

Discourse and Power Relations:

A Critical Discourse Analysis of a Pakistani Talk Show

Nayab Iqbal

Faculty of Social Sciences
Hamdard University, Karachi, Pakistan

Kaukab Abid Azhar*

Faculty of Management Sciences
Barrett Hodgson University, Karachi, Pakistan
E-mail: kaukababidazhar@gmail.com

Zubair Ahmed Shah

Faculty of Management Sciences
Barrett Hodgson University, Karachi, Pakistan

***(Corresponding Author)**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1836/jopr.v2i1.26-40>

Submission

Track:

Received:

28-01-2-2020

Final Revision:

03-04-2020

Available online:

10-04-2020

Corresponding

Author:

Kaukab Abid Azhar

kaukababidazhar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The paper aims at studying the ways power and inequality are enacted in a Pakistani talk show aired on Capital TV on 14th August 2019. The research primarily focused on analyzing turn-taking patterns of the discussion held between the host of the program and three guests. The analysis revealed the unequal distribution of turns implying the unequal distribution of power between the host and guests as well as between the guests. The host of the program through her discourse asserted power as she was the one to control the topic of discussion throughout the program. Her power can be attributed to the power of media. Besides, one of the guest speakers, Jawwad asserted his power through his knowledge. The female speaker did not have enough representation and was not given enough chance to share her views,

therefore, it can be concluded that gender was another element that played an important part in forming the power relations in the discussion that was observed.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse Power Relations, Media Discourse and Talk Shows, Turn-taking*

INTRODUCTION

Critical discourse analysis is a discipline that deals with the way language enacts and reinforces power relations, inequality and power struggle in any social or political context. Power relations can be explicitly found everywhere in the society. There is an unequal distribution of power present in almost all the institutions of society. This is not only limited to social institutions but is clearly evident in different social groupings between male and females or different ethnic groups or class of the society. This, as a result, leads to a power struggle between different individuals or group of a particular society. Moreover, power can be either used positively or misused. Power relation is something that exists between individuals in different situations. For example, a power relation may exist between a teacher and a student or between a doctor and a patient.

Critical discourse analysis as a discipline sheds lights on the way power is misused as well as the way power abuse occurs. The way power is handled in a society helps develop the common ideological frame of that particular society. CDA helps expose power abuse present in the society that helps reshape the ideology of any society in a positive manner. Fairclough (2003) suggests that the dialectic relation between language and social society is realized through social events (texts), social practices (events), social practices (order of discourse) and social structures. Similarly, discourse plays an important role in examining the power struggle present in any social context. Discourse is something that is constructed within the society depending on the context. Discourse helps shape society on one hand and reflects the society on the other. Besides, it is not an only discourse that shapes society but society itself plays a major role in shaping a discourse hence, these two co-exist.

However, media is a common channel where the element of power relation and power struggle is evident. Even when the things are not explicitly stated, there is a complete ideology or struggle of power between people associated with this channel of conversation.

People through various means assert their power over others. Different people are commonly observed giving suggestions related to the political and social conditions of the country on different news channels or talk shows. They assert their power through the way they use language and change the course of discussion from one point to another. Bilal, Akbar, Gul, & Sial (2012) in their paper through analyzing political talk shows concluded how discourse can be used to manipulate and assert power over others. The analysis was done following Van Dijk's approach of CDA. The paper concluded that people use certain tactics to gain social power and political dominance.

Similarly, in this paper, the power relations between the host and the guest speakers as well as between the guests are studied critically to see how discourse helps construct power relations between individuals. The study aims at finding the ways language helps assert the dominance of one speaker over the other with a specific focus on the turn-taking patterns occurring throughout the program. This would, however, help understand the relation between discourse and power as the analysis would conclude how discourse constructed in a particular social context can be used as a means to shape one's status in a society. The research questions of the study are: How does discourse help establish power relations between the speakers of the program? What are the common power relations that exist between the speakers of the program?

