INTERACTIONAL PATTERNS AND COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN SELECTED NIGERIAN TELEVISION TALK SHOWS

RUTH KARACHI OJI

Research Scholar, Department of Mass Media and Writing, School of Media and Communication,
Pan-Atlantic University, Ibeju-Lekki, Lagos, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the interactional patterns and communicative strategies employed by interlocutors on Silverbird Television's (STV) 'Head to Head' talk show programme. In conversations that are interactive, people are expected to adhere to the norms of conversation. This study analysed the discourse of participants on the show with a view to finding out if those norms are adhered to or not and factors that accounted for the strategies and patterns observed. Interactive episodes were purposively selected. The concepts of Conversation Analysis and Pragmatics were employed in analyzing the data for this study. The talk shows were of a highly conversational order, employing features of turn-taking, adjacency pairing, feedbacks and repair. The Interviewer dictated the pattern and mode of the interaction in most cases. The cooperative principle is also not always adhered to in the talk show discourse as there is outright flouting of the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. The politeness principle is most of the time not observed by the Interviewer in a bid to get his discussants reveal pertinent information.

KEYWORDS: Television Talk Shows, Silverbird Television, Interactional Patterns, Communicative Strategies, Cooperative and Politeness Principles

INTRODUCTION

Interaction is one of the tenets that every speech community upholds. Every member of the community interacts with one another for one reason or the other. They express their ideas, feelings and emotions when interacting. In both formal and informal settings, people engage in conversations that are interactive. Interaction usually begins with an exchange of greetings among people and rolls over into conversations. People maintain relationships through dialogues with one another (Bright, 1996; Banathy & Jenlink, 2005). The interaction may lead to crisis or peace, depending on how it is handled. It is done in many ways and in different patterns.

Communication touches every sphere of human activity and it informs all of man's actions because it is necessitated by his need to interact with others. It also serves as a means of social interaction (Carbaugh, 2005). This is so because it helps us understand ourselves, to keep in touch with others, to understand them and relate well with them. It is also the medium through which relationships are established, extended and maintained. James, Ode, and Soola (1990) share that communication is the process by which one person (or a group) shares and imparts information to another person (or group) so that both people (or groups) clearly understand one another. They further explain that communication 'is not just the giving of information. It is the giving of understandable information and receiving and understanding of the message. Communication is the transferring of a message to another party so that it can be understood and acted upon.'

It is, therefore, clear that as part of the process of socialisation in a society, communication is indispensable. There is also the pertinent need to acquire rules for appropriate communicative interaction. That is why learning to communicate includes the proper use of language (Psathas, 1990). For example, one may be told how to act and what to say or not in particular places, at certain times and to particular people. One also learns effective use of language for communication from the interactions observable among people around. For this reason, much of what is learnt is implicit, that is, never spelt out or explained. Rather, they are absorbed as part of growing up(Pridham, 2001). Communication skills, therefore, ought to be developed by all whose aim it is to use language for a meaningful and successful interaction. This can be done by considering what applicable and acceptable interactional patterns and communicative strategies exist in the language. Factors such as how to introduce open and close a topic, adjacency pairings, turn-taking and conversational repairs, among others, are strategies to be equipped with for meaningful interactional exchanges. For this, Richards and Schmidt (1983) identify eight of such communication strategies as: approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, borrowing, miming, topic shifts and topic avoidance.

According to Richards and Schmidt (1983), 'approximation' is a communication strategy that entails the selecting of another word in place of the right word in the target language. The word selected must, however, be synonymous with the original word. 'Word coinage' refers to a coined word to be used by a speaker in an event he or she does not know the right word for the expression to be made. 'Circumlocution' refers to the use of a paraphrase or description of a word in a case where the right word is not known. Also, 'borrowing' is a communication strategy that can be used when a word in the target language cannot be remembered. Consequently, a substitute word from the mother tongue can then be used. 'Miming' refers to acting out the word at the end of an expression instead of saying it. Furthermore, 'topic shifts' occurs when one changes the topic under discussion for lack of adequate vocabulary or lack of confidence to continue the discussion. Additionally, 'topic avoidance' is a strategy that allows the speaker to avoid introducing certain topics especially for lack of vocabulary.

The importance of developing communication strategies for effective conversations cannot, therefore, be overemphasized. Such communication strategies may be described as 'self-initiated repairs and requests for assistance which occurs when the speaker is trying to express concepts for which the target language vocabulary is lacking'. Apparently, these are needed in order to keep conversations going. Such conversations on television talk show programmes are interesting to listen to as one observes how these strategies are applied or managed in discourse and the overall effect of those on the conversational goal.

