

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel
Department of English



Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking, Yielding, and Holding Strategies

Used in Talk Shows.

A Case of Arabic and British Talk Shows

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for Master Degree in
Didactics of English

Submitted by:

Supervised by:

Moufida BOUKERTOUTA

Dr. Slimane BOUKHENTACHE

Zahia CHIOUKH

Board of Examiners

Supervisor: Dr. Slimane BOUKHENTACHE

Mohammed Saddik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Chairperson: Miss. Radia KHERBOUCHE

Mohammed Saddik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Examiner: Ms. Amal BOUKHEDENNA

Mohammed Sadik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Academic Year 2019-2020

Dedication

I proudly dedicate this modest work to

My family

Dedication

I dedicate this work to

The cherished memory of my father; to the most ardent being bestowed me with her never-ending encouragement, my mother, to my brothers and my sister, to all my friends and my relatives.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we are extremely grateful and thankful for *Allah* to bestow us with the patience and strength to complete this research.

We would like to thank our supervisor *Dr. BOUKHENTACHE Slimane* for his guidance, assistance, and support.

Our appreciations go also to *Miss KHERBOUCHE Radia* and *Miss BOUKHEDENA Amel* who devoted their precious time to examine and evaluate this humble dissertation.

Special thanks to *Dr. NAILI Redouane* who was ready all the time with his persistent support and help.

We are also grateful to all those who supported us with insightful comments and valuable information at various steps of this work.

Abstract

The study aims at casting light on one of the main problems that speakers face up in cross-cultural conversations. It attempts to explore the difference between Arab and Anglo-Saxon speakers' turn-taking, yielding, and holding strategies. To achieve this aim, two morning talk shows conversations were selected, namely "Sabah El-KheirYa Arab" and "This Morning". Conversation analysis was chosen to carry out this research. The scripts of the talk shows were analyzed to identify the use of turn-taking strategies (i.e., turn-taking, turn-yielding ,and turn-holding) and their identifiers(i.e., overlaps, back-channels ,and adjacency pairs). The results indicate that Arab and Anglo-Saxon speakers use turn-taking, yielding, and holding strategies with different interpretations (e.g.,Anglo-Saxon's speakers consider interruption as a sign opposing. However, Arab speakers cooperate with each other through interruption) Furthermore, the data suggests that there are some problems related to conversational turn-taking strategies, in forms of overlaps, silences, number of pauses (i.e., misunderstanding of cross-cultural turn taking identifiers could lead to faulty interpretations among speakers) . It also shows that British speakers have the tendency to control the floor, regardless of the next speaker position. On the other hand, Arab speakers tend to value turn-taking strategies with regard to their culture.

Key words: Turn-holding, Turn-taking, Turn-yielding

List of Abbreviations

EFL: English Foreign Language

CA: Conversation Analysis

ICU: Turn-Constructional Unit

ITV: Independent Tele-Vision

MBC1: Middle East Broadcasting Center 1

STV: Scottish Tele-Vision

TRP: Transition Relevance Place

TV: Tele-vision

US: United States

UK: United Kingdom

Vs.: Versus

List of Tables

Table 1	Types of Turn-Taking Strategies Used in Arab's Talk.....	44
Table 2	Turn-Taking Strategy in Arab's Talk.....	45
Table 3	Turn-Yielding Strategy in Arab's Talk.....	48
Table 4	Turn-Holding Strategy Used in Arab's Talk Show.....	50
Table 5	Turn-Grabbing strategy used in Arab's Talk show.....	51
Table 6	Overlaps in Arab's Talk Show.....	53
Table 7	Back-Channels in Arab's Talk.....	55
Table 8	Adjacency Pairs Used in Arab's Talk Shows.....	58
Table 9	Types of Turn-Taking Strategies in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk.....	58
Table 10	Turn-Taking Strategy in Anglo-Saxon's Talk.....	59
Table 11	Turn-Yielding Strategy Used in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk Show.....	62
Table 12	Turn-Holding Strategy Used in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk Show.....	64
Table 13	Turn-Grabbing Strategy in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk.....	69
Table 14	Overlaps in the Anglo-saxon's Talk.....	70
Table 15	Back-Channels in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk.....	73
Table 16	Adjacency Pairs in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk.....	75

Table of Contents

Dedication 1.....	1
Dedication 2.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Abstract.....	4
List of Abbreviations.....	5
List of Tables.....	6
Table of Contents.....	7
General Introduction.....	
Introduction.....	10
1. Review of Previous Research.....	10
2. Statement of the Problem.....	15
3. Research Questions.....	15
4. Aim of the Study.....	15
5. Hypothesis.....	15
6. Means of Research.....	16
7. Structure of the Study.....	16
Chapter One: Cross-Cultural turn-Taking Strategies.....	17
Introduction	17
Section One: Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking, Yielding and Holding	17

1.1. 1. Definition of Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking.....	17
1. 1. 2. Definition of Conversation.....	18
1. 1. 3. Turn-Taking in Conversation.....	19
1. 1. 4. Definition of Turn.....	20
1.1. 5 . Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking.....	21
1.1. 6. Turn-Taking Components.....	22
1. 1. 6.1.Turn Constructural Component.....	22
1. 1.6. 2. Turn Allocation Component.....	23
1. 2 . 6.3. Silence and Overlaps.....	23
1. 1. 6. 4. Repair and Back-Channels.....;	24
Section Two: Turn-Taking Strategies.....	26
1. 2. 1. Turn-Taking	26
1. 2. 2. Holding the Turn.....	27
1. 2. 3. Yielding the Turn.....	27
Section Three: Turn-Taking in Arab's and Anglo-Saxon's Conversation.....	29
1.3.1. Turn-Taking Strategies in Anglo-Saxon's Conversation.....	29
1.3. 2.Turn-Taking in Arab's Conversation.....	32
1.3.3. Major Differences in Turn-Taking Strategies in Arab's and Anglo-Saxon's Talk.....	34
Conclusion.....	36

Chapter Two: Arab's and Anglo-Saxon TV Talk Shows	37
Introduction.....	37
Section One: Talk Show's Generalities.....	37
2. 1. 1. The Socio-Historical Background.....	37
2. 1. 2. Definition of Talk Shows.....	38
2. 1. 3. Interactional Goals.....	40
Section Two: Communicational Components in Talk Shows.....	40
2. 2. 1. Patterns of Communication in Talk shows	41
2. 2. 2. Topic in TalkShows.....	42
2. 2. 3. Interruptions in Talk Shows.....	44
Section Three: Arab's Talk Shows Vs Anglo-Saxons Talk Shows.....	44
2. 3. 1. Arabs Talk Shows.....	45
2. 3. 2. Anglo-Saxon Talk shows.....	47
Conclusion.....	48
Chapter Three: Research Method and Data Analysis.....	49
Introduction.....	49
Section one: Research Methodology.....	39
3. 1. 1. Research Paradigm.....	49
3. 1. 2. Sample.....	49

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES	10
3. 1. 3. Data Collection Procedures.....	50
3. 1. 4. Research Instrument.....	50
3. 1. 5. Setting.....	51
3. 1. 6. Data Analysis Procedures.....	52
3. 1. 7. Limitation.....	52
Section Two: Data Analysis.....	52
Introduction.....	53
3. 2. 1.1 Arabs Speakers Turn-Taking, Yielding, and Holding Strategies.....	53
3. 2. 1. 1.1. Turn -Taking Strategy.....	55
3. 2. 1. 1.2. Turn-Yielding Strategies in Arab’s Talk.....	57
3. 2. 1. 1. 3. Turn- holding Strategies in Arab’s Talk.....	59
3. 2. 1.1. 4. Turn Grabbing in Arab’s Talk.....	61
3. 2. 1. 1.5. Overlaps in Arab’s Talk	62
3. 2. 1.1. 6. Back-Channels.....	65
3. 2. 1.1. 7. Adjacency Pairs.....	67
3. 3. 2. 2. Turn-Taking, Yielding and Holding Strategies.....	68
3.3.2.2.1 Turn-Taking in The Anglo-Saxon’s Talk.....	69
3. 3. 2.2.2. Turn-Yielding Strategy in Anglo- Saxon’s Talk	72
3. 3. 2.2. 3. Turn-Holding Strategy in Anglo-Saxon’s Talk	74

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES	11
3. 3. 2. 2. 4. Turn Grabbing Strategy in Anglo-Saxon's	78
3. 3. 2.2. 5. Overlaps in Anglo-Saxon's Talk	80
3. 3. 2.2 6. Back-Channels	84
3. 3. 2. 7. Adjacency Pairs in Anglo-Saxon's Talk	89
Section Three: Data Discussion	92
3. 3.1. Arab's Turn Taking Vs. Anglo-Saxon's Turn Taking	92
3. 3. 2. Pedagogical Recommendations for Future Research	95
Conclusion	96
General Conclusion	97
References	99
Appendices	
Appendix A	
Appendix B	
Résumé	
ملخص	

General Introduction

Introduction

1. Background of the Study
2. Statement of the Problem
3. Research Questions
4. Aim of the Study
5. Assumption of the Study
6. Means of Research
7. Structure of the Study

General Introduction

Introduction

A conversation is a social exchange that combines initiation, response, and follows up. In doing a conversation, speakers talk to each other in certain order that is called turn taking. The study of turn taking is a central feature of conversation analysis since it is a part of our daily conversations.

Turn-taking exists to organize talks in interviews, debates, ceremonies, conversations. Martinez (2018) stated that a turn is a unit of speech that organizes the transformation of speech from one speaker to another in a conversation. Conducting a conversation requires specific turn taking strategies mainly turn-taking, turn-yielding, and turn-holding. However, culture can be a problematic issue, because in a cross-cultural conversation, each speaker has his own turn-taking interpretations. Thus, knowledge about one's culture and at the same time about other's culture may realize a successful cross-cultural communication. In recent years, TV talk shows provide a reliable sample that explains the differences in turn-taking strategies in different languages. Based on these considerations, many research studies have been conducted to explore the impact of culture on turn-taking strategies. The current study seeks to explore the differences and the similarities in turn taking strategies used by Arab and Anglo-Saxon speakers.

1. Background of the Study

Turn-taking was a point of focus for many fields, which have directed their studies to analyze features of turn-taking in colloquial conversations.

Martinez (2018) stated that scholars from various fields including ethno-methodology, conversation analysis, and sociology, have extensively analyzed features of turn-taking strategies in colloquial conversations. However, the study of cross-cultural talk in interaction was initiated within the field of linguistic Anthropology. Therefore, this gave place to more innovative approach referred to as “The cultural variability hypothesis”. It has challenged the model of conversation proposed by Sacks et al. (1974). According to Gardner, Fitzgerald, and Mushin (2009), the sociologist Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974); have initiated research on spontaneous conversation to define the turn taking strategies used by native speakers of English. Based on their obtained results, they suggested a model of turn-taking exchange system called “a simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation”. The study of Sacks et al. (1974) anticipated an ideal way to convey conversation based on series of facts, mainly fourteen elements in this system. Although that seminal work of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) presented the most comprehensive description for the turn-taking system in conversation, recent studies have opposed some of their claims with regard to this phenomenon. Consequently, this has raised a question that concerns all ethno-methodologists and conversation analysts about the nature of turn-taking practices that result from universal communication norms or cultural specific ones.

Martinez (2018), stated that Berry (1974) initiated one of the first documented comparative studies related to turn taking. She compared the turn-taking in conversations that occurred between north American English speakers and conversations of native Spanish speakers. The findings of her study indicated that both English and Spanish speakers made the same amount of overlaps, which unexpectedly opposed the prototypic model of Sacks et al. (1974) in English conversations that highlights “no gaps and no overlaps”. In terms of the

types of overlaps produced in both English and Spanish conversations, the study clarified the difference in the average length of back-channel utterances, which contain utterances such as uh, huh, or yeah in English and si, si, in Spanish. The main finding of the study proved that the way of cooperative overlaps used by both English and Spanish speakers widely differs. The Spanish speakers performed to be more inclined to produce intrusive overlaps as they had the floor conversation.

In another study, Murata (1994) observed the existence of different types of interruption. In other words, he compared the overlaps in conversations between native English speakers and native Japanese speakers. The findings of the study showed crucial differences in the use of overlaps as a way of interruption in both languages. In the English conversation, for example, he noticed that both cooperative and intrusive interruptions take place similarly. On the other hand, Japanese speakers use cooperative interruptions more than the interruptive. Thus, while English turn-taking system seems to produce conversational involvement and attentiveness by a way of interruption, Japanese conversational style does not prefer to interrupt, except if it is necessary, or as a way of feedback. The results of this study showed that the interpretation of the conversation styles of both English and Japanese speakers do not follow the model of turn-taking of Sacks et al. (1974). However, they challenged the conventional pattern for conversations introduced by them, especially in the case of English conversations.

In a more recent study, Li (2001) examined the influence of culture in the use of overlaps in conversations. Li (2001) analyzed two inter-cultural and two intra-cultural conversations that appeared between native speakers of Canadian English and native speakers of Chinese. In the intra-cultural conversations, the findings of this study clarified that the use of intrusive overlaps was more frequent in the Canadian conversations than in the Chinese conversations. Li (2001) found that the amount of interruptive overlaps produced by native

speakers of Chinese were less than those of Canadian English speakers. Thus, the findings led to the conclusion that the use of cooperative overlaps was more used by native speakers of Chinese. This system is expected to be a phenomenon that arises across all cultures. While the interruptive overlaps may be something that is embedded in the socio-cultural values of each culture.

Brown (2013) studied the records of conversations in six languages: Arabic, English, German, Mandarin, Spanish, and Japanese in order to compare the turn-taking practices in each language. He concentrated on the analysis of frequency and length of back-channels and overlaps, which are the turn-taking identifiers. The study showed that the amount and the length of back-channel utterances varied across all six languages. Japanese speakers produced the longest back-channel utterances, while Mandarin had the shortest. Although the frequency of overlapping speech was considered high in all six languages, it was lower in the English conversations.

Another interesting study was done by Nugroho (2014) entitled "study of turn-taking used in interviews TV program: *Indonesia Now Exclusive* Angeles Monica with Dalton Tanonaka on Metro TV". The aim of their study was to find the way in which participants in a conversation take and construct turns in the talk. In their study, they relied on some theories from Sacks et al. (1974) about turn-taking system.

To summarize thus far, the results of these studies suggested that there are certain differences with regard to turn-taking practices across languages. Also, there seems to be evidence of particular communicative demands or expectations in each language's culture.

2. Statement of the Problem

Having an effective cross-cultural conversation requires certain turn-taking strategies. Therefore, the role of the speaker is to choose the best strategies and be aware of other cultural differences. In order to manage a conversation, all categories of English language speakers; native and non-native should avoid the misunderstanding and faulty interpretation of conversations. Thus, this study tackles the use of the most dominant turn-taking strategies in conversations, mainly turn-taking, turn-yielding, and turn-holding in Arab and Anglo-Saxon talk.

3. Research Questions

This study aims to answer the following research questions:

- 1) How do Arab speakers use the turn-taking strategies (turn-taking, turn-yielding, and turn-holding)?
- 2) How do British speakers use turn-taking, yielding, and holding?
- 3) How does learning about the differences help in having an effective cross-cultural turn-taking and avoid misunderstanding ?

4. Aim of the Study

This work is carried out mainly to determine the kind of turn taking strategies used by native speakers of Arabic and native speakers of English in TV talk shows. At the speaker level, the study aims to investigate the speaker personal choice and turn-taking practices. While on the conversational level, it aims at identifying the cross-cultural different interpretation of turn-taking strategies. In addition to the other important turn-taking identifiers like timing, overlapping, back-channels, turn-grabbing, and adjacency pairs.

5. Assumption of the Study

The current study is primarily based on the following research hypothesis:

Arab and British speakers use turn-taking, turn-yielding, and turn-holding strategies differently.

6. Means of Research

The nature of the study entails the use of qualitative data collection procedure in order to investigate the differences in turn-taking between Arab and Anglo-Saxon speakers in TV talk show conversations. Thus, conversation analysis for both English spoken and Arab spoken talk shows is needed for the study.

7. Structure of the Dissertation

The piece of research comprised three chapters: two theoretical parts and a practical one. The first chapter is entitled "Cross-cultural Turn-taking Strategies". It is divided into three sections. It includes turn-taking strategies definitions, their aspects, and their distinctive features in Arab's and western world. The second chapter is devoted to Arab's and Anglo-Saxon's TV talk shows. It is divided into three sections; it starts with identifying the TV talk shows generalities. Then, it explained the talk shows communicational components. Finally, it clarified the difference between Arab and Anglo-Saxon TV talk shows.

The third chapter describes the methodology of the research. It is divided into three sections. The first section is devoted to research methodology; it includes research instruments, data collection and analysis procedures. The second section is for the data analysis, where the turn-taking strategies of both shows are analyzed. The last section is the data discussion and interpretation. The overall results are discussed by means of answering the questions posed above and testing the hypothesis put forward.

Chapter One: Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking Strategies

Introduction

In order for any exchange to be communicative, participantsought to conform a distinguished feature of conversation known as “turn-taking”.This feature is usually considered to follow simple set of rules, which take place through a complicated system of signals. In conversations, speaker’s participation varies in different aspects including; the length of the turn and its class.Speakers signal to each other that they wish to either take or yield or hold the turn through syntactic,pragmatic or prosodic means.

This chapter introduces and examines the cross-cultural turn taking system. We will first present cross-cultural turn taking, turn-yielding, and turn-holding, their concepts, andtheir components. Next, we will try to explore the differences between turn-taking in Anglo-Saxon conversations and in Arabic ones.Finally, we will shed light on the importance of organizing turn-taking in the effectiveness of any cross-cultural conversation. To clarify all of these elements different aspects are presented.

Section One: Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking, Yielding and Holding Strategies

1.1. 1.Definition of Cross-Cultural Turn Taking

Cross-cultural turn taking usually refers to interpersonal interaction and the exchange of roles in social conversations across different cultures. This concept has become issue of interest especially in the era of globalization. In fact, the term cross-cultural is generally used to describe studies in the field of cultures. In the present research, the major concern is to explore the different turn taking strategies used by Arab and western world. Before defining cross cultural turn taking, it is necessary to define the term ‘*conversation*’ as a key word in our research. Next, we will present ‘*turn-taking*’ and ‘*turn*’, then we move to cover the turn taking strategies.

1.1. 2. Definition of Conversation

The spoken form received more attention recently due to its necessity in conducting talks across cultures. Language has become a need for any non-native speakers. Hence, the goal behind learning a foreign language is to be able to participate in conversations with native speakers of that language.

Conversation is that exchange of talk between people in a particular time and place, in order to carry out an interactional discourse; in which participants alternate in taking turns. Goffman (1976) defined the word 'conversation' as follows: "Conversation is restrictively defined, might be identified as the talk occurring when a number of participants come together and settle into what they perceive to be a few moments off from (or carried on to the side of) instrumental task" (p. 264). That is to say, a conversation is a task through which speakers engage in a social interaction. They exchange talk and influence each other's responses. This interaction is based on a turn-by-turn pattern of communication. According to Williamson (2009), the size of utterances speakers will say, their occurrence or their relative distribution in the conversation cannot be predicted.

Liddicoat (2007) stated that conversation was a point of focus for writers over a very long period of time. However, much of what they have written about conversation is perspective in nature and deals only with the idea of what makes good conversationalists. Thus, such approaches to conversation are a set of perspective rules which describe what a conversation should be. These principles that constitute appropriate conversations vary from one culture to another. Liddicoat defined conversation as follows:

Conversation is the way in which people socialize and develop and sustain their relationships with each other. When people converse, they engage in a form of linguistic communication, but there is much more going on in conversation than just the use of a linguistic code. Much that is important in conversation is carried out by

things other than language, including eye gaze and body posture, silences and real-world context in which the talk is produced. (Liddicoat, 2007, p.01)

Each speaker may have a view of what he would like to discuss, which idea he would wish to convey, and how. However, for a successful conversation participants need to follow certain norms. These norms are highly important to organize how participants take turns and move from one speaker to another without obstacles.

1.1.3. Turn-Taking in Conversations

The importance of conversation in our life is increasingly evident. Any exchange of talk between members of the community is a conversation: the talk that we say at social media, meetings, or event. All of these features are an opportunity to engage within a conversation. That exchange of talk simply requires turn taking. In this regard, Bakeman and Gnisci (2005) claimed that “turn-taking is one of the basic mechanisms in conversation, and the convention strategies vary between cultures and languages” (p. 71). Thus, turn-taking adjusts when to speak and when to keep silent.

Sack et al. (1974) were the first who initiated studies on turn-taking systems. In that concern, they stated:

the system of turn taking is when (a) when the current speaker selects the next speaker, the next speaker has the right and, at the same time, is obliged to take the next turn; (b) if the current speaker does not select the next speaker, any one of the participants has the right to become the next speaker. This could be regarded as self-selection; and (c) if neither the current speaker selects the next speaker nor any of the participant become the next speaker, the current speaker may resume his/her turn. (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 61)

As explained above, turn taking is the changing role of the speaker and the listener. It begins by the first speaker speaking. In this case, the speakers take a chance to speak trying to

keep their turn or give a chance to the next speaker to take the turn. Then, the turn taking stops when there is nothing to say. In the same vein, Yule (1996) pointed out that turn taking is a form of social interaction for getting control in a conversation; it is a set of knowing how to get and keep a turn and how to give it away.

Participants must have the ability to manage their role in order to make their conversation run smoothly. They have to prevent certain communicative problems with other foreign speakers, since turn-taking usually differs from one culture to another. The transition relevance place is one of turn-taking components that clarify the different features in talk among social groups. In that concern, Yule (1996) stated:

In any situation where control is not fixed in advance, anyone can attempt to get a turn-taking. Because it is a form of social action, turn-taking operates in accordance with local management system that is conventionally known by members of social group. The local management system is essentially a set of conversational greetings, turns, keeping them, or giving them away. This system is needed most at those points where there is a possible change TRP. Within any social group, there will be features of talk (or absence of talk) typically associated with TRP. (Yule, 1996, p. 72)

After those definitions of turn taking, our focus next will be directed to define "Turn".

1.1.4. Definition of Turn

A turn is the essential factor in managing conversation, which is attached to a speaker and each speaker takes turns within conversation. Harris (1951) defined this concept as "any stretch of talk, by one person, before and after which there is silence on behalf of that person" (p. 14). That is to say, a turn is anything said by a speaker, be it short or long..

According to Edelsky (1981), turn definitions can be divided into; mechanical turns and interaction turns. The mechanical one refers to the process of holding the floor in

interaction as units of talk without taking into account social context until someone else takes the floor.

On the other hand, interactional definitions are concerned with what really happens during the interaction. Edelsky (1981) pointed out that speakers are more concerned with completing topics and discussing the units of talk instead of just structural units. So, here, the real focus is on the intention of conveying a real message behind the turn rather than a mechanical conversation.

1.1. 5. Cross-Cultural Turn-Taking

Studies in the area of cross-cultural turn-taking dated back to 1986. Many researchers tried to approach how people from different cultures communicate successfully. According to Laruen and Trogon (1993), effective communication depends on a shared understanding of behavioral cues and that the turn-taking rules probably cannot be generalized to all cultures and they differ even on one's own culture. That is to say, cross-cultural turn-taking is mainly based on one's behaviors and regularities rather than a set of rules to follow while speaking to others, because it is difficult to identify the cues of taking turns of each culture until being a member of this community.

In the same context, Malandro and Barker (1989) claimed that cultural effects on patterns of turn-taking cues (such as eye contact behaviors) are a likely problem in social interaction across communities, because of different interpretations of turn-taking cues. A common example is that British people do not nod their heads to let you know they understand; rather, they blink their eyes to let you know they have understood and they listen to you.

Put it simply, mechanisms of turn-taking are different from one society to another and from one language to another. As Murcia and Olshtain (2000) pointed out "there are often

important cultural (and sub-cultural) differences in the way discourse communities do turn taking”(p.10).

1.1. 6. Turn-Taking Components

Sacks et al.'s (1974) seminal work presented two components on which turn-taking system in conversation is depending, namely turn-constructive component and turn-allocation component. But what do they stand for?

1.1. 6. 1. Turn-Constructive Component

According to Sacks et al. (1974), a turn is, as a rule, constructed for Turn-Constructive Units (TCU) which can be of various syntactic forms: sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical. Once a turn constructive unit is uttered-taking the form of a sentence, a clause, or a phrase- the speaker has the claim to sustain it before it draws to an end (the turn can be composed of only one turn constructive unit or more). Sacks et al. (1974) noted that an utterance can be projected by means of its type, such as a clause. By the same token, participants recognize its completion when for example a final clause is uttered. The authors further mentioned that intonation also plays a part in the recognition of turn completion, and yet, without providing minute details about it. Once turn constructive unit(s) is/are completed, the turn comes to transition relevance place where it is allocated to next speaker.

In short, turns are made up of TCUs (Turn Constructive Units) initiated by a speaker produces another TCU or TCUs. A Transition Relevance Place (TRP) is projected by other speakers, for instance, by a syntactic form or an intonation. But what happens once a TRP is reached?

1.1. 6. 2. Turn-Allocation Component

The second component stressed for turn taking system in Sacks et al.'s (1974) model is turn-allocation component. A number of turn-allocation techniques are available to speakers: those that were provided by current speakers selecting the next speakers, and those in which self-selection would be used to begin the next turn. Psathas (1995) argued that the system of turn-taking strategies is organized by a few basic rules:

- a. if the turn-so-far was constructed in such a way that the current speaker selected the next speaker, then the person selected had the right to begin to speak in next turn.
- b. If the turn-so-far was constructed in a way that did not involve "current speaker selects next, «then self-selection may be initiated with whoever started first gaining the right to a turn.
- c. If the turn-so-far was constructed in such a way that the current speaker did not select the next, then the current speaker might continue to speak until someone else self-selected.

The system was recursive in that if, at the point when the initial turn unit reached its initial transition relevance place and neither of the rules above (a or b) operated, and if, according to the rule (c) the current speaker had continued, then the rules a-c would reapply at the next transition relevance place. This would precede recursively until a transfer of speakers had occurred.

1.1. 6. 3. Silence and Overlaps

In everyday conversations, participants may pass across situation where they do not speak; rather they keep silent or speak simultaneously. As far as silences in conversation are concerned, Sacks et al. (1974) made distinction between three types, namely, gaps, pauses, and lapses. The three types significantly disparate so long as they differ in terms of length and their position in the conversation. While gaps are silences taking place at a given Transition Relevance Place between turns, pauses are those silences taking place in the course of a turn.

Lapses, on the other hand, are even longer than both gaps and pauses; they are extended silences taking place between turns and many terminate in discontinuous talk. One way for a lapse to be avoided, is that the current speaker can self-select once a Turn Constructional Units ended, thereby initiating Turn Constructional Unit; the gap will be, in this manner, turned into a pause.

Overlaps, on the other hand, are cases where more than one speaker talks at a time, their talk overlaps. Jefferson (1984) suggested three types of overlap. First, transitional overlaps appear as a result of a recipient starting to talk at a given turn close, TRP, while the current speaker follows the talk. Second, terminal or recognitional overlap relates to the situation when a next speaker makes an attempt to hold the floor at the final sound of the last word of an utterance that is possibly completed. The third type happens when terminal overlaps, which is regarded as minimal, is widened when new utterance of the recipient overlaps with further talk of the current speaker, it is known as progression overlap. It can be deduced, then, that current speaker's persistence on dominating the floor in both terminal and progression overlaps is apparent.

Nonetheless, Schegloff (2000) stated that there are forms of simultaneous talk that are not counted as problematic as competitive in conversation. These turns encompass choral talk, in view of the fact speakers speak together on consensus and agreement. Further, it happens that current speaker wants the recipient to remind them, for example, of a word they might have forgotten, and if ever their talk overlaps during that process, it is still unproblematic.

1.1. 6. 4.Repairs and Back-Channels

In a conversation, speakers handle the breakdown of the talk by repairs, and they express their interest to the current speakers when being recipients via backchannels. Repairs are actions taken to handle and mend breakdowns in conversation as Sidnel (2007) wrote, to address and solve problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding.

Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977) distinguished between self-initiated repairs and other-initiated repairs. The first type, is introduced by the speaker whom they called 'the trouble source', while the second one is repairs made only when another person prompts a perform or a repair. They depend on a number of devices to initiate repairs, such as: huh, what?. In short, Repair mechanisms are used to handle the breakdowns in the conversation, such as solving problems of silence and overlaps as well as tackling other problems associated with understanding, hearing, and speaking.

Repairs can be used to handle misunderstanding between participants, while backchannels are used to spot their understanding as well as their attention to the other speaker. Backchannels indicate that those participants who are not holding the floor, are not totally passive. Condon (2001) defined backchannels as the use of non-linguistic and minimal linguistic forms to assert one's understanding to a speaker. Signals such as, *uh huh*, *yeah*, and *mmm* are all indicators to the current participant that the message that he wants to carry has been delivered.

To summarize, both repairs and backchannels are essential in conversations. Repairs indicate that there is a misunderstanding or a contradiction in the conversation. Back-channels, on the other hand, indicate for the current speaker that the recipient is attending to his talk and appreciative his messages.

Section Two: Turn-Taking Strategies

Taboada (2006) stated that since strategies for turn taking are different, linguists have divided these strategies into three major types: turn-taking, turn-holding, and turn-yielding. The latter refer to the actions that can happen in any conversation. In other words, turn-taking strategies explain how people start the conversation, carry on talking, and give the chance to others in order to complete it.

1.2. 1. Turn-Taking

This strategy is useful when a speaker wants to take a chance within a conversation. It means that, the speaker has the initiative to begin a conversation and bring up a topic to be discussed. Stenstrom (1994) divided taking the turn strategy into three parts:

- **Starting up:** Which is the first step that people do in order to open a conversation, it is an improper planning done by speakers in order to carry out a discussion. In fact, there are two types of starting up: hesitant start and clean start. Hesitant is when the speaker does not prepare previously to open a conversation, for example: you know, well...and so on. On the contrary, a clean start is characterized by a good and fluent preparation to begin the conversation.
- **Taking Over:** After the starting up strategy, another speaker responds directly by taking over the turn. So, the second speaker comments or answers what has been asked. Stenstrom (1994) argued that taking over the floor involves an uptake or a link. An uptake means another listener receives what the speaker says and then response or uptake the turn. Words like *yeah* and *ah* are often used to prove that someone will take over the turn. However, links means that the next speaker carries on the turn by using connectors like: but, and, so.
- **Interrupting:** During the conversation, other speakers may interrupt any other participant, so the speaker does not always finish his turn. According to Stenstrom (1994), interrupting strategy is categorizing into two types: alerts and meta-comments. Alert is done through the use of a high intonation of voice. It indicates that a participant tries to stop the speaker's talk in order to say something valuable. Met-comments, on the other hand, are done by using polite utterances like: 'may I.. .', and 'let me just'.

1. 2.2. Turn-Holding

Turn holding is another turn-taking strategy in which the participant wants to occupy the floor because he/she has not finished the talk or has something interesting to add. According to Stenstrom (1994), this strategy occurs when the speaker wants to hold the chance of speaking but he/she has a difficulty in controlling what to say exactly. In order, to avoid breakdown in communication the speakers need to use some devices like verbal filters and lexical repetition. In this regard, Brown and Yule (1983) stated that “there are some strategies and signals the speaker uses to give more time to organize the ideas or to think about what to say such as the frequent responses like well, em, err (in any order) interspersed with pauses” (p. 30) . Moreover, Richards and Schmidt (1983) talked about other expressions of continuity like “first”, “another thing”, and “after that”. He claimed that, sometimes while someone is speaking, another speaker may interrupt him/her or tries to take the floor. However, the current speaker may avoid this kind of interruption and controls the floor by the use of a high voice pitch or speaking quickly through the use of continuity expressions the speaker may hold the floor as much as possible. It is noteworthy to mention that turn holding also may appear if the next speaker is not ready to take the floor or has nothing to say. So that, the current speaker is obliged to hold the turn even that he/she does not have what to add.

1.2. 3. Turn-Yielding

According to Taboada (2006), turn yielding is the most interesting strategy of turn-taking. It concerns how the current speaker passes the turn to another speaker or the next speaker to have a chance to speak. Stenstrom (1994) claimed that yielding the turn consists of three types:

- **Prompting** is when the speaker makes prompting in order to drive the addresser to give responses. Providing a prompt response will automatically yield the turn by making a ‘greeting’, ‘offer’, ‘apologizing’, ‘inviting’... etc.

That is, greetings always require an answer and the same thing with invitations.

- **Appealing** is when the speaker makes a signal to the other participant to make some sort of response or feedback like: you see, as you know, right.

So, the word ‘right’ appeals the addresser to respond directly his/her turn.

- **Giving up**, here, the speaker realizes that he has nothing to add and gives up the turn. and its yields.

Utterances like ‘em’ or simply ‘I give up’ can define yielding the turn strategy and requires for another participant to take the floor. Moreover, speakers may use to end up with the turn another cue, which is keeping silent for a short period of time.

In order to do so, speakers use certain cues to make the hearer understand that he/she has finished his talk; thus, someone else can take the turn. Duncan (1972) identified six turn yielding cues which may help in conveying the message and avoiding breakdowns in communication. These cues are: intonation, drawl, socio-centric sequences, pitch/loudness, syntax, and body motion.

- **Intonation:** it is a rising or a falling pitches juncture while delivering final clause in the turn taker’s talk.
- **Drawl:** It is the final stressed syllable with a remarkable length on the last syllabus of the last clause.
- **Socio-centric sequences:** they are expressions such as, “but ah”, “you know”, as you see”. It generally follows a substantive statement.

- **Pitch/loudness:** a decrease in pitch occurring in conjunction with one of the socio-centric sequences.
- **Syntax:** the completion of a grammatical clause involving a subject-predicate combination, such as "right!"
- **Body motion:** like body language, hand gestures, and eye contact. It is generally transmitted via visual channel.

Section Three: Turn-Taking in Arab's and Anglo-Saxon's Conversation

1.3.1. Turn-Taking Strategies in Anglo-Saxon's Conversation

Turn-taking behaviors differ depending on the context that the speaker is engaged in, but more importantly on the language used and the culture being involved in. This area will shed light on the most important characteristics of turn-taking behaviors between native speakers of English language (British and Americans in common). Moreover, we will discuss the role that culture plays in some aspects of turn-taking processes within a conversation.

As a matter of fact, studies in the domain of turn-taking in talk are dated back to the late of 1970s. The chief theory of how turn-taking works within conversations among native speakers of English language belongs to Sack, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974), the article of the three linguists has a marvelous and long-lasting influence on the domain of linguistics mainly and many other disciplines and it becomes later a model for studying turn-taking in talk-in interactions. (O'Connell, Kowal, & Kaltenbacher, 2018, p. 348)

Sacks et al.'s (1974) model assumes a space for interaction by which all participants may have a say within a conversation. According to Sacks et al. (1974), this space is called the 'floor' and each contribution in the conversation is called 'a turn'. Furthermore, Sacks et al. (1974) developed a set of basic observations about turn-taking within conversations between native speakers of American English. These basic turn-taking observations are the following:

- Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1977) observed that “a transition in conversation is characterized with ‘**no gaps**’ and ‘**no overlaps**’ are common. It means that, only one person talks at a time. They added that only one party talking at a time” (p. 701).
- Each speaker may have a turn within a conversation and this may happen more than one time.
- If more than one person talks at once, the intervention will be brief.
- The order of each turn is not fixed and the same thing for the size of the contribution.
- The length of the conversation, what speakers should say, and the distribution of turns among them, is not predetermined. In this regard Sacks et al. (1977) claimed that: "Turns can be projectable [sic] one word long, or for example, they can be sentential in length" (p. 702). In other words, the major aspects of the organization of turn-taking are ‘context free’ , and each speaker may express his/her idea at ease , because it does not matter if the contribution done in a short sentence or totally the opposite.
- The number of people who contribute in the conversation can change with the time and the length of the conversation too.
- Turn allocation strategies are clearly used. The current speaker may choose who’s the next speaker or someone else may take the floor. In the same context, Sacks et al. (1974) pointed out that while “... addressing a party will not necessarily, in itself, select him as next speaker.” Sacks et al. (1974) added, “current-speaker selects-next” (p. 701)
- If there is a turn-violation, there are different ways to repair the conversation.
- Talk may be continuous and sometimes not.

These basic rules led them to design a system called “Simplest Systematics” which organizes the turn-taking behaviors and make it universal to all conversations of their social and cultural contexts.

Furthermore, Sacks et al. (1977) set up certain rules to exchange turns among American speakers, which Sacks et al. (1977) called "Transition Relevance Place" (TRP). Sacks et al. (1977) claimed that there are three stages that must be followed in order to guarantee the successfulness of TRP: The first stage is related to the current speaker who may select who speaks next by calling him/ her, or by addressing a question for someone to answer. That is to say, the chosen person is obligated to speak at the next TRP and take a place within the conversation. The second stage occurs when the current speaker does not select the next speaker, then naturally any person may take the floor and select him/herself to be the next TRP. The last stage occurs when none of the two mentioned above rules have been applied, here the current speaker may continue at the TRP and hold the floor.

Based on the previously mentioned stages, it is clear that the floor of speaking is valuable for American speaker, since they usually prefer the power to control the talk. This criteria appears in the first stage. Even if the American speaker take the floor at the beginning, he also decides about who will speak next. Thereby, the hearer who desires to speak next must be ready to begin at the next TRP otherwise the floor will go. That is to say, hearers may structure their contributions in the conversation while another person is speaking and predict the next TRP speaker and in which time he/she takes the floor.

Schmitt (2013) clarified that 'gaps' and 'overlaps' are major features of native speakers' turn taking system, which are barely noticeable. Schmitt (2013) noted that turn-taking in the New York conversations is quite fast, because the speakers have a predisposition towards simultaneous speech. On the other hand, non-native speakers are remarked to be slower as 'speakers' respond to the questions after pausing or silencing several minutes.

Another study done by Strivers et al. (2009) showed that English speakers, along with Dutch and Danish speakers, used fast response to avoid hold up turn-taking within their conversations. Further, those speakers marked the question raised by the existing speaker to

maintain what to speak and when. Moreover, Turn-taking in English conversation is characterized by close timing, and using prosody, or rhythm to avoid pauses in dialogue and to faster their turns.

To conclude, the previously mentioned turn-taking norms used by English native speakers in their conversations are based on the idea of the floor is a precious product. It shows that prefer the power of controlling the floor as much as possible. However, individuals should share this control with other speakers and allow them to take a turn in order to be engaged in the conversation. Moreover, in their conversations, those who are the quickest speakers are the ones who take the floor next.

1. 3. 2. Turn-Taking in Arab Conversations

Turn-taking regularities vary among communities and languages. In this part, we will shed light on the most common characteristics among Arab speakers who use English in their conversations and how the mother tongue/ culture affects turns taking, yielding, and holding within conversations.

In fact, Arab speakers take more time in managing turn-taking strategies due to their cultural view. In their ordinary talk, Arabs give enough time to elderly people in order to allow them contribute with their knowledge in the conversation, even though they take a lot of time. That is to say, Arabs have the freedom to lead a conversation without taking any loyal consent from other participants (mainly young ones).

Richards and Schmidt (1983) clarified this idea:

In other words, Muslims cannot start the conversation before the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or take the floor while elder people are speaking, unless taking prior permission. Generally, turn-taking is socially constructed, which cooperate with the cultural and religious conventions of a particular society. (p. 142)

For Arabs, one should be aware of the turn-taking principles before engaging in the conversation (mainly in relation to religion and culture), otherwise a breakdown of communication may take place. It is also important to mention that in the Holy Quran there are two important rules when holding a conversation:

The first rule: A partner cannot start his/her turn without an introductory statement.

The second rule: Each contribution in the conversation has a closing sentence in order to initiate the next turn. In addition, males have much dominant roles than females in holding the floor, because there are some religious laws that forbid women to take the floor instead of males when Almighty Allah says:

“O wives of the Prophet! You are not like any other women. If you keep your duty (to Allah), then be not soft in speech, lest he in whose heart is a disease should be moved with desire, but speak in an honorable manner” (Al-Hilali & Khan, Al-Ahzab, 1999, p. 32). That is to say, religion has a great influence in turn-taking patterns in Arab conversation. This makes it different from Anglo-Saxon speakers. Age and sex determine who must take the turn first and how many times. Moreover, for Muslims, women are recommended to lower their voice when speaking with males in order to show respect.

1.3.3. Major Differences in Turn -Taking Strategies in Arab and Anglo-Saxon Talk

According to Almakrob and Al-Ahdal(2020), interruption, silence, and back-channeling are three major characteristics that may clearly identify turn-taking patterns within Arab speakers of English.

1.3.3.1.Interruption

For native speakers of English, interruption in the turn-taking is considered as an impolite act. On the other hand, in Arab cultures, interruptions are preferable in the flow of the conversation. The interruption in Arab conversation is considered as a support for one's view by saying expressions like 'I totally agree with', 'let me add something here', or it is an opportunity to oppose a view by saying 'I do not agree', 'this something wrong'. That is to say, unlike western cultures, interruption is a valuable component when taking turns. Moreover, it has a significant role in verbal communication for Arabs, because it encourages participants to engage in the discussion, and express their opinion freely without feeling embarrassed or harmed by others.

1.3.3.2.Silence

Silence within the conversation has also a great value. As it mentioned above, Arabs should remain silent when elder people speak to show respect. In the same vein, Endrass, André, Huang, and Gratch (2010) claimed that silence is important in the context of time which is given to other participants to interpret what the present speaker wants to say; as well as, it is a "sign of respect". However, silence in western turn-taking is considered as a sign of failure, because the speaker who remains silent is the one who has no contribution within the talk.

According to Endrass et al. (2010), a long pause in the conversation is not a favored practice in English native speakers' cultures, because they perceived silence as 'non to say'

and give the turn to another speaker in order to assure the continuity of the conversation. That is to say, western speakers manage their turns with minimum gap or overlap so that speakers remain active until the end of the conversation. In contrast, Arab speakers believe that pauses in turn-taking help in constructing the idea or the information to be delivered. This explains why many scholars stressed the need for identifying the common characteristics of English as a universal language in order to avoid misunderstanding in interactions. In this regard, Ferguson (2009) set up a study to highlight the need for identifying the functions that link English as a universal language with all speakers in order to avoid breakdown of communication. Moreover, he sought for determining some turn-taking patterns to facilitate interaction with non-native speakers and achieve the main goal for any conversation.

1.3. 3. 3.Back-Channels

According to Shriberg (2005), back-channels are another important identifier of turn-taking strategies. It simply refers to some short utterances produced when the interlocutor takes the turn. He clarified that back-channeling is used to make sure that all participant are following what the current speaker is saying, and to show that the listener attends to him by using expressions *like huh, yeah, um, right*. Furthermore, these short utterances express interest, understanding or willingness to let the speaker continue his/her turn.

On the other hand, Arab speakers use back-channels in their conversations by producing expressions like "what else"? "I got this idea". However, native speakers of English prefer using short expressions; such a 'okay', 'right', 'yeah', 'alright'. In fact, the influence of the mother tongue is one of the factors which cause those differences in turn-taking patterns across cultures. In this regard, Ward and Al-Bayyari (2010) stated:

In English (at least in parts of North America), times when the listener is especially welcome to back-channel are indicated by a region of low pitch. In Arabic (at least in parts of Egypt and Iraq), these times are commonly indicated by a different prosodic

cue, a prosodic feature complex which includes a steep pitch downslope, a “down dash.” This pattern is not common in English.(p. 2)

That is to say, a low pitch is perceived as an invitation to back-channel by native speakers, but it is not the case for Arab speakers. It is because of back-channels differences between the mother language and English; Arab speakers of English take a longer time to take the turn. This clarifies why English speakers use words such as "okay", and "right" to serve this function. On the other hand, Arabs may use expressions like "و بعددير " , and then " " (what else ?).

Conclusion

Taking into consideration all of the conversation aspects that are listed above, it is possible to understand the difficulties that occur when Arabs speak to native English speakers. One may ask questions like: when is it appropriate to take a turn in an English conversation? Why do Anglo-Saxon speakers cut turns off when they are speaking? These differences may raise negative feelings towards native speakers' speech styles. However, it is better to deal with these frustrations by learning the turn-taking behaviors and concentrate more on the areas that cause communication problems. More precisely, looking for differences between native speakers and non-native speakers' structure of turns.

Chapter Two: Arab and Anglo-Saxon TV Talk Shows

Introduction

The study of TV talk shows has become very interesting in recent years. The twentieth century has witnessed the growing interest in talk shows, which present both entertainment and knowledge. Talk shows are composed of a special mixture of institutional and ordinary conversation. Their distinctive feature is the spontaneous talk that makes them idiosyncratic from other types of broadcast talk such as news interviews and political debates.

This chapter is centered on an overview of talk shows and their conversational features; it is divided into three sections. As a matter of fact, the first section tackles the talk shows generalities, including its socio-historical background and definition. The second section includes the talk show components such as topics, interactions, and interruptions, while the third section sheds light on the major differences between Arab and Anglo-Saxon talk shows.

