

## **The effect of joint interviewing on the performance of gender**

Authors: Seale, C., Charteris-Black, J., Dumelow, C., Locock, L. and Ziebland, S.

Clive Seale  
School of Social Sciences  
Brunel University  
Uxbridge  
Middlesex  
UB8 3PH  
UK  
Email: [clive.seale@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:clive.seale@brunel.ac.uk)

Jonathan Charteris-Black  
School of Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies  
University of the West of England  
Frenchay Campus  
Coldharbour Lane  
Bristol  
BS16 1QY  
UK

Carol Dumelow, Louise Locock, Sue Ziebland.  
DIPEX  
Department of Primary Health Care  
University of Oxford  
Old Road Campus  
Headington  
Oxford  
OX3 7LF  
UK

Length (Main text plus references): 7,719 words  
Plus three tables

**Abstract:** We report a series of controlled comparisons of 57 one-to-one qualitative interviews and 37 mixed-sex joint interviews on the same health related topics. Our analysis identifies comparative keyword frequencies and is supported by qualitative investigations of keywords in context, drawing on existing relevant knowledge of common gender differences in language choice. Men are less likely to swear in joint interviews and women no more likely to do so. Other gender differences, for example, concerning women's propensity to talk about feelings and a wide range of other people, and men's propensity to talk about information technology, are reduced in the joint interview setting. Health issues, including pregnancy and children's health, appear to be seen by both men and women as topics where women's perspectives should be prominent. The findings suggest that this tendency is more marked in the joint interview setting, so researchers wanting to find out about men's experiences of fatherhood may find out more in one-to-one interviews with men. The greater readiness of men to engage in gender-stereotyped behaviour in sole interviews, most of which involved a female interviewer, suggests that an interviewer's gender identity is perceived as somewhat neutral by comparison with the considerable salience of the gender of a joint respondent. This finding potentially contributes to knowledge of the qualitative interview as a special form of institutional talk.

**Keywords:** Joint interviewing; gender difference; experience of illness; comparative keyword analysis

## Introduction

The dynamics of one-to-one qualitative interviews (Gubrium and Holstein 2002) and of focus groups (Kitzinger 1994; Barbour and Kitzinger 1999) have been the subject of much methodological comment and study, but the joint interview is less well understood. Rather than simply being ‘half way’ between sole interviews and focus groups, joint interviews (ie: one interviewer and two respondents) may generate interactions that are qualitatively different from either. We report a study of joint interviews with mixed-sex pairs of respondents, comparing these with one-to-one interviews on the same topics. We place this in a social research methodological context but draw also on sociolinguistic literature on the performance of gender in mixed and single sex settings.

### *Methodological literature*

It is important at the outset to be clear about definitions and philosophical perspectives. We distinguish joint interviews from situations where a one-to-one interview happened to include a third party, as was the case in the study reported by Boeije (2004), who found that spouses sometimes wanted to overhear, or to be present during all or part of an interview with a person experiencing multiple sclerosis. We, on the other hand, have studied situations where pairs of people, usually spouses, were at times intentionally interviewed in order to gather a joint perspective. Boeije takes the realist view that co-presence of third parties can ‘undermine the validity’ (2004: 3) of data that is by preference generated in sole interview settings. Boeije finds that the presence of a spouse can make respondents avoid criticising the spouse or be reluctant to reveal personally discrediting information. We, on the other hand, take a more agnostic view of validity, which depends on the use to which an account is put by the researcher rather than being inherent in the account itself, and explore instead the effect of differential context (joint versus sole) on the type of account produced.

Arksey (1996), in her review of the social research literature on joint interviewing, indicates that these are ‘qualitatively different’ (1996: 1) from sole interviews, echoing Allan’s (1980) view that they may ‘lead to data being generated that could not be obtained from interviews with individuals’ (1980: 205), such as a fuller or more comprehensive account, or allowing for direct observation of interactions between spouses to indicate, for example, how they negotiate decisions. Seymour et al (1995) suggest that joint interviews can reveal the different kinds of knowledge held by each person and that gaps and memory lapses may be remedied by the interventions of a second person. Additionally, they say that a carer can be a helpful prompt for a person with disabilities. In general, these authors claim, a more holistic view of a relationship between a pair can be gained. Morris (2001) argues that the rhetorical production of ‘jointness’ by a marital couple can be observed in joint interviews and recommends close attention to passages where speakers refer to ‘we’ or ‘us’.

There are different views about the effect of the joint interview on disclosure of personal, private or sensitive issues. Seymour et al (1995) take the view that sole interviews facilitate the discussion of sensitive issues, but Morris (2001) in her comparative study of joint and sole interviews with people with cancer and their

carers found no difference in this respect. Radley and Billig (1996) suggest that joint interviews may be occasions for accounts that place particular emphasis on public justifications. But Morris (2001) found that sole interviews could equally be occasions for the display of public accounts, with couples interviewed separately often using identical phrases, suggesting a degree of pre-interview rehearsal for public consumption.