There are numerous researches conducted on the ways discourse helps shape ideologies, build up power relations, assert dominance over individuals or different social groups in different contexts. Fairclough (1997) in his paper discussed the main tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis. It says CDA addresses social problems where power relations are discursive. Besides, discourse constitutes society and also does ideological work. This is something that is also evident in the conversation analyzed for the current research paper. However, numerous researches have been conducted in different areas based on Fairclough's model of CDA. Like Mirazee and Hamidi (2012) in their research paper have focused on Fairclough's model of Critical Discourse Analysis and its implication in education. They

concluded that CDA helps the teacher understand their classroom discourse in a better manner. It leads to the better quality of the classroom environment and classroom interaction.

As the focus in this study is on applying Fairclough CDA's model to a media program, therefore, there are other researches conducted on media using CDA. Bhatia (2006) through the critical discourse analysis of the political press conference showed how diplomatic talk can be used to communicate political differences in a positive manner. The article analyzed the textual data from the political press conference between the former Chinese president Jiang Zemin and US president George W. Bush. The leaders belonged to a different ideological background having differences in age, experience and socio-economic status. The critical discourse analysis of their conversation revealed the use of influence and power for subtle persuasion as well as reinforcement of mutual trust, respect, and progress.

Moreover, Ilie (2001) by using the excerpts from two American talk shows has focused upon the distinguishing features of talk shows by comparing it with a casual conversation on one hand and institutional conversation on the other. The study concluded that talk shows have characteristics that are pertaining to both the casual conversation as well as the institutional conversation. The major distinguishing feature of the talk show is its semi-institutional nature in terms of discourse configuration, goal, participant role assignment, role switching and talk as well as topic control.

Besides, Van Dijk (2006) in his paper *Discourse and Manipulation* has discussed manipulation as a form of social abuse, cognitive mind control and discursive interaction through the analysis of Tony Blair's speech in the House of Common legitimating the participation of UK in the US-led war against Iraq in 2003. The study concluded that language was used as a means to manipulate in the speech that was analyzed. Blair in his speech said that UK parliament has a right to decide about going to war although it was already decided the last year. Blair also presented his emotional side thus emphasizing the strength of his beliefs. Similarly, Van Dijk (2006) in his paper *Ideology and Discourse* has used a discourse analytical approach to study ideology. He concluded that ideology is the foundation of group attitude and other beliefs and also control the biased personal mental model that underlies the production of ideological discourse. Ideologies are themselves discursively reproduced by groups and acquired by their members. However, discourse is not the only way to express ideology but it is also expressed through other social practices.

Furthermore, Bardici (2012) discussed the relationship between discourse and ideology by referring to the way social media was credited for the Egyptian uprising and political transformation. The study concluded that the discourse on social media exaggeratedly depicts the power of social media by describing the Egyptian revolution as Facebook revolution. It also revealed that the revolution in Egypt was far more complicated than how it was presented by some of the journalists. It confirms how media through its way of representation does ideological work and highlights its power through various means.

Then, McEnery, McGlashan, & Love (2015) in their paper discussed the press and social media's reaction to the ideologically inspired murder of a soldier Lee Rigby in central London by two converts to Islam. The aim was to analyze the contrast between the way Press looked towards this incident and the way social media reacted towards it. The corpus-assisted analysis was carried out to analyze the event at three different points of the event. One highly salient difference between the press and Twitter relates to the attribution of blame and the search for explanations. The press distances Islam from the killers and identifies them as an extremist group whereas some of the Twitter users tried to reframe the discussion in general terms relating to racism but the discourse fades in the timeline of the event until it is absent in the sentencing corpora.

However, using Fairclough's (1997) framework of critical discourse analysis the current research paper discusses how power is enacted in a talk show. It also sheds light upon the ways discourse helps dominate one party over the other.

METHODOLOGY

The research study is based on qualitative research paradigm as it is exploratory in nature. It is conducted in a natural setting. It helps explore any issue in depth as it provides an opportunity to focus on all the events that help play an important part in developing a social phenomenon being studied.

Besides, the research is based upon critical discourse analysis of the talk show. Critical discourse analysis is a research method that helps study language as a means of exercising

power and dominance in a particular social context. Moreover, discourse analysis is yet another data collecting instrument used in the research. Discourse analysis is a qualitative method of analyzing the texts focusing on the connection between language, power, and social practices. It helps to analyze the conversation with a specific focus on the meanings derived from a particular context. In this study, turn-taking patterns in a talk show are analyzed to see how it contributes to establishing power relations between the speakers of the program.

Moreover, the selection of the program was based upon ‘Convenient Sampling’ as the program ‘siidhi baat’ was selected among other programs according to the ease of availability. However, it was made sure that the program was in accordance with the aim of the research which was to analyze a program based on discussing social issues. The host Beenish Saleem (referred as H) and the guests Jawwad (J), Tahir Sabar Meer (M) and Aneeqa Ali (A) were the participants of the program. The program was recorded and transcribed before analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson (1974) in their paper *The Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation* mentioned some of the ways turns are organized in a conversation. The turn-taking patterns present in the program are analyzed using their model of turn-taking. According to the rules of turn-taking, one speaker speaks at a time with the change of speaker at a particular point in time. Similarly, in a natural conversation, the turn order and turn size are not fixed. After analyzing the turn-taking patterns followed throughout the program it was found that most of the times it was the host to speak more and control the flow of conversation. However, she was also the one to violate the rules of turn-taking which states that one speaker speaks at a time by interrupting the guest speakers at many points during the conversation. Being the host, she initiated the conversation giving quite a detailed introduction on the special day on which the program was telecasted.

Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) in their paper *The Simplest Systematics for Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation* mentioned some of the ways turns are organized in a conversation. The turn-taking patterns present in the program are analyzed using their model of turn-taking. According to the rules of turn-taking, one speaker speaks at a time with the change of speaker at a particular point in time. Similarly, in a natural conversation the turn order and turn size are not fixed. After analyzing the turn-taking patterns followed throughout the program it was found that most of the times it was the host to speak

more and control the flow of conversation. However, she was also the one to violate the rules of turn-taking which states that one speaker speaks at a time by interrupting the guest speakers at many points during the conversation. Being the host, she initiated the conversation giving quite a detailed introduction on the special day on which the program was telecasted.

Appendix (lines 1-11)

H: assalaam o alaikum Capital TV ki xusuusi nashist me me~ aap ko xushaamdiid kehti hu~. xusuusi nashshist islie kyu~ ke aaj bohat happening day he bohat important day he aur isi day ki munasibat se aaj humne ye meeting outdoor rakkhi hai bilkul in the heart of minaar e pakistan. minaar bilkul yaadgaar e pakistan jisko kaha jaata he aur vo bilkul islie kyu~ke aaj happy independence day he aap sabko bohat hi ziyaada jashn e azaadi mobarak. Pakistan aaj 70 years ka complete ho gaya he 71st year me hum chale gae~ he~ bohat hi interesting log he~ unka me~ introduction karati hu~ taake unhe jaldi se hum is conversation me~ shamil kare~ aur aagay phir show ko forward leke jae~ ge~ apni wishes 2019 bhi de~ ge~ apne views bhi de~ ge~. 68 years of Pakistan uske uuper comment bhi kare~ ge~ aur aage Pakistan ka future kya he aur unka future kya he is bare me~ bhi baat kare~ ge~ so let me introduce it's an honour for me bohat hi prestigious (?) mere saath maujuud he~. sabse pehle Jawwad sahab, the great singer isse ziyaada me~ koi introduction nahi de sakti because naam hi kaafi hai assalaam o alaikum

H: I welcome you to this special episode of Capital TV. It's a special episode as it is quite happening day today because of which we have arranged our show outdoor exactly in the heart of minaar-e-pakistan. minaar to which we refer as Pakistan's historical place especially because it is happy independence day today. I wish all of you a happy independence day. Pakistan has completed its 70 years today and has entered 71st year of its existence. We have very interesting people I will introduce you to them and then take the show forward so that we can begin with our discussion. We will share our wishes, our views, we will also comment upon 68 years of Pakistan and also talk about the future of Pakistan and ask the guests about their future as well. So let me introduce it's an honour for me as I have very prestigious people with me on this show. First of all I will introduce Jawwad sahab, the great singer who does not need any more introduction as his name is enough (assalaam-o-alaikum) greetings.

She continued speaking till the point she allowed one of the guests to speak on the selected topic. Besides, the turn size was also not fixed as the host being the controller of the program had the privilege to speak more than the other speakers of the program and in this way she exercised her power over the guests that were invited. Her power can be attributed to the power of media. People associated with the field of media are considered powerful

because of the advantages they have to control any topic as per their will. However, they at times misuse their power by changing the course of discussion as per their priorities.

Another striking thing that was noticed was that as compared to Jawwad Khan, the singer she interrupted the other two guests Meer and Aniq Ali more. For instance, on one occasion she asked Jawwad to comment on the present situation of Pakistan considering the economic, social, stability, educational and political situations in Pakistan. Jawwad gave a very detailed opinion on the critical situations facing Pakistan.

Appendix (lines41-48)

J: dekhe~ me~ to samjhata hu~ ke Pakistan ke andar jis tarha ki siyaasat ho rahi he uska koi taalluk hi nahi he insaano~ ke masaail ke saath vo to television pe aap log jo parties ke logo~ ko beTha ke apas me jo aap xud laRa dete he~ ya phir vo xud laR paRte he~ aur jin issues pe vo laRte he~ unme na to rozgaar hota he logo~ ka na to jis tarha aap ne kaha na taliim hoti he na sehat hoti he na izzat hoti he na roti kapRa makaan hota he to logo~ ki jo bunyaadi zuruuriyaat e zindagi he ya log jis tarha zindagi me~ jo suhuuliyaat chahte he~ uski taraf to koi talluk hi nahi he unka aur baaqi reh gaya Pakistan me jo siyaasat daan he~ aur jo siyaasat ho rahi he aur Pakistan jis tarha chal raha he uske andar log jo he~ vo struggle ki taraf aye~ ge~ ya nahi aye~ ge~ ye sab se baRa question he

H: sir struggle hi to kar rahe~ he~

J: According to me the politics that is going on in the country has nothing to do with the issues faced by the common people in this country. They only fight in the television programs either you people make them fight or they start fighting themselves. And the issues on which they fight are neither related to the jobs of the people nor related to the educational crisis, related to health, respect and food, shelter and clothes. The basic necessities of life or the basic needs that people have in their lives are not their concerns. And now if we talk about the type of politics being played in Pakistan then will it bring people towards struggle or not this is the question

H: struggle is something we have been doing

The host interrupted Jawwad only at some points during his conversation so it can be concluded that he had a powerful position in the discourse taking place. Besides, the way he dealt with the topic attacking politicians and condemning their behaviours also reflects his power. According to the main tenets of CDA mentioned by Fairclough power relations are discursive which was clearly evident as the host was found demonstrating power at some time whereas Jawwad proved his power at other instances. He demonstrated his power through his knowledge that he displayed during the discussion unlike other two guests who were often found passing jokes and having a friendly discussion with the host. He in a way had enough control when given turn to speak as he was not actually interrupted and people mostly agreed with him.

Appendix (lines 98-114)

M: me~ aap ko ye aarz kar raha hu~ k Jawwad sahib ne jo kaha Jawwad Ahmed jo he~ vo pichhle biis salo~ se hum dost he~ aur hum dost islie he~ ke hamaari jo nazriyaati jo he hum ahingi he vo jo he us me jo he common bohat he or me~ Jawwad sahab se jo hu~ muttafik hu~ in baton pe sirf ye kaho~ ga inho ne astaahi jo pesh ki uska me antara yu~ kaho~ ga ke hum kis tarha se faxar kar sakhte he~ aRsath saal hone pe bhi hamare baad me~ azaad hone vala ye chiin hamara hum saya mulk chiin hum India ki ziyaada misaale~ islie nahi de~ ge~ kiyu~ ke phir jo he vo ((ahhhh)) matlab vo jo he or baat ho jaati he

H: phir jo Twitter pe aap ke saath hoga vo aap ko xud hi pata chal jaye ga

M: hum chiin ki baat Twitter pe jo hoga ((laughs)) hum chiin ki baat karte he~ ke vo hum se baad me azaad hua aur vo hum palRa he ka jo comparison he aur ruus ka jo comparison he aur hamara hua ye he ke hamari jo xaarja policy he uski bunyaad jo he vo maye unniis sau se~taliis me rakhi gaye thi vo ye thi ke ruus se jo ye naya Pakistan he usko hum bachaye~ ge~ nazriyaati taur pe siyaasi taur pe maashi taur pe ruus se bachaye ge~ aur America ke saath ilhaad kare~ ge~ uska baGal bachcha bane~ ge~

H: jii break lenii he~ phir mujhe Aneeqa se bhi baat karni he

M: [me~ please]

H: please mujhe allow kare~ ek choTe si break lete he~ break se jab hum wapis aaye~ ge~ to Aneeqa se hum opening words le~ ge~

M: I would like to say that whatever Jawwad sahab has said, Jawwad and me are friends for the last 20 years because we almost have similar views and have a lot in common when it comes to ideology and I totally agree with Jawwad. I would only conclude whatever Jawwad has said by saying that how can we feel proud when even after 68 years our neighbor country China we would not give India's example as it would be something different

H: then you will see what will happen with you on Twitter

M: I would talk about China ((laughs)) whatever will happen on Twitter we are referring to China as it got independent after us and its our neighbor country and America's comparison and Russia's comparison and what happened is our Foreign policy that was finalized on May 1947 that actually implied that we would save new Pakistan from Russia and join America and become its servants

H: let's take a break

M: I please

H: please allow me let's take a small break, we will have opening words with Aneeqa once we come back from the break

The host not only interrupted this guest but also took the break and changed the entire topic as she did not want him to continue discussing what he was. The host misused her power by controlling the discussion according to her own plans. According to one of the tenets of CDA by Fairclough discourse constitutes society. In our society, it is mostly observed that the

hosts in any program are the ones to talk more. They instead of facilitating the other speakers interrupt and assert their power over others invited on the show. The discourse used by the anchorperson in our culture has set this norm of the host being the dominant party most of the times.

Besides, the way this guest at the beginning of his conversation praised the first guest, Jawwad shows his way of maintaining solidarity and connection with the other speaker on the show. On the other hand, the way people responded again reflected Jawwad's powerful position among the other people present in the discussion.

Moreover, Jawwad in return did not make any such comments about Meer and did not even responded as such which showed him maintaining a distance. This again can be attributed to his powerful position as compared to others. The way he behaved and remain connected only to the topic throughout the program portrayed him as being dominating over others.

Appendix (lines 123-141)

H: Aneeqa aap kitni excited hoti he~ Fourteenth August ko because festivity to ek hoti he aur aap kaise dekhte he~ Pakistan ka 68th years ka hona? How happy you are?

M: aur inse pochchiye ye one wheeling karti he~

H: haan ye is baare me~ mene baat karni he one wheeling kar ke vo backlight toRna vo is tarha ka aim koi set kiya he?

M: motor cycle ki ba~siri nikaal ke

A: aap ko mujhe dekh ke lagta he me~ motor cycle chalaati hu~ ge~ ((laughs))

H: haan dekhne me~ to lagta he frankly speaking

M: bhae jis tarha se ye

A: balke me~ to in cheezo~ ke xilaaf hu~ aksar road pe jab jaati hu~ driver ko bolti hu~ gaRi side pe karo kiyu~ ke vo apne saath insaaf nahi kar rahe at least hum logo~ ko karna chahiye kuch bhi ho sakta he on the spot at least hamare paas break lagaane ke liye time hona chahiye margin hona chahiye to me~ gaRi hamesha side pe kar leti hu~ unhone to baaz nahi aana itni maar khaty he~ unpe dafa bhi lagi hue he but nahi karna chahiye kyu~ ke parents kis tarha se paalte he~ unko

H: hum kitne aazaad he~ aap ye aazaadi mehsuus karte he~ Jawwad? You feel you are a free man?

H: Aneeqa how much excited are you about 14th August because we do have festivities and how do you look at 68 years of Pakistan? How happy are you?

M: and ask her if she does one wheeling

H: yes I want to ask about it, one wheeling, breaking the backlights you must have set any such aim?

M: motorcycle without silencer

A: do you think after looking at me that I would be driving motorcycle ((laughs))

H: yes you seem to do that honestly speaking

M: the way she

A: in fact I am against these things. Whenever I go outside I ask the driver to take the car on side, they are not honest with them at least we should be honest anything can

happen on the spot so at least we must have time to take the break. I always take the car on side, they will never change, they are beaten even FIR has been charged on them they shouldn't do that, parents take so much effort to grow them up, they
H: how much independent are we? Do you feel this independence Jawwad? You feel you are a free man?

In the utterance mentioned above the host again violates the rules of turn-taking by interrupting the third speaker who is a female singer, Aneeqa Ali. Besides, the guest Meer was also found commenting in the middle of her conversation to continue the discussion in a friendly manner. However, the host again not only interrupted but shifted the entire conversation by inviting Jawwad again to speak in the middle of Aneeqa's turn. As per one of the rules of turn-taking, the speaker may allot turns to another speaker; however, allotting turns to another speaker in the middle of someone's turn can be again considered as a violation of the rules of turn-taking. Besides, the female guest did not have enough time to talk in detail about the main topic that was related to critically looking at 68 years of Pakistan's independence.

She just responded to some of the questions raised by the host and other speaker not much related to the main topic. She was not only interrupted in the middle but was also deprived of her chance of speaking on the social and political issues facing Pakistan, unlike the other two male guest speakers. This difference of space in conversation can also be attributed to the gender differences as it was striking that unlike the male speakers the female speaker did not even get the chance to share her views on the main topic of discussion. She was only made part of the casual discussion whereas the other female speaker had more chances of speaking as she had the advantage of being the anchorperson. Besides, the less representation of the female speaker can be attributed to the male having an authoritative position in discourse as opposed to the female guest.

However, male speakers cannot be blamed for misusing their power as they were not the ones to interrupt her when speaking. Her lack of representation was as a result of host giving privilege to the male speakers especially Jawwad. Therefore, it can be concluded that the host misused her power as she had the responsibility to allot turns to the speakers, making them an equal part of the conversation but she despite being a female did not make efforts to

avoid being biased towards her own gender in terms of giving her enough space in the discussion. It was because of her lack of efforts that the female guest most of the times remained the passive listener which reflected her lack of power over the other two guests.

In the rest of the discussion, Jawwad again dominated the conversation. He, when questioned, made references to different policies and historical events. He too, like Meer blamed America for certain events but the striking part was that unlike Meer he was not interrupted by the host when he did so. He made references to the geographical and historical condition of Pakistan to discuss the root of all the problems. He referred to Liaquat Ali Khan and Zia-ul-Haq and their ideology and how did it contribute to Pakistan's relation with other countries like America and Russia. He talked about how we were forced to obey America throughout this entire time making references to Zia-ul-Haq's Islamic ideological mindset. The host only spoke at one point during his discussion and that also to agree with him. He conveyed his ideas in a very authoritative manner giving absolute reasons for the dilemmas that the country has been facing. His way of handling the topic, his tone contributed to him being the most powerful participants in the discourse being observed.

According to the features of CDA discourse addresses social problems and people are involved in political discourse as well. Throughout, this discussion Jawwad addressed many social problems making reference to historical events that were the root cause of the problems faced by Pakistanis nowadays. The way he dealt with the topic reflected his ideology of looking at the major issues our country is facing. Besides, because he talked openly about such views on media this may cause people reshaping their ideology so indirectly his discourse did ideological work. If someone is able to influence people's mind or opinion they indirectly control their action which is a form of manipulation. It was through his logical and detailed analysis of Pakistan's social and political issues that he had an edge over other speakers throughout the discussion in terms of being a powerful speaker.

When Meer again tried to share his views, he was interrupted by the host again who said that they would first listen to a national song by Jawwad.

Appendix (lines 169-181)

M: achcha national songs

H: phir me~ aap ka taRka bhi suno~ ge~

M: national songs ke hawale se mera ye aarz sun le~

H: ((zaruur))

M: ke ye hamara vo mulk he

H: ((hmm))

M: jahaa~ milli naGme aur milli taraane aur jangi taraane sab se ziyada gaaye jate he~ lekin nationalism nahi he me~ Jawwad bhaaye ki baat nahi kar raha Jawwad bhai jo he~ inko me~ maanta hu~ dil se dost bhi maanta hu~ aur ek baRa insaan bhi maanta hu~ aur ek achcha aur paRha likha insaan bhi jo jis tarha se me~ keh rahaa hu~ lekin Jawwad bhae is baat se disagree nahi kar sakhte ke jitne hamare yaha~ jo he~ milli taraane he~ utna hi deficiency aur utna hi fugdaan he nationalism ka

H: patriotic song ek ho jaye aaj ke din koi sa bhi aapki pasand ka

M: okay national songs

H: I will listen to your comment

M: I have something to say about national songs

H: ((okay why not?))

M: this is the country

H: ((hmm))

M: that has numbers of patriotic songs but it lacks nationalism I am not talking about Jawwad I respect Jawwad and I truly consider him my friend and a great human being and a nice and educated person as I have said but Jawwad can't disagree with me on this point that the more we have national songs the less we have patriotism

H: let's have a patriotic song of your choice

He was given the chance to speak when he requested the host saying that he has something to say about the national songs. He then shared his opinion saying that our country is one of those countries that have a huge collection of national songs yet people do not even know the meaning of patriotism. His statement, however, attacked the people directly as he made a comment describing the common ideology that people have in Pakistan when the only means by which they prove their patriotism is through singing national songs. However, the host again abruptly ended his discussion by asking Jawwad to sing a national song.

Furthermore, the discourse that people are involved in this program is based on describing social events and discussing social issues. Different speakers are seen taking a powerful position in the discussion taking place at different points in the discussion.

The most common form of power displayed in the program is the power of media demonstrated by the host of the program. The other form of power was displayed by one of the guests Jawwad who showed his power through his knowledge. The way he organized his speech and the ways he gave proofs to authenticate his opinions conformed to his powerful position in the discourse.

Besides, the other guest Meer despite being interrupted at various point in conversation reflected his authority through attacking the general public when referring to the common ideologies people have. The third and the only female guest failed to assert her power not only because she was interrupted by the host in the middle but also because she did not herself make any effort to share her views that would have been relevant to the discussion taking place.

Moreover, throughout the program, unequal distribution of turns was witnessed with interruptions and overlapped utterances being frequent especially by the host of the program. The unequal distribution of turns, however, contributed to the unequal distribution of power between the speakers of the discourse.

CONCLUSION

The critical discourse analysis of the program revealed power relations existing between the speakers involved in the conversation. The analysis of the discourse revealed the instances of misuse of power mostly done by the anchorperson. Besides, it also reflected the authoritative position of one speaker over the other implying inequality in terms of distribution of turns between the speakers of the program. Therefore, it can be concluded that power relation did exist between the participants. This is the normal scenario in almost all the talk shows when one party has an advantage over the other. They assert their dominance either through their tone or knowledge. In some situations, participants in the talk show even assert their dominance by attacking the other party present in the show. However, this tactic was not used by the speakers in this program that but they did maintain their dominance over other despite being friendly towards each other.

References

- Bardici, M. V. (2012). A Discourse Analysis of the Media Representation of Social Media for Social Change - The Case of Egyptian Revolution and Political Change. Retrieved from <http://muep.mau.se/handle/2043/14121>
- Bhatia, A. (2006). Critical discourse analysis of political press conferences, *Critical discourse analysis of political press conferences. Discourse & Society, 17*(2), 173–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506058057>

Bilal, H. A., Akbar, H. S., Gul, N., & Sial, M. M. (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis of Political TV Talk Shows of Pakistani Media. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(3), 375–384.

<https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.2263>

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge
Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R.(1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T.Van Dijk (Eds), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp.258-284). London: Sage.

McEnery, T., McGlashan, M., & Love, R. (2015). Press and social media reaction to ideologically inspired murder: The case of Lee Rigby, Press and social media reaction to ideologically inspired murder: The case of Lee Rigby. *Discourse & Communication*, 9(2), 237–259.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481314568545>

Mirazee, S. & Hamidi, H. (2012). Critical Discourse Analysis and Fairclough’s model. *ELT Voices-India*, 2(5), 182-191.

http://www.academia.edu/2645766/Critical_Discourse_Analysis_and_Faircloughs_Model-Mirzaee_and_Hamidi_2012_

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation, Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>