

## TURN-TAKING OF COMMUNICATIVE ROLES IN DISCUSSIONS OF KAZAKHSTANI TALK SHOW PROGRAMS IN KAZAKH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

Dinara Koishigulova, Danel Almasbekovna Karagoishiyeva,  
Gulnar Mamayeva, Zhumaziya Abdrakhmanova, Akmaral  
Syrgakbayeva, Gulizat Omirkhankyzy Abdiman  
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan  
Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan  
L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan

**Abstract:** *The article analyzes the turn taking of communication passages in the talk show discussions in the Kazakh and Russian languages. Both Kazakh and Russian TV programs are characterized by the synthetic style of turn taking of communicative roles of a presenter and guests in the studio, which combines the features of cooperative, confrontational and neutral styles. However, if the Kazakh talk show programs have smoother, monotone style of turn taking of communicative roles; in Russian talk show programs transition from cooperative communication stage at the beginning of the program to the development of confrontational discussion of the problem has been recorded.*

**Keywords:** talk show, interaction, conversational analysis, organization of turn taking of communicative roles, general styles of role turn taking.

TV programmes share with various news, happening around us and reflect most significant problems of the society, thus influencing the development of the society. For example, in most cases TV sets, which have become an inseparable part of everyday life of some people, transfer programmes on live. Certainly, in these cases participants of such kind of programs take part in live talk shows without preliminary preparation and influence on speech behavior of their listeners. For that reason, TV sets are considered as a ‘mirror’ of the society. A prominent scientist Uali N. says that: <sup>1</sup> „social and psychological stereotypes of readers’/viewrers’/listeners’ routine mind do not cease influencing on establishing the image in Mass Media texts”, and he emphasizes that „it is clearly seen that these situations are to be researched in speech interaction of a speaker and listener through Mass Media discourse”.

Yessenova K. says that depending on the form of information transfer Mass Media are divided into three groups, namely television, radio and periodicals. All news received audially and visually through these media compose the concept of media text as a complex of verbal

---

<sup>1</sup> N. Uali, *The theoretical basis of Kazakh social media: thesis of dissertation 10.02.02*, Almaty, 2007, 329 p.

and media signs.<sup>2</sup> The consideration of media text as a result of interaction with the human factor, moreover with the whole society, namely with the linguistic society comes from requirements of the contemporary anthropocentric science. As the object of the research, viz. a journalist as a maker of the media text (talk show) and a viewer and participant as a receiver of these media texts is a humanr, and the topic is composed from problems and values common to all mankind as well, the importance of the research comes from investigating human factor in a sociolinguistic aspect.

Media text investigated in the given research represents the result of the interaction between participants, which is produced in an unprepared way in the middle part of talk shows.

The basis of our methodological approach is a conversation analysis, which emphasizes the organized nature of the conversation and regulatory structure, which are held by speakers. We are interested in oral speech, which is the basic, fundamental and original form of human language.

*„Linguistic research initially focused on written language, which is easier to research. In addition, the written material was generally more accessible. In the absence of decent scientific method, research of oral speech took place on the basis of written language”.*<sup>3</sup>

Concerning this Kibrik and Podlesskaya note that:<sup>4</sup> *„Linguists often make statements about some of language facts, based on the data of the written language. This is completely unjustified: the validity of any such approval should be checked directly on the verbal material. It is also unreasonably to assume that written language has any priority over the verbal one and to consider that it is more „valuable” the object of scientific research”.* Thus the structural nature and linguistic function of human language can be seen when it is used and produced in an unprepared and spontaneous way.

It is important to clarify that this work is descriptive by its nature, in other words, this work is not designated to learn to speak correctly the language. And the attention is not paid to the spelling mistakes or incorrect accents in speech communication participants as well. The authors aim at revealing one of the basic types of conversation

---

<sup>2</sup> K. Yessenova, *The text of the current Kazakh media pragmatics (on the basis of Kazakh press): thesis of dissertation: 10.02.02, Almaty, 2007, 49 p.*

<sup>3</sup> P. Paukkeri, *Recipient in Russian Conversation: On the Distribution of Functions between Responses Da, Nu and Tak*, Helsinki, Helsinki University Printing House, 2006.

<sup>4</sup> A. A. Kibrik, V. I. Podlesskaya, „To the creation of cases of oral Russian speech: the principles of transcription”, in *Scientific and technical information*, no. 2 (6), 2003, pp. 5-11.

organizations as organization of turn-taking communicative roles using the conversation analysis to the media texts of the Kazakh and Russian talk show programs.

Thus, the role turn-taking is the primary defining characteristic of dialogical communication. It is of great interest to observe turn-taking of communication between the presenter and the guests of talk show discussions, as well as a comparison of the nature of roles turn-taking in the discussions in the Kazakh and Russian languages, which is a new, previously unexplored aspect of oral research of media discourse.

