

“Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends”

Mr. Muhammad Nadeem

Research Scholar, muhammadnadeem98@hotmail.com

Dr. Sadia Siddiq

Assistant Professor, COMSATS University, Islamabad
sadia-siddiq@comsats.edu.pk

Mr. Jalees ul Hassan

Research Scholar, jaleesulhassanofficial@gmail.com

Abstract

This research focused on the analysis of informal conversations among both foreign and local groups of friends and students of BS English, studying at NUML University, Islamabad, Pakistan through Harvey Sack's model of Conversational analysis (1974) and Paul Grice model of Cooperative Principle to investigate specific elements and strategies employed by both the class of friends to manage turn taking, examine the different patterns of turn allocation, and analyze how interruptions and overlaps are handled. It specifically examined several aspects of conversational analysis such as turn taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principles. It investigated the strategies both the local and foreign groups of friends often use to navigate turn taking, explores patterns of turn allocation, and examines how interruptions and overlaps are managed in an informal naturally occurring conversation. Additionally, it also analyzed the occurrence and functions of adjacency pairs, including their role in establishing rapport and navigating disruptions. The study also examined how

friends of both the class adhered to or deviated from the cooperative principles, such as providing accurate or relevant information. To achieve its goal, the current study used a Qualitative research method, including audio recordings and transcriptions to capture and analyze naturally occurring informal conversations among both local and foreign friends. The research aimed to provide a comprehensive and an indepth understanding of these different aspects of conversational analysis and their significance in sustaining social bonds among these both groups of friends. The findings of research at hand are hoped to contribute to the broader sociolinguistic context and communication studies, enhancing our understanding of informal talk and human interaction within close friendships.

Keywords: Conversational Analysis, Turn Taking, Adjacency Pair, Cooperative Principles, Informal Talk among friends, NUML University Islamabad

Introduction

Conversations among friends often play a significant role in shaping and maintaining social relationships. These informal exchanges in friends usually provide a platform for individuals to express their thoughts, share experiences, and engage in various communicative acts. Moreover, understanding the dynamics of informal talk among friends is not only essential for comprehending the intricacies of human interaction but it also offers valuable insights into the nature of friendship itself. For this analysis of talk among both local and foreign groups of friends, Harvey Sacks and Emanuel A. Schegloff's model of conversational analysis and adjacency pairs, and Paul Grice's model of Cooperative principles is employed. Conversational Analysis as a model is established by different scholars and it has been considered as an influential approach to the study of language use that often investigates the structure and organization of naturally occurring talk in interaction (Sacks, 1992). Furthermore, it has various aspects. The first aspect of it is 'Turn Taking' which refers to the process by which participants in a naturally occurring conversation alternate speaking roles and take turns in order to maintain a balanced and orderly exchange of ideas (Sack, 1974). This research investigated how both local and foreign groups of friends navigate turn taking, explored the strategies they employed to signal the end of their speaking turn and initiate the next speaker's turn. It also examined patterns of turn allocation, including whether friends of both classes took equal turns or if certain individuals

dominated the conversation. Additionally, the study explored how interruptions, overlaps, and other conversational cues are managed within the context of friendly discourse. Thus, by analyzing audio recordings and transcriptions of natural conversations among friends, this research aimed to identify the underlying principles and mechanisms that often govern turn taking in such social contexts. Furthermore, Adjacent pairs, is also another fundamental and vital aspect of conversational analysis which usually refers to the sequential relationship between two related utterances, such as greetings and responses, questions and answers, or requests and fulfillments (Sack; Schegloff 1974). The research at hand analyzed the occurrence of adjacency pairs in conversations, identifying its common patterns and variations. It also explored how friends of both the classes, foreign and local, use adjacency pairs to establish rapport, express agreement or disagreement, seek information, and engage in a friendly manner in their naturally occurring informal talk. Moreover, the study also investigated instances where adjacency pairs are disrupted or subverted, and the strategies friends employed to navigate these deviations. Other than turn taking and adjacency pairs, Cooperative principles, is also one of the important aspects of conversational analysis. Based on Grice's framework, cooperative principle governs effective communication by emphasizing maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner (Grice, 1975). The current research thus examined how both local and foreign groups of friends adhered to or deviated from these principles during their conversational information in their naturally occurring informal conversation. It also investigated whether friends from both the groups of class provided accurate, truthful and relevant information, avoided excessive or insufficient contributions, and used appropriate language and tone in order to maintain a cooperative conversational environment.

Statement of the Problem

The issue addressed in this research is the need to analyze and understand the various aspects of Conversational Analysis of talk among friends, comprising both foreign and native friends, studying BS English at NUML University, Islamabad, Pakistan. The study aims to apply the Harvey Sack and Emanuel Schegloff model of Conversational Analysis and Paul Grice model of Cooperative Principle to investigate specific elements and strategies employed by both the class of friends to manage turn taking, examine the different patterns of turn allocation, and analyze how interruptions and overlaps are handled. Furthermore, the research investigates the occurrence and functions of adjacency pairs in the informal talk among friends, particularly their role in establishing friendly discourse and managing its disruptions within these interactions. Additionally, the study seeks to assess how friends adhere to or deviate from cooperative principles, including the provision of accurate and relevant information during conversations. Thus, to achieve its goal this research utilizes qualitative methods, such as audio recordings and transcriptions of naturally occurring conversations, in order to capture and analyze the dynamics of these interactions. The ultimate goal is to gain a comprehensive understanding of conversation analysis within

the context of close friendships and its broader implications for sociolinguistics and communication studies.

Research Objectives

The research objectives of this study are designed to comprehensively analyze informal talk among both local and foreign groups of friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan, focusing on the three key aspects of conversational analysis: turn taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principles. By addressing these aspects, this study aims to deepen our understanding of the different dynamics and implications of conversations within close-knit social circles.

1. To analyze and investigate comparatively the naturally occurring informal talk among both local and foreign groups of friends, the transition of turns, notion of interruptions, overlaps, and other aspects of turn-taking and to determine its general patterns and to explore whether certain friends dominate the conversation or if turn allocation is balanced.
2. To investigate common patterns of adjacency pairs, and to explore the utilization of it in both local and foreign groups, talk of friends studying at NUML University, Islamabad, Pakistan, in their naturally occurring conversation in order to express agreement, disagreement, seek information, relation of disruption and subversions.
3. To examine the application of cooperative principles, especially adherence to or deviations from the cooperative principles of truthfulness, relevance, manner, and clarity and to explore how both local and foreign groups of friends manage potential misunderstandings and maintain a cooperative conversational environment in a naturally occurring conversation.