Gender is clearly an independent influence on whether an interview generates accounts involving self-disclosure ('I/me' talk), since a range of sociolinguistic studies (summarised in Coates (2004)) show women are more likely than men to produce such accounts across a variety of settings. Seymour et al (1995) suggest that joint interviews may be helpful in encouraging personal disclosure from men who are otherwise uncomfortable about doing this with a stranger in a sole interview. The effect of joint interviewing on women, though, is considered to be less facilitative: Arksey's (1996) review cites a number of authors claiming that women may be inhibited in such settings if they involve a mixed sex pair, being interrupted by overbearing male informants who see themselves as speaking on behalf of the couple. As will be seen, our analysis does not support this view

Systematic comparison of sole and joint interviews is rare in this methodological literature, which also tends to substitute personal reflections on interviewing experiences for a more data-driven analysis. Morris (2001) is an exception, reporting a study of people with cancer and their carers, some of whom were interviewed singly, others jointly. Morris found equal amounts of talk by both parties in joint interviews, after an initial phase in which the patient (of either sex) had told his/her story. Women tended to report on emotional issues more than men. However, a significant proportion of the joint accounts were devoted to the presentation of a jointly shared version of events, with 'we' talk and mutual 'echoing' and completion of each others phrases (or 'duetting' (Coates 1996)) being particularly evident.

### *Sociolinguistics of mixed-sex talk*

Joint interviews can, of course, be done with same-sex pairs. The present study, though, is of mixed-sex interviews so findings from the general sociolinguistics literature concerning gender are highly relevant. Any analysis of the sociolinguistics of mixed sex talk must start from an appreciation of widespread findings about gender differences in language use, summarised in Coates (2004). In general, mixed-sex settings can often then be seen to reduce these differences, with the exception of some differences (for example, male quantitative dominance of talk) which are only evident in a mixed setting.

Since the publication of Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990) which portrayed gendered identity as a potentially mutable and adaptable performance it has become commonplace amongst sociolinguists interested in gender to question the 'gender differences' tradition that Coates represents (for example, Cameron (2003)). Many studies now demonstrate the presence of subcultures that break with the norms of conventional heterosexual gendered expression, or that achieve gendered identification via unexpected means (for example, through male 'gossip'). While these demonstrate the increased opportunities that exist nowadays for variably performed gender identities, a host of empirical studies show that the linguistic

markers summarised below remain the methods by which the majority of speakers in modern (English speaking) populations perform gender across many different contexts.

Rayson et al (1997) have reported quantitative gender differences in vocabulary use in the spoken element of the British National Corpus (BNC), a representative collection of some 4.5 million words (Crowdy 1995). Their findings for particular words will be given as our own findings are reported as this study establishes a baseline against which gender differences in more specialised corpora can be judged. For the moment, we rely largely on Coates' (2004) comprehensive review of the 'gender differences' sociolinguistic literature.

Coates notes that studies show women to disclose more personal information, talk more about feelings and other people, tell stories that express embarrassment or fear, and to use more questions encouraging interaction rather than ones that constitute their interlocutor as an expert. They use more minimal response tokens like 'yeah', 'right' and 'mhm' and these are usually positioned to show support and encourage interaction. Where men use these tokens they are more likely to be used in a disruptive way, announcing an interruption or delivered after a long pause to indicate lack of interest.

Men, on the other hand, swear and use taboo language more than women, reducing this in mixed sex settings. They prefer to talk about impersonal topics such as 'current affairs, modern technology, cars or sport' (Coates 2004: 133), discuss their achievements or drinking habits and engage in 'expertism'. Unlike women talking in single sex groups, who include a wide range of characters of both sexes in their stories, men generally do not tell stories that involve women as major characters and they are less likely to demonstrate co-operative language patterns (such as an encouraging use of minimal response tokens).

In mixed sex settings men have been found to talk more than women and hold the floor for longer, but are also more likely in such settings to mitigate their performances of masculinity. They have, for example, been found to tell stories that involve female characters, that focus on personal disasters, fears and caring. They may also co-narrate stories with spouses. This involves, for example, latching (following from previous speaker with no interval), repetition and utterance completion of the other's speech, suggesting raised attentiveness to the needs of interlocutors. Thus 'in mixed contexts, it seems that men have more latitude to explore a wider range of masculinities and to display more feminine aspects of themselves' (Coates 2005:101). These findings also suggest a process of communication accommodation in mixed sex settings (Street and Giles 1982) whereby speakers adapt their own language to more closely mirror those of the people they are with.

The broad hypothesis which drives the present methodological study is that a joint interviewing context is likely to result in accounts that demonstrate greater convergence in both linguistic style and topic content than in similar one-to-one interviews. A subsidiary question concerns the potential for mixed-sex joint interviewing to result in accounts that favour the perspective of one gender.

## Methods and materials

In a corpus of 1035 transcribed qualitative interviews collected originally for use on the Dipex web site ([www.dipex.org](http://www.dipex.org)) we identified 37 joint interviews, these being semi structured interviews where respondents were encouraged to talk at length about their experiences. Topics concerned the experience of illness, pregnancy or parenting (Table 1). In all but one matched triplet of interviews the interviewer was female. Each of the joint interviews was matched with a one-to-one ('sole') interview with a man and a woman on the same topic, collected for the same purpose and normally involving the same interviewer. Where possible the age of the respondent and their socio-economic classification (Rose and Pevalin 2005) was matched. In one case (prostate cancer) a female sole match could not be found. In 16 cases a male match could not be found, most of these involving parenting or pregnancy experiences, since few sole interviews with men on these topics were available in the overall corpus.

