

A CONVERSATION ANALYTIC STUDY OF PRACTICES OF AFFILIATION AND
DISAFFILIATION IN ARABIC IN ALJAZEERA'S "THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION"

BY

DANA SHALASH

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2019

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Irene Koshik, Chair
Professor Emeritus Clifford Christians
Professor Andrea Golato, Texas State University
Professor Linda Herrera

ABSTRACT

This dissertation studies the discursive strategies used by the interviewer (IR) to further or block the interviewees' (IEs') agenda and stance in "The Opposite Direction," a weekly news interview program that broadcasts live in Arabic on Aljazeera. The show has been on the air since Aljazeera's inception, in the late 1990s. The show hosts two guests with opposing political views, who are pitted against each other in a heated discussion as they represent and defend their own political and institutional affiliation. I argue that the IR uses different questioning practices with the two interviewees (IEs) allowing one to further his agenda while blocking the other's agenda. Guests whose political views are in sync with those of the IR are seated to the right of the screen. I call them interviewees in the *favorable* position (IEFs). The other guests, representing the 'other' view, are seated to the left of the screen and are in the *disfavorable* position (IEDs). This dissertation shows that these actions of agenda- furthering or blocking are implemented by the IR and shows *how* they are achieved. For the analysis presented in this dissertation, I have studied twenty, fifty-minute episodes from "The Opposite Direction" using Conversation Analysis as my analytic method.

The dissertation shows that the IR regularly employs four practices that allow him to further his own and his IEFs' agenda. Those include 1) repeats of IEFs' prior talk with rising intonation, 2) pseudo candidate understandings, 3) candidate responses, and 4) anticipatory completions. The first practice is treated by the IEF as an opportunity to confirm and highlight a previous point. As a result, the IEFs normally respond by producing an identical repeat. For the second strategy, the IR uses the format of a candidate understanding, resaying of previous turns in new words as if to check his understanding. I referred to this practice as a "pseudo" candidate understanding because there is little to no connection between the IEFs' previous points and the IR's reformulation. Using pseudo candidate understandings allows the IR to divert the conversation in a specific direction that allows the IR to further *his* own agenda. The IEFs respond by confirming those pseudo candidate understandings, and at times incorporating them in their next turns. The third practice, using candidate responses, allows the IR to insert, model, and cue to the IEF a satisfactory response even before the IEFs have had a chance to

respond to the IR's question. And finally, the IR displays affiliation with his IEFs by completing his IEF's turn in progress. All four practices allow the IEF to have more opportunities to talk and to further either the IR's or the IEFs' own agenda.

My dissertation also shows that the IR uses disaffiliative strategies with his IEDs. Those include 1) repeats of IEDs' prior turns, 2) disagreement through disrespectful language, and 3) using 'did you know' questions. Repeats of IEDs' prior turns, or DOIRs as I refer to them, allow the IR to block the IED's turn in favor of issuing a direct disagreement in the next turn. The repeat in a DOIR sequence is done to set up a contrast between what the IED has just said and what the IR subsequently claims to be true.

The dissertation distinguishes between the affiliative and disaffiliative repeats. It shows that Disaffiliative other initiated repeats (DOIRs) are distinct from their Affiliative repeats (the AOIRs). Whereas AOIRs are said with rising intonation and are oriented to as an opportunity to confirm and highlight a previous point, DOIRs are said with falling intonation and are treated as a pre-disagreement.

The dissertation fills a gap in the Arabic literature by studying and analyzing examples of repair formats in Arabic talk including repeats. The dissertation also builds on existing literature on broadcast news interviews and it presents examples of other undescribed strategies through which IRs express adversarialness with their IEs. The dissertation has implications that are multidisciplinary for Conversation Analysis, Arabic linguistics, cross cultural studies, Middle Eastern studies and Arabic media studies.

Keywords: Conversation Analysis, Arabic, Affiliation, Disaffiliation, Broadcast News Interviews, Aljazeera, The Opposite Direction

To Saleen, Aysam, and Dalia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of my adviser, Professor Irene Koshik who has been a truly dedicated and supportive mentor in the last few years. Professor Koshik has been incredibly patient with me during this entire process, patiently guiding and teaching me how to become a better conversation analyst and a better researcher.

I am also thankful for Dr. Andrea Golato, whose patience, support, and prompt response always lifted up my spirits and pushed me to learn and familiarize myself with literature outside of the English speaking world. I am also thankful for Dr. Christian Clifford and Dr. Linda Herrera who agreed to step in and serve on my committee just before I was ready to defend my preliminary proposal last year. Their insight has been truly helpful, and their feedback helped me pay better attention to other macro issues that I wouldn't have considered otherwise in my dissertation.

I would like to thank my family, especially my mother, whose love and guidance are with me in whatever I pursue. My mom is my role model in hope, persistence and dedication. Becoming a refugee and losing her dad at a very young age, my mom could never have a normal life let alone real education. Therefore, she wanted her children to have what she could never have, and she definitely made sure I never give up or look back.

I would also like to thank all of my sisters, especially my youngest sister, Hamda, for all of the help and emotional support she's provided since I started the PhD. And finally, I wish to thank my three children, Saleen, Aysam, and Dalia, for providing unending inspiration and for giving me three reasons to never give up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS.....	35
CHAPTER 4: REPAIR AND NON-REPAIR PRACTICES IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC TALK.....	40
CHAPTER 5: INTERVIEWER’S PRACTICES THAT ALIGN WITH THE INTERVIEWEE.....	70
CHAPTER 6: INTERVIEWER’S PRACTICES THAT DISALIGN WITH THE INTERVIEWEE.....	129
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	164
REFERENCES.....	170
APPENDIX A: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS.....	178
APPENDIX B: EXPLANATION OF FOUR LINE TRANSCRIPTION.....	179

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In this dissertation, I study the discursive strategies used by the interviewer (IR) to further or block the interviewees' (IEs') agenda and stance in "The Opposite Direction," a weekly news interview program that broadcasts live in Arabic on Aljazeera. The show has been on the air since Aljazeera's inception, in the late 1990s. The show hosts two guests with opposing political views, who are pitted against each other in a heated discussion as they represent and defend their own political and institutional affiliation. I argue that the IR¹ uses different questioning practices with the two interviewees (IEs) allowing one to further his agenda while blocking the other's agenda. Guests whose political views are in sync with those of the IR are seated to the right of the screen. I call them interviewees in the *favorable* position (IEFs, hereafter). The other guests, representing the 'other' view, are seated to the left of the screen and are in the *disfavorable* position (IEDs). In this dissertation, I propose to show that these actions of agenda-furthering or blocking are implemented by the IR and to show *how* they are achieved. For the analysis presented in this dissertation, I have studied twenty, fifty-minute episodes from "The Opposite Direction" using Conversation Analysis as my analytic method.

Unlike its Western counterpart, existing research on Arabic broadcast news interviews is limited to only a few studies (Alfahad, 2013, 2016; Ayish, 2005; Migdadi et al., 2013) which tend to rely on descriptive analysis rather than presenting analysis of actual data in the form of transcribed talk. Additionally, research on Arabic question-response in both institutional and everyday talk is non-existent. Therefore, this study will have implications that are multidisciplinary for Conversation Analysis, Arabic linguistics, cross cultural studies, Middle Eastern studies and Arabic media studies.

The next sections will be organized as follows: Chapter 2 will provide a review of the literature written on broadcast news interviews and their findings across cultures. The chapter will also provide some relevant background on Aljazeera, the show "The Opposite Direction," and will review academic studies of this program. Particular focus will be on studies of how the show and the show host promote

¹ Each show is hosted by the same IR, Faisal Alkasim.

challenges and adversarialness among participants. The chapter will also review relevant literature on Arabic diaglossia and code switching which, as I will later show, can be utilized, together with disrespectful language, as a discursive strategy by the IR to challenge his IEDs.

Chapter 3 will explain the dataset and Conversation Analysis— the research methodology used in the data collection, transcription, and analysis. The chapter will also provide a rationale for why Conversation Analysis methodology is used.

Chapter 4 will review practices of repair in English and Arabic as many of the practices I later discuss are formatted similarly to repair practices. It will first review different repair formats as documented in the literature, mostly from English. It will also present new data and describe repair practices in spoken Arabic based on the Egyptian Callhome corpus. The chapter will then focus on other initiated repeats and the non-repair actions they achieve in talk across cultures. Because repeats have not yet been described in Arabic talk, this chapter will also present new data on repeats from the Egyptian Callhome corpus. The chapter then ends with reviewing repeat practices in institutional talk.

The following two chapters will present an analysis of data from “The Opposite Direction.” Reviews of the literature on specific practices discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 will be included within these chapters. Chapter 5 will analyze the discursive strategies that the IR uses to align with and to further the IEF’s agenda. These practices include the IR use of 1) other-initiated repeats with rising intonation, 2) proposing pseudo candidate understandings, 3) offering candidate responses, and 4) offering anticipatory completions. These practices, as I will show, allow the IR and the IEFs to jointly construct and further their own agendas.

Chapter 6 will study the discursive strategies that the IR uses to challenge and block the IEDs’ agendas. These include the IR's use of 1) repeats of the IEDs’ prior turns with falling intonation to challenge and discredit their prior turns, 2) explicit disagreement and disrespectful language usually done in spoken dialects of Arabic, and 3) “did you know” questions that convey hostile presuppositions with which the IED can neither agree or disagree.

Chapter 7 will provide a conclusion and implications, as well as suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. BROADCAST NEWS INTERVIEWS

As one of the most thoroughly studied types of institutional talk by Conversation Analysts (e.g. Clayman, 1992; Greatbatch, 1998; Harris, 1991; Heritage 1985; Heritage and Greatbatch 1991; Heritage and Roth 1995; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Rendle-Short, 2007), earlier studies of broadcast news interviews focused on how interviewers in the U.S. and the U.K. balance their acts of adversarialness and objectivity with the interviewees. Because they are not expected to assert their own opinions, IRs have been reported to maintain a “neutralistic” (Clayman, 1992) rather than a completely neutral stance. For instance, interviewers may attribute a controversial position to an absent third party. IRs can also embed their stance through questions (as we will see in the section 2.2.3.). Therefore, most of the early conversation analytic research on broadcast news interviews in the U.S. and U.K. shows that interviewers employ different types of questioning practices to maintain such a neutralistic stance. Later studies expanded geographically to study broadcast news in a number of other countries such as Greece (Patrona, 2009), Israel (Blum Kulka, 2002), Saudi Arabia (Alfahad, 2013; 2015), and Australia (Rendle-Short, 2007). Many of these recent studies, as we will soon see, report that IRs are less concerned about expressing a neutralistic stance towards their interviewees. IRs in these studies often use more challenging and aggressive forms of questioning.

Broadcast news interviews have a number of distinguishing characteristics, as summarized by Ekstrom (2001, p. 565), that set them apart from everyday conversation and other forms of institutional talk. First, the interviewer (IR) begins and ends the interview; second, the IR has the initiative and invites respondents (politicians and public figures) to speak; third, the respondent takes account of the fact that the interviewer has the power to set the agenda and decides what the conversation will cover; fourth, the interviewee is expected to cooperate by answering the journalist’s questions. Refusal to answer is also a response to the question. And finally, the interviews are usually conducted before an anonymous audience. In addition, the role of the journalist or interviewer is to act “as a professional journalist rather than as a partisan advocate or celebrity entertainer” (Clayman, 2012). Clayman (2012) explains that the

IRs and IEs in the US and UK normally hold newsworthy discussions on current events where the interaction is relatively formal rather than conversational in character. In assuming a formal and neutralistic position, the IR avoids speaking in the first person ('I'), and the IR's move to the next question (be it a follow-up question or an entirely new subject) is expected to be done without evaluating or commenting on the interviewee's answer to the preceding question (Clayman 1992; Ekstrom, 2001).

That said, IEs are not powerless as they can evade IRs' questions by shifting the question topic and agenda if the IRs are heard to disalign with them (Ekstrom, 2001, p. 566). After all, the IR-IE talk represents a form of institutional interaction between journalists and politicians; they both represent their institutional identity by structuring the turn taking sequences, and by using discursive strategies that allow journalists to maintain neutralistic yet critical positions and stances (Heritage & Greatbatch 1991; Ekstrom 2001).

In recent years, a more adversarial type of broadcast news interview has appeared. The introduction and advancement of satellite and cable T.V., some argue, has allowed for a type of interview that has many of the formal features of the standard broadcast news interview as discussed above, yet combines "features of the argumentative and confrontational exchanges often found in other forms of broadcasting, such as talk radio and topical debate shows²" (Hutchby, 2011, p. 350). Most recent research shows that IRs are nowadays less concerned with maintaining a neutralistic stance in their questioning of IEs. IRs are becoming increasingly and explicitly adversarial in political talk shows, particularly on privately owned satellite and cable channels. Hutchby (2011) studied interviews on Fox News which he explains as a channel unconstrained by any commitment to neutrality and objectivity with its tendency of blending political reporting with stance-taking (ibid). Findings from Spanish, Greek, Australian, Saudi and Israeli news interviews lend support to Hutchby's findings. Patrona (2009) shows that news interviews in Greek are also highly adversarial. Interviewers use a number of face threatening strategies such as questions with negative presuppositions about politicians' acts, statements that challenge

² Hutchby references Fox News "The O'Reilly Factor" in his paper as an example.

interviewees' prior talk and convey a hostile stance through uncooperative conversational behavior, namely interruptions, ironic remarks and face-to-face disagreements with the IEs. Similar findings have been reported in the Israeli News interview context by Blum Kulka (2002).

In the Arabic context, IRs are becoming more adversarial in privately owned stations as opposed to government run channels (Alfahad, 2013; 2015). Saudi IRs challenge their IEs by frequent interruptions, the use of imperatives rather than questions and forms of address that do not reflect the customary respect for officials (Alfahad, 2013; 2015). Other Arab IRs were also noted to consciously suspend politeness strategies for the sake of maximizing rather than minimizing challenge and confrontation (Migdadi et al., 2013). Migdadi et al. (2013) report that IRs and IEs challenge each other by using rudeness³, interruptions, and abusive language to accentuate their strong disagreement and develop hostile feelings for each other, and by using sarcasm as a face threatening act.

Clearly, there exist some cross-cultural similarities that IRs use to either redress or express adversarialness with their IEs. The following section will review these common discursive strategies as have been reported in the existing literature. Prefatory statements, third party attributions, and questions are among the main discursive strategies used by IRs to display a critical position while maintaining a neutralistic stance with their IEs. Conversely, other discursive strategies allow IRs to do and produce "non-neutrality" (Hutchby, 2011) more explicitly such as the use of direct accusations, abusive language, irony and sarcasm.

³ The authors do not provide any definition or rationale for using the term "rudeness". They simply equate it with the term "provocative".

2.2. DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES USED TO PERFORM A NEUTRALISTIC STANCE IN BROADCAST NEWS INTERVIEWS

2.2.1. Prefatory statements

Prefatory statements or question prefaces are formatted as declarative statements and can be rather extensive (Clayman, 2010). They allow the journalists to provide background information for both the recipient and the overhearing audience to understand the import of the question and why it's being asked. Consider this example of an IR's question preface leading up to a grammatically formulated question. The preface takes a stance about the necessity of raising social security taxes, in lines 4-7. The IE, the Republican presidential candidate Pat Buchanan, begins to respond to the stance conveyed in the prefatory statement in line 9.

Excerpt 1: Prefatory statements in broadcast news interviews (from Clayman, 2010, p. 179)

1. IR: ... Now- uh- my question about- the-
2. IE: Mm h[m,
3. IR: → [the social security tax increase (Was) .hh
4. I don't think an_yone doubts that by now absent a
5. tax increase .hh social security an' all the
6. social security recipients in this state .hh uh:
7. would be=h de- in default?
8. (.)
9. IE: tlk I don't [(agree with-)
10. IR: [How would you have saved it.
11. IE: hhuh huh. .hh I would've- I would've done a
12. a different approach...

A question preface allows the IR to construct a context of his own choosing for the next question (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, p. 195-96). Here, the question preface involves a statement about the necessity of increasing social security taxes, portrayed as a matter of common consensus ("I don't think

anyone doubts...” in line 4). Using a prefatory statement allows the IR to distance himself from making an explicit criticism. The IE begins to respond by disagreeing with the criticism in the prefatory statement with “tlk I don’t [(agree with-)]” in line 9. But, the IR interrupts the IE and continues with the question proper in the next turn. Clayman and Heritage (2002) explain that unattributed statements such as this example are treated by IEs as being less impartial than statements attributed to third parties, and they are thus more vulnerable to receiving pre-emptive responses (p. 179), as we have seen in this example.

2.2.2. Third party attributions.

Third party attributions allow IRs to distance themselves from the statements and questions being asked. They allow journalists to display a challenge while maintaining a neutralistic stance. This strategy entails a shift in the speaker’s interactional footing (Goffman, 1981; Clayman and Heritage, 2002) by attributing the point of view expressed to a third party, be it a group or category of persons, named or unnamed. Also, by presenting themselves as speaking on behalf of the general public, the IRs allow themselves to claim “not credibility so much as legitimacy” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, p. 171). Attributing statements to third parties is one of the most common discursive practices used by IRs in news interviews cross-culturally to embed a hostile stance while distancing themselves from the statement, as shown in example 2 below. In the following interview with the South African Ambassador (which was still under apartheid rule and had just declared a state of emergency as a result of increasing civil unrest), the IR expresses a view not as his own but as that of ‘critics’ that the purpose of the state of emergency is to suppress political dissent.

Excerpt 2: third party attributions in broadcast news interviews (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, p. 164)

1. IR: Finally Mister Ambassador as you know the
2. → critics say that the purpose of the state of
3. emergency the real purpose of the state of
4. ‘mergeh- uh state of emergency is to suppress
5. political dissent. those who are opposed to the
6. Apartheid government of South Africa. Is that so,

7. (.)

8.IE: I would have to: uh- take issue with

9. → that premise. because...

The IR is here expressing a strong opinion, which could bring his neutralistic stance in jeopardy. By attributing the opinion to “critics”, the IR can be heard as merely reporting that opinion. The IR is thus able to express direct opposition to the IE without positioning himself as opposing the interviewee. The IE responds by only challenging the premise of the question (in lines 8-9), but not the interviewer himself (i.e., he speaks of “that premise” rather than “your premise”).

2.2.3. Questions in Broadcast News Interviews

Questions are the most thoroughly researched strategy in broadcast news interview research. Researchers have examined a number of recurrent questioning practices in broadcast news interviews and studied how these practices are intertwined with journalistic tasks and professional norms. One of the distinctive criteria of news interviews as opposed to many other types of institutional talk is that turns and turn taking are pre-allocated. IRs are expected to ask while IEs answer. Heritage and Clayman (2010) explain that journalistic questioning involves a balancing act or tension between two major professional norms: ‘objectivity and adversarialness’ (p. 227). But because “strict neutrality (or impartiality or freedom from bias) is impossible” (p. 228), the journalists mitigate their disagreement with the IEs by asking questions. As is the case with courtroom talk where lawyers ask questions for the jury, in broadcast news interviews, IRs ask questions of public figures for the sake of an overhearing audience. IRs’ questions are not always strictly neutral. IRs “package their actions as ‘questions’” (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, p. 188).

Consider this excerpt from Clayman and Heritage (2002) where a leading Labor politician, Tony Benn, who was narrowly defeated four years earlier in an election for the deputy leadership of his party, is asked if he will stand against the new leaders of the party.

Excerpt 3: IR’s packaging their actions as questions (from Clayman and Heritage, 2002 p. 146-47).

1. IR: → =Have you any intention of standing against

2. either Mister Kinnock (.) or Mister Hattersley

3. .hhh at the party conference for either of their
4. Two jobs.
5. IE: No.
6. (0.2)
7. IR: → Why not.
8. (0.6)
9. IE: Well I've:: given you the answer.=Why should
10. I.=I mean I:'m in favor [of the=
11. IR: [Because=
12. IE: =electoral college. .hhhh
13. IR: =you disagree with them on- on a number
14. [of issues.
15. IE: [uhr
16. IE: You see (that) is very-you are really very
17. funny. I mean I understand why people hate the
18. media. .h[hh Because when I=
19. IR: [hah huh hah
20. IE: =give you a straight answer to a straight
21. question which I've given on television for
22. weeks and weeks .hhh you press, .h you
23. try to make trouble.

The IR's issues a yes/no question in lines 1-4 which conveys that the IE may have an issue with his party members. The IR denies having any issues in line 5 "No". The IR then in line 7 issues a question "why not" which hints that the IE should have an issue with them because the latter "disagree with them on- on a number of issues" (lines 13-14). In lines 16 onwards, the IE issues a direct attack on the IR, beginning with his claim that he understands "why people hate the media." especially when he gave a "straight

answer to a straight question,”. The IE here treats the IR’s questions as pushing the IR’s personal and institutional agenda on him. The IE criticizes the IR’s questions as “pressing” and “making trouble”. As Clayman and Heritage (2002) explain, examples such as these are rare. Even when IEs attack IRs, IEs “rarely make generalized claims about interviewer neutrality, and instead comment on the details of a particular propositions and lines of questioning” (p. 147).

In their comparison of the journalists’ questions’ designs both in the US and the UK in the few past decades, Clayman and Heritage (2002) have found that the characteristics of indirectness of these questions which were noticeable in political interviews in the past do not apply nowadays (p. 190). By “conventional indirectness,” Clayman and Heritage refer to questions such as “can you... tell us something of how you view the election prospects” which treat the IE’s response as optional rather than obligatory (ibid). Also, broadcast interview questions are nowadays more complex; the design/structure of questions can overtly index elements of the personal identities of both IEs and IRs. Their complex grammatical and rhetorical constructions, Clayman and Heritage (2002) further explain, tend to either support or challenge the positions of public figures on various issues (p. 191). In the next section, I will review different types of questions used by IRs, as have been reported in the literature.

2.2.3.1. Questions that Convey the IR's Stance in Broadcast News Interviews

As a powerful tool, questions in broadcast news interviews can set agendas in a number of ways. First, questions can set agendas by identifying a specific topic. Silence or failure to address the question’s topic would be noticeable and accountable (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). In addition to identifying a topical domain, questions can also identify actions that the IE should perform in relation to the topical domain. In the next excerpt, the British Prime Minister Heath is asked by the IR if he likes his political rival, Wilson.

Excerpt 4: Setting agendas through questions (Clayman & Heritage, 2002, p. 198) ((modified⁴))

1. IR: → Do you quite like him?
2. (0.1)

⁴ Modified by deleting 6 lines of IE talk.

3. IE: .hhh .h .h We:ll I th- I think in politics you
4. see: i- it's not a question of going about (.)
((6 lines by IE omitted))
5. IR: → <But do you like> him?
6. (0.4)
7. IE: .hhhh Well agai:n it's not a question of f uh (.)
8. li:kes or disli:kes. I::t's a question of
9. wor:king together:: with other people who are in
10. politics,
11. (0.6)
12. IR: → But do y'like him.
13. (0.4)
14. IE: .hhh (.) That'll have to remain t'be see:n won't
15. it.

The IR's question in line 1 "Do you quite like him?" presses the IE for a response. Heath responds by addressing the topic, Wilson, but does not respond to the action agenda that the questions calls for (yes or no) on whether or not he 'likes' Wilson. The IE's avoidance of the question's agenda allows the IR to reissue it again in line 5 then again in line 12. Wh- questions (what, why, how) can also set agendas, but they set the parameters for response more broadly. Yes/no questions are more constraining on the IE, while the wh- question may be answered with a wide range of resources (Clayman & Heritage 2002, p. 200-01).

Questions can also incorporate presuppositions i.e., propositions that are not the primary focus of inquiry but are nonetheless assumed to be true in the design of a question (Clayman & Heritage 2002; Clayman, 2012). Consider this question from an interview with Arthur Scargill of Britain's National Union of Mineworkers. By asking about 'the difference' between his Marxism and the views of a political opponent, this question presupposes that Scargill is indeed a Marxist.

Excerpt 5: Presuppositions in Questions (from Clayman and Heritage, 2002. p. 118)

01. IR: → .hhh er What 's the difference between your
02. marxism and Mister Mcgarhey's communism.
03. AS: er the difference is that it's the press that
04. call me mar:xist when I do not, (.)

While a question such as “do you consider yourself a Marxist” seeks to establish that the addressee is Marxist, the question in Excerpt 5 already establishes that as a fact. And since that fact is undesirable to the IE, the question that presupposes it is clearly adversarial in its import. The IE responds with a denial of the presupposition in lines 3-4.

Embedding presuppositions is also used as a means through which interviewers show alignment through questions with the IEs. In the next excerpt taken from Shalash (2009), the journalist displays a stance and conveys alignment with the IE. The journalist and the IE (the Libyan Ambassador) share the same ethnic and linguistic membership category. Prior to this exchange, the Libyan Ambassador responded to a question by another journalist in English, defending his country. In that response, the IE had just rejected the Israeli Ambassador's labelling of Libya as 'terrorist' in English. After the IE had given his briefing statement and refuted the Israeli accusations in English, an Arab journalist, as shown below, asks a question in Arabic.⁵

Excerpt 6: Presuppositions in questions to align with IE (from Shalash, 2009, p. 23).

1. IR: → ma howa raduka 'ala ittiham libya 'ala
what is your-reaction on accusing Libya as
what is your response to accusing Libya as a
2. IR: annaha dawla irhabiyya tumares al irhab mn
being state terrorist practices the terrorism
terrorist state by the ambassador of a state whose

⁵ The original text provides a three-line transcript as shown here. No Arabic script was provided.

3. IR: mn safer ma'rouf tab'an mumarasatuhu?
from ambassador well-known of course his practices?
practices are of course well-known?
4. IE: naHnu la nantather shahadah mn eh- mn
we no waiting certificate from eh- from
we are not waiting for a certificate from eh- from
5. IE: mumathel lelkayan al sohyouni al
representative of-the-entity the-Zionist the
a representative of the Zionist entity that is
6. IE: ma'rouf bi annahu kayanun a: qama 'ala
wellknown as it is entity a: established on
known to have been established based on
7. IE: al irhab wa sfku-addima'a
the terrorism and shedding-blood
terrorism and bloodshed
8. IE: wa mazal yaHtalu alaradi al Filstiniyya
and still occupies the territories the Palestinian
and still occupies the Palestinian Territories ((talk continues))

The journalist's question has an obvious stance that aligns with the Libyan Ambassador. The IR's question "what is your response to accusing Libya of being a terrorist state by the ambassador of a state whose practices are of course well-known" does much more than questioning; it also conveys an embedded presupposition and an accusation of Israel. The presupposition is heard by the IE to convey that Israel's practices are well known, and that Israel should be the one labeled terrorist. Therefore, the IE hears an alignment with his stated stance and responds in lines 4-8 by saying "we are not waiting for a certificate from eh- from a representative of the Zionist entity that is known to have been established based on terrorism and bloodshed and still occupies the Palestinian Territories." This statement includes a

confirmation of the presupposition in lines 6-8; the IE elaborates on the “well known practices” as consisting of “terrorism and bloodshed and occupation of the Palestinian Territories.

In addition to setting agendas and conveying presuppositions, questions, especially yes/no questions, can also set a preference or expectation for specific answers. Negative interrogatives such as in Excerpt 7 below exert more pressure on public figures to answer in a certain way that may damage their public figure’s interests, hence, such questions are adversarial in character (Heritage, 2002; Clayman, 2012 p. 644). Consider this example from a televised press conference.

Excerpt 7: Yes/no questions (from Claymon and Heritage 2002 p. 210)

- 1.IR: W’l Mister President in your zea:l (.) for funds
2. → during the last campaign .hh didn’t you put the
3. Vice President (.) an’ Maggie and all the others
4. in your (0.4) administration top side .hh in a
5. very vulnerable position, hh (0.5)
- 6.Clinton: → I disagree with that. hh

The grammatical form of the question in lines 2-5 “didn’t you put the Vice President (.) an’ Maggie and all the others in your (0.4) administration top side .hh in a very vulnerable position,” is heard as an assertion that favors a “yes” answer, that Clinton did put the Vice President an’ Maggie and all the others in his administration in a vulnerable position. This question is treated as having a view point to agree or disagree with. Clinton hears the adversarial assertion in the question and responds with “I disagree with that .hh”. Among these various grammatical forms, the negative interrogative—namely those incorporating a negative into the copula—stands out as most powerful in its push for a particular answer (Heritage, 2002). Negative interrogatives are routinely treated as assertions more than as questions, and perceived by interviewees as stating an opinion, thus being hostile and breaking the interview conventions (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

In addition to setting the agenda, conveying presuppositions, and inviting certain responses, some forms of hostile questions are “disjunctive” questions which invite interviewees to select among

alternatives undesirable to the IEs, and which the IE cannot endorse. These would be cases where an interviewer seeks to show that an interviewee's statements are self-contradictory or incompatible with evidence. Clayman and Heritage (2002) argue that among the most elaborately hostile questions are those that place interviewees in a situation of inconsistency and self-contradiction in their positions. Clayman and Heritage (2002) provide an example where the IE, then Senate leader Bob Dole, is asked to explain the fact that President Reagan's political programs are "in trouble." In the question preface, the IR offers two anonymous third-party attributed formulations of the situation. The first is that Reagan's programs, but not the President himself, are "in trouble." The second gives an explanation for the trouble in terms of ineffective legislative leadership. As Clayman and Heritage explain, the latter explanation, which engenders a laugh from Dole, is offered as implicating Dole himself, as shown below.

Excerpt 8: (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, p. 230-31)

01. IR: Senator (0.5) uh President Regan's elected
 02. thirteen months ago: an enormous landslide.
 03. (0.8)
 04. IR: It is said that his programs are in trouble,
 05. though he seems to be terribly popular with
 06. the American people.
 07. (0.6)
 08. IR: It is said by some people at the White House we
 09. could get those programs through if only we
 10. had perhaps more: .hh effective leadership up
 11. on the Hill and I [suppose] indirectly =
 12. IE: [hhhheh]
 13. IR: =that might (0.5) relate t'you as well:. 14. (0.6)
 15. IR: → Uh what do you think the problem is really. Is=
 16. it (0.2) the leadership as it might be claimed up

17. on the Hill, or is it the programs themselves.

In his final formulation of the question (lines 15-17), the IR draws on this extensive question preface and explicitly invites Dole to identify “the problem” in terms either of the weaknesses of the programs, or ineffective legislative leadership. These are presented as the possible explanations for Reagan’s legislative difficulties. None of the two options can commend itself to a Republican senate leader. Although the next turns are not available in their data, Clayman and Heritage add that the IE’s response avoids these two options “in favor of a response that cites the weakness of his majority in the Senate” (p. 231).

Finally, accusatory questions (Clayman and Heritage, 2002) include formats such as “Why did you X” or “How can you X”, or “How could you X” with the latter form being clearly confrontational; these forms question past activities and imply the unanswerability of the question.

Existing literature shows that declaratives can also be heard and treated as questions. Since not all languages have formal ways to identify questions, speakers resort to grammatical and/or prosodic resources that are associated with questions. Arabic is an interesting case. Standard Arabic is similar to English in that it has formal *wh*-questions and yes/no questions. The spoken dialects of Arabic, however, drop the yes/no particle in polar questions; speakers rely on prosodic features. Speakers’ epistemic asymmetry also appears to play a primary role in making an utterance recognizable as a question (Heritage, 2012; Hayano, 2012) and this is how speakers of languages without formal means for asking polar questions can identify them as questions (Hayano, 2012). Most languages, English included, have grammatical and/or prosodic resources associated with questioning. However, consider this example from Pomerantz (1980) where the speakers’ epistemic asymmetry plays a role in making a turn heard as accomplishing an action similar to *why*- or *how come*- questions. In Excerpt 9 below, B treats A’s turn as requesting information from an “unknowing” or K- position⁶.

⁶ According to Pomerantz (1980), some statements are heard as questions depending the speakers’ access to knowledge. A speaker may have more (K+) or less (K-) access to information than the addressee. A speaker’s utterance may be oriented to as asking for information if s/he had less access to that information. Later Heritage

Excerpt 9: Role of speakers' epistemic asymmetry (taken from Pomerantz, 1980, p. 195)

1. A: → Yer line's ben busy.
2. B: Yeuh my fu(hh) .hh my father's wife
3. called me. .hh so when she calls
4. me::, .hh I always talk fer a long
5. time. cuz she c'n afford it'n I
6. can't. hhhh heh .ehhhhhh

Here, A displays limited access to an event in B's domain of experience. B is expected to have more knowledge about what has been happening to keep her line busy. B treats A's turn as a question or perhaps a complaint. In response, B provides an account/response explaining why her line has been busy. Thus, a speaker encourages the recipient to 'volunteer' the information without explicitly requesting it through *why* or *how come*.