Research Questions

1. How do groups of both local and foreign friends of BS English at NUML University Islamabad manage turn taking in their naturally occurring informal conversations, and what are the underlying patterns and strategies employed within these interactions such as dynamics of turn allocation, distribution, negotiations, interruptions or overlaps in turn taking?
2. What are the common patterns, occurrences and functions of adjacency pairs in informal conversations among both local and foreign groups of friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad Pakistan, and how do they initiate and respond, deviate or disrupt in order to establish and maintain rapport in these pairings?
3. How do both foreign and local groups of friends of BS English, studying at NUML University Islamabad Pakistan, in their naturally occurring informal conversations adhere to or deviate from cooperative principles

such as from the principles of truthfulness, relevance, quantity, and manner in order to not only navigate the potential misunderstandings but to maintain a sense of cooperativeness within the bounds of naturally occurring friendship discourse?

By addressing these research questions, this study aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics and implications of talk among both local and foreign groups of friends, studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan, contributing to the existing body of knowledge in friendship discourse.

Significance of the Study

Analyzing talk among both local and foreign groups of friends, specifically focusing on turn taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principles, holds significance in several key aspects. It advances knowledge in informal communication, providing insights into the dynamics of conversations within friendships. The study contributes to understanding friendship dynamics, uncovering power dynamics and equality, revealing patterns of interaction, and enhancing cooperative communication. Furthermore, the findings have practical applications in communication skills training, aiding individuals in improving their communication competence and fostering positive social relationships.

Literature Review

Examining talk among both local and foreign groups of friends (students) of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan and investigating the aspects of turn taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principles within the boundaries of conversational analysis offers valuable insights into the dynamics of informal conversations within a specific cultural and educational context. This chapter based upon literature review provides an overview of key studies and findings related to each of the aspects.

Basic Concepts:

Turn Taking: Turn-taking is a key aspect of conversational analysis that usually facilitates effective communication and interaction encompassing the rules and practices that govern the allocation of speaking opportunities among participants. This phenomenon has been extensively studied by researchers such as Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, whose seminal work in the 1970s laid the foundation for the analysis of turn-taking in conversation. Their findings revealed that turn-taking is not arbitrary but follows systematic patterns, involving cues and signals used by participants to initiate, hold, and relinquish the floor (1974). Further they argued that the study of turn-taking provides valuable insights into the organization and dynamics of human interaction, highlighting the intricate mechanisms through which participants engage in collaborative and cooperative conversation.

Adjacency Pair: As mentioned above, Conversation Analysis is a field of study focused on analyzing naturally occurring talk-in-interaction, and has identified various

structural and sequential features that shape conversations. One important concept within this framework is that of adjacency pairs (Sacks, 1974). Adjacency pairs refer to the sequential relationship between two utterances that are closely linked and occur one after the other in conversation. Sacks (1974) proposed that adjacency pairs consist of a first pair part and a second pair part. These pairs are structured in a specific way, with the first pair inviting or expecting a particular type of response, and the second pair providing that response. For example, a greeting such as "Hello" (FPP) is typically followed by a reciprocating greeting like "Hi" (SPP) (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973).

Cooperative Principles

Cooperative principle is also a vital aspect of conversational analysis and thus crucial for effective communication in pragmatics. Proposed by Grice (1975) in his influential work "Logic and Conversation" (1975), it encompasses the maxims of truthfulness, relevance, quantity, and manner in communication. According to the Cooperative Principle, in a conversation, participants are expected to make their contributions relevant, informative, truthful, and clear in order to achieve successful communication.

Various Approaches:

Conversational Style: Analysis of talk among friends utilizes various approaches to gain comprehensive insights into the dynamics and characteristics of these interactions. The first one, Ethnomethodology, as introduced by Garfinkel (1967), focuses on the understanding of the methods and practices individuals employ to make sense of their social world. This approach examines how friends construct meaning and social order through their talk. Interactional sociolinguistics, is the second approach which, influenced by Gumperz (1982), explores the influence of social factors on conversational interactions among friends. It analyzes how language is used to negotiate identities, establish solidarity, and display social hierarchies. Discourse analysis is the third approach, as outlined by Fairclough (1992), delves into the broader social, cultural, and political contexts that shape conversation. It often investigates how friends use language to construct and negotiate social realities, ideologies, and power relations. Conversation analysis is the fourth approach, pioneered by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974), involves detailed examination of naturally occurring talk, focusing on turn-taking patterns, repair mechanisms, and the use of conversational devices. Sociolinguistic variation is the fifth approach, as studied by Labov (1972), investigates linguistic variations among friends, exploring how language use varies across different social groups and contexts, contributing to social meaning and group identity. Lastly, corpus linguistics, a methodological approach employed by McEnery and Wilson (2001), involves the collection and quantitative analysis of large corpora of spoken or written texts, enabling the identification of patterns and trends in conversation among friends. By utilizing these diverse approaches, researchers can develop a comprehensive understanding of naturally occurring talk among friends in different contexts.

