



RESEARCH PAPER

**Turn Taking Strategies and Gender: A Conversational Analysis of
 Pakistani Politicians in TV Shows**

Asifa Tabassum¹ Dr. Muhammad Rashid Hafeez*²

1. MS, Department of English, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

2. Associate Professor, Department of English, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author**

m.rashid@gcwus.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the interplay of gender, power dynamics, and conversational strategies in Pakistani political talk shows using the conversation analysis framework. Talk shows were transcribed using Jafferson's transcription model. Through a thorough analysis of turn-taking, interruptions, and overlapping, this study closely examines the patterns and outcomes of these behaviours for individuals of both genders. Employing a descriptive qualitative methodology, the study finds out specific tactics employed by male and female politicians during their conversations. The findings highlight that male politicians often take the lead in discussions, using tactics such as interruptions, overlapping, and frequent turn-taking to assert their control and influence. Conversely, female politicians tend to opt for cooperative strategies, fostering collaborative and cooperative exchanges. Moreover, the study sheds light on the significant impact of power dynamics on conversational behaviour. Male politicians strategically employ techniques like interruptions, overlapping, and turn-taking to reinforce their authoritative position. Ultimately, this study adds to our understanding of how language and discourse reflect as well as perpetuate societal norms and gender dynamics. It unveils the complexities of communication within the realm of political talk shows. The insights derived from this study hold significant implications for enhancing media literacy, promoting gender equality, and refining effective communication strategies in the arena of public discourse.

KEYWORDS Conversational Analysis, Interruption, Overlapping And Gender Equality, Talk Shows, Turn Taking

Introduction

Language plays a significant and intricate role in the examination of power dynamics, particularly regarding dominance and inequality between men and women across diverse contexts. They demonstrated that "Media discourses" are producing social relations of domination and exploitation by constituting versions of reality that are related with social position and objectives of those who are producing them. Media plays out a fundamental role inside the turn of events, changing and deconstruction of social and gendered characters in these days. So, media can manipulate attitudes and opinions of its viewers by providing avenue for male politicians to define stereotypical gender-based identity during interaction with female politicians in talk shows (Qadir & Riaz, 2015). Beyond mere reflection, language possesses the capacity to actively challenge established power structures. Power itself embodies the possession of authority, resources, and the capability to exert control over the lives of individuals, influenced by prevailing social and cultural ideologies. This is exemplified through the

concept of the "gender gap," a ubiquitous phenomenon denoting disparities in power, status, access, and decision-making that persist across various aspects of life. In the third world countries, the space for women, in particular, keeps on shrinking despite the growth of news media (Ahmed, Hafeez & Shahbaz, 2020). In essence, language serves as a powerful tool for shaping, observing, and dissecting the socio-political fabric of society.

Gilzai and Baloch (2016) found that "Conversation analysis and gender differences are central spaces of exploration in sociolinguistics by managing gendered distinction of language. Gender is socially determined category which is related with our social interaction in everyday lives and how we perceive and interpret everything in term of gender of our interlocutor and the stereotypes which are related with it. There are certain preconceptions about the way in which men and women speak. This way is influenced by social patriarchal setup in which men usually dominate women. So, gender is something which we learn through our socialization (p.21)".

According to Sacks (1974) Conversation Analysis is a methodology that is related with how an individual takes turns in spoken collaboration? Premise decide in discussion is that one individual talks at a time after which they might assign a turn to another speaker. He further dictated that a talk show is a TV programming style where in one individual looks at changed subjects that are set forward through a political broadcaster. So that, to make discussion streams well, members of any discussion need to know when they should start a discussion and when they must show silence to deliver idea in an orderly and detailed conversation. Aspects of conversation such as allocation of time that is turn taking, interruption that is number of questions and overlapping of both genders to show cooperation during interaction in talk shows are necessary. Speech patterns and use of linguistic markers of male and female politicians during interaction in talk shows have potential value to depict who is dominant in conversation? (Sacks, 1974). This foundational aspect of discourse subtly governs when individuals initiate and conclude their contributions, constituting a process that operates beneath the surface of daily interactions yet wields substantial influence over the dynamics of communication. The exploration of how turn-taking functions within conversations has captivated the attention of researchers from linguistics, sociology, and communication studies, due to its capacity to reveal insights into the intricate structure, power dynamics, and social implications embedded in the usage of language.

