

## **Violation of Priority in Media and Political Discourse Dialogue (On the Basis of Kazakhstan Talk Shows)**

Dinara Koishigulova, Gulmira Madiyeva, Taussogarova Ayauzhan,  
Zhambylkyzy Marina and Saniya Kerimova  
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 71 Al-Farabistr, 050040 Almaty, Kazakhstan

---

**Abstract:** Recently, the interest has increased in problems of speech communication associated with the development of linguistic pragmatics which is one of the most promising areas of research verbal communication. The success of speech communication is determined by the pragmatic summands and achieving the strategic goal of the speaker in non-conflict verbal communication. Political talk shows are one of the most interesting objects for linguistic research. Political TV talk shows as screen genre of media political discourse, implemented through the media and which goal is a struggle for power through the formation of public opinion is complexly organized mental-medial product of multimodal interaction. The multimodality parameter is determined by simultaneously using works different in its semiotic in a single audiovisual space through different sensory modalities which are subjected to conversation analysis and this study presents the results of this analysis.

**Key words:** Interaction, discourse, media discourse, communicative roles change, interruption of speech communication, conversation analysis

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Recently, interest has increased in problems of speech communication associated with the development of linguistic pragmatics which is one of the most promising areas of research of verbal communication. The success of speech communication is determined by the pragmatic summands and achieving the strategic goal of the speaker in a non-conflict verbal communication. With the evolution of society, complications of social and economic needs in communication involve a wide range of individuals, who are not equal in social indicators (e.g., employment status, education level, place of residence, culture, etc.). Participants of the interaction, engaging in dialogue arranged to implement the principles of the organization of the communicative context but in a particular speech situation they can violate the principles for various reasons. This fact leads to failure of verbal communication which as a consequence, does not have the desired results and became unimplemented. One of the manifestations of unimplemented verbal communication is a communicative phenomenon of interruption of communication which is covered in this study.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Interruption of speech communication is one of the main dialogue control strategies. At the same time, according to Kunsmann (2013), it is a violation of the rules

and principles expectations regarding to rules if communicative roles change “violating another speaker’s right and obligations” “interruption breaks the symmetry of the conversational model and that interruption is violations of the turn-taking rules of conversation and described as uncooperative. Speakers interrupt more in conversation and this strategy is associated with competitiveness, dominance and a way of getting the floor”.

It should be noted that controlling the turn-taking, the researcher can determine how the participants of communication implement their strategies through verbal and non-verbal expressions, including with what type of turn-taking the communicants interrupt. It is appropriate to ask what is turn-taking and to what type of turn-taking the interruption belongs to?

Turn-taking or “taking reply step” is the most important category of conversation analysis which is a way of organizing its content structure. The study of the principles of turn-taking is one of the main aspects of the conversation discourse study. The largest contribution to the formation and development of the turn-taking were made by ancestors of conversation analysis E. Shegloff, (Sacks, 1974). Mr. Jefferson who worked in the ethno-methodological direction of American sociology and anthropology. In their works devoted to turn-taking, the researchers highlights a number of rules for the organization of replicas alternation which control the order to minimize the pause and overlays, in accordance

with which it is possible to allocate the strategic aspects of turn-talking. As one of the most important characteristics of their model, the authors see the potential applicability to any kind of dialogue, noting the possibility to adapt it depending on the specific socio-cultural context.

According to one of the basic principles of conversation analysis, natural speech, despite that at first glance it seems chaotic, it is strictly ordered and that order has a social significance. Accordingly, any naturally occurring conversation implies the existence of the order which does not have to be constantly explained in the course of exchange of remarks. The order is also necessary so that the spoken was clear to all participants of the conversation. The conversation reflects social, interactive competence of people seeking to explain their behavior and the behavior of the interlocutors (Isupova, 2002).

Turn-talking is a transfer of the speaker's role from one participant to another, causing the completion of a separate communication contribution of the previous entity and taking the rights to the communicative contribution by other. These rules can be understood as a mechanism for the division of a "pie", shared between the interlocutors, endowing them with minimum units or "shares" of speaking, after which the right to speak passed to the next person. As a result, there is a "complex speech product that reflects communicative event of oral contact, mostly unmediated communication in which partners verbally (and non-verbally), by changing the roles of the speaker and the listener in specific situation with the help of certain strategies and tactics strive to achieve the desired results and reach (or not reach) them" (Formanovskaya, 2002).