### **Material of the research**

The material of this research work is based on 20 video clips of 2 influential TV talk show programs in the Kazakh language „*Aytuga onay*” („*It is easy to say*” the author’s translation), which is transmitted at the national TV channel „Kazakhstan” for time period of 2012-2014. The total duration of the sounding is 2 hours and the volume of deciphering is 31 pages. And a talk show in Russian „*Nasha Pravda*” („*Our Truth*”, the author’s translation), a talk show by Alexei Shakhmatov, which is transmitted on the commercial channel „KTK”, for the time period of 2015-2016, the total duration of the sounding is 1 hour 30 minutes and the volume of deciphering is 20 pages. Participants in both the talk show programs are all sorts of people.

### **Aim and method of the analysis**

The study of the principles of turn-taking of communicative roles is one of the main aspects of the study conversational discourse. E. Schegloff, G. Sacks, G. Jefferson, ancestors conversational analysis who worked in the mainstream of ethnomethodological direction of American sociology and anthropology, made the largest contribution to the formation and development of the concept of turn-taking of communicative roles.<sup>5</sup>

At first conversational analysis was investigated within the framework of ethnomethodology of sociolinguistics. And it is still applied in sociolinguistics. Although, Heritage says that „*the conversation analysis represents the method getting into details of social activity. It can be applied to*

---

<sup>5</sup> H. Sacks, *Lectures on Conversation*, Blackwell Publishing, 2005, 818 p.; H. Sacks, E. Schegloff, G. Jefferson, „A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation”, in *Language*, no. 50 (4), 1974, pp. 696-735.

*different subjects and problems. His influence extends to many field of science, such as linguistics, social psychology, anthropology and a cognitive linguistics*”<sup>6</sup> and also notes that conversational analysis is widely used not only in sociology, but also in other scientific fields.

Sociologists Hutchby and Wooffitt indicate that „*the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction*”.<sup>7</sup> It is clearly seen from this argument, that conversational analysis is a method directed to analyze the everyday interaction, took place by impacting each other.

Conversation means a type a communication between people. The aim of the conversational analysis is to study the process of oral communication. Grigorieva says the following about this: „*By the conversation analysis they understood an empirical study of language texts reproduced in natural communicative situations, recorded and stored by electronic means, transcribed and analyzed in terms of the structures of communicative deployment of events of speech acts of involved partners*”.<sup>8</sup> Thus, according to empirical researches, it is necessary to record oral unprepared conversation and study interjections of speakers by identifying types of grouping the interjections.

Identifying the order of phrases grouped demonstrates either cooperative or confrontational type of the interaction. Because the conversational analysis emphasizes not only the organized, but also cooperative character of the conversation and studies the mechanism of this interaction. Cooperation means that the conversation is not directly distributed between a speaker and a listener. Meanings are born with the help of cooperation and discussions.<sup>9</sup>

The aim of this research is to identify the order of communicative roles of mutual interaction of talk show participants in the Kazakh and Russian languages. Alongside this, it is necessary to determine the types of replica steps, taking place during turn taking of communicative roles and rights of turn taking of replica interchange during interaction.

Thus, the research is aimed at identifying the institutional role of talk show participants and results of mutual interaction. Alongside this, the following questions are answered: What type of replica steps are used

---

<sup>6</sup> J. Heritage, *Harold Garfinkel Ethnomethodology*, Helsinki, Gaudeamus, 1996.

<sup>7</sup> I. Hutchby, R. Wooffitt, *Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2008.

<sup>8</sup> V. S. Grigorieva, *Discourse as an element of the communicative process: pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects: monograph*, Tambov, Publishing House of Tambov State Technical University, 2007, 288 p.

<sup>9</sup> M. Pikkarainen, *Institutional Roles of the Participants of Communication on Russian Television (MA Dissertation)*, Helsinki, Helsinki University, 2008.

either cooperative, confrontational or neutral? What replica steps are mostly used by talk show presenters during interaction with talk show quests? And what replica steps are used by talk show quests during interaction with each other? At last, in order to answer all these questions, it is necessary to answer the question: what is the turn taking of communicative roles?

### **Turn-taking of communicative roles**

Turn-taking of communicative roles or taking a step of replica is an important conversation analysis category and presents a way of organizing its contextual structure.

Turn-taking of a role is communicative event centered, where speaking person is situated in the center. The research studies all linguistic aspects, its inner system, as well as terms of language existence. Turn taking is closely connected with pragmatic presuppositions of communicants and with their assessment of the overall context in which the conversation takes place. It materializes in conscious intention to control the course of turn taking of role as the one of the tools to influence the interlocutor using various communication resources.