Some television talk show programmes entail a lot of interrogation from the interviewer to the interviewee, on religious, political, economic and social issues. Atiba (1987) identifies four codes that are presumably employed in TV interviews. One is the questioning technique which gives consideration to the kind of questions that are asked and ways of conveying them to the interviewee. There are neutral and indirect questions which suggest to the interviewee that the interviewer is not biased. Conversely, there are loaded or direct questions that clearly indicate to the interviewee that an attempt is being made by the interviewer to corner him and place him in a tight situation. Atiba (1987, p. 10) notes:

> The use of different kinds of questions by the interviewer sets the stage for the
> interview itself. The way the questions are formulated will determine to a large extent
> the amount and quality of the information that will be obtained. Also, the way questions

are asked is an important factor in the form of interaction that will ensue during the course of the interview.

He Further Notes that

>During the course of an interview questions are posed by the interviewer to the interviewee in order to obtain information. The nature of the information exhibited can be verbal or nonverbal. The information can be factual or attitudinal. Finally, there can be various reasons why interviewees submit themselves to an interrogation by another individual. All of these points seem to indicate that there is good reason to consider the interview as a special form of interaction, with social and psychological implications…
>(p.18)

The second group of verbal code is the rules of etiquette, that is, the formal rules for polite behaviour in society or in a particular group. Such rules define the way the interview on the show commences, proceeds and ends. This implies that the way the interviewee is introduced and referred to is paramount. Another rule of etiquette has to do with the act of interrupting a speech by another speaker. Most of the time, the interviewee is interrupted and not allowed to complete what he or she is saying before the interviewer moves on to another question. At other times, the interviewee is given little chance to express his or her opinion. Occasionally, though, the interviewee is given the opportunity to reply at length.

Verbal feedback is another code that enhances the interaction. Feedback is provided to the interviewer to the interviewee and vice versa, in the form of expressions such as 'aha', 'yes', 'I see', 'hmmm' and so on. This kind of feedback can serve as reinforcement to what the speaker is saying, both in terms of encouraging him to continue talking and sometimes, in the sense of indicating agreement with what is being said. The last of the verbal codes identified by Atiba (1987) is voice intonation. This is used to indicate agreement, but more often, it is used to indicate disagreement, disbelief and doubt. Atiba explains that the use of voice intonation 'is sometimes purposive and at times unconscious, but the extent to which it is used can have an impact on the course of the interaction taking place.'

This study examined how conversations are managed between the interviewer and the interviewee so as to highlight the patterns of interaction and communicative strategies employed. The extent of adherence or otherwise to the norms of conversation as well as the factors that lead to such outcomes are also examined. Sometimes, there are digressions and shifts from the topic of conversation and this may lead to a non-realisation of the conversational goal. The interactional patterns and communicative strategies of television programmes is a fertile area of study to be explored. This study focused on one television talk show by a private-owned television (TV) station, namely, 'Head to Head' on STV.

Theoretical Framework

This study is hinged on the concept of Conversation Analysis (CA) and the pragmatic principles of cooperation and politeness. The practice of CA comes from the American tradition of sociology and is concerned with the management of conversation and how communication is achieved (Lerner, 2004). It was developed in the late 1960s and 1970s principally by the sociologist Harvey Sacks and his close associates Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Allen & Guy, 1974; 1978). Clark (2007) argues that CA is a markedly data centered form of discourse analysis. It starts with the conversation itself and the data determines the structural categories, while discourse analysis starts with a linguistic theory

based on a patterning of units and then fits conversation to the model, thus viewing conversation as a product.

CA is applied to everyday conversations as well as structured interactions in institutions and elsewhere (Ayass& Gerhardt, 2012). The overall pattern of face-to-face conversation varies greatly according to such factors as where the conversation takes place, the social relationship between the participants and the topic of conversation. Hence, Clark (2007) notes that CA focuses on the conversation itself in order to discover patterns, distributions and formation of rules that can then be applied to subsequent pieces of discourse. Cameron (2001, p. 89) sees CA as

> Amicroanalytic approach, which takes apparently mundane and unremarkable spoken
> interactions and finds intricate patterning in the way they are organized. Just as putting
> a snowflake under a microscope reveals structure and complexity which are not visible
> to the naked eye, so putting talk under the CA microscope defamiliarizes what we
> normally take for granted, and reveals the unsuspected complexity of our everyday
> verbal behavior.

There are features that CA examines in conversations. They are: openings and closings, turn-taking and adjacency pairing, and feedback and repairs, among others.

