The Role of Gender in TV Talk Show Discourse in Bangladesh: A Conversational Analysis of Hosts' Interaction Management

Md Nesar Uddin[1] & Mahmuda Sharmin[1]

[1] Department of English, The University of Memphis, Memphis, United States

Correspondence: Md Nesar Uddin, Department of English, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN-38152, United States. E-mail: muddin@memphis.edu

Abstract

Over the years of research on gender and language, a growing interest has developed in the study of gender differences and differences in verbal interactions. However, TV talk-shows are a relatively less studied area of pragma-linguistics. TV talk shows are like everyday face-to-face talks except that they take place in an institutional setting. They include all the major features of conversations wherein turn-taking is a salient component of conversational interactions. Based on Holmes' six universals about language and gender that stood against Lakoff's Deficit Model, this study examined four episodes from four TV talk-shows in Bangladesh, two being hosted by men and two by women, to determine how differentially the hosts take turns to manage their verbal interactions in their talk shows. This study employs the conversation analysis approach developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson to examine how the hosts' turn-taking overlaps with guests' speeches, and how the hosts' practices of interruptions, based on gender, are shaped with distinct functions to manage their interactions in talk shows. Data analysis shows that the female hosts, aligned with Holmes' universals, managed interactions by soft transitions, minimal turns with supportive overlaps, the strategy of co-construction, and nonlinguistic back channels whereas the male hosts' interaction management patterns were fully opposite from each other's: one took excessive turns mostly characterized by interruptive overlaps while the other, like the female hosts, made soft transitions and avoided interruptive turns. This study adds to gender and language studies contributing to emerging social perceptions that woman verbal interactions are characterized by solidarity and co-operation despite their social high standing.

Keywords: TV talk show, conversational analysis, turn-taking, interaction management, gender

1. Introduction

1.1 TV Talk Show as an Emerging Area for Gender Study in a Developing Country

Today the tv talk show pervades almost all tv channels. The talk show director designs the program in keeping with the genre and its relevance to the audience. Even though the conversation analysis of tv talk shows by researchers is a relatively new studied area, the inception of this program as a tv genre dates back to the mid-twentieth century. The tv talk show is an invention of the twentieth-century electronic media broadcasting (Timberg & Erler, 2010). This is a television platform that stages conversational interactions of one or a panel of guests and the host on serious as well as entertainment issues (Oyeleye & Olutayo, 2012). Wilson (2008) distinguished tv talk shows into three distinct categories: daytime talk shows, late night talk shows, and tabloid talk shows. Apart from these, there are also talk shows like morning talk shows, Sunday talk shows etc. Although different researchers categorized talk shows into different types, two most common formats are the informal guest-host format and the public affair shows. In public affair shows, the host interviews a panel of guests who are celebrities or experts in a given field. The public affair shows encompass everyday social, socio-economic and political issues which have much currency and importance to people.

Recently, Bangladesh has observed an exponentially growing presence of women in workplaces, especially, in electronic media. They are working as news reporters, news presenters, program anchors, and tv talk show hosts etc. The major tv talk shows are hosted by women many of whom have succeeded to earn overwhelming applause from audiences. The tv talk show program is a very recent phenomenon in Bangladesh. At the beginning of the 21st century, a number of private tv channels were established and since then they initiated talk shows on different issues in different formats. Most of the talk shows are public affair shows that predominantly cover political and

social issues and invite experts and celebrities to contribute to given issues. In case of political issues, in most cases, experts having political alignment with major political parties are invited to contribute to a heated discussion. At times, hosts' lack of neutral stance and leaning to some political ideology determine their role of how they will manage their interaction with the guests who are invited to discuss given issues. In many cases, male and female hosts' approaches to managing interactions in tv talk shows are noticeably differing. They employ differing turn-taking strategies to make their shows evolve. However, whether the host's gender identity plays any distinct role at determining how the host takes turns with the discussants to manage interactions has not been a studied area in global contexts in general and in Bangladeshi context in particular, and hardly draws any researcher's attention. This current study examines four episodes of four famous tv talk shows in Bangladesh to discover what differential turn taking approaches are taken based on gender to manage tv talk show interaction.

1.2 TV Talk Shows in Previous Studies

Television Talk Show as a face-to-face discourse is a relatively less studied area of pragma-linguistics. Conversation analysis approach has been extensively applied to analyze TV talk show interactions till the end of the first decade of the 21st century (Gamson, 1998; Tolson, 2001; Shattuc, 1997; Hamo, 2008, Trepte, 2005). Their research brought up analysis of interactions in the USA TV talk shows and the social significance of these shows. Some tv talk shows are very popular and have universal appeals to the audience. This popularity or inclusive appeals account for hosts' dynamic anchoring and or institutions' liberal philosophy that hosts tend to implement to manage their talk shows. Tolson (2001) analyzed the roles of talk show hosts and the different devices they employ to make their shows more interactive. He held that hosts are to bridge the gap between the special guests and the audience. They introduce the guest speakers and experts to the audience at home, the topic of discussion, lead the proceedings and take care of technicality (Rees, 2007).

Different talk shows have different functional roles. Some shows stage therapeutic interactions by which victims can get psychologically relieved of the trauma that they encountered in life. Brunvante and Tolson (2001) analyzed the roles and strategies of talk show hosts that they use to create healing interactions. Cloud (2014) examined all the episodes of the Oprah Winfrey Show that covered the 2010 Haiti earthquake. In that article, she argued that the show employed therapeutic discourse to justify Naomi Klein's shock doctrine.

In TV talk shows, especially on political issues, interactions between the host and guests or experts are, in most cases, very argumentative and confrontational. At times, the audience attends the shows as in Oprah Winfrey Show or Mehdi Hassan's Head to Head. Some studies attempted to explore how hosts manage the confrontational interactions between experts and themselves or the audience. Wood's (2001) study focused on how the talk show hosts handle conflicts between the audience and experts. Lauerbach (2007) studied the discourse practices of host and guests in CNN talk show in a context of the post-election campaign. Her study applied discourse analysis approach supplemented by argumentation analysis approach. Rees (2007) made a meta-analysis of six studies that focused on how argumentation characterizes interaction in tv talk shows.

1.3 Study of Turn-Taking in TV Talk Show Interaction

One of the most salient tools that are used to manage oral interactions is turn-taking. Although a lot of studies used the conversation analysis approach to study turn-taking in classroom settings (Maroni, Gnisci, & Pontecorvo, 2008), in radio talk shows (Jucker & Landert, 2015), in everyday oral interactions (Weatherall & Edmonds, 2018; Schegloff, 2000; Okamoto, Rashotte, & Smith-Lovin, 2002), very few studies explored how hosts-guests' interactions on tv talk shows are shaped by turn-taking strategies. Aznárez-Mauleón (2013) examined what discursive styles the tv talk show hosts in Spain use during hosts-guests' interactions. She argued that talk show hosts strategically deployed a role-related discursive style to manage interactions. Oyeleye and Olutayo (2012) focused on the issue of turn-taking that occurs during hosts-guests' interactions in tv talk shows. They studied how the hosts and guests manage turns in their interactions. The purpose of their study was to identify the differences of forms and functions of turn-taking used by hosts and guests of talk shows. Their analysis identified three turn distribution strategies: Current speaker selects next speaker (CSSN), next speaker self-selects as next (NSSS), the current speaker continues (CSC). Their study found that CSSN occurred, in most cases, at the beginning of the shows when the hosts introduced the guests to the audience, NSSS took place by hosts through overlaps, interruptions, after a pause and a falling intonation. The participants also self-selected to answer the questions posed by the hosts with waiting for pauses. In the previous studies of the tv talk show, no researchers attempted to explore tv talk show hosts' use of turn-taking as interaction management strategies based on gender identities. Also, Bangladeshi tv talk show is an unexplored area in conversation and discourse analysis research. This study examines how much Lakoff's Deficit Model and Holme's universals are reflected in women's language in Bangladesh, and sheds light on the unique roles of male and female tv talk show hosts in managing interactions

through turns that are with and/or overlaps.

Robin Lakoff's (1975) Deficit Model argues that hedges and interruptions characterize woman language whereas Holme's (1993) six universals emphasized on the solidarity and affective functions of women's language. To examine how much Lakoff's Deficit Model and Holme's six universals apply to tv talk show discourse in Bangladeshi, this study analyzed the interaction management tools, especially, turn-takings, employed by male and female hosts in four tv talk show episodes in Bangladesh.

To identify how male and female hosts manage interactions in tv talk shows, the study seeks to answer the following two research questions:

1) How do male hosts take turns to manage tv talk show interactions?

2) How do female hosts take turns to manage tv talk show interactions?

1.4 Theoretical Framework

Sacks, Jefferson and Schegloff's (1974) conversation analysis approach was applied for this study. The approach was derived from American sociologist Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, a sociological perspective, developed in the early 1960s to understand and explain people's interactions and how they make sense of the word through their conversational interactions. Conversation analysis approach analyzes talk in actions and interactions and examines the different functional devices used in conversational interactions (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2017). How discursive practices of social interactions are organized and managed is a primary concern of conversation analysis (Oyeleye & Olutayo, 2012). Conversation analysis identifies some basic characteristics and recurrent patterns of oral interactions, turn-taking being a dominant one (Schegloff, 2007). Since turn-taking, as a conversation strategy, is the key to organizing and managing interactions, conversation analysis highly emphasizes on the sequential organization or in other words, how speakers organize their interactions by turn-taking (Neuliep, 1996). Among different turn-taking models, the sequential-production model as developed by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) is a very comprehensive one. This model stipulates that turn-taking take place in a transition moment when a speaker completes a turn constitution unit. Transitions from one speaker to another occur smoothly when the speaker makes sufficient pauses or uses supra-segmental cues that allow the interlocutor to assume that it is time for taking the turn. Also, transitions take place in a disruptive way through overlaps or interruptions when the participants speak simultaneously or one's utterances start overlapping others' already continued speech. Sacks et al. (1974) held that conversation analysis attempts to identify and analyze if speakers follow the turn taking the principle of "no gaps/no overlaps" or their transitions occur in what Orestrom (1983) called a "non-soft" way.

The invention of the audio tape recorder has enabled conversation analysts to repeatedly inspect talk in action and study the linguistic cues used for interaction management and organization. Later, the emergence of videotape recording has extended the possibility and now researchers can study the non-linguistic cues as well such as facial expression, body language etc. that contribute to the management of interactions. Conversation analysis is an effective tool for analyzing face-to-face interactions present in tv talk shows where interactions show how participants take turns to agree/disagree with the interlocutors and or to forward interactions. This study focuses on both soft and disruptive turn takings and what roles they play in managing tv talk show interactions hosted by men and women.

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

Participants were four TV talk show hosts (two male and two female) with 14 guest speakers: two shows had four each, one had two and the other had four guests. All four speakers in Male Host One's show and in Female Host One's show each were the students of Dhaka University, Bangladesh. All four speakers in Male Host Two's show were celebrities in their areas. Two of them (one male and one female) were Bangladesh Supreme Court lawyers and they represented two major political parties in Bangladesh. And the other two—one male and one female—were reputed television celebrities. In Female Host Two's talk show, two male speakers participated. One of them was a renowned university professor of political science and the other one was a government diplomat.

2.2 Data

The data were collected from four episodes of four Bangladeshi tv talk shows: *Ekattor TV Talk Show*, *G Dialogues, Independent TV Talk Show*, and *Politics Plus,* the former two being hosted by men and the latter two by women. The duration of each episode was one and half hours, all programs being six hours long in total. The episodes of _Ekattor TV Talk Show_ and _Independent TV Talk Show_ were telecasted in January 2016. The topics of both the

episodes were about the political gatherings of two major political parties. After the then ruling government assumed the power in 2014 through an election that all major opposition parties avoided, the dominant opposition party, BNP, for the first time, was able to stage a demonstration in January 2016. On the same day, the ruling Awami League party also held a political showdown as an attempt to justify the non-participatory election. Since after a long time two big gatherings of two major political parties took place without any clash or mishap between the two archrival parties, it became a talk of the country and a great news for social and electronic media. The other two talk shows *G Dialogues* and *Politics Plus* were telecast in March 2019 on the issue of Dhaka University Student Union election that was being held after 28 years.

The language used in the talk shows was predominantly Bangla. For analysis purpose, a one-hour video from each episode was transcribed into Bangla and then translated into English. CLAN software was used to transcribe the data in following conversation analysis convention. Attempts were taken to make the translations as close as possible to the original Bangla utterances (that is why some translations are not grammatically structured). The first two minutes that both the hosts spent by introducing the guests to their audiences were cut from each episode.

The data were coded into two main themes: male turn-taking and female turn-taking. Then the turn takings were again divided into subcategories such as soft transition, interruptive overlapping, supportive overlapping, supportive interruptions, disruptive interruptions, co-construction, back channels. Nvivo 12 plus was used to code and analyze the data. Based on conversation analysis approach, the data were qualitatively analyzed. A quantitative approach was also employed to count the frequencies of turn-taking and its functions in interaction management.

2.3 Coding Scheme

The codes used for guests and hosts were as follows:

MH1 = Male host 1

MH2 = Male host 2

FH1 = Female host 1

FH2 = Female host 2

GS1 = Guest speaker 1

GS2 = Guest speaker 2

GS3 = Guest speaker 3

GS4 = Guest speaker 4

GS5= Guest speaker 5

Table 1. Categories related to turn-taking

Turn-taking	Operative definition
Soft transition	To take a turn without interrupting the current speaker. The current speaker selects the next speaker by linguistic and/or nonlinguistic cues that indicate that the host can take the turn.
Interruptive overlapping	To start talking while the guest is in talking and both talk together for some time.
Supportive Overlapping	To talk in the middle of the guest's talking to support the ideas or help extend the ideas.
Co-construction	To help the guest complete the whole sentence or give examples.
Disruptive Overlapping	To talk in the middle of the guest's talking with no relevant goal.
Backchannels (linguistic)	Overlaps to indicate that the host is caring about what the guest is saying.
Backchannels (non-linguistic)	Smile, other facial expressions or physical gestures with hands or head

3. Results

When it comes to analyzing the female host's turn taking, it is evident from the data that the female host maintained the sequential production model of turn-taking (Sacks et al., 1974). The female host waited for soft transition. In case of the male hosts, the MH1 followed the sequential production model of turn-taking and his turns were not interruptive while the other host took repeated turns which could have been minimized and most of those turns constituted interruptive overlaps. Turn taking is a very common practice in conversation. However, the female hosts and MH1 were found to have taken far fewer turns than MH2. From the analysis of the data, we can conclude that male hosts take more turns and their turns are more interruptive and overlapping than female hosts because MH1's interaction strategies and use of turns resembled the female hosts'. However, the female hosts were

found to use nonlinguistic back channels more than male hosts during interactions.

Table 2. Frequencies of turn-taking by male and female hosts

Turn-Taking	Freq. by FH1	Freq. by FH2	Freq. by MH1	Freq. by MH2
Soft transition	9	8	7	3
Interruptive overlapping	6	4	8	42
Supportive overlapping	15	12	13	7
Co-construction	3	1	0	0
Disruptive Interruption	0	2	4	35
Backchannels (linguistic)	8	7	4	19
Backchannels (non-linguistic)	12	8	2	2
Total	52	42	41	108

Table 2 shows the number of turn-taking categories used by both the male and female hosts to manage the interactions in the tv talk shows.

4. Analysis

4.1 Interaction Management by the Women Hosts

Both female hosts managed their interaction with their quest speakers by employing different approaches which were not found exploited by MH2. The female hosts forwarded the conversation by making soft transitions, supportive interruptions, taking the strategy of co-construction, listening to and prioritizing participants' talking, and by silence and nonlinguistic back channel.

4.1.1 Soft Transition

The female hosts managed interactions by following the principle of sequential production. They waited for linguistic and nonlinguistic markers used by guests to take turns and develop discussion. Linguistic cues are like falling intonation, the Table 2 shows that they took soft transitions respectively 9 and 8 times during the interactions. The female hosts waited for the CSSN pattern where the current speaker used some linguistic and/or non-linguistic cues that made her assume that she should take the turn. For example, when the current speaker finished his talk and completed the last sentence with a pause, the female host took the turn by asking a question to another guest. Sometimes they took some turns which were overlapping; however, those were not to bring new topic into discuss but to help move the discussion forward.

Extract 1

1) GS1F:	ekdike (.) eh BNP boRO birodi dol ke		AS in one side, eh, BNP, the major
2)	Bola hocche [apnara GONOtontrer jonno	=	opposition party was said to [work for democracy
3) FH2:	[gontonter jonno		[for democracy
4) GS1:	=kaz koren (.3) BNP netri KHAleda ZIA o		BNP leader Begum KHALEDA
5)	bolechen amra alochonar moddome		ZIA also said they want to move
6)	[egiye jete] chai=		after negotiation
7) FH2:	[ºyesº]	yes	yes
8) GS1:	=(.) eta eta: bangdesher rajnitite ekta SPOSTO		it is a CLEAR change in the
9)	Poriborton (.4) eta o↑BOSHOI proshongsher		politics of Bangladesh it is worth
10)	bishoy (.) ami ASHA kori eta BANladeshe		appreciating I hope this is the
11)	prokrito gonotrantric prokriyar shuru.		(.3) beginning of real democratic process
12)			in BANgladesh
13) FH2:	HASAN talukdar (.) apniki ei bishoye		HASAN Talukdar (.) do you agree
14)	ekmot?		with this?

In Line 12, we see the guest speaker made a falling intonation with a pause that allows the female host to make a smooth transition from the guest speaker to herself. The guest found adequate time to respond to the question posed by the host and then when he finished, the female host took the turn and asking the second guest speaker if

he would agree with the first speaker. Here it is noticeable that by soft transition the host helped the guest to complete the topic he was asked to respond. In lines 4 and 8, the female host made comments that overlapped but those were supportive. The same pattern was observed throughout FH1's interaction.

Extract 2

16) GS2:	amar onuman ARO kharap chilo (.3)	I had anticipated worse (.) so it might
17)	ei jonno hoyto bh(h)lo lagte pare (.)	feel good but so long time after
18)	kintu shwadhinoter eTO:: din por 90's	independence, after 90's, a healthy
19)	er por ekta sastokor gontrantic DHARA	democratic trend would flourish day
20)	din din flourish korbe [Kintu =	by day [but
21) FH2:	[she asha	[that hope
22) GS2:	= panch January ebong tar POrer ghotona	5th January and coming events changed
23)	Amader Chintake CHANGE koreche (.)	out thought (.) from this this is good but
24)	edik theke eta bhalo tobe etaki Bhalo? na	not good (.3) the biggest characteristic
25)	bhaLO:na (.3) amder rajnoitik ongone bo:ro	of our politics is prediction is very
26)	boishisto onuman kora KHUB kotthin (.)	difficult (.) very difficult=
27)	khub kotthin=	
28) FH2:	= na bishesh kore Rajnoitik itihas	no specially our political history
29)	[amader Shikhiyeche I mean=	I mean [taught us
30) GS2:	[KHUB kotthin	[VERY difficult
31) FH2:	= amra kokho:noi dekhi nai duta boro	we have never seen that the two major
32)	Dolke ektre somabesh korte.	parties gathered so peacefully

In line 28, FH2 took the turn when the guest speaker responded to the topic raised. The guest completed his opinion about his expectations from the political parties, then the female host unobtrusively took a turn and added her comment. Her addition gave an interpretation of what the guest's speech implied. Through these smooth transitions, the host was able to bring her talk show toward an expected goal. FH1 also followed the same turn taking practices. She avoided unusually repeated turns and allowed the speakers to finish their talk.

Extract 3

35) FH1:	Apnaro keo mone koren kina DUCSO	Do you anyone think that DUCSO the
36)	holo netritto toirir ekta sutikagar?	Factory of producing leaders?
37)	apnader medhye [ke bolben	Will [anyone from you will talk?
38) GS1:	[Obshyoi (.) ami bolbo je jatiyo]	Of course (.) I will say that our political
39)	RAJnitite AMader jara sorbojon srodhey	legends all are 70 plus (.3) here long
40)	legendary ache sobari boish sottor kinba	years of sterility in politics if it had
41)	achir kotyay chole geche (.3) ekhane dirgho	been avoided then leadership would
42)	attash bochorer jei bondhatto she jodi	have been created by most qualified
43)	ghuchto tahole bochor bochor notun	voters in the highest academia (3)
44)	netritto peto jara sorbocchu bidyapite	I mean leaders elected by the people
45)	MOST qualified voterder dara nirbachito	who practice creative talents
46)	hoto(.3) nata mani medha vittik jara	
47)	chorcha kore tader vote nibachito tader	
48)	prote ekta SOMMAN srodhar jayga	
49)	[deshbashi oboShyoi	
50) FH1:	[mani amner ji sobai] bole netritto toiri	I mean YES everybody says it was
51)	hoyni dirgho tirish bochor ashole atash	because long thirty actually twenty

52)	bochor nirbachonti na houwar karone (.)	eight years election did not take (.)
53)	netritwo shekhan theke ashte pare shei	Leadership can come from that place
54)	ashabad thekei:	

In line 50, even though we see FH1's turn overlapped part of the guest speaker's concluding words, it was not interruptive. She was found to avoid unnecessary comments and lead the speakers to detailing the topic she raised in the talk show.

4.1.2 Co-Construction

Co-construction takes place when a speaker starts an utterance and a second speaker completes it. Especially, it happens when the current speaker carries on talking and at a certain point she seems to look for an example or an idea, then the second speaker helps continue the discussion by offering examples or ideas. In this current research data, we found a repeated pattern that FH2 effectively managed interactions with the guest speakers by co-construction. FH2 was found to help the guest by providing information and constructing relevant utterances. However, in the case of FH1, no co-construction practice was found. The following example shows that the host immediately offered an example when the speaker said, 'for example'.

Extract 4

55) GS5:	hh ORTHAT (.) asol karon ta hocche netara	That is that is the main reason the
56)	>Kono uttejonakor< boktobyo DEYnai	leaders did not deliver >any heated<
57)	Jemon (.3)	Speech (.) for example (.3)
58) FH2:	tara tader kormiderke [uttezito koreNAI	they did not [infuriate the activities
59) GS5:	[he tara SOBAI	they were ALL cool headed
60)	tthanda mathay chilo	

In the 57, the guest speaker made a pause and seemed to look for an example, and the FH2, in line 58, presented an example which the guest speaker restated to make sure that he was looking for the same kind of example. FH1 was also found to support the interaction through co-construction. This type of co-construction characterized the female hosts' supportive approach to triggering the conversation for a meaningful end.

4.1.3 Supportive Overlaps

Like co-construction, supportive overlaps are also intended to propel the discussion. The female hosts made a considerable number of mild interruptions with a view to supporting the speakers' ideas and showing them other perspectives to think over. The female hosts were able to understand the context of interaction and maximized the collaborative opportunities by giving supportive comments.

The following example shows how FH2 supported the speaker's contribution by adding the implied message which the speaker repeated to demonstrate that they both are on track.

Extract 5

61) GS6:	em (.) swadhinoter share CHA::R doshok por	Em after four and half decades of
62)	palon korte rajnoitik dolgulo tader somobesh	independence political parties are
63)	kormosuchi parche (.3) ↑ Apnara khush (.) kintu	able to implement gathering rights
64)	ami [Khushi noi=	you are happy but [I am not=
65) FH2:	[ha ha ha	[ha ha ha
66) GS6:	=amar prottasha ARO [beshi chilo	=my expectations [were more
67) FH2:	[protyasha kome	[expectations lowered
68)	g(h)eche	down

It is evident form line 67, the female host supported the speech by the guest speaker. Her words "protyasha kome" supported the preceding words "beshi chilo". Though the turn overlapped the guest speaker's two words, this approach helped lead the discussion forward. Her interruption was supportive in that the speaker repeated the same comment that she had made.

4.1.4 Rare Interruptive Overlaps

A noticeable characteristic that is apparent throughout the shows anchored by the women was by their

cooperative approach to making the discussion collaborative. They served this purpose by allowing the guest speakers to explicate the topics or issues that they raised to initiate conversation. They patiently listened to their speakers and even during their talk when they were interrupted by someone they agreeably passed the floor on to them and allowed them to contribute to the discussion.

Extract 6

69) GS1:	ekhon SWOSTI onuvob korar kichu karon	There are reasons to feel RELEXED
70)	ache KINtu (.3) duta rajnoitik doler moththe	now but the persistent difference
71)	obyahot parthokyo ja ami tader kotha theke	between the two political parties what
72)	[bojhi=	I [understood from their speech=
73) FH2:	[hmm]	[hmm]
74) GS1:	=BNP IMMEDIATE election chacche ar (.)	BNP wants immediate election and
75)	Awamileague er theke shunechi 2019 er	I heard from Awami leaders there
76)	age Kono electionoi hobe na (.)	will be no election before 2019
77)	[eKHAnai parthokyo	here remains the difference
78) FH2:	[amra dethte pacchi please apni	we can see, please you continue
79)	bolu:n (.)Sayyed [Ashraf kotha=	Sayyed [Ashraf talked,
80) GS1:	[Um um	[Um um
81) FH2:	=boleche begum KHALEDA zia o kotha:	Begaum Khaled also talked
82)	boleche (.5) >amra dujon theke:i Shunte	>we can hear both of them<
83)	parbo< (.) yes.	yes

Lines 73, 78 and 81show three turns by the host where the first two turns overlapped the guest speaker's words, but they did not interrupt the ongoing discussion. However, the participant interrupted by "um um" that overlaps her speech, she refrained from extending her speech and left the floor to her guest speaker. She very politely said, "please continue…" Her prioritizing others' talk made the conversation very smooth and meaning making.

4.1.5 Using Nonlinguistic Back Channels

The data show that only in case of support or collaboration the female hosts made some interruptions. Otherwise, they followed the sequential model for soft transition. While the guest speakers talked, they avoided interruptive turns but made back channeling by paralinguistic behaviors such as facial expressions or other body gestures. The following excerpt shows how the female host advanced the conversation by nonlinguistic backchannels. In the following excerpt, the translation is not given side by side, rather follows the transcript.

Extract 7

84) GS3: ami bektigotoBHAbe mone kori (.) ekdol bole je eta GONOTONTRO rokkhya dibos ar onyo dol mone

85)   kore =

86) FH2: gonotontro [hotya dibos]

87) GS3: =[gonotontro hotya] dibos (.) asole sotyo ubhoyer obsThanei: ache (.3)

88)   apni Jodi blolen <eta gonotontro hotya dibos> ami Bolbo eta SOMPURNO

89)   gonotontro hotya dibos na =

90) FH2: ((nodding and showing she agrees))

91) GS3: =AMI jodi eLECTION er kotha boli (.) election kichuta proshnobidho hoyeche shei dristite gonotontro

92)   huchot kheyeche tobe ami mone korina gonotontro SOMPUNO DHonsho hoyeche ar

93)   gonotontro rokkha hoyeche eta o:: thik na=

94) FH2: ((nodding))

95) GH3: gonotontrer ekta MATRA ache tobe she Matrata kome geche (.4) apni jodi bolen

96)   gonotontro rokkha hoiche tobe PANCHOI janunaryr age birajman gonontrantric

97)   obsthya ekhon ar nai ekhon je songshod ache ta SOMPURNO protiniditwashil

98)   bolte parben na

99) FH2: ((smiling))

100) (GS3: I PERsonally think that our one party is saying that it is a DEMOCRACY

101)   protecting day and the other party is saying that it is a=

102) FH2: [democracy killing day]

103) GS3: =[democracy killing day] Actually there is truth in both the stances, if you say it is

104)   a democracy killing day I would say it's not a fulling democracy killing day rather

105)   democracy just bumps here

106) FH2: ((nodding))

107) GS3: if I indicate the eLection the election is somewhat questionable in that sense

108)   democracy bumps but I don't think that democracy has been totally destroyed and

109)   democracy has been saved is not also fully correct

110) FH2: ((nodding))

111) GS3: Democracy has a dimension and the dimension may be has lessened. If you say

112)   democracy has been saved, then the democratic condition that prevailed before

113)   January 5 is not existent now now the parliament which prevails cannot be said a

114)   fully representative one

115) FH2 ((smiling)))

In this example above, lines 90, 94 and 99 show that the female host used her non-linguistic backchannels such as nodding and smiling that helped her successfully manage the interaction. During this long talk, the female speaker supported the speaker by her gestures and facial expressions. She was found to smile, nod and do other paralinguistic behaviors that ensured that she showed her active involvement in the interaction.

4.2 Interaction Management by Male Hosts

The approaches to conversational interactions undertaken by the male hosts were very different from each other's. Turn taking is a usual part of conversation. MH1 was found to follow sequential model of interaction. He allowed the guest speakers to finish their talk and answer the questions. He took turns when he noticed that his guest speakers responded to their main points of discussion. Compared to MH2, he took fewer turns and those turns had fewer overlaps, and those overlaps were less interruptive. However, MH2 repeatedly took turns that overlapped the guests' speech causing interruptions. He took turns when he made questions and comments which hardly contribute to advancing the conversation. Most questions and comments lacked relevance to the context of discussion. TV talk show hosts sometimes throw a lot of questions to bring out the fact or have the speaker make unbiased discussion. However, MH2 was found to have failed in decoding the truth. He questioned and commented without allowing the speakers to finish the talk. MH2 took the following strategies to manage his interaction with his interviewees in the talk show.

4.2.1 Interruptive Turns by MH2

Usually, questions are intended to elicit information related to the given topic. However, the data show that MH2 deployed a lot of disruptive interruptions by questioning. He violated the practices of normal turn-taking and the speaker's rights by disruptive interruptions (Weatherall & Edmonds, 2018). His all turns overlapped the speeches of his guest speakers. This overlapping did not occur once or twice; rather he did it repeatedly when the current speaker did not still reach what Valenzuela called the "proximity of the end of his turn" (2012, p. 24). His repeated questioning appeared more to establish and maintain authority than to bring out more information about the initial question asked. While the female hosts hardly used disruptive interruptions throughout the whole talk show, MH2 made 35 interruptions which were in no way supporting the discussion. For example, the following excerpt was about the contemporary situation of film and cultural media. However, the male host' repeated questions derailed the guest speaker from the main topic.

Extract 8

116) GS3: amader Commitment hocche: amder   our Commitment is our ↑ values

117)   ↑ mulybod (.) amder obokkhoy ei jinishgulo   our erosion, these some things

118) Amra hariyeschi amader [goto kich bochor =	we lost in our [last few years
119) MH2: [er MAni ki?	[What does it mean?
120) GS3: =ONEK ortho [oNEk	=a lot of meanings
121) MH2: [Mulyobod oDHO:poton	[what do Values and Deviation
122) Mani ki?	Meaning?
123) GS3: MUlyobodh [odhopoton (.) lo:v	Values [deviation (.) greed
124) MH2: [ami egul(h)a shu:ni kintu	[I hear them but not
125) tader ortho Bhalo kore buJhina	understand their meaning well
126) GS1: Um (.) amraje egulor ortho BHalo	Um (.) that we understand their
127) [Bujhi ta na	[meaning better is not that
128) MH2: [hmm	[hmm
129) GS3: amra oDhopoton bolte ja bujhi ta holo	What we understand by deviation
130) [Jokhon SOMAZE o rashtre	is that [when in society and the state
131) MH2: [amra jokhon oDHopoton shuni etar	[When we hear deviation, doesn't
132) Ekta akar ache bole mone hoyna?	it means it had a shape?
133) GS3: etar ekta akar ache [kintu khoy hoye geche	It had a shape [but eroded
134) MH2: [eta jokhon ekta bh(h)alo	when it was in a good shape?
135) akare thake?	
136) GS3: Amader ekta soMRidho itihas chilo=	we had an enriched history=
137) MH2: jeMon?	For EXAMPLE?

When we look at the above excerpt, at first sight, the interaction pattern looks like a dialogue or a bantering between two persons even though this was not the case. The tv talk show was highly regarded for its role in bringing serious social issues into their discussion. However, the teasing nature of questioning by MH2 depicts a dismal picture of how the male host derailed the speaker from a normal course of discussion toward a desolate ending. The repeated turns with overlaps interrupted the guest speaker from continuing the primarily raised topic. The conversation shows that after every single utterance, the host took a turn by questioning or commenting that was disruptive in nature. The following example shows the same pattern.

Extract 9

138) GS1: jemon ami jodi boli (.) tumi MITHYA	For example if I say(.) you are telling
139) Bolcho (.) tumi [SOTYO bolcho na bole=	a lie (.) instead of thatif I say you are
140)	[not telling the truth=
141) M Host: [Ubhoy obsthay ami	in both cases I will be SHOCKED
142) SHOCKED hobo	
143) GS1: =Ubhoy obSTHAY tumi shocked hobe	in both cases you will be shocked
144) Kintu kibhabe [apni PRothomoto shocked	but [how you will be shocked at first
145) M Host: [Ubhoy oboSTHay ami	[in both cases I will be shocked in
146) ekoibhabe Shocked hobo	the same way
147) GS1: apni secondtate [ekoibhabe shocked	you will [not be shocked at the second
148) Hobenna	in the same way
149) M Host: [ami EKOIbhabe	shocked [I will be shocked in the same way
150) hobo karon ((bujhinai))	karon ((not understandable))
151) GSF1M: ami SHOCKED hobona [karon ami	I will not be in the same way [because I
152) M Host: ami SOTYO bochi	I am telling the TRUTH
153) GSF1M: apni MITHYA [bolchen.	you are [telling a LIE

154) M Host: [apni SOTYO bolchen na(.) hoyto	[you not telling the truth(.) you might be
155) APNIO eKOIbhabe shocked	shocked likewise

This interaction shows how the female guest speaker was repeatedly interrupted by the host and could hardly move on her talk. He made a lot of back channels, but his irrelevant questions and interrupting comments disrupted the continuation of the female speaker's speech.

4.2.2 No Topic Completion by MH2

Topic completion is essential for successful conversations. Topic completion takes place when the speaker and the interlocutor understand the context of interaction and transition between the speaker and the listener happens softly. All speakers' cooperative approach can ensure mutual understanding of when and how to take turns without interruptions. In this case study, the data clearly show that there was a lack of mutual understanding of the context of interaction. Especially, the failure to head toward the topic completion was exacerbated by a lot of interruptions by MH2 and his turning to the next speaker without allowing the prior speaker to finish. The following example shows how MH2 threw trifling questions and turned to the next speaker without allowing the current speakers to finish their talk.

Extract 10

156) GS4: SOTTHIK lok jodi [SOTTHIK jagay	APPROPRIATE people [if not come to
157) Na asle	APPROPRIATE PLACE
158) MH2: [bebsayra rajnitite ASbena?	[Businessmen should not come to politics?
159) GS4: NA [na na=	NO [No No
160) MH2: [Engineer politics e ASben?	[Engineers should not come to politics?
161) GS4: Na [na na=	No [No No
162) MH2: [Obhineta?	[Actors?
163) GS4: [keho	[somebody
164) MH2: [Dakter?	[Doctor?
165) GS4: Sobai [asa uchit	All [should come
166) MH2: [BArristers?	[Barristers?

The excerpt above shows that MH2's repeated turns impeded GS4 from keeping on the main topic which he was trying to respond. MH2 was trying to answer if the country became a laughing stock or there was a scarcity of entertainment, but he was taken far away from this topic, and finally MH2 took a turn to another speaker whom he asked the same question. The next speaker also was not given opportunities to complete the topic because the host had already turned to another speaker. Interruptions and turning from one speaker to another speaker without topic completion were the interaction management strategies he applied throughout the whole conversation.

4.2.3 Back Channels by MH2

Back channels are great ways to advance conversational interactions. All through the talk show, MH2 employed a lot of back channels and his back channeling played important roles in making his authoritative presence in the show. He mostly used 'hmm' to support interaction procedure.

Extract 11

167) GS2: [SOTYO=	[TRUE=
168) MH2: [hmm hmm]	[hmm hmm
169) GS2: rajnitite eta KHUB sotyo (.) jokhon	in politics it is VERY true (.) when it is
170) Dekha jay AMRA mani ekta DOl Je	seen a PARTY Any party [criticizes
171) Kono dol [arekta dolke Somalochona	another party
172) kore	
173) MH2: [hmm hmm	
174) GS2: bortoman PERspective [niye kotha bole=	talk about current PERspective=
175) MH2: [hmm, hmm	[hmm hmm

176) GS2: jokhon APnara [khomotary chilen=   when you [were in power=

177) MH2: [hmm hmm   [hmm hmm

178) GS2: APnaro:: eKHoi korechen [mani amra   you did the same [I mean we are

179) KHUB poshchadpod=   VERY backward=

180) MH2: [somBHob hole ARO pechone   [if possible go back further like

181)   jan jemon Basherkella titumir   BAsher kellah, Titumir

182) GS2: Amra shuDHu peChonei jacchina (.)   We not only look back, going back

183)   pechone Jaite jaite ekebare swadinota   going back back and back

184)   juddho   Independence war

While FH2 was found to use a lot of non-linguistic back channels, MH2 used a lot of linguistic back channels to manage his interaction with the guest speakers. The data show that only through back channels MH2 supported the interlocutor to engage in the discussion. However, his obsession with repeated questions and turn to the next speaker with letting the current speaker draw a conclusion outdid his supportive back channels.

4.2.4 Soft Transition by MH1

Unlike MH2, MH1 followed the sequential production model of interaction in that he avoided taking unnecessary repeated turns and interruptions. Like FH1 and FH2, he gave his speakers enough time and space to respond to the questions he posed. He waited for soft transition and when he noticed that his guest speaker might not stop unless he interrupted, only then he took turns. However, those turns did not stymie the interaction. The following example shows that MH1 allowed the speaker to explicate his point and when the speaker answered the question only then MH1 took the turn. Importantly, the data from MH1 and MH2 have provided opposite evidence with regard to interaction management by turns. While MH2's turns are characterized by repeated interruptions and overlaps, MH1's turns are predominantly soft and less used if not necessary. MH1's turns are free from overlaps and used only to facilitate ongoing discussion.

Extract 12

183) GS1: amra BANgladesh chattroleague KOthar   We Bangladesh Chattraleague do not resort

184)   fuljhuri dite chaina (.3) amra chai: CHattroder   big talks (.3) we want to ensure students

185)   (.4) MOUlik je somossyagulo ache shei moulik   basic problems (.4) basic problems

186)   SOMosya somadan korte (.5) ei MOUik   include when they start their academic

187)   somosyagulor modhye pore je (.) chattrora   life (.) in the first year they need living

188)   ↑ PROthom borshe asar pore she tar shikka   place (.) and their food quality and in

189)   jibon otikranto korar pore je jinish gulo   the university they need a study

190)   tar OTI:b prowujonio ta hochhe tar thaker   environment (.3) your reading room

191)   jaygata (.) ebong tar khabarer MAN ebong   development (.5) food environment

192)   biswabidyaloye pora shunar je poribesh   and library [opening for twenty-four

193)   sheta hocche (.3) apnader reading roomer   hour.

194)   unnonoyn (.5) khabarer unnyon library

195)   chobbish ghonta khula rakha

196) MH: seta dekhchi (.) apnara amra dekhechi   I see that (.) you we see say in the

197)   ESTtehareo: bolen shemonti Apnar kotha ki?   Manifesto (.) Shem what do you say?

Line 196 shows that MH1 took turn after detailed description of what GS1 would do if elected as the president of Dhaka University Student Union. MH1 did not interrupt and allowed GS1 to discuss his vision. The overall data of MH1's talk show that he avoided repeated turns and only took turns when needed. Sometimes his turns had overlaps but those were not disruptive and not derailing the interlocutors from their topics of discussion.

4.2.5 Supportive Overlaps by MH1

In contrast to MH2's interaction management approach, MH2 propelled the talk show discourse by supporting the discussion by the guests. He followed the sequential model of production by employing soft transition

approach and at times supported the guests by ideas. So, this host's intervention sometimes overlapped the current speech of the guest. However, his overlaps contributed to the development of the discourse.

Extract 13

198) GS3: dekhen amra biVinyoBHabe bolar chesta	Look, we tried to say in different ways
199) kori (,3) O bolar [chester koreche	He also tried to say
200) MH1: [Ji bolen	Yes, tell please
201) GS3: quota SONgsker andolon eta kintu	Quota reformation movement is but
202) Ekta ANDolon (.) erokom kintu osonkhyo	a movement. There are a lot of
203) [Andolong ache=	movement like this
204) MH1: [Andolone ache nanabid hote pare	There are movements. They might be different
205) GS3:=nana bid hote pare	They might be of different types.

In this small excerpt above, two supportive overlaps are found. They have been used to support with ideas in the middle of the speech of the guest.

5. Conclusion

Data found in the Bangladeshi tv talk show discourses gave evidences contrary to Robin Lakoff's (1975) Deficit Model that argues that woman language is characterized by hedges and interruptions. Whereas Lakoff argued that women talk differently in such a way that reflects their subordinate positions in the society, the data in this particular context show that it is not the language but the attitudes that distinguish women from men. The women studied for this research were the members of higher social strata. Their approaches to interaction with others made them different from the male hosts. Lakoff held that women's subordinate positions in the society disqualify them from authority and power, but this research shows that women even though are in high social strata use the solidarity approach, not the authoritative one, to manage social interaction. From the data studied for this project we cannot make any putative statement about men's interaction management strategies: MH1's interactive strategies were opposed to traditional view-points that men employ means by which they try to establish the power and authority and maintain them by, especially, confrontation because he followed the sequential production model of interaction although the strategies of soft-transition and supportive overlaps while MH2 used repeated turns which were full of interruptions and overlaps.

Interruptions are commonly considered the violation of speakers' rights to finish the topic within a limited time (Weatherall & Edmonds, 2018). MH2 in this study was found to have repeatedly violated the speakers' rights by trivial questions. His repeated comments derailed the speakers' topics from the track and his abrupt turns to the next speaker left the current speaker dismayed. On the other hand, FH1 and FH2's approach in the talk show and the language that she used support some of Holmes' (1993) six universals which she proposed with regard to language use based on gender. The data showed that the hosts focused more on the affective functions of interactions, emphasized on solidarity and were more prone to using languages showing interaction support. Holmes' proposal was an effort to change the existing perceptions that woman language is characterized by deficiency and inferiority. She said that women emphasize the interaction functions that are more effective than men do. She said that women use linguistic tools that are more reflective of solidarity while men emphasize on means by which they try to establish the power and authority and maintain them by, especially, confrontation. She also talked about women's flexibility in interactions that give interlocutors more space to develop the interaction. The current research data conform to these universals. Besides, the female host's emotional support was prevalent throughout the whole episode, which was reflected in the female hosts' language and non-linguistic backchanneling.

Acknowledgement

References

Aznárez-Mauleón, M. (2013). An approach to the host's discursive style in Spanish "testimony" talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *45*, 50–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.11.001

Dana, L. C. (2014). Shock Therapy: Oprah Winfrey, Celebrity Philanthropy, and Disaster "Relief" in Haiti. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, *31*(1), 42–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2013.864047

Gamson, J. (1998). *Freaks talk back: Tabloid talk shows and sexual nonconformity*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226280639.001.0001

Hamo, M. (2008). Ian Hutchby, Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting. *Language in Society*, *37*(2), 290–294. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404508080391

Holmes, J. (1993). Women's talk: The question of sociolinguistic universals. *Australian Journal of Communication*, *20*(3), 125–149. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.memphis.edu/docview/85571196?accountid=14582

Jucker, A. H., & Landert, D. (2015). Historical pragmatics and early speech recordings. Diachronic developments in turn-taking and narrative structure in radio talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *79*, 22–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.01.010

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, *2*(1), 45–79. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500000051

Lauerbach, G. (2007). Argumentation in political talk show interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(8), 1388–1419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.004

Lorenzo-Dus, N. (2009). *Television discourse: Analysing language in the media*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-11717-5

Maroni, B., Gnisci, A., & Pontecorvo, C. (2008). Turn-taking in classroom interactions: Overlapping, interruptions and pauses in primary school. *European Journal of Psychology of Education - EJPE* (Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada), *23*(1), 59–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173140

Neuliep, J. W. (1996). The Influence of Theory X and Y Management Style on the Perception of Ethical Behavior in Organizations. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, *11*(2), 301–311. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.memphis.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=9610292168&site=eds-live&scope=site

Okamoto, D., Rashotte, L., & Smith-Lovin, L. (2002). Measuring Interruption: Syntactic and Contextual Methods of Coding Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *65*(1), 38–55. https://doi.org/10.2307/3090167

Oyeleye, A. L., & Olutayo, O. G. (2012). Interaction management in nigerian television talk shows. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *2*(1), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p149

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7–55). Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. (2000). Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language in Society*, *29*(1), 1–63. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500001019

Shattuc, J. M. (1997). *The Talking Cure: TV Talk Shows and Women*. London: Routledge.

Thornborrow, J. (2007). Narrative, opinion and situated argument in talk show discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*(8), 1436–1453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.001

Tolson, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Television talk shows: discourse, performance, spectacle*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600950

Trepte, S. (2005). Daily Talk as Self-Realization. *Media Psychology*, *7*(2), 165–189. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532785XMEP0702_3

Valenzuela, Á. R. (2012). A Descriptive Analysis of Overlapping in Attitudinal Terms in Two Types of Interview. *Lenguas Modernas*, *37*, 21. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.memphis.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=78186735&site=eds-live&scope=site

van Rees, M. A. (2007). Discourse analysis and argumentation theory: The case of television talk. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *39*, 1454–1463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.005

Weatherall, A., & Edmonds, D. M. (2018). Speakers formulating their talk as interruptive. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *123*, 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.11.008

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (2017). Conversation Analysis in Language and Gender Studies. In M. M. Susan Ehrlich (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality* (2nd ed., pp. 241–242). Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley Blackwell.

Wilson, K. (2008). *Classification of Talkshows*. Retrieved February 13, 2010, from http://AllFreeEssays.com

Copyrights