A SOCIOLINGUISTICS STUDY OF TURN TAKING AND POWER DYNAMICS IN PAKISTANI POLITICAL TALK SHOW

Khansa Ramzan
MPhil scholar, NUML Faisalabad
Email: Khansaramzan222@gmail.com
Prof. Dr Aftab Akram
Lecturer, Department of English, NUML Faisalabad
Email: aakram@numl.edu.pk

ABSTRACT
This research examines the way individuals in Pakistani political discussion shows exhibit and exercise power in language. It is concerned with the manner in which speakers take turns to speak and how these occurrences illustrate resistance, exercise, or domination. The Conversation Analysis (CA) by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), which outlines conversation structure, forms the basis of this research. Iqrar-ul-Hassan hosted and Syed Zeeshan was the guest on an episode of Public Demand that gave the figures. In order to observe how pauses, overlaps, and interruptions were used to control the flow of talk, their conversation was carefully recorded and analyzed. What the findings show is the host often used his authority to control the course of discussion and the visitor protested by interrupting and overlapping.
Key words: Turn talking-power dynamics, conversation analysis, political talk show, Interactional control.

Introduction

Conversation captures the way that people are related to one another, communicate information, and exert control. Conversation is more than simply a speech exchange. The process of turn-taking when speaking is necessary to sustain the form of a conversation. There are, however, moments when taking turns is well beyond simply preserving order, as in political debate, and becomes instead an effort to win control and power. Pakistani political discussion programs, in which hosts and guests are perpetually struggling to be heard, are a classic instance of this struggle. These discussion shows regularly experience encounters that transcend plain discussion. In attempting to dominate the conversation or the attention of the audience, participants participate in verbal jousting whereby they interrupt, overlap, and question each other. To control the talk, the host usually has institutional power and employs time management or questioning. The guest, often a journalist or politician, tries to disrupt that power by steering the discussion off course, defending themselves, or cutting in. Language is employed constantly to negotiate power through this give-and-take dialogue. Turn-taking in Pakistani political talk shows is the focus of this investigation. It draws on the Conversation Analysis (CA) framework developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974).

Iqrar-ul-Hassan, who was a guest, and Syed Zeeshan, who was the host of the talk show Public Demand, contributed data for this research. This study aims to explore how both individuals strategically employ language to counter each other, convey authority, and influence the audience by studying their interactions. The research seeks to further understanding of the use of language as a power weapon in Pakistani media through the verification that even each word, pause, and interruption carries meaning beyond the glaring.

Research Questions:

JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265

JOURNAL OF APPLIED
LINGUISTICS AND
TESOL

Vol.8. No.4.2025

1. What role do overlaps and interruptions play in building resistance and authority?
2. How should the talks between anchor and politician in Pakistani talk show be represented in turn talking behavior?
3. In these exchanges, which language traits indicate dominance and power?

Research Objectives:
1. To investigate how turn-taking systems work in political discussion programs in Pakistan.
2. To examine how power relations show through language used during turn taking.
3. To investigate how anchors support or challenge political control in conversation.

Significance of Study:
The present study determines the sociolinguistic norms that govern spoken discourse by examining turn taking, interruption, and overlapping structure in a Pakistani political talk show. Through Syed Zeeshan and Iqrar-ul-Hassan's argument through the implementation of the Sacks and Jefferson (1974) model in a local context. Finally, this study is significant as it. Overall, this study is significant because it enlightens us as to how language structure enables social roles, authority, and control over interaction, thereby allowing us to understand better, how conversations function in public and media communication.

Research Gap:
Speakers frequently employ overlaps, interruptions, and rapid exchanges on Pakistani political discussion programs, which hinders effective taking of turns. The separation between the host who is the institutional controller and the guest who is the ideological respondent often removed by these patterns of conversation. Although such types of interaction are prevalent in media discourse, there has been minimal research addressing how turn-taking processes themselves constitute and produce power relations in this environment. Therefore, in Pakistani political talk shows, this study explores how patterns of turn-taking—more particularly, interruptions, overlaps, and self-selections—act as tools of interactional control and power negotiation between guests and hosts.

Literature Review:
Taking Turns in Conversation Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) published the original model of turn taking, arguing that speaker choice and places of transition relevance (TRPs) controlled by conversational implicit norms. These standards promote cooperation and order within conversation. However, these standards are often modified to accommodate the goals of institutional settings, like press interviews and politics (Hutch by, 1996).