Before discussing whether or not these strategies are used in The Opposite Direction, I will first provide some background information on Aljazeera, the show and its host.

2.3. BACKGROUND ON ALJAZEERA

Perceived as the "voice of the Middle East" (Vesley, 2002), Aljazeera has become the pan Arab channel whose mission is to unify Arab audiences everywhere. As stated on its Arabic website, Aljazeera claims that its mission, among others, is to "التمسك بالقيم الصحفية من صدق وجرأة وإنصاف وتوازن واستقلالية ومصداقية وتنوع" السعي للوصول إلى الحقيقة وإعلانها في تقاريرنا وبرامجنا ونشراتنا الإخبارية . للاعتبارات التجارية أو السياسية على المهنية دون تغليب "تقديم وجهات النظر والآراء المختلفة دون محاباة أو انحياز لأي منها . بشكل لا غموض فيه ولا ارتياب في صحته أو دقته". On its Arabic and English websites, Aljazeera's code of ethics is translated verbatim, in bullet point format. Here are some of the main points that are especially pertinent to the dissertation. Aljazeera seeks "[To] adhere to the journalistic values of honesty, courage, fairness, balance, independence, credibility and

(2008) introduced the term "epistemic gradient" in which he explains that depending on its details and structure, a question's epistemic 'gradient' is either steep or flat. A question like "Who did you talk to?" suggests the asker has minimal knowledge about the inquired person. On the other hand, a "You were talking to Steve, weren't you?" suggests that the asker knows that answer and is merely looking for confirmation.

diversity, giving no priority to commercial or political over professional consideration. Endeavour to get to the truth and declare it in our dispatches, programmes and news bulletins unequivocally in a manner which leaves no doubt about its validity and accuracy... [And to] Present the diverse points of view and opinions without bias and partiality.⁷”

In the absence of political pluralism in the Arab world, as Ayish (2005) and Zayani (2005) explain, Aljazeera serves as a pan-Arab opposition and a forum for resistance by providing a voice for Arab opposing views. This branded the network as one which questions and challenges the common authority and political discourse. Aljazeera takes pride in covering political and social issues over which Arab governments prefer to keep quiet (Zayani, 2005, p. 2). Aljazeera’s main slogan to present “the opinion and the other opinion” is manifested in two of its prominent evening live programs “The Opinion and the Other Opinion” and “The Opposite Direction’. The data to be studied in this dissertation come from the latter show.

Aljazeera was established in 1996 after the new Qatari Sheikh (Hamad Bin Khalifa the second), British educated and a graduate of the Royal Military Academy in Sandhurst, deposed his father. He wanted reform by abolishing the Ministry of Information in an attempt to end media censorship and to introduce a liberal and democratic system. He then established Aljazeera whose personnel, including the well-known Faisal Alkasim, the host of “The Opposite Direction”, joined Aljazeera after leaving the BBC Television Arab Satellite channel (an unsuccessful British-Saudi initiative at the time).

Aljazeera quickly gained fame in the Arab world. It revolutionized Arab media by broadcasting taboo topics such as secularism, women's rights, and questioning polygamy as explained by Sharia law, among others. These were topics that no other news outlet dared to discuss at that time (Alkasim, 1996, 2005; Zayani, 2005). By introducing Western-style television journalism into the Arab world broadcasting scene, Aljazeera became the first Arab station to air a series of live talk shows “characterized by vigorous discussions and extensive viewer participation ... [that] seek to break away

⁷ This is also a word by word translation of the Arabic direct quotation above.

from dull television talk shows through hosting dissenting Arab world political figures and adopting an uncompromising approach to public issues” (Ayish, 2005, p. 108).

In 2000, Al Jazeera gained its popularity in the Arab world and became a household name after its (mostly live) coverage of the Palestinian Intifada and the Israeli attacks on Palestinian regions including the killing of a Palestinian child while taking cover behind his father, on live T.V. In the following year, as Alshathry (2015) explains, Al Jazeera gained international fame after 9/11 and its coverage of the American war on Afghanistan, and later, Iraq. Al Jazeera was the only channel allowed to broadcast from and interview major Al Qaeda leaders. Having an eventual monopoly over covering the war on Afghanistan from that country, itself, and broadcasting exclusive interviews with Taliban and Ben Laden allowed Al Jazeera to compete with its rivals in the West (mainly Reuters and CNN). Later, Al Jazeera had exclusives on the war on Iraq (Alshathry, 2015, p. 7-9) which led its competitors to report and purchase footage from Al Jazeera. In 2001, the network launched its Arabic online version Al-Jazeera.net, which was followed by Al-Jazeera International and Al-Jazeera America.

Despite its popularity among the Arab and Muslim population, Al Jazeera’s effects on the media sphere in the region have brought many political tensions for Qatar with other countries, especially its neighbors (Miles, 2005; Zayani, 2005). Because Al Jazeera was critical of Arab leaders (Miles, 2005, p. 45) and the dictatorship regimes in the Arab world, access to Al Jazeera was denied or obstructed in a number of surrounding Arab countries such as Egypt and Jordan (Zayani, 2005; Ayish, 2005; Alkassim, 2005; Miles, 2005). Furthermore, many of its journalists were expelled from Bahrain, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and other countries (Miles, 2005, p. 323). A likely reason for these drastic initiatives is that Al Jazeera expressed implicit or explicit criticism towards the states concerned (Miles, 2005: 45). Indeed, during the first months of what is called “the Arab Spring” in 2011, Al Jazeera continued to play a crucial role supporting the political change in the region (Alshathry, 2015, p. 14).

On the flip side, Al Jazeera has been accused of enticing division among Arabs and hatred against America through some of its debate programs, such as “The Opposite Direction” (Alkassim, 2005; Alshathry, 2015). Recently, in June 2017, Saudi Arabia together with UAE, Egypt and Bahrain formed a

coalition against Qatar over Aljazeera. The coalition cut complete diplomatic and economic relations with Qatar and provided Qatar with a list of thirteen demands to resolve the Gulf conflict (Fisk, 2017). In an article for the Independent Newspaper, Fisk (2017) explains that among these demands is shutting down Aljazeera under the pretext that Qatar and Aljazeera support terrorism by giving voice to everyone including the Muslim Brotherhood, an internationally recognized terrorist organization based in Egypt. Qatar has refused to shut down Aljazeera. As a result, the diplomatic conflict among these states is still ongoing, at the time of writing this dissertation. In July of 2017, Israel, now united with Saudi Arabia, threatened to close Aljazeera's office in Tel Aviv and to strip Aljazeera's reporters in Israel from their permit to report from Israel (Harkov, 2017).

Indeed, Aljazeera and the emir⁸ of Qatar are known to have close ties with the Egyptian born cleric Al-Qaradawi, the de facto Muslim Brotherhood spiritual guide. Al-Qaradawi has lived in Qatar since 1961 and has regularly appeared on Aljazeera. Some critics argue that Qatar's closeness to the Muslim Brotherhood and other extremist organizations rose politically after the latest uprisings in the Arab world (Trager, 2017). Qatar is accused of providing a platform for Brotherhood figures and other extremist groups to promote their ideology (ibid) on various programs including "The Opposite Direction."

2.3.1. Background on Aljazeera's "The Opposite Direction"

"The Opposite Direction", a novel formula in Arab media, is a site for discursively framing the latest news in the Arab world. It features two guests with opposing views who are pitted against each other in a heated discussion. It is modeled on CNN's Crossfire but is "more fierce" than its western counterpart, as its host Faisal Alkasim explains in an article he wrote for the Harvard Journal in 1999. The show allows the audience to participate on its social media sites (Facebook and Twitter) and through an ongoing online poll. In earlier years prior to social media, audience members called in to participate. Alkasim (1999; 2005), the show host, writes that his show provides a platform for everyone to present their side and for the other side to defend itself. In the early years of its inception, the show was the first in the history of

⁸ Emir means prince in Arabic. The emir of Qatar is the country's royal leader.

Arab T.V. to host some of the most hated thinkers and secularists in a relatively conservative Arab world.

Alkasim (2005) writes:

“Never before have Arab viewers seen the revered Muslim Sheikh Dr. Youssef Al Qaradawi argue vehemently live on air with the staunch secularist thinker Sadik Jalal Al Azim over the conflict between Islam and secularism. Never before have they seen one of the most wanted Arab thinkers Nasser Hamid Abou Zaid face the well-known Muslim scholar Mohammad Amara. Never before have they seen the renown[ed] feminist Dr. Nawal El Saadawi make mincemeat of the clergy, represented on the program by Sheikh Yussef Al Badri, over women’s rights. Never before have they seen a debate on polygamy, which is permitted under strict conditions in Islam, between a veiled female Islamist and a liberal woman. This particular episode ended in an unusual way. As the program unfolded, many of the viewers phoning in to speak sounded angry over the debate and were calling upon the woman representing the view of the Islamists to withdraw from the discussion—and so she did as the discussion got heated.” (p. 94-5)

“The Opposite Direction” is both popular and confrontational; there were cases where the guests walked away from the discussion table and set, on live T.V. There were instances⁹ in which guests threw their water cups in their opponents’ faces¹⁰, and many more cases where verbal fights turned into physical fights. Some of the speakers have become extremely popular among the Arab viewers for talking about daring issues within the Arab world. Alkasim (2005) explains that his program has given voice to “globalized alternative Arab political voices or ‘rebels’ and made them known to a very large audience at home and abroad” (p. 97). Locally, Alkasim (2005) boasts, his show was voted as the best Arab TV program for six consecutive years in the Qatari *Al Raya* newspaper¹¹ back in 2002, and he was chosen as the media man of the year (Alkasim, 2005, p. 98).

Despite its popularity, a number of opponents of the show oppose the loud style and the frictions that it may cause among parts of the society. A number of Arab countries cut ties with Qatar over the show (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002). However, the episodes are now archived and are accessible on Aljazeera’s website and on Aljazeera’s YouTube channel, allowing Arab audiences more opportunities to access the popular program. Some disagree with Alkasim’s style and the premise of the show, calling it a

⁹ In an episode aired on April 17, 2013, the IEF threw water twice in the IED’s face at the end of the show. A short clip can be viewed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tBxck4dvfPM> (starts at 0:57)

¹⁰ See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sBKMBIBEI6o>

¹¹ “Faisal Al Kasim voted best media man for the sixth consecutive year,” *Al Raya*, December 31, 2002, p. 14.

platform for “name calling” and a “wild turkey fight” (Ahmed, 2014). Some (Ayish, 2005; Ahmed, 2014) argue that allowing such violent or disrespectful acts on the show are reasons behind the show’s popularity. Clips from the show are usually shared among and go viral on various social media sites¹². That said, Ahmed (2014) claims that some potential guests refuse to participate in the show, or they do not return after they have appeared once (para. 6).

2.3.2. Who is Faisal Alkasim?

Alkasim, a Syrian born television personality, is known for his provocative style on his show “The Opposite Direction”. In fact, many credit him for playing a main part in Aljazeera’s reputation in the Arab world. Alkasim was voted as one of the top most influential Arab personalities in 2007 by Arabian Business Magazine. Prior to joining Aljazeera, he worked for BBC Arabic as a producer and a news anchor. He has also written news articles for a number of newspapers in Syria, Qatar and London, and he still writes a weekly article in “Al-Sharq” (The East) Qatari Newspaper. Alkasim was born in Al-Suwweyda in Syria to a Druze¹³ family. Alkasim received his BA in English literature in Syria. He then left the country and received his PhD in English literature in the UK. In fact, Alkasim holds a dual Syrian-British citizenship.

As for his political views, Alkasim has never openly or directly discussed his political views. On his show as well as on his Facebook and Twitter pages, Alkasim is perceived as a supporter of ‘oppressed Sunni minorities’ in Syria, Iraq, and Iran. He has been viewed in many cases as a big supporter of the 2011 Arab revolutions. In the last decade, he has taken a clear stance against Iran, Hezbollah, and much more recently against Saudi Arabia. However, this was not the case in the early years of his show where he was a supporter of Hezbollah and Iran and was against any Israeli or American presence and intervention in the Middle East.

¹² In this [post](#)

¹³ Druze is a sect of Shia Islam

Alkassim has been widely criticized by various people for different reasons. He has been criticized for his selection of guests. Some believe that he often invites “incompetent” guests to argue against more competent guests, according to a Netflix¹⁴ documentary about Aljazeera. In one episode, on the rise of ISIS in Syria, it is claimed that a military personality was invited to debate with a Lebanese writer. The former was viewed as incompetent for the debate (Netflix, 2018). In addition, Alkassim was described as sectarian by Zeinab Hawi, a Syrian blogger and writer. Hawi (2015) claims that Alkassim usually selects pro-government guests only from the Christian religion to debate with opposition figures mainly from the Muslim-Sunni religion. Hawi (2015) accused him of trying to give the revolution a sectarian appearance¹⁵. In 2016, in the last two minutes of his show, Alkassim asked one of his Kurdish guests to leave the show while on air¹⁶ for being “too difficult”. Prior to kicking him out, Alkassim offered his guest some “Bendol” and asked him if he would like “a suppository instead”. The IED was upset and murmured that he would like to be excused from the show¹⁷. The clip went viral on social media where fans supported Alkassim and his acts. The actual episode on Aljazeera was later edited and that particular clip was deleted.

2.4. ACADEMIC RESEARCH ON “THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION”

Notorious for its heated debates, “The Opposite Direction” and its host have been the subject of many discussions that focus on Aljazeera, its programs, and their impact on the Arab world (Awwad, 2005, p. 17-19). Many note that the popularity of the show stems not only from its discussion of taboos, but also from its host’s style in addressing such topics (Ayish, 2005; Migdadi et al, 2013). “The Opposite Direction” and other live debate shows on Aljazeera constitute an important popular forum where the spontaneous discussions of current affairs are fostered. These live broadcasts on Aljazeera, previously an unknown practice in tightly controlled Arab media, are ideal sites for examining this oppositional

¹⁴ According to the description provided on the Netflix page. I have not personally watched the documentary as I have no access to or subscription to it.

¹⁵ This article here: <http://www.souriyati.com/2015/05/08/7368.html>

¹⁶ This blog [post](#)

¹⁷ The episode can be found here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AOE4gPyURWk>

discourse (Awwad, 2005). A number of researchers (Alfahad, 2013; 2015 of Saudi news interviews; Al-Rojaie, 2003; Ayish, 2005; Migdadi et al, 2013 of “The Opposite Direction”) note that technological advances and the introduction of private stations has pushed for more confrontational and adversarial styles in broadcast news interviews in some parts of the Arab world.

In the next two sections, I will first review current findings on the IR's strategies for challenging his IEs in “The Opposite Direction.” Then, I will review relevant literature on the discursive strategies that the IEs use with each other to display disagreement and challenges.

2.4.1. IR's expressing and promoting of confrontation in “The Opposite direction”

Migdadi et al. (2013) argue that the IR's role in “The Opposite Direction” is to promote heated disagreements among the IEs. Indeed, Ayish (2005) notes that the IR, Faisal Alkassim, uses the “silence” strategy quite often to achieve such heated discussion. Here, Ayish refers to the IR's silence. He explains that the fiercer the debate between the IEs, the more extended the host's silence is—particularly in discussions of highly sensitive issues where he claims the IR takes a “more detached posture, appearing to be a neutral observer” (p. 119). In one of the episodes, Aysih describes how one of the IEs talked for five consecutive minutes, uninterrupted by the IR. That guest was discussing the corrupt Arab leaders and was using emotional language that was likely to be perceived as offensive by the other guest (ibid).

The lengthy holding of the floor by one of the IEs as opposed to their opponents is common in the program. Migdadi et al. (2013) show that the IR allows one of the IEs to hold the floor more than the other guest by actively silencing the other, as illustrated in Excerpt 10 below. In this excerpt, MAM is given more opportunity to talk.

Excerpt 10: allowing one IE more chance to talk (from Migdadi et al, 2013, p. 110 ((modified))¹⁸)

1. IR: man, bisabab maatha?
 who? for what reason

¹⁸ I made some translation changes to the English as some were mistranslated as in line 1 (e.g., ‘who’, and line 4 “hold on”). Original authors provided an IPA transcription of Arabic. I changed it to Romanized Arabic. The transcription symbols are exactly as they appear in the original paper (overlapping signs being difficult to follow).

(four lines omitted)¹⁹

2. IR: [jamiil. jamiil jiddan, da3na al'aan ...]
[good. very good, let's now...]
((4 lines omitted))
3. MB: [alwaqt alwaqt]
→ [the time, the time]
4. IR: bas daqiiqah
→ [hold on]
5. MAM: la, la anta axatht waqtak ((some deletion))
no, no you have taken your time
6. MB: [yaa daktowr!]
[O, doctor!]
7. IR: aaxir shay'
→ the last point

Here, the IR seems to be allowing MAM to have access to the floor when MB contests that in line 3 “[the time, the time]” they are running out of time and he hasn’t been given a chance to express his opinion. The IR in line 4 denies him the floor “[only one minute]” and so does the other guest MAM in line 5 “no, no you have taken your time”. MB tries again in line 6 “[O, doctor!]” but he is denied the floor again as the IR gives it to his opponent and asks the latter to add “the last point” in line 7.

Similarly, Al-Rojaie (2003) studies how the IR in “The Opposite Direction” may be helping one interviewee have more access to the floor than the other guest. Al-Rojaie argues that the IR can be “overdoing” interruption with the other guest. He provides a number of examples from the show where IR uses what he calls ‘excessive’ and ‘biased’ interruptions that usually deny one of the IEs their right to the floor. These interruptions, Al-Rojaie claims, are different from interruptions used to clarify or challenge

¹⁹ lines omitted in original paper

interruptions in “The Opposite Direction” to those in PBS’s “Newshour”. It should be noted, however, that the two shows are not parallel. “The Opposite Direction” is more adversarial, and Al-Rojaie himself makes a note of “PBS being more neutralistic” later in his thesis.

In addition, the IR has been reported to use polling and polling results as a strategy to further encourage disagreement and confrontation between the guests. Online polling was not introduced until relatively recently in the program. The introduction of online polling to evaluate audience views of both sides of the debate contributes to the process of rising tensions among the IEs, Ayish (2005) argues. He explains that the IR constantly reminds the guests (or as Ayish refers to them, the “contestants”) of the votes’ results as if to encourage them to make more effort to improve their standing among viewers through more tense exchanges (p. 122). For example, in a 2003 episode on the role of the Kurds²¹ in the new Iraq, the IR pitted two guests against each other. One (Al Nereedy) was defending the Kurds while the other (Matar) was questioning their Kurdish geopolitical agenda and doubting their allegiance to a united Iraq. The subject of the polling was whether or not the Kurds are playing a positive role in the new Iraq. At first, the pro-Kurd state had a strong lead, and the IR kept emphasizing that which, according to Ayish, provoked Matar to become more adversarial. As the program unfolded, the tide changed and the numbers gradually shifted to 51% versus 49% at the end of the program²². Ayish explains that the IR was “actively using the polling card” and was constantly reminding the IEs of the outcome of the online voting to prompt Matar to be more confrontational while pushing his opponent to be more defensive (p. 122).

Another strategy to express disagreement in Arabic news interviews involves the use (or lack) of address forms. The use of titles+ name is used to show respect in Arabic and in “The Opposite Direction,” Issa (2010) explains. He shows a number of examples where the IR and IEs use titles for other

²¹ “Kurdistan was erased from the world's maps after World War I when the Allied Powers carved up the Middle East and denied the Kurds a nation-state. More than twenty million Kurds live in parts of Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Syria. Throughout the 20th century their struggles for political and cultural autonomy were opposed by the region's countries and the Kurds were often used as pawns in regional politics.” From “The Kurds’ Story” on pbs.org

²² Total number of votes being 2,764.

participants to show respect. In contrast to the ordinary use of titles, Al Rojaiei (2003) studies the use of ‘type title’ such as *akhi* (brother) and *sidi* (sir) in “The Opposite Direction” to preface disagreement. He argues that the IR frequently uses such titles for functions associated with argumentation, such as encouraging disagreement, challenge, and introducing arguments that provoke high level of disagreement and dispute (p. 201). Alfahad (2013, 2015) also looked at how address forms (or the lack, thereof) show lack of respect in Arabic broadcast news interviews. His data, however, come from a different show broadcast on a private Saudi channel “Alarabiya”. He claims that address forms that do not reflect customary respect for officials were used in an overtly aggressive approach of a kind not witnessed before by the Saudi audience.

A final strategy that the IR uses to display and promote tension and confrontation between his guests includes the use of anonymous sources. Ayish (2005) points out that the IR uses this strategy to substantiate his arguments or to counter those of guests and audiences. The IR’s use of anonymous sources was “intended to fuel debates as they were losing their intensity” (p. 121). Ayish does not present examples, but as I will later show, “The Opposite Direction” is rife with examples of the IR using third party attributions to embed hostile messages while distancing himself from the statements. Chapter 6 of this dissertation will show other linguistic practices that the IR uses in “The Opposite Direction” to disagree with and challenge his IEs, and will show how his IEs respond to these actions.

I now turn to reviewing the discursive strategies that the IEs use in the show to disagree with and challenge each other.

2.4.2. Adversarial strategies used by the IEs in “The Opposite Direction”

A number of interesting strategies used by the IEs to disagree with each other in “The Opposite Direction” have been reported in the literature. Some of these strategies include using a loud voice, insults, abusive language and sarcasm. I will go over these in detail below.

Migdadi et al. (2013) point out that the IEs on “The Opposite Direction” are constantly maximizing rather than minimizing face threats by using strategies such as rudeness²³, interruptions, abusive language and even sarcasm to accentuate their strong disagreement and develop hostile feelings with each other. Migdadi et al. (2013) explain that the use of such strategies is “equated with skillfulness in debate and is used to increase each of the participants’ own power” (p. 94-5). Consider this example where IE’s disagreement results in using derogatory language.

Excerpt 12: IEs’ use of derogatory language in “The Opposite Direction” (from Migdadi et al., 2013, p. 105) ((modified))²⁴

01. IR: [ya axi] mush hatha mawdu3na
[sir], this is not our topic
02. AISH: [ya axi] xali-ih yiskut, ya daktowr
[brother] ask him to [stop talking], doctor!
03. AZ: kaan biwidi an yakuun amaam-I insaan akaadiimi astaTii3
I would have liked to sit with an academician
04. an atHaddath ma3a-h [bi-Tariiqah HaDaariyyah]
I can talk with [in a civilized way!]
05. AISH: [ay akaadiimi!] [wallah shahaadaat]
[“What an academician you are! You degree”²⁵]
06. AZ: [wa laysa 3amiilan li-l-Hukuumat]
→ [And not a government tattler!]
07. AISH: [3ayb 3alay-k, anta insaan Haywaan wa Haqiir]
→ [shame on you! you are an animal and scum!]

²³ The authors do not provide any definition or rationale for using the term “rudeness”. They simply equate it with the term “provocative.”

²⁴ The Arabic turns are originally transcribed using IPA. I changed it into Romanized Arabic. Aside from that, nothing was changed including the translation and transcription errors.

²⁵ A more accurate translation here would be “what degree!?”. In Arabic AZ said something along the lines “what degree!?” in a dismissive manner, meaning he does not consider AZ to be a respected academic.

08. IR: ya axi,

[sir]

09. AZ: ubidi axla3 sabaaTi u aDrubuh fiih

→ And I will take off my shoes to hit him]

((continues))

The use of explicit insults contributes to more antagonism in the debate, Migdadi et al. explain.

Expressions such as “Shame on you! You are an animal and scum!!” and “and I will take off my shoes to hit him” in lines (7) and (9) are offensive and further intensifies conflict in debate. Migdadi et al. explain that AISH himself is aware of his extreme impoliteness and use of rude terms as he tries to modify it soon after its occurrence by justifying why he used it (not transcribed).

Use of sarcasm is another strategy the IEs use in “The Opposite Direction” to challenge and disagree with each other. Consider this example, also from Migdadi et al. AISH uses sarcasm to disagree with his rival on the nature of equipment used in teaching rooms in Arab universities. AZ suggests that Arab universities suffer from many problems such as lack of funds, dated equipment, and administrative corruption.

Excerpt 13: Sarcasm by IEs in “The Opposite Direction” (from Migdadi et al., p. 112)

1. AZ: ana daxlt ila ihda al-qaa3aat w’adduktowr yashrah

I visited a university classroom and the professor was lecturing using

2. bissabburah walqaa3ah fiiha 1200 shaxs fii i7da ad-duwal al-3arabiya

chalkboard to a class of 1200²⁶ students in one of the Arab countries

3. AISH: o-laysh maa ishtarayt lah sabbura ilikroniyyah?

→ Why didn’t you buy them an electronic board?

In lines (1–2), AZ supports his claim that there is corruption by giving an example of an Arab university that he visited in which the instructor was still using a chalkboard (instead of an electronic board) to teach

²⁶ The excerpt in the original paper says 1200 students, but the authors later write 120 students in their analysis.

120 students. To oppose this suggestion, AISH sarcastically blames his rival for not buying an electronic chalkboard for that class. Migdadi et al. point out that AISH's making such a ridiculous argument reflects his adversarial position.

2.5. DIGLOSSIA AND CODE-SWITCHING

I will now review the literature on Arabic diglossia and code switching. This literature will be relevant to my later analysis of code-switching as one of the strategies used by the IR, together with disrespectful language, to challenge and block the IEDs' agendas. Because research on Arabic diglossia and code switching is extensive, especially the literature on everyday talk, I will focus on code switching in formal settings. As a diglossic language, Standard Arabic has been traditionally viewed as an identity marker that unites Arabs (Pan-Arabism identity) regardless of its speakers' nationality, ethnicity, and religion (Haeri, 2003; Bassiouney, 2006; Sayahi, 2014). In addition to the local spoken dialects of the language, there is a highly codified (and structurally more complex) superimposed variety, high (H) variety, which is "learned by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation" (Ferguson 1959, p. 336). The low (L) varieties, on the other hand, are learned at home and are used in informal, less prestigious, everyday contexts. Standard Arabic is in fact descended from Classical Arabic (the language of the Quran), and as Haeri (2003) notes a "Muslim" identity marker (p. 43). Holes (1995) states that "although the syntax, vocabulary and phraseology of Arabic have undergone considerable changes in the [last] fourteen centuries... the common origins of Classical Arabic and all other contemporary varieties of the language are still plain for all to see" (p. 4). Standard Arabic is used for writing and formal discourse across the Arab world and is mainly learned through formal education. The local varieties of Arabic, on the other hand, constitute the mother tongue of the native speakers of Arabic who learn it at home, and these varieties differ across geographical lines (ibid). According to Ferguson, Standard Arabic (SA) has been assumed to be frequently used in intellectual, formal contexts such as politics, economics and religion, while nonstandard varieties occupy other ordinary and informal topics and domains (Ferguson, 1996, p. 34).

Although it has been viewed and studied as a stable phenomenon in that there is a functional distribution between the H and L varieties, diglossia is not stable as L varieties are not unified and keep changing functionally and structurally depending on their ecologies (Mufwene, 2001; Sayahi 2014). As a solution, some have reexamined the role and function of switching between the H and L codes in talk. Some introduced the notion of a continuum or “middle language” (Versteegh, 1997) in their study of speakers’ code switching between and mixing of different varieties of Arabic, and the role of code in identity formation. Indeed, recent sociolinguistic studies of Arabic diglossia note that there has been a shift in the perception and use of nonstandard varieties of Arabic. Many researchers have studied code switching in written and oral discourse in different formal domains, such as political and religious speeches in countries such as Egypt (Holes,1993; Bassiouney, 2006) and Lebanon (Matar, 2009). Their studies show common findings; the switches were strategic, and there is a direct relationship between the change of code and change in function. These findings show that switching to local varieties in political and religious contexts is done for the purpose of persuading the audience.

Similarly, code switching to the local dialects for the purpose of persuasion is becoming noticeable in religious talk, like the mosque, another domain where it is not expected (Sayahi, 2014). Sayahi (2014) looked at how Imams (Muslim clerics) used diglossic code switching between standard Arabic and Tunisian Arabic. He argues that the use of Tunisian Arabic in such domains exemplifies a diglossic shift in progress (p. 69) which may be paving the way for the normalization of the use of Arabic varieties in more domains. Earlier, Soliman (2008) also studied the use of Egyptian Arabic in formal religious discourse specifically by a popular Islamic scholar (Khaled) in his televised sermons. The switches moved from heavily Classical²⁷ and Standard Arabic to Egyptian Arabic. This, Soliman (2008) claims, allows the speaker to transmit religious knowledge to the common people in a form that will be easily understood (p. 145).

²⁷ Classical Arabic refers to the language of the Quran; it has a more sophisticated grammar and morphology system than Standard Arabic. Standard Arabic is the simplified form used as the official language in the Arab countries.

Similar findings have been noted in interviews and talk shows where speakers have been noted to switch between Standard and local varieties. Bassiouney (2006) examines the use of Standard and Egyptian Arabic within the framework of code-switching by women in relation to identity in local Egyptian talk shows. She concludes that the use of standard features is not related to the gender of the speaker but rather to which part of their identity they appeal to. In other words, educated women, contrary to what was claimed in early literature, can and do use SA in the media as a discourse function to establish status and authority. Eid (2007) analyzes the use of standard and non-standard varieties of Arabic in interviews by two cultural and literary figures in Egypt. Eid explains there is a change in attitudes towards switching to local varieties in Egypt, and pointed out that all speakers in a number of interviews from Egyptian radio and television mixed the two varieties of Arabic without exception (p. 55).

It is becoming clear now that what was once perceived to be a low, less serious and unacceptable variety in formal talk is no longer unacceptable, albeit studies were mostly done in Egyptian contexts. Speakers, especially in formal domains (religious, sports, and personal interviews as shown above), strategically code switch between these varieties to achieve different goals in talk. This change in attitude towards the production and perception of the Standard and nonstandard varieties could be affected by the technological advances, and the introduction of satellite channels that allow access to spoken varieties of Arabic, as Eid (2007) argues.

Outside of the Egyptian context, Albirini (2010) studied code switching in Aljazeera's "The Opposite Direction." He claims that switching to Dialect Arabic (DA) by speakers is done to simplify a preceding idea, mark a shift in tone from serious to comic, and to discuss taboo or derogatory issues (p. 215). It should be noted, however, that Albirini writes that he never listened to the actual exchange between participants, and that his analysis and findings stem from *reading* the transcript of the episodes on Aljazeera's website. Albirini states he "systematically *read* the transcribed data and then code[d] those segments that are relevant to the research questions" (p. 76) (*italics mine*). A common issue with transcriptions provided by the network is that they do not attend, at all, to many linguistic and other

nonlinguistic features that take place during the interaction. For instance, repairs, interruptions and repetitions are not at all transcribed in the texts provided on their site. Relying on the network's transcription may falsify the analysis and results. From a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective, a detailed transcription of talk and gestures, followed by a turn by turn analysis of a particular practice is needed to understand how actions are being performed and recognized by participants. Repetitions, pauses, in-breaths and other turns that may not seem relevant to the "content" of an interaction for outsiders, could constitute an integral part of a particular practice formation. Conversation analysts study talk as it unfolds moment by moment. Hence, they attend to all linguistic and nonlinguistic features to understand how participants understand and orient to a particular action. Skipping or deleting turns from a sequence could then yield inaccurate analysis and results.

There are other methodological issues in the existing literature on Arabic diglossia and code switching; many of these studies looked at speeches or utterances by single speakers, such as speeches of public figures which might be scripted and rehearsed. And, the few studies that dealt with interviewees' turns (e.g., Eid, 2007) did not have access to and examine utterances and questions by the questioner. Studying the journalist's questions is crucial to study how an action is treated and responded to by the IEs.

By following a detailed conversation analytic approach to data transcription and analysis, particularly turn by turn analysis, this proposal will study the interaction as a whole by focusing on turn by turn sequences. This dissertation will study a number of practices that the IR uses to either align or disalign with his IEs. One of these strategies is using disrespectful language through code switching from SA to DA to signal disagreement. Chapter 5 will illustrate how the IR's code switches to dialects is treated by IEs as a change in the IR's *footing* as disaffiliative strategy. I will now explain how the data were collected and analyzed.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODS

3.1. DATA

The data come from “The Opposite Direction,” a weekly news interview that broadcasts live on Aljazeera in the Middle East. Twenty fifty-minute episodes have been transcribed following Conversation Analytic transcription conventions²⁸. A four line transcription method is used. The first line presents the Arabic transcription, followed by a transliteration of the Arabic turns in the second line. The third line presents the morpheme by morpheme translation followed by a free English translation in the fourth line. The episodes date from 2013-2018. The first 13 episodes focus on the civil war in Syria. I chose these episodes that focus on the war in Syria mainly for simplicity in terms of the topics and issues raised, and the Arabic varieties used. My main goal was at first to limit the number of topics discussed so that my readers are not overwhelmed with the background information on the expense of presenting a coherent linguistic analysis. By focusing on one regional topic such as the revolution in Syria, which already is a broad geopolitical issue itself affecting a number of surrounding countries and politics, I was able to place more emphasis on forming collections of practices used by the speakers. Also, since I study codeswitching as a possible disaffiliative practice, analyzing episodes that cover one current event would limit the number of dialects spoken. Guests in the early episodes under discussion are Syrian, and therefore, this proposal studies switching from Standard to Syrian Arabic. Dealing with more than two varieties of Arabic (Standard and Syrian) could complicate the analysis at this point. The main aim of this dissertation is not to study how many varieties are spoken and by whom. Instead, I suggest that code switching to a spoken Arabic dialect is done when the IR uses disrespectful and insulting language to challenge his IED. This claim will be supported later in the dissertation.

The newer episodes that I have added (especially those dating from 2017-2018) discuss other regional issues in other parts in the Middle East. I transcribed and studied seven additional episodes that focus on other regional issues in the Middle East. The rationale behind this is to test whether or not the

²⁸ A list of the Conversation Analytic transcription symbols is provided in the Appendix

IR, a Syrian native²⁹, would still use the same affiliative or disaffiliative practices with his IEs regardless of the topic under discussion. The language used in the majority of this show is Standard Arabic, the language used in formal settings and in Aljazeera's programs and documentaries. This show, however, contains some occasional switching to Arabic dialects, such as Levantine, Iraqi and Gulf Arabic. Due to the nature of topics and guests, my dataset includes many switches to Levantine Arabic.

I chose this specific program because it provides rich and explicit examples of both affiliation and disaffiliation, despite the host's and Aljazeera's claims of maintaining professionalism and impartiality. Although the IR's questions may have been scripted and rehearsed, the interaction itself is rife with examples of "spontaneous" turns that illustrate how certain linguistic practices are used and treated to help one party further their political agenda while blocking the agenda of the other party.

The show has been on the air for nearly two decades. Every episode is hosted by the same host, Faisal Alkasim, the interviewer (IR). Every week/episode, two new guests join the program to discuss some major current event. Hence, the data in this analysis consist of a total of forty-one different speakers (one host and ten IEs). The seating of the guests is interesting as it serves as a reference frame: the IE to the left holds views that are "wrong" and "disfavored" while the IE to the right is "right"³⁰. The seating communicates the interviewer's stance: the interviewees seated to the left of the screen/audience hold opposing views to Al-Jazeera and to the other guest. These IEs are usually attacked by the IR and the second guest, and can therefore be considered to be in the 'disfavorable' position (IED). The second guest, seated to the right of the screen/audience, on the other hand, holds the "right" views and so is in alignment with the IR and Al-Jazeera, hence, s/he is in the 'favorable' position (IEF). Additionally, the IR always begins the show by introducing the guests and referring to the results of an online poll claiming that the majority of the participating overhearing audience has taken the side of Aljazeera and the IEF (the

²⁹ The host, Faisal Alkasim, is a Syrian native, although it appears that he has been residing in both London and Qatar.

³⁰ In the Arabic culture, left is associated with evil. Arabs are taught to always use the right hand for eating, writing, playing and shaking hands. When walking into or out of a door, Arabs are taught to use the right foot first. Otherwise, it's a bad omen.

IR usually claims that at least two thirds of viewers agree with his, Aljazeera's and the IEF's viewpoint). In the next section of the methodology (section 3.2.), I will explain how these categories are derived from and warranted by the interaction. This dissertation will, therefore, study *how* these alignments and disalignments are produced and responded to by the IEs.

3.2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Methodology used in this thesis is Conversation Analysis. Although the first set of data came from institutional talk, CA methodology was first developed to study ordinary conversation and later was applied to the study of institutional talk such as classroom interaction, political speeches, doctor-patient talk, and news interviews. CA research focuses on recorded conversations that occur naturally without any intervention from the researcher (Drew and Heritage, 1992, p. 235). CA methodology derives categories of analysis from the data provided and does not rely on any theoretically generated categories of analysis applied apriori to the data. The focus of a CA analysis is on particular practices of talk, and on the actions that the talk is accomplishing as the interaction unfolds turn by turn (Schegloff, 2007). From a CA perspective, *practices* refer to how the interaction is done, i.e. the way talk and other nonlinguistic features such as gestures are designed at the turn level, and at the sequence level. *Actions* refer to what is being done through talk, for example, confirmation, complimenting, etc. And, *Sequences* refer to the courses of action implemented turn-by-turn through the talk. Turn Constructional Units (TCUs) constitute one unit of analysis. They are built from lexical items, phrases, and clauses (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Sacks et al. (1974) explain that turns made up of TCUs are locally managed and are deployed by speakers within a system that organizes the production and allocation of those turns (Heritage & Roth, 1995). TCUs allow for the prediction of possible completion points in advance for the next speaker to contribute to the exchange of turns.

The term adjacency pairs in interaction refers to conversation turns which make up an action sequence. They consist of an initiating action (first pair part action such as greeting or asking) followed by a responsive action (second pair part). The adjacency pair is a basic sequence which may, but need not, be expanded in various ways (Schegloff, 2007a, p. 22). Some action types consist of two-part sequences

such as greetings, farewells and *how-are-you?* sequences. But others are more complex and may consist of pre-sequences (like pre-invitations) or insert expansions (like a repair). Pre-sequences precede the initiation of a base sequence while insert expansions occur between the initiation of a sequence and the response to it. An insert expansion delays a second pair part Schegloff (2007a). Insertion sequences address some issue with the base initiating action such as asking for clarification of the first pair part (*post-first*), or they can be preliminary to a response, i.e., they elicit information necessary to do the response (*pre-second*) (ibid). While sequences can have an elaborate many-turn course, they can be built up out of elementary adjacency pairs, like question-answer, offer-acceptance, greeting-greeting (Schegloff, 2007a; Levinson, 2012).

When examining participants' turns, conversation analysts try to understand "why that now?" (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) i.e., conversation analysts try to discover what co-participants are doing by saying a particular utterance at a particular point in the conversation. Participants display their understanding of what other participants' talk is doing by responding to their talk. Analysts then study how this displayed understanding is achieved by forming collections of talk that is used to perform a similar social action and analyzing the practices common to the collection.

Because I examine how affiliation and disaffiliation are produced by the IR and how they are treated by the IE, I follow CA as my research methodology. I will study how IEs treat and respond to the IR's affiliative and disaffiliative actions. A detailed CA transcription also allows researchers to study how the talk is produced and also how the participants' non-linguistic gestures (such as facial expressions and hand movements) may contribute to the action. Hence, I use a detailed CA transcription system because it is important to see which aspects of talk and non-talk are displayed by participants to be relevant. A list of CA transcription symbols is provided in Appendix A.

By forming collections of how particular patterns of talk are regularly used and oriented to in talk-in-interaction, CA analysts can make claims about how these practices are used to perform certain actions. Since I will be studying patterns of affiliation and disaffiliation in Arabic broadcast news interviews, I must first clarify my use of labels and categories such as IEF and IED. I argue that that the

labels 'Favorable' and 'Disfavorable' are based on the IR's treatment of them as such in talk. Schegloff (2007b) explains that conversation analysts who provide category specific labels should be committed to "getting at the practices by which the world we see and hear gets produced" (p. 475). When characterizing the parties with terms such as favorable and disfavorable, Conversation Analysts "need in principle to show that the parties were oriented to that categorization device in producing and understanding – moment-by-moment – the conduct that composed its progressive realization" (ibid). CA analysts therefore study the ways in which participants make accessible to each other these orientations, and are expected to show "the claim is grounded in the conduct of the parties, not in the beliefs of the writer" (p. 476).

The next three chapters will present examples of transcribed talk from everyday talk and institutional talk showing how recipients orient to different practices as performing several different actions. Before presenting and analyzing the data from "The Opposite Direction" in Chapters 5 and 6 however, chapter 4 will first review examples of repair from both English and Arabic talk.

CHAPTER 4: REPAIR AND NON-REPAIR PRACTICES IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC TALK

Because practices of repair to be discussed in this dissertation are similar to repair practices in other contexts such as those in everyday talk, I will first review practices of repair in conversation as documented in different languages. Repair practices have been observed and studied in many languages such as English (e.g., Schegloff et al. 1977; Kitzinger, 2012), German (e.g., Egbert, 2009) and French (e.g., Golato and Golato, 2015; Maheux-Pelletier and Golato, 2008), Japanese (Hayashi, 2003), among others. Since research on Arabic repair, especially on other-initiated repair, is very limited³¹, this chapter will present and analyze examples of repair in Arabic from the Egyptian Callhome corpora³². One of the goals of this dissertation is to show how conversational practices in Arabic are taken and used for other purposes in “The Opposite Direction”, even though those conversational practices are based on dialect rather than standard Arabic. At the time of writing this dissertation, a Levantine³³ corpus was not available to me, but the practices discussed here from the Egyptian corpus are not dissimilar from those in Levantine Arabic. This remains to be confirmed with future research, of course.

Additionally, this chapter will review repair practices in institutional talk with a focus on repeats. This is because repeats are one of the common practices that are used by the IR in “The Opposite Directions” to perform different actions. These actions will be further analyzed in Chapters 5 and 6).

4.1. REPAIR

Repair refers to a set of practices speakers use to address “problems or troubles in speaking, hearing and understanding the talk in conversation (and in other forms of talk-in-interaction . . .)” (Schegloff, 1997, p. 503). Repairs can be initiated by the speaker of the repairable or trouble source (self-initiated repair), or by others (other-initiated repair). The excerpts below illustrate both instances of self- and other-initiated repair operations (excerpts 14 and 15, respectively).

Excerpt 14: Self-initiated repair (Schegloff et. al, 1977, p. 364)

³¹ There is some recent literature on self-initiated repair structures in spoken Arabic (e.g., Al-Harabsheh, 2015) but not on other initiated repair in Arabic at the time of writing this dissertation.

³² <https://talkbank.org/access/CABank/CallHome/ara.html>

³³ Most of the examples of dialect use from “The Opposite Direction” that I will analyze in this dissertation are said in Levantine Arabic.

1. N: she was givin me a:ll the people that
2. → were go:ne this yea:r I mean this
3. → quarter y' //³⁴ know
4. J: Yeah

As shown in lines 2-3 above, self-initiated repairs refer to those repairs issued by the speaker of the trouble source him/herself. N corrects him/herself by targeting “yea:r” as the trouble source and provides a correction/solution in the same turn by substituting “yea:r” with “quarter” in lines 2-3. In other-initiated repairs, however, any party other than the trouble source speaker (Schegloff et. al, 1977, p. 364) may initiate the repair, as seen in Excerpt 15 below.

Excerpt 15: Other-initiated repair (Schegloff et. al (1977, p. 364)

1. Ken: Is Al here today?
2. Dan: Yeah.
3. (0.2)
4. Roger: → He is? hh eh heh
5. Dan: → Well he was.

In this excerpt, after Dan confirms that Al is here today, Roger issues the repair initiation (line 4) allowing Dan in this case to provide the repair solution himself in “Well he was.” (in line 5). While the above-mentioned excerpt of other-initiated repair shows that the repair can be completed by the speaker of the trouble source (other-initiated self-repair), the repair can also be completed by the same speaker who other-initiates the repair (other-initiated other-repair) (Schegloff et al, 1977, p. 364). But as my dataset lacks examples of the latter case, I will focus on other initiated self-repairs, where the speaker of the trouble source provides the repair solution, usually in the following turn (Schegloff et al. 1977, p. 377).

³⁴ Double obliques indicate the point at which a current speaker’s talk is overlapped by the talk of another. This symbol is no longer in use (Lerner, (2004). [] is the current CA symbol to indicate overlapping talk.

4.2. OTHER INITIATED REPAIR FORMATS

4.2.1. Open Class Repair Formats

Other-initiated repairs (OIRs) can be performed in several formats ranging from ‘weaker’ to ‘stronger’ formats (Schegloff et al. 1977) depending on their specificity. Weaker formats include initiators like “what” or “huh” (or as Drew 1997 labels them ‘open class initiators’) produced with rising intonation and which claim least grasp of the trouble source (see Excerpt 16 below).

Excerpt 16: “Weak” other repair initiation formats (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367)

1. D: Wul did’e ever get married ‘r anything?
2. C: → Hu:h?
3. D: Did jee ever get married?
4. C: I have // no idea³⁵

In Excerpt 16, C initiates an OIR “Hu:h?” in line 2 which could target the entire previous turn as a trouble source. D hears the OIR as a genuine hearing problem and reissues the question in the following turn (4) “Did jee ever get married?” to which C responds with “I have // no idea”.

The same repair format is also available in Arabic. Consider the following example of open class repair in spoken Arabic taken from the Egyptian Callhome corpus. Here, F is speaking to her aunt (A) and her son (M) who both appear to be on a speaker phone. F tells them that she’s booked her flight to Egypt and will be visiting her family (including M and his family) in one month. F here asks M if he wants F to bring him anything from the US. In response, M issues a question in line 4 “Hhh. (.) do you like America my dear?”. F’s next turn in line 5, “huh?” is an open class repair format that signals a potential hearing problem.

Excerpt 17: Open Repair Format in Egyptian Arabic

- 1.F: [>مش عايز حاجه من امريكا<]
 [>mish ‘ayez Haga min amriika?<]

³⁵ Double obliques indicate the point at which a current speaker’s talk is overlapped by the talk of another. This symbol is no longer in use (Lerner, (2004). [] is the current CA symbol to indicate overlapping talk.

[>not need.2MS anything from america?<]

[>do you not want anything from america?<]

[]

2.A: [طمئنا عليك]

[Tamnina 'aaleiki]

[reassure us on you]

[tell us you have good news]

3.F: مش عايز حاجه من امريكا ههه

mish 'ayez Haga min amriija hh.?

not need.2MS anything from America hh.?

do you not want anything from America hh.?

4.M: ها (.) عاجباك امريكا يا ستي

hhh. (.) 'agbaaki amrika ya sitti?

hhh. (.) fond of america dear?

hhh. (.) do you like America my dear?

5.F: → ايه?

eeh?

huh?

6.M: عجبك?

'agbitik?

like it?

you like it ((America))?

7.F: لا والله ههه ((laughter))

la wallah hhhh. ((laughter))

no by God hhh. ((laughter))

not really hhh. ((laughter))

8.M: ههه ((laughter))

hhh. ((laughter))

9.F: هه ((laughter))

hh . ((laughter))

F's "huh?" in line 5 was treated by M as a repair strategy performed to solve a potential hearing problem that targets the entire previous turn. M responds by repeating part of his question in line 5 "you like it?" to which F responds jokingly with "not really hhh."

4.2.2. Category Specific Repair Formats

Unlike "open-class repair initiators" (Drew 1997), that refer back to the entire previous turn, category-specific initiators like "who" or "where" refer back to a more specific trouble source in the prior turn as shown in Excerpt 18 below. This excerpt targets a specific category as the trouble source. Here, A had trouble understanding the reference ("Sibbie's sistuh") in B's prior turn, and thus, A initiated a category specific repair initiator "who" in line 2 which is repaired in line 3 by B when B provides the person reference targeted by the repair initiator.

Excerpt 18: Category specific initiator (from Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 367)

1. B: Oh Sibbie's sistuh hadda ba:by bo:way.

2. A: → Who?

3. B: Sibbie's sister.

4. A: Oh really?

5. B: Myeah,

Now consider this excerpt of Arabic category specific repair. Here, two Egyptian men, both residing in the U.S., discuss the latest news in their home country. Ten minutes into the conversation, M1 asks M2 what else they can talk about. M2 then asks if M1 had heard of a recent earthquake that took place in Egypt. M1 initiates a category specific repair "who?" in line 2 that targets a specific word "earthquake".

Excerpt 19: [CallHome/ara/7011_ar.cha](#) 15:02

1.M2: انت عارف الزلزال طبعاً

Inta a'ref ilzilzal Tab'aan

You know the earthquake of course

You must've heard of the earthquake of course

2.M1: → ممين?

Meen?

Who?

3.M2: الزلزال

Ilzilzal

The earthquake

The earthquake

4.M1: الزلزال.

Ilzilzal.

The earthquake.

The earthquake.

5.M2: اه.

Ah.

Uh huh.

Note that M1 uses “who?” rather than “what?”. This shows that M1 had problems hearing a reference in the previous turn. M2 responds by partially repeating “the earthquake” in line 3. M1’s repeat of “the earthquake.” in line 4 will be further analyzed later in this chapter, as it is doing another action.

4.2.3. Stronger Repair Formats: Candidate Understandings and Repeats

Finally, the strongest initiators are repeats or partial repeats of a prior turn, as in Excerpt 23 below and candidate understandings (reformulation of a previous turn) as in Excerpts 20-22. These ‘stronger’ formats claim virtually adequate understanding of the trouble source, subject to confirmation (Schegloff et al. 1977).

Excerpt 20 exemplifies a candidate understanding where the recipient of the talk reformulates prior talk and requests confirmation. This excerpt is taken from the Watergate scandal tapes. In line 1, Haldeman offers “he may be victimized on it” as a possible motivation for a colleague’s upcoming testimony. In line 4, Nixon initiates repair on Haldman’s previous turn “you mean by his lawyer”.

Excerpt No. 20 (taken from Benjamins, 2012, p. 85)

1. Hal: → he may be victimized on it
2. (0.6)
3. Hal: I’m not sure he’s ma[king]
4. Nix: → [you] mean by his lawyer
5. Nix: [hhhhhhhhh]
6. Hal: [yeah or](.) somebody else

Nixon’s turn in line 4 does not show trouble hearing Hal’s prior turn. Instead, his turn, designed as a candidate understanding, requests that the prior speaker confirm a possible understanding of their turn.

Hal responds by confirming the candidate understanding “[yeah”.

Candidate understandings are a very common practice in spoken Arabic. The following excerpt, from the Egyptian Callhome corpora, illustrates how speakers reformulate a prior turn using the Arabic phrase ‘ya’ani’ (‘you mean’). Here, F, an international student in the US, is speaking to a relative, N, on the phone. F mentions to N that she is taking a walk outside while on the phone. F had briefly mentioned that it is almost one in the afternoon. Her relative, N, is in Egypt where it is late in the evening. This excerpt begins with F telling N that she’s “supposed to be going back” in line 1 and that she has more

classes to go to in line 5. N issues a candidate understanding in line 6 in higher pitch than her previous turns and reformulates what F has just said “↑you mean you’re on your lunch break now?”.

Excerpt 21: 08:11

1. F: اه المفروض انه انا راجعه ثاني
ah ilmafruud innu ana rag’aa tani
ah supposed that I going back
ah I’m supposed to be going back
- 2.N: ه:
a:h
o:h
3. (0.2)
- 4.N: <راجعه ثاني ايه?>
>rag’aa tani eh?<
>going again what?<
>going back where?<
- 5.F: عندي دراسه ثاني
‘indi dirasah tani
I have classes again
I have more classes
- 6.N: → ?يعني انتي بالوقتي في ساعة غدا↑
↑ya’ani inti bilwa’ti fi sa’et ghada?
↑you mean you at this time hour lunch?
↑you mean you’re on your lunch break now?
- 7.F: ه
uh

uh huh

When F informed N that she was “going back”, after she had told her she was leaving class, it may have not been clear to N that F was merely on break. N responds with “o:h” in line 2 which is produced in response to receiving new information of some sort (Heritage, 1984), followed by a short pause. N then immediately issues a faster turn of a repeat accompanied with a question word in line 4 “>going back where?<”. F responds by explaining that she has more classes to attend in line 5. As a result, N issues a candidate understanding in line 6 reformulating what F has just said, “↑you mean you’re on your lunch break now?”. N’s candidate understanding is said in higher pitch than her previous turns, but this is not necessarily a characteristic of Arabic candidate understandings. That candidate understanding is treated by F as seeking confirmation. F responds with a confirmation in line 7 “uh huh”.

The next excerpt illustrates another example of a candidate understanding. This excerpt is taken from a third phone call from the Egyptian Callhome corpora. Here E1, who is currently in the US and appears to be an international student’s spouse, is speaking to her mom in Egypt. This is the very beginning of the conversation where E1 is explaining to her mom how and why she is making this specific phone call. Her mom seemed a bit surprised especially since E1 has already called her very recently. E1 explains in the first few lines that she has applied to participate in a data collection study, and as a result she won a chance to make a free, twenty-minute international phone call.

Excerpt 22: CallHome/ara/7083.cha 00:11

1.E1: اصل كان في هنا جامعه باعته يعني []

asli kan fi gam’aa hina ba’tah ya’ani []

actually was there college here sent I mean []

actually there was a school here posting I mean []

2.? [(unint)]

3.E1: = عرض باسته عرض تقول لو انا يعني بعث اسمي وعنواني

‘ard ba’tah ‘ard tiqul feeh law ana- ya’ani ba’atti ismi o ‘inwani=

offer- posting offer saying wherein if I- meaning sent my name and address=

offer- posting an offer which states if I- meaning I sent my name and address=

4.Mom: =هـ

=ah

=uh huh

5.El: =حيدوني عشرين دقيقه مجاناً=

=Hayidduni i'shriin dai'ia magannan

=give.3P me twenty minutes free

=they will give me twenty minutes ((to call overseas)) for free

6.Mom: واللّهي؟

wallahi?

by God?

seriously?

7.El: اكلم مصر مجاناً

akkalim maSr maganan

to speak.1S Egypt free

to call Egypt for free

8.Mom: واللّاه العظيم؟

wallahi il'azeem?

by God the Great?

swear to God?

9.El: واللّهي

wallahi

by God

I swear to God

10.Mom: هه ((laughter))

ha ha ((laughter))

11.El: هه ((laughter))

ha ha ((laughter))

12.Mom: → يعني المكالمه ابلاش? [هههههههه]

ya'ani ilmukalma ibbalash? [ha ha ha]

you mean this call free? [ha ha ha]

you mean this is a free call? [ha ha ha]

13.El: اه المكالمه ابلاش هههه

[ah ilmukalma ibbalash ha ha]

[yeah this call free ha ha]

[yeah this is a free call ha ha]

Initially, El explains to her mom that a local college was advertising for a chance to win a twenty minute phone call to call another line overseas, free of charge. In line 5, El says “=they will give me twenty minutes ((to call overseas)) for free”. Then, she adds “to call Egypt for free” in line 7. El, however, does not make it very clear that *this* specific phone call to her mom is the reward, and that she is calling her mom for free. In line 12, mom issues a candidate understanding and rephrases what was said earlier by El “you mean this is a free call [ha ha]” which reformulates and rephrases what El has said earlier by making the reference “this call” more specific. El responds by confirming in an overlapping turn “[yeah this call is free ha ha]”.

4.2.4. Repeats of Speakers' Prior Turns

In this section, I first summarize prior work on repeats, be it a partial or full repeat. The dissertation will not be analyzing self-repeats; therefore, all examples presented and analyzed here focus on other-initiated repeats. Repeats have been documented in many languages including English (e.g., Schegloff, 1997; Robinson, 2013), Russian (e.g., Bolden, 2009), and German (Golato et al., unpublished manuscript). This section will, also, present new data on repeats in Arabic. Repeat practices are relevant to my study, given that both affiliative and disaffiliative practices I am analyzing involve repeating speakers' prior turns.

4.2.4.1 Partial Repeats

As briefly discussed earlier, repeats of speakers' prior talk constitutes one of the strongest repair formats. This section will focus on this specific format by providing and analyzing examples from both English and Arabic. The next excerpt illustrates how a *repeat* of a prior turn can be done as a candidate hearing proffered for confirmation.

Excerpt 23: Repeats (taken from Shegloff, 1997, p. 526)

1. Guy: What's-w- ' what kind of a starting time ken:: we get
2. fer:: hh sometime this afternoon.
3. (0.7)
4. Guy: Any[time-
5. Clerk: [Oh:::, [let's see.
6. Guy: [Any time tuhday.
7. Clerk: Two fordy.
8. Clerk:→ One, thirty.
9. Guy: → One thirty?
10. Clerk:→ Mm hm:::?
11. Guy: One thirty.

Guy's repeat of Clerk's turn "one thirty?" in line 9 is heard to elicit confirmation that he heard it correctly. Clerk responds by confirming "Mm hmm:::?" without making any modifications in line 10.

The next example is of a repeat in Arabic, taken from the Egyptian Callhome data. This is an expanded version of Excerpt 19 above where two Egyptian men, both residing in the US, are speaking on the phone, discussing a recent earthquake in Egypt. When M1 asks M2 what else they could discuss, M2 in line 1 mentions the earthquake that took place in Egypt. It turns out that M1 did not hear nor was he aware of this earthquake occurrence. As a result, M1 initiates a repeat to solve any potential hearing problems in line 5.

Excerpt 24: CallHome/ara/7011_ar.cha 15:02

- 1.M2: انت عارف الزلزال طبعاً
 inta a'ref ilzilzal Tab'aan
 you know the earthquake of course
 you must've heard of the earthquake of course
- 2.M1: مين?
 meen?
 who?
 who?
- 3.M2: الزلزال
 ilzilzal
 the earthquake
 the earthquake
- 4.M1: → الزلزال.
ilzilzal.
 the earthquake.
 the earthquake.
- 5.M2: اه.
 ah.
 uh
 uh huh.
- 6.M1: زلزال ايه?
 zilzal eh?
 earthquake what?
 what earthquake?
- 7.M2: مش مصر كان فيها زلزال [(unint)]
 mish Masr kan feha zilzal [(unint)]

didn't Egypt had in earthquake³⁶ [(unint)]

wasn't there an earthquake in Egypt [(unint)]

[]

8.M1: [والل-] ايمنى?
[wall-] eimta?
[serious-] when?

9.M2: >يا راجل واللّهي ما تعرف? <
>ya raged wallahi ma ta'raf?<
>O man seriously didn't know?<
>dude you seriously didn't know?<

10.M1: واللّهي العظيم ما عرف
wallahi il'azeem ma a'raf
by God the Great don't know
I swear to God I didn't know

M2's attempt to start a new topic in line 1 "You must've heard of the earthquake of course" is met with a category specific repair in line 2 "who?" which targets a specific component in the previous turn. Also, the use of "who" rather than "what" also shows that M1 did not hear the reference in M1's first turn. Therefore, in line 3, M2 responds by repeating one specific part "the earthquake". M1 in return responds by repeating "the earthquake." in line 4 with an emphasis on "earthquake". M1 treats M1's repeat as a candidate hearing proffered for confirmation and responds with a confirmation in line 5 "uh huh". However, as it will be explained later in this chapter, we will see that the M1's repeat in line 4 was possibly done disaffiliatively.

³⁶ This is not a negated question, or any type of question in Arabic.

Repeats of someone else's prior turn, although they may be used as candidate hearings, can also implement other repair actions. In what follows I'll describe some of the other repair actions repeats achieve in talk. Another action is to invite speakers to self-correct as can be seen in excerpt 26 below.

Excerpt 25: partial repeat as OIR (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 377)

1. Ken: 'E likes that waider over there,
2. Al: → Wait-er?
3. Ken: Waitress, sorry,

Here, Ken repeats "Wait-er?" with rising intonation and places stress on the suffix used originally by Ken in line 1. By doing that, Al initiates an OIR and invites Ken to respond and provide a correction of the trouble source, which Ken does in line 3 "Waitress, sorry,". This type of practice is not present in Arabic to my knowledge.

4.2.4.2 Full Repeats of Speakers' Prior Turns

As we've seen, repeats to initiate other-repair can be either full repeats or partial repeats. Full repeats of a question, as shown in Excerpt 26 below, can perform an action different from the ones described above. Excerpt 26 is taken from a multi-party dinner party. Here the full repeat of Deb's original question (questioning action requesting information) by Dan in line 3 is treated to "index trouble understanding a questioning action" (Robinson and Keveo-Feldman, 2010, p. 239) and what the question is getting at. This action differs from that of Excerpt 19 above, where a full repeat of a prior TCU is understood as a candidate hearing proffered for confirmation. Excerpt 26 below deals with full repeats of prior *questions* where the repeat takes issue with the questioning *action* itself, as discussed by Robinson and Keveo-Feldman (2010).

Excerpt 26: Full repeat of a prior question (Robinson & Keveo-Feldman, 2010)

((lapse in conversation))

1. Deb: → Do you re::ad?
2. (0.4)
3. Pet: → Do I re::ad?

4. (1.4)
5. Deb: D' you read things just for fun?
6. (0.2)
7. Pet: Y:e:ah.
8. (0.5)
9. Right now I'm reading N:rma Jean ((continues))

Peter's identical repetition (except for the syntax 'I' instead of 'you') of Deb's prior turn "Do I re:ad?" targets the question action itself as Robinson & Kevoe-Feldman (2010) argue. They explain that Peter's full repetition in line 3 "problematizes" Deb's questioning action (p. 241) for a number of reasons: first, both Deb and Dan are college educated and *can* read, and second, the original question lacks a syntactic complement for "read" (i.e., . . . things just for fun). After a (1.4) lapse, Deb reissues the question and adds a complement "D' you read things just for fun?" in the following turn.

Also, note that Peter does not initiate repair with a partial repeat, such as "do I?" or "read?" (which, Robinson & Kevoe-Feldman (2010) explain, would take issue with a component of the question, but not necessarily with the entire questioning action (p. 245)). After Deb's reinitiated question, Peter responds to the full repeat with a simple confirmation, "Yeah" and continues to explain what he's reading.

4.2.4.3 Incomplete Repeats

A third type of repeat is an incomplete repeat, i.e., a hearably prosodically incomplete repeat of a specific component of a prior TCU to elicit a relevant completion of that component (also referred to as Designedly Incomplete Utterances (DIUs) by Koshik 2010³⁷). Consider Excerpt 27 from Kendrick 2015.

Excerpt 27: Incomplete repeat (from Kendrick 2015, p. 173)

1. Kel: Lisa's a chemist as well.
2. (0.3)
3. Hea: → Lisa:[::

³⁷ Koshik's (2010) examples were from pedagogical settings and were mainly used to elicit error correction.

4. Kel: [Williams.

Heather's partial repeat of Kelly's turn "Lisa::" is stretched and uttered with a prosodically incomplete intonation i.e., "with neither a final rise nor a final fall in pitch" (Kendrick 2015, p. 173). Kelly treats the repeat to solicit completion and more information (about Lisa) from the first speaker, in this case a last name "Williams". A repeat is heard as incomplete "if it lacks a coherent intonation contour (e.g., with neither a final rise nor a final fall in pitch) and if the final sound of the repeat is noticeably stretched" (ibid).

The excerpts discussed so far show how recipients use repeats in English and Arabic to perform several different repair actions including initiating repair to solve hearing or understanding problems, to invite speakers to self-correct, and to elicit information/completions from trouble source speakers. Repeats have also been found to accomplish a number of non repair actions in talk, e.g., to display surprise and disbelief (Heritage 1984; Jefferson, 1980), to signal pre-disagreement with the prior speakers (Goodwin, 1983; Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks, 1977), and to confirm a prior turn (e.g., Heritage and Raymond, 2012; Schegloff, 1996; Stivers, 2005). In what follows I'll continue to review other, non-repair actions achieved by repeats of prior utterances. But before proceeding with the review, I will briefly review the notion of preference in CA.

4.3. PREFERENCE STRUCTURE IN CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

The principle idea of preference is that speakers follow implicit constraints when acting and reacting in talk—in their selection, production and interpretation of initiating and responding actions, repair, turn-taking, and sequence progression (Pomerantz & Heritage, 2012). In CA work, the concept of preference refers to the "structural relationship between sequence parts: it is an interactional/social feature of sequences and orientations," and not a psychological one (Schegloff, 2006, p. 61). Preference structure was first described in relationship to responding actions, or second pair parts. The concepts of preferred and dispreferred responses, as was explained earlier by Pomerantz (1984), relate to whether or not the action is regarded as the "invited" response in a specific environment. Pomerantz explained that a "next action that is oriented to as invited will be called a preferred next action; its alternative, a dispreferred

next action” (p.63). Some type of turns are expected to *invite* a certain type of next turn, for instance, an offer invites acceptance rather than rejection.

Pomerantz (1984) defines a responding action as dispreferred if it is not oriented to as invited. These dispreferred actions are structurally marked, displaying certain ‘dispreference’ features such as “delays ... requests for clarification, partial repeats, and other repair initiators, and turn prefaces” (p. 70). Although this is true for English, the same cannot be said for other languages. Although the concept of preference structure is universal, the types of seconds that are preferred and dispreferred vary across cultures. Research on preference structure in Arabic is still needed³⁸.

Repeats of prior TCUs (similar to delays, pauses and hedges) can function as preliminaries to dispreferred responses such as rejections and disagreements (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 380; Schegloff, 2007, p. 102-104). Repeating a speaker’s prior turn, instead of producing a responsive, sequentially fitted second pair part (SPP) by the next speaker, can signal to participants that a dispreferred action, disagreement, is possibly coming. A repeat that locates a trouble in the first pair part (FPP) of an adjacency pair may signal that a dispreferred response is in the works because it breaks the contiguity of the base sequence (Schegloff, 2007) and delays the production of a relevant second pair part (SPP). Excerpt 28 below illustrates how repeats can delay a second pair part, preliminary to a dispreferred response, such as rejections and disagreements (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 380; Schegloff, 2007, p. 102-104). Partial repeats accompanied by a question word have been shown in the CA literature to do just that. The two Excerpts below illustrate how a partial repeat either preceded or followed by “what” can signal that a dispreferred response is in the works.

Excerpt 28: Partial repeat plus question word as preliminary to a dispreferred response (from Kendrick, 2015, p. 184)

24. Kel: I just get bo:red. I’m- like we’ve got two-

³⁸ The closest literature on Arabic preference structure I could find was a paper by Al-Gahtani and Roever (2015) which discussed how Learners of Arabic as a second language were found to have a better grasp of the preference structure of requests in Arabic. The authors found that the production of pre-expansions increased with the increase of L2 proficiency level.

25. a week. (0.4) °shit°
26. (1.0)
27. Hea: → A week till what.
28. Kel: We fi:nish. (0.4) isn't it. (0.5) ten days.
29. (0.3)
30. Hea: No, wait. We're week six.

Heather's OIR, in the form of a partial repeat + "till what" in line 4, "A week till what.", locates the referent for "what" as a trouble source. At first, Kelly treats Heather's OIR as an understanding problem and responds with a replacement for the question word "what": "we fi:nish" but then "backs down from the assertion" (Kendrick, 2015, p. 184). Kelly repairs the time reference in the trouble-source turn from a week to "ten days". In this way, Kelly orients to Heather's OIR as disagreement-implicative, a possible preliminary to a dispreferred response. Heather challenges Kelly's assertion and responds with "No, wait." explaining that they are in the sixth week of the academic term.

In Excerpt 29 below, the trouble-source speaker also orients to the repeat as what Schegloff calls 'disagreement-implicative' (Kendrick, 2015, p. 184). Here "what." plus a partial repeat acts as a pre-rejection or pre-disagreement. Kelly makes a proposal to Heather to study together on Saturday. Heather responds with a repair/repeat.

Excerpt 29: what+ Partial repeat as a preliminary to dispreferred response (Kendrick 2015, p. 185).

1. Kel: Are you going to come to campus and work
2. with me, .t on Saturday.=
3. Hea: → =What.=on Saturday?
4. (0.5)
5. Kel: I think you should:.
6. (0.3)
7. Kel: It [will be fun.
8. Hea: [I don't know. I might be he:re on Sunday.

9. It depends how much I get done, sort of

10. toni:ght.

Heather's use of a typical repair initiator: a turn-initial "what." and a latching repeat of a component in a prior TCU "on Saturday?" (in line 3) could be hearable as a request for confirmation of the day on which Kelly proposed to meet. But Kelly does not confirm the day. Instead, as Kendrick explains, she reaffirms the proposal by transforming it into a suggestion: "I think you should:." (line 5). This shows that Kelly didn't treat the "What." plus repeat as an OIR but rather as a display of reluctance, an indication that Heather may reject the proposal. Heather does not accept the proposal to meet on Saturday (lines 8-10), but offers Sunday as a possible alternative. Hence, Heather's pre-rejection was designed to provide Kelly with an opportunity to revise the proposal accordingly. This case therefore demonstrates that speakers can use partial repeats with a question word (e.g. "what") to signal that a dispreferred response is in the works.

The last two excerpts show that English is one of the languages in which repeats can do non-repair actions, that of signaling an imminent disagreement. Now I will show how repeats in Arabic talk can do similar non-repair actions.

4.4. NON-REPAIR REPEATS IN SPOKEN EGYPTIAN ARABIC

The following excerpts show that similar to English, Arabic speakers can also treat repeats of prior turns as signaling disagreement. Now consider this excerpt where M asks F (who appears to be studying in the U.S.) whether or not she likes the U.S. (not transcribed here). F remarks that unlike Egypt, it's "fatally quiet" in the US or in the campus town where she is residing at the time of the call. Being in Egypt, M is probably accustomed to overly loud and noisy traffic. Hence, M issues a partial repeat in line 2 and repeats "quiet?" which F initially treats as an opportunity to clarify, but which she later treats as a pre-disagreement.

Excerpt 30: 01:30

1.F: لا والله هديو قاتل يعني

la wallah hiduu' qatel ya'aani

no by god quiet fatal I mean
oh gosh it's fatally quiet ((in the US))

2.M: هذو ء
huduu',
quiet,
quiet.

3.F: هذو ء قوي اه
uh huduu' awwi
yeah quiet very
yeah very quiet

4.M: ? ياه ↑
↑yaaah?
↑come on?
↑come on?

5.F: اه واللهي
ah wallahi.
yeah by God.
yeah I swear.

Here, F describes how the US is different from her home country. F uses the phrases “fatally quiet” in line 1 to describe the US. Although the entire conversation is said in Egyptian Arabic, F uses the modifier “qatel” (“fatally”) in Standard Arabic. In response, M repeats part of F’s prior turn “quiet,” in line 2. F treats M’s repeat as an invitation to confirm. She confirms with “uh” (“yeah”), followed by a repeat of “quiet” plus a slight modification of the modifier used³⁹. Here, F uses the Egyptian modifier “awi” (“very”) in line 3 “yeah very quiet” in place of the Standard Arabic modifier “qatel” (“fatally”) that she

³⁹ Word order in Arabic is reversed: modifier/adverb follows the adjective.

used in her previous turn. It becomes later clear that M's repeat in line 2 may have been originally done as a pre-disagreement as he immediately issues a disagreement “↑yaaah?” (“come on?”) in line 4. F treats that turn as challenging her previous claim and responds with “yeah I swear.” In line 5.

The next example of an other-initiated repeat is an expansion of Excerpt 24 above. Two Egyptian men, both residing in the US are talking about the latest news in their home country. In line 1, M2 mentions a recent earthquake that took place in Egypt in line 1. It turns out that M1 did not hear nor was he aware of an earthquake occurrence. M1 issues “earthquake?” with rising intonation in line 4. M2 initially orients to that repeat as a candidate hearing and as an invitation to confirm which he does in line 5 “uh huh”. M1's subsequent repeat “what earthquake?” in line 6, however, is treated by M2 as a pre-disagreement.

Excerpt 31: The earthquake [CallHome/ara/7011_ar.cha](#) 15:02

1. M2: انت عارف الزلزال طبعا
 inta a'ref ilzilzal Tab'aan
 you know the earthquake of course
 you must've heard of the earthquake of course
2. M1: مين?
 meen?
 who?
 who?
3. M2: الزلزال
 ilzilzal
 the earthquake
 the earthquake
4. M1: → الزلزال.
 ilzilzal.
 the earthquake.

the earthquake.

5. M2:

.اه

ah.

uh huh.

uh huh.

6. M1:

زلزال ايه?

zilzal eh?

earthquake what?

what earthquake?

7. M2:

مش مصر كان فيها زلزال

[(unint)]

mish Masr kan feha zilzal

[(unint)]

didn't Egypt had in it earthquake

[(unint)]

wasn't there an earthquake in Egypt

[(unint)]

[]

8. M1:

ايمنى? [-والل]

[wall-] eimta?

[serio-] when?

9. M2:

< يا راجل واللهي ما تعرف >

>ya ragel wallahi ma ta'raf?<

>O man seriously didn't know?<

>dude you seriously didn't know?<

10. M1:

واللهي العظيم ما عرف

wallahi il'azeem ma a'raf

by God the Great don't know

I swear to God I didn't know

In line 2, M1 initiates a category specific question “who?” which targets the referent as problematic. After M2 confirms that he said “earthquake”, M1 responds with repeating again plus a question word “what earthquake?” in line 6. Note that M1 asks “what earthquake” rather than “which earthquake?”. The latter distinguishes between multiple references while "what earthquake" has no references. Thus, using “what earthquake?” indicates that M1 may be unsure if there was an earthquake or not. M2 treats this second repeat + question word as pre-disagreement as he backs down and responds with, “wasn’t there an earthquake in Egypt [()]” in line 7. M1 quickly jumps in an overlap and begins to say “serious-” which he quickly aborts and asks “when?”. M2 responds with “>dude you seriously didn’t know?<” in line 9 to which M1 responds with “I swear to God I didn’t know”. In this excerpt, we see an example of a repeat being treated as an opportunity for confirmation, then once repeated again with a question word, it was treated as pre-disagreement. The repeater, M1, however does not proceed with a disagreement as he may have done both repeats merely to elicit more information/news rather than to challenge or disagree with M2 even though M2 treated the second repeat in line 6 as pre-disagreement. This in fact shows that a repeat practice can be oriented to as doing a disaffiliative action even if it was not intended by the speaker.

This chapter so far attempted to provide a review of repair and non-repair practices in English. It also presented new data showing examples of repair in Arabic talk based on the Egyptian Callhome corpora. The findings of this chapter so far show that similar to English, Arabic speakers use different repair formats such as open class, category specific, candidate understandings, and repeats of speakers’ prior turns to perform repair actions. The chapter so far also presented examples of repair practices doing non-repair actions with particular focus on repeats. Similar to repeats in English, repeats in spoken Arabic can be treated by speakers as preliminary to a disagreement action. These findings in this chapter will support the findings in the next two chapters, mainly that Arabic repeats in everyday talk can also be used in institutional talk to perform similar actions. Before moving to the next analytical chapters and study how these practices are used in “The Opposite Direction”, I will first briefly review how repeats are used in other types of institutional talk, as they have been documented in the literature.

4.5. REPEATS IN INSTITUTIONAL TALK

While the abovementioned examples of repeats are taken from everyday conversations, repeats can also be used in institutional talk to achieve similar and sometimes different, institution-specific actions.

Similar to everyday talk, partial repeats are used as repair initiators by 911 call takers to confirm or verify what the caller has just said, especially when call takers need to confirm vital information in an emergency such as an address, as shown in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 32: repeats in emergency call centers (taken from Zimmerman, 1992, p. 442).

- 1.CT: [Nine one one what is yur emergency=
2.?: [(.)]=
3.C: =Uh yeah we have a little boy who can't breathe
4. at sixty nine hundred Marvin Lane
5. (.2)
6.?: (Hold'em)
7. (.3)
8.CT: → Sixty nine hun: [dred Marvin Lane?]=
9.?: [(dammit) =
10.C: =Yes, Burleigh City

In line 8 above, the call taker repeats the address given by the caller in line 4. The partial repeat in this case is designed to verify the information that was said by the caller in his/her previous TCU. The Caller responds by confirming the verification attempt and adding more information in line 10 “=Yes, Burleigh City”.

In contrast to emergency calls, partial repeats are commonly used in both direct and cross examination by lawyers to invite witnesses to confirm a point for the overhearing audience, the jury. Drew (1992) explains that attorneys use repairs to “underscore and highlight” (p. 476) the witness’s point for the jury as illustrated in the excerpt below, taken from Drew 1992. Here the attorney asks the witness, a forensic officer, about prints on a gun that was used in a burglary where the victim was shot.

Excerpt 33: (taken from Drew, 1992, p. 476)

1. A: Uh now, Sergeant ((name)), was the print put
2. on these before the shotgun shell was fired
3. or after?
4. W: Before it
5. A: → Before?
6. W: Yes sir

The attorney asks the witness if the prints were put on the gun before or after the shots were fired. The witness responds with “before it” in line 4 which is partially repeated by the attorney with question intonation in line 5 “before?”. Partial repeats here, Drew explains, allow the attorneys to highlight and emphasize the witnesses’ talk in both direct and cross-examination (p. 476) before their closing remarks to ensure it has been heard and appreciated by the overhearing audience, the jury.

Repeats can be used for a different purpose in cross examination. Excerpt 34 below, taken from a trial for rape, illustrates how repeats can also be used by the attorney to disagree with and discredit the witness. In this extract, the rape victim is being cross-examined by the defense attorney. The questions in this extract discuss the night of the alleged rape, when the witness met the defendant in a place which the attorney describes as a “bar” but which the witness rejects and describes as a “club”. The attorney has been implying that the witness’s story lacks consistency, and that her testimony is different from what she’s told the police.

Excerpt 34: (OULETTE_51)

- 1.D: A' February fourteenth of uh: (0.4) nineteen seventy
2. fi:ve you were (0.3) what eighteen years old.
3. (0.3)
- 4.D: At that time?
- 5.W: Ye:s.
6. (1.7)

7.D: Now: (0.7) February fourteenth of nineteen seventy five

8. you were (0.3) you were down a- (.) in Bo:ston. (.) Is

9. tha- Is that ri:ght?

10.W: Ye:s

11.D: An' you went to a: uh (0.9) uh you went to a ba:r? (in)

12. Boston (0.6)

13. Is that correct?

14. (1.0)

15.W: → It's a clu:b.

16. (0.3)

17.D: → A clu:b?

18. (1.0)

19.D: There was liquor served there wasn't there? ((fast

20. delivery))

21.W: Ye:s

22. (0.5)

23.D: You had so(me) liquor didn't you?

24.W: Ye:s.

25. (3.1)

26. It's a: uh singles club. Isn't that what it is?=

27. =((sound of striking mallet))

28.P: ()

29. (0.9)

30.J: No you may have it,

31. (1.1)

32.D: It's where uh (.) uh (0.3) gi:rls and fellas meet.

33. Isn't it?

34. (0.9)

35.W: People go: there.

36. (4.9)

Prior to using a partial repeat “club”, the attorney uses a number of yes/no questions designed to elicit a yes or no answer to either confirm or disconfirm the attorney’s propositions. In lines 11-13 the attorney is retelling the witness and jury what happened that night before the alleged rape, mainly that the witness “went to a ba:r?” followed by a (0.6) pause and an affirmative question in line 13 “is that correct?”. The attorney is inviting her to confirm the proposition that she was in a bar with the implication that she had been possibly drinking. The witness, however, rejects the word choice “ba:r”, rebuts the attorney’s version (Drew, 1992, p. 490) and instead produces a correction “it’s a clu:b” in line 15 with stress on the word “clu:b”. The Attorney’s following turn in line 17 is interesting. The attorney responds with a partial repeat of the witness’s prior turn with rising intonation “A clu:b?”. Unlike the previous trial (forensic officer as a witness) excerpt, the attorney’s repeat does not seem to be seeking to highlight vital information for the jury. The attorney’s repeat is not inviting the witness to confirm and highlight this information. After a second of silence (and an absence of confirmation or any type of response from the witness), the attorney adds a fast follow up question in lines 17 “There was liquor served there wasn’t there?”, a negated question that invites a yes answer. The witness responds with “ye:s”. While the attorney’s partial repeat of the trouble source is designed as an OIR, it lacks the OIR’s sequence organization structure (no second pair part). In the previous forensic officer trial excerpt, where the attorney was addressing his witness, the partial repeat by the attorney was “not generally associated with attorney’s doubt about prior answer, nor with witnesses’ self repair; instead [it manages] to have the witness affirm or repeat the point” for the benefit of the jury (Drew, 1992, p. 476). However, as illustrated in the last rape trial excerpt, the attorney’s repeat of the victim’s prior TCU is used to achieve something different. Here, the attorney is implying that the witness is not credible, and his partial repeats were done to express doubt, which is evident in his follow up questions indicating the alcohol was served

in that place where singles go to meet each other. The implication is that the less innocent term “bar” is a more appropriate term than “club.”

This practice of partial repeats through which the lawyers challenge a hostile witness resembles another practice in everyday talk discussed earlier, using partial repeats to signal pre-disagreement. The structure of a pre-disagreement repeat sequence in everyday talk also allows speakers to target and bring into question a recipient’s prior turn to signal an imminent disagreement. Unlike in everyday talk, however, lawyers cannot disagree with their witnesses explicitly. Lawyers display disagreement through questions. Furthermore, the witness in a cross-examination may not be expected to respond to the lawyer’s repeats, as we see in Excerpt 34 above, where the hostile witness does not produce a second pair part. After producing that repeat, the lawyer (in Excerpt 34) simply continues with follow-up questions to further his disagreement and discredit the witness.

Repeats used by attorneys in direct and cross examination talk share both similarities and differences with those used in broadcast news interviews and talk shows. As we will see in the next excerpts, hosts of broadcast news interviews and talk shows can signal affiliation and disaffiliation with their guests, just like attorneys do with their witnesses. However, the practices through which such actions (affiliation, disaffiliation, discredit) are achieved differ from one context to another. The next excerpt, taken from an entertainment talk show, shows how a partial repeat is used by the host to take a clear stance and display affiliation with his guest against a second guest (who is not present on the set yet).

Excerpt 35: Confrontation in talk shows (from Hutchby, 2006, p. 64)

1. Guest: It’s been goin’ fer a year now
2. and I j [ust want-
3. Host: → [A YEA:R?
4. Guest: just a- [just abou:t.
5. audience: [°wwuuuhuhuho°

The host here interrupts the first guest's talk and repeats part of the guest's prior utterance "A YEA:R?" in line 3 and makes it more salient for the audience. The IR's repetition in line 3 differs prosodically from the first guest's original turn in that it is said louder, with a question intonation, and with a vowel lengthening. Here, the host's repetition of "A YEA:R?" is followed by a gasp from the audience. Hutchby explains that both the host's utterance in line 3 and the audience response in line 5 are designed to form 'negative affiliation' (p. 69) i.e., "affiliation through an exhibition of dismay at the reported behavior" (ibid) of the second guest (who is not present on stage at this point yet). Here, the host is helping the first guest make her complaint against the second guest more "visible" to the audience (p. 69). Hutchby explains that both the host and the first guest are working together to condemn the behavior of that second guest and to frame her activities and behavior as disagreeable. This, Hutchby adds, is very different from what occurs in broadcast news interviews, as described in the next chapter. The next chapter will show that whereas IRs in broadcast news interviews are not expected to take an affiliative stance with their IEs, the IR in "The Opposite Direction" employs a number of linguistic practices that are treated by his IEFs as affiliative.

CHAPTER 5: INTERVIEWER'S PRACTICES THAT ALIGN WITH THE INTERVIEWEE

Unlike talk show hosts, broadcast news interviewers (IRs) are expected to maintain neutrality in broadcast news interviews by refraining from verbally reacting to the interviewees' (IEs') answers to their questions (Clayman, 1992; Hutchby, 2006). IRs are expected to avoid producing acknowledgments, evaluations, continuers and other reactions because "their production would identify prior talk as news for questioners (who are usually fully briefed beforehand or may be required to appear so)" (Heritage 1985, p. 100). The IRs do not ask questions for themselves but do so for an overhearing audience (Goffman, 1981). However, this chapter will show that the IR in "The Opposite Direction" performs certain actions that are treated by the IEFs as affiliative.

5.1. AFFILIATIVE REPEATS OF INTERVIEWEES' PRIOR TURNS

Repeats of interviewees' (IEs') prior turns are common in AlJazeera's "The Opposite Direction". An initial analysis of my data shows that the interviewer (IR) produces repeats as if he is the direct recipient of talk, i.e., similar to the abovementioned excerpt from an entertainment talk show examined by Hutchby (2013), and in contrast to other broadcast news interviews that have been previously studied. Interviewers in broadcast news interviews are not expected to evaluate or comment on IEs' answers to a preceding question (Clayman 1992; Ekstrom, 2001), nor are they expected to act like the direct recipients of talk (Hutchby, 2013). Similar to Hutchby's excerpt, the IR's repeats of the favorable IE's prior TCUs are done affiliatively to support the IE's side. This, I argue, is similar to attorneys' use of repeats to highlight and make certain words of the testimony more salient for the overhearing audience, as in Excerpt 36 below (a copy of Excerpt 33). Here we saw the attorney's partial repeat is "not generally associated with attorney's doubt about prior answer, nor with witnesses' self repair" (Drew, 1992, p. 476). Instead, as Drew argues, it is done "to have the witness affirm or repeat the point" (ibid) and highlight it for the jury.

Excerpt 36 (restated): trial (Drew, 1992, p. 476)

1. A: Uh now, Sergeant ((name)), was the print put
2. on these before the shotgun shell was fired

3. or after?
4. W: → Before it
5. A: → Before?
6. W: Yes sir

Now consider the excerpt below, from Aljazeera’s broadcast news interviews program ‘The Opposite Direction.’ As is the case with affiliative partial repeats in talk shows, the IR’s repeats of IEF’s prior turns are also done to “select and highlight” (Clayman, 2016, p. 164) components of the IEF’s prior turn and make it more salient for the overhearing audience. These affiliative repeats are constructed to align with the speaker, help build a case and gather information for the overhearing audience, similar to attorneys’ repeats in Drew’s (1992) example illustrated in Excerpt 33/36 above. Because these repeats are done to affiliate with and to help the IEF repeat and confirm a previous point for the audience, I will call them Affiliative Other Initiated Repeats (AOIR).

In Excerpt 37 below, taken from a 2014 episode, two Syrian politicians are interviewed regarding negotiations with the Syrian president Alasad. Each IE represents a different opponent group in Syria. The IED (representative of the free army) welcomes negotiations with Alasad while the IEF (representing the opponents’ coalition) rejects attempts made by the international community to mediate negotiations with Alasad’s regime. The IEF here insists that a political solution with Alasad is not an option and that the people of Syria will continue to fight until Alasad is ousted. The beginning of the IEF’s turn is deleted. In the deleted portion, the IEF lists names and examples of people and nations who fought their enemies and never gave up so that he can make a comparison to the Syrian people’s willingness to fight. This excerpt begins with an abrupt change of volume and pace. The IEF below makes a relatively slower and more stretched utterance than his normal previous turns.

Excerpt 37: The Opposite Direction “let the people of Syria hear you”

((prior talk deleted))

1.IEF: نحن قادرون ان نحارب الف سنه ..

<naHnu qadirun an nuHarib alf saneh>

<we able to fight thousand year>

<we ca:n> fight for a thousand years> ((Gaze at IR with half closed eyes))

2.IR: الوضع الانساني في سوريا (.h كارثي : بس عم يقول لك

bas 'am yiqul lak (.h al waDa' alinsa[ni fi soria .h karithi]

but is telling you (.h) the situation hum[anitarian in Syria .h catastrophic]

but he's telling you (.h) the humani [tarian situation in Syria .h is catastrophic]

[]

3. [((IR hand movement up and down))]

[]

4.IEF: [والله انا اقدر]

[wallah ana uqqadir]

[by God I appreciate]

[I swear to God I understand]

5. ذلك [(0.2)]

thalik [(0.2)]

that] [(0.2)]

[]

6.IR: [((IR moves lips while looking at IEF))]

7.IEF: انا اقدر ان الوضع الانساني كارثي

uqqader an alwad'u alinsani karithi

appreciate that the-situation the-humanitarian catastrophic

I understand that the humanitarian situation is catastrophic

31. ونحن نتمنى اليوم .h

.h wa naHnu natamana alyawmu

.h and we hope today

32. ((looks at IR and places both hands on table))

33. IEF: نوصل لحل سياسي لكن انا اليوم
 nuwSal li Hal siyasi lakin ana alyawm
 reach.p1st to solution political but I today
 we reach a political solution but if I wanted today
34. فر شويه تعب على الناس [من شان او]
 min shan aw[wafer shwayyet ta3ab ‘ala ilnas]
 in order to sa [ve a little misery for people]
 to sa [ve people a little misery]
 []
35. [((cough in the background))]
36. IEF: بحطهم امام ذل ايراني ل مية سنه
 baHutthom amam thul irani la miyt saneh .h
 I’ll place them before humiliation Iranian to hundred years .h
 I’ll put them under Iranian humiliation for a hundred years .h
37. IR: mhm
38. IEF: [وامام:]
 [wa’amam:
 [and in front:
 []
39. IR: → [?سنه ميه]
 [miyt saneh?
 hundred year?
 [one hundred YEARS? ((IR’s face not visible))
40. =سنه ميه
Meyt saneh
 one HUNDRED years=

ONE HUNDRED years=

41. IR: → =ذل ايراني? ((bends closer to IEF with finger pointing))

=thul Irani?

=humiliation Iranian?

=IRANIAN humiliation?

42. ((moves closer to IEF while finger pointing towards him))

43. ذل ايران = ستحكمنا ايران

thul IRANi =sa taHkumuna Iran

humiliation IRANi =will control us Iran

IRANian humiliation =Iran will control us

44. مية سنة نعاني الذل والامريرينون

miyt sameh nu3ani althul wal ammarein wa n-

hundred year suffer.1p humiliation and bitterness and w-

for hundred years and we'll suffer humiliation and bitterness and w-

45. نهجر

nuhajjar

forced.1p

forced out=

46. ((points up and down on table))

47. IR: ↑ = <سمعهن شعب السوري> قلهن .h ((points at screen))=

=↑>SAMI'on sha'ab alsuri .h QULLon=

=↑>MAKE HEAR them people of Syria .h TELL them=

=>LET the people of Syria HEAR these words .h TELL them=

48. ((points at screen))

49. IEF: <ونهجر من اراضينا اذا نحن اليوم نقبل اليوم >

<wa nuhajjar min araDina itha naHnu alyawm naqbal alyawm

<and forced from our-lands if we today accept. 1p today

<AND WE'LL BE FORCED OUT of our LANDS IF we today accept ((gaze at screen))

50. بدون خروج جيش الاحتلال

biduun xuruuj jaysh al iHtilal

without exiting army the occupation

the occupation forces ((continues))

In line 1, the IEF is continuing a turn in which he insists that the Syrians will still fight and won't give up. The IEF in this particular turn speaks slowly, clearly and looks at the IR with half closed eyes. The popular perception⁴⁰ in the Arab culture of such gestures is that the speaker is making a promise or threat depending on the situation. Here, the IEF claims that he (and those he represents) are not willing to negotiate; instead, they'll continue to fight for years. The IR in line 2 starts his turn with "but" which may signal disagreement, followed by referring to and rephrasing a prior (non-transcribed) turn by the IED (who is for political negotiations with the regime). The IED had stated that they need to negotiate to end the catastrophic situation. The IR's turn "but he's telling you (.) the hum[anitarian situation in Syria .h is catastrophic]" allows him to bring attention back to the IED's prior turn with which the IR may disagree. The IR invites the IEF to respond to (and potentially refute) the IED's claim. The IEF interrupts the IR's turn-in-progress in an overlapping statement in lines 4-5 with "I swear to God I understand that (0.2)". Yet, rather than deny it, the IEF's response confirms the IED's claim that Syrians live in catastrophic situations. This may contradict his earlier turn where the IEF vowed that Syrians can still fight for years to come. The IEF then produces a short pause in line 5, possibly because he may have caught himself producing a response that conflicts with his initial turn/claim. Also, the IR may have expected a different response (one that refutes the claims rather than confirm them) as he continues to look at the IEF while simultaneously moving his lips silently in line 6 as in an attempt to help the IEF continue, add or even rephrase what he's just said, or simply provide a response. Note that the IR refrains from producing any

⁴⁰ As noted in several personal blogs and sites, such as "To make signs of closing the eyes is an indicated threat" in <http://blogs.transparent.com/arabic/the-arabic-art-of-hinting-with-the-eyes/> (retrieved on April 10th, 2017)

responses (like “hmm” “yeah”) or follow up questions even though he had a chance to take control of the floor at this point, reissue a question or change topics. Instead he allows the IEF another chance at the floor and waits for the IEF to initiate another turn in lines 7-11 where the latter repeats and modifies his initial utterance and adds an account as to why he’s against political negotiations despite the catastrophic humanitarian situation in Syria. The IEF explains that although they do hope to reach a solution, it would merely provide a fading relief with dangerous consequences, as he adds in line 13, “I’ll put them under Iranian humiliation for a hundred years .h”.

Once the IEF completes his utterance, the IR, whose face isn’t visible on the screen, issues a latched continuer⁴¹ “mhm” in line 14. However, while the IEF is about to continue in line 15, the IR in an abrupt overlapping turn initiates what sounds like an other-initiated repair and repeats part of the IEF’s previous turn with an elevated volume, stress and question intonation “[one hundred YEARS?” in line 16.

Excerpt 38: Partial repeats in the opposite directions

51. IEF: بحطهم امام ذل ايراني ل مية سنه .h
 baHutthom amam thul irani la miyt saneh .h
 I’ll place them before humiliation Iranian to hundred years .h
 I’ll put them under Iranian humiliation for a hundred years .h
52. IR: mhm
53. IEF: [وامام:
 [wa’amam:
 [and in front:
 [
54. IR: → [سنه ميه ?
 [miyt saneh?

⁴¹ Continuers in CA refer to behavioral tokens such as ‘uh huh’ and ‘yeah’ produced at transition relevance places during the course of extended units of talk (Schegloff 1982). Continuers indicate that the hearer does not intend to take the floor, displaying an understanding that the speaker is not yet finished with their turn.

[hundred year?

[one hundred YEARS? ((IR's face not visible))

55. =سنه ميه

Meyt saneh

one HUNDRED years=

ONE HUNDRED years=

56. IR: → =ذل ايراني? ((bends closer to IEF with finger pointing))

=thul Irani?

=humiliation Iranian?

=IRANIAN humiliation?

57. ((moves closer to IEF while finger pointing towards him))

58. ذل ايران = ستحكمنا ايران

thul IRANi =sa taHkumuna Iran

humiliation IRANi =will control us Iran

IRANian humiliation =Iran will control us

59. مية سنه نعاني الذل والامر ينون

miyt sameh nu3ani althul wal ammarein wa n-

hundred year suffer.1p humiliation and bitterness and w-

for hundred years and we'll suffer humiliation and bitterness and w-

60. نهجر

nuhajjar

forced.1p

forced out=

61. ((points up and down on table))

62. IR: ↑ = >سمعهن شعب السوري = قلهن .h ((points at screen))=

=↑>SAMI'on sha'ab alsuri .h QULLon=

=↑>MAKE HEAR them people of Syria .h TELL them=

=>LET the people of Syria HEAR these words .h TELL them=

63. ((points at screen))

64. IEF: <ونهجر من اراضينا اذا نحن اليوم نقبل اليوم <

<wa nuhajjar min araDina itha naHnu alyawm naqbal alyawm

<and forced from our-lands if we today accept.1p today

<AND WE'LL BE FORCED OUT of our LANDS IF we today accept ((gaze at screen))

65. بدون خروج جيش الاحتلال

biduun xuruuj jaysh al iHtilal

without exiting army the occupation

the occupation forces ((continues))

The IEF responds to the IR's repeat by confirming his previous utterance "ONE HUNDRED years" in higher volume in the next turn (in line 16). By doing that, the IEF treats the IR's repeat as an opportunity to highlight his prior point by repeating it again. Note however that the IR does not issue any follow up questions asking the IEF to elaborate, nor does the IEF himself provide an account. Instead, the IR immediately produces another turn in line 18 that latches to the IEF's last turn. This one too is designed as a repeat with a rising intonation "=IRANIAN humiliation⁴²?". The IEF confirms by repeating "IRANian humiliation=" also in a louder tone in line 20 and provides an account. Note that the IR does not issue any follow up questions or comments after the IEF provides a response and/or account. This sets this specific practice apart from other practices such as displayed surprise or ritualized disbelief actions as discussed by Wilkinson and Kitzinger (2006)⁴³. In the latter case, the person that initiates the repeat of the

⁴² Word order is reversed in Arabic.

⁴³ Consider this example of displayed surprise from Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006 (p. 168-169)

01. Clt: I've had five at home

02. Ros: Fi: :ve,hh

← ritualized disbelief

03. Clt: mm

← confirmation

04. Ros: Goodness!

← surprise token

surprise source would end the sequence with a surprise token (e.g., *wow*, *oh my goodness!*, *gosh*) as illustrated in footnote 43.

The cases of repeats of another's prior turn examined earlier in the dissertation were treated by recipients as doing different actions (repair and non-repair actions). Recipients' responses to those practices varied accordingly (such as producing confirmation, reformulating of a trouble source). However, the IEFs' responses to the repeat practices here, as exemplified in Excerpts 37 and 38 above, are different. Structurally speaking, these repeats can be heard as interrogatives that invite an affirming (yes) answer. The recipients of the repeats analyzed thus far do not respond by providing simple confirmations (such as "mhm", "yeah"), nor do they respond with correcting the trouble source. Instead, in most of the cases studied in this dissertation, recipients of repeats respond with "confirming by *repeating*" (Schegloff, 1996) the trouble source (*italics mine*). Unlike Schegloff's (1996) data, the IEs do not confirm allusions made by the other speaker (the IR); instead, they confirm the repeat by producing a (virtually identical) repeat. The IEFs treat these repeat practices as a strategy by the IR to allow them to highlight a previous point/turn. In fact, the IEF repeats and confirms his entire prior turn in a more confident manner (louder, higher volume, without any pauses and hesitations). The co-participants simply seem to build a case for the overhearing audience similar to Excerpt 33 where the lawyer affiliates with his witness by highlighting the latter's testimony for the jury. Furthermore, the IR's affiliation and agreement with the IEF in Excerpt 38 becomes more explicit in line 25 where the IR, loudly and quickly, responds to the IEF's warning by saying ">↑let the PEOPLE of Syria HEAR these words .h TELL THEM<=" while pointing at the screen. This utterance is significant because it shows what the IR may have been trying to achieve by initiating these repeats all along. Such repeats were designed to allow the IEF to confirm and highlight their previous turns so that the overhearing audience (in this case, "the People of Syria") "hear these words". The IEF obeys, looks back and forth at the screen and at the IR and

In the case of displayed surprise, the surprise source in the base FPP invites a surprise token in the SPP (e.g., *oh my god*, *wow*) as a response in the SPP. A repeat of the first speaker's FPP plus its SPP constitutes an inserted sequence. In this example, the repeat By Ros performs display of surprise or ritualized disbelief (line 2) which invites a confirmation (line 3) from the first speaker, followed by a surprise token by the second speaker in line 4.

in a louder, more stretched, utterance continues to explain the dangers of accepting negotiations with Alasad and Iran in lines 27-28 “<<AND WE’LL BE FORCED OUT of our LANDS IF we today accept the status quo and the occupation forces”.

Repeats designed to highlight a previous turn are common in “The Opposite Direction”. Excerpt 39 below illustrates another example of a repeat format used by the IR to highlight and make a previous utterance by the IEF more salient for the overhearing audience. In Excerpt 39, taken from a different 2014 episode, the IEF explains that Hezbollah’s fighters who fight along with the Alasad regime in Syria are an enemy to Arabs and Muslims (specifically, Sunni Muslims). Hezbollah is a Shiite political, ideological and military party in Lebanon that is funded by Iran. The name Hezbollah in Arabic means, literally, Party of Allah. However, the IEF here, an Arab *Sunni* Muslim explains that Hezbollah should change their name and remove the Quranic association.

Excerpt 39: The Opposite Direction “enemies of Allah”

01. IEF: لأنه نعرف نحنا في القرآن الكريم لا يجب أن يسمى حزب الله
 la yajibu an yusamma hizbollah li’anahu na’rifu naHnu fi alquran alkarim
 not must to called hizbollah because know.1S we in the-Quran the-holy
 it must not be called Hezbollah .h because we know that

02. ((quotes a verse faster and louder with many hand movements up and down))

03. ((recites a verse, deleted))

04. IEF: ؟ أعداء الله (.) لماذا؟
 a’daa’ Allah (.) limatha?
enemies Allah (.) why?
 it’s the enemies of Allah party (.)why?

05. IR: → =أعداء الله؟ ((opens eyes wide, raises eyebrows))
 =a’daa’ Allah? ((opens eyes wide, raises eyebrows))
 =enemies Allah? ((opens eyes wide, raises eyebrows))
 =enemies of Allah? ((opens eyes wide, raises eyebrows))

06. IEF: (.) h. وسأعطي أكثر من ذلك بعد ذلك أعداء الله .h
a'daa allah .h (.) wa sa'uTi akthar min thalik ba'da thalik (.)
enemies allah .h (.) and give.1S more than that after that (.)
enemies of Allah .h (.) and I'll give more than that after that (.) ((continues))

After reciting a Quranic verse⁴⁴ to begin to provide a disqualification for Hezbollah's adoption of a Quranic name in lines 1-2, the IR suggests what he sees as a more fitting name for Hezbollah in line 3, the "enemies of Allah". The IEF claims that the label or linguistic choice of 'Hezbollah' by Hezbollah members is wrong. He argues that the word Hezbollah as mentioned in the Quran contradicts what Hezbollah members stand for. The ancient divide between Sunnis and Shias started after the death of Prophet Mohammed (or Allah's Messenger) as both parties disagreed on who was to become his successor, the first Caliph. Shias believe that the prophet had explicitly named his successor before his death while Sunnis don't⁴⁵. This led to the split between the two, and many battles ensued as a result. Note however, that the verse itself does not disqualify anyone from anything. It merely says that those who believe in Allah and Mohammed are the party of Allah. In fact, both sects of Islam do. After a micro pause, the IEF continues to provide an account for his word choice ("why="). The IR in line 5, however, interrupts the IEF's TCU-in-progress, and initiates a latching turn designed as a repeat with rising intonation. The IR repeats the IEF's prior turn with a rising intonation "=enemies of Allah?" while raising his eyebrows. Whereas the IEF response was said in a statement intonation contour in line 4, the IR repeated that phrase with rising intonation, as an interrogative⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ The deleted verse: "Your ally is none but Allah and [therefore] His Messenger and those who have believed - those who establish prayer and give zakah, and they bow [in worship]. And whoever is an ally of Allah and His Messenger and those who have believed - indeed, the party of Allah - they will be the predominant." Surah Al-Maidah [5:55-56]"

⁴⁵ Shias believe that Prophet Mohammed named Ali, his son-in-law, to be his successor, but Sunnis denied that and appointed four of the prophet's closest friends to succeed him. Very simply put, Shias decided to split and follow Ali. Note however, both Sunnis and Shias share the same spiritual beliefs and practices.

⁴⁶ Questions in *Standard Arabic* (SA) must be signaled by a question word, with a statement word order and rising intonation (Defense language institute, 1974: 57), but that is not the case in spoken Arabic which allows declarative sentence interrogatives. Here the phrase "enemies of Allah" is said in SA, but the intonation is similar to that of an interrogative.

This repeat here is treated by the IEF as a strategy performed to highlight the IEF's previous turn for the audience. The IEF responds by confirming by repeating his turn again, in higher volume (than his previous turns) in line 5 and adds that he'll provide an account later. The IR's repeat is said with an interrogative intonation that invites a confirmation from the trouble source initiator. Note that similar to the previous excerpt, the IR doesn't use other formats of repair, such as open class format). Instead, he uses one of the 'stronger' formats (e.g. those that claim adequate hearing or understanding, subject to confirmation (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks, 1977). The use of an open class (or a weak) repair initiator by the IR could have potentially been heard (and treated) by the IE as a genuine hearing problem (as is the case in Excerpt 16 above). Similar to Excerpts 37 and 38, the IEF treats the repeat as "affiliative" (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2006), as an opportunity to allow him to highlight and make his turn more salient to the audience. The IEF responds by "confirming by repeating" the trouble source.

These repeats are both similar to and different from the repeat done by the talk show host in Excerpt 35 above (restated below). The host in Excerpt 35/40 acts like the direct recipient of information by repeating part of his guest's previous turn "A YEA:R" louder and in question intonation.

Excerpt 40 (restated): Confrontation in talk shows (from Hutchby, 2006, p. 64)

01. Guest: It's been goin' fer a year now

02. and I j [ust want-

03. Host: → [A YEA:R?

04. Guest: just a- [just abou:t.

05. audience: [°wwuuuhuhuh°

In my data, the IR's repetitions of his IEFs' prior turns are also said in the similar manner. As in Hutchby's example, repeats here are also done to signal affiliation. However, the two shows have different participant structures; entertainment talk shows have an in-studio audience and the host moves around the guests and the audience relatively freely. This is important because the audience may interrupt turns and turn sequences, as in Hutchby's example. The IR and the IEs in "The Opposite Direction" on

the other hand remain seated, and their only audience is the overhearing audience at home. Unlike hosts of entertainment talk shows who act as the main recipient of talk, as exemplified in Hutchby’s excerpt, the IR in my dataset is expected to remain neutral, as we saw in the description from the show’s website. The IR’s repeats in Excerpts 37-39 show that the IR does not, in fact, remain neutral; these repeats are done to affiliate with the IEFs—similar to Hutchby’s talk show host and to Drew’s lawyer-witness example. The IR does not follow up with disagreements or further follow up questions. In fact, the IR’s repeat merely allows the IEF a further chance to take the floor where the IEF gets to confirm, elaborate and provide an account for the targeted term. The reiteration, as Grimshaw (1982) explains, serves to confirm, and underline the addressee’s prior utterance (p. 337-38). The IEF, in response, repeats by confirming “enemies of Allah, .h (.)” and continues to provide an account in lines 6-7. To sum up, we can see that the repeat was used by the IR to allow the IEF to ‘agree by repeating’ (Schegloff, 1996) part of or all of the IR’s prior utterance and confirm its proposition for the overhearing audience.

The following excerpts are taken from newer episodes that discuss newer issues. These episodes aired in 2017 and 2018. Unlike the previous excerpts from 2013-2016, newer episodes discussed more diverse topics that are not necessarily focused on Syria. Despite the change of topics, the IR continues to use similar affiliative strategies with his IEFs. In the next few excerpts, the IR repeats part of the IEFs’ prior turns, and the IEFs treat these repeats as an opportunity to highlight previous points to the overhearing audience. The IEFs in these examples confirm by repeating that same point in about half of the newer instances. As we will see later in this chapter, there are, however, some variations to the responses. The next excerpt is taken from a recent episode where the IR and the IEF are both warning the audience of any Russian intervention in the Arab countries. Here, the IEF compares the current Russian political environment to a mafia in line 1, which the IR repeats with rising intonation in line 2.

Excerpt 41: Mafia work 2:55

1. IEF: روسيا تحت حكم بوتين هي مارست العمل المافوي
Rusya taHt Hukum putin hiya marasat al’amal almafyawi
Russia under rule Putin it practiced work mafi

Russia under Putin's rule has practiced Mafia work

2. IR: →

العمل المافيو؟

al'amal almafyawī?

the work the mafia?

mafia work?

3. IEF: →

العمل المافيو [لكن المصيبة

al'amal almafyawī [lakin almusiba

the work the mafia [but the catastrophe

mafia work [but the catastrophe

[

4. IR:

[مم

[mhm

Here, the IEF explains in line 1 that Russia under Putin is practicing what he refers to as Mafia work. The IR in line 2 does an other initiated repeat “Mafia work?” with rising intonation which is treated by the IEF as an opportunity to confirm by repeating. The IEF in turn responds in line 3 by repeating “Mafia work” and continues to elaborate.

The next excerpt, also from the same episode, illustrates another example of an AOIR where the IR repeats the IEF's prior point in rising intonation. The IEF treats it as an opportunity to make his earlier comment more salient for the overhearing audience and responds by confirming by repeating that same point.

Excerpt 41: Not armed by Russia

1. IEF:

هكذا اصبحت روسيا تحت حكم بوتين شننا ام ابينا

hakatha aSbaHat rusya taHta Hukum Putin shi'na am abayna

like this became russia under rule putin like it or not

this is Russia under Putin's ruling whether we like it or not

2.

اليوم اعطيني نظام دكتاتوري واحد في كل المنطقه العربيه

alyoum i'Tini nitham diktatori waHed fi kul almanTiqa al'arabiya
 today give me regime dictator one in all the region the arab
 give me one single dictator regime today in the entire Arab region

3. لا تسلحه روسيا يعني شو هال[صدفه
 la tusalliHuhu rusya ya'ani shou ha [sudfeh]
 not armed Russia mean what a [coincidence]
 not armed by Russia I mean it can't be a [coincidence]
 []

4. IR: → [لا تسلحه روسيا?]
 [la tusalliHuhu rusya?]
 [not armed russia?]
 [not armed by Russia?]

5. IEF: لا تسلحه روسيا يعني شو هالصدفه
 la tussaliHuhu rusya ya'ani shou hal sudfeh
 not armed russia I mean what a coincidence
 not armed by Russia I mean that can't be a coincidence

The IEF here continues to accuse Russia of arming all dictatorships in the region. In lines 2-3, the IEF explains that there isn't "one single dictator regime today in the entire Arab region not armed by Russia". As the IEF continues with a remark "this can't be a coincidence" the IR interjects with an other initiated repeat with rising intonation in line 4 "not armed by Russia?". The IEF treats that repetition/question as an opportunity to confirm by repeating his prior turn which he does in line 5 "Not armed by Russia I mean that can't be a coincidence".

While the majority of instances of AOIRs are treated as affiliative by the IEFs, my dataset shows some variation in how IEFs respond to them, as we will see in the next excerpts.

5.1.1. Variations in Responses to the AOIR

5.1.1.1. Responding with “of course” + Repeat

The examples of AOIR discussed so far exemplify how the IR’s repeats are treated by IEFs as an opportunity to highlight something said earlier to the overhearing audience by repeating. On one occasion, however, the IEF does not confirm the IR’s repeat by repeating only. The IEF does still repeat a previous point and makes it salient for the overhearing audience, but he first responds with “Tab’an”, the Arabic equivalent to the English “of course”. The Arabic “Tab’an” “(of course)” as we will shortly see functions similarly to the English “of course”; it allows the addressee (the IEF, here) to “contest the askability” (Stivers, 2011) of the IR’s question. Before moving to the analysis of the next excerpts of AOIRs preceded by “of course” + repeat, consider this example from Stivers.

Excerpt 42: Of course (taken from Stivers, p. 89)

1. J: =Well don’t tell Bernie but I got him a hat fer his birthday.
2. S: Oh you got Bernie a hat?
3. J: Yeah.
4. (.)
5. J: Cuz you took his. It’s sort of like
6. S: I⁴⁷ [didn’t take his. <I paid him for it. what he paid for it.
7. J: [m
8. J: Oh you paid him for it.
9. S: → Of course!⁴⁸
10. J: Oh:. So I got him one sortuvv li:ke that.

Here, Joyce’ accusation that Stan “took” Bernie’s hat is denied by Stan in line 6 “<I paid him for it.”.

Joyce responds with a request for confirmation in line 8, “Oh you paid him for it.” which insinuates that

⁴⁷ In the original excerpt, line 6 was transcribed with ^ to denote primary accent “^I [didn’t take his. <I paid him for it. what he paid for it.” I modified it here using the equivalent symbol used in CA _

⁴⁸ Same as previous. Symbol for primary accent modified by using _ here as opposed to the ^ used in the original text.

Stan might have taken the hat without paying for it. Note here that as Stivers explains, Joyce’s turn invites confirmation but it also entails that disconfirmation is possible too. Stan’s response in line 9, “Of course!”, however, treats disconfirmation as “inconceivable”.

In a few instances, the IEF responds to the IR’s repeat with “Tab’an”, the Arabic equivalent of the English “of course”, followed by a repeat. Like its English counterpart, I argue, “Tab’an” is used by the IEFs to contest the askability of the IR’s question. Starting with Excerpt 43 below, taken from a 2017 episode, the IEF expresses his frustration that Hezbollah is still in power, and that Hezbollah is still involved in the Lebanese political sphere. This excerpt is taken from the end of the show where the IR asks the IEF to briefly sum up his stance regarding calls to disarm and dismantle Hezbollah, before the show time was up. The IEF here makes some graphic remarks and calls for “*burning them*” in reference to Hezbollah. The IR initiates a repeat on the IEF’s previous turn in line 4. The IEF responds to with “Tab’an Tab’an” (of course of course) before he repeats his previous point “*burn them*” possibly to confirm and highlight his previous point to the overhearing audience.

Excerpt 43: 02212017:47:10

1. IR: يعني باختصار انت مع الدعوات الدوليه
ya’ani bi ixtiSar anta ma’ alda’wat aldawliya
meaning in short you with calls the international
meaning in short you’re with the international calls⁴⁹
2. [باختصار
[bi ixtiSar
[in short
[in short
[
3. IEF: ابيه طبعاً انا مع حرقين

⁴⁹ Here, the IR is referring to the international calls to dismantle Hezbollah.

[*eh Tab'aan ana ma' Harqhon*

[*yeah of course I'm with burning them*

[*yeah of course I am with burning them*

4. IR: →

حرقن؟

Harqhon?

Burn them?

Burning them?

5. IEF:

طبعاً طبعاً حرقن مثل ما فعل هتلر

Tab'an Tab'an Harqhon mithil ma fa'al Hitler

of course of course burn them like what done Hitler

of course of course burn them just like Hitler did

The IR begins by asking if the IEF agrees with the international demands to fight and dismantle Hezbollah. The IEF responds with “*yeah of course I am with burning them*”. Note that the IR had not said anything about “burning” anyone prior to the IEF’s first mention of it. The IEF simply equates dismantling Hezbollah with burning them. The IR then partially repeats “*burning them?*” in line 4 with rising intonation to which the IEF responds with responding with one intonational unit “*Tab’an Tab’an Harqhon mithil ma fa’al Hitler*” (“Of course of course burn them just like Hitler did”) in line 5. Note that the IEF’s response to the IR’s repeat is different from the previous responses discussed earlier. Here, the IEF is not simply confirming by repeating. The IEF’s response which consists of one intonation unit combines “*Tab’an Tab’an*” (“of course of course”) first followed by “*Harqhon mithil ma fa’al Hitler*” (“burn them just like Hitler did”). The first part of that response “*Tab’an Tab’an*” treats the question as “unaskable” and that the alternative (of not burning them) as *inconceivable* (Stivers, 2011), followed by a repeat “*burn them*”. After contesting the askability of the IR’s question, the IEF confirms by repeating and highlighting his original point regarding burning Hezbollah members. He even goes as far as providing an elaboration “just like Hitler did”.

5.1.1.2. Responding with “of course” without a repeat

On other occasions, the IEF responds to the IR’s AOIR by confirming a previous point with “Tab’an” (of course) only, without a repeat. Instead of taking the opportunity to repeat and make a controversial comment more salient for the overhearing audience, the IEF in such cases merely contests the question’s askability. Consider Excerpt 44 below which is taken from the same episode as Excerpt 43 above. Here the IEF makes violent and explicit remarks regarding Hezbollah. The IR repeats some graphic and violent remarks said earlier by the IEF who proposes to burn Hezbollah with acid, also with rising intonation. The IEF does not take the opportunity to highlight this controversial point by repeating. Instead, the IEF contests the other possible alternative (which is not to burn them with acid). In a way, by responding with “Tab’an” the IEF indicates that the answer is so obvious that the question did not need to be asked. The IEF starts this excerpt speaking faster and louder than his normal voice.

Excerpt 44: Acid 02212017:39:50

1. IEF: *يا اخي اذا في اسيد نرته عليه*
>YA AXI IZA FEE ACID INZITTUH ‘ALEH<
>O BROTHER IF THERE ACID TO DUMP ON THEM<
>O BROTHER IF ONLY WE CAN FIND AND THROW ACID ON THEM
2. IEF: *خلصونا ما بقى* ()]
[finish this no longer ()]
[enough already there’s no more ()]
[]
3. IED: [↑YA SAYYED FAISAL ()]
[↑O MISTER FAISAL ()]
4. IR: *?اسيد*
aseed?
acid?
5. IEF: *ما بدنا نتعايش (.) طبعاً*

Tab'aan (.) ma bidna nit'aayash

of course (.) not want.IP coexist

of course (.) we don't want to coexist

Here, the IEF, an anti-Hezbollah Lebanese journalist, expresses his frustration with the fact that Hezbollah is still armed and in power, and he is speaking louder and faster than his normal voice. He also switches to nonstandard Arabic in this excerpt. The IEF states in line 1 that he wishes he could “*find and throw acid on him*” which the IR partially repeats in the next turn in line 4 “*acid?*”. The IEF responds by contesting the IR’s question with “*Tab’an (.)*” (“*of course (.)*”) which allows him to contest the “question’s askability” (Stivers, 2011, p. 105) followed by an account “*we don’t want to coexist*”. This specific excerpt took place at the very end of the show and the IR ended the show right then by thanking the guests and the audience for tuning in. Therefore, there was no room for follow up questions and studying the IEF’s response, we can see that the IEF hears some type of lack of affiliation perhaps because what he has just said may be too extreme. His response, which consists of “*Tab’an*” only without a repeat, seeks to confirm his previous point on the one hand, and to contest the IR’s question and askability on the other.

Consider Excerpt 45 below where the IEF responds to the repeat also by “*Tab’an*” (“*of course*”) followed by an elaboration. Here, the IR starts this excerpt by asking the IEF if he would equate Russia to the American Blackwater Security. The IEF respond with “*Nooo*” in line 3. The IR in response asks for more explanation, or “*spell it out for me*” in line 4. The IEF ‘spells’ it for him in line 5.

Excerpt 45: Blackwater vs. Russia

1.IR: هل تتجرأ وتقول ان روسيا الشركه العظمى صارت

hal tatajaraa’ wa taqul anna Russia alsharika al’uthma Sarat

do dare.2S. and say that Russian the company the great became

are you even suggesting that the great company⁵⁰ of Russia is

⁵⁰ The IR is referring to Russia as a company here.

2. <معقول يا رجل>مثل شركة بلاكووتر الامريكيه
 mithla sharikat blackwater alamrikiya >ma'qul ya rajul?<
 similar company blackwater the American >man is that possible?<
 similar to the American company Blackwater >man is that possible?<
3. IEF: لاء
 laaa'
 nooo
 nooo
4. IR: قول لي اياها
 qul li iyyaha
 say to me it
 spell it out for me
5. IEF: لا لا الشركات الامنيه تتعامل يمكن باخلاقيات اكثر
 la la alsharikat alamniya tata'aamal yimkin bi axlaqiyat akthar
 no no the company security handle perhaps with morals more
 no no those security companies perhaps handle their business with integrity
6. IR: ?الشركات الامنيه
 alsharikat al'amniya?
 the companies the security?
 the security companies?
7. IEF: طبعا
 Tab'aan
 of course
 of course
 ((continues))

In this excerpt, the IEF takes it upon himself to clarify that Russia is worse than the secretive American security company known in the Middle East as the Blackwater⁵¹. The IEF, a strong opponent of Russia and its involvement in the Middle East, warns that Russia and its military do worse damage than the Blackwater and commit more heinous crimes against Arabs. The IEF in line 5 explains that “those companies [Blackwater] perhaps handle their business with integrity” in comparison to Russia and the Russian military. The IR as a result initiates an other initiated repeat with rising intonation in line 6 “the security companies?” to which the IEF responds with “of course” in line 7. The IEF then continues to elaborate on the differences (lines omitted).

The last two excerpts show that the IR’s practice of repeating his IEFs’ prior points to be confirmed and highlighted for the overhearing audience can be treated differently by IEFs. The IEFs in the last two excerpts particularly respond to the repeat with “Tab’an” only without producing a repeat. This may suggest that the IEFs at times hear the IR’s questions/repeats as lacking affiliation, and as a result, their response with “Tab’an” without a repeat seeks to merely contest those questions.

5.1.1.3. Genuine Repair Practice Treated by the IEF as an Invitation to Highlight Previous Point

On one occasion as illustrated in Excerpt 46 below, the IR employs an other initiated repeat to perform repair action, a correction of the IEF’s pronunciation. Here the IR repeats part of the IEF’s prior turn in Standard Arabic to correct a word said in dialect pronunciation, but it was treated by the IEF as an opportunity to highlight and confirm a previous turn (as in Excerpts 37-41 above). The IEF treats it as an invitation to make something said earlier more salient for the overhearing audience. This in fact shows that the practice of confirming by repeating is a viable practice that the IEF can orient to even if it was not intended by the IR, and so a genuine repair in the form of an error correction can be mistaken for performing the action of inviting a repeat. In the next excerpt, taken from a 2017 episode, the IEF claims that the American administration is behind all the chaos happening in the Middle East. In the first lines, the IEF claims that by now everyone knows well that “everything that’s happening is directed by the

⁵¹ Blackwater is an American private military company founded in 1997. It is now known as “Academi” after it was acquired by a group of private investors in 2011.

Americans” (line 2). The IEF then continues to elaborate in line 4 that “America is the one employing killing and attacking”, with employing said partially in Levantine Arabic dialect.

Excerpt 46: Employing 05162017:03:00

1. IEF:

الجميع اصبح يدرك ومن ضمن قناعه مطلقه (.)
aljamee' aSba7a yudrek wamin Dimna qana'a muTlaqa (.)
everyone became aware and within knowledge absolute (.)
everyone is absolutely well aware now that (.)
2.

ان جميع ما يحصل هو من كل ما يحصل هو بإداره امريكيه
inna jamee' ma yaHSul huwa min kul ma ya7Sul huwa bi idara amrikiya
that all what happening from all what happening with Americans
everything happening- everything that's happening is directed by the Americans
3. IR:

حلو
Helew
good
good
4. IEF:

اميركا هي من توظف هي من تقتل هي من تضرب
amrika hiya man tuwwaZef hiya man taqtul hiya man taDrub
America is who employs she who kills she who strikes
America is the one employing killing and attacking
5.

هي من تضع الشروط وهي من تحرك الادوات
hiya man taDa' alshuruuT wahiya man tuHarrik aladawat
she who puts rules and she who moves tools
america is the one setting the rules and drawing schemes
6. IR: →

ف.ق.: وهي من توظف
wahiya man tuwwaThef?
And she who employs?

And it is the one employing?

7. IEF: و هي من توطف
wahiya man tuwwaZef
and it who employs
and it is the one employing

8. IR: مم همم
mhmm

The initial turns by the IEF are spoken entirely in Standard Arabic. In line 4, however, the IEF uses a dialect pronunciation for the word “tuwwaZef” (employs). Here, the /z/ is one of the dialect Arabic variants of the sound ‘th’ or [θ]. Because this is a common variant in Levantine and Egyptian Arabic only, other speakers of Arabic from other countries may not understand the meaning of the word as pronounced by the IEF. Hence, the IR issues an other initiated repeat in line 6 with some modification. The IR repeats it with the Standard Arabic pronunciation “wahiya man tuwwaThef?” in line 6, offering a correction of the IEF's pronunciation with standard pronunciation, presumably done for the benefit of the overhearing audience. However, the IEF does not pick up on it. Instead, he treats the IR’s repeat as providing him a chance to confirm by repeating. And he does that. The IEF does in fact repeat the same original dialect pronunciation again in line 7.

5.1.1.4. An Opposite Case Involving Code-Switching

In the previous example, we have seen how a genuine repair practice was treated by the IEF as an invitation to repeat and highlight a previous point. The next excerpt illustrates the opposite case. In this next excerpt, the IR employs a repeat to potentially allow the IEF an opportunity to highlight and repeat a prior point for the overhearing audience. The IEF’s original turn and the IR’s subsequent repeat were said in Standard Arabic, but the response to the repeat by the IEF was said in Levantine Arabic. This excerpt is taken from a new 2017 episode where the IEF is describing the Iranian threats in the region and claims that this threat should not be overlooked because the power differentials and enemies have changed in the area. The IEF here claims that Iran is more of a threat to Lebanon than Israel is. This excerpt begins in

line 1 with the IEF stating that Israel is “no longer” a threat to Lebanon which the IR partially repeats: “no longer?” with question intonation in line 2. Lines 1 and 2 were said in Standard Arabic, while line 3 was partially said in non-Standard Levantine Arabic.

Excerpt 47: 02212017:03:06

1. IEF: لم يعد هناك اي تهديد اسرائيلي للبنان و[خصوصا
lam ya’ud hunak ay tahdid israli li lubnan wa [khusus
no longer there any threat Israeli to Lebanon and [especially
there is no longer any Israeli threat to Lebanon and [especially
2. IR: → لم يعد?
lam ya’ud?
no longer?
no longer?
3. IEF: ما بقى في تهديدات (.) اسرائيل
ma baqiya fi tahdidat, (.) Israel
no existing any threats, (.) Israel
no existing threats, (.) Israel
4. اسرائيل تبحث عن السلام اليوم في المنطقه
Israel tabHath ‘aan alsalaam alyawm fi almanTiqa
Israel looks for peace today in the region
Israel is nowadays interested in peace in the region

The IEF makes the claim that Israel is “no longer a threat”, a claim that would not normally be well received in the Arab world given the long history of enmity with Israel. However, the entire point in this particular episode was to emphasize the Iranian and Hezbollah’s threat as a new major enemy. The IR in response repeats part of the IEF’s prior turn “lam ya’ud?” (i.e., “no longer?”) with rising intonation. The IEF responds by repeating that phrase, albeit in Levantine Arabic form. The IEF may have treated the IR’s repeat as an opportunity to confirm and highlight a previous point by repeating it. He responds by

confirming by repeating, except the repeat was not said in the same original format. The IEF modifies his Standard Arabic pronunciation of “no longer” and substitutes it with a local dialect version “ma ba?a” (‘no existing’) in line 3. The IEF may have done that because the Standard Arabic version translated as “no longer” is too formal and may not be recognized by all of the overhearing audience members. In a sense, the IEF may have decided to make that point salient in a dialect format. The IEF then continues to elaborate in line 4 that “Israel nowadays is interested in peace in the region”.

Unlike the previous excerpt, there is no reason here to treat the IR’s repeat as involving error correction, i.e. a prompt to self-correct from Standard Arabic to a local variety. This is due to the fact that it would be bizarre for the IR, who uses mostly Standard Arabic on his show, to invite his IEs to use local varieties that may be unintelligible to speakers of other Arabic dialects. In fact, the IEF’s account in the next turn, in lines 3-4, “Israel is nowadays interested in peace in the region” indicates that the IEF in Excerpt 47 is orienting to the IR’s repeat as an opportunity to confirm and highlight that prior turn “lam ya’ud” or its less Standard version “ma baqiya” (“no longer). This is in contrast to the previous example, Excerpt 46, which shows that the IR may have in fact repeated the IEF’s prior turn, which was originally said in a dialect format, in a more Standard variety to correct the IEF’s pronunciation from dialect to a Standard variety.

5.2. AFFILIATION THROUGH PSEUDO CANDIDATE UNDERSTANDINGS

While the abovementioned excerpts from “The Opposite Direction” show how the IR repeats part of his IEFs’ previous turns to show affiliation, the following excerpts use a different practice to show affiliation. The next examples resemble the format of a candidate understanding. Candidate understandings refer to the “resayings of the trouble-source in other words, often framed by ‘you mean’... which claim to hear and have a possible grasp on what is meant, subject to checking this out with the speaker of the trouble - source turn” (Kitzinger, 2012, p. 249). Excerpt 20 above from the Watergate scandal (copied below) is an example of a candidate understanding proffered for confirmation. By reformulating Haldeman’s prior turn, Nixon’s “[you] mean by his lawyer” in line 4 exhibits an

understanding problem of Haldeman’s prior turn. Nixon’s turn is, therefore, done to confirm his candidate understanding—which Haldeman does in line 6 “yeah”.

Excerpt 48 (taken from Benjamins, 2012, p. 85)

1. Hal: → he may be victimized on it
2. (0.6)
3. Hal: I’m not sure he’s ma[king]
4. Nix: → [you] mean by his lawyer
5. Nix: [hhhhhhhhh]
6. Hal: [yeah or] (.) somebody else

Similarly, the IR in “The Opposite Direction” uses candidate understanding formats regularly, especially with his IEFs, but as we will soon see, the IR’s candidate understanding formats perform something different from genuine candidate understandings. The IR’s candidate understandings differ from genuine understandings in that they are not done to check the IR’s understanding of the IEF’s prior turn. In fact, they hardly have any connection with or relevance to the IEFs’ previous turns. As we will shortly see, by using the format of a candidate understanding, the IR implicitly inserts his own words and redirects the conversation towards advancing his own agenda. Therefore, I will refer to them as pseudo candidate understandings. “The Opposite Direction” is rich with examples of this type of practice when the IR is addressing the IEs with whom he agrees, but not with the IEs with whom he disagrees.

In Excerpt 49 below, the IR is addressing the IEF, reminding him to respond to a point that the IED (pro-Saudi Arabia) had said earlier, mainly that accusing Saudi Arabia of enticing violence and division in the Middle East strips Iran of its wrongdoings in the region. The IEF in response answers that Saudi Arabia is already killing more Muslims, and that Saudi officials have themselves confirmed that their military helicopters have been operating in Iraq hand in hand with the Americans. The IEF explains that bombarding Iraqi regions and killing ISIS and other Sunnis leaves Iraqi areas under no one’s control. Those areas as a result end up being controlled and occupied by Iran and Russia.

Excerpt 49: pseudo candidate understandings in Arabic 10102017:21:40

- 1.IEF: اليوم لما تضرب داعش وتخرج داعش من المستفيد?
 Alyawm lamma taDrub da'esh wa tukhrej da'esh man almustafeed?
 Today when hit isis and exit isis who benefits?
 Now when ISIS is bombarded and ousted who's going to benefit the most?
2. ايران (.) والروس
 Iran (.) wal rouss
Iran (.) and the Russians
- 3.IR: → يعني تريد ان تقول ان السياسات السعوديه كلها تصب في مصالح ايران?
 ya'ani tyurid an taqul an alsiyasat alsu'udiya kulaha taSubbu fi maSaleH Iran
 Meaning want.2s to say2.s that policies Saudi all pour in benefits Iran
 Meaning you want to say that all the Saudi policies benefit Iran?
4. IEF: مباشرة (.) تصب في مصالح ايران
 taSSubu fi maSaleH Iran (.) mubashara
 pour3.s in benefits Iran (.) directly
 They benefit Iran (.) directly

Here the IEF claims that the Saudi Arabian actions on the ground such as bombarding ISIS in Iraq benefits Iran because it leaves some Iraqi areas under no one's control once ISIS is ousted. This, according to the IEF, makes it easy for Iran and their allies, the Russians, to step in and control those areas. The IEF may have never meant to connect Iran and Saudi as conspiring or benefiting one another. In fact, it is the IR who has been claiming in this episode that the Iran and Saudi tension is a façade, and that they are conspiring to divide and split the region. As a result, the IR issues a candidate understanding in line 3. The IR's candidate understanding prefaced with 'meaning' allows the IR to rephrase and implicate Saudi Arabia and its "policies" and actions as *directly* benefiting Iran. In this specific example, the connection between the IR's candidate understanding format and the IEF's previous turns is somehow much clearer than most candidate understandings used by the IR, as we shall see next.

Excerpt 50 is taken from the same episode as (and is a continuation of) Excerpt 39 above. The IEF continues to try to convince the audience that Hezbollah is, just like Alasad, the enemy. The IR initiates candidate understanding formats twice in lines 15 and 17. However, the connection between the IR's candidate understanding formats and the IEF's prior turn is less clear here than in the previous excerpt. These are not actual candidate understandings but pseudo candidate understandings, used to further the IR's agenda.

Excerpt 50: “cancerous disease”

05. IEF: لأنه نعرف نحننا في القرآن الكريم لا يجب أن يسمى حزب الله
 la yajibu an yusamma hizbollah li'anahu na'rifu naHnu fi alquran alkarim
 not must to called hizbollah because know.1S we in Quran holy
 it must not be called Hizbollah .h because we know that

06. ((quotes a verse faster and louder with many hand movements up and down))

07. IEF: أعداء الله (.) لماذا?
a'daa' Allah (.) limatha?
enemies Allah (.) why?
 it's the enemies of Allah party (.)why?

08. IR: أعداء الله ?
a'daa' Allah?
enemies Allah?
enemies of Allah?

09. IEF: وسأعطي أكثر من ذلك بعد ذلك أعداء الله .h.
 a'daa allah .h (.) wa sa'uTi akthar min thalik ba'da thalik (.)
 enemies allah .h (.) and give.1S more than that after that (.)
enemies of Allah .h (.) and I'll give more than that after that

10. هذا الحزب (0.2)
 hatha alHizbu (0.2)

this the-party (0.2)

this party (0.2)

11. IEF:

عن البيئة العربية (0.2) (.) غريب (.) هو ولد عجيب (.)

huwa waladun 'ajib (.) ghareeb (.) 'an albi'a al'arabiya (0.2)

he boy weird (.) strange (.) from the-environment the-Arab (0.2)

it's a weird (.) strange (.) creature from the Arab environment (0.2)

12.

((points to himself when uttering Arab nation, counts on fingers))

13. IEF:

بأهدافها (.) بعقيدتها (0.2) بأفكارها]

[bi afkariha (0.2) bi 'aqidatuha (.) bi ahdafiha]

[in thinking.3S (0.2) in ideology.3S (.) in goals.3S]

[in its thinking (0.2) in its beliefs (.) in its goals]

[]

14.

[IR nodding constantly]

15. IR: →

< ني مرض سرطا يعني >

>marad SaraTani ya'ani?<

>disease cancerous mean.2S?<

>cancerous disease you mean?<

16. IEF:

[مرض – (unintelligible talk)]

[diseas- (unintelligible talk)]

[can- (unintelligible talk)]

[]

17. IR: →

[أخطر من المرض ني سرطا]]

[akhTar min almarad alSaraTani?] ((hand gesture forward))

[more dangerous from disease the-cancerous?] ((hand gesture forward))

[more dangerous than a cancerous disease?] ((hand gesture forward))

18. IEF:

أخطر من ال سرطا (.) لم يفعل

- akhTar min alSaraTa- (.) lam yaf'al
 more dangerous than cance- (.) didn't do
 more dangerous than cance- (.) what they caused to
19. في الأمة - ذكرت لك (.)
 fil-umma- thakartu laka
 in-the-nation- I mentioned to-you
 the nation- I mentioned to you (.)
20. لا إسرائيل ولا كل الأعداء الذين يمكرون
 la Israel wa la kul al'adaa allathin yamkurun
 not Israel and not all the-enemies who conspire
 neither Israel nor all the conspiring enemies did to
21. بالأمة العربية والإسلامية
 bil umma al-arabiya wa the-islamiya
 to the nation the-Arab and Islamic
 the Arab and Islamic nation
22. كما فعله حزب: الل (.)
kama fa'alahu Hizbo:llah (.)
as done hizbo:llah (.)
like what Hizbo:llah's done (.)

The IEF continues to give an account for why Hizbollah should be called the 'enemies of Allah' in lines 7-8 and provides an account to validate his description, mainly that this party is "a weird(.) strange (.) creature from the Arab environment (0.2) in its thinking (0.2) in its beliefs (.) in its goals". The IEF also points to himself when uttering 'Arab nation' to distinguish himself (as a Syrian Sunni) from Hizbollah (Hizbollah members are majorly Lebanese Shiite but the organization is funded by Iran (a non-Arab, majorly Shiite country). The IR is aligning with the IEF as he's nodding throughout the IEF's turn in lines 11-5. In line 17, however, the IR initiates a pseudo candidate understanding. Here, the IR's turn

“>cancerous disease you mean?<” is formatted as a candidate understanding, i.e., resaying of the trouble source in other words, often accompanied by “you mean”. Yet, the IR’s comparison of Hizbollah to a cancerous disease may have never been considered by the IEF. The IR’s pseudo candidate understanding has little or nothing to do with the IEF’s previous description of Hizbollah which the IEF described as “a weird (.) strange (.) creature from the Arab environment (0.2)” in line 13. The pseudo candidate understanding is done in yes/no question format with rising intonation with stress on the candidate phrase ‘cancerous disease’. The IEF in line 18 accepts and agrees with the IR’s reformulation and as he starts repeating it “canc-”, his turn is quickly interrupted with an overlap by the IR who chooses to offer another, more alarming, candidate reformulation “more dangerous than cancer” with stress on the word ‘more’ in line 19. However, this is said with statement rather than question intonation with stress on the first part of it “more dangerous”. The IEF once again accepts the IR’s new reformulation proposed in line 19 and repeats it word by word, followed by a micropause and an account to further support his acceptance of and agreement with the IR’s offered words, in lines 20-24. Note that the IEF does not respond with other agreement tokens (e.g., ‘uh huh’, ‘right’, ‘yeah’), the IEF agrees and confirms by repeating the candidate reformulation proposed by the IR. The repetition allows him to highlight the new information proposed by the IR and make it more salient for the overhearing audience.

What we see in the above excerpt is that there is a sense of agreement and alignment between the IR and the IEF throughout this excerpt; the IR seems to be helping the IEF to describe a serious, potentially incurable phenomenon (Hezbollah) that must be stopped before it spreads (just like cancer). Similar to the affiliative other-initiated repeats in previous excerpts, pseudo candidate understandings proposed by the IR give a sense of an affiliative usage between speakers while jointly constructing (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010) utterances to build a case for the overhearing audience.

In Excerpt 51 below, we will see another example of the IR offering a pseudo candidate understanding of the IEF’s prior turn. But instead of offering single phrases, the IR offers a structurally more sophisticated pseudo reformulation. In this episode, the IR and IEs discuss the increasing numbers of Islamic groups and fighters in Syria. Whereas the IED (a secular fighter) explains that the independent

Syrian rebels who originally started the Syrian revolution want neither the regime nor the Islamic jihadis in Syria, the IEF (a conservative) sees these Islamic groups as the answer to help Syria prosper after ousting Alasad. Towards the end of this episode, a special third guest joined on the phone for a few minutes. This guest claimed that these Islamic groups are not real Muslims because they commit crimes against the people of Syria which goes against the teachings of Islam. Below, the IEF responds to that guest (who is no longer on the phone) by rejecting those accusations.

Excerpt 51: “charity work”

((IR interrupts IEF by hand movements up and down addressing IEF))

1.IR: <ت:: تفعله هذه الجماعا: عما (.) بس بس قاللك الرجل>
 <bas qallak ilrajul ‘amma: taf’alahu hathihi aljama’aa:t>
 <but told you te man wha:t do these grou:ps>
 <but but the man told you (.) wha:t these groups (.) are doing>

2.IEF: = ذا الرجل [ءه::فليقل ما يشا =
 =Falyaqul ma yashaa:’ [HATHA ALRAJUL
 =TO SAY WHATE:VER [THIS MAN
 =LET THIS MAN SAY WHATEVER h[e WA::NTS<

3.IR: [هل سمعت ماذا تفعل داعش
 [>hal samiwta matha taf3al Da’esh
 [>did hear.2S what does ISIS Doing?<=
 [>did you hear what ISIS is doing?<=

4.IR: ((chopping hands up and down fast))

5.IEF: = فليعط [ي دليله =
 = Falyu3 [Ti dalilah
 =To pro[vide his.proof
 =LET him pro[vide his evidence ((side pointing at screen))

- 6.IR: [هل سمعت ماذا تفعل داعش]
 [>hal samiwta matha taf3al Da'esh
 [>did hear.2S what DOING ISIS ?<=
 [>did you HEAR what ISIS is DOING?<
- 7.IEF: =h. فليقدم دليله .h
 =fal YUQQADIM dalilah .h
 =to PROVIDE.2S proof.2S .h
 =IET him SHOW his evidence .h
8. ((points left hand at screen while gazing at IR to the right))
- 9.IR: <طيب>
 >tayeb< h. ((nod))
 >OK< h. ((nod))
- 10.IEF: فليقدم دليله
 fal yuqqadim dalilahu
 let present.2S proof.2S
 let him present his evidence ((continues to point at screen up and down, gaze at IR))
- 11.IR: [.h -كيف (.)الكلام عن داعش كل]
 kif- .h [o kul ilkaam 'an Da'esh (.)]
 how- .h [and all talk about ISIS? (.)]
 how- .h [and all the news about ISIS? (.)] ((gaze, hand gestures up and down at IEF))
- 12.IEF: [(°يا°)]
 [(°ay°)]
 [(°which°)]

[>MEANING THEY FORGOT ALL THE charity work that these groups do]

22. =على الأرض?<]=

'ala alarD?<]=

on the GROUND?<]=

23. ((pointing hands repeatedly on the table “on the ground”))

24.IEF: =بينما كله (.) هذا=

=hatha kuluhu. baynama (.)

=this is all. while (.)

=all this. while (.)

25.IR: ايه

eh

yeah

26.IEF: هذه الجماعات ال ال الاسلاميه تسيطر ال تي على الارض تقوم

Hathihi aljama'at al- al- alislamiya alati tuSaytir 'ala alarD taqum

These groups the- the- Islamic which control on ground do

Th- th- these Islamic groups controlling those areas provide ((counting on fingers))

27. بتأمين اللقاحات الاعائه بتأمين [وتساعد

bita'min alighatheh wa alluqaHat tusa'id[(unintelligible)

provide welfare and vaccines and assist [(unintelligible)

welfare and vaccinations and provide [(unintelligible)

[

28. [((IEF counts on fingers while addressing IR))

[

29.IR: → وتسد الفراغ الذي تركه

[WATSUDU al FARAGH allathi tarakuh

[and CLOSE the GAP that left

[>AND THEY FILL in the GAPS left by the

30. النظام <?]=

Alnitham<?]=

REGIME<?]=

31.IEF: =والجرائم و و اللصوص تمنع و=

=wa TAMNA' alluSuS wa wa wa aljara'im

=and PRVENT thieves and and and crimes

=and PREVENT robberies and and and crimes ((still pointing on fingers))

32. <رهيب بشكل الجرائم نسبة فيها انخفض التي المناطق من>

<min almanaTeq alati inkhafaDa fiha nisbit aljara'im bi shakil RAHEEB

<from areas that reduce in.it rate crimes in level TREMENDOUS

<in all those areas where crime rates went down TREMENDOUSLY> (.)

33.IR: م

Mhm

Mhm

In line 1, the IR refers to the third guest's (non-transcribed) turns in which he denounced the actions of Islamic groups fighting in Syria and labeled them non-Muslims. This is different from the IEF's claims that such groups want to free and rebuild Syria and to help the Syrian people. The IR interrupts the IEF (who was defending these groups), and asks him to respond to the guest's claims in Line 1: "<but but the man told you (.)what: these groups (.) are doing>." However, instead of responding to the actions, the IEF responds by dismissing what the guest ("this man") said in line 2 ">LET THIS MAN SAY WHATEVER h[e WA::NTS<". The IEF's utterance, however, does not respond to the accusations made by the third guest towards ISIS (which were reintroduced by the IR in line 1). The IR, in an overlapping turn, initiates a more answer-constraining (Raymond, 2003) question, a polar question in lines 3-4 "did you hear what ISIS is doing?" By issuing this question, the IR is not expecting either a yes or no answer because the IEF (as well as the other participants) have *just* 'heard' what the guest said about ISIS's wrongdoings. Instead,

the IR, playing devil's advocate, is probably expecting the IEF (who is in favor of the presence of Islamic groups in Syria) to refute or dispute these accusations. The IEF does not provide a response either to the questions in line 5 or later in line 7 to confirm or disconfirm hearing about ISIS wrongdoing. Nor does the IEF refute the presupposition conveyed in that question, or provide another explanation as we will see later as the conversation unfolds. He merely responds with personal attacks and challenges in line 5, loudly, "LET him provide". Despite the IR's quick reissuance of the same question again for the third time ">did you hear what ISIS is doing<?" (line 6), the IEF responds with yet another challenge to the third, absent guest in line 7 "LET him SHOW his evidence" while yelling and pointing at the screen.

After unfruitful attempts to get the IEF to respond and refute the accusations, the IR then begins a topic departure in line 11 by initiating a question "how-" which he quickly aborts, issues a quick repair followed by a declarative question "and all the news about ISIS?". Here, the IR leaves out any references of the third guest, possibly so that his questions aren't heard by the IEF to target the guest himself. The IR rephrases his interrogative to place emphasis on "and the news about ISIS". Still, the IEF does not deny the news/claims. Instead, the IEF switches to a calmer voice and starts a topic shift in line 13 where he adopts the questioner's persona and begins to issue a question "sir did you know" (this specific practice will be discussed in detail in the next section). The IR allows the IEF the floor. By asking a "did you know" question, I argue that in this excerpt the IEF impersonates a more knowing (K+) position and enacts a higher epistemic stance (Heritage, 2010; 2012) relative to the IR (and probably other addressees). Although it is designed to provide "new" information, and the IEF is acting as though he is offering new information, this very same question has actually been introduced and uttered by the IR in his monologue at the beginning of the show. Among the questions posed in his opening monologue, the IR asked "Aren't most of the tapes that are damaging to the Islamic groups made in the basements of the Syrian and Iranian intelligence?⁵²" So, in lines 15-17, the IEF recontextualizes the IR's previous question and uses it as *his* in order to refute those claims by the third guest. The IEF conveys that those videos are fabricated by the

⁵² This is a literal, word by word translation of the IR's question

Iranian intelligence. The IR responds with a “mhm” which could be heard as confirmation token. However, the IR in line 21-22 quickly jumps in and offers a fast and louder candidate reformulation, done as a pseudo candidate understanding of the IEF’s prior turn in a question intonation “[>MEANING THEY FORGOT ALL THE charity work that these groups do on the ground?<=”. The IR’s pseudo candidate understanding here has little to no relevance to the IEF’s prior turn. It is said once IEF was heard to move away from discussing Islamic groups to focusing on blaming Iran instead. In other words, the IR manages to divert the IEF’s attention to focusing back on Islamic groups, by issuing a pseudo candidate understanding of the IEF’s prior turn. Also interestingly, the “they forgot” that the IR mentions in line 21 could be heard to cue to the IEF that he himself may have *forgotten* to mention this information too.

The IEF agrees with the pseudo candidate understanding in line 24 “all this. while (.)” and goes on to mention all the good charity and community work ISIS is doing in lines 26-27 (e.g. providing vaccinations and charity work). The IR, then, initiates another pseudo candidate understanding in an overlapping turn in lines 29-30. Here, the IR offers more information in faster and louder speech “[>AND THEY FILL in the GAPS left by the REGIME<?”]. The IEF agrees with the insertion and continues to elaborate while counting on fingers all the ‘good deeds’ done by these groups in lines 31-33 “=↑and prevent robberies and and and crimes <in all those areas where crime rates went down tremendously> (.)”.

Now going back to the first question initiated by the IR “did you hear what they are doing”, it is very possible that the IR’s questions from the beginning sought to refute the third guest’s accusations of ISIS, and to elicit these types of good-deed answers from the IEF instead. However, after receiving a number of nonaligning responses from the IEF, the IR’s subsequent questions are filled with inserted answers, performed as pseudo candidate understandings, that the IEF “forgot” to mention to the overhearing audience. These questions formatted as a candidate understanding were accompanied by some form of “you mean” that help the questioner divert the addressee’s attention to accept certain types of responses when the latter’s turn begins to move away from the point under discussion. This

formulation “you mean” also attributes the content to the coparticipant. By interrupting the IEF’s turn-in-progress and initiating a pseudo candidate understanding of the IEF’s turn, the IR offers a redirection of what the IEF should be discussing. The IEF agrees with the IR's pseudo candidate understanding, accepts and completes it by adding more information. Similar to the affiliative other-initiated repeats discussed earlier, these pseudo candidate understandings allow both the IR and the IEF to produce jointly constructed utterances (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010) that further their political agenda and stance.

In the next excerpt, taken from more recent episodes in 2017, the IEF is criticizing Saudi Arabia’s policies in the Middle East and claims that Saudi Arabia is becoming more and more hostile to other Muslim regimes and countries. Here, the IEF claims that Turkey is the latest enemy targeted by Saudi Arabia. The IEF is pro-Turkey and the Turkish involvement in the Middle East. In lines 1-2, the IEF explains that Turkey, which recently made an alliance with the Islamic Alliance nations,⁵³ was victimized by Saudi Arabia. In lines 1-3, the IEF merely mentions that Saudi is turning against Turkey. The IR, however, initiates a pseudo candidate understanding in line 4 to make the connection more alarming to the Middle Eastern overhearing audience.

Excerpt 52: 10102017:23:19

1. IEF: (. التي تحالفت مع الاتحاد الاسلامي (.حتى تركيا
Hatta turkiya (.) allati taHalaat ma’ alitiHad alislami (.
Even Turkey (.) which allied with the Islamic Itihad
Even Turkey (.) which made an alliance with the Islamic Itihad⁵⁴
2. ((move gaze to screen)) ذهبوا لينقلبوا عليها واذا بتركيا اليوم,
Thahabu li yanqalibu ‘alayha wa itha bi turkiya alyawm
Went.3P to turn.3P against her and then Turkey today
They turned against Turkey which today is a ((move gaze to screen))

⁵³ What the IEF may have meant here is that Turkey, by making all these alliances with Islamic nations, may be competing against Saudi Arabia as a new Islamic power in the region.

⁵⁴ Alliance among Islamic nations

3. (unint)] رجل
 Arjal [(unint)
 Strong [(unint)
 [
4. IR: → ف.ق.: [يعني تنقلب السعوديه على الاسلام ولمسلمين]
 [yaani tanqalibu alsu'udiya 'ala alislam wa almuslimeen?
 [meaning turning away Saudi Arabia from Islam and the Muslims
 [meaning Saudi Arabia is turning away from Islam and Muslims?
5. IEF: على الاسلام والمسلمين
 'ala alislam walmuslimeen
 Away from Islam and Muslims
6. IR: ضد المسلمين?
 DeDha almuslimeen?
 Against Muslims?
7. IEF: h. او شعب اختار في طريق النجاح (. اين وجد د دوله مسلمه
 ayna wujida dawla Muslima (.) aw sha'ab ikhtar fi Tariq alnajaH .h
 Where found country muslim (.) or people chose in road success .h
 Wherever you find an Islamic country (.) or people who are succeeding .h
8. ((slaughter hand gesture)) فان السعوديه تتدخل لتدمرها
 Fa inna alsu'udiya tatadakhhal li tudamiruha ((slaughter gesture))
 The Saudi Arabia interferes to destroy it ((slaughter hand gesture))
 Then Saudi Arabia will step in to destroy them ((slaughter hand gesture))

Here, as the IEF was explaining recent hostile Saudi Arabian actions against other Muslim countries such as Turkey, the IR interrupts in line 4 with an overlapping response “meaning Saudi Arabia is turning away from Islam and Muslims?”. The IR’s turn is designed as a candidate understanding that rephrases what the IEF has previously said. But note that the IEF did not actually say that Saudi Arabia is turning

against “Islam” and *all* “Muslims”. That said, the IEF accepts the IR’s pseudo reformulation of his previous turn and repeats part of it in the next turn in line 5 “against Islam and Muslims”.

The next excerpt, taken from the same episode as the previous one, illustrates another example where the IR uses another pseudo candidate understanding to rephrase the IEF’s prior turn to divert the conversation in a way that helps him further a certain agenda. The IR and the IEF here condemn the Saudi Arabian involvement and actions in the neighboring Arab countries, and they claim that such actions affect and hurt Muslims the most. They also state that Saudi Arabia as a result is losing its religious and moral importance for Muslims. Here, the IEF begins this excerpt by explaining that Saudi Arabia used to be like a wizard, had a magic wand and dictated religious beliefs and laws to Muslims. The IR then initiates a pseudo candidate understanding accompanied by “you mean” in line 3 possibly to suggest that this no longer holds true, and that Saudi Arabia no longer has the same religious import in the Middle East.

Excerpt 53: magic wand

1. IEF: كانت لديها عصا (0.5) تدجل بها على كثير من المسلمين

Kanat ladayha ‘aSaa (0.5) tudajjil biha ‘ala katheer min almuslimeen (.)

Was.3S own.3S stick (0.5) lie with it on many of muslims (.)

Saudi owned a magical wand (0.5) and used it to brainwash many Muslims (.)

((casting spell and wand hand movement))

2.IEF: وهي هيئة العلماء (.) والعلماء والمفتين

Wa hiya hay’aat al’ulamaa’ (.) wal ‘ulamaa’ wal mufteen

And it’s association the scientist (.) and the scientists and the muftis⁵⁵

That wand consisted of the [Muslim] theologians (.) and the theologians and the Muftis⁵⁶

3.IR: → [() الان انكشفت العمليه يعني?]

Al’aan inkashafat al’amaliyeh ya’ani? [()]

⁵⁵ a Muslim legal expert who is empowered to give rulings on religious matters

⁵⁶ See previous footnote

Now exposed the operation you mean? [()

Now it's been exposed you mean? [()

[

4.IEF:

[انكشفت ليبدو () ليس فقط

[inkashafat liyabdou laysa faqat ()

[Got exposed to look not only ()

[

5.IR:

[[? والامبراطوريه الاعلاميه]]

[wal impratoriya al I'lamiyyeh?

[and empire media?

[and the media empire?

Here the IEF (a secular Moroccan thinker and writer) explains how Saudi Arabia used and hired theologians and religious men in the past to control other countries in the region. The IEF compared Saudi Arabia to a wizard that possessed some power, or a magical wand, for dictating rules and laws to Islamic nations to control them. The IR initiates a pseudo candidate understanding here in line 3 “now it's been exposed you mean?”, which indicates that the Saudi brainwashing agenda was hidden in the past, but now it's cover has been blown. The IR's rephrasing of the IEF's previous turns makes this connection that was not made by the IEF earlier, that their brainwashing policies have been revealed. The IEF confirms by repeating in line 4 “got exposed () not only” and as he continues to explain, the IR interrupts and issues another question in an overlapping turn in line 5 “and the media empire?”. This last question refers to the fact that Saudi Arabia owns dozens of T.V. channels in the Middle East. It is clear then, that the IR was merely seeking a confirmation for his pseudo candidate understanding in line 3, and once he received that, he continued to the next question.

5.2.1 Variations to the practice

Although most examples of affiliative pseudo candidate understandings in this dissertation were accompanied by a “you mean” phrase, a couple were not. As we saw in Excerpt 51 above, Excerpt 54

below also illustrates another example where the IR may offer a pseudo candidate understanding without “you mean”. Here, the IEF warns the audience of the Iranian threat by claiming that Iran is messing with parts of the Middle East (such as Syria and Yemen) in “a clear and explicit manner” in line 1. As the IEF is about to offer an account and elaborate on that threat in line 2 “it does”, the IR offers a pseudo candidate understanding to the IEF’s turn-in-progress in an overlapping turn which allows the IR to further his own agenda against Iran.

Excerpt 54: The Jerusalem mantra 02282017:05:30

1. IEF: ايران تعبت في المنطقه بشكل واضح وصريح
Iran ta’bath fi almanTiqa bi shakel waDeH waSareeH
Iran plays in the region in manner clear and explicit
Iran is messing with the region in a clear and explicit manner
2. () تقوم ب [Taquam bi ()
[acts in ()
[it does ()
[
3. IR: → ?ترفع شعار القدس وتفعل ما تشاء [tarfaa’ shi’aar alquds wa taf’al ma tashaa’?
[repeat mantra Jerusalem and does what ever?
[((Iran)) recites the Jerusalem mantra to mask other actions?
4. IEF: تماماً (.) تدمر المنطقه (.) تهجر المنطقه . تستبيح المنطقه
Tamaman (.) tudammer almantaqa (.) tuhajjer almantaqa (.) tastabeeH
almanTaqa
exactly (.) damages the region (.) destroys the region (.) victimize the region
exactly (.) it damages the region (.) destroys the region (.) victimizes the region
5. IR: هم مم

mhmm

((IEF continues))

While the IEF was in the process of unpacking his claim turn in line 2, the IR issues an overlapping turn, formatted as a candidate understanding of the IEF's turn, in line 3. Here, the IR's pseudo candidate understanding, which lacks the "you mean" phrase, refers back to and seemingly unpacks the Iranian 'threats' which according to the IR "recites the Jerusalem mantra to mask other actions". In other words, the IR claims that Iran is using and capitalizing on the Jerusalem issue to mask and potentially legitimize its own intervention in the region. This is a pseudo rather than a real candidate understanding because there does not seem a direct or explicit connection between the IEF's original turn in lines 1-2 and the IR's later reformulation of it in line 3. The IEF responds in line 4 by accepting and confirming the IR's pseudo candidate understanding "exactly (.)" as he continues to elaborate and provide more account on those threats in line 4 "it damages the region (.) destroys the region (.) victimizes the region".

5.3. AFFILIATION THROUGH CANDIDATE RESPONSES

A third discursive strategy that the IR uses to further his and the IEF's agenda is offering candidate responses that allow the IR to answer his own questions. Generally speaking, IRs in broadcast news interviews exert pressure on their IEs to answer questions. IRs do not answer their own questions. The IR in "The Opposite Direction," however, may provide an answer, or a candidate response, to his own question. By offering a candidate answer while asking for information, participants "may implicitly propose to be, or display being, somewhat knowledgeable even while seeking information (Pomerantz 1998, p. 370). Pomerantz studies how school clerks calling children's homes incorporate a candidate answer in their questions to "model" (p. 368) a satisfactory answer⁵⁷. Similarly, the IR is "modeling" and

⁵⁷ The following is an example of a school attendance clerk calling a home of a student, taken from Pomerantz (1998, p. 368). The clerk is seeking information and is modeling an answer in line 7 for the absent student who answered the phone.

1. Clerk: Well how- have you been home from school i:l Renee,
2. (0.5)
3. Stud: Yeah
4. (2.0)

“cueing” a satisfactory answer for the IEF to adopt. Incorporating candidate answers after a question allows the recipient to provide just the information relevant to the immediate concern (ibid). Excerpt 55 below shows one interesting example of the IR’s candidate responses. This episode discusses the Iranian⁵⁸/Hizbollah’s involvement in (and their effects on) the Arab nations. The IEF here is anti-Hizbollah and is warning the IR and the audience of the dangers of Hizbollah to the Arab and Muslim world.

Excerpt 55: Candidate response in “The Opposite Direction”—poisoned dagger

1. IEF: <يعتبرونها معركة عقائدية ضد الأمة العربية
>ya’tabiruniha ma’rakah ‘aqadi’iya DiDha alumma al’arabiya
>they consider it battle faith against nation arab and Islamic
>they consider it a religious battle against the Arab
2. <والإسلامية
walislamiya<
and Islamic<
nation<
3. ولتحقيق أهدا:ف عجزت عنها إسرائيل
wa li taHqiq ahda:::f ‘ajizat ‘anha Israel
and to achieve go:::als difficult for Israel
and to achieve go:::als that Israel could never achieve
4. (0.2) الآن الانقسام الحاد
(0.2) alaan alinqisam alHad

4. Clerk: Okay, when was the first day that you were out ill

5. (2.2)

6. Stud: I don't know

7. Clerk: Well you know how long it's been, couple weeks? or what.

8. Stud: Yeh

⁵⁸ Iran is majorly a non-Arab Shiite Muslim nation while the Arab nations are majorly Sunni. Lebanon is an Arab state that has a large Shite population too.

(0.2) now division acute

(0.2) now the acute

5. الطائفي المذهبي في الأمة العربية (.)

alTa'ifi almathhabi fi alumma al'arabiya

sectarian religious in nation arab (.)

sectarian and religious division in the Arab nation (.)

6. لم يسبق له مثيل =

lam yasbuq lahu mathil=

not precedent before=

is unprecedented=

7. IR: = مين سببه؟

=meen sababuh? =

=who reason.3S? =

=who's behind it? =

8. IEF: = [سببه إيران]

= [sababuh Ira:::n

= [reason.3S Ira:::n

= [[IRA:::N is behind it

[

9. IR: → [حزب الله]

[>Hizbollah<

[>Hizbollah<

10. IEF: .hh وحزب الله الذي

wa Hizbollah allathi .hh

and Hizbollah which .hh

and Hizbollah which .hh

11. IR: تحول إلى خنجر (.). تحول إلى خنجر
 taHawwal ila khanjar (.). taHawwl ila khanjar
 turned to dagger (.). turned to a dagger
 turned into a dagger (.). turned to a dagger
12. ((pointing at IEF and nodding))
13. IEF: وخنجر الآن مسمووم في قلب الأمة العربية
 wa khinjar al'aan masmu:::m fi qalbi alumma al'arabiya
 and dagger now poiso:::ned in heart the nation arab and
 and now a poiso:::ned dagger in the heart of the Arab and
14. الإسلامية
 alislamiya
 Islamic
 Islamic nation

In this excerpt, the IR uses a number of questions to elicit specific answers. The first question, in line 7, comes after a lengthy narrative by the IEF, who continues to explain the hostility and threats of Iran (and so, Hizbollah) toward the Arab and Islamic world. The IEF has been referring to Iran (non-Arab Muslim *Shias*) in this turn (and other previous, non-transcribed turns). The IEF has also compared Iran to Israel. According to him, the former has done worse damage to Arabs and Muslims than the latter. Whereas the IEF continues with his turn in lines 5-6 by explaining that threat, the IR initiates a question designed to resolve any potential ambiguities (since *two* enemies were just mentioned). The IR uses a category specific question “who’s behind it?” in line 7, to which the IEF responds in a loud and more stretched response “IRA:::N is behind it”. The IEF may have possibly heard the IR’s question as a genuine hearing problem. However, the IR doesn’t wait for the IEF to answer because he himself issues an immediate response overlapping with the IEF’s turn “IRA:::N” in a faster turn and higher pitch than the IEF’s in line 9 “>↑Hizbollah<”. By offering a Candidate Answer, the IR shapes the “context” of the inquiry

(Pomerantz, 1998). The IEF accepts the candidate response and repeats it in the following turn in line 10 “and Hizbollah which .hh”.

The following excerpt shows another instance of the IR asking a question and providing a response to his own questions before allowing the IEFs themselves do so. In such instances, the IEFs end up accepting and adopting these responses offered by the IR. Here, the IEF disagrees with the IED who had said earlier that the only reason why Russian weapons are used in areas of conflict such as Syria in the Arab world is because they are cheap. The IEF in response refutes the IED’s claims that cheap (and possibly less destructive) weapons have been used, and he shows pictures of more destructive weapons (which he refers to as phosphoric weapons) being used in Syria. While the IEF is explaining in line 4 that phosphoric weapons are being used in most countries where Russia is involved, the IR asks “where?” in line 5. The IR then immediately offers candidate responses in lines 6 and 8, respectively. The IR’s first candidate response attempt in line 6 “in Syria” in fact overlaps with the IEF response in line 7 “in Syria”. The IR then offers a second, latching candidate response in the following turn “in Yemen”.

Excerpt 56: phosphoric weapons

1. IEF: الان الاسلحه الروسيه التي تقول انها
alaan alasliHa alrusiya allati taqul innaha
now weapons Russian that you say that
now regarding the Russian weapons that you claim
2. تدعم بها الشعوب لانها رخيصه (.)
tad’am biha alshi’oob la’anaha rakhisa (.)
supports.3S with nations because it inexpensive
Russia provides to those countries because they’re inexpensive (.)
3. بتعرف شو هيهي? (.)
Bti’rif shou hiyeh? (.)
You know what is? (.)
You know what kind of weapons they are? (.)

4. اسلحه فسفوريه (.) تطلق في كل المناطق التي تتدخل فيها روسيا
 asliHa fisforiyeh (.) tuTlak fi kul almanaTek alati tatkhal fiha rosia
 weapons phosphoric (.) shot in all regions that intervene in Russia'
 They're phosphoric weapons (.) shot in regions where Russia's involved
5. IR: وين?
 Wein?
 Where?
6. IR: → [= بسوريا]
 [bi soria=]
 [in Syria=]
7. IEF: [بسوريا]
 [bi soria]
 [in Syria]
8. IR: → = باليمن
 =bil yaman
 =in Yemen
9. IEF: باليمن
 bil yaman
 in Yemen
10. IR: ب?
 bi?
 in?
11. IEF: وين يتدخلوا الراس بيذا السلاح الفسفوري
 weyn bitdakhalo alruss yibda alsilaH alfisfori
 where intervene the Russians the weapon phosphoric
 wherever the Russians intervene phosphoric weapons are used

The IEF begins to explain that more serious and destructive weapons are used in regions where Russia is involved which is contrary to what the IED had said earlier. The IR asks a more specific question in line 5 “where?” but does not wait for the IEF to provide an answer. Both the IR and the IEF respond in overlapping turns “in Syria” in lines 6 and 7. Then, the IR offers another candidate response in line 8 “in Yemen” which the IEF accepts and repeats in line 9 “in Yemen”. The IR continues to elicit more answers in line 10 by asking “in?” to which the IEF responds with “wherever the Russians intervene phosphoric weapons are used”.

We can see from these two examples that the IR tends to cue and model answers for his IEFs to adopt. The IEFs in both excerpts accepted the candidate responses and incorporated them in their next turns. This is critical as it shows that this linguistic practice is used strategically by the IR and it allows him to keep the discussion in a particular direction, one that furthers his own agenda.

5.4. AFFILIATION THROUGH ANTICIPATORY COMPLETIONS

Another affiliative strategy that the IR uses with his IEFs is continuing and completing their TCU in progress, or what Lerner (1996) refers to as anticipatory completions. These refer to the practice where “two participants collaborate in the production of a single TCU” (p. 244). Lerner explains that an anticipatory completion is initiated “just after the preliminary component, at a place the final component could be due, and is designed as a syntactic continuation of the utterance part it follows at the point of onset, and in the absence of further talk by the prior speaker (ibid, p. 244).” This practice maintains contiguity of turn toward completion “while achieving speaker transition that regularly results in one and only one participant speaking at a time” (ibid, p. 245). The original speaker of the TCU may accept or reject the proffered completion, which “becomes a specially relevant responsive action” (ibid, p. 241) as in the excerpt below. This practice of “placing words in [someone’s] mouth” (ibid, p. 244) can perform several actions in talk. One of the actions performed by anticipatory completions is to demonstrate agreement with a current speaker. Alternatively, it can be used to collaborate with a current speaker in explaining something to another participant. Consider this example from Lerner (2006).

Excerpt 57: (from Lerner, 1996, p. 241)

1. Marty: Now most machines don't record that slow. So I'd wanna-
2. when I make a tape,
3. Josh: → be able tuh speed it up.
4. Marty: → Yeah.

By offering an anticipatory completion in line 3, Josh completes Marty's turn-in-progress. Marty accepts the completion in line 4 with "Yeah.". Now going back to "The Opposite Direction," the IR is using the same practice of anticipatory completion to help further his and the IEF's agenda. Consider Excerpt 58 below, a copy of a portion of Excerpt 55.

Excerpt 58: turned into a dagger

05. IR: = مين سببه؟
 =meen sababuh?=
 =who reason.3S?=
 =who's behind it?=
 [

06. IEF: =[سببه إيراالن
 =[sababuh Ira:::n
 =[reason.3S Ira:::n
 =[[IRA:::N is behind it
 [

07. IR: [<حزب الله>
 [>Hizbollah<
 [>Hizbollah<

08. IEF: .hh وحزب الله الذي
 wa Hizbollah allathi .hh
 and Hizbollah which .hh
 and Hizbollah which .hh

09. IR: → تحول إلى خنجر (.) تحول إلى خنجر

taHawwal ila khanjar (.) taHawwl ila khanjar

turned to dagger (.) turned to a dagger

turned into a dagger (.) turned to a dagger

10. ((pointing at IEF and nodding))

11. IEF: وخنجر الآن مسموم في قلب الأمة العربية

wa khinjar al'aan masmu:::m fi qalbi alumma al'arabiya

and dagger now poiso:::ned in heart the nation arab and

and now a poiso:::ned dagger in the heart of the Arab and

12. الإسلامية

alislamiya

Islamic

Islamic nation

As we have seen in the previous excerpt, in line 8 the IEF accepts and repeats the IR's candidate response and even tries to elaborate further "and Hezbollah which .hh" but the IR interrupts again in line 9 and provides an "anticipatory completion" (Lerner, 2006) of the IEF's turn-in-progress. The proposed completion is a full clause ">turned into a dagger (.)". It is followed by a micro pause which constitutes a transition-relevant place (TRP), i.e., a potential end to a current turn. The IR also, simultaneously, continues to nod his head while pointing and looking at the IEF. The IR may be expecting the IEF to accept, repeat and confirm this candidate reformulation, just like he did earlier in line 8. When the IEF does not take the floor, the IR repeats "turned into a dagger<" while looking and nodding at IEF. The IR's repetition of his anticipatory completion as well as his bodily language are simultaneously telling the IEF to accept that candidate reformulation. At last, in lines 11-12, the IEF confirms by accepting and elaborating on the IR's completion of his turn stressing the words "poiso:::ned dagger" and stretching the vowel in "poiso:::ned", making the threat sound more inflammatory: "and now a poiso:::ned dagger in the heart of the Arab and Islamic nation".

This next excerpt is taken from an episode where the IR and the IEF warn the audience of Russia and Putin’s intervention in the Middle East. Here, the IR, in what looks like a candidate understanding, concludes that Russia is not a great nation. The IEF in response starts with “Putin,” in line 3 to which the IR initiates a continuer token “yeah” in line 4. The IEF then elaborates on the IR’s comment “we’re not dealing with a great nation” by saying that “Putin is a criminal in a state leadership position”. To emphasize this notion of Putin’s illegality, the IR then offers two candidate completions in lines 6 and 8 below.

Excerpt 59: Putin

1. IR: يعني يعني بس باختصار شديد نحن لانسنا
ya’ani ya’ani bi ixTisar shaded naHnu lasna
meaning meaning in short very we not
meaning meaning in short we’re not
2. ب ب بصدد دوله عظمى بل
be be Sadad dawla othma bal
with with deal nation great but
de dealing with a great nation
3. IEF: بوتين,
Putin,
Putin,
4. IR: ايه
eh
yeah
5. IEF: بوتين مجرم زعيم شركة مافيا يمتلك امكانيات دوله,
Putin mujrim za’eem sharikat mafia, yamtaliku imkaniyat dawlah,
Putin criminal leader company mafia, owns potentials state,
Putin is a criminal leader who runs a mafia, owns state level potentials,

6. IR: → دكتاتور يدعم دكتاتوريات
diktatoor yad'aam diktatoriyaat
dictator supporting dictatorships
a dictator supporting other dictatorships
7. IEF: ببساطه
bi basaTa
in simple
simply put
8. IR: → ويسحق احلام الشعوب
wa yasHaq aHlaam alshi'oub
and crushes dreams the nations
and he crushes nations' dreams
9. IEF: (يسحق احلام شعبه بدايتا .)
yasHaq aHlaam sha'bahu bidayatan (.)
crushes dreams his-people first (.)
he crushes his own people's dreams first (.)
10. ثم ينتقل الى الشعوب الاخرى
thumma yantaqel ila alshi'oub alukhra
then moves.3SM to the.nations the.others
then moves to other nations

As the IEF begins to elaborate on the IR's previous comment about not dealing with a great nation, he remarks in line 5 that "Putin is a criminal leader who runs a mafia, owns state level potentials,". The IEF's response consists of two clauses with a continuing intonation which possibly prompts the IR to offer another continuing clause in line 6 "a dictator supporting other dictatorships". The IEF responds by confirming the completion here "simply put". The IR continues with another clause in line 8 "and he crushes the nations' dreams" which the IEF accepts and incorporates in lines 9-10 "he crushes his own

people’s dreams first (.) then moves to other nations”. This clause in line 8 is not technically an anticipatory completion because it’s not completing a prior TCU, but it is starting a new one. However, it has the same effect of adding new information to the IR’s turn.

In the next excerpt, the IR is trying to make a point that despite the rising political tensions between Moscow and Washington, these two power players are in fact conspiring against the Middle East and are in this together. Therefore, there is no conflict of interest in Syria since everything, according to the IR and the IEF, is orchestrated. In this excerpt specifically, the IR and the IEF discuss the Russian intervention in Syria and claim that it has gotten Washington’s and Israel approval. To support this argument, the IEF here remarks that one of the Syrian opponents that met with then President Obama in 2016 reported that they presented former president Obama with plenty of options (“fifty” options) to solve the conflict in Syria but that Obama rejected them all. As the IEF is about to continue with that report in lines 1-3, the IR offers an overlapping anticipatory completion “the Russian solution?” in line 4.

Excerpt 60: The Russian Solution 05162017:15:15

1. IEF: قدمنا لاوباما خمسين خيار لكنه رفضها جميعا
 qaddamna li Obama khamseen khayar lakinahu rafaDaha jamee’aa
 presented.3P to Obama fifty options but-he rejected all
 we presented Obama with fifty options but he rejected them all
2. وقال عليكم بقبول.h (0.4)
 wa qal ‘alaykum biqibul.h (0.4)
 and said.2S must.2P accept .h (0.4)
 and he said you must accept .h (0.4)
3. [الرد الروسي]
 [al ‘aard al russi]
 [the offer the Russian]
 [the Russian offer]
 []

4. IR: [الحل الروسي?]
 [alHall al russi?]
 [the solution the Russian?]
 [the Russian solution?]
5. IEF: (.) والحل الروسي .ه اذن واضح (.) الموضوع
 wal Hall al russi .h ithan waDeH (.) almawdou' (.)
 and the solution the Russian .h then clear (.) the subject (.)
 and the Russian solution .h then it's obvious (.) the issue (.)

The IEF in line 2 makes a (0.4) pause which possibly primed the IR to offer an anticipatory completion in line 3. The IR may have treated the silence or the pause either as trouble remembering words and elected to help the IEF complete his turn in progress. Or, the IR may have simply wanted to offer the “right” wording for the IEF. This specific IEF tends to pause frequently between his turns. He speaks more calmly and takes his time to enunciate his words and turns. Either way, both the IR and the IEF ended up responding and completing the IEF’s previous turn in an overlap. Whereas the IEF said “the Russian offer”, the IR offered “the Russian solution?” in line 4 which the IEF repeats in his next turn in line 5 “and the Russian solution .h”.

These examples show that the IR and the IEFs collaborate in the production of a single TCU” (Lerner, 2006, p. 244) which Lerner explains “is designed as a syntactic continuation of the utterance part it follows at the point of onset, and in the absence of further talk by the prior speaker (ibid).” The IEFs here all accepted the proffered completion by the IR. This practice of “placing words in [someone’s] mouth” (ibid) allows the IR to suggest the direction of talk for his IEFs.

To sum up this chapter, the IR in “The Opposite Direction” employs a number of linguistic practices to allow his IEFs more access to the floor and to keep them on topic while making certain points of their prior turns more salient to the overhearing audience. These practices also allow the IR to manipulate and redirect the course of talk. The IR and the IEFs are jointly working together to further their own agenda. The IR initiates repeats of the IEF’s prior turns with rising intonation, issues pseudo

candidate understandings, candidate responses, and anticipatory completions for the IEF to confirm and highlight them for the overhearing audience. The next chapter will study the disaffiliative practices that the IR uses with his IEDs.

CHAPTER 6: INTERVIEWER'S PRACTICES THAT DISALIGN WITH THE INTERVIEWEE

6.1. INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTER

The IR uses a number of questioning patterns to challenge the interviewees with whom he disagrees (IED). Some of these strategies have not yet been previously described, but some have already been described in the literature on both Arabic and Western broadcast news interviews. These include using negative interrogatives, question prefaces and third party attributions. As discussed earlier, recent studies on Arabic news interviews (including 'The Opposite Direction') show that IRs appear less "neutralistic" (Clayman, 1992) and more confrontational towards their guest on private satellite channels compared to news interviews on state owned ones. For example, IRs in such shows have been noted to use more interruptions (Al-Rojaie, 2003), imperatives rather than questions to display disagreement (Alfahad, 2015), and forms of address that do not reflect the customary respect for officials (Alfahad, 2015). IEs have also been reported to go as far as using expressions of rudeness, interruptions, and abusive language to accentuate strong disagreement among each other (Migdadi et al. 2013).

Literature on the design of question-answer formats and the adversarial actions they can achieve in broadcast news interviews in Arabic is still lacking. In contrast, the roles of questions and question formats in performing adversarialness by IRs have been extensively studied in other, mainly Western, contexts. Findings show that adversarialness in broadcast news interviews can be performed through questions that allow IRs to appear 'neutralistic' (Clayman, 1992) while setting agendas and incorporating hostile presuppositions (Clayman & Heritage 2002; Clayman, 2013) towards their IEs. As we have seen in the introduction, some questions are more adversarial than others. Negative interrogatives exert more pressure on public figures to answer in a certain way that may damage their public figure's interests (Clayman, 2013 p. 644).

I will first begin this chapter by showing examples of how the IR can and does convey agendas and hostile presuppositions when interacting with IEDs in "The Opposite Direction." This will fill in a gap in the literature on Arabic discourse in broadcast news interviews while contributing to the developing body of the literature on institutional talk. I will first show that the IR in Arabic also employs

similar practices to challenge and disaffiliate with his IEDs while trying to maintain impartiality. Two of these practices have not yet been studied, to my knowledge, in Arabic news interviews. Then, I will present three more strategies that the IR uses to exert more pressure on and challenge his IEs. These additional strategies include the IR's use of direct disagreements and disrespectful statements usually in spoken Arabic dialect, repeats of the IED's prior turns with falling intonation, and finally the use of "did you know" questions.

6.2. ADVERSERIAL STRATEGIES IN "THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION"

Faisal Alkasim, the host of Aljazeera's "The Opposite Direction" regularly explains on his show that the purpose of his live show is to allow parties with opposing views to speak freely, and for him to ask the hard questions to educate the Arab audience without taking sides. That said, while claiming impartiality, he challenges certain guests with whom he disagrees and disaffiliates by 1) attributing hostile statements to third parties, 2) using prefaced statements, and 3) resorting to question formats such as negated questions. Below I provide examples of all three strategies from my dataset. After that, I will present three as yet undescribed strategies for performing adversarialness: 4) repeating the IED's prior turn with falling intonation, 5) exhibiting disagreements, with disrespectful language usually done in spoken Arabic dialect, and 6) using "did you know" questions. While the first three strategies allow the IR to distance himself from directly criticizing the IED, the last three allow the IR to express a more adversarial stance towards his IEDs.

6.2.1. Third Party attributions

The first example is taken from the first years of the revolution in Syria (the year 2013 to be exact). Here, the IR questions the motives behind placing the Syrian National Guard on Mount Qasyoun, i.e., on the Syrian border with Israel. What the IR may have been planning to get at here is that these guards were placed to protect Israel by ensuring that the Syrian rebels (at the beginning of the revolution) do not enter Israel/Palestine. By attributing the statement to a third party, the IR distances himself from accusing Alasad's regime of being an ally to Israel. The IED, being pro-Alasad, treats the statement as a criticism of him and his political affiliation.

6.2.2. Question Prefaces in “The Opposite Direction”

A second strategy that has been well documented in the Arabic broadcast news interview literature is prefacing questions with a statement. Here I provide an example from my own dataset. This is taken from a 2012 episode where the war in Syria was still in its beginning. The IEs are both Alawites (a sect of Shia). Alasad and the ruling family are well known Alawites. Here, the IR begins his first question to the IED with a preface in which he states that Alawites who are fighting with Alasad are returning home dead, as stated in lines 1-2 below. After that preface in lines 1-5, the IR issues his question in line 6, “how do you respond?”

Excerpt 62:

question prefaces in “The Opposite Direction”

1. IR: → مئآت بل الاف الاطراف يعودون في توابييت في جنائز إلى القرداحة
mi'aat bal alaaf alatraf ya'udoun fi tawabiit fi jana'iz ila alqardaHa
hundreds actually thousands parties return in tombs in coffins to Alqardaha
hundreds actually thousands of bodies are returning in coffins to Alqardaha
2. وال إلى الساحل السوري (.) [من اجل من اجل عائله]
wa ila- ila alsahel alsori [min ajli min ajli 'ailah]
and to- and to the coast Syrian [for who for sake family]
and to- and to the Syrian coast⁵⁹ [for who for one family]
3. [IR's hands up and down slowly]
4. من اجل عائله او عابلتين (.)
min ajli 3a'ila aw 3a'ilatayan (.)
for one family or two families (.)
5. يقولون- هكذا يقول
Hakatha yaqoul- yaqoulon
this he.says- they.say

⁵⁹ The Syrian coast appears to be majorly populated by Alawites according to the episode

- that's what he says- they say
6. ماذا تقول لهم ?
matha taqoul lahom?
what say you them?
how do you respond?
7. هل هي بهذه السهوله
hal hiya bihathihi albasaTa am matha
is it in this simple or what
is it that simple or what's going on?
8. IED: سيدي الكريم (.) اولا مساء الخير
sidi alkarim (.) awalan masa' alkheir
sir dear (.) first evening good
dear sir (.) first good evening
9. انت عندما تسأل ماذا تريد الطائفة العلويه
anta 'indama tas'al matha turid alTa'ifa al3alawiya,
you when ask what want the alawite the sect,
when you ask about the wants of the alawites,
10. و الطائفة السنيه والطائفة [ال] [()]
walTaifa alsuniya, walTaifa [()]
and the sect the sunnis and the sect [()]
and the sunnis and the [()]
[
11. IR: [نعم]
[na'am]
[yeah]
12. IED: انت تسأل تسأل السؤال الخطأ تطرح السؤال الخطأ

fa anta tas'r- tas'al also2al alkhaTa' TaTraH also2al alkhaTa'

then you asr- ask the wrong question.=you ask the wrong question

In this excerpt, the IR does not start with a question right away; he in fact prefaces his question with a statement that displays an opinion that others including the IEF agree with, particularly that some Syrians believe that the Alawites are being used to serve the interests of 'one or two (Alawite) families'. In other words, Alasad's family, which has been the ruling family in Syria for decades, is taking advantage of and is enlisting the rest of the Alawite⁶⁰ population to serve and protect Alasads. Prior to asking the question, the IR claims in a statement that many Alawite fighters are being used and are sent to fight "for who for one family" i.e., the Alasads and Alawite elites (in line 2). Such statements can be heard by IEs as a disagreement when followed by a question (Clayman & Heritage, 2002, p. 127). And the IED does in fact respond by dismissing the question and the preface. The IED begins to respond that when sectarianism is discussed, then the IR is asking the wrong question.

6.2.3. Negated questions in "The Opposite Direction"

Another strategy is to use negated reversed polarity questions, questions that are not treated as a genuine question. This type of questions conveys an assertion of the opposite polarity (Koshik, 2002). They are used in adversarial contexts where the asker already knows the answer (Koshik, 2005). In the next excerpt, it is interesting to see that negated questions in Arabic have a similar function to those in English. Here, speaking on behalf of the Lebanese government, the IED rejects the IR's claims that Lebanon is now paying the price for Hezbollah's involvement in the war in Syria. The IR begins with a content question in line 1 but quickly aborts it and moves to a negative polarity question in lines 2-3. Abandoning a content question for a yes/no question puts more constraints on the IED to answer with yes or no (Raymond, 2003). And by using a negative polarity question, the IR makes an assertion that the Lebanese are paying for Hezbollah's involvement in Syria.

Excerpt 63: IR's use of conducive questions in "The Opposite Direction"

⁶⁰ Alawites form about 10% of the Syrian population.

01. IR: طيب ماذا تفعلون أنتم في لبنان (.) <بس خليني أقول ل>
 Tayeb matha taf'aloun antum fi lubnan (.) >*bas khalini aqul lak*<
 ok what doing.2P you.P in Lebanon (.) >just let me tell you<
 ok what are you doing in Lebanon (.) >*just let me ask you*<
02. → ألا تدفعون فاتورة تورط حزب الله في
 ala tadfa'oun faturat tawaruT hizbollah fi
 aren't paying.2P bill involvement hizbollah in
 aren't you.pl paying the price for hizbollah involvement in
03. سوريا=?
 Syria?=
 04. IED: أبداً=أبداً
 =abadan=abadan
 =never= never
05. IR: من الذي يفجر
 man allathi yufajjir?
 who that bombarding?
 who is bombarding?
06. IED: < كان الأمر سيحدث أكثر من ذلك >
 <kan ala'amr sa yaHduth akthar min thalik>
 <was the-issue will happen more than that >
 <things could have gotten worse>

In this excerpt, the IR begins with an information seeking question “what are you doing in Lebanon (.)”? After asking a content question that invites a potentially lengthy answer, the IR aborts his first question and initiates a more conducive and answer-constraining (Raymond, 2003) question, a negated polar question “aren't you paying the price for Hizbollah's involvement in Syria?=” in lines 2-3. This yes/no question conveys a hostile agenda, i.e., “the Lebanese are paying the price for their involvement in the

Syria war”. Negated questions such as this are often heard as an assertion (Heritage, 2002; Koshik, 2005). The IED responds with the negation “never =never” in line 4 and rejects the assertion conveyed in the IR’s question. As we have seen in Excerpt 7 earlier in the introduction, Clayman and Heritage (2012) show that public figures often hear these negated questions as assertions rather than genuine questions. Excerpt 64 (a copy of Excerpt 7) below shows that Clinton treats the IR’s negated question as an assertion and responds by “disagreeing” with that assertion.

Excerpt 64: Yes/no questions (from Claymon and Heritage 2002 p. 210)

1. IR: W’l Mister President in your zea:l (.) for funds
2. → during the last campaign .hh didn’t you put the
3. Vice President (.) an’ Maggie and all the others
4. in your (0.4) administration top side .hh in a
5. very vulnerable position, hh (0.5)
6. Clinton: → I disagree with that. hh

Similarly, the IED in Excerpt 63 treats the IRs negated question as conveying an adversarial assertion. The IED responds by rejecting it. The IR then issues another follow up question in line 5 “who is bombarding” referring to the attacks on Lebanon in retaliation. By using a more category specific question, the IR is inviting and pushing the IED to admit that the latest bombings in Lebanon⁶¹ were carried out by Syrians, which is what news outlets were reporting at the time. This response would satisfy the IR’s previous question and agenda that the Lebanese are paying the price for Hizbollah’s involvement in the Syrian war.

Now I will show three more strategies the IR uses to express adversarialness with the IED after receiving a series of disaligning and/or disaffiliative responses from the IED. These three strategies are different from the previous ones discussed earlier in this section where the IR distanced himself from expressing a direct stance towards his IEDs. The first adversarial strategy involves repeating the IED’s

⁶¹ This episode aired in 2014.

prior turn with falling intonation to discredit him. The second involves explicit disagreement and disrespectful language using Arabic dialect. This usually involves the IR's switching from his normal, expected Standard Arabic to Arabic Dialect (SA to AD). And the third involves the use of "did you know" type of questions, grammatically formed as yes/no questions, where the IR doesn't necessarily expect a confirming or disconfirming answer from the IED. Instead, these questions are heard as adversarial, and if the IED were to answer with yes or no, he would place him/herself in an awkward position with the audience, as we'll see later.

6.2.4. Disalignment through Repeats of IE's Prior Turns

The next excerpt illustrates all three adversarial strategies. I will discuss each strategy in turn, in this and the following sections. In this excerpt, the IR questions Alasad's unwillingness to participate in the 2014 negotiation talks in Geneva following the demands of the international community. The IR begins with a series of questions addressing the IED, who represents a Syrian political group in favor of negotiating with Alasad. After a series of disaligning responses, the IR resorts to switching to a local variety, Syrian Arabic. At this point in the interaction, the IR is speaking louder whereas the IED is using a calmer voice. Switches to local varieties of Arabic will be coded in *italics* (see Appendix B). The IR's first turn refers to Alasad's unwillingness to go to Geneva.

Excerpt 65: Repeat of IED's prior turn

1. IR: <يذهب أن يريد لا لماذا?>
>limatha la yuridu an yathhab?<
>why not wants.3sm to go?<
>WHY does he not want to GO?<
2. ((points at IED))
3. IED: = اسمحلي
ismahli=
let me=
let me=

4. ((IED extends arm towards IR to ask for floor))
5. IR: = > يذهب أن يريد لا لماذا < أسألك بدي >
=> *bidi as 'alak* < limatha la yurid an yathhab?
=> *want. Is ask you* < why not want. 3sm to go?
=> *I want to ask you* < why does he not want to go?
6. IED: لا الحكم عن يتنازل بدوا ما- ما
la ma- ma bidu yitnazal 'an alHukum (.)
no not- not want. 3sm give up authority (.)
no no *he doesn't want to give up authority* (.) ((moves body towards IR, index finger up))
7. IR: → > [يتنازل بدوا ما .] < الحكم عن
> ma bidu yitnazal ['an alHukum. <]
> no not want. 3sm give up [authority. <]
> *he doesn't want to give up* [authority. <]
[]
8. IED: [.h السلطة عن يتنازل بدوا ما]
[*ma bidu yitnazal 'an alsulTa* .h]
[*not want. 3ms give up power* .h]
[*he does not want to give up power* .h]
9. IR: رأسه اندعس لكن [الأرض على رأسه اندعس =]
LAKIN INDA'AS RASUH [=INDA'AS RASUH 'ALA ILARD]
BUT RUN OVER [RUN OVER HIS HEAD ON THE GROUND]
BUT HIS HEAD'S BEEN RUN OVER= [RUN OVER THE GROUND]
[]
10. [((IR's makes chopping hand movement))]
[]
11. IED: [.h اخي يا]

- [ya akhi .h]
- [O brother .h]
- [brother .h]
- []
12. [(IED extends hand towards IR)]]
13. IR: [اندعس أبو اللي خلفوا على الأرض]
- [inda'as abu illi khalafuh 'ala ilarD]
- [RUN OVER FATHER HIS PARENTS ON THE GROUND]
- [*HIS ANCESTORS HAVE BEEN RUN OVER THE GROUND*]
- []
14. [(IR hand movement up and down as in cut/sword)]]
- []
15. IED: [يا .hh اخي° خليني خليني ((calmly))]
- [°ya akhi° .hh khalini khalini ((calmly))]
- [°O brother° .hh let me let me ((calmly))]
- [°brother° .hh let me let me ((calmly))]
- []
16. [(IED extend hand trying to take floor)]]
17. IR طيب
- inta shuf Tayib.
- you see ok.
- you go see ok.
18. IEF: خليني خليني
- khalini khalini
- let me finish let me finish
19. IR: ايه

eh

ok

20. IEF: .h خلين خليني .h ((changes lips and facial expressions, motions hand stop towards IR))

khalini khalini .h

let me let me .h

let me let me .h

The IR's question ">WHY does he not want to GO<?" is an information seeking question that invites a certain type of answer, usually a phrasal answer. The IR's question (in SA) in line 1 ">WHY does he not want to GO<?" doesn't receive an answer from the IED who instead asks for the floor to complete his previous utterance. Therefore, the IR initiates another question in line 5 prefaced with nonstandard Arabic "*I want to ask you*" to gain the floor, and repeats the question again in Standard Arabic "why does he not want to go?" This time, the IED responds with a negation "'no no" followed by an answer "*he does not want to give up authority (.)*" (line 6) and moves his body closer to IR. The IR in line 7 issues a repeat of the IED's prior turn "[>he doesn't want to give up authority.<". The IR repeat is said with falling intonation in contrast with the affiliative repeats discussed in the previous section. The IED responds with "*he does not want to give up power .h*" (line 8).

The IR's repeat here is both similar to and different from the repeat done by the lawyer in Excerpt 34 where the witness chose the word "clu:b" over the lawyer's lexical choice "bar". The lawyer's repetition of the witness's "a clu:b?" is done as a pre-disagreement. Here, too, as it becomes clear later, the IR's turn performs a pre-disagreement (Schegloff, 2007; Golato et al., forthcoming) with the IED by repeating the IED's prior turn. The witness in Excerpt 34 does not respond to the pre-disagreement and after a (1.0) second pause the lawyer himself continued with the disagreement by stating there was liquor served there. The IED here responds to the pre-disagreement in an overlapping utterance in line 8, where he repeats his previous utterance with some lexical change/correction "[*he does not want to give up power .h*". It is then that the IR responds with the disagreement, in louder spoken Arabic dialect in the next turn. While the lawyer's disagreement was performed indirectly through a question, the IR's disagreement here

was a direct attack. The IR's turn in line 9 is said in a much louder voice in Syrian Arabic "*BUT HIS HEAD'S BEEN RUN OVER*=" while simultaneously doing chopping hand gestures. The statement "someone's head has been run over" is both humiliating and derogatory in the Arab culture. The IED hears the explicit disagreement and the attempt to discredit him. He tries to take the floor by issuing an overlapping turn "brother .h" while extending his arm towards the IR as in an attempt to calm him down. The IR blocks the IEF's attempt to the floor and continues with his attack "[*RUN OVER THE GROUND*". As we can see, despite the structural similarities to those pre-disagreements done by lawyers with hostile witnesses, there are apparent differences with how disagreements proceed and the level of indirectness; the IR's disagreement is more direct and explicit than the lawyer's.

These disaffiliative other-initiated repeats (DOIRs) can also be distinguished from the affiliative other-initiated repeats (AOIRs) discussed in the previous chapter. Despite some structural similarities manifested in the IR's repetition of the IEs' prior turns, DOIRs are said with falling intonation. AOIRs on the other hand are said with rising intonation and are responded to as an invitation to highlight their previous turn. IEFs respond by confirming-by-repeating, and by providing an account. This ends the AOIR sequence and participants move on to a new one. DOIRs, on the other hand, are treated as pre-disagreement, and the IEs may try to respond by providing a variation on the response of their previous turn as we have seen above. But, unlike AOIRs, the IR in a DOIR sequence blocks the IED's turn in favor of issuing a direct disagreement in the next turn, although we will see some variations of the IR's response in the next excerpts. That said, the repetition in a DOIR sequence is done to set up a contrast between what the IED has just said and what the IR subsequently claims to be true.

The following is another example, from a more recent episode (2018), where the IR uses a repeat to signal an imminent disagreement with the IED. Here, the IED, a Lebanese journalist residing and working in Saudi Arabia at the time of this interview, defends Saudi Arabian policies and Saudi Arabia's attempts to establish "intimate relations" with the US. The IED responds to and refutes claims by the IR and the IEF that Saudi Arabia has been funding terrorist groups in the Middle East. The IR initiates a repeat to bring some of the IED's points into question.

Excerpt 66: Saudi Arabia a democracy

1. IED: =السعوديه طبعاً ما عم تشكل ميليشيات في المنطقه=
Alsu'udiya Tab'aan ma 'am tushakel milishyat fi almanTiqa=
Saudi Arabia of course no form militias in the region=
Saudi Arabia of course is not supporting militias in the region=
2. IR: ايوه
aywa
uh huh⁶²
3. IED: = وجريمه (.) وقتل (.) لانها دولة مؤسسات وليست دولة إرهاب =
=Lianha dawlat mu'asasat walaysat dawlat irhab (.) wa qatel (.) wajarima
=Because country services not country terror (.) and murder (.) and crime
=it's supporting services and not terrors (.) or murder (.) or crime (.)
4. [تبحت]
[tabHath]
[interested]
[interested in]
[]
[]
5. IR: <السعوديه دوله مؤسسات.> []
[>alsudiya dawla mu'ssat.<]
[>Saudi supports services.<]
6. IED: دولة مؤسسات طبعاً
Dawlat mu'asasat Tab'an
Supporting services of course
supporting services of course

⁶² “uh huh” is used here as a continuer, used by the IR to display that the IED is not finished talking and not as an agreement.

Here, the IED continues to defend Saudi Arabia and refute the IR's and the IEF's claims that Saudi Arabia has been supporting terrorist groups in many parts of the Middle East. The IED explains that Saudi Arabia supports services and not terrorism, murder, or crime. The IR interjects in an overlapping turn in line 5 and repeats part of the IED's prior turn "[>Saudi is supporting services.<". The IR's turn is said with downward intonation. The IED treats the IR's other initiated repeat as disaffiliative, as he responds with "supporting services of course" while emphasizing "of course". Responding with "of course" here shows that the IED does in fact treat the IR's repeat as a pre-disagreement. By using "of course", the IED not only confirms that Saudi Arabia supports services, but he also challenges the IR's presupposition in the IR's repeat—that Saudi Arabia supporting services should even be questioned. The IED tries to continue with a response in line 7 "[now]", but the IR interrupts and issues an overlapping turn with laughter "[and (it's) a democracy too", implying that it is known that Saudi Arabia is as much of a democracy as it is a supporter of services. By doing that, the IR issues his disagreement in the form of sarcasm. The IR disagrees with the IED's premises that Saudi Arabia is good. The IED then continues to defend Saudi Arabia and explain that it is a democracy and that democracy is a relative concept. Note, however, that the IR's disagreement here is slightly different from his disagreement in the previous excerpt. It is a more direct and explicit disagreement in the previous excerpt. In contrast, the IR's disagreement in this last excerpt is done in the form of sarcasm. The IR does not proceed with any further or explicit disagreements; he merely ends the sequence "fine (.) fine OK" while quickly looking over his notes, as he is probably planning to switch topics and/or issue a new question sequence.

The following excerpt also illustrates how the IR repeats parts of their IEDs' prior turns to signal an imminent disagreement with them. The IED treats this other initiated repeat as disaffiliative and responds by providing some type of account or variation on the prior turn. Excerpt 67 below is taken from a very recent (February 2018) episode where the IED, a Kuwaiti writer and researcher, disagrees with the IR's claims that the Arab Gulf countries (including Kuwait) are moving towards normalizing diplomatic relations with Israel, the same state that is killing and occupying an Arab country, Palestine. Here, the IED responds by stating that Qatar had already started diplomatic normalization with Israel long before

his country. The IED shows pictures of a Qatari official (referred to in line 1) dining with Israeli officials and points out that Qatar (where Aljazeera is located and funded) has been normalizing relations with Israel for years. Both the IR and the IED fight over the floor, loudly, as they both retaliate with exposing names of officials from both countries that allegedly meet with the enemy. The excerpt below begins with the IR asking the IED in an overlapping turn why the IED had chosen to criticize and show pictures of the Qatari official. The IR does not wait for a response; in fact, he continues with another latched turn where he once again exposes the name of the Kuwaiti official, Turki Al Faisal⁶³. The IED, however, attempts to respond in line 3, “[hold on (.) hold on (.)]” followed by another overlapping turn in line 5 where he claims that that Kuwaiti official does not hold any official title. This prompts the IR to issue a repeat of part of the IED’s previous turn to bring it to question in line 6. This repeat is a little different from the previous ones in that it is not exactly an identical repeat, it is partially repeated in Arabic dialect as I will explain below. It is, nonetheless, treated by the IED as disaffiliative and is responded to as such.

Excerpt 67: 12262017:7:45

- | | | |
|---------|---|------------------------|
| 1. IR: | [ليش (ما اخترت غير هذا يا سيدي)] |] |
| | [laysh ma ikhart gher hatha ya sidi? |] |
| | [why not chose other this O sir? |] |
| | [why only criticize that ((Qatari official)) sir? |] |
| | [|] |
| 2. IEF: | [() |] |
| | [() |] |
| | [() |] |
| 3. IED: | [لحظة (.) لحظة (.) | ((stop hand movement)) |
| | [laHtha (.) laHtha (.) | ((stop hand movement)) |
| | [hold on (.) hold on (.) | ((stop hand movement)) |

⁶³ The name of the Kuwaiti official, Turki Al Faisal, has already been mentioned by the IR prior to this excerpt.

4. IR: [المخابرات تركي الفيصل رئيس]
 [turki alfaysal ra'ees almukhabarat =]
 [Turki Al faisal head of intelligence =]
 [Turki Al faisal is the head of ((Kuwaiti)) intelligence=]
 []
5. IED: [تركي الفيصل تركي الفيصل ليس له صفة رسميه]
 [turki al fais- Turki Al Faisal laysa lahu Sefa rasmiya]
 [Turki Al Fais- Turki Al faisal doesnt him label official]
 [Turki Al Fais- Turki Al Faisal does not hold an official title]
6. IR: → = بطل ال ه صفة رسميه
 = *battal iluh* Sefa rasmeya.
 = *no longer him* title official.
 = *he does not hold* an official title.
7. IED: اذا بديك تقول لي
Itha biddak tiqul li
If you want tell me
If you are talking about
8. [اذا بديك تقول لي عن المؤتمرات ()]
 [*itha biddak tiqul li 'an almu'tamarat*]
 [*if you want to talk* about conferences]
 [*if you are talking* about conferences]
 []
9. IR: [اه؟ (.) بطل ال ه صفة رسميه] ((changes facial expressions))
 [*ah battal iluh Sefa rasmiyeh* (.) *ah?*] ((changes facial expressions))
 [*yeah no longer title official* (.) *ha?*] ((changes facial expressions))
 [*he doesn't hold* an official title (.) *ha?*] ((changes facial expressions))

- 11.IED: [.h اخي يا]
 [ya akhi .h]
 [O brother .h]
 [brother .h]
 []
12. [(IED extends hand towards IR)]]
- 13.IR: [اندعس أبو اللي خلفوا على الأرض]
 [INDA'AS ABU ILLI KHALAFUH 'ALA IL'ARD]
 [RUN OVER FATHER HIS PARENTS ON THE GROUND]
 [HIS ANCESTORS HAVE BEEN RUN OVER THE GROUND]
 []
14. [(IR hand movement up and down as in cut/sword)]]
 []
- 15.IED: [.hh اخي هيا ((calmly)) خليني خليني]
 [°ya akhi° .hh khalini khalini ((calmly))]
 [°O brother° .hh let me let me ((calmly))]
 [°brother° .hh let me let me ((calmly))]
 []
 [(IED extend hand trying to take floor)]]
- 16.IR طيب
 inta shuf Tayib.
 you see ok.
 you go see ok.
- 17.IEF خليني خليني
 khalini khalini

- let me finish let me finish
- 18.IR ايه
 eh
 ok
- 19.IEF .h خلين خليني .h ((changes lips and facial expressions, motions hand stop towards IR))
 khalini khalini .h
 let me let me .h
 let me let me .h

The IR continues to control the floor while the IED continues to calmly ask for the floor (once again in line 18). Being denied the floor, the IED becomes overly agitated (changes his facial expressions and lips) and asks for the floor by repeating parts of his last turn “let me let me .h” in line 20 in a calmer yet more serious manner while extending his hand towards the IR in a “stop” motion.

In excerpt 65/68, a change in code is used by the IR when he uses insulting language to explicitly disagree with the IED. The IR tends to use Arabic dialect rather than SA when disagreeing with IEDs to make insulting statements towards the IED. This is the case in 13 out of the 15 cases I have examined. Migdadi et al. (2013), as we have seen in the introduction, show that the IEs on “The Opposite Direction” regularly use explicit and derogatory language among themselves to maximize their disagreement. Here, we can see that the IR also uses that same strategy to express explicit disagreement with his IED.

Let’s consider another example here. This is taken from a more recent 2018 episode where the IED claims that he had in the past denounced the ruling party (the Ba’ath⁶⁵) and its security forces. The IR responds by making an insulting comment towards the IED, in line 3, to disagree with him. The IR makes the insulting comment in Syrian Arabic.

Excerpt 69: IR’s insulting statement in Syrian Arabic

⁶⁵ The Ba’ath party was established in the middle of the 20th century and advocated for the formation of a single Arab socialist nation. It has been the ruling party in Syria from 1963 (by Alasads), and it was the ruling party in Iraq (led by Saddam Hussein) from 1968 to 2003.

1. IED: بنتقد الامن والبعث
bantiqid al aman wal baath
I criticize the security and the Ba'ath
I denounce the army and the Ba'ath party
2. IR: انت بنتقد الامن والبعث?
inta btintiqid ilaman wal Ba'ath?
you criticize the security and the baath?
You denounce the army and the Ba'ath?
3. → يا راجل بس اللهي بيني وبينك ما حدا سامعنا
ya rajel bas wallahi beini o beinak ma Hada same'na
man for god sake just between you and me nobody can hear us
Man, come on, just between you and me, no one can hear us
((moves closer to him))
4. انت تنتقد الامن?
inta tintaqed albaath?
you criticize the Ba'ath?
you denounce the army and the Ba'ath?
5. انت تعلم انه حزبك حزب الشباب الوطني (.)
inta ta'lam inuh Hizbak Hizb al Shabab alwaTani (.)
you know that your party party the young the national (.)
You know that your party (.) the National Youth Party (.)
6. =بشرفك (.) ل لاي حزب تابع?
bisharafak (.) li- liay Hizeb tabe3?=
by your honor (.) to- to which party belongs?=
come on now (.) to- to which party does it belong?=
= [الحزب الجوي ولا الحزب (.)]

=alHizb iljawi [wella ilHizb ()]

=the party space [or the party ()]

=to the aerospace [party or to the ()]

8. IEF: [((laughter))]

In this excerpt, as the IED was explaining his position that he has publicly denounced the ruling party in the past even while still working for the government, the IR repeats part of the IED's prior turn which signals an imminent disagreement. The IR does not wait for a response from the IED, and his repeat is immediately followed by a disagreement. His disagreement with the IED comes in the form of sarcasm in line 3 "يا رجل بس الله بي بينك وبينك ما حدا سامعنا" ("Man, come on, just between you and me, no one can hear us"). This is a lie because they are debating on air and on national T.V. By issuing this statement, the IR is ridiculing and belittling the IED and his previous statement. The IR's turn in line 3 is also insulting towards the IED. This was said in Syrian Arabic. He then continues to attack the IED by questioning the IED's party's affiliation, pointing out that the party that the IED actually leads belongs to a governmental branch. The IR does not state that clearly. In fact, he issues another sarcastic turn in lines 6-7, by asking if the IED's party belongs to the aerospace party (there is no such a thing of course), which prompts the IEF at the other side of the table to laugh.

6.2.6. Disagreement through "Did you know" questions

After the turns shown in Extract 68 end up neither advancing the topic nor abandoning it, and the IED becomes agitated, the IR quickly begins a topic departure at line 21 (continued below). The IR now moves away from content questions and resorts to a more conducive questioning format, polar questions (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Polar questions also constrain answers (Raymond, 2003). The "did you know" questions I focus on here are a type of polar question. These questions do not ask for information, nor do they seem to expect a response. They are regularly used by the IR in this specific program to provide an account for previous turns that did not receive the desired response from the IED. They are lengthy, said in clear, loud Standard Arabic, and they typically embed "hostile presuppositions" (Heritage, 2002) and confrontational messages (Hayano, 2013). These as we'll see below include

information that may at first sound like “new” information. And as with other hostile questions, a direct answer to such questions would accept its presuppositions as valid, and it takes interactional work to refute the presuppositions (Heritage, 2003; Hayano, 2013). By using a “did you know” question in Excerpt 70 below, the IR offers an account for his prior comments that Alasad is in a bad shape, or that his head has been run over the ground. Excerpt 70 below is a continuation of Excerpt 68.

Excerpt 70: Did you know questions

- 16.IR: → هل تعلم أن كهرباء الساحل (.) <طب بدّي أسألك>
 >Tayeb bidi is'alak< hal ta'lam anna kahraba al saHil (.)
 >ok I want to ask you< did you know that electricity the coast (.)
 >ok I want to ask you< did you know that the electricity (.) on the coast (.)
17. كهرباء يتاعته ب الساحل
 kahraba ta'tuh bi al saHil
 electricity his in the coast
his⁶⁶ electricity on the coast
18. ((thumb points backwards))
19. ب طرطوس واللاذقية تجيء من عند
 .h bi TarTus wa allathikiya tiji' min 'ind
 .h in Tartus and Lattakia comes from
 .h in Tartus and Lattakia .h >comes through regions controlled
20. عند الجيش الحر > (.)
 'nd al jaysh al Hurr< (.)
 by the army the free< (.)
 by the free army< (.)
21. يعني الجيش الحر بكرة <يقوف عنه الكهرباء>

⁶⁶ “his” refers to Alasad here.

ya'ani aljaysh ilHurr bukra >yuqef 'annuh ilkahraba<
meaning the-army the-free tomorrow >denys him electricity<
meaning the free army could at any time >cut out his electricity<

22. .h تطفئ باللائقفة وبالسا: [حل .h

.h TeTfi BILLATHIKIYA O BIL SAH[I:L

.h turn off IN LATTAKIA AND THE COA:[ST

.h IN LATTAKIA AND THE COA:[ST

[

23. [((hand movements))

[

24.IED: [°اخي يا °

[°ya akhi°

[°brother°

25.IR: → هل تعلم أن النظام لم يعد يسيطر ولا على بئر نفط

hal ta'lam anna alnitham LAM YA'UD YUSAYTER wala 'ala bi'r nift

did you know that the-regime NOT ABLE CONTROL neither on well oil

did you know that the regime NO LONGER CONTROLS any oil wells

26. بسوريا

bi soria

in Syria

in Syria

27. ((continues hand movement up and down fast))

28. → هل تعلم أن الطريق الوحيد السالك في سوريا

hal ta'lam an alTariq alwaHid alsalik fi soriya

did you know that the-road the-only working in Syria

did you know that the only open route in Syria >connects

29. لها من لبنان إلى دمشق
laha min libnan ila dimashq
to it from Lebanon to Damascus
from Lebanon to_ and
30. ومن السويدية إلى دمشق بكل البلد?<=>
wa min Suweida ila Dimashq bi kul ilbalad?<=>
and from Suweida to Damascus in all the-country?<=>
from Suweida to in the entire country?<=>
31. ((continuous hand movements))
- 32.IR: = المربع الأمني اللي مزروب فيهم هل يستطيع النظام أن يخرج من الخمسة كيلومتر
= is the regime able to exit [the 5k of headquarters *where he's dumped*]
33. [((circular hand movements))]
34. (.) [(خضراء) (unint)=
(.) [(manTiqa) (unint)=
(.) [(region) (unint)=
(.) [(region) (unint)=
[
- 35.IED: [أنا- أنا- أنا تقديرِي .h=
[<ana- ana- ana taqdi::ri> .h=
[<I- I- I my estima:::te> .h=
- 36.IR: = [طب ليش لنفاوضه]
=[Tayeb laysh lanfawDuh?]
=[then why negotiate with him?]
[]
37. [((IR opens hands/balms))]
[]

that Alasad is in a poor position. On the other hand, disconfirming and answering with ‘no’ means the IED simply doesn’t know what’s going on. Both possibilities are damaging to his public image.

In addition to being more adversarial and answer-constraining, I argue that “did you know” questions signal that the questioner has more ‘epistemic primacy’ (Heritage, 2012; Heritage & Raymond, 2012) than the addressee. By switching to a more knowing K+ persona, the IR claims to have more power and knowledge. After initiating the initial “did you know” question, the IR immediately offers an account and clarification of his question in lines 26-27 “meaning the free army could at any time >cut out his electricity supply<.h IN LATTAKIA AND THE COA:[ST”. This ‘new information’ is treated as confrontational by the IED who attempts to interrupt the IR’s turn to disagree. The IED prefaces his disagreement with “brother” in line 29. Prefacing a response with a “brother” has been shown to signal disagreement in the Arabic culture in broadcast news interviews (Al Rojaiei, 2003). However, the IR doesn’t allow the IED a chance to take the floor. Instead, he initiates yet another latched ‘did you know’ question, also louder and in a faster pace, in line 30-31 “did you know that the regime NO LONGER CONTROLS any oil wells in Syria” while moving his hands up and down and fast. Once again, the IR doesn’t allow the IED an opportunity to respond to that second question as he initiates a third “did you know” question in lines 33-35, faster and louder, while continuing to move his hands up and down fast “did you know that the only open route in Syria >connects from Lebanon to Damascus and from Suweida and Damascus in the entire country?”

The third ‘did you know’ question is followed by another, a fourth question in lines 37-39. This last one serves as the concluding question and is designed as a yes/no question: “is the regime able to exit the 5k of headquarters *where he’s been dumped* (.).”. The first part of this question is said in Standard Arabic while the second part in Syrian Arabic. As a reversed polarity question (RPQ), this question is not treated as a genuine question. RPQs convey an assertion of the opposite polarity (Koshik, 2002). They are used in adversarial contexts where the asker already knows the answer. Prior to this question, the IR issued a number of “did you know” questions that set an adversarial context. For instance, the IR has claimed that most roads in Syria are blocked, that Alasad is trapped in his headquarters and that he has no

control over electricity and power lines. Hence, IR's question "is the regime able to exit the 5k of headquarters *where he's been dumped* (.)" conveys the assertion "the regime is not able to exit the 5k of headquarters *where he's been dumped*". Neither yes nor no constitutes a good answer. A 'yes' answer would agree with the presupposition that Alasad has been dumped. A 'No' answer would agree with the RPQ that Alasad cannot leave or exit his headquarters. The IED tries to respond in an overlap in line 40 "I- I- my estima:::te" which is quickly interrupted by the IR's louder and faster speech. The IR continues to withhold the floor and issues yet another, a fifth, and latching question in line 21 "[then why negotiate with him?"]. As a reversed polarity question, this question, too, conveys the assertion that there is no need to negotiate with Alasad. RPQs, as Koshik (2003) explains, can be used to convey "negative assertions that challenge the grounds for a prior claim or action, suggesting that there are no adequate grounds for it, and therefore no basis for asserting the claim or doing the action in the first place" (p. 101-2). The IR here is making the assertion that there is no reason to negotiate with Alasad. This last question by the IR ends what may be heard as closing remarks in a cross-examination talk. In this short sequence alone, the IR issues five questions, but allows the IED to respond only to the last question.

The IR's last question is said in Syrian Arabic in line 41 while the IR is simultaneously opening the palm of his hands "[*then why negotiate with him?*"]. By indicating that Alasad is no longer in control of anything (traffic, oil wells, electricity), the IR refutes the IED's original statement that Alasad is in a position to negotiate and that he still has power and authority. When the IED is finally allowed a chance to respond without any interruptions from the IR, his response in lines 43, 45-46 is significant. The IED responds by rejecting the IR's assertion and by providing a transformative response (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010) which alters the terms and agendas of the questions "<unfortunately (.) you're not living in Syria>". Such responses indicate there is a problem with providing a direct answer and they reflect a high degree of resistance as they adjust and reject the agenda of the question, and in particular the presuppositions upon which the question is built (Hayano, 2013, p. 429-30). The IED not only refutes all the IR's accusations, but he also cancels all the presuppositions and assertions in the IR's questions. By marking or labelling the IR and the IEF as "not living in Syria", the IED rejects the epistemic stance that the IR has

claimed in this exchange through his use of “did you know” questions. The IED had previously stressed his own K+ position by repeating and stressing “I” in line 40. Another important point about the IED’s response is that he is addressing both the IR and IEF (by using the plural form of you, and by looking at both of them). The fact he is addressing both is a way for him to take a stance against not only the IR but also the IEF. (Note: whereas the IR is Syrian, he in fact lives in London and Qatar. The IEF also does not seem to be residing in Syria at the time this aired).

A similar questioning pattern takes place in the next excerpt from a different episode with another IED. Here, the participants discuss Lebanon’s Hezbollah’s involvement in the neighboring Syrian war where Hezbollah fighters have joined jihadi groups alongside the Syrian regime against the Syrian people/rebels. The IED in this excerpt (a continuation of Excerpt 61) represents Lebanon’s Hezbollah. The IR hints that Hezbollah’s involvement will cause undue negative damage to the Lebanese people in general and to Hezbollah in particular. Lebanon has suffered political unrest in the past decades anyway, and Hezbollah’s involvement in another neighboring war, according to the IR, might cause worse damage to the people of Lebanon.

Excerpt 70: did you know questions

- 42.IR: طيب ماذا تفعلون أنتم في لبنان (.) <بس خليني أقول ل>
 Tayeb matha taf’aloun antum fi lubnan (.) >*bas khalini aqul lak*<
 Ok what doing.2P you.P in Lebanon (.) >*just let me tell you*<
 ok what are you doing in Lebanon (.) >*just let me ask you*<
43. ألا تدفعون فاتورة تورط حزب الله في
 ala tadfa’oun faturat tawaruT hizbollah fi
 aren’t paying.2P bill involvement hizbollah in
 aren’t you.pl paying the price for Hezbollah’s involvement in
44. سوريا=
 Syria?=
 45.IED: أبدأ=أبدأ=

=abadan=abadan

=never= never

=never= never

46.IR: من الذي يفجر

man allathi yufajjir?

who that bombarding?

who is bombarding?

47.IED: < كان الأمر سيحدث أكثر من ذلك >

<kan ala'amr sa yaHduth akthar min thalik>

<was the-issue will happen more than that >

<things could have gotten worse>

48.IR: → طيب هل تعلم أن القادم <كما المعلومات الموجودة

Tayeb hal ta'lam anna ALQADIM >kama alma'lumat almawjuda

Ok did know.2S that THE-FORTHCOMING > as the-information available

ok did you know that what's COMING >according to the information

49.IR: =لدي أنا ما بدني أحكي شي> أنه

laday= ana ma bidi aHki ishi< innu

to me= I not want.1S say thing< that

I have= I'm not saying my opinion < that

50. أيامه سوده لحزب الله ولحسن نصر الله?

ayamoh soda la Hizbollah o la Hassan Nasrullah?

his days black to Hizbollah and to Hassan Nasrullah?

Hezbollah and Hasan Nasrallah have dark days ahead of them?

51.IED: وأنا سأقول لك شغلة

wa ana sa aqul lak shaghleh

and I will tell you something

and I will tell you *something*

- 52.IR: = > يا أخي 'عم أقول لك مش عم أقول لك <
=>ya akhi “am aqul lak mish am aqul lak”<
=> o brother “I’m telling you not telling you”<
=>brother ‘I am telling you not telling you’⁶⁹<

53. ((changes facial and lip expression))

54. ماذا سيحدث في لبنان?
↑matha sayaHduth fi Libnan?
↑what will-happen in Lebanon?
↑what will happen in Lebanon?

In this excerpt, the IR begins with an information seeking question “what are you doing in Lebanon (.)?” After asking a content question that invites a potentially lengthy answer, the IR aborts his first question and initiates a more conducive and answer-constraining (Raymond, 2003) question, a negated polar question “aren’t you paying the price for Hezbollah’s involvement in Syria?” in lines 2-3. This yes/no question conveys a hostile assertion that “the Lebanese are paying the price for their involvement in the Syria war” and is treated as challenging. The IED responds with the negation “never =never” in line 4 and refutes the assertion implied in the IR’s question. The IR then issues another follow up question in line 5 “who is bombarding” referring to the recent attacks on Lebanon in retaliation. By choosing a category specific question (“who”), the IR may be expecting an answer along the lines that the bombarding in Lebanon was committed by Syrian groups (i.e., “who”), in retaliation for the Lebanese involvement in the Syrian war. The IED rejects the IR’s agenda that the Lebanese people *are* “paying the price for their involvement in Syria” and downplays the threats of bombarding, by responding with “<things could have gotten worse>” in line 6. Here, the IED means that the attacks on Lebanon were inevitable, and had Hizbollah not gotten involved in Syria, the damages/attacks on Lebanon could have been greater. The

⁶⁹ What the IR is trying to say here is something along the lines “no, don’t tell me” or “how about you don’t tell me”.

IED's response transforms and rejects the question's agenda (Stivers & Hayashi, 2010). Hearing the growing challenge by the IED, the IR resorts to "did you know" type of question which allows the IR to move from an "unknowing" (K-) to a "knowing" (K+) stance. In addition, it will block the IED's responses. The IR's question "ok did you know that what's coming >according to the information I have *I'm not saying* my opinion< that Hezbollah and Hasan Nasrallah have dark days ahead of them?" is not only confrontational, but it also conveys even more hostile presuppositions than his previous questions. The IR's question presuppositions are threatening to Hezbollah. The question is heard to include an "assertion" (Heritage, 2013) from a K+ position. The assertion made here is that "Nasrallah and Hezbollah have dark days ahead of them". Hearing the threat in that question, even the IR himself tries to adopt a somehow neutralistic stance by referencing a third party and distancing himself from that threat "according to the information I have *I'm not stating* my opinion" mid turn.

These questions are designed to discourage any confirming or disconfirming responses from the IEDs. The IEDs do not respond with either yes or no. Instead, they respond by rejecting the assertions and presuppositions conveyed in these questions. The IED in this excerpt answers in an evasive statement that alters the question's agenda "and I'll tell you *something*" in line 10. This is heard as challenging by the IR who quickly interrupts the IED's turn as he clearly becomes upset and responds by repeating and discrediting the IED's statement "=>brother '*I am telling you' not telling you*<" in line 11. In Arabic, this phrase has the following meaning: the first part of the IR's statement "I am telling you" is a mocking quote of the IED's turn because the IED in line 10 started his turn with "and I'll tell you *something*". The second part of the IR's statement "not telling you" means something along the lines "how about you don't!" In short, the IR asks the IED to stop talking. The IR then reissues his first question again, in rising intonation and higher pitch "↑what will happen in Lebanon?" in line 13.

In the last two excerpts, the IR uses "did you know" questions after failing to elicit certain responses from the IEDs. These questions are more adversarial as they embed hostile presuppositions. Either answer (affirming or disaffirming) would be damaging to the IED. The IEDs hear the threatening

nature of the question and if they manage (or are allowed) to respond, they design their responses by transforming (either adjusting or rejecting) the questions' agendas (Hayano, 2013).

In addition to these “did you know” questions, this chapter also looked at other previously unreported strategies that interviewers systematically use to challenge and disagree with their IEDs. These strategies include explicitly disagreeing with the IEDs using disrespectful language in spoken Arabic dialects, and repeating prior turns by their IEDs with falling intonation in order to set up a contrast with what the IED just said and a following statement presented as true by the IR. The use of “did you know” questions and disagreement with disrespectful language were used more frequently by the IR in the earlier episodes from 2013-2016 where the guests discussed the topic of the Syrian civil war. The IR is originally from Syria. The IR used less disrespectful language and almost no “did you know” questions with his IEDs in the later episodes studied here from 2017-2018 where other topics were discussed.

To conclude this chapter, a number of practices are used by the IR, Faisal Alkasim, to disaffiliate with his IEDs. Despite claiming impartiality, the IR expresses challenges towards certain guests with whom he disagrees by 1) attributing hostile statements to third parties, 2) using prefaced statements, and 3) resorting to question formats such as negated questions. In this chapter, I provided examples of the all three strategies from “The Opposite Direction”. After that, I presented three as yet undescribed strategies for performing adversarialness such as: 4) repeating the IED's prior turn with falling intonation in order to subsequently disagree with it, 5) performing disagreements with disrespectful language usually done in spoken Arabic dialect, and 6) using “did you know” questions. The last two strategies were more common in the earlier episodes when the topic of discussion focused on the Syrian civil war. I have shown that while the first three strategies allow the IR to distance himself from directly criticizing the IED, the last three usually allow the IR to block the IEDs from furthering their agenda. In the next chapter, a more detailed conclusion will be provided.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In this dissertation, I studied the linguistic strategies that the IR in “The Opposite Direction” uses with his IEs to either block or support their agenda. I showed that the IR uses strategies similar to those already documented in the broadcast news interviews literature, such as third party attributions, negated questions, and using question prefaces. These strategies allow Alkassim to distance himself and embed a hostile stance with his IEDs. However, my dissertation findings show that Alkassim also uses a number of undescribed practices with his IEDs that were analyzed later in the dissertation. Additionally, Alkassim uses affiliative practices with his IEFs allowing them to further their agenda and more chance to the floor.

In chapters 1 and 2, I reviewed literature on broadcast news interviews across cultures showing that one of the common findings was interviewers’ moves towards more and more direct disagreement and explicit stance taking towards their IEs. Despite claims of neutrality, IRs employ certain discursive strategies to embed an adversarial stance. Some of those strategies have been well documented in the Western and Arabic literature although studies on Arabic news interviews are much more recent.

Chapter 2 provided some background on Aljazeera, “the Opposite Direction” and its host, and it also reviewed academic work done on that particular program. The review highlighted academic work and its findings regarding the adversarial strategies used and promoted by the program host and guests alike.

Chapter 3 explained the methodology used in this dissertation and provided a rationale for why Conversation Analysis methodology was best suited for this study. It also explained the data and provided a rationale for why that program and those episodes were selected.

Chapter 4 reviewed practices of repair in both everyday and institutional contexts. I first presented research on CA studies on repair and non-repair practices in English. The chapter reviewed different types of actions that are achieved by different repair formats, starting from the open or weak formats and ending with the strongest formats (candidate understandings and other initiated repeats). I then added my own findings on repair in Arabic conversation. The findings suggest that similar to other languages, Arabic speakers use different repair formats. Those include open/weak formats (e.g., “huh?”),

category specific (e.g., “meen?” (who?)), and stronger formats that include candidate understandings and repeats of prior turns. While repeats of other’s talk is well documented in the Western literature, this practice has not yet been studied in Arabic talk, to my knowledge. My findings show that Arabic speakers use repeats of prior turns to request confirmation, clarification, and to signal pre-disagreement. Therefore, this dissertation allowed me to make a contribution to the Arabic literature by presenting and analyzing examples of repair and non-repair practices in naturally occurring Arabic talk (based on the Egyptian Callhome corpus). Next, I turned to studies on repeats in institutional talk. One of the goals of this dissertation was to study how conversational practices in Arabic are taken and used for other purposes in “The Opposite Direction”.

In the next two analytic chapters of the dissertation, I analyzed the affiliative practices that the IR uses with his IEFs (Chapter 5), and the disaffiliative practices he uses with his IEDs (Chapter 6). The findings of Chapter 5 show that the IR regularly employs four practices that allow him to further his own and his IEFs’ agenda. Those include 1) repeats of IEFs’ prior talk with rising intonation, 2) pseudo candidate understandings, 3) candidate responses, and 4) anticipatory completions. The first practice is treated by the IEF as an opportunity to confirm and highlight a previous point. As a result, the IEFs normally respond by producing an identical repeat. For the second strategy, the IR uses the format of a candidate understanding, resaying of previous turns in new words as if to check his understanding. I referred to this practice as a “pseudo” candidate understanding because there is little to no connection between the IEFs’ previous points and the IR’s reformulation. My findings suggest that using pseudo candidate understandings allows the IR to divert the conversation in a specific direction that allows the IR to further *his* own agenda. The IEFs respond by confirming those pseudo candidate understandings, and at times incorporating them in their next turns. The third practice, using candidate responses, allows the IR to insert, model, and cue to the IEF a satisfactory response even before the IEFs have had a chance to respond to the IR’s question. And finally, the IR displays affiliation with his IEFs by completing his IEF’s turn in progress. All four practices allow the IEF to have more opportunities to talk and to further either the IR’s or the IEFs’ own agenda.

Chapter 6 analyzed the disaffiliative strategies that the IR uses with his IEDs. The chapter first presented examples of the IR using prefaced questions, third party attributions, and negated questions—strategies that allow him to embed an adversarial stance and keep a neutralistic one. These practices have been reported in studies of broadcast news interviews, but not yet in Arabic. My dissertation findings also show that the IR uses other undescribed disaffiliative strategies with his IEDs. Those include 1) repeats of IEDs' prior turns, 2) disagreement through disrespectful language, and 3) using 'did you know' questions. Repeats of IEDs' prior turns, or DOIRs as I referred to them, allow the IR to block the IED's turn in favor of issuing a direct disagreement in the next turn. The repeat in a DOIR sequence is done to set up a contrast between what the IED has just said and what the IR subsequently claims to be true. My findings show that Disaffiliative other initiated repeats (DOIRs) are distinct from their Affiliative repeats (the AOIRs). Whereas AOIRs are said with rising intonation and are oriented to as an opportunity to confirm and highlight a previous point, DOIRs are said with falling intonation and are treated as a pre-disagreement. In fact, AOIRs resemble those repