Dialogues in Humanities and Social Sciences
2023, VOL. 1, NO. 1, 29-34

OPEN ACCESS

# Discourse Analysis of Informal Peer Conversation: Examining Language Strategies and Power Dynamics in Dialogue

Sohana Ayaz[1]*

[1] MS English scholar, COMSATS University Islamabad, Pakistan. ***Corresponding Author.** Email: soniiayaz@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT**

Discourse analysis (DA) offers critical insights into how language functions as a tool for communication, social interaction, and identity construction. This study applies conversation analysis (CA) methods to an informal discussion between two literature students, Elif and Shafaq, focusing on turn-taking, discourse markers, hedges, and power dynamics. By examining these conversational features, the study highlights the interplay of social and emotional strategies in everyday peer interactions. The findings contribute to the broader fields of linguistics, literary studies, and social psychology, illustrating how informal dialogues reflect complex social structures and intellectual engagements. The study emphasizes the relevance of language strategies in constructing and negotiating social roles, power dynamics, and emotional engagement in informal settings.

**ARTICLE HISTORY**
Received 11 May. 2023
Revised 20 June. 2023
Accepted 27 June. 2023

**KEYWORDS**
Discourse analysis, spoken discourse, Conversation analysis, Turn-taking, Power dynamics, Discourse markers, Literature students, Peer communication, social dynamics, Language strategies.

## Introduction

Language is a central tool for shaping social interactions, expressing identities, and asserting power in communication. Beyond being a means of conveying information, it constructs social realities, negotiates relationships, and reflects positions within societal structures. Discourse Analysis (DA) provides a comprehensive framework to explore how language functions beyond isolated words or sentences, focusing on its role in social contexts. DA examines how speakers convey meaning, adhere to social norms, and assert roles through language. Among its subfields, Conversation Analysis (CA) offers a detailed study of spoken interactions, analysing features like turn-taking, discourse markers, hedges, adjacency pairs, and repair mechanisms to understand the nuances of everyday communication. As formal discourse has been widely studied, informal peer interactions remain comparatively underexplored. Such interactions, particularly among peers in academic contexts, reveal how language is used to navigate intellectual engagement, assert roles, and manage power dynamics. These conversations, less constrained by formal structures, highlight the subtle ways individuals construct identities, manage relationships, and participate in intellectual discussions. By applying DA to informal peer conversations, we can uncover the linguistic strategies that shape social behaviour and interactional norms. This study focuses on an informal discussion between two literature students, Elif and Shafaq, examining how they employ linguistic strategies to negotiate conversational roles and manage intellectual engagement. Cantered on *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen, their conversation provides insights into how language is used to share ideas and assert intellectual authority. By analysing turn-taking, hedges, discourse markers, and power dynamics, the study highlights how language facilitates intellectual exchanges and reflects broader social dynamics in informal academic interactions. Turn-taking is a fundamental aspect of conversational organization, with speakers alternating roles as listeners and contributors. How turns are initiated, maintained, or relinquished reveals social dynamics such as dominance, deference, and collaboration. Dominant participants often control the conversational flow through extended speech or seamless turn transitions, while others may adopt more passive roles. Studying turn-taking in peer interactions sheds light on how conversational control reflects underlying power relationships. Discourse markers and hedges further illustrate how speakers navigate conversations and intellectual engagements. Discourse markers like "well," "so," or "you know" organize thoughts, indicate focus shifts, and manage relationships, while hedges such as "I think," "maybe," or "kind of" express uncertainty or politeness. These devices soften assertions, invite agreement, or mitigate potential conflicts, demonstrating how speakers manage authority and social harmony.

