

**T.C.**  
**SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ**  
**SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ**  
**YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI**  
**İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ BİLİM DALI**

**A COMPARATIVE AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF  
CONVERSATION ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND TURKISH LANGUAGES  
AND ITS EFFECTS ON TURKISH STUDENTS LEARNING ENGLISH**

**Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ**

**YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ**

**Danışman**  
**Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdülhamit ÇAKIR**

**Konya-2010**

Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ	A Comparative and Contrastive Analysis of the Results of Conversation Analysis of English And Turkish Languages and Its Effects on Turkish Students Learning English	Yüksek Lisans Tezi	2010
----------------------	--	-----------------------	------

**T.C.**  
**SELÇUK UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**A COMPARATIVE AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF  
CONVERSATION ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND TURKISH LANGUAGES  
AND ITS EFFECTS ON TURKISH STUDENTS LEARNING ENGLISH**

**Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ**

**MASTER OF ARTS THESIS**

**Supervisor**  
**Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdülhamit ÇAKIR**

**Konya-2010**

Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ	A Comparative and Contrastive Analysis of the Results of Conversation Analysis of English And Turkish Languages and Its Effects on Turkish Students Learning English	Master of Arts Thesis	2010
----------------------	--	--------------------------	------

## CONTENTS

<b>CONTENS</b> .....	i
<b>BİLİMSEL ETİK SAYFASI</b> .....	v
<b>YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ KABUL FORMU</b> .....	vi
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	vii
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	viii
<b>SUMMARY</b> .....	ix

### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	3
1.3 Aim of the study.....	4
1.4 Research question.....	5
1.5 Statement of the hypothesis.....	5
1.6 Method, scope and limitations of the study.....	6

### CHAPTER II

#### CONVERSATION

2.1 What is conversation?.....	8
2.1.1 Participants give each other room to talk (turn-taking).....	11
2.1.1.1 Turns.....	11
2.1.1.2 Assent terms & adjacency pairs.....	13
2.1.1.3 Overlaps.....	15
2.1.1.4 What happens throughout a turn.....	17
2.1.2 Throughout a conversation.....	19
2.1.3 Cohesion and coherence.....	23
2.1.3.1 Discourse markers and interactional signals.....	26
2.1.3.2 Adjacency pairs.....	26
2.1.4 Conversational principles: Co-operation.....	33

2.1.4.1 The maxim of quality.....	34
2.1.4.2 The maxim of quantity.....	35
2.1.4.3 The maxim of relevance.....	35
2.1.4.4 The maxim of manner.....	37
2.1.4.5 Flouting maxims.....	37
2.1.4.6 Conversational principles: Politeness.....	39
2.1.4.7 The social basis of conversational principles.....	40

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS**

3.1 Conversational analysis and discourse analysis a comparative and contrastive point of view.....	42
3.2 Conversational analysis.....	43
3.2.1 Historical development.....	45
3.2.2 Some basic principles of doing conversational analysis.....	45
3.2.3 Conversation and speech acts.....	48
3.2.4 The characteristics of daily conversations.....	50
3.2.5 Throughout a conversation.....	55
3.2.5.1 The organization of conversation.....	56
3.2.5.1.1 Turn taking system.....	56
3.2.5.1.2 Transition relevant places.....	59
3.2.5.2 The meaning of conversation.....	60
3.2.5.2.1 Pre-sequences.....	60
3.2.5.2.2 Insertion sequences.....	64
3.2.5.2.3 Repairs.....	66
3.2.5.2.4 Preference.....	68
3.2.5.3 Form and content.....	72
3.2.5.3.1 Cohesion and coherence.....	73
3.2.5.3.2 Adjacency pairs and content.....	76
3.2.5.3.3 Types and coherence.....	78
3.2.5.3.4 Conversation and speech acts.....	82

3.2.6 Elements structuring a conversation.....	84
3.2.6.1. Face-to-face conversation.....	85
3.2.7 Conversational strategies.....	86
3.2.7.1 Opening a conversation.....	88
3.2.7.1.1 A formal conversation.....	88
3.2.7.1.2 An informal conversation.....	89
3.2.7.2 Phatic communication.....	89
3.2.7.3 Dealing with topics.....	91
3.2.7.4 Closing a conversation.....	97
3.2.7.4.1 A formal conversation.....	97
3.2.7.4.2 An informal conversation.....	98

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **THE ANALYSES OF SOME DAILY CONVERSATIONS**

4.1 Snippets about analyses.....	99
4.2 The analysis of a Turkish face-to-face conversation Nr.1.....	100
4.2.1 The explanation of the conversation.....	102
4.3 The analysis of a Turkish face-to-face conversation Nr.2.....	103
4.3.1 The explanation of the conversation.....	110
4.4 The analysis of a Turkish face-to-face conversation Nr.3a.....	112
4.4.1 The explanation of the conversation.....	116
4.5 The analysis of a Turkish face-to-face conversation Nr.3b.....	117
4.5.1 The explanation of the conversation.....	120
4.6 The analysis of an English face-to-face conversation Nr.4.....	121
4.6.1 The explanation of the conversation.....	123

## **CHAPTER V**

### **NOTES FROM ANALYSES**

5.1 Why do we analyse?.....	124
5.2 The similarities and differences of the spoken language of Turkish and English.....	126

**CHAPTER VI****CONCLUSION**

6.1 Summary of the study..... 138

6.2 Notes to language teachers..... 140

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**.....141

**ÖZGEÇMİŞ**.....145



	T.C. SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü	
---	--	---

### BİLİMSEL ETİK SAYFASI

Bu tezin proje safhasından sonuçlanmasına kadarki bütün süreçlerde bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara özenle riayet edildiğini, tez içindeki bütün bilgilerin etik davranış ve akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde edilerek sunulduğunu, ayrıca tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanan bu çalışmada başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda bilimsel kurallara uygun olarak atıf yapıldığını bildiririm.

Öğrencinin Adı Soyadı  
(İmza)

	<p>T.C. SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü</p>	
---	---	---

### YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ KABUL FORMU

..... tarafından hazırlanan .....  
başlıklı bu çalışma ...../...../..... tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda  
oybirliği/oyçokluğu ile başarılı bulunarak, jürimiz tarafından yüksek lisans tezi olarak  
kabul edilmiştir.

Ünvanı, Adı Soyadı	Danışman ve Üyeler	İmza

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Abdülhamit ÇAKIR for his peerless courtesy, guidance, constructive comments, supportive approach and almost never ending patience throughout this study.

I would also like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt thanks to my mother Rana BİLGİÇ, my father Mehmet Celalettin BİLGİÇ for their wondrous, heart-warming support and morale each time I gave up. I am also thankful to my sister Hivda Nur BİLGİÇ for her unique existence and my prospective wife Didem ÇITAK for everything she has done for the completion of my thesis.

Last but not least, my thanks should also go to my sister Yeşim DİLEK, who has been always so generous at helping me and sharing her rich experiences every time I need.

	T.C. SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü	
---	--	---

Öğrencinin	Adı Soyadı	Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ	Numarası 074218021004
	Ana Bilim / Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı	
	Danışmanı	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdülhamit ÇAKIR	
Tezin Adı		A Comparative and Contrastive Analysis of Results of Conversation Analysis of English and Turkish Languages and Its Effects on Turkish Students Learning English	

### ÖZET

Bu çalışmada konuşma analizinin bulgularını uygulayarak gündelik konuşmalar bakımından Türkçe ve İngilizce dilleri arasında fark ve benzerlikleri ortaya çıkarmaya ve İngilizce eğitimi alan Türk öğrenciler üzerinde farklılıklardan oluşan etkileri en aza indirip benzerliklerin olumlu etkilerini ise en üst düzeye çıkarmaya çalıştık. Bu iki dili anadili olarak konuşan konuşmacıların gündelik konuşmalardaki davranışları arasındaki fark ve benzerliklerin farkında olmak Türk öğrencilerine hedef dil olan İngilizce’de daha başarılı bir şekilde iletişim kurabilmelerine olanak sağlayacağını kanıtlamaya çalıştık.

Çalışmamızda, birinci bölüm çalışmanın geri kalanı için genel bir bakış teşkil etmektedir. İkinci bölüm sözlü etkileşimin ne olduğunu anlatmakta ve karşılıklı konuşma hakkında teorik bilgi sunmaktadır. Üçüncü bölüm, çalışmanın uygulama kısmının temelini oluşturan ‘Konuşma Analizi’ hakkında teorik bilgi vermektedir. Dördüncü kısımda üç adet Türkçe doğal konuşma kaydı ve bir adet İngilizce konuşma detaylı olarak analiz edilmiştir. Bir önceki bölümde yapılan analizlere dayanarak Türkçe ve İngilizce dillerinin günlük konuşma davranışları arasındaki farkları ve benzerlikleri anlatmakta olan beşinci bölüm çalışmanın ana temasını oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmanın son bölümü yani altıncı bölüm çalışma adına bir sonuç bölümü sunmakta ve tüm çalışmayı kısaca özetlemektedir.

	T.C. SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü	
---	--	---

Öğrencinin	Adı Soyadı	Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ	Numarası 074218021004
	Ana Bilim / Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı	
	Danışmanı	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdülhamit ÇAKIR	
Tezin İngilizce Adı		A Comparative and Contrastive Analysis of Results of Conversation Analysis of English and Turkish Languages and Its Effects on Turkish Students Learning English	

### SUMMARY

In this study we have tried to elicitate the differences and similarities between Turkish and English languages in terms of daily conversations by applying the findings of conversation analysis and minimize the effects caused by the differences and maximize the positive effects of the similarities upon Turkish students learning English. We have argued that being aware of the differences and similarities of the daily conversational behaviours of the native speakers of these two languages would enable Turkish students to take part in communicative situations in the target language, English, more successfully.

In our study, Chapter I constituted a general overview to the rest of the study. Chapter II presented what is typical of spoken interaction and theoretical information about conversation. Chapter III presented theoretical information about ‘Conversational Analysis’, which constitutes the main core of the applicational part of the study. We analyzed three naturally recorded Turkish conversations and one English conversation in detail in Chapter IV. Chapter V constituted the main theme of the study; that is, the differences and similarities of the daily conversational behaviours between Turkish and English languages based on the analyses made in the previous chapter. The last chapter of this study, Chapter VI, presented a conclusion part and summarized the whole study.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

The answer for the question “What is discourse?” can be given as “anything” including a simple sound that can be made within the process of conversation or a novel as a whole.

People do not always communicate between each other making use of complete sentences or utterances. Moreover, people do not also make use of grammatically well-formed sentences when they are involved within a communicative process. Then what enables people to succeed in understanding each other is something more than simple sentences or utterances. Although being able to aware where a sentence ends and what makes a sentence grammatically well-formed are important, one can not claim that they are enough for a successful communication. A successful communication process requires the acquired knowledge of conversational principles that are instinctively followed by everyone who takes place within a conversational process. Although there are some different approaches to the study of conversation, one can mention about two main categories which are discourse analysis and conversation analysis.

The definition of discourse analysis includes a variety of approaches for analyzing written, spoken or signed language use. On the other hand, conversation analysis can be, most basically, defined as the study of talk in interaction.

In this study, conversation analysis will be our main focus. Firstly, some basic features of spoken interaction will be examined. Secondly, conversations in English and Turkish languages will be examined in accordance with the features of spoken interaction and finally, the effects of the differences and similarities between the

conversational analyses of these two languages upon the Turkish students learning English will be argued.

The word “Table” can be used as a very suitable metaphor to define the language especially in language learning process. Each language has four main legs by means of which it is standing. They are listening, reading (receptive skills), speaking and writing (productive skills). Although, it can not be claimed that reading and writing skills are unimportant, for a successful use of a language for communicative purposes one needs to improve his/her listening and speaking skills firstly. So far we know much more about the rules and principles that govern the written language than about those governing the spoken language. But we use the spoken language to interact with each other, and generally to a much greater extent than we use the written language, so it is highly important that we know how spoken interaction is structurally and strategically organized.

The attention that should be paid to the spoken interaction gains more importance in language teaching classes. The main purpose of learning a language is to be able to take part in communicative situations in the target language successfully. Therefore, all the problems that may hinder the process of language learning in a communicative way should be observed and removed. The main problem in being able to communicate successfully in the target language may be caused by the cultural and structural differences in the rules of conversation, or both the language learners and teachers may make use of the similarities between conversational rules of their mother tongue(s) and the target language in the language learning process. So that a comparative conversational analyses of the mother tongue and the target language would be helpful for being able to communicate successfully in the target language.

## 1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Why Turkish students are not able to use English communicatively? What is the main source of misunderstandings and misinterpretations that occur while taking part in a communicative process in the target language? How can the problems that occur by the differences in the conversational principles of English and Turkish languages be overcome and the similarities made use of in the English Language Teaching (ELT) classes?

Misunderstandings and misinterpretations commonly occur also between the speakers who are sharing the same cultural background. For a smooth and successful conversation both the sender and the receiver have to cooperate in interactive, discourse organization and communicative levels. This means that they are expected to follow the rules such as turn-taking, listen the one who holds the floor at the time of speech and make the correct interpretations from what is being told in order not to cause misunderstandings.

The problems caused by the cultural differences in communication can be accepted as normal to a degree. However, a problem is a problem when it occurs and breaks the communication within a conversation. In order to get rid of the problems caused by the cultural differences the conversational principles in two different cultures should be studied. By means of such kind of a study the differences that break the success of the conversational interaction can be revealed and also changed into an advantage as there may also be some similarities. This fact increases the importance of the application of the findings of conversation analysis in the language learning classes both for the mother tongue and the target language. Because, the main reason of the misunderstandings or misinterpretations in conversational interactions is that people do not know interactional structure, the rules of interactional strategies and they do not use them in their daily lives and this is a wider case when one of the participants of a conversation is speaking the language that is



used in that conversation as a foreign language as there will be a cultural gap between the native speaker and himself/herself.

### **1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY**

The aim of our study is to show how different types of spoken interaction are structurally, strategically organized in English and Turkish languages and find out the differences and similarities and their reasons in order to make the language (English) learning process of Turkish students easier and make language learners take part in conversational situations successfully. We will try to achieve this aim through the conversational analyses of some spoken interactions in English and Turkish languages.

The main aim of learning a language is, of course, to be able to communicate through it. Therefore, teachers of English focus on the success of the communicative process of their students. The findings of this study is expected to be helpful both for the teachers and the learners of English in Turkey. If the problems that are breaking the communication within a conversation are found out and removed this will help the students to apply the findings of this study outside the classroom, in other words, in their daily lives.

If the participants of a conversation are aware of the features of the conversation that they are involved then there will be less misunderstandings and misinterpretations as they will be able to know when to stay silent or take the floor and what to do throughout the spoken interaction. The application of conversational analysis becomes necessary in order to supply unproblematic conversational situations for Turkish students when they are interacting native speakers of English through English language itself.

#### **1.4 RESEARCH QUESTION**

This study is aiming to find answers to the following questions:

- What is conversational analysis?
- How the findings of conversational analysis differ in English and Turkish languages?
- How can the teachers and Turkish students of English make use of the similarities of the rules that are subconsciously followed by the native speakers in daily conversations in English and Turkish?
- What can be done to overcome the differences in the conversational rules of English and Turkish?
- In what ways the findings of conversational analysis can be used in language learning process effectively both by the teachers and the students?

#### **1.5 STATEMENT OF THE HYPOTHESIS**

Conversational analysis is a field of study that tries to decode the rules and the principles of daily conversations within a certain language. These rules and principles are not followed consciously but almost instinctively by the native speakers of that language.

In this study it is hypothesized that the rules of daily spoken interactions in different languages differ in some certain points. These differences may be caused by the cultural unlikeness of the speakers of these languages or the structural formations of the languages that have been descending for hundreds of years. The differences in the rules of daily conversations in two languages naturally affect the succes of the

foreign language learners in their attempts to take part in communicational situations. A comprehensive contrastive analysis of the native and the target language will be helpful both for the learners and the teachers to overcome the difficulties caused by the differences of the rules in daily speech and also to make use of the similarities.

## **1.6 METHOD, SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

A conversation is a process in which at least two participants are involved. Throughout a conversational process there occurs a talk-exchange among the participants. Therefore, a spoken interaction is also named as a talk-exchange as it is constituted of participants holding the floor in turns. The term talk-exchange includes any spoken interaction in which there exist at least two participants such as arguments, interviews, conversations, instructions and so on. However, sentence frames that are produced by a single sender are called as discourse (i.e. letters, jokes, stories, lectures etc.) as there is no receiver while the message is being produced. In this study, we will analyze talk-exchanges.

When a child is talking to his/her mother or when an accountant is talking to his/her boss these talks are accepted as spoken interactions. A spoken interaction may occur in many different social surroundings and these surroundings are effective in the development and process of the interaction. In other words, The context of interaction has a vital role in determining the kind of spoken interaction.

In this study only the conversations in English and Turkish languages will be analyzed. On the other hand, the recorded Turkish texts are limited with the people whose conversations can be legally recorded by the researcher without permission. The conversations that will be analyzed are only face-to-face conversations.

In our study, we are going to mention general features of spoken interaction with the help of different examples firstly. Later on, we are going to make comparative analyses in English and Turkish languages in order to find out the

differences and similarities between the conversational structures of these two languages. Lastly, we are going to argue the ways of how to remove the difficulties caused by the differences in conversational structures between the two languages in English language teaching and learning processes for teachers and Turkish students and how can we make use of the similarities of these structures in language learning and teaching processes as teachers and students of English.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **CONVERSATION**

#### **2.1 WHAT IS CONVERSATION?**

We are so used to it, so close to it, that we may not appreciate it for what it is. The first, and obvious, thing to say about conversation is that it is a social activity. Apart from talking to yourself, or to animals, we engage in it with others. Much follows from this. To talk with others involves thinking about their feelings, thoughts and needs. If two or more people are to communicate, then they are expected to:

- Co-operate.
  
- Think about others' feelings and experiences.
  
- Give each other room to talk (Turn-taking).

In other words, conversation is a reciprocal process. Second, conversation involves people agreeing about the topic. There is usually a lot of activity centred on locating an agenda. We have all overheard, and taken part in talk where each person is intent on his or her topic irrespective of what others are saying. One person might be describing what they have just read in the paper; another talking of his or her feelings concerning a driving test. This is really two monologues - not dialogue.

Third, conversation involves an immediate response. There is not much of a time lag between the action of one person and the response of the other. A number of things flow from this. It means, for example, that what a participant utters may be less thought out. Linked to this is the need for each participant to be tolerant of what is said to them in the heat of the moment. The immediacy of talk also allows people to ask questions and to explore different angles. However, it can also mean those who fail to respond are viewed with suspicion.

Fourth, although conversation is all around us - it is a very sophisticated activity. One must have a well-developed feeling about what s/he can (or cannot) say and when s/he can (or cannot) speak. One must know how to use words to do things and also exactly what words s/he can use in certain circumstances. And one must be able to supplement and reinforce what s/he chooses to say with other appropriate behaviours: his/her movements, gestures, posture, gaze, and so on. One must also attune himself/herself to how others employ these same skills.

Reading a list like this brings home why things can often go awry - such as those embarrassing moments when we say 'the wrong thing'. It also enables us to see why so many people feel clumsy, or have difficulties, in this area. Significantly, many of these things are also culturally specific. What is right for one group, may be wrong for another. This means that conversations between people of different cultures require special care.

Fifth, conversation entails certain commitments. For it to work, we have to trust in the others involved. When they say they will do something, for example, then we tend to have to take it at face value. At a minimum we have to be open to the possible truth of their words. We may have doubts - but without a degree of trust or openness to the views of others, conversations (or social life) could not happen. Indeed, effective work must always be based upon participants believing in the truthfulness of the educator. Once that is called into question, and the trust is broken, there is the danger conversation will cease and informal educators will no longer be productive.

Sixth, talk involves the participants in interpretation - and in filling the gaps. To make sense of what others are saying the participants of a conversation often have to make leaps forward. The speakers cannot give the receivers all the information they need right at the start. They put their words in context, make assumptions, and add in material to give shape to what they are saying. For example, a person may start telling someone about the problems s/he is having with his/her neighbours over noise.

To make sense of his/her anger the listener has to add in various things, e.g. that his/her mother is very ill; that there is a history of tension in the street and so on. In other words, conversations often involve people drawing on a large amount of 'background knowledge'. If the participants do not have it then they have to make great leaps of imagination and hope that all will become clear as the sender speaks, or receivers ask questions.

Finally, we have to acknowledge that conversation is a complex and perplexing activity. It embodies rules and etiquette. It requires participants to possess skills that are improved with practice. Those who lack these can find themselves socially, even physically, isolated. Those who find it difficult to engage in conversation and dialogue inevitably have fewer chances to practice the art so tend to find themselves locked into a vicious circle. Many find conversation difficult to handle. We can talk about people who seem incapable of listening to others; some so self-obsessed they merely deliver a monologue to an unfortunate audience; others who ignore the verbal and visual clues that enable a conversation to flow; and some so competitive they turn each exchange into a battle of wills from which they must emerge victorious.

For a successful conversation, the participants must achieve a workable balance of contributions. A successful conversation includes mutually interesting connections between the speakers or things that the speakers know. For this to happen, those engaging in conversation must find a topic on which they both can relate to in some sense. Those engaging in conversation naturally tend to relate the other speaker's statements to themselves. They may insert aspects of their lives into their replies, to relate to the other person's opinions or points of conversation.

## **2.1.1 PARTICIPANTS GIVE EACH OTHER ROOM TO TALK (TURN-TAKING)**

Turn-taking is a vital principle within a conversational process. The one who holds the floor is determined by some certain rules.

### **2.1.1.1 TURNS**

As conversations need to be organized, there are rules or principles for establishing who talks and then who talks next. This process is called turn-taking. Turn-taking is a basic form of organization for conversation.

There are two guiding principles in conversations:

1. Only one person should talk at a time (Overlaps between turns have some particular or cultural significance: signalling annoyance, urgency, or a desire to correct what is being said).
2. We cannot have silence. (Pauses between turns also have some meanings).

The transition between one speaker and the next must be as smooth as possible and without a break.

Transfers from the current-speaker to next-speaker occur at transition-places, or, competition-places. Two types of turn-allocational techniques are:

- a) the current-speaker selects the next-speaker;
- b) the next turn is allocated by self-selection.



