



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University-Tébessa
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Letters and English Language



**A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender in Algerian TV Shows:
The Phonetic Features and Vocabulary Choices of The Weekend Show Panel**

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in Partial
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Language Sciences

Candidates:

Aya HAMI

Nour SOUAIDIA

Supervisor:

Ms. Chaïma BRAHAM

Board of Examiners:

President: Mrs. Zineb ABID (M.A.A, Larbi Tebessi University -Tebessa)

Supervisor: Ms. Chaïma BRAHAM (M.A.A, Larbi Tebessi University -Tebessa)

Examiner: Mrs. Mebarka ACHI (M.A.A, Larbi Tebessi University -Tebessa)

2022/ 2023

Acknowledgements

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

All praise belongs to Allah.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to our supervisor, Ms. Chaïma Braham, for her advice, guidance, support, encouragement, and kindness. As one of the department's most talented teachers, and everyone wants to work under her supervision. It was an honour for us to be her supervisees this year. We will never forget that or any of the challenging moments we passed through. Thank you so much for the assistance. She is the finest teacher we have ever had. We will never forget her or what she taught us. We will strive to become the most qualified professionals in our field and will always be thankful for everything she has done for us.

Besides, we are thankful to the honorable board of examiners Mrs. ABID and

Mrs. ACHI for accepting to examine our work.

Dedication

I am deeply grateful and filled with immense pride as I dedicate this work to two extraordinary individuals who have played an irreplaceable role in my life My Mother and Father. Words cannot express the depth of my appreciation for your unwavering love, guidance, and support. You have been the beacon of light that illuminates my path, providing the strength and inspiration to overcome any challenges.

To my dear brothers, Ramzi and Riad, and my beloved sister Lamia, your unwavering support and encouragement have been priceless throughout this journey. I extend my gratitude to ALLAH for blessing me with such a wonderful family, whose presence and love have shaped me into the person I am today.

To my Special one Affef. The person that stood behind me in every step I have taken.

To my brother-in-law, Mohammed, who is a third brother to me. Your presence and support have meant the world.

To my Adam, Idris, Assma, Tassnim and Ranim. The source of joy in the family.

To my dear friends, classmates, and loved ones, I am profoundly grateful for your unwavering support throughout this journey. Your presence and encouragement have meant the world to me. You have been my pillars of strength, offering words of wisdom, lending a listening ear, and providing the motivation to keep going.

To my bestfriend and partner in crime, Nour, who has made the university experience an absolute blessing. This journey would not have been complete without you, girl.

To my cute cat, Mizou, and my adorable turtle, Toutou

AYA Hami

Dedication

Words cannot express how grateful I am for my cherished family who bring me success, joy, and fortitude. Expressing my profound appreciation and affection for you seems impossible with mere words. My debt to my mother is immeasurable, but thanks for being the light of my life. Your guidance has made me the person I am today. Dedicated to my awesome father, He is a true example of resilience and strength for me, and my admiration should never stop growing for him. His lessons will live forever in my mind and heart. He is my hero.

I would like to express my gratitude to my uncle NOUR EDDINE and his wife who have been the best uncles I have ever had.

It means nothing to me without the support, guidance, and love that my two sisters have always given to me AMANI & IKRAM

To my beloved friends, you were always there when I needed you most, and I will never forget that. I cherish our friendship, and I am grateful for your unconditional love and support. Thank you for being in my life. RIM, OUMAIMA, OUMAIMA, & FATMA

It was a pleasure to have my friends BRAHMI and BOUAMRA who support me and be patient through this process.

To my beloved friend, who made the university experience a blessing and was my partner in this crime. I'm so thankful to have crossed paths with you. I'm so proud of all the successes we achieved together and all the moments we shared. Without you, this journey would not have been possible. AYA

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Dedication	ii
Dedication	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	~~Error! Bookmark not defined.
List of Acronyms and Symbols	viii
Abstract	2
General Introduction.....	3
Background of the Study	3
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Aim of the Study.....	5
Research Questions and Assumptions	6
Methodology.....	7
Structure of the Study	7
Chapter One: Literature Review.....	9
Section one: Language and Gender.....	9
Sex and Gender.....	10
Language and Gender Approaches	11
<i>The Deficit Approach</i>	11
<i>The Dominance Approach</i>	12
<i>The Difference Approach</i>	12
<i>The Social Constructionist Approach</i>	14
Features of Single and Mixed-sex Conversations	14
<i>Features of Single-Sex Conversations</i>	15
<i>Features of Mixed-Sex Conversations</i>	15
Gender Miscommunication in Mixed-Sex Groups.....	16
<i>Accommodation</i>	16
<i>Interruption</i>	18

<i>Indirectness</i>	19
<i>Politeness</i>	21
<i>Prestige</i>	22
Conflict Resolving in Mix-sex Conversations.....	24
Gender Stereotypes	26
Language, Media and Gender	28
<i>Talk Shows</i>	28
<i>Men and Women in Media</i>	29
<i>Aspects of talk shows affecting language behaviour</i>	30
Section Two: Language Aspects	35
Phonetic Features	36
<i>Speaking Rate</i>	36
<i>Pauses</i>	37
<i>Rising Intonation</i>	39
<i>Emphatic Stress</i>	40
<i>The Length of the Turn</i>	41
Vocabulary Choices.....	42
<i>Empty Adjectives</i>	42
<i>Adjectives of Colour</i>	43
<i>Hedges</i>	44
<i>Intensifiers</i>	45
<i>Diminutives</i>	46
<i>Borrowed Vocabulary Items</i>	48
<i>Swear Words</i>	49
<i>Tag Questions</i>	50
Conclusion	51
Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis and Discussion.....	53
Section One: Methodology.....	53
The Research Design	53
Population and Sampling Technique	54
Data Source.....	55
Data Extraction	56
Method of Data Analysis	57

<i>Content Analysis</i>	57
Section Two: Data Analysis	59
Data Analysis Procedures	60
The Obtained Findings through Content Analysis.....	60
<i>Phonetic Features</i>	61
<i>Vocabulary Choices</i>	74
<i>Gender Miscommunication</i>	89
Section Three: The Discussion of Results.....	94
Limitations of the Study	100
Implications of the Study.....	101
Recommendations for Further Research	101
General Conclusion	103
References	105
Appendices	119
Résumé	153
الملخص	152

List of Tables

Table 1	<i>Common Stereotypes of Women and Men Based on Psychological Research</i>	27
Table 2	<i>A list of neutral adjectives and women's language adjectives</i>	42
Table 3	<i>Penalists and Features Coding</i>	61
Table 4	<i>The distribution of Speaking Rate (SR) among panelists</i>	62
Table 5	<i>The frequency of the utilisation of Filled Pauses (FP) among penalists</i>	64
Table 6	<i>The frequency of the utilisation of Non-Filled Pauses (NFP) among penalists</i>	66
Table 7	<i>The occurrence of the use of emphatic stress (ES) between both penalists</i>	69
Table 8	<i>The distribution of turns, the length of turns (LoT), and the mean (\bar{x}) among male penalists</i>	71
Table 9	<i>The distribution of turns, the length of turns (LoT), and the mean (\bar{x}) among female penalists</i>	72
Table 10	<i>Comparison of number and length of turns: male vs. female panelists</i>	73
Table 11	<i>The representation of Empty adjectives (EA) in the show among panelists</i>	74
Table 12	<i>The distribution of Hedges (HED) among panelists</i>	76
Table 13	<i>The distribution of Intensifiers (INT)among panelists</i>	78
Table 14	<i>The distribution of Borrowed Vocabulary Items (BI)among males penalists</i>	80
Table 15	<i>The distribution of Borrowed Vocabulary Items (BI)among females penalists</i>	83
Table 16	<i>Comparing Nativised and Non-Nativised Borrowed Items: Male vs Female Penalists</i> ..	82
Table 17	<i>The distribution of Code Switching (CS) among male and female panelists</i>	85
Table 18	<i>The Classification of the use of Jargon (J)among panelists</i>	87
Table 19	<i>The distribution of Interruption (INTER) based on phonetic features and vocabulary choices</i>	92

List of Acronyms and Symbols

- **N°** : Number
- **s**: Seconds
- **SD** : Standard Deviation
- **SPSS** : Statistical Package for Social Sciences
- **WL**: Woman Language
- \bar{x} :Mean

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ACCOUNT OF GENDER IN TV SHOWS

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ACCOUNT OF GENDER IN ALGERIAN TV SHOWS
THE PHONETIC FEATURES AND VOCABULARY CHOICES OF THE WEEKEND SHOW

PANEL

by

AYA HAMI

Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University-Tebessa-

&

NOUR SOUAIDIA

Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University-Tebessa-

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in

Language Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Echahid Cheikh Larbi Tebessi University

Tebessa, Algeria

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ACCOUNT OF GENDER IN TV SHOWS

Abstract

In the realm of language and communication, the influence of gender has long been recognised as a significant factor shaping linguistic behaviour and interaction patterns. Within the context of TV shows, understanding the role of gender in language selection and performance is particularly relevant. This study delves into the linguistic landscape of the Algerian talk show *The Weekend Show* to investigate the vocabulary choices and phonetic features employed by male and female penalists. By examining these language aspects, the aim is to shed light on the gendered language of the show's penalists and explore how these differences may give rise to miscommunication. This is achieved by carefully selecting episodes from *The Weekend Show* talk show, after employing a purposive sampling technique. The research follows a descriptive research design where extracted data is analysed through a directed content analysis. Through the analysis of the findings, several key results have emerged. Firstly, there are observable differences in the speech of males and females, specifically in the utilisation of the selected phonetic features and vocabulary choices. Statistical significance is observed in the excessive use of filled pauses and borrowed vocabulary items among male penalists and long turns among female penalists. Conversely, non-filled pauses and intensifiers demonstrate qualitative significance, suggesting notable variations in speech styles and influence of the discussed topic. Furthermore, these differences can lead to miscommunication, mainly interruptions. Lastly, the use of emotional and collaborative language among females and dominant, assertive, and competitive language among males perpetuate gender stereotypes.

Keywords: gender, vocabulary choices, phonetic features, linguistic behaviour, interaction patterns, TV shows, gender-based stereotypes.

General Introduction

Background of the Study

Accounting for the way we speak in different social contexts is one of the main concerns of variationist sociolinguistic studies (Labov, 1972). The focal point of these studies revolves around how speakers' use of language is influenced by a variety of social correlates, mainly social class, ethnicity, age, and gender. In the 1970s, sociolinguistic studies concentrated on the distinctions between the speech of males and females. The attention is based on ideologies underlying the differences and similarities, and leading to different approaches justifying the interactions occurring between both genders. A substantial portion of these studies, primarily those of sociolinguists such as Lakoff (1975), claimed that mixed-gender conversations have traditionally been dominated by men. Thus, men's speech styles have been represented as unmarked ways of implementing power and dominance (Lakoff, 2004). In contrast, other studies such as Darnell (1975) and Cameron (1998), in their common view, stated that males and females live in different worlds which make them have different cultures; this systematically affects their language use. As a result, these studies played a significant role in explaining the communication between men and women in different social contexts in the current culture.

In this regard, there are cultural differences between men and women that refer to the maintained system of socially learned values, traditional norms, and beliefs. Algeria, which represents an example of Arabic culture, is recognised for its cultural heritage that has evolved over time. Algerian culture is a complex combination of varied denomination groups, music, literary riches, and several languages or dialects spoken throughout the country. Algeria's official language is Standard Arabic, but for everyday communication, informal talks, songs and movies, Algerians use dialects which are inspired by Standard Arabic, and heavily influenced by Berber, French, Spanish, Turkish and Italian from which they have many borrowed words.

Therefore, culture plays a significant role in shaping and reinforcing gender stereotypes, influencing beliefs about appropriate roles and behaviours for males and females. Iddou (2011), in her work, claimed that both males and females in Algeria have different linguistic behaviours in the sense of women's vocabulary selection is different from men's. For example, women in Algeria may exhibit a greater tendency to use empty adjectives in their speech compared to men. Additionally, women may be more cautious in avoiding the use of taboo words or expressions that are considered socially inappropriate or offensive. Also, she mentioned that male and female speech differences vary from one area to another in Algeria. This leads to the conclusion that culture is one of the factors that determine and shape men's and women's verbal behaviour which varies at different linguistic levels. In terms of pronunciation, women generally exhibit better pronunciation than men, including the learning of a second language. This may explain why more girls choose to study language as their major than boys. Women also tend to use a high-pitch voice and rising intonation pattern, which can suggest gentleness and lack of confidence. On the other hand, men tend to use falling intonation to show confidence and power (Lakoff, 1975).

Particularly, TV shows, which are a form of public communication, have a significant impact on how the language and communication style of both genders are presented to the audience. Through these shows, different cultural aspects are depicted and displayed, which can influence how people perceive and understand gender and linguistic behaviours. In other words, live TV shows can shape the way people view language use and communication patterns between men and women and provide a window into the effect of gender on language use.

Statement of the Problem

Algerian TV shows often feature both male and female participants, but it is unclear how gender differences in language selection and performance impact communication and understanding between participants. While there is evidence to suggest that males and females

use distinct vocabulary and phonetic features in their speech, it is not clear how these differences manifest in a talk show setting. This study aims to address this gap in knowledge by investigating the gender differences in vocabulary choices and phonetic features among participants in *The Weekend Show*, one of the Algerian TV shows, with the acknowledgement that these differences may potentially lead to miscommunication, and also highlights that various strategies that can be employed to overcome the challenges arising from gender variations in vocabulary and phonetic features.

Significance of the Study

The primary significance of this study and its findings lies in their contribution to our understanding of the role of gender differences in language selection and performance within Algerian TV shows. By exploring the impact of these differences, this research sheds light on the dynamics of communication and language skills in the television context. Since television, which is a beneficial medium, is known to have an impact on students' spoken and written language skills such as vocabulary, grammar, and syntax, the knowledge gained from this study can be useful to media professionals, researchers, and viewers seeking to comprehend the messages conveyed, engagement strategies used, and conversational dynamics in television shows.

Furthermore, the study enriches the Algerian scientific community by providing visions into gender differences in language selection and performance on television, making it a valuable contribution to the field. Moreover, this study has the potential to offer significant insights to individuals from diverse nationalities and cultures, allowing them to gain a deeper understanding of ours.

Aim of the Study

This study aims to determine the linguistic choices of males and females through the investigation of the language they use at the level of vocabulary and phonetic implementation

occurring in the Algerian talk show *The Weekend Show*. This overall aim is accomplished through the following objectives: identifying the differences in language vocabulary choices and the phonetic features that both genders adopt in their conversation, exploring how gender stereotypes may account for these differences, and determining the role specific vocabulary and phonetic features may play in miscommunications in mixed-sex groups in the selected show.

Research Questions and Assumptions

The questions of our research are the following:

1. To what extent do the investigated phonetic features (speaking rate, pauses, rising intonation, emphatic stress, and the length of the turn) prevail in the speech of males and females penalists in *The Weekend Show*?
2. To what extent do the investigated vocabulary items (empty adjectives, adjectives of colour, hedges, intensifiers, diminutives, borrowed vocabulary items, swear words, and tag questions) prevail in the speech of males and females penalists in *The Weekend Show*?
3. Which vocabulary choices and phonetic features cause miscommunication in mixed-sex groups in the selected show?
4. How do gender stereotypes account for the differences in vocabulary choices and phonetic features distribution among male and female participants?

Based on the literature, these assumptions were formulated:

1. Males and females exhibit distinct language patterns, with females generally speaking at a slower pace, using more filled pauses, and employing emphatic stress, while males tend to utilise rising intonation and dominate in longer turns.
2. The use of empty adjectives, adjectives of colour, hedges, intensifiers, and diminutives are more frequent in the speech of females, however; the use of swear words, tag questions, and borrowed vocabulary items are more frequent in the speech of males in *The Weekend Show*.

3. Miscommunication arises from interruptions influenced by specific vocabulary choices and phonetic features, while no significant miscommunication in terms of accommodation, indirectness, politeness, or prestige relate to vocabulary choices and phonetic features.

4. Gender stereotypes can influence the vocabulary and phonetic features used by male and female speakers, with women tending to use more nurturing or emotional words, while men may use more assertive, competitive, aggressive or dominant words.

Methodology

The research follows a descriptive research design with a mixed-method approach using content analysis as a tool for the analysis of the obtained data. More specifically, we opted for directed content analysis to analyse and compare the language selection and performance of both genders in *The Weekend Show*. Additionally, we utilised frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations as they offer a more impartial and measurable means of detecting variances in vocabulary and phonetic features among male and female participants.

Algerian TV shows are the broad scope of our study, and our main focus is gender diversity within them. In order to achieve this, we used the method of non-probability sampling, where we purposefully selected the live TV show *The Weekend Show*, which airs live on Ennahar TV every Thursday at 09:30 p.m. The selected sample fits all the necessary requirements of the study as an Algerian TV Show involving gender diversity.

Structure of the Study

The present study is designed to investigate the variations in vocabulary and phonetic features caused among both gender in the TV show *The Weekend Show*. The study consists of two main chapters.

The first chapter of this research provides a theoretical review of the two research variables language and gender in the context of talk shows. It is divided into two sections.

Section one, language and gender in talk shows, discusses the concept of gender and its approaches, gender miscommunication in mixed-sex groups, dispute resolution, as well as media-related factors that influence language behaviour. Section two, language aspects, provides an overview of the various aspects (vocabulary and phonetic) that differ among male and female speakers.

The second chapter focuses on practical aspects and is divided into three sections. The first section outlines the methodology, including population and sampling-technique, data extraction and data analysis method. The second section presents data obtained from the content analysis of the selected show, in addition to the analysis of the data. The last section provides the discussion and interpretation of these findings.

Chapter One: Literature Review

Language is a means of communication and a significant tool that shapes our social interactions which influences and is influenced by cultural norms, and expectations for the realm of gender. This sociolinguistic account in particular explores the relationship between language and gender in Algerian talk shows, with a focus on vocabulary choices and phonetic features. The examination of the linguistic patterns and practices present in these talk shows uncovers how language reinforces gender roles and reflects gender stereotypes in Algerian society. The first section provides an overview of the concepts of sex and gender and explores various approaches to studying the language-gender relationship. It discusses communication differences in single and mixed-sex conversations, addressing gender miscommunication and conflict resolution strategies. The impact of media language on both genders is also examined. The second section focuses on the linguistic aspects of gender, including vocabulary choices and phonetic features. As readers progress through this chapter, they will gain a deeper understanding of the intricate relationship between language and gender, particularly within the context of talk shows in Algeria.

Section one: Language and Gender

This section presents a thorough overview of the key concepts related to the analysis of males' and females' language features. First, it starts by identifying the clear distinction between gender and sex and the approaches related to language and gender. In addition, this section focuses on explaining gender miscommunication and, conflict resolution in mixed-sex conversations, and delves into the concept of gender stereotypes and their impact on language styles used by different genders. Finally, the section highlights the language behaviour in the media across aspects of the media that affect language use by both genders.

Sex and Gender

Sex and gender reflect two complex concepts that are sometimes used interchangeably (Litosseliti 2006). Gender is shaped by society and culture, while sex is determined by biology and involves categorising individuals as male or female based on physical, physiological, and anatomical characteristics, including XX chromosomes for females and XY chromosomes for males. However, gender refers to the traits and characteristics associated with being male or female within different societies and cultures (Butler, 1999; Litosseliti, 2006; Coates, 2013).

Scholars have recognized that while individuals are born with biological sex (male or female), their language use is shaped by social and cultural influences, as noted by Coates (2013). This has led to a distinction between sex and gender in sociolinguistics, where gender is viewed as a socially constructed category based on sex. However, some scholars, such as Bell et al. (2006), continue to use the term gender in relation to the biological sex of speakers. This perspective challenges the notion that sex and gender can be completely separated, as it acknowledges the role of social and cultural history in shaping language use, and it highlights that sex always underlies gender.

Wahyuningsih (2018) focused on how language varies with respect to gender, which refers to the social and cultural roles associated with being male or female adhering to the view that they are separate. The study examined how men and women use language in different ways and how these differences are influenced by cultural norms and expectations. These linguistic variations can include differences in the lexicon (word choice), speech styles, grammatical constructions, as well as phonetic and phonological features. This implies that how we use language is not solely determined by biological sex, but is also influenced by societal and cultural factors. Therefore, understanding language variation in relation to gender requires considering the

complex interplay between biology, society, and culture, and the ways in which they shape individuals' language use patterns.

Language and Gender Approaches

The main gender approaches discussed deliberately exclude the biological approach, as it shares the concept that men and women are inherently different due to their biological distinctions which is referred to the first heading of the section.

The Deficit Approach

The deficit approach is somehow the oldest since it was the first to primarily deal with male/female speech broadly. Jespersen (1922) is one of the linguists who tackled, in his book *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin*, a set of ideas about men's and women's language. He focused on the concept that language is the source of men's power, whereas women are descended from men. Consequently, males' language is the norm because it is comprehensive, accurate and implicitly superior to that of females' one. According to his theory, women use the language by imitating men's language since their speech is deficient, incomplete and imperfect. The deficit approach suggests that "women's ways of speaking are, either by nature or nurture, deficient in comparison to men's" (Cameron, 1998, p.14).

In accordance with this ideology, Lakoff (1975), in her work *Language and woman's place*, claimed that the way women speak is totally different from men, and this contributes to sexist attitudes and practices against women. She also claimed that women were socially excluded, leading to gender inequality when using language. Women wanted to interact in a particular way that reflected their social status which is inferior to males. As a result, women's linguistic expression was less effective than men's (Lakoff, 2004). According to Coates (2013), Lakoff suggested a concept called "women's language" (WL), which is characterised by linguistic

forms including hedges, tag questions, and exaggerated intonation which is explained in detail in section two (refer to 1.2.1). WL is regarded as deficient, inadequate, and weak compared to the norm of male's language.

The Dominance Approach

Lakoff (1975) claimed that the primary distinction between men and women is the disparity in power between them. She stated that women's speech is regarded as incomplete and sometimes meaningless because of their low status in society, whereas men's speech is faultless. The dominance approach viewed women as an oppressed group and interpreted linguistic differences in women's and men's speech in terms of men's dominance and women's subordination (Zimmerman & West, 1975; Coates, 2013).

In the same regard, Lakoff (2004) suggested that the powerless members of society must also be more polite. Thus, in communities where women are the powerless members, their speech would contain more elements of linguistic politeness, prestige, and tag questions to reflect insecurity. This theory enables interpretations of some communication issues that exist between men and women because of the socially imposed gender roles and the unequal hierarchical positions.

The Difference Approach

Lakoff's (1975) theory was the main inspiration for the development of the difference approach proposed by Tannen (1991). It is based on the concept that the subcultural view considered men and women as belonging to two distinct but equally valid subcultures because of how they were raised from childhood (Tannen, 1991; Coates, 2013). The difference model provided another way to evaluate women's language outside the context of oppression or

inferiority. According to Coates (2013), scholars have been able to demonstrate the advantages of linguistic strategies unique to women and to appreciate the manner in which women speak.

Generally, men and women communicate differently because they are part of two distinct subcultures that have different cultural worlds. This social and physical division since childhood created distinct languages and ideologies between males and females. Tannen (1991) has identified several differences in communication styles between men and women, which can sometimes lead to miscommunication. The following are the main six key differences.

- **Status vs. Support:** Men may communicate to establish and maintain status or hierarchy, while women use language to create connection and provide support.
- **Independence vs. Intimacy:** Men often communicate to assert their independence, while women prioritise building intimacy and connection through communication.
- **Information vs. Rapport:** Men may prioritise conveying information and facts, while women prioritise building rapport and social connections through conversation.
- **Problem-Solving vs. Empathy:** Men tend to focus on problem-solving and offering solutions, while women may prioritise empathy and understanding.
- **Assertiveness vs. Politeness:** Men may use more direct and assertive language, while women may use more indirect and polite language to avoid conflict and maintain social harmony.
- **Conversational Dominance vs. Participation:** Men may engage in more conversational dominance, while women tend to participate more by listening and supporting.

It is important to note that these differences are based on generalisations and not all men or women may exhibit these communication styles. Additionally, these differences can vary across cultures, contexts, and individuals. Being aware of these differences can help reduce gender miscommunication.

The Social Constructionist Approach

The social constructionist approach has gained momentum in recent years, particularly in the study of language and gender. Scholars have moved towards understanding gender as a constitutive factor in the construction of social identities, and this approach has been influenced by Butler's (1990) notion of performativity. According to Butler (1990), gender is not an inherent trait, but rather a social construct that is performed through language and behaviour. This perspective allows for the recognition of agency and subjectivity among individuals in the construction of their gender identities. Many sociolinguists have adopted Butler's view of gender as performative, including Wodak (1997), Sunderland (2004), and Litosseliti (2006). This approach allows for an understanding of how individuals actively construct their gender identities through their language use and behaviour, and how they can conform to or resist societal norms associated with gender.

This approach challenges previous research that viewed women as passive victims of societal norms. Instead, it recognises that individuals have agency and can actively engage in the construction of their gender identities, conforming to or resisting social expectations. This perspective opens up new possibilities for understanding gender as a dynamic and contextual process that is continuously constructed through language and social interactions.

Features of Single and Mixed-sex Conversations

The nature of communication is shaped by the gender composition of participants, whether in single-sex or mixed-sex conversations. These conversations exhibit unique characteristics, including interruptions, power dynamics, and communication style differences. Gaining an understanding of these features can provide insights into how gender influences communication dynamics in various social settings.