Power can be easily expressed and exercised through language. Social structures of dominance both shape and shaped by discourse, as noted by Fairclough (1989). Conversational turn taking comes to be taken as a marker of legitimacy and authority in political discourse. Dominant speakers use topic control, extended turns, and interruptions to assert influence (Lakoff, 1990; Tannen, 1994).Watching Political Discussion and the Media Based on media discourse research (Great batch, 1988; Clayman & Heritage, 2002), interviewers and journalists often use turn allocation and question design to challenge or support participants. Pakistani political shows, as per Mehmood (2019) and Rehman (2021), involve high interruption, overlap talk, and emotional tone in South Asian contexts. In the end, this research advances our knowledge of how language and discourse both reflect and perpetuate gender dynamics and cultural attitudes. It enhances media literacy, promotes gender equality, and enables effective communication methods. According to Sacks (1974), does conversation analysis have something to do with the way in which people take turns talking to one another? The assumption of the conversation is that

a single person talks at once, after which another speaker might be offered their turn. He continued by stating that a talk show is a form of television programming where one individual investigates numerous issues that are raised by a political broadcaster. Hence, in making effective streams of discussion, participants should know how to start talking and when not to speak in a bid to offer ideas through methodical and comprehensive exchange of ideas. In addition, he pointed out that a talk show is television programming whereby an individual explores various issues that have been shown by a political journalist. Participants in a discussion need to hence learn how to start a conversation and when to keep quiet in order to display their concepts in an organized and comprehensive flow of ideas. To show cooperation in the participating in talk shows, some characteristics of the conversation are necessary, including allocating turn-taking time, interrupting with too many questions, and overlapping both males and females. When conducting interactions in talk shows, male and female politicians' speech patterns and linguistic markers can be helpful in showing who controls the discourse (Sacks, 1974).Khan et al. (2019) have explored applying functional analysis of interruptions to manage agenda-setting in political discussion television shows in Pakistan. They concluded that issues are manipulated via interactive control of talk. They also stated that the aim of such television shows is to discuss and gain knowledge about the sides of legislative matters that are being covered by different news channels. People have thus normally promoted a comic way of talking in well-balanced discussions, and "News Interviews (more commonly referred to in Pakistan as political talk shows)" involve spirited discussion, permitting participants to convey conflict, adversity, and competition by means of interruption (Khan et.al, 2019)This research starts an in-depth examination of the intricate nature of taking turns in a conversation.

Methodology

This research applies Conversation Analysis (CA), a qualitative method, to the analysis of real spoken data. The data was obtained from Public Demand, a Pakistani political talk show that had Iqrar-ul-Hassan as guest and Syed Zeeshan as host. Purposive sampling was employed for the selection of the episode since it offers many instances of interruptions, overlaps, and turn-taking— factors all of which are critical to our research. A simple form of Jefferson's transcription technique was applied to record the conversation by hand, noting every emphasis, pause, and overlap. The transcript was then reviewed attentively:

1. Turn Construction Units (TCUs) were employed to segment the talk into pieces of workable size so that sepal.
2. All interruptions, overlaps, and self-selections identified.
3. The reason for interpreting each case was to assess in what way speakers used language to claim, sustain, or resist control of the conversation.

3.1. Research Design: As the aim of this research is to understand how language utilized to speak and negotiate power in real-life interactions, a qualitative research design utilized. This research design is more interested in the meaning and interaction of words that speaks rather than with figures or statistics. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) developed the Conversation Analysis (CA) framework, which acts as the basis of this research. This technique helps to analyze how individuals interrupt or overlap while talking, exchange turns, and show resistance, authority, or control. Descriptive and interpretive components are included in the design. It describes what occurs during a discussion and describes why it happens. Individuals often compete for floor space on political discussion shows, at times graciously and at other times pugnaciously. It describes the

things that happen during a conversation and the reasons behind them. On political talk shows, speakers usually compete for the floor, sometimes politely and other times aggressively.