Turn-taking, however, transcends mechanical alternation between speakers; it embodies a dynamic interplay molded by linguistic nuances, cultural nuances, and societal factors. Through verbal and nonverbal cues, participants signal their intent to speak and relinquish the floor to others (Goodwin, 1979). This intricate turn taking process entails not only the timing of transitions but also the complexities of overlaps, interruptions, and moments of silence (Jefferson, 1984). By delving into the mechanisms underlying turn-taking, a profound understanding emerges, unravelling the concealed patterns that dictate human interaction. This illumination provides insight into how individuals navigate and negotiate their roles within the intricate tapestry of conversation. This research paper embarks on a comprehensive exploration of the multidimensional nature of turn-taking in conversation. It will navigate the theoretical underpinnings that guide the understanding of this phenomenon, along with the methodologies employed for its investigation. Furthermore, it will dissect the myriad elements that influence turn-taking behavior, encompassing cultural norms, power dynamics, and the interplay of social identities (Schegloff, 2007). Drawing from empirical studies and real-world instances, this paper seeks to unravel the intricate web connecting language, interaction, and social structure within the context of turn-taking.

The significance of turn-taking transcends its function in merely structuring conversations; it serves as a magnifying glass through which broader societal issues come into view. By scrutinizing the distribution of turns, interruptions, and overlaps, this paper endeavors to unearth power imbalances and gender disparities embedded within language usage (Zimmerman & West, 1975). Moreover, it aims to uncover the intricate links between turn-taking and larger socio-cultural phenomena, such as gender roles, authority dynamics, and intricate social hierarchies (Tannen, 1984). The exploration of these complexities serves as a vehicle for a profound understanding of communication's dynamics and the comprehensive implications of language deployment within social interactions. Subsequent sections will venture into reviewing the available literature and theoretical frameworks that guide turn-taking analysis, delve into the methodologies that facilitate its exploration, and meticulously dissect how turn-taking operates as a microcosm of broader social dynamics in political actors' conversation in TV talk show (Stivers et al., 2009). The exploration is a pursuit of insight into the interconnected facets of language, society, and communication, ultimately contributing to a deeper comprehension of how individuals navigate the intricate ballet of conversation. Furthermore, based on the above explanations, it is essential to study Conversational Analysis according to speaking space for women politicians on Pakistani media.

Literature Review

Carnel (2012) has focused on aspects of talk show in interaction between The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. In this study turn taking has been observed and analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively during interaction of participants in talk shows. He considered that "Verbal exchange" can be portrayed as a conversation that is concerned with what is the relationship of individuals or how properly they see every aspect of conversation and what subjects are discussed? In verbal exchange, speakers and audience are associated to respond to one another with their turns to provide information through which they could see each other's utterances which are basic. Speaker is the host who says something in the first turn, for example, he/ she gives an assertion and audience is the visitor who answers the host's explanation. In this discussion, host should have a tendency and information to make the show runs well and get the program's objective (Carnel, 2012).

Then Nguyen Van Han (2014) has conducted research through case studies, related to gender and power for reflecting social differences and conversation styles in conversation practices. He claims that women have more tendencies to use more polite language to show friendly constructions than men. Moreover, it has been found that women like to avoid 'masculine' traits to show authority in conversation and feel more comfortable in private settings, but men feel more dominance to exercise power during talk (Han, 2014).

Khan et al. (2019) have investigated functional analysis of interruptions to manage agenda setting in Pakistani political talk shows. They analyzed that interactive control of talk is used to manipulate topics. Furthermore, they also stated that reason for these television shows is to talk about and discover features of legislative issues that are also being communicated on different news channels. Hence, as indicated by them, generally in balanced conversation individuals have fostered the humorous method of talking and "News Interviews (better referred to in the Pakistani setting as political talk shows)" show fierce conversation and hence, permit members to show conflict, difficulties, and rivalry through interruption (Khan et.al, 2019).

Ullah et al. (2020) have studied current affairs talk shows on leading TV channels that are agents of political harmony. Escalatory and de-escalatory frames such as politics, economy, judiciary, local issues, and social development which are topics of discussion during talk shows have been analysed by doing content analysis. As Pakistani political talk shows play vital role in politicizing the public discussions by giving ability to an individual to speak freely at an immense level while examining the policy driven issues. Television shows of distinctive news channels assess political and economic tendency of media houses. Thus, utilization of TV news is liable for changing and making the impression of viewers about world (Ullah et.al, 2020).

Khan (2020) has analyzed role of Political Talk Shows in creating Political awareness and changing the public opinion by doing qualitative research with objective to study socio-economic characteristics of respondents. His research indicates how political talk shows are shaping perceptions and beliefs of Pakistani people about politics? Media has huge impacts on various perspectives of an individual as an individual get mindful insight about current policy centered and government issues (Khan, 2020).

Conversations serve as a fundamental aspect of everyday spoken communication, providing valuable insights into human behavior, as explored through conversation analysis (Clayman & Gill, 2023). This methodology is utilized to uncover social identities, methods of communication, and patterns of interaction within specific social groups (Liddicoat, 2021). Commonly referred to as human social interaction, conversation analysis delves into how participants comprehend and respond to various subjects, aided by linguistic cues often observed in specific talk shows (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008).

Key elements like the management of turn-taking, interruptions, and overlapping are meticulously studied within conversation analysis to comprehensively grasp the intricacies of dialogues during Pakistani political talk shows (Drew & Heritage, 1992). This analytical approach proves vital in unveiling the dynamics of discussions between individuals of different genders, thereby shedding light on the strategies of communication employed (Tannen, 1984).