Features of Single-Sex Conversations

Same-sex conversations tend to involve greater levels of emotional expression and disclosure, with individuals feeling more comfortable and able to relate to others of the same sex (Tannen, 1991). Additionally, Tannen (1991) claimed that direct communication and supportive language is also common in single-sex conversations, with individuals expressing their thoughts and feelings more explicitly, assertively, and straightforwardly, using expressions of empathy and encouragement. A study by Kimmel and Mahler (2003) found that single-sex groups tend to have a stronger sense of unity and cohesion than mixed-sex groups; highlighting the importance of social support and belonging in shaping adolescent behaviour and attitudes. They argued that this may be because single-sex groups provide a safe space for boys to express their emotions and discuss issues related to masculinity without fear of judgment or ridicule from girls. Therefore, males may engage in more competitive behaviours, while females may behave more cooperatively.

Features of Mixed-Sex Conversations

There are distinct features that can affect mixed-sex conversations, including:

- The frequency of interruptions: Research has shown that men interrupt women more often in mixed-sex conversations which can impact the flow and balance of conversation (Lakoff, 1975). This interruption pattern can be a form of dominance and hinder effective communication between men and women.
- Power dynamics, which refer to the imbalances in influence, control, and authority within interactions or relationships between individuals or groups, is another important feature of mixed-sex conversations. Men tend to have more power, influence, and control in mixed-sex

conversations (Carli, 1990). Consequently, this power dynamic can influence language use, interruptions, and topics of conversation in mixed-sex conversations.

- Differences in communication styles: women are more likely to use backchannel cues, such as nodding and smiling and showing more facial expressiveness, to indicate that are listening, while men may prioritise asserting their presence by interrupting or speaking over others (Aries, 1996).

These factors collectively contribute to the complexities of gendered communication in mixed-sex interactions and may lead to miscommunication.

Gender Miscommunication in Mixed-Sex Groups

In mixed-sex groups, gender miscommunication can arise when individuals have different expectations or assumptions about appropriate communication styles, including accommodation, interruption patterns, indirectness, and the use of prestigious and polite language. For example, women may be more likely to use indirect language and politeness markers, while men may be more likely to interrupt and use assertive language as illustrated in the following studies.

Accommodation

Accommodation is a social and cognitive approach introduced by Giles in 1973. It addresses the reasons and limitations of speech changes that may take place during social interactions. Street and Giles (1982) claimed that speech accommodation theory has two main premises: The first states that “communicators are motivated to adjust their speech styles with respect to one another as a means of expressing values, attitudes, and intentions” (p.205), and the second claims that the individual's perception and interpretation of another person's speech will affect how they will respond.

There are particular accommodation strategies that individuals use, mainly divergence, convergence and maintenance. According to Giles et al, (1991), these accommodation strategies show one's intention to be included or excluded from a particular social group. First, convergence is a process individuals use to appear more similar to others by adapting their communicative behaviour. The assimilation process from one group to another is enhanced by convergence, which decreases the differences between the interlocutors. For instance, when lower-status groups adjust their language to seem more like higher-status groups to gain acceptance from them. Additionally, in order to promote smooth communicative exchanges, this strategy does cover accommodation in linguistic features and accents, paralinguistic features like speech rates, pauses and intonation, and also nonverbal features like smiling and gazing (Giles & Ogay, 2007). Second, divergence is a strategy used to emphasise the distinctions between the interlocutors at the level of individuals or group interaction. In other words, it is the way in which individuals preserve and value their varied speech (Giles and Ogay, 2007). Third, maintenance is a communication strategy used by individuals to maintain their usual way of speaking without attempting to imitate or emphasise differences with their conversational partner nor accentuate their difference (Bourhis, 1979). This means that maintenance happens when one makes no changes to their speech and is unaffected by their interlocutor's speech.

Accommodation, while not explicitly creating gender miscommunication, can potentially contribute to it in certain situations including the following:

- **Lack of authenticity:** when individuals feel pressured to conform to gender expectations, they may accommodate or adopt a communication style that is perceived as more appropriate or acceptable for their gender, leading to a lack of authenticity in their communication. This lack of

authenticity can hinder effective communication, as it may not genuinely reflect their thoughts, feelings, or intentions (Eagly, 1987).

- **Unconscious biases:** accommodation to gender norms can also result in unconscious biases, where individuals perceive or interpret communication through a gendered lens rather than objectively (Giles & Ogay, 2007). These biases can influence how messages are interpreted, leading to miscommunication as individuals may interpret messages differently based on their gender-related biases or assumptions.

Thus, understanding the potential impact of accommodation on lack of authenticity and unconscious bias is crucial in exploring the complex dynamics of gender miscommunication.

Interruption

Interruption in conversation is the act of one speaker breaking into the speech of another speaker during a conversation (Tannen, 1994). Interruption can take various forms, including overlapping speech, interruptive questions, and direct interruptions.

- Overlapping speech occurs when two or more speakers talk simultaneously. Although it can serve different functions such as signalling enthusiasm, and agreement, it causes disagreement as well. For example, during a lively debate, two speakers start talking at the same time, causing confusion and hindering effective communication.
- Interruptive questions are questions asked by one speaker while another speaker is still talking, which can challenge or clarify a point made by the speaker and signal a desire to take over the conversation. For example, speaker A is explaining a concept when speaker B interrupts with a question, seeking clarification and redirecting the conversation.

- Direct interruptions occur when one speaker cuts off another speaker mid-sentence or mid-word, which can be used to show dominance, assertiveness, or control over the conversation and can also be used to challenge or undermine the credibility of the speaker (Sacks et al., 1974).

Interrupting others during conversation can create gender miscommunication due to conflicting communication styles based on gender. Several studies have shown that men tend to interrupt women more frequently in conversation, leading to feelings of exclusion or being unheard by women (Lakoff, 1975; West & Zimmerman, 1983). Additionally, men may perceive women's communication style as weak or ineffective, leading them to interrupt and take control over the conversation (James & Clarke, 1993). According to Tannen (1994), this type of interruption in conversation can occur for various reasons. For instance, men may interrupt to establish their dominance, and women may use more hesitant language due to their socialization. Furthermore, men may interrupt because they perceive women's communication style as ineffective or weak, and seek to take control over the conversation. Interruption can also impact power dynamics in communication, as men may use it as a means to maintain their dominance and exert their power over women, and interruption should be used cautiously as a measure of power or dominance in social interaction studies (Beattie, 1981). Thus, it is crucial to be aware of gendered communication patterns, such as interruption, and strive for more equitable and respectful interactions that allow everyone to feel heard and valued.

Indirectness

Indirectness can be defined as the practice of using language that does not convey a straightforward or explicit meaning, but instead implies meanings, hints, or indirect suggestions (Tannen, 1994). Tannen's theory highlighted the importance of recognising and accommodating different communication styles for effective communication and intercultural understanding.

Lakoff (1975) has contributed to the study of indirectness in language, noting its various social functions such as conveying politeness, softening requests, or conveying deference. Lakoff also focused on the use of indirect language to mitigate the impact of one's speech, through hedges, fillers, or tag questions. The scholar emphasised that social and cultural context plays a crucial role in shaping the use of indirect language, and particularly stressed the role of gender, suggesting that women are more likely than men to use indirect language to convey politeness or avoid confrontation.

Numerous studies have investigated the use of indirectness in different cultural and linguistic contexts. For example, in Japanese culture, indirectness is a highly valued feature of communication, as it is seen as a way to maintain harmony and avoid confrontation (Matsumoto, 1988). In contrast, in Western cultures, directness is often preferred as it is seen as a way to communicate clearly and efficiently (Leung & Cohen, 2011). In addition, a study by Shattuck-Hufnagel and Turk (1996) investigated the use of indirectness in Arabic speech in comparison to English. The study found that Arabic speakers used more indirect language than English speakers, and this difference could be attributed to the cultural value placed on indirectness in Arabic communication.

Indirectness in language can create miscommunication between genders. Studies have shown that women are more likely than men to use indirect language to convey politeness or to avoid confrontation (Lakoff, 1975). However, men may interpret indirect language as ambiguous or unclear, leading to misunderstandings or frustration (Mills & Grainger, 2016). In Arabic contexts, for instance, Sadiqi (2003) found that women in Morocco use indirect language more frequently than men, especially when addressing men, as a way to avoid being seen as impolite or challenging social norms. However, men reported difficulty in understanding the indirectness of

women's language and sometimes interpreted it as a lack of confidence or assertiveness.

Therefore, it is crucial to highlight the importance of recognising and accommodating different communication styles between genders to avoid miscommunication and promote effective communication in diverse cultural contexts.

Politeness

Politeness is the process of conveying an utterance in the most respectful manner, which in this case is required to reduce disagreement with others (Brown et al., 1987). Simply, politeness means treating others with respect and consideration. In sociolinguistics and pragmatics, Crystal (2008) stated that politeness is a phrase that denotes linguistic qualities connected with social conduct norms, such as courtesy, rapport, deference, and distance. These features include the use of specific discourse markers (please), appropriate voice tones, and respectful forms of address such as the selection of first versus last names or the choice of intimate versus distant pronouns. Polite individuals demonstrate good manners, interact in a way that is socially acceptable, and refrain from being rude or impolite towards others (Pal, 2020). However, some terms are inappropriate and should never be used in certain circumstances, including demonstrating respect for others through one's manners, words, and actions.

Brown et al. (1987) classified politeness into two categories. There is both positive and negative politeness. Positive politeness is defined by attempts to achieve unity through declarations of friendliness, casual language use, compliments, and hedges, for example, so let's do this together. Negative politeness; on the opposite extreme, is demonstrated by treating individuals with respect and avoiding intruding into their personal space; an example would be as follows: I am sorry to bother you but could you do me a favour, please.

Jespersen (1922) claimed that women preserved their native tongues and taught them to their daughters. Even though the boys comprehend their mothers' and sisters' speech, they follow their fathers' and brothers' speech from the age of five or six. Following the same path, Lakoff (1973) emphasised that girls are taught from a young age to talk with "little lady" tones, and they are allowed to complain, whereas boys are allowed to scream. Moreover, since males and females have distinct and unique expressions that are associated with their respective genders, they typically do not use expressions that are traditionally associated with the opposite gender (Rocheft 1665 as cited in Jespersen, 1922; Holmes, 2013). This further reinforces the notion that expressions associated with men are seen as typical, while those associated with women are considered different or deviant.

There is no explicit expression of gender miscommunication in politeness between adults due to gender stereotypes, or it rarely occurs since it entails rude behaviour. However, there may be a miscommunication in politeness between teachers and students due to the age difference. Students may use silence as a way to be polite towards their teachers, but it may not be well received and may even be considered impolite. Similarly, using positive politeness towards teachers may also be misinterpreted as impolite due to the social distance between the two parties, as noted by Nakane (2006). i.e., other factors intervene in the creation of miscommunication such as social distance, power and age.

Prestige

According to Labov (1966), prestige in linguistics is a socially motivated behaviour that involves positive or negative evaluation, and certain linguistic features are considered prestigious or stigmatised based on culture. Pearce (2007) further added that there is a direct correlation between social prestige and linguistic prestige, with individuals related to powerful social groups

being the main speakers of prestige language and variety. Cultural norms and perceptions play a role in determining which dialectal variants, accents, or linguistic features are considered prestigious, and this recognition can influence linguistic behaviour.

There are two types of prestige; covert and overt.

- **Covert prestige** is associated with non-standard variations. It is possible to establish evidence that covert prestige in some cases is connected with particular linguistic forms (Trudgill, 1972). She added that covert prestige reflects our society's value system as well as its various subcultures inside this society by proving that, for male speakers, working-class non-standard speech is highly regarded and prestigious for three reasons: age-linguistic differentiation, sex-linguistic differentiation, and group solidarity.
- **Overt prestige** is generally and openly expressed in the speech community's linguistic behaviour. Middle-class women usually use more standard or prestige varieties in speech than men (Gordon, 1997). This may suggest that middle-class women may consciously or unconsciously adopt language forms that are considered prestigious or socially desirable in their speech, potentially reflecting their social status and adherence to societal norms or expectations.

Jaber (2022) conducted a study with a large sample size in a natural setting to generalise the findings. The study aimed to identify who uses more prestigious language by dividing the sample into mixed-gender and same-gender groups. Both males and females use prestigious language, but for different reasons. Females prefer prestige variants to represent their high social status as educated individuals, while males use it only in official communications. When males and females converse, there is more progress toward prestigious variations in groups with only one gender present, as both genders are sensitive and caring when the opposite gender is absent.

It is not the use of prestige itself that creates gender miscommunication, but rather the potential for misinterpretation based on social and cultural factors. In a workplace, a female employee may use more prestigious language when speaking with her male supervisor to demonstrate respect and professionalism. However, if the male supervisor is not used to hearing such language, he may misinterpret her intentions and perceive her as being too formal or distant. This could lead to a breakdown in communication between the two parties, as the female employee's intentions were misunderstood due to the use of prestigious language.

Conflict Resolving in Mix-sex Conversations

Strategies such as communication, negotiation, mediation, bargaining and setting ground rules have been suggested by Wani (2011), Harrison & Muhamad (2018), and Chidubem (2019) for conflict resolution.

- Communication is a cooperative process characterized by an open and honest exchange of ideas, thoughts, and feelings to express oneself, understand others, and find common ground.
- Negotiation can be defined as all interplay, techniques, and face-to-face efforts to communicate with and alter an opponent's position.
- Mediation is a type of negotiation in which a third party facilitates the conversation.
- Bargaining which allows individuals to understand their opponents' views by expressing their demands.
- The ground rules state that each participant should take his or her time expressing opinions and treating each other with respect.

These strategies highlight the importance of resolving all issues in society especially communication issues through peaceful means without resorting to violence.

Additionally, in order to resolve conflict in mixed-sex conversation the hearer can actively

listen to the other person's perspective and try to understand their point of view. This can help to build empathy and reduce conflict. Gibb (1961) proposed a theory of defensive communication, which includes a focus on active listening as a strategy for reducing defensiveness and resolving conflicts. According to Gibb (1961), active listening involves four key behaviours to resolve conflict and signal agreement; attending, following, reflecting, and clarifying.

- Attending means paying attention to the speaker and demonstrating interest through nonverbal cues.
- Following is understanding and following the speaker's train of thought.
- Reflecting refers to paraphrasing or summarizing the speaker's message to demonstrate understanding.
- Clarifying includes asking questions to clarify confusion or ambiguity. Gibb argued that active listening can reduce defensiveness and increase the likelihood of finding a mutually acceptable solution to a conflict.

Humour is another effective strategy for managing conflicts in the workplace according to Romero and Cruthirds (2006), as it can reduce tension and enhance communication effectiveness. However, humour should be used appropriately and respectfully. Women tend to be more willing to compromise than men when resolving conflicts, as found by Dildar and Amjad (2017).

Understanding gender differences can significantly reduce communication frustration and misunderstandings between men and women. In Gray's (2003) view, recognising and respecting gender differences can reduce mixed-sex conflicts. He claimed that men and women handle problems differently; women talk about their difficulties to feel better while men tend to isolate themselves and think about solutions. Gray (2003) also noted that both genders approach conflict

resolution, forgiveness, and love differently. By acknowledging and accepting these differences, both genders can handle conflicts more effectively and foster more fulfilling relationships.

Gender Stereotypes

Stereotypes are simplified and standardised concepts that share the same beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours among people from the same culture (Teo, 2014; Samovar et al., 2015; Bright., et al., 2022). In particular, stereotypes are a reflection of cultural conventions and a person's thoughts and attitudes are shaped by their environment. These rules are transmitted from generation to generation through language, making them unified and clear.

According to Casad and Breanna (2017), there is a common belief that women are perceived as more friendly, inclined towards gossip, and skilled in discussing their emotions and relationships. On the other hand, men are often seen as competent, assertive, and direct. They are associated with discussing factual information, technology, and travel, and these characteristics are generally considered positive stereotypes for both genders.

According to Eddleston et al., (2006), children have a clear understanding of what constitutes appropriate attributes of their gender since childhood. Simply, parents show their children how they act from a young age, which is why men always feel dominant and powerful, unlike women. Furthermore, these traditional gender roles serve as rules for professional behaviour because they unconsciously govern how a person should communicate and act based on their gender. There are several forms of stereotypes that are shared by the majority of human beings.

Table 1*Common stereotypes of women and men based on psychological research*

Women's Traits	Men's Traits
Affectionate	Dominant
Appreciative	Achievement-oriented
Emotional	Active
Friendly	Ambitious

Note. Adapted from (Merchant, 2012)

Table (1) presents a summary of common stereotypes associated with women and men based on psychological research. These stereotypes reflect societal perceptions of the typical traits or characteristics attributed to each gender. Regarding women, the stereotypes include being affectionate, which implies warmth and nurturing behaviour. However, it is important to acknowledge that these stereotypes do not represent the full range of diversity and complexity within individuals of each gender.

Women are also commonly expected to be appreciative and express gratitude towards others. The stereotype of women being emotional suggests that they are more likely to openly experience and express their emotions. Additionally, women are often perceived as friendly, emphasising their sociability and inclination towards building relationships.

For men, the stereotypes include being dominant, which implies assertiveness, authority, and a desire for control. Men are also commonly associated with being achievement-oriented, driven by goals, success, and recognition. The stereotype of men being active highlights their inclination towards physical activity and energy. Furthermore, men are often perceived as ambitious, striving for success and seeking higher positions in their careers.

Language, Media and Gender

Language has a profound impact on how individuals view gender roles and identities. The way men and women act in the media and the language used by them to describe them can significantly impact how people perceive and interact with each other in their daily lives. Talk shows, in particular, are popular mediums for discussing gender issues. They often provide a platform for individuals to express their views on a range of topics related to gender roles and identity. Nevertheless, these shows can also reinforce stereotypes and perpetuate harmful attitudes toward men and women through their language.

Talk Shows

A talk show is an entertainment system that aims to be amusing and fun, but it can also function as a form of news interview when it focuses on important social, political, or moral issues. Talk shows create a virtual space that mimics physical environments, and they use a variety of tools such as cameras, body language, and decor to create an atmosphere of intimacy and trust with the viewers. The talk show format often involves personal stories and private life details of the guests or host, which further enhances this sense of familiarity with the audience (Ilie, 2001). In communication, the audience can be referred to using various terms, such as "the people," "the customer," "electors," or "women," among others. It is therefore essential to

consistently define the participation framework and communication goals to ensure that the audience is engaged to understand the message being conveyed.

Additionally, it is important to invite people who are familiar with the topic being discussed to ensure that the audience receives accurate and relevant information (Livingstone & Lunt, 1994; Sergio Straniero, 1999). In other words, having knowledgeable individuals as hosts or panels can help to improve the quality and effectiveness of the communication process. For instance, Steve Harvey, as a comedian, is well-suited to host talk shows that are meant to be humorous and light-hearted, such as *The Steve Harvey Show* or *Family Feud*. In another scenario, Hafid Darraji, a sports commentator, is an expert in sports and is likely to host sports talk shows, where he can provide insights and analysis on various sporting events.

Men and Women in Media

The underrepresentation of women in the media has been documented by Sharma (2013), who found that men's voices still dominate media outlets in most parts of the world. The Women's Movement has been instrumental in highlighting this issue (Danner and Walsh 1999; Malhotra & Rogers, 2000). Unfortunately, women's participation in media debates is often limited by news organisations, who either ignore them or dismiss them as emotional radicals (Len-Ros et al., 2005). Female journalists have also criticised the selection of newsworthy topics, as issues that are important to women are frequently ignored or relegated to minor sections (Van Zoonen, 1998). Additionally, Len-Ros et al. (2005) found that men are often portrayed as assertive, aggressive, and dominant on television, while women are more likely to be portrayed as communal, caring, giving, and sensitive.

Aspects of talk shows affecting language behaviour

The media, especially talk shows, play a significant part in our daily lives, providing information, entertainment, and social interaction. They often feature discussions between a host/moderator and guests/panellists on a particular topic whose language behaviour can be affected by many aspects of media including the audience, number of participants, and topic of discussion, and the host.

Number of Participants

The number of participants in a talk show can affect language behaviour in terms of the flow and structure of the conversation. A study by Goodwin (1986) examined how the number of participants in a conversation affected turn-taking behaviour by analysing the conversational behaviour of participants in two-person and larger group conversations and found that speakers in two-person conversations tended to engage in shorter turns and switch topics more frequently compared to speakers in larger groups. This suggests that in larger groups, speakers tend to take longer turns, resulting in more extended and in-depth conversations. The study's findings demonstrate that the number of participants in a conversation can indeed impact turn-taking behaviour, with larger groups tending to have different conversational dynamics than smaller groups.

Similarly, Schegloff's (2000) study showed that panel discussions involving multiple participants are less structured and more conversational than one-to-one interviews. The study found that such discussions often have a higher frequency of interruptions, overlaps, and turn-taking. Schegloff (2000) identified various techniques used by participants to manage overlapping talk, such as:

- Cutting off which involves one speaker interrupting another to take the floor and start speaking before the other has finished. This can be done by speaking louder, changing tone, or using interrupting phrases like *but*, *wait*, or *excuse me*. Cutting off can be perceived as impolite or disrespectful which is the same as overlapping, depending on the context and cultural norms.
- Pressing is a technique used to signal to the other speaker that the current speaker wants to continue speaking despite the overlapping talk. This can involve speaking faster, speaking over the other speaker, or repeating oneself to emphasise the point. Pressing can also be seen as impolite or interruptive in certain contexts.
- Backchanneling refers to the use of vocalisations or gestures like *mm-hmm*, *uh-huh*, or nodding to acknowledge the speaker and indicate understanding or agreement, even while the speaker is still talking. Backchanneling is a supportive listening strategy that helps manage overlapping talk without interrupting the current speaker.

The study also highlighted the collaborative nature of turn-taking in conversation, which is particularly relevant in panel discussions where participants must negotiate turn-taking and ensure equal opportunities to speak. In summary, Schegloff (2000) emphasised the importance of understanding language behaviour in panel discussions and the ways in which participants collaborate to manage overlapping talk and ensure a productive conversation. In our view, the recognition of the challenges posed by simultaneous contributions and actively working towards maintaining a productive conversation can enhance the overall quality of panel discussions and promote meaningful exchanges of ideas. By acknowledging and addressing these dynamics, participants can foster an inclusive and engaging environment that allows for diverse perspectives to be heard and valued.

The Topic of Discussion

The language and terminology used on a talk show varies depending on the topic of discussion. One study by Ali (2018) on how the language behaviour of hosts and guests in American and Iraqi TV talk shows is influenced by the topic of the show was done by analysing two talk shows, "The Doctors" in the United States and "Shabab Wbanat" in Iraq, and examining how the topics discussed on the show influence the language chosen by the hosts and guests. He noted that in "The Doctors" talk show, the topics discussed were related to medical issues, and the language used by the hosts and guests was often technical and medical in nature. In contrast, on the Iraqi talk show "Shabab Wbanat", which focuses on social and cultural issues, the language used was often more emotional and expressive, reflecting the topic of discussion. Through conversation analysis, he found that the language employed by hosts and guests on these talk shows varied based on the topic of discussion. This provides insights into how language use can vary depending on the topic of discussion, and how cultural and social factors play a role in shaping language behaviour. Nevertheless, it should be noted that this study did not explicitly consider gender as a variable. It focused primarily on the influence of the topic of the show on the language used by hosts and guests, and how cultural and social factors may shape language behaviour in different contexts.

Talk shows can also influence language norms in society. A particular word or phrase used frequently on a talk show may become more accepted or normalised in everyday language. Lakoff et al. (2004) argued that the way political issues are framed, or presented, can have a significant impact on how they are understood and discussed in society. Framing can be achieved through specific language or terminology. They referred to this as framing with language which means "getting language that fits your worldview. It is not just language. The ideas are primary

and the language carries those ideas, evokes those ideas" (p.4). In terms of shifts in language norms, talk shows can play a role in popularising certain language usage or promoting specific language norms. For example, if a talk show host frequently uses a certain word or phrase to refer to a particular issue or group of people; this can influence how viewers perceive that issue or group, and even affect how they speak about it in their own conversations.

In addition, emotional topics can also affect language behaviour. For example, discussing emotional topics can lead to changes in language style and usage, such as the increased use of first-person pronouns that have been linked to self-reflection and emotional processing. This suggests that language can be an effective tool for understanding how people cope with emotions. This has significant implications for mental health research and treatment (Pennebaker et al., 1997).

In our view, gender can influence individuals' perspectives, experiences, and attitudes, which can shape their contributions to the discussion. The diverse viewpoints and insights brought by individuals of different genders can enrich the conversation and offer a more comprehensive understanding of the discussed topic. The interaction of gender can manifest in various ways. Participants may bring their gendered personal experiences, societal expectations, or cultural perspectives to the discussion. These factors can influence how they perceive and interpret the topic, as well as the parts they share.

The Audience

The audience of a talk show can play an important role in shaping the language and behaviour of the host and guests by providing feedback. Talk show audiences are often encouraged to participate by giving feedback or reacting to what they are hearing. This can range from clapping and cheering to booing and heckling. The feedback provided by the audience can

influence how the participants speak, as they may adjust their language and behaviour to elicit a certain response from the crowd (Gumperz, 1982).

Additionally, Kiesler and Sproull's (1992) study on group decision-making and communication technology examined the role of the audience in shaping power dynamics. They found that when people communicate in a group setting, power dynamics emerge and influence how individuals communicate and interact with one another. Specifically, they found that individuals with a high level of status or authority in a group tend to speak more and are more likely to influence the group's decisions. In contrast, those with a lower level of status or authority tend to speak less and be less influential in decision-making. This study supports the idea that an audience can create power dynamics between the participants and the crowd. The participants may feel the need to express themselves in a way that maintains their power and authority over the audience, or they may try to connect with the crowd in a way that builds rapport and support.