Previous Research

Turn-taking: While there is limited research specifically focused on conversations among both local and foreign groups of friends(students) studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan, however, studies in related contexts provide valuable insights. For instance, studies by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) and Stivers et al. (2009) explored turn-taking mechanisms in various conversational settings, highlighting the role of visual cues, prosody, and body language in signaling turn transitions. These studies provide a foundation for understanding turn-taking patterns and dynamics, which can be applied to the informal conversations among both local and foreign groups of friends (students) studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) conducted pioneering research on turn-taking in conversation, introducing the concept of "turn constructional units", and the principle of "next-speaker self-selection." They observed that in conversation participants tend to adhere to a set of tacit rules that govern the transition from one speaker to another. Further studies have explored the role of prosody in turn-taking. For instance, De Ruiter, Mitterer, and Enfield (2006) examined the role of pitch and timing cues in signaling the end of a speaker's turn and the potential transition to another speaker. They found that speakers often use rising intonation patterns to indicate a continuation of their turn, while falling intonation patterns tend to mark the end of a turn. Other research has focused on the role of nonverbal cues in turn-taking. Stivers et al. (2009) investigated the use of gaze direction and head movement as signals for turn-taking in multi-party conversations. They found that participants frequently used visual cues, such as brief glances or head nods, to indicate their intention to take the next turn. Furthermore, conversational context and cultural factors also play a significant role in turn-taking dynamics. Pomerantz (1984) highlighted the importance of "preferred responses" in shaping turn allocation. Participants often design their turns in anticipation of a particular type of response, which can influence when and how they yield the floor to another speaker. Moreover, technological advancements have allowed researchers to investigate turn-taking in computer-mediated communication. Herring (1999) examined turn-taking patterns in text-based online chat rooms and identified differences compared to face-to-face conversations. In text-based settings, turn-taking can be influenced by factors such as typing speed, message length, and the use of explicit turn markers like emotes or ellipses. By understanding these mechanisms, researchers can gain valuable insights into human communication and contribute to the development of more natural and effective conversational agents. The findings from these previous researches can be applied to understand how rules of turn-taking function within their naturally occurring informal conversations among both local and foreign groups of friends (students) studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Adjacency Pairs: Researchers have examined various types of adjacency pairs in different contexts. Jefferson (1984) explored repair sequences, which involve FPPs

signaling trouble in understanding and SPPs providing clarification. Other studies have focused on question-answer pairs (Heritage, 1984), compliments and acknowledgments (Pomerantz, 1978), and requests and responses (Holtgraves, 1990). The sequential organization of adjacency pairs plays a crucial role in maintaining conversational coherence and accomplishing social actions. Sidnell (2011) argued that adjacency pairs contribute to the overall flow and structure of conversations by establishing expectations and guiding participants' next turns. Furthermore, Schegloff (2007) emphasized the importance of adjacency pairs in the management of social actions and the negotiation of conversational rights and obligations. **Basic Structure and Types of Adjacency Pairs:** The basic structure of adjacency pairs consists of an initiating turn followed by a responding turn (Schegloff, 1968). Several researchers have identified various types of adjacency pairs, including question-answer pairs (Sacks et al., 1974), greetings-responses pairs (Brown & Levinson, 1987), complaint-apology pairs (Curl & Drew, 2008), and request-grant pairs (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). Each type of adjacency pair serves distinct communicative purposes and exhibits specific structural characteristics.

Functions and Interactional Significance: Adjacency pairs play a crucial role in maintaining conversational coherence and achieving mutual understanding between participants (Schegloff, 1972). They serve as fundamental units of conversation, allowing for the negotiation of meaning, expression of social roles, and management of conversational asymmetry (Tannen, 1981). Studies have also highlighted the role of adjacency pairs in the construction of social identity and power dynamics within interactions (Pomerantz, 1984). Also, cross-cultural studies have shown that adjacency pairs exhibit variations in different cultural and linguistic contexts (Levinson, 1992). Politeness strategies, conversational norms, and speech acts may influence the deployment and interpretation of adjacency pairs (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Understanding these pragmatic implications is essential for effective intercultural communication and language teaching. The study of adjacency pairs thus offers valuable insights into the organization and dynamics of conversation, shedding light on the intricacies of verbal interactions. These studies have shown how friends employ adjacency pairs to navigate conversational expectations, express agreement, disagreement, and engage in social bonding. These findings from previous research can be applied to understand how adjacency pairs function within conversations among both local and foreign groups of friends (students) studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Cooperative Principle: Numerous studies have explored and expanded Grice's Cooperative Principle, examining its application in various contexts and languages. For instance, Clark and Marshall (1981) conducted an experiment to investigate the role of the Cooperative Principle in children's understanding of indirect requests. They found that children aged 5 to 8 gradually developed an awareness of indirect requests and the importance of implicature, which is a key aspect of the Cooperative Principle.

Another line of research has explored how the Cooperative Principle operates in computer-mediated communication. In their study, Herring et al. (2002) examined how participants in an online discussion forum adhered to the Cooperative Principle. They found that while participants generally followed the principle by providing relevant and informative contributions, violations and misunderstandings occasionally occurred due to the lack of nonverbal cues and the asynchronous nature of the medium. Furthermore, the Cooperative Principle has been analyzed in intercultural communication. An example of such research is the work of Gudykunst (2003), who investigated how cultural norms and values influence the application of the Cooperative Principle. His findings revealed that different cultures may have varying expectations regarding directness, politeness, and the level of information shared, leading to potential challenges in cross-cultural communication. Thus the Cooperative Principle has been extensively studied and applied across different domains. These studies have contributed to our understanding of how this principle operates in various contexts, shedding light on the intricacies of effective communication. (Clark & Marshall, 1981; Grice, 1975; Gudykunst, 2003; Herring et al., 2002). These studies demonstrate how friends strategically use cooperative principles to negotiate meaning, manage conversations, and establish social bonds. Also these studies provide a cultural lens for understanding how cooperative principles manifest in conversations in the context of both local and foreign groups of friends (students) at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan.

While there is a dearth of literature directly examining naturally informal conversations among both foreign and local groups of friends at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan drawing from related studies and adapting the findings to the specific context can contribute to understanding the dynamics of talk among both local and foreign groups of friends in setting of NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan. There is still room for further research that could be conducted specifically to address and analyze the the naturally occurring informal conversations or talk among both foreign and local friends studying at NUML University Islamabad, utilizing qualitative research methods such as audio recording and transcription to gather first hand data and analysis which can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities of conversations among friends.

Research Methodology: This section elucidates the research methodology encompassing the design of the study, theoretical underpinnings, target population, sampling strategy, and the methods employed for data collection and subsequent analysis in the present investigation.

Research Design: To achieve the research objectives and answer the research questions, this study employed a qualitative research design which is assumed to be the most suitable for this study. Qualitative methods were used to capture and analyze naturally occurring conversations among both local and foreign groups of friends(students) studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan. The use of audio recordings and

transcriptions allowed for detailed analysis of the conversational dynamics, including turn taking, adjacency pairs, and the application of cooperative principles.

Theoretical Framework: For the comparative analysis of naturally occurring talk among both foreign and local friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Harvey Sacks conceptual framework of Conversation Analysis and its different aspects such as 'Turn Taking', 'Adjacency Pairs', and Grice's Cooperative Principles is adopted. Conversation Analysis is an influential approach to the study of language use that investigates the structure and organization of naturally occurring talk in interaction. It was originally developed by the sociologist Harvey Sacks along with Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson in the 1960s who were influenced by Ethnomethodology, a sociological approach that examines how people create and maintain social order in everyday naturally occurring interactions. Hutchby and Woofitt (1998) , two most prolific scholars in the field of sociology defined conversation analysis in their seminal work, 'Conversation Analysis'(1998) as a method of analyzing the detailed structure of talk in naturally occurring conversation, focusing on how speakers organize their talk and how listeners orient themselves to it. Moreover, Harvey Sacks, one of the key founders of Conversation Analysis defined it in his magnum opus 'Lectures On Conversation Volume One and Two (1992) as the study of organization in talk, and of the ways in which speakers and recipients use language resources to accomplish social actions in interactions.

Turn Taking: Turn talking is another fundamental aspect of Conversation Analysis which refers to the rules that governs how participants in a conversation take turns. It examines how conversation is organized. Harvey Sacks (1974) was the first scholar who studied the concept of Turn taking in English telephone conversations and group talks. However, Cook (1989) argued that the mechanism of turn taking may vary across cultures or language. It was observed in the English speaking societies that turn taking involves one speaker at a time. The first speaker speaks and then stops followed by the next speaker, and so on. This conversational pattern looks like ABABAB. Harvey Sack (1974) argued that the rule governing turn taking serves as local management system for speaker to share the scarce resource of the right to speak and being listened to, known as the floor. Also, the turn taking construction units, which can be sentences, clauses, or phrases, are the minimal units that speakers use to take turns. Speakers mark the end of their turn construction unit with Prosodic features such as intonation. In addition, according to the theorists of turn taking, the turn taking rules govern how speaker change and share the floor during the conversation. Its rules include: when speaker A is speaking and selects the next speaker B in his or her turn, then A must stop speaking, and B must speak next. Also, if A does not select B, any other party may self-select, and the first speaker to do so gains the right to the floor. Lastly, if no one self selects, A may continue speaking or yield the floor to someone else.

Adjacency Pairs: Adjacency pairs is also one of the significant aspects of Conversation Analysis that is proposed by the Sociologist such as Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff in the 1970s. In conversation analysis, adjacency pairs refers to the sequential pattern of conversational exchanges where one utterance is directly followed by a related response. In other words, adjacency pairs is a sequence of two utterances, where the second speaker responds to the greeting, request, question, complaint, or an offer of the first speaker either in preferred or dispreferred way. According to Sacks, and Schegloff, preferred responses are typically brief and less complex and they usually conform to the expectations of the speaker initiating the request. For instance, if a speaker asks, 'can you pass me the salt?', the preferred response of the second speaker would be, 'Sure, here you go.' The second speaker response in this case meets the expectations of the first speaker, and the conversation smoothly moves forward. On the other hand, dispreferred responses are complex and long as they do not meet the expectations of the first speaker initiating the request. For instance, if the first speaker asks that, 'can you work on the assignment tonight', to which the second speaker would respond in a dispreferred way such as, 'Uhh.. I am planning on going to a concert tonight, and I don't think that I can make it.' Thus, it is a dispreferred response as it requires additional information which can delay or disrupt the conversation. Thus, adjacency pair is an important aspect of conversation analysis which help to maintain the flow and coherence of a naturally occurring conversation.

Cooperative Principle: Cooperative principles, based on Grice's framework, guide effective communication by emphasizing principles of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. These principles were first proposed by the British Philosopher of language Paul Grice in his masterpiece essay, 'Logic and Conversation'. Grice argued in his essay that "make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." (Logic And Conversation, 1975). Meaning that in a conversation, a speaker should provide information that is relevant to the topic at hand and must contribute to the conversation in a way that aligns with its purpose and direction. In other words, speakers should provide information that must help to move the conversation forward and stay on the topic. Friends in any informal naturally occurring talk often strive to adhere to these principles in order to facilitate mutual understanding and maintain a cooperative conversational environment. By providing accurate and relevant information, avoiding excessive or insufficient contributions, and using appropriate language and tone, friends enhance the effectiveness of their communication. Analyzing how friends employ cooperative principles in their conversations reveals the role of shared expectations and social norms in shaping the dynamics of friendly discourse.

To answer research questions, the researcher has taken two informal instances of a naturally occurring conversation of both foreign and local groups of friends studying at NUML University, Islamabad, Pakistan, in the form of audio recording and has

analyzed it manually, following Harvey Sack, Emanuel A. Schegloff theoretical framework of Conversation analysis(1974) and it's different aspects such as turn taking,and adjacency pairs, along with Grice Cooperative Principles to see general patterns, similarities and differences.

Participants: The participants in this study consisted of both local and foreign groups (four friends in each) of friends or students of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan. The researcher obtained informed consent from the participants of both the groups for audio recording their conversations. Further the participants were informed about the purpose of the study.

Data Collection: Audio recordings of naturally occurring informal conversations among the participants of both the groups were collected over a specific period of time. The conversations took place in informal settings, such as cafes of university campus where friends often engage in relaxed and spontaneous informal talk. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided informed consent for the audio recording of their conversations. The transcripts were then analyzed using conversational analysis techniques, focusing on turn taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principles.

Data Analysis Methods: The analysis of the data followed the principles of conversational analysis, specifically drawing on the models proposed by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Paul Grice. The transcribed conversations were then comparatively examined by the researcher for determining the patterns of turn taking, including the strategies used by both foreign and local friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan to signal the end of their speaking turn and initiate the next speaker's turn in order to see the differences and similarities and also to see organization of the talk among friends. The allocation of turns and potential dominance within the conversation were also explored. Furthermore, the occurrence and functions of adjacency pairs were also comparatively analyzed by the researcher of both the foreign and local groups of friends studying at Numl University Islamabad, Pakistan, identifying common patterns and variations among both local and foreign groups of friends in informal talk in order to determine how friends in both groups initiate and respond to these pairs in their respective naturally occurring conversation. The ways in which adjacency pairs contribute to establishing rapport, expressing agreement or disagreement, seeking information, and engaging in a friendship manner were examined. Instances of disruption or subversion of adjacency pairs and the strategies employed by friends to navigate these deviations were also analyzed. Moreover, the application of cooperative principles in conversations among both foreign and local friends studying at NUML University was comparatively examined by the researcher focusing on adherence to or deviations from the principles of truthfulness, relevance, quantity, and manner. The provision of accurate and relevant information, the avoidance of excessive or insufficient contributions, and the use of appropriate language and tone were analyzed in order to understand how friends

maintain a cooperative conversational environment in these two different naturally occurring conversations.

Analysis: Conversation I: An informal instance of a naturally occurring conversation among four local friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Speaker (A): Where have you been? We haven't seen you for days?

Speaker B: He is a landlord... hmmm.. Isn't it? Why would he talk to us?

Speaker (C): That's not the case. But...

Speaker D: Oh common. We all know you very well.

Speaker C: Would you people please listen to me?

Speaker A: No.

Speaker D: Today we won't listen to any explanation.

Speaker C: Just listen to...

Speaker A: No. You are not allowed to speak.

Speaker C: For God's sake. Try to understand. Let me...

Speaker B//// A: Understand what !!

Speaker B: I mean, we all are Jobian but we...

Speaker D: Ok, forget everything. Now, you give us a treat.

Speaker C: Is this the only solution?

Speaker D/A: Yes, my Lord.

Speaker C: Are you people sure?

Speaker A/ D/ B: We are dead sure.

Speaker C: What do you people want in treat by the way?

Speaker B: A private jet for each of us... hahaha.

Speaker D: Kidding. Tea

Speaker C: Here we go. There comes tea.

Speaker A: By the way, what about ahhhhhh... a short trip to Murree next weekend?

Speaker D//B: Sounds great.

Speaker C: I must run now.

Speaker A: Why ahhh... are you such a boring person?

Speaker C: I am James Bond. Hahaha

Speaker D: Do you have money? Or...

Speaker B: Oh common on... I told you uh he is a landlord.

Speaker C: Ok. Let's rock and roll next week.

Investigating Turn Taking

Initiation and allocation of the turn in any naturally occurring conversation is most of the time related to the power dynamics and often reveal the relative power of the speakers. In particular, in any naturally occurring conversation, it can reveal how power and status are negotiated and maintained in a conversational setting. In other words, those who have more power are more likely to take the turn in the group talk,

disrupt the conversation or keep the charge of the floor for a longer period of time. One such example can be observed in the above conversation.

9.1.2 Interruption

For instance, in the very first utterance, initiated by the first speaker A, who asks from Speaker C that where he was as they have not seen him for days, speaker B interrupt speaker C and takes the charge of the floor without even allowing speaker C to respond to the utterance of the Speaker A, which shows direct reflection and display of power that to whom it belongs in this naturally occurring conversation.

(Asad (A) : Where have you been? We haven't seen you for days?

Speaker B : He is a landlord... hmmm.. Isn't it? Why would he talk to us?

Also in the very second construction unit of the above conversation where speaker C tries to respond to the utterance of speaker A, he was again interrupted by speaker D which as a result it also shows that the charge of the floor always lies in the hands of those who hold more power in the conversation.

Nadeem (C): That's not the case. But...

Umar : Oh common. We all know you very well.

Instances of interruption can also be seen in the above conversation as the speaker C is time and again interrupted by the other speakers not allowing him to speak shows that whosoever has the power holds the charge of the floor in any naturally occurring conversation.

Speaker C : Just listen to...

Speaker C : Let me...

Overlapping: Rules that governs turn taking ensure that only one speaker must speak at a time but overlapping may occur when speakers in any naturally occurring conversation tries to compete with one another in order start their turn or when the transition relevance place is misprojected or when speakers tries to respond to the utterance of the other speaker together out of enthusiasm overlapping happens which as a result also causes interruption in the conversation. Following are the transitional units that show overlapping occurring in the naturally occurring talk among the local friends of BS English studying at the NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan.

C: For God's sake. Try to understand. Let me...

B/A: Understand what..!

N: Is this the only solution?

D/A : Yes, my Lord.

C: Are you people sure?

A/ D/ B : We are dead sure.

Transition of Turns among speakers: Furthermore, the transition of turns among the local group of friends of BS English studying at the NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan, be it initiation or the ending of turn doesn't embrace at all the rules of turn taking for a smooth and healthy interplay of discourse in their conversation. Therefore, interruption is seen most often.

No Specific Theme: No constant theme is followed in the naturally occurring talk among the local group of friends studying at the NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan. Sometimes different speakers inquire their fellow speaker for his not seen for days, at other times they request treats from him and also at other instances they can be seen discussing trips to Murree. Such examples of constructional units in the above conversation shows that no constant theme is being followed in the conversation. The above informal instance of a naturally occurring conversation among a local group of friends of BS English studying at NUML UNIVERSITY Islamabad, Pakistan,

Adjacency Pairs: In the above naturally occurring informal instance of conversation among local groups of Friends studying at NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan, adjacency pairs like Question-Answer have been used for seeking information. The Question-Answer pair, throughout the conversation among local groups of friends at NUML University Islamabad in the above instance, contains both preferred and dis-preferred responses. For instance, one such example of preferred adjacency pairs is given below:

Speaker C: Is this the only solution?

Speaker D/ A: Yes, my Lord.

Speaker C : Are you people sure?

Speaker A/ B/ D : We are dead sure.

Additionally, dis-preferred responses are also in abundance as compared to the preferred ones in the above conversation which also shows the lack of structure and organization among the talk of the local group of friends of BS English studying at NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan. Few examples of dis-preferred adjacency pairs are illustrated below:

Speaker C: What do you people want in treat by the way?

Speaker B: A private jet for each of us... hahaha.

Speaker A: By the way, what about ahhhhhh... a short trip to Murree next weekend?

Speaker C: I must run now.

Speaker A: Why ahhh... are you such a boring person?

Speaker C: I am James Bond. Hahaha

Moreover, subversion and disruption in the above instance of conversation can also be observed which eventually reflects that there is no proper flow and structure in the talk among the local group of friends of BS English studying at NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan. For instance, as speaker A asks from Speaker C for his 'not seen' for days, speaker B and D disrupts the talk in between and does not allow speaker C to respond as it can be seen in the given utterances of the conversation.

Speaker (A) : Where have you been? We haven't seen you for days?

