Organization of Female Turn Taking Pattern in Urdu Conversations

Rabeah Saeed Kiani[1], Ambreen Shahnaz[2] and Shazia Akbar Ghilzai [3]

Abstract

This article looks at the norms of turn-taking in Urdu discourse as an aspect of female communication tactics. A "turn-talking game" is what Tannen (1984) describes communication as being. This study aims to discover the structure of female turn-taking patterns in Urdu conversations and the distribution of turns within them. While the data does demonstrate that speakers switch and turn size and ordering might fluctuate, the majority of the time, just one side is speaking at a time. Different methods are employed to distribute turns, and those transitions are meticulously coordinated. The research also considers overlapping and pauses in Urdu conversation, but they do not distort the turn-taking pattern. Instead, these elements are ruled preserving.

Keywords: Turn-taking, Constructional Component, Turn Allocational Component, Silence.

Introduction

One of the most fundamental ways to structure a discussion is turn-taking. Taking turns while speaking is one of the most essential aspects of any discussion. Whether it's a chat, a ballroom dance, road construction, or open-heart surgery, each activity involving several people needs a system to organize and manage their contributions. A turn-taking mechanism is used in talks to spread the opportunity to engage. This study examines the structure of turn-taking in Urdu conversation and the distribution of turns by females within it.

Two or more people engaging in a conversational verbal exchange of ideas is called dialogue (Oxford English Dictionary, 2012). According to Tannen (1984) a conversation is like a game of turn-talking. During meetings, in particular, the rules of the game are not laid out, but there are serious consequences for not following them. These are just a few of the things that every person involved in a discussion, whether consciously or not, has to think about:

- Should we even talk?
- Who would you like to talk to if someone were to speak?
- How long should each of us take a turn speaking?
- Is there a preferred method of introducing the purpose of the meeting?
- Are we able to communicate in a way that overlaps?
- What is the best way to indicate that we are nearing the end?
- How about a moment to be heard?
- How can we most effectively pass the buck to a particular individual?

[1]Lecturer, Department of English, Women University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Bagh.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad, Wah Campus.
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of English, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

- What should we do if someone attempts to take our turn before we're done? (FitzGerald et al., 2010).

Turn-taking and the Sacks Model

Sacks et al. (1974) conducted a study that documented a substantial collection of authentic conversations to discern the principles individuals employ to structure their verbal communication. Their work is noteworthy and frequently referenced. The researchers noted a clear pattern of one person speaking at a time, even though different people take turns, and the length and order of turns may vary. They also observed a coordinated transition between speakers, and specific techniques were used to allocate turns (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 699). Based on their findings, they determined that their technique applies to all types of lectures, regardless of the subject, setting, number of speakers, or speaker identification. Analyzing communication into its constituent elements is fundamental to this concept of sequential, almost mathematical concepts. A "turn-taking point" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 704), where speakers can alternate, is reached when one such unit is completed. The next step might be one of three options. To start, the presenter can choose who will speak next by asking a direct question, bringing someone's name up and inviting people to join in, or even making direct eye contact. After that, no one else should be considered for the following speaking turn; the nominee has been officially nominated. Secondly, everyone in the conversation has the option to choose who will talk next if the present speaker doesn't do so. Thirdly, the original speaker can keep on if nobody else wants to speak. The process starts with rule one and continues with the rest of the sequence.

Turn and Floor Management

The 1974 essay titled "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation" by Sacks et al. outlines a system that speakers employ to regulate the allocation of speaking turns. Sacks et al. (1974, p. 699) observed that there is a clear pattern of one party speaking at a time, but speakers do change. They also noticed that the length and sequence of turns may vary, but transitions between speakers are well planned. Additionally, they found that techniques are employed to assign turns. They continue by explaining the system of turns in the context of a pair of elements and an assortment of rules that helps keep participants on topic and reduces "gap and overlap" in discourse. The 'turn constructional component' governs 'different unit-types' and is the initial part. Second, there's what's called the "turn-allocational component," which governs how the speakers take turns speaking and keeps the discourse in a dyadic format.