Furthermore, the presence of a live audience can create performance pressure for the participants. They may feel compelled to speak in a certain way or use particular words in order to impress or entertain the audience. This can lead to more polished, rehearsed language behaviour, or it can result in mistakes and slip-ups if the pressure becomes too high. The study by Lumley and O'Sullivan (2005) supported this idea. In this study, the researchers found that test-takers performed differently based on the gender of the audience and the topic of the task. They observed that female test-takers in particular were more affected by the presence of an audience and that this effect was more pronounced when the topic of the task was deemed more personal. These findings suggested that the presence of an audience can lead to performance pressure and

that this pressure can affect language behaviour, as test-takers may adjust their language and behaviour in response to the audience.

The Host

The host of a talk show can influence the language used by individuals of both genders. The language used by the host, as well as the dynamics and atmosphere of the talk show, can shape how guests and participants interact and express themselves during the show, regardless of their gender. The host's language choices, tone, and style of interaction can affect the language behaviours of guests and participants, potentially affecting their communication patterns, expressions, and responses (Tannen, 1984).

To recapitulate, this section is an attempt to provide an overall explanation of gender differences in language use, as the latter became one of the crucial topics that have attracted many sociolinguists' attention. It includes its approaches, gender miscommunication and its conflict resolution in mixed-sex conversations, and gender stereotypes, which are the characteristics and styles used by each gender. Finally, it emphasises the impact of media on language behaviour, including its effects on both genders.

Section Two: Language Aspects

This section provides a detailed and insightful explanation of the language used by both genders in regard to vocabulary choices and phonetic features. Phonetic features refer to the various aspects of speech production, including voice quality, speaking rate, pauses, intonation, emphatic stress and the length of the turn. Meanwhile, vocabulary choices encompass a range of linguistic elements, such as adjectives, hedges, intensifiers, diminutives, borrowed vocabulary items, swear words, and tag questions. It is worth mentioning that the majority of the identified linguistic features are associated with the language used by women, as described by Lakoff

(1975). Meanwhile, other scholars such as Tannen (1991), Holmes (2013), and Coates (2013) have also noted several characteristics that may be associated with gender disparities in speech. By understanding the nuances of both vocabulary choices and phonetic features, we can provide a greater insight into how men and women communicate differently.

Phonetic Features

Phonetic features are crucial aspects of language that affect communication. These features include voice quality, speaking rate, pauses, intonation, and emphatic stress. They play an essential role in conveying meaning, emotion, and intention to others. Therefore, understanding how gender interacts with these phonetic features in different languages and cultures is crucial for reaching effective communication in various contexts. By being aware of gender-specific linguistic behaviour and how it impacts communication, we can develop more effective communication strategies that are sensitive to gender differences.

Speaking Rate

Speaking rate, defined as the speed at which an individual speaks, is an important aspect of phonetics (Laver, 1980). Speaking rate is a critical aspect of speech production, as it can affect the intelligibility of the speaker's message (Raphael et al., 2011). This means that the speed at which a person speaks is an important component in how well their message can be understood by the listener. In addition, Crystal (1969) stated that speaking rate has been shown to vary across languages, dialects, and individuals, making it a useful feature for identifying and distinguishing different speech communities (as cited in Hubers 1971).

One common method for measuring speaking rate is through the calculation of the number of words produced per unit of time including pause duration, which has also been used to assess speaking. For English, the medium speaking rate is a little over 200 words per minute

(Laver, 1980). Studies have shown that speaking rate can have a significant impact on the acoustic properties of speech, including fundamental frequency, duration, and intensity (Lehiste, 1970). For example, faster-speaking rates are associated with higher fundamental frequencies and shorter vowel durations, while slower-speaking rates are associated with lower fundamental frequencies and longer vowel durations (Lehiste, 1970).

Gender is known to be one of the factors that can affect speaking rate, as studies have shown that men and women tend to speak at different rates (Bradlow et al., 1996). Several explanations have been suggested for these gender differences in speaking rate, including physiological, social, and cultural factors. Physiologically men typically have larger vocal tracts than women, which may allow for faster speech production (Bradlow et al., 1996). In addition, hormones, such as testosterone, have been shown to affect speech rate, with men having higher levels of testosterone than women (Llamas, 2009). Social and cultural factors may also contribute to gender differences in speaking rate. For example, studies have shown that women tend to speak more slowly and with greater pitch variability than men, which may be due to cultural expectations of femininity (Kanki & Prinzo, 1996). In contrast, men may be expected to speak more quickly and assertively, leading to faster speaking rates. These gender differences in speaking rate also vary depending on the language; study of British English found women spoke slower than men, whereas this difference was not significant in Spanish and Italian (Llamas, 2009).

Pauses

Pauses, including filled and non-filled poses, are a crucial aspect of speech production and have been the subject of much research.

- **Filled pauses**, such as um, er, ah or uh, are phonetically reduced sounds that are often used in speech to signal a pause, to indicate hesitation and uncertainty, or to search for the next word (Laver, 1980, Clark & Tree, 2002). These filled pauses are more common in spontaneous speech than in prepared speech and can vary depending on factors such as the speaker's age, gender, and culture (Clark & Tree, 2002; Revis & Bernaisch, 2020).
- **Non-filled pauses**, on the other hand, are pauses that contain no linguistic material, such as silences between words or phrases (Laver, 1980). Studies have shown that non-filled pauses can be used for a variety of functions, such as signaling a change in topic or conveying a speaker's emotional state, or allowing the listener time to process what has been said (Duncan, 1972; Schegloff et al., 1977).

Some studies have found that women may use more filled pauses, such as um and ah, than men in certain contexts. For example, a study by Beattie and Butterworth (1979) examined the use of the aforementioned filled pauses among women in spontaneous speech. The researchers recorded and analysed conversations between male and female university students, and found that women used more filled pauses than men. They suggested that this difference could be due to socialisation and language learning, as well as differences in communication styles and goals between men and women.

Similarly, a study by Yuan and Liberman (2008) analysed a large corpus of speech from the US Supreme Court to examine gender differences in the use of filled pauses. The results revealed that female justices used more filled pauses than male justices, even after controlling for variables such as age, seniority, and case characteristics. They suggested that gendered socialisation and expectations surrounding language use may be contributing factors, with women facing greater pressure to display uncertainty or hesitation in their speech, and filled

pauses being seen as a way to signal politeness or deference in male-dominated contexts. The study highlighted the influence of social and cultural factors on linguistic behaviour and has implications for fields such as forensic linguistics and sociolinguistics.

Rising Intonation

Intonation is an essential aspect of speech that helps convey meaning beyond words themselves. It refers to the pitch patterns of speech, which can change the meaning of a sentence or phrase (Lehiste, 1970). According to Ladd (1996), "intonation refers to the pitch contour of an utterance - the way in which the pitch rises and falls over time"(p.6). The falling pitch is typically used to give a direct answer to a question, and the rising pitch is typically used to indicate uncertainty or doubt, or to ask for confirmation. In other words, intonation involves changes in pitch, stress, and rhythm that can convey different emotions, attitudes, and intentions.

Scherer (1986) proposed that intonation is one of the primary ways with which emotions are expressed in speech. He identified six primary emotions that are conveyed through intonation: anger, fear, sadness, joy, surprise, and disgust. In addition, intonation has been studied in relation to attitude and persuasion. For example, Zoghaib (2019) found that speakers who use more varied intonation patterns are perceived as more persuasive than those who use a monotone, and it demonstrates the direct relationship between intonation, attitudes, and persuasion. The study also showed how variations in intonation can affect the perceived credibility of the speaker, the persuasiveness of the message, and ultimately, the attitudes of the audience by manipulating the vocal quality of the speaker.

There are several types of intonation, including rising intonation. Johnson (2000) defined rising intonation as "a final intonation raises at the end of a sentence whose illocutionary force is declarative" (p. 38). Rising intonation is typically associated with questions but can also indicate

uncertainty or incompleteness in declarative sentences. Research shows that it is commonly used in polar questions and can be used to express doubt or seek confirmation (Gussenhoven, 2004; Ladd, 2008). Lakoff (1975) argued that rising intonation in declaratives is often used by speakers to seek affirmation, particularly women who tend to use it more frequently than men. She suggested that this may be due to societal expectations about women's speech patterns, where rising intonation can be seen as a way of expressing deference or seeking validation from others. Lakoff (1975) provided this example.

A: Which route are you going to take? □

B: Oh, I thought I would take Route 9? □

The interpretation that Lakoff discovered with is that B's intended meaning is requesting confirmation that route 9 is an appropriate route, and she seemed hesitant so the response from the speaker is in form of a question because the intonation is rising. An alternative interpretation is that B might have intended the utterance to either encourage the conversation to continue or to express a personal decision that is open to receiving comments but not open to negotiation (as cited in Jespersen, 1922).

Emphatic Stress

Emphatic stress is a type of stress placed on a particular word or phrase in a sentence to give it special emphasis. It involves the manipulation of pitch, tone, and stress to highlight the focal point of a sentence (Crystal, 2008). Emphatic stress is a way of drawing the listener's attention to a specific syllable or word with more emphasis than normal intonation or stress. It can also indicate the speaker's level of insistence about the topic being discussed. Additionally, it can highlight a syllable that would not typically receive stress, emphasising the speaker's choice between competing forms (Laver & John, 1994). In other words, emphatic stress is a type of

stress placed on a word or phrase in a sentence to emphasise its importance or significance. This is often done by changing the pitch, volume, or tone of voice when pronouncing the word or phrase, to draw attention to it and convey the speaker's intent or emotion.

While emphatic stress can be used by speakers of both genders, Lakoff (1975) argued that women's language differs from men's language in the use of emphatic stress. She suggested that women use it to emphasise their statements and signal their confidence and assertiveness when speaking. Women are socialised to be more tentative in their language use, which can make them appear less confident. To counteract this, women use emphatic stress to signal strength or highlight certain.

The Length of the Turn

The length of the turn is a fundamental aspect of human communication, and it is closely related to turn-taking. The length of the turn refers to the length of a spoken statement made by one person before either another person takes over the conversation, there is a pause, or another person speaks at the same time (Levinson, 1983). In another words, the duration of a speaker's utterance before they yield the floor to another speaker. It is included in this research due to its relatedness to gender and will only be treated from a temporal point of view which is phonetic in nature.

For example, women tend to take shorter turns than men, and people of higher social status tend to take longer turns than those of lower status (Goodwin, 1981). In addition, speakers often adjust their turn length based on the content and context of the conversation. For instance, turn length can be influenced by the type of interaction. In an interview study, Have (1999) found that interviewees tended to take longer turns than interviewers, perhaps because they were trying to present themselves in a positive light.

Vocabulary Choices

Different vocabulary items are used in unparalleled ways due to gender; they are crucial elements of language that impact communication. These items can be influenced by cultural and societal expectations, including gender norms and stereotypes, which can affect the meaning and be guided by the intention of the speaker. By comprehending how gender shapes language choices, we can enhance our ability to communicate effectively and respectfully with others in various settings and diverse contexts.

Empty Adjectives

Empty adjectives are a category of adjectives that can be used to express both their literal, specific meanings and the speaker's approval or admiration of the object of their discussion (Lakoff, 2004). These adjectives are related to emotional reactions related to the information being discussed. There are two types of empty adjectives, those used exclusively by women and others that are neutral. The classification of these adjectives is as follows:

Table 2

A list of neutral adjectives and women's language adjectives

Neutral	Women only
Great	Adorable
Terrific	Charming
Cool	Sweet

Note. Adapted from (Lakoff, 2004)

This classification appears to be a set of adjectives that could be used to describe a person or thing in a positive manner. However, it is notable that all of the adjectives listed in the neutral

adjectives may reflect more generic positive attributes, while the women only category is conventionally associated with femininity or traditional gender roles, such as sweetness, charm, and loveliness. This could be interpreted as perpetuating gender stereotypes and limiting the ways in which women are perceived and valued.

Another classification according to Panagiotidou (2015), is grouping adjectives of the basis of their connotation, which is the positive or negative value associated with them. Positive adjectives such as attractive, elegant, strong, and pretty can be used by both genders interchangeably since they convey positive qualities. This means, positive adjectives do not have specific gender connotations; they can be used to describe both males and females interchangeably, such as the word *موهوب* is not specified to one gender than the other. However, negative adjectives like *عود* (a negative adjective used to describe a tall girl in Arabic) are only appropriate when used by the same gender, as they can offend the opposite gender. This is because negative adjectives have negative connotations that men may not consider when using them. Women, on the other hand, are generally more sensitive and may use different adjectives to describe the same thing. For instance, women may refer to a tall lady as a model/*عارضه الزياء*. Additionally, Cholifah et al. (2013) observed that women tend to use empty adjectives when speaking to both genders, whereas men only use them when speaking to women (as cited in Al Qaisiya, 2017, p. 49).

Adjectives of Colour

According to Lakoff (2004), it is crucial to examine why discrimination disproportionately impacts women more than men, particularly in relation to adjectives of colour. Lakoff (2004) argued that it would be unreasonable to eliminate words such as mauve and lavender for women or require men to learn them since men are often unconcerned with things

that they perceive as being relegated to women. Similarly, when it comes to nuances of red, like scarlet, ruby, vermilion, rose, cherry, coral, and claret, men may be unable to distinguish between the various shades of red, whereas women can.

Panagiotidou (2015) conducted a study to analyse the use of adjectives in fashion magazines. In this study, different articles were selected, and the number of words and adjectives used in each article was counted. Adjectives were classified into connotative vs. neutral adjectives, colour terms and other categories. The connotative adjectives were further divided into positive and negative connotations. The results showed that there was no clear difference between magazines targeting men and women in relation to the use of adjectives of colour. The description in the magazine for men used neutral adjectives, while stereotypical female adjectives were used for women, and empty adjectives were not used at all. The use of positive connotation adjectives was overall higher in magazines targeting women, but this finding cannot be generalised as the study had limited primary material and data.

Hedges

In academic writing, hedges are words or phrases that are utilised to make an utterance less forceful or intense. They are used to show that a statement is based on sound reasoning rather than specific knowledge, which allows readers to participate in the discussion. In addition, hedges can reduce the impact of a statement, making it less strong. However, the use of hedges can sometimes cause confusion in language (Hyland, 1998; Prathratsint, 2015; Holmes & Wilson, 2022).

The hedge, according to Lakoff (1973), is used by women in order to avoid making any strong statements. Lakoff (1975) claimed that anyone who can use hedges lacks self-confidence, which everyone does at some point. For instance, (بالك انتم ا رأيكم صواب , بالك انا الغلط) can imply

uncertainty or doubt about the speaker's opinion or position.. Yet, Lakoff's impression is that women use it more because they are socialised to believe that asserting themselves strongly is not nice, ladylike, or even feminine, consequently; women tend to employ more hedges in their speech since women's language seems to include more expressions of *well,y'know*, and *kinda*. Men talk more, swear more, and provide angry orders to get things done. Women, nevertheless, use more hedges since they are less certain about their opinions. Women's terms, in general, are related to stereotypes (Coates, 2004; Newman et al., 2008; Holmes & Wilson, 2022).

Bradac et al. (1995) conducted a research to test who employs hedges among both genders since Lakoff (1975) claimed that women employ more hedges than men. However, the findings were completely opposite to what Lakoff stated, indicating that males use more hedges than females. In addition, men reported a relatively high level of hedge diversity, demonstrating a clear link between hedge use and maleness. The diversity finding may suggest that men have a deeper and more detailed understanding and familiarity of hedges.

Intensifiers

Intensifiers are related to one of the major categories of adverbs since adverbs alter verbs, and intensifiers specifically increase intensity (Pearce, 2007). Intensifiers are frequently used to draw attention away from the statement's cognitive meaning and toward its emotional message (Rahmawati et al., 2019). Masita et al. (2022) agreed that an intensifier could be used to make a statement stronger by emphasising its meaning, drawing the listener's attention to it, and making them take it seriously. According to Holmes & Wilson (2022), intensifiers are modifiers that emphasise or boost the meaning of another word or phrase.

According to Lakoff (1975), women use intensifiers more often than men do. This is referred to as women's language because certain modifiers are only related to women, such as

just, real, and really. Nonetheless, while the intensifier so is more frequent in women's language than in men's, men can still use it. As stated by Fuchs (2017), women use significantly more intensifiers than men. Nevertheless, this impact is only significant when social class and age are considered. In a nutshell, intensifiers are modifiers that add emotion to the word being modified, as well as emphasis and strength to the sentence. For example, (المائدة 98)

(اعْلَامُ كُفْرًا وَهُدًى بَعْدَ غُرُورٍ وَمُنْجَاتٍ) this signifies that Allah is harsh against those who violate
 ا ل a
 ا ل ا ل ا ل ا ل ا ل ا ل ا ل ا ل ا ل a
 ا ل ا ل a
 ا ل a

his sanctity and transgress his bounds; nonetheless, he is full of forgiveness and mercy to those who obey him and honestly repent. Intensifiers are effective for conveying information in a straightforward manner; they are more commonly applied to women due to their emotive nature. Males are assertive and direct, yet they do not use their emotions, which is why they use them less.

Fuchs (2017) conducted research on how age, gender, social class, and dialect influence how often British English speakers use intensifiers. Men use intensifiers less frequently than women in various age groups and social classes, according to the findings. This could be related to a shift in gender roles resulting in a more stereotypically feminine speaking style. The reported findings are based on a broad empirical framework and provide additional evidence that there are no clear-cut differences between female and male communicating styles in the sense that most females frequently use intensifiers, whereas most males rarely do. Gender variations in intensifier use, as examined in this study, become obvious only when combined with age and social class.

Diminutives

The diminutive function, defined as any morphological device that indicates at least small, is one of the grammatical primitives that appear to occur universally or nearly universally (Jurafsky, 1996). Schneider (2003) defined diminutive words as terms that convey smallness

while also possibly expressing an attitude. Depending on the precise interaction of linguistic and extra linguistic factors in a given context, the stated attitude might be positive or negative, i.e., affectionate or disparaging. In other words, a diminutive is achieved with adding suffix to a word to express affection or to denote that something is small.

Sifianou (1992) claimed that females use diminutives more frequently as markers of friendly, negative politeness and solidarity. Mattiello et al (2021) reported that pet owners use diminutives to express humour, affection, kindness, sympathy, empathy, and even paternal love, as in child-centred speech settings, women use diminutives more than men, especially when addressing children such as dearie, sweetie. For example, (بيزوتي او بيزوتي الشطورة), *my little smoochy darling* this is what the mother calls her daughter whenever she does something good to encourage her. Women are metaphorically compared to children since possibly both belong to the weaker side that needs guidance and the stronger side is always entitled to use diminutives. Women are perceived to be weaker and smaller than men, thus they seek guidance. (Mahmood K. M., 2017) found that adults use diminutives when talking to close friends, especially ladies who are talking to female friends and that women use more diminutives than men when talking about emotional things. Female speakers' diminutives are more likely to employ sympathetic or empathetic forms than male ones.

The study of how gender influences the use and acquisition of diminutives in language seeks to understand how diminutives may reflect or reinforce societal norms and expectations related to gender roles and identities. Dabašinskienė (2012) examined gender differences in the acquisition of Lithuanian diminutives by young children. The researcher found that girls tend to use diminutives more frequently and earlier than boys. In addition, girls also demonstrate an enhanced understanding of the nuances of diminutive use. Dabašinskienė (2012) explored

possible explanations for these gender differences, such as the influence of maternal speech and the role of gender socialisation. The findings suggested that gender plays a significant role in language acquisition, and that the use of diminutives can serve as a marker of gendered linguistic behaviour.

Borrowed Vocabulary Items

According to Trudgill (2003), borrowing refers to the process of incorporating terms from one language into another by bilingual speakers. These borrowed words eventually become integrated into the second language. There are two types of borrowed items: nativised and non-nativised. Nativisation occurs when borrowed words or phrases are adapted and modified to suit the phonological and syntactic patterns of the recipient language. This can lead to the emergence of distinct dialects or languages. For instance, the French word *libérer* (to free) becomes *libirewhom* in the Algerian dialect. The language that incorporates the borrowed items is known as the recipient language, while the language providing the items is referred to as the donor language (Iram et al., 2021). Conversely, Non-nativised borrowing according to Sergiivna et al. (2020) occurs when a word is directly adopted from another language without significant phonological or orthographic alterations, as seen with English *omelette* borrowed from French.

In a study conducted by Panhwar and Rajper (2023), the focus was on examining the reason behind the replacement of Sindhi vocabulary with English words through borrowing. The study revealed that the younger generation tends to use English more often while engaging in everyday conversations. The increasing use of English by children can be attributed to their exposure to technology, video games, and cartoons in English. The study highlights the fact that language is continuously evolving and cannot be confined to a particular region or culture. In

order to accommodate new technologies, language must also evolve by incorporating new words and expressions.

Swear Words

Swearing refers to utterances containing taboo words, which is the simplest explanation (Ljung, 2011). Basically, swear words are chosen based on the intensity of emotion conveyed by the particle, such as (*shit, damn*); as explained by (Lakoff, 1973). Sukendra (2021) added that swearing is one of the various strategies adopted by speakers to emphasise their speech with a variety of techniques and non-linguistic phenomena to express their strong feelings; In other words, individuals use swear words to express their strong emotions with a combination of intonation, stress, and voice tone, in addition to facial expressions; taboo language creates a strong impression when applied. Andersson & Trudgill (1990) stated that swearing refers to taboo words used with strength and targeted at oneself or another. These words are often derived from animals, sex, body excretions, and disease (as cited in Horan, 2013). The most recognised swear words in modern times fall into one of three fundamental categories: religion; sex and sexual body parts; and bodily secretion vocabulary. Briefly, taboo words represent unsuitable terms that respectable individuals would not utter in public (Hughes as cited in Stapleton et al., 2022).

Women are taught from childhood to use polite phrases and speak like a little lady, which is why swear words used by women are soft and they utter them only when getting angry, whereas men utilise them in their ordinary life discussions with each other, even the topic and setting influence individuals' styles. Many scholars believed that many self-respecting women learn to use phrases like dear and goodness (Lakoff, 1973; Bell, 1984; Lakoff, 2004). In addition

to that, Güvendir, (2015), claimed that males swear more because they are more aggressive due to having a smaller orbital frontal cortex than women which is a biological explanation.

To understand the interaction of both genders in a mixed-gender conversation, Nicolau & Sukanto (2014) conducted a study to identify who swears the most. However, the findings are at odds with what earlier researchers asserted. In mixed-gender groups of the same age, women use more swear words than men. Moreover, participants' exposure to swear words is clearly influenced by media such as movies and television. Kapoor (2016) reached the same conclusion. While female participants thought swearing was more inappropriate, they were exactly as likely as male participants to utter such words.

Tag Questions

Tag questions as defined by Yule (2010) are short questions in English made up of an auxiliary (don't, isn't) and a pronoun (it, you) and are placed at the end of a statement. Payne (2011) elucidated that tag questions, also known as question tags, are interrogative segments attached to an independent declarative clause that require confirmation or disconfirmation. Lakoff (1973) claimed that there are occasions where the speaker makes a claim but is not completely convinced of that claim; either there is a need or no need for confirmation, legitimacy, and emotions that could be personal or collaborative. Tag questions are part of the vocabulary choices in this dissertation because they can be expressed in a single word in Algerian Arabic. Occasionally, there is a specific answer that requires no discussion, such as "الجو ملووح اليوم الال؟". Both the speaker and the addressee know the answer, so there is no need for a debate.

Lakoff (1973) stated that women use tag questions more frequently to express uncertainty and avoid confusion with the addressee. This is an indication that the speaker lacks confidence. Furthermore, they use it when expressing opinions, eliciting agreement rather than asserting an

idea. Though, males prefer tag questions in more assertive forms and strong language (Yule, 2010; Jovanovic & Pavlovic, 2014). Simply put, because men are clear and assertive, they do not employ tag questions as much as women do since women are sensitive; their language is not direct and they feel insecure.

Apart from deciding who employs tag questions most among both genders. A second objective for several scholars was to determine if languages use tag questions the same way or differently. Jovanovic & Pavlovic (2014) conducted a study that compared the use of tag questions between males and females in a variety of languages including English and Serbian. According to the findings, both genders use tag questions equally in English which is different from Lakoff's claim. The study found that English speakers address both genders equally, but employ more polite language when addressing either gender, without a fixed form. On the opposite extreme, there is a fixed form of tag questions that are more commonly used by women in Serbian.

Conclusion

The analysis of language used in Algerian talk shows serves the purpose of examining the relationship between language and gender roles and stereotypes. By investigating vocabulary choices and phonetic features, which encompass specific linguistic elements, we aim to understand how these aspects of language reflect and reinforce societal expectations associated with gender. Scholars such as Lakoff (1975), Tannen (1991), Holmes (2013), and Coates (2013) have identified and discussed these linguistic elements, providing valuable insights into the ways and the reasons in which men and women communicate differently. Hence, we selected these specific vocabulary choices and phonetic features because they are widely recognised and discussed by scholars as common characteristics associated with gendered communication. By

focusing on these features, and through this analysis, we gain a more nuanced understanding of the distinct communication patterns and dynamics between genders, shedding light on the role of language in shaping and perpetuating gender-related norms and stereotypes.