The current speaker may select the next speaker by foregrounding him or her. This can be done in a number of ways, including, by looking at that person, or by asking that person a question. Actually, if the current-speaker wishes to select the next-speaker, he or she must do so prior to the next transition-place, for an undesired potential speaker may self-select at that transition-place. Here is an extract that shows how the speaker chooses the next speaker at the end of her speech:

[1]

Catherine: What do you think about this subject, John?

John: If I were you...

A selected next-speaker has the right, and the obligation, to speak. However, if the current-speaker does not select a next-speaker, s/he can come to a transition-place and set the stage for competition between aspiring next-speakers. The first one to speak becomes the next current-speaker. If no one speaks, the current-speaker has the option of continuing. *Reaction-time latency* is the time intervening between a current-speaker's completion and a next-speaker's start. *Initiative-time latency* is the time intervening between a current-speaker's completion and the start of a follow-up utterance by the same speaker.

Although the significance of the approaching of the turn during a conversation process varies between cultures, situations and between languages We have different ways of indicating that a turn will be changed. However, there are some other factors that are not linguistic and that have roles in an efficient turn-taking.

- Eye contact

- Body position

While an English speaker is talking, his/her eyes are down for much of the time. While s/he is listening, his/her eyes are up for much of the time. For much of the time during a conversation, the eyes of the speaker and the listener do not meet. In English culture, when speakers are coming to the end of a turn, they might look up more frequently, finishing with a steady gaze. This is a sign to the listener that the turn is finishing and that he or she can then come in.

The instruction that some of us were given at school, "Look at me when you speak to me", is unsoundly based. In normal English conversations, a speaker does not look steadily at the listener but rather may give occasional quick glances.

Some people find it impossible to carry on a conversation with someone who is reading the newspaper. We need to be able to see where someone's eyes are directed to know whether we are being listened to.

In telephone conversations, where we cannot see eye gaze and watch for bodily movements we have to use other clues to establish whether the other person is listening to us.

- Intonation

- Volume

#### **2.1.1.2 ASSENT TERMS & ADJACENCY PAIRS**

In addition to the full transfer of speaker, there are numerous other types of verbal turn-taking in conversation. For example, there are assent terms (backchannels) and adjacency pairs.

Assent terms such as, 'Yes,' 'Okay,' 'Uh-huh,' 'Right' make it clear to the speaker that the listener has taken in and understood the previous message. They also serve to establish the listener's ongoing availability, and they commit him or her to

attend the speaker's next utterance. Assent terms are among the few items that can be spoken while another is speaking that are generally not heard as an interruption, although this depends on the speaker and the situation. The use of assent terms within a conversational process is named as backchanneling. One type of assent term is a ratifying repetition: Here the listener repeats one of the last words spoken by the current-speaker.

[2]

A: Beat cream cheese and 3/4 cup sugar with electric mixer on medium speed until well blended.

B: ... beat until well blended...

Assent term or backchannel realizations vary interestingly from culture to culture. Therefore, some terms that are used as assent terms in some languages may sound odd in English. As this may break the smoothness of the communication process, the cultural differences in the conversational flows in different languages must be decoded by the speakers.

Adjacency pairs are composed of any two types of utterance that are linked, either by logic or convention. Given the first element of an adjacency pair, the second is expected; upon its occurrence it can be seen to be a second item to the first; upon its nonoccurrence it can be seen to be absent. For example: If a question is asked, it should be answered. If someone in the audience is commanded, summoned, or invited by the speaker in any way, that person is expected to make an appropriate verbal response (unless it was understood to be a rhetorical question, that is, one that the speaker obviously desires no answer to). If the first part of a saying or a proverb is recited by a speaker, it may be appropriate for listeners to finish the statement. Deborah Tannen tells of conversationalists who routinely finish each other's sentences.

[3]

John Motson: Welcome to the match between M. United vs. Arsenal. I am

John Motson... ( a little pause)

Andy Gray: ... and I am Andy Gray.

[4]

A: You know what they say: Easy come...

B: ...easy go...

### 2.1.1.3 OVERLAPS

When two or more participants within a conversation try to take the floor at the same time this is named as overlap. Overlap is a feature of a normal conversational process and it may occur from a number of reasons such as:

- The desire to start a turn before another so as not to miss the opportunity.

[5]

Joe : When they were in

\*power las...\* wait CAN I FINISH?

Jerry : \*that's my point I said\*

(Yule, 1995, p. 74)

- The desire to make a particular contribution while it is relevant.

[6]

H : I think \*that\*

W : \*Do you want some more salad?\*

(Tannen, 1996, p. 59)

- Uncertainty as to whether the current speaker intends to continue.

[7]

Mr. Strait : Wha... \*Where do you...\* go head

Dave : \* I mean it's a... oh sorry\* I em...  
(Yule, 1995, p. 73)

- The desire to correct what is being said by the speaker.

[8]

A: The match will start at half-past-nine \*we've to be at home before  
it.\*

B: \*a quarter to ten.\*

- To signal annoyance or urgency.

[9]

Father : Your brother told me that you were not at the school yesterday  
\*and also you...\*

Girl : \*it's a lie!\*

[10]

A: Sorry! Do you know how can I get to the train station?

B: Sure! You must be a stranger ha... \*you seem really confused...  
(laughs)\*

A: \*yes, my train will leave in ten  
minutes should I take a taxi or walk?\*

- The expression of solidarity or closeness while expressing similar opinion  
etc.

[11]

Min : Did you see him in the video?

Wendy: Yeah... the part on the beach

Min : Oh my God, \*he was so sexy\*

Wendy: \*he was just being so cool\*

Min : And all the waves \*crashing around him!\*

Wendy:

\*yeah that was really wild!\*  
(Yule, 1995, p. 74)

Deborah Tannen has shown that there is much overlapping and simultaneous talk among certain Jewish groups; Roger Abrahams has shown the same among certain African and African-American groups. Indeed, in some of these cultures, individuals perceive the failure to overlap as lack of interest, or dullness. However, in mainstream Western culture, overlapping talk is generally seen as messy and unpleasant. An aspiring next-speaker must time his or her utterance to come just after the completion of the current-speaker's utterance, but before the utterances of fellow aspiring next-speakers. At these moments, instances of multiple-people-speaking-at-once are common but they are usually very brief, as the norm is for the first speaker to continue and for the others to drop out. The act of dropping out serves as a repair mechanism, that is, it fixes the situation that has momentarily 'gone awry.'

Researches have also revealed that women seem to overlap their conversations more, and are better able to hold simultaneous discussions with multiple other people than men. A potential reason for this is in the way that women can often multi-task better than men, who are better at single-focus activities. At this point, one can mention about three main categories of overlaps in accordance with their reasons within a conversation:

- Speech overlap
- National overlap
- Gender overlap

#### **2.1.1.4 WHAT HAPPENS THROUGHOUT A TURN?**

Throughout a spoken interaction the participants hold the floor in turns. This system is named as turn-taking system as it is detailly mentioned in the previous

topic. Most basically the turn-taking system works as one participant, A, talks, stops and the other participant, B, starts, talks and leaves the floor. As a result an A-B-A-B-A-B distribution of talk has been obtained.

When a speaker is holding the floor, in other words, in a turn whatever s/he utters may start another turn, may keep the conversation going or completely break it. By means of uttering something the speaker may make the receiver utter some other thing or remain in silence and terminate the conversation. For example, a question requires an answer under normal circumstances. On the other hand, every utterance made by the speaker means something in its particular context. The “intended meaning” of the sender should also be decoded by the receiver while the conversational process is taking part. So, it can be concluded that the turn is part of the structural organization of the conversation.

According to the researches, people have an instinctive ability to take the turns when they are involved in a conversational process. The time gap that occurs between one speaker leaves the floor and the other holds it is measured by microseconds. Another fact about the daily speech of human beings is that less than 5 per cent of the speech stream is delivered in overlap.

A conversation takes place between at least two speakers. These speakers take the turns throughout the spoken interaction with the help of some certain and not previously determined rules that are followed subconsciously by the participants. However, whether there are two or more participants within a spoken interaction process, all the participants take part in the conversation and hold the floor and leave it in a quite smooth way that this no one else is confused about when to speak or when to transfer the turn.

As we have mentioned before there are some certain rules in turn-taking system and there also exist some certain ways while a speaker is leaving the floor to another:

- The current speaker may select the next speaker by foregrounding him or her and the chosen next-speaker has the right and the obligation to take the turn.

- When the current speaker does not select a next-speaker s/he sets the stage or competition between the potential next-speakers when s/he comes to a transition-place. The first one to speak becomes the next current-speaker.

- If no one takes the turn the current-speaker has the option for continuing.

The time gaps that occur when transitions are realizing between the speakers are named as “reaction-time latency” which is described as the time gap that occurs during a current-speaker leaves the floor and the next speaker holds it. Initiative-time latency is the time intervening between a current speaker’s completion and re-start as no other next-speaker takes the turn.

### **2.1.2 THROUGHOUT A CONVERSATION**

Any type of spoken interaction between two or more participants can be described as “conversation”. Throughout each conversation there exists at least a message that is intended to be conveyed from the sender to the receiver and it is the message in most cases that makes the conversation takes place. When people are making a conversation they do not tend to give the main message of their conversation just at the beginning of the process. Firstly, they tend to use some terms that are expected to help them to begin the oral interaction. These terms that are used for beginning a conversational process are named as “openings”. After using an opening the speaker decides in accordance with the answer of the receiver whether to go on to give the message or not. Another point in conversation is that the process does not end just when the message has been sent to the receiver successfully. In order to complete a successful conversational process the participants use some terms which are known as “closings”. To sum up we can say that there are three main parts within conversations:



- Opening

- Message

- Closing

[12]

A: Excuse me, please. Could you tell me where the South Street is?

B: Take the second on the left and then ask again.

A: Is it far?

B: No, it's only about five minutes' walk.

A: Many thanks.

B: Not at all.

(Ockenden, 1987, p. 2)

In the short extract above we can see that even within such a short spoken interaction there exists an opening (Excuse me, please). The answer of the opening speech of the participant A seems a non-verbal one. An approving look or mime may lead the participant A give the message of the conversation. The message (asking for the address and telling the way that the participant A should follow) has been given in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th lines. The conversation does not end when A receives the answer s/he needs, instead, s/he uses a closing term (many thanks) to end the conversation just like B (not at all).

A spoken interaction that takes place between two or more participants almost always carries a message; however, there is no obligation that only one topic should be talked about as a message throughout a conversation. In some cases, a topic that is intended to be talked about may lead to other topics or subtopics. Moving from one topic to a completely different one is named as topic-drift. In the extract below the topic of the conversation moves from losing the luggage at an airport to skiing, to weight-watching and exercise, to meal-times at hotels and these moves occur within a very short space of time.

[13]

A: ... no bother to me, 'cos I happened to have in my side pack a spare vest and \*socks you see.

B: \*Ah, I see, that was in your hand baggage.\*  
\*was it?\*

A: \*And I got my toilet equipment with me.

B: Yeah it's a good idea to take a few basic things in te hand baggage, isn't it, \*I think in the case of that.

A: \*Yeah, well it's usually the things you require first, you see, sometimes you don't have time to unpack all your luggage when you arrive.

B: Still, pretty horrendous, though.

A: Oh, it was very unsettling, ...still, so many other unsettling factors I didn't know whether I was on my head or on my heels that day.

B: Mm...

C: D'you do a lot of skiing then?

A: I go each year, yes... it's my only chance of getting my weight down, you see, and it isn't the exercise that does it, it's the fact that the meals are so far apart.

C: (laughs)

D: Yeah?

A: Yes, I'm not joking... if we eat say, right, breakfast eight, lunch one, evening meal six, perhaps a snack after that then \*you're eating four times a day, but

C: \*You'd never get no skiing would you?

A: Well, in these places, you breakfast at eight, well, half past eight, ... (etc.)

(Aydın Aydın, 2005, p. 44)

Although the topics of the conversation in the extract above seem to be completely irrelevant with each other, it can be said that they are all the subtopics of the main topic which is A's holiday. All the other topics (losing the luggage at an airport to skiing, weight-watching and exercise, meal-times at hotels) that are discussed or talked about throughout the conversation among three people (A, B and C) constitute the subtopics the main topic.

When we are taking part in a conversation we tend to use some signals in order to sign that we will begin a conversation, go on the same topic, change the topic of the conversation or end it. The signs that are used for these purposes are generally framed within a standard. Some examples of these signs are:

**Openings:**

- Good morning.
- Excuse me...
- Have you heard...
- What a lovely day!
- Hello!
- Can I help you?
- Guess what...
- Do you know...?
- Sorry to disturb you...
- Look!
- Can you spare a minute?

**Ongoing checks:**

Made by the speaker:

- Can you understand me?
- I mean...
- In other words...
- Do I make myself clear?
- Are you listening?
- The point I want to focus...
- Do you know what happened next?

Made by the listener:

- That means...
- Let's make it clear...
- Mhm...
- Have I got you right?

**Changing topic:**

Introducing a new topic:

- By the way...
- Speaking of her...
- On the other hand...
- That reminds me...

Concluding topic:

- We'll see.
- So it goes.
- That's what I want to say.
- Life goes on.
- This talk never ends.
- That's life.
- That's what I mean.

**Ending**

- Oh, time is late!
- I've to go now
- It was nice talking with you.
- Let's back to work.
- We'll talk about it later.
- Maybe we can get together sometime
- It's been a pleasure

**2.1.3 COHESION AND COHERENCE**

Throughout a conversation there may exist so many topic-drifts; however, the conversation is still hangs together. The answer to the question that how can a

conversational process is still meaningful although there are so many changes in the topic or even when the participants do not know each other closely is cohesion and coherence in the spoken interaction.

The term cohesion is basically defined as the grammatical and lexical relationship within a text or sentence. Cohesion can be defined as the links that hold a text together and give it meaning. Therefore a metaphor “glue” can be used for cohesion as it holds sentences of a spoken or written text together. However, this linking together realizes only in the grammatical level.

Coherence is what makes a text, whether spoken or written, semantically meaningful. Coherence is achieved through syntactical features such as the use of deictic, anaphoric and cataphoric elements or a logical tense structure, as well as presuppositions and implications connected to general world knowledge. Robert De Beaugrande and Wolfgang U. Dressler define coherence as a “continuity of senses” and “the mutual access and relevance within a configuration of concepts and relations”.

The existence of cohesive links within a conversation does not mean that the conversation is meaningful, or the absence of cohesive links, also, does not mean that the conversation is not meaningful. Then, what makes a conversation meaningful is the harmony between the intended meanings (Illocutionary force) of the utterances of the participants. When we examine the sample dialogue below we can easily see that cohesive links are not enough by themselves within a spoken interaction:

[14]

A: It's a mystery to me, how the conjuror sawed that woman in half.  
 B: Well, Jane was the woman he did it to. So presumably she must be Japanese.

(Cook, 1989, p. 23)

In the dialogue above there are cohesive links such as so, she etc. However, they seem not enough for a meaningful conversation. The example [15] shows that

the absence of the cohesive links, also, not necessarily makes a conversation meaningless:

**[15]**

A: The window is open.

B: Go back to sleep , will you?

(Cook, 1989, p. 23)

In this extract there exists no cohesive links between the utterances made by the participants. However, the conversation still hangs together, in other words, it is still meaningful. The meaning in the conversation comes from the intended meanings of the utterances of the speakers. In the first sentence speaker A is concerned about the window which is open and expresses his/her concern with the utterance “The window is open.” Understanding but not considering speaker A’s concern speaker B expresses his/her will to sleep. This conversation can be interpreted in different ways in different contexts of course. However, the main point is that the first thing that we need for a conversation to be meaningful is coherence and cohesion is helpful but not obligatory.

The only way to recognize the coherence within a spoken interaction is to decode the illocutionary force that lies beyond the utterances of the speakers. Because coherence is not based on a relationship between the utterances but between the actions performed by those utterances.

**[16]**

A: What’s the day today?

B: How I Met Your Mother is on tv today.

In the sample dialogue above speaker A asks for the day and speaker we assume that speaker B is answering the question and the day is Monday, for example.

### 2.1.3.1 DISCOURSE MARKERS AND INTERACTIONAL SIGNALS

The linguistics definition of a discourse marker is a word or phrase that is relatively syntax-independent, does not have a particular grammatical function, does not change the meaning of the utterance, and has a somewhat empty meaning. Examples of discourse markers include the particles "oh", "well", "now", "then", "you know", and "I mean", and the connectives "so", "because", "and", "but", and "or". Discourse markers are used within a conversation to signal how the upcoming unit of speech relates to the current discourse state. Interactional signals are the items that constitute turns of their own or link turns together in a spoken interaction. Examples for interactional signals are “hm”, “mm”, well”, “yes”, “alright”, “no”, “mm-hm”, “okay”, “right”, “yeah” etc.

The absence of discourse markers and interactional signals in a conversation does not change the meaning; however, the conversation becomes dull and less conversation-like as in the example:

#### [17a]

A: Right, who's goin' to lift the bottom?

Well... come o'... someone's got to take 'old of it.

B: I ain't goin' to.

(Cook, 1989, p. 10)

#### [17b]

A: Who's goin' to lift the bottom?

Come o'... someone's got to take 'old of it.

B: I ain't goin' to.

(Cook, 1989, p. 10)

### 2.1.3.2 ADJACENCY PAIRS

People tend to be co-operative in conversations. Adjacency pairs is a term to describe the way in which conversations can be segmented into pairs of exchanges that are connected in some way even though spoken by different speakers. A

question, for example, expects an answer. A statement invites a response (such as agreement, modification, disagreement). A command or request expects compliance. Exclamations are odd because they are non-interactive. If someone calls out 'Help', it is action not language that is required. If the exclamation is 'ouch', it is likely to elicit a question, 'What's the matter' which in turn starts off an adjacency pair, completed by, for example, 'I've cut my finger'. The idea of adjacency pairs is interesting because it is a way of understanding two kinds of ebb and flow in a conversation. There is the ebb and flow of cohesion, that is the connection between things said and the way in which things move from one to another through a text, spoken or written. A question/answer format sets up a series of adjacency pairs in a rather rigid framework. If, on the other hand, the person usually answering, turns the tables and asks a question, there is a blip in the adjacency pairs which affects another kind of ebb and flow in conversations, namely the ebb and flow of *power*. Power doesn't have to be thought of as taking advantage in a menacing, underhand or overbearing way. It is an effect in the grammatical choices, especially in the use of questions and commands. Responding to a question with a question causes a break in any pattern of adjacency pairs, as does replying to a command with a question. Interestingly, exclamations do not seem to assume or confer power.

**[18]**

Father: Tidy your room!

Son: Why?

Some researchers have observed that whilst adjacency pairs are a normal feature of much everyday conversation, they tend to be rounded off by a third element in conversations of unequal power distribution, such as those of doctor/patient, teacher/pupil or parent/child.

**[19]**

Doctor: Are you sleeping well?

Patient: No, not at all.



Doctor: Hmm. That could be the problem.

[20]

Teacher: What is the capital of France?

Pupil: Paris, Miss.

Teacher: Good.

[21]

Parent: You've been playing in the mud again.

Child: I haven't.

Parent: Don't answer back. And don't tell lies.

As we have mentioned so far, an adjacency pair occurs when the utterance of one speaker makes a particular kind of response very likely. In an adjacency pair, there is often a choice of two likely responses. A request, for example, is most likely to be followed by either an acceptance or a refusal. In such cases, one of the responses is termed the preferred response (because it occurs most frequently) and the other the dispreferred response (because it is less common) (Cook, 1989, p.53,54). In the examples below we will be able to analyse the usage of preferred and dispreferred responses. How they are used? What happens when they are used?

[22]

A: Why don't you come up and see me some time? (Invitation)

B: I would like to. (Acceptance)

(Atkinson and Drew, 1979, p. 58)

[23]

A: Uh if you'd care to come and visit a little this morning I 'll give you a cup of coffee. (Invitation)

B: hehh well that's awfully sweet of you I don't think I can make it this morning hh uhm I'm running an ad in the paper and uh I have to stay near the phone. (Refusal)

(Atkinson and Drew, 1979, p. 58)

As the two examples above illustrate, the production of a dispreferred second (response) generally requires more conversational effort than a preferred second. In extract [23], one can distinguish the following components in B's turn: delaying a response + marker + expressing appreciation of the offer + declination itself + giving a reason for why one has to decline.

<b>Preferred and dispreferred seconds</b>		
Offer	Acceptance	Refusal
Request	Compliance	Refusal
Assessment	Agreement	Disagreement
Blame	Denial	Admission
Question	Expected answer	Unexpected answer or no answer
Invitation	Acceptance	Refusal

(Levinson, 1983, p. 336)

There are some situations, however; “disagreement” counts as a preferred response as in the example [24]:

[24]

A: I haven't done well, haven't I? (Assessment)

B: Nonsense, of course you did well.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 336)

Sometimes conversation takes place with more than two participants and the exchange below reveals some of the complexities that arise from an analysis of multi-party interactions characterised by a conflict of interests. In the extract [25] we will examine such a dialogue. It involves two boys (V and Q) and their mum (M). V is 6 and keen on teasing his little brother, Q, who is 3 years old:

[25a]

V: Q, do you want some more marbles?

Q: Yes

V: You can't have any.

Q: Mummy, V won't let me have his marbles.

M: Why are you teasing your brother? Give him some of your marbles.

V: But he's already got so many.

The schematic analysis of the conversation that takes place in the example [25] is given below:

**[25b]**

V: Offer

Q: Accept

V: Cancel offer

Q: Complain (dispreferred second to V's offer by implication)

M: Request for information ( preferred second to Q's complain by implication as it acknowledges the complaint) + Order

V: Refuse (a preferred second to M's request by complying with the request for information)

Sometimes the second part of an adjacency pair can be delayed by an alternation of turns occurring within it and this delay is known as an insertion sequence.

**[26]**

A: I wanted to order some more paint.(Request)

B: Yes, how many tubes would you like, sir? (Question 1)

A: Um, what's the price with tax? (Question 2)

B: Er, I'll just work that out for you. (Hold)

A: Thanks. (Acceptance)

B: Three nineteen a tube, sir. (Answer 2)

A: I'll have five, then. (Answer 1)

B: Here you go. (Acceptance)

In the exchange, the turns which separate the parts of the request-acceptance pair are insertion sequences.

In an insertion sequence speakers exchange turns while talking about the topic that is related to the main sequence; however, sometimes speakers may switch from one topic to another unrelated one, and then back again to the main topic and such a case is called side sequence.

[27]

A: Can you hand the larger bowl please?

B: Is it O.K.