Those, who speaks first in a large extent defines the interpretive framework for all subsequent statements. The dominant partner is the one who is able to change the topic and keep track of the order of roles. He controls who is talks, how much and what. Controlling speech act as a rule is an initial. He can program an order, manner and style of speech, a way of expression (Palmer, 1989).

It should be noted that these roles are relative. At each moment a dialogue one of the participants becomes the leader and the other becomes follower. Turn-talking is characterized by the type of relatedness of neighboring replicas in time. It distinguishes 3 types of "taking steps".

- Simultaneous turn-talking
- "Smooth" turn-talking
- Turn-talking after a pause

Simultaneous turn-talking is represented by two types of interrupting actions: overlays and interruptions. Overlays are the result of the simultaneous introduction

of several communication participants at the point marked with signal actions of communicative course transmission and interruptions occur from the entry of one of the listeners in the communicative exchange at a time when the speaker is not ready to give him the right for the next communicative turn:

Here is an example

Sergei says that he couldn't go with us on a picnic

[Why?

[He told us another thing yesterday

Well (.) he must have good reasons

It is very strange

(bracket denotes a simultaneous speaking)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Each discourse, no matter which is accompanied by a paralinguistic and non-verbal expression means. They allow each addressee and addresser understand what their partner in this communication want. Proceeding from this, it should be noted that simultaneous turn-talking can be identified and found not only on the basis of verbal means but also non-verbal means of expression. Therefore, (Petrova, 2008) writes: "Numerous "overlaps" or violations of priority in the dialogue, expressed in the fact that) several communicants might speak simultaneously, violating the minimum dialogical unity (hereinafter, MDU) "question answer" at the same time can be verbal and non-verbal communication, for example, one participant of the interaction speaking, another at the same time kinetically takes part in a conversation, thus reacting to interlocutor's remarks and cognitively processing the incoming information".

Modern pragmalinguistic communication studies are often conducted either through stylized speech of characters in the written works or through audio recordings of various kinds of discourse. The term "conversation" is defined verbally, for example, Schegloff (2000) refer to it as "speech exchange systems", later on replacing with "talk-in interaction" with verbal concentration in the production of interactive structures and further to the "turn-taking" for the purpose reconstruction of structures and the system of verbal exchange of information in dialogue. Interestingly, the researcher notes that in "summons-answer sequences" the "summons" can be produced verbally and "answer" have the kinetic characteristic, for example, to look away, to change body position, distance and all this as an answer to a question or reaction the stimulus. In many cases, dialogism is perceived and understood as an alternate participation in communication which belongs to the classical understanding of communication: one

speaks, the other listens, the third, taking turns, takes part in a conversation. However, spontaneous communication (its different genres whether it be informal conversation or a cooperative discussion of a problem) is replete with situations where the participant refuses to play the role of verbal communicant, takes verbal pause but cognitively participates in the interaction without leaving it and involving different levels of modality such as proxemics. At the same, time classical scheme “one speaks the other listens” is broken: one speaks and the other at this point is “speaking” too but in a different way without verbal means.

This process is called “overlap” and is defined as the time period in which the fundamental orientation of “one party talks at a time” is broken and two or more participants in the communication speak at the same time (Sacks, 1974).

The basic dynamic model of communication which is the core of the dialogue and traditionally designated as MDU involves the scheme of phased verbal flow and the phased perception or the Stimulus (S) Reaction (R), undergoes some modifications, reflected in the fact that the idea or theme can be transferred by several modalities and at the same time, that is we are talking about the same time “speaking” of more communicants. Thus, the principle of successive which is the basis of MDU is replaced by the principle of simultaneity. Simultaneous interaction model is more resistant to interference that occurs as the result of communication and often leads to his termination.

This process takes place in any area of communication, including in the media political discourse. Thus without the media which represent a political meaning, defines the agenda, constructs an image, build public opinion and clarify various subjects of interest, the public communication can't take place. That is why political communication inevitably becomes a media discourse. As institutional types of communication, close cooperation of political discourse and media discourse gives grounds to the presence of the phenomenon media political discourse with certain characteristics wrote about it: “A politician's speech at the conference, not broadcasted on television or radio, represents a purely political discourse but its television or radio broadcast is a media political discourse”. On this basis, we can distinguish the constitutive features of media political discourse and their hybrid varieties:

Members of the media political discourse are professional journalists, acting as intermediaries between politicians and clients, politicians themselves, resorting to the services of journalists and mass (listeners, readers,

viewers) subjects of media political discourse is inherently broad, since it includes the struggle for power and is reflected in the texts of the media. To the media political discourse text we refer all media texts of political subjects. Media political discourse has a number of prerequisites to manipulate the public consciousness. Its purpose, integrating targets of media and political discourse is a transmission of exposure information aimed at the conquest, the realization, the preservation of power. The object of media political discourse is to affect public opinion

Media political discourse has such a social knowledge management resource about the world and, accordingly, its reaction as information. The information in the broadest sense of the word is a reflection of the real world. But the transmission of information is not a statement of the facts of objective reality but their interpretation, i.e., the transfer of information in reality. Information induce directed thought processes and emotional states information shapes our thoughts, structures our experience and defines our views on the world around us. Informing, media political discourse and also affects. Media political discourse reflects the attitudes, beliefs, values of certain social and political groups, i.e., has ideology. Recipient of discourse belongs to a certain culture and has a certain ideology, discourse interaction with which promotes the achievement of its intentions. Media political discourse focused on the present and dispersed in space. Media political discourse, thus is a complex communicative phenomenon, implemented through the media and aims the struggle for power through the formation of public opinion.

Production of television talk shows as one of the most spectacular genres of media political discourse is also associated with the sign of spontaneity. Despite the possibility of pre-prepared questions for the journalist, the conversation during the talk show has the nature of a direct, straight interaction, thanks to what it is in a situation of talk shows it is possible to observe the spontaneous verbal responses of participant which are located in a single visual space that causes particular accuracy of their discursive behavior.

Realizing themselves as a “focal person”, politicians coordinate their behavior in such a way so it's adequately perceived and interpreted by their opponents and viewers. In addition, poly-subject factor that determines the interaction of two or more participants in the communication process, leads to the desire of talk shows participants to keep control over the situation and forces them to continually use the feedback mechanism to further consistent implementation or adjustment of interaction. Audio visual nature of television

communication, creating a spectacular effect of screen genres, spontaneity of interactive talk-show participants, providing the highest accuracy of their discursive behavior and poly-subject, underlying mechanism of exchange of communicative roles, specifically affects the research methodology. The most effective method for studying interaction as a complex of simultaneous verbal and nonverbal process is the video analysis which involves not only a detailed record of all verbal actions of communicants in the form of a sequence of individual speech contributions but also fixation of visible non-verbal signals manifesting communicative intentions of the participants. Using video recordings as empirical material allows to reveal the various forms of active and passive perception and to determine what role they play in the process of constructing the local interactional spaces. Video analysis as a method of research of interaction also allows to determine the relevance of the behavior of the participants, who at that particular moment act as listeners and observers.

The material of the present study is based on 20 video sequences from 3 television broadcast of political talk show “Alang” which airs on the national TV channel “Kazakhstan”, for 2012-2014 the overall sound of 2 h and a volume of 31 pages deciphered. Participants, selected for the analysis of the talk show were former and current Kazakh MPs, politicians and journalists who discuss current state policy issues.