Section One: Talk Shows Generalities

2.1. 1. The Socio-Historical Background

Ilie (2006) argued that a talk show as a setting of interaction is comparable to the Italian academy in the sixteenth century, the French salon in the seventeenth and the English coffee-house in the eighteenth century. Ilie (2006) supported the view that “talk shows can be regarded as a particular kind of face-to-face conversation” (p. 491). This face-to-face conversation takes place in specific sociocultural settings. Scannel (1991) noted “although today’s programs are prerecorded, they are recorded in such a way to preserve the effect of liveness” (p. 1).

The talk show went through a gradual development. Martinez (2003) noted that talk show was established from a chat between the host and a celebrity to a show where there was more room for audience discussion. As a way of example, the popularity of talk shows in America was noticeable in the television landscape. In that concern, Tolson (2001) stated “In the United Kingdom, only the major terrestrial (public service) produce their own talk shows; all the rest (...) are imported from the united states” (p. 3). It may well be agreed that America takes the founding function when it comes to production, development and distribution of talk shows.

The contribution of the audience in talk show and the shift towards mixing genres has led to its variation. The talk show is no longer a hybrid genre. This is one of the reasons why there has been little detailed research on talk shows. Indeed, Tolson (2001) noted that “much academic debate about talk shows has been very generalized and often highly speculative” (p. 4). The television medium has witnessed the development of a wide range of talk shows with different emphases. Haarman (2001) pointed out that there is “an immense variety in the performers, the content and style (...), the procedures followed and the characteristics and interventions of the participation and/or overhearing audiences” (p. 31). The different types of talk shows may be classified according to the time of the day in which they are broadcasted (e.g., breakfast talk shows, daytime talk shows, evening talk shows or late night talk shows). In addition, they can be classified according to their content (e.g., issue oriented talk show, trash talk show, celebrity talk show or current affairs talk shows).

2.1. 2. Definition of TV Talk Shows

According to Ilie (2006), there are three main causes why it is very difficult task to define talk show. Firstly, talk show represents a rapidly changing mixed media phenomenon. Secondly, a talk show showed intersexuality through overlaps with other mediatized forms of

talks. Finally, the talkshow is considered as a mixed broadcast discourse, such as interviews, debates, sitcoms, game shows, and quiz shows. To distinguish its distinctive features, it is important to explore the sociocultural environment and the contextual factors that generated it and have continued to form it.

On the other hand, Tolson (1991) clarified that the talk show is “obviously based upon a set of protocols for the television interview” (p. 178). Talk show has a special format that is different from other types of broadcast discourse. It is planned to give information. Moreover, argumentation is its essential element in which the discussion done by the host and the guest is sincerely handled to reach good results according to the topics raised. Clayman and Heritage (2011) added that institutional talk further differs from ordinary talk among other things, turns indicators and lexical choices.

Ilie (2001) argued that talkshows’ interaction does not always consider as an institutional talk. This is due to the fact that it shared many characteristics with ordinary conversation. Therefore, it is considered as semi-institutional conversation, although it happens in an institutional setting.

It is important to note that talk shows interactions and format varies across cultures. Consequently, it became an interesting sample for cross-cultural conversations and discourse studies.

Although the fundamental characteristics of talk shows are easily recognizable across cultures, it seems possible to identify cultural nuances that distinguish talk shows according to their country of origin. The situational contexts of the British, American, Italian and French talk shows, for example, differ widely. Talk shows have been examined from a variety of perspectives, including cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural approaches. (Ilie, 2006, p.

2.1. 3. Interactional Goals of a Talk Show

Interaction is a central feature of talk shows conversations. It either signals the successfulness of the talk show, or it simply demonstrates the faulty interpretations of speech. However, there are several talk show identifiers that form it.

Ilie (2001) stated that talk shows also, share several similarities with ordinary conversation. Thus, the dialogues of talk shows can be less topic-centered and more spontaneous. This can be noticed when it occurs between the participants that are well familiar with each other; for instance, friends, and relatives. Talk shows are not principally information-focused, because they do not assert maximum objectivity, and they do not rule out personal and emotional contribution of both the questioner and the respondent. Therefore, this kind of dialogue can be viewed as conversational discourse. On the other hand, talk show conversations are rule-governed and limited by certain restrictions. Talk shows usually follow a question-answer pattern, in which the participants of the show are accomplishing certain roles; the show host is the interviewer and the guest is an interviewee. .

Ilie (2001) pointed out that the institutional dialogue and conversational dialogue share the same goal of interactional speech. Regarding those institutional goals, talk shows are meant to complete a socializing and educational function, such as influencing, supporting, inspiring opinions, or addressing different social. Ilie (2001) stated that semi-institutional context of talk shows is expressed in less predictable topics and subtopics shifts, through various ways such as; interruptions, unprompted participant interventions,

and audience participations. In the informal everyday conversation, the participants of a talk do not usually know each other very well. However, talk show host knows the guests in most cases, since the two are invited to a pre-interviewed. That is to say, talk shows' participants have background knowledge about the discussed topic. In addition, the host has already diagnosed the guest's interactional pattern. This feature is related only to the pre-recorded talk shows, because it is not an easy task to predict topics and interactional pattern in other spontaneous talk shows.

Section Two: Communicational Components in Talk Shows

This current section is devoted to the explanation of talk shows 'basic components including the patterns of communication, topics of discussion and interactional features.

2. 2. 1. Patterns of Communication in Talk Shows

The opening and the closing parts of talk shows enable us to determine its type easily. For instance, a formal talk show opening conversation is characterized by the use of institutional talk. On the other hand, entertainment talk shows start with a casual conversation, which is not restricted to any type of talk.

In the same vein, Ilie (2001) pointed out that patterns of communicative and social performance in talk shows can be related with more than one discourse type. For example, introductory and closing statements of a talk give the impression of entertaining program, planned to be funny and easy going. In contrast, the periodic goal-oriented question-answer sequences may be considered to belong to the class of news interviews, because they are estimated to present information about social, political or moral issues and support the exchange and confrontation of views.

The relation between the talk show participants' is determined by the show's type itself. If it is broadcast news, it is considered as a constitutional conversation, which is totally objective and based on giving information only. In contrast, talk shows conversations are mostly unpredictable, the flow of the talk can be changed from a formal one to a more spontaneous and casual one.

Therefore, Ilie (2001) noted that the relations between the host with the guest and the host with the audience can involve new and unpredictable forms of interaction. In talk shows information is given either directly by breaking the news, for instance, or advertising a product or an event. It could be done indirectly, by various means of the interviewing technique like quiz interviews.

In a nutshell, unlike proper interviews talk shows are not just information-focused. They do not claim maximum objectivity, since there is an emotional involvement of both the interviewer and the interviewee. Furthermore, the questioning procedure in the talk show conversation, is sometimes interrupted by side-comments or an evaluation of answers made by the show host or by the participants.

2. 2.2. Topics in Talk Shows

According to Tiittula and Nuolijärvi (2000), in personality-centered talk shows the topics are selected according to the guest. The questions of the host are based on the guest's personality, because he/she creates their topics of interest. Moreover, any aspect stated by the guest can direct the direction of conversation. When the guests break the question-answer pattern of conversation, the sequence of conversation becomes unpredictable. For example, the topic can be changed and become unpredictable, or the tone of conversation can be transformed from friendly to an aggressive.

Ilie (2001) pointed out that talk shows represent an endlessly and rapidly changing media phenomena. They are hybrid talk genres whose pattern constantly reconstructs and redefines themselves, breaking the rules of their conventions. Moreover, the topic of the show largely depends on the personality of the show host, the general background, the views of participants, as well as the type of audience. Talk shows can create deviations from conversational and institutional norms to a varying degree. For instance, they can coordinate spontaneous and purposeful talk, non-institutional and institutional roles in a distinctive way. Consequently, the host's non-controlled and controlled talk is combined with interlocutor-oriented message, and multiple audience-oriented talk.

Penz (1996) considered talk shows to have an institutional nature. Penz (1996) stated that in contrast to everyday conversation where the introduction of topics is determined locally, the topics of talk shows are planned in advance. The host is the one who bears responsibility for topic choice and topic progression. Thus, it is impossible for any of the other participants to introduce a new topic.

As Ilie (2001) held, a topic shift is only possible if the host does not insist on a pattern of questioning by reconstructing a question that answered he/she thinks was not appropriate.

Shuy (1982) suggested that one of the characteristics of a conversation is that one topic is presented. Thus, it does not tend to be reinstated or recycled another time if it is resolved. However, if the listener does not react to a certain topic, one does not introduce the topic again, the host should be aware of the topics of interest of his/her guests. According to Shuy's (1982) observation, personality is a central factor of talk show's conversational flow. Hence, if the guest does not respond to a topic carried by the host, he will not insist on exploring it.

Penz's(1996) observation of talk show material supported what Shuy (1982) argued about reconstructing topics. This is Because the focus of Penz's (1996) research is on issue oriented talk shows. Thus, we cannot say if the same topic can be introduced for several times. The interviewee in a personality-centered talk show does not usually respond to what is being said by the host, because it is considered as negative interference.

2. 2. 3.Interruptions in Talk Shows

Interruptions are distinctive identifiers of conversational interaction in the talk show. Therefore, they have been considered as major strategy for showing power in discourse. However, Goldberg (1990) stated that recent researchers have become interested in the fact that interruptions are not usually considered as a sign of power. Goldberg (1990) differentiated between power and non-power interruptions. Power-oriented interruptions are generally considered as impolite, rude and intrusive. They express the interrupter's opposition, aggression, or displeasure. These types of interruptions are usually perceived as an act of conflict, competition or non-involvement. On the other hand, non-power interruptions or rapport-oriented are expressions of empathy, affection, solidarity, concern or interest. They are seen as acts of cooperation, and mutual interest. In the talk show's setting, the power-oriented interruptions are used by the talk show hosts to regulate turn-taking development and choose topics as well as highlight the effectiveness of the speaker or show certain aspects of the presented topics.

Penz (1996) stated that only on very rare occasions where the guest in a talk show may interrupt the host, and it usually happened when the guest engages in a dispute with the show's host. Consequently, the determination of what really is an interruption is considered quite subjective. The second type of interruption identified by Penz (1996) is

rapport-oriented interruptions. He pointed out that the self-selection of speakers when a prior speaker has not finished a turn has often been seen as a violation of sequencing rules.

In support of this view, Ferrara (1992) stated in talk shows conversations, most cases of joint production, which is self-selection, are not seen as an attempt to grasp a speaker's turn or to change a topic.

Unlike everyday conversation, talk shows have time limits. Because of its particular time limit, the closing of talk shows is different from the pattern that is found in everyday conversation. The closing interaction in everyday conversations is normally achieved. However, as Penz (1996) pointed out, in talk shows the host does not appear to negotiate the closing of talk with his guest or the studio audience. Hence, the closings are exclusively introduced and brought to an end by the talk show host and the production team. The features of talk shows that are presented in this chapter include some general and prototypical characteristics of interaction in talk shows.

To summarize, talk shows can be associated with more than one discourse type, they have similarities with casual conversation. Talk shows are seemed to represent a mixed discourse or semi-institutional discourse and there is no shared feature between the conversational aspects and institutional aspects of talk shows. Previous research of conversation interaction in talk shows are presented as a starting point for further research.

Section Three: Arab Talk Shows Anglo-Saxons Talk Shows

2. 3. 1. Arab Talk Shows

According to Karetzky (1989), the late 20 century was a turning point for Arab media. It has attracted the attention of many scholars. The reasons for this interest are due to

the technological developments such as the advent of satellite TV. The latter, that have extended the productivity of TV signals and consequently changed the Arab broadcasting landscape to the various local and international political development that have been widely covered. The analysis of Arab media has mainly focused on broadcast media, on TV news genres, and the reporting of political development. It has extensively directed its interest on Al-Jazeera and other Arab and western news channels including the BBC.

Like other parts of the world, the majority of Arab TV programming comprises various entertainment shows and programmes that are appreciated by large audiences across the area, generally much larger than news genres.

According to Al-Shetawi (1987), the Arab media researchers have extensively started to give more importance and attention to entertainment genres, and admitting the crucial role they play in Arab's culture. In the Arab world, the talk show program has developed one of the most popular formats occupying broadcast on Arab satellite TV screen since the early 1990s as it explained by Al-Shetawi (1987).

According to Schleifer (2001), interest of Arab's talk shows in breaking public affairs programs was present for many years. Thus, several years before Al-Jazeera, Arab talk shows were reformed from successful western format during the mid-1990s handling various issues related to politics, society and religion. They presented novel talk genres to the region in the way they discussed an extremely wider range of topics for the first-time.

In the same vein, Sakr (2007) explained that:

Studio-based discussion programs were financially attractive to Arab stations in the early days of Arab satellite broadcasting for other reasons besides low production costs. The most obvious one was to attract viewers with the promise of live debate that would break long-entrenched taboos.

Hence, Arab's talk shows presented a novel genre to the region, but mostly based on experiment of other countries, starting from political shows such as *Larry King Live*, *Crossfire* and *Hardtalk*, followed by more social structured talk shows more similar to *The View* and *Oprah Winfrey show* debates' issues.

2. 3. 2. British Talk Shows

Talk show is a totally an Anglo-Saxon product. It is originated from England in the 18th century, people used to talk about entertainment and politics in the coffee show, where the early talk show was born. Because of the production of radio and television technology, the real talk show developed in the United States.

According to Ilie (2006), Anglo-Saxon talk shows are linked with mediation of a host, guest class (i.e., an expert or lay participant, a studio audience and sometimes an audience of callers). The following are some of the key features of talk shows stated by Ilie (2006):

- As audience-oriented mediatized events, talk shows target simultaneously a multiple audience made up of the directly addressed audience of interlocutors, studio audience, and the overhearing audience of TV-viewers.
- Both experts and lay people are often present as show guests. Much of program's focus has to do with the interchange between them.
- The show host, usually a media personality, is monitoring most discussion of stimulating, guiding, and facilitating the participants' roles and contribution to the program (for information exchange, confrontation, and entertainment).

Each episode of the program focuses on a particular topic of social, political or personal concern. Confrontation and conflicting opinions are usually guaranteed by the selection of the topic of the participants.

- Personal experience and common sense have considerable status increasingly appear as forms of knowledge that are opposed to expertise and dominant discourses (of power, race, gender).
- The discursive strategies of talk shows are : in interviews, narrative, debate, game,

Confession and testimony.

- Most programs are either broadcast live or recorded in real time with little editing.(p. 3)

Hence, The hybrid nature of Anglo-Saxon's TV talk shows is that it can profitably be examined by adopting a comparative perspective since they show both conversational features (to non-institutional discourse, such as ordinary conversation) and institutional features (institutional discourse, such as news interview, and broadcast, and debates).

Conclusion

This chapter was devoted to TV talk shows in two different cultures; Arab's world and Anglo-Saxon world. It tackled the basic elements of TV talk show generalities; definition, characteristics in relation to conversation analysis. Then it discussed the major communicational components of talk shows including; topics, interactions, and interruption. Finally, it shaded light on explaining the differences between Arab and Anglo-Saxon TV talk shows conversations.

Chapter Three: Research Method and Data Analysis

Introduction

The present study is designed to investigate the turn-taking strategies used in both Arab and Anglo-axon TV talk shows, and compare the two systems through their real practice and evaluate those strategies. Conversation analysis is the selected approach to analyse specifically the spontaneous talk. This chapter discusses the methodology used to carry out this research and the data analysis and discussion.