Turn-constructional Component

Turn-construction units (TCUs) are the fundamental components of turns, and they can vary in terms of their size or length and linguistic texture (Selting, 2000). The process of transferring the speakership starts with the speaker being originally entitled to one unit, which, when completed, forms an initial transition relevancy place (TCP) (Sacks et al. 1974:703). 'Everyday communication is seldom symmetrical' (1860, p. 62), according to Itakura (2001), and this lack of equality shows that 'one speaker's dominance over the other' (1862, p. 54). One way to assert dominance in an encounter is to take longer turns, which 'limit access to the floor for other prospective speakers'.

Selting (2000) questions Sacks et al.'s characterization of the TCU as a "potentially complete turn" that is "not necessarily a linguistic unit" but rather a "interactionally relevant unit" that concludes with a TRP. Selting challenges this description based on the criteria of "syntactic structure" and

"projectability". She suggests a modification to the turn-constructional component in her evaluation of Sacks et al.'s model. She states that the turns' "semantic, pragmatic, and sequential context" permits many types of projection, including "single TCUs ending in TRPs" or "multi-unit turns where the TRPs of internal TCUs are blocked until the final TCU of the turn that ends in a TRP" (Selting, 2000, p. 512). Seligman asserts that while every full turn is inherently a TCU, not all TCUs are workable turns because to the potential for the speaker to postpone the TRP. According to Zimmerman and West (1975, p. 108), conversational arrangement necessitates not just active "speakership" but also extremely active "listenership" as each listener must predict where the TRP will be located to prevent overlapping.

Turn-allocational Component

There are two categories of "turn-allocational techniques" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 703). One category includes methods where the present speaker chooses the next speaker. The other category includes methods where the next turn is assigned by self-selection. The set of rules for assigning turns is as that comes next: As a first step, the presenter has the option to choose the subsequent speaker (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 703). Furthermore, self-selection can be applied or not, depending on whether the current speaker chooses the next speaker (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 703). Furthermore, according to Sacks et al. (1974, p. 703), the speaker who is now speaking has the option to either continue or not continue, even if neither the presenter nor the audience choose the next speaker. The rule set "re-applies at the next transition-relevance place" and keeps re-applying - in the same sequence - until transfer occurs if both the first and second rules have not been applied and the current speaker has continued (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 703). According to Sacks et al. (1974, p. 705), these regulations make sure that "one speaker at a time" and that gaps, interruptions, and overlaps don't happen.

Silence

According to Sacks et al., there are three main kinds of non-speech: gaps, pauses, and lapses. According to Herman (1995, p. 84), they are accessible based on their position in the turn and the trade. According to Sacks et al. (1974, p. 715), a "pause" is defined as a "intra-turn silence" that occurs not at a transition-relevance location. A "gap" refers to a silence that follows a probable completion point, while "lapses" are protracted silences that occur at transition relevance places. To avoid gaps becoming lapses, the present speaker can self-select to transform the gap into a pause, which then causes another TCU, which ultimately results in a TRP. The speaker whose turn has lapsed is accountable to the subsequent quiet, which is referred to as a "attributable silence" (Herman, 1995, p. 84). "Like speech, silences carry illocutionary force and have perlocutionary effects," says Saville-Troike (1985, p. 6). Sifianou (1997) argues that while brief pauses are typically perceived as allowing people to ponder, extended periods of silence might reveal one's "attitudes and values," including "consideration for the other person" or a lack thereof.

Interruptions and Overlaps

According to Sacks et al. (1974, p. 708) when a speaker is not present in an overlapped region, it eliminates a part of the overlap and consequently the overlap itself. Based on the framework proposed by Sacks et al. (1974) for a "sequential, one-at-a-time type of conversation" (Edelsky, 1981, p. 384) simultaneous overlaps and interruptions are considered unfavorable and may suggest conflict. According to Edelsky, the second type of floor is characterized by simultaneous speaking, where interruptions and overlaps are not viewed as competitive. In this type of floor, two or more

individuals either engage in a seemingly unstructured conversation or collaboratively develop a single idea. A modification in "the delineation of the conversational quandary that the turn-taking system is intended to address" arises when overlaps are perceived as affirmative markers of "collaborative engagement and eagerness." Consequently, regulations designed to avoid duplication may not effectively address the present situation at every point in time (Schiffrin, 1988, p. 268).