At its core, the essence of conversation rests in its collaborative nature, involving multiple participants who actively contribute, thereby nurturing social connections (Clark, 1996). Conversations enable individuals to decode and acknowledge each other's characteristics, forming the basis for building interpersonal relationships (Goffman, 1967).

A significant facet of conversations lies in their capacity to foster mutual understanding, as participants endeavor to find common ground in relating to one another's point of views (Stivers, 2008). The approach of conversation analysis places notable emphasis on the systematic structure and interpretation of dialogue, acknowledging it as an organized accomplishment that involves the active participants (Sidnell, 2010).

Pamungkas (2012) has conducted research on conversation analysis of the interview between Oprah Winfrey and the Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg to find conversational aspects by analyzing turn taking pattern. He makes a concise layout about strategy of CA, that is discussion in communication is efficiently coordinated and production of talk in coordinated effort is methodic. A central feature of Conversation Analysis is the study of turn taking that is concerned with how speakers take turns and

how they assign the turns to each other. Interruptive overlaps are significant aspects in features of turn taking which occur when an utterer starts speaking before the turn of another speaker has finished (Pamungkas, 2012).

Santander and Amaia (2013) gave point of view of Conversational organization as "Political interview" shows a well-defined structure in which the interviewer and the interviewee follow the formation of turn taking and question-answer interaction that is often challenging and confrontational in nature. Interaction consists of a series of questions that are produced by diverse speaker to show thematic sequence about any discussed topic. There is significant potential conflict when there is fighting for taking more turns which shows interactional behavior of participants during conversation. Such disruptions perform function of interactional control. They have also made research on Turn taking markers in political interviews by comparing frequency of interruptions and turn taking during interaction of three politicians. Political talk shows can be portrayed as question-answer cooperation between at least two points, which are frequently difficult and intriguing in nature, since angry and sensible inquiries happen consistently. Rather than interactional trades between questioners and interviewees, opening ordinarily comprises of an inclusive speech delivered by the interviewer alone. They precede initial spate of talk that is tended to express to viewers as opposed to interviewees (Santander & Amaia, 2013).

Furthermore, Ismaliyah (2015) has noted "Framework of CA", in which people utilize language in conversation setting to hold talk by following turn taking rules like to yield and hold the turn. He demonstrated that turn usually occurs at certain well-defined points in conversation which are called Transition Relevance Places. These points can be misused by speaker in holding the turn, and in allocating the turn to address with another conversationalist. CA analyses the way in which what speakers say and then expect direct answers. He further argued that "When speaker is having the control of discussion and endeavors to get the turn then it is called turn-taking. Turn typically happens when speaker holds the floor and controls the discussion particularly at certain points by focusing on transition relevant place. Formal standard of turn assigning to other speaker is called turn taking (p.18)". There is a situation when a speaker takes a chance to speak that is called a turn. Turn-taking gives a chance for speakers to do conversation smoothly, so there is no dominant speaker in the conversation. First speaker utters something which is then followed by another speaker. It may make a simultaneous conversation.

As Rui and Ting (2014) have analyzed conversation structure of Ellen show by turn claiming, holding, and yielding cues to enhance discourse competence for successful oral conversation. Their investigation of discussion considers construction and association of human oral discussion by opening and closing conversation. They believed that turn taking requires two conversationalists A and B. While A starts to speak, B stops. Consequently, A quiets down while B is talking. Entire discussion is coordinated as A-B-A-B overall. During interaction of discussion, members endeavor to rehearse few methodologies to accomplish turn-taking (Rui and Ting, 2014).

Moreover, study of Il Jannah (2014) has focused on conversation analysis (CA) in analyzing turn-taking features in conversation between two main characters; they are Mark Zuckerberg as American and English native speaker and Eduardo Saverin as Spain and English non native speaker in "The Social Network" Film. He expressed that turn-taking one of aspects of conversation analysis is a condition when there is somewhere near one and not more than each party talking. Thus there will be another turn for other participant to answer the speaker. Il Jannah (2014) stated that

"Interruptions are infringement of turn taking when following speaker begins to talk while current speaker at this point is talking and current speaker's turn could not be portrayed as conclusive word. Interruptions can drive the conversationalist mad on grounds that when current speaker is discussing genuine point, next speaker endeavors to get the turn with overlap methodologies and breaks movement of conversation in program". He further argued that "Interruption" is essentially a gradual step of current speaker's benefit to complete a turn which occurs sometimes while following when speaker will stop his words and allow resulting speaker to take his/her opportunity to talk. So, Interruption is a disorderly discussion in which speaker and listener do not comprehend about the turn chances in discussion. He also communicated that overlapping happens when people are restless to procure the floor in conversation. It has a particular significance, like signaling annoyance, urgency and a desire to correct what is being said. This explicit significance can be anticipated as the reason why people overlap others? (Il Jannah, 2014).