Research Method: The main qualitative research technique employed within this study is Conversation Analysis (CA). Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) developed Conversation Analysis, which is concerned with the complex organization of naturally occurring spoken interaction. It examines how individuals respond to one another in real time, take turns, deal with overlaps, and interrupt. Since it explores how power and control negotiated by discourse in Pakistani political media, this method is appropriate for application to the present study. The data was from Public Demand, a political talk show in Pakistan hosted by Syed Zeeshan and featuring guests Iqrar-ul-Hassan. Purposive sampling employed to select this episode because it contains several examples of turn negotiation, overlaps, and interruptions—entities that are all extremely important elements of CA-based analysis. To capture pauses, overlaps, tension, and stress, the video was hand transcribed using condensed Jefferson transcription conventions. To preserve the organic tone and rhythm of the conversation, the transcription remained in both Roman Urdu and English. After transcribing, the data, analyzed using several CA steps:

1. Segmentation: In order to decide where speakers may switch turns, the conversation divided into Turn Construction Units (TCUs).

2. Identification: Self-selections, overlaps, and interruptions recorded.

3. Interpretation: Each case examined to see how it was indicative of resistance, control, or interactional power.

Sampling and Data Collection: Data collected from publically available on YouTube channel Urdu point hosted on official channel on Urdu point. The selected show were downloaded transcribed manually using Jefferson`s transcription convention (simplified where appropriate for readability) each transcription include feature such as pauses , overlaps, turn taking, intensions, and self-repairs turn talking

Theoretical Framework: The theoretical models of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) Conversation Analysis (CA) and Fairclough's (1989) Power in Discourse conceptualization are the building blocks for this research. A systematic model for explaining how participants in a conversation allocate speaking turns, organize speaking turns, and resolve interruptions or overlapping speech is offered by the Turn-Taking Model in Conversation Analysis. The Turn-Taking Model developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson in 1974 forms the basis of this research and explains how individuals exchange speaking turns in informal conversations. The model shows that conversation follows social conventions; generally, one individual speaks at a time, with others waiting for the right moment to respond. Transition Relevance Places (TRPs) is the name given to these natural positions. These rules are often violated, however, in actual day-to-day conversations like political debate shows. It is conceivable that speakers may begin speaking without any invitation, interrupt one another, or talk simultaneously. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) Conversation Analysis (CA) turn-taking model applied in this research. Pursuant to their theory, conversation adheres to a structured format: At any point in time, there is only one speaker in command. Limited simultaneous speech used for speaker transitions. The present speaker has the authority to name the next speaker. Participants are free to take the floor on their own if there is no designated speaker. Local, sequential procedures used to organize speaker transitions. Power assertion tries or struggles for conversational ascendancy sometimes signaled by transgressions of these rules, like simultaneous talk and interruption (Schegloff, 2000)**.**

Sociolinguistic analysis of the development by interactional authority, dominance, and opposition in spoken communication, facilitated by this theory paradigm.

Data Analysis

The Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) Conversation Analysis (CA) framework for studying how individuals manage conversational turns was applied to analyze the data. Since the objective was to study how both speakers utilized pauses, overlaps, and interruptions in order to claim or maintain control, an episode of Public Demand featuring Syed Zeeshan and Iqrar-ul-Hassan selected to analyze. To signal disagreement or reclaim space in the conversation, the guest repeatedly interrupted the host, who often employed questions and shifts in topic to steer the conversation. These patterns of turn-taking illustrated how language is employed to build and negotiate power; they were not random. The research revealed that when speakers strategically use speech to convey or oppose dominance, control of conversation is constantly shifting.

The transcript data using two interrelated frameworks:

Turn-taking (sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974)

1. Identified how speaking turns allocated and managed.
2. Noted overlaps, interruptions, caps, and topic shifts.
3. Analyzed how speakers repair turn or construct dialogue.

Identity construction (Bocholt& Hall, 2005)

1. How speaker position themselves(e.g., as victims, professionals, learners, identified, relational identities through alignment, distancing, face work
2. Considered use of humor, narrative, stance, or affect to perform identity.