*Table 1: topics covered in joint interviews and their matched sole interviews*

	Joint	Sole female matches	Sole male matches
<i>Experience of own illness/health issue</i>			
Colorectal cancer	1	1	1
Prostate cancer	1	0	1
Young people with cancer	2	2	2
Living with dying	2	2	2
Hypertension	1	1	1
Experience of intensive care	7	7	7
Young adult sexual health	1	1	1
<i>Pregnancy-related experiences</i>			
Antenatal screening	6	6	1
Ending a pregnancy	3	3	3
<i>Parents / carers' experiences</i>			
Parents deciding about immunisation	2	2	2
Parents of children with congenital heart disease	10	10	0
Caring for someone with dementia	1	1	0
Total	37	36	21

Analysis involved both quantitative and qualitative techniques, supported by computer software. Interviewer speech and male and female respondent speech were separated into different files for quantitative comparisons of word usage. The numbers and lengths of utterances by the various speakers were calculated for each interview and entered into SPSS for statistical comparative analyses. WordSmith Tools (Scott

2005) was used for comparative keyword analysis (Seale et al 2006) to identify key quantitative differences in vocabulary choice. WMatrix ([www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/ucrel/wmatrix](http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/ucrel/wmatrix)) supplemented this by applying dictionary-based semantic tagging that helped identify meaningful word and short phrase clusters on which there were significant differences between texts. The 'keyword-in-context' displays of these software packages, and our inspection of original transcripts generated a more contextual understanding of the function of particular words. This means we present a context-sensitive, systematic comparative analysis of joint and sole interview texts that is both replicable and objective, informed by our knowledge of methodological and sociolinguistic literature

Comparisons of interviews proceeded through the following four steps

1. A comparison to establish baseline differences between men and women in sole interviews
2. A comparison between joint and sole interviews for men to answer the question 'what is the effect of joint interviewing on men?'
3. The same comparison as (2) for women.
4. A comparison to establish differences between men and women in joint interviews. Differences identified here could be compared with differences found in step 1 to see if they had lessened or otherwise changed.

For making direct comparisons between groups of interviews, transcripts were selected, or 'matched', so that like was always compared with like. First, a '*strictly matched*' sub-sample of 24 interviews was selected. This comprised eight pairs of male and female sole interviews matched for topic, age and socio-economic status for which there were eight matched joint interviews. This selection of interviews largely involved parents talking about ending a pregnancy (3 pairs), immunisation (2 pairs), or antenatal care (1 pair). One pair involved carers of people with dementia; another pair involved young adults talking about sexual health. All four of the steps described above could be done on this sub-sample, preserving the principle of comparing like with like.

While this sub-sample forms the core of the analysis reported here, it is restricted to just 24 of the 94 available interviews listed in Table 1, due to the need to discard ones without valid matches. Therefore, this analysis is supplemented by other '*loose matched*' sub-samples, described below.

1. The *sole loose matched* sample consisted of 21 pairs of matched men and women who gave sole interviews. This was used solely for step 1.
2. The *male loose matched* sub-sample consisted of 20 pairs of matched joint and sole interviews with men. This was used for step 2.
3. The *female loose matched* sub-sample consisted of 26 pairs of matched joint and sole interviews with women. This was used for step 3.
4. The *joint loose matched sample* consisted of 24 joint interviews where both speakers were either parents, carers of people with illness experiences, or people reporting on their own illness experience. Because male and female respondents' speech was separated into different files, a comparison of male and female speech in joint interviews (step 4) was therefore possible with this sub-sample.

The logic of this analytic sequence, which has been applied to all of the findings sections below (except the first), can be illustrated by considering a simple investigation of the distribution of swear words using the 'loose matched' samples only. We included searches for the words *bastard*, *bloody*, *bugger*, *damn*, *fuck* and *shit* (as well as variations such as 'fucking' and 'fucker'). All instances were inspected in context to exclude instances where these were used but were not swear words.

*Step 1:* comparison of male and female sole interviews revealed 21 such words in men's speech, compared with three in women's, confirming the general findings of the sociolinguistics literature (Coates 2004; Rayson et al 1997).

*Step 2:* comparison of joint and sole interviews with men revealed fewer such words in joint interviews (five as opposed to 19), suggesting that the effect of joint interviewing is to reduce men's tendency to swear.

*Step 3:* with four swear words occurring in female sole interviews and one in their joint interviews, we conclude no particularly strong reduction is caused by joint interviewing in women's already-low propensity to swear.

*Step 4:* Two swear words by men and none by women in joint interviews suggests that this is a setting where the usual gender difference in swearing is absent, because the 'mixed company' of the joint interview setting has reduced men's tendency to swear. Thus men have accommodated, on this measure, to women's linguistic style. Interestingly, the presence of a female interviewer in most of the sole interviews (step 1) does not seem to have inhibited men from swearing. We return to the possible perception of research interviewers as 'gender neutral' in the discussion section of this article.



## Findings

### *Quantitative dominance*

Table 2 shows that, for the strictly matched samples, there is no significant difference in the amount that either gender speaks or the number of interventions they make in sole interviews. In joint interviews, women speak significantly more and more often than men.