Qadir and Riaz (2015) said that "Interruption is a point where a following speaker usurps another speaker's capability to keep talking by taking conversation floor with no confirmation that other speaker proposed to surrender turn. It is observed that male government authorities show power by changing subject of female government authorities. They further dictated that male dominates conversation by getting and holding floor longer than female and interrupts more to make various contributions by using language strategies to maintain status differences. They further advocated that "Gender differences in language are identified with social differences, by taking a glance at conversational destinations as men use "report style", planning to pass on irrefutable information. While women use "proclivity style", which is progressively associated with gender stereotypes (p. 24)".

Prastowo (2016) has analyzed conversation structure of Jon Stewart in Axe files through turn taking system, turn construction strategy and turn allocation components. He believes that Turn-taking framework is based on yielding the turn, taking the turn and in giving a premise to nature and association of discussion. It unequivocally interfaces the development and allocation of talk so, these two features of talk can be coordinated into a solitary arrangement of techniques. Turn-constructural and turn-allocation units of Sacks's model (1974) are related with ways in which a speaker can attract upon to build a talk. In first place, there is turn constructional unit in which speaker may deliver an assortment of linguistic units like words, expressions, conditions, and sentences. While second is, turn allocation unit in which current speaker can choose next speaker and next speaker can self-select for conversation in an interaction. As Pirhastuti and Yusuf (2018) have made research on turn taking markers in Catatan Najwa to investigate organization of turn taking. They used Sacks et al. (1974) model of turn taking to analyze turn taking markers of participants during political talk shows. Organization of turn taking according to Sacks et al. (1974) model is comprised on turn allocation component (TAC) and turn constructional component. TAC (Transition Allocation Component) prevents participants from speaking simultaneously at the Transition Relevant Place (TRP). The TRP is a point in conversation where a new speaker may take the turn. There are several strategies for handling turn transitions at the TRP:

i) The current speaker clearly passes the turn to someone else, often by directing a question or request to a specific participant, allowing the selected next speaker to take the turn immediately after the current speaker finishes his/ her turn.

ii) A listener may choose to begin speaking first, promptly gaining the turn without waiting for the current speaker to yield.

iii) If the current speaker does not pass the turn or if no listener self-selects to take the turn, the current speaker may continue speaking.

In the turn construction component, turns are constructed using Turn Construction Units (TCUS), which can vary in size and linguistic texture. Each turn is completed at the initial TRP when one speaker gives up the turn for the next speaker to begin their turn. This process ensures the smooth flow of conversation and proper turn-taking in interactive communication.

To analyze the interaction, behavior, and speaking roles of participants in a conversation, it is essential to observe turn-taking cues. Turn yielding cues are used by speakers to signal that they have finished expressing their thoughts and that someone else can speak next. The display of a turn-yielding cue does not require the listener to immediately respond and take the floor. When the turn-taking process functions appropriately, the listener will respond to the turn-yielding cues by taking his/ her turn in the conversation, and the speaker will promptly yield the floor to allow the transition to the next speaker (Pirhastuti & Yusuf, 2018).

Then Jufadri (2018) has made research on turn taking strategies used by David Bechham and the host in Google talk show. He stated that "Discussion is a type of spoken collaboration that is utilized by at least two individuals to convey a thought in a coordinated manner. It is method of utilizing language socially of getting things done with words along with different people. Some sorts of turn taking techniques that can be utilized by conversationalist are turn taking, interruption and overlapping. In holding the turn, speaker continues talking and in yielding the turn, speaker gives a go to audience. In many societies, as a rule, just a single individual talks all at once then speakers change their roles starting one talking and there after another. A point in a conversation where change in turn taking is possible is known as a Transition Relevance Place. TRP exhibits that current speaker has finished to talk. For the most part, individuals delay until one speaker shows that the individual has finished, when in doubt by hailing a completion point. So, speakers can complete their turns by representing a request and by completing a syntactic plan of an utterance (Jufadri, 2018).

As Ali (2018) has done a study of conversation analysis that is comprised on global structure like opening and closing of talk shows and local structure that is concerned with participant's orientation towards turn taking, interruption and overlapping. Turn taking tends to develop critical development of conversation in particular situation. He expressed a model that incorporates most realities about any discussion like turn request is not fixed, however fluctuates, and turn size is not fixed, yet varies (Ali, 2018).

Uddin and Sharmin (2019) have employed conversation analysis approach to examine how the host's turn-taking overlaps with speeches of guest speaker? As practices of interruptions, based on gender, are shaped by hosts with distinct functions to manage their interactions in talk shows. By focusing on issue of turn-taking that happens during cooperation of visitors in TV talk shows, they concentrated how hosts and visitors oversee turns in their collaborations? Reason for their investigation was to recognize the distinction in structures and elements of turn-taking utilized by hosts and visitors during talk shows. Their research distinguished three turn circulation systems: Current speaker chooses next speaker (CSSN), next speaker self-chooses as straightaway

(NSSS) and current speaker proceeds (CSC). Their investigation found that CSSN happened, much of the time, towards the start of shows when hosts acquainted the visitors with audience, NSSS occurred through overlaps, interruptions and CSC occurs, after stopping for a moment and a falling sound (Uddin & Sharmin, 2019).

