Investigating Cross-cultural Turn-taking strategies; a Contrastive Study between English and Arabic Mechanisms

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the Master Degree in language Sciences

Submitted by: **Supervised by:**

Amina LAOUAR   **Prof. Salah KAOUACHE**

Assia BOUROUROU

Board of Examiners

Examiner: Mrs. Fouzia BENNACER…Mohammed Seddik Ben-Yahia University-Jijel.

Chairperson: Dr. Ammar BOUKRIKA..Mohammed Seddik Ben-Yahia University-Jijel.

Supervisor: Prof. Salah KAOUACHE………....Frères Mentouri University-Constantine.

2016

DEDICATION

IN THE NAME OF ALLAH THE MOST MERCIFUL AND THE MOST COMPASSIONATE

This work is dedicated

To the beloved and the most kind-hearted perons in our life

OUR PARENTS

To our dearest sisters and brothers

TO OUR RELATIVES

To all who supported us in good times and bad times

OUR FRIENDS

Acknowledgements

First of all, we would like to thank our supervisor Prof. Salah KAOUACHE for whom we are sinceraly grateful, for his smart guidance and endless support without which this work would never have been accomplished. We also thank him for his help, invaluable feedback, and wise advice throughout this research despite his other concerns.

We are immensely grateful to Mr. Boukazoula Mohammed for providing us with precious information and ideas that helped us to carry out this piece of research.

Gratefulness is also owed to Mr. Sliman Boukhentach for helping us in choosing this research topic.

We would also acknowledge Mrs. Bennacer Fouzia for providing us with some materials that helped us in the theoritical side of this piece of research.

Also, we would express our appreciation to Mr. Benhbiles Bakir for helping us in translating some transcriptions of the videos.

ABSTRACT

The present study sheds light on Cross-cultural Turn Taking strategies; a contrastive study of Arabic and English mechanisms, as a central issue in pragmatics and conversation analysis. Under the scope of conversation analysis, this study is conducted to discuss the Turn-taking mechanisms across culturally. The latter is carried out through transcribing videos taken from TV shows from both cultures -English and Arabic- namely BBC English, Al-djazeera TV and Saudi2 to collect data for the analysis. The system of Turn-taking includes both verbal and non-verbal signals namely: pauses, overlaps, discourse markers, adjacency pairs, intonation, and body language. These strategies are compared and contrasted in order to find out the main differences in terms of Turn-taking strategies between the two cultures. On the whole, the treatment gives that Turn-taking cues differ across- cultures and this validates the stated research hypothesis which is: if people knew that Turn-taking strategies differ from one culture to another, cross-cultural pragmatic failure would be reduced. The present research consists of two chapters: one theoretical and another one is practical. The theoretical chapter consists of two sections; the first section will be about teaching culture, while the second section will be about Turn-taking strategies across-cultures. The practical chapter describes the tools of research, displays the findings, and ends up with some recommendations.

List of Abbreviations

BBC: British Broadcasting Company

CA: Conversation Analysis

CC: Communicative Competence

DA: Discourse Analysis

DM: Discourse Markers

FPP: First Pair Part

LMS: Local Management System

ND: No Date

PBUH: Peace Be Upon Him

SPP: Second Pair Part

TCU: Turn Constructional Units

TRP: Transition Relevance Place

TT: Turn-taking

List of Tables

Table of Content

General Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Conversation is the core of the human social life; human beings cannot live in isolation without being involved in social communication with each other. The opening up of lines of communication is not at random. This sort of contact is rather rule-governed and is achieved by means of some strategies namely 'Turn-taking'. These rules are part of the communicative competence of speech communities and are known by all members of the same society by means of social conventions. Because of many reasons such as migration, trade and studying, some people need to communicate with people from other cultures. The point is, the strategy of Turn-taking is needed in this sort of communication with foreign speakers, but may be influenced by the native language of the speaker. It should be mentioned that some linguists say that Turn-taking strategies are universal, while others maintain that this strategy is culture specific. That is, it varies from one culture to another. Little is known about how this system varies across-cultures, and thereby, it makes it easy for miscommunication and confusion to take place.

Aim of the Study

The aim behind the interest in this subject is the belief that Turn-taking strategies are culture specific and differ from one culture to another. The study aims to prove that this strategy is not universal; rather, it is culture specific and also to avoid the cross-culture pragmatics failure to take place among people from different cultures when conversing with each other. Furthermore, it aims to highlight the differences between Turn-taking strategies across cultures.

Research Questions

To achieve the above stated aims, the following questions are asked:

- Are Turn-taking strategies universal or culture specific?

- What are the major differences between Turn-taking strategies in Arabic and English cultures?

Assumption

On the basis of the above questions, it may be assumed that, people knew that Turn-taking strategies differ from one culture to another and this may lead to reduce cross-cultural pragmatic failure.

Research Methodology

The present research methodology is based on conversations taken from T.V shows. Conversations from Arabic channels (El-djazeera and Saudi2) and from an English channel (BBC) are taken as a sample of investigation. The Turn-takings of those people who are engaged in those conversations will be transcribed and analyzed. The analysis will focus on the comparison and contrast between the Arabic and English conversations in order to find out the main differences between the two types of Turn-takings in terms of pauses, overlaps, hesitations and discourse markers, intonation, adjacency pairs, and body language.

Structure of the Study

The present research consists of two chapters: one is theoretical and the other one is practical. The theoretical chapter consists of two sections; the first section will be about teaching culture, while the second section will be about Turn-taking strategies across-cultures. The practical chapter describes the tools of research, displays the findings, and ends up with some recommendations.

Chapter One: Cross-cultural Turn-taking Strategies

Introduction

Human beings cannot live in isolation. That is, a person needs to live in societies in which he gets in social contacts with members of the society. For a successful communication, people need to follow certain norms of their own language and culture. It is worthy to mention that culture and communication are intertwined so closely to the degree that some linguists such as Trosborg (2010) and Yule (1996) maintained that culture is communication and communication is culture. That is, people communicate the way they do because they are raised in a particular culture and learn its rules and norms. These rules and norms vary from one language to another and from one culture to another. When two persons from different cultures meet, it is likely for communication to take place. This sort of contact is achieved by means of some techniques of conversation namely Turn-taking. This system is rule-governed. These rules differ widely from one culture to another.

This chapter sheds light on culture and its close relation to the system of Turn-taking. The first section focuses on culture and Cross-culture communication. The second section investigates Turn-taking strategies of the English culture, and those of the Arabic one. Some special reference is based on the holy Quran because of the place it has in the Arab community.

Section One: Teaching Culture

1.1.1. Origins of Culture

Before speaking about the term culture, it is worthy to speak about its origins. To start with, culture comes from the Latin word 'colere', which means to cultivate. Some linguists stressed that the term culture originated mainly from agriculture. O'sullivan et al. (1994, p.69) claimed that "[culture] stems, originally, from a purely agricultural root; culture as cultivation of the soil, of plants, culture as tillage". Furthermore, they maintained that culture has a meaning even in biology which is the growth of bacteria (ibid).

Broadly speaking, cultivation means to plant and take care of a given crop. That is, 'to cultivate' is to prepare and use land for growing crops and plants. O'sullivan et al. (op.cit:69) emphasised that cultivation can go beyond the boundaries of agriculture to be applied to people. In this context, cultivation indicates the assignment and teaching people and take care about their 'natural capacities' to produce 'perfect rulers' from them; they used the metaphor 'cultivation of minds', and here a 'cultured' or 'cultivated' person means someone who is well-educated and has a good level (ibid).

1.1.2. Definition of Culture

O'sullivan et al., (1994) considered that the term culture as being so complex and vague. It may encompass different concepts given by different anthropologists, ethnographers, men of letters as well as cultural researchers, etc. This complexity and vagueness of the term 'culture' lies in the fact that it is multidiscursive; it can be mobilized in a number of different discourses. In much the same way, Hinkle (1999) reported the vagueness of the term 'culture' saying that there are "as many definitions of culture as there are fields of enquiry into human societies, groups, systems, behaviors and activities".

Likewise, Corbett (2003, p.5) reported that:

"'Culture' is the object of study of a range of different research disciplines. For example, anthropology investigates in general how membership of a particular social group is related to a particular sets of behavior; ethnography seeks, partly, through structured exposure to other cultures, to explore and describe how the speech systems and behaviors of groups are related to either social structures and beliefs, and cultural studies seek to understand and interpret the way that members of a group represent themselves through their cultural products (whether those products are poems, songs, dances, graffiti, or sport events)".

The British anthropologist Tylor (1971, p.1) defined culture as "the complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society".

According to Trosborg (2010), both the notions of culture and cultures are closely related to each other. Yet, each of them has its own distinct meanings. Culture shows how an individual thinks, acts and feels as a given social group in relation to other individuals of that social group. Thus, a circle of friends, a theatre ensemble or a business organization is defined by its own unique culture and attitude and relationship.

If such groups or communities relate to one another, it can then, be noticed that they are differently constituted, and thus start to refer to them in the plural namely as 'cultures'. In this sense, cultures are differentiated by their purpose, value, membership, history, etc. Streeck (2002) stressed that when collective of disparate communities together form a

society, it is started to consider them under the umbrella of 'national cultures' where cultures are defined by their geographical boundaries instead of other identifying features. Thus, according to Harris and Moran (1987), culture explained the pattern of assumptions and behavior made by human systems as response to their environment, be it a nation with its macrostructure, a local community with its needs and customs, a market with its consumers and suppliers, or an industry with its colleagues and competitors. It should be remembered, though, that within a corporate culture, individual differences will always exist.

Language is culture, culture is language, and culture and language are so intertwined and shape each other. The two are inseparable.

1.1.3. Cross-culture, Intercultural Definition

When people from different cultures meet, social interaction will take place between them for many reasons such as business, politics and trade, etc. This sort of contact refers to cross-cultural interaction.

Kramsh (1998, p.81) stated that:

> " The term 'cross-culture' or intercultural usually refers to the meeting of two cultures or two languages across the political boundaries of nation – states…the term intercultural may also refer to communication between people from different ethnic, social, gendered, cultures within the boundaries of the same national language. Both terms are used to characterized communication…intercultural communication refers to the dialogue between minority cultures and dominant cultures, and are associated with issues of bilingualism and biculturalism".

Aspects of Cross-cultural Communication

As it is cited in http://en. Wikipedia.org/…/Cross cultural communication (Dec 2010), there are several parameters that may be perceived differently by people of different cultures; these may encompass:

- High and low context cultures: context is the most crucial cultural dimension and also extremely difficult to define. The idea of context in culture was put forth by an anthropologist whose name Edward T Hall. Hall (1959) broke up culture into two main groups: high and low context cultures. He defined context as the stimuli, environment or ambiance surrounding the environment. Depending on how a culture depends or relies on the three points to communicate their meaning, will place them in either high or low context cultures. For instance, Hall (ibid) explained that high-low context cultures suppose that the individuals know very little about what they are being told, and therefore should be given a lot of background information. High-context cultures suppose the individual is educated about the subject and has to be given very little background knowledge.

- Non verbal, oral and written: paying special attention to specific areas of communication and interaction to enhance the effectiveness of the intercultural messages.

Non verbal communication includes everything from something as obvious as eye contact and facial expressions to more discrete forms of expression as the use of space. Some experts have labeled the term kinesics which means communicating through eye contact and facial expressions.

Huseman (1959) explained that eye contact is the key factor in setting the tone between two individuals and differs in meaning between cultures.

The final part to Non-verbal communication lies in our gestures, and can be broken down into five subcategories:

- **Emblems:** emblems refer to sign language. For example, the 'Thumbs up' which is one of the most recognized symbols in the world.

- **Illustrators:** illustrators mimic what we speak such as; gesturing how much time is left by holding up a certain amount of fingers.

- **Regulators:** regulators act as a way of conveying meaning through gestures (for instance, when a person rises his hand indicates that she/he has a certain question about what was just said) and become so complicated since the same regulator might have different meanings across different cultures.

- **Affect displays:** affect displays reveal emotions such as sadness (tears) or happiness through a smile.

- **Adaptors:** adaptors are more subtle as a yawn.

- Oral and written communication is considered as another aspect of cross-cultural communication. It is generally easier to learn, adapt and deal with in the business world for the fact that each language is unique.

1.1.4. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is considered as a new area of linguistics when compared to phonetics, morphology, syntax or semantics. In the 1960s, pragmatics was not an established field and it covered issues that could not be placed into other areas of linguistics. However, language use and context gained more interest in 1970s, and consequently, pragmatics was recognized as a field of linguistics. That is, the field of pragmatics seeks to determine the intended meaning either meant by the speaker or interpreted by the interlocutor. In other words, people to distinguish the usual meaning (the literal meaning) of a word or utterance and the meaning it has in certain circumstances, distinguishing between meaning and use. In order to arrive at

such meanings, elements of context such as location (place), participants, state, background knowledge and their relations should be taken into account.

According to Crystal (1997), pragmatics refers to " the study of language from the point of view of users, especially for the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effect their use of language has another participants in the fact of communication".

Thomas (1995) criticized Crystal's definition by stating that Crystal's main focus use or the producers of the message while interaction contains other important aspects as well. According to Thomas, Crystal took a social view by defining pragmatics as, speaker meaning and over looking hearer's interpretation. Both of these aspects are taken into account by Yule (1996), who defined pragmatics as "the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker /writer and interpreted by a listener/reader".

According to Yule (1996), pragmatics is the study of understanding international human action. Therefore, it includes the interpretation of acts assumed to be undertaken to complete some purpose. So, the central notions in pragmatics should encompass belief, intention and act.

1.1.5. Fields of Pragmatics

There are two fields in pragmatics, which are utterance and conversation.

1- Utterance: it is a unit of analysis in speech which has been defined in various ways, but most commonly as a sequence of words within a single person's turn at talk that falls under a single intonation contour. It can be one sentence or more, but more commonly consists of stretches of speech shorter than sentences.

2- Conversation: it is a linguistic interaction that involves two parties or more.

1.1.6. Definition of Conversation

According to Hornby (2010, p.332), "conversation is an informal talk involving small group of people or only two". Levinson (1983, p.284) defined conversation as: "the impromptu, spontaneous, everyday exchange of talk between two or more people. Conversation may be taken to be that familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings like religious, services, law courts, classrooms and the like".

Nofsinger (1991, p.10) stated:

> "Conversation is a process in which people interact moment-by moment, turn -by- turn basis. During a sequence of turns participants exchange talk with each other, but more important, they exchange social and communicative actions, these actions are the moves of conversation considered as a collections of games. Indeed conversational actions are some of the most important moves of the broader game of everyday life".

That is, conversation is the way in which people socialize and develop their relationships with each other. Furthermore, Liddicoat (2007, p. 01) claimed that when people get in conversation, they engage in a form of linguistic communication, but there is much more going on in a given conversation than just the use of a linguistic code. The most crucial in a conversation is carried out by things other than language, involving eye contact and body language, silences and real-world context in which talk is produced.

According to Clifton (2004), "the term conversation may refer to the form of interactive, spontaneous communication between two or more parties who are following rules of

politeness and ceremonies. A conversation works unpredictably for specific purposes since it is of a spontaneous nature".

For a very long period of time, several writers such as Hornby, Liddicoat and Clifton etc. gave an enormous importance to conversation. However, much of what has been written about conversation is perspective and it deals only with the idea of what makes a good conversationalist. Such approaches to conversation took the form of a set of perspective rules which describe what should be. They presented sets of social rules which point out which topics are appropriate or how language should be used for maximum effect. These principles of what constitutes good or appropriate conversation vary across culture and change over time.

1.1.7. Approaches to the Study of Conversation

There are two major approaches to the study of conversation namely; conversation analysis and discourse analysis, both of them study the structure of conversations.

1.1.7.1. Conversation Analysis Approach

1.1.7.1.1. Definition of Conversation Analysis

Sidnell (2009) stated that conversation analysis is an approach to the study of social interaction that focuses on practices of speaking that recur across a range of contexts and settings. Early studies in this tradition concerned with the analysis of English conversations. However, recently, Conversation analysts start to study talk in a broader range of communities all over the world.