Dialogical discourse implies a mandatory exchange of communicative roles that provide verbal and non-verbal „signals taking the role of the speaker, transmitting this role to another communicant, giving up this role, completing his speech contributions, etc.”<sup>10</sup>

Role turn taking in the dialogue can be carried out unconsciously, automatically, and materialized in „conscious intention to control the course of the alternation of roles as a one of the tools to influence the interlocutor, using various communication resources”<sup>11</sup>

Turn taking of communicative roles is the transfer of the role of the speaker from one participant of communication to another, which conditions the completion of a separate communicative contribution of the previous entity, and taking the rights to the communicative contribution to others. These rules can be understood as a mechanism of the division of a „cake”, which is distributed between the interlocutors, enduing them with the minimum units, or „pieces” of speaking, after saying that, the right to speak is passed to the next interlocutor.<sup>12</sup> This

---

<sup>10</sup> I. P. Susov, *Introduction to Linguistics: Textbook*, M., Vostok-Zapad, 2007, 379 p.

<sup>11</sup> I. P. Susov, *Linguistic pragmatics*, Vinnitsa, Nova Knyga, 2009, 272 p.

<sup>12</sup> O. G. Issupova, „Conversation analysis: representation of the method”, in *Sociology*, no. 15, 2002, pp. 33-52.

creates „*complex speech product that reflects communicative event of oral contact, mostly unmediated communication in which partners verbally (and non-verbally) strive to achieve the desired results in concrete situations with the help of appropriate strategies and tactics by changing communicative roles of a speaker and listener and reach (or do not reach) them*”.<sup>13</sup>

He, who speaks in the first place, to a large extent defines interpretative framework for all subsequent expressions. The dominant partner is the one who is able to change the topic and keep track of the order of roles. It controls who speaks, how much to speak and what to speak. Controlling speech act tends to be initial. It can program subsequence of messages, the manner and style of speech, a way of expressing of an interlocutor.<sup>14</sup>

On the other hand, the subsequent speaker has great power over expression of the first interpreter because he gives reply directly to these words. The two sides can also use each other for invitations, greetings or ceasing the speech of third parties participating in the general conversation.

It should be noted that these roles are relative. At each moment a dialogue one of the speakers becomes the leader, and the other is leaded one.

In addition, turn taking of communicative roles is characterized by the type of ascribed character of neighboring replicas in time. Three types of „*taking steps*” are differentiated:<sup>15</sup> Simultaneous turn taking of communicative roles; „Smooth” turn taking of communicative roles; Turn taking of communicative roles after a pause.

Simultaneous form of turn taking of communicative roles is represented by two types of interrupting actions: overlays and disturbing.

Overlays are a result of the simultaneous entry of several participants of communication at the point marked with the signal transmission operations of communicative step and disturbing arise from the entry of one of the listeners into the communicative exchange at a time when the speaker is not ready to give him the right to commit the next communicative step.

---

<sup>13</sup> I. N. Formanovskaya, *Speech communication: communicative and pragmatic approach*, M., Russkiy yazyk, 2002, 216 p.

<sup>14</sup> M. T. Palmer, „Controlling conversation: turns, topics and interpersonal control”, in *Communication Monographs*, no. 56, 1986, pp. 2-18.

<sup>15</sup> G. R. Vlasian, „The exchange of communicative role as as the fundamental factor of the dynamic structure of the transverse discourse”, in *Foreign philology: Humanitarian vector*, no. 4(32), 2012, pp. 103-107.

### **General styles of turn taking of roles**

Concept of the general style of turn taking of roles is of great importance to study the turn taking of roles in the dialogue, since it significantly affects the determination of the status of the replicas. Initial steps in this direction were made by D. Tannen, who was the first to introduce the concept of „*high involvement style*” into the analysis of dialogue.<sup>16</sup>

Aristov in his work, identifies the following types of styles of role turn taking: neutral, confrontative and affiliative.<sup>17</sup>

Neutral style of the role turn taking reflects the classical idea of the perfect, smooth change conducted with minimal pauses and overlays between replicas. Using a neutral style implies obeying the Principle of Cooperation of P. Grice and the Principle of Courtesy of J. Leach. This style is implemented in situations of short communication of unfamiliar people or communication in the framework of a social institution, directing unequivocal compliance with certain norms and conventions.

Confrontative style involves different kinds of interruptions and disturbing the interlocutor in order to capture a communicative role. This style is characterized by a very high rate of speech and a large quantity of simultaneous speaking.

Affiliative style is predominantly a typical character of situations of informal speech interaction and aims at strengthening social contact, keeping the positive face of a partner. This style can characterize synchronous speech steps signaling support and approval, disturbing and interceptions, conducted on a cooperative basis, which does not interfere understanding because of semantic isomorphism. Some researchers find various types of overlay and disturbing as the manifestation of the principle of economy, which is a result of the lack of necessity to listen the interlocutor till the end, if the basic idea of his remarks are already understood. In such situations, a violation of the order of role turn taking is the only way of rational use of dialogue time.

Since the object of our study is a television talk, attention is drawn to a television-institutional subclass of institutional interaction, which has its own characteristics, which are not typical for either ordinary or to other institutional arrangements. It is clear that various television talks,

---

<sup>16</sup> D. Tannen, *Conversational style. Analyzing Talk among friends*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005, 244 p.

<sup>17</sup> S. A. Aristov, *Pragmalinguistic modeling of the exchange of communicative roles: thesis of dissertation*, Tver<sup>3</sup>, 2001, 211 p.

especially in talk shows, are popular in many countries and, therefore, a brief overview of the history of talk show programs seem to be appropriate.

### Talk show

In this research work media text is perceived as the mutual interaction between talk show presenter and studio guests. Because, nowadays, „*talk shows are an essential part of modern conversational culture, they have social relevance, that is, they have an impact on society*”.<sup>18</sup>

In the English language the phrase „talk show” was used several centuries ago. Ilie and Burke say the following about this word combination „*sixteenth century Italy had the academy, a kind of discussion group for intellectuals, with fixed membership and fixed days for meetings. The seventeenth century saw the emergence of its French counterpart, the salon, a semi-formal social occasion organized by a hostess, normally once a week, for a mixture of ladies and men of letters. In England, the equivalent social institutions flourished in the eighteenth century in the form of the more informal coffee-house, the assembly and the club*”.<sup>19</sup> According to these scientists words, talks were a demonstration of cultural interaction of authoritative people in a society. For instance, interaction of writers, famous social citizens or other informal conversations in Great Britain took place in cafes, clubs or meetings in the form of shows.

However, the 80's of the XX century were the culminating moment of talk show development. Tolson says that „*In the 1980s, a subsequent development surfaced: the talk show hosts became more aware of the potential of the 'chat' on a talk show and the talk show attained new heights of sophistication, both in Britain and the USA*”.<sup>20</sup>

Also, mixture of different genres is a characteristic feature of talk show programs. This is discussed in Tolson's work: „*there is a shift towards an institutional 'mixing of genres', where the talk show interview meets stand-up comedy*”. This mixed character of talk shows increases the popularity of talk shows. It is mentioned in Tolson's work that in 1990's talk shows were very popular in American TV channels.<sup>21</sup> Alongside this,

---

<sup>18</sup> M. Pikkarainen, *Institutional Roles of the Participants of Communication*.

<sup>19</sup> C. Ilie, „Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows”, in *Journal of Pragmatics*, no. 33, 2001, pp. 209-254.

<sup>20</sup> A. Tolson, „Televised chat and the synthetic personality”, in Paddy Scannell (ed.), *Broadcast talk, 178-200*, London, Sage, 1991.

<sup>21</sup> A. Tolson, „Introduction: the talk show phenomenon”, in Andrew Tolson (ed.), *Television talk shows. Discourse, performance, spectacle, 1-5*, Mahwah, Erlbaum, 2001.



Pikkarainen says the following about the reasons of popularity of talk-shows in 1990s: „*Boom talk show, in fact, are associated with two phenomena created by media culture, namely, the cult of the stars and celebrities, and the need to keep viewers in the know*”.<sup>22</sup>

If in western countries the popularity of various talk-show programs was increasing in 1990s, at this time independent television in Kazakhstan was just starting to establish. Gabbasova says the following about this situation: „*Development of Kazakhstan’s television actually began in the 90s, when with the collapse of the Soviet Union the former centralized broadcasting control system was destroyed. At this time, the public broadcasting ownership was split between the former Soviet republics*”<sup>23</sup> and adds that talk-show programs were broadcasted only by two Moscow channels. Beketova in her book writes that the situation of Kazakhstani television was so poor, that there was no possibility to develop talk-shows: „*In 1994 Kazakhstani state television and radio broadcasting was in deep crisis concerning the popularity among television viewers, the objectiveness of transmitted information, keeping the principles of a democratic state, based on the freedom of word and idea*”.<sup>24</sup> Alongside this, it is said that that time the people used to watch only Moscow ORT channel’s talk-show programs in Russian.

Genre of talk show was initiated in the U. S. A., then it reached Russia, later it became popular in Kazakhstan. Having seen the first talk show in the Kazakh language Imanbay Zhumabayev says (www.qazaquni.kz): „*for the period from 1992 to 2002 there were no talk shows in Kazakh TV channels. That time we accepted talk shows for discussions. The first talk shows in the Kazakh language are „Paryz and karyz” („Responsibility and Duty”), „Bar men zhek” („Yes and No”), „Doda” („Competition”). It is true that TV programs, especially talk shows came very late to the Kazakh TV channels*”.