Table 2: Gender differences in sole and joint interviews: interjections and words

	Men	Women	p=
<i>Strict matched Sole</i>			
Mean no. of interjections	77	94	0.560
Mean total words	9876	11366	0.518
<i>Strict matched Joint</i>			
Mean no. of interjections	143	181	0.008
Mean total words	3489	8815	0.008

This contrasts with the research literature summarised in Coates (2004) to the effect that although ‘there is a widespread belief in our society that women talk more than men... research findings consistently contradict this’ (2004:117). It accords with the findings of Rayson et al (1997) who found in their study of the British National Corpus that women talked more and took more turns than men. Our own earlier research (Seale et al 2006) suggested that that the topics of health and illness may be regarded by both men and women as ones where women’s concerns and experiences ought to predominate. Given the topic of many of these interviews (child health and pregnancy) this seems a likely explanation of the overall quantitative parity or predominance of speech from women.

### *Speaking for ‘us’ rather than ‘me’*

These interviews often involved inquiry into an experience (eg: termination of pregnancy) or a decision (whether to vaccinate a child) in which both interviewees (often parents or partners) were involved. As a result, talking about ‘our’ experience was quite common. Analysis of sole interviews (step 1) showed that men were more likely to see themselves as speaking for both themselves and their partner than were women in such interviews, reflected in a considerably higher usage of *we*, *our*, *we’ve*, *we’re* and *us*. Two examples from male sole interviews are:

Well, at seven weeks we had the scan... we didn't er get told the okay until about twelve weeks, but so, but it felt like we'd been going for months because we'd had so many scans.

So I think even at that stage if we'd known, you know, the chromosomal disorder was easy. That was, for us, was a very easy choice.

Women, on the other hand, were more likely to understand the sole interview as an opportunity to speak about their own experience, reflected in their higher usage of *I*, *my* and *me*. Table 3 gives detailed statistics on this. Such tabulations underlie the quantitative claims that follow, as well as those reported in other sections below, but not all are shown since space does not allow.

Table 3: *I/we pronouns: rate per 1000 words in sole interviews\**

	Strict match		Loose match	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
<i>Men more</i>				
We	10.1	15.8	5.6	9.1
Our	0.8	2.2	0.4	1.2
We've	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.6
We're	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.5
Us	2.3	3.4	1.1	1.8
<i>Women more</i>				
I	43.6	31.9	51.6	41.1
my	8.1	5.7	9.5	7.5
me	4.0	2.6	8.0	5.6
Total no. of words	94,923	85,314	216,996	175,949

\*All gender differences are significant below  $p=0.0001$  (log likelihood test)

This pronoun usage changes markedly when men and women are interviewed in joint settings. The analysis for each gender, comparing how word usage changed between sole and joint interviewing settings (steps 2 and 3) showed both genders to be more likely to use *you* in joint interviews, largely because they were addressing each other during the joint interview. But 'we' usage became considerably more frequent for women, with *our* and *we* figuring amongst the significant keywords for jointly interviewed women, both in the strictly matched and loose matched comparisons with sole interviews, and *we've* and *we're* figuring in the strictly matched comparison. No such change occurred for men. Examples of women's 'we' usage in joint interviews are as follows:

Our, our consultant explained to us that it's a national average

So we had no question in our minds at all and we took our oldest son to be vaccinated, without any worries, whatsoever

Comparison of men and women in joint interviews (step 4) showed no significant gender difference in the rate of 'we' references, with only 'me' figuring as a keyword referencing the self for women. This suggests that joint interviews reduce this gender difference. Men are relatively hesitant to regard their own experience as the topic of inquiry in either joint or sole interviews. When interviewed alone, women regard their own personal experience as the topic of inquiry, modifying this in the joint setting to

include their partners. The implications of this for researchers trying to find out about men's personal experiences are discussed later.

### *Other people*

Women generally include references to wider informal social networks in their stories than do men (Coates 1996; Rayson et al 1997; Seale et al 2006). Comparison of men and women in strictly matched sole interviews (step 1) confirmed this, with *mother, husband, somebody, sister, person, neighbours* and *boyfriend* figuring in women's keywords, but only *wife, wife's* and *boy* in men's. The loose matched comparison added *mum, ladies, person* and *mum's* to this tally for women, and *fetus, child* and *girlfriend* to men's tally. Men in sole interviews thus tend to focus on their partners or use rather impersonal terms to refer to children, whereas women discuss a wider range of people, including those outside the immediate household or family. An example from a woman in a sole interview is:

I've had my **mum** and my **sister** and my **friends**. One of my **colleagues**, well one of my **friends** from work. every time I was moved to a new ward or to another hospital he made sure he was there for each move and to greet me and make sure I was all right and settled. And you know **people** visiting and what have you has really, I couldn't have asked for more really. You know, you really know who your **friends** are when you get stuck like that. But I've always had good **neighbours** so I shall miss them when they move next week.

An example from a man is:

I do believe the decision was made [with regard to] the effect it would have had on the **child**. But I guess...from my **wife's** point of view that she would have had the greater burden.