A: Yeah, thanks.

B: Now combine cream cheese and green onion\_\_have you heard the latest news by the way?

A: Is this enough? Which news?

B: Add more cream cheese. Angelina Jolie has adopted an Ethiopian Baby Girl.

A: Oh! That's cool but I do not agree with the idea of adopting anyway. Enough?

B: That's your idea. Yeah by the way now spread it on each tortilla.

Side sequence is also used for clarification. In the general flow of a conversation, sometimes, a participant may think that s/he has misunderstood one point and ask for clarification. This case is also named as side sequence.

[28]

Steven : One, two, three (pause) four, five, six (pause) eleven, eight, nine, ten.

Susan : Eleven? – eight, nine, ten.

Steven : Eleven, eight, nine, ten.

Nancy : Eleven?

Steven : Seven, eight, nine, ten.

Susan : That's better.

(Aydın Aydın, 2005, p. 60)

In a conversation there are some pairs of turns understood as a preliminary to the main course of action. Participants in conversation draw attention to, or prepare the ground for, the kind of turn they are going to take next. These pairs of turns are called pre-sequences.

Each pre-sequence prepares the way for another joint action. The pre-request sets up a request; the pre-invitation sets up an invitation; the pre-narrative sets up a narrative; and the pre-conversation sets up an entire telephone conversation may be. So that pre-sequences are useful in organizing longer sections of conversation.

[29]

Pre-request:

Customer: Do you have hot chocolate?

Waitress: Yes, we do.

Pre-invitation:

Man: What are you doing?

Woman: Nothing. What's up?

Pre-narrative:

June: Did I tell you I was going to Scotland?

Kenneth: No.

Pre-conversation:

Caller: (rings the phone)

Recipient: Miss. Pink's office.

If a right to a turn is obtained its ending must also be signalled so that the other participants know it is finished and a contribution from them will not be construed as an interruption. A preclosing is a presequence that signals the end of a conversation is near. It provides opportunity for the discussion of any additional remaining topic before the participants proceed with the closing sequence.

Using pre-closing terms (O.K., Well, etc.) is a way of establishing one kind of warrant for undertaking to close a conversation. If the floor offering is declined then together these two utterances can constitute not a possible, but an actual first exchange of the closing section. The pre-closing ceases to be 'pre-' if accepted...

[30]

A: Okay?

B: Okay.

A: Bye.

B: Bye.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 325)

#### 2.1.4 CONVERSATIONAL PRINCIPLES: CO-OPERATION

It is impossible to think of a language that is free from rules during conversations. The conversations within that language, most probably, are expected to be out of control and communication by means of such a language will be impossible. It is clear that in normal conversation we do not simply say whatever we please, but instead follow some general guidelines as to what is acceptable and what is not; and the acceptability of these guidelines are determined by the society that uses the language for communicative purposes.

In 1975, the philosopher of language H.P. Grice published a seminal article entitled "The Co-operative Principle". Both the speaker and the addressee have to follow certain pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic rules in order to communicate effectively. They have to co-operate. Grice's Co-operative Principle consists of several maxims that appear very simple, straightforward, and common-sensical.

These maxims look at first sight like rules, but they appear to be broken more often than grammatical or phonological rules are, and this is why Grice uses them “maxim” rather than “rule”.

#### **2.1.4.1 THE MAXIM OF QUALITY**

The maxim of quality means that the speaker or even a writer has to include all the information that the addressee requires to understand what is being mentioned. If the speaker leaves a crucial piece of information within the conversational process, the addressee will not understand what the speaker is trying to say and the communication may break. The motto of this maxim can be like this:

- Do not say what you believe to be false (be true).
- Do not say that for which you lack evidence.

At first sight, it may seem that it would be simpler for this maxim to be “Tell the truth”. However, it is often difficult to be sure about what is true, and so Grice formulates this maxim in a way that, although it looks more complicated, is actually easier to follow. Evidence of the strength of this maxim is that most people find it difficult to lie when asked a direct question, and we tend to believe what people tell us without thinking, especially if it is written down (presumably because writers normally have more time than speakers to consider carefully what they say). The most common expressions that are used to follow the maxim of quality within a conversation are:

- As far as I know...
- It seems to me...
- Now, correct me if I’m wrong, but...
- I’m not absolutely sure but... etc.

#### 2.1.4.2 THE MAXIM OF QUANTITY

According to the maxim of quantity, while taking part within a communicative process people are expected to provide just enough information to get their point across, neither more nor less. The conveyance of too much or too little information risks the communication to break. The motto of the maxim of quantity can be:

- Make your contribution to the conversation as informative as is required, but not more, or less than is required.

In the extract below the maxim of quantity is flouted and the conversation gets unnecessarily longer or unexpectedly shorter:

##### [31a]

Woman : What happened today?

Man : The meeting started three minutes late, I sat by the door, the first person to speak...

##### [31b]

Woman : What happened today?

Man : Not too much.

The most important thing, however, that we have to keep in mind that the flouting of the maxim of quantity is based on the context in which the conversation takes place.

#### 2.1.4.3 THE MAXIM OF RELEVANCE

The maxim of relevance requires the speakers to stay on the topic while interacting. In other words, the participants of a conversation have to make sure that



their comments fit with what is being talked about. The maxim of relevance can be summarized as:

- Make what you say bear on the issue at hand.
- Be relevant.

The most common expressions used while following the maxim of relevance are:

- By the way
- Anyway
- Nevertheless etc.

When taking part in an oral interaction one is not expected to answer the question “How was your day?” as “I have a 19" monitor.”. However, just like the maxim of quantity the relevance of the utterance made by one of the participants is totally up to the context in which the conversation takes place.

**[32]**

Jim : Where is the roast beef?

Mary : The dog looks happy.

Any competent speaker knows that Mary means something like “In answer to your question, the diner has been eaten by the dog.”. So that what Mary says is quite relevant to what she has been asked.

#### 2.1.4.4 THE MAXIM OF MANNER

The maxim of manner is for removing the ambiguity in a communicative situation to make the utterances of the participants more clear and easy to be understood by the other participant(s). The maxim of manner can be summed up as:

- Be perpicuous.
- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- Avoid ambiguity.
- Avoid verbosity and sloppiness.
- Be orderly.
- Be clear.

#### 2.1.4.5 FLOUTING THE MAXIMS

When any participant of a spoken interaction flouts a maxim, s/he usually makes it in a flagrant (and often foregrounded) way, so that it is obvious to all concerned that it has been broken. If this happens, then it is clear that the speaker is intending the hearer to infer some extra meaning over and above what is said. Grice distinguishes what he calls “sentence meaning” from “utterer’s meaning” and he refers to an utterer’s meaning indicated through a flout as an “implicature”. So that the implicature is what we have been referring to so far as the “extra meaning”.

[33]

A: I might win the lottery.

B: Yes, and cows might fly.

The obviousness of the untruth of B's reply give our cognitive system a hudge nudge. B is flouting the maxim of quality, so there must be something else going on, and so we start a hunt for likely inferences we can make. Here, of course, we quickly settle on the implication that A's chances of winning the lottery are about the same as cows flying. Flouting the maxim of quality is the driving force in irony. The violation of the maxim of quality, therefore, has the intention of using some figures of speech within the conversation such as hyperbole, metaphor, irony and sarcasm.

**[34]**

A: I have never seen him on sick leave so far.

B: He is made of iron, nothing can get him down.

In the sample dialogue above speaker B uses hyperbole in order to emphasize that the man they are talking about is very strong against the illnesses. However, the use of figures of speech within a conversation has its meaning only when the receiver of the message knows that "men are not made of iron", otherwise, what is told by the speaker would be a simple lie.

The speaker may also flout the maxim of quantity in order to give deliberately more or less information than required and when the speaker says too much the intention is prolixity, when s/he is too brief then it creates terseness. The main intentions to say too much may be the sense of occasion or respect, on the other hand, being too short in speech may be caused by being rude, blunt or forthright.

**[35]**

A: Well, how do I look?

B: Your shoes are nice.

The violation of the maxim of relevance also has some other meanings in accordance with the context in which the spoken interaction occurs. One of the main

reasons of flouting the maxim of relevance is to sign the embarrassment caused by the context and the other is a desire to change the subject.

The flouting of the maxim of manner has different meanings in different context, of course. For instance, the maxim of manner can be violated within a conversation in order to make humour or to exclude an overhearer from the conversation. In the extract given below the speaker B is flouting the maxim of manner on purpose in order to exclude potential overhearers:

[36]

A: Let's get the kids something.

B: Okay, but not I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M. (spelling it out)

#### **2.1.4.6 CONVERSATIONAL PRINCIPLES: POLITENESS**

The politeness principle, like the co-operative principle, may be formulated as series of maxims. According to the linguist Robin Lakoff the formulated maxims of politeness are as follows:

- Do not impose: keep your distance.

This maxim states that we keep distance from others by not imposing. In order to keep distance from others, Tannen points out that we tend to use formal expressions or use technical vocabulary to exclude personal emotions.

- Give options: let the other person have a say.

The second maxim is characterized by saying things hesitantly, by not stating one's will clearly or by using euphemisms. It involves the status difference of the speaker and the hearer, and the speaker yields the power of the hearer by leaving the option of decision to the hearer. Tannen points out that women often behave in this

way to show consideration to others, or to leave the decision to others. The expressions that can be used generally to follow this maxim are:

- Would you mind...
  - Could you possibly...
  - May I ask you to...
  - What would you like to do...? (Instead of “Let me tell you what want to do...”).
- Make your receiver feel good

The third maxim, on the other hand, emphasizes equality between the speaker and the hearer, and it enhances the closeness between them.

These maxims that have been mentioned so far about politeness are not actual rules that have to be followed by all the speakers as an obligation; however, they are senses we have of the natural way to speak.

#### **2.1.4.7 THE SOCIAL BASIS OF CONVERSATIONAL PRINCIPLES**

Some cultural differences may cause misunderstandings among people while within an oral interaction. For example, in some societies, parents have more rights to interfere in the domestic affairs of adult children than in others. In such a society the interference of the parents would not be evaluated as rudeness or unfairness.

If a speaker has been grown up in a culture that has directness in speech is a valued way of showing solidarity, and s/he uses direct speech acts to people whose culture is more oriented to indirectness and avoiding direct imposition, then s/he will be considered as being impolite.

Misunderstandings between the participants of a conversational situation may also occur between genders as well as people from different cultural backgrounds. One of the most important aims of the studies of discourse analysis and conversation analysis is to find out and formulate why some conversations are not successful and cultural differences in terms of gender, society etc. are the main causes of the unsuccessfulness of most of the conversations.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS**

#### **3.1 CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS A COMPARATIVE AND CONTRASTIVE POINT OF VIEW**

Conversational analysis and discourse analysis can be considered as two major approaches to the analysis of conversation, though some other distinctive approaches exist. Both of these approaches are mainly concerned with giving an account of how coherence and sequential organization in discourse is produced and understood; however, the two approaches have quite distinctive and incompatible styles of analysis.

In discourse analysis, both methodology and the kinds of theoretical principals and primitive concepts such as rule, well-formed formula are employed. The main prosedures employed in the studies of discourse analysis can be summed up as follows:

- The isolation of basic categories or units of discourse.
  
- The formulation of a set of concatenation rules stated over those categories, delimiting well-formed sequences of categories (coherent discourses) from ill-formed sequences (incoherent discourses) (Levinson, 1983, p. 286).

The number of these features used by dicourse analysts can be increased. However, it can be said that all the prosedures applied in discourse analysis tend to go with these two above. There is typically an appeal to intuitions, about, for example, what is and what is not a coherent or well-formed discourse.

In contradistinction to discourse analysis, conversational analysis is a rigorously empirical approach which avoids premature theory constraction. The

methods applied in conversational analysis studies are essentially inductive. In spite of making immediate categorization of restricted data which is the typical first step in discourse analysis studies, search is made for recurring patterns across many records of naturally occurring conversations.

Secondly, the main emphasis in conversational analysis studies is on the interactional and inferential consequences between alternative utterances. In contrast to discourse analysis, again, there is as little appeal as possible to intuitive judgements. According to conversational analysts, intuition is claimed as an unreliable guide in this area, as in deed it may be in other areas of linguistics.

One other thing about conversational analysis is that in the studies of conversational analysis there is a tendency to avoid analyses based on single texts. Instead, as many instances as possible of some particular phenomena are examined across texts, not primarily to illuminate “what is really going on” in some interaction, but rather to discover the systematic properties of sequential organization of talk, and the ways in which utterances are designed to manage such sequences.

### **3.2 CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS**

Conversational analysis is a research method that takes conversations in real-life settings as the object of study, and as a window on to the roles, social relationships, and power relations of participants.

The study of conversational analysis is generally regarded as distinct from discourse analysis which has often been more concerned with formal methods of analysis; however, when a daily conversation is taken into consideration it might seem a quite complex and chaotic form and the studies and findings of conversational analysis helps one to find out what order there might lie under that seemingly chaotic and complex daily conversations.



Conversational analysis is often associated with a group of scholars in the USA known as ethnomethodologists as they set out to discover what methods people use to participate in and make sense of interaction (Cook 1989 [1990; 52]). The most well-known ethnomethodologists are Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, Anita Pomerantz and Gail Jefferson.

In their studies of conversational analysis, ethnomethodologists do not prefer to wait until a conversation ends in order to be able to make the necessary comments about the rules or the order of the conversation. They try to understand how a conversation unfolds within time. They view discourse as a developing process, rather than a finished product (Cook 1989 [1990; 51]).

Derived largely from ethnomethodology and sociolinguistics, it starts from the premiss that conversations are one of the central activities of social life, and that through them much social life is organized. Conversational analysis therefore sets out to record patterns of conversation in order to detect underlying rules that enable communication to proceed in a largely orderly fashion. It focuses on the structure, cadences, and other characteristics of verbal interactions, usually in dyads or very small groups. The subject-matter of the discussion is noted, but can be unimportant, and is not itself the main focus of analysis (as in content analysis). Research findings have proved useful in elucidating many hidden aspects of human interaction which have wider interest in understanding real-life as well as research interviews.

The method normally involves making tape-recordings or video recordings of conversations, which are then subjected to detailed analysis—for example, noting the number of times one person interrupts another, how conversations are initiated, how turns to talk are allocated, and counting the duration of pauses, silences, and speech in seconds.

### **3.2.1 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT**

The theoretical and methodological approach that is known as conversational analysis today was a subject that was drawing the attention of researchers 1950s and early 1960s, in the earlier stages of the developmental process of conversational analysis there were numerous other approaches to the study of interaction.

One of the earliest examples for the studies over interaction is known as Bales's Interaction Process Analysis, which was a preformulated category system of 12 categories that are used to classify interaction in process.

In the early 60s the importance of making records of the conversations that occur naturally in daily speech was noticed. The development in linguistics also influenced anthropologists who started to develop new approaches to the study of communication and language in connection with ethnographic studies of cultures.

Tape recording technology served in a great way for the studies to develop further stages within time. During this period researchers have been divided into two main poles in the studies of conversational analysis. While one of the groups defending a more traditional way of researching the interactions that take place among the people, the other group followed a different path by defending that the studies of the interactions between people should be made on everyday life conversations and they tried to gather their examples of conversations for making the necessary analysis from people's everyday lives such as daily interactions, phone conversations.

### **3.2.2 SOME BASIC PRINCIPLES OF DOING CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS**

Conversation analysis, as mentioned several times, deals with the data in the shape of naturally occurring, recorded conventions. In many respects conversation

analysis proceeds in a fashion quite similar to the natural sciences, though there are some crucial differences.

Firstly, conversation analysis, as already mentioned too, proceeds by induction. A bunch of data is collected – taped or filmed – and then transcribed and studied. The taping/filming of the data is quite possible and simpler with the help of the technology today. Such kind of recording allows the analyst to study the interaction as it really happened, in the smallest detail, over and over again. In order to accomplish a faithful analysis this is quite necessary for the analyst. Furthermore, all the material received during recording, can be made fully available to the readers and receivers for inspection and reanalysis.

Conversation analysis is a qualitative method and most often the analysts will have tested many hypotheses before anything like a documentable structure begins to emerge, if the idea of a particular structure has not been given up. Documenting and describing in sufficient detail an interactional phenomenon is a very long, laborious, and comprehensive process with many setbacks. Using the data that has not been taped and transcribed by oneself in the first place is not advised to be used for analysis. In order to achieve optimal familiarity with the data and thus be able almost to anticipate interactional actions in the same way as the interlocutors themselves, one must go through the whole data-gathering process. However, this is not always a practicable approach, given the financial and time consuming costs.

Secondly, conversation analysis is a method, not a theory. This fact has led some to claim that conversation analysis is entirely theory-free and studies are only appropriately conducted if they are completely free of preconceptions. This is, of course, is not true. To begin with, conversation analysis is an accumulative science which gradually establishes an every-growing bulk of knowledge which analysts relate to start their own studies from. This means that new studies do not start all over. The claim of theorylessness are rather to be taken as an expression of a

methodological ideal which should be strived for in order to remain as unbiased as possible when studying not as an actually fulfillable requirement.

A major difference between the natural sciences and conversation analysis is of course that the analyst himself must be a member of or share sufficient knowledge with the social group whose interaction is being studied in order to be able to make sense of the interaction. Membership knowledge is required for analyzing the interaction. In other words, the analyst studies his material as a kind of “insider” as opposed to the natural scientist who is not and cannot be an insider. This of course brings into question the objectivity of the analyst. However, the fact that the analyst must have some membership knowledge does not mean that the analyst’s own introspection or intuitions about what is going on count as evidence. Introspection, assumptions about what interlocutors’ intentions are, and other such things which require the jumping in and out of the involved parties’ minds (the analyst’s as well as participants’) has no place in the conversation analysis documentation of phenomena. A phenomenon is only documentable in so far as the analyst can show that the interlocutors themselves show that they are orienting to a particular interactional accomplishment. Hence, though the analyst’s intuitions and membership knowledge may be necessary for him/her to get on the track of a phenomenon, they do not count as documentation.

We can conclude this section with some remarks about the craftsmanship of conversation analysis. In accordance with the basic assumptions discussed above, concerning action and context, analysis of data starts from considerations of actions-in-sequences, as opposed to approaches to utterance meaning which focuses on utterances in isolation. As discussed above, the description of a phenomenon takes into consideration such things as where an action is produced – following what actions? – and how it is responded to. The analyst is expected to susceptively ask for each action “why that now” and take it as a motto of conversation analysis.

### 3.2.3 CONVERSATION AND SPEECH ACTS

Conversations are not formed just a number of aimless sentence groups. When we speak we do something with our words. Our words, in a way, perform actions that we intend. Speech acts are known as actions carried out by language itself. However, in order to make the correct inference from what is said and understand the action performed by the utterance one needs the shared knowledge of physical and social world of the speaker. Moreover, we also need to make assumptions about the knowledge of the people with whom we are interacting (Cook, 1989, p. 35). The main question at this point is that how words work for the participants of an interaction and how or where these speech acts are used within a conversational process. The answers of these questions can not be given within a formal framework as the grammatical correctness of an utterance is not enough to be meaningful within an interactive situation.

Taking part in a conversation successfully is not the same thing with the grammatical correctness, as we have mentioned. The term correctness gains its meaning in a quite different way when it is used for communication. When the utterance made by the speaker carries the intended action and the illocutionary force and inferred by the listener(s) in a way that is intended by its producer then we can say that it is successful, in other words, correct. Conversation is a process that spontaneously takes place and the utterances gain their meanings peculiar to the common context of the interactive process.

[1]

A: The heater is on.

B: It has a safety switch don't worry... go back to sleep...

In the example above A is seemingly uttering an informative sentence giving B the information that the heater is on. On the other hand, B's answer is quite unexpected and meaningless if A's utterance was just carrying an informative duty

about the heater. However, this is not the case, uttering the sentence “The heater is on” A is either making a polite request to B to turn it off or s/he also demands an explanation about his/her concerns about the heater’s condition. We can talk about numerous ways of explaining this concern of request of A’s and all of them have the same illocutionary force with the sentence given in the example. Moreover, most of the utterances do not need to be formulated as a request at all but as information, question, exclamation etc. For example:

- Will you keep the heater on?
- Oh! It’s strange to keep the heater on throughout the night!
- Have you realized the heater? It’s on.
- Isn’t it dangerous to keep the heater on when sleeping?
- Won’t you turn off the heater?
- Leaving the heater on when sleeping is dangerous it says on tv...

All the sentences above expresses the concern about the situation of the heater and the polite request of the speaker to turn the heater off, indeed. These sentences do not perform their actions directly but indirectly.

Spoken interaction, in other words, conversation is a part of human’s lives and people do not interact with each other just as it is their right. Instead we all have to make conversations to maintain our lives. The main goal of conversation should not be correctness but its being informative, humorous, entertaining.

### 3.2.4 THE CHARACTERISTICS OF DAILY CONVERSATIONS

Conversation has been approved as the most fundamental and pervasive means of conducting human affairs as people tend to use it most commonly to build communicative ties for any kind of interaction or flow of knowledge. Therefore, on the many types of communicative act, most study has been realized upon the subject of conversation.

Conversation has been used as a non-technical term; however, people seem to be capable of distinguishing it from other kinds of talk. Simply we can say that conversation is not a simple talk. There exist some certain requirements to define an ordinary talk as a conversation, such as:

- It is not primarily necessitated by a practical task.
  - Any unequal power of participants is partially suspended.
  - The number of participants is small.
  - Turns are quite short.
  - Talk is primarily for the participants and not for an outside audience.
- (Cook, 1989, p. 51)

The nature of conversation is unpredictable and lack of structure and just for this reason when a conversational situation takes place under the title of a certain task then its unpredictability and being lack of structure features are lost. Such kind of a situation also affects the participants choices of utterances and this limits the boundaries of conversation and modifies its nature.

When we think about a worker talking in front of his/her boss, or a student in front of a professor. The first thing that arouse in our minds is the inequality of the social and power status of the participants of these speeches. Quite naturally, the ones who stand in the lower scale should be careful about their choices of words. Such an unequal power breaks the nature of the conversation as a conversation should be

spontaneous and the participants of it should feel comfortable enough utter without thinking about the status of the others.

Although there is no fixed number or a certain limitation for the number of the participants within a conversational process. It should be kept in mind that a hundred people can not participate in a spoken interaction at the same time as it would be nothing but a mess.