Chapter Two: Methodology, Data Analysis and Discussion

This chapter focuses on the practical application of the reported literature review. It comprises three sections that cover various aspects of the research. The first section starts with the research design, followed by an explanation of the population and sampling technique employed. It further elaborates on the data extraction process and introduces the method of data analysis which in this case is directed content analysis. Then the second section presents the findings derived from the direct content analysis. It examines both the vocabulary and phonetic features observed in the selected talk show that are analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Additionally, it explores gender-related miscommunication. Lastly, the third section is dedicated to the discussion of the obtained data in relation to the research questions and assumptions. This section sheds light on the implications and interpretations of the findings, providing a deeper understanding of the research topic.

Section One: Methodology

This section is dedicated to outlining the methodological steps undertaken in the research.

The Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive research design that combines both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis. Descriptive research is utilised to provide an account of a situation, problem, phenomenon, service or program, community living conditions or attitudes toward a particular issue (Kumar, 2011). The study aims to systematically characterise the phenomenon of language use in terms of vocabulary choices and phonetic features across both genders in Algerian Talk Shows. This characterisation is based on existing patterns identified in the literature.

A mixed-method approach for data analysis is used based on the research objectives and questions presented earlier. This approach is the most appropriate because it involves using qualitative and quantitative research methods that focus on gathering, interpreting, and data (Punch, 1998) to comprehensively understand the distinctive speech features between males and females in *The Weekend Show*. The qualitative research method can help identify specific language features used by both genders, and examine the communication issues caused by gender in the TV show. On the other hand, the quantitative research method is used to count the rates, frequencies, and distributions of these features. A quantitative research method involves presenting the findings in numerical representations, accompanied by tables, diagrams, and figures, so this method can help identify patterns and trends that may not be immediately visible through qualitative methods alone (Punch, 1998). Therefore, a mixed-method approach would provide a comprehensive understanding of the distinctive speech features between males and females in the selected talk show.

Population and Sampling Technique

The population of interest for this study is Algerian talk shows that feature interactions between male and female participants because the aim is to investigate the language differences between males and females in a talk show involving both genders. To ensure the study's focus, three conditions were established. Firstly, the show should feature both males and females engaging in conversation. Secondly, the show should be recent and live because we are interested in the natural speech of interlocutors. Lastly, the participants should remain constant throughout the show's episodes, without any alterations. By establishing these conditions, the study can maintain a clear and precise focus on language differences between both genders in a specific context. The talk show *The Weekend Show* emerged as the only talk show that fulfilled all of

these requirements. Therefore, it was purposefully selected as the focus of our study, enabling to analyse a live talk show that provided an authentic representation of mixed-sex conversations and discussions.

In the selection of a sampling technique, Kumar (2011) highlighted the use of randomisation as a means to avoid bias in research. However, due to the prementioned criteria, random assignment was not feasible in this particular study. Instead, non-probability sampling techniques, especially purposive sampling, can be valuable in descriptive research when specific criteria or characteristics are desired to be focused on. With purposive sampling, individuals or cases that possess the desired qualities or attributes relevant to the research objectives can be deliberately selected (Punch, 1998). Therefore, purposive sampling, a form of non-probability sampling, was employed to select *The Weekend Show*.

Data Source

The Weekend Show, which airs live every Thursday at 9:30 pm on Ennahar TV, is an influential program that has quickly become popular among Algerians based on the number of views and the statistics that the host presents at the beginning of different episodes. The show has an equal gender representation with three female and three male panelists. Moufida Adess, a theatre performer from Guelma, Samia Taboush, an actress and social media influencer from Souk Ahras, and Nessima Djaffar Bay, a media personality from Algiers are the female participants, while Samir (Mister X), a blogger and youtuber, Yahia Tabich, an Algerian journalist, and Yassine Kentache, an Algerian journalist and television presenter are the male participants, with Kentache serving as the host of the show (these are coded in Table 3). The coding is done randomly without taking age or any other factors into consideration. Together,

they engage in discussions pertaining to topics of significance relevant to our generation (refer to Appendix A) for details about the topics covered in every episode.

In addition to the show's panel, occasionally, the show invites famous guests to join the discussion, adding to the program's diversity and depth. The episodes vary in length, with the shortest lasting 23 minutes and the longest lasting 2 hours, providing ample time for the panelists to delve deep into the discussed topics. The program has been on the air for five months but had to stop airing during Ramadan. Over the course of 21 episodes, the show's impact on the Algerian society can be seen in the show's diverse range of guests and topics, which reflect the country's cultural, social, and political situation. It is worth noting that since data is already available and not collected first hand, it is more appropriate to describe the data extraction rather the data collection process.

Data Extraction

The Weekend Show consists of 21 episodes covering various topics. In order to extract appropriate data, we aimed to ensure smooth and natural discussions among them, regardless of the topic's nature, therefore we carefully selected the topic with the longest duration from these specific episodes 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 18, allowing for more extensive discussions and the opportunity for participants to delve into the intricacies of the topics at hand.

Additionally, we intentionally excluded segments featuring guest speakers in specific episodes because their involvement was inconsistent, and we needed participants who were present in all episodes. This led us to exclude some lengthy topics where guests dominated the conversation, such as in episodes 1, 13, 15, 16, and 17. Instead, we focused our attention on shorter topics within these same episodes. By selecting topics that were less dominated by guest speakers i.e., we aimed to uphold the desired level of consistency and continuity in the

discussions. This deliberate choice allowed us to extract accurate and reliable data from the episodes, as the core participants were able to engage in a more balanced and uninterrupted dialogue. In addition, we utilised a mixed-method approach, analysing the data both qualitatively and quantitatively. For the quantitative analysis, we focused on episodes where all of the panelists were present, while for the qualitative analysis, we examined data from all selected episodes.

Furthermore, we made the decision to exclude some episodes from the analysis due to the central focus on guest speakers. In episodes 3, 11, 19, and 21, the discussions revolved primarily around the contributions and perspectives of the guest speakers, rather than the regular panelists we aimed to prioritise. By excluding episodes where guest speakers played a central role, we maintained a consistent focus on the core panelists who were present throughout all the episodes. For additional details regarding the numbers and titles of the topics discussed in the talk show, along with the duration of each topic in Appendix A

Method of Data Analysis

The research utilises one analytical tool which is described in detail below.

Content Analysis

To analyse the extracted data, a content analysis is employed. Content analysis is chosen to address the first three research questions, which focus on linguistic differences related to vocabulary choices and phonetic features in mixed-sex conversations. Hsieh and Shannon (2005) stated that content analysis is a research method that involves systematically coding and categorising text data to identify themes or patterns. It enables researchers to subjectively interpret the content of a text, web content, or film among others through a structured classification process, in which that categories are assigned to the text as a qualitative step, while

the quantitative step involves analysing the frequency of these categories. This combination of qualitative and quantitative methods allows for a comprehensive analysis of the data. Therefore, content analysis allows for the conversion of vocabulary choices and phonetic features into numerical data, facilitating the identification of patterns in language use among men and women and determining which features may contribute to miscommunication.

Hsieh and Shannon (2005) outlined three types of qualitative content analysis. The first is conventional content analysis, where categories for investigation are derived directly from the text rather than pre-existing theoretical perspectives. The second type is summative content analysis, which involves quantifying the frequency of specific words and expressions. The third type, which is employed in this study, is directed content analysis. In this type, researchers aim to validate or expand existing theories or research. The initial coding scheme is established based on a theory or prior research, and if new categories emerge in the text, additional coding categories are created. Therefore, in this research, the data analysis begins with established categories derived from the literature and previous studies mainly those of Lakoff (1975), Tannen (1991), Holmes (2013), and Coates (2013), and any newly identified categories from the sample are incorporated accordingly.

Procedures

To conduct a directed content analysis, the procedures outlined by Hsieh and Shannon (2005) are used as follows.

1. Based on previous research that has reported linguistic differences, including vocabulary choices and phonetic features influenced by gender, we have compiled a comprehensive list of expected patterns that are likely to be observed in the chosen talk show.

2. The various categories found in earlier research are defined in chapter one and are summarised in Appendix B, where each category is accompanied by a brief definition.
3. All the selected episodes of the show were thoroughly watched, and from these episodes, phonetic features and vocabulary choices were observed and extracted, and these details of these observations are provided in Appendix C. The data collected underwent a validation process by the supervisor to ensure accuracy and reliability.
4. In this step, during the analysis process, if a new category emerges that was not originally included in the predefined list, it is identified as a new category. In this study, three new categories related to vocabulary choices were identified: code switching and the use of jargon and foreign vocabulary items. These categories were not initially included in the analysis but were discovered during the examination of the data and we chose to include them because of their high frequency and consistency.
5. The findings are presented in a statistical format, allowing for a quantitative representation of the data.
6. In this step and during data interpretation, the main focus is drawing connections and meaningful conclusions from the identified patterns and themes, guided by the research objectives and existing theoretical frameworks. In the discussion of the findings, a decision is made regarding whether the new findings refute, refine, or enrich the existing literature, contributing to the advancement of knowledge in the field.

Section Two: Data Analysis

This section presents to the analysis of collected data.

Data Analysis Procedures

The collected data was subjected to an analysis involving frequencies, percentages, means (\bar{x}), and t-tests to check the statistical significance of the results using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (16.0). These numerical values were presented in tables within the analysis or in an Appendix D depending on convenience.

The logic underlying this analysis unravels separately for each investigated category through content analysis. For clarity, each category is presented and defined in the appendix B.

Subsequently, the data from both male and female penalists is analysed to identify the distribution of vocabulary items and phonetic features.

The Obtained Findings through Content Analysis

Apart from comparing the vocabulary choices and phonetic features in the speech of both genders, the aim of this analysis is to identify the instances of gender miscommunication caused by these linguistic elements, if any, and determine their frequency.

Table 3*Panelists and Features Coding*

Panelists	Codes	Miscommunication	Codes	Vocabulary Choices	Codes	Phonetic Features	Codes
Male Host MH	MH	Accommodation	ACC	Empty Adjectives	EA	Speaking Rate	SR
Male Participant 1	MP1	Interruption	INTER	Adjective of Colour	AC	Filled Pauses	FP
Male Participant 2	MP2	Indirectness	IND	Hedges	HED	Non-filled Pauses	NFP
Female Participant 1	FP1	Politeness	POL	Intensifiers	INT	Rising Intonation	RI
Female Participant 2	FP2	Prestige	PRE	Diminutives	DIM	Emphatic Stress	ES
Female Participant 3	FP3			Borrowed Items	BI	The Length of The Turn	LoT
Episode	E			Swear Words	SW		
Male	M			Code Switching	CS		
Female	F			Jargon	J		
				Foreign Word	FW		
				Tag Questions	TQ		

Table 3 provides an overview of the coding process and the key elements analysed, namely panelists, phonetic features, vocabulary choices, and miscommunication. This table serves as a valuable reference point for readers to understand the coding framework used in the analysis and to easily navigate the relevant information.

Phonetic Features

The following is the analysis of the aforementioned phonetic features.

Speaking Rate (SR)**Table 4***The distribution of speaking rate (SR) among panelists*

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total MSR	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total F SR
1	30	29	28	87	37	29	26	92
2	16	36	19	71	23	24	24	71
4	26	31	24	81	22	21	37	80
6	28	31	22	81	27	23	25	75
7	19	28	25	72	29	24	30	83
8	18	26	28	72	17	23	26	66
9	21	30	29	80	28	23	27	78
12	22	16	31	69	25	19	26	70
13	22	22	30	74	25	22	25	72
14	32	30	29	91	24	26	25	75
Total		778				762		
\bar{x}				78				76
SD				7.376				7.480

This table displays SR per 10 seconds for each individual in each E. Although SR is conventionally measured over one minute, the decision to use this shorter duration was made because some of the panelists' turns were very short as reported in (Appendix C) and also to reduce the impact of interruptions.

Overall, the total M SR was (778s) which exceeded that of F (762s). An independent sample t-test was used to determine whether this difference is valid. The independent sample t-test revealed that the difference between M SR ($\bar{x} = 78$, $SD = 7.376$) and F SP ($\bar{x} = 76$, $SD = 7.480$); $t(18) = .482$, $p = .636 > .05$ did not reach statistical significance (for the detailed results of the t-test refer to Appendix D), however closer analysis shows interesting qualitative gender differences.

The panelists' speaking rates were distributed differently across the Es, reflecting the impact of the topic discussed. Notably, the highest speaking rate among M panelists was

recorded at (91s), this coincided with the E 14 that exhibited the longest gap in speaking durations between M and F. Conversely, the lowest speaking rate of (69s) among M was observed in E 12. Similarly, F panelists displayed variations in their speaking rates, with the highest rate occurring in the first E (92s) and the lowest rate in a different E 8, which highlight how the specific topics influenced the panelists' pace of speech, resulting in faster or slower delivery depending on the circumstances.

It is equally interesting that in E 2 both genders showcased an intriguing equilibrium; they exhibited an equal contribution. Moreover, it was E 7 that emerged as a compelling juncture, where a great discrepancy arose as females exhibited a remarkable fluency with additional (11s) over the SR of males. Additionally, among male penalists, MP1 had the highest SR in E 2 (36s), demonstrating his ability to speak at a faster pace, and he also had the lowest SR in E 12 (16), possibly due to the use of filled pauses. The same was observed in the FP2; she had the highest SR among all female penalists and also the lowest one; 37s in E1 and 17s in E 8, respectively. This shows that every communicative event has its idiosyncrasies; the same person can speak fast or slow depending on circumstances.

SR can be explained in light of cultural factors and individual speaking styles prevalent among the penalists. First, cultural factors can play a significant role in shaping communication patterns. Gender roles, and socialization influence the way individuals express themselves. In certain cultures, males may be encouraged or expected to assert themselves more vocally and dominate conversations, leading to a higher speaking rate. On the other hand, females may adhere to other communication norms, which might result in a relatively lower speaking rate. Second, individual speaking styles also contribute to these differences. People have distinct personalities, communication preferences, and comfort levels when engaging in conversation. Some

individuals naturally speak more quickly or have a tendency to be more talkative, while others may take more time to formulate their thoughts or speak at a slower pace; this can be influenced greatly by the discussed topic.

Filled Pauses (FP)

Table 5

The frequency of the utilisation of Filled Pauses (FP) among penalists

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total M FP	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total F FP
1	4	12	7	23	6	5	7	18
2	14	5	5	24	3	9	2	14
4	16	17	11	44	6	6	10	22
6	7	5	2	14	4	3	8	15
7	9	16	6	31	11	2	8	21
8	4	7	4	15	5	0	11	16
9	3	9	8	20	3	2	7	12
12	6	15	0	21	9	4	4	17
13	9	2	1	12	1	4	5	10
14	13	19	2	34	5	9	9	23
Total		238				168		
\bar{x}				24				16
SD				9.998				3.919

It is interesting to note that the total FP count for males is 238, while it is 168 for females. The independent sample t-test shows that this difference among males and females is statistically significant; M FP ($\bar{x} = 24, SD = 9.998$) and F FP ($\bar{x} = 16, SD = 3.919$); $t(17) = 2.158, p = .04 < .05$.

Data reveals that contrary to the notion that males typically employ assertive and direct language without hesitation, the findings suggest that, on average, males actually use more filled pauses than females. Out of 10 Es, males outnumbered females in eight of them in terms of FP. This indicates potential hesitancy or uncertainty in their speech. Moreover, the data revealed significant in-group variations in terms of the frequency of FP. MP1 demonstrated the highest

frequency of FP, which may be attributed to his inclination to carefully select his words and gather his thoughts during speech. On the other hand, as the host, MH had additional responsibilities, such as guiding the discussion and providing spontaneous questions or remarks, which could explain his slightly higher usage of FP as he navigates the flow of conversation. MP2 and FP3 displayed a relatively lower frequency of FP, suggesting a more fluent and confident speaking style, contrary to stereotypical expectations. FP2 exhibited a slightly higher frequency compared to FP3. Furthermore, FP1 exhibited the highest frequency of FP among all panelists, likely influenced by her individual communication style and personal traits. Some panelists may have a communication style that includes more frequent FP as part of their natural speech pattern.

When considering gender differences in FP usage, in E 4, titled "الشهرة .. أطفال تحت المجهر", males exhibited the highest count of FP with a total of 44, significantly surpassing the 22 FP observed among females in the same E. This observation suggests that the topic discussed in E4 might have prompted males to engage in more frequent pauses as they grappled with expressing their thoughts or emotions. Contrastingly, in E14 entitled "الساعة" أعمال رمضان .. عدسات تجاري عقارب", females displayed the highest count of FP, while males had a relatively lower count. This indicates a shift in the dynamics, where females faced challenges in articulating their ideas or experiences, resulting in a higher number of FP. The specific topic of discussion in E14 likely contributed to this phenomenon, highlighting the potential complexity surrounding the subject matter for the female panelists. Interestingly, in E13 entitled "المعلمة المغدورة علمه حرننا فطعنها ظمرا .. الألسناذة ربحازة", both males and females exhibited the lowest count of FP. This suggests that the topic discussed in this E may have been more familiar to both genders, regardless of its nature.

As a result, panelists were able to express their thoughts about the subject with ease, leading to

smoother and more fluent conversations. These variations in FP usage among different Es and genders reflect the influence of the topic being discussed. It emphasises how certain subjects can evoke different levels of difficulty, emotional response, or familiarity for panelists, leading to fluctuations in FP frequency as they navigate through the complexities of communication.

Non-Filled Pauses (NFP)

Table 6

The frequency of the utilisation of non-filled pauses (NFP) among penalists

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total of M NFP	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total of F NFP
1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2
2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total		4				7		
\bar{x}				0.4				0.7
SD				0.516				0.674

Table 6 provides a detailed account of the count of NFP, allowing for a closer examination of gender differences in speech patterns. While males had a total count of 4 NFP, females exhibited a higher count of 7NFP. However, this difference is statistically insignificant as the independent sample t-test shows; M NFP ($\bar{x} = 0.4$, $SD = .516$) and F NFP ($\bar{x} = 0.7$, $SD = .674$); $t(18) = -1.116$, $p = .279 > .05$.

Despite the insignificance, the difference indicates that females, as a group, tend to have a higher frequency of interruptions or breaks in their speech compared to males which leads them

to remaining silent. Additionally, females may experience a greater tendency for pauses while expressing their thoughts or engaging in conversations.

Among the male penalists, MH and MP2 demonstrated a total of 2 NFP each, indicating occasional breaks or pauses in his speech. As the host, MH strategically incorporates non-filled pauses into his speech to allow penalists adequate time to understand and process his questions before responding. This practice ensures thoughtful and relevant answers, promoting clarity and meaningful exchanges during the conversation. MP2 may have used them to understand the content more effectively. MP1, on the other hand, did not display any NFP because it was discovered earlier that he is the one who relies on filled pauses most.

For females, FP1 notably had the highest count of 5 NFP, indicating a relatively higher frequency of breaks in her speech. For instance, in E 1 entitled “حياة المشاهير بين الواقع والمواقع” FP1 used non-filled pauses at specific moments in her speech. At 00:07:00, she said *les abonnées* يشريوهم..... يشريوهم and in 00:14:48 نؤولهاك مؤثر يجيا طيش م الكش مؤثر, she utilised pauses purposefully which are indicated with the ellipsis. By inserting these intentional pauses, FP1 created a momentary break in the conversation, drawing attention to the emphasised statements and giving the audience time to reflect and comprehend the significance of her words. This technique can enhance the impact of her message and facilitate better understanding among the listeners. The same pattern was observed in E 17 “فاجعة زلزال تركيا وسوريا .. الجزائر والجزائريون”; both FP1 and FP2 exhibited instances of NFP that coincided with moments of emotional expression. FP1 At 00:28:18 راح يكون مبدل شوي راح يكون and FP2 at 00:31:31 said *no comment* مؤدرتش نعلق عليهم مي, reflected their emotional response to the topic being discussed through NFP. These pauses can be seen as a natural response to the intensity of their emotions,

allowing them to gather themselves, express their feelings, and potentially allow the listeners to emphasise and process the emotional content being shared.

Rising Intonation (RI)

This feature was the least prevalent in all the analysed Es. Among the male penalists, there were only 5 cases of RI (refer to appendix E), even when taking the Es where some penalists were absent into consideration. MH and MP1 had two instances, and MP2 has only one. These penalists may adjust their intonation based on factors such as the relationship with the listener and the intended meaning or emphasis of their statement. Female penalists did not have any recorded instances of rising intonation.

MH, as the host, strategically utilised rising intonation to navigate sensitive topics and inquire about personal experiences indirectly. For instance, in E five, “الوجود التتمر .. شبح يطارد الزنوس“، at 00:05:20 MH used a rising intonation in \square نعرض بي لشيء في المهرجان ربما when speaking with FP1, who happens to be older. The choice of rising intonation could be attributed to the age gap between them, the gender difference and the sensitivity of the posed question with the male host aiming to avoid making FP1 uncomfortable during the conversation. By using rising intonation, he seeks to convey a sense of politeness and respect. This technique allows him to create a non-confrontational environment for penalists to share their personal experiences, fostering open and honest discussions.

In the context of this specific show, it is important to consider the cultural background of the penalists and how it may influence their communication styles since cultural norms can influence individuals' comfort levels and choices when it comes to using RI. RI may be more commonly used and accepted as a way to initiate or maintain a conversation. The fact that male penalists demonstrated a higher usage of RI on declarative could suggest that they were

employing itto convey politeness, invite agreement, or signal their willingness to engage in conversation with the other penalists. Another possibility is that it could imply that female penalists were more direct and assertive in their speech, expressing their ideas or opinions with a sense of confidence and certainty. They may have chosen not to use RI as they felt no need to seek confirmation or show uncertainty in their declarative statements, which is the main purpose of this feature.

Emphatic Stress (ES)

Table 7

The occurrence of the use of emphatic stress (ES) between both penalists

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total of M ES	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total of F ES
1	0	2	1	3	3	4	1	8
2	1	1	4	6	5	3	0	8
4	4	0	1	5	2	4	2	8
6	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	5
7	1	0	3	4	2	1	1	4
8	1	4	2	7	1	0	2	3
9	1	1	4	6	2	1	1	4
12	1	1	4	6	3	2	1	6
13	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	4
14	0	2	3	5	1	6	0	7
Total			47				57	
\bar{x}			8				6	
SD			4.700				5.700	

Table 07 reveals a difference in the use of ES between males and females, which did not reach statistical significance. The independent sample t-test yielded that M ES ($\bar{x} = 8$, SD = 4.700) and F SP ($\bar{x} = 6$, SD = 5.700); $t(18) = -1.244$, $p = .230 > .05$.

The total count of ES for males is 47, while females have a higher count of 57. i.e., ES is more frequent in their speech compared to males in the data provided. Observing table NUMBER

further, it can be seen that among the male penalists, MP2 surpassed the others with 24 instances, showcasing his confident, expressive, and passionate communication style. MP1 and MH had close values, 12 and 11, respectively. MH's behaviour is influenced by his host role in guiding and emphasising important points during the show.

For instance, in E 4 at 00:02:30 in the utterance 'حساس و'اجم'ول', MH used ES stress to highlight specific words related to the topic being discussed. This intentional emphasis draws attention to their significance and indicates the specific areas of focus in the conversation to ensure that they receive the necessary attention from the penalists.

On the other hand, among female penalists, FP2, FP3, and FP1 demonstrated 26, 21, and 10 occurrences of ES. The lower frequency in the speech of FP1 suggests that she is more selective and her communication style is more reserved compared to that of FP3 and FP2, who use ES to confidently emphasise their points.

It is worth mentioning that in Es 15 and 16, males did not use ES at all, while females only did not use it in E 16. This suggests that there are Es where ES is more prevalent among females than males.

Length of the Turn (LoT)**Table 8***The distribution of turns, the length of turns (LoT), and the mean (\bar{x}) among male penalists*

E	MH			MP1			MP2		
	Total LoT	N° of Turns	Mean LoT	Total LoT	N° of Turns	Mean LoT	Total LoT	N° of Turns	Mean LoT
1	139	6	23.2	132	3	44	96	2	48
2	150	6	25	174	3	58	314	4	78.5
4	53	1	53	266	3	88.6	309	4	77.25
6	194	7	27.7	173	2	86.5	148	2	74
7	66	3	22	240	3	80	268	3	89.3
8	176	5	35.2	115	2	57.5	173	3	57.6
9	138	9	27.6	177	4	44.25	247	4	61.75
12	79	5	15.8	144	3	48	225	2	112.5
13	159	5	31.8	35	1	35	89	2	44.5
14	194	5	38.8	455	9	50.5	523	7	74.7
Total	1348	52	/	1911	33	/	2392	33	/
\bar{x}	/	5	30	/	3	59	/	3	72
SD		2.149			2.162			1.567	
	Total LoT of Males			5651	LoT Mean of Males			53.685	
	Total N° of Turns of Males			118	N° of Turns Mean of Males			4	

Table 8 presents data on the number of turns and the LoT for each male penalist. The Total LoT column represents the total duration spoken by each penalist, while the N° of Turns column indicates the number times each penalist participated per E. The mean LoT column presents the average duration of the turn.

Upon examining the data, we can observe that MH had a total LoT of 1348s, with an average duration of (30s) per turn. He had a total turn count of 52 which is the highest among males, resulting in an average of 5 turns per E. This suggests that MH's role as the host primarily involves asking questions and providing comments rather than engaging in lengthy monologues. MP1, on the other hand, accumulated a longer total LoT of 1911s, with an average duration of (59s), yet a lesser number of turns (33), resulting in an average of 3 turns per E. This indicates

that MP1 takes more time to express his thoughts during the conversation, despite having a shorter number of turns. Although MP2 had the same numbers of turns (33), like MP1, his total LoT (2392s) was longer resulting in the longest average duration in every turn (72s) per E. MP2 demonstrates a tendency to have more prolonged speaking turns compared to the other penalists. He engages in more in-depth conversations.

Table 9

The distribution of turns, the length of turns (LoT), and the mean (\bar{x}) among female penalists

E	FP2			FP3			FP1		
	Total LoT	N° of Turns	Mean LoT	Total LoT	N° of Turns	Mean LoT	Total LoT	N° of Turns	Mean LoT
1	205	5	41	303	4	75.75	167	3	55.6
2	162	2	81	285	3	95	102	2	51
4	143	3	47.6	275	2	137.5	141	1	141
6	82	2	41	206	2	103	163	2	81.5
7	74	3	246	129	1	129	108	2	54
8	149	4	37.25	14	1	14	196	3	65.3
9	182	3	60.6	244	3	81.3	291	4	72.75
12	135	3	45	272	3	90.6	156	3	52
13	84	1	84	69	1	69	55	2	27.5
14	220	5	44	388	3	129.3	515	7	73.57
Total	1436	31	/	2185	23	/	1894	29	/
\bar{x}	/	3	73	/	2	92	/	3	67
SD		1.287			1.059			1.663	
	Total LoT of Females			5515	LoT Mean of Females			77.54	
	Total Count of Females Turns			83	Females Turn Count Mean			3	

Table 9 presents comparable data across females to that of males. Upon analysing the data, it becomes apparent that significant disparities exist in the speaking patterns of FP2, FP3, and FP1. FP3 registered the longest total LoT of 2185s, albeit with the lowest number of turns (23), averaging 2 turns per E. FP2, have accumulated a total LoT of 1436s across 31 turns, leading to an average of 3 turns per E and demonstrated an average LoT of 73s. Followed by FP1 whose total LoT amounted to 1894s, encompassing 29 turns with an average of 3 turns per E, yielding

an average turn length of 67.422 seconds. Hence, it is noticeable that FP3 contributed with more extensive and detailed utterances, evident in her comparatively higher mean LoT, whereas FP2 and FP1 tended to engage in more frequent yet brief turns.

Table 10

Comparison of number and length of turns: male vs. female panelists

E	Total LoT		Total N° of Turns	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	367	675	11	12
2	638	549	13	7
4	628	559	8	6
6	515	451	11	6
7	574	311	9	6
8	464	359	10	8
9	562	717	17	10
12	448	563	10	9
13	283	208	8	4
14	1172	1123	21	15
\bar{x}	565	551	12	8

The provided table presents a comprehensive comparison of the speaking patterns between males and females based on the number and LoT. The independent sample t-test shows that the difference among males and females in terms of LoT is statistically insignificant; M LoT ($\bar{x} = 565$ SD = 241.052) and F SP ($\bar{x} = 552$, SD = 256.567); $t(18) = 17.930$, $p = .904 > .05$; however, it is statistically significant for the number of turns; M N° of turns ($\bar{x} = 12$, SD = 4.185) and F N° of turns ($\bar{x} = 8$, SD = 3.302); $t(18) = 17.075$, $p = .04 < .05$.

Close comparison highlights that females have longer average LoT compared to males. However, males had a higher average turn counts per E. These findings suggest that females tend to engage in more detailed and elaborate discussions during their turns, while males tend to participate more frequently and briefly. Traditionally, there is a societal expectation that males dominate conversations and take up more speaking time, while females are expected to have

shorter and less frequent contributions. However, the data reveals a different reality, indicating females' inclination towards in-depth and elaborate discussions. These findings challenge the stereotype that females only engage in brief and superficial conversations. It highlights the valuable contributions and the level of thoughtfulness that females bring to the discourse. For instance, in E 10, titled "عہلیات التجمیل ... ہوس بقود المشاہیر إلی غرف العہلیات", females exhibited remarkable dominance. This suggests a particular interest and expertise among females in discussing the topic of cosmetic surgeries, reflecting a gendered preference. Likewise, E 18, "الغرف المظلمة... إفل ما یحدث فی کوالیس عہلیات التجمیل", presented a similar pattern. Details of LoTs and counts in entire Es for M and F panelists are in Appendix E.

Vocabulary Choices

Here is the analysis of the previously mentioned vocabulary categories.

Empty Adjectives (EA)

Table 11

The representation of Empty adjectives (EA) in the show among panelists

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total MEA	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total FEA
1	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	3
2	3	0	2	5	2	3	2	7
4	1	0	4	5	1	1	1	3
6	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4
7	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	3
8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
9	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	2
12	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	1	3	2	6	3	1	1	5
Total		26				30		
\bar{x}				3				3
SD				2.271				2.000

Table 11 illustrates the frequency of EA usage by both genders. The difference between them was statistically insignificant; the independent sample t-test result is M EA ($\bar{x} = 3$, $SD = 2.270$) and F EA ($\bar{x} = 3$, $SD = 2.000$); $t(18) = -.418$, $p = .681 > .05$. Notably, there is no substantial disparity among females in their use of EA since females relate to the same object using different terms; they are almost distributed equally. However, a noticeable discrepancy exists among males, primarily MP1; employed them only six times, followed by MH, and then MP2 who used them the most. MP1 used specific EA that describe several things, contrarily MH and MP2 use words precisely and accurately. This is a crucial skill for journalists, as it allows them to communicate ideas clearly and accurately.

In E 5 featuring the topic of "النزهر" (bullying) a significant usage of EAs by several penalists, including FP2, FP1, and MP2 were noticed due to this sensitive and emotional subject. Some EA were; negative adjectives that can be hurtful. FP2 used EA like طويل (tall) and "زرانة" (giraffe), while FP1 used "طويلة" (tall) and "بقرة" (cow) to describe the negative effect of these adjectives on the person being bullied as such and that topic generally. MP1 employed EA such as باشعة (ugly), طويل (tall), and قصير (short) for the same reason. It is worth noting that this type of negative EA is typically used by males. However, during this E, FP1 shared an incident where someone of the same gender addressed her using the word بقرة (cow) which is atypical.

On the other hand, positive EA were used by various penalists, including MH and FP3, with terms like مشهور (famous) and جميلة (beautiful). These positive EA were used interchangeably by both genders. Interestingly, in E 13 and E 16, which tackled significant topics, EA were not randomly employed by the penalists. Hence, the usage of EA is predominantly influenced by the specific topics discussed in each E. Penalists tended to employ them more frequently when engaging in sensitive or emotional topics. The choice of positive or negative EA can vary depending on the context and the impact they are intended to

convey.

Adjectives of Colour (AC)

Throughout the analysed Es, there is a remarkable absence of the use of colour adjectives. The topics discussed in the Es did not involve conversations where colour related terms would be relevant. For instance, in the context of E 17 "تركيا زلزال فاجعة"

"پنض امنون والجزائريون الجزائر .. وسوريا،" the mention of the red crescent and the green number carries symbolic meaning and represents conventional terms. These terms have established meanings and associations that are widely recognised and understood by various communities. While colour adjectives may not feature prominently in these Es, the understanding of colours as a medium of communication remains indispensable.

Hedges (HED)

Table 12

The distribution of Hedges (HED) among panelists

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total of M HED	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total of F HED
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2
4	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
13	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total		6				4		
\bar{x}				.6				.4
SD				.843				.699

Table12 provides a comprehensive analysis of the differences in the use of HED between males and females. Overall, the total of males was observed to use HED six times, while females

utilised HED four times, yet this difference is not statistically significant; M HED ($\bar{x} = .6$, $SD = .843$) and F HED ($\bar{x} = .4$, $SD = .699$); $t(18) = 17.403$, $p = .57 > .05$. Since the use of HED serves as a linguistic strategy for softening language and mitigating directness in communication, findings revealed that males, displayed a greater tendency to employ HED in their speech when addressing females.

Certain individuals, namely MP2 and FP2, consistently demonstrated a lack of HED in their communication throughout the Es. This can be attributed to their direct and assertive communication styles, which align with prevalent gender stereotypes. MP2, as a male participant, adhered to the stereotype of employing more direct and assertive language by not utilizing HED. However, it is noteworthy that FP2, a female participant, also diverged from the expected communication pattern for females by not employing HED. Her use of assertive language challenges the conventional perception and can be considered a departure from the stereotypical gender role.

On the other hand, MH and FP3 are the individuals who utilised HED the most. MH, as the host, effectively incorporates HED to soften language, as demonstrated in E 15 “والدمش عودين” and “السحرة عن تبليغ حملة” when asking FP3 a question about a sensitive personal experience. FP3 appreciated his use of HED as a sign of respect and kindness, allowing for a more relaxed response. Similarly, FP3 herself employed HED when discussing her disappointment with her friends in E 12 saying “بالك انا زبدأ من ادفة وبن انعرض” highlighting the importance of HED in conveying her feelings. Furthermore, FP1 and MP2 exhibited a similar frequency of hedge usage but in different Es, indicating that the use of HED is subject-dependent. For instance, MP2 employed HED when discussing celebrity marriages, choosing softer language rather than directly accusing the media. Conversely, FP1

utilised HED in E 17 "فاجعة زلزال تركيا وسوريا .. الجزائر والجزائريون بنضامون" to emphasise the need for unity and support during challenging times. Ultimately, the number of HED was very small and inconsistent across both gender, that is why it is analysed qualitatively case by case.

Intensifiers

Table 13

The distribution of Intensifiers (INT) among panelists

E	MH	MP1	MP2	Total of M INT	FP2	FP3	FP1	Total of F INT
1	3	1	3	7	3	1	3	7
2	1	2	3	6	2	4	3	9
4	1	3	6	10	2	4	3	9
6	2	0	2	4	2	1	2	5
7	2	3	5	10	2	1	2	5
8	1	2	3	6	2	1	0	3
9	2	1	6	9	4	4	2	10
12	1	2	4	7	2	1	2	5
13	3	0	1	4	1	1	1	3
14	4	3	4	11	1	4	2	7
Total		74				63		
\bar{x}				0.4				0.7
SD				0.516				0.674

Table13 shows that both male and female penalists on the show use INT in their speech leading to the absence of statistically significant difference. The independent sample t-test shows M SR ($\bar{x} = 7, SD = 2.503$) and F SP ($\bar{x} = 6, SD = 2.497$); $t(18) = 18.000, p = .33 >.05$.

Throughout the analysed extracts, males used 74 INT, while females used 63. This suggests that both genders engage in the use of INT to emphasise or intensify certain aspects of their speech.

these Es In both E 1, "والحوافع الواقع بين المشاهير حياة", and E 15 "حملة تليغ عن السحرة والمشعوذين", the penalists of both genders used the same number of INT. This suggests that the topic of

was significant and delicate, emotionally charged, and involved passionate debates leading to increased use of INT by both male and female penalists.

It is interesting to observe that Es 14 and nine had the highest number of INT used by males and females, respectively. In E 9, entitled "مجهولون افتراضيا حاضرون .. المواقع نجوم واقعيًا،" females utilized the most INT, with 10 occurrences. This can be attributed to the sensitive nature of the topic being discussed. On the other hand, in E 14 entitled « أعمال رمضانية .. عذسات تجاري .» "عقارب الساعة،" males used the highest number of INT. This E focused on Ramadan-related programs and provided an opportunity for the male penalists to express their thoughts and opinions with greater emphasis. The use of INT by males in this E may reflect their natural communication styles, which could be influenced by their personal backgrounds and experiences. Overall, the use of INT by both males and females in the show reflects their desire to emphasise certain points, express passion and emotions, and engage the audience in meaningful discussions.

The Classification of the use of Diminutives (DIM) among panelists

In the analysed extracts, DIM was not commonly used. They were used only in E 4, "المجهر تحت أطفال", by FP1. She used a DIM term "طنبلة" to refer to a young girl whose story she shared. The use of this term served multiple purposes in this specific context. FP1's choice was intended to evoke a sense of empathy and connection with the young girl's experiences. By using this term, she additionally conveyed her understanding of the girl's vulnerability and the challenges she faced. It also showcased FP1's maternal instincts and her ability to relate to the girl on a more personal level.

Furthermore, the use of the term highlighted the girl's young age and emphasised the importance of recognising and addressing the specific difficulties faced by children. It served as a reminder to treat children with respect, kindness, and consideration. FP1's actions and words

demonstrated the significance of empathy and creating a positive environment for children, highlighting the impact that adults can have on their lives.

Borrowed Vocabulary Items (BI)

Table 14

The distribution of Borrowed Vocabulary Items (BI) among males penalists

E	MH		MP1		MP2	
	Nativised	Non-nativised	Nativised	Non-nativised	Nativised	Non-nativised
1	3	7	3	2	1	7
2	5	5	2	6	0	2
4	2	14	1	11	3	13
6	2	5	1	8	4	3
7	4	8	5	12	5	11
8	0	4	1	4	0	5
9	3	5	2	4	3	6
12	0	1	0	2	2	4
13	1	4	0	3	0	0
14	1	7	3	7	0	6
Total	21	61	18	49	18	57

The table offers a comprehensive explanation regarding the usage of borrowed items by male penalists. All of them use a significant number of non-nativised BI than nativised ones due to their educational level. MH, as the host of the show, predominantly employed more BI of both categories. His choice of Nativised BI is influenced by his role in addressing various topics relevant to the Algerian society, ensuring understanding among viewers of different age groups, as exemplified in E 1 "حياة المشاهير بين الواقع والحواقع" where he used terms like *Iblouka*, *Boukitouch*, and *Mbloukiya*.

Additionally, MH extensively incorporated non-nativised items, utilising them 61 times, especially in E 4, "الشهرة .. أطفال تحت المجهر", where he included terms like *studio*, *reaction*, *Madame*, and *des comptes*. MP2 similarly mentioned non-nativised terms such as *compte*,

TikTok, les magazines, reflecting their relevance to the discussed topics. For example, MP2

specifically chose TikTok due to its popularity among children, even though it is a relatively new application. MP1, in E 7, "احتيال، ابتزاز وتهديد .. هذا ما يحدث على السوشل ميديا" shared his personal experience and incorporated terms like *CCP*, *la poste*, *tournage*, which are context-specific to the topic under discussion.

Overall, M penalists employ nativised and non-nativised borrowed items as a means of effective communication. Nativised terms are used to enhance understanding among diverse viewers and provide a sense of inclusion, while non-nativised terms are employed based on their relevance to specific topics and their familiarity in contemporary society.

Table 15

The distribution of Borrowed Vocabulary Items (BI) among females penalists

Es	FP2		FP3		FP1	
	Nativised	Non-nativised	Nativised	Non-nativised	Nativised	Non-nativised
1	1	5	6	11	1	3
2	0	1	2	5	1	4
4	1	3	0	2	2	5
6	2	0	1	7	0	0
7	1	1	2	4	1	4
8	0	0	0	0	3	0
9	0	2	1	3	2	3
12	0	1	0	1	1	1
13	1	0	0	0	1	3
14	0	0	2	5	2	6
Total	7	13	14	38	14	29

Table15 provides a detailed explanation of using both nativised and non-nativised BI by females. According to the findings, FP1 and FP3 used the same amount of nativised BI, such as *Sinaryouhet*, *Npartagie*, and *Bloukiwni* in E one However, FP2 used half of them. Since FP2 is a journalise and she was influenced by social media she did not use nativised borrowed items.

On the opposite extreme, there are topics that do not tolerate the use of nativised BI, such as in the E 10 “عمليات التجميل .. هوس يقود المشاهير إلى غرف العمليات”. Because this topic is too particular and limited in scope to be nativised, penalists should be able to understand it without translations. Furthermore, because it is related to beauty and cosmetic surgery, the terminology used is likely to be recognisable to female penalists. Overall, FP three used the most non-nativised words. Even when comparing each E, notably in E 1 *حياة المشاهير بين الواقع والمواقع*, she used 11 times. These included *Instagram, restaurateur, facilement, and bonjour*.

On the other hand, both FP1 and FP2 used them to a lesser extent. In E 6 *الحياة المزينة .. بداية*, the topic does not belong to any particular category, which is why they do not include non-nativised items. FP2 and FP1 prefer native Arabic language, which are more natural for listeners. This helps to create a more comfortable atmosphere and allows for smoother conversations.

Table 16

Comparing Nativised and Non-Nativised Borrowed Items: Male vs Female Penalists

E	Nativised BI		Non-Nativised BI	
	M	F	M	F
1	7	8	16	19
2	7	3	13	10
4	6	3	38	10
6	7	3	16	7
7	14	4	31	9
8	1	3	13	0
9	8	3	15	8
12	2	1	7	3
13	1	2	7	3
14	4	4	20	11
Total	57	34	176	80
\bar{x}	6	3	18	8
SD	3.945	1.838	9.890	8.000

The independent sample t-test shows that there is no difference between M and F in the use of nativised BI; M nativised BI ($\bar{x} = 6$, $SD = 3.945$) and F nativised BI ($\bar{x} = 3$, $SD = 1.838$); $t(18) = 12.730$, $p = .112 > .05$. However, the same test shows that the difference among M and F is statistically significant in the use of non-nativised BI; M non-nativised BI ($\bar{x} = 18$, $SD = 9.890$) and F non-nativised BI ($\bar{x} = 8$, $SD = 8.000$); $t(18) = 13.794$, $p = .01 < .05$. Males use BI more frequently due to their social and environmental conditions.

The use of French words in the Algerian community can be attributed to historical and sociocultural factors. Algeria was a French colony for many years, and the French language had a significant influence on the country's linguistic landscape. As a result, French words and phrases have become integrated into the Algerian vernacular, particularly in domains such as education, administration, and everyday conversation. The use of French words can serve as a means of expressing cultural identity, bridging the gap between Algeria's colonial past and its present, and reflecting the multilingual and multicultural nature of Algerian society.

Swear Words (SW)

The use of SW is generally seen as a sign of disrespect and is often considered offensive or aggressive in nature. In the show, there is no sign of SW, and this indicates that the penalists on the show adhered to a standard of language that avoids the use of offensive or disrespectful words. This aligns with the cultural norms and expectations of using appropriate and respectful language in public discourse. In many societies, including ours, individuals are taught from a young age to avoid using such language. This expectation of refraining from SW applies to people in positions of influence, including those who appear on television shows.

In the context of the show, cultural norms and societal expectations play a significant role in preventing the use of swear words in interactions, especially in mixed-sex conversations. In many cultures, there are established codes of conduct and standards of

communication that prioritise respect and politeness. Using swear words in such interactions would be considered inappropriate and would likely lead to negative reactions from the penalists and the audience. As the individuals appearing on the show are well-educated and famous public figures, there is an added responsibility for them to use appropriate and respectful language when discussing issues and speaking in public. They are expected to set an example for others in the community and demonstrate the use of respectful and non-offensive language.

Furthermore, the presence of mixed-sex conversations on the show serves as a deterrent to the use of SW. In many cultures, there is a general understanding that using offensive language in the presence of the opposite sex is disrespectful and inappropriate. Penalists on the show are likely aware of these cultural norms and would exercise caution in their language choices to maintain a respectful and inclusive environment.

Tag Questions (TQ)

TQ are distributed equally among both genders and they are very little, three each. However, males and females used them in different contexts and for different reasons. Yacine, in particular, used TQ when addressing females more specifically. For example, he used it when he was unsure "publicités des الف يجيب الالف هو لكي بدير" and "و ال اني غلط, les commandes" about a claim he made. As the host, using TQ in this context could be a way to seek confirmation or prompt further discussion. This could indicate his preference for engaging others in conversation and seeking their validation. Another observation was that MP2 and FP2 did not use TQ during their speech. TQ are often associated with seeking validation or confirmation, and their absence in MP2 and FP2's speeches could indicate that they were confident, assertive, and did not feel the need to seek agreement or affirmation from others.

In the case of FP1 and MP1, their limited use of TQ across the analysed data, can be related to the specific topics they were discussing. For example, episode 2 intitled "وهم الحياة",

(يعني) حبيت زهد رأي ذا ؟، وهمكم ذا، TQ MP1 used the "السعيدة ... الزواج من الوسط الفني بين indicates politeness in expressing his opinion. Using TQ varies depending on the context and individual communication styles.

New Categories

During the analysis, the following new categories were explored. The newly added categories are classified into code switching (CS), jargon (J), and foreign words (FW). First and foremost, code switching is classified since penalists switch between Arabic and French during their speech. Secondly, there are words that pertain exclusively to one field, namely jargon. Additionally, there are other categories that neither belong to BI, CS, nor J. They are categorised under FW and divided into French and English words.

Code Switching (CS)

Table 17

The distribution of Code Switching (CS) among male and female panelists

Episode	Yacine	MP1	MP2	Total of M CS	Nassima	FP3	FP1	Total of F CS
1	12	9	9	30	13	15	5	33
2	7	29	1	37	6	4	3	13
4	4	5	7	16	15	3	2	20
6	7	5	3	15	3	11	4	18
7	9	5	5	19	9	7	5	21
8	4	7	3	14	11	4	4	19
9	7	20	5	32	10	4	3	17
12	5	9	2	16	8	6	2	16
13	0	3	0	3	6	0	3	9
14	4	27	8	39	5	10	6	21
Total		221				187		
\bar{x}				22				19
SD				11.704				6.272

Table 17 presents a detailed analysis of the updated data concerning CS. It reveals that M utilised CS more than FM. However, the independent sample t-test shows that this difference is statistically insignificant; M CS ($\bar{x} = 22$, $SD = 11.704$) and F CS ($\bar{x} = 19$, $SD = 6.272$); $t(18) = 13.776$, $p = .42 > .05$.

The lowest number of CS occurrences among M and F during episodes where all penalists were present was observed in episode 13, entitled "المغذورة علمه حرننا فطعزها ظمرا .. الألسناذة ربحازة المعلمة" since the topic is sensitive, and they want to convey an important message to the audience. Therefore, it is critical to use our native language which is characterised with CS carefully and correctly to ensure understanding. Overall, both genders exhibited the use of similar CS constructions, such as switching from Arabic to the French words *exactement*, *puisque*, *parce que*, *déjà*, among others. It is important to note that CS indicates bilingual competence and is not necessarily related to language proficiency. Among female penalists, FP2 in E10 said *alors que même* بديروا عمليات التجميل رجال *même*, even in E 16 she used CS during her speech by saying *comme si* نير الك رايح *picnic*, demonstrated the highest indication of bilingual competence through her frequent use of CS, followed by FP3, and the lowest was FP1. The reason for this may be due to their ethnic backgrounds, since individuals who live in the East of Algeria like FP1 and FP3 oftendo not use French very. For example, FP1 employs CS in her speech, sticking only to use expressions that are commonly used in our daily lives. Similarly, both FP2 and MP2 also employed code switching. However, during M speech, MP1 used CS the most, followed by MH and MP2. Since all of them are from the capital (Algiers), so the difference in using CS is a matter of individual preference.

*Jargon (J)***Table 18***The Classification of the use of Jargon (J) among panelists*

E	Yacine	MP	MP	Total of M J	Nassima	FP3	FP1	Total of F J
1	4	1	4	9	4	7	4	15
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	0	1	2	0	4	0	4
6	1	0	1	2	1	2	5	8
7	1	4	5	10	5	0	2	7
8	2	4	1	7	0	0	1	1
9	6	9	2	17	6	4	4	16
12	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
14	3	6	2	11	5	6	4	15
Total		60				68		
\bar{x}				6				7
SD				6.000				3.919

The provided table offers a comprehensive explanation of the utilisation of J by penalists of different genders. It reveals that both genders almost use it equally, with FM slightly higher. The difference did not reach statistical significance, M J ($\bar{x} = 6$, SD = 6.000) and F J ($\bar{x} = 7$, SD = 3.919); $t(18) = 17.722$, $p = .77 > .05$.

Female participants used J almost equally. While MP1 used it the most among male penalists. Notably, FP2 and MP1 in episode 9, entitled "نجوم المواقع .. حاضرون افتراضيا مجهولون واقعيًا", utilised the highest number of J terms. This observation can be attributed to the topic of discussion, which is inherently connected to the use of J, specifically related to social media, including terms like "1M," "le sponsor," "reels," "les abonnées," and "brand." However, in episodes two and 15, entitled "عن السحرة والمشعوذين حملة تليغ" and "وهم الحياة السعيدة ... الزواج من الوسط الفني بين النجاح والفشل" respectively, no jargon was employed among both genders. This absence can

be attributed to the nature of these topics, which are more social in nature and do not necessitate the use of specialised terminology.

Foreign Words (FW)

FW are single words that are classified into either French or English; they are not much used by most individuals. The little difference M, influenced by the prominence of the French language in Algerian society and the assimilation of Algerian heritage by the French community, exhibited a higher frequency of Fr FW into their speech compared to FM. This inclination may be further reinforced by the shared cross-cultural background among the male penalists. They use French language in their daily life, they travel a lot and make new friends that is why they used French FW more, however; females use them less due to their different socialisation or to diverge from male speech norms. For instance, MH utilised the French term "relevé bancaire" in episode 8 *هل يثقونما الفنان أو المؤثر؟*, discussing wealth and luxurious lifestyle, while MP1 in episode 1 used the term "les scandales" in relation to the live streams of famous people. On the other hand, both FP1 and FP3, among the female penalists, integrated foreign words like "unelogue" in episode 5 *شبح بطارد الزفوس وبزهي الوجود*, which is specific to a particular context and may not be widely recognised among M and FM alike.

Additionally, En FW are closely associated with globalisation and technology, however they are rare in the data. They are used in the discussions held during episodes 6 and 20 where penalists such as MH, FP2, and FP3 used them to express certain concepts. For example, Yacine and FP2 referred to "Fake life" as an English foreign term in episode 6 *الحياة المزيفة .. بداية ال نهاية لها*, highlighting the influence of technology on our perception of reality. Similarly, FP3 used the word "shopping" in episode 20 *المج هول بات معلوم*, This trend reflects the impact of globalisation and technology on language use, as En FW have seamlessly integrated

into various cultures and environments even in non-English speaking countries; they are starting to do so in Algeria. This phenomenon underscores the status of English as a global language, as its words and expressions have become an integral part of our daily lives.

Gender Miscommunication

The following is a record of the gender miscommunications found in the data together with an explanation of whether they relate to the investigated phonetic features and vocabulary choices.

Interruption (INTER)

Table 19

The distribution of Interruption (INTER) based on phonetic features and vocabulary choices

Features	Yacine		Samir		Yahia		Total of M INTER		Nassima		Samia		Moufida		Total F INTER	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Vocabulary Features																
/																
Phonetic Features																
SR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FP	1	5	0	1	0	1	1	7	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	3
NFP	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
ES	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LoT	6	7	0	2	1	3	7	12	0	2	3	3	1	2	4	7
Total	Ms: 9				Fs: 23				Ms: 8				Fs: 10			
	32								18							
Not related to the Investigated Vocabulary or Phonetics																
/	2	2	1	0	6	2	9	4	0	2	6	1	0	0	6	3
Total	Ms: 9				Fs: 4				Ms: 6				Fs: 3			
	13								9							

It is interesting that INTER as a gender miscommunication was not attributed to any specific vocabulary item. Conversely, the data presented in table 19 indicate that Ms and Fs tend

to interrupt each other, but the frequency and reasons behind it vary depending on the gender of the speaker. Overall Ms interrupted Fs more than interrupting their Ms' counterparts. Because of the LoT, Ms interrupted their M counterparts seven times, whereas they interrupted Fs 12 times. This disparity is attributed to the tendency of Fs for having long turns. For more details about panelists use of interruption based on phonetic features in each E refer to appendix H.

Furthermore, Ms interrupted Ms once due to FP, but they interrupted Fs seven times for the same reason despite the fact that males had a higher number of filled pauses (FP), such as "um" or "uh," compared to females as reported in the previous table, it is observed that these filled pauses led to interruptions specifically when females were speaking. FP are vocalized hesitations commonly used in speech, and they can sometimes disrupt the smooth flow of conversation. In this case, it seems that when females were expressing their thoughts or ideas, the presence of filled pauses prompted interruptions from the male participants. The reasons for these interruptions could vary, but it suggests that the male participants might have perceived the FP as an opportunity to interject or redirect the conversation.

Interestingly, Ms did not interrupt their m counterparts because of NFP or ES. These factors seem to contribute to a smoother flow of conversation between Ms. Similarly, RI did not result in INTERs from M towards F because F did not employ RI in their speech, which explains why MH, a M participant, interrupted Ms only once. The absence of RI from Fs has contributed to the limited INTERs from Ms towards Fs.

On the other hand, F exhibited a different pattern of INTERs. They interrupted Ms four times and interrupted Fs seven times because of the LoT. In our culture, there may be a greater emphasis on politeness and avoiding interruptions when interacting with males, particularly in mixed-gender conversations. Females may feel more comfortable and familiar interrupting other

females due to shared experiences and a sense of camaraderie, whereas they may perceive it as more important to show respect and maintain politeness when interacting with males.

Additionally, they interrupted Ms two times due to RI. Notably, FP, ES and SR, did not prompt INTERs from Fs towards either gender.

Overall, Ms interrupted Ms a total of nine times and interrupted Fs 23 times. F, on the other hand, interrupted Ms 08 times and interrupted Fs 10 times. Thus, it is evident that Ms exhibit INTER more frequently than Fs. The discrepancy in INTER frequency could indicate a gender-based power dynamic, where Ms exert more dominance in conversations by interrupting more frequently. This aligns with societal norms and expectations that may influence communication patterns. Additionally, other factors, such as the topic being discussed or external circumstances, had influenced the INTERs.

Interestingly, other INTER in the conversations were actually prompted by the nature of the topic itself, with individuals expressing their opinions through verbal and non-verbal cues such as emojis, body language and eye contact. Therefore, it is crucial to highlight that many INTER as gender miscommunication were not directly caused by any of the investigated features, but rather by the overall dynamics of the conversation. Consequently, these INTERs were effectively resolved through the use of humour by the host who skilfully managed the conversation by guiding the flow, giving turns to each penalists, and creating a pleasant atmosphere. Additionally, the penalists displayed active listening skills and utilised polite language, which contributed to minimising INTERs.

Accommodation (ACC)

The analysis of the Es revealed that ACC as an implicit form of gender miscommunication did not arise from any specific vocabulary items or phonetic features.

Additionally, while penalists demonstrated various forms of ACC, this did not lead to miscommunication. Both M and F penalists predominantly adhered to a maintenance strategy, where they maintained their established communication styles without significant alterations. However, it is noteworthy that FP2 occasionally exhibited convergence with M language patterns. This convergence manifested in her adoption of assertive language, confident facial expressions, and direct eye contact. Notably, FP2's convergence did not result in miscommunication but rather showcased her ability to utilise assertive and straightforward language, by passing indirectness and subjectivity when discussing various topics.

Indirectness (IND)

IND as a form of miscommunication occurred in Es 06 and 15 *الحياة المزينة .. بداية ال نهاية لها* but there is no indication that any specific vocabulary choices or phonetic features played a role in creating or contributing to it. The occurrence of this isolated instance of IND may have been influenced by other factors such as contextual cues, individual communication styles, or the unique dynamics of that specific conversation.

In E 6, intitled "الحياة المزينة .. بداية ال نهاية لها", MP1 used IND during his turn from 6:06 to 8:11. which led to miscommunication by MH saying *نعم انت مع او ضد*. MP1's IND created a misalignment or lack of clarity in his message. Also in E 10 "عديلات التجميل .. هوس بقود المشاهير إلى", FP1 used IND speaking about cosmetic surgeries in general saying *لبي نحناح كابين عديلات* *anesthésie générale* 7:21 so she got interrupted by MH saying *عديلات التجميل طيب ني اقبال من* and did not comment on the specified topic. In response to MP1's and FP1's indirect language, MH, the host, interrupted them to seek clarification and specify their answers. MH's INTER indicated a desire to better understand their points and to encourage a more explicit or direct response. By intervening and redirecting the conversation, MH aimed to

ensure a clear and focused discussion on the specific topic at hand. This interaction highlights the importance of effective communication and the role of the host in guiding the conversation and maintaining clarity.

Politeness (POL)

According to the analysis conducted, it was found that POL, as an implicit form of gender miscommunication, did not occur in the Es examined. Moreover, no specific prementioned vocabulary choices or phonetic features were identified as creating POL as a form of miscommunication. Interestingly, the findings indicate the opposite. POL was observed as a strategy to address and mitigate INTER. The penalists in the show displayed respect and POL towards one another. This use of POL can be interpreted as a deliberate approach to maintaining a harmonious and conversation. Penalists likely recognised INTER as a potential disruption to effective communication and sought to address them with polite gestures in order to resolve conflicts caused by INTERs, fostering a more cooperative and inclusive environment.

For example, in E 10 , عمليات التجمول .. هوس يقود المشاهير إلى غرف العمليات , during FP2a's turn at 21:37, MH interrupted her and used the phrase "اسم حولي قاطعتك" ("Excuse me for interrupting you") to express his intention of adding something and clarifying a point, this is POL. Similarly, in E9, FP2 was interrupted by MP1, who used the phrase "اسم حولي نسؤسريك برك" ("Allow me to ask you, please") as a polite way to interject and pose a question. These examples demonstrate how Ms in the conversations employed POL to demonstrate consideration towards their F counterparts. Furthermore, in the intriguing example from E 1, when FP3 was interrupted by MH, she politely responded with the phrase "اسم حولي نكمل" ("Excuse me, let me continue"). However, when FP2 interrupted her with an emoji at 10:28, FP3's response was "نسؤمة خليني نكمل" ("FP2 let me continue"), omitting the use of "اسم حولي" ("Excuse me"). This can be seen as an instance of

positive POL, where the familiarity and closeness between the Fs allowed for a more informal but still respectful communication style. In contrast, Ms tended to maintain negative POL, which focuses on minimising imposition and preserving autonomy in conversations.

Prestige (PRE)

Based on the analysis of the Es, there was no evidence of PRE as an implicit form of gender miscommunication. Additionally, neither vocabulary choices nor phonetic features were identified as contributing to it. It is possible that the penalists were familiar with each other, which could have prevented any misinterpretation or miscommunication arising from the use of PRE.

Section Three: The Discussion of Results

This section is dedicated to the discussion of the results derived from the content analysis, specifically in relation to the research questions and their corresponding assumptions. It is worth mentioning that qualitative analysis offers a more comprehensive understanding of phonetic features and vocabulary choices in mixed-sex conversations since quantitative analysis alone is not sufficient. This research delves into contextual and cultural factors, uncovering nuances and highlighting the interplay between gender, culture, and communication. By examining specific utterances and conversational dynamics, qualitative research provides significant insights into language use. For that, the analysis arise as follows:

The findings derived from the content analysis help in answering the research questions, which are formulated as follows:

1. To what extent do the investigated phonetic features (speaking rate, pauses, rising intonation, emphatic stress, and the length of the turn) prevail in the speech of males and females penalists in *The Weekend Show*?

2. To what extent do the investigated vocabulary items (empty adjectives, adjectives of colour, hedges, intensifiers, diminutives, borrowed vocabulary items, swear words, and tag questions) prevail in the speech of males and females penalists in The Weekend Show?
3. Which vocabulary choices and phonetic features cause miscommunication in mixed-sex groups in the selected show?
4. How do gender stereotypes account for the differences in vocabulary choices and phonetic features distribution among male and female participants?

Answering the First Research Question: To what extent do the investigated phonetic features (speaking rate, pauses, rising intonation, emphatic stress, and the length of the turn) prevail in the speech of males and females penalists in The Weekend Show?

The analysis regarding the first research question reveals differences in the usage of phonetic features among both genders and the reasons for these differences. Males were found to speak at a faster rate than females, supporting previous research by Kanki & Prinzo (1996) and Bradlow et al. (1996) and emphasising the impact of cultural and individual factors on communication.

Contrary to past studies by Beattie and Butterworth (1979) and Yuan and Liberman (2008), males were found to use filled pauses more frequently, while females were more inclined to use non-filled pauses, aligning with the research conducted by Duncan (1972) and Schegloff et al. (1977). This reveals the complex nature of gender differences in pause usage and the need to consider individual and cultural factors when analysing speech patterns.

Males were also found to use rising intonation more often, challenging Lakoff's (1975) theory that women use this feature more frequently. It is suggested that males use rising intonation to express politeness and willingness to engage in conversation in mixed-sex groups.

Regarding emphatic stress, women were found to use this tool more often to assert themselves and communicate confidently, aligning with Lakoff's (1975) argument. However, the frequency of its usage varied among female participants, indicating individual preferences which were discovered through the qualitative analysis.

Lastly, contrary to the assumption that women take shorter turns and men take longer ones, women were found to engage in more extensive and detailed dialogues during their turns. The male host had the shortest turn length, likely to encourage participant engagement, aligning with Have's (1999) study.

Since it was assumed that females tend to speak at a slower pace, using more filled pauses, and employing emphatic stress, while males tend to use rising intonation and have longer turns, the research findings provide a partial validation of this assumption. It is true that females speak slower and use emphatic stress more. However, the other patterns were refuted because males use more filled pauses and shorter turns.

Answering the Second Research Question: To what extent do the investigated vocabulary items (empty adjectives, adjectives of colour, hedges, intensifiers, diminutives, borrowed vocabulary items, swear words, and tag questions) prevail in the speech of males and females penalists in The Weekend Show?

The analysis pertaining to the second research question highlights differences in vocabulary choice among genders and the factors influencing these discrepancies. The findings suggest that women use empty adjectives more often, supporting Lakoff's theory (2004). However, colour adjectives were notably absent, possibly due to the irrelevance of colour categories to the topic discussed, aligning with Panagiotidou's study (2015).

Contrary to Lakoff's theory (1975), males were found to use intensifiers and hedges more frequently than females. It may be influenced by societal expectations and cultural norms that encourage assertiveness and confidence, which explain the frequency of intensifiers, with politeness in male communication styles which explain the frequency of hedges. This aligns with Bradac et al.'s research (1995) regarding hedges and contradicts Lakoff's theory and Fuchs' research (2017) concerning intensifiers.

Females were found to use diminutives more often, particularly when showing empathy towards children, which aligns with multiple past studies. Additionally, in terms of borrowed vocabulary items, men used these elements more frequently, which may be attributed to a wider exposure to French through extensive travel and diverse interactions. Additionally, the reversed pattern in the results among males and females may be attributed to the fact that the male and female penalists come from different regions in Algeria which certainly influence the way they talk.

Males were also found to engage more in code-switching, supporting Karim & Kanwal's research (2014) but contradicting Momenian & Samar's findings (2011). Meanwhile, men used French words more often, while both genders used English words similarly due to globalization. Women were found to use more jargon, possibly due to their familiarity and expertise in the discussed topics. If the topics were different, the results would have ended up different too.

Swear words were absent contradicting past research. This contradiction may be attributed to the fact that the analysed speech is public; due to cultural norms and the promotion of proper language, using swear words in Algerian media is inappropriate. Finally, males used tag questions more frequently; this contradicts Lakoff's (1973) theory that women use these more often to express uncertainty. Both genders use tag questions to express politeness.

The second assumption is partially confirmed. The findings support the assumption that females use empty adjectives, diminutives, and borrowed items more frequently in their speech, while males exhibit a higher usage of tag questions and borrowed items. However, the findings contradict the assumption that females use hedges and intensifiers more frequently. In addition, there were no significant findings regarding the use of swear words and adjectives of colour.

Answering The Third Research Question: Which vocabulary choices and phonetic features cause miscommunication in mixed-sex groups in the selected show?

The third research question investigates the role of vocabulary items and phonetic features in miscommunication within mixed-sex groups. The results indicate that miscommunication due to accommodation is not influenced by specific vocabulary or phonetic elements, contrary to past perspectives. These findings contradict those of Eagly (1987) and Giles and Ogay (2007), suggesting that accommodation can compromise authenticity and lead to unconscious bias. This supports the idea that vocabulary and phonetic features do not significantly contribute to accommodation-related miscommunication.

Contrarily, interruption was more common in the data, although it was not significantly tied to specific vocabulary features, it was related to certain phonetic features like the length of the turn, filled and non-filled pauses, and overlapping speech. Additionally, males interrupt females more frequently because it serves as a means of interference or control in conversations, as suggested by James and Clarke (1993) and Tannen (1994). Strategies like humour, active listening, and negotiation are important to manage these interruptions.

Indirectness, another form of potential miscommunication, is not tied to specific language elements but rather to contextual cues, individual communication styles, and conversation

dynamics. The findings show that males interpret indirect language as unclear, leading to misunderstandings.

Politeness does not contribute to miscommunication, instead, it reduces it. No specific vocabulary or phonetic features were found responsible for miscommunication related to politeness supported Pal (2020) view, and contradicted the findings of Nakane (2006). Both genders use polite language, indicating the influence of cultural norms.

Finally, the use of prestigious language by females does not contribute to gender miscommunication. This supports the assumption that females use prestigious variants to assert their high social status and educational level, aligning with prior research of Gordon (1997) and Jaber (2022).

The third assumption is partially confirmed. The findings disapprove the notion that vocabulary choices lead to interruption. However, the results validate the notion that phonetic features play a role in it. Additionally, the findings support the assumption that miscommunication in terms of accommodation, politeness, and prestige on language use does not exist.

Answering The Forth Research Question: How do gender stereotypes account for the differences in vocabulary choices and phonetic features distribution among male and female participants?

The study findings reveal that within the context of the selected talk show, there are observable patterns in language usage that align with gender stereotypes. Females tend to exhibit more emotional and collaborative language patterns, while males are characterized by dominant, assertive, and competitive language. These findings support previous studies, such as Casad and Breanna (2017) and Eddleston et al. (2006), which highlight the perceived differences in

language styles between genders. However, it is important to note that individual preferences, cultural norms, and the specific topics discussed in conversations can influence and modify these patterns. The study also acknowledges the occurrence of miscommunications, particularly through male interruptions, but emphasises that cultural factors and conflict resolution strategies employed by both genders play a role in communication dynamics. Overall, the study reinforces the assumption that gender stereotypes can shape language patterns but highlights the complexity and diversity of communication styles within both males and females.

The results partially support the assumption that gender stereotypes can influence the vocabulary and phonetic features used by male and female speakers. Women tend to use more nurturing or emotional words, while men use more assertive, competitive, aggressive, or dominant words. However, it is important to consider that communicative styles and cultural norms can also impact these stereotypical language patterns.

The study has certain limitations that need to be acknowledged, along with recommendations for future research and the implications of the study; there are presented as follows:

Limitations of the Study

In the process of compiling this dissertation, several challenges were encountered that impacted the results:

1. The study aimed to compare the use of vocabulary and phonetic features between genders in a workplace setting. However, it was not possible to record spontaneous speech in an actual administration, leading to the choice of analysing a live talk show.
2. The selected excerpts from the show episodes did not always pertain to the same topic, posing a significant challenge especially when analysing phonetic features such as turn length and speaking rate.

3. Due to the previous complications, methodological modifications to accommodate the aforementioned features were necessary.
4. Time constraints led to the exclusion of voice quality from the literature review as it required specialised software for analysis.
5. During the analysis, it was discovered that each episode covered multiple topics, underlining the importance of collecting data from natural speech where the topic influences the participants. This led to another revision of the methodology and the identification of new categories associated with vocabulary items.

Implications of the Study

This study significantly contributes to the understanding of gender differences in language selection and performance within Algerian TV shows. It offers important perceptions into the communication dynamics and language skills specific to the television context, benefiting media professionals, researchers, and viewers.

By exploring the manifestation of gender in Algerian TV shows, this research adds a unique perspective to the existing literature on language and gender. The findings provide important implications for future research and enhance our understanding of how gender influences language use in television settings by identify the variables and features that may contribute to gender-based miscommunication, helping to prevent conflicts.

Additionally, the results present extra evidence that language use is systematic, every linguistic behaviour has an explanation. Besides, it shows that the interaction on different social factors in inevitable making the work on only one social factor hard because it cannot be isolated.

Recommendations for Further Research

The recommendations for future research arising from this research are as follows:

1- The present study investigated both vocabulary items and phonetic features. Further research can focus specifically on one of those characteristics in details such as the influence of rising intonation on communication dynamics and understanding among participants.

2- It is highly recommended to work on other characteristics that are under the umbrella of vocabulary items and phonetic features. One specific area of interest is voice quality, and it is suggested to utilise specialised software to measure and analyse this aspect more comprehensively.

3- While the present study focused on a single talk show, future research can broaden the scope by including a wider range of TV shows that meet similar criteria. This can provide a more comprehensive understanding of gender differences in language selection and performance across different talk show formats, hosts, and participant dynamics.

4- Comparative studies across different cultures and nationalities can provide valuable insights into how gender differences in language selection and performance manifest in diverse sociolinguistic contexts. Exploring similarities and differences in communication patterns can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the role of gender in language use.

General Conclusion

The sociolinguistic analysis of gender in TV shows reveals the profound influence of gender on language use, with significant implications for communication. By examining specific language aspects such as vocabulary choices and phonetic features, this study uncovers the distinct linguistic variations between males and females, rooted in societal norms and expectations. These linguistic differences, while reflecting gender roles, can lead to miscommunication. Therefore, it is significant to address these challenges by implementing strategies that promote effective communication and bridge the gap caused by gender-based language disparities.

This study consists of two chapters that provide an extensive exploration of language aspects and gender dynamics in the context of talk shows. The first chapter serves as a literature review, comprising two sections. The initial section offers a general overview of language and gender in the context of talk shows, while the second section focuses on specific language aspects, namely phonetic features and vocabulary choices which have been extensively studied and discussed by notable scholars such as Lakoff (1975), Tannen (1991), Holmes (2013), and Coates (2013). The second chapter begins with a detailed description of the research methodology, followed by an analysis of data extraction and a discussion of the results. It is concluded by addressing the limitations of the study, discussing its implications, and providing recommendations for future research. Throughout this chapter, the research questions and assumptions are addressed based on the findings obtained from the content analysis. Notably, the analysis uncovers new categories that enrich the ensuing discussion and broaden our understanding of the distinct setting of talk shows.

The findings from this study reveals notable differences in the use of phonetic features and vocabulary choices, influenced by various factors such as the topic of discussion, individual communication styles, diverse backgrounds, cultural norms, and gender roles. Specifically, differences in the usage of phonetic features can lead to miscommunication, particularly in the form of interruptions, which are more frequently employed by males. Additionally, miscommunication can arise from indirectness, which is influenced by the specific topic being discussed. Interestingly, to address these miscommunications, penalists may employ strategies such as accommodation and politeness. Stereotypes surrounding language use suggest that males tend to use more direct and assertive language, and females exhibit more emotional and less direct language, it is important to consider the nuanced nature of communication. Individual variations and the influence of specific topics challenge and reshape stereotypical gender roles, highlighting the complexity and diversity of language use among different genders.

References

- Ali, H. J. (2018). Conversation analysis of the structural units of interaction in american and iraqi tv talk shows: the doctors and shabab wbanat. *International Journal of Language Academy*.
<https://doi.org/10.18033/ijla.3870>
- Aries, E. (1996). *Men and Women in Interaction*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Beattie, G., & Butterworth, B. (1979). Contextual Probability and Word Frequency as Determinants of Pauses and Errors in Spontaneous Speech. *Language and Speech*, 22(3), 201–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383097902200301>
- Beattie, G. (1981). Interruption in conversational interaction, and its relation to the sex and status of the interactants*. *Linguistics*, 19(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1981.19.1-2.15>
- Bell, A. (1984). *Language Style as Audience Design*.
- Bell, C. A., McCarthy, P. L., & McNamara, D. S. (2006). Variations in Language Use across Gender: Biological versus Sociological Theories. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 28(28).
<https://escholarship.org/content/qt1q30w4z0/qt1q30w4z0.pdf?t=op2jea>
- Bourhis, R. Y. (1979). Language attitudes and self-reports of French-English behavior. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 11(4), 295-303.
- Bradac, J. J., Mulac, A., & Thompson, S. A. (1995). Men's and Women's Use of Intensifiers and Hedges in Problem-Solving Interaction: Molar and Molecular Analyses. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 28(2), 93–116.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2802_1

- Bradlow, A. R., Torretta, G. M., & Pisoni, D. B. (1996). Intelligibility of normal speech I: Global and fine-grained acoustic-phonetic talker characteristics. *Speech Communication*, 20(3–4), 255–272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-6393\(96\)00063-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-6393(96)00063-5)
- Bright, D. S., & Cortes, A. H. (2022). Principles of Management. In Bright, D. S., & Cortes, A. H.(Eds), *International Management: Cultural Stereotyping and Social Institutions* (p177) https://library.unimelb.edu.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1924095/Intercultural_Communication2.pdf
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (Eds.). (2009). *Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (1998). *The feminist critique of language: A Reader*. Routledge.
- Carli, L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(5), 941–951. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.941>
- Casad, B. J & Breanna, R.T. (2017). The SAGE Encyclopedia of Psychology and Gender. In Nadal, K. L. (Ed). (2015), *Gender Stereotypes*(pp.755-758). <https://www.researchgate.net/deref/http%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.4135%2F9781483384269.n>
- Chidubem, A. (2019). *CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGY: A PANACEA FOR PROMOTING ORGANIZATIONAL UNITY*. 7, 251–258.
- Clark, H. H., & Tree, J. E. F. (2002). Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, 84(1), 73–111. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-0277\(02\)00017-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-0277(02)00017-3)

- Coates, J. (2004). *Women, Men, and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. Pearson Education.
- Coates, J. (2013). *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. New York: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Willey-Blackwell.
- Dabašinskienė, I. (2012). Gender Differences in Language Acquisition: A Case Study of Lithuanian Diminutives. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 43(2), 177–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01629778.2012.674795>
- Danner, L., & Walsh, S. (1999). “Radical”; feminists and “bickering”; women: Backlash in U.S. media coverage of the United Nations fourth world conference on women. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 16(1), 63–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295039909367072>
- Darnell, R. (1975). [Review of Sociolinguistic Patterns, by W. Labov]. *Language*, 51(4), 1008-1016. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412715>
- Dildar, S., & Amjad, N. (2017). Gender Differences in Conflict Resolution Styles (CRS) in Different Roles: A Systematic Review. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 15(2), 37. <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P4-2076931037/gender-differences-in-conflict-resolution-styles-crs>.
- Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23(2), 283–292. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033031>
- Dykes, R. (n.d.). *Code-Switching Among Bilinguals*. pp 73-83.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social Role Interpretation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eddleston, K. A., Veiga, J. F., & Powell, G. N. (2006). Explaining sex differences in managerial

career satisfier preferences: The role of gender self-schema. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 437–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.437>

Ennaji, M. (2005). *Multilingualism, Cultural Identity, and Education in Morocco* (1st ed.).

Springer. <http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=542e7ca9bc6706328f623c047a1717fe>

Fuchs, R. (2017). Do women (still) use more intensifiers than men?: Recent change in the sociolinguistics of intensifiers in British English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 22(3), 345–374. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.22.3.03fuc>

Gal, S. (1978). Peasant men can't get wives: Language change and sex roles in a bilingual community. *Language in Society*, 7(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005303>

Gibb, J. G. (1961). Defensive Communication. *Journal of Communication*, 11(3), 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1961.tb00344.x>

Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. (1991). *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics*. Cambridge University Press

Giles, H., & Street, R. L. (1982, January 1). *Speech accommodation theory: A social cognitive approach to language and speech behavior*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284034390_Speech_accommodation_theory_A_social_cognitive_approach_to_language_and_speech_behavior

Giles, H., & Ogay, T. (2007). Communication Accommodation Theory. In B. B. Whaley & W. Samter (Eds.), *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars* (pp. 293–310). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gordon, E. A. (1997). Sex, speech, and stereotypes: Why women use prestige speech forms more than men. *Language in Society*, 26(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500019400>

- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational Organization: Interaction Between Speakers and Hearers*. Academic Press
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Between and within: Alternative sequential treatments of continuers and assessments. *Human Studies*, 9(2–3), 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00148127>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, J. (2003). *Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus: The Classic Guide to Understanding the Opposite Sex*. Harper Paperbacks.
<http://gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=2d37a618c977a8d341577748b90b3661>
- Gussenhoven, C. (2004). *The Phonology of Tone and Intonation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Güvendir, E. (2015). Why are males inclined to use strong swear words more than females? An evolutionary explanation based on male intergroup aggressiveness. *Language Sciences*, 50, 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2015.02.003>
- Lars-Gunnar Andersson, & Trudgill, P. (1990). *Bad language*. Blackwell By Arrangement With Penguin Books.
- Harrison, T., & Muhamad, J. (2018). *Engagement in Conflict* (pp. 187–204).
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119167600.ch13>
- Have, P. T. (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. SAGE.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2022). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (Sixth edition). Routledge.
- Horan, G. (2013). ‘You taught me language; and my profit on’t/Is, I know how to curse’: Cursing and swearing in foreign language learning. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(3), 283–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.804533>

- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Hubers, G. (1971). Prosodic systems and intonation in english. *Lingua*, 26(4), 370–382. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(71\)90003-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(71)90003-9)
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Benjamins.
- Iddo, N. (2011). Men's Vs. Women's Speech In Algeria. *Revue LAROS*, 7(1), 103-109. Retrieved from <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/130213>
- Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(2), 209–254. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00133-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00133-2)
- Iram, P., Rosy, I., Syed Waqar, A. S., Nishfa, R., & Iqra, B. (2021). Exploring Reasons on Lexical Borrowing from English Language (L2) to Sindhi Language (L1). *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 83, 22–25. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JLLL/83-03>
- Jaber, R. S. (2022). The Sociolinguistics of Iraqi Women: A New Perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 2(1), 45–55. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2022.2.1.6>
- James, D., & Clarke, S. (1993). Women, men, and interruptions: A critical review. *Gender and Conversational Interaction*.
- Jespersen, O. (1922). *Language; Its Nature, Development and Origin*.
- Jones, A., & Quach, X. (2007). Barriers to Intercultural Understanding: Stereotype. *Intercultural Communication*. The University of Melbourne, Teaching and learning unit, faculty of economics and commerce. <https://sandcintercomm.wordpress.com/intercultural-understanding/barriers-to-intercultural-understanding/>
- Jovanovic, V., & Pavlovic, V. (2014). The Use Of Tag Questions with Male and Female Speakers of English and Serbian. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2967908>

- Jurafsky, D. (1996). Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. *Language*, 72(3), 533. <https://doi.org/10.2307/416278>
- Kanki, B. G., & Prinzo, O. V. (1996). METHODS AND METRICS OF VOICE COMMUNICATIONS. *Methods and Metrics of Voice Communication U.S. Federal Aviation Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and United States Air Force*.
- Kapoor, H. (2016). Swears in Context: The Difference Between Casual and Abusive Swearing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 45(2), 259–274. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-014-9345-z>
- Karim, A., & Kanwal, S. (2014). Language, Power and Gender: A Case Study of Code Switching by Less Educated People In Pakistan. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica*, 3(3), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.4312/ala.3.3.21-36>
- Kimmel, M. S., & Mahler, M. (2003). Adolescent Masculinity, Homophobia, and Violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(10), 1439–1458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203046010010>
- Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1992). Group decision making and communication technology. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 52(1), 96–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(92\)90047-b](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(92)90047-b)
- Koenig, A. M. (2018). Comparing Prescriptive and Descriptive Gender Stereotypes About Children, Adults, and the Elderly., *Department of Psychological Sciences, University of San Diego, San Diego, CA, United States* <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01086>
- Kreiman, J., & Sidtis, D. (2011). *Foundations of Voice Studies: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Voice Production and Perception*. Wiley-Blackwell.

- Kreiman, J., Van Lancker Sidtis, D., & Gerratt, B. R. (2005). Perception of voice quality. In Pisoni, D. B., & Remez, R. E. (Eds.), *The handbook of speech perception* (pp. 338-362). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. SAGE.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research Methodology: Step-by-step for Beginners* (3ed.). SAGE Publications: London
- Ladd, D. R. (1996). *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1966). The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (2006). *The social stratification of English in New York City* (2nd ed). Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and Woman's Place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45–80.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707>
- Lakoff, R. T. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.
- Lakoff, R. T. (2004). *Language and Woman's Place: Text and Commentaries*. Oxford University Press
- Lakoff, G., Dean, Howard, & Hazen, Don. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate* (1st ed.). Chelsea Green.
- Laver, J. (1980). *The Phonetic Description of Voice Quality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Laver, J., & John, L. (1994). *Principles of Phonetics*. Cambridge University Press.

- Lehiste, I. (1970). *Suprasegmentals*. MIT Press.
- Len-Ríos, M. E., Rodgers, S., Thorson, E., & Yoon, D. (2005). Representation of Women in News and Photos: Comparing Content to Perceptions. *Journal of Communication*, 55(1), 152–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2005.tb02664.x>
- Leung, A. Y. M., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(3), 507–526. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press
- Litosseliti, L. (2006). *Gender and Language: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
- Livingstone, S. M., & Lunt, P. K. (1994). *Talk on television: Audience participation and public debate*. Routledge.
- Ljung, M. (2011). *Swearing: A cross-cultural linguistic study*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Llamas, C. (2009). *Language and Identities*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Lumley, T., & O’Sullivan, B. (2005). The effect of test-taker gender, audience and topic on task performance in tape-mediated assessment of speaking. *Language Testing*, 22(4), 415–437. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt303oa>
- Mahmood K. M. E. (2017). *A pragmatic analysis of diminutives in Palestinian society*. 11(1), 45–62.
- Malhotra, S., & Rogers, E. M. (2000). Satellite Television and the New Indian Woman. *Gazette (Leiden, Netherlands)*, 62(5), 407–429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016549200062005004>
- Masita, M., Rabiatur, A., & Devi, T. (2022). *Gender and Language in BentengPanynyua English Club / LETS: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching Studies*. 2(2), 8. <https://jurnal.stainmajene.ac.id/index.php/lets/article/view/153>

- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12(4), 403–426. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(88\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(88)90003-3)
- Mattiello, E., Ritt-Benmimoun, V., & Dressler, W. U. (2021). Asymmetric use of diminutives and hypocoristics to pet animals in Italian, German, English, and Arabic. *Language & Communication*, 76, 136–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2020.11.004>
- Merchant, K. (2012). "How Men And Women Differ: Gender Differences in Communication Styles, Influence Tactics, and Leadership Styles". CMC Senior Theses. Paper 513. https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1521&context=cmc_theses
- Migge, B. (2007). Code-switching and social identities in the Eastern Maroon community of Suriname and French Guiana. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00310.x>
- Mills, S., & Grainger, K. (2016). *Directness and Indirectness Across Cultures*. Springer.
- Momenian, M., & Samar, R. (2011). Functions of code-switching among Iranian advanced and elementary teachers and students. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6
- Nakane, I. (2006). Silence and politeness in intercultural communication in university seminars. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(11), 1811–1835. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.01.005>
- Pal, D. (2020). OF POLITENESS.
- Pennebaker, J. W., Mayne, T. J., & Francis, M. E. (1997). Linguistic predictors of adaptive bereavement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(4), 863–871. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.4.863>

- Prasithrathsint, A. (2015). Linguistic Markers and Stylistic Attributes of Hedging in English Academic Papers Written by Native and Non-Native Speakers of English. *MANUSYA*, 18(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-01801001>
- Punch, K. (1998). *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- Qaisiya, F. A. (2017). Language and Gender in Describing Physical Appearance. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4(1).
- Rahmawati, D., Resmana, E. C., & Indrayani, L. M. (2019). Woman Language Features in Recode World's Technology Conference: A Sociolinguistics Studies. *ELT-Lectura*, 6(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v6i2.3122>
- Raphael, L. J., Borden, G. J., & Harris, K. S. (2011). *Speech Science Primer: Physiology, Acoustics, and Perception of Speech*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Revis, M., & Bernaisch, T. (2020). The pragmatic nativisation of pauses in Asian Englishes. *World Englishes*, 39(1), 135–153. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12387>
- Romero, E. J., & Cruthirds, K. W. (2006). The Use of Humor in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(2), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2006.20591005>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Sadiqi, F. (2003). *Women, Gender, and Language in Morocco*. BRILL.
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R., & Roy, C. S. (Eds.). (2015). *Intercultural communication: A reader* (Fourteenth Edition and Fortieth Anniversary Edition). Cengage Learning.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation.

Language in Society, 29(1), 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500001019>

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1977.0041>

Scherer, K. R. (1986). Vocal affect expression: A review and a model for future research.

Psychological Bulletin, 99(2), 143–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.99.2.143>

Schneider, K. P. (2003). *Diminutives in English*. Max Niemeyer.

Sergiiivna, B. I., Volodymyrivna, B. I., & Yakivna, M. S. (2020). Linguistic Essence of the Process of Borrowing: French and English Language in Contact. *Arab World English Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt3.24>

Sharma, B. (2013). Image of Women in Media. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2316183>

Shattuck-Hufnagel, S., & Turk, A. (1996). A prosody tutorial for investigators of auditory sentence processing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 25(2), 193–247.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01708572>

Sifianou, M. (1992). The use of diminutives in expressing politeness: Modern Greek versus English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 17(2), 155–173. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90038-D)

[2166\(92\)90038-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90038-D)

Stapleton, K., Fägersten, K. B., Stephens, R. S., & Loveday, C. (2022). The power of swearing: What we know and what we don't. *Lingua*, 277, 103406.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2022.103406>

- Straniero Sergio, F. (1999). The Interpreter on the (Talk) Show: Interaction and Participation Frameworks. *The Translator*, 5(2), 303–326.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.1999.10799046>
- Sukendra, I. (2021). Culture-Shaped Language of Male and Female Writers: A Comparative Study of English and Bahasa Indonesia. *Lingua Cultura*, 15(1).
<https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v15i1.7077>
- Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses*. Springer.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Gender and discourse*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1991). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. Ballantine Books.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Teo, T. (2014). *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology*. Springer. p. 1861
- Titze, I. R. (2008). The Human Instrument. *Scientific American*, 298(1), 94–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0108-94>
- Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society*, 1(2), 179–195. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500000488>
- Trudgill, P. (2003). *A glossary of sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). Men and women differences in using language: a case study of students at stain kodus. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*.
<https://doi.org/10.30659/e.3.1.79-90>
- Van Zoonen, L. (1998). ONE OF THE GIRLS? The changing gender of journalism. In *News, gender and power* (In C. Carter, G. Branston, S. Allen, p. (pp. 33-46).). Routledge.

- Welbourne, T. (2005). Women “Take Care,” Men “Take Charge:” Stereotyping of U.S. Business Leaders Exposed, *Catalyst*, 7
- Wodak, R. (1997). *Gender and Discourse*. SAGE.
- Wani, H. (2011). *Understanding Conflict Resolution*. 1(2).
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. *American Sociological Association's Annual Meetings, Sep, 1978, San Francisco, CA, US; This Is a Revised Version of a Paper Presented at the Aforementioned Conference.*, 102–117.
- Yuan, J., & Liberman, M. (2008). Speaker identification on the SCOTUS corpus. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 123(5), 3878. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2935783>
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed). Cambridge University Press.
- Zimmerman, D. and West, C. (1975). “Sex Roles, Interruptions and Silences in Conversation”. In *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House
- Zoghaib, A. (2019). Persuasion of voices: The effects of a speaker’s voice characteristics and gender on consumers’ responses. *Recherche Et Applications En Marketing*, 34(3), 83–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/205157071982>

Appendices

Appendix A

Episodes Topics and Durations

Table A 1
The Topics Covered in Every Episode With The Duration

Episode Duration	Covered Topics	Duration Devoted to Each Topic		The Basis of Selecting the Analyzed Topic	Extracted Cast Talk for Analysis after Eliminating Guest Talk & Recorded Videos		Total Time Analysed	
		From	To		From	To		
1 01:50:54	1. حياة المشاهير بين الواقع والحواف	00:02:24	00:20:07	The longest topic is the 6 th , yet it was excluded because most of the talk was held by a guest.	00:02:24	00:03:01	00:20:25	
		00:24:32	00:28:14		00:03:47	00:20:04		
	Total: 00:22:25							
	2. سهرة جزائرية بامتياز .. بن زيمة بنوج بالكرة الذهبية أول مرة	00:28:59	00:31:36					
		Total: 00:02:38						
	3. مامي لبيس عاليا .. بابيلون تصدم الجمهور الجزائري	00:31:38	00:36:07					
		Total: 00:04:30						
4. بين الزيف والواقع .. ماهي حادثة قرصنة مواقع التواصل	00:36:07	00:40:20						
	Total: 00:04:12							
5. كبار الفن الجزائري يروجون للزياء في عرض اسنثاني	00:40:20	00:43:12						
	Total: 00:02:52							
6. مهرجان التراث .. جدل كبير وشكوك نطفو على السطح	00:50:10	01:07:07						
	01:11:07	01:23:03						
Total: 00:28:53								
2 01:22:08	1. هل كل من هو سعيد في مواقع التواصل سعيد في الواقع؟	00:00:00	00:12:45	The longest				
		Total: 00:12:45						

Episode Duration	Covered Topics	Duration Devoted to Each Topic		The Basis of Selecting the Analyzed Topic	Extracted Cast Talk for Analysis after Eliminating Guest Talk & Recorded Videos		Total Time Analysed		
		From	To		From	To			
	2. وهم الحياة السعيدة ... الزواج من الوسط الفني بين النجاح والنشل	00:13:47	00:39:37		00:13:47	00:23:01	00:23:46		
	Total: 00:25:50				00:24:42	00:39:37			
	3. انضمام موزونة بن نغول إلى مسلسل بنت البلاد	00:44:34	00:48:03						
	Total: 00:03:29								
	4. النيفي تغازل الجزائريين ببديوي من موندبال 1982. ما الوصية؟	00:48:03	00:51:11						
Total: 00:03:08									
5. مليون دوالر للممثلة تركيبتين لحضور كأس العالم بقطر	00:51:11	00:52:29							
Total: 00:01:18									
3	01:49:23	1. الننانة والمهيلة المحبوبة بيونة ضينة حصة اليوم	00:05:39	01:04:36	This episode was not analyzed because the guest was the center.				
		Total: 00:58:57							
		2. السرقات بعالم النين .. نضائح وشبح زهاية المسيرة	01:04:36	01:17:42					
		Total: 00:13:06							
4	02:04:53	1. الشهرة .. أطفال تحت المجهر	:0002:25	:0034:21	The longest	:0002:25	:0006:26	:0025:20	
		Total: 00:47:28				00:10:40	00:14:52		
		2. التسول .. أطفال تحت المجهر	:00:52:29	01:07:36					
		Total: :0015:07				01:14:53	:0017:47		
		3. العمالة .. أطفال تحت المجهر	01:07:36	01:20:45					
Total: :0013:09			:0020:11	:0023:21					
4. ديدن كانون 16 و ريكما بچم عان في عمل مشترك	:01:26:11	01:27:57							
Total: :00:01:46			:0027:45	:0037:34					
			:0048:40	:0049:53					

Episode Duration	Covered Topics	Duration Devoted to Each Topic		The Basis of Selecting the Analyzed Topic	Extracted Cast Talk for Analysis after Eliminating Guest Talk & Recorded Videos		Total Time Analysed				
		From	To		From	To					
	5. حمزة بن دالج يبعث برسالة خاصة للشعب الجزائري ويخاطب موعده خروجه	01:27:57	01:30:35	The longest							
	Total: 00:02:38										
	6. حملة الالاعنف ضد المرأة تنصدر واجهة منصات التواصل	01:30:35	01:40:31								
	Total: 00:09:56										
	7. المصممة الجزائرية حنيطة بريكي مهددة بالقتل	01:40:31	01:48:00								
	Total: :0007:29										
	8. ثمان دولارات شهريا لتوثيق حسابات تويتر .. هذه ردود الدغل	01:48:00	01:50:30								
	Total: :00:0230										
5	01:49:02	1. البنمر .. شبح قطارد الزنوس وين هي الوجود	00:02:06	:0039:06	The longest			:0022:35			
		Total: 00:37:00									
		2. المهدلة نوال قدودو	00:43:44	01:19:05							
		Total: 00:35:21									
		3. عودة شيرين إلى طنوقها .. هل سننؤد الجمهور؟	01:19:21	01:24:56							
		Total: 00:02:35									
		4. تاجر إرهابي وسط شارع تونسيم .. جزائريون نجو من الموت	01:24:56	01:25:43							
		Total: 00:00:47									
5. وصول تعداد البشر إلى 8 مليار على سطح الكوكب بعد ما كان 2.5 مليار عام 1950	01:25:44	01:26:28									
Total: 00:00:44											
6. نوندام العباسي ينصدر الترانة الجزائرية	01:26:28	01:28:37									
Total: 00:02:09											
7. بومدين بوجمعة يثير التساؤل بعد نزوله إلى قطر	01:28:37	01:32:04									
Total: 00:03:27											
6	00:51:38	1. الحياة الجزائرية .. بداية ال نهابة لها	00:05:15	00:24:24	The longest			00:16:41			
		Total: 00:19:09									

					00:17:59 00:23:05 00:23:49	00:22:19 00:23:22 00:24:24	
		2. قطر تكسب الرهان والجزائريون حاضرون في مونديال 2023	00:41:40 00:43:00 Total: 00:01:19				
		3. الجماهير اليابانية تقوم بتنظيف الملعب بعد كل مباراة	00:43:00 00:43:10 Total: : 00:00:10				
7	00:46:20	1. احتفال، انجاز وتهديد .. هذا ما يحدث على السوشل ميديا	00:02:10 00:22:51 Total: 00:20:41	The longest	00:02:10 00:03:30 00:15:47 00:21:31	00:02:43 00:14:46 00:21:14 00:22:51	00:18:26
		2. شابين من الجزائريين بدرجتهم المئوية يذهبون الى جنوب افريقيا	00:39:27 00:40:50 Total: 00:01:23				
		3. غاب زيمار فحضر شبيهه نايمار	00:40:50 00:41:30 Total: 00:00:40				
		4. السلام يجذب السياح الجازب في مونديال قطر	00:41:30 00:42:06 Total: 00:00:36				
		1. النراء والحياة الكريمة .. هل يحقهما الفنن أو المؤثر؟	00:03:43 00:21:28 Total: 00:17:45		00:03:43 00:04:14 00:13:09 00:20:49 00:21:06	00:04:06 00:12:39 00:18:27 00:20:59 00:21:28	00:14:38
8	00:40:29	2. صامويل ايتو يعندي بالضرب على يونيو جزائري	00:21:33 00:31:48 Total: 00:10:15	The longest			
		3. الالعاب بن سيعيني يدخل الونص الذهبي في صممت	00:32:26 00:32:56 Total: 00:00:30				
		4. الدون رونالدو العبا في فريق عربي	00:32:56 00:34:27 Total: 00:01:31				
		5. ملعب 974 بقطر يخيفني عن النظر	00:34:27 00:35:02 Total: 00:00:35				
		1. نجوم المواقع .. حاضرون انتراضيا مع هولون واقريا	00:02:06 00:30:39		00:02:06 00:09:29	00:08:59 00:16:11	00:24:43

			Total: 00:28:33			00:18:02 00:21:03 00:24:42 00:27:45	00:20:47 00:23:38 00:27:26 00:30:39		
10	01:37:11	1. عمليات التجميل .. هوس يقود المشاهير إلى غرف العمليات	00:03:17	00:35:15	The longest	00:03:17	00:28:40	00:28:56	
		Total: 00:31:58		00:30:25		00:32:23			
		2. هوس الشريرة .. لكل ما هو مزروع مرغوب	00:40:54	01:03:25					
		Total: 00:22:31		01:03:45		01:12:46			
		3. إعجاب أم مرض نفسي .. متابعون مهوسون بمشاهيرهم	01:03:45	01:12:46					
		Total: 00:09:01		00:23:21		01:24:27			
		4. بن زيمة يعزل نوليا	00:23:21	01:24:27					
Total: 00:01:06		01:24:27	1:27:26						
		5. النكاء الصطناعي .. المحمصطنعة تغزو المنصات	01:24:27	1:27:26					
Total: 00:02:59									
11	01:37:32	وداعا 2022 .. مرحبا 2023	00:02:41	01:12:21	This episode was not analyzed because guests participated in the whole session and there was no topic				
12	01:39:58	1. الصداقة بين الوفاء والحرص	00:04:14	00:28:48	The longest	00:04:14	00:06:52	00:19:16	
		Total: 00:24:34		00:09:18		00:23:53			
		2. احتفالات رأس السنة تحول ناغيت إلى بحر من الزفافات	01:01:50	01:04:55		00:25:40	00:27:33		
Total: 00:03:05						00:28:38	00:28:48		

		3. كريسيانوا بيختم مسيرته مع زادي الزصر السعودي	01:04:55	01:08:42				
		Total: 00:03:47						
		4. أرملة الرئيس الراحل بومدين تكشف عن أسرار أول مرة	01:08:42	01:11:32				
		Total: 00:02:50						
		5. وزارة التجارة تشن حملة على منتجات منافسة لؤيم المجمع الجزائري	01:11:32	01:16:27				
		Total: 00:04:55						
		6. تحضيرات على قدم وساق لإنجاح الشان	01:16:27	01:24:10				
Total: 00:07:43								
13	01:47:39	1. Assegas Amegaz.. حلوة خاصة بمناسبة يناير	00:03:05	00:41:04	The longest topic is the 1 st , yet it was excluded because there was no topic of discussion. The 2 nd and 3 rd topics were excluded because the guests held most the talk.			
		Total: 00:37:59						
		2. الشان .. الجزائر على بعد ساعات من انطلاق العرس الافتراضي	00:41:08	01:01:42				
		Total: 00:20:34						
		3. نوابغ جزائرية ترفع اسم الجزائر عاليا	01:01:42	01:17:23				
		Total: 00:15:41						
		4. الغنصرية تجاه زيدان تغر غضبا عاليا	01:17:23	01:20:12				
Total: 00:02:49								
5. القائل الصامت يواصل حصد الأرواح	01:20:12	01:25:07						
Total: 00:04:55								
6. علمه حرقنا نطعمها ظمرا .. السناذة ربحانة المعلمة المغدورة	01:25:07	01:35:14						
Total: 00:10:07								
7. حمزة بركاوي في ذمة هلا بعد معاناة طويلة	01:38:48	01:47:09						
Total: 00:08:21								
14	01:27:55	1. أعمال رمضان .. عدسات تجاري عقارب الساعة	00:02:29	00:52:26	The longest			
		Total: 00:49:57						
		2. بعد عرضه للهامة نضامن كيدي مع رابع ماجر	00:52:39	00:58:35				
		Total: 00:05:56						
3. حملة مقاطعة البيض	00:58:35	01:03:16						
Total: 00:04:41								