There were mild indicators that joint interviewing increased men's propensity to talk about a wider range of other people (step 2) and other indicators that they decreased women's (step 3). Thus *person* appeared as a men's joint interview (strict matched) keyword and *mates* in the equivalent loose matched comparison (as in 'all my mates were really good'). For women, *mother, sister, neighbours* and *mother* ceased to be significant keywords, being replaced by the impersonal *child* or *baby* in joint interviews.

These shifts suggest a degree of gender convergence in joint interviews. A direct comparison of the speech of men and women interviewed in joint settings (step 4) confirms this. There were several 'other people' keywords in men's speech in the strict matched comparison (*wife, guys* and *man*) and *wife, guys, people* and *partner* appeared in the loose matched comparison. An example, containing many 'people' words and which also demonstrates a man and his wife orienting to this 'performance' of gender as somewhat unusual, is given below:

Because, you know, it's not just you as a couple. You know, there's, er you know, there's **family** involved in, in the process and um and particularly the **grandparents**. I mean my **parents** don't have any **grandchildren** yet um ... This was their first **grandchild**, you know... So they, you know, they were,

they were proudly starting to tell **friends** and so on and, and it was taken away from them. So it's been hard for them as well. And probably also for, um for **dads**, because, you know, they don't go through the, er the physical side of it, but they go through the emotional side of it. And, er you know, **men** deal with grief in a totally different way from **women** and don't like to talk about it. I've not er really talked about it to many **people**. I've talked to close **family** [*Wife laughs, saying: 'you're doing very well tonight'*] and...one or two **friends**, but it's not something that you just, you know, pitch up at the pub with your **mates**...and over a pint of beer start talking over, because **guys** don't do that. So, um and maybe that's one element of, of all of the support network that's out there, that doesn't probably really explain to **guys** how they're supposed to, to deal with er emotions and grief and crying and all that sort of thing. (*Man in joint interview*)

No keywords appeared for jointly interviewed women in the strict matched comparison with sole interviews; *husband* and *baby* appeared in the loose matched comparison. Thus the effect of joint interviewing is to reduce or perhaps even reverse this commonly found gender difference.

### *Feelings*

Talk about a wide range of feelings is very commonly found to be characteristic of women rather than men (Coates 2004) and in illness narratives particularly (Kiss and Meryn 2001; Seale et al 2006). Comparison of strict matched pairs of sole interviews (step 1) established this difference quite clearly. There were no feelings keywords for men but *felt*, *nervous*, *feel* and *silly* characterised women's speech. With the exception of *nervous* these also all appeared as women's sole interview keywords in the loose matched comparison, which also identified *coped*, *accept*, *horrendous*, *hated*, *frightened* and *confused*. 'Felt' is not an unequivocal 'feelings' word as it can also be used to refer to beliefs and physical sensations, but inspection of context showed it to be almost exclusively used to refer to feelings (for example 'I just felt unhappy', 'we felt really judged'). A fuller example is:

I **felt** a lot of comfort and joy for other people who were having a successful pregnancy. You know I **felt** I love to see it working well... And um I was quite taken aback and quite shocked by that so you know there, people have some very extreme feelings around this subject.

Comparison of each gender across sole and joint interview settings (steps 2 and 3) revealed no significant keywords relating to this dimension, with the exception of women in joint interviews who were less likely to talk about how they had *coped* or might *cope* with their situations, suggesting a mild reduction in women's references to emotions in joint interviews.

Comparison of men and women in joint interviews (step 4) showed that only the keyword *felt* was more common in women's speech in the strict matched comparison and only *confident* in the loose match. *Panicking* now appears as a keyword for men in joint interviews. Thus joint interviewing appears to have reduced women's greater propensity to discuss feelings, and slightly increased men's

### *Attentiveness and support*

Words like ‘hmm’, ‘mm’ and ‘yeah’ are often used to indicate attentiveness and support, as is shown in this extract from a joint interview where a woman intersperses her partner’s story with ‘Hmm’:

Man: Yeah, I guess um I haven't had a great deal of one night stands and they're not terribly fulfilling  
Woman: Hmm  
Man: and there's always that worry about what, what, where has she been and  
Woman: Hmm  
Man: who's she's been with and  
Woman: Hmm  
Man: so there's, there's anxiety on that front. It's better, better to be with someone I think.

Coates (2004) reviewing the literature on such ‘minimal responses’ or ‘back channels’ suggests that it is

unanimous in showing that women use them more than men, and at appropriate moments, that is, at points in conversation which indicate the listener’s support for the current speaker... . Holmes (1995: 55) asks rhetorically whether minimal responses are ‘a female speciality’ (2004: 87).

However, Rayson et al (1997) report ‘yeah’, and ‘hmm’ to be more common in men’s speech and ‘mm’ to be more common in women’s speech, though these authors do not report the context of these interjections.

Our findings indicate the opposite to Coates’ conclusion, being more in line with Rayson et al. Men were more likely than women to use *yeah*, *hmm* and *OK* in both strict and loose comparisons of sole interviews (step 1). Both genders became more likely to use *mm*, *mmm*, *yeah* and *hmm* in joint interviews, presumably because there were two people to attend to rather than just one (steps 2 and 3). When men and women were compared in joint interviews, men remained more likely to use such markers, these now including *mm*, *mmm*, *yeah* and *hmm*.

But context is important when assessing the function of these words. Coates suggests that that ‘when men *do* use minimal responses, these are often delayed, a tactic which undermines the current speaker and reinforces male dominance’ (2004: 88). To investigate this proposition a stratified random sample of 100 uses of such words were selected (25 from each type of interview). Blinded to the gender of the speaker and whether the interview was sole or joint, one of us (a linguistics specialist: JC-B) categorised each usage according to whether or not it was a minimal response token, and then according to whether it was associated with an interruption or other kind of assertion of dominance, such as a lack of interest in what the other speaker was saying.

29/100 examples were categorised as not being minimal responses and this appeared randomly distributed (14 women and 15 men; 16 sole and 13 joint). Such usages were, for example, where a speaker reported another person’s speech. No examples

were judged to have involved interruption, an attempt to undermine the other speaker, or to have resulted in dominance of the interaction. The other 71 instances were judged to involve the use of these words to indicate attentiveness and support for the other speaker. For example:

Interviewer: Basically what um what I do is I do interview today

Male respondent: **Hmm**

Interviewer: We cover issues like um relationship history, your knowledge about contraceptives

Woman: I mean he was one of these doctors that just tells you the facts.

Man: **Hmm**

Woman: He told us that there was a risk of death but it was a very small risk and um it was very, really it was a very simple operation where it was a, ...

We therefore conclude that the greater use of markers of attentiveness and support by men is maintained across both sole and joint interview settings. It seems likely that in the case of joint interviews this is because women are more likely to hold the floor, with men in a listening role much of the time.

### **Communication preferences**

A further area in which gender differences have been found is in communication preferences. Coates (2002) has found that men's story telling often involves portraying the speaker as an expert. Jackson et al (2001) show that men are more likely than women to use the internet to get information. Kiss and Meryn (2001), reviewing the literature on gender and cancer, conclude that men prefer information exchange to attending support groups or sharing feelings. Where men do organise support groups, men have been found to like to use them to discuss medical information and hear the views of invited expert speakers, whereas women have been found to dislike the involvement of such outsiders, preferring small meetings with opportunities for intimacy with other women (Gray et al 1996). Klemm et al (1999) and Seale et al (2006) in studies comparing men and women's postings to online illness forums indicate that men are more likely to exchange information whereas women are more likely to be mutually supportive and share personal experiences.

To explore the effect of joint interviewing on these well established gender differences we therefore examined word clusters relating to the use of information technology and to use of the telephone, on which marked gender differences were initially highly evident. For this, we draw on an analysis of semantically tagged word clusters, using WMatrix software.

#### *Gender and information technology*

Men in sole interviews were significantly more likely to use *Information technology and computing* words, in both strict and loose matched comparisons (step 1:  $p < 0.001$  for both comparisons). Words contributing most to this category were *screen, internet, website, computer* and *IT*. Examples from sole-interviewed men include:

it made it more real for us to see it [the fetus] on **screen** I think.

I've looked on the **internet** at certain sites but not really very much. There was a help line when I was ill but I wasn't, at that point I didn't really want to, didn't really want to phone up and speak to someone about it

I think that, the official sites I think are, um you know, um contain good quality information. You can look on the um you know, the national immunisation **website**, the 'MMR: the facts' **website** I think provide very reliable information.

The joint interview setting had no significant effect on men's propensity to use these words (step 2). But for women in the strict matched sample, joint interviewing produced a highly significant ( $p < 0.0001$ ) shift towards greater usage of these words (step 3), although no significant difference occurred for women in the same comparison for the loose matched sample. Some examples from joint-interviewed women include:

it was just amazing seeing him on **screen**, like that. Or "it" on **screen**, as we used to say, because we didn't know the sex.

you have to take everything on the **internet** with a grain of salt

if you certainly look on any autism **website**, a lot of them will now tell you the marker illnesses to look out for.

There was no significant gender difference for this category in the joint interview setting (step 4). This suggests that the joint interview setting reduces gender differences for these topics, possibly because women increasingly discuss them in joint interviews.

### *Gender and phoning*

Women in sole interviews were significantly more likely than men (step 1) to use *telecommunications* words ( $p < 0.0001$  strict;  $p < 0.001$  loose). Words contributing most to this category were *phone*, *phoned*, *telephone*, *phone up*, *phone call*, *phoned up* and *phone number*. Examples of women using these words in sole interviews include:

I was at home, um just myself and one of my, one of my sons and the, on the **phone** call um he said "I've got bad news and good news for you. The bad news is that you have a Down's Syndrome child, the good news is that you're booked in to have an abortion first thing tomorrow."

So I spent the whole morning on the **phone** from here, **phoning up** various charities...

Once I had to trawl through **directory enquiries** and try and find this woman

Joint interviewing when compared with sole interviewing was associated with a significant reduction ( $p < 0.01$ ) in men's use of *telecommunications* words (step 2). Significant reductions also applied to women in both strict ( $p < 0.0001$ ) and loose ( $p < 0.05$ ) comparisons (step 3).

The gender difference in favour of women using *telecommunications* words remained when men and women in joint interviews in the strict matched sample were compared ( $p < 0.001$ ) but there was no significant difference in the loose matched comparison. Gender differences for this topic therefore remain in the joint setting, though are possibly somewhat weakened.