Data and Methodology

The data for the present research is taken from female Urdu speakers of Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi who are residing in University main hostel, by audio recording of everyday ordinary conversation. The data consists of three conversations with a total running time of 26 minutes. The conversations were recorded with a mobile phone. The recordings were taken in a calm room to get more accurate sound and to avoid noise, which could affect the results of the findings. All the conversations were recorded from two wings of main hostel to have more natural data. The participants of the conversations were ensured in order to get more natural data. The decision of the topic was left to the participants' choice; they were free to talk about their interest. The topics of the conversations were not restricted to one specific domain since the discussion in the conversations covered the social, personal, economic and political aspects and their impact on the present life style. Due to time constraint, the analysis is limited to only one conversation in detail in order to look for turn taking rules in female Urdu conversation.

Careful, persistent listening allowed us to select and transcribe pertinent bits from all three discussions, which were written in Urdu. Using the transcribing technique proposed by R.S. McGregor and the conversation analysis transcript norms established by Gail Jefferson, the chosen pieces are transliterated into Urdu (Sacks et al.,1974).

Data Transcription

Repeated listening to the recordings helped create the transcriptions when relevant bits were located in the recordings. The first step is to transliterate the fragments into Urdu using R.S. McGregor's transcription technique (McGregor, 1992) in conjunction with Gail Jefferson's conventions for conversation analysis transcripts (Sacks et al., 1974). While English is considered a subject-verb-object language, Urdu follows a subject-object-verb (SOV) fundamental word order. Take, for example,

a.   I   write   a letter
        Subject   Verb   Object

In contrast, in Urdu we write or say the same sentence as in b.

b.   *mein* (I)   *aik khat* (a letter)   *likht*ā *h*ō*n* (write)
        Subject   Object   Verb

English is the language of teaching in most educational establishments and because Urdu speakers are used to applying English vocabulary when speaking Urdu, it is common practice for them to switch to English words while speaking Urdu. Since transliteration methods do not always provide an accurate representation of spoken English, English spelling is employed wherever possible. Furthermore, neither capitalization nor full stops are used to denote sentences. The current study makes use of commas and question mark as punctuation symbols. Commas separate parts of a turn and question marks finish questions in the English translation, both of which help to make the meaning clear. Other than this, the transcription, transliteration, and translation processes are

also used in this investigation. Sohail (2010) exemplifies transcription symbols which are adopted for the transcription of Urdu conversations of the current study by the researchers to determine the patterns of turn distribution and how female Urdu speakers take turns while talking.

Data Analysis and Research Findings

To investigate how turn distribution occurs in daily Urdu conversation, rules of turn-taking have been developed and analyzed based on the model presented by Sacks et al. in 1974. The given data is categorized into three main sections which are further divided into categories and subcategories. Analyzing ordinary conversation involves examining how participants engage in the exchange of thoughts through speech, which leads to the concept of a "turn." A turn refers to the act of a speaker speaking, and as speech alternates, turns also alternate (Herman 1998, p. 19). During a conversation, one individual patiently waits for the other person to finish speaking before starting their own turn. However, it is not possible to produce a situation where one participant waits for the other to complete speaking, so ensuring that only one side speaks at a time. There are several factors that contribute to the impracticability of this idea:

Initially, even in the most basic scenario involving only two individuals engaged in conversation, delaying would undeniably lead to the emergence of a pause between the conclusion of one person's utterance and the commencement of the subsequent one. Furthermore, in a discourse structured in this manner, it would be necessary to have a clear and unequivocal "turn-completion signal." The turn-taking method for discussion, as defined by Sacks et al. (1974) is characterized as being "locally managed" and "party-administered". It is under local management as it only plans for the present and immediate future, rather than considering events that will occur in thirty seconds, five minutes, or tomorrow. The party is organized in a manner where there is no designated "referee" to decide the order and duration of each person's speech. Instead, the players themselves resolve this.