Transcription Example: For example, in one episode, the host Syed Zeeshan discusses Altaf Hussain's party. He talks about how Hussain led an entire movement while staying in the background. Iqrar-ul-Hassan responds, "No, no, I'm not talking about a monitor." Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) developed the Conversation Analysis (CA) notions, employed to conduct the analysis. Speakers through this approach primarily concern organic conversation with the planning and management of turns. The structure of talk presumed, based on a system of Turn Construction Units (TCUs) and Transition Relevance Places (TRPs), through which speakers can enter or exit a conversation. Here, self-selections, overlaps, and interruptions all become powerful tools that reveal social dominance and interactional control. All the conversations in the selected Public Demand episode with Syed Zeeshan and Iqrar-ul-Hassan transcribed and examined one at a time. Some cases of interruption and overlap, identified in the analysis, where there were attempts by both participants to hold on to or regain control of the speaking, floor.CA asserts these turns reflect a struggle for dominance in interaction and constitute rivalry for the speaking turn. Iqrar suddenly interrupts the host, Zeeshan, when he equates his new political party with Altaf Hussain's party, stating, "nahi nahi, main monitor ki baat nahi kar raha." Iqrar tries to reassert interpretive control and correct the host's framing of his words in this case by self-selection and sudden interruption. Based on Sacks et al.'s proposed model, this interruption demonstrates how a participant can assert self-autonomy and contest a dominant narrative with turn-taking mechanisms. Similarly, the host has repeated efforts to get back to his subject illustrate institutional power; as a host, he is entitled to socially sanctioned control over turns and steer the conversation. Iqrar's repetition of overlapping and re-entry into the talk, however, challenges that hierarchy and illustrates how interactional power is not static but fluid. Turn taking, illustrated to be social conduct as well as linguistic rhythm through CA-based analysis. The overlaps and

interruptions in this political discussion show are not conversational breakdowns, but instead are strategic maneuvers to exert authority, influence perception, and build meaning. The presence of speaker's Control of the conversation exhibited by their ability to take, hold, or yield the floor. This directly corresponds with the concept advanced by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) that language is an organized system of social control.

There is little overlap in the conversation, indicating that etiquette and conversational order being followed. Iqrar's constant denial demonstrates resistance and an attempt to regain his turn, while the anchor's persistence ("So you mean you will…") demonstrates an attempt to control the conversation. Iqrar clarifies misunderstandings and regains control of the conversation by repeating, "No, no," as a repair initiate. In order to preserve the subtleties of oral communication, such as hesitancies and interruptions during turn-taking, transcription accuracy given top importance.

"Turn-taking between speakers facilitates the speakers to transition smoothly from one role to another and achieve an ordered exchange of conversation. Occasionally, though, the order is disrupted by overlaps or interruptions that expose places of tension, enthusiasm, or competition for the floor."

(Naz, Farukh & Arslan, 2024, Contemporary Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, p. 46)

"To aap keh rahe hain ke aap universities mein ja kar tehreek chalayenge?" is another instance of the host uttering this. & Iqrar crops up again in "nahi nahi, aap abhi bhi monitor wali baat pe hain." Application for CA: This duplication is an instance of "simultaneous talk at TRP or pre-TRP position," according to CA. It indicates that the guest is trying to interrupt the host's topic control and redirect the conversation. These overlaps, which are a clear sign of interactional resistance, often occur when a participant comes in to prevent unwanted framing while waiting for another to complete their TCU, Sacks et al. say. Both players use the following CA-defined strategies in the course of the interaction: Attempts to control or oppose evidenced by interruptions. Conflict and competitiveness evidenced by overlaps.

"Interruptions and overlaps in television conversation tend to indicate a continuous struggle for control of interpretation, demonstrating the way participants employ language to exert, confront, and reconstitute power in institutional contexts."

(Ishfaq et al., 2025, Journal of Applied Linguistics & TESOL, p. 45)

Turn Taking Analysis: Data used in the checking part on the air interview under Guest Iqrar ul Hassan and Syed Zeeshan. The topic discussed here is Iqrar-ul-Hassan's proposal for the establishment of a "Fikri Tehreek" (intellectual movement) and his position toward political participation. The dialogue exhibits several instances of turn overlaps, interruptions, and self-selected entries and hence is a good example of sociolinguistic turn-taking behavior.

From Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), conversational structure is one-speaker-at-a-time, coordinated by turn-construction units (TCUs) and transition relevance places (TRPs). Both speakers in this conversation sometimes break these rules — not haphazardly, however, but as strategic actions in order to hold, claim, or resist the conversation floor.