Turn-Taking

Clark (2007) is of the view that turn-taking is central to the structure and management of conversation. The speaker is expected to utilise three basic strategies, namely, take the turn, hold the turn and yield the turn. Clark notes:

> A point in conversation where a turn of place is possible is called a transition relevance
> place. When listeners do not wait for a TRP before speaking, this is an interruption;
> whereas if they anticipate a turn being completed, miscue their entry and come in
> before the end, this is overlap. (p. 68)

Clark further explains that participants in a conversation do not usually feel comfortable when there is a pause and suppose it extends beyond about 10 seconds, they tend to utter 'fillers' such as 'um', 'well then', to break the silence and continue the conversation. The turn-taking framework gives rise to adjacency pairs, since turns that are taken must relate to the previous turn(Furo, 2001;Ford, Fox & Thompson, 2002).

Adjacency Pairs

Adjacency pair is another framework for a meaningful interaction. Cameron (2001, p. 94) refers to adjacency pairs as 'a sequence of two utterances, each by a different speaker'. Adjacency pair has also been seen as 'utterances produced by two successive speakers such that the second utterance is identified as related to the first as an expected follow-up. The two form a pair – the first utterance constituting a first pair part and the next utterance constituting a second pair part.' (Richards & Schmidt, 1983, p. 128) Examples of adjacency pairs that make for turn-taking include: Greeting-Greeting, Summons-Answer, An Invitation-An Acceptance, An Assessment-An Agreement, and A Complaint-An Apology. These are 'preferred responses'. There are also 'dispreferred responses' in that they are not the usually expected responses to questions that are asked. For example, the second pair parts in the following list shows 'dispreferred responses': Compliment-Rejection, Shift, Return; Complaint-Denial, Excuse, Justify, Challenge; Offer-Reject; and Request-Put off, Challenge, Refusal. Richards and Schmidt (1983) suggest that students and other learners of a language

should strive to learn the stock of adjacency pairs that are available in that language so that they can effectively communicate, given any context or setting.

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is primarily concerned with unspoken or implicit meanings in language. Malmkjaer and Anderson (1981, pp. 354, 416) note that the name Pragmatics became established by H. P. Grice's work in 1975 and 1978, in his theory of conversational implicature. According to Cameron (2001, p. 68), Pragmatics is 'the field of enquiry that deals with how language can be used to do things and mean things in real world situations'. She further notes that 'making meaning is a dynamic process involving the negotiation of meaning between the speaker and the hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social and linguistic) and the meaning potential of an utterance'. More to this, Pragmatics is viewed as 'the use of language in goal oriented speech situation which the speaker is using language in order to produce a particular effect on the mind of the hearer' (Cummings, 2005, 2009; Leech, 1983; Verschueren, 2002; Verschueren, Östman, &Blommaert, 2003).

The notion of implicature was presented by Grice (1975). He proposed that there is a relationship between logic and conversation. He made a distinction between the logical meaning of words and their broader interpretations which he referred to as 'implicatures' that arise out of the rules and principles of conversation. Implicature stands as a paradigmatic example of the nature and power of pragmatic explanation of linguistic phenomenon. According to Grice, there are two types of implicature: the conversational implicature and the cooperative principle.

Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975) argues that there is a 'cooperative principle' in force when people interact with one another. The cooperative principle (CP) assumes that there is a tacit understanding between speakers which in turn leads to their cooperation in a meaningful way. The cooperative principles operate on four underlying rules. Grice (1975, p. 45) defines the cooperative principle as 'a rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe, namely: make your conversational contribution such as it is required at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged'. In order to comply with this principle, speakers need to follow a number of sub-principles which Grice broke down into four 'maxims', namely: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner.

The maxims of quantity relate to the amount of information to be provided. The contribution is to be as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange, but not more informative than is required. The maxims of quality relate to how true the contribution made is. A speaker is expected not to say what is believed to be false, or that for which adequate evidence is lacking. The maxims of relation have to do with making contributions that are relevant. The maxims of manner concern not so much with what is said, but how it is said. On this maxim, there is need to avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Focus is on being brief and orderly.

Politeness Principle

Leech (1983) suggests that the politeness principle is even more compelling than the cooperative principle. He notes that 'if speakers have to choose between being cooperative (informative, truthful, relevant and perspicuous) and being polite, they would normally choose to be polite'. In other words, politeness affects the application of the cooperative

principle. Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness in terms of positive and negative face needs. Maybin and Mercer (1996) note that positive face relates to the desire to be liked and admired and are supplied through greetings, compliments and other direct expressions of approval. Negative face, however, relates to the desire not to be imposed upon and is fulfilled by accompanying requests with apologies, hedging expressions (like 'kind of' or 'I think maybe') and using other forms to avoid a face threatening act. Actions that impose on either the positive or negative face are those referred to as Face Threatening Acts (FTAs).

Brown and Levinson (1987) list a number of positive and negative politeness strategies. Positive politeness: show interest in the hearer, claim common ground with the hearer, seek agreement, and give sympathy. Negative politeness: be conventionally indirect, minimize imposition on the hearer, beg forgiveness and give deference.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this study is an extract from an STV talk show programme, 'Head to Head'. The episode was selected purposively for its highly interactive and conversational nature. A voice operating recording system was used to record the conversation as the interview was conducted and aired on TV, after which the conversation was orthographically transcribed to facilitate analysis.

ANALYSIS

Using aspects of CA and the pragmatic principles of cooperation and politeness, the analysis for this study is done and presented in tables. Comments are made on the findings and presented as a discussion. In the following presentation, the interviewer is represented as 'I', while the respondent is represented as 'R', for the sake of brevity. Also, the dialogue is numbered for ease of reference in the analysis.

The analysis is sub-grouped into Analysis 1 and Analysis 2. Analysis 1 is based solely on the Cooperative principle and is shown on tables one to four, while Analysis 2 is based on the Cooperative principle and the Politeness principle and is shown on tables five and six. Comments are made following each table, based on what was observed from the data. This extract is a dialogue between Victor Ayara, the interviewer and staff of STV, and Prince Ukachukwu Nicholas, the then gubernatorial candidate of the ANPP of Anambra State, on October 19, 2009. The conversation revolved around electoral issues.

Analysis

The analysis in this section is based on the Cooperation principle and is shown on tables one to four.

Table 1

Text	Cooperative Principle
I: You're welcome to today's edition of Head to Head on STV, Prince Ukachukwu. **R:** The pleasure is mine. **I:** There are so many issues besieging politics in Anambra at this time. **R:** Of course, yes. There are lots of problems and there is em confusion in the air. **I:** But I want to ask you now. You are the candidate of the ANPP? **R:** Yes.	• The opening statement and response is adequate in terms of quantity and manner. • The respondent in (4) flouts the maxim of quantity by being under-informative. He says that there are problems but does not mention what they are. • The respondent in (6) observes the maxim of quantity, quality and manner. He gives just the right amount of information, is truthful about it and is brief, as the answer should be.

The conversation is opened through the use of an adjacency pair, that is, Statement-Response. A statement is made by the interviewer and response is given by the respondent. They observe the conversational norm of opening an interaction. The interviewer promptly introduces the topic for discussion in turn (3). There is also an adjacency pair of a Statement-Response in (3 and 4). This is achieved through the taking of turns respectively by the interviewer and respondent. An adjacency pair of a question and answer is derived from turns (5 and 6). In this case, the answer in (6) is a preferred response.

Table 2

Text	Cooperative Principle
I: Andy Uba says he doesn't want any election to hold. Do you still think there's going to be an election in 2010? R: If you I: especially when he wants to continue, when he wants the Appeal Court to grant him the permission to continue staying at the Government house since this was stopped short. R: INEC surprisingly er told us that you know, we should send in our, our name. we read the guidelines for for for our elections and then simply to, er, I don't know, face the Appeal held in Court by Andy Uba. They said it, yes, and now about twenty-five candidates have emerged from em various parties and now that things are going peacefully and we're told that they er they're em adjourning definitely for real and em em moreover since we're supposed to take over for campaign. So there's total confusion in the air. I: So which means that what you are about to do and twenty four others could be an effort in futility? R: Well er we're we're waiting for the er for the the the I: Then in the event that the ruling is not favourable to you and other candidates, I mean, if INEC decides to say, OK, this is what the Appeal Court rules: Andy Uba takes off, so what happens to all the activities? R: All I will say is that we're waiting for the court ruling since the case is in the Court of Appeal.	• The interviewer violates the maxim of cooperation since he does not allow his respondent make his point especially after having selected him as the next speaker by his pausing after the question he asks in (7). • The respondent in (10) is being overly-informative, thereby flouting the maxim of quantity. His response should be to the question, 'do you think there's going to be an election in 2010?' However, he proceeds with telling how they sent in names, read guidelines, 25 candidates emerged, and so on. At the end of his supposed answer, he just said, 'there's total confusion in the air.' By saying this he observes the maxim of quality in that he said that which he knew to be true. • The respondent in (12) fails to answer the question because he likely knows that the assumption made by the interviewer could be true. He, therefore, flouts the four maxims in his not being informative, truthful and relevant, and in his being obscure. • The respondent again in (14) flouts the maxim of quantity by being under-informative. His lack of cooperation is displayed in his absolute refusal to answer the question, 'what happens to all the activities?'

In the data, the interviewer asks a question in (7), briefly yields the turn, but takes the turn again without allowing the respondent to make his point. Also, since the respondent does not give a clear cut answer in (10), the interviewer makes an inference as to what the respondent's answer implies. Additionally, there is an adjacency pair of question and answer in (13 and 14).

Table 3

Text	Cooperative Principle
I: OK. Em, I want to ask you. Let's zero it down to 2010. You are a Chartered Accountant? **R:** Yes. **I:** You are a Stockbroker? **R:** Thank you. **I:** As a professional in these fields, what are you looking for? **R:** Yes I'm **I:** What are you looking for in Government house, Awka? **R:** Er, Government house Awka. Yes, thank you very much. If you say, say before 1966 when Dr. M. I. Okpara was the Governor of the Eastern region, we were the first in everything. You see, em, you see, we were, we built er University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The the the er the West built er what's called ere m University of Ibadan. The North replied with Ahmadu Bello University. We built SCV. The West replied with er National Bank. The North replied with Bank of the North. East, still the East were the first. We built so many things. We built TransAmadi Industrial Estate. These things were built by the government.	• The maxims of quantity, quality and manner are observed here as the response by the respondent shows in (16 and 18). He answers the question adequately, says the truth, especially as there is evidence to back it, and he is brief – as seen in his two responses, 'yes' and 'thank you'. • The respondent in (22) flouts the maxims of quantity, relation and manner. His response was under-informative as it does not reveal the answer to the question of what he is looking for in the government house. Also, he flouts the maxim of relation in that the answer he gives does not in any way relate to the question and as such, the question remained unanswered. What is more, rather than being brief and straightforward, he engages in history lessons about past achievements by the previous Eastern governors. However, by flouting these maxims, the respondent could want the interviewer to infer that based on what the previous Eastern governors had done – such as building of schools and banks – he also hopes to achieve the likes and more, if given the power to rule.

There is an introduction of a sub-topic which is signaled by 'OK', by the interviewer. The interviewer asks a question in (19), but interrupts the respondent in (20) and goes ahead to modify his question in (21).

Table 4

Text	Cooperative Principle
I: But what are you going to do differently from every other person because you're sounding like a normal politician always talking about this and that especially when they are not yet there? **R:** Hmmm. Now my brother, have you gone to my State? If you crossed er Niger, I mean, Asaba, Delta State, and you want to cross to Onitsha to Upper Iweka and even beyond that, I'll say, these places need to be beautified. **I:** I'll tell you again. Will beautification bring security to Anambra State? **R:** Se- security, that's another phase **I:** Edochie was kidnapped in the same area. **R:** Yes. What I'm saying **I:** And a lot of people like you **R:** Yes **I:** do not live in there because of the insecurity in the area. **R:** Yes.	• The response given by the respondent in (24) clearly flouts the maxims of quantity and manner. He does not give adequate information as to what he was going to do differently. He only mentions the need for some places to be beautified, but does not say if the beautification of such places is his major goal of desiring to get into office. This leads to his flouting the maxim of manner. His response may be considered ambiguous since it lacks clarity. The interviewer even had to mention the pressing need of insecurity in the State, since the respondent did not consider it a major bane that ought to be immediately addressed over that of beautification. • The respondent observes the maxims of quality and manner in that he agrees to the fact that there is insecurity in the State and that people are afraid to reside in the area. He is also brief in acknowledging this, as shown in (32).

The adjacency pair in (23 and 24) is Question-Question. The interviewer asks a question that made him yield the turn. However, the respondent answers him with a question. This is referred to as a dispreferred response. Also, pair (25

and 26) is a question and an answer, and this is a preferred response. The interviewer, however, interrupted the turn of the respondent in (28), since he felt that he had not finished making his point.

Analysis 2

The analysis in this section is based on the Cooperative principle and the Politeness principle and is shown on tables five and six.