Section One: Research Methodology

3. 1. 1. Research Paradigm

The design of our study used qualitative research methods. We used qualitative method to observe and determine the patterns of turn-taking strategies that are derived from the videos of both TV Talk shows; the Arabic and the British one. These talks are the main sources of research data.

3. 1.2. Sample

The sample of our study is two morning talk shows, Arabic one “Sabah El-KhirYa-Arab” and a British one “This Morning” talk show. We chose those talk shows because they belong to spontaneous conversation which is needed to carry on our research. These target talks discussed the same issue and had identical number of participants. Morning talk shows are in a form of interview discussion, and they rarely enter in a debate talk. The selected episode from “Sabah El-KheirYa-Arab” lasted 12 minutes with two hosts (male and female) and their guest Dr. Yomna El-Dirani. Concerning the Anglo-Saxon one, it lasted 18 minutes with two hosts (male and female), and the guest was the British Prime Minister Boris Johnson. This choice was made to give a balance between the talk shows participants i.e., the

same number of participants, the same topic, and almost the same timing. So, the real aim here was to investigate turn taking strategies; organization, identifiers, and the interpretation of each culture.

3.1.3. Data Collection Procedures

The steps followed to obtain the data from the selected conversations are the following:

- Searching for websites that provided an Arabic and and British talk show, which are based on an interview conversation, particularly, a spontaneous conversation.
- Downloading the two episodes on the condition that each two compared TV talk shows must discuss the same topic (The Britishvs. the Arabic one).
- Taking some time on watching the interviews to ensure that they discussed the same topic and had identical number of participants. Also, we ensured that it contained turn-taking principle elements; that is, the three basic strategies and other elements, such as interruption and overlaps.
- Analyzing each turn-taking strategy separately.

3. 1.4. Research Instrument

The research instrument that we selected to carry out our study was “conversation analysis”. 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. Sidnell (2009) clarified that early studies in this field were based on the analysis of English conversation. However,lately, conversation analysts started to study talk in wider ranges of communities across different cultures.Hence, CA begins from the concept that conversational interaction comprises doing things with words, for instance, describing, questioning, agreeing, and offering. Those social actionsare considered the fundamental nature of human action and

interaction in the construction and management of personal identity, social relationships, and human institutions.

According to Perakylo (2001), Conversation analysis is a method for investigating the structure and the procedures of social interaction between people. It concentrates mainly on talk, but combines it with the non-verbal features of interaction in its research design. As their data, CA studies focus on the use of video or audio recordings made from naturally occurring conversations. Concerning their results, Conversation Analysis studies mainly the descriptions of recurrent constructions and performs of social interaction. Moreover, CA studies can center its focus either on ordinary conversations taking place between familiar members or on institutional talk where the participants complete their institutional tasks. CA interprets basic characteristics of human sociality that exist in talk. It analyzes the ways in which particular social institutions are involved in, and operated by conversational talks.

In a nutshell, Conversation Analysis is the accurate approach for studying conversation in institutional setting, as in the case of our sample of the talk shows, “Sabah El-Kheir Ya-Arab”, and “This Morning”.

3.1.5. Setting

Two TV programs were chosen as a sample of the present study. The episode that we have chosen from the Arabic morning talk show was recorded during the Coronavirus period on 9 February 2020. It took place on MBC1 channel in a studio setting. The show is presented by Ghada Mawselli and Hani El-Hamid. It is a daily talk show, recorded every morning at 10:00 am. Concerning the British morning talk show, it is called “This Morning”, recorded too during the Corona pandemic period, on 5th March, 2020. It is broadcasted everyday on ITV and STV channel at 10:00 am. This talk show took place in a studio setting. The two presenters of the show are Holly Willoughby and Philip Schofield.

3.1.6. Data Analysis Procedures

The research was done in the following order:

- Two tables were made to give a general idea about how each turn-taking strategy occurred in both shows. The three basic strategies; turn taking, turn yielding, turn holding with other turn-taking identifiers presented at the very beginning of the analysis.
- We started analyzing the Arabic show firstly, and then we moved to the British one. We followed the same analytic process with the same elements.
- A second type of the tables was used in our study. Each table displayed one of the turn-taking organizational elements (turn-taking, turn-yielding, turn-holding, turn-grabbing, overlapping, back-channels, and adjacency pairs). In these steps, we included the types of each strategy, its sub-classes, and examples of utterances from the conversation of both shows. After that, it was analyzed more precisely for each participant. Moreover, the relationship between each two related turn-taking identifiers was highlighted too.

3.1.7. Limitation of the Study

The present study needs a variety of references and documents related to turn taking strategies across cultures. However, due to the Corona pandemic period, we did not access the sources that we needed from the library of the University, or from websites that are used under specific conditions. The second obstacle that we faced is concerned with choosing spontaneous talk shows that must discuss the same topic; we hardly found appropriate ones, since almost talk shows are previously prepared and recorded.

Section Two: Data Analysis

Introduction

In order to carry out our research, we selected two morning TV talk shows; an Arabic and a British one. The Arabic TV talk show is called “*Sabah AL-KheirYa-Arab*” which is a TV broadcast on *MBC1*. It is a cultural, social talk show. It follows issues that are happening around the world. The two hosts of this TV talk show were: *Hanni Al-Hamed and Ghada Mawselli*. The topic of the episode that we selected is the scientific truth about Coronavirus presented by their guest *Dr. Yomna El-Dirani*. She is a specialist in bacterial and infectious diseases. On the other hand, the British morning talk show that we analyzed in our research is called “*This Morning*”, which is broadcasted on *ITV* in the *United Kingdom*, presented by *Phillips Schfield, and Holly Willoughby*. This show airs live news, and this episode tackled Coronavirus pandemic by hosting the Prime Minister *Boris Johnson* as a guest.

3.2.1. Data Analysis

3.2.1. 1. Arab Speakers Turn-Taking, Yielding, and Holding Strategies

The following table presents a general view of the types of each turn-taking strategies that appeared in the Arab talk show. In addition to turn-taking identifiers (overlaps, back-channels, silence).

*Table 01**Identifiers Used in the Arab's Talk*

Identifiers	Types
Turn-Taking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hand raising • Nodding • Using uptakes • Meta-comments
Turn-Yielding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Giving-up • Asking questions (Whquestions, Yes/No questions, Tag questions) • Using comments
Turn-Holding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexical repetition • Verbal filters • Silent pauses
Turn-Grabbing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interruptions
Turn-Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current speaker select next speaker other • Self-selection
Overlaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaking simultaneously • Partial overlaps
Back-channels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal signals by using words like: surely, right, yes, ok, let's start • Non-verbal signals like: gestures of moving the head

	<p style="text-align: center;">or the hand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal Filters (Ahah, Aham ...)
Silence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rarely occurred

Table 1 followed

3.2. 1.1.1. Turn-Taking Strategy

The following table presents turn-taking strategy with each sub-classes elements, it introduces utterances from the Arab talk show.

Table 02

Turn-Taking Strategy in Arab Talk Show

Turn-Taking Strategies	Class	Sub-class	Sample
Turn-Taking Strategy	Starting-up	Clean Start	Host (A): Every day we go across faulty news about corona virus...you may fall sick in this way or that way ...
		Hesitant Start	Host A: We are still connecting with you Dr ...but AAA let us see the shape of this virus and why it is

			calls like this...
Taking-over	Uptake		The guest : certainly, antibiotics kills the bacteria ,but Corona is a virus that has no cure until now .
	Link		Host B: I feel sorry for animals...they have been distributed ...this is not fair.
Interrupting	Alerts		_____
	Meta-Comments		Host(B): In which side should we use it Dr, please ? Host A: Okey , why don't we let the doctor ask us her questions...

Table 2 followed

Starting-up is the first strategy used in theArabtalk show. When host(A) introduced the topic, he started by a clean start as it is shown in table 2. At the middle of the conversation, hesitant start occurred by the same host, because he already involved in the

speech with the two other participants. He found difficulties in interrupting the guest that is why he hesitated in his speech.

Almost all turn-taking strategies appeared in the talk show conversation. The most used strategy is taking-over within its two sub-types. Up-takes come as a reaction for the current speaker question, and that what clarifies its usefulness in this talk show. On the other hand, links are indirect connectors used when they talk in conversation. The two hosts succeeded in applying this sub-type of turn-taking. It made the conversation interesting and showed that the two hosts are active participants.

Concerning interruption, it is also present from the side of the two hosts. However, it was done politely, that is why “alerts” are not used.

Excerpt

Host (B):....on which side should we use it, please Dr?

Host (A):...why do not we let the doctor ask us her question, since we are living the pandemic of Corona period?

3.2. 1. 1.2. Turn-Yielding Strategies in Arab’s Talk

Table 3 introduces turn-yielding strategy that occurred in the Arab talk show including its sub-classes. Utterances from the Arab talk show are presented to clarify each sub-type separately.

Table 03

Turn-Yielding Strategy in the Arab Talk

Turn-yielding Strategies	Class	Sample
Yielding the Turn	Prompting	Host (2): Good morning... Guest: Good morning...
	Appealing	Host (1): You mean I can go to china now, even if they call the great China wall on my name, right? Host (2): Yes, certainly .
	Giving up	Host (A): So Doctor, I am lost in this huge amount of information...

The above data clarified the turn-yielding types that are used by the two hosts. Prompting appeared at the beginning of the talk show. In prompting, the participant's acts prompt the other speaker to respond with strength. Prompting consists of apologizing, greeting, inviting, questioning, and requesting.

Excerpt

Host (B): Our guest is Yomna El-Dirani, specialist in bacterial and infectious diseases.
Good morning, Doctor.

Host (A): Welcome Dr.

Guest: Good morning, thank you.

Appealing means a turn which gives an explicit signal to the listener, in order to give feedback such as: tag question, all right, ok, right, you see... and so on.

Excerpt

Host (A): You mean I cannot go to China now, even if they call the great China wall on my name, right?

Host (B): Yes, certainly.....people who want to study there have changed their mind ...so; you have better not to go (laughing), stopit!

Giving up is another sub-type of turn-yielding. Here, the speakers realized that they did not have anything to say or to add. They gave the chance to others by making a long pauses. This strategy pushed the listeners to take the turn. In this conversation, giving up was shown from the side of host (A) by using the pitch sound.

Excerpt

Host (A): So...we let the Dr.Yomna asks ussince we are living the pandemic period...

So....doctor...I am lost in the huge amount of information...

3.2. 1. 1.3. Turn-Holding Strategy in Arab Talk

The following table clarified turn-holding strategy within its three sub-classes (Verbal filters, lexical repetition, and silence).

Table 04

Turn-Holding Strategies Used in the Arabic Talk Show

	Sub-class	Sample
Turn-Holding Strategy	Verbal Filters	Host(A): Aaa...ok
		Host(A): Emm
		Host(B): that is ...aaa..beneficial for us.
	Lexical Repetition	Host(A): Today, we will discuss some issues, there are... there are...
	Silence	Guest: Well,:::

Turn-holding strategies involved verbal filters, lexical repetitions, and silence. In this conversation, we found the three types as it is mentioned in the table above. At the beginning of the talk show, the host (A) applied turn-holding by using verbal filters.

Lexical repetition was presented through the repetition of a sentence twice in order to avoid the breakdown of the conversation. Host (A) used this strategy when he wanted to hold the chance of speaking, but he found difficulties in controlling what to say exactly. That is why lexical repetition was needed to allow him organize his ideas or to think about what to say.

Excerpt

Host (A): Today, we will discuss some issues, there are... there are...

Pauses are rarely occurred in this conversation. The three participants kept silent for a very short period of time in the first minutes of the talk show, then host (A) took the turn and

broke the silence. The guest kept silent too, in the 6th minute. When host (B) asked her a question, then the host (A) reformulated it so that she could understand it well.

Excerpt

Host (B): Doctor, let us follow you step by step... what are the preoccupations that could be beneficial for us?

Guest: Well...

Host (A): (reformulating the idea of host (B)). How can we protect ourselves...?

3.2. 1. 1.4. Turn-Grabbing Strategy in Arab Talk Show

The following table presented the frequency of turn-grabbing strategy that occurred in the Arab talk show. Utterances from the show conversation are introduced to highlight the use of this strategy.

Table 05

Turn Grabbing Strategy Used the Arab Talk Show

Participant	Turn-Grabbing Number	Sample
Host(A) with Host(B)	3 times	Guest:... Will you travel or not? Host (B): No, I will travel.. It is normal. Host (A): For me, It depends on the direction.
Host(A) with the Guest		

	_____	_____
Host(B) with the Guest	2 times	<p>Host (A): Is it true that there are some scientists that found cure for Coronavirus?</p> <p>Host (B): I think....</p> <p>Guest: I will answer..Aaa...they are working on it.</p>

Table 5 followed

Turn grabbing is the competition for turns among the participants. Every participant wanted to get the turn by being quick and active in order to take the floor. This strategy can occur in different ways, by interrupting the current speaker, by raising voice, or showing opposing view of the current speaker to gain the turn.

In this conversation, turn-grabbing rarely occurred among the participants, since they are not involved in a debate talk. The guest Dr.Yomna El-Dirani was looking for the answers through asking the two hosts questions. The two hosts made a kind competition to give an answer concerning travelling during Coronavirus period.

Host (A) did not make any competition with his guest to get the turn. He never interrupted her while she was speaking, that might be due to the fact he is a male participant. However, there was an interesting discussion between the female host and the guest Dr.Yomna. They discussed Corona issue more deeply.

3.2. 1. 1.5. Overlaps

Table 6 represented the number of overlaps that occurred in the Arab talk show, and its two types

Table 06

Overlaps Used in Arab's Talk Show

Overlaps	Number of Overlaps	Types	Sample
Host(A) with Host(B)	_____	Partial Overlaps	Host (B): ...this is the suitable mask that protects us from Corona. Guest: protects us from Corona.
Host(A) with the Guest	One time	Full Overlaps	Host (A): Why do not we let the doctor asks us?
Host(B) with guest	Three times		Guest: Yeah, I will ask you if you want.
The three participants	One time		Guest:... wash your hands like this. Host (B): wow! I did not use to know it. Host (A): these steps are for cleaning fingers, right?

Overlaps occurred when the participants tried to speak at the same time. There are only three times when speakers used this strategy. This led us to say that, even the speaker made an effort to respect turns of others, he/she could not control or predict what the other participants wanted to say. But, He/she has to know how to deal in these situations.

Excerpt1

Host (B): This is suitable mask } that protects us from Corona.
 Guest: } that protects us from Corona.

Excerpt2

Guest: If there is no suspicious cases of Coronavirus...and N95 masks are not available,

We can use normal masks.
 Host: We can use normal masks.

In these two examples, the two speakers competed for the floor. Before the first speaker completed his turn, the second one took it. The overlap in these instances is a partial overlap, which began during the interlocutor turn, but extended further after its end.

In example (3) and (4), the overlap took place completely within the interlocutor's turn. This overlap is called full overlap. The interlocutor still held the floor and shared it with the listener. In those examples, the participants are involved in the conversation; they took the floor at the same time.

Excerpt 3

Host (B): Yeah...definitely...
 Guest: No, not to China of course...