Pomerantz & Fehler (1991, p.64) maintained that CA is an analytical methodology that attempts to describe the actions of participants in terms of the relevancies demonstrated by participants through their interactions.

Zemel et al. (2009) argued that actions are analyzed as situated within a stream of ongoing action as sequentially organized. Moreover, conversation analysts claimed that the actions that actors design fit the particular circumstances in which they are accomplished and which thereby reproduce, extend and aid constitute these actions.

Also Peräkylä (2008) claimed that conversation analysis is considered as a method to investigate the structure and the process of social contact between human beings. It focuses primarily on talk, but integrates also the non-verbal aspects of integration in its research design.

Furthermore, Liddicoat (2007) claimed that conversation analysis deals with the organization and orderliness of social contact. In order to do this, it started with an assumption that the conduct, including talk of daily life, is produced as meaningful and sensible. The main goal of conversation analytic research is the explication and description of the competences that ordinary speakers relay on and use in participating in intelligible socially organized interaction. At its most basic, this work is one of describing the procedures by which conversationalists produce their own behavior and understand that of others.

Psathas (1995) stated that CA studies the orderliness of social action, especially those social actions that are used in daily interactions, in discursive practices, in the sayings, tellings, doings of members of society. Its main assumptions are:

- Order is a produced orderliness.

- Order is produced by the parties in situations. That is; it is situated and occasioned.

- The parties orient to that order themselves. That is; this order is not an analyst's conception, not the result of the use of some performed theoretical conceptions concerning what action

should/ must/ ought to be, or based on generalizing or summarizing statements about what action generally/ frequently/ often is.

- Order is repeatable and recurrent.

- The discovery, description, and analysis of that produced orderliness is the task of the analyst.

- Issues of how frequently, how widely, or how often particular phenomena occur are to be set aside in the interest of discovering, describing, and analyzing the structures, the machinery, the organized practices, the formal procedures, and the ways in which order is produced .

- Structures of social action can be described and analyzed in formal. That is, structural, organizational, logical, a topically contentless, consistent, and abstract terms.

1.1.7.1.2. Early Studies on Conversation Analysis

1.1.7.1.2.1. Sack's Contribution to Conversation Analysis

According to Woofit (2005), Sack is considered as the founder of what is today known as Conversation Analysis. Sack was working in a suicide prevention center in Los Angeles city. He had been examining a corpus of recorded telephone calls to the center. One of the tasks of the center's staff was to try to get the caller's name, and on many occasions, if they gave their name, they found that the callers would then identify themselves in reply. However, in many cases, the center's staff had difficulty getting callers to state who they were, either callers would not say their name after the center's staff had introduced themselves, or later, when explicitly asked for their name, they would refuse to disclose it. For the center, then, the problem was getting callers to reveal their names.

The first lecture in Sack's collected lectures is entitled 'Rules of Conversational Sequence'. He starts with three examples of telephone opening to the suicide–prevention line:

Example one:

A: Hello

B: Hello

Example two:

A: This is Mr. Smith may i help you

B: Yes, This is Mr. Brown

Example three:

A: This is Mr. Smith may help you

B: I can't hear you

A: This is Mr. Smith

B: Smith

Sack marked that the basic problem the call-taker faced had to do with getting callers to give their names. He showed that one of his earliest results, on reviewing the tapes was that, if the staff member started with 'this is Mr. Smith may I help you' any other answer than 'Yes, This is Mr. Brown' meant that the staff member would have serious trouble getting the caller to give her /his name. This led to a crucial discovery. It is obvious that the first and the second turn in each of the first two exchanges forms some kind of unit (an 'adjacency pairs').

1.1.7.2. Discourse Analysis Approach

1.1.7.2.1. Definition of Discourse Analysis

According to Crystal (1997), discourse analysis focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language, as found in such 'Discourse' as conversations, speeches, commentaries and interviews. Text analysis emphasizes the structure of written language, as found in such 'texts' such as notices, essays, road signs and chapters. But this distinction is not simple, and there have been many other uses of these labels. Specifically, 'discourse' and 'text' can be used widely to include all language units with a definable communicative function, either spoken or written text. Some scholars deal with spoken or written discourse, while others deal with 'spoken or written text'.

Paltridge (2008, p.2) pointed that:

> "Discourse analysis focuses on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for successful communication. It looks at patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it is used. Discourse analysis also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the word and different understandings. It examines how the use of language is influenced by relationship between participants as well as the effects the use of language has up on social identities and relations. It also considers how views of the word and identities, are constructed through the use of discourse. Discourse analysis examines both spoken and written texts".

Discourse analysis can be defined as: the analysis of language beyond the sentence level. This differs with types of analysis specifically of modern linguistics, which are mainly about the study of grammar: the study of smaller pieces of language, as sounds (phonetics and phonology), parts of words (morphology), meaning (semantics) and the order of words in sentence (syntax). Discourse analysts study larger chunks of language as they flow together.

Another definition to discourse analysis is provided by Yule (1996), who pointed that discourse analysis includes a very wide range of activities, from the narrowly focused investigation of how words such as 'oh' or 'well' are used in casual talk, to the study of dominant ideology in a culture are signed. According to some linguistic issues such as speaking and writing, DA focuses on the record of the process by which language is used in some context to express intention.

Discourse Analysis is a word which has different interpretations for scholars working in different fields. For a sociolinguist, it is mainly about the structure of social interaction manifested in conversation. For a psycholinguist, it is concerned with the nature of comprehension of short written texts. Also from the computational linguist point of view, DA is concerned with producing operational models of text-understanding within highly limited contexts (ibid).

1.1.8. Context

According to Fetzer & Oishi (1984), context is one of those terms which is indispensible to pragmatics and discursive theories but almost impossible to demarcate and to define. Context is imported into discourse, it is invoked in DA and it is an imported condition for the construal of textual coherence. Consequently, analysis of discourse is internally connected with an analysis of discourse: context is considered as an essential part of DA, and DA is embedded in context. Furthermore, context is seen as a dynamic construct which is

interactionally structured in and through the process of communication and interaction. The dynamic outlook is based on the premises of indexicality of social action, and on the construction of common context. That is to say; meaning is not conceived as autonomous.

Karttunen (1998) defined context as a set of true propositions which determine those that can be taken for granted in performing the next speech act. Context contains a set of background assumptions, what the speaker presumes to be shared by the intended audience.

1.1.9. Speech Acts

Speech act theory is a branch of pragmatics which is concerned with the ways in which words can be used to present information and also to carry out actions.

As it is introduced by the Oxford philosopher Austin in his book entitled 'How to do things with words, 1962' and further developed by the American philosopher Searl, speech act theory considers the levels of actions at which are said to perform. In his book, 'How to do things with words', Austin pointed out that a large number of utterances are performative. That is, they are part of an action.

Austin (1962) observed that there exist many uses of language which has the linguistic appearance of fact stating but they are really different explicit performatives like 'You've fired' and 'I quit' are not used to make more statements. Austin tried to describe 'The total speech act in total speech situation', He warned against oversimplifying those complexities of meaning, by reducing meaning to descriptive meaning.

Austin (1962, p.3) said that:

> "It has come to be seen that many specially perplexing words embedded in apparently descriptive statements do not serve to indicate some specially odd additional feature in the reality reported, but to indicate (not to report) the circumstances in which the statement is made or reservations to which it is subject or the way in which it is to be common is called the 'descriptive fallacy' ".

By the concept of speech acts and the felicity condition for performing them, Austin emphasized that to produce a performative sentence is to be evaluated in terms of conventionality, actuality and intentionality of uttering the sentence.

According to Austin (ibid), a person can apologize by saying 'I apologize', promise by saying 'I promise', and thank by saying 'Thank you'.

Austin (ibid) named 'Illocutionary' those sorts of speech acts which can be performed by the use of the performative formula. The illocutionary act is but one level of the total speech act that someone performs when uttering a given sentence. Consider that in general when someone acts intentionally, one has a set of nested intentions. For example, if someone has arrived home without his keys, one might move his finger in a certain way with the intention not just of moving his finger in that way but with the further intentions of pushing a certain button, ringing the doorbell, arousing his spouse, and finally getting into his house. The single bodily movement involved in moving his finger comprises a multiplicity of actions, each corresponding to a different one of the nested intentions. In much the same way, speech acts are not just those acts of generating certain sounds. Austin classifies illocutionary acts into five type, verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behabitives and expositives.

Speech act theory is influenced by the work of Searl (1969) whose ideas on meaning and communication have stimulated research in philosophy and in human and cognitive sciences. Searl (ibid) pointed out that language itself is performative; it does not merely describe or report. He viewed that there are five illocutionary points that speakers can achieved on propositions in an utterance, namely; the assertive, the commissive, directive, declaratory and expressive illocutionary points.

1.1.10. Conversational Actions Cross-culturally

According to Dingemanse (2014), one of the major problems that any program of Cross-cultural study of social interaction is the issue of the Cross-cultural equivalence of actions like those discussed in terms of 'speech act' or in terms of 'conversational actions'. Are actions like 'requesting' or 'promising' things speakers of English do with words? Or can we expect to see several of these kinds of actions among speakers of other languages all over the world?

According Kulka et al. (1989), some studies have applied speech act categories cross-linguistically, like those that dealt with speech acts as 'apologies' in some languages such as Arabic, Persian, Korean, Chinese, Japanese and Akan. Much of the work in this area falls in the so-called **'**Cross-cultural pragmatics' paradigm. Most of these studies were based their work on interviews, surveys, and discourse completion exercises rather than on the sequential analysis of records of conversational data. There are few studies that applies sequential analysis to similar questions, as in Beach and Lindstrom's (1992) comparison of acknowledgement tokens in conversational recordings of Swedish and American English, as well as Sidnell and Enfield's (2012) study of agreement sequences in Caribbean English Creole.

Ethnographic looks local metalinguistic knowledge can offer interesting takes on that problem of Cross-linguistic action types, as in a study carried out by Edward on insults

Guyanese Creole Edward (1979), in which he deals with 'insults' as a cross-linguistic category. In this study, Edward describes how Guyanese insults are locally break down into two named sub-categories of insult that might not be translatable into other languages.

The anthropologist Rosaldo criticized speech act theory in a discussion of Ilongot speech acts (1982) where she argued that the taxonomy of speech acts done by Searl (1969) was not Cross-linguistically transferable. Searl later in (2006), as a response to this critique argued that she had misunderstood, claiming that these universal categories need not be found in every culture in the world to be valid. It was largely obvious that the best way to settle these sorts of debates and make progress with these questions is to empirically study comparable data sets of social interaction in various languages and societies, in contrast to the mostly written and elicited data considered by many studies in Cross-cultural pragmatics. However, observing conversational actions in interaction needs certain conversational analytic tools to approach the sequential context in which they occur.

1.1.11. Communicative Competence

Until the late 1960s, the primary job of a linguist had been to deal with the structures of language in terms of phonology, morphology and syntax. The social context in which language is used and learned was completely discarded. This view is typical of structural studies which dominated the 20th century linguistic studies, including transformational generative linguistics developed by Chomsky since 1957. Chomsky made a distinction between the two notions of competence and performance. He said that competence is the underlying knowledge of language while performance is the put of competence into practice.

By the advent of Hymes in 1966, he coined the linguistic term 'communicative competence' which refers to a large user's of grammatical knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology and the like, as well as knowledge of 'how' and 'when' to use utterances

appropriately. Hymes was the principle objector to the exclusive study of Chomsky's competence. He suggested that a child who might produce a sentence without due regard to the social and linguistic context would be a social monster. Hymes undertook ethnographic exploration of communicative competence that included 'communicative form and function in integral relation to each other'.

Later on, Canal and Swain (1980) redefined Hymes'concept of CC by dividing communicative competence into three types:

- Grammatical (linguistic) Competence: This type deals with the knowledge of grammar and the production of sentences as well.

- Sociolinguistic Competence: this type deals with the description of the social norms governing language use such as when to talk, when to remain silent and when to take turn.

- Strategic (communicative) Competence: this type is about the appropriate use of communication strategies.

Canal (1983), added the Discourse Competence as a fourth type of CC model of Canal and Swain (1980). Canal's new concept of DC concerns with writing and how coherence and cohesion can be achieved in a given written text.

Bashman (1990) communicative competence included both organizational competence and pragmatic competence. The former, organizational competence includes both grammatical competence which is the understanding of the structures of language, and textual competence which is the ability to produce texts. While pragmatic competence includes both the illocutionary competence as well as the sociolinguistic competence. The former has to do with the relationship between signs, referents, and language usage, while the later has to do with context of communication. That is, when one gets to a given society, one

has to respect the conventions and norms, and values which govern that society. The approach pioneered by Hymes is now known as the 'Ethnography of Communication'.

1.1.12. Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic Competence refers to the use of language in a particular context with respect to the socio-cultural rules of the community. According to Bashman (1999), pragmatic competence is the knowledge of appropriate production of language in communication and comprehension.

According to Smolcic in http://elearning.la.psu.edu/aplng/802/lesson-3/5.2-four-areas-of-communicative competence, pragmatic competence refers to the ability to use language appropriately in different social situations. She maintains that it is true to say that there is no correct way to use language, but we can certainly define what is the appropriate use of language in different circumstances is. These circumstances can be in different ways:

- Purposes for communicating; often referred to as functions .The case of inviting and apologizing.

- Relative status of those people who are engaged in the communication.

- Topic area about which participants are communicating. The case of general, business, computing, medicine.

- Situation which refers to a physical location. For instance, in a bank, at the airport, in a restaurant.

1.1.13. Cross-cultural Pragmatics

Researchers within Cross-cultural pragmatics such as Yule, Thompson and Kashru, etc. believed that the culture influences our everyday life and work knowledge. Moreover, they claimed that culture has an effect on the way we speak and act.

According to Yule (1996), from basic experiences and life knowledge one has, one creates cultural schemata which help to make sense of the world. Every culture creates different cultural frameworks and this leads to 'Cross-cultural variations'. Varying cultural schemata can indeed cause difficulties and misunderstandings when visiting foreign countries because cultural schemata vary from one culture to another, it is common that foreign people seem to behave and speak differently from what the visitor is used to in his home country.

Yule (ibid) maintained that Cross-cultural pragmatics is the study of differences in expectations based on cultural schema. He said that Cross-cultural pragmatics examines how speakers from different cultures construct meaning. It studies 'different cultural ways of speaking' or 'pragmatic accents'. When two persons from two different cultures are communicating to each other, misunderstanding is likely to happen and therefore, communication breaks down. This is what refers in the field of pragmatics as 'Cross-cultural pragmatic failure'.

According to kachru (1999), speakers or hearers of a particular language need to have access to some kind of shared knowledge to correctly encode and decode the meaning of spoken and written language. Thus , if someone does not have access to this knowledge and he is therefore unfamiliar with the norms of that particular language, it may be difficult for that person to express what they intend to communicate in a manner that enables their interlocutors to understand it in the way that it was intended .

Example one:

At a meeting of a Polish organization in Australia, a distinguished Australian guest is introduced 'Let us call her Miss Vanessa Smith', one of the Polish hosts greets the visitors cordially and offers her a seat of honor in the form of the following words 'M's Vanessa! Please! Sit! Sit!' The polish hosts here is using a pragmatic transfer. He uses the word 'Miss' as a substitute for the Polish word 'Pany', which unlike (M's) can very well be combined with first names. What is more interesting in the above example is the use of sounds, the short imperatives 'sit!' which makes the utterances like a commend and in fact like a commend addressed to a dog. Polish native speakers frequently use imperatives in context in which English native speakers would use more in direct forms.

Example two:

An Arab person is invited to dinner by his English friend in England. When the English person calls the Arab in the phone to invite him, he asks him to bring a 'plate' with him. The Arab thought that the English one asks him to bring some 'kitchen-ware' as it is used in the Arab culture. When the Arab went to the invitation bringing with him a 'kitchen-ware', the English one gets surprised because when he asks him to bring a 'plate' he means 'a dish' but not 'kitchen-ware'. This is the case of a Cross-cultural pragmatic failure.