Regarding the sorts of units used by a speaker to begin a conversation, the speaker is initially allowed to use one unit while taking a turn. The first completion of the first unit represents an initial transition-relevance location. The transfer of speakership is handled by identifying transition relevant sites that each instance of a unit-type may encounter.

Turn-allocation strategies may be divided into two categories:

(a) Speaker-selected turn allocation, where the current speaker chooses the next speaker
(b) Self-selected turn allocation, where the next speaker is chosen by themselves.

Rules of Turn Construction in Urdu Conversation

The following is a fundamental set of regulations that dictate the order in which turns are taken during everyday conversations among Urdu-speaking women. These rules ensure that each participant is given a fair opportunity to speak and that the transfer of turns is coordinated to minimize any gaps or overlaps.

In the chosen conversation, speakers A, B and C are friends. They are university fellows, studying in the same class and are in research work. Their department has arranged a field trip for Neelam and Jehlum valley for data collection. Both speakers A and C know about this trip but speaker B is ignorant about this, they told her about this and the rest of the conversation consists on planning about this field trip. At the time of conversation all the participants are sitting in the study room of the main hostel.

Table 1: Conversation 1

Dialogue Number	Character (A, B and C)	Dialogue and translation
1	A	Slam jī kya hv rĕa hai? Hi what's going on?
2	B	kuch nĕēṁ fzvl bythy haṁ ā jav bīthv Nothing, come here and sit down.
3	A	tum ny kv´ī n´y kapṛy banvaý ēīṁ? (Sitting) Have you stitched some new clothes?
4	B	ný kary kīuṁ (0.2) kīa kv´ī <u>kh</u>aṣ bat hai is mīṁ? Why new clothes? Is there any special in it?
5	C	ēaṁ na kīa tumhīṁ nĕīṁ pta ĕy ky hmara fīlḍ [trip ja raha hai nīlam jĕlam vīlī Yeah,don't you know that our trip is arranged for Neelam and Jehlum Valley?
6	A	trip ky bary mīṁ tumhīṁ nhīṁ
7	A	pta hai? (Overlapping) Don't you know about trip?
8	B	mujy tv nhīṁ ptĕ mujy btaya kis ny hai? I don't know, who told me about it?
9	A	clv ab tv bta raĕy ēīṁ na avr vīsy bhī abhī kafī din hīṁ jany mīṁ Now we are informing you and there are many days left to go.
10	C	yar mīra frīndli mas´vrĕ yēī hai ky udar na jav vĕ buĕt dīnjrus hy udar ki saṛak buĕt riskī hai Friends I will suggest you to not go there, that road is very risky.
11	B	lykan aīsy mvq´y zindgī mīṁ phir tv nhīṁ milty na? But such occasions don't come again in life.
12	C	yĕ tv hai This is true.
13	A	acha calv jaldī apni tyarī mukamal krv Ok, now complete your preparations.
14	B	vīsy tahira trip ja kab rĕa hai? But Tahira when trip will go?
15	A	hmm(0.2) agly hafty trip ky jany ky imkan hīṁ Hmm(0.2) there are chances that ia may arrange in next week.
16	A	(0.3)
17	A	yar mujy tv ghar sy s´aīd ajazat na mily May be I could not get permission from home.
18	B	vĕ kīvṁ? But why?
19	A	tumhīṁ ajazat kīvṁ nĕī mily gi? (Overlapping) Why you will not get permission?
20	C	yar ghar mīn sister ki śadī kī tyarī cal raĕa hai aj kal avr amī bhi buhat masrvf hīn. bakī sab ky aigzam cal rĕy hīṁ Now a days there is preparation for sister's wedding is in progress at home and mother is very busy in work. She is alone at home, as all others have exams now a days.