Excerpt 4

Guest: Wash your hands like this.
 Host (B): Wow...I did not use to know it.

Host (A): These steps are for cleaning fingers, right?

Generally, Overlap occurs when the next speaker did not respect the notion of the relevance place i.e. she/he did not wait for the speaker to give him the floor.

3.2. 1. 1.6. Back-Channels in Arab Talk

Table 07

Back-Channel Utterances Used in Arab Talk Show

Participants	Number of Back-Channels Utterances	Sample
Host(A)	25	Uhum Let us start (ياالله) Yes (نعم) Ok (طيب)
Host(B)	18	Right (صحت) Ahah Defenetely(فوجلا) Yes(ايوا)
Guest	10	Yes(نعم) Ok Yes(اي)

Back-channels are short utterances produced when the interlocutor is taking the floor. They are used to make sure that all the participants are following what the current speaker is saying, by making a positive response using some expressions. As it is shown in the table 7,

Arab speakers used a variety of back-channels utterances. They mixed between the Arabic dialect, standard Arabic, verbal filters, and English language.

Excerpt 1

Host (A): Dear viewers, every day we come across faulty information about Coronavirus. Corona is here...is there...It can be transmitted like this or that...

Host (B): Why your finger is directed to me?

Host (A): (laughs and changes the position of his hand), Corona dear viewers.

Host (B): (أه) yes corona to people who are watching...

Excerpt 2

Guest: ...but antibiotics will not treat us from Corona virus, at all.

Host (B): Good

Host (A): (طيب) alright, why do not we let ...

Excerpt 3

In this example, the host (A) used verbal filters to show that he was following what his guest was saying.

Guest:...there are two types of masks, this is called N95 mask, while this is the normal mask.

Host (A): Ahum...

From the above table, we can notice that the host (A) is the one who used more back-channels utterances than the two female participants. This is due to the fact that the male host showed more politeness to Dr. Youmna.

3.2. 1. 1.7. Adjacency Pairs in Arab Talk

Table 08

Adjacency Pairs Used in the Arab Talkshow

Adjacency pairs	Sample
Greeting-Greeting	Host(B): (يسعدني صباحك يار...) Good morning. Guest : (صباح النور.) Good morning.
Invitation-Acceptance	Host (A): Alright, why do not we let the doctor asks us some questions? Guest: Ok, I will ask you if you want.
Question-Response	Guest: Will the Corona virus transmit if we make shopping from China? Host (A): I guess yes..., it could be transmitted.
Thanks-Response	Host (B): Thanks for correcting all the faulty information that was in our minds, Dr.Yomna. Thank you, have a nice day.(يعطيك الف عافية) (ويومك سعيد.) Guest: Most welcome.(تسلم)

Adjacency pairs are of different types. Some ritualized first pair-parts may have an identical second pair-part (hello – hello, good morning – good morning), while others expect a different second pair-part (thank you - most welcome).

Generally, adjacency pairs that occurred in this talk show were meant to make a well-organized talk and to show that there was cohesion between the participants. The most used one in this conversation was question-response, due to the fact that the guest was invited to discuss the issue of Coronavirus through answering the questions of the two hosts.

3.3.2.2. Turn-Taking, Yielding, and Holding Strategies Used in British Talk

The following table presented turn-taking strategies that occurred in the Anglo-Saxon talk show, with reference to its types.

Table 09

Frequency of Turn-taking strategies in the Anglo-Saxon Talk

Identifiers	Types
Taking the Turn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nodding • Eye gaze • Interruption • Pitch sound • Asking questions • Hand raising
Turn-Yielding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prompting • Appealing • Turn-selection • Wh questions , Tag questions , Yes-no questions
Turn-Holding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filled pauses (Verbal filters)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexical repetition
Turn-Grabbing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turn-stealing • Interruption • Overlaps • Raising intonation
Overlaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete overlaps
Back-channels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nodding • Verbal signals (yes, exactly, yeah...) • Verbal Filters (Ahum, Ahah) • Repeating the last words of the current speaker (you know..., so...) • Using gestures: trying to explain by moving hands, agreement by moving head

Table 9 followed

3.3.2.2.1. Turn-Taking strategy the Anglo-Saxon’s Talk

Table (10) explains taking turn classes and sub-classes that have appeared in “This morning” talk show

Table 10

Taking the TurnStrategy in Anglo-Saxon’sTalk Show

Turn-Taking Strategies	Class	Sub-class	Sample
	Starting-up	Clean Start	Host(A):...well-comeback, overnight

Taking the Turn strategy			the government has fast fresh allegationwithholding information about the Coronavirus...
		Hesitant Start	Host (A): we are joining to answer those questions Mr.Prime Minister...good morning Mr.Prime Minister.
	Taking over	Up-take	Guest: this is a very important question. And that is why a lot of debates have being...
		Link	Host (A): that is still too not fast enough.
Interrupting	Alerts	_____	
	Meta-comments	Host (A): well, this is your putting out at the moment. It is very simple.	

As it is shown in the table 10, all turn-taking sub-classes were used by the participants, except alerts. The host (A) started his first turn fluently, and then he moved to a hesitant start, when he welcomed his guest, the Prime Minister of UK, Mr. Boris Johnson. The male host and his guest controlled the floor; they had the majority of turns while the female host had little chances to hold the floor. Up-takes were most used by the guest, since he was answering the two host's questions.

Excerpt

Host (A): ...how are we close to do that?

Guest: so, we will see what scientists have advised us. The best thing. I find that these guys are brilliant, the epidemiologists who understand behavioral psychology of population. They understand how these things spread.

Interruption was used also by the male host in the whole talk show. He interrupted him many times. Thus, he used meta-comments which was a sub-class of interruption as it is shown in the following examples.

Excerpt 1

Host (A): Well, this is your putting out at the moment, it is very simple.

Excerpt 2

Host(A): Is it not better if we all have all the information in a straight way?

Links were used by the hosts to make the conversation more active and smooth. The two hosts discussed different issues with their guest starting from Coronavirus and ending with his personal life. That is why links were preferable to be used in conversations, they are helpful for the guest too.

Excerpt

Guest: what we will be doing is to make sure that communities get the support.

Host (A): So, you revised not to go...

Alerts were not used in this conversation, since, it was an opened discussion with a political participant. The three speakers discussed the UK strategies about dealing with Coronavirus. Sometimes, the male host asked his guest hard question, however, the guest replied carefully in all situations.

3.3.2.2. 2.Turn Yielding Strategy in British Talk

The following table presented turn-yielding strategy used in the Anglo-Saxon talk show, within its sub-classes.

Table 11

Turn Yielding Strategy Used in the British Talk Show

The turn taking strategy	Class	Sample
Turn Yielding strategy	Prompting	Host (A): Good morning, Prime Minister Boris Johnson, thanks for coming today. Guest: Good morning.
	Appealing	Host (A): Is the delay amm essentially is trying to spread this out? So that it does not all happen as one.

		Guest: it is a very... very important question..
	Giving-up	Host (B):::we are arrived to know if it has broken new areas.

The three types of turn-yielding strategy were used in this conversation. Starting from prompting, the current speaker led the addresser to give responses by makinggreeting, offer, apologizing, or inviting. The current speaker automatically made a response to what has been said. Prompting appeared at the very beginning of the conversation, when host (A) greeted his guest Mr. Borris Johnson as it is shown in the following excerpts:

Host(A): Good morning, Prime Minister Boris Johnson, thanks for coming today.

Guest: Good morning.

The guest also used prompting when he made an offer for the host (A) at the beginning of the conversation.

Excerpt

Host (A): ... we would move from contain into delay...

Guest: let me explain...let me explain exactly what is happening today, ammm people know that the number continues to grow...

The second sub-class of turn-yielding strategy that was present in the show was appealing. Here, the current speaker made a signal to the other participant to make him respond to what he was saying, using some utterances like; as you see, as you know, and

right. The guest used appealing when he was discussing the UK economic state during Corona pandemic period, he used the utterance “you know” to make the hosts reacted to him and yielded the turn for them.

Excerpt

Guest: ...And you know... I want see for what money is spent. I want to see fewer homes in the future

Host (A): this is a good green policy...

The third turn yielding sub-type is giving up. When the speaker realizes that there is nothing to say, he/she simply yields the turn for other participants. This can be done in various ways such as using the utterances that signal for a very short period of time. There are other cues that help speakers understand that the current speaker is finishing his talk to avoid the breakdown of conversation, like intonation, loudness or pitch, and body motion.

In the following example host (B) yielded the turn to host (A) by making the intonation down in the last words.

Excerpt

Host (B): We have arrived to know it has broken new areas.



Generally, host (A) is the one who yielded more turns to the guest using question, while Mr. Borris used giving up when he finished talking to allow the host takes the floor again. Host (B), had little turns and the same with turn-yielding strategies.

3.3.2.2. 3. Turn-Holding Strategy in the British Talk

The following table presented the turn-holding strategy that occurred in that Anglo-Saxon talk, including its types.

Table 12

Turn-Holding Strategy Used in the British Talk Show

Turn taking strategies	Sub-class	Sample
<p style="text-align: center;">Turn-holding</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Verbal filters</p>	<p>Host (A): Emm, are you withholding information?</p> <p>Guest: No, not at all...let me...let me explain that top immediately, because it is Aaa very important issue...</p> <p>Guest: But, Aaa washing hands is the most effective thing...</p> <p>Host (A): And other...other emm topics, people think that you put yourself into self-isolation.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Lexical repetition</p>	<p>Host (A): Is it...is it...better if we all have all the information in a straight way?</p> <p>Host (B): I just...I just worry, because we know..</p> <p>Guest: We want...we want</p>

		<p>communicate...over</p> <p>communicate with the public</p> <p>about what is happening...</p>
	<p>Silence</p>	<p>Guest... We are still at the stage [...] where the best thing we can do ,and will be like that for a long time is to wash your hands.</p> <p>Host (A): I want to know at what point I have to tell my mom actionally [...] it is a good idea to stay at home.</p>

Table 12 followed

As we noticed, the most turn-holding strategy used was verbal filters especially by the guest Mr. Borris, followed by the male host.

Excerpt 1

Guest: ...but aaa washing hands is the most effective thing.

Excerpt 2

Host (A): ...and other, emm other topics, people think that you put yourself into self-isolation.

Excerpt

Guest: And aaa we are going faster as possible as we can ...

Excerpt 4

Host (A): Emm.. Are you withholding information?

Both the guest and the two hosts used turn holding strategy in different manners. Host (A) usually used verbal filters “emm” more than the two other participants, while, the guest Mr.Borris used the three sub-types in different way, but he used the verbal filters “Aaa” in the whole conversation.

Another turn-holding sub-type that was used in the show was lexical repetition. It is clear that the guest was the one who used it more than others; this is due to the fact that he was facing serious questions by the host (A). That is why he hesitated a lot. He wanted to hold the floor until he found a convinced answer.

The host (a) used also lexical repetition, but, host (B) used it two times.

Excerpt 1

Host (A): Can you, can you guaranty that in the absolute crocks of this you can feed us?

Excerpt 2

Host (A):.. And other, other emm topics.

Excerpt 3

Guest: I am very proud, Iam very proud of the work of the emergency services.

Excerpt 4

Guest: Let me explain, let me exactly explain what is happening today, so, emm people know that the number is continuing to grow...

Excerpt 5

Guest: we want. We want communicate..

Excerpt 6

Host (B): I just. I just worry because we know who ...

From excerpt 3 and 4, we can notice that both the guest and the host used the two strategies in the same utterance.

The guest was the participant that used more silence than the two hosts.. He kept silent for a very short period of time when he was answering the hosts, and defending his policy toward fighting Coronavirus.

Excerpt 1

Guest...we are still at the stage [...] where the best thing we can do and still be like that for a long time is..

Excerpt 2

Host (A): I want to know....

Generally, turn-holding strategy occurred in the whole conversation. It showed that the three speakers wanted to occupy the floor in various way, using specific utterances especially, lexical repetition and verbal filters.

3.3.2.2. 4. Turn-Grabbing Strategy in British Talk

Table 13 represented the turn-grabbing utterances that occurred in the Anglo-Saxon talk show.

Table 13

Turn Grabbing Strategy in the British Talk Show

Participants	Turn-grabbing Number	Sample
Host(A) with Host(B)	0	_____
Host(A) with the Guest	16 times	<p>Host (A): I want to know at what point do I have to tell my mom actionly, my good idea is to stay home.</p> <p>Guest: yes, on the specific incident where individuals get it...</p>
Host(B) with the Guest	5 times	<p>Host (B): ...How they can find beds and staffs to cope with what we potentially see...</p> <p>Guest... Of course, great increase number of nurses.</p>

As we have seen in the previous turn-taking strategies, host (A) and the guest were the ones who controlled the floor by making immediate responses to what had been said. Moreover, they interrupted each other a lot, while host (B) competed with her guest only 5 times.

Excerpt 1

Host (A): So, how are we closed for doing that?

Guest: ...so, we will see what the scientists advise us... the best thing I find, is that these guys are brilliant...

In this example, host (A) and guest wanted to hold the floor simultaneously. The host asked the guest his question, but the answer lasted more than one minute when he held the turn. On the other hand, host (A) controlled the floor in the whole conversation; he did not give the chance to host (B) as much as he took.

3.3.2.2. 5. Overlaps in Anglo-Saxon Talk

The following table presented the overlaps that occurred in the Anglo-Saxon talk show. It included the frequency of overlaps, its type, and the utterances from the show.

Table 14

Overlaps in the British Talk show

Overlaps	Number of Overlaps	Types	Sample
Host(A)with Host(B)	2	Partial overlaps	Guest:...we do not think of the moment that schools will be closed unless of course there is an incidence in the school. Host (B): in the school.
Host(A) with Guest	7		
Host(B) with the	4		

Guest			
The Three Participants	1	Full overlaps	Guest: We are not stupid, we can handle the truth. Guest: No, absolutely.

Table 14 followed

Overlap did not largely occur in this conversation. However, the three participants used it, especially with the guest Mr. Borris Johnson. As it is shown in the table 14, host(A) made overlaps with the guest 7 times . While, host (B) had only 4 overlaps with the guest. Most of overlaps occurred between host (A) and the guest were partial overlaps.

Excerpt

Guest: We have a wonderful system of government,

And we are working around the clock to protect those victims.

Host (A): Do you look back at something like...

Guest: we are still at the stage where the single best thing we can do, is washing our hands

Host (A): this is your putting out
 at the moment, it is...

In the following excerpt, Mr. Borris Johnson interrupted the host (A) at the middle of his turn.

Host (A): we are not stupid, we can handle the truth tell us in a straight way

Guest: absolutely, exactly.

Host (A) and the guest had different speech when overlapping with each other, because they had different views.Host (B) overlaps too with the guest, but only few times. The two repeated the same speech as it is shown in this exerpt.

Guest: We do not think at the moment that schools should be closed unless of course there is an incident in the school.

Host (B): in the school.

Concerning the two hosts, their focus was only on Mr.Borris, they rarely overlapped with each other. The following excerpt was a case where host (A) and host (B) spoke at one time, asking together their host, but, the host (B) took the floor before host(A).

Host (B):.if you do not know for a week you might make necessary decision.

Host (A): I need to know at what point do I have to tell my mom...