Section Two: Turn-taking Strategies

1.2.1. Definition of Turn-taking

When two or more persons meet, it is likely for a social interaction to take place. This sort of contact is not chaotic but it is rather, rule governed. This interaction is achieved by means of some protocols of conversation namely Turn-taking. This system is not stereotypical of any type of person, language, or culture. Turn-taking is applied in most contexts by everyone, and it is not based on a given number of participants. Thus, Turn-taking is not optimized for fairness or efficiency.

McDonaugh and Shaw (1993, p.156), said: "within the 'framework' of the conversation, 'turns' have to take place if the conversation is not to be totally one-sided. Certain strategies [for taking, holding, and relinquishing turns in conversation] have to be put into operating by the speaker".

According to Edelsky (1981), turn definition can be divided into two main groups: mechanical and interactional. The former analysis turns as units of talk in interaction, without putting into consideration the social context. Turns are attributed to a single speaker and defined in terms of the behavior of other parties in the conversation; (a turn ends when somebody else claims the floor). Goffman (1981), stressed: "a turn at talk is the opportunity to hold the floor, not necessarily what is said while holding it".

However, interactional definitions deal with what happen during the interaction. It takes into accounts the intention of the turn taker. Edelsky (1981), pointed out speakers are more concerned with completing topics than structural units. Therefore, she defined turns as cases of On-record speaking, with the intention of transmitting a message. Adelsky (ibid), also differentiated turn and floor, such as, situations where a turn is constructed collaboratively by

more than one speaker. Adelsky (1981) considered that the floor is the activity taking place or the topic being discussed, often done in collaboration. Hayashi (1996), further developped Adelsky's definition of the concept floor, defining it as a means of orientation to the communication at the higher level of conversation structure. Selting (1998), held out an extensive review of the meaning behind the term of Turn Constructional Unit (TCU) as a unit of talk. TCUs were proposed by Sack et al. (1974), as the basic unit of conversation. Each TCU ends in a transition relevance place. That is, the place where the turn may go to another speaker. Selting (ibid) claimed that, the notion of TCU is a holistic model and in need of interpretation. Recently, the study of TCU is relevant because one TCU may constitute a complete turn. TCUs can be as short as a word, or as long as a sentence. He investigated the criteria to devide a turn into units, he summarized that TCU requires examination of both syntactic and prosodic elements.

As it is seen, units in conversation are determined by their boundaries: a unit is talk produced up until an end-point, the point where another interlocutor can take the floor. Ford and Thompson (1996) defined units as those characterized by ending in a complex transition relevance place. One interesting aspect of their study is that they used backchannels and laughter by the interlocutor as a signal of a possible completion point of the current speaker's turn. Backchannels are produced by the interlocutor at a point where the current speaker could finish his talk. That is; backchannels are produced at a point where the speaker takes the floor. However, with the backchannel the interlocutor signals that they reject it. Also, to signal their understanding or agreement with what is being said.

Another definition of TT is provided by Yule (1996), who pointed out that TT is any situation where control is not fixed before anyone can attempt to get control, because it is a form of social action, TT analyses in accordance with a local management system that is conventionally known by members of a social group. The LMS is essentially a set of rules for

getting turns, keeping them, or giving them away. This system is important most at those points where there is a possible change in who has the turn. Each possible change of turn point is called a transition relevance place. Within any social group, there will be features of talk typically related with TRP.

According to Bortfeld et al. (2001), the concept of Turn-taking covers a wide range of concern, not just a theoretical construction in the linguistic field of DA, rather an important pattern in communicative events that govern speech acts and define social rules as it maintains and establishes social relationships. One cue associated with conversation strategies may cue the hearer to know that who has the floor to speak or make an utterance. Turn-taking has a crucial role to play in structuring people's social interactions, in terms of control and regulations of conversations.

According to Bakeman & Gnisci (2005), the system of Turn-taking has become object of analysis both for linguists as well as sociologists. As a matter of fact, TT refers to the process by which people in a conversation decide who is to speak next. This depends on both cultural factors and smart cues. The system of TT is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation, and the conversation strategies vary between cultures and languages.

1.2.2. Types of Turn-taking Strategies

Turn-taking strategies are divided into three types of actions that can happen at any conversation. A speaker may yield the turn, or hold the turn, and an interlocutor may take the turn.

1.2.2.1. Turn Yielding Strategy

According to Taboada (2004), turn yielding strategy is perhaps considered as the most interesting aspect of the three. This strategy is achieved in a variety of ways: pauses,

address terms, questions, and tag questions. Pauses are frequently used as the most obvious signal that the current speaker wants to yield the turn. In example one (01) speaker John proposes a meeting, which projects a second part (an acceptance or a rejection), but makes the desire to yield the turn clearer with a pause.

Example 01:

John: 'Listen. I want I want uh (0.8) to have a meeting with Mr. Smith'.

    (0.55)

Peter: 'Yes. Of course. When?'

Pauses are also present in example (02) bellow, in which speaker (A) yields the turn (in the second turn in the example), a short pause preceedes the turn. It is, of course, difficult to decide whether the pause is part of the usual Turn-taking mechanism, or whether the speaker is simply taking a few second to yield the turn.

Example 02:

A: 'Mm Monday, the truth is that I only have two hour in the morning. But Tuesday in the afternoon, how's that?

    (1.56)

B: 'I have almost all afternoon free after about twelve fourty'.

A: (1.13) 'perfect'.

Pauses were only transcribed if they were at least (0.2) seconds long. Ford and Thompson (1996), maintain that a length of at least (0.3) seconds is relevant in Turn-taking.

In the third example bellow, pauses happen most often turn–medially, when speakers provide a chance for their interlocutors to take the turn, which is not taken up. A pause is considered as a runner dropping the baton. ᶦIf the runners drop the baton while it is being passed to the next runner, that the next runner should retrieve it. If the drop occurs away from such a transition place, the current runner ought to retrieve itᶦ. Similar to this situation,

another situation is presented in example (3) bellow in which Speaker (A) replies to a suggestion of the 22nd with a ˈYesˈ (after a pause), and a repetition of the date. Then speaker (B) produces a pause, presumably to yield the floor, but the interlocutor does not pick up that chance and (B) repeats the date, making it more explicit that (B) is free that day. In the next turn, speaker (A) did not take the turn at that pause, because he wants more specific information about when on that day (B) is available.

Example 3:

A: '… what do you think about the 21st?'

B: (0.65) 'Yes. The 21st (0.88) the 21st is good. I am free'.

A: 'All day?'

Address terms are used in very few cases. The speakers may, or may not, have known each other, but in all cases were presented to each other, and thus know each other's names. In example (4) follow, the speaker uses a sequence of a direct question and her interlocutor's name to yield the turn. Address terms are not necessary, since there is only one interlocutor and that could explain their scarcity.

Example 4:

A: '… So mm what do you think if we arrange to meet then at 1p.m. to have lunch, Uh I don't know, wherever you want, and then we have the whole afternoon free to finish the project? What do you think, Miriam?'

Direct questions are closely related to address terms. Given that the conversations always cover or involve two pair parts, a direct question is addressed to the only other interlocutor. Thus, even if a question contains no address term, the address term is implied. Example (5) shows a direct address, with the syntactic structure of a question. In fact, speaker (A) realizes early on that this is a question, and does not allow speaker (B) to close his utterance, but overlaps as soon as the date (Friday the 23rd) has been mentioned. Example (6)

indicates an instance of the same phenomenon, with a question which is actually not answered in the following turn.

Example 5:

A: 'Uh, (0.5) what about Saturday (0.33) < the > (0.54) the 23rd [of July]'.

B: '[Saturday the 23rd] would be perfect'.

Example 6:

A: '… On the 31st, I have a class from two to four. Let's see how that is with you?'

B: 'Okay. You could have told me before. No? …'

Questions may take the form of tag questions, where confirmation rather than information is requested. Sack et al. (1974, p.22), determine tag questions as exist devices for a turn, or post-completers. They show that the turn is complete, and the interlocutor may take the floor. In example (7) bellow, speaker (A) asks for confirmation of the date proposed with a No?

Example 7:

A: 'Okay. Uh look, let's let's try to meet here. How about the 8th?'

B: 'The 8th of February?'

A: 'Yes. That is two days from today, right?'

B: 'Uh-huh. …'

1.2.2.2. Turn Holding Strategy

According to Taboada (2004), in conversation in general, and in task-oriented in particular, people who engaged in the conversation may let the floor to an interlocutor when that interlocutor is not yet ready to take it, a speaker may produce a first part in an adjacency pair, through a question, a command, or a mention of time availability. It is then obvious that the interlocutor has to response or otherwise responds to the other offer. In some conversations, the passing of the turn is very clear. The other speaker may wish to accept that

passing of the turn, but may not be ready to provide a full answer yet. Then she/he holds the turn via a number of devices: silent pauses and filled pauses.

Starting with silent pauses, which means periods of time when nobody speaks, are the least effective method for holding the floor. A pause may refer to a number of things, among them that the communication has broken down and needs to be repaired. When the turn is passed by a converser and the interlocutor makes a pause, then the speaker that passed the turn may notice that something went wrong, and reclaim the turn, may be producing clarification. Or she/he is not saying anything, waiting for the interlocutor to speak.

Example 8:

A: (0.96) 'Okay. Let's see (0.46) how about 24th? (0.92) I can any-time, expect for from 1 to 4'. (0.67)

B: (1.42) 'on the 24th I could, but I have a meeting, from 10 until 12. Could you from 10 to 12? (1.12)

Example (9) bellow shows that Pauses take place at the beginning of the turn. Speaker's (B) pauses at the beginning of his turn (turn number 4), presumably because he is checking his schedule for the day proposed.

Example 9:

A) -01: (0.65) 'Yes. The 22nd (0.88) the 22nd is good. I'm free'.

B) -02: 'All day?'

A) –03: 'All day'.

B) –04: (0.54) 'Oh me too. That's great'.

A filled pause shows obviously that the interlocutor to whom the floor has just been passed, wishes to talk but is not quite ready to do so. Filled pauses take a number of forms: eh, ah, mm, uh. They rarely appear alone, rather being accompanied by a pause, a discourse

marker, or both. Example (10) bellow indicates a filled pause on its own. Eh, not only at the beginning of his turn, but also throughout the turn.

Example 10:

A –5: 'Uh I'll come by your office uh at two p.m., < b > because I have < in> in the morning…)

Also, repetitions serve as Turn-holders. In example (11) bellow, speaker (A) repeats in the last turn of the example, the date just proposed (the 17th), with rising intonation. This could be both a request for a confirmation and a turn holder. The request for confirmation hypothesis is supported by the fact that there is a pause after 17th? But the turn holder hypothesis is possible. Since (A) continues to talk without having received confirmation he may just have said something to hold the floor, and to show that he is considering that date.

Example 11:

A-01: 'And let's see what other day I can'.

B-02: (0.64) 'can you on the 17th?'

A-03: 'The 17th? (1.59) I can't on the 17th. (1.8) <WH> what do you think of the 22nd?'

1.2.2.3. Turn-taking Strategy

According to Taboada (2004), in any conversation, a speaker cannot take the turn to speak unless the current speaker yields it. According to Sack et al.'s (1974), terms, the speaker is self-selecting at the transition relevance place.

Overlapping is the clearest instance of self-selection by an interlocutor, since it shows that the current converser is not yet ready to take the turn. In most cross-talk cases, the simultaneous talk is clearly not an instance of trying to take the floor, but merely a backchannel as in example (12) bellow where speaker (B) makes a backchannel that signals

understanding that Monday is not good (ah), but then lets speaker (A) ends his turn before he asks the following question ('and when are you back'?).

Example 12:

A – 01: 'Eh Monday I'm away. [Monday] <Me> very busy for me'.

B – 02: '[ah] and when are you back?'

In other cases, it is more plausible thinking that the interlocutor was trying to take the turn, sometimes to preclude discussion of a date, or to make the interlocutor stops when a date has been proposed, so that the self-selecting speaker gets the opportunity to consult her/his calendar.

In example (13) bellow, speaker (A) suggests Friday and finishes his question with raising intonation. At that point, speaker (B) repeats Friday with a raising intonation also. But speaker (A) has not ended his turn, and repeats the Friday proposal, specifying that he is free then. The overlapping talk occurs when speaker (A) repeats Friday, because speaker (B) was prompt to take the turn at that point. In fact, (B) could naturally have expected his interlocutor's turn to finish at the point where speaker (A) asked a question. According to Schegloff (1988), 'If a turn has several components (that, turn constructional units) in it, one of which is a question, the question is almost always the last of them, for on its completion, the question will ordinarily have make it someone else's turn to talk'.

Example 13:

A: 01: 'Okay. What do you think uh < ma > on Friday? [Friday] I'm free'.

B: 02: '[Friday]? I Friday. Oh jeez. Let me see. Um, I have a meeting. With this David, Uh I don't remember his last name < F > from ten to twelve'.

1.2.3. Turn-taking Organization

The study of Turn-taking organization has always assumed that there are certain ways that speakers communicate their desires to yield, take, or maintain the floor.

1.2.3.1. Adjacency pairs

'Adjacency pairs' refer to one of the rules that people follow when they are in a conversation. The unit of conversation consists of two parts, one from the speaker and the other from the interlocutor. That is, when the speaker says something, he has to wait for the interlocutor to answer.

According to Yule (1996), adjacency pairs always consist of a first part and a second part produced by different speakers. The utterance of a first part immediately creates an expectation of the utterance of a second part of the same pairs. Failure to produce the second part in response will be treated as a significant absence and hence meaningful.

Pairs of utterances in talk are often mutually dependent; a most obvious example is that a question predicts an answer, and that an answer presupposes a question. It is possible to state the requirements, in a normal conversational sequence, for many types of utterances, in terms of what is expected as a response and what certain responses presuppose. Table (1.1) bellow shows some examples:

Table1. 1:

Examples of Adjacency pairs

Utterance fonction	Expected response
Greeting	Greeting
Question	Answer
Congratulation	Thanks
Apology	Acceptance
Infom	Acknowledge
Degreeting	Degreeting
leave-taking	leave-taking

Pairs of utterances such as greeting-greeting and question-answer are called adjacency pairs. The mutual dependence of such utterances is underlined by the fact that it can be absolutely sure of the function of the initiating utterance (the so-called; first pair- part) when it is contextualized with the response it gets (the second pair- part), and vice versa (thus 'hello' in English could be a greeting, a request to a telephone caller to identify themselves, or an expression of surprise: 'Hello! what's this here?'). In the following example, the imperative first pair-part can be classified functionally as an informing move, in light of the acknowledging second pair-part it receives:

Example: Degreeting / Degreeting

A: see you.

B: see you.

Adjacency pairs can be classified into different types. Some ritualized FPPs may have an identical SPPs as in (hello-hello, happy New Year – happy New Year), while others expect a different SPP (congratulation – thanks). Equally, an SPP such as 'thanks' will presuppose quite a wide range of first pair parts (offers, apologies, informing moves, congratulations, commiserations, etc.). Other FPPs have too many possibilities and generate further expectations too; take, for instance, invitation:

A: would you like to come over for dinner this evening?

B: Yes, with pleasure. (Accept)

   Yes, if it could be after eight. (Accept with condition)

   Sorry, I cannot. (Reject)

According to McCarthy (1991), the principle of adjacency pairs and the way they are realized in natural speech point to the importance of creating minimal contexts in the teaching of common communicative functions and the limited value of teaching single utterances. The

structure and elaboration of adjacency pairs, then, is determined by role and setting, and the functions of component utterances depend on the co-presence of both parts.

1.2.3.2. Sequences

According to Liddicoat (2007), adjacency pairs provide the basis for sequence organization in conversation. The minimal sequence is consisted of a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP). However, sequences can go beyond this basic two turn structure and sequences can potentially become somehow lengthy and involve a large number of turns. Regardless of how long a sequence is, it remains based on an FPP and an SPP and the talk in a sequence is relevant to the performance of this base adjacency pair. Therefore, adjacency pairs can be considered as being the basic building blocks from which sequences in conversation are built up.

Sequences are constructed of two turns at talk: an FPP and an SPP While the adjacency pair structure is the basis of sequences of talk. These sequences can be expanded in different places in their production. Sequence expansion allows talk which is made up of more than a single adjacency pair to be constructed and understood as performing the same basic action and the various additional elements are seen as doing interactional work related to the basic action underway. Sequence expansion may take place prior to the articulation of FPP this is referred to as 'pre-expansion', as it can occur after the base SPP this is called 'post-expansion'.

- **Pre-expansion**

Pre-expansion involve an expansion of a sequence before the occurrence of a base FPP. Pre-expansion are preparatory to some other, projected work to be done in the sequence and implemented by the first pair part of the base adjacency pair. Some pre-expansions are 'type-specific' since they project a specific base FPP for instance. They are pre-invitations as in 'hey, are you busy tonight?', pre-announcements as in 'Guess what happens to me?', or

pre-requests as in 'you wouldn't happen to be going my way would you?'. Such type-specific pre-expansions typically check on a condition for the successful accomplishment of the base FPP.

- **Insert -expansion**

According to Liddicoat (2007), in the discussion of adjacency pairs, it is claimed that some type of talk can occur between a first pair part and a second pair part. These instances of talk are cases of 'insert-expansion': expansion which occurs within the adjacency pair itself and separates the FPP from the SPP. However, that talk which occurs between an FPP and an SPP does not cancel the relevance of the yet to be produced SPP. Insert-expansions interrupt the activity underway, but are still relevant to that action. Insert-expansions allow a possibility for a second speaker, the speaker who should produce the SPP, to the interactional work relevant to the projected SPP.

As pre-expansion, insert-expansion is realized through a sequence of its own, which can be called an insert sequence. Insert-expansion is typically launched by an FPP produced by the second speaker which needs an SPP for completion. Once the sequence is completed, the base SPP once again becomes relevant as the next action. This allows the insert-expansion to delay a base SPP until some preliminary work can be done and completes this work. The type of work being done by the insert is determined by the sequential relationship of the insert itself as insert expansions can relate to either the FPP that has launched the adjacency pair in which they are inserted or they may be addressed to the SPP that needs to be produced as a result of the FPP these are called post-first insert expansions and pre-second expansions respectively.

- **Post-expansion**

Liddicoat (2007, p.151), stated that sequences are also potentially expandable after the completion of the base SPP. Once an SPP has been completed, the sequence is potentially

completed: the action launched by the FPP has run its course and a new action could begin. However, it is also possible for talk to occur after the SPP which is recognizably associated with the preceding sequence. That is, it is possible for sequences to be expanded after their SPP. This phenomenon is known as post-expansion.

1.2.3.3. Repair

According to Liddicoat (2007), 'repair' refers to those processes which are available to speakers through which they can deal effectively with the problems that arise in talk. Repair is relevant to all levels of talk from the Turn-taking system to sequence organization and preference.

Schegloff (2006) said: "wherever people communicate, we can expect to find mechanisms for repair: ways of dealing with problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding". Moreover, Sidnell (2010), stated that 'repair' refers to a structured set of practices via which those parties who are engaged in a given conversation are able to address and solve such problems of speaking, hearing, or understandings. Episodes of repair are consisted of many parts. A repair initiation marks a 'possible disjunction with immediately preceding talk', while a repair outcome results in either a 'solution or abandonment of the problem'. That particular segment of talk to which the repair is addressed, is called 'the trouble source' or 'the repairable'.

1.2.3. Turn-taking Signals

The study of conversational signals in Talk-in-interaction is structured according to various dimensions. Most research in the area of conversation analysis has concentrated on a number of different signals namely, intonation and pitch, silence and hesitation, discourse markers, and body language and Turn-taking.

1.2.4.1. Intonation and Pitch:

According to Chafe's (1994), intonation units are defined as basic segment of talk interrupted by the human need to breath. Intonation units are determined by changes in pitch, duration, intensity, and alternation of talk and silence. Several studies examine the pitch characteristics signaling the end of the turn. Beattie et al. (1982) analyzed an interview with Margaret Thatcher and determined that she signaled the end of the turn when she did not intend to yield the floor. At the interrupted points, she had a fast pitch fall as in her turn-final utterances. This led to frequent interruptions, because the interviewer interprets the pitch change as a Turn-yielding signal.

1.2.4.2. Hesitation and Discourse Markers

According to Rieger (2003), hesitations are pauses of varying lengths which are usually left unfilled. They usually take place when a speaker finds herself/himself in a position where she/he lacks the words to use or struggles with cognitive or verbal planning. Beattie (1977) found that people were interrupted more often during a silence. In other words, when a speaker does not say anything but still wants to hold the turn, a filled pause is produced to signal the desire to continue speaking.

Ford and Thompson (1996) claimed that pauses help to identify completed Intonation Units. They examined pauses preceded by a filled pause (uh, um, well, so). Local and Kelly differentiate the two types of silences phonetically: in holding silences, there is a glottal closure after the filled pause, maintained through the silence, and released at the beginning of the following word by the same speaker. According to Taboada (2004, p.8), trait-off silences have an–out- breathing at the end of the filled pause, which also has a more centralized vowel.

According to Wennerstrom and Siegel (2003), discourse markers are a different group of conjunctions, interjections, filled pauses, adverbs and adverbial phrases, as okay,

yeah, right, uh-huh, and, so, I mean. The problem with DM is that they do not fit one of the three basic types of signals: syntactic, semantic or intonational. They are surely not prosodic in nature. But it is difficult to say whether they contribute syntactic or semantic information to determine whether the turn is ending, and whether the interlocutor desires to take the turn.

Bangerter et al. (2004) pointed out that DM are generally assumed to signal relations among propositions or among sentences, they serve to link global and local discourse structure, or to indicate a return to a previous topic after a digression. They indicate a dispreferred second in an adjacency pair, they can serve as acknowledgment tokens or backchannel signals, help listeners integrate information in spontaneous talk, or monitor the interlocutor's comprehension of the speaker's meaning. Bangerter et al. (ibid) examined what they call project markers (uh-huh, yeah, right, okay) as signals of transitions between different parts of a telephone conversation.

Condon (2001), showed that a few individual discourse markers have been studied as to their role in TT: the role of Turn-initial 'well', and, 'so' and, 'but' showing differences in the content of the turn they start. Condon had extensively studied the discourse functions of 'OK', among which are the marking of boundaries in decision-making processes. That is, if not directly a Turn-taking device 'OK' helps mark that one portion of the discourse is over and thus the floor may be open. She also carried out other studies of 'OK' that have pointed out its role as closure in phone conversations, as a marker of a topic transition, or as a marker that the conversation is proceding as expected as opposed to 'well', which may signal a dispreferred second part in an adjacency pair.

Rymond (2004) maintained that the function of certain DM in TT: 'Oh' can elicit a clarification question. That is, allocating the turn back to the previous speaker. Now and then can be used to keep the floor; this mean that is sometimes a device for starting a turn. The

marker so is also thought to be involved in TT because it serves as a marker of a summary of what has already happened. And therefore can signal the last unit in a turn.

Ferrara (1997) analysed different uses of 'anyway'. Among them is the expression by the speaker that she/he wanted to regain the floor, after an interruption although mainly it serves to manage digressions by the speaker.

1.2.4.3. Body Language and Turn-taking

Novick et al. (1996) stated that during a conversation Turn-taking may involve a cued gaze that prompts the listener that it is his turn or that the current speaker is finished talking. There are two gazes that have been identified and associated with Turn-taking. The two patterns associated with Turn-taking are mutual-break and mutual-hold. Mutual-break takes place when there is a pause in the conversation and both participants use a momentary break with mutual gaze toward each other and then breaking the gaze, then continuing conversation again. Mutual-hold is when the speaker also takes a pause in the conversation with mutual gaze, but then still holds the gaze as she/he starts to speak again.

Furthermore, Langlord (1994) argued that TT is an organizational system. He examined facial features 'eye contact' and other gestures so as to prove that TT is signaled by many gestures, not only a break in speech. His claim stem from analysis of conversations through speech, sign language, and technology.

1.2.4.4. Overlapping in Turn-taking

According to Schegloff (2000), when more than one person is engaging in a given conversation, it is likely for overlapping or interruption while both or more parties are speaking at once. For those people who are engaged in a conversation, overlapping in terms of TT can be problematic. There are four types of overlap namely; terminal overlaps, continuers, conditional access to the term, and chordal. The first type takes place when a

speaker assumes the other speaker has or is about to finish his turn and begins to speak, thus creating overlap. The second type 'continuers' is a way of the hearer acknowledging or understanding what the current speaker is saying. As showed by Schegloff, such examples of the continuer's phrases as 'Uh-huh' or 'Mm-hum'. The type 'Conditional access to the turn' implies that the current speaker yields his turn or invites another speaker to interject in the conversation. Another example illustrated by Schegloff is a speaker invited another to speak out of turn when finding a word in a word search. The fourth type 'chordal' consists of a non-serial occurrence of turns; meaning both speakers' turns are occurring at once, such as laughter.

1.2.4.5. Timing and Turn-taking

Cowley (1998) stated that timing is another cue associated with TT. Within TT, timing may cue the hearer to know that he has a turn to speak or make an utterance. Due to the very nature of Turn-taking, and that it is dependent on the context, timing differs within a turn and may be subjective within the conversation. Vocal patterns, such as pitch, specific to the individual also cue the hearer to know how the timing will play out in Turn-taking.

1.2.5. Turn-taking Strategies in Arabic Conversations with Reference to the Glorious Quran

As it is already mentioned, the strategies of conversation vary from one culture into another and from one society into another. That is, each culture has its own strategies for taking turns while conversing which are different from those strategies of other cultures. In the Arabic culture, Arabs are taught how to take turns in conversations from the Holly Quran. In other words, Arabs takes the rules of TT from the Glorious Quran.

According to Ajaaj (2014) in social Arab traditions, elderly people have the freedom to lead a conversation without taking any loyal permission from other partners (mainly those

young partners). Young people do not have the right to start their role in front of elder people without taking prior permission. According to Quranic principles, Muslims are not allowed to start speech in the presence of the prophet peace be upon him (PBUH) or elder people as shown in the following Aya:

قال تعال:«يا أيّها الّذين آمنوا لا تقدموا بين يدي الله و رسوله و اتقوا الله إنّ الله سميع عليم.»1 (الحجرات: الآية 1)

'O you who believe! Do not put (yourselves) forward before Allah and his messenger (SAW), and fear Allah. Verily! Allah is All-hearing, All-knowing'.

(Al-Hilali and Khan, Al-Hujuraat: 1)

Ibn Khatheer (1999), commented on this point saying that the Almighty Allah teaches Muslims the proper behavior. They should not start anything in the presence of the prophet Mohammed (PBUH) without taking permission. This strategy applies also for elderly people as part of the Arabic traditions.

Just like the English people, Arabs have the same attitude of speaker-hearer relation. According to Ajaaj (n.d.), the Holly Quran has two main features of holding a conversation; a partner cannot start without an interlocutory statement (opening sentence). Also, a partner cannot close a conversation without a closing sentence which initiates the next turn. The following conversation holds between Prophet Zakariya (1st PP) and the Almighty Allah (2nd PP) in which Zakariya pleads Allah for a boy to inherit him.

Opening sentence   قال تعالى : " ذكر رحمت ربك عبده زكريا " (2)

Pre-expansion 1 (turn 01)   " إذ نادى ربه نداءا خفيا"(3)

Pre-expansion 2 (turn 02)   "قال رب إني وهن العظم مني و اشتعل الرأس شيبا و لم أكن بدعائك رب شقيا"(4)

1st PP (turn 01)   " و إني خفت المولى من ورائي و كانت امرأتي عاقرا فهب لي من لدنك وليا "(5)

Expansion 1   " يرثني و يرث من أل يعقوب و اجعله رب رضيا" (6)

2nd PP (turn 01)   " يا زكريا إنا نبشرك بغلام اسمه يحي لم نجعل له من قبل سميا "(7)

Post expansion1 (1st PP)   " قال رب أنى يكون لي غلام و كانت امرأتي عاقرا و قد بلغت من الكبر عتيا "(8)

Post-expansion 2 (2nd PP)   " قال كذلك قال ربك هو علي هين و قد خلقتك من قبل و لم تك شيئا "(9)

1st PP (turn 02)   " قال رب اجعل لي أية"

2nd PP (turn 02)   "قال آيتك ألا تكلم الناس ثلاث ليال سويا "(10)

Closing sentence   " فخرج على قومه من المحراب فأوحى اليهم ان سبحوا بكرة و عشيا"(11)

(سورة مريم : الايات 2-11)

Conclusion

The previous chapter was divided into two sections. The first section provided a set of elements about culture, Cross-culture, pragmatics, Conversation Analysis, Discourse Analysis, context, speech acts, communicative competence, and pragmatic competence. The second section was invoked to speak about Turn-taking strategies from different perspectives. Starting with those strategies which are applied in the English context, and closing with those strategies which are applied in the Arabic context with reference to the Holly Quran in the Surah of 'Miryam'.

Chapter Two: Research Method, Data Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

The present piece of research is conducted under the scope of conversation analysis approach to discuss Turn-taking Strategies across cultures, and how these strategies differ from one context to another and from one culture to another. Videos taken from different TV channels have been applied to collect data for the analysis. The system includes both verbal and non-verbal signals, namely adjacency pairs, intonation and pitch, silence and hesitation, discourse markers, body language, and overlap and timing. This chapter discusses the methodology used to carry out this piece of research and the data analysis and discussion.

2.1. Research Methodology

2.1.1. Research Design

The present study uses both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The quantitative methods are used to determine the observed patterns. That is, displaying the data that come from the transcription of the conversations in form of tables which makes it clear to understand and easy to obtain the findings. On the other hand, the qualitative research method is the examination of the Turn-taking strategies across-cultures that is shown through the transcriptions which are considered as the main source of the qualitative data.

2.1.2. Description

The present study of conversation strategies across cultures is based on the analysis of transcribed videos taken from different TV channels, namely; BBC English (British Broadcasting Company), and Al-Jazeera TV, Saudi 2. These videos are taped in a CD. They are classified as follow:

- BBC: (British Broadcasting Company) from this TV channel, two interviews are taken. One of these interviews takes place between the British Prime Minister

David Cameron and the journalist Jon Snow. And the other one occurs between the Egyptian president Abd-el fatah Al-sisi and the English journalist Lyse Doucet.

- Saudi 2: from this Arabic channel, interview broadcasting in English is carried out between the political analyst Mohammed Alam and the journalist Walid of 'Point of View' programme.

- Al-Djazeera T.V: from this Arabic channel, an interview is carried out between the Algerian previous president Ahmed Ben Bella and the journalist Ahmed Mansor in 'Bila Hodoud' programme.

These videos are chosen from international T.V channels. And also those people who are engaged in the four conversations in the present study are very famous people. They are known in the international political community and also for this piece of research to be valuable. Similarly, these videos are chosen for the purpose that they serve the above stated aim of the present study.

2.1.3 Transcription Process

The transcription of conversation analysis aims at representing in text the actual sounds people make in the position they make them in order to make the resultant transcript as accessible to people as possible. In much the same way, it must be put into account that the process of representing actual talk in textual form as a transcription is not somehow 'Neutral' and simply the case of transforming what is seen and heard into what can be read.

As Heath and Luff (1993, p.309) stated:

> "The process of transcription is an important analytical tool, providing the researcher with an understanding, of and insights into, the participant's conduct. It provides the researcher with a way of noticing, even discovering, particular events and helps focus analytic attention of their socio-interactional organization".

- The first step in the transcription is listening again and again to the interviews.

- The second step is to play back small actions of conversations extract repeatedly and gradually writing out the words and sounds of the conversations according to the transcription conventions showed in the following table.

Table 2.1:

Transcription Conventions

Transcription elements	Meaning
↗	Raising arrow indicates a raising intonation.
↘	Falling arrow indicates a falling intonation.
[	Left bracket indicates beginning of overlap
(.)	Period within parenthesis indicates a micro pause ; pauses greater than 0.1 seconds, measured to nearest tenth second.
[ ]	Bracket indicates continued, same-speaker speech between turns where overlap occurs.