Turn Allocation Structure: Turn allocation in informal conversations may be self-selected or speaker-selected. Throughout this interview: A Conversation Analysis Perspective on Turn-Taking, Overlapping, and Control of Conversations 1. Overlaps and Coordination of Competitive Floors In this data, overlapping speech—where two speakers talk simultaneously—indicates

competitive and strategic interaction rather than being an accidental occurrence. In the following example:

Zeeshan, the host: "To aap keh rahe hain ke aap universities mein jaa kar aik tehreek banayenge?"

Iqrar responded, "Nahi Nahi, aap abhi bhi monitor wali baat par hain, main aisa nahi keh raha."

Iqrar's "Nahi Nahi" initiates the overlap before the host finishes. This overlap is a competitive effort to take control of the floor of conversation instead of a cooperative one. Iqrar re-achieves topical and interactional control by interrupting to challenge the host's wording. Jefferson (1984) knows this overlap as a "butting-in" overlap, whereby the new speaker rewords or reformulates the ongoing talk without providing a transition-relevance place (TRP). 2. Interruptions as Repair and Control of Conversational Topics There are two reasons for interrupting this discussion: Initiating the repair process to remove misunderstandings regaining right to speak through exercise of turn control Iqrar is discussing Altaf Hussain's style of leadership while the host continues to interrupt him. The host's effort to maintain topical control—a usual feature of institutional talk revealed in these interruptions. Consequently, Iqrar frequently employs interruptions that initiate repairs, such as "Nahi Nahi, main monitor ki baat nahi kar raha". Iqrar interrupts in order not to have his previous words misinterpreted, rather than to exercise power. This is a case of self-initiated, other-completed repair within conversation analysis: Iqrar initiates the repair, and the host ultimately allows him to complete it.2. Turn Transition and Response

After Zeeshan's statement, Iqrar-ul-Hassan takes the next turn.

His response, "No, no, I'm not talking about a monitor," performs disagreement and clarification. This transition happens smoothly, showing that both speakers follow the basic rules of turn-taking (as per Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974).

Feature: There is no overlap; the next speaker starts immediately after the other stops. This shows that there was a Transition Relevance Place (TRP), or in other words, it is a natural turning point. 3. Clarification and Repair The sequence Repetition of "No, no" by Iqrar is a repair initiator. He promptly corrected the host, saying, "I'm not on about the monitor," when he noticed that the host misunderstood him and assumed he was referring to a "monitor." This self-repair shows an attempt towards coherence and conversation management. Repair processes are for continuing mutual understanding and preventing communication breakdown. Pursuit of Topics and Repetition "So you mean you will go to universities and tell people to start a movement?" the anchor asks, furthering the misconception even after Iqrar has explained. Here, the anchor has used pursuit of topics to keep the conversation in his control in order to negate the claim of the guest. It shows characteristics of institutional conversation where the interviewer asks for an elaboration or a reaction. Interactional Power: The anchor maintains control by quickly regaining the floor and reframing the question.5. Reassertion and Competition Iqrar begins again with "No, no" using the same strategy. This repetition reflects resistance as he seeks to recapture interpretive control over his own words and rejects the anchor's framing. "You are still stuck on the monitor thing" states his perspective while identifying the misunderstanding. Meaning: The conversation reveals competitive turn-taking, where both speakers attempt to influence the course of the conversation and its meaning. 6. Interactional Style and Conversational Dynamics The sequence typifies the supportive yet competitive discourse that characterizes media interviews. Teaming up of the host's insistent questions and the visitor's insistent denials creates a repair-challenge-repair cycle. The

rhythm of "No, no," "So you mean," and "No, no" shows speedy turn exchanges coupled with calculated pauses aimed at keeping the conversation interesting. 5. Reassertion and Competition Iqrar begins again with "No, no" using the same strategy. This repetition reflects resistance as he seeks to recapture interpretive control over his own words and rejects the anchor's framing. "You are still stuck on the monitor thing" states his perspective while identifying the misunderstanding. Meaning: The conversation reveals competitive turn-taking, where both speakers attempt to influence the course of the conversation and its meaning. 6. Interactional Style and Conversational Dynamics The sequence typifies the supportive yet competitive discourse that characterizes media interviews. Teaming up of the host's insistent questions and the visitor's insistent denials creates a repair-challenge-repair cycle. The rhythm of "No, no," "So you mean," and "No, no" shows speedy turn exchanges coupled with calculated pauses aimed at keeping the conversation interesting.