Suwandi (2019) has made research on interruptions in political debates by focusing on gender and power relationship, types, functions, and reasons of interruptions during presidential debate. He argued that roles of men in general will show rivalry and predominance by intruding on discussion to control theme while ladies will in general show joint effort that is also aspect of gender discrimination. Interrupter does interruption for requesting to help and for explanation as in a discussion, at some point speakers can hardly wait for transition relevance place. One sort of discussion investigation is turn taking procedure. Turn taking technique is utilized to deal with turn of every member in discussion. In any circumstance where control is not fixed in cutting edge, anybody can endeavor to gain power that is called Turn Taking. He further separates transform bringing techniques into three types like turn taking, interruption and overlapping (Suwandi, 2019). He further stated Conversation Analysis focuses on interruptions with regard to gender and power dynamics. When investigating interruptions during political debates, power tendencies become evident. There are various types of interruptions, including simple interruption, butting-in interruption, intrusive interruption, agreeable interruption, and overlap interruption. In simple interruption, the interrupter cuts off the first speaker before they finish their sentences, resulting in simultaneous speech and an incomplete utterance from the first speaker. Overlap interruption occurs when both the first speaker and the interrupter speak at the same time, with the first speaker continuing their utterances while the interrupter attempts to take the floor. Butting-in interruption involves when an interrupter trying to seize the floor from the first speaker and continuing his/ her utterances, disregarding the interruption. Finally, interruption can also happen when the first speaker stops speaking before completing his/ her utterance, allowing the interrupter to take the floor. In social practices and natural interactions, individuals often assert their power and maintain control by reinforcing power relations through interruptions. The interruption dynamics in conversation can be influenced by power dynamics, where certain individuals may use interruptions to dominate or show authority over others in the conversation. So, interruption is deviation from turn taking standard, as conversation is based on verbal exchange. They also stated that interruption is a talk execution that occurs while someone starts to talk and other should tune in. Suwandi (2019) demonstrated functions of interruption by stating that cooperative interruption happens when interrupter takes glance at the speaker who needs assistance. Interrupter provides some insight like a word, expression, or sentence or can be a plan to speaker to finish his/her expressions. Disruptive interruption happens when interrupter intrudes on discussion since person cannot help contradicting what speaker has said. Moreover, interrupter additionally adds his/her opinions while person in question is interfering with conversation. Interrupter has something critical to wrap up changing the subject as visitor explains what speaker has said previously for reasonable clarification (Suwandi, 2019).

Santander & Amaia (2013) characterized interruption straightforwardly as a manner by which conversationalists could go ahead. Furthermore, they characterized interruption as expected approach to disturb a speaker's turn and development of conversational subject of first speaker. In an interruption a speaker starts to talk while current speaker is yet talking, at a point in current speaker's turn which could not be characterized as final word. According to Santander and Amaia (2013), there are

different types of interruptions in conversations, each serving different functions. Agreeable interruption is aimed at supporting and expressing approval and satisfaction with the speaker's content in an ongoing discussion. On the other hand, intrusive interruption poses a threat to the other speaker by interfering with the flow of the conversation, either by trying to take the floor, causing conflict, or changing the subject. Floor taking interruption occurs when the interrupter introduces a new topic for discussion and then proceeds to talk without changing the topic. This type of interruption may be seen as an attempt to assert control over the conversation. Reasons for interruptions can vary. Interrupters may interrupt to seek help when they are struggling with their own words or thoughts, especially in situations like TV programs where the presenter controls the topic. Another reason for interruption is to seek clarification when the listener does not understand something the speaker said, and the interrupter directly interrupts to ask for more explanation. Additionally, interruptions may occur when the interrupter disagrees with the discussed topic and wants to express his/ her own opinion (Santander & Amaia, 2013).