### Literature Review

This literature review explores key concepts and studies relevant to the analysis of informal peer conversations, focusing on turn-taking, power dynamics, discourse markers, hedges, emotional engagement, and

CONTACT Sohana Ayaz soniiayaz@gmail.com. Pakistan
© 2023 The Author(s). Published by ICSDR Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

their influence on peer-to-peer communication. **Discourse Analysis (DA) examines how language constructs meaning, identity, and relationships within specific social, cultural, and situational contexts. Schiffrin (1987) asserts that DA bridges linguistics and sociology, offering insights into how individuals and groups create meaning through language. Conversation Analysis (CA), a specialized branch of DA, narrows its scope to spoken interactions, examining the structural organization of conversations. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) argue that conversations are governed by systematic rules that reflect shared social norms and expectations. CA delves into micro-level features like intonation, pauses, and overlaps, which significantly influence conversational flow and social interaction. For instance, intonation patterns can signal emotions, such as enthusiasm or hesitation, shaping how messages are interpreted. Turn-taking is central to conversational organization, ensuring orderly exchanges between speakers. According to Sacks et al. (1974), turn-taking is a "locally managed" system where participants coordinate their contributions in real-time. Dominant speakers often manage turn initiation and termination through strategies like interruptions and prolonged turns (Schilling-Estes, 2008). Such behaviors can signify authority or influence, depending on the social context. Cross-cultural variations also exist; collectivist cultures may prioritize group harmony, avoiding interruptions, while individualistic cultures may view interruptions as signs of engagement (Tannen, 1993). Power dynamics in informal peer interactions are intricately linked to linguistic strategies. Fairclough (1989) suggests that power is embedded in language and can be exercised overtly or covertly. Dominant participants often use strategies such as topic control and strategic interruptions to assert authority. Emphasis markers and rhetorical devices further reinforce control, drawing attention to specific ideas. Gendered conversational patterns also highlight power dynamics; men are often observed to dominate discussions, whereas women tend to use more inclusive language strategies like hedges and discourse markers to foster collaboration (Goodwin & Heritage, 1990). However, these patterns are context-dependent and shaped by cultural norms. Discourse markers and hedges are critical tools in peer communication. Discourse markers like "well," "so," and "you know" organize speech, signal transitions, and guide listeners through conversations (Schiffrin, 1987). Hedges such as "I think," "sort of," and "maybe" soften assertions, reflecting politeness and uncertainty (Lakoff, 1972). These devices often work together to achieve nuanced communication. For instance, combining a discourse marker with a hedge, such as "Well, I think this might work," demonstrates tentative confidence and maintains relational harmony (Fraser, 1990). In the context of peer discussions, these linguistic devices shape intellectual and social dynamics. Swann and Graddol (1988) note that students use hedges and discourse markers to express agreement, soften critiques, and seek clarification, fostering a collaborative environment. Emotional engagement is further revealed through verbal and nonverbal cues. Bucy (2017) highlights how tone, gestures, and facial expressions complement spoken language to convey emotions and reinforce social bonds. Peer conversations also involve ‘adjacency pairs’, such as question-answer sequences, which create coherence and demonstrate conversational collaboration (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Repair mechanisms, as described by Jefferson (1974), ensure conversational flow by addressing misunderstandings through self- or other corrections. These elements not only maintain conversational structure but also reflect the interdependence of speaker roles. Discussions among literature students offer a unique perspective for analyzing peer interactions. Literary discussions blend intellectual rigor with social negotiation, requiring students to critique texts, propose interpretations, and challenge ideas diplomatically. Swann and Graddol (1988) emphasize that these interactions often mirror broader social dynamics, with dominant participants shaping discussions while others adopt supportive roles. In summary, this review highlights the importance of linguistic strategies in structuring conversations, negotiating power, and fostering intellectual engagement in informal peer settings. These insights provide a foundation for analyzing how literature students navigate conversational roles, manage social relationships, and assert intellectual authority.

## Problem Statement

As formal discourse has been widely studied, informal peer conversations, especially among students in literary and academic settings, remain relatively underexplored. Such conversations provide a rich ground for analysing how social strategies and power dynamics unfold in real-time exchanges. This study seeks to fill this gap by examining a discussion on literary themes to understand how peers use language to negotiate conversational roles and engage intellectually. Informal peer-to-peer interactions, particularly in academic settings, reflect intricate layers of communication that go beyond simply conveying information. The strategic use of language in these interactions not only facilitates intellectual engagement but also helps define social roles and assert power dynamics. In the case of literary students discussing texts, language becomes a tool for both sharing insights and positioning oneself within the conversation. This study investigates how such dynamics play out in a

relatively relaxed, informal setting, where the stakes are intellectual engagement and social interaction rather than formal authority or hierarchy.

### Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its contribution to the fields of linguistics, social psychology, and literary studies by focusing on informal discourse. It highlights how peers use language strategies, such as turn-taking, hedges, and discourse markers, to assert control, express emotions, and engage intellectually. Understanding these dynamics can offer broader insights into social behaviour and identity formation in everyday interactions.In particular, this study emphasizes the role of discourse markers and hedges in shaping the tone of conversations. These linguistic devices are not merely functional—they reflect the emotional state of speakers and the level of confidence with which they assert their ideas. By analysing these features in the context of a literary discussion, this study provides valuable insights into how informal peer conversations can mirror the complexities of power dynamics and intellectual positioning.

### Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in the principles of conversation analysis (CA), which explores the organization and structure of spoken interactions. Key elements of this framework include turn-taking systems, adjacency pairs, repair mechanisms, hedges, and discourse markers. The analysis focuses on the micro-level features of spoken discourse, offering a detailed examination of conversational dynamics and the underlying social and emotional strategies.

### Research Questions

1. What strategies do literature students use to manage conversational interactions and maintain engagement?
2. How do power dynamics shape the conversational flow between peers?
3. How do hedges and discourse markers reflect emotional and intellectual positioning?
4. How do turn-taking and adjacency pairs contribute to the structure and tone of the conversation?

### Research Objectives

1. To analyse the language strategies used by literature students in managing conversational interactions.
2. To investigate how power dynamics are established and negotiated in informal peer conversations.
3. To explore the role of hedges and discourse markers in reflecting emotional and intellectual positioning.
4. To examine the structural elements of conversation, such as turn-taking and adjacency pairs, and their impact on the tone and flow of dialogue.

### Methodology

This study adopts the principles of conversation analysis (CA), a subfield of discourse analysis, to explore the nuances of linguistic strategies in informal peer conversations, focusing on how turn-taking, hedges, discourse markers, and power dynamics shape the interaction between two literature students, Elif and Shafaq, during an informal discussion. The primary data consists of a recorded and transcribed conversation between two female literature students in their early twenties, centered on themes in *Pride and Prejudice* by Jane Austen. This setting, an informal academic seminar, offers a balance between intellectual discussion and relaxed peer interaction, providing a rich context for examining both intellectual exchanges and the negotiation of social roles. The conversation was recorded with the participants' consent, ensuring adherence to ethical guidelines, and was meticulously transcribed to capture pauses, hesitations, overlaps, tone markers, and other conversational cues, forming a robust foundation for analyzing micro-level linguistic strategies. The analytical framework focuses on core elements of CA, such as turn-taking, which examines how conversational turns are initiated, maintained, and relinquished to reveal dynamics of dominance and collaboration; discourse markers, which include words and phrases like "well," "you know," and "I mean" that structure the conversation and manage social relationships; and hedges, expressions such as "I think," "maybe," and "sort of" that convey tentativeness and negotiation of intellectual positioning. Furthermore, adjacency pairs, such as question-answer exchanges, are analyzed to understand conversational coherence and role negotiation, while power dynamics are explored through linguistic strategies like interruptions, emphatic statements, and repair mechanisms that reflect and construct hierarchical roles within the dialogue. This methodological approach, chosen for its ability to provide detailed insights into the interplay of language and power in spontaneous spoken interactions, highlights the interactional strategies used

by the participants, illustrating how language serves as a medium for asserting intellectual authority, fostering inclusivity, and managing social dynamics, thereby offering a nuanced understanding of conversational roles in informal academic settings.

### Data Collection

The study's data were obtained from a recorded informal conversation between two literature students, Elif and Shafaq, discussing themes from Pride and Prejudice by Jane Austen. This conversation, conducted during a literature seminar, offers a rich context to analyze peer interactions and intellectual engagement. Elif, more dominant, directed the conversation, while Shafaq maintained a passive, responding role. The transcription meticulously captured pauses, hesitations, and tonal nuances, focusing on linguistic features such as turn-taking, discourse markers, hedges, adjacency pairs, and power dynamics to explore conversational roles and intellectual authority.

### Data analysis

The analysis of the conversation between Elif and Shafaq provides valuable insights into how language strategies shape their interaction. By focusing on aspects such as turn-taking, the use of discourse markers and hedges, power dynamics, and adjacency pairs, it is possible to understand the conversational roles they adopt, how they negotiate authority, and the ways in which they engage intellectually. Through this detailed examination, it becomes evident that Elif holds a dominant role in directing the conversation, while Shafaq adopts a more tentative and subordinate position. Turn-taking is a crucial aspect of conversation as it establishes the rhythm and direction of interaction. In the dialogue analyzed, Elif takes on a central role by initiating discussions and controlling the flow of conversation. Her ability to hold the floor for extended periods showcases her assertiveness and command over the interaction. This is evident in the opening part of their conversation, where Elif poses a question that invites Shafaq to contribute, but the response Shafaq gives demonstrates her position as a secondary participant.

For instance, Elif states:

*"I've been thinking about the role of irony in Pride and Prejudice. Don't you think Austen uses it to critique the social norms of her time?"*

Shafaq responds hesitantly:

*"Umm… yes, definitely. But I feel… well, it's more subtle than that."*

This brief exchange shows how Shafaq's response is marked by hesitancy, indicated by the use of "Umm" and the phrase "I feel," which signals her reluctance to challenge Elif's opinion directly. This highlights Elif's role as the dominant speaker in steering the discussion. The use of a question by Elif functions as an invitation for dialogue, but Shafaq's hesitant response reflects her position as a more passive participant, indicating her acknowledgment of Elif's leadership in the conversation.

Discourse markers and hedges are essential linguistic tools that speakers use to signal shifts in conversation, express hesitation, or maintain politeness. In this analysis, both Elif and Shafaq employ these tools, but they do so differently, revealing their respective positions in the conversation. Discourse markers such as "well," "you know," and "I mean" are employed to structure their responses and manage transitions. These markers are crucial for indicating when a speaker is shifting their line of thought or when they are attempting to introduce an idea in a non-definitive way.

Shafaq's use of "Umm" and "I feel" marks her as hesitant, suggesting that she is aware of the potential for disagreement and wishes to mitigate the impact of her words. Her response, *"Umm… yes, definitely. But I feel… well, it's more subtle than that,"* illustrates how she is trying to express her opinion while softening its impact. The phrase "I feel" signals uncertainty, aligning with findings in discourse analysis that suggest hedges are used to express tentativeness and politeness (Lakoff, 1973; Holmes, 1990).

Elif's language, by contrast, is marked by fewer hedges and more assertive discourse markers. Her response:

*"Yes, right, but it's still a critique, just, you know, in a more indirect way."*

Highlights her confidence in her argument and her desire to prompt Shafaq to agree with her. The phrase "you know" functions as a discourse marker that invites shared understanding, reinforcing Elif's position as the more dominant speaker. This contrast between Elif' assertive language and Shafaq's hedging illustrates how power dynamics are expressed through their different conversational styles. The power dynamics between Elif and Shafaq are a central aspect of their interaction and can be seen in their linguistic choices. Elif's control over

the conversation is reinforced by her use of firm statements and minimal hedging, which suggest her confidence in her ideas and her unwillingness to cede conversational ground. The structure of the conversation shows that Elif frequently interrupts Shafaq's attempts to voice her opinion, subtly signaling her dominance in the dialogue.

For instance, after Shafaq says:

*"I feel… well, it's more subtle than that."*

Elif interjects with:

*"Yes, right, but it's still a critique, just, you know, in a more indirect way."*

By stepping in with a correction and clarification, Elif reaffirms her authority and direction in the conversation. This interruption not only corrects Shafaq's statement but also reinforces Elif's dominance in the dialogue, illustrating how power is negotiated and maintained through language.

The conversational structure also underscores the power imbalance between the speakers. While Shafaq makes efforts to contribute, her interruptions are infrequent and often short-lived, signifying her role as a less authoritative participant. Elif's willingness to dominate the conversation reflects the influence of power as constructed through language, supporting the notion that linguistic resources play an integral role in maintaining or challenging power structures (Fairclough, 1992). Adjacency pairs, a fundamental feature of conversation, are also essential for maintaining coherence and are indicative of how power dynamics are maintained. Adjacency pairs, such as questions followed by answers, create a predictable pattern that keeps the conversation on track. Elif often initiates these pairs by posing questions or making statements that demand a response, which in turn reinforces her role as the conversation leader. Shafaq's responses, which are generally brief and hesitant, serve to maintain the conversational flow but do little to shift the direction of the discussion. This pattern indicates that while Shafaq participates, her contributions are reactive rather than proactive.

When Shafaq seeks to clarify her position or hesitates, Elif often steps in with a repair, maintaining her role as the conversation leader. For example, after Shafaq's hesitant statement:

*"I feel… well, it's more subtle than that."*

Elif responds quickly:

*"Yes, right, but it's still a critique, just, you know, in a more indirect way."*

This response functions as a repair mechanism, correcting Shafaq's statement while reasserting Elif's authority. By using repairs, Elif demonstrates her dominance, shaping the interpretation of the conversation and reaffirming her control.

In conclusion, the analysis of Elif and Shafaq's conversation highlights the complex interplay of linguistic strategies that contribute to power dynamics, turn-taking, and intellectual engagement. Elif's assertive use of language, minimal hedging, and frequent dominance in initiating adjacency pairs underscore her dominant role, while Shafaq's hesitant responses and use of hedges reveal her more passive position. Through these linguistic choices, power is negotiated and maintained, demonstrating the central role of language in structuring interpersonal relationships and authority within conversations.

## Recommendations

1. Expand Contextual Diversity: Future research should explore conversational dynamics across varied settings, including non-academic environments, professional dialogues, and casual discussions, to compare how power and language strategies differ.
2. Gender Analysis in Discourse: Conducting in-depth studies on the role of gender in shaping conversational control and linguistic strategies will enhance understanding of power imbalances and social negotiations.
3. Incorporate Multimodal Analysis: Integrating nonverbal communication, such as facial expressions, gestures, and body language, can provide a more comprehensive understanding of emotional engagement and the subtleties of social dynamics.
4. Cultural Comparative Studies: Investigate how cultural norms influence conversational structures, including turn-taking and the use of hedges and discourse markers, to uncover cross-cultural variations in communication strategies.
5. Explore Digital Platforms: Given the shift towards virtual communication, analyzing conversational dynamics on digital platforms like social media, online forums, and video conferencing can reveal adaptations in language use and power assertion in virtual interactions.
6. Interdisciplinary Integration: Collaboration with fields such as psychology, sociology, and digital media studies can broaden the analytical framework and provide nuanced perspectives on discourse and social interactions.

## Conclusion

This study highlights the complex nature of informal peer conversations, showing how language plays a key role in shaping social interactions and intellectual discussions. By analyzing features like turn-taking, discourse markers, hedges, and power dynamics, it reveals how language helps build social roles and manage authority. For example, dominant participants, like Elif, use confident language and take control of the conversation, while passive participants, like Shafaq, use hesitant speech and hedges to maintain a polite and cooperative tone. These language strategies not only affect the conversation but also reflect broader social norms. The study shows that discourse markers and hedges help organize speech, soften statements, and express emotions, creating a respectful and collaborative dialogue. Examining informal conversations like this is important because they reflect real-life communication patterns often missed in formal studies. Understanding these dynamics provides insights into how people negotiate power, share emotions, and position themselves intellectually in everyday interactions. Future research could build on these findings by studying informal conversations in different cultural and disciplinary settings, including how nonverbal communication and digital platforms influence conversational dynamics. Such studies would deepen our understanding of how language continues to adapt and serve as a foundation of human interaction.

## Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## References

Bucy, E. P. (2017). Nonverbal communication in interpersonal interactions. *Journal of Communication Research*, *42*(3), 215–230.

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and power: Relationships between communication and control. *Discourse & Society*, *1*(2), 259–279.

Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *14*(3), 383– 398.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. *American Journal of Sociology*, *55*(1), 1–17.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *19*, 283–307.

Jefferson, G. (1974). Error correction as an interactional resource. *Language in Society*, *2*(2), 181–199.

Lakoff, R. (1972). Hedges: A study in meaning and communication. *Papers in Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1–24.

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

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers in interaction. *Text*, *7*(3), 271–294.

Swann, J., & Graddol, D. (1988). Literary discussions among students: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Applied Linguistics*, *9*(4), 287–304.

Tannen, D. (1993). Gender and conversational interaction. *Oxford University Press*, *16*(2), 97–123.