Table 5

Text	Cooperative Principle	Politeness Principle
I: Now, you were the ANPP Chairman. R: Yes. I: And you ended up not seeing anyone else in ANPP Anambra to come out as a candidate. R: Yes. I: You could make up, sorry, you looked for a way to make sure that you emerged. R: Yes. No! That's not true I: OK. You were the State Chairman. So everyone expected that you would be a father figure in Anambra politics as far as ANPP is concerned. That's not democratic, is it? R: No I: But you gave the position to yourself as a candidate. R: I will tell you. First of all, er, I was instrumental em, in fact, by 2001 there was er, er, this national frontier and er NSA that er merged to become UNDP and I said I was not going to run, but the national leadership of the party and the Anambra people, em leadership of the party saw in me fine qualities good enough that I'm fi- I: even when you were not in the party from the outset? R: Eh? Sorry? I: Even when you were not in that party. So you used your financial might to bulldoze everybody into coming out as the candidate. R: No no no no, listen, listen to me. We only moved from UNPP to APP to strengthen, to give birth to I: To be the Chairman so that you can introduce yourself as the candidate. R: I want to, I want you to understand me. UNDP and APP gave birth to ANPP. Are you understanding what I'm saying? So that was that. The marriage of UNDP and APP gave birth to ANPP. It was unanimous.	• The respondent in (34 and 36) observes the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. However, in his response in (38), he flouts the maxim of manner. This is so because his response seems ambiguous since he says 'yes' and also 'no'. • The respondent in (42) is flouts the maxim of quantity. He goes back to memory lane, listing the things that led to the formation of the party.	• The interviewer performs an FTA, but with negative politeness. By saying, 'that's not democratic, is it? (39), he gives the respondent the opportunity to say no, thereby minimizing the threat to the respondent's face. • The interviewer performs a bald on record FTA. He asks the question directly, without mitigation, that is, without politeness. He even insinuates that the respondent bribed his way through to emerge as the party's candidate – (45). • The interviewer goes on to threaten the negative face of the respondent. He uses the 'no mitigation strategy' in addressing the respondent in (47). He shows no respect for the respondent's positive face, that is, his desire to be approved and liked by others. By asserting that the respondent used his financial might to bulldoze everybody, it is as though he were telling the audience that his respondent is a crook and a corrupt man. • The response of the respondent bears out the fact that he felt a threat to his image as he seemed frustrated and unhappy, as shown in (48).

The turn-taking in lines (33-41) is remarkable. Both interviewer and respondent took turns without interruptions. However, in (46), the interviewer interrupts the response of the respondent by not allowing him complete the point he was making.

Table 6

Text	Cooperative Principle	Politeness Principle
I: Did you threaten them to achieve that? R: Threaten? I'm telling you that it was, I said they came together and pleaded with me. Don't you hear me? They said, 'please come and rule us'. I: It means you were not willing to run R: Not that I was not willing to run. I: You were an unwilling candidate! R: No! I, I at first had to consult. I: You were not willing. R: No! I: You just said that they came to beg you to run, R: They said they saw qualities in me and they know what is happening in Anambra State that I am the only person that can I: OK. Was that not what you were looking for all along? R: No! You see when people see I: Now what do we believe? You were not looking for this? R: Yes. I: You were unwilling R: No! Not really. Don't use the word 'unwilling'. They came to me. I: But they had to beg you. They didn't have to beg you. R: No, no no no. my er, my brother. I tell you that I've been on the sideline watching what has been happening in Anambra State. I: As a partnership? R: On, on on ANPP ticket. I'm very qualified with experience. I have everything and incidentally too, I have what some of them do not have. I have managed politicians for over five years. It's not easy. That is experience. I: Alright, Prince Ukachukwu. We thank you so much for coming on today's edition of the programme. R: Thank you, too. I: We'll see you some other time on another edition of Head to Head.	• In turns (51-58), the cooperative principle is observed by both the interviewer and the respondent. The right amount of information is given, the truth presumably said, the answers are relevant, brief and unambiguous. • The respondent in (67) flouts the maxim of quantity and thus, the maxim of manner. His response to the question in (66) should have been straightforward and simple. However, he proceeds with telling how qualified and experienced he is and what makes him so, thus being elaborate in his speech.	• The interviewer in (51) asks the question in such a way that the respondent is placed in a tight corner. He had no option but to provide an answer to the question. The interviewer did not seek to be polite at all in the way he framed the question. • The respondent's answer in (50) shows his desire to save his face. So he asks the interviewer, 'threaten?' and goes on to explain himself. On his part, he tries to use the negative politeness by asking the interviewer in (50), 'don't you hear me?' This is more polite because he could also have asked, 'how could you suggest that I threatened them?' • Also, in (53), the interviewer bluntly tells the respondent, 'You were an unwilling candidate.' Again, in (59), he says, 'OK, was that not what you were looking for all along? By his statement in (53), the interviewer was impolitely telling the respondent that he was an unwilling candidate. His statement in (59) was too blunt and implies that one is not usually begged to go for such electoral position and as such, it could only be that the respondent is pretending about his being begged to be the candidate. He really must have had an interest in that position and had done everything possible to achieve it, yet he did not want to own up to that possibility. • By the very direct remarks the interviewer makes to the respondent, he shows no regard for the respondent's negative face, that is, his need to be independent and not be unduly imposed on. The responses of the respondent in (63 and 65) show how much struggle he put up to save his face. Obviously, the way the interviewer phrased his questions is not polite and seems to be geared towards making the respondent say what he does not want to say, agree with a point he may later regret, or expose what his real intentions are.