Speaker (B) : He is a landlord... hmmm.. Isn't it? Why would he talk to us?

Speaker (C): That's not the case. But...

Speaker (D) : Oh common. We all know you very well.

Furthermore, categories of adjacency Pairs like Request-Denial and Agreement/Disagreement have also been witnessed in the above talk among local group of friends of BS English studying at NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan.

Agreement- Disagreement Pair

Speaker C: Is this the only solution?

Speaker A/ D: Yes, my Lord.

This is the perfect example of agreement adjacency Pairs where speaker C tries to clarify from the other speakers and the speaker A and D say yes in response.

Request - Denial

Speaker A : By the way, what about ahhhhhh...a short trip to Murree next weekend?

Speaker A : I must run now.

In the above adjacency pairs, speaker C disagrees with speaker A for having a trip to Murree next weekend and answers him in a dis-preferred way.

Request-Denial: Request-denial pair of adjacency pair can also be seen in the above category of adjacency pairs where speaker A denies the request of speaker C listening to him.

Speaker C : Would you people please listen to me?

Speaker A: No.

Cooperative Principle: In the above naturally occurring talk among a local group of friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan, maxims of cooperative principle has both violated but followed as well in order to build the cooperativeness in the conversation. For instance, Speaker (B) violates the third maxim of Relation by interrupting speaker C adding a sarcasm to the discussion irreverently and by forcefully taking the floor although as he is not invited by any of the speaker to speak on the behalf of speaker C to pass a comment, still he takes the floor and tries to pass his judgment; he just violates the maxim of relation which is being relevant when asked as it is mentioned in the conversation as :

Speaker (A) : Where have you been? We haven't seen you for days?

Speaker (B) : He is a landlord.. hmmm.. Isn't it? Why would he talk to us?

Speaker C should have given a chance to speak but speaker B not only disrupts speaker C but also speaks irrelevant which eventually shows non cooperative behavior on his behalf in the conversation. Further in the conversation when the speaker C requests to other speakers as “would you people please listen to me?” then speaker A replies as “no ” which is actually not only too blunt but too little as information and lacks a valid reason and therefore it is the violation of the second maxim of cooperative principles which is the principle of quantity. He does not mention the exact reason why he does not want to listen to speaker C. Later, speaker D answers the same question in this way “today we won't listen to any explanation.”, which can also be taken as a violation of relation. Speaker C is asking if they will listen to him or not, however the response of speaker D here is completely irrelevant.

Speaker C : Would you people please listen to me?

Speaker A : No.

Speaker D : Today we won't listen to any explanation.

Furthermore, in the above naturally occurring conversation, maxim of quantity, relation and of manner are followed by giving enough but not much information, by giving relevant information, and by being brief and orderly in order to build a sense of cooperativeness in the conversation among the local group of friends of BS English studying at NUML university Islamabad, Pakistan as it is evident in the following example.

Speaker C : Is this the only solution?

Speaker A//D : Yes, my Lord.

Speaker C : Are you people sure?

Speaker A/ B/ D : We are dead sure.

However, going down in the conversation, it can be observed that three of the maxims of cooperative principles are being violated by different speakers or local group of friends where speaker C asks other friends about what they want to have in their food to which speaker B replies irrelevantly by saying that a private jet, which as a result is a direct violation of maxim of relation, quality , and manner as he is not only being irrelevant in his response but also obscure as well as it is evident in the below few utterances:

Speaker C : What do you people want in treat by the way?

Speaker B : A private jet for each of us... hahaha.

Moreover, when speaker A asks his colleagues about the next trip, speaker C responds not only irrelevantly but also obscurely and lies about his real intention as well which is a reflection of the violation of Maxim of quality, relation and manner. Also, further in the above instance, speaker C also responds to the query of speaker A in a totally irrelevant manner and adds obscurity to the conversation. Such responses on the behalf of different participants in the group although disturbs the sense of cooperativeness in the conversation but also triggers them to understand the hidden or intended meaning.

Speaker A : By the way, what about ahhhhhh... a short trip to Murree next weekend?

Speaker C : I must run now.

A : Why ahhh... are you such a boring person?

C: I am James Bond. Hahaha

Instance 02: Friends Talk Among Foreigners at NUML Islamabad, Pakistan

Friend 1: Hey guys ... uhh...Have you all read the novel "The Reluctant Fundamentalist"?

Friend 2: Yep, I have. It's thought-provoking.

Friend 3: Why are you asking? And what's it about?

Friend 1: ahhh .. not like something special... but you know I read a lot.

Friend 4 : hmm...Is it written by Salman Rushdie? Or...

Friend 1: NO. Actually it's a Pakistani American writer. Mohsen Hamid. And it's about a Pakistani man...

Friend 2 : ...About a Pakistani man named Changez. Isn't it?

Friend 1 : Great guess, I must say.

Friend 2 : yes...haha.. I knew it.

Friend 4: Does it deal with identity and cultural conflict? Just a guess by the way.

Friend 2: Yes, Changez struggles with his Pakistani identity in America and Pakistan as well. Like a mongrel he feels everywhere.

Friend 3: / 4 : Interesting.

Friend 3: How does Changez develop?

Friend 1: Eating Popcorn.

Friend 4 : He becomes disillusioned with America and questions his values.

Friend 3: Adding it to my reading list.

Friend 1: Worth a read, thought-provoking.

Friend 4: Let's discuss it once we finish. How's that?

Friend 2: Great plan, looking forward to it.

Friend 3: Excited to explore the themes.

Friend 1: Love discussing books with you all.

Friend 4: Our conversations add depth.

Friend 2: Cheers to that! Our next adventure.

Friend 3: Cheers! Can't wait.

Investigating Turn taking: In the above naturally occurring conversation among the foreign group of friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, the transition of turn taking seems to have a cooperative pattern, where each participant takes turns to contribute their thoughts and ideas in a friendly manner. For instance, there is no significant interruption or dominance of a single individual. The conversation flows smoothly, with each participant being given an equal opportunity to express their thoughts and perspectives. However, there is a minor instance of interruption in the above conversation among foreign groups of friends when the Speaker (4) asks about the author of the novel. So, speaker (1) interrupts and corrects their assumption about Salman Rushdie being the author. However, this interruption does not lead to a disruption in the conversation, and it is quickly resolved as it can be seen in the following example:

Speaker 4 : hmm...Is it written by Mehmood Darwaish? Or...