The length of turns are surely imprecise as precisising or limiting them would destroy the natural flow of conversational process. However, conversation is a process that takes place between at least two or more participants. Therefore, other participants should also take part in the process. Although the equality in the length of terms is impossible and against the nature of the spoken interaction, when a participant holds the floor for an hour, for example, we can consider conversation to have ceased.

Last but not the least, the conversation that takes place should only be for its participants. The feeling that 'others' are listening or aware of what has been said makes the participants feel stressed to choose what they say more carefully and may also cause not to say what they might utter under the normal circumstances of a conversation. The most common example for such kind of talk can be seen on tv and radio programmes. As the participants are under the pressure of being seen and listened by the others their conversations do not occur in their natural ways but in a way that is limited by the stress and pressure of being heard by the others.

We can talk about two main poles for talk. On the one end of the pole there is formal spoken discourse and on the other end of the pole we can see conversation and there exist many intermediate cases between these two main poles. Although the boundary between the conversation and the other discourse types are not clear enough, the unpredictability or being spontaneous, in other words, and the lackness of



structure are the initial factors that makes the definition and the discrimination of conversation from other discourse types.

The talk given below, for instance, can not be defined as a real conversation because of some factors that we will examine:

[2]

A: Come in Highland Boy. Can you hear me? Over.

B: Yes, I can hear you. What's the weather like up there? Over.

A: Fine. Over.

B: Good. Keep smiling. Over and out.

(Cook, 1989, p. 51)

The answer for the question that why are radio conversations different from face-to-face conversations is in face-to-face conversations participants do not have to say "Over" in order to inform that his/her turn is over. In face-to-face conversations turn-taking process occurs naturally and without a necessity to use anything to indicate the end of a turn.

We can simply say that conversation is a highly structured activity and people tacitly follow some basic rules throughout it. As well as mentioning about the structure of spoken interaction, we can also talk about the features and characteristics of daily conversations as these caharacteristics make them different from ordinary talks:

- In most cases the participants rely on the context to clarify the meaning. Therefore, the language of a spoken interaction is often inexplicit.

[3]

A: Isn't it strange?

B: No, I don think so.

It is impossible for us to decode what A says as we are out of the context. They might be talking about anything else and what we can understand is only that B does not agree with A.

- As we have mentioned one of the main features of conversations is being unpredictable. We can not talk about a thematic planning ruling the way a conversation proceeds. It is always possible to observe the changes of subject matter and alterations in level.

[4]

A: I'm dying to know - where's my watch by the way?

B: What?

A: What Gillian's aerobics sessions are like HA HA HA HA

B: What aerobics sessions? It's here.

A: Gillian does aerobic sessions every evening. LEADS them. Thanks.  
Can you imagine.

(Cook, 1989, p. 54)

In this conversation there exist two topics. "Aerobics" as the main topic and "the missing watch" as the lesser topic. The speakers shift between the main topic and the lesser topic throughout the interaction.

- Within the process of conversation the participants may sometimes lose their fluency, which is accepted as a normal situation. There may occur false starts, hesitation noises, pauses, repetitions, and some other errors while performing the conversational process.

[5]

A: Have you completed the Project?

B: Well mm... it's about to... I mean I'll rapidly finish it, if I have a chance to begin, indeed.

Speaker B, in the dialogue above, firstly hesitates whether to say the truth or not and we can see his/her hesitation with “well mm...”. Afterwards s/he makes his/her mind to tell the truth and shifts his/her answer.

- Conversations are usually formed quite rapidly. The pronunciation of some of the words or some sounds are altered by the speakers in order to keep the fluency or the natural flow of spoken interaction. People tend to make use of prosodic features, for instance, for repairs, misunderstandings or in order to show diverse emotions within the process of a conversation.

[6]

A: what have you got to do this afternoon

B: oh I'm going to repair the child bar

A: what do you mean CHILD bar

B: uh it's er metal bar goes across – has to be fixed from the one side of the car I mean from this one side of the back seat to the other for the BABY seat to go on

A: AH...

(Cook, 1989, p. 55)

In the conversation above the first speaker A is asking the second B to repair the term by making it more specific, and the second several times repeating his own explanation to make it clearer and while making these both speakers make use of prosodic features by means of using stress to emphasize what do they mean or ask to the other.

- The grammar rules of written language can not be seen in spoken language. People do not follow the clear-cut sentence patterns while taking part within a conversation. It is impossible to decode the grammatical features of the speech with the help of the traditional grammar rules that are used for good writing. Some other set of rules have to be formed in order to decode the grammar patterns of daily speech.

[7]

A: Gonna watch the match today?

B: Sure. Orlando is my favourite you know.

A: Yeah... it's my favourite, too... but I dunno... they've no chance this time.

The conversation above involves too many violations of written grammar rules; however, it is quite meaningful for the participants and they can communicate successfully.

- Speakers do not always use the words just in their formal senses in conversations. In other words, sometimes words are used for so quite different contexts that even the other participants of a conversation have difficulties in understanding. Such situations are caused by the difficulties of memory, lack of attention, or difference in the perception of the participants. Therefore, the vocabulary used in daily conversations can be said to be informal, domestic limited and inexplicit.

[8]

A: He's not a football player he's a virtuoso...

B: Virtuoso?

A: He plays quite well I mean.

B: oh, I see...

### **3.2.5 THROUGHOUT A CONVERSATION**

Language is the most common way of communication throughout the history of human. With the help of conversation people do things with the utterances and use the language socially, which means it builds up connective ties among people.

In the study of conversation there exist two main options one of which is the study of the content which means the main emphasize will be upon what the

conversation is about, the topics discussed throughout the conversation, how they are included into the process, and what kind of topics lead to the other ones. The function of the conversation and the contextual features are also included in such kind of a study.

Another field to be focused on in the study of conversation is the formal aspects of conversational process. The main questions to be asked in this brunch of the study of conversation are how spoken interaction works, what rules govern the process of spoken interaction, turn-taking, interrupting, and such kind of formal structures that are found in the nature of conversation.

In this study we are observing both formal and content sides of conversation in order to find out how different are features of conversation in different languages which are English and Turkish in this study. What the cultural differences are, and in what ways they affect the Turkish learners of English. How can language learners get rid of the problems that arises from the differences of culture in two languages and how can they turn similarities into advantages in the lanuage learning process.

### **3.2.5.1 THE ORGANIZATION OF CONVERSATION**

At the beginnings of this chapter we have mentioned about the historical development of the conversational analysis studies. In order to rule out the organisation of any spoken interaction we need to talk about the most basic system that is used in conversations. This system is known as turn-taking system and transitional relevant places which are simply the possible change-of-turn points will also be mentioned as it is closely related with turn-taking system.

#### **3.2.5.1.1 TURN TAKING SYSTEM**

The process of turn-taking is defined as the most fundamental unit of conversation. In other words, if there is no exchange of turns and only one speaker

holds the floor throughout the talk, it becomes impossible to name it as a conversation.

Although in some cultures overlapping is accepted as a sign of paying attention to what is being said by the current speaker, in most societies especially in Western-type cultures people tend to listen while a speaker is holding the floor. One speaker talks at a time, alias. The main question is not how people talk one at a time but how they go about allocating turns to each other or themselves and just at this point the mechanism of turn-taking comes into the picture.

In accordance with the conversation analysis bottom-up approach there is no fixed definition of what a turn is. However, we can simply define it as continuous stretch of talk by one participant from it begins until it ends. Although there are no rules about how long a turn can be and when it should stop, these things can be negotiated as the conversation unfolds.

A turn is constructed from various unit types which are referred as turn constructional units. A turn constructional unit is often a grammatical unit of a turn. For example, a word, a phrase, a clause, or a sentence; however, many other things can also be regarded as a turn constructional unit such as intonation.

Turn constructional units are essential to the taking of turns within a spoken interaction. The participants of a conversation do not start to speak at any arbitrary point. According to Schegloff and Jefferson, a speaker who is holding the floor within a conversation is entitled to one turn constructional unit and the first possible completion of that unit constitutes a 'turn transition-relevance place' (1974). When a speaker comes such a transition place the following set of turn-transition rules hold:

- For any turn, at the initial transition relevance place of an initial turn constructional unit:

a) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a “current speaker selects next” technique, then the party so selected has the right and is obliged to take the next turn to speak; no other have such rights or obligations, and transfer occurs at that place.

b) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a “current speaker selects next” technique, then self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted; first starter acquires rights to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place.

c) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a “current speaker selects next” technique, then current speaker may, but not need to continue, unless another self-selects.

- If, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn constructional unit, neither 1a or 1b has operated, then the rule set a-c re-applies at the next transition-relevance place, and recursively at each next transition-relevance place, until transfer is affected.

When a speaker comes to a transition-relevance place there exist a time-latency within the process of conversation to maintain the interaction. No matter who holds the next turn, whether the same participant himself/herself or another participant, the time that intervenes between the turns are quite important for the smoothness of the flow of interaction. The time that intervenes between a current-speaker’s completion and a next-speaker’s start is defined as “reaction-time latency”. On the other hand, the time intervening between a current-speaker’s completion and the start of a follow-up utterance by the same participant is named as “initiative-time latency”. The main point in turn-taking system is to manage these transitions as smoothly as possible, although a long latency time has also a meaning within a spoken interaction.

### 3.2.5.1.2 TRANSITION RELEVANT PLACES

Within a conversational process it is quite important to be able to foresee what is going to happen next. The ability of foreseeing the next bend in the conversational path, the next 'turn', in other words, is known as predictability.

The chunks of conversation is somehow stucked together by what Sacks has called 'adjacency relationship' and predictability has a lot to do with adjacency relationship as the words tend to spread out over time and space (Mey, 2001, p. 141).

In a regular adjacency pair the second part is expected to be stucked to the first part, in other words, it is not expected from a second of an adjacency pair to separate from its first. Moreover, it will be more absurd for a second to be entirely absent in a conversation. Normal adjacency as in a classical case of greeting, for instance, would require more or less instantaneous response. Other typical so-called adjacency pairs are question-answer, request-offer or denial, order-compliance etc. When the one part of the pair is given, then the other is normally predictable.

The expectancy included in the adjacency relationship operates also in other environments. Here, we can meet more or less clearly predictable turn signals in the form of changes in the speed of delivery; this is why we often are able to predict the end of somebody's speech at a public occasion, or of intonation and word-choice patterns as in certain stylized types of conversation and other discourse. Conversational 'closers', for example, on the telephone: 'OK?', 'OK' serve as what has been referred to as 'opening up closings'; conversational 'starters' in daily speech such as ('Excuse me', 'Yes?') exhibit similar predictable patterns.

In daily conversations people do not use most of the routine sequences in their word-meaning sense. They have a ritualized character that wholly or partially excludes a normal reaction. The example below shows us the routine ritualized greeting of Turkish English Language teachers in Turkey:



[9]

Teacher: Good morning class!

Students: Good morning teacher!

Teacher: How are you?

Students: Fine, thanks. And you?

Teacher: I'm fine thank you. You may sit down...

In this example neither the teacher nor the students really inquiring about each others health. These utterances have become purely formal devices used for starting a conversation. The teacher in the example wants to build up a conversational situation between him/her and the students in order to start the lecture and consults the routine utterances. These are also used by other face-to-face conversations as 'starters'.

### **3.2.5.2 THE MEANING OF CONVERSATION**

This section and the following few sections are about how do we use conversational techniques to convey the meaning within an interactional situation. The mere exchange of formalities, of course, can not be accepted as a real conversation. What we are trying to find out is how the way one talks with people functions in human communication, both through the medium of the simple formalisms such as turn-taking, and by including other, more elaborate techniques. Content which is an integrating part of our analysis of conversation, as it is of all human language activity also has an important role in this study.

#### **3.2.5.2.1 PRE-SEQUENCES**

People tend to use some certain utterances that may function as a precursor to another utterance, or perhaps sequence of utterances while taking part in a conversation. The utterances that serve as a precursor to others are named as pre-sequences. In other words, presequences are most basically described as follows:

- A pre-sequence is a sequence that:

- is used to introduce a conversational action and,
- often prefigures a particular sort of action and secures the addressee's cooperation.

- A pre-sequence is the specific turn that has the function of prefiguring the coming action.

Pre-sequences can be considered as formal tools of conversation management; however, they occupy a position that can be portrayed between the formal and the content aspect of conversation.

We have mentioned about sequences in chapter 2. However, in this chapter we will analyze them from a different point of view in order to achieve more detailed knowledge about the subject. Here are some kinds of pre-sequences:

- Pre-announcement, which is a presequence for an announcement of news. It consists of a turn in which the announcing participant checks on the newsworthiness of the item, and may also consist of a turn in which the recipient allows or disallows the newsworthiness of the item before beginning a request-acceptance or question-answer sequence to elicit the announcement.

**[10]**

A: Oh, guess what.

B: What?

A: Professor Deelies put another book on his order.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 349)

The first turn in the exchange above is pre-announcement.

- Pre-arrangement is a pre-sequence in which an attempt is made to arrange for later contact, as by means of a question-answer sequence determining the

availability of one of the participants. It will be helpful to keep in mind that pre-arrangements are frequently indistinguishable from pre-invitations except in context.

**[11]**

A: Erm, what are you doing today?

B: ER, well, I'm supervising at quarter past.

A: Er, yuh, why don't, er, would you like to come by after that?

B: I can't, I'm afraid no.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 347)

In the dialogue above, the pre-arrangement is expressed by means of a question-answer sequence determining the availability of one of the participants.

- Pre-invitation is a pre-sequence that is likely to be understood by the respondent as a signal of coming invitation. The coming invitation may be question-answer sequence concerning the availability of the participant to be invited.

**[12]**

A: Hi, John.

B: Say what are you doing?

A: Well, we're going out. Why?

B: Oh, I was just gonna say come over here this evening.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 346)

In the second and third turns of the dialogue we can observe pre-invitation.

- Pre-request, which prefigures a request, possibly by ascertaining the ability of the respondent to satisfy the coming request.

**[13]**

A: Do you have blackberry jam?

B: Yes.

A: Okay. Can I have half a pint then?

B: Sure.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 347)

The first two turns of the exchange above are defined as pre-request.

- A summons-answer sequence is a pre-sequence that consists of a turn that seeks attention and grants it opening the way for the talk to follow.

**[14]**

A: Ted?

B: Yes, dear?

- A pre-closing is a pre-sequence that signals the end of a conversation is near. It provides opportunity for the discussion of any additional remaining topic before the participants proceed with the closing sequence.

**[15]**

A: Okay?

B: Okay.

A: See you soon.

B: Bye.

Although the kinds of pre-sequences are named differently by different analysts, we can simply say that they almost serve for the same purpose and have the same meaning in detail.

Under the title of pre-sequences, we had better talk about post-sequences also as it is not a large topic to discuss about under a distinct title. Post-sequence is a type of sequence that is subordinate to and follows another sequence. It remedies some unresolved matter relating to the dominant sequence.

**[16]**

A: Would you mind dropping this off for me on your way to work?

B: Yeah, I guess so.

A: Cause I'm gonna be late getting off because I have to iron something to wear.

B: Well, I will if it's not too crowded.

A: OK.

(Laughlin, 1984, p. 185)

The third through fifth turns of the extract above are a post-sequence. They resolve some doubt concerning the fulfillment of the sincerity conditions (the psychological state of the speaker concerning the propositional content of an illocutionary act) in the first sequence's acceptance of the request of the first turn.

### 3.2.5.2.2 INSERTION SEQUENCES

Even though the immediate neighboring relationship, typically holds for two utterances belonging to the same exchange, there are cases where such immediacy is not maintained; the resulting 'gap', however, does not damage the conversational coherence. The main question arises at this point is "How is this possible?".

The main subject we are dealing with here is called 'insertion'; often, insertion itself is also used to effect a remedial exchange such as 'repair'. The normal flow of the conversation does not break when an insertion sequence occurs. Participants behave as if they were aware that the turns in their talk are operating at different levels, and thus the main flow of conversation may continue its course, even though part of it is shunted off in order to let the conversationalists attend to actual or potential, upcoming difficulties. After the obstacles have been removed, conversation continues as before; the original turn-taking counters either haven't been affected by the insertion sequence or are reset following it. Thus, in the middle of a spoken exchange, one may be presented with a greeting or request for information, or an order, none of these having anything to do with the natural stream of the conversational process.

[17]

A: Can I turn on the tv?

B: Is the baby sleeping?

A: No, it's just woken up.

B: Okay, then.

In the exchange above the request made by the speaker A and its acceptance (or may be a possible refusal) by the participant B is intervened by another question-answer pair which is defined here as an insertion sequence.

Sequencing may be interrupted, or even stopped altogether, whenever other business needs to be attended to. Evidently natural disasters, or even minor mishaps like in the example given below, need immediate attention and require that the conversationalists adjust their interchange to the emergent situation in the outside world. In general, although interruptions and insertions may happen at all times during all kinds of conversations many of the actual phenomena are related to a particular culture, and can not be properly understood without some insight into particular pragmatic presuppositions that are at work.

In the sample below the father, being home alone with a sick kid is on the phone to departmental secretary at university:

[18]

- A : So I think I'll be in tomorrow, when Jacob's a little better. And if you could maybe ask Bob King to take my phonetic class... [in a loud voice] HEY STOP THAT RIGHT AWAY
- Secretary : You want me to stop what?
- A : Sorry, I was talking to cat – Hold on...
- Secretary : ???
- A : The damn cat was fixin' tos it on the baby's face... As I was saying, Bob promised to take my phonetic class today, if necessary...

(Mey, 2001, p. 147)

### 3.2.5.2.3 REPAIRS

People sometimes misunderstand what is being said within a conversation. The breaking of the natural stream of a conversation is a situation that is unwanted by the participants of that interactive process. The reasons that cause such a damage in the natural flow of a conversation can be numerous such as including material failure to understand what is being said due to the noise etc., failure to observe normal sequencing as in the case of non-adjacency, or of speaking out of turn. In such cases participants either correct their own words or those of another participant. Such kind of insertions are named as 'repairs'.

We can talk about different kinds of repairs that changes in accordance with who starts the repairing process and who repairs what is being uttered etc.:

- Self repair, is a repair that is performed by the speaker of the utterance that needs repair.

**[19]**

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filter.

B: A BOLT?

A: I mean for my oil PAN.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 340)

The kind of repair above is also named as other initiated self repair as the process is initiated by the addressee of the repaired utterance; on the other hand the utterance made by the speaker B in the second turn is defined as 'echo question', which occurs in the turn after a repairable utterance and repeats the portion felt by the speaker to need repair. Moreover, this kind of a repair is also known as third turn repair as the self-repair takes place in the third conversational turn.

**[20]**

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filter.

B: What?

A: I mean for my oil PAN.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 341)

In the exchange above “what” uttered by speaker B is a next turn repair initiator, which is an utterance, used in the turn after a repairable item, that prompts for a third turn repair in the next turn.

A reformulation is a self repair by means of a paraphrase of the repairable item. In the example below the speaker paraphrases to make it clear what s/he intends to say:

[21]

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filter.

B: Which?

A: The big one underneath.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 329)

Reformulation can be realized without any other initiation also:

[22]

A: I need a new bolt for my oil pan, the bolt in the bottom for draining the oil.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 330)

- Self initiated repair, is a repair that the speaker of the utterance that needs repair makes without a prompting from another participant.

[23]

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filt – um, PAN.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 340)

- Other repair, or other initiated repair, is a repair made by a participant other than the one whose speech is repaired.

[24]

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filter.



B: PAN, you mean.

A: Right...

(Levinson, 1983, p. 341)

Another kind of an other initiated repair is ‘embedded repair’, which is performed by the questioned utterance by the substitution of the repairing item in the addressee’s own utterance. An embedded repair may be a preferred form of repair because it avoids questioning the competence of the speaker.

[25]

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filter.

B: What size bolt does your *pan* take?

A: Seventeen millimeter.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 360)

In the exchange 25, the substitution by B of ‘pan’ for the erroneous choice ‘filter’ is an embedded repair. The kind of repair that is not handled as covertly as an embedded repair is defined as an exposed repair.

#### 3.2.5.2.4 PREFERENCE

In the formation of an adjacency pair, there exist two possibilities for the response part of a pair. The respond either can be in a way that is expected by the producer of the first part of the pair and named as a “preferred response”, or unexpected that is “dispreferred response”. Preferred responses are more likely to occur within a spoken interaction and they may be an acceptance for an offer or invitation, an agreement for an assessment, an expected answer to a question, and a denial to a blaming. Just the opposite forms of the instances given here can be given examples of dispreferred seconds such as a refusal to an offer or invitation.

In general what we notice is that there are relatively uncomplicated cases, where the second part of an opening is expected in the context and goes straight through, whereas other sequences trigger a need for checking, backtracking, and so on.

The conversations below take place in a liquor store. We will examine the two different answers of the customer and their meanings as a preferred and dispreferred sequence.

**[26a]**

Sales Clerk : You're over 21, aren't you?  
 Customer : Sure.  
 Sales Clerk : OK, here is your beer.

**[26b]**

Sales Clerk : You're over 21, aren't you?  
 Customer : Well, er, yes, my birthday was actually yesterday, and we're having a party tonight.  
 Sales Clerk : Alright, may I see your ID?

(Mey, 2001, p. 150)

In the second case the customer's return to the sales clerk is clearly problematic. The fact that superfluous information is given offered in the second part of the turn makes this type of answer inappropriate, as well as ineffective. As a result the salesperson gets suspicious and asks for the customer's ID.

Moreover, we can notice a couple of some other things, if we look more closely at the customer's utterance in the second case. The elaborate response in case (b) is in stark contrast to the simple 'Sure' in (a). In (b), we can observe hesitation in customer's reply to the question of the salesperson, and he starts his sentence over again (a 'false start': 'er'); there exists an expletive ('yes'), there is a so-called 'hedge' (showing a certain insecurity: 'well'), there is a lot of irrelevant information that the salesperson is not even interested in such as the birthday of the customer and the party. All the talk serves as evidence that something in customer's utterance is glossed over.

In chapter 2 we have mentioned that a dispreferred response requires more linguistic effort when compared with a preferred second. The structure of a dispreferred second is more complex as it is harder to say 'No' to request or

something like this than to say 'Yes'. The dialogues below are examples of a request-acceptance and a request-(indirect)denial.

**[27a]**

A: Could you help me lift this box, please?

B: OK.

**[27b]**

A: Could you help me lift this box, please?

B: Well, er, let me see, I have to take Cindy to nursery school and take my mother-in-law who just has broken her arm to the doctor and Fred my handy-man is coming over to fix the attic window, so... couldn't we make it some other day, perhaps, or does it have to be tomorrow?