21	B	lv jī (0.2) yĕ bhī kvˊī masˊlĕ hai? Oh! Is this a problem?
22	B	(0.4)
23	B	hum tumarī amī sy bat kar dīty hīṁ na avr aīk hafty bad mil ky end kr līn gy We will talk to your mother and will complete the work when we will be back after a week.
24	C	yar kam delay karna tv musˊkl lagta hai It seems difficult to delay the work.
25	A	kīvṁ is mīṁ kīa musˊkl hai? Why, what is difficult in it?
26	C	musˊkil yĕ hĕ ky amī nĕ gar mūn colour krwany walứ ky sath is week ka commitment kia hĕ is week ka Because mother has committed with them for this week.
27	C	(0.2)
28	C	avr next week in lvguvṁ nĕ kēīm avr kam karna hai And next week they will work at some other place.
29	B	oh I see(.) mrī sister aj kal thesis submit krwa ky free hai usay din kv mīṁ kĕ duṁ ga ky wu din ku calī jaya kary tumarī amī ki help ky liy Oh I see, my sister is now a days free after submission of her thesis. I will tell her to go there in day time for your mother's help.
30	C	agar aīsa hv jaˊy tv hamara masˊla bhi hal hv jaˊy avr mujy permission bhi mil jaˊy gi. If this happens so, than our problem will also solve and I will also get permission from home.
31	C	ok thĕk hai Ok its all right
32	A	thĕk hai, kal milīṁ gay. Ok will see you tomorrow.
33	B	Allah hafiz Allah hafiz.

Here speaker B and C are sitting in classroom, meanwhile speaker A entered in the room and ask from them what's going on? As they were sitting there idly. In response of A's question speaker B answered her by self-selecting because A's question was from both A and B, so here Sack's rule-1 (b) applies. After sitting, speaker A self-selects B after his answer and asks her that had she stitched any new clothes? Here rule 1(a) applies and A is creating a space for speaker B to speak next.

In line-4, speaker B in response of A's question again ask question that why new clothes? And after that there is pause of 0.2 m.sec, when speaker B doesn't get response from other two than she proceeds the conversation by asking another question that is there any special occasion coming for which there should be such preparation? Here Sack's rule-1 (c) applies, where neither current speaker selects next, nor another party self – select himself. So the current speaker selects herself and create next TCU, after that next speaker C find space for herself and starts speaking.

In line- 5 when speaker C is giving information about field trip, than at the same time A overlaps C and asks from B whether she knows about trip or not. Here a very interesting fact come to point that in line- 5 & 6 there is overlapping of speaker C and A, but at the same time both are listening

to each other and also B is getting information from both and as a response of that B is answering question.

Throughout the conversation, there is same pattern of turn taking; i.e, at some time there is self-selection, either by current speaker or next speaker, or other selection. There are also overlaps and pauses (silence) in conversation which do not affect the pattern of turn taking and hence these are rules preserving. We get following different patterns in Urdu conversation, during the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn constructional unit,

Rule #1 (a)

if the turn-so-far is constructed using a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then the selected party has the exclusive right and obligation to speak next. No other parties have these rights or obligations, and the transfer of speaking occurs at that place. As stated by Sacks (1974, p. 716) the existence of strategies can be inferred from evident instances such as "an addressed question," which plainly designates the addressee to respond next. Let's examine a scenario in which three buddies are engaged in a conversation concerning a field trip.

Table 2: Conservation 2

Dialogue Number	Character (A, B and C)	Dialogue and translation
13	A	acha calv jaldī jaldī apni tyarī mukamal krv Ok, now complete your preparations.
14	B	vīsy tahira trip ja kab rĕa hai? But Tahira when trip will go?
15	A	Hmm(0.2) agly hafty trip ky jany ky imkan hīṁ Hmm(0.2) there are chances that it may be arranged in next week.

All three individuals are engaged in a discussion over the trip, and each person is expressing their thoughts and opinions openly. In line 14, B directs the inquiry towards Tahira by specifically addressing her by name. A is chosen by the question to speak next, and she does so on line 15. In Urdu talks, there are some actions that the current speaker might use to initiate a sequence and pick the next speaker. These acts may involve making a request, seeking approval, or commenting on something. Sacks et al. (1974) propose that, similar to inquiries, other acts that initiate a sequence can designate the next speaker when accompanied by some sort of address.

Rule #1 (b)

If the present sequence of turns does not entail the employment of a 'current speaker picks next' approach, then the option of self-selection for the next speaker may or may not be implemented. The first person to start the conversation is granted the right to speak, and the transfer of speaking rights happens at that point.

Table 3: Conservation 3

Dialogue Number	Character (A, B and C)	Dialogue and translation
8	B	mujy tv nhīṁ ptĕ mujy btaya kis ny hai? I don't know, who told me about it?
9	A	clv ab tv bta raĕy ĕīṁ na avr vīsy bhī abhī kafī din hīṁ jany mīṁ Now we are informing you and there are many days left to go.
10	C	yar mīra frīndli mas′vrĕ yĕī hai ky udar na jav vĕ buĕt dīnjrus hy udar ki saṛak buĕt riskī hai Friends I will suggest you to not go there, that road is very risky.
11	B	lykan aīsy mvq′y zindgī mīṁ phir tv nhīṁ milty na? But such occasions don't come again in life.
12	C	yĕ tv hai This is true.

During this conversation, in line 10, speaker C self-select herself and gives suggestion and also alarm to both of her friends that it is risky way to go there, so change the programme of going there. While in the next turn when speaker B tells about esteeming such rare chances in life than she agrees.

Here one very interesting point to be noted is that in line 10 and 11, overlapping is taking place near the turn completion and in this overlapping both speaker A and B select speaker C and there is pattern in this overlapping. After this overlapping speaker B starts speaking by following speaker A and C, so pattern is maintained and we can say that overlapping is rule preserving.

Rule #1 (c)
If the current turn does not need the employment of a 'current speaker picks next' strategy, then the current speaker has the option to continue or not, until another individual voluntarily takes their turn. As is apparent from the following example:

Table 4: Conservation 4

Dialogue Number	Character (A, B and C)	Dialogue and translation
20	C	yar ghar mūn sister ki śadī kī tyarī cal raĕa hai aj kal avr amī bhi buhat masrvf hīn. bakī sab ky aigzam cal rĕy hīṁ Now a days there is preparation for sister's wedding is in progress at home and mother is very busy in work. She is alone at home, as all others have exams
21	B	lv jī (0.2) yĕ bhī kv′ī mas′lĕ hai? Oh! Is this a problem?
22	B	(0.4)

23	B	hum tumarī amī sy bat kar dīty hīṁ na avr aīk hafty bad mil ky end kr lūn gy
		We will talk to your mother and will complete the work when we will be back after a week.
24	C	yar kam delay karna tv musˊkl lagta hai
		It seems difficult to delay the work.

Here three speakers A, C and B are talking about their issues before going to field tip and their solution. In line 22, when speaker B gave transition relevance place at the end of first TCU, but speaker A or C didn't start speaking. There comes a gap 0.4 m sec and after that speaker B uttered another TCU in order to give speaker C a TRP to start her turn. Here pause of 0.4 in the turn of speaker A is rule preserving, as after that speaker A gave another TCU in order to act on rule 1(c).

Rule # 2 a, b, and c
If neither l (a) nor l (b) has been used at the beginning of an initial turn-constructional unit, and the current speaker continues after providing l(c), then the rule-set a-c is applied again at the next transition relevance place, and this process is repeated recursively at each subsequent transition-relevance place until transfer is achieved. Rule 1(c) is being implemented, as seen in the case above.

Table 5: Conservation 5

Dialogue Number	Character (A, B and C)	Dialogue and translation
21	B	lv jī (0.2) yĕ bhī kvˊī masˊlĕ hai?
		Oh! Is this a problem?
22	B	(0.4)
23	B	hum tumarī amī sy bat kar dīty hīṁ na avr aīk hafty bad mil ky end kr lūn gy
		We will talk to your mother and will complete the work when we will be back after a week.
24	C	yar kam delay karna tv musˊkl lagta hai
		It seems difficult to delay the work.

After the application of rule 1(c) in line 23, in line 25 there is rule 1(b) is followed by C on the suggestion given by speaker that she gave answer to her suggestion that delay in work is not possible.