As a result of the talk show video analysis we were able to establish that the choice of strategies talk show participants interactions caused by status-role dominance where one party is a “legitimate speaker” and has a leading role in the expansion of the theme and the other at the same time takes a verbal pause but is taking part in a conversation, making the cognitive processing of incoming information. The desire to speak a lot in a short time, in connection with the possibility of speech interruption by other members, has a certain effect on the discursive behavior of a talk-show participant, acting as a “legitimate speaker”. He seeks to enhance the perception of verbal context with different kinetic signs that repeat or duplicate the actual speech data. The most common gesture that reflects the desire of the speaker to make the recipient focus on certain thought, to point out the essence of the statement (35% of total kinetic signs used by communicants, acting as “legitimate speaker” in the analyzed talk show) was the gesture “pinch”. This gesture has a shape in which thumb and index finger (sometimes with middle finger) pointing upwards are joined. Its use is accompanied by such words and phrases such as: namely; here is just; in fact of the matter; this is what; this; actually and metalinguistic verbs



Fig. 1: (Zheksenbay Duisebayev Majilis Deputy of the RK Parliament): Here, we need to take into account the fact (I)



Fig. 2: Zheksenbay Duisebayev (Majilis Deputy of the RK Parliament): Here we need to ask the question Why? (I)

and designs, for example. However, we said. Here I have to say that Zheksenbay Duisebayev, acting as a “legitimate speaker”, tries to emphasize the modality of obligation for the whole system, the whole society (Fig. 1). So he focuses recipient’s attention not only with accentuated emphasis on the words. Here, we need to take into account the fact but also with a “pinch” gesture. In (Fig. 2), to draw attention to his narrative, the politician uses kinetic gesture “index finger upward”, used in 20% of cases of the use of gestures by politicians as a “legitimate speaker”. It focuses the recipient’s attention on how he personally relates to the mentioned events (Fig. 2). The desire to attract the maximum attention of the recipient, using not only the verbal context but also a gesture demonstrates the strong confidence the speaker in his own words. To enhance the sensory impact on the opponents “legitimate speakers” also used the method of “the authority of the person”. The impact of verbal signs increases by specifying the source of the expressed opinion. The most common relevant confirmation gestures in this situation are the various deictic illustrative gestures “point with finger, hands, eyes, head” which make up 20% of the total resource of the “legitimate speaker”.



Fig. 3: Nurmuhammed Baygara (Politician and Journalist): As just miss Raisa said: “if there are no users, the economy” (II)



Fig. 5: Nurmuhammed Baygara (politician and journalist): Firstly, we insured the car, secondly, we had to insure... (I)



Fig. 4: Azamat Abildayev (Majilis Deputy of the RK Parliament): You said said, that “...” (III)



Fig. 6: Ergozha Ersain (chairman of the Movement “Education”): I do not agree with you on three criteria. First of all... (IV)

These gestures accompany the verbal deictic pronouns and adverbs, he, she, you, this and here, there and others. With these kinemas the speaker express addressing specific talk show participant, showing that this opinion is shared not only by the speaker. The presence of “authority” in the studio suggests the possibility to confirm or deny the statement of the “legitimate speaker” which gives weight to the words of the speaker (Fig. 3 and 4).

In order to give more convincing speech, enhance verbal information of policy in the role of “legitimate speaker” used non-verbal gesture of “punctuated finger counting” (25%), listing or highlighting the most important information, a logical sequence of actions and etc (Fig. 5 and 6).

So, in the discursive behavior of “legitimate speaker” are used mainly gestures-illustrators, duplicating the actual voice data with the aim to focus the recipient’s attention on some ideas (“pinch”-35%, “the index finger up”-20%); enhance verbally expressed information

“punctuated finger counting”.25%); give weight to the words of the speaker (“the authority of the person” 20%). The interactive behavior of talk show participants, who take a verbal pause while acting as “legitimate speaker” can’t be characterized as a passive perception of the speaker. They cognitively take part in the interaction without leaving it while involving different levels of modality. The classical scheme of “one speaks the other listens” is violated in such a way that one speaks and the other at this point also “speaks” but in a different way without verbal means. This process is named multimodal “overlap” and is defined as a temporary segment, in which the fundamental orientation of the “one party talks at a time” is broken and two or more of the communication participant are speaking at the same time. “Overlap” or the violations of priority in the dialogue, expressed in the fact that several communicants can speak simultaneously, violating the minimum dialogical unity “question

answer”) verbal and non-verbal communication can take place at the same time, for example, one participant of the interaction speaks and another at the same time kinetically takes part in a conversation, thus reacting to the interlocutor cues and doing so cognitively processing incoming information (Kazakovskaya, 2006).