(Mey, 2001, p. 151)

As we have said, such negative responses to requests are different from positive ones in a number of respects: structure, word count, 'hedges' and hesitations (like 'er'), and probably with regard to some other features as well, such as articulation, speed of delivery, pitch so on. The main aim to use more linguistic effort to say 'No' is to convey the impression that one does not just decline to perform the requested action, but that 'No' is due exclusively to circumstances beyond one's control, which then have to be specified. This specification takes time and requires a greater effort which results as hesitation, pauses, false starts, repairs and so on.

The term used for this ranking is 'preference', another perhaps more suitable term would be 'markedness'. A 'marked' sequence is structurally richer and more complex than an 'unmarked' one. Marked behaviours are, furthermore, dispreferred as they require more effort on the part of the users, which usually results in a noticeable deviance from what is expected or accepted. For the same reason, dispreferred behaviours are often lacking in effectiveness.

As mentioned in the previous paragraphs dispreferred seconds require more effort in order to explain that the unexpected answer is out of the control of its producer; therewithal, we have talked about that they are 'marked' behaviours. In

order to make these more clear we can say that dispreferred seconds are ‘marked’ by such features as:

- Delays
- Prefaces
- Accounts

A delay can be described as an item that is used to put off a dispreferred second part.

**[28]**

A: Can you do it?

B: What?

A: Can you take care of it?

B: Now?

A: If that’s all right.

B: Well, [pause] I mean, no, I’m afraid not.

(Levinson, 1983, 334)

The extract above contains delays as a repair initiation in the second turn, insertion sequence in the fourth and fifth turns, and the ‘well’, pause, and the self-repair in the sixth turn.

A preface is an audible device, such as one of the following used within a turn to put off a dispreferred response:

- Items like ‘well’
- Token agreement
- Indications of appreciation, apology, or qualification
- Self-repair

We can observe in the second turn of the following case prefaces of token agreement, appreciation, self-repair, and so forth:

[29]

A: Do you need help?

B: Um, yes, thanks, but you—I mean, I’ll just do it myself.

An account is an explanation as to why a dispreferred second part is given as a response in an adjacency pair. As we discussed above, people tend to use accounts in order to explain that the dispreferred situation is not their own will, or under their control. For this reason, an account is a frequent feature of dispreferred second parts.

[30]

A: What about coming here on the way; or doesn’t that give you enough time?

B: Well no; I’m supervising here.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 335)

B’s response ‘I’m supervising here’, in the dialogue above, is an account that tries to explain why s/he does not answer A in a preferred way.

On the whole, one can conclude that certain kinds of openings and responses are always definitely preferred, while others are usually and more or less definitely dispreferred. Moreover, these preferred and dispreferred seconds not only occur within face-to-face conversations but in all types of mutual interaction types such as telephone conversations et cetera.

### 3.2.5.3 FORM AND CONTENT

We will examine some of the content-oriented mechanisms of conversation, within this title. So far, we have focused on the formal devices in conversation; that is structuring the talk, measuring the interventions and controlling the floor. These

formal devices are often inseparable from what the forms in question express. A request is followed by a compliance or a rejection, not only on the formal level: there is a reason for pairs occurring together, to wit, the fact that both members of the pair deal with the same content.

### **3.2.5.3.1 COHESION AND COHERENCE**

People are able to make the distinction of coherent and incoherent talks, intuitively. Most basically, cohesion is defined as the links that hold a text together. On the other hand, coherence is described as what makes a text semantically meaningful. Stubbs (Mey, 2001, p. 153) expresses the distinction between a cohesion and coherence as follows: “Cohesion has to do with relations between certain linguistic forms... whereas coherence refers to relations between communicative acts.”

In other words, cohesion establishes local relations between syntactic items, whereas coherence has to do with the global meaning involved in what we want to express through our speech activity. As to conversation, while the local sequence of turns creates a certain amount of cohesion, it is by no means sufficient to guarantee coherence. To be coherent, a text must obey the ‘Coherence Rule’ as defined by Tsui (Mey, 2001, p. 154): “In order for an utterance to form a coherent sequence with the preceding utterance, it must either fulfill the illocutionary intention of the latter, or address its pragmatic presuppositions.”

Local cohesion certainly is a valuable help in detecting and managing textual coherence, it is by no means a guarantee, nonetheless. The extract below has no coherence at all, although it is locally pretty well organised as a sequence of turns. The dialogue takes place between a psychiatrist, namely an interviewer, and his patient, an 80-year-old, middle-class lady who suffers from schizophrenia:

[31]

I: Is it something you have experienced?

P: No, yes, it's been said to us.

I: Aha.

P: Yes, it's been said.

I: Who said to you?

P: Well, I can hardly remember who. There are many young gentlemen here, many young people who have been separated, and they have said it – they have told something about it. Yes.

I: Where are these young people?

P: Well, there are three hundred things after all, so we are, we had people all over space, yes. There were... the whole of space was filled with people and then they were put into three skins at our place.

I: Three skins?

P: Yes, they were put into the body, but I think that two of the skins are ready, they should be ready, they should be separated. And there were three hundred thousand who had no reason, or soul, or reason. But now they are so..., now it seems that there are some who have neither soul nor reason and they had to be helped, and people had to be helped, I can't do it here in this where we are, we have to be in... if I am to take care of these things. These ... that's what the ladies say they are aware...

P: I've helped them in Øster Søgade (a major thoroughfare in central Copenhagen), we helped them in that way.

I: In Øster Søgade?

P: Yes, we helped them in that way there and there were many who slid away and many who were helped. Yes.

I: There were many who slid away and many who were helped?

P: Yes, I don't know how many, I don't know. But there are many trisks and svilts, I think there are most trisks and svilts [meaningless English words]. That is those who are made out of svilt clay.

I: Out of svilt clay?

P: Yes, it is out on space. They make them in trilms.

I: Trilms?

P: By trilms. And then they go through three levels. Some only go through two. Some go through three. Yes, when they make them.

(Mey, 2001, p. 155)

In the extract above, although there exists a certain amount of text cohesion, both the patient and the interlocutor have to rely completely upon the interviewer's prompting role in order to be able to proceed in minimally ordered fashion. For this reason, the interviewer tries to have the patient start her speech again by means of repeating some of her last words whenever she halts.

No one can make an exact prediction about what is going to be said within a conversational process; however, the dialogue above is more incoherent and less predictable than most. We do not understand what the conversation is about, we do not understand even the meanings of some words used by the patient (trisks, svilts, trilms). Therefore, even as cohesion goes, the only way for the interviewee to continue the conversation is to repeat some of the last words of his patient as it is impossible to make a meaningful utterance upon what has been said by the patient. The interviewer just keeps the speech flow going, without having an inkling of where it is going. At a later point of the extract above the interviewee remarks herself that a tape is playing in her head. The ‘tape’ metaphor, indeed, clearly symbolizes the text cohesion that exists in this interaction. However, we say the same thing for coherence in this piece.

In contrast to the the sample given above one may not be able to observe cohesion in the extract below; however, they are making sense within a bigger framework:

[32]

A: What’s the time?

B: (a) Twelve noon.

(b) Time for coffee.

(c) I haven’t got a watch, sorry.

(d) How should I know.

(e) Ask Jack.

(f) You know bloody well what time it is.

(g) Why do you ask?

(h) What did you say?

(i) What do you mean?

(Mey, 2001, p. 156)

When we have a look at the definition of the coherence criterion that is a common illocutionary intent is observed in the adjacent pair ‘request for information (about physical time) – compliance by giving the requested information’, of all the answers given above, only (a) is strictly qualifies for this definition. However, we can



not claim that the other answers do not make any sense. Within particular contexts they all have their own senses. The answer given in (f), for example, may be uttered as a response to a deliberate attempt to make speaker B remember that it is time for an unwanted situation for him/her.

As the examples have shown, while sequencing plays an important role in the structuring of our conversations, the mere fact that utterances follow utterances with a certain amount of regularity and cohesion is in itself no guarantee of coherence. Sequencing clearly can not just be matter of constructing utterances according to some abstract rules of ‘conversational syntax’; the rules are at best reconstructions of what actually happens in an environment of users building up the conversation. Hence, even though conversations are composed of units that have some direct correspondence to sentences. The analytical method of sentence grammars have only limited validity in the domain of conversation.

### **3.2.5.3.2 ADJACENCY PAIRS AND CONTENT**

An adjacency pair, in its most basic sense, is a unit of conversation that contains an exchange of one turn each by two speakers, in other words, conversation consists in people’s turn-wise collaboration, including the repetitions and extensions that these turns naturally lead to. The turns are functionally related to each other in such a fashion that the first turn requires a certain type or range of types of second turn. The collaboration mentioned here is not a process that proceeds randomly, but it functions within some certain rules, governing not only what follows what, who can speak when, and so on, but also what a conversation is about.

Conversation analysts distinguish between the first and second pair parts of any adjacency pair. For example, the first pair part of an adjacency pair may be a summons; then what constitutes the second part has to be an utterance which deals with compliance, either positive or negative. The following exchanges are examples of such pairs:

**[33a]**

A: One more piece, honey?

B: Yes, please.

**[33b]**

A: One more piece, honey?

B: No, thanks.

The second part may contain more information such as ‘No, thanks. That’s enough for today’, or ‘I’m on a diet’, especially when it is in negative form, as we have dealt with in the previous topics.

In the theory of adjacency pairs the second part of a pair is immediately relevant and expectable. Moreover, if a second part is not found in the context of the conversation, then the first pair part is judged officially not to exist, and the first speaker may repeat the first part with some emphasis maybe.

**[34]**

A: Would you please close that window?

B: ...

A: I asked you to close that window.

The separation of the parts of an adjacency pair is not often in normal conversation circumstances; however, they have their own meanings in different contexts and different cultures, of course.

The complete absence of a second pair part is noticeable, and has some certain conversational effects, as in the case of ‘pretending it didn’t happen’. Formally, one can express the same ‘denied reality’ using an explicit and strictly speaking, self-contradictory second pair part such as ‘We didn’t hear that, did we?’ And an even

stronger second part would contain an indirect speech act of reprimanding as in the example that takes place between a member of a company who tries to ask the boss's wife for a date without being aware of the situation and another member who wants to stop him below:

**[35]**

A: [To the boss's wife] Would you like to have a drink after the meeting?

B: I don't believe what I'm hearing.

In the dialogue above 'I don't believe what I'm hearing' means, indeed, 'I heard you, but I can't believe my ears, since I definitely think you shouldn't have said what you have just said.' The second pair part of the adjacency part in this extract comes from another speaker that A expects; however, it shows us that the absence of a second pair part or the abnormal flow of an adjacency pair within a conversation also has its own meaning in its particular context and this way of absence and abnormality may change from culture to culture.

### **3.2.5.3.3 TYPES AND COHERENCE**

An adjacency pair is typically defined as a question with its answer; however, the main point that we wonder is its 'type'. In order to be able to understand and solve this problem one has to know what is the real answer to a question when its illocutionary force is taken into consideration. The sample spoken interaction below will be helpful to make it more clear:

**[36]**

A: Is Lennart there?

B: You can reach him at extension 88236.

(Mey, 2001, p. 159)

It is crystal clear that the pair above does not constitute a regular question-answer type. The information requested by A seems to learn about whether Lennart is

there (at the listener's location), or not and this information is provided indirectly by B. On the contrary, a regular answer to the locutionary force of this question such as 'No, he isn't', or 'I'm sorry he isn't', or simply 'No', while staying strictly within the bounds of adjacency pair typology in which second pair part provides the information requested by first pair part would be very uninformative.

The best way out of this mess is to assume that whatever follows a question is named as the answer. With reference to this assumption, we can simply say that there exists no speech act of answering, no answerhood. In other words, answering is not a speech act.; it can only be properly defined on the basis of, among other things, the preceding question. There is not an illocutionary force of answering.

When we look at the answer given by B above from another point of view, we can easily see that the question, in its illocutionary sense, is not about whether or not Lennart was at the given location, but just represented an indirect way of asking: 'Where is Lennart?' For this reason, it can be clearly stated that the question-answer pair given in extract 36 is coherent when its illocutionary intent is taken into consideration: 'requesting information'.

In a strict adjacency pair typology, such an interpretation of the speech acting involved in the sample dialogue 36 is not recognized as legal. If one takes the point of the original question to be the extraction of information about Lennart's presence in particular location ('there'), then the 'bald-on-record' answer 'No, he isn't' is correct, but not too helpful. By contrast an answer that specifies 'Where I can reach Lennart?' provides the information that is needed.; whether or not Lennart is at the original, presumed location has now become irrelevant.

The problem of 'unexpected second parts' has been overcome by conversational analysts by means of making a distinction between sequences and pre-sequences. Therefore, the question given in 36 is not a request for information, but a pre-request for something else, for instance, the permission to speak with Lennart, an

effort to be put in touch with Lennart, and so on. One could perhaps say that the question whether Lennart is there inquires about a ‘felicity condition’ for the real request. The competent interlocutor perceives this, and infers that the real reason for inquiring about Lennart’s location is the speaker’s desire to see him, or talk to him on the phone; therefore, he neglects that original question and answers what he thinks is the real request by indicating where Lennart may be reached.

Sometimes, within a spoken interaction process, the interlocutors may misinterpret a pre-request as ‘the real thing’. In the dialogue above a customer walks up to a check-cashing counter:

[37]

A: Can I cash a check?

B: I’ll be right there.

A: That’s okay. I was just wondering whether it was too late, or not.

(Mey, 2001, p. 160)

Here, the first utterance is mistakenly interpreted as a pre-sequence to a check-cashing encounter, where it in reality was just a request for information: ‘whether it was too late, or not’.

A question may have numerous answers all of which are relevant to the point of the question. Therefore, a strictly sequential adjacency concept, based on a narrow speech act typology of ‘questioning’, does not provide a useful solution. The extract below will be helpful to illustrate what is being discussed:

[38]

A: What does Joe do for a living?

B: (a) The same as always.

(b) On this and that.

(c) I’ve no idea.

(d) What’s that got to do with it?

(e) He doesn’t.

(Mey, 2001, p. 161)

Although the answers given above do not provide any ‘real’, or ‘legal’ answer to the question, except in some vague, evasive way, all of them are ‘to the point’, meaning that they make sense as answers.

Of all the answers above, only (a) strictly qualifies as a typologically acceptable reply, it contains no information about whatsoever about Joe’s business except in the case of a questioner who is more or less familiar with Joe and what he usually does for a living. As to the other answers they, appropriately with respect to the question, state that Joe does not do anything in particular for a living in (b); that the addressee does not know the answer in (c); that the question rejected by the addressee as improper or irrelevant in (d); and that Joe is a lazy bum in (e). Although they are not all in strict accordance with the principle of pair adjacency, all these answers, depending on the context, of course, are perfectly acceptable. The answers above are related with the content of the question. They do not just address its illocutionary force, but also its pragmatic presuppositions. Therefore, the notion of conversational coherence is not upset by the answers like the ones quoted in extract 38.

Pairs are important within a conversational process; however, conversation itself is much more than just combining pairs in sequences not even to mention the fact that those pairs can easily expand into ‘threes’, ‘fours’ and so on, and that ‘sequence’ in this sense does not have to entail ‘immediately following or preceding’. For a discourse to be coherent, it is not enough, or even necessary, that an utterance and its predecessor or successor, combined into an adjacency pair, abide by the strict rules formulated by some of the conversation analysts. Tsui’s ‘Coherence Principle’ with its double emphasis on both illocutionary force and pragmatic presuppositions, is stronger than, and hierarchically superior to, the notion of paired adjacency. Adjacency is a case of coherent sequencing needs to defined strictly in terms of adjacency.

### 3.2.5.3.4 CONVERSATION AND SPEECH ACTS

The regular ‘paired’ structure of conversation has a parallel to the regularity with which certain speech acts manifest themselves as institutionalized acts, and to the obvious regularities that operate in speech act behaviour: answers follow questions, greetings follow greetings and so on (Mey, 2001, p. 162).

We had better consider the following spoken exchange, in which John says to Mildred at a party they are both attending:

[39]

John: It’s getting late Mildred.

We can increase three answers among Mildred’s many possible different answers:

Mildred: Are you really bored?  
 Mildred: Do you want to go home?  
 Mildred: So?

(Mey, 2001, p. 162)

In order to be able to determine the ‘type’ of the exchange takes place between John and Mildred, we have to find out what John’s utterance really stands for. In other words, is it a statement about the time of day; an expression of boredom; a secret code for: ‘Remember to take your pill’; or something entirely different?

The illocutionary intention of John’s remark has to be decoded in order to be able to understand the main intention of his utterance. What kind of speech act does it represent? A statement, request, confession? The answer to this question depends upon the such things as: how well Mildred knows John; What sort of a party it is and so on. To borrow a terminology originally developed in another context: one must know the script for this particular interaction in order to assess the contextual value of this particular utterance. A party script would include information about people’s

conversational behaviour at parties: they may joke, fight, argue, discuss linguistics, eat, and so on; alternatively, they may even enjoy themselves.

Thinking about the Mildred's possible answers, the most surprising fact about them is that they all make sense within the natural flow of the conversation. Especially when we look at their possible outcomes, they must certainly be valid, effective answers: John, may get upset, and just walk off, or he may hand Mildred the car keys, or they may continue the conversation.

We can make some important conclusions from the extract that we have examined in 39. First of all, speech acts are not particularly good tools to work with when it comes to understanding an utterance in context: which speech act one actually is looking depends very much, if not exclusively, on that particular context.

Second, classifying conversational adjacency pairs in terms of illocutionary intention is a problem in itself; however, it certainly is not going to be less thorny if we limit ourselves to situating those pairs in their immediate appropriate contexts, without taking their perlocutionary effects into account.

What counts is how a speech act functions. If John's remark to Mildred functions as a statement, then it is that speech act; if it functions as an expression of boredom, then it is that expression, and so on. What we are really looking at here is a pragmatic act; as Levinson (Mey, 2001, p. 163) states the units in question seem to be functionally defined by the actions they can be seen to perform in context.

The most important point, in the light of the above, within a conversational process is not what a speaker decides to question, order, request etc., but the effects these speech acts have upon the conversational interaction. This also makes the discussions about the type of conversational interaction, in reality, a bit beside the point.



### 3.2.6 ELEMENTS STRUCTURING A CONVERSATION

Negotiating a conversation is quite a challenge, when we consider all the elements involved:

- Setting – where you talk
- Enter/exit
- Purpose
- Topics
- Formality
- Who talks to whom
- Turn-taking vs overlap
- Cues
- Appreciation
- Use of humour
- How/if get to the point
- Direct/indirect
- Sequencing order
- Pace
- Eye contact
- Attitude, tone of voice
- Silence
- Length of each utterance, of conversation as a whole

Differences between speakers in any of these elements can lead to irritation, moral judgments, or misreading of intent. When there are tensions between the participants already, these conversational differences can cause serious ruptures.

We have all listened to and participated in conversation nearly every day of our lives. Changing our communication styles and expectations is like asking the leopard to give up its spots. If we are involved in a cross-cultural or high conflict

situation, we had better try to be aware of how our conversational habits may be affecting our negotiations. It may help to raise our observations about communication patterns with the other party (and this is the hard part) without a good or bad evaluation attached.

### 3.2.6.1 FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATION

In face-to-face conversations we sometimes may come across brief conversations which begin and end without any introductory and terminating procedures. Such kind of brief chats tend to occur when something unexpected happens and also may occur between complete strangers. The dialogue that takes place on a bus stop when the bus is not on time will be a smart example for this kind of conversations and brief chats of this kind consist only of 'what is talked about'. However, the other extreme is a conversation where beginning and end form elaborate patterns and where the message consists of several topics which in their turn are made up of a number of subtopics. The extract below takes place between two friends who are chatting about A's real-life accident:

[40]

B: Hello, Manolo, how are you?

A: Erm, I'm better from my... felt in the Lakes.

B: Why... why... what did you happen?

A: Erm, we went to the Lakes for a walk with our teacher of English here and erm, we erm, climb... climbed... they say climbed, erm, and erm, when we came back from the mountain I feel... felt and broke... a little broke of my elbow... then I went to hospital in the night but it take two hours and I must suspect... expect... erm, for the next day... in the morning, and (points to his sling) I have this slip, I think it's a slip but I don't remember, as well.

B: The arm, do you... is still hurt... still, still hurt?

A: No, no... not so much... no it's hurting... it's not hurting... is, I think it is good because I have my arm very quiet, and it's good, I don't... I sleep well, erm, so well, so, so, and... I can sleep and be...

B: Can you have a shower?

A: Yes, yes, every day...

B: Dear, I'm sorry to hear that event, but I'm pleased to see you are

OK.

A: Thank you very much see you later.

B: See you soon.

(Aydın Aydın, 2005, p. 282)

The conversation above is informal and consists of three sections; opening, message and closing. The opening part of this conversation is quite short, in other words, there exists no saluting expressions. A very long message section starts just after a short opening section and it is followed by a short closing section.

### 3.2.7 CONVERSATIONAL STRATEGIES

Conversational strategies used by the participants within a spoken interaction process differ not only depending on the actual situation, but also the length of the conversation itself. We will focus on openings, dealing with the topic throughout the conversation and closings of formal and informal conversations within this section. However, before talking about these strategies in detail the sample lists below will be helpful to formulate some particular utterances used to open and close formal and informal spoken interactions.

#### Formal Conversations

Greetings		Introductions		Good-byes	
Hello, Mr. Smith	Hello.	Dr. White, I'd like to introduce you to Rachel.	It's a pleasure to meet you. / Pleased to meet you.	It was nice meeting you.	It was nice meeting you too.
Hello, doctor.	Hello.				
Good morning.	Good morning.			It was nice to see you.	Same to you.
Good afternoon.	Good afternoon.				
Good evening.	Good evening.			Have a good day.	Thank you. You too.

How are you?	Fine, thank you.			Good night / Goodbye.	Good night / Goodbye.
--------------	------------------	--	--	-----------------------	-----------------------

### Informal Conversations

Greetings		Introductions		Good-byes	
<i>Sample sentence</i>	<i>Sample response</i>	<i>Sample sentence</i>	<i>Sample response</i>	<i>Sample sentence</i>	<i>Sample response</i>
Hey. Hi.	Hey. Hi.	Ann, this is Jim. He's in my class.	Hi Jim. Nice to meet you.	Nice meeting you.	You too.
How are ya?	I'm good. All right.			Take it easy.	
How are things?	Pretty good.	Hi. My name's John.	I'm Dave. Nice to meet you.	Take care.	
How's it goin'?	OK. Not bad.			I'm off.	OK, bye.
How ya doin'?	I'm doin' good.			I gotta go.	See ya. See ya later. Bye.
What's up?	Nothin' much. Not a whole lot. Nothin'. Nothin' special. Not much.			So long.	
What's new?				See ya.	
What's happenin'?				See ya later.	
What are you up to?				Bye.	
What's goin' on?					