To be certain, Meshinbayeva says that talk-show programs are: „*a special version of television discussion formed from show and interview*”.<sup>25</sup>

We have learnt about genre of talk shows, their history of development, types of turn taking of communicative roles of talk show participants and styles of communicative roles. This research allows identifying styles of interaction and types of communicative roles turn taking between s talk show presenter and quests, a quest and a quest of talk shows in the Kazakh and Russian languages. Further, we will start discussing analysis of the research.

---

<sup>22</sup> M. Pikkarainen, *Institutional Roles of the Participants of Communication*.

<sup>23</sup> D. Z. Gabbasova, *TV dialogue of talk shows of German and Kazakh television as a socio-cultural moment in communication: thesis of dissertation*, Almaty, 2005, 123 p.

<sup>24</sup> L. K. Beketova, *Problems of reforming television and radio in Kazakhstan*, Almaty, RGZnI „Daur”, 1996, 115 p.

<sup>25</sup> G. A. Mashinbayeva, *Linguo pragmatic language TV aspects: thesis of dissertation 10.02.02*, Almaty, 2007, p. 34.

## Analysis

Analysis of twenty-talk show programs in the Kazakh and Russian languages showed that the host of the program is always the dominant partner in communication, since he regulates the subject of discussion and tracks roles turn taking. He owns the initiating, controlling and the vast majority confrontative speech steps. The presenter can determine the sequence of messages of an interlocutor and have an impact on the manner and style of speech. Guests of the studio basically act as interpreters of the replica and questions of the presenter. They own to the replica-reaction to previous statements. However, interpreters can also adjust the conversation, turning the conversation in the direction suitable to them. They understand the essence of what has been said, they also „isolate the intentions of the interlocutor, make a series of cognitive operations and determine the direction of their own response towards unison, express consent, or dissonant, expressing disagreement with the partner interactions”.<sup>26</sup>

Factors shaping the overall style of the turn taking of communicative roles are the thematic organization and strategic orientation of the communicants. Describing the overall style of turn taking of communicative roles in studied discussions, as well as ways of its regulation, it should be noted the presence of distinguishing features when comparing the Kazakh and Russian talk shows.

The talk show programs in Russian cooperative dialogue stage is observed, when the partners make contact with each other. Then the conflict stage of communication, accompanied by disturbing, non-cooperative intervention of dominant communicant follows. However, in the case of a talking „disturbing is not perceived as a violation and as the braking means of the communicative process, but rather as a way to promote interaction”.<sup>27</sup> The talk show programs in Russian, there is a synthesis of style of turn taking communicative roles. Cooperative (neutral) style is combined with confrontational one. The proof of this conclusion is the statistical data obtained during the analysis (Table 1).

**Table 1: Turn taking of communicative roles in talk show programs in the Kazakh and Russian languages, % of the total number of sequences of communicative roles**

---

<sup>26</sup> N. I. Formanovskaya, *Communicatively-Pragmatic Aspects of Communication Units*, M., The Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, 1998, p. 159.

<sup>27</sup> S. A. Aristov, *Situational model of changing communicative roles*, 2000; available at: [www.library.ru](http://www.library.ru).

Talk show programs in the Kazakh language					Talk show programs in the Russian language				
Disturbing	Simultaneous speaking	Role turn taking after the pause	Intervention by laugh	Subsequent turn taking of roles	Disturbing	Simultaneous speaking	Role turn taking after the pause	Intervention by laugh	Subsequent turn taking of roles
8,6	14,2	2,8	2,5	83,5	17,8	12,3	4,7	6,8	73

In conversations of the talk show programs in the Kazakh language throughout the whole discussion of the problems a uniform style of communicative role turn taking is indicated, as well as in the Russian, which combines the features of a neutral, cooperative and confrontational styles. However, as shown in Table I, in the talk shows in the Kazakh language less interrupting, pauses between communicative steps, more cases of simultaneous speaking on a cooperative basis, smooth turn taking of communicative roles was recorded; no interruption to communicative progress of program participants by an opponent's laughter was identified. According to foreign researcher W. Ellis, in the process of turn taking of communication roles laughter is perceived quite natural and is caused mainly by the intention to establish cooperative relations between the communication partners and relieve tension with respect to the prior or subsequent speech stroke.<sup>28</sup> For example:

**Presenter:**→Жаңа сюжетте айтылып жатыр (.) оңтүстіктерілер (.) ↑опырып алаа деп- („It is recently said in the story that southern people take a lot”).

**K/quest:**ҒымҒ. ХЫХ-(mm, Hum).

**Presenter:**Келіс [есіз беосымен?]- („Do you agree with that?”).

**K/quest:**[Ғ.Оңтүстіктерілер] тек опырып алады ҒойҒ. енді=ол ендіжұрттың бәріне белгілі Ғой- („It is a well known fact that southern people take a lot”).