3.3.2.2. 6. Back-Channels in British Talk

Table number 15 represented the number of back-channels utterances used by the three participants with excerpts from the show.

Table 15

Back-Channels Utterances Used in the British Talk Show

Participants	Number of back-channels	Sample
Host(A)	09	Guest: I think... It would be better if we take all the hole information in a straight way ... Host (A): (nodes his head).
Host(B)	12	Guest: they all meet together for an hour... Host (B): Aham..
Guest	04	Host (A): people thought you putted yourself into self-isolation. Guest: yeah...

As it is shown in the table, back-channels were not largely used in this conversation. However, the female host was the one who used back-channels when she was listening to Mr.Borris. Sheexpressedher interest to what he was saying. Host (A) also used 9 back-channel utterances, while the guest used only 4.The back-channel most used by host (A), was the utterance “yeah”, in addition to head nodding, and verbal filter “aham”.

Excerpt1

Guest: All what I can say is that..

Host (B): yeah...

Excerpt 2

Guest: What they are doing is that they immediately identifying the region where they...

Host (B): (nodding)

Excerpt 3

Guest: They all meet together for an hour..

Host (B): Aham...

Concerning host (A), he used only body gestures (moving the head) as a back-channel utterance responding to Mr. Borris speech.

Excerpt 1

Guest: I think... It would be better if we take all the...

Host (A): (nodding)

Excerpt 2

Guest: We are doing something to help business...

Host (A): (nodding)

For the third participant, Mr.Borris, he used the utterance “yes”, or body gestures too to response to the two hosts’ questions.

Excerpt 1

Host (A): People thought you putted yourself into self-isolation.

Guest: yeah...

Excerpt 2

Guest: What we want to dois to make sure that community gets the supports that it needs.

Host (A): (nodding)

Host (B): (nodding)

Excerpt 3

Guest: What I was doing, is directing operations...making sure that people get their money..

Host (A): (moved his head)

Host (B): yeah...

3.3.2.2.7. Adjacency Pairs in Anglo-Saxon Talk

The following table presented the types of adjacency-pairs that occurred in the Anglo-Saxon talk show.

Table 16

Adjacency Pairs Used in the British Talk Show

Adjacency Pairs	Sample
Greeting-greeting	Host (A): Good morning, Prime Minister. Guest: Good morning, good morning.

Invitation-acceptance	_____
Question-response	Host (A): are you withholding information? Guest: No, not at all, let me clear that...
Thanks-response	Host (A): thanks for coming today. Guest: most welcome.
Congratulation	Host(B): congratulations, honestly I mean with ... Guest: thank you very much. Host (A): congratulations.

As it is shown in table 16, the three participants used adjacency pairs, but the most used one was “question-response” by host(A) and the guest, or host(B) with the guest. All adjacency pairs in the show were directed to Mr. Borris.

Excerpt 1

Host (A): Are you withholding information?

Guest: No, not at all. Let me, let me explain...

Excerpt 2

Host (B): How can they find beds to cope with that...?

Guest: of course, there is an increase number on nurses...

Greeting-greeting was used at the beginning of talk show when host (A) greeted Mr. Borris.

Excerpt

Host (A): Good morning, Prime Minister.

Guest: good morning, good morning.

Invitations were not used in the show, but thanks and congratulation were used

Excerpt

Host (A): thanks for coming today.

Guest: most welcome.

Example:

Host (B): congratulations, honestly I mean with ...

Guest: thank you very much.

Host (A): congratulation

3. Section Three: Data Discussion

The current section sets out the essence of the research work; hence, it provides interpretations and discussions of the data collected by means of the research tools. Essentially, it answers the basic research questions as it compares the results to previous studies. As a reminder, the present investigation sought to answer the following research questions:

- ✓ How do Arab speakers use the turn taking strategies (turn-taking, yielding, and holding)?
- ✓ How do Anglo-Saxon speakers use turn taking strategies (turn-taking, yielding, and holding)?

In what follows, the questions are answered according to the results obtained.

3.3.1. Arab Turn-Taking Strategies Vs. British Turn-Taking

We have presented an analysis of turn-taking strategies that were used in the Arab talk show “*Sabah El-kheir Ya-Arab*”, and the British one “*This Morning*”. We watched both shows, and then examined them in terms of seven characteristics: turn-taking, turn- yielding, turn-holding, turn-grabbing, overlapping, back-channels, and adjacency pairs. In both talk shows, when the speaker wanted to take the turn, he produced a question or a comment.

Although the shows had different timing (12 minutes for the Arab one, and 18 minutes for the Anglo-Saxon one), the number of turn taking strategies in the Arab talk show was more than the British one. This is because Anglo-Saxons speakers have long turns comparing to Arab one. According to Smith’s study (1986), culture plays the crucial role in turn-taking practices. Smith (1986) clarified the idea of monochronic and polychronic cultures. People in monochronic cultures think of time as a straight line that is divided into pieces. These people generally feel that sticking to a schedule or time limit and accomplishing tasks within a given amount of time is extremely important even if humans have other needs which conflict with the task.

In contrast, people in polychronic culture, generally place a higher value on relationships than they do on accomplishing tasks within a time frame. we found that Arab speakers give equal distributions and order for turns, while in Anglo-Saxon conversation, turn order, turn size, turn distribution, and the conversation length are not pre-set as explained in Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974). Both conversation shared a same characteristic, in which taking over is the most turn taking sub-class used in the conversation. This is presented in questions-responses produced by all the participants.

In both Talk shows, participants used appealing a as sub-class of turn-yielding strategy. They produced verbal or paralinguistic cues or asking questions. However, in terms of

number, turn yielding was used mostly in Anglo-Saxon show controlled by the male host who directed all his questions to his guest. For Arab talk, both hosts had an identical number of turn-yielding utterances that show us that they respected each other's turns and worked in a harmony.

To hold the turn, the speaker uses generally discourse markers and filled pauses to fill the gap that might occur in his speech to protect his turn of being taken, or stolen by the next speaker. The Anglo-Saxon speakers used more turn holding utterances than the Arab one. This is because both of the guests and the male host in "This Morning" show wanted to control the floor in the whole show, and protect their turn until they finished their message. Concerning the Arab talk show, holding the turn was used in an approximate manner, mostly by the male host while he was speaking with the female guest. He hesitated when he asked her because this is a part of Arab's men culture to choose appropriate word to speak with a woman.

On the other hand, the guest (male) in the Anglo-Saxon talk interrupted the female host, and did not give importance to gender differences. Filled pauses like "umm", "aaa" were the most used by Arab speakers, while lexical repetitions were the most used by Anglo-Saxon to yield the turn.

Concerning turn-grabbing, it largely occurred in the British talk more than in the Arabic one. Although both shows are not in a form of a debate, the British speakers competed for the floor (i.e., both of the hosts and the guest interrupted each other's to gain the turn). The Arabic speakers respected the other's turn and rarely interrupted each other.

Turn-taking identifiers are essential in any conversation. Starting from overlapping, which was present in both talk shows with its two types; partial overlaps and full overlaps, full overlaps were more used in the British talk, because in most cases the next speaker

interrupted the current speaker during his turn until its end. However Arab speakers used overlaps to show that they were listening carefully and following the other participant.

Concerning back-channels, it was more used in the Arab talk show than the British one. This is due to the fact that Arabs show interest to the current speaker and react positively with him using different forms of back-channel utterances like discourse markers (Ahah, Aham, yes, , (نعم صحيح) and lexical repetition . In the British talk, body gestures (nodding, eye gaze) are the back-channel strategies most used by the three participants. Regarding adjacency pairs, question-response utterances were the most used in both shows, since all participants were involved in a discussion about Coronavirus pandemic. Both guests of the two different shows were exposed to a variety of questions about how could people deal with the virus and avoid faulty information about it .However, invitation-acceptance was only used in the Arab talk show when the male host was addressing the female guest in order to show respect and politeness .

3.3. 2. Pedagogical Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the remarks and the limitations that we noted from the study, it is noteworthy to suggest some recommendations for future research in the field. Researchers are recommended to approach this topic from different angles. At this point, they may stick to investigate the cross-cultural turn taking strategies in broadcast news. Since we have already tackled semi-institutional talk shows, they are recommended to explore the institutional conversation and mark the different turn-taking strategies patterns between the two. Otherwise, they can make a comparative analysis of two different talk shows, an entertainment talk show with broadcast news interview. However, for the analysis of talk shows or broadcast news conversations, scholars need to vary and multiply their sample to get reliable findings.

Conclusion

Some social behaviors can carry an emotional punch, while others seem mundane. In intercultural interaction, if the participants do not know which are which, then small misinterpretations can lead to deep misunderstanding.

This section cast light upon the general interpretation yielded from findings of conversation analysis of two different talk shows. Turn-taking strategies are used by both Arab and Anglo-Saxon speakers, but with different interpretations. This is due to the fact that they are two different cultures, i.e., Turn-taking, turn-yielding, and turn-holding are used with different averages in each culture. Anglo-Saxon's speakers are more likely to hold the floor irrespective of the current speaker position; while, Arabs give more importance to the speaker and react with his speech. That is what led the two groups of speakers to use turn-taking identifiers like; overlaps, back-channels, adjacency pairs in varying averages. This clarifies that, while some conversation actions are acceptable in one culture, they may be differently interpreted in the other culture. The findings indicated that the Arab and Anglo-Saxon speakers use turn-taking strategies differently, despite having some universal features.

General Conclusion

The overall research work consisted of three major parts: two parts are devoted to the theoretical framework of the study while, the second part covered the practical side of this investigation. As far as the theoretical part is concerned, this research started with a general review of the literature related to the research topic in the two chapters. The first chapter provided an overview of cross-cultural turn-taking strategies. By the same token, it shed light on the major differences in Arab and Anglo-Saxon turn-taking, yielding and holding strategies. It tackled the most pertinent issues related cross-cultural turn taking. However, the second chapter spotlighted the difference between TV talk shows in Arabic and Western world. It provided an over-view for talk shows, its generalities, characteristics of talk shows conversations, and other communicational components of talk shows. Additionally, it highlighted the crucial differences in talk-shows turn-taking systems in both Arab and Western talk.

Correspondingly, the third chapter reported the practical aspect of the study. It comprised three sections. The first section was entitled 'methodology' and it outlined the nature of the study along with the procedures followed to gather data. The second section provided a detailed analysis of the data collected. Lastly, the third section reported the results obtained through interpretations with a brief reference to the findings obtained from similar studies.

The findings showed that turn-taking strategies used in Arab's and Anglo-Saxon's talk widely differ in terms of turn-taking, yielding and holding. It agreed with the findings of previous studies on turn-taking across cultures, more precisely; study of Richards and Schmidt(1983) Murata (1994), Brown (2013), and Martinez (2013). The scores obtained from analyzing both shows spontaneous conversations indicated the strong effect of target culture

on turn-taking, yielding and holding, in addition to their identifiers; overlaps, back-channels, adjacency pairs, turn-selection, and turn-grabbing. Based on these findings, the research hypothesis is confirmed.

The findings reported are significant as they contribute to the field of language learning in general, and conversation analysis studies in particular. Therefore, they added to the body of research over the investigation of turn-taking strategies in talk shows conversations. In this vein, further research is encouraged to explore more about turn-taking across-cultures in spontaneous talk and approach its investigation from different angles.

References

- Almakrob, A.Y., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2020). Culture-Specific Aspects of Turn-taking: An Analysis of Conversations in a Saudi Context. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 50.
- Al- Shetawi, M. (1987). The Arab-West Conflict as Represented in Arabic Drama. *World Literature Today*, 61(1), 46-49.
- Bakeman, R., & Gnisci, A. (2005). Sequential observational methods. In M. Eid & E. Diener (Eds.). *Handbook of multi method measurement in psychology (Chap. 6)*. Washington, DC: APA. Retrieved March 4, 2014 from ejpe-xxiii-1-quat: EJPE-XXI-modelo.qxd 15-01-2008 13:07 Page71
- Brown, G, J.(2013). Resources for turn competition in overlapping talk. *Speech communication*,55 (5, 721)-743.
- Condon, S. L. (2001). Discourse of revisited: Default organization in verbal interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(4), 491-513.
- Duncan, S. (1972) Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 23: 283-292.
- Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor?. *Language in society*, 10(3), 383-421. Endrass, B., André, E., Huang, L., & Gratch, J. (2010). A data-driven approach to model Culture-specific Communication Management Styles for Virtual Agents. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems: volume 1-Volume 1* (pp. 99-108).
- Ferrara, K. (1992). The interactive achievement of a sentence: Joint productions in therapeutic discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 15(2), 207-228.
- Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom code switching research. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 12(2), 231-241.

- Gardner, R., Mushin, I., & Fitzgerald, R. (2009). The underlying orderliness in turn-taking: *Australian Journal of communication*, 36(3), 65.
- Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in Society*, 5, 257-313.
- Goldberg, J. A. (1990). Interrupting the discourse on interruptions: An analysis in terms of relationally neutral, power-and rapport-oriented acts. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(6), 883- 903.
- Haarman, L. (2001). Performing talk. In *Television talk shows* (pp. 39-78). Routledge.
- Harris, Z. S. (1951). *Methods in structural linguistics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis*. Polity.
- Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation analysis and institutional talk. *Handbook of language and social interaction*, 103, 47.
- Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2011). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions* (Vol. 44). John Wiley & Sons.
- Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(2), 209-254.
- Ilie, C. (2006). Talk Shows. *Encyclopedia of Language and linguistics*, 12, 489-94.
- Jefferson, G. (1984) .On stepwise transition from talk about a trouble to inappropriately next-positioned matters. *Structures of social action .Studies in conversation analysis*, 19, 222.
- Karetzky, S. (1989). *The Media's coverage of the Arab-Israel Conflict*. Sure Sellers Incorporated.
- Laruen, J. & Trognon, A. (1993). Organization of turn-taking and mechanisms for turn-taking. Li, H. Z(2001). Cooperative and intrusive interruptions in inter-and intracultural dyadic

- Liddoccat, A. J. (2007) .An Introduction to Conversation Analysis Continuun.*The TowerBuilding. New York . discourse. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 20(3), 259-284.*
- Malandro, L. A., Barker, L. L., & Barker, D. A. (1989).*Nonverbal communication*. MA: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Martinez, E. R. (2003). Accomplishing closing in talk show interviews: A comparison with news interviews. *Discourse Studies, 5(3), 283-302.*
- Martinez, C. B. (2018). Cross-cultural analysis of turn-taking practices in English and Spanish conversations. *Vernacular: New Connections in Language, Lterature, & Culture, 3(1), 5.*
- Murcia, M. C., &Olshtain, E. (2000).*Discourse and context in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murata, K. (1994). Intrusive or co-operative?A cross-cultural study of interruption.*Journal of pragmatics, 21 (4), 385-400.*
- Nugroho, A. (2014). A study of turn-taking used in interview TV program “Indonesia Now Exclusive Anges Monica with Dalton Tanonaka” on Metro TV. *Language Horizon, 2 (2).*
- Nuolijarvi, P., &Tiittula, L. (2011). Irony in political television debates. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43(2), 572-587.*
- O'Connell, D. C., Kowal, S., & Kaltenbacher, E. (1990). Turn-taking: A critical analysis of the research tradition. *Journal of psycholinguistic research, 19(6), 345-373.*
- Penz, H. (1996). Language and control in American TV talk shows: *An analysisof linguistic Strategies* (Vol. 12). Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Perakyla, A. (2007). Conversation analysis. *The Blachwell Encyclopedia of sociology.*
- Psathas, G. (1995). Talk and social structure and studies of work.*Human studies, 18(2-3),*

139-155.