Conclusion

The aim of the study was to examine how turn-taking processes applied in Pakistani political TV programmers to build, undermine, and reallocate power. Based on Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's (1974) Conversation Analysis theory, this study examined the way conversational features such as interruptions, simultaneous talk, corrections, and independent floor claims indicate how the participants constantly negotiate power, particularly between moderator Syed Zeeshan and guest speaker Iqrar-ul-Hassan. The data analysis revealed that Pakistani talk shows are informative platforms; they are competition forums in language terms where turn taking is a fundamental means of expression, credibility construction, and authority establishment. Through repeated interruptions, overlaps, and self-repairs, the guest actively challenges the host's institutional control, even as the host initiates topics and assigns turns. These actions give the visitor the opportunity to rephrase inquiries, support their position, and change the direction of the interaction. In order to assert, defend, or regain the conversational floor, both speakers use strategic speech behaviors during turn taking, which functions as a linguistic site of struggle. This underlines the arguments put forward by Sacks and colleagues that local coordination is responsible for talk and that dominance varies in accordance with floor control and maintenance at specific moments. In addition, the study reveals that discursive power is a fluid feature of interaction rather than an inherent characteristic. Although the guest's language agency permits resistance, reinterpretation, and the periodic diversion of the talk path, the moderator's institutional power enables him to take the initiative and steer the discussion. The "collaborative nature of conversational structure" where disagreement or interruption even takes place within a shared appreciation of conversational structure, better demonstrated by this meeting, say Sacks and colleagues. Sociolinguistic ally speaking, Zeeshan and Iqrar's talk acquires perfectly the mixed character of Pakistani communication: aggressive and cooperative, competitive and socially monitored. Rather than signaling disorder or rudeness, simultaneous speaking and interruption are recurring in South Asian discourse traditions, where linguistic simultaneity and continued active participation signal interest and involvement. Therefore, turn taking is linguistically and culturally significant in Pakistani broadcasting, according to patterns of communication in broader society. Findings also lend support to the concept that power relations articulated in multifaceted yet quantifiable means during turn-taking processes. Each player's choice to keep, relinquish, or take the floor is a self-positioning example, a mechanism to signal opposition, authority, or competence. "So you mean you will go to universities and start a movement?" is one of the moderator's frequently deployed question forms, which have as their goal to create a specific interpretation.

Conversely, Iqrar exhibits self-advocacy and resistance in conversation through repeated corrections ("No, you are still on the monitor thing"). Turn taking becomes a verbal expression of social conflict, where dominance and relevance are negotiated turn after turn. Theoretically applying the Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson method sheds light on how ordinary conversational rules work in institutional discourse, such as broadcasting discussions. He study found that rather than being merely rude or chaotic, disruptions in this context indicate interactional resources. Their message is one of involvement, conflict, and a desire to control interpretation. In order to show both contestation and engagement, overlaps usually occur as cooperative or conflicting attempts to enter the conversation. A participant's desire to maintain their self-image and exercise interpretive authority highlighted in repair sequences, as evidenced by Iqrar-ul-Hassan has repeated "Nahi Nahi." Collectively, these traits show that language is a site of power performance, where authority is implement.

Future Recommendations

A short but useful glimpse at how individuals exercise power through language in Pakistani political talk shows is given by this research. However, there is still much to learn. In the future, researchers can study a wider range of talk shows on different television channels to identify if similar patterns of turn taking and power exist in other shows. How male and female hosts or guests demonstrate control or politeness while engaging in conversations using interruptions, overlaps, and tone would also be interesting to compare. Conversation Analysis (CA) can be used in combination with another technique, like Politeness or Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), in future work theory to understand why certain patterns of power and respect develop in conversations, besides how turns are allocated. Future studies could analyze a number of Public Demand episodes or programs across time to assess how communication styles are affected by political or social changes, as only one episode was analyzed in this study. Lastly, it would be interesting to see how audiences perceive dominance and interruptions, if they understand them as indicators of authority, rudeness, or confidence. This can go some way towards the understanding of how media discourse impacts public opinion and public perception of authority in Pakistan. In conclusion, further research into how language expresses and constitutes identity, respect, and power, especially in public and media interactions where each word and interruption carries weight, should be conducted.