In the data just considered, the turn-taking happened to be even until the interviewer interrupted the respondent in turns (58 and 60). This is followed by other pairs that are realized in their turns as Question-Answer, Statement-Response, and Greeting-Greeting. The conversation is closed with a greeting by the interviewer to the respondent for being present for the interview. The respondent also responds with a greeting, expressing thanks to the interviewer. In all, the conversational features of turn-taking and adjacency pairing were observed in full operation in the data.

Turn-Taking and Adjacency Pairs

The following pairs were observed in the data:

Question-Answer: turns (5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 25, 26, 39, 40, 59-65)

Question-Question: turns (23, 24, 49, 50)

Statement-Response: turns (1-4, 17, 18, 62-65)

Self-initiated repairs: turns (37 and 44)

SUMMARY

This study has investigated and found that there are interactional patterns and communicative strategies that are observable in TV talk shows, in the case of STV's 'Head to Head' programme. In some cases, the interviewer seemed to be concerned with his position as the one doing the questioning and as such, did not give his respondent enough ground to comment on the issues raised. Perhaps, the interest of the interviewer is to make people see him as a tough interviewer. He may be interested in the fame this may bring him. However, the effect of this pattern of interaction with his respondent led to a heightened, anxious atmosphere especially for the respondent who felt that he must have to save his face. From the study, it seems that the interviewer dictates the pattern and mode of interaction, the way the conversation unfolds and is carried out. At some points when the interviewer remained calm and yielded the turn, it followed that the respondent did not feel pressured, but took the turn and endeavoured to make his point. Obviously, in most of the cases, the interviewer interacted in such a way as to pressure the respondent to agree with his own point of view.

Also, there was the use of mannerisms and gap fillers especially by the respondent. It seems that because of the nature of the questions of the interviewer and the way he presented them, the respondent got caught off-guard and sometimes did not really know what to say. As a result of this, he used some lexical items repeatedly in a stretch of utterance and gap fillers such as 'em', and 'er' a lot. Ordinarily, the respondent may not have it as his habit to use a lot of gap fillers and repetitions in his everyday speech. Nevertheless, because of the interview setting, he was forced to speak the way he did, since he had to think of plausible answers and more important, provide them immediately the turn was yielded to him. That was an observable strategy the respondent used to ensure that the conversation continued.

The assumption is that people always bring in a cooperative behaviour in conversations. On this talk show, there were abundant cases when the principle of cooperation was not applied. From the analysis of the data, the cooperative principle with its maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner, were sometimes observed, and sometimes flouted. In most cases, the respondent flouted especially the maxim of quantity. This is evidenced in his refusal to give adequate answers to some of the questions asked and this led to non-cooperation. At other times, he went on to give more information than was asked of him, sometimes cluttering his answers with unnecessary details. By doing so, he also invariably flouted the maxim of manner since he was not brief and orderly as required. Some of those answers could then be considered irrelevant as they did not relate in any way to the question he was asked. Perhaps, flouting those maxims was a deliberate act by the respondent as he may not want to be seen as incapable of providing answers to the questions posed to him. That was also a strategy of keeping the conversation going. The interviewer too failed to observe the cooperative principle at the point when he did not make his questions clear enough and had to repeat or modify them again.

However, in some cases, the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner were duly observed by the respondent. He gave just the right amount of information desired, gave answers for which he had evidence of the fact, said what was relevant, and was brief, orderly and unambiguous. This shows that in TV talk shows, the cooperative principle is adhered to as well as flouted, but it seems that they are flouted most of the time as there is always the use of indirect speech and the expectation that the hearer should make inferences from what is being said.

There are aspects of conversation that lead to order and organization in TV talks shows. Since no conversations are predetermined, one cannot make bold to say what the end of a conversation would turn out to be. Using CA, this study has analysed how the turn-taking system which is central to the structure and management of conversations, was managed by the participants on STV's 'Head to Head'. It was discovered that the interviewer mostly selected the respondent as the next speaker. Furthermore, in order to assert his role and position, the interviewer, sometimes interrupted the turn of his respondent without allowing him to complete his turn. This led to overlaps in their discourse. Consequently, a viewer may have had a hard time fathoming some of what was said at those points of interruptive overlaps and as such, the points would have been missed.