### **Orienting to gender**

In an earlier study of men posting on a internet based breast cancer message forum (Seale 2006), we found that men who deviate from traditional masculine language choices (eg: talking about their feelings or their children, expressing care and concern) often tended to comment on this behaviour, either in themselves or others. One might therefore expect such explicit orientation to gendered norms to be more common in joint than in sole interviews. To establish whether there were quantitative or qualitative differences between joint and sole interviews we examined all instances of the word *men* in loose matched sole interviews (21 instances) and loose matched joint interviews (13 instances) that involved men.

In male sole interviews 4/21 involved an explicit orientation to male gendered norms. An example is:

there's about one email every 2 months or something [in the men's group] (laughs) because **men**, we can't put, write down emotional stuff like that very well, you don't get a lot of response.

In men's talk in joint interviews 9/13 instances involved an orientation to such norms. One took the form of a man suggesting that although this was 'old fashioned', he felt men had to be 'strong' and take over 'more responsibilities for everyday decisions' when their partners had a problem like that of his wife. Two involved reflections on difficulties they believed men had in expressing emotions. Two involved a man talking about how he had read his sister's magazines to find out about health issues since magazines for men did not contain such material. Two were incorporated in a complaint about double standards in judging sexual behaviour:

I don't know whether it's just **men** and women or just society but I've always, it's always seemed to me that a man who's with a lot of women uh is a, he's a stud or you know he's, he's um it's, it's something to be proud of. But a woman [is] considered a slut, you know if she's with a lot of **men**.

Two more involved a man who complained of being excluded during a health care procedure that was focused on his wife:

there was nowhere for me to be close to her while she was having the, the detailed scan. And I th-, I, I think there is generally an expectation that **men**



are not going to take as much of an interest in these things as women do um so I guess a lot of the time women get talked to and **men** just sit there and listen.

There is therefore only a small quantitative difference, albeit in the direction that supports the hypothesis that joint interviews are more likely to prompt thoughts about masculinity as a topic. More cautiously, we may conclude that being interviewed about personal illness experiences prompts such reflections in some men, whether in sole or joint settings.

## **Discussion**

Many of these interviews involved talk about pregnancy and childbirth, where all concerned are likely to have seen the woman's experiences as the 'first hand' one. This, coupled with the fact that interest in health issues is in general often associated with women, may explain some of our findings. Thus, contrary to concerns that the joint interview setting might result in dominance by men (Arksey 1996), our results show that women in joint interviews are more likely to achieve quantitative dominance. This explanation may also be applied to the finding that men in sole interviews were more likely than women to speak about joint experience (reflected in greater use of *we*, *us* etc). Women in sole interviews clearly interpreted the inquiry as being into their own personal experience (reflected in their greater use of *I* and *me* words), their reference to joint experience increasing when they were interviewed in joint settings. Clearly, men's readiness to talk about themselves separately from their joint identity within a couple was less than that of women and this may be particularly because of the topics covered in these interviews. If researchers want to find out about men's personal experiences of illness and fatherhood it may be better to interview them on their own and to ask questions that maintain a focus on men's, rather than a couple's experiences.

The absence of male dominance is also indicated by the findings about markers of attentiveness, agreement and support for the other speaker. Men are particularly likely to produce these markers and this is not because they are using them as part of a strategy to disrupt or dominate interaction, either in joint or sole settings. While it seems likely that this is related to the listening role of men in joint interviews where women did most of the talking, it is also possible that men, when questioned about personal experience, are particularly concerned to support the interaction. Perhaps they would be different if asked to demonstrate expertise in another kind of topic and it is possible that the studies reviewed by Coates (2004), showing men to be prone to interrupting others or ignoring them, came from such fields.

Our analysis supports the view that joint interviewing reduces certain 'traditional' gender differences that are otherwise evident in one-to-one interviews. The literature shows it to be well established that, when discussing illness experience as well as a variety of other topics, women tend to speak about a wider range of other people than men and discuss feelings more. The effect of joint interviewing on these differences is to reduce them, with our evidence suggesting that men and women move towards each others' topic preferences. The same can be said of the topic of gender and information technology, where men in sole interviews exhibit a well documented tendency to express more interest in this than women (Locock and Alexander 2006) but where joint interviewing reduces the difference, partly because women start to

talk about this topic more. The findings for telecommunications talk are only somewhat supportive of the general picture of gender accommodation in joint interviews.

While it might be concluded from this that the joint setting is experienced by men as one in which unfamiliar gendered norms are experienced, the findings on expressions of unfamiliarity only provide weak support this view. Rather, they suggest that men in both sole and joint interview settings (and we must remember that the interviewer in all but one pair of interviews was a woman, so the 'sole' settings themselves were not single sex environments) had some awareness that the topic of personal health and illness experience was leading them into areas where gendered expectations are commonly contested.