### 3.2.7.1 OPENING A CONVERSATION

Although some face-to-face conversations may lack opening section, most conversations begin with an opening before the message is introduced. In face-to-face conversations we can examine openings in two main categories:

- A formal conversation
- An informal conversation

#### 3.2.7.1.1 A FORMAL CONVERSATION

The dialogue takes place between a secretary and Mrs. Abott, who wants to see Mrs. Florescu to discuss economic development.

**[41]**

A: Good morning.

B: Good morning. May I help you?

A: Yes, I am here to meet with Mrs. Florescu.

B: Do you have an appointment?

A: Yes, I am supposed to meet with her at 10:00 to discuss economic development.

B: If you could please take a seat, I will tell her that you are here. Could I have your name, please?

A: Of course. My name is Lily Abott.

B: Okay, Mrs. Abott, Mrs. Florescu will be with you in just one moment.

A: Thank you.

Both speakers salute each other in a formal way (Good morning) at the beginning of the conversation. Greetings like 'Hi', 'What's up?' are not used as the

participants do not know each other. After the greetings the conversation continues as the formal exchanges of questions and answers.

### 3.2.7.1.2 AN INFORMAL CONVERSATION

In the exchange below speaker C, a female studio manager, has been invited for supper to a married couple A and B. The atmosphere through which the conversation takes place is relaxed.

[42]

A: \*hello\*

C: \*Hello\*. sorry I'm LATE.

A: \*(laughs) that's alright\* are you...

B: \*(laughs and murmur)\*

C: YES, I said half past SEVEN.

A: oh I expected you between about... half past and quarter to.

C: hello LIZ... sorry I'm LATE (laughs).

B: oh I like your hair.

C: M

A: yes Ann you've had it curled.

C: (laughs)

A: yes that's nice... I say that's nice.

(Aydın Aydın, 2005, p. 289)

When we make a comparison between a formal and an informal exchange the first difference that we encounter is the greeting parts (hello-Hello). Other characteristic features that can be observed within an informal spoken interaction are the laughters and spontaneous compliment instead of the usual inquiries about health.

### 3.2.7.2 PHATIC COMMUNICATION

People tend to employ a warm-up period before introducing a topic while taking part in an oral interaction. This warming-up period can be of varying length and during this period participants engage in 'phatic communication'.

Phatic communication can be defined as the non-referential use of language to share feelings or establish a mood of sociability rather than to communicate information or ideas; ritualized formulas intended to attract the attention of the listener or prolong communication; however, we can also use phatic talk to wind up a conversation.

Phatic communication refers also to trivial and obvious exchanges about the weather and time, made up of ready-made sentences or foreseeable statements. Therefore this is a type of communication that establishes a contact without transmitting a precise content, where the container is more important than the content.

The question “How are you?”, for instance, is usually an automatic component of a social encounter. Although there are times when “How are you?” is asked in a sincere, concerned manner and does in fact anticipate a detailed response regarding the respondent’s present state, this needs to be pragmatically inferred from context and intonation.

With the help of a phatic talk people can begin a conversation when there is a need for it. For example, “How are you?” that we have mentioned in the previous paragraph can be followed by a long conversation, if the participants have something to say each other. Phatic communication, in some sense, prepares the participants to the exchange of the real message and makes the participants feel comfortable to begin the communicative process. The communication can be completed, again, by means of using phatic talk.

Phatic talk usually has the following ingredients:

- Questions about health
  
- Comments on the weather

- Comments on personal matters
  
- Polite phrases

### **3.2.7.3 DEALING WITH TOPICS**

The definition of the term ‘topic’ is pretherotical notion of what is being talked about (Brown and Yule, 1983a, p. 71). Schegloff defines it as vernacular term, roughly referring to “what is talked about through some series of turns at talk (Schegloff, 1979, p. 270). Simply we can say that topic is what the speakers talk about. In some conversations there exists only one topic, but this one topic generally tends to generate another. On the other hand most conversations contain more than one topic. A topic has a tendency to split into subtopics dealing with particular aspects of the main topic.

Our main focus will be on ‘topical strategies’ used by the speakers of English to deal with topics in conversation. We can talk about seven topical strategies :

- Introducing
- Changing
- Shifting
- Drifting
- Digressing
- Resuming
- Terminating

Except for termination, all of the topical strategies represent different forms of introduction. Therefore, in some sources, ‘introducing a topic’ is sometimes is not taken into account as a different topical strategy at all.



Introducing a topic involves bringing up a first topic at the beginning or a new topic in the course of conversation. The first topic is most likely to be introduced by means of some linguistic strategy which helps the speaker to get started and prepares the listener for the speaker's next action. Certain linguistic items like 'right', 'well' and 'now' can either introduce a topic on their own or precede some other introductory strategy. In spontaneous conversations, on the other hand, with speakers who know each other well and share a great deal of common ground, the first topic may be introduced by means of a question as in the sample extract below:

[43]

A: Well, what happened in the match yesterday?

B: I didn't watch it, I was in a meeting but Marshall says that I've missed a lot. Yankees've won the championship.

A: I knew it... They've been the best throughout the season... wish I could've watch it.

B: Don't worry bro... I've recorded on a DVD... wanna watch it tonight?

A: Excellent.

Changing the topic is abandoning the current topic in favour of a new, unrelated topic. There exist formal and informal markers used by the participants of a conversation in order to change the topic.

[44]

A: Um, you and Sheila have been doing some lectures for first year Microbiology.

B: I wonder whether I could possibly have a copy of last year's tax return.

(Aydın Aydın, 2005, p.299)

The informal marker 'I wonder' emphasizes the change of the topic in the sample dialogue above. Some other informal markers used in conversation to emphasize the change of the topic are:

- what else
- Did I tell you
- Do you know
- I wonder

Some formal markers used to change the topic in a conversational process are as follows:

- Let me tell you
- Can I ask you
- Let me ask you

Shifting a topic involves moving from one topic to a related topic or from one aspect of the current topic to another. Both topic changes and shifts may be initiated by a marker; the marker found in topic shifts marks the transition between two related topics rather than, as in topic changes, introduces an entirely new topic. Some examples of shift markers are:

- Actually
- By the way
- In fact
- In actual fact
- Incidentally
- Now
- Talking about
- That reminds me
- Well
- What about

**[45]**

A: I'm so grateful for your help

B: Never mind it... we're friends.

A: Oh, talking about friends. I'd just like to ask whether Barney and Ron...

In the extract above speaker A shifts the topic by making use of a marker 'talking about'; however, the transition between the topics tend to be marked by pauses and/or laughter when linguistic markers are entirely missing.

Topic drifts are linguistically and prosodically unmarked, in other words, drifting involves moving imperceptibly from one topic to another; however, the old and the new topic is usually linked in some ways. In the sample dialogue below speakers are talking about which present to buy for the birthday party of their friends. Speaker A recommends a silver necklace, and as soon as she does, speaker B reminds her mother's necklace that has given for repair:

**[46]**

A: What about this one? Katie loves ornaments.

B: I've forgotten to take my mother's necklace that I've given 4 days ago.

Shall we go and take it today?

A: Today?

B: Yes, otherwise she will kill me...

A: Oh, I see, OK then.

Topic digressions, the fifth topical strategy, occur when a speaker initiates a move away from the current topic. When either of the speakers is prompted by a greater momentary interest in the new topic, the previous topic is then suspended, one-sidedly or temporarily. A new topic is introduced and then closed before the old topic is re-adopted. Topic digressions may or may not be related to the current topic. Some digressions are spontaneous, for example, when a speaker suddenly remembers that s/he has to pass on some information to the other participant. Other digressions are deliberate, resulting from speakers seeking and receiving clarification or

additional information. The participant who began the digression has been found to often take the initiative to resume the old topic.

[47]

A: so if there's a hardware store we could call in and get one on the way back.

B: do you think there is one.

A: yes

B: OK then

A: that would be nice wouldn't it?

B: yes it would

A: I mean the job not the hardware shop

B: yes I realize what do you keep telling me for

(Cook, 1989, p. 57)

'I mean' uttered by speaker A in the exchange above is a digression marker. We can list some other digression markers as follows:

- Actually
- As a matter of fact
- By the way
- I mean
- Incidentally

Topic resumption, or resuming the topic, happens when a digression is ended and the previous topic is returned to. In general the speaker who broke out of the current topic also takes the initiative to go back.

[48]

A: \*... we didn't wrap UP for you\*

B: \*oh INCIDENTALLY (pause) you know\* about MALCOLM (pause) putting his dislocating his SHOULDER...

A: no I wouldn't like to TOUCH it I'd put DIRTY FINGER-MARKS on it (laughs)

(Aydın Aydın, 2005, p. 303)

In the sample interaction above, speaker B initiated the digression ‘oh INCIDENTALLY’ and it is also B who resumes the old topic, ‘unwrapping presents’. This means that we can observe two different topical strategies which are digressing and resuming throughout this extract.

Topic resumption markers, or return markers, include:

- All right
- Right
- OK
- (Well) now
- Now then
- Anyway
- So

Lastly, terminating a topic, involves closing the old topic before introducing a new one or before closing the entire conversation. Linguistic termination markers are rare within a conversational process; however, silent pauses, laughter are nonlexical markers of termination. Besides, in some cases the current topic comes to an end, and there is no need for a marker to indicate the termination.

**[49]**

A: Hullo, I was just ringing up to ask if you were going to Bertrand’s party.

B: Yes, I thought you might be.

A: Heh heh.

B: Yes, would you like a lift?

A: Oh, I’d love one.

B: Right, okay um I’ll pick you up from there.

(Levinson, 1997, p.359)

Speaker B’s ‘right, okay’ in extract 49 is a marker for termination. Some other termination markers are:

- OK
- All right
- Right
- That's it
- There we are
- Well

#### **3.2.7.4 CLOSING A CONVERSATION**

Face-to-face closings need more conversational effort than in a telephone conversation. The main reason for that may be the more routine-like structure of telephone conversations; however, a face-to-face conversation may demand more varied closing techniques.

Most closing sections consist of winding-up talk and polite phrases before the conversation is closed. As in the case of openings, we can categorize face-to-face closings in two main types:

- A formal conversation
- An informal conversation

##### **3.2.7.4.1 A FORMAL CONVERSATION**

The closing section of a formal talk is brief and polite when compared to an informal closing section. There exists no extra talk except what the situation requires.

**[50]**

A: Thanks for your time.

B: My pleasure...

A: Goodbye.

B: Goodbye.

### 3.2.7.4.2 AN INFORMAL CONVERSATION

[51]

A: Why don't we all have lunch  
 B: Okay so that would be in St Jude's would it?  
 A: Yes.  
 B: Okay so...  
 A: One o'clock in the bar  
 B: Okay  
 A: Okay?  
 B: Okay then thanks very much indeed George  
 A: All right  
 B: See you there  
 A: See you there  
 B: Okay  
 A: Okay, bye  
 B: Bye.

(Levinson, 1997, p.317)

In the exchange above 'Okays' and 'Alright' are pre-closing items, 'See you' and 'Bye' are the final exchange of terminal elements in this conversation. One more thing that should be paid attention is that the 'Goodbyes' in a formal conversation are in the form of 'Byes' within an informal exchange.

As a conclusion in face-to-face conversations openings and closings may sometimes be lacking, openings and closings are affected by the degree of formality, topic changes, shifts and drifts are common, body language plays an important role, extralinguistic details play an important role in the existence, length and types of opening and closing terms within a face-to-face conversation.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **THE ANALYSES OF SOME DAILY CONVERSATIONS**

#### **4.1 SNIPPETS ABOUT ANALYSES**

This chapter is the application of the theoretical information that we have mentioned so far. In this chapter there exist analyses of five different conversations. The main problem in the studies of conversation analysis is the difficulty in finding naturally recorded conversations. Moreover, there exists no known application in Turkish which means that it is almost impossible to find and analyze Turkish conversations that are naturally recorded. In order to solve this problem we have recorded Turkish conversations that are to be analyzed in this study. The participants of the conversations are totally unaware of the recording process so as not to break the naturalness of the spoken interactions.

Analysis number 1 is between D (Didem), who is R's prospective daughter-in-law and R (Rana), who is mother of D's fiancé. In analysis number 2 there exist three participants who are D, R and H (Hivda), who is sister of D's fiancé. In analysis number 3 the situation is a bit different. Although it seems that there exist two different conversations, 3a and 3b, these two conversations has been recorded at the same time which means they occurred at the same time during a visit in the Festival of Sacrifices. As analysing these different spoken interactions under one title would be so messy, we have analysed them under the titles of 3a and 3b and put a time column to show the times of the utterances in two conversations and how do these different conversations overlap each other. Further information will be given in the following chapter. In conversation 3a there are two participants who are named as S1a (Speaker 1 a) and S2a. In the conversation 3b there exist four participants; S1b, S2b, S3b, S4b. The a's and b's indicates which conversation a speaker belongs to (whether 3a or 3b). The last analysis is in English and this is not recorded by us. This conversation has been quoted from another source and analyzed in order to reveal the differences and similarities of the daily conversations of Turkish and English languages.



**4.2 THE ANALYSIS OF A TURKISH FACE-TO-FACE  
CONVERSATION NR.1**

A FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATION	T U R N	ACT	TOPICAL S T R A T E G I E S	E X C H A N G E	T E R M I N A C T I O N	I N T E R A C T I O N
R: Rahat uyuyabildin mi?	1	<Ask>	[Introducing]	(Asking) 1	1	1
D: Hıı hıı... Belim çok ağrıyor benim.	2	<Answer> <Inform>	[Digressing]			
R: Niye?	3	<Query>				
D: Bu sefer öteki tarafı... (Pause...) Erken mi uyandın?	4	<Expand> <Ask>	[Resuming]			
R: Ben?	5	<Query>				
D: Hmm.	6	<Confirm>				
R: Ben... saat kaçtı... 9 gibiydi. Erken yattım ben. Erken yatınca da... Beni de şeyden... Karamürsel' den arkadaşım aramış *Hivda* çıktı telefona annem duşta dedi.	7	<Answer> <Expand>				

(Long pause)					
D: *Hıı hı*	8	<Acknowledge>			
R: Aaa diyor uyandırdım mı yok yok dedim... (Pause) Dün çok yorgundun... kıyamadım.	9	<Empathizer>	[Shifting]		
D: Ayyyyy belim çok fena...	10	<Inform>	[Changing]	(Stating)2	2
R: Niye ki?	11	<Query>			
D: Annem geliyor ya şimdi...	12	<Expand>			
R: Zaten giderken gözü arkada kalacak... Kızın beli ağrıyordu... İnşallah anne ol da anneliği bir tat... Çok hoş bir şey çok zor bir şey Didem.	13	<Acknowledge>  <Expand>			
D: Öyleymiş ya sinem diyordu ben hayatta böyle olacağımı düşünmezdim diye...	14	<Suggest>			
R: Yani... bambaşka bir şey.	15	<Acknowledge>			
D: Yani diyor... hani her şeyini anlıyorsun diyor ne yaptığını ne ettiğini... kötü bi anını her şeyini anlıyorsun diyor.	16	<Expand>			
R: Aynen öyle.	17	<Acknowledge>			

Recording date: 07.07.2009

\*...\* Overlapping speech

#### 4.2.1. THE EXPLANATION OF THE CONVERSATION

Two topics are discussed in this dialogue: “How much and how they sleep?” and “Being a mother”. This means that this piece of conversation consists of one termination. The termination of the first topic and moving to the second is signalled by a pause and an empathizer used in order to sign that what is said for the first topic is enough.

This extract constitutes an interaction and the interaction is formed by one termination. There exist two exchanges and seventeen turns. Five topical strategies which are introducing, digressing, resuming, shifting, changing are used throughout the conversation. The exchange of the first part is asking. The acts that take place in the first part (before the termination) of the conversation are ask, answer, inform, query, expand, ask, query, confirm, answer, expand, acknowledge, empathizer. Lastly, there are eight turns in the first part.

The exchange in the second part is stating and the second part consists of nine acts inform, query, expand, acknowledge, expand, suggest, acknowledge, expand, acknowledge; and eight turns.

**4.3 THE ANALYSIS OF A TURKISH FACE-TO-FACE  
CONVERSATION NR.2**

A FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATION	T U R N	ACT	TOPICAL S T R A T E G I E S	E X C H A N G E	T E M P O R A L I T Y	I N T E R A C T I O N
D: Bunu buzluğa mı koycam?	1	<Ask>	[Resuming]	(Asking) 1	1	1
R: Onu... yok alta koyacaksın şu şey kenarda *yer var...*	2	<Answer>				
D: *Buraya mı*	3	<Query>				
R: hı hı	4	<Acknowledge>				
D: Şunlar?... (Long pause) ÖDÜM PATLADI (Laughs)	5	<Query> <Surprise>	[Digressing]	(Stating) 2	2	2
R: (Laughs) Gelini korkuttun... (Laughs)	6	<Statement>				
D: (Laughs)... Günaydın	7	<Greeting>				
H: Günaydın.	8	<Greeting>				
R: Şunu kaldır didem... Şunla börek yapmışım hiç güzel olmuyor.	9	<Request> <Inform>	[Resuming]			
D: Hmm.	10	<Acknowledge>				

(Long Pause). Nerden çıktın sen yaa?		<Ask>	[Changing]	(Asking) 3	
H: Ooo ben saat dokuz buçuktan beri ayaktayım. (Pause) AA Sponge Bob...	11	<Answer> <Surprise>			
D: Saat sekizde sızdı kaldı. (laughs)	12	<Inform>			
H: Sekizde mii!	13	<Query>			
D: (Laughs)	14	<Acknowledge>			
H: Yok ya onbir de yattım... o kadar da değil oğlum...	15	<Reject> <Meta-comment>			
D: (Laughs)	16	<Acknowledge>			
R: Kaçta geldiniz didem?	17	<Ask>		(Asking) 4	
D: Onbir buçukta geldik	18	<Answer>			
R: Ben yine *şeyi...*	19	<Frame>	[Changing]	(Stating) 5	3
H: *Tamam ben de onbirde yattım.*	20	<Inform>			
R: ... yemek programını...	21	<Preface>			
D: haa... o şeydeydi...	22	<Query>			
R: Kırmızı *halı*...	23	<Clue>			
D: Kırmızı... beni sinir eden kırmızı halı...  Nasıldı onun evi?	24	<Confirm>  <Ask>		(Asking) 6	
R: Seyredemedim ki uyudum kaldım.	25	<Answer>			
D: Ha onun evi... O hafif biraz şey demi...	26	<Query>			
R: Aynen *öyle*	27	<Justify>			
D: *Hafif* de değil *baya...*	28	<Expand>			
R: *Aynen*	29	<Justify>			
D: Şey ya... onun evini çok... üniversite öğrencisiymiş o.	30	<Check>			

R: Hıı hı *üniversite*	31	<Confirm>		
D: *evini* *çok merak ediyorum ben onun*	32	<Statement>		
R: *Ama şey..* 24 yaşında mı *25 yaşında mı ne*	33	<Check>		
D: *24.* Ayy benim elime... ne diyodu o... benim yemeklerime rakip olamazlar. (Laughs)	34	<Answer> <Expand>		
R: (Laughs)	35	<Acknowledge>		
D: Onu çok merak ediyodum yaa. Üniversite öğrencisinin evi nasıl olabilir acaba diye.	36	<Ask>		
R: Ya zaten onun kurulu düzeni olması *lazım.*	37	<Meta-comment>		
D: *e işte*	38	<Acknowledge>		
(Long pause)				
D: Ya bi de artık sonunda onun hani sürpriz yapıyorlar ya... sıktı o sürprizler.	39	<Statement>	[Shifting]	(Stating) 7
R: Sürprizi sevmiyorum zaten o sürprize geldi mi *kapatıyorum ben*	40	<Answer>		
D: *O şeyi izledin mi Ankaralı bi adam vardı?*	41	<Ask>	[Shifting]	(Asking) 8
R: Hıı hı... onu da izlerken... babanla izlerken ikimiz de uyumuşuz (laughs).	42	<Answer>		
D: Ayy beni mahvetti o yaa öff... *sürprizi çok kötüydü yani bi görsen...*	43	<Meta-comment>		

R: *Ay Allah korusun öyle deme.*. ben şeyi çok severdim ıı... neydi... Var mısın Yok musun bir de Yemekteyiz programını. Yani başka seyredecek hiçbir şey yok. Akşam şey... Aşk Memnu'yu seyrettim.	44	<Disagree> <Frame> <Filler> <Statement>  <Inform>	[Changing]	(Stating) 9	4
D: Ha... Onda n'oldu?	45	<Acknowledge> <Ask>		(Asking) 10	
R: Onda n'oldu... Pek şeyler gelişmedi yani her zamanki gibi... *muhabbetler aynı...*	46	<Confirm> <Answer>			
D: Ne... Nihal'le Behlül mü evlencek?	47	<Ask>		(Asking) 11	
(Short Pause)					
H: Şey Behlül bakıyor yaa Bihter'den vazgeçiyor böyle... çapkınlığa çıkıyor bu...	48	<Answer>			
D: Haa...	49	<Acknowledge>			
H: Sıkılıyor Bihter'den. Sonra ciddi ciddi Nihal'e böyle aşık olmaya başlıyor... sonra Bihter anlıyor... öyle gidiyor işte.	50	<Expand>			
D: 87'li miymiş ha?	51	<Ask>	[Digressing]	(Asking) 12	
H: Anlamadım?	52	<Preface>			
D: 86'lı mı, 87'li mi ne.	53	<Expand>			
H: Öyle mi?	54	<Check>			
D: Hı hı. (Short pause). Eee?	55	<Confirm> <Ask>		(Asking) 13	