Speaker 1: NO. Actually it's a Pakistani American writer, Mohsin Hamid. And it's about a Pakistani man...

Speaker 2 : ...About a Pakistani man named Changez. Isn't it?

Speaker 1 : Great guess, I must say.

Speaker 2 : yes...haha.. I knew it.

Thus, only a single interruption is witnessed throughout the whole conversation, however it is productive in nature and is not causing any disruption in the conversation. Furthermore, in the above naturally occurring conversation among foreign group of

friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, it appears that all the participants are having a friendly and equal relationship with each other. No participant is trying to dominate the other. There is no evident power dynamic or hierarchy in the conversation. The participants engage in a lighthearted and amicable manner, sharing their thoughts, making guesses, and appreciating each other's contributions.

Speaker 1: Love discussing books with you all.

Speaker 4: Our conversations add depth.

Speaker 2: Cheers to that! Our next adventure.

Speaker 3: Cheers! Can't wait.

Moreover, the transition of turns among foreign friends is very organized and according to the rules. Proper use of turn initiation, ending, and self-allocation helps in making the conversation more productive and purposeful. Turn initiation and turn have been used according to the rules and are highly productive in building up the conversation, following the same theme.

Overlapping: Additionally, In the above naturally occurring conversation among foreign groups of friends, there is also an example of overlapping, which usually occurs when two or more speakers talk simultaneously or when one speaker interrupts another before they have finished speaking as it evident in the above instance of conversation

Speaker 4: Does it deal with identity and cultural conflict? Just a guess by the way.

Speaker 2: Yes, Changez struggles with his Pakistani identity in America and Pakistan as well. Like a mongrel he feels everywhere.

Speaker 3: / 4 : Interesting.

Through the close examination, we can observe that in this part of the conversation, both the speaker 3 and speaker 4 respond simultaneously with the word "Interesting." This simultaneous response creates a moment of overlap, as both friends want to express their interest in the topic at the same time. Although, It is a brief interruption, however it does not disrupt the flow of the conversation significantly. It must be kept in mind that overlapping often happens when speakers are eager to contribute out of enthusiasm or when there is a momentary lapse in turn-taking norms. However, in this case, it appears to be a minor interruption that does not seemingly affect the overall interaction or the participant's understanding of the conversation. Also, in the above naturally occurring informal conversation among foreign friends studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan, a single theme revolves around throughout the whole discussion. For instance, the theme of discussing the novel "The Reluctant Fundamentalist" seems to remain constant throughout the conversation. All the participants seem to engage in a purposeful discussion about the book, sharing their thoughts, guesses, and insights about the author, the protagonist, and the themes of identity and cultural conflict. There seems to be no significant digressions from the main topic, and the conversation revolves around their interest in the novel and their plans to read and discuss it further. This focused and cohesive discussion showcases a

shared purpose among the foreign group of friends and their enthusiasm for exploring the themes presented in the book.

Adjacency pairs: In the above instance of conversation among foreign group of friend's various categories or sequences of Adjacency pairs such as Question-Answers, request-denial, agreement-disagreement, invitation-acceptance have also been observed.

Question-answer: For instance, of many, there is one example of a question-answer pair in the above conversation, where speaker 3 asks about the personality development of the protagonist Changez in the novel *Reluctant Fundamentalists*: "How does Changez develop?"; to which speaker 4 replies: "He becomes disillusioned with America and questions his values.

Invitation-acceptance: Also, the category of Invitation-Acceptance of pairs has also been observed. For instance, when the speaker 4 asks other participants that "Let's discuss it once we finish. How's that?"; to which the speaker 2 responds, Great plan, looking forward to it.

Agreement-disagreement: In the naturally occurring informal conversation, an example of Agreement-disagreement Adjacency pair has also been noted. For example, when the speaker 1 asks his fellow participants that "Hey guys..uhh...Have you all read the novel *'The Reluctant Fundamentalist'*?" ; to which one of the participants 2 replies, "Yep, I have. It's thought-provoking."

Request-denial: Pair of Request-Denial can also be seen in the above conversation among the foreign group of friends. For instance, when speaker 3 inquires, speaker 1 is asking about the novel to which speaker 1 replies that:

Speaker 1: ahhh.. not like something special... but you know I read a lot.

Also in Question-Answer pairs the preferred responses are high in number as compared to dis-preferred ones in the talk among foreign groups which is indicative of the factor that all the participants are engaged in an organized and cooperative manner following a single and a constant theme of discussion. One such example of it is given below

Preferred-dis-preferred:

Speaker 3: Does it deal with identity and cultural conflict? Just a guess by the way.

Speaker 2: Yes, Changez struggles with his Pakistani identity in America and Pakistan as well. Like a mongrel, he feels everywhere.

The above is a perfect example of a preferred response.

The Cooperative Principle: In the above naturally occurring conversation among foreign friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan, various maxims of the cooperative principles are being followed as well as violated in order to not only built the sense of cooperativeness in the conversation but to provide an opportunity to the friends involved in the conversation to understand the intended or hidden meaning of each other. The Maxim is the 'Maxim of Quality' which says that speakers should provide truthful and accurate information. For instance, in the above conversation, the speaker 4 asks speaker 1 if the novel is written by Salman Rushdie, to which speaker 1 responds honestly by denying it and providing the correct

information that it's written by Mohsin Hamid. So here, Maxim of quality has been followed. Furthermore, 'Maxim of Quantity' in cooperative principle means to Provide sufficient information, neither too much nor too little. For instance, in the above conversation the speaker 2 follows this maxim by giving a concise answer when confirming that the novel is about a Pakistani man named Changez. Moreover, Maxim of Relation means 'Be relevant and stay on the topic. Examples of it can be observed in the conversation as speaker 4 adheres to this maxim by asking if the novel deals with identity and cultural conflict, which is directly related to the topic of the book. Maxim of relation is also violated when speaker 3 is asked about 'How does Changez develop? ; to which speaker 1 replies by 'Eating Popcorn', because the speaker 1 here is not being relevant here at all. And it can be considered as an example of Maxim of manner as the speaker is obscure in his approach while answering speaker the other speaker. In addition, 'Maxim of Manner' means to 'Be clear, brief, and avoid ambiguity or obscurity. Example of it can also be observed in the above talk among foreign friends as the speaker 1 violates this maxim by responding with "ahhh.. not like something special... but you know I read a lot," which is an unclear and vague statement. To conclude, the conversation generally follows the cooperative principle, with friends providing truthful and relevant information while attempting to stay on topic. However, there are a few instances where the maxim of manner is not strictly adhered to, leading to ambiguous or unclear responses.