Richards J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (1983). *Conversation Analysis*. In J. C Richards & R. W.

Sacks, H., (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation.

In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7-55). Academic Press.

Schegloff, E.A, Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-selection in the

Organization of repairs conversation . *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.

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

Language in society, 29(1), 1-63.

Sidnell, J. (Ed). (2009). *Conversation analysis : Comparative perspectives* (Vol. 27).

Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization

of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.

Scannell, P. (Ed.) . (1991). *Broadcast talk* (Vol.5). sage.

Schmitt, N. (2013). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Shriberg, E. (2005). Spontaneous speech: How people really talk and why engineers should

care. In *Ninth European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology*.

Stenstrom, A. B. (1994). *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London and New York:

Longman.

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., ...&

Levinson, S. C. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in

conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26), 10587-10592.

Shuy, R. W. (1982). Topics as the unit of analysis in a criminal law case. *Analyzing discourse:*

Text and talk, 113-126.

Schleifer, S. A. (2001). Looks are deceiving: Arab talk shows and TV journalism.

Transnational Broadcasting Studies, 6.

Sakr, N. (2007). *Arab television today*, IB Tauris.

Taboada, M. (2006). Spontaneous and non-spontaneous turn-taking. *Pragmatics*, 16(2/3), 334.

Tolson, A. (1991). Televised chat and synthetic personality. *Broadcast talk*, 178-200.

Tolson, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Television talk shows: Discourse, performance, spectacle*.
Routledge..

Ward, N. G., & Al Bayyari, Y. (2010). American and Arabic turn-taking cue. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 41(2), 270-275.

Ward, N. G., & Al Bayyari, Y. (2010). American and Arab perceptions of an Arabic turn-taking cue. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 41(2), 270-275.

Williamson, G. (2009). "Conversation". Internet. <http://www.speech-therapy-information-and-resources.com/conversation.htm>

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

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Appendix A

Arab Talk Show Conversations

The video link: (<https://www.Youtube.com/SayaShow>)

Turn-Taking strategies	Types
Taking the turn	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Hand raisingNoddingUsing uptakesMeta-comments
Turn-Yielding	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Giving-upAsking questions (Wh questions, Yes/No questions, Tag questions)Using comments
Turn-Holding	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Lexical repetitionVerbal filtersSilent pauses
Turn-Grabbing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Interruptions
Turn-Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Current speaker select next speaker otherSelf-selection

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Overlaps	Speaking simultaneously. Partial overlaps.
Back-channels	Verbal signals by using words like: surely, right, yes, ok, let's start. Non-verbal signals like: gestures of moving the head or the hand. Verbal Filters (Ahah, Aham ...)
Silence	Rarely occurred

Table 02

Taking the Turn Strategy in Arab's Talk

Turn-Taking Strategies	Class	Sub-class	
Taking the Turn Strategy	Starting-up	Clean Start	Host (A): Every day we go across faulty news about corona virus...you may fall sick in this way or that way ...
		Hesitant Start	Host A: We are still connecting with you Dr ...but AAA let us

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

			see the shape of this virus and why it is calls like this...
Taking-over	Uptake		The guest : certainly, antibiotics kills the bacteria ,but Corona is a virus that has no cure until now .
	Link		Host B: I feel sorry for animals...they have been distributed ...this is not fair.
Interrupting	Alerts		_____
	Meta-Comments		Host(B): In which side should we use it Dr, please ? Host A: Okey , why don't we let the doctor ask us her questions...

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Table 03

Yielding the Turn Strategy in The Arab's Talk

Turn-yielding Strategies	Class	Samples
Yielding the Turn	Prompting	Host (2): Good morning... Guest: Good morning...
	Appealing	Host (1): You mean I can go to china now, even if they call the great China wall on my name, right? Host(2): Yes, certainly .
	Giving up	Host (A): So Doctor, I am lost in this huge amount of information...

Table 04

Turn-Holding Strategies Used in the Arabic Talk Show

	Sub-class	Utterances
Turn-Holding Strategy	Verbal Filters	Host(A): Aaa...ok Host(A): Emm Host(B): that isAaa..beneficial for us.

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

	Lexical	Host(A): Today, we will discuss some
	Repetition	issues, there are... there are...
	Silent pauses	Guest: Well,:::

Table 05

Turn Grabbing Strategy Used the Arabic Talk Show

Participant	Turn- Grabbing Number	Utterances
Host(A) with Host(B)	3 times	<p>Guest:... Will you travel or not?</p> <p>Host (B): No, I will travel..</p> <p>It is normal.</p> <p>Host (A): For me, It depends on the direction.</p>
Host(A) with the Guest	_____	_____
Host(B) with the Guest	2 times	<p>Host (A): Is it true that there are some scientists that found cure for Coronavirus?</p> <p>Host (B): I think....</p> <p>Guest: I will answer..Aaa...they are working on it.</p>

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Table 06

Overlaps Used in Arab's Talk Show

Overlaps	Number of Overlap	Types	Utterances
Host(A) with Host(B)		Partial Overlaps	Host (B): ...this is the suitable mask that protects us from Corona. Guest: protects us from Corona.
Host(A) with the Guest	One time	Full Overlaps	Host (A): Why do not we let the doctor asks us? Guest: Yeah, I will ask you if you want.
Host(B) with guest	Three times		
The three participants	One time		Guest:...wash your hands like this. Host (B): wow! I did not use to know it. Host (A): these steps are for cleaning fingers, right?

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Table 07

Back-channel Utterances Used in Arab's Talk Show

Participants	Number of Back-Channels	Sample
Host(A)	25	Uhum Let us start (لا بد) Yes(معند) Ok(بييط)
Host(B)	18	Right(حص) Ahah Defenetely(لاعف) Yes(اويا)
Guest	10	Yes(معند) Ok Yes(هيا)

Table 08

Adjacency Pairs Used in the Arabic Talkshow

Adjacency pairs	Sample
Greeting-Greeting	Host(B): (برايك حابصدي لدعسيدي) Good mornin). Guest : (رونلا حابصدي) Good morning.
Invitation-	Host (A): Alright, why do not we let the doctor asks us some

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Acceptance	questions ? Guest: Ok, I will ask you if you want.
Question-Response	Guest: Will the Coronavirus transmit if we make shopping from China? Host (A): I guess yes..., it could be transmitted.
Thanks-Response	Host (B): Thanks for correcting all the faulty information that were in our minds ,Dr.Yomna. Thank you, have a nice day.(تيفاء فلا كيطعي) (ديعد كمويو) Guest: Most welcome.(ي لملست)

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Appendix B

Anglo-Saxon's Talk Show Conversation

The video link: (<http://bit.ly/1BxNiLl>)

Table 09

Frequency of Turn-taking strategies in the Anglo-Saxon's Talk

Turn-taking Strategies	types
Taking the Turn	Nodding. Eye gaze. Interruption. Pitch sound. Asking questions. Hand raising.
Turn-Yielding	Prompting. Appealing. Turn-selection. WH. questions , Tag questions , Yes-no questions.
Turn-Holding	Filled pauses (Verbal filters). Lexical repetition.
Turn-Grabbing	Turn-stealing. Interruption.

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

	<p>Overlaps.</p> <p>Raising intonation.</p>
Overlaps	Complete overlaps.
Back-channels	<p>Nodding</p> <p>Verbal signals (yes, exactly, yeah...).</p> <p>Verbal Filters (Ahum, Ahah).</p> <p>Repeating the last words of the current speaker (you know..., so...).</p> <p>Using gestures: trying to explain by moving hands, agreement by moving head.</p>

Table 10

Taking the Turn Strategy in Anglo-Saxon's Talk Show

Turn-Taking Strategies	Class	Sub- class	Sample
Taking the Turn strategy	Starting-up	Clean Start	Host(A): ...well-comeback, overnight the government has fast fresh allegation withholding information about the Coronavirus...
		Hesitant Start	Host (A): we are

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

			joining to answer those questions Mr. prime minister...good morning Mr. .prime minister.
	Taking over	Up-take	Guest: this is a very important question. And that is why a lot of debates have being...
		Link	Host (A): that is still too not fast enough.
	interrupting	Alerts	
		Meta-comments	Host (A): well, this is your putting out at the moment. It is very simple.

Table 11

Turn Yielding Strategy Used in the British Talk Show

The turn taking strategy	Class	Sample
	Prompting	Host(A): Good morning,

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Turn Yielding strategy		prime minister Boris Johnson, thanks for coming today. Guest: Good morning.
	Appealing	Host (A): Is the delay aamm essentially is trying to spread this out? So that it does not all happen as one. Guest: it is a very... very important question..
	Giving-up	Host (B):::we are arrived to know if it has broken new areas.

Table 12

Turn-holdingStrategy Used in the Anglo-Saxon' Talk Show

Turn taking strategies	Sub-class	Sample
Turn-holding	Verbal filters	Host (A): Emm, are you withholding information? Guest: No, not at all...let me...let me explain that top immediately, because it is Aaa very important issue...

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

		<p>Guest: But, Aaa washing hands is the most effective thing...</p> <p>Host (A): And other...other emm topics, people think that you put yourself into self-isolation.</p>
	<p>Lexical repetition</p>	<p>Host (A): Is it...is it...better if we all have all the information in a straight way?</p> <p>Host (B): I just...I just worry, because we know..</p> <p>Guest: We want...we want communicate...over communicate with the public about what is happening...</p>
	<p>Silent pauses</p>	<p>Guest...We are still at the stage [...] where the best thing we can do ,and will be like that for a long time is to wash your hands.</p> <p>Host (A): I want to know at what point I have to tell my</p>

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

		mom actionally [...] it is a good idea to stay at home.
--	--	---

Table 13

Turn Grabbing Strategy in the British Talk Show

Participants	Turn-grabbing number	Sample
Host(A) with host(B)	0	_____
Host(A) with the guest	16 times	Host (A): I want to know at what point do I have to tell my mom actionlly, my good idea is to stay home. Guest: yes, on the specific incident where individuals get it...
Host(B) with the guest	5 times	Host (B): ...How they can find beds and staffs to cope with what we potentially see... Guest... Of course, great increase number of nurses.

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Table 14

Overlaps in the British Talk show

Overlaps	Number of overlaps	Types	Sample
Host(A)with Host(B)	2	Partial overlaps	Guest: ...we do not think of the moment that schools will be closed unless of course there is an incidence in the school. Host (B): in the school.
Host(A) with Guest	7		
Host(B) with the Guest	4		
		Full overlaps	Guest: We are not stupid, we can handle the truth. Guest: No, absolutely.
The three participants	1		

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Table 15

Back-Channels Utterances Used in the British Talk Show

Participants	Number of back-channels	Sample
Host(A)	09	<p>Guest: I think... It would be better if we take all the hole information in a straight way ...</p> <p>Host (A): (nodes his head).</p>
Host(B)	12	<p>Guest: they all meet together for an hour...</p> <p>Host (B): Aham..</p>
Guest	04	<p>Host (A): people thought you putted yourself into self-isolation.</p> <p>Guest: yeah...</p>

CROSS CULTURAL TURN TAKING STRATEGIES

Table 16

Adjacency Pairs Used in the British Talk Show

Adjacency Pairs	Sample
Greeting-greeting	Host (A): Good morning, prime minister. Guest: Good morning, good morning.
Invitation-acceptance	_____
Question-response	Host (A): are you with holding information? Guest: No, not at all, let me clear that...
Thanks-response	Host (A): thanks for coming today. Guest: most welcome.
congratulation	Host(B): congratulations, honestly I mean with ... Guest: thank you very much. Host (A): congratulations.

Résumé

L'étude vise à mettre en lumière l'un des principaux problèmes auxquels les locuteurs sont confrontés dans les conversations interculturelles. Il tente d'explorer la différence entre les stratégies de tour de rôle, de cession et de maintien des locuteurs arabes et anglo-saxons. Pour atteindre cet objectif, deux conversations matinales ont été sélectionnées, à savoir «Sabah El-KheirYa Arab» et «This Morning». L'analyse de conversation a été choisie pour mener à bien cette recherche. Les scripts des talk-shows ont été analysés pour identifier l'utilisation de stratégies de prise de tour (c.-à-d., Prise de tour, rendement de tour et tenue de tour) et leurs identificateurs (c.-à-d. Chevauchements, canaux arrière et paires de contiguïté). Les résultats indiquent que les locuteurs arabes et anglo-saxons utilisent des stratégies de tour de rôle, de cession et de maintien avec des interprétations différentes (par exemple, les anglo-saxons considèrent l'interruption comme un signe d'opposition. Cependant, les locuteurs arabes coopèrent entre eux par l'interruption). Les données suggèrent qu'il existe des problèmes liés aux stratégies conversationnelles de prise de virage, sous forme de chevauchements, de silences, de nombre de pauses (c.-à-d., une mauvaise compréhension des identifiants de prise de virage interculturel pourrait conduire à des interprétations erronées parmi les locuteurs). Cela montre également que les locuteurs britanniques ont tendance à contrôler la parole, quelle que soit la position de l'orateur suivant. D'un autre côté, les arabophones ont tendance à valoriser les stratégies de tour de rôle par rapport à leur culture.

ملخص

تهدف الدراسة إلى إلقاء الضوء على إحدى المشكلات الرئيسية التي يواجهها المتحدثون في المحادثات بين الثقافات. يحاول استكشاف الاختلاف بين استراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار والعائد والإمساك للمتحدثين العرب والأنجلو ساكسونيين. ولتحقيق هذا الهدف تم اختيار برنامجين حواريين صباحيين هما "صباح الخير عرب" و "هذا الصباح". تم اختيار تحليل المحادثة لإجراء هذا البحث. تم تحليل نصوص البرامج الحوارية لتحديد استخدام استراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار (أي ، تبادل الأدوار ، وإعطاء الدور ، وإمساك الأدوار) ومعرفاتها (مثل التداخلات ، والقنوات الخلفية ، والأزواج المتجاورة). تشير النتائج إلى أن المتحدثين العرب والأنجلو ساكسونيين يستخدمون استراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار ، والعطاء ، والاحتفاظ بتفسيرات مختلفة (على سبيل المثال ، يعتبر المتحدثون الأنجلو ساكسونيون المقاطعة علامة معارضة. ومع ذلك ، يتعاون المتحدثون العرب مع بعضهم البعض من خلال المقاطعة). تشير البيانات إلى أن هناك بعض المشكلات المتعلقة باستراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار في المحادثة ، في أشكال التداخل ، والصمت ، وعدد مرات التوقف (أي أن سوء فهم معرفات تبادل الأدوار بين الثقافات قد يؤدي إلى تفسيرات خاطئة بين المتحدثين). كما يوضح أيضاً أن المتحدثين البريطانيين لديهم ميل للتحكم في الأرضية ، بغض النظر عن موضع المتحدث التالي. من ناحية أخرى ، يميل المتحدثون العرب إلى تقدير استراتيجيات تبادل الأدوار فيما يتعلق بثقافتهم.