H: Ondan sonra... ııı... Bihter şey yapıyo... açığa çıkıyo bunların ilişkisi Bihter intihar ediyo falan filan.	56	<Answer>	[Resuming]		
R: Henüz çıkmadı.	57	<Acknowledge>			
H: Daha zaten Nihal'le falan da evlenmedi heralde yani... evlilik değil de böyle nişan gibi bişey mi ne öyle bişey... O Beşir de ölüyodu ha...	58	<Expand>  <Inform>		(Stating) 14	
D: *Niye yaa yazık*	59	<Opine>			
R: *Ay yazık*	60	<Opine>			
D: Ay Ölmesin... *Bi onu...*	61	<Meta-comment>			
H: *Hatta ortalarda bi yerde ölüyodu* ama yerini bilmiyorum. O Madam'ı da yolluyorlardı	62	<Expand>  <Inform>			
R: Kimi?	63	<Query>		(Asking) 15	
H: Madam'ı... Ondan sonra Bihter falan ölünce işte işler böyle şey olunca... Behlül de kaçıyo ha.	64	<Confirm>  <Expand>  <Inform>			
D: (Laughs)	65	<Acknowledge>			
H: ... sonra Madam'ı tekrar Çağırıyorlar falan.	66	<Expand>			
D: Madam o şeyle evleniyomu... adamlarla?	67	<Ask>			
H: Yok *sonunda öyle bişey hatırlamıyorum*	68	<Answer>			
R: *Adnanla evleniyor*	69	<Answer>			
D: Ha?	70	<Query>			
H: *Öyle bişey...*	71	<Confirm>			



R: *Aslında en yakışacağı da o ha*... *eziliyor büzülüyor...*	72	<Meta-comment>			
H: *Ama değiştirerek yapıyorlar.* Belki mesela Beşir ölmez... belki Madam'la o evlenir bilemiyorum yani...	73	<Meta-comment>		(Stating) 16	
D: Hıı. (Short Pause)	74	<Acknowledge>			
H: *Ayrıca tahminen...*	75	<Expand>			
R: *Beşir'le kız şey yapıyorlardı şu anda*... anlaşıyorlardı.	76	<Inform>			
D: Beşirle hangi kız?	77	<Ask>		(Asking) 17	
R: O evde Cemile var ya...	78	<Answer>			
D: Haa anlaşıyorlar mı?	79	<Query>			
R: Hıı hı. Birbirlerine kur yaptılar.	80	<Confirm>			
D: Hadi ya!	81	<Query>			
R: Hıı hı.	82	<Confirm>			
H: Vay anasını neler olmuş (Laughs).	83	<Statement>			
D: O... kız niye yurt dışına gitti?	84	<Ask>		(Asking) 18	
R: Ben hiç... o zamandır... yani kaç bölüm... Sivas'a gittim gideli hiç izlemedim. Gitmiş gelmiş ondan haberim yok.	85	<Answer>			
D: Ya Yaprak dökümünde en Ölmeyecek adamı öldürdüler ya.	86	<Opine>	[Changing]	(Stating) 19	5
H: Kimi?	87	<Ask>		(Asking) 20	
D: Cem vardı ya bitane.	88	<Expand>			
H: O kim?	89	<Query>			
D: Hani...	90	<Clue>			
H: Kim?	91	<Query>			

D: Böff... zengin bi çocuk vardı ya.	92	<Clue>		
H: Ya ben o diziyi izlemiyorum (laughs).	93	<Statement>		
D: İzlicen izlicen... hiç bakmadın mı?	94	<Ask>	[Drifting]	(Asking) 21
H: Ya Mebrure izlerken mecbur Bakıyodum yani (laughs)	95	<Answer>		
D: Ya şey... kızın adı aklıma gelmiyo... (short pause) iki kardeş bunlar... ya neydi o kızın adı...?	96	<Query>		(Asking) 22
H: Esmer olan mı?	97	<Ask>		
D: Ya Yaprak Dökümündeki o Cem'in karısının adı neydi?	98	<Ask>		
R: Bilmem.	99	<Answer>		
H: (Laughs)	100	<Acknowledge>		
R: (Laughs) hatırlamaya çalışıyorum.	101	<Statement>		
H: Şey... sen söyle... şu iki sürekli kavga eden iki kız kardeşi mi *diyorsun*?	102	<Query>		
D: *Hah* *Evet*	103	<Confirm>		
H: *Onların hangisi?*	104	<Ask>		
D: Onlardan zengin olanla evlendi. Oğuz'un... eski sevgilisi.	105	<Answer>		
H: Ya esmer olan mıydı *kumral olan mı?*	106	<Ask>		
D: *Esmer olan* esmer olan.	107	<Answer>		
H: Ha esmer olan... bildim ya.	108	<Confirm>		

Recording date: 21.11.2009

\*...\* Overlapping speech

### 4.3.1 THE EXPLANATION OF THE CONVERSATION

Five topics are discussed throughout the given conversation: "Where to put the items in the kitchen", "When does 'H' get up", "What happened in the television programme 'Yemekteyiz'", "Events that took place in different soap operas" and lastly "Identifying an actress". The termination of the first topic and beginning to the second realizes all of a sudden so that we can not observe any markers that are expected to be used in order to enable the participants move from one topic to the other smoothly. The frame "Ben yine şeyi..." serve as a transition marker when the terminating the second topic. The frame "Ben yine şeyi çok severdim" and the filler "ııı... neydi..." marks the termination of the third topic. Although the transition to the last topic seems sudden as in the first topic, the speech of speaker 'R' "Ben hiç... o zamandır... yani kaç bölüm... Sivas'a gittim gideli hiç izlemedim. Gitmiş gelmiş ondan haberim yok." evokes the impression in speaker 'D' that 'R' has nothing more to say about the topic being discussed in the mean of time so that she chooses to change the topic.

This conversation is composed of two interactions. The first interaction is taking place between two speakers 'R' and 'D'. The second interaction starts when a third speaker joins to the conversation and from that moment the content of the conversation totally changes. The first interaction does not include any termination and it consists of only one exchange "Asking" and one topical strategy: resuming; four acts: ask, answer, query, acknowledge; and lastly four turns.

The second interaction includes four termination parts. The first part of the second interaction involves three exchanges: stating, asking, asking; Three topical strategies: digressing, resuming, changing; nineteen acts: query, surprise, statement, greeting, greeting, request, inform, acknowledge, ask, answer, surprise, inform, query, acknowledge, reject, meta-comment, acknowledge, ask, answer; and fourteen turns.

The second part constitutes four exchanges: stating, asking, stating, asking; three topical strategies: changing, shifting, shifting; twenty-eight acts: frame, inform, preface, query, clue, confirm, ask, answer, query, justify, expand, justify, check, confirm, statement, check, answer, expand, acknowledge, ask, meta-comment, acknowledge, statement, answer, ask, answer, meta-comment, disagree; and twenty-six turns.

Throughout the third part of the second interaction there exist ten exchanges: stating, asking, asking, asking, asking, stating, asking, stating, asking, asking; three topical strategies: changing, digressing, resuming; fifty-two acts: frame, filler, statement, inform, acknowledge, ask, confirm, answer, ask, answer, acknowledge, expand, ask, preface, expand, check, confirm, ask, answer, acknowledge, expand, inform, opine, opine, meta-comment, expand, inform, query, confirm, expand, inform, acknowledge, expand, ask, answer, answer, query, confirm, meta-comment, meta-comment, acknowledge, expand, inform, ask, answer, query, confirm, query, confirm, statement, ask, answer; and forty-one turns.

The last part in the second interaction includes four exchanges: stating, asking, asking, asking; two topical strategies: changing, drifting; twenty-three acts: Opine, ask, expand, query, clue, query, clue, statement, ask, answer, query, ask, ask, answer, acknowledge, statement, query, confirm, ask, answer, ask, answer, confirm; and twenty-three turns.

**4.4 THE ANALYSIS OF A TURKISH FACE-TO-FACE  
CONVERSATION NR.3a**

<b>T I M E</b>	<b>A FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATION</b>	<b>T U R N</b>	<b>ACT</b>	<b>TOPICAL</b>	<b>E X C H A N G E</b>	<b>T E N E R T M E R I R N A C T I O N</b>	<b>I N T E N S I O N</b>
00:02	<p>S1a: Bi de resmen burada şimdi adam... abi Aspirin yazdırmaya dokt... şeye hastaneye gidiyorsun.</p> <p>Hastane onun için değil ki.Ben o gün arkadaşın yanında dururken o sekreterle... işte ordaki kızla beraber... adam doktor mu... yazıcı mı... sekreter mi hiç belli değil. Kalkmıyoki ne yapcan?... ne yapcan? Bana bile dedi yani... geç bakalım</p>	1	<p>&lt;Expand&gt;</p> <p>&lt;Opine&gt;</p>	[Resuming]	(Stating ) 1	1	1

	dedi... bakalım dedi. Ya dedim benim bişeyim yok ki ben sadece kan sayımlarımı *yaptırcam falan...*				
00:28	S2a: *Dahiliyeci bile yok demi?*	2	<Ask>	[Drifting]	(Asking) 2
00:29	S1a: Hayır hayır var.	3	<Answer>		
00:31	S2a: Nerde bu hastanedeki mi?	4	<Query>		
00:32	S1a: Hı hı.	5	<Confirm>		
00:34	S2a: Ama yeni mi geldi *o zaman?*	6	<Query>		
00:35	S1a: *Olur mu yaa... şurda... parkın karşısında muayenehanesi vardı ya muayeneyi kapattı.*	7	<Expand>		
	(Short Pause)				
00:43	S2a: Ben gitcem ama Aydın'da var.	8	<Statement>		(Stating) 3
00:45	S1a: Ya senin gitceğin yer dahiliyeci değil. Senin gideceğin yer kardiyojoloji.	9	<Meta-comment>	[Drifting]	
00:50	S2a: Dahiliyeci istiyorum ben...	10	<Statement>		
00:51	S1a: Dahiliyeciler tek başlarına *bilmezler.*	11	<Disagree>		
00:52	S2a: *Ama burada kardiyojoloji yok.*	12	<Inform>	[Drifting]	

	burdaki Aydın'a ya da İzmir'e *yönlendiriyor.*				
00:56	S1a: *Kardiyoloji var burada be*	13	<Reject>		
00:57	S2a: Biliyorum Sunay hanım var. Sunay hanıma gittim ben. Ben burada değil de daha iyi çekilmesi *daha...*	14	<Confirm>  <Statement>	[Drifting]	(Stating) 4
01:02	S1a: *Ama şimdi tabi orda bırakmazlar.* Orda her çeşit tahlilini yapıyorlar yani araştırıp senin... yani rahatsızlığının nedeni ne onu buluyorlar.	15	<Confirm>  <Expand>		
01:11	S2a: Ata Kalp varmış Aydın'da oraya gitcem. Sırf kalp üzerine.	16	<Inform>		
01:14	S1a: Ata Kalp ama... güzel o.	17	<Agree>		
01:16	S2a: Güzel ama...	18	<Preface>		
01:17	S1a: Alıyo muymuş?	19	<Ask>	[Drifting]	(Asking) 5
01:18	S2a: Alıyo işte bakılabiliyomuşuz. Şimdi bayramdan sonraya gitmeyi düşünüyorum.	20	<Answer>  <Statement>		
01:24	S1a: Şimdi bak bişey	21	<Alert>	[Shifting]	(Stating) 6

	söyleyecem buradan kalp ciğer ya da... dahiliyeciye falan gidiyorsun... bunlar yıllarca ihtisas yapıyor kendi alanlarında...		<Inform>				
01:33	S2a: Evet *evet evet...*	22	<Acknowledge>				
01:33	S1a: *Yani olayın şeyi bu...* Normal doktor aşyosa kendini o zaman uzmana gönderiyor. Yani televizyon Programlarında izliyorum... bunlar 3 sene ihtisas yapıyorlarmış kendi alanlarında iç hastalıklar iki sene...	23	<Expand>				

Recording date: 29.11.2009

\*...\* Overlapping speech



#### 4.4.1 THE EXPLANATION OF THE CONVERSATION

The participants of the this dialogue are discussing about “doctors and hospitals” and only one main topic is discussed throughout the conversation. Therefore there exists only one interaction and no termination.

The conversation consists of one part on the basis of termination and within this part there are six exchanges: stating, asking, stating, stating, asking, stating. The participants are discussing the same main topic from the beginning of the conversation till the end so that the there occur a number of drifts in a row throughout the conversation. The topical strategies used by the speakers are: resuming, drifting, drifting, drifting, drifting, drifting, shifting. We can observe twenty-eight acts: Expand, opine, ask, answer, query, confirm, query, expand, statement, meta-comment, statement, disagree, inform, reject, confirm, statement, confirm, expand, inform, agree, preface, ask, answer, statement, alert, inform, acknowledge, expand; and twenty-three turns.

**4.5 THE ANALYSIS OF A TURKISH FACE-TO-FACE  
CONVERSATION NR.3b**

<b>T I M E</b>	<b>A FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATION</b>	<b>T U R N</b>	<b>ACT</b>	<b>TOPICAL</b>	<b>E X C H A N G E</b>	<b>T E N E R T M E R I N A C T I O N</b>	<b>I N T E N S I O N</b>
00:05	S1b: Kimya bölümü okudu... Gel burda üç kuruşa çalış.	1	<Statement>	[Resuming]	(Stating ) 1	1	1
00:10	S4b: Şans.	2	<Confirm>				
00:17	S1b: Sinana gir bu sefer sınavlara...	3	<Statement>	[Shifting]	(Stating) 2		
00:21	S2b: Öyle öyle...	4	<Confirm>				
00:29	S3b: Bak Gülbahar da girmiş... İnternette hep yazıyor...	5	<Suggest>				
00:33	S2b: Baksın bi *takip etsin...*	6	<Suggest>				
00:35	S1b: *Kazananları sözleşmeli olarak alıyorlarmış.*	7	<Inform>	[Drifting]			
	(Pause)						

00:40	S3b: Bi de askerlik istiyor mu bankada?	8	<Ask>	[Drifting]	(Asking) 3
00:43	S2b: İstemiyoy ya *demi*	9	<Answer>		
00:44	S1b: *İstemiyoy istemiyoy...* O anca hani... daha üst düzey sınavlara girerken... Sözleşme imzaladı dersaneyle... belli olmaz ortada bırakır dedi... karşılıklı kaç... oniki milyarlık falan imzaladılar.	10	<Answer> <Expand>  <Statement>	[Shifting]	(Stating) 4
01:04	S4b: Bırakırsa oniki milyar ödeyecek...?	11	<Query>		
	(Pause)				
01:09	S1b: E... Anlaşmaları öyle	12	<Confirm>		
01:11	S4b: hıı...	13	<Acknowledge>		
01:13	S1b: Bunda da çok gönülsüz.	14	<Expand>		
01:15	S4b: hıı...	15	<Acknowledge>		
01:18	S3b: O kaç... Dokuz bin tane mi... o kaç bin tane polis *alcaklarmış.*	16	<Check> <Clue> <Inform>	[Digressing]	(Stating) 5
01:21	S1b: *On bin tane.*	17	<Confirm>		
01:22	S3b: On bin polis mi *alcaklarmış?*	18	<Query>		
01:24	S4b: *Başvursuun...* Ya benim arkadaşım çok rahatım ben diyo sekiz beş'te masa	19	<Suggest> <Inform>		

	başındayım diyo...					
01:28	S1b: Masa başı...	20	<Query>			
01:29	S4b: Ne İngilizce Öğretmeni mezunuydu mesela – İngilizce Öğretmenliği mezunuydu... Atan... Ya atanamadı birkaç yıl *denedi...*	21	<Expand>			
01:36	S1b: *Şimdi bu önümüzdeki sene için olacak.*	22	<Statement>	[Resuming]		
01:38	S4b: Hıı.	23	<Acknowledge>			
01:41	S1b: Metinler oldu ya... Metinlerin oldu. Hatta bugün anlattı onu... Ocak Şubat ayında eğitim alacaklar *altı yedi ay...*	24	<Inform>	[Shifting]	(Stating) 6	
01:53	S4b: *Metin polis mi oldu?*	25	<Query>			

Recording date: 29.11.2009

\*...\* Overlapping speech

#### **4.5.1 THE EXPLANATION OF THE CONVERSATION**

In this extract only one topic is discussed by the four participants of the conversation “having a job”. There exists one interaction and no termination within this spoken interaction.

The conversation consists of one part which constitutes six exchanges: stating, stating, asking, stating, stating, stating; eight topical strategies: resuming, shifting, drifting, drifting, shifting, digressing, resuming, shifting; thirty acts: statement, confirm, statement, confirm, suggest, suggest, inform, ask, answer, answer, expand, statement, query, confirm, acknowledge, expand, acknowledge, check, clue, inform, confirm, query, suggest, inform, query, expand, statement, acknowledge, inform, query; and twenty-five turns.

**4.6 THE ANALYSIS OF AN ENGLISH FACE-TO-FACE  
CONVERSATION NR.4**

A FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATION	T U R N	A C T	T O P I C A L S T R A T E G I E S	E X C H A N G E	T E R M I N A C T I O N	I N T E R A C T I O N
A: Did you arrange to have lunch With Jamie?	1	<Ask>	[Introducing]	(Asking)1	1	1
B: No I didn't.	2	<Answer>				
A: No?	3	<Query>				
B: No I just sort of said – let's sometime or something *vague* you know bit silly.	4	<Confirm> <Expand> <Hedge>  <Empathizer>				
A: *Yeah.*	5	<Acknowledge>				
B: But umm – yeah. Oh I must do that sometime – oh yes One thing too. Umm are you at all interested in coming to the B minor mass?	6	<Frame> <Expand> <Frame> <Preface> <Ask>	[Changing]	(Asking)2	2	

A: When is it? The fifteenth of April?	7	<Check> <Clue>		
B: Yeah	8	<Confirm>		
A: Umm – when is that? *Next week?*	9	<Check> <Clue>		
B: *That’s next* Tuesday...	10	<Confirm>		
A: I’ll ask Trish tonight I think it’s the day before she goes back to school.	11	<Inform> <Expand>	[Digressing]	(Stating)3
B: Mm.	12	<Acknowledge>		
A: And – she may be doing something.	13	<Expand>		
B: Yeah	14	<Acknowledge>		
A: If she... if she would like to come I will come.	15	<Meta-comment>		
B: Mhm... (*giggles*)	16	<Acknowledge>		
A: *Where?*	17	<Ask>		
B: In other words you’ll come if your girlfriend wants to come.	18	<Suggest>	[Resuming]	(Stating)4
A: Yes.	19	<Answer>		

\*...\* Overlapping speech

(The dialogue by Aydın Aydın, 2005, p. 326)

#### 4.6.1 THE EXPLANATION OF THE CONVERSATION

Two topics are discussed throughout the sample conversation above: “The lunch with Jamie” and “Coming to the B minor mass”, which means that this piece of conversation consists of one termination. The termination is signalled by a frame (oh yes) and a preface (one thing too). This spoken interaction is formed by an interaction and there exist one termination, nineteen turns, twenty-nine acts, four topical strategies and four exchanges.

In the first part of the conversation we can observe only one exchange which is asking and one topical strategy: introducing; ten acts: ask, answer, query, confirm, expand, hedge, empathizer, acknowledge, frame, expand; and six turns.

The second part of the sample spoken interaction above consists of three exchanges: asking, stating, stating; three topical strategies: changing, digressing, resuming; nineteen acts: frame, preface, ask, check, clue, confirm, check, clue, confirm, inform, expand, acknowledge, expand, acknowledge, meta-comment, acknowledge, ask, suggest, answer; and thirteen turns.



## **CHAPTER V**

### **NOTES FROM ANALYSES**

#### **5.1 WHY DO WE ANALYSE?**

“Why learn English?” Little or much, well or poorly, many of us today have learnt English. But have we ever questioned why we basically do that? The first question before beginning to a long and stressful process is “Why?”. The learners of English firstly try to answer the possible questions that may arouse in their minds and make them hesitate in deciding whether to further the process or not. Sometimes they may think about whether it will worth struggling so much to learn English or not. Because of the reasons that we have mentioned we had better talk about the motivations of learning English and find an answer to the question “Why?”.

We can easily get access to knowledge thanks to English. Today people want to reach any information in any time they need. This is the main necessity of the information age. Today people are able to reach information about whatever they are interested in science, music, health, technology, business, sports, media such as internet, television and the press etc. However, the main problem is most of this knowledge is in English.

According to the statistics there exist about one billion web pages that are English or have English options. One may find books on any subject all over the world in English and also the books that are not written in English are translated so that this provided a large variety of choices. One may read in English about whatever s/he is interested in. Another advantage of English when compared with other languages spoken throughout the world is the press. Only English-language magazines and newspapers can be found in almost every part of the world. English is also key to the world of science. In 1997, 95% of the articles in the Sciece Citation Index (an international list of scientific texts) were written in English. Only about 50% of them were from English-speaking countries like the USA or Britain.

English is helpful in communicating with others throughout the world. Therefore, it will not be a mistake to call English as “the language of communication”. According to the statistics of British Council English about one and a half billion people in the world speak English another one billion is learning it. 75% of the letters and postcards throughout the world are written in English. Another point is almost all the conferences and competitions conducted in English such as the Olympics. In most cases most diplomats and politicians from different countries use English to communicate with each other, on the other hand, English is the main language of organizations like the United Nations, NATO, and the European Free Trade Association.

Lastly, we can say that English is also required for a good job or if one wants to push his/her career forward. For a good career in this global world one has to be able to communicate in English almost as well as a native speaker.

So far we have mentioned about the different aspects of motivation to learn English. This information is necessary in order to be able clarify why all these analyses or why talking about the differences and the similarities between English and Turkish languages. Because we have to learn English and it is an inseparable part of our lives just because of the reasons we have talked about in the beginning of the chapter and these reasons can be expanded to much more larger numbers.

At this point the answer to the question “why do we analyse?” can be given. When we accept that English is a necessity for almost everyone, we have to think about how can we learn it better and how can we get rid of the problems that may be encountered throughout the learning process. A comparative and contrastive analysis will be helpful by means of revealing the differences and the similarities of the communicational behaviours of the speakers of these two languages.

## 5.2 THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF FACE-TO-FACE CONVERSATIONS OF TURKISH AND ENGLISH

The analyses that we have made so far reveal that most of the differences in the communication styles of the two communities are caused by the cultural differences between the native speakers of Turkish and English.

The first point that draws attention in the analyses of Turkish and English spoken texts is that in both Turkish and English conversations overlaps occur if the conversation is less formal and the number of overlaps decreases when the conversation is formal. However, the main difference in Turkish and English conversations is what makes a conversation formal and what does not. This is designated by the cultural lifestyles and traditions of these two different communities. The sample in Turkish below is taken from the the first dialogue that we have analysed and the participants are a future mother-in-law (R) and and her son's fiancé (D):

[1]

D: Ayyyyy belim çok fena...