While transcribing these videos, only parts of the conversations that contain the Turn-taking cues that are the base of the analysis of the present study are taken.

After transcription process ends, the process of analysis and interpretation starts. Transcription, analysis, and interpretation are intertwined together, the minute transcription starts, analysis and interpretation also begins simultaneously.

2.1.4. Transcription Results

Transcription results are presented in three categories; Turn-yielding examples, Turn holding examples, and Turn-taking examples. The videos used for collecting data are transcribed and shown in the form of appendices (1- 4). Also videos that are in Arabic version are translated into English version

2.1.5. Limitations of the Study

This study contains some limitations and this is for many reasons:

- Time constraints can be considered as the most limitation of the current piece of research. Having more time would be helpful in data analysis.
- It was hard to find videos that achieve the stated aim of the present study.
- It is worth mentioning that, the transcription of the videos selected for the analysis was a very hard process that took a long period of time.

2.2. Data Analysis

2.2.1 Pauses

Table 2.2:

The number of pauses in the four conversations across-culturally

Turns	Conversations			
	Con 01	**Con 02**	**Con 03**	**Con 04**
Interviewee's pause	02	08	13	29
Interviewer's pause	03	15	05	10
Total number of pauses	05	23	18	39
Total number of turns	26	32	44	30

The above table shows the presence of pauses in the four conversations that are used for the analysis. From the first glance at the table, it is noticed that the frequency of pauses differs from one culture into another. In the first conversation (see appendix 01) which takes place between two English native speakers shows that from a total number of 26 turns, pauses appear only five times.

Example: 01

David Cameron-01: … It's actually trained and skilled euh people here in Britain not least

with a three million apprentices were not trained in this parliament. So,

they can do the jobs **(.)** that are dynamic economy is creating.

Jon Snow-02: but euh creating a country a country for budget responsibility office is

that in actual fact euh about a fifth of growth is down to **(.)** new people

coming into the country.

The second conversation (see appendix 02) occurs between two Arabs from Saudi Arabia conversing in English. This conversation shows that the two parts who are engaged in this conversation overuse pauses. Within this conversation; from a total number of turns of 32 turns, pauses appear 23 times. These pauses appear nearly in every line of the conversation.

Example 02:

Walid- 04: Mr. Mohammed. I'm euh **(.)** umm after euh the horrible move, there was a

problem **(.)** euh there in euh their Iranians to the Saudi Embassy.

Example 03:

Mr. Mohamed- 17: It has no political value **(.)** by state for what happens involves **(.)** or at

least involves the fact that they were as a government not responsible

for it.

Example 04:

Walid- 21: we also at the same question, how come they did not apologize to the

Kingdom itself **(.)**, and they apologized to the United Nations **(.)** how would

would you analyse the move?

The third conversation (see appendix 03) takes place between two Arabs speaking in their native language. And which is translated into English shows that from a total number of turns of 44 turns, pauses appear 18 times.

Example 05:

Ahmed Mansor- 04: Euh **(.)** when you were in prison. Have you been in contact with the

secret organization abroad.

Example 06:

Ahmed Ben Bella- 11: euh **(.)** the means were the places outside, not any other. I mean

means umm (.) there were some ropes.

The fourth conversation (see appendix 04) which takes place between an Arab politician speaking in Arabic. The speech of whom is translated into English, and an English journalist. This conversation shows that from a total number of turns of 30, pauses appear 39 times and most of them are done by the Arabic politician.

Example 07:

Lyce Doucet-05: people are looking at the realies of Egypt **(.)** and they see euh euh a

droconian **(.)** country terorism law that both Egyptians and **(.)**

international human rights groups have described the permenant state

of emergency.

Abd-El Fatah –Alsisi-06: over the past five years euh, we have been going through a

revolution **(.)** it's euh very important that we have stability so that

we can provide for people. But this doesn't mean that we will

achieve stability by force and supression **(.)**, we are trying to

organize our life **(.)** people have the right to express their opinion

euh and demonstrate **(.)** They have the right the right to decide

wether i stay in power **(.)** but euh we are talking about organizing

a country with a large number of population…

2.2.2. Overlaps

Table 2.3:

The number of overlaps in the four conversations across-culturally

Turns	Conversations			
	Con 01	Con 02	Con 03	Con04
Interviewer's overlaps	10	06	04	03
Interviewee's overlaps	11	05	00	01
Total number of overlaps	21	11	04	04
Total number of turns	33	32	44	30

The above table shows the number of overlaps in the four conversations that are used for analysis. It is noticed that overlaps appear in the four conversations. However, the frequency in which overlaps appear differ from one conversation to another. And this difference in turn, depends on the nature of culture. That is, the use of overlaps differs from one culture to another.

In conversation one (see appendix 01) which takes place between two native speakers of English shows that from a total number of turns of 33 turn, overlaps occur 21 times.

Example: 08

Jon Snow-04: you know that euh the rate euh, the birth rate for example that the polish

immigration 600.000 polls came into the …⌐ ⌐

David Cameron-05:   yeah

Jon Snow-04: last ten fifteen years and and Britain is risen up there and one of the most

satisfactory birth replacement is…⌐

David Cameron-06:   yeah, we have a reason.

Example 09:

Jon Snow-13: yeah, there are 50 percent of them …⌐

David Cameron-14:   first, first, let's take the

Lowest paid people …

In the second conversation (see appendix 02) which occurs between two Arabs from Saudi Arabia conversing in English language. In this conversation, overlaps take place 11 times from a total number of turns of 32 turns. As it is shown in the next examples:

Example 10:

Mr. Mohammed-17: It has no value (.) An apology by state for what happens involves (.) or

at at least involves the fact they were as a government not responsible for

it, but they were. So, the apology is invalid…⌐

Walid-18:   euh euh I'd like to ask also…

Mr. Mohammed-19: it's like the Israel attacking Palestinians place and then apologizes.

In the third conversation (see appendix 03) which takes place between two Arabs conversing with their Arabic language. And which is translated into English language. This conversation shows that there is a few uses of overlaps all along the interview. All of the

remarked overlaps are done by the interviewer. In this conversation, overlaps occur only 04 times from a 44 total number of turns. As it is shown in the next example:

Example 11:

Ahmed Ben Bella-19: ah! (.) They did not call me until juin. I remained in the houses of

militants …

Ahmed Mansor-20:   this means that these people were hiding you.

Example 12:

Ahmed Ben Bella-35: (.) the party, the party. At that time which was

in Algeria i …

  Ahmed Mansor-36:   how was your feeling?

     In the fourth conversation (see appendix 04) which takes place between an Arab politician who had been interviewed by an English journalist. This conversation shows that, there is a few uses of overlaps since from a total number of 30 turns, overlaps occurs only 4 times and the most remarkable ones are done by the English. As it is shown in the next examples:

Example 13:

Al Sisi-14: that's true, but these are exceptional circumstances...

Lyse Docet-15:   so, you justify?

Example 14:

Al Sisi-26: for the past two years (.) sabotage and destruction, why? This country is big enough to accommodate of us…

Lyse Doucet-27:   including Muslims brotherhood?

2.2.4. Hesitation and Discourse markers

Table 2.4:

Number of Hesitation and discourse Markers across-culturally

Turns	Conversations			
	Con 01	Con 02	Con 03	Con 04
Interviewer's D.M.	07	24	06	07
Interviewee's D.M.	11	29	08	27
Total number of D.M.	18	53	14	35
Total numbers of turns	33	32	44	30

The above table represents cultural differences in terms of hesitation and discourse markers, as they appear in the four conversations which are chosen cross-culturally for the analysis. It is noticed from the table that the aspect of hesitation and discourse markers appear as all the conversation. However, the rate in which this aspect appears differs from one culture into another.

In the first conversation (see appendix 01) that takes place between two native speakers of English represents that from a total number of 33 turns, hesitations and discourse markers take place only 18 times as it is examplified as follow:

Example 15:

Jon Snow-04: you know that **euh euh** the rate of birth for example that **euh** the polish

immigration 600.000 polls came into the last ten fifteen years and Britain is

raised up there and one of the most satisfactory birth replacement is one of the

most satisfactory birth replacement is …

David Cameron-06: yeah, we have a reason.

Jon Snow-07: and what we can do without a ….

David Cameron-08: well, well, um, that there is a big different streams between Britain and

Germany **um**…

The second conversation (see appendix 02) which takes place between two Arabs from Saudi Arabia who are conversing in English shows that there is a huge use of hesitations and discourse markers. From the conversation, it is remarkable that from a total number of 32 turns, there is 53 number of hesitations and discourse markers as it is shown in the following examples:

Example 16:

Walid-04: Mr. Mohammed, I'm **euh** (.) **um** after euh the horrible move, there was a problem

(.) **euh** there in **euh** their Iranians to the Saudi Embassy.

Mr. Mohammed-05: well. I mean you euh already highlighted euh story of the storming of

the Saudi Embassy in Tehran…

Example 17:

Walid-08: True, of course euh is a big mistake, I mean there any of course. They violated

euh a very big international law…

Mr. Mohammed-09: well, remember what would lead among one of the Beatus of **euh euh**

euh diplomatic missions anywhere in the world being almost sacred is is

an important business **euh** it's an old business of **euh euh euh**

conventions.

The third conversation (see appendix 03) that occurs between an Algerian politician and an Arab journalist who are conversing in their native language shows a few use of hesitation and discourse markers. From the conversation, it is noticed that from a total number of 44 turns, hesitations and discourse markers appear only 14 times as it is shown in the following example:

Example 18:

Ahmed Ben Bella-11: euh! The means were the places outside not any other means. I mean

Umm (.) there were some ropes. The most important thing is that secret

Places to which we shelter outside the prison.

Ahmed Mansor-12: ok (.) **euh** how have they manage to exfiltrate you to France from

El-bulaida?

Ahmed Ben Bella-13: Unfortunately! Unfortunately! (.) euh my comrades did not call me.

The fourth conversation (see appendix 04) that takes place between an Arab politician who had been interviewed by an English journalist, shows that from a total number of 30 turns; hesitations and discourse markers appear 35 times and most of them are done by the Arab politician as it presented in the next examples:

Example 19:

Lyse Doucet-03: but in Britain, they have been protests including a letter signed by **euh**

British empies and academic saints. Euh the president shouldn't have been

invited and they **euh** accused you of being a dictator. How do you respond

to that?

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-04: um um there is freedom of expression (.) in your country and also

In ours (.) and **euh** the British people need **euh euh** to listen to our

point of view and **euh euh** so, they know the reality of life in

Egypt.

2.2.4: Intonation

Table 2.5:

Representation of intonation across-culturally

Turns	Conversations			
	Con01	Con02	Con03	Con04
Rising Intonation	36	20	26	30
Falling Intonatin	29	50	39	30
Total number of Intonations	63	70	63	60
Total number of Turns	33	32	44	30

The above table shows the use of intonation in the four conversations that are used for the analysis. From the first glance at the table, it may be noticed that intonation differs from one language into another. That is, the use of intonation differs widely between the English culture and the Arabic culture.

The first conversation (see appendix 01), which takes place between two native speakers of English, is shown that the most used type of intonation is the rising one. It is remarked that from a total number of 33 turns, rising intonations occurs 34 times, whereas only 29 of falling intonation are noticed. The following sentences show some examples.

Example 19:

Jon Snow-02: but euh↗ creating a country in which the office for budget responsibility

office   is that in actual fact euh↗ about a fifth of growth is down to (.) new

people coming into the country.

David Cameron-03: ↗ well, you got to look at GDP but you also look at GDP per capita.

So, again↗ you know the economist who↗ knocked around all the

arguments in the figures tell us a variety of things but I ↗ think it's

important to measurement migration because people are concerned to

euh the birth people and to me.

Most of rising intonation occurs when participants are asking questions be they WH-questions or YES/NO questions as in the next examples:

Example 20:

Jon Snow-23:↗ what's your plan now?

David-25: ↗ the plan is, we need a Syrian people of course it has to have people at its head

that reassure the alawite they are part of the future of Syria…↘

Example 21:

Jon Snow-30: ↗ All five years!!!?

David Cameron-31: ↗ Oh yeah ↘

The second conversations (see appendix 02) which takes place between two Arabs from Saudi Arabia and who are conversing in English shows a large use of falling intonation. From the table, it is noticed that from a total number of 32 turns, falling intonation occurs 50 times in comparison to rising intonation which occurs only 20 times all along the conversation and from here it is concluded that Arabs while conversing in English, they use a transfer in intonation. As it is shown in the following examples:

Example 22:

Walid-06: euh ↘ I think I would imagine also more to come…↘

Mr. Mohammed-07: euh↘ and more to come as as as you are expecting. Remember that we

still have a GCC meeting of foreing ministers ↘euh next ↘ Saturday

we also have euh ↘ the biggest grouping of the arab world which is the

arab league.↘

In the third conversation which occurs between two Arabs conversing in Arabic language and which is translated into English, falling intonation is used more than the rising

intonation. Looking at the table above, it may be noticed that from a total number of 44 turns, falling intonations occurs 39 times whereas falling intonation takes place only 26 times as it is shown in the next examples.

Example 23:

Ahmed Mansor-02: ↗ Hello Mr. the president↘

Ahmed Mansor -03: welcome↘

Example 24:

Ahmed Mansor-04: euh↘ when you where in prison. Have you been in contact with the

secret organization abroad?↘

The fourth conversation (see appendix 04) which takes place between an English journalist and an Arab politician shows an equal use of the two types of intonation. It can be noticed from the table that from a total number of 30 turns, falling intonation occurs 30 times and also the rising intonation.

It appears that most of the falling intonations are done by the Arab person. And most of the rising intonations are used by the English person. As it is shown in the next examples:

Example 25:

Lyse Doucet-17: You comment about the state of Egypt now↗ I'm suggesting you don't

think that Egypt is ready for a full democracy yet↗. It's that is that your

point of view↗.

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-18: No↘ (.) on the contrary. I'm trying to make you understand our

situation ↘ . Democracy is a will and practice. Our will is to allow

Egyptians express their freedom and practice↘.

Example 26:

Lyse Doucet-27:↗ including Muslim brotherhood?

Abd-el Fatah Al-sis-28: of course↘.

2.2.5: Adjacency Pairs

The term 'adjacency pairs' refers to that mechanism that gives the other part of the conversation the opportunity to take the floor. In the four conversations that are used for the analysis of the present study, different types of adjacency pairs are present. However, this mechanism differs widely across-culturally. As it will be illustrated in the following examples:

From the first conversation (see appendix 01) which takes place between two native speakers of English, the following types of adjacency pairs can be extracted.

- **Question / answer**

Example 27:

Jon Snow-23: But you don't tell us, what's your plan now?

David Cameron-25: The plan is we need a Syrian government that can represent all of the

Syrian people of course it has to have people at its head that can

reassure the aliete that they are part of the future of the Syria…

Example 28:

Jon Snow-28: finally, prime minister are you looking forward to retirement?

David Cameron-29: well, I'm looking forward to the next five years.

- **Degreeting / Degreeting**

Example 29:

Jon Snow-32: Prime Minister, thank you.

David Cameron-33: Thank you.

From the second conversation (see appendix 02) that occurs between two Arabs from Saudi Arabia who were conversing in English language, it is greatly important to mention that different types of adjacency pairs are present including greeting/greeting, inform/acknowledge, degreeting/degreeting. As it will be illustrated in the following examples:

- **Greeting / Greeting**

Example 30:

Walid-01: first of all Mr. Mohammed welcome to the show to have you.

Mr. Mohammed-02: thank you very much, thank you, thanks a lot.

- **Question /Answer**

Example-31:

Walid-13: I think as you mentioned that they really have a big history of such of course

       violations and moves a lot. Iran as a country in general if I could call it a country

as a huge negative history of such violations, attacks on embassies there, they

are already making problem in the middle east. Many, would also say that

creating more terrorism. How do you analyse …?