9.3 Table.I Comparing Friends Talk between Local Friends and Foreigners’ Friends at NUML Islamabad, Islamabad

Conversational Aspect	Friends Talk Among Local Friends at NUML	Friends Talk Among Foreigner Friends at NUML
1. Turn Taking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power Dynamics impacts the conversation. ● Violation of rules causing interruption and overlapping (Disruption) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Well-structured and ordered conversation. ● A single interruption and overlapping is found; however, it is still productive.

Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends

<p>2. Adjacency Pair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adjacency pairs used for seeking information. ● Dis-preferred responses are more than preferred ones. ● Subversion and disruption is witnessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adjacency pairs used for seeking information. ● Preferred responses are more than dis-preferred ones. ● Well-structured and well-ordered conversation.
<p>3. Cooperative Principle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Violation of all maxims of cooperative principle. ● Multiple Examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is little cooperation in the conversation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Just one instance of violation of maxim of quality and maxim of relevance, however both are then backed up by the next speakers. ● There is more cooperation in the conversation.
<p>4. Themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More themes and multiple instances of disruptions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A more purposeful conversation following a common theme.
<p>5. Violation of Rules</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are more instances of violation of rules and are not backed up later. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are a very few violations of rules and are still backed up by the next speakers.

<p>6. General Comparison</p>	<p>I. Power dynamics</p> <p>has impa cts on the conve rsatio n.</p> <p>II. There is no</p> <p>polite ness in friend s talk.</p> <p>III. Structure and</p> <p>order is not much devel oped.</p> <p>IV. Not much</p> <p>langu age profic iency.</p>	<p>i. Power dynamics</p> <p>has no impa cts on the conve rsatio n.</p> <p>ii. There is enough</p> <p>of polite ness in the friend s talk.</p> <p>iii. The</p> <p>conve rsatio n us well- order ed and well- struct ured.</p> <p>iv. There is more</p> <p>langu age profic iency witne ssed.</p>
------------------------------	---	---

Discussion

The current study aimed at exploring the informal talk among friends of both foreign and local friends of BS English studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan in their daily conversation while using Harvey Sack and Emanuel A. Schegloff Model of Conversation Analysis, and Adjacency pairs and also used Grice principles of

Cooperative Principle. Moreover, this research particularly dealt with three objectives, as to analyze and investigate comparatively the naturally occurring informal talk among both local and foreign groups of friends, the transition of turns, notion of interruptions, overlaps, and other aspects of turn-taking and to determine its general patterns and to explore whether certain friends dominate the conversation or if turn allocation is balanced. Furthermore, to identify common patterns of adjacency pairs, and to explore the utilization of it in both local and foreign groups of friends studying at NUML University Islamabad Pakistan, in their naturally occurring conversation in order to express agreement, disagreement, seek information, relation of disruption and subversions or engage. Moreover, to examine the application of cooperative principles, especially adherence to or deviations from the principles of truthfulness, relevance, manner, and clarity and to explore how both local and foreign groups of friends manage potential misunderstandings and maintain a cooperative conversational environment in a naturally occurring conversation. The researcher found that in local friends group talk at NUML Islamabad, Pakistan, a number of disruptions, interruptions, and overlapping is witnessed. In addition, the rules related to turn taking, adjacency pairs and cooperative principle have been violated and no constant theme has been followed by participants involved in the informal conversation or talk among a local group of friends of BS English studying at Numl University. Moreover, the phenomenon of power dynamics has greatly impacted the conversation.

On the other hand, the foreigners' friends talk follow at length the rules of turn taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principle. Although a few violations have been witnessed, they are immediately repaired by the next speakers in a productive way. Moreover, the group talk among foreigners' friends of BS English studying at NUML University is following a common theme and is purposeful talk or conversation. This is a more comprehensive study of the exploration of the informal analysis of conversation among both foreign and local groups of friends studying at NUML University Islamabad, Pakistan in their daily conversation. It is reflected in the current research at hand that local a group of students or friends should learn the appropriate use of all types and patterns of Adjacency pairs, cooperative principles, and turn-taking rules in order to be more organized, and structured in their informal communication. Currently, they are just using these different aspects of conversational Analysis but they are not as organized and structured in their speech as foreign students.

Ethical Considerations: Ethical considerations were taken into account throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and their privacy and confidentiality were ensured. The audio recordings and transcriptions were anonymized, assigning pseudonyms to participants to maintain their anonymity. The research followed ethical guidelines and regulations set by the research institution and relevant ethical committees.

Future Recommendations: This research could be further extended by comparing informal conversations among different groups of friends or students from diverse cultural backgrounds that could provide in-depth insights into cross-cultural variations in conversational practices and help to understand the influence of cultural factors on communication patterns. Future researchers could also explore the application of conversational analysis to informal conversations in digital contexts, such as online messaging platforms or social media. Analyzing the dynamics of turn-taking, adjacency pairs, and cooperative principles in digital conversations can shed light on how technology shapes and influences communication patterns. Last but not the least future researchers can use both qualitative analysis and quantitative methods to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of conversational dynamics. By collecting and analyzing data on conversational features, such as turn lengths, frequency of interruptions, or patterns of adjacency pairs, future researchers can identify statistical trends and correlations, while providing a more robust analysis of conversational behavior.

References

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Curl, T. S., & Drew, P. (2008). Contingency and action: A comparison of two forms of requesting. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41(2), 129-153.
- De Ruiter, J. P., Mitterer, H., & Enfield, N. J. (2006). Projecting the end of a speaker's turn: A cognitive cornerstone of conversation. *Language*, 82(3), 515-535.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Herring, S. C. (1999). Interactional coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4(4).
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1992). Activity types and language. *Linguistics*, 30(2), [page numbers missing].

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., de Ruyter, J. P., Yoon, K. E., & Levinson, S. C. (2009). [No specific publication provided]