The arrangement of the rules functions to restrict the available choices they offer. Although l (a) is the first rule to be applied, it does not imply that its alternative is unrestricted by the limitations imposed by the existence of rules above that would be applicable if 1 were not present. Therefore, the option described in rule l (b) is applicable only if the option described in rule l (a) has not been used. In order to ensure systematic use of the option described in rule l (a), it must be used before the initial transition-relevance place of an initial unit. The execution of option l (a) is limited by the presence of rule 1b in the set, regardless of whether rule 1b's option is actually used. In order to ensure the systematic use of option b of rule 1, while rule 1c is present, it must be used at the beginning of an initial unit, before the current speaker's choice to continue (rule 1c) is triggered. If the condition l (c) is called, then rule 2 will be applied. The rule set a-c will be reapplied, and

the option of rule l (a) will once again have priority over the option of rule lb. Therefore, the implementation of rule l (b) is limited by the existence of rule 1 (c) in the set, independent of its actual utilization.

The rules establish a specific sequence for applying the technique groups (i.e., the two groups of turn-allocational techniques) in a way that allows for the inclusion of both types of techniques in the rule-set while still maintaining the principle of 'one speaker at a time'. This ordering prevents any potential conflict that could arise from including both types of techniques without a specific sequence. If the method groups were unordered, meaning that both might be used on any occasion where one was applicable, then the techniques themselves, which should only result in the selection of one next speaker, would allow for the possibility of selecting more than one party. This possibility arises due to the involvement of distinct parties in each approach. If the party conducting self-selection is not the same as the party being picked by the present speaker, many subsequent speakers will have been chosen. This possibility is eliminated by the rule-set's sequencing of the application of the approaches. In addition, the provision of rule l (b) known as the 'first starter has rights' establishes a certain order within the range of options offered by the method group. This order is designed to handle the potential for multiple self-selection that is made possible by the technique.

Conclusion

The researcher's conclusion from the debate is that conversation consists of turns-at speak. Participants observe the progression of a turn in order to identify potential instances where it may be considered finished. These points of potential completion are specific moments in the conversation where it is relevant for the following speaker to take over. These locations are referred to be transition relevance places. At each of these junctures, a set of regulations governs the process of transitioning to the next speaker in a typical Urdu discussion. This can occur either by the current speaker choosing the next speaker or through self-selection. The Urdu conversation adheres to the turn-shifting norms outlined in the Sacks model. Furthermore, the usage of pauses and overlaps also significantly contribute to the preservation of these rules. Therefore, these components demonstrate the consequences of Sack's approach in discussions conducted in Urdu by female speakers.

References

- Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's Got the Floor? *Language in Society*, *10*(3), 383-421.
- Fitzgerald, M., & Mullavey-O'Byrne, C., & Clemson, L. (2010). Cultural issues from practice. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal. 44.* 1 - 21. 10.1111/j.1440-1630.1997.tb00749.x.
- Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic discourse: Dialogue as interaction in plays.* Routledge.
- Herman, V. (1998). Turn management in drama. In J. Culpepper, M. Short and P. Vedonk *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context* (London: Routledge).
- Ikatura, H. (2001). Describing Conversational Dominance. *Journal of Pragmatics 33*(12),1859-1880.
- Jefferson, G. (1984). Notes on a systematic deployment of the acknowledgement tokens "Yeah" and "Mm hm". *Papers in Linguistics, 17,* 197-206.
- McGregor, R. S. (1992). *Urdu Study Materials: For Use With Outline of Hindi Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- *Oxford English Dictionary Online* <www.oed.com> dialogue, n. 1b. [accessed 07/05/12].

- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696-735.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1985). The Place of Silence in An Integrated Theory of Communication. In Tannen, D. and Saville-Troike, M. (eds.) *Perspectives on Silence*. (Norwood, N.J: Ablex).
- Schiffrin, D. (1988). Conversation analysis in Newmeyer, F. J. *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey. Language: The Socio-cultural Context* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge).
- Selting, M. (2000). The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk. *Language in Society, 29*(4), 477-517.
- Sifianou, M. (1997). Silence and Politeness. In Adam Jaworski (ed.) *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter) 63-84.
- Sohail, A. (2010). Alignment Tokens in ordinary Urdu conversation. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research, 13*(1), 77-93.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *The Pragmatics of Cross-Cultural Communication*. Georgetown University, Washington.
- Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In Thorne, B. and Henley, N. (eds*.) Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*. (Rowley, MA: Newbury House).