Mr. Mohammed-14: interesting question, I can expand on it by saying that Iran prior to

1979 was a very respectable state, I mean may be a lot of pressure took

Place. May be a lot of poverty took place that Iran the shower was one

of the most noted countries voted for law and order and voted for

Stability so forth.

Example 32:

Walid-10: imagine, where the applications of course employers by the international law on

Iran because of the violation rights on the kingdom's Embassy what do you think

is happened also such from the united nation internationally? How are they doing

of course the replies as such ones?

Mr.Mohammed-11: they take lessons from what happen to the Saudis and pre-cautions will

always be made by these countries. This diplomatic activity will take

place in Iran.

- **Inform / acknowledge**

Example 33:

Walid-06: I would imagine also more to come…

Mr.Mohammed-07: And more to come as you are expecting. That we still have a GCC

meeting of foreign ministers next Saturday. We also have the biggest

grouping of the Arab world which is the Arab league.

Example 34:

Walid-08: True of course. It is a big mistake. I mean there any of course, they violated a very

big international law. They failed to protect that of course diplomat at the embassy

or the consulate at the same time and they failed to protect. They didn't do nothing

to protect…

Mr.Mohammed-09: well. Remember what would lead among one of their the Betus of

Diplomatic missions anywhere in the world being almost sacred is an

Business. It is an old business of conventions. Remember the Vienna

convention of 1961 to give sanctity and almost total protection of

foreign missions abroad.

- **Degreeting / Degreeting**

Example 35:

Walid-30: thank you Mr. Mohammed Alam. It's sort of pleasure having you here. I thank

you for providing us with these information and inchallah the best is coming.

Mr. Mohammed-31: thank you, thank you Walid. Thank you for inviting me.

As far as the third conversation is concerned (see appendix 03); it takes place between two Arabs conversing in their mother tongue. It is worth mentioning that different types of adjacency pairs are used all along this conversation including; greeting /greeting, question / answer, and degreeting / degreeting as it will be shown in the following examples:

- **Greeting / Greeting**

Example 36:

Ahmed Mansor-02: hello, Mr. president.

Ahmed Ben Bella-03: welcome.

- **Question / Answer**

Example 37:

Ahmed Mansor-04: euh, when you were in prison, have you been in contact with the secret

organization abroad.

Ahmed Ben Bella-05: yes, of course.

Example 38:

Ahmed Mansor-08: what were the orientations of those Frensh lawyers?

Ahmed Ben Bella-09: socialists, they were all socialists of course.

Inform / Acknowledge

Example 39:

Ahmed Mansor-20: this means that these people were hiding you.

Ahmed Ben Bella-21: yes, it was them who were hiding me.

- **Degreeting / Degreeting**

Example 40:

Ahmed Mansor-43: thanks my president.

Ahmed Ben Bella-44: God saves you.

Similarly, in the fourth conversation (see appendix 04) which occurs between an Arab politician and an English journalist; it is something of merit to mention that different types of adjacency pairs are included in the conversation such as pairs of greeting / greeting, question / answer, inform / acknowledge, and degreeting / degreeting.

- **Greeting / Greeting**

Example 41:

Lyse Doucet-01: president Abd-el Ftah Al-sisi, thank you very much for making your

time to speak to the BBC.

Abd- el Fatah Al-sisi-02: thank you for the introduction please let me say a few words…

- **Question / Answer**

Example 42:

Lyse Doucet-03: but in Britain they have been protests, including a letter signed by British

empies and academic sains, the president Al-sisi shouldn't have been

invited and they accused you of being a dictator . How do you respond

to that?

Abd- el Fatah Al-sisi-04: uh umm there is freedom of expression in your country and also

in ours, and the British people need to listen to our point of view,

and so they know the reality of life in Egypt.

Example 43:

Lyse Doucet-11: you, yourself said Julio this year that you want to free young people who

were wrongly jailed. You were already released a hundred (.) activist at the

the time Islamic Aid festival. Are you planning to release more who were

wrongly jailed?

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-12: we have regular reviews to make sure nobody is wrongly

imprisoned. One more than one occasion the review committee has

sent me the names of people that are wrongly jailed and they are

pardoned.

- **Inform / Acknowledge**

Example 44:

Lyse Doucet-13: so you recognized that innocent people have been caught up in this jumble

security. So you hear that people are in Prison simply for wearing of

revolutionary scarf but it doesn't unfair.

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-14: that's true, but these are exceptional circumstances.

- **Degreeting / Degreeting**

Example 45:

Lyse Doucet-29: Mr. Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi thank you very much for your time?

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-30: (moving head)

2.2.6. Body Language

In addition to the above stated verbal Turn-taking Strategies that are remarked in the four conversations used for the analysis, non-verbal Turn-taking strategies are also noticed in the four conversations by the use of some movements in the body; such as bobbing the head, gazing and also movements of hands.

Seemingly, these behavioral cues depend up on a shared understanding for an effective communication to take place. That is, Turn-taking strategies in terms of 'gestures' or 'body language' are probably not generalizable to other cultures. In other words, the use of gestures in Turn-taking system differs from one language to another and from one culture into another. This may be shown in the four conversations that are used for in the present study.

The first conversation (see appendix 01) shows the use of different types of gestures all along the transcribed parts of the conversation. It is noticed that both of the interlocutors, who belong to the British culture, yield turns to each other using some gestures as head movements, as well as gazing.

Similarly, in the second conversation (see appendix 02), it is noticed that the interlocutors each of whom belongs to the Arabic culture overuse hand movements and other facial expressions when they want to take, yield or hold the floor.

In much the same way, the third conversation (see appendix 03) in which both of turn holders belong to the Arabic culture, it is noticed that the interlocutors use only their hands when they want to give the floor to the other interlocutor.

Finally, in the fourth conversation (see appendix 04) which takes place between two persons from different cultures. It is noticed that the interlocutors do not use the same gestures when giving the turns to each other. From the interviews, it is noticed that the British person overuses her hands and gazing, whereas the Arabic person didn't use too much his body language in the conversation.

2.3. Discussion

The major concern of the present piece of research is to investigate the Cross-cultural Turn-taking strategies; a contrastive study between English and Arabic mechanisms. These strategies are used by different people from different cultures taken from TV shows programs. These conversations are transcribed and those conversations which are in Arabic language have been translated into English language and then transcribed. These transcriptions are examined in terms of the three characteristics: turn yielding, turn holding, and turn taking. This study aims at finding the differences between Turn-taking strategies in Arabic and English cultures.

These strategies are put into practice by speakers taking into account the use of some cues namely; pauses, overlaps, discourse markers, intonation, adjacency pairs, and body language. From the analysis of those cues, it is found that their use differ widely from Arabic culture and English culture.

The mechanism of pauses is produced either in the middle of the utterance or at the end of the sentence, when the speaker wants to show to the other speaker that his turn is finished and it is for the other speaker to take the floor. The use of this Turn-taking cue differs from the Arabic culture into the English culture.

Similarly, the mechanism of overlap is present in all of conversations that are used for the analysis. This cue takes place when two speakers want to take the floor at the same time. Although, the frequency in which this cue occurs differ from one speaker to another regarding the nature of the culture they belong to.

Discourse markers, in much the same way, are observed in the four conversations. This cue is present through the use of some conjunctions, interjections, filled pauses, adverbs and adverbial phrases. However, these discourse markers differ from Arabic to English. That is; from the conversations, it is noticed that Arab persons use some discourse markers that are different from those used by English persons. The most used ones are euh, um, ah-huh. While the English people use other discourse markers such as, I mean, well, yeah, ok, right.

Another cue is observed in all of the conversations which is intonation. The latter is applied as a strategy to yield the turn to the other speaker. However, the use of this cue differs widely between Arabic and English languages. It is observed that English people's intonation is most of the time rising in comparison to that used by Arabic persons which is almost falling.

Adjacency pairs are also used in the four conversations of the study. They are used to show the interlocutor that it is his turn to take the floor. The use of these adjacency pairs differs widely across-culturally. Generally, conversations are opened by the category of greeting/greeting. However, the way of greeting differs between Arabic and English people. Also, the category of question/answer is a point of difference between the two cultures Arabic and English. When a speaker asks a question, he shows to the other speaker that it is his turn to speak. From the conversations, it is noticed that when the speaker asks a question, the interlocutor has the right to answer or even to avoid answering it.

Last but not least, body language is also analyzed as Turn-taking cue. These are sorts of gestures including hand movements, bobbing head, and gazing that are used as a way to

yield the turn to the other speaker. From the four conversation of the study, it is noticed that the use of gestures as a turn taking mechanism differs between English and Arabic cultures. Arabs overuse their hands and head movement to show to the speaker that he has to take the turn. Whereas, the English people are gazing to yield the turn to the other speaker and also they use their head movements but this is of low frequency.

Conclusion

This piece of research is about investigating Cross-cultural Turn-taking Strategies taking into account the aforementioned aim of the study. And also to answer the research questions which are: Are turn taking strategies universal or culture specific? What are the major differences between Turn-taking strategies in Arabic and English language cultures?

To investigate this, videos taken from TV shows are transcribed and then analyzed. Hence, after conducting this research, it is found that Turn-taking strategies are not universal rather, they are culture specific. It is also found that cross-culture Turn-taking strategies differ in terms of Turn-taking cues.

General Conclusion

Throughout this research work, the main focus of this study is to investigate the Cross-cultural Turn-taking Strategies, a contrastive study of English and Arabic Turn-taking mechanisms. The aim behind this study is to find the differences of Turn-taking strategies across culturally.

This study looks at Turn-taking strategies from a pragmatic and conversation analysis perspectives. It was an attempt to find how people take turns while conversing in different cultures to overcome the problem of miscommunication.

From what is noticed in this work, taking the floor is a crucial social skill for people in every culture. All things considered, this dissertation aims to highlight the main differences between Arabic and English Turn-taking mechanisms. The present research methodology is based on conversations taken from T.V shows. Conversations from Arabic channels (El-djazeera and Saudi2) and from an English channel (BBC) are taken as a sample of investigation. The Turn-takings of those people who are engaged in those conversations will be transcribed and analyzed. The analysis will focus on the comparison and contrast between the Arabic and English conversations in order to find out the main differences between the two types of Turn-takings in terms of pauses, overlaps, hesitations and discourse markers, intonation, adjacency pairs, and body language. This piece of research consists of two chapters.

The first chapter, in two sections, sheds light on different notions and concepts the present work is based up on. The first section shows different concepts related to culture, cross-culture, and communication. On the other hand, the second section concerns with Turn-taking strategies in English culture and those of the Arabic culture with special reference to the Glorious Quran. As far as the second chapter is concerned, it shows the practical side of this dissertation via transcribing and analyzing conversations taking from TV shows.

To conclude, it should be brought to light that despite the existence of some similarities in terms of Turn-taking strategies between Arabic and English. It is something of merit to mention that differences are the most noticed. Arabic and English Turn-taking mechanisms differ in terms of overlaps, pauses, adjacency pairs, hesitation and discourse markers, intonation as well as in terms of body language.

Recommendations for Future Research

On the basis of the results obtained from this research, the following suggestions are to be recommended for future research:

- In the present research and for time constraints, only four videos are taken as a sample for the analysis. In this view, it is recommended to carry out this research in the future taking more than four videos for the data to be more reliable.

- It is also recommended to carry out this research in the future using other research tools other than analyzing videos. That is; it may be carried out through the analysis of conversations occurring in naturalistic settings.

References

Ajaaj, M. A-Q., (2014) *Pragma-discoursal study of turn taking in Arabic conversations with special reference to the glorious Quran.* Department of translation, Al-Ma'moon University College.

Al-Hilali, M., & Khan, M. M. (1404, H.). *Translation of the meanings of the nobel Quran in the English language.* Madinah, King Fahd complex.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To do things tith words.* Oxford: Clarendon press.

Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford: Oxford university press.

Bakeman, R., & Gnisci, A. (2005). *Sequential observational methods.* In M. Eid & E. Dineer (Eds.). Handbook of multi method measurement in psychology (chap. 6). Washington, DC: APA. Retrieved April 09/2016 from ejpe-xxiii-1- quarto: EJPE-XXI- modelo. Modelo. qxd/ 13:07 p.71.

Bangerter, A., Herbert, H. C., & Katz, A. R. (2004). *Navigating joint projects in telephone conversations.* Discourse processes. *Vol. 37/1:* pp.1-23.

Beattie, G., Anne, C., & Mark, P. (1982). *Why is Mrs. Thatcher interrupted so often?* Nature *300:23* pp.744-747.

Bortfeld, H., Leon, S.D., Bloom, J.E., Schober, M.F., & Bernnan, S. E. (2001). *Disfluency rates in conversation:* Effects of age, Relationship, Topic, Role, and Gender. Language and Speech. *Vol. 44/2:* P.P. 123-147

Canale, M., Swain, M. (1980). *'Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing'*

Canale, M., Swain, M. (1980). *'Theoritical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.* Applied linguistics *(1):* p.p 1-47.

Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness and time:* The flow and Displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clifton, J. (2004). *The Humanistic lesson: Student primacy in a world of meaningful interaction.* Humanizing: Language Teaching.

Condon, S. L., (2001). *Discourse OK revisited:* Default organization in verbal interaction. Journal of pragmatics. *Vol. 33:* pp.491-513.

Corbett, J. (2003). *An intercultural approach to English language teaching.* Cleredon,U.K.: multilingual matters.

Cowly, S., (1998). *Of timing, Turn-taking, and conversations.* Journal of psycholinguistics research, *27(5),* pp.541-571. Doi: 10. 1023/ A: 10 24 94 89 12 805.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dingemense, M., & Floyd, S. (2014). *Conversation across-cultures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edelsky, C. (1981). *Who's got the floor?* Language and society. *Vol. 10:383.*

Ferrara, K., (1997). *Form and function of the discourse marker 'anyway':* implications for discourse analysis. Linguistics. *Vol.35:* pp.343-378.

Fetzer, A. & Oishi, E. (Ed). (2007). *Context and contexts: Parts Meet Whole?* Library of Congress Cataloging -in- Publication data.

Ford, C. & Thompson, S. A. (1996). *'Interactional Units in Conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns'*. In Ochs, E., Schegloff, E., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). Interaction and Grammar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1976). *'Replies and response'*. Language in society. *Vol. 5:* pp.257-313.

Hayachi, R. (1996). *Congnition, empathy, and interaction: floor management of English and Japanese conversation.* Advances in discourse processes LIV. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. pp. 12-14.

Heath, C., & Luff, P. (1993). *Explicating face to face interaction.* In N. Gilber(Ed.), researching social life. London: Sage.

Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (1999). *Culture in second language teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Hornby, A. S. (2010). *Oxford Advanced learner's Dictionary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

http:// en. Wikipedia.org/…/Cross cultural communication. December2010/ date of access: February,15th 2016.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bpLfqcDZQdk. Date of access April 8th, 2016.

 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GOdv2-E7ELA. Date of access April 8th, 2016.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KqVPxafKmak. Date of access April 8th, 2016.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mkjGqOg5-Kw. Date of access April 8th, 2016.

Hymes, D. H. (1966). *'Two Types of Linguistic Relativity'.* In Bright, W. Sociolinguistics. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 114-158.

Ibn Katheer, A. (1999). *The interpretation of the glorious Quran. Vols. 5-7.* Beirut, Daar al-kutub al-çaalmayh.

Kramsh, C. (1998). *Language and culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kulka, B., Shochana, House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics:* Request and apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex pub. Corp.

Langford, D. (1994). *'Analysing talk: Investigating verbal interaction in English',* London, UK: Mackmillan press, pp. 69-118.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *Introduction to Conversation Analysis.* London: British Library.

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDonaugh, J. & Shaw, (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT.* Blackwell.

Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse (2nd ed.).* London, Uk: routlegde.

Nofsinger, R. E. (1991*). Everyday conversation.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Novick, D. G., Hansen, B., & Ward, K., (1996). *'Coordinating turn-taking with gaze',* spoken language. ICSLP 96. Proceedings. Fourth international conference on, *vol. 3,* no., pp.1888-1891. *Vol.3,6-3* oct1996.