In this example, a presenter recalls that before the dialogue a story was shown about a situation, when in South Kazakhstan redemption in the form of cattle for a girl (tocher) is much more expensive than in other regions of Kazakhstan. Since a presenter asks the studio guests from South Kazakhstan, whether he agrees with this view. With the first syllable, the guest interrupts with driving laughter, then he gives a positive response (as all Kazakhs know that the residents of South Kazakhstan region ask a lot of cattle for girls of marriageable age

<sup>28</sup> Y. Ellis, „Laughing together: Laughter as a feature of affiliation in French conversation”, in *J. of French Lang. Studies*, no. 2 (7), 1997, pp. 147-161.

from the groom). In our opinion, the guest responds in this way in order to support the presenter in the co-operative basis.

But it should be noted that in the talk show programs in the Kazakh language both a presenter and studio guests prefer not to interrupt the interlocutor by laughing, as this may possibly be adversely perceived by an opponent, just like in the following example:

**D/quest:** АЛ БҰЛ ЖІПІТТЕРГЕ ӨСУ КЕРЕК! МЕН ОЛАРДЫ ЕРТЕН ГОЛИВУДТЕН КӨРГІМ КЕЛЕДІ= МІНЕ МЕНІҢ ТІЛЕГІМ! [СОЛ!]- („These guys need to grow up. I would like to see them in Hollywood. This is me wish”).

**Presenter:** [хиххах Ғ ЖАҚСЫ:] көрейік тәуекел Ғ((күледі)) („ok. We will see”).

**D/quest:** Меніңше, бұл күлкілі емес= („To my mind, it is not funny”).

In this example, the guest (D) supporting the musical band of Kazakhstan, gives them a positive assessment, showing everyone that he has a desire to see them in the big world stage like Hollywood. But the next communicant does not believe that they will become stars of the world and expresses his feeling with a laugh. Verbal expression of a guest (K) „well, we'll see it” gives us an understanding that the second communicant disagrees with preceding communicant. After that, a third remark in a dialogue is of a guest (D) gives the notion that laughter of a guest (K) with the expression „we'll see” was negatively perceived by a reviewer (D). Because an opponent (D) named the laughter verbally as „*kulkuli*” (funny) and gave a negative answer like „*it's not funny*”.

Furthermore, as demonstrated in Table 1, the participants of the Russian talk show interactions often use acts of interrupting or disturbing on the non-cooperative basis (17.8% versus 8.6% in the Kazakh talk show interactions), which can be considered as part of the *interrupt strategy*. Interruption strategy is when „*communicant disputes the right to make the next step*”.<sup>29</sup> This communicative (verbal) step is a verbal action of one of the communicants, the minimum significant element that promotes interaction and leading the communication to the achievement of the overall objectives of the communicative aim.<sup>30</sup> Interruption strategy is presented by tactics of overlay (simultaneous speaking) and

---

<sup>29</sup> I. N. Lavrienko, „Change of communicative roles in the English-language conflict movie discourse”, in *V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University*, no. 897, 2010, pp. 138-143.

<sup>30</sup> M. Coulthard, *An introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Harlow, Longman, 1977, pp. 60-104.

interruptions. In 70% of the cases of interlocutor interruption, Russians do not use special markers intervention interrupts. Speaker duplicates a fragment of the last phrases of an opponent or enters into a dialogue „without warning”. For example:

**A/quest:**Они сейчас спели живем и: зал так же подхватил/и: значит ы: мне кажется а: в этой песне наверно нужно убрать ы:: музыку и она станет еще красивее(.) я думаю что это очень ↑красивая ↑застольная песня если муж с женой будут („they sing a song now. The audience followed. I think, there is no need for music in this song. It will become more beautiful. I think it is a very beautiful song, if a husband and a wife will”).

**Zh/Presenter:**[Убрать оранжировку вы имеете [ввиду?=(„Do you mean to remove arrangement?“).

**A/quest:**[Да уберите оранжировку=а так очень красиво мне всё понравилось↓ („Yes, to remove the arrangement. I like the song very much“).

In this example, a presenter duplicates a fragment of the phrase of an opponent heard, and do not waiting when the guest (A) finishes his opinion. A presenter enters into a dialogue without warning, interrupting guest (A). Respectively, the guest do not to listen to the presenter’s question and answers by repeating the same question, using the tactics of the overlay.

Further, we have seen how the following speech markers are used during turn taking of communicative roles between the interlocutors at the transition point: *it is correct; if I’m not mistaken; you know; well; but; this is not true; correct; I’m not sure; I agree; I disagree; I do not think that.*

Some differences were also detected in the identification of markers of transmission/taking communicative step. Since interaction of talk show program is mainly represented by question-answer complexes, the transfer of the communicative step is marked by the completion of the formulation of the question to the other party. Taking a course may be marked in a special way, especially in the case of interrupting. The Kazakh talk show programs markers of taking communicative step by the guest were reported, as a presenter of a program is interested in them, and accordingly, the guests answer the questions more often than a presenter does so to the questions of guests.