		4. شالكورا ننتقم من بئكيه بالآل غازي	01:03:16	01:10:46				
			Total: 00:07:30					
		5. مسج هولون يعقدون على سمير ميسير الكس	01:10:46	01:14:05				
			Total: 00:03:19					
15	00:23:24	1. الكاميرات الخفية	00:02:51	00:04:24	The longest topic is the 3 rd , yet it was excluded because most of the talk was held over the phone with a guest.			
			Total: 00:01:33					
		2. حملة تبليغ عن السحرة والمشعوذين	00:04:24	00:08:37		00:04:24	00:08:37	00:04:13
			Total: 00:04:13					
		3. بعد الشدة يأتي الفرج .. الرئيس نبون سينجيب لزداء ميلي سا	00:08:37	00:14:39				
			Total: 00:06:02					
		4. مدرجات الشان مملوءة عن آخرها والجمهير الجزائريّة تصنع الحدث	00:17:28	00:18:44				
			Total: 00:01:16					
		5. الوظائف الؤنصاديّة تنصدر المهن الألكثر طلبا بالجزائر حسب تقرير BCG	00:18:45	00:22:56				
			Total: 00:04:11					
16	00:28:59	1. بينضيف العناصر التونسي الوفي للجزائر رضا النبل	00:02:23	00:23:48	The longest topic is the 1 st , yet it was excluded because the guest was the center.			
			Total: 00:21:25					
		2. جبال الشريعة .. منعة سياحية ألغها المخاطر	00:23:57	00:27:56		00:23:57	00:26:55	00:03:48
			Total: 00:03:59		00:27:06	00:27:56		
17	01:48:02	1. ناجعة زلزال تركيا وسوريا .. الجزائر والجزائريون ينضامنون	00:01:44	00:40:03	The longest topic is the 6 th , yet it was excluded because most of	00:01:44	00:07:19	00:23:54
				Total: 00:38:19		00:07:45	00:13:49	
						00:16:24	00:17:15	
						00:20:44	00:21:28	
						00:27:52	00:38:14	

				the talk was held by two guests.	00:39:45	00:40:03		
		2. عمهد التندبة الجزائرية عبد الوادر ظريف ينزل الى رحمة هلا	00:40:03		00:40:44			
		Total: 00:00:41						
		3. بعد غياب عامين سلطان الشاشة الجزائرية يعود الى أرض الوطن	00:40:44		00:49:02			
		Total: 00:08:18						
		4. سلطانة الطرب الجزائرية ناة عابسة توجه نداء اسبغلة	00:49:02		00:51:56			
Total: 00:02:54								
		5. ميليسا تباشر العالج بفرنسا	00:51:56	01:04:03				
		Total: 00:12:07						
		6. لبار السن يكسحون مواقع التواصل الاجتماعي	01:04:03	01:30:06				
		Total: 00:26:03						
18	02:07:38	1. نجوة لفرق الحماية المدنية الجزائرية	00:03:16	00:21:23	The longest			
		Total: 00:18:07						
		2. الوالة عبر مواقع التواصل الاجتماعي والخرجات الميدانية	00:29:48	00:34:15				
		Total: 00:04:27						
		3. اليوم العالمي لمرض سرطان الطفولة	00:34:15	00:41:56				
		Total: 00:07:41						
4. الغرف المظلمة.. كل ما يحدث ني كواليس مسابقات ملكة الجمال	00:41:56	01:09:45		00:41:56	00:45:22	00:14:42		
Total: 00:27:49			00:46:17	00:47:43				
			00:53:38	00:58:14				
			01:00:11	01:01:55				
			01:03:25	01:04:35				
5. المراهقة المتأخرة نصرفات نتخطى العمر واللباقة	01:10:35	01:24:00		01:06:12	01:08:32			
Total: 00:13:25								
6. امرأة محهولة تتعرض للتلميذ بالمدارس وتهدف أياديهم بوخرات ابر	01:24:00	01:28:15						
Total: 0:04:15								

		7. التزويم المغناطيسي .. رحلة الى الوعي لعلاج الأمراض النفسية والإدمان	01:28:30	01:49:56				
			Total: 00:21:26					
19	01:33:09	1. زهاية عهد الموسوي السراطة .. ال لابذال مجددا	00:02:17	00:35:05	The episode was not analyzed because only two members of the cast were present and most talk held by five guests.			
			Total: 00:32:48					
		2. الزصب على مواقع التواصل .. احتيال بهوية مجهولة	00:35:05	01:01:57				
			01:14:20	01:16:55				
			Total: 00:29:27					
		3. وضت المحكمة الفرنسية بسجن 6 سنوات نافذة في حق النيران سجد المجدد	01:01:57	01:04:36				
			Total: 00:02:39					
		4. صيادلة يعرضون الرعب بربب مدمني المهلوسات	01:16:55	01:32:04				
			Total: 00:15:09					
20	01:55:08	1. الخصوصية لدى الجزائري .. المجهول بات معلوم	00:03:02	00:31:22	The longest topic is the 2 nd , yet it was excluded because most of the talk was held by four guests.	00:03:02	00:03:39	00:18:01
						00:04:41	00:05:16	
						00:06:05	00:08:22	
						00:09:00	00:13:59	
				00:16:05	00:16:25			
				00:16:40	00:17:32			
				00:17:51	00:18:05			
				00:18:54	00:19:17			
				00:19:54	00:20:40			
				00:22:01	00:25:20			
				00:26:49	00:27:48			
				00:28:42	00:31:22			
			Total: 00:28:20					
		2. المهلوسات .. سم ينخر أجساد الشرباب	00:31:22	01:25:42				
			Total: 00:54:20					
		3. نتاة مربية تولى عزمها خطيبها بعد ما نفتت بصرها	01:26:34	01:29:16				
			Total: 00:02:42					
21	01:52:32	1. وخز الأطفال .. وضية يكذبونها الغموض	00:15:48	00:37:14	The episode was not analyzed because most			
			Total: 00:21:26					
		2. السحر والشعوذة .. خراب البيوت وتحطيم الزنوس	00:37:14	01:11:04				
			Total: 00:33:50					
		3. المدارس .. من محيط راقى للتعليم الى محيط تهدهه الفت	01:11:04	/				

			Total: cannot be determined	talk was held by the guests. The duration of the 3 rd topic could not be determined; the video was corrupted.			
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--	--	--	--

Appendix B

Data Coding

Table B 2: Categories With Brief Definition

	<i>Categories</i>	<i>Definitions</i>
<i>"Vocabulary choices":</i>	Hedges	use a code for instances where speakers use language to soften their claims or make their statements less absolute.
	Tag questions	use a code for instances where speakers use tag questions to seek agreement or confirmation from their conversational partner.
	Empty adjectives	use a code for instances where speakers use adjectives that do not add any meaningful information to their statements
	Adjective of colours	can be used as descriptors. This arises when they are used to describe or alter an object.
	Intensifiers	use a code for instances where speakers use words to emphasise or intensify their statements.
	Diminutives	use a code for instances where speakers use words to indicate smallness or affection.
	Swear words	use a code for instances where speakers use profanity or vulgar language.
	Borrowed items	use a code for instances where speakers use loanwords or borrow from another language.
<i>"Phonetic features":</i>	Speaking rate	use a code for instances where speakers speak fast or slow.
	Voice quality	use a code for instances where speakers use variations in their voice quality, such as monotone or expressive.
	Intonation	use a code for instances where speakers use variations in their pitch or tone to convey meaning.
	Pauses	use a code for instances where speakers use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filled pauses: are verbal interruptions or hesitations that people use in speech as a sign of nervousness or lack of confidence • Non-filled poses: are moments of silence in speech that serve a similar function to filled pauses.

	Emphatic stress	use a code for instances where speakers use stress or emphasis to emphasise certain words or phrases.
	The length of the turn	the amount of time a speaker speaks before allowing another speaker to take a turn.
"Gender Miscommunication":	Accommodation	refers to the ways in which individuals adapt their language or communication style to better align with the norms, expectations, or preferences of their audience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convergence refers to the process of adapting one's communication style • Divergence refers to the process of intentionally distancing oneself from the norms, expectations, or preferences of the listener. • Maintenance is the process of maintaining one's communication style without adapting to the norms, expectations, or preferences of the listener. Maintenance is unintentional
	Interruption	use a code for every instance where a speaker interrupts another speaker.
	Indirectness	use a code for instances where speakers use indirect language.
	Prestige	use a code for instances where speakers use language that conveys social status or power.
	Politeness	use a code for instances where speakers use language to convey politeness or respect. It consists of two types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive politeness: By emphasising friendliness, techniques are meant to avoid offence. • Negative politeness: based on avoidance and assumes that the speaker will impose on the hearer.

Appendix C

Outcome of the Content Analysis

Table C 3: Data extracted from the episodes concerning Vocabulary choices and Phonetic features

Episode 01	Vocabulary selection	Participants	Duration/ Exact moment	Uttrance	Analysis	Misscommunication
والحوادث الواقعة بدين الجماهير حياة .	Empty adjectives	Yacine	(2 :27) (13:18)	جيلة مشهور	The particioants use empty adjective just foking their opinions concerning the topic discussed	
		Samir	(5 :36)	ملايح		
		Yahia	(8:22/8 :24)	مشهور		
		Nassima	(14:59)	شباب		
		Samia	(13 :18)	مشهور		
		Moufida	(7 :05)	نانه		
	Adjective of colours					
	Hedges					
	Intensifiers	Yacine	(2 :27/25 :20) (6 :01) (15 :39/15 :56)	جدا بزاف اكيد	All the penalists use intensifier to emphis that nit everything shared in social media istrue and we should not believe everything we see	
		Samir	(5:33)	بزاف		
Yahia		2 :46/2 :53 5:34/7:54/ 8:38) (7:55)	بزاف طبعا كثير			

	Nassima	(4:02) (4:29) (4 :15/4 :16 /4 :17/4 :19)	بزاف Exactement اكثر		
	Samia	(24:54)	بزاف		
	Moufida	(7 :05/13 :45) (7 :10) (13:36/14:53)/	جدا صح بزاف		
Diminutives					
Borrowed items	Yacine		IbloukaBloukitouch Mbloukiya / emojis / des exemple / les commandes /sujet/ des series / social media / block	All the participantsnn used borrowed items with its types since this show targette all the genration and even we use nativised borrowed items in our dialect in every day conversation	
	Samir		Tpartagie/ Jamet /itpuki emojis /block		
	Yahia		Neklachiw j'aime / obliger /retard / social media /les reseau sociaux / la music / les scenario		
	Nassima		Des séries une séries -scénarisé - réseaux social - les adolescents npartagie		
	Samia		Scinaryouhet/Telephone/Tsstag na/ npartagie/blokiwni /tjustifilli Telephone/L'Instagram/ Publique /Bravo/Facilement		

				/Troisième/restaurant/Bonjour /Problèmes/les crêpes(2) /Les glasses		
		Moufida		Jamet des jeunes/ contre		
	Swear words					
	Tag questions	Yacine		وهو كيدير pub يجيب الالف lescommandes	Yacine used tag question because he needs a confirmation from Moufida since she was talking about influencers that they have no affect on people	Yacine interrupted Moufida since they was talking about influencers but this overlap does not create a miscommunication

Appendix D

T-Test results

Speaking Rate

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SR	0	10	77,8000	7,37564	2,33238
	1	10	76,2000	7,48034	2,36549

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
SR Equal variances assumed	,097	,759	,482	18	,636	1,60000	3,32198	-5,37922	8,57922
SR Equal variances not assumed			,482	17,996	,636	1,60000	3,32198	-5,37932	8,57932

Filled Pauses

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
FP	0	10	23,8000	9,99778	3,16157
	1	10	16,1111	3,91933	1,30644

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
FP Equal variances assumed	4,510	,049	2,158	17	,046	7,68889	3,56337	,17084	15,20693
Equal variances not assumed			2,248	11,944	,044	7,68889	3,42087	,23159	15,14619

Non Filled Pauses

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
NFP	0	10	,4000	,51640	,16330
	1	10	,7000	,67495	,21344

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
NFP Equal variances assumed	,543	,471	1,116	18	,279	-,30000	,26874	-,86461	,26461
Equal variances not assumed			1,116	16,848	,280	-,30000	,26874	-,86739	,26739

Emphatic Stress

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ES	0	10	4,7000	1,63639	,51747
	1	10	5,7000	1,94651	,61554

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
ES Equal variances assumed	,963	,339	1,244	18	,230	-1,00000	,80416	2,68947	,68947
Equal variances not assumed			1,244	17,484	,230	-1,00000	,80416	2,69305	,69305

Length of Turn

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	0	10	565,10	241,052	76,227
LoT	1	10	551,50	256,567	81,134

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
LoT Equal variances assumed	,102	,754	,122	18	,904	13,600	111,325	-220,285	247,485
LoT Equal variances not assumed			,122	17,930	,904	13,600	111,325	-220,350	247,550

Number of Turns

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	0	10	11,8000	4,18463	1,32330
NoT	1	10	8,3000	3,30151	1,04403

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. ErrorDifference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
N Equal variances assumed	,304	,588	2,076	18	,042	3,50000	1,68556	-,04123	7,04123
T Equal variances not assumed			2,076	17,075	,043	3,50000	1,68556	-,05502	7,05502

Empty Adjectives

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EA	0	10	2,6000	2,27058	,71802
	1	10	3,0000	2,00000	,63246

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. ErrorDifference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
EA Equal variances assumed	,938	,346	-,418	18	,681	-,40000	,95685	-2,41026	1,61026
Equal variances not assumed			-,418	17,718	,681	-,40000	,95685	-2,41256	1,61256

Hedges

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
HED	0	10	,6000	,84327	,26667
	1	10	,4000	,69921	,22111

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
HED Equal variances assumed	,929	,348	,577	18	,571	,20000	,34641	-,52778	,92778
HED Equal variances not assumed			,577	17,403	,571	,20000	,34641	-,52957	,92957

Intensifiers

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
INT	0	10	7,4000	2,50333	,79162
	1	10	6,3000	2,49666	,78951

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. ErrorDifference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
INT Equal variances assumed	,001	,970	,984	18	,338	1,10000	1,11803	-1,24890	3,44890
Equal variances not assumed			,984	18,000	,338	1,10000	1,11803	-1,24890	3,44890

Nativied BI

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
N BI	0	10	5,7000	3,94546	1,24766
	1	10	3,4000	1,83787	,58119

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. ErrorDifference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
N Equal BI variances assumed	4,200	,055	1,671	18	,112	2,30000	1,37639	-,59168	5,19168
Equal variances not assumed			1,671	12,730	,119	2,30000	1,37639	-,67993	5,27993

Non-nativised BI

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
NN BI	0	10	17,6000	9,89051	3,12765
	1	10	8,0000	5,31246	1,67995

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
NN Equal BI variances assumed	2,286	,148	2,704	18	,015	9,60000	3,55027	2,14115	17,05885
			2,704	13,794	,017	9,60000	3,55027	1,97474	17,22526

Code switching

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
CS	0	10	22,1000	11,70423	3,70120
	1	10	18,7000	6,27252	1,98354

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
CS Equal variances assumed	7,011	,016	,810	18	,429	3,40000	4,19921	-5,42221	12,22221
Equal variances not assumed			,810	13,776	,432	3,40000	4,19921	-5,62017	12,42017

Jargon

Group Statistics

	M/F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
CS	0	10	6,0000	5,69600	1,80123
	1	10	6,8000	6,46013	2,04287

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
CS Equal variances assumed	,223	,643	,294	18	,772	-,80000	2,72356	-6,52199	4,92199
Equal variances not assumed			,294	17,722	,772	-,80000	2,72356	-6,52843	4,92843

Appendix E
Detailed Results

Table E1

The distribution of Rising Intonation (RI) among panelists in the entire episodes

E	MH	MP1	MP2	FP2	FP3	FP1
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	0	0	0	0	0
5	1		0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	1	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0		0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	0	0		0	0	0
16	0	1		0	0	0
17	0	1		0	0	0
18	0	0		0	0	0
20	0	0		0	0	0
Total		5			0	

Table E2

Details of Length of Turns and Counts in Entire Episodes for Male Panelists

EP	Nassima			Samia			Moufida		
	Total Length (Seconds)	Turns Count	Turn's mean (Seconds)	Total Length (Seconds)	Turns Count	Turn's mean (Seconds)	Total Length (Seconds)	Turns Count	Turn's mean (Seconds)
01	205	5	41	303	4	75.75	167	3	55.6
02	162	2	81	285	3	95	102	2	51
04	143	3	47.6	275	2	137.5	141	1	141
05	199	2	99.5	353	2	176.5	292	2	146
06	82	2	41	206	2	103	163	2	81.5
07	74	3	246	129	1	129	108	2	54
08	149	4	37.25	14	1	14	196	3	65.3
09	182	3	60.6	244	3	81.3	291	4	72.75
10	561	10	56.1	242	3	80.6	240	2	120
12	135	3	45	272	3	90.6	156	3	52
13	84	1	84	69	1	69	55	2	27.5
14	220	5	44	388	3	129.3	515	7	73.57
15	39	1	39	23	1	23	23	1	23
16	16	1	16	32	2	16	23	1	23
17	89	3	29.6	197	6	32.8	468	6	78
18	266	4	66.5	139	3	46.3	166	2	83
20	102	3	34	171	6	28.5	223	6	37.2
Total	2708	55	/	3342	46	/	3329	49	/
Mean	/	3	62.83	196.6	3	78.1	195.8	3	69.7
Total Length of Females Turns			9379	Female's Turn Length Mean			70.21		
Total Count of Females Turns			150	Female's Turn Count Mean			3		

Table E3*The use of Code Switching among participants*

Episode 01	Vocabulary selection	Participants	Uttrance
	Code switching	Yacine	life style f le mon de complet life style Des familles très riches f le Monde En est d'accord quelques les influenceures w les influenceuses <u>trèsbien</u> <u>Des cas</u> <i>Alaise</i> 30secondes <u>bien sur</u> <i>Le même</i> <u>Est ce que</u>
		Samir	la même chose non nonnon Et tout c'est Clair c'est ça 4Seasons Malgrerahi f blocklesstoryte3ccCoucou Mais mn scandalesscandales
		Yahia	A ce point A ce point Rahoum retard Parce que Bon(2) Jamais D'accord Parce que Bien
		Nassima	-Parce que c'est une réalité - tu créai une vie -s'avons mieux - mais je suis contre partout dans le monde -sur un plat forme - sur une chaine télévision - Mais -une structure marketing -je suis obligé -parce que

			-ils sont pas comparé quelque s'ave dire influenceure -il peut être un artistique Exactement Pardon
		Samia	Toujours active f les réseaux sociaux collaboration et tout en panne b tomobile loin de تجازة tout Par curiosités Alors Est-ce que d'accord toujours Alors Oui donc Parce que _3 million 2 millions vraiment par contre Et la preuve Je ne sais pas
		Moufida	Gâteau f les frigidaire C'est non Saye Même Puisque

Table E4*The use of foreign words*

Episode	Fr FW		En FW	
	M	F	M	F
1	1	1	0	0
2	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0
5	1	2	0	0
6	0	0	1	0
7	4	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0
9	3	0	0	0
10	0	1	0	0
12	1	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0
15	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0
17	0	1	0	1
18	0	2	0	0
20	0	0	0	1
Total	10	7	1	2

Foreign words are terms or vocabulary originating from languages other than the native language of the speaker or the language being primarily used in a specific context. These words are adopted from other languages and may retain their original form, pronunciation, and meaning (webster dictionary 2003).

Table E5*The use of Jargon*

Episode 01	Vocabulary selection		Participants	Duration/ Exact moment	Uttrance
	Jargon		Yacine		L'engagement des publicités /Les stories 10millional million 500k 600k3k
			Samir		Les fans
			Yahia		L'engagement Buzze Des stories Les stories
			Nassima		-buzze Dislike - les abonnes (2) -youtubeur
			Samia		Les abonnés L'émissions les stories les publications300k 23j'aimes J'aimes
			Moufida		lesabonnes Story l'émission les pubs
				Foreign words	French words
Samia					
Yahia					
Nassima					
Samia					
Moufida					
English words	Yacine				
	Samia				
	Yahia				
	Nassima				
		Samia			

			Moufida		
--	--	--	---------	--	--

"jargon" following Trudgill's (2003) definition. This term is used by individuals who are not involved in a particular activity to describe the specific language used within that activity. When this term is employed, it suggests that the vocabulary associated with the language style is excessively intricate and difficult to understand.

Table E6*The distribution of interruption based on phonetic features*

Episod e	Yacine		Samir		Yahia		Nassima		Samia		Moufida	
1	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1 LoT	1 LoT 1 FP 2 *	0	1LoT	1 *	1Lo T 1*	1 *	1Lo T	1 *	1 LoT	1*	1 LoT
2	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1*	1*	1 *	0	1*	1FP 1EM 1Lo T 1*	2*	0	1*	0	2*	0
4	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1Lo T 1*	2LoT	1 *	1LoT	1Lo T 1*	1* 1Lo T	1* 1Lo T	1Lo T	3* 1Lo T	0	1Lo T	1Lo T
5	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1* 1Lo T	3* 2LoT 1NF P 1FP			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2*
6	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1*	0	1 *	0	1*	2*	1*	0	1* 1Lo T	1Lo T	1*	0
7	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	2* 1FP 1Lo T	1*	0	1*	0	0	0	0	3* 0	0	1* 0	0
8	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	1*	0	0	1NF P	0	1*	0	0	0	0	0	1*
9	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	2*	2*	1 *	2*	0	4*	1* 1*	1* 1*	1* 1*	1* 1*	0	0
10	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	0	1* 1LoT			0	2*	1F P	2*	0	0	0	1*

	1NF P															
12	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	1*	1*	0	0	0	2*	0	0	0	0	2*	0				
	1LoT															
13	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	0	1*	0	1*	0	0	0	0	1Lo	0	0	0				
	T															
14	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	1*	0	0	0	1*	4*	0	0	0	0	1*	1*				
15	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0				
16	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	0	0	0	0			1	1FP	0	0	1 RI	0				
	RI															
17	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	2*	2*	0	2*			1*		0	0	0	0				
	1 RI															
18	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	0	2*	0	1*						1Lo	0	1*				
	T															
20	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F				
	2Lo	3 FP	1	1*			1*	1 FP	1 FP	0	0	1 FP				
	T															
	7 LoT (male)				12 LoT (female)				4 LoT (males)				6 LoT(female)			
Total	1 FP (males)				7 FP (female)				2 FP (males)				3 FP(female)			
	0 EM (male)				1 EM (female)				0 EM (male)				0 EM (female)			
	0 NFP (male)				3 NFP (female)				0 NFP (male)				0 NFP(female)			
	1 RI (male)				0 RI (female)				2 RI (male)				0 RI(female)			
	0 SR (male)				0 SR (female)				0 SR (male)				0 SR (female)			

Résumé

Dans le domaine de la langue et de la communication, l'influence du genre est reconnue depuis longtemps comme un facteur façonnant le comportement linguistique et les schémas d'interaction. Dans le contexte des émissions télévisées, comprendre le rôle du genre dans la sélection et la performance linguistiques est particulièrement pertinent. Cette étude explore le paysage linguistique de l'émission Algérienne *The Weekend Show* afin d'analyser les choix de vocabulaire et les caractéristiques phonétiques utilisés par les participants masculins et féminins. En examinant ces aspects linguistiques, l'objectif est de mettre en lumière le langage utilisé par le panel de l'émission et d'explorer comment ces différences peuvent entraîner des problèmes de communication. Cela est réalisé en choisissant soigneusement les épisodes et en extrayant des données à l'aide d'une approche de recherche descriptive, en utilisant un échantillonnage délibéré pour sélectionner *The Weekend Show*, et en utilisant l'analyse de contenu. À travers l'analyse des résultats, plusieurs conclusions clés ont émergé. Tout d'abord, des différences observables ont été identifiées dans le discours des hommes et des femmes, en particulier dans l'utilisation des caractéristiques phonétiques et des choix de vocabulaire, qui sont influencés par divers facteurs. En revanche, l'absence de pauses remplies et l'utilisation d'intensificateurs présentent une signification qualitative, suggérant des variations notables dans les styles de discours et l'influence du sujet abordé. De plus, ces différences peuvent entraîner des problèmes de communication, principalement des interruptions. Enfin, l'utilisation d'un langage émotionnel et collaboratif chez les femmes et d'un langage dominant, assertif et compétitif chez les hommes perpétue les stéréotypes de genre.

Les mots clés: genre, choix de vocabulaire, caractéristiques phonétiques, comportement linguistique, schémas d'interaction, émissions de télévision, stéréotypes basés sur le genre.

الملخص

في مجال اللغّة والتواصل، تم الاعتراف جزئياً بنبرة طويلة بتأثير الجنس كعامل مهم في تشكيل السلوك اللغوي وأنماط التفاعل. وفي سياق العروض التلفزيونية، يصبح دور الجنس في اختيار اللغّة والأداء ذا أهمية خاصة. تطرقت هذه الدراسة إلى التحديق في خيارات المفردات والسمات الصوتية **The Weekend Show** المشهد اللغوي للبرنامج الحوارية الجزائري المستخدمة من قبل الذكور والإناث. من خلال دراسة هذه الجوانب اللغوية، الهدف هو تسليط الضوء على اللغّة الجنسية المستخدمة المستخدمة في العرض واستكشاف كيف أن هذه الاختلافات تؤدي إلى سوء التواصل. ويتم تحديق ذلك من خلال اختيار الحلقات بعناية، واستخدام تصميم بحث وصفي، واستخدام عينات موضوعية الاختيار عرض نهائية الأسبوع، وإجراء تحليل المحتوى. ومن خلال تحليل النتائج، ظهرت عدة نتائج رئيسية. أولاً، هناك اختلافات ملحوظة في كالم الذكور والإناث، وتحديداً في استخدام السمات الصوتية المختارة والخيارات اللغوية. ويلاحظ الأهمية الإحصائية في استخدام نبرات التوقف المملوءة، وطول النبرة، وألغراض المسبحة في المفردات، مما يشير إلى أنماط أو اتجاهات واضحة. وعلى العكس من ذلك، تظهر نبرات التوقف غير المعجاة والمكثفات أهمية نوعية، مما يشير إلى اختلافات ملحوظة أو المحطات ذاتية. وعلاوة على ذلك، يمكن أن تؤدي هذه الاختلافات إلى سوء الاتصال، وخصوصاً من خلال النزق طاع. وأخيراً، فإن تأثير مواضيع وخصائص ثقافية محددة يشكل تحدياً لهذه القوالب الزمطية القائمة على نوع الجنس ويؤدي نشكلها، مع التشديد على الطابع المعقد والمنزوع الاستخدام اللغّة

الكلمات المفتاحية الجنس ، اختيار المفردات ، السمات الصوتية ، السلوك اللاغوي ، أنماط التفاعل ، البرامج التلغوية ، الصور

..الزمطية للجنسين