O'sullivan, T., Hartley, J., D., Montgomery, M., & Fiske, J. (1994). *Key concepts in communication and cultural studies.* London: Routledge.

Paltridge, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis.* An introduction. London: London continuum.

Peräkylä, A. (2008). *Conversation Analysis.* The Black well Encyclopidia of Sociology Online. Oxford.

Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B.J. (1991). *'Conversation analysis:* An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices'. In T. A. Dijk, (Ed). Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies, a multidisciplinary introduction. *Vol 2: 64.* London: Sage.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis.* The study of talk –in- interaction. London: A stage university paper.

Raymond, G., (2004). *Prompting action:* the stand-alone 'so' in ordinary conversations. Research on language and social interaction. *Vol.37/02:* pp.185-218.

Rieger, C. (2003). *Disfluencies and hesitation strategies in oral L2 tests.* Proceedings of diss. *03*: Disfluency in spontaneous speech workshop, 05/08 September 2003, Goteborg University, Sweden. Eklund, R. (ed.), Gothenburg Papers in theoretical linguistics, pp. 41/44.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). *'a simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking in conversation'.* In language vol. 50.4: pp.696-735. Republished in schenkein (1978). *Vol. 7-55.*

Schegloff, E. (1988). *Discourse as an interactional achievement II :* An exercise in conversation analysis. Nowood.

Schegloff, E., (2000). *Overlapping talk and the organization of Turn-taking for conversation.* Language in society*, 29 (01),* pp. 1-63.

Searl, J. (1969). *Speech Acts:* An essay in the Philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searl, J. (1979). *Expression and Meaning:* Studies in the Theory of Speech Act. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selting, M. (1998). TCUs and TRPs: The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk. Inlist-intereraction and linguistic structures *4:* http:// inlist: uni Konstanz. de/ issues/.

Sidnell, J. (2009). *Conversation Analysis Comparative Perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Converstaion Analysis and Introduction.* United kingdom: Wiley-Backwell.

Smolcic, E. In http://elearning.la.psu.edu/aplng/802/lesson-3/5.2-four-areas-of-communicative-competence. Retrieved April 05, 2016. Penn State University: Privacy and Legal Statements, The college of the Liberal Arts.

Taboada, M., (2004). *Spontaneous and non-spontaneous turn-taking, Canada:* Simon Fraster University.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction:* An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman.

Trosborg, A. (2010). *Pragmatics Across Languages and Cultures.* In Bubltz, W., Juker, A. H., & Schneider, K. P. (Eds). *Vol 7.* Library of Congress Cataloging -in- Publication data.

Tylor, E. B. (1871). *Primitive Culture: researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art and custom.* London: John Murray.

Wennerstrom, A., & Andrew, F. S. (2003). *Keeping the floor in multipartie conversations:* Intonnation, Sytax and Pause. Discourse processes. *Vol.36/2:* pp.77-107.

Woffit, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis & discourse analysis: a comparative and critical introduction*. British library cataloging in publication data: London.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford New York. Oxford University Press.

Zemel, A., Xhafa, F., & çakir, M. (2009). *Combining Coding and Conversation Analysis-Analysis of VMT Chats.*

Appendix 01: Conversation one

David Cameron-01: ↗people who come here ↗are economically productive, many people come here are working and are contributing 2.2 reason was making her speech is that you do have to look at all of the economic arguments around migration and we have to accept and sometimes frankly the elite don't accept that when you get a lot of unskilled migration that can hold their own or drive down wages that can have an effect on some of the poorest hardest working people in your country ↗ twin a.m. ↗Here let's have reformed to welfare. So, we do not automatically↘ **euh** attract over attract people to written but it's ↗ actually trained and skilled **euh** people here in Britain not least with a three million **euh** apprentices were not trained in this parliament. So, they can do the jobs **(.)** that are dynamic economy is

Creating…↘

Jon Snow-02:   but↗ **euh** creating a country in which the office for budget responsibility office

is that in actual fact **euh** about a fifth of growth is down to **(.)** new people

coming into the country.↘

David Cameron-03: ↗well, you got to look at GDP but you also look GDP per capita. So, ↗again **(moving hands)** you know the economists who knocked around all the arguments in the figures. ↗Tell us a variety of things, but ↗I think it's important to measure net migration because ↗people are concerned to **euh euh** the British people and to me…↘

Jon Snow-04:   you ↗know that **euh euh** the rate, the birth rate for example that **euh**

↘the polish immigration 600.000 polls…

David Cameron-05: yeah↘

Jon Snow-04: Come into the last ten fifteen years and Britain is raised up there and one of the most satisfactory birth replacement is …

David Cameron-06: ↗ **yeah** we have a reason.

Jon Snow-07: and ↗ what can we do without

David Cameron-08: ↗**well,** ↗**well,** but there is a different streams between Britain and Germany↘ **umm** which is that Germany has a declining population. We ↗ have a growing population are birth rate is at replacement levels.↘ ↗ So, we don't need to have another big wave of net migration to Britain.↘ But↗ what we have to do to do that is to sort out the welfare rules that are over attracting people from Europe take further steps to make sure that we're not bring in people from outside Europe as bogus students or the like and get the numbers under better control which is what Tereza speech was all about.↘

Jon Snow-10: well, been big this this this conference the party of the working family, the working party, and working for you George Osborne, the builder.↘

David Cameron-11: ↗ **yeah**

And and umm umm yet you are penalizing the very very poorest of those working families that's …

David Cameron-12: ↗ **well,** that's that's not the case (**hand movement**),

let's take…

Jon Snow-13: **yeah**, there are 50% of them.↘

David Cameron-14: ↗first, first, let's take percent of the lowest paid people; the lowest paid people are going to benefit from a national living wage. That is, a 50% increase next year per hour, a twenty pounds a week pay rise for the lowest paid people, ↘the lowest incomes families obviously we are making changes to welfare but at the same time as cutting taxes and introducing the national living wage and of course the the people in the lower incomes are better protected because they keep the elements…

Jon Snow-15: ↗**well**, **well**, will you give a pledge

that

If it turns out that there are thousands

of people↘.↗ who are very bodily

affected by this change? ↗Will you

do something about that?

David Cameron-16: we thought very carefully↘…

Jon Snow-17: that is not ↗what I'm asking

↗**Well**, I will answer.↘ We thought very carefully before ↗introducing this change.↘ It changes the pass through parliament↘ and it's that combination of a national living wage…↘

Jon Snow-18: **euh euh**

reaching

nine pounds tax cuts in next year you can earn 11,000 pounds before you pay any tax and yes these welfare changes and other they are not difficult decisions but that combination. I believe is fair↘…

Jon Snow-19: ↗you got a lot on your plate domestically and internationally opposed to just look at Syria now the problem with the Iraq there was no plan after Sudan.

the problem with Libya in which strongly participate in.↘ ↗There was no plan for after Ghadafi.↘ What's your plan? ↗

David Cameron-20: ↗a set on Syria. There was a planned, it just didn't work there was a Syrian was sorry a Libyan government, ↘ we worked hard to help that government but it did not…

Jon Snow-21: look it did not survive is very very...↘

David Cameron-22: ↗ all people knew he was to. But his people in Benghazi and he was someone who supplied simplex to the IRA incidentally semtex that the **euh** the dissident IRA probably still have anyone .So,

> Anyone thinks that somehow keeping Ghadafi in places was a friend of Britain. I think is making great mistakes.↘

Jon Snow-23: ↗ but you do not tell us, tell us ↗what is your plan is now? ↘

David Cameron-24: [↗**yeah euh yeah,** ↗]

David Cameron-25: the plan is we need a Syrian government that can represent all of the Syrian people. Of course it has to have people at its head that can reassure the elite that they are part of the future of Syria…↘

Jon Snow-26: So, ↗who's about…?

David Cameron-27: ↗ No, we are working with our allies. and frankly we have tried to work in the past with the Russians, with the Iranians, and with others.↗

Jon Snow-28:↗ finally, Prime Minister, are you looking forward to retirement? ↘

David Cameron-29: ↗**well**, I'm looking forward to the next five years. I feel I'm halfway through the most important job of my life↘. And I'm gonna give it everything I've got.↘

Jon Snow-30:↗ all five years!!?↘

David Cameron-31:↗ **oh yeah**,

Jon Snow-32: ↗Prime Minister thank you.↘

David Cameron-33: thank you.↘

Appendix 02: conversation two

Walid-01: ↗first of all, Mr. Mohammed welcome to the show and to have you.↘

Mr. Mohammed-02: thank you very much↗, thank you.↘

Walid-03: thanks a lot.↗

Walid-04: Mr. Mohammed.↘I'm **euh (.) umm** after **euh** the horrible move, there was a problem **(.) euh** there in **euh** there Iranians to the Saudi Embassy.↘

Mr. Mohammed-05: well ↗, I mean you **euh** already highlighted euh story of the storming of the Saudi Embassy in Tehran and also the **euh** incident that the simultaneous incident that took place in Mashhad an hour in **euh** our in our consulate.↘ So↗, both diplomatic missions of Saudi Arabia were attacked storm vandalized **euh** a set bulze actually and much of their content, and you know the content of the diplomatic missions is very important and sensitive documents.↘ Much of their content were were we are basically stolen and taken away and there are likely luckily the the diplomts and those who worked in the end of the story is all over the news, all over TV.↘ ↗ How they escaped, and how they suffered, and how they call the Iranian police to rescue them and how **euh** how the police **euh** basically stagnated and it on purpose and how these…↘

Walid -05:   **umm**

                                   ↗How these the mob those demonstrators who were there to **euh** intending hard to our mission.↘ ↗ How they actually were almost visibly noticed as working on shifts…↘

Walid-06:   true↗

↘ because the story took took took, you know, took many many hours to complete the whole incident.↘ And they looked like they were conceived and we know as analysts and observers that this cannot happen to a diplomatic mission without the **euh** without **euh** without it↘ being part of a larger plot from the espionage espionage survices in in in ↗Tehran and government, involvement and orchestration of it.↘ And ↗Iran has had had a history↘ euh euh euh euh I mean this is always mentioned as we talked about is.↘ And ↗Iran has had a long and terrible foreign diplomatic missions…↘

Walid-06: **euh euh euh euh** ↗ I think i would imagine also more to come…↘

Mr. Mohammed-07: **euh euh euh** ↘ and more to come as as as you are expecting. remember that we still have have a GCC meeting of foreign ministers **euh euh euh euh** next Saturday we also have euh **(.)** the biggest gropping of the Arab world which is the Arab league.↘

Walid-08: ↗ true, of course ↗ **euh** is a big mistake, I mean there any of course↘ they violated **euh euh** a very big international law↘ **(.)** they failed to protect **(.)** that of course diplomats at the Embassy or the **euh auh euh** or ↗ the consulate at the same time and they failed to protect. they did not do nothing to protect.↘

Mr. Mohammed-09: ↗well, remember ↗ what would lead among one of there the bitus of **euh (.)** diplomatic missions anywhere in the world being almost sacred is an important business↘ **euh euh euh** it's an old business of **euh euh euh** conventions.↘ ↗ Remember the

Vienna convention of 1961 to (**moving hands**) to give sanctity.↘ And almost **euh euh** total protection of foreign missions abroad.↘ It's it's a very big and will be tailed convention followed by **euh euh euh euh** by another convention in ↗ Vienna 1963 to protect the individuals and whatever is inside the diplomatic missions.↘

Walid-10: euh euh ↘ imagine **euh** ↗where the applications of course employers by ↗the international law **(.)** on ↗Iran because of the violation rights on the kingdom's embassy↘ **(.)** ↗what do you think is happened↘ also **euh** such from the united nation, internationally ↗how are they going of course to replies as such ones?↘

Mr. Mohammed-11: ↗they take lessons, ↘ they take lessons from ↗what happens to the Saudis and **euh euh euh** precautions will always be made by these countries. This diplomatic activity will take place in Iran.

Walid-12: ↗**sure, sure**↘ **(.)**

Walid-13: ↗**I think euh** as **euh** you mentioned that they really have big history of such of course violations↘ **umm-uh** and moves a lot **umm-uh** ↗Iran as a country in in general if↗I could call it a country has has a huge negative history of such of course moves violations attacks on **euh euh euh** embassies **(.)** there they are already making big problems in the middle east.↘ Many many ↗would also say that are also creating more terrorism.↘ (**moving hands and gazing**) **(.)** ↗how do you analyze?

Mr. Mohammed-14: interesting question↘ ↗ I can expand on it by saying **euh euh euh euh** that **euh** ↗ Iran prior to 1979 **(.)** was a very respectable state **(.) I mean euh euh euh** may be a lot of may be a lot of pressure took place may be **euh euh** may be euh euh a lot poverty

took place that Iran under the shower was one of the most noted countries voted ↗for law and order and voted for stability so forth↗ (**moving hands and gazing**).

Walid-15: ↘uh-huh, umm

Walid-16: ↗I think Iran is also it's spreading its violence as as you are mentioning otherwise in Lebanon↘ and Yemen creating more issues of the middle east **(.)** ↗let me ask you, let me ask you about the apology↘ that was e**uh** was **euh** made by them to the united nation. **Euh euh**↗ what does it mean? ↘↗ How do you analyze it? ↘ (**Yielding turn using hands**)

Mr. Mohammed-17: ↗ it has no political value↘ **(.)** an apology by state for what happens involves **(.)** or at least↘ involves the fact that they were as a government not responsible for it, ↘ but they ↗were. So, ↗the apology is invalid…

Walid-18: ↘ uh-huh ↗I would like to ask also…↘

Mr. Mohammed-19: ↗ it's it's like the Israeli attacking the Palestinian place and then apologize.↘ ↗you, you only apologize when you have not done something and (.) ↘you also apologize so that your victim learns that you will not do it again.↘(**moving hands**)

Walid-20: ↗exactly, ↗ exactly.

Walid-21: we also at the same question↘. ↗ How come they did not apologize to the kingdom itself? **(.)** ↘they apologized to the United Nations **(.)** ↗ How you would analyze the move?↘ (**Using hands and gazing**) ↗what do you think they mean by such apology?↘ **(.)** do you think they meant it?↘

Mr.Mohammed-22: ↗ no, they tried to observe the shock **(.)** they are actually not apologize.↘

Walid-23: ↗they did not expect…↘

Mr. Mohammed-24: ↘ they did not expect,↘ they are they are **euh euh**

soften the block of the world's reaction and these

are games that **euh euh** that somebody like our Saudi

envoy↘ **euh euh** to the **euh euh** to the united nation

is a wide of that the Iranian is umm the Iranian

government is a militia system that has not

apologized for even worst accidents since the

middle of 1980.↘ (**moving hands and gazing**).

Walid-25: I would imagine that ↗of course what going on currently in ↗Iran **(.)** I do not think of course **euh euh euh** it's gonna **euh euh euh** go for a while↘ **(.)** because the issues that they are doing of course otherwise in the middle east or to their country itself **(.)** unstapled economy, very bad economy **(.)** so you see the people living in ↗Iran and also having a very stabled life even security wise of course…↘

Mr. Mohammed-26: you are right.

Walid-27: thank you Mr. Mohammed Alam, it's sort of pleasure having you here ↘ thank you for providing us with these information and inchalah the best is coming.↘

Mr. Mohammed-28: thank you↘, thank you walid↘, thank you for inviting me.↘

Walid-29: and as we end as always saluting in Islam peace be up on you.

احمد منصور: السلام عليكم و رحمة الله تعالى و بركاته.

Ahmed Mansor-01: peace be upon you.↘

احمد منصور: سيادة الرئيس، مرحبا بيك.

Ahmed Mansor02: ↗ hello, Mr. President.↘

احمد بن بلة: اهلا و سهلا.