Discourse markers are the stereotypical particles and interjections „buffers” in the terminology of Yang Wei-dong<sup>31</sup> *well; yeah; yes; so;*

---

<sup>31</sup> W. Yang, „Realizations of turn-taking in conversational interactions”, in *US-China Foreign Language*, no. 5 (8), 2007, pp. 19-30.

phrases *you know; I think that..*; interjections *that's it! Well done!*; adverbs *it is clear; it is good; it is right*; markers of agreement/disagreement *yes/no; certainly; it is true; it is so/it is not so; no-no*.

And also, the analysis talk show host interactions in the Kazakh and Russian languages and their comparison allows to identify the following types of speech moves, specific to presenters of studied talk show programs (Table 2): *initiating detailing, supporting and opposing (confrontational)*.

**Table 2: Types of speech steps of presenter of the Kazakh and Russian talk shoe discussions, % of total number of speech steps of the presenter**

Talk show	Types of speech steps			
	Initiating	Detailing	Confrontational	Supporting
Kazakh	12,2	32,8	23,4	31,6
Russian	6,4	39,7	33	20,9

As shown in Table 2, in Kazakh talk show interactions a greater number of initiating communication moves are observed compared with the discussions of Russian talk shows. This is due to more frequent change of sub-topics of conversation at the initiative of the presenter. Markers of initiating moves can be imperatives with the meaning of invitation to the conversation or verbs with the meaning of conversation starter: *Bagdarlamaynyn uzhyymy daiyndagan siuzhetke nazar audaraiyk* (Let's pay attention to the story prepared by the program team); *Ia dolzhen nazhat' s istorii, kotoruiu vy vse znaete* (I have to start with the story, you all know); *Davaite, posmotrim chto ob etom govoriat narod* (Let's see what people say about it); *Siz bul zhaiynda der ediniž?* (What would you say about it?).

A greater number of antagonistic remarks of a presenter indicate to more confrontational character of Russian-speaking discussions, who try to enter into the debate with guests and encourage them to debate more frequently compared to the Kazakh presenters. According to the statistical data presents in Table 2, presenters of Kazakh talk shows are focused on obtaining information from the source, as the highest percentage of communication passages is classified as detailing. Compare:

**Presenter:** Значит (.) Булат насколько я понимаю для тебя главный больной вопрос/профессиональный уровень (“it means, Bulat, that the most important headache for you is a professional level”).

**B/quest:** Да↓(,Yes.)

**Presenter:** Ты говоришь о том что скучная театральная жизнь в Казахстане // Полностью с тобой согласен // но причем тут национальные театры? Давай будем говорить о том / как оживить эту театральную жизнь („You say that theatre life in Kazakhstan is very boring. I totally agree with you. But what is the connection with the national theatres? Let’s say about how to reanimate this theatre life?”).

And Kazakh talk show:

**Presenter:** ЖІГТІҢ бар=? („Do you have a boyfriend?”).

**A/ quest:** =Бар((*басын изейді*)) („Yes” nodding the head) (0.3).

**Presenter:** Бір-біріңді жақсы көресіңдер ме=? („Do you love each other?”).

**A/quest:** *бы*  $\uparrow$ Әрине $\downarrow$ ((*басын изейді*))- („Yes, of course.” nodding the head.)

**Presenter:** @Қашан үйленесіңдер?@- („When are you going to get married?”) (2.0).

**A/quest:**  $\downarrow$ Бұйырса оқу бітіргеннен кейін $\downarrow$ - („I hope after graduating”).

**Presenter:** Кейде бір айтпай ма осы'(.).цт @Ана:р к $\uparrow$ ішкене салмақташапы то:лы $\downarrow$ к @деп. Айтпай ма ондай=?- („Does he say sometimes to lose some weigh?”).

**A/quest:** Онда:й(.). айтып көрген  $\uparrow$ ЕМЕС („No, he has never said”).

**Presenter:** Мүмкін @өзі де толық шығ $\uparrow$ ар=?@ („maybe, he is also fat”).

**A/ quest:**  $\downarrow$ →Жоқ, [өзі арық $\downarrow$ - („No, he is slim”).

**Presenter:** [ $\downarrow$ Арық па $\downarrow$ <?- („Is he slim?”).

**A/ quest:**  $\downarrow$ мхм $\downarrow$ ((*басын изейді*))- („hmm” nodding the head).

**Studio:** XXXX ((шапалақтайды))- (applauding).

It should also be noted that the Kazakh presenters own more supporting speech steps compared to Russian counterparts. This feature, together with the simultaneous speaking and interruptions on a cooperative basis may indicate a more neutral style of turn taking of communicative roles in the discussions of Kazakh talk show programs.