REFERENCES

Shams, M., Shams, S. A., & Khan, U. (2021). Conversational dominance in mix gendered Pakistani political TV talk shows. Global Social Sciences Review, VI(II), 406–417. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(vi-ii).40.

Yahya, U. (2022b). The gendering of women in the discourse of politics: A case of political talk shows in Pakistan. Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 6(II). https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2022(6-ii)33.

Sexism and misogyny in Pakistan TV talk shows. (2020, April 27). Global Voices. https://globalvoices.org/2020/03/10/sexism-and-misogyny-in-pakistan-tv-talk-shows/?

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of Turn-Taking for conversation. Language, 50(4), 696. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Manning, R. D. (1991). Class, Ethnicity, and Social Inequality.Chrisopher McAll. American Journal of Sociology, 97(2), 562–564. https://doi.org/10.1086/229803

Accounts of Conduct in Interaction: Interruption, overlap and turn-taking (2002) – ISCA. (n.d.). https://www.conversationanalysis.org/schegloff-media-archive/2002-accounts-of-conduct-in-interaction-interruption-overlap-and-turn-taking/

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language in Society, 29(1), 1–63. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500001019

Ani, I. L., Damayanti, I., & Sabarudin, S. (2024). Interruption in turn taking irregularities at speaking for conversation class. Journal of English Education and Teaching, 8(2), 400–413. https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.8.2.400-413

Tymbay, A. (2022). Effectiveness of interruptions as a communicative strategy in the 2020 Presidential Debates in the USA. *Brno Studies in English*, *2*, 101–118. https://doi.org/10.5817/bse2022-2-5

Lestary, A., Krismanti, N., & Hermaniar, Y. (2018b). Interruptions and Silences in Conversations: A Turn-Taking analysis. PAROLE Journal of Linguistics and Education, 7(2), 64. https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v7i2.64

Lestary, A., Krismanti, N., & Hermaniar, Y. (2018b). Interruptions and Silences in Conversations: A Turn-Taking analysis. PAROLE Journal of Linguistics and Education, 7(2), 64. https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v7i2.64

Beattie, G. W. (1982b). Turn-taking and interruption in political interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan compared and contrasted. *Semiotica*, *39*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.198

Beattie, G. W. (1982b). Turn-taking and interruption in political interviews: Margaret Thatcher and Jim Callaghan compared and contrasted. Semiotica, 39(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1982.39.1-2.93

Tabassum, A. (2023). Turn Taking Strategies and Gender: a conversational analysis of Pakistani Politicians in TV shows. PAKISTAN LANGUAGES AND HUMANITIES REVIEW, 7(I). https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2023(7-i)36

Sari, C. C. (2020). CONVERSATION ANALYSIS: TURN-TAKING MECHANISM AND POWER RELATION IJ CLASSROOM SETTING. Celtic a Journal of Culture English Language Teaching Literature and Linguistics, 7(2), 118–136.

Saadah, H., Setyaningrum, E. Y., & Daulay, I. K. (2024b). Conversational Discourse Analysis Turn- taking on an English podcast. English Education Journal of English Teaching and Research, 9(2), 133–139. https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v9i2.21896

Purwanti, E., Cahyani, A. P. R., Meisa, W., Suryadi, D., Sari, M. I., & Pasandalan, S. N. (2025). Turn-Taking strategies in talk show interviews: A qualitative study of K-Pop idol BTS on the Tonight Show. Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies, 12(1), 29–46. https://doi.org/10.26555/adjes.v12i1.1330.

Shi, B. (2023). Literature Review of Turn-Taking. Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies, 2(1), 22–30. https://doi.org/10.56397/jlcs.2023.03.04

Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010b). Talk in action. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318135

Noval, A. Y., Athallah, A. T., & Pujiati, H. (2022). Conversation Analysis: Turn-Taking Analysis in Variety's Actors on Actors Conversation Video featuring Zendaya and Andrew Garfield. Stairs English Language Education Journal, 3(2), 114–122. https://doi.org/10.21009/stairs.3.2.5

Syafar, D. N., Putri, D. M., & Autila, R. (2023). TURN TAKING STRATEGIES IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION. TELL-US JOURNAL, 9(2), 364–375. https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2023.v9i2.6882

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., De Ruiter, J. P., Yoon, K., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106(26), 10587–10592. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0903616106