Overlapping can be defined as the talk spoken at the same time by one or more speakers. Sacks et al. (1974) classified overlapping into four types. First, simultaneous overlap that happens when each participant takes over the turn at the same time with same topic. Overlap is seen as superordinate concept referring simply to simultaneous talk as overlap must be understood as a feature of turn-taking. Secondly, structured overlap that happens when speaker almost finishes his turn and then other speaker starts his turn. Thirdly, competitive overlap that occurs when another speaker talks before the current speaker finishes his/her talking. Finally, non-competitive overlap that occurs in conversation without any intention to compete for taking floor of the current speaker. Supportive overlaps serve the purpose of driving the discussion forward. Female hosts frequently employed mild interruptions to support the speakers' ideas, provide additional perspectives for better context understanding, and create more collaborative opportunities by offering supportive comments. To begin talking while the guest starts and then both talk together for quite a while is part of interruptive overlapping. To talk in the guest's discussion with no pertinent objective is part of disruptive overlapping. So, according to above mentioned studies, it is evident that discourse of women politicians highlights them less confident when they utilize label questions, communal speech and when they ask for clarification to keep away from swear words. In this way, men keep an eye on interruption to show dominance, level headedness, and authority to maintain their strength over female's discourse. Speech patterns of women politicians such as use of linguistic markers to define speech characteristics of male and female politicians during interaction in talk shows have potential value to depict who is dominant in conversation? Literature of previous studies provide the basis to assess speaking space for women politicians on Pakistani media in the context of political talk shows. Current study is going to utilize theoretical framework of Sacks to analyze less speaking space for women politicians during Interaction in talk shows.

Theoretical Framework

Conversation refers to a collaborative activity where two or more participants engage in understanding and recognizing each other's characteristics. During talk shows, conversation also involves the exchange of information to establish social relationships among participants. According to Prastowo (2016), the theoretical foundation of Pragmatics is based on examining the translation of language to understand what has been said and why participants cut the conversation. It explores how male and female politicians interpret sentence constructions to grasp the hidden

meanings in utterances. Pragmatics primarily focuses on language in different contexts. The evaluation approach for conversations, proposed by Sacks et al. (1974), is based on the Sequential production model during talk. This concept draws inspiration from Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, a sociological perspective that emerged in the mid-1960s to understand people's interactions and how they interpret words in conversations. Ibe and Odebunmi (2019) defined conversational dominance as a multi-dimensional concept. It involves sequential dominance, where a speaker initiates and maintains the conversation by directing responses to other participants. Participatory dominance is related to interruption, turn-taking, and overlapping during the conversation. Quantitative dominance is determined by the number of words spoken by each participant. Statistical analysis is used to explore these aspects of conversations.

Material and Methods

For data analysis, this study identifies types, reasons, and functions of turn-taking based on Jacob L Mey's Theory of turn-taking (2001). Additionally, types, reasons, and functions of interruption defined by Suwandi are used to understand the meaning of utterances. This study also deals with types of overlap as indicated by Sacks et al. (1974) to analyze the computation of overlaps. As in this research qualitative method has been applied to collect, compare and to interpret data by observing natural occurring conversation during talk shows. Quantitative methodology has been utilized to give methodical and systemic depiction of information about speaking space for women politicians on Pakistani media. Statistical analysis through tables and figures also has been done to measure number of turns, interruptions and overlapping to check reliability and validity of collected data. This research employs a descriptive qualitative methodology to describe features of conversation, such as turn-taking, interruption, and overlapping, observed during interactions in these selected talk shows. data of this research has been collected by downloading latest videos of Pakistani political talk shows on four leading channels. So, all these talk shows have been selected to observe gender-based discrimination by providing less time to female politicians during interactions. These talk shows are named as To the point with Mansoor Ali Khan, Off the record with Kashif Abbasi, Capital talk with Hamid Mir and Nadeem Malik live which are aired on respectively news channels as ARY News, Samaa News, Geo News and Express News. Format of these shows is based on usually one anchor person, two or three male politicians and one female politician. Participants are 4 male hosts and 25 guest speakers that represent two major ruling and opposition parties of Pakistani politics, government, and diplomacy. Entire corpus is made of 305 minutes from four television shows which are recorded from November 2020 to April 2021. Purposive sampling has been used for this research as selected talk shows are available and easily accessible on internet to provide detailed information for investigation of the related topic. Model of Jefferson for transcription of videos has been utilized as Transcription symbols and their meanings are these:

Results and Discussions

Data after collection is going to be classified according to turn taking strategies, types, reasons, and functions of interruption and types of overlapping for qualitative analysis. After identification of data researcher has separated and counted all turn takings, interruptions and overlappings of both male and female politicians who have participated in talk shows. To seek clarification, number has changed into percentage and then percentage of data has been depicted through pie charts for easily understanding of who is more powerful during conversation in talk shows.

Table 1
Time consumed by Participants

Programme	Time	Male politicians	Percentage	Female politicians	Percentage
1	74 minutes	55 minutes	74%	19 minutes	26%
2	74 Minutes	48 minutes	65%	26 minutes	35%
3	89 Minutes	56 minutes	63%	33 minutes	37%
4	68 minutes	46 minutes	68%	22minutes	32%

Table 2
Questions asked by politicians

Programme	Time	Male politicians	Percentage	Female politicians	Percentage
1	74 minutes	30	40%	10	13 %
2	74 minutes	19	26%	10	13%
3	89 minutes	19	21%	5	6%
4	68 minutes	20	29%	6	9%