R: Niye ki?

D: Annem geliyor ya şimdi...

R: Zaten giderken gözü arkada kalacak... Kızın beli ağrıyordu... İnşallah anne ol da anneliği bir tat... Çok hoş bir şey çok zor bir şey Didem.

D: Öyleymiş ya sinem diyordu ben hayatta böyle olacağımı düşünmezdim diye...

R: Yani... bambaşka bir şey.

D: Yani diyor... hani her şeyini anlıyorsun diyor ne yaptığını ne ettiğini... kötü bi anını her şeyini anlıyorsun diyor.

R: Aynen öyle.

This dialogue was recorded when these two women did not know each other well enough. They want to take part in a more intimate interaction; however, especially D is afraid of talking just in a way that she talks with her own mother as it may be understood as a disrespectful behaviour and she is waiting for R to take the first step for a less formal talk. Respect and rules of being respectful is much more widespread in Turkish culture. An English speaker may call his/her mother/father-in-law by name. Although the style of talking respectfully is similar to each other both in English and Turkish speakers of English show respect to people who are higher than them in terms of caste or rank not according to the age or social relationships as in Turkey. Another point in formal conversations is that Turkish participants do not stare directly at the eyes of the speaker especially if s/he is the one that must be respectful. Instead of this s/he gives quick glances which signs that s/he is listening to the speaker.

[2]

Boss: I have to go to XDFR on Sunday, want to fly back in the evening.

Employee: Sir the flight in the morning is at 7 a.m., and that means you have to reach airport at 5 a.m. Why don't you catch the afternoon flight? You can easily stay the night and come back on Monday.

Boss: 5 a.m. on Sunday is too early.

Employee: Yes sir, it's too early.

When the conversation is less formal, however, we can easily observe that the number of overlaps that we can not come across in a formal spoken interaction increases. The conversation below is taken from the dialogue between the same speakers R and D; however, they no longer need to be formal as they have known each other for some time:

[3]

D: Ha onun evi... O hafif biraz şey demi...

R: Aynen \*öyle\*

D: \*Hafif\* de değil \*baya...\*

R: \*Aynen\*

D: Şey ya... onun evini çok... üniversite öğrencisiymiş o.

R: Hıı hıı \*üniversite\*

D: \*evini\* \*çok merak ediyorum ben onun\*

R: \*Ama şey..\* 24 yaşında mı \*25 yaşında mı ne\*

D: \*24.\* Ayy benim elime... ne diyodu o... benim yemeklerime rakip  
olamazlar.

(Laughs)

R: (Laughs)

The situation is the same in English also:

[4]

B: No I just sort of said – let's sometime or something \*vague\* you know bit  
silly.

A: \*Yeah.\*

B: But umm – yeah. Oh I must do that sometime – oh yes. One thing too.

Umm are you at all interested in coming to the B minor mass?

A: When is it? The fifteenth of April?

B: Yeah

A: Umm – when is that? \*Next week?\*

B: \*That's next\* Tuesday...

Although we have pointed out that overlaps are not observed in formal conversations that does not mean that they never occur. When two or more participants within a conversation try to seize the floor at the same time this is known as overlap and we have mentioned in the former parts of our study. Overlaps have quite different reasons and we also have made mention of them in our study. What we are going to talk about is what happens when two or more speakers start talking at the same time in English and Turkish conversations.

In both languages it can be said that when two or more participants try to seize the floor at the same time the one who seems to say a more important thing or the one who has started a bit earlier than the other(s) etc. gets the hold of the floor. In addition to these criteria, as a sign of respect, Turkish speakers leave the floor to their elders or the ones to whom they feel that they should be respectful and the situation does not change whether the conversation is formal or not.

[5]

H: \*Öyle bişey...\*

R: \*Aslında en yakışacağı da o ha\*... \*eziliyor büzülüyor...\*

H: \*Ama değiştirerek yapıyorlar.\* Belki mesela Beşir ölmez... belki

Madam'la o evlenir bilemiyorum yani...

D: Hıı.

(Short pause)

H: \*Ayrıca...\*

R: \*Beşir'le kız şey yapıyorlardı

In the sample above H is R's daughter and both in the first and fifth lines she starts talking with her mother they are talking about a soap opera so that the conversation is not formal but no matter the conversation is about H leaves the floor to her mother as a sign of respect although she starts talking a bit earlier (in the tape recording).

One other topic that is to be discussed in terms of differences and similarities between the daily conversations in Turkish and English languages is assent terms, or in other words, backchannel realizations.

Firstly we had better remember the definition of assent terms. In our study we have defined assent terms as one of the few items that can be spoken while another is speaking that are generally not heard as an interruption; however, this depends on the speaker and the situation, of course. Assent terms make it clear to the speaker that the

listener has taken in and understood the previous message. They also serve to establish the listener's ongoing availability, and they commit him or her to attend the speaker's next utterance. Lastly, the use of assent terms in the time of a spoken interaction is named as backchanneling.

As previously mentioned in our study assent terms or backchannel realizations vary interestingly from culture to culture. For this reason, some terms that are used as assent terms in Turkish may sound odd in English or just the opposite. As the instinctive usage of the assent terms of mother tongue may break the smoothness of the communication process in the target language, the cultural differences in the conversational flows of these two languages must be decoded by the learners.

In Turkish and English assent terms are normally different. The thing that the learners should pay attention is the use of these assent terms as we use them almost instinctively and we may use the assent terms of our mother tongue without being aware of what we are doing. The most common assent terms used in English and Turkish are as follows:

Some common assent terms used in English

- Yeah
- I see
- Really
- OK
- Umm
- Oh

[6]

A: When is it? The fifteenth of April?

B: Yeah

A: Umm – when is that? \*Next week?\*

B: \*That's next\* Tuesday...

Some common assent terms used in Turkish

- Hı hı (Hıı)
- Iıı
- Evet
- Anlıyorum
- Yaa
- Yok ya
- Yani
- Hmm

[7]

H: \*Ama değiştirerek yapıyorlar.\* Belki mesela Beşir ölmez... belki  
Madam'la o evlenir bilemiyorum yani...

D: Hıı.

H: Ayrıca tahminen...

A Turkish speaker, for instance, may use the assent term “ııı” before making an utterance in order to gain enough time for thinking what to say instead of “umm”, or the assent term “oh”, which indicates surprise may be uttered as “yaa” by a Turkish speaker while interacting in English and it can be understood as “yeah”, which may break the smoothness of communication process.

Although assent terms are different in Turkish and English, some types of backchanneling are quite similar in both languages. For instance, sometimes the participants of a conversation use backchannels by means of repeating some of the last words of the current speaker and this is the case which is similar both in Turkish and English:



[8]

A: Beat cream cheese and 3/4 cup sugar with electric mixer on medium speed until well blended.

B: ... beat until well blended...

[9]

R: \*Ay Allah korusun öyle deme.\*. Ben şeyi çok severdim ııı... neydi... Var mısın Yok musun bir de Yemekteyiz programını. Yani başka seyredecek hiçbirşey yok. Akşam şey... Aşkını Memnu'yu seyrettim.

D: Ha...Onda n'oldu?

R: Onda n'olduu... Pek bişeyler gelişmedi yani her zamanki gibi... muhabbetler aynı...

In both conversations above speakers B in 8 and R in 9 repeating some of the last words uttered by the other participant in order to show that they are listening what is being said or they have understood what is being told or asked.

Another similar feature of the spoken language of Turkish and English is repairing process. In both languages speakers follow almost the same ways for repairing and none of these ways is misunderstood, if the situation or the context of the conversation is not entirely different of course. Here is an example from dialogue 3b:

[10]

S4b: Ne İngilizce Öğretmeni mezunuydu mesela – İngilizce Öğretmenliği mezunuydu... Atan... Ya atanamadı birkaç yıl denedi...

In this utterance there exists a self initiated repair which occurs when the speaker of the utterance that needs repair makes without a prompting from another participant of the conversation. Here is the same type of repair that we have examined previously from an English daily conversation:

[11]

A: I need a new bolt for my oil filter – um, PAN.

(Levinson, 1983, p. 340)

Like the extract above, other repair types also exist in the same way in Turkish. Some examples are as follows:

Other initiated self repair:

[12]

A: Buraya gelmeden önce de arabayı tamire bıraktım.

B: Tamire?

A: Ya... yani yıkamaya.

Other repair or other initiated repair:

[13]

A: Elindeki kitaba bakabilir miyim?

B: Dergiye demek istedin herhalde.

A: Hı hı...

Embedded repair, another and may be a more preferable type of repair as it avoids questioning the competence of the speaker:

[14]

A: İsteddiğin bütün dosyaları DVD'ye attım ordan alırsın.

B: Tamam ben bu CD'yi eve götürüyüm orda bakarım.

While analysing the tape records in Turkish one of the most conspicuous feature is in some (not all the time) cases Turkish speakers may interfere each others utterances; however, it does not bother the one whose utterance is interfered. Deeper observations have revealed that such interferences are not taken as rudeness when

they are made by the ones who are older than the one who is holding the floor. This case shows us once again that culture has an undeniable role on the conversational behaviours of people. In the extract taken from 3a below S1a who is elder brother of S2a interferes her sentence but the conversation continues as if nothing happened:

[15]

S1a: Ata Kalp ama... güzel o.

S2a: Güzel ama...

S1a: Alıyo muymuş?

S2a: Alıyo işte bakılabiliyomuşuz. Şimdi bayramdan sonraya gitmeyi düşünüyorum.

S2a's utterance "Güzel ama..." is interfered by S1a in the third line; however, no one takes it as a sign of rudeness. In contradiction to this case when such an interference is made by a younger participant it is generally accepted as an interference and rudeness.

We have defined overlap as when two or more participants try to take the hold of the floor at the same time and overlaps occur within a conversation because of various reasons. We all know that when these overlaps are not desired by the one who is holding the floor or any unwanted attempts to take the floor while someone is speaking is named as interruption. Nobody wants anyone talking while s/he is speaking. However, while recording Turkish conversations we have come across a very strange and may be a unique feature that is clearly distinguishable in Turkish and English.

In accordance to the religious beliefs of most Turkish people two religious festivals are celebrated within a year. The first one is Ramadan Festival and the second one is the Festival of Sacrifices. In both of these festivals Turkish people give quite importance to visit their relatives, friends, neighbours etc. People do not stay for a long time during their visits and mostly younger people visit elders firstly. Ramadan

Festivals lasts for three days and the Festival of Sacrifices lasts for four days. As people try to visit everyone in such a short time most of the times two or more groups of guests coincide at the same time. One of our tape records (3a – 3b) has been recorded during the time of the Festival of Sacrifices in 2009 and there were at least 4 different families and approximately 13 people who are relatives at the time of the recording process. They were staying in the same room and they were unaware of the recording process, of course. While analysing the conversation the strangest thing that draws attention is that conversation 3a, which has two participants (s1a and s2a) and conversation 3b, which has four participants (s1b, s2b, s3b and s4b) occur at the same time, which can be understood by examining the time columns in the analyses. Although all the utterances produced by the six different speakers overlap each other, let's call it mass-talk, nobody takes it as rudeness or as an unwanted behaviour. Under normal circumstances it is expected that one of the groups, especially the ones who are older in Turkish culture, will warn the other to be silent or not to talk at all; however, in festivals or similar visits we can not talk about the normal circumstances and expectations. We can simply say that this is one of the most clear difference that shows the importance of culture in conversational behaviours of different people.

A similar situation in English culture can be observed in parties; however, in the parties the people who are taking part within a conversation stay close to each other and form groups while making a conversation. In the tape recording we are mentioning the situation is quite different the participants of these two different conversations (3a – 3b) are sitting in room in a disordered way the ones who are talking on the same subject are not sitting closely to each other one of the participants of conversation 3b, for instance, is sitting on one corner of the room and the other is on the other.

Visiting relatives, friends, neighbours etc. is a cultural and religious feature in Turkish people. Therefore, such kind of conversations that we have examined in 3a and 3b can only be seen in cultures that are similar to the one that Turkish people have. If we tried to analyse 3a and 3b as one conversation than we would have to re-

write almost what we have said so far about conversation analysis and conversational behaviours. Instead of this, throughout the study we have mentioned that rules are general and they may change in accordance with cultural features and this already forms the motto and the basic motivation of our study.

In addition to what we have said so far there exist so many minor details that distinguishes people's style of conversation in the studies of conversational analysis. The more we deepen our studies, the more factors we can reach that are effective upon the conversational behaviours of the people. Religion and traditions, for instance, are two important factors that causes differences in the conversational styles of people. When we are talking about two different languages that means we are talking about two different cultures and may be religions so that the effect of these features should not be ignored in the processes of conversational analysis and language learning.

Religion which is not the main focus of our study is something whose application style changes from individual to individual. In Turkey some people gives great importance not to get in even a spoken touch with a person who is from the opposite sex. When a female who has such beliefs has to take part in a conversation with a male or just the opposite, they just produce quite short utterances in order to get only the necessary information and build almost no eye-contact. In such cases, utterances are quite short and they are produced only to receive the information needed and no assent terms, gestures and mimes or any other extra conversational features are not used throughout the interactional process.

As we have mentioned in different points throughout our study there exist numerous details that affect the style of spoken interaction in the studies of conversational analysis, especially when it is inter-cultural. So far we have tried to reveal the basic differences in conversational behaviours between Turkish and English languages from as many different points of view as we can. Most of the points that we have been discussed so far have been noticed and illustrated from tape

recordings in Turkish (Analyses 1, 2, 3a and 3b) and compared with the analyses in English.

## **CHAPTER VI**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **6.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY**

In our study, we have tried to reveal the basic differences of the daily conversational behaviours of Turkish and English speakers. In order to achieve this goal we have made use of the features of the principles of conversational analysis. We have argued that a comparative and contrastive conversational analysis between these two languages will be helpful to Turkish students learning English in decoding the way that the target language works. So it is expected that the students will be able to communicate in the target language easily and more efficiently.

In our study, Chapter I presents an overview to the whole study. Chapter II presents information about conversation and the features of conversation. Chapter III which is the main core of the theoretical part of our study presents theoretical information about conversational analysis. Chapter IV which is the heart of the study technically analyzes one English daily conversation and four naturally recorded Turkish daily conversations. Chapter V which is the continuation of the previous section reveals the differences between the conversational behaviours of Turkish and English speakers in general.

In this study, especially in chapters IV and V we have focused on the comparative and contrastive analyses of daily conversations in Turkish and English. The previous chapters which can be defined as preparation phases for the main focus of the study generally consist of technical information. It can be said that conversation analysis differs from other branches of sociology because rather than analyzing social order, it seeks to discover the methods by which members of a society produce a sense of social order. The point which is crystal clear here is that the social order produced by the members of a society would, of course, differ from

the social order produced by another society. In our study we have tried reveal these differences that are caused by culture, religion, traditions etc.

While taking part within a conversational situation participants have to construct systematic solutions to some organizational problems of spoken interaction. In general, these problems are opening and closing a conversation, taking the turns within a conversation, repairing, topic management, showing agreement or disagreement etc. We can find out how participants overcome these problems throughout an oral interaction by means of making close analysis. The main point here is that thanks to conversation analysis we are able to reveal that people from different cultures may solve these organizational problems of conversation in different ways, although they may make use of the same ways in some situations and this forms the basic motivation of this study. Revealing the differences and similarities of the conversational behaviours of Turkish and English speakers is expected to be helpful to the students who are learning English as being able to recognize the ways Turkish people use to handle a conversation and which of them can be applied while communicating in English and which of them have the risk of breaking the communication process.

There exist some limitations in this approach. The most important of all, may be, is that the conversation analyzed should be natural for an efficient analysis; that is, it should be recorded and participants should be unaware of the recording process, transcribed and then analyzed. The more natural conversation is, the more truthful results can be achieved. In this study, we have overcome this problem by making natural recordings in Turkish and the participants of the conversations analyzed are totally unaware of the process. So that this study is also the only known study that includes naturally recorded Turkish texts and their detailed analyses.



## 6.2 NOTES TO LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Being able to analyze and decode how a language works is accepted as a quite useful contribution in language learning process. Therefore the findings of conversation analysis is almost vital for language learners, if we are not talking about old-fashioned methods.

In Turkey today, especially the new generation teachers try to use communicative modern methods in language teaching process. Almost all the students learning English and language teachers are in favour of communicative methods as they are more effective for the learners to be able to communicate via the target language. However, supporting these methods without an efficient application of them means nothing. If language teachers want to make their students be able to take part in communicative situations successfully and avoid the applications that may break communication process, they should be aware of the differences that are caused by culture, religion, traditions, linguistic features etc. and the similarities between Turkish and the target language English. So that students can make use of the similarities and try to overcome the differences between these two languages while communicating in English.

To sum, this study is expected to be helpful both for Turkish students learning English and English language teachers in Turkey as it provides a means of back up for the application of communicative methods. Moreover, naturally recorded Turkish conversations and their detailed analyses may serve as an avant-garde study for further studies both in Turkish and English language learning and also surveys of pragmatics about Turkish language.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aydın Aydın, Bengü. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Analyzing Some Everyday Conversations by Using the Features of Spoken Language*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Campbell, R. and Wales, R. (1970). "The Study of Language Acquisition" in Lyons (ed.) 1970.
- Candlin, C.N. (1972). *Acquiring Communicative Competence*. Paper given at the 32nd Dutch Philologists' Conference, Utrecht, April, 1972, mimeo.
- Cherry, C. (1966). *On Human Communication*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Language Teaching a Scheme for Teacher Education Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Cook, Guy. (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- G. Brown, G. Yule (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Garfinkel, Harold (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- H. Sacks, E. A. Schegloff (1979). *Two Preferences in the Organization of Reference to Persons and Their Interaction*. in G. Psathas (Eds). Newyork: Irvington Publishers.

Hymes, D.H. (1962/1968). "The Ethnography of Speaking" in Gladwin & Sturtevant (eds.) 1962. Reprinted in Fishman 1968. Page references to the reprint.

Hymes, D.H. (1971). *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jefferson, G.: 1985. *An Exercise in the Transcription and Analysis of Laughter*. Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Volume 3 - Discourse and Dialogue, (Ed. T.A. Van Dijk), London: Academic Press.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç.(2005). Autonomy and Relatedness in Cultural Context, Implications for Self and Family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.

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

Levinson, Stephen C. (1997). *From Outer to Inner Space: Linguistic Categories and Non-linguistic Thinking*. Linguistic and conceptual representation, ed. J. Nuyts and Eric Pederson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackey, W.F. (1965). *Language Teaching Analysis*. London: Longmans.

Mey, Jacob L. (2001). *Pragmatics*. Second Edition. Malden: Blackwell publishers Inc. Massachusetts, USA.

- Ockenden, M. (1987). *Situational Dialogues*. Longman
- Pride, J.B. (1971). *The Social Meaning of Language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Psathas, George. "Conversation Analysis The Study of Talk-in-Interaction". Qualitative research method series: 35 A.
- Rose, Kenneth R; Kasper, Gabriele. 2001. *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rutherford, W.E. (1968). *Modern English: A Textbook for Foreign Students*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G.(1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50/4.
- Schegloff, E.A. (1979). *Identification and Recognition in Telephone Conversation Openings*. in G. Psathas (Eds). Newyork: Irvington Publishers.
- Schegloff, E.A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*.
- Schegloff, E.A. (2002). Accounts of Conduct in Interaction: Interruption, Overlap, and Turn-Taking. *Handbook of Sociological Theory* (Ed. J.H. Turner), New York:Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

- Schmitt, Norbert. 2002. *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press. New York
- Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Shotter, J. (1993). *Conversational Realities*. London: Sage Publications.
- Tekdemir, G. (2007). İnsanlar Arası İlişkilerde Anlamın Birlikte İnşası. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1985) *How Conversation Works*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1972c). "The Teaching of English as Communication". *English Language Teaching* 27 (1): 15-19.
- Winnie Cheng, W. (2003). *Intercultural Conversation*. John Benjamin's Publishing CO. USA
- Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- İnceoğlu, M. (1993). *Tutum Algı İletişim*. Ankara: V Yayınları.

	T.C. SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü	
---	--	---

### Özgeçmiş

Adı Soyadı:	Fatih Agah BİLGİÇ			
Doğum Yeri:	Konya			
Doğum Tarihi:	03/07/1985			
Medeni Durumu:	Bekar			
Öğrenim Durumu				
Derece	Okulun Adı	Program	Yer	Yıl
İlköğretim	H. Uluşahin İ.Ö.O		Konya	1991-1996
Ortaöğretim	M.S.R. Anadolu İ. Hatip Lisesi		Konya	1996-2000
Lise	Meram Anadolu Lisesi		Konya	2000-2003
Lisans	Selçuk Üniversitesi	İngilizce Öğretmenliği	Konya	2003-2007
Yüksek Lisans				
Becerileri:	Müzik, Bilgisayar.			
İlgi Alanları:	Araç kullanmak, müzik, internet, teknoloji, seyahat, sinema, bilardo.			
İş Deneyimi:	<p>Kristal Kola A.Ş.'de 2000 ve 2006 yılları yaz tatilleri süresince reyon elemanlığı.</p> <p>Tıp Kongreleri düzenleyen MD's (Medical Doctor's) şirketinde 2005 yılı yaz tatili süresince organizatör asistanlığı.</p> <p>Özel bir kursta 2005 yılı yaz tatilinde İngilizce öğretmenliği.</p> <p>2007 yılından beri Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı kadrosunda Pınarbaşı Barbaros İlköğretim Okulu'nda İngilizce öğretmenliği.</p>			
Aldığı Ödüller:	<p>Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği 2007 yılı mezuniyeti bölüm birinciliği.</p> <p>Final Dergisi Dersaneleri tarafından lise 2'ler arası yabancı dil sınavında Konya birinciliği ödülü.</p>			
Hakkımda bilgi almak için önerebileceğim şahıslar:	Yrd. Doç Dr. Abdülhamit ÇAKIR Yrd. Doç Dr. Ece SARIGÜL			
Tel:	0332 – 249 59 69			
E-Posta:	<a href="mailto:fabillgich@hotmail.com">fabillgich@hotmail.com</a>			
Adres	Dumlupınar Mh. İstek Sk. Selçuklu Konutları B Blok Kat: 5 No: 18 Selçuklu KONYA			