**Presenter:** Ахмет Алдашев ағамыз келіп отыр АҒА, ӘНІ (.), Әлихан(.)әріптесіңіз, ініңіз айтад=(.)тамаққа қатысы жоқ дейд (.) $\uparrow$ келіссіздер ма? („Our elder brother Akhmet Aldashev came to us. Sir, your little brother and your colleague Alikhan says that it is connected with the meal”).

**A/guest:**→Оған онша көп (.) келісе қоюға бо (.) амайды.Ыһ <Мына (.) әр тағам (.) менен тағам (.) дануменен дене қимылының сәйкестігі>БОЛМАҒАН кезде [сосын] („There is no need to agree with that. Hmm. Now, when there is no correlation between the food and the body movement”).

**Presenter:** [ >ЕК- ЕКІ] НӘРСЕ ДЕЙСІЗ ҒОЙ? („You say that they are two separate things?”).

**A/ guest:** ИӘ-иә-(„yes, yes”).

**Presenter:** <↑Бірінші тамақ, екінші дене қимылының [аздығы?]> („the first thing is the abundance of food, the second is the absence of body movement”).

**A/guest:** [ДЕНЕ ҚИМЫЛ]ЫНЫҢ[°иә°]-(„yes”).

**Presenter:** [ТАМ]АҚ КӨП, ҚИМЫЛ ҚИМЫЛ аз? („Too much food and too few movement”).

**A/guest:**ҚИМЫЛ аз=(„Few body movement”).

The analysis confirmed that the guests of the talk show discussions own the role of interpreters, who basically react to the replica of a presenter and rarely on their own initiative enter into polemics with him (in 3% of cases in the Kazakh and 4.4% of cases in Russian talk show discussions). Kazakhs as a guest of a studio more often agree with the arguments of a presenter or evade a definite answer compared to Russian. Markers of agreement are different modal words and verb forms of intellectual activity and such stereotypical phrases *iә, arine, ras, mine, solai, nak osylai, duryz, kuptaymyn, makuldaymyn, dal ayttyңыз, kelisemin* (yes, certainly, it is true, that’s it, it is right, it is quite right, it is correct, I support, I encourage, you are right, I agree) etc. presenters of Russian talk shows prefer to provoke controversy with the interlocutors, what is evidenced by the increasing number of opposing steps compared to the number of communication passages expressing agreement with the views of opponents (38% vs. 20.5%). Both in Kazakh and in Russian talk show discussions most speech passages are neutral informative steps (Table 3). This pattern suggests that one of the main functions of the talk show is to inform the listening audience about a specific socially relevant problem.

**Table 3: Types of speech steps of quests of the Kazakh and Russian talk show discussions, % of total number of speech steps of quests**

Talk	Types of speech steps
------	-----------------------



show	Neutral informative	Agreement	Disagreement	Uncertain solutions	Initiative and confrontational
Kazakh	36,6	26,8	21	12,6	3
Russian	27,4	20,5	38	9,7	4,4

## Conclusion

So, a dominant role of a presenter is remained in discussions in both languages. Although Kazakh talk show programs are characterized by a smooth, homogeneous style of turn taking of communicative roles, combining features of the cooperative, confrontational and neutral style. Transitions from cooperative stage of communication at the beginning of the program to confrontational are recorded in the Russian debate. Such a transition can be labeled with simultaneous speaking on the basis of non-cooperative, interrupting, imperatives, adverbs, verbs, conjunctions, particles and phrases with the meaning of resistance. Alongside with the intervention of laughter and a lot of opposing replicas, communicative style of Russian participants of the talk show discussions can be characterized not only as a confrontational, but also more spontaneous and natural, which once again confirms the phenomenon of spontaneity in the middle of a talk show.

In both talk shows in Kazakh and in Russian in the central part of the dialogue, when more than two communicators take part in the discussion, there are often situations in which the participants receive the right to speak on their own initiative, the result is a simultaneous speaking. The presenter of the program is upstaged, but he always monitors the process, so that the discussion goes on anascribed aspect.

But it should be noted participants of Kazakh talk show discussions rarely resort to the tactics of interruption, allow fewer pauses of hesitations between communicative steps, often do neutral informative speech passages; presenter use imperatives. However, a certain percentage of spontaneous communication in the turn taking of communicative roles adds the use of markers taking a communicative step, evading the answer, absence of markers of transferring of speech step from the presenter, the use of supporting and detailing speech steps.

Also Kazakhs much more clearly feel the impact of institution of television on themselves compared with Russians, which is expressed in their apparent stiffness, less active participation and less frequency of speech acts.