Table 3
Computation of overlapping

Programme	Time	Male politicians	Percentage	Female politicians	Percentage
1	74minutes	7	10%	3	4%
2	74 minutes	5	7%	2	3%
3	89 minutes	7	8%	5	6%
4	68 minutes	14	20%	3	4%

This research analyzed turn-taking patterns using Jacob L Mey's hypothesis which includes (turn holding and turn yielding cues) to investigate how politicians participate in news interviews which includes turn holding and turn yielding. Collected data revealed gender discrimination, as male hosts and male politicians dominated the conversation by taking more turns and constructing longer sentences as compared to female politicians. Female politicians followed the sequential production model of turn-taking, showing soft transitions to continue discussions. They occasionally used overlapping not to change the topic but to push the conversation forward. Male hosts changed the topic when they observed guest speakers are responding to the main points of discussion. Collected data suggests that there was a lack of mutual understanding of interactional context, as male hosts often interrupted female speakers without allowing them to finish their points. This direct discourse of male politicians sometimes involved language that embarrassed and belittled female politicians. Moreover, out of the total time of the talk shows, more time (51%) was spent in responses by the male politicians while female politicians got less than half of that time (25%). The remaining time was consumed by the hosts of talk shows. Frequency of interruptions also has been studied, with male politicians interrupting at a higher rate (22%) than female politicians (8%). This difference showcased male politicians' authority and control over female politicians. Male politicians mainly used butting-in interruptions, intrusive interruptions, and overlap interruptions highlighting their dominance. Computation of overlap is displayed in above table. Overlapping occurred when both host and guests tried to elaborate their previous statements. Total number of overlapping by male counterparts is 8% and from female counterpart is 3% with clearly depiction of gender inequality.

Male politicians tended to be more aggressive and competitive, while female politicians leaned towards collaboration. Male politicians used questioning to assert dominance, while female politicians exhibited structured and non-competitive overlaps. This highlights the fact how female politicians were frequently interrupted and hindered by male hosts, impacting their ability to fully express their ideas. Male politicians strategically used turn-taking cues to secure more opportunities for overlapping and interruption. These findings highlighted the complex dynamics of gender and power in political television talk shows.

In the exploration of collected data, Jacob L Mey's hypothesis has been utilized to elucidate the phenomenon of turn-taking (Mey, 2001). This theory encompasses turn holding and turn yielding cues. Specifically, this research delves into the realm of turn-taking within the context of politicians who are participating in TV talk shows. One striking observation is the disparity in turn-taking between male and female politicians that reveals significant gender discrimination. This is evident in the fact that male politicians and hosts dominate the discourse by allocating and constructing a greater number of turns (Qadir & Riaz, 2015).

The analysis of percentage of turn-taking further highlights this gender-based inequity. The data shows that male politicians occupy 51% of the total talk time while the female politicians are allocated only 25% time during these talk shows. This difference serves as a glaring sign of gender discrimination. As male hosts and male politicians gain control during the conversation, the gendered imbalance becomes clear.

Turn-taking patterns of female politicians show that they follow the sequential production model of turn-taking, as outlined by Sacks (1974). Female politicians, as opposed to their male counterparts, employ soft transitions to continue the discussion, often using questions to effortlessly take the floor. This sequential approach involves maintaining a cooperative conversational environment, where they allow male speakers to elaborate their points and concerns. Female politicians intentionally use overlapping turns, not always to introduce new topics, but to take the discourse forward. This highlights a stark difference in the use of strategies by male and female politicians.

As opposed to that, the male politicians show different conversational strategies. They change the topic of discussion when a guest responds to a theme. Male politicians often conclude their viewpoints on selected topics without adding significant remarks, while female politicians subtly add their remarks. This fine shift allows male politicians to maintain a sense of control. Moreover, it is found that female politicians employ a distinct trait, i.e. a cooperative approach that develops a sense of collaboration within the conversation.

An inherent objective of conversation is the fulfillment of subjects. This involves mutual comprehension of contextual cues and a smooth transition between speakers. Unfortunately, data of this research suggests a lack of shared understanding of the conversational context, particularly exemplified by interruptions. Interruptions, often perpetuated by male hosts moving onto the next speaker without allowing the current speaker to conclude, disrupt the thematic fulfillment. This conversational dynamic, influenced by interruptions, hinders a seamless exchange of ideas and viewpoints.

The analysis of interruptions provides further insight into the power dynamics at play. Male politicians tend to interrupt at a frequency of 22%, whereas female politicians interrupt at 8%. This substantial difference underscores the domination exerted by men over women in these interactions. Male politicians exhibit various forms

of interruptions, including butting in, intrusive, and overlap interruptions. These forms of interruptions are indicative of their authority and dominance. Conversely, female politicians predominantly engage in simple and agreeable interruptions, reflecting their softer transition and potentially lower confidence levels.