This study also highlighted how the turn-taking was structured by successive utterances and how each utterance was functionally dependent on the previous one. This led to a discovery of how the utterances were paired. Rather than the supposed Question-Answer pairing expected, other adjacency pairs such as Question-Question, Statement-Response and Greeting-Greeting were realised. There was also the aspect of repair which was initiated by both the interviewer and his respondent in order to keep the conversation going.

The principle of politeness is sometimes flouted or violated on the TV talk shows. It is expected that one tries to be more polite to people who are socially distant from him. However, in STV's 'Head to Head' programme, it was observed that in most cases, the interviewer particularly did not observe the politeness principle. He performed several FTAs through his utterances and did not attempt to minimise the imposition he placed on the respondent. This is to say that he did not even show that he realised that there was any threat to the 'face' or reputation of his respondent. As a result, he did not think of phrasing most of his questions in a way that showed consideration or politeness. He asked his questions in a very direct manner, even supposing the worst to be true of his respondent. Of course, the respondent had to struggle to save his image and counteract whatever negative impression that may have been held of him by the viewers of the programme. Perhaps, being polite in this case may not lead the interviewer to get the information he desires from his respondent, being that politics is the controversial issue of discussion.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has shown how the turn-taking mechanism, sequential organization such as adjacency pairing, preference organization as seen in preferred and 'dispreferred' responses, feedbacks and repairs, help to structure discourse on TV talk shows. The principles of politeness and cooperation have also aided in highlighting what communication strategies and interactive patterns were adopted by the participants on the talk show.

Evidently, the conversation was not much of a cooperative one. This is so because the interviewer sometimes did not allow the respondent to make his point before interrupting him. Also, the respondent showed feelings of frustration, as though he was not being listened to and his viewpoints disregarded. The pragmatic principles of cooperation

and politeness bore this out. It is, therefore, evident that some interviewers and of course, respondents, already have a mindset or position on the issues to be discussed and are not ready to change their perspective regardless of the evidence presented.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, D., & Guy, R. (1978). Conversation Analysis: The Sociology of Talk. The Hague: Mouton.

2. Allen, D. E., & Guy, R. F. (1974). Conversation Analysis: The Sociology of Talk. The Hague: Mouton.

3. Atiba, C. A. (1987). *The television news interview*. London: Sage.

4. Ayass, R., & Gerhardt, C. (Eds.). (2012). The appropriation of media in everyday life. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

5. Banathy, B. H., &Jenlink, P. M. (Eds.).(2005). Dialogue as a means of collective communication. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

6. Bright, W. (1996).Language in society. New York: Cambridge University Press.

7. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987).*Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

8. Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage.

9. Carbaugh, D. A. (2005).Cultures in conversation. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

10. Clark, U. (2007). *Studying language: English in action*. New York: Palgrave.

11. Cummings, L. (2005). Pragmatics.A multidisciplinary perspective. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

12. Cummings, L. (Ed.). (2009). The pragmatics encyclopedia. Abingdon New York: Routledge.

13. Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). (2002). The language of turn and sequence. Oxford

14. New York: Oxford University Press.

15. Furo, H. (2001). Turn-taking in English and Japanese: Projectability in grammar, intonation, and semantics. New York: London Routledge.

16. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation.In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.)*Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 3: 41-58., New York: Academic Press.

17. James, S., Ode, I., &Soola, O. (1990).*Introduction to communication*. Ibadan: Spectrum.

18. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.

19. Lerner, G. H. (2004). Conversation analysis.Studies from the first generation. Amsterdam

20. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.

21. Malmkjaer, K.,& Anderson, J. M. (Eds.). (1981). *The linguistics encyclopedia*. London: Routledge.

22. Maybin, J., & Mercer, N. (1996).*Using English: from conversation to canon*. London: Routledge.

23. Pridham, F. (2001).The language of conversation. London New York: Routledge.

24. Psathas, G. (Ed.). (1990). Interactional Competence. Washington: University Press of America.

25. Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. W. (eds), (1983).*Language and communication*. New York: Longman.

26. Verschueren, J. (Ed.). (2002). Handbook of pragmatics. Amsterdam Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

27. Verschueren, J., Östman, J. O., &Blommaert, J. (Eds.).(2003). Handbook of pragmatics.

28. Amsterdam Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Pub.