Ahmed Ben Bella-03: welcome.↘

احمد منصور: اه (.) هل كنت على صلة بالتنظيم في الخارج و انت بالسجن؟

Ahmed Mansor04: ↗ euh (.) when you were in prison. Have you been in contact with the secret organization abroad?↘

احمد بن بلة: إيه (.) ، نعم

Ahmed Ben Bella 05: ↗ **yes (.)**, of course.↘

احمد منصور: كيف كانت الصلة ؟

Ahmed Mansor-06: ↗ how was the relation? ↘

احمد بن بلة: ااه (.) اولا كانت الصلة ااه كانت الصلة بواسطة المحامين حتى بعض المحامين الفرنسيين جاو اتوا للجزاير علشان يكونوا محامين لينا،يعني يكونوا محامين لينا.

Ahmed Ben Bella-07: ↗ **euh** firstly, the relation was **euh** via lawyers, especially some French lauyers who came, ↗ came to Algeria to defend us, I mean, to defend us.↘

احمد منصور: إيش كانت توجهاتهم للمحامين الفرنسي ؟

Ahmed Mansor-08: ↗what were the orientations of those French lawyers? ↘

احمد بن بلة: يساريين كلهم ، كلهم يساريين (.) طبعا.

Ahmed Ben Bella-09: ↗socialists, they were all socialists (.) of course.↘

أحمد منصور: ماهي أدوات الهروب التي استخدمتموها للهروب من السجن؟

Ahmed Mansor-10: ↗what were the means that you used to escape from the prison? ↘

احمد بن بلة: اااه (.) الأدوات هي الأماكن برا،مش أدوات أخرى.يعني ادوات مممم (.) فيه بعض الأحبال.المهم هي الأماكن السرية التي نلجأ اليها.

Ahmed Ben Bella-11: ↗ **euh (.)** the means were the places outside. Not any other means. I mean means **umm (.)** there were some ropes. The most important thing is that secret places to which we shelter outside the prison.↘

أحمد منصور: طيب (.) اااه (.) كيف هربوك الى فرنسا من البليدة؟

Ahmed Mansor-12: ↗ **ok (.) euh (.)** how have they managed to exfiltrate you to France from AL-Bulaida? ↘

احمد بن بلة: ايه (.) أولا ماتصلوش بيا لجماعة نتاع الحركة، نتأسف، ياللاسف!

Ahmed Ben Bella-13: ↗ **euh** (.) unfortunately, unfortunately! my comrads in the troupe did not call me.↘

أحمد منصور: تركوك!؟

Ahmed Mansor-14: ↗ they abandened you!?↘

احمد بن بلة: ايه والله يااخي تركوني لمدة شهور...

Ahmed Ben Bella-15: ↗ **yes**, I swear my brother they abandoned me me for months …↘

أحمد منصور: شهور!؟

Ahmed Mansor-16: ↗ months!?

احمد بن بلة: ايه ،شهور نعم.

Ahmed Ben Bella-17: ↗ yes, for months indeed.↘

أحمد منصور: يعني انت في مايو 52 هربت؟

Ahmed Mansor-18: ↘ this means, you escaped in May 1952? ↘

احمد بن بلة: اه (.) مااتصلوا فيا حتى ليونيا. كنت مأوي في بيوت المناضلين.

Ahmed Ben Bella-19: ↗ euh (.) they did not call me untill Juin. I remained in the houses of

militants. ↘

أحمد منصور:يعني كانوا يأووك هؤلاء الناس!

Ahmed Mansor-20: ↘ this means that these people were hiding you! ↘

احمد بن بلة: ايه هوما اللي كانوا يأووني.

Ahmed Ben Bella-21: ↗ yes, it was them who were hiding me.↘

أحمد منصور: ااه.ايش كانوا الفرنسيين وضعهم ايه،كانوا لازالوا يطاردونك؟

Ahmed Mansor-22: ↗ euh. And what about the French were they still pursuing you? ↘

احمد بن بلة: ااه (.) فتشوا عليا في كل بقعة .يعني مازالوا مطارديني.

Ahmed Ben Bella-23: ↗ euh (.) they looked for me everywhere. I mean they kept tracking

me.↘

أحمد منصور: عجيب؟! انوا انتو (.) فرنسا تطاردكم وانتم في داخل الجزائر وانتم تهربون الى داخل فرنسا نفسها اللي كانت تطاردكم .

Ahmed Mansor-24: ↗ don't you find it strange! ↘ (.) France was pursuing you in Algeria and you decided to turn away to France. ↘

احمد بن بلة : اييه، ولكن اه (.) باش نزيدلك انو في وقت الحرب احنا ضربناهم في فرنسا بالذات لانو حنا عندنا مليون جزائري تما. وكان عندنا نظام ضربناهم في فرنسا. ضربنا سوستيل هذا اللي كان عندنا ضربناه في لي شونزيليزي Les champs Elysée في وسط باريس.

Ahmed Ben Bella-25: ↗yes. But **euh (.)** for your information. During the war, we seek to hit the Frensh in their home because at that time we had one million Algerian living there, we attacked Saustel in "les Champs Elysée" in the cetre of Paris… ↘

أحمد منصور: اغتلتوه!؟

Ahmed Mansor-26: have you assassinated him!? ↘

احمد بن بلة : ايه (.) ما قتلناه للاسف.

Ahmed Ben Bella-27: ↗ **euh (.)** unfortunately we missed him. ↘

احمد منصور: كم كان عدد الذين كانوا في فرنسا يتبعون النظام؟

Ahmed Mansor-28: ↗ how many FLN followers were there in France?

احمد بن بلة : (.) كان وحد ل 150 الف،90% منهم في النظام،90% منهم في النظام.

Ahmed Ben Bella-29: (.) there were about 150000, 90% of them were Pro-FLN, 90% of them were Pro-FLN. ↘

احمد منصور: 150 الف!

Ahmed Mansor -30: ↗ 150 thousands!

احمد بن بلّة: ايه (.) هوما اللي زودوا الثورة يااخي.

Ahmed Ben Bella-31: ↗ yes (.) it is thanks to them that the number of militants has

increased.

احمد منصور: ايه اهم المنظمات الدولية اللي كنتم على علاقة بيها؟

Ahmed Mansor-32: ↗ what were the main international organizations with which you were

in contact? ↘

احمد بن بلّة : والله، في فرنسا كان مش غير اليساريين (.) بصراحة كان فيه ناس آخرين مش يساريين ولكن هذه حرب،

حرب غاشمة، وطالت الحرب وسببت خسائر مبعدها خسائر وطلعت كتب عن التعذيب، طلع كتاب اسمه

"التعذيب" كون ضجة في فرنسا.

Ahmed Ben Bella-33: ↗ i swear, in France there were not only socialists, frankly there were

others who were not socialists, **euh (.)** but this is a war, a tragedic war that has lasted for long

and which caused a huge loss. Too many books were published about 'Torture'. In France a

polemic book entitled 'La Torture' was published. ↘

احمد منصور: مين اتخذ قرار ذهابك الى القاهرة؟

Ahmed Mansor-34: ↗ who ordered you to go to Cairo? ↘

احمد بن بلّة : (.) الحركة، الحركة في هاذاك الوقت اللي كانت موجودة في الجزائر.انا...

Ahmed Ben Bella-35: (.) the party, ↗ the party at that time which was in Algeria. I …

احمد منصور: كيف حسست؟

Ahmed Mansor-36:↗ how was your feeling**?** ↘

احمد بن بلة : انا المفروض كان مش باش نمشي للقاهرة، كان من المفروض نوصل للقاهرة بعدين نمشي لجاكارتا.

Ahmed Ben Bella-37: ↗ normally, i was not supposed to stay in Cairo. It was supposed to travel to Jakarta via Cairo.↗

احمد منصور: اااه

Ahmed Mansor-38: aaaah.↗

احمد بن بلة : حتى يبعدوني.

Ahmed Ben Bella-39: they wanted to keep me away.↘

احمد منصور: يبعدوك!؟ كنت عامل قلق

Ahmed Mansor-40: to keep you away!?↘ So, this means that you were a source of disturbance. ↘

احمد بن بلة : ايه، هذا هو.

 Ahmed Ben Bella-41: ↗ **yes**, that's it.↘

احمد منصور: ههههههههههه.

Ahmed Mansor-42: hhhhhhhhh

احمد منصور: اشكرك سيادة الرئيس.

Ahmed Mansor-43: ↗thanks my president.↘

احمد بن بلة : الله يعيشك.

Ahmed Ben Bella-44: God saves you.↘

Lyse Doucet-01: ↗ president Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi thank you very much for making your time to speak the BBC.↘

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-02: thank you for the introduction,↘ (.) please **euh umm** let me say a few words ↘ (.) yes,↘ there is a road map for democracy in Egypt, and **euh** we are keen to carry out the will of Egyptians umm because ↘ our ultimate goal is to achieve what the people want **euh (.)** Egyptians wanted change. ↘

Lyse Doucet-03: but in Britain ↗, they have been protests including a letter signed by British empies↘ and academic sains,↘ the president Al-sisi should not have been invited and they euh accused you of being a dictator. How do you respond to that? ↗

 Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-04: ↘ **umm** there is freedom of expression **(.)** in your country and in ours **(.)** and euh the British people need **euh** to listen to our point of view, ↘ and **euh** so they know the reality of life in Egypt.↘

Lyse Doucet-05: ↗ people are looking at the realities of Egypt ↘ and they see **euh** a draconian **(.)** country terrorism law that both ↗ Egyptians and (.)↗ International human rights groups.↗ ↗ Have you described the prominent state of emergency? ↗Why does Egypt need that?

 Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-06: over the past five years ↘ **euh,** we have going through a revolution↘ **(.)** it's **euh** very important that we have stability.↘ So that, we can provide for people.↘ ↗ But this does not mean that we will achieve stability by force and suppression↘ **(.)** we are trying to organize our life↘ **(.)** people have the right to express their opinion euh and demonstrate ↘**(.),** they have the right to decide whether I stay in power↘ **(.)** but **euh** we

are talking about organizing a country with a large **euh** number of population and **euh** lot of problems.↘

Lyse Doucet-07: ↗ but has the law have to be so severe. ↗Why is it necessary?

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-08: (.) euh I wont to defend the law, ↘ I will defend the reason for the law **(.)** ↘ we have spoken a lot about our own experience with democracy.↘ ↗ I've said that **euh** this is **euh** is an ongoing process.↘ We have had some success↘ **(.)** we have not achieved everything **euh** we would like.↘

 Lyse Doucet-09: ↗ but thousands of them are in jail **(.)** that is the reality.↘ **(Moving hands)**

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-10: euh look, ↗ the measures are taken within the law↗ **(.)** but are not **euh** illegal detentions **(.)** this is a country of 90 million people.↘

Lyse Doucet-11: you, ↘↗ yourself said yulio this year that you want to free young people who were strongly jailed.↘ You were already released a hundred **(.)** activists at the time the Islamic Aid festival.↘ ↗Are you planning to release more who were wrongly jailed?↗

 Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-12: ↘ we have regular reviews to make sure umm nobody is **euh** wrongly imprisoned ↘ **(.)** on more than one occasion **(.)**; ↘the review committee has sent me the names of people that **euh** are wrongly jailed and they are pardoned.↘ And there has **not just** been a hundred of them.↘

Lyse Doucet-13: ↗so you recognize that **euh** innocent have been caught up in this jumble security.↗ so, you here that people in prison simply for hearing of revolutionary scarf, but it does not unfair.↗

 Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-14: that's true, ↗ but these are exceptional circumstances…↘

Lyse Doucet-15: $\begin{bmatrix} \text{so, you} \\ \\ \text{Justify!!} \nearrow \end{bmatrix}$

 Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-16: no, ↘ no,↘ never, this not justification↘ **(.)** I try to say that we scrutinize every carefully, so that **(.)** no one is treated unfairly in Egypt.↘ **(.)** ↘ But we are going through a difficult phase.

Lyse Doucet-17: you comment about the state of Egypt now↗ **(.)** ↗I'm suggesting you do not think that Egypt is ready for a full democracy yet.↗ Is that, is that your point of view. **(Moving hands and eyes)**

 Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-18: no↘ **(.)** on the contrary.↘ I'm trying to make you understand our situation↘ **(.)**. Democracy is a will and practice. Our will is to allow Egyptians express their freedom and practice.↘

Lyse Doucet-19: ↘ it is said that thousands of young Egyptians in jail.↘ ↗Are you planning to take action, more action to euh release them from prison? ↗

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-20: ↘ it's so good to talk about human rights in Egypt **(.)** but what about the millions of Egyptians who face **euh-umm** hard ships every day?↗ Why don't you ask them about how we can give them a better life?↗

Lyse Doucet-21: ↗ another important part of democracy is free press.↗ Have you looked of what what have said about cases of eighteen journalists who are now said to be in Egyptian prisons? Are you aware of their cases? ↗

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-22: let me tell you something.↘ **euh** I could be asked **euh** about the number of journalists I have ordered to be arrested.↘ **(.)** I have said many times↘ **(.)** that if it

was my decision, I would never have arrested any members of the media **(.) euh**, even if they had made mistakes.↘

Lyse Doucet-23: (.) ↗ **euh umm** you have said one of the biggest rests to Egypt's security and stability is depend on Muslim brotherhood **(moving hands)** ↗ you said if you were elected, that the Muslim brotherhood would not exist, ↗ is that still your goal?↗

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-24: the problem is with public opinion↘ **(.) euh** in Egypt. The way the Muslim brotherhood behaves has made the Egyptian public very aware euh about dealing with them again.↘

Lyse Doucet-25: ↗ whatever the mistakes work of the Muslims brotherhood empowered mistakes were made↘ **(.)** ↗ there is a worry about, by dealing with them in such an extreme way that it would drive away from any kind of engage with democracy. We drive them more toward extremism. Do you worry about that? ↘

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-26: for the past two years **(.)** killing, **(.)** sabotage, and distraction. Why? This country is big enough to accommodate all of us…↘

Lyse Doucet-27:   ↗ **including Muslim**

Brotherhood!!?

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-28: of course.↘

Lyse Doucet-29: ↗ Mr. Al-sisi, thank you very much for your time.↘

Abd-el Fatah Al-sisi-30: (moving head)

Résumé

La présente étude vise à jeter la lumière sur les stratégies de la conversation d'un coté interculturelle, une étude contrastive des mécanismes de la langue Arabe et la langue Anglaise, comme question centrale dans la pragmatique et l'analyse de conversation. Dans cette optique, l'interaction culturelle est réalisée à travers des videos transcrivant prise à partir des emissions televiser des deux culture pour recueillir des données pour l'analyse. Le system comprend des signaux verbaux et non verbaux qui sont: les pauses, les chevauchements, les marqueurs discussives, les paires de conversation, l'intonation, ainsi que le langage du corps. Ces stratégies sont comparées et contrastées afin de trouver les différences principales en termes de stratégies de conversation entre les deux cultures. Dans l'ensemble, le traitement donne d'un coté interculturelle, les mécanismes de conversation sont différents et cela valide l'hypothèse de la recherche indiquée.

ملخص

تسلط الدراسة الحالية الضوء على إستراتجية الحوار بين الثقافات؛ حيث تعتبر دراسة تقابلية بين آليات الحوار في اللغتين العربية والانجليزية، كما تعد هذه الدراسة قضية محورية في مجالي البراغماتية وتحليل المحادثة. وقد تم إجراء هذه الدراسة لمناقشة استراتيجيات الحوار عبر الثقافات في نطاق علم التحليل المحادثة، وقد أجريت هذه الدراسة من خلال كتابة وترجمة أشرطة الفيديوهات التي أعدتها البرامج التلفزيونية في كلتا الثقافتين، وذلك من أجل جمع وتحليل البيانات.

ويشمل النظام على حد سواء كل من الإشارات اللفظية وغير اللفظية، والتي تتمثل أساسا في: التوقف، التداخل، علامات الخطاب، ازدواجية الحوار، التنغيم، وكذا لغة الجسد. وقد تم مقارنة هذه الاستراتيجيات من أجل إيجاد أوجه الاختلاف والتناقض بين الثقافتين العربية والإنجليزية. كما أسفرت الدراسة الحالية في الأخير على أن إستراتيجيات الحوار تختلف من ثقافة إلى أخرى، مما أدت بدورها إلى تأكيد صحة الفرضية التي بنيت عليها هذه الدراسة.