Conclusion

Hence, it is concluded that it is evident in these talk shows that female visitors have been again and again hindered by male hosts to continue their discussions. Male politicians made unimportant inquiries and their interference with remarks disturbed the continuation of discourse of female speaker. Male politicians tend to do more interruption and try to get more chances for overlapping by using turn holding and turn yielding cues. In essence, this study reveals that male politicians are more assertive and competition-oriented in their discourse, while female politicians lean towards collaboration. Collected data depicts that total time given to male host and male politician is 51%. While women get only 25% time for discussion in all these talk shows that shows contradiction in position of both genders in society. Male politicians and male hosts interrupt to female politicians 22% times, while female politicians interrupt to male politicians 8% times during interactions in all these talk shows. The manner in which male and female politicians overlap in their speech is also distinct. Male politicians demonstrate a higher overlapping percentage at 8%, as compare to overlapping percentage of female politicians at 3%. The types of overlapping further delineate gendered communication patterns. Male politicians exhibit disruptive, supportive, and competitive overlapping, while female politicians primarily use structured and non-competitive overlapping.

In summary, the analysis uncovers the intricate dynamics of turn-taking, interruptions, and overlapping within the context of TV talk shows. These observations provide a comprehensive understanding of how power dynamics, gender roles, and communication strategies intersect in shaping political discourse. The data emphasizes the disparities and imbalances that persist, reflecting the broader societal and cultural constructs that influence language and communication dynamics. Communicative behavior is gender specific, and it is dictated through the selection of explicit and implicit linguistic means in political discourse. Political television talk shows have huge impact to demean decisions of individuals concerning the legislative issues as they utilize different linguistic, rhetoric and emotional techniques to indoctrinate. Gender gaps in political participation are quite continual by undermining abilities of women., developing social barriers, leaving meagre spaces within masculine political structure of Pakistan and for this reason, lowering the level of political participation. Being immediate is viewed as sign of manly discourse when contrasted with female discourse which is for the most part roundabout in nature. Future researcher can stretch out to more shows of similar television talk shows. Another comparative analysis may incorporate Critical discourse analysis of Pakistani political talk shows by analyzing power relations existing among male and female politicians during interaction in political talk shows.

References

- Ahmad, A., Hafeez, M. R., & Shahbaz, M. (2020). Sell-outs, fatsos or whores?" representation of politically active Pakistani women on social media. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 4(1), 40-50.
- Ghilzai, S. A., & Baloch, M. (2015). Conversational analysis of turn taking behavior and gender differences in multimodal conversation. *European Academic Research*, 3(9), 1-13.
- Ali, A. (2018). Analyzing Conversation Analysis: A Study of Global and Local Structures in TV Talk Shows. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 4(4), 38-47.
- Carnel, D. (2012). Aspects of talk show interaction: A qualitative and quantitative analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1569-1582.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2023). Conversation analysis. In *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 67-84). RoutledgeHeritage, J. (1984). Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97-121). Irvington Publishers.
- Han, N. V. (2014). Gender and power: Reflections of social differences in conversation styles. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing*, 1(3), 17-24.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2002). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgment tokens "yeah" and "uh huh". *Papers in Linguistics*, 17(2), 197-216.
- Khan, I. A., Ali, K., & Muhammad, S. (2019). Analysis of Interruptions in Pakistani Political Talk Shows. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS)*, 39(2), 607-615.
- Khan, T. A. (2020). Role of Political Talk Shows in Creating Political Awareness and Changing Public Opinion. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 12(1), 7-16.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2021). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.

- Nguyen Van Han. (2014). Gender and power: Reflections of social differences in conversation styles. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing*, 1(3), 17-24.
- Prastowo, B. (2016). Analyzing Conversation Analysis of The Axe Files Talk Show: A Study on the Turn-Taking System, Turn Construction Strategy, and Turn Allocation Component. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 2(2), 163-176.
- Qadir, S. A., & Riaz, M. (2015). Language, gender, and power: A critical review of the language practices of male and female politicians on television talk shows in Pakistan. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 90-100.
- Rui, Y., & Ting, H. (2014). Conversation analysis of a TV talk show. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 1(4), 223-229.
- Sacks, H. (1974). An analysis of the course of a joke's telling in conversation. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer (Eds.), *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking* (pp. 337-353). Cambridge University Press.
- Santander, M. V., & Amaia, M. (2013). Turn-taking markers in political interviews: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 95, 409-417.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., ... & Levinson, S. C. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26), 10587-10592.
- Suwandi, S. (2019). Gender and Power: A Study on Interruptions in Political Debates. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 109-121.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Ablex Publishing.
- Uddin, M. M., & Sharmin, M. N. (2019). Gender, Power and Turn-taking in Political Talk Shows. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 44-54.
- Ullah, I., Nawaz, N. A., & Shahbaz, M. (2020). Political Talk Shows and Their Role in Political Socialization: A Case Study of Pakistani TV Channels. *Science, Technology and Development*, 39(3), 178-185.
- Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions, and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Newbury House Publishers.