From the viewpoint of a sociolinguist interested in the effect of mixed settings on language choices we must note that we have not compared mixed settings with pure single sex settings. In all cases but one the interviewer was female, so most of the sole interviewed men were, technically speaking, in a 'mixed' setting. This possibly explains why 'we' usage was common in the male sole interviews, or why men appear particularly concerned to use markers of attentiveness and support. In other respects though (eg: swearing, references to feelings and other people) men in sole interviews conformed to what one might expect of a man in a single sex setting. We suggest therefore that qualitative research interviews are a particular form of 'institutional talk' (Heritage 2004) in which the gendered identity of an interviewer, following norms of professional behaviour that largely involve elicitation and acceptance of the other, is experienced by respondents as somewhat less salient than that of a marital partner. Our 'sole' interviews with male respondents are therefore likely to have been experienced as gender neutral environments by men, contrasting with interviews in which their female partners were also involved, which will have been experienced as 'true' mixed-gender settings.

Our analytic method means that we have focused largely on differences in vocabulary and topic content rather than interactions and conversational sequences. The findings, too, may be limited in their relevance for interviewing outside the health field, or where joint interviewing does not also involve the mixing of genders. Nevertheless, we hope that our comparative analytic approach may prove useful in future studies of other kinds of joint interview. Within the limitations described above, it is clear that our method delivers a systematic comparison of different interview settings, shedding some light on the responses of men and women to mixed sex joint interviewing about health related experiences. This, we hope, will be of interest both to sociolinguists interested in the general effects of mixed sex settings on the performance of gender, and to qualitative social researchers planning studies that involve interviews.

### **Acknowledgements**

This study was supported by a grant from the UK Economic and Social Research Council (RES-062-23-0130). We are grateful to them, to the DIPEx organisation who collected the original interviews, and to the interviewees who participated.

## References

Allan, G.1980. A note on interviewing spouses together. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 42 (1): 205-210.

Arksey, S.1996. Collecting data through joint interviews. *Social Research Update* 15. <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU15.html>

Barbour, R. S., and Kitzinger, J. 1999. *Developing focus group research: politics, theory, and practice*. London: Sage.

Boeije, H.R. 2004. And then there were three: self-presentational styles and the presence of the partner as a third person in the interview. *Field Methods* 16 (1): 3-22.

Butler, J. 1990. *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cameron, D. 2003. Gender and language ideologies. In *The handbook of language and gender*, edited by Holmes, J. and Meyerhoff, M., 447-467. Oxford: Blackwell.

Coates, J. 1996. *Women talk. conversation between women friends*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Coates, J. 2002. *Men talk: stories in the making of masculinities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Coates, J. 2004. *Women, men and language*. London and New York: Pearson / Longman.

Coates, J. 2005. Masculinity, collaborative narration and the heterosexual couple. In *The sociolinguistics of narrative*, edited by Thornbarrow, J. and Coates, J., 89-105. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Crowdy, S. 1995. The BNC spoken corpus. In *Spoken English on computer: transcription, mark-up and application*, edited by Leech, G., Myers, G. and Thomas, J., 224-234. London: Longman.

Gray, R., Fitch, M., Davis, C. and Phillips, C. 1996. Breast cancer and prostate cancer self help groups: reflections on differences. *Psycho-oncology* 5: 137-142.

Gubrium, J. F. and Holstein, J. A. 2002. *Handbook of interview research: context and method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heritage, J. 2004 Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analysing data. In *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice*, edited by Silverman, D. 222-245 London: Sage.

Jackson, L., Ervin, K., Gardner, P. and Schmitt, N. 2001. Gender and the Internet: women communicating and men searching. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 44: 363-379.

- Kiss, A. and Meryn, S. 2001. Effect of sex and gender on psychosocial aspects of prostate and breast cancer. *British Medical Journal* 323: 1055-8
- Kitzinger, J. 1994. The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 16 (1): 103-21
- Klemm, P., Hurst, M., Dearholt, S.L. and Trone, S.R. 1999. Cyber solace: gender differences on internet cancer support groups. *Computers In Nursing* 17(2): 65-72
- Locock, L. and Alexander, J. 2006. 'Just a bystander'? Men's place in the process of fetal screening and diagnosis. *Social Science and Medicine* 62 (6): 1349-59
- Morris, S.M. 2001. Joint and individual interviewing in the context of cancer. *Qualitative Health Research* 11 (4):553-567.
- Radley, A. and Billig, M. 1996. Accounts of health and illness: dilemmas and representations. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 18 (2): 220-240.
- Rayson, P., Leech, G. and Hodges, M. 1997. Social differentiation in the use of English vocabulary: some analyses of the conversational component of the British National Corpus. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 2(1): 133-152.
- Rose, D. and Pevalin, D.J. 2005. *The national statistics socio-economic classification: origins, development and use*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Scott, M. 2005. Wordsmith Tools 4.0 Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Available at <http://www.lexically.net/wordsmith/version4/>)
- Seale, C. 2006. Gender accommodation in online cancer support groups. *Health* 10(3): 345-360
- Seale, C., Charteris-Black, J. and Ziebland, S. 2006. Gender, cancer experience and internet use: a comparative keyword analysis of interviews and online cancer support groups. *Social Science and Medicine* 62 (10): 2577-2590
- Seymour, J., Dix, G. and Eardley, T. 1995. *Joint accounts: methodology and practice in research interviews with couples*. Social Policy Research Unit, University of York.
- Street, R. L. and Giles, H. 1982. Speech accommodation theory: a social cognitive approach to language and speech behavior. In *Social cognition and communication* edited by Roloff, M. and Berger, C.R., 193-226. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

\joint interviews paper 2