Torres, O. & Prevost, S. (1999). "Turn Taking vs. Discourse Structure: How Best to Model Multimodal Conversation." In Wilks, Y. (ed.), *Machine Conversations*, pp. 143-154.
- Cassell, J. (1998). A framework for gesture generation and interpretation. *Computer vision in human-machine interaction*, 191-215.
- Chao, C.; Lee, J.; Begum, M.; & Thomaz, A. L. 2011. *Simon plays Simon says: The timing of turn-taking in an imitation game*. In IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN).
- De Ruiter, J. P., Mitterer, H., & Enfield, N. J. (2006). Projecting the end of a speaker's turn: A cognitive cornerstone of conversation. *Language*, 515-535.
- Duncan, S. Jr. (1972). "Some Signals and Rules for Taking Speaking Turns in Conversations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23(2), 283-292.
- Fox, B.A. (2001) An exploration of prosody and turn projection in English conversation. in M. Selting and E. Couper-Kuhlen (eds), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Fussell, J. J., Macias, M. M., & Saylor, C. F. (2005). Social skills and behavior problems in children with disabilities with and without siblings. *Child psychiatry and human development*, 36(2), 227-241.
- Hall, E. T., Birdwhistell, R. L., Bock, B., Bohannon, P., Diebold Jr, A. R., Durbin, M., & Vayda, A. P. (1968). Proxemics [and comments and replies]. *Current anthropology*, 83-108.
- Jan, D., Herrera, D., Martinovski, B., Novick, D., & Traum, D. (2007). A computational model of culture-specific conversational behavior. In *Intelligent virtual agents* (pp. 45-56). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Kendon, A. (1967). Some functions of gaze-direction in social interaction. *Acta psychologica*, 26, 22-63.

- Klimpfinger, T. (2009). "She's mixing the two languages together"—forms and functions of code-switching in English as a lingua franca. *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*, 348.
- Liddicoat, A. J. , & Crozet, C. (2001). 7 Acquiring French interactional. *Pragmatics in language teaching*, 125.
- López-Ozieblo, R. (2013). Reflections on the Use of Nonverbal communication in teaching Spanish to sino-speakers. *Revista de Lenguas para fines específicos*, 19, 309-328.
- Matsumoto, D. (2006): *Culture and Nonverbal Behavior*. In: The Sage Handbook of Nonverbal Communication, Sage Publications Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Miller, J. L. (1994). On the internal structure of phonetic categories: A progress report. *Cognition*, 50(1), 271-285.
- Mondada, L. (2011). Understanding as an embodied, situated and sequential achievement in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 542-552.
- Padilha, E., & Carletta, J. (2002, September). A simulation of small group discussion. In *Proceedings of EDILOG* (pp. 117-124).
- Parsons, S., Leonard, A., & Mitchell, P. (2006). Virtual environments for social skills training: comments from two adolescents with autistic spectrum disorder. *Computers & Education*, 47(2), 186-206.
- Pickering, L. (2009). Intonation as a pragmatic resource in ELF interaction. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 235-255.
- Rivière, A. M. (2009). *Turn-Taking and Gaze Behavior Among Cajun French and Cajun English Speakers in Avoyelles Parish*. Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of the Louisiana State University.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. Jefferson, G (1974): *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation*. *Language* 50(4), 696–735.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1998). Reply to Wetherell. *Discourse & Society*, 413-416.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Accommodation and the idiom principle in English as a lingua franca. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 6(2), 195-215.
- Stanton-Chapman, T. L., & Snell, M. E. (2011). Promoting turn-taking skills in preschool children with disabilities: The effects of a peer-based social communication intervention. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26(3), 303-319.
- Watson, O. M. (1970): *Proxemic Behavior: A Cross-cultural Study*. De Gruyter.
- Watson, O. M., & Graves, T. D. (1966). Quantitative Research in Proxemic Behavior. *American Anthropologist*, 68(4), 971-985.