Analysis showed that the participants during verbal pause during use “staged” and “forcing” as a specific strategy. At the same time, they are needed as components of cooperative dialogue, thus contributing, in one case, to the creation of a specific interactive structure or emphasized non-verbal increase of participation in the communication, in the other to intercepting the initiative.

Video analysis showed that the implementation of this strategy is carried out thanks to the opportunities that multimodal “overlap” offers to the participants. In the simultaneous dialogue in the framework of a multi-modal “legitimate speaker” as has been said, combines in its speech verbal and non-verbal means of communication. Other members of the interactions take verbal pause, during which they perform the cognitive processing of incoming information of the “legitimate speaker” and react to it by means of other semiotic systems resources. The components of a multimodal “overlap” belong to different energy fields and to different forms of interactive participation, so no interference occurs and communication is not disturbed. Non-verbal participation during verbal pause is carried out by means of gestures that replace verbal expression.

About 45% of the total number of non-verbal signs, used by the participants to implement the strategy of “mocking” in the analyzed talk shows, account for the gesture “nod” as the equivalent of a positive response to a positive common question or as a substitute for the consent of the speech act. This can be a single nod of consent with the words of “legitimate speaker” or periodically repeated many times, the so-called “academic nod”-a gesture of phatic function (Fig. 7). Approval of the “legitimate speaker’s” words can be staged more intensely if a nod accompanied with closing the eyes (10%) (Fig. 8). A nod and closing the eyes can sometimes be accompanied by a muttering, indicating the increasing intensity of the consent of until the desire to verbally respond to the speaker’s words (5%).

However, a nod does not always means an approval with the statements of the “legitimate speaker”. To the “legitimate speaker’s” remarks Maksat Nuryybaev (Fig. 9). shakes his head in doubt, pulling the lips together, trying to portray an attempt to verbally express his contrary opinion (15%). Disagreement with the words of the “legitimate speaker” implemented by the communicants (12%) as a gesture of “eye roll” with an



Fig. 7: Nazira Berdaly (Kazakhstani Journalist) (V)



Fig. 8: Nazira Berdaly (Kazakhstani Journalist) (V)



Fig. 9: Maksat Nuryybaev (lawyer) (VI)

ironic smile (Fig. 10). In all these examples, the “communication” occurs in the absence of interference. This reaction of talk show participants, who took a verbal pause, allows the speaker to further develop their initiated subject. Change of communication roles is not happening. Nonverbal participation during verbal pause is carried out by means of gestures that replace verbal expression. Thus, smile and “nodding” in agreement (45%), the intensity of which increases with the help of kinesthetic signs “closing eyes” and “muttering” (15%) as well as the



Fig. 10: Saparbay Zhubayev (Economist, Economic Sciences PhD) (VII)“



Fig. 11: An employee of the department of environment of the Almaty city amir Zhetbayev (right) ecologist Shildebayev Zhumat (left) (VIII)“

shaking head in disagreement” (15% ) and other gestures, accompanied by eyes expressions, for example “throwing the head back and raising the eyebrows” (13%) which is the equivalent of a verbal phrase “Really?” or simply gesture “eye roll” in conjunction with an ironic smile (12%) has contact supporting function as feedback signal. The strategy of “forcing” is used by politician to confront his opponent in the interaction and is characterized by certain rigidity, aggressiveness which can also be expressed simultaneously by multiple modal levels: verbal and nonverbal.

To implement this strategy were used kinesthetic units which purpose is to interrupt the speech of “a legitimate speaker” to object him or get the opportunity to ask a clarifying question. The most obvious signal to attract attention and asking for the opportunity to speak is an academic gesture of raising hand (Fig. 11). This gesture amounts to the 45% of the total number of kinesthetic signs used by politicians in the implementation of “forcing” strategy.

In order to demonstrate their desire to enter into dialogue, participants, who took verbal pause to draw attention to their words, not only gesture but also interrupt “legitimate speaker”(30%). At the Fig. 12 speaker Mels Eleusizov absolutely does not agree with “the legitimate speaker’s” opinion and with all communicative resources trying to defend his point of view. On the verbal level he repeatedly uses negative No, no to completely deny the speaker’s words. The verbal context is enhanced with energetic gesturing of the index finger. Such verbal overlap of participant’s cues leads to a communicative failure because it creates a disturbance in perception. Politicians, involved in such overlaps have to repeat the same information several times in order to stop the other party’s speech. The development of thread prolonged. So, the strategy of “forcing” used by talk show participants to change the status-role dominance,



Fig. 12: Mels Eleusizov Chairman of the Movement “Tabigat” in Kazakhstan

i.e., for communicative role reversal. Attempts to get the role of “legitimate speaker” force them to use units of all modal levels. To implement this strategy were used kinesthetic units, the purpose of which was to segment the flow of dialogue, similar to punctuation. Such kinemas as a gesture of a raised hand, vigorous hand gesturing with “pinch” fingers, were necessary to demonstrate a desire to enter into dialogue by interrupting the speaker’s speech. Using the non-verbal means first and then verbal ones leads to verbal “overlap” which has a lot of potential interference in simultaneous dialogue and a smaller duration interval as it’s impossible for several people to speak for a long time and at the same time, delivery and the perception of information inevitably violated which leads to the termination of communicating. The analysis showed that the application of “forcing” strategy may change status-role dominance of participants. In this case the “legitimate speaker” forced to take a verbal pause and give way to the role of the speaker to other participants of the talk show. However, during the verbal pause they continue to engage in dialogue but with non-verbal means. With the failure of “forcing” strategy

communicative role reversal doesn't occur but participant that tried to get the opportunity to speak, continues to "speak" non-verbally.

### CONCLUSION

The conducted analysis suggests the following conclusions. The television political talk shows as screen genre of media political discourse, implemented through the media and which aims struggle for power through the formation of public opinion is a complexly organized mental-medial product of multimodal interaction. Multimodal parameter determined by simultaneously using in a single audiovisual space different in its semiotic nature works through different sensory modalities.

The central condition for the functioning of such multimodal interaction is the effect of mutual perception mechanisms. Realizing themselves as a "focal person", politicians coordinate their behavior in such a way as to be adequately perceived and interpreted by their opponents and spectators, forcing them to constantly use the feedback mechanism to further consistent implementation or adjustment of their multimodal interaction strategies.

The choice of strategies of talk show participants is caused by the status-role dominance. When one participant is a "legitimate speaker" and he has a leading role in the development of the thread, he uses illustrating gestures, duplicating the actual voice data and enhancing it to have a certain influence on the talk show participants. Another participant at the same time takes a verbal pause but takes part in a conversation by using the "staged" or "forcing" strategy. To implement the "staged" strategy are used gestures that replace verbal expression and has contact supporting function as a feedback signal. The strategy of "forcing" is done by

using kinesthetic units which function is to segment the flow of dialogue, similar to punctuation marks, to demonstrate the desire to enter into the dialogue by interrupting the speaker's speech to object it or get the opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Discursive behavior of a talk show with the rejection of verbal can increase the duration of simultaneous modal communication without damage to the interaction while the verbal overlay of communicant's cues leads to interference in the acceptance and understanding of the information and the termination of communication.

### REFERENCES

- Formanovskaya, I.N., 2002. Speech communication: Communicative pragmatic approach. Moscow, Russia.
- Isupova, O.G., 2002. Conversation analysis: Method representation. *Sociol.*, 15: 33-52.
- Kazakovskaya, V.V., 2006. Question-answer unity in dialogue adult-child. *Voikova Russian Academy of Sciences*, Moscow, Russia.
- Kunsmann, P., 2013. Gender, status and power in discourse behavior of men and women. *Linguistik Online*, Vol. 5.
- Palmer, M.T., 1989. Controlling conversations: Turns, topics and interpersonal control. *Commun. Monogr.*, 56: 1-18.
- Petrova, A.A., 2008. Multimodal interaction aspects of research. Ph.D Thesis, Volgograd State University, Volgograd, Russia.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff and G. Jefferson, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Lang.*, 50: 696-735.
- Schegloff, E.A., 2000. Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Lang. Soc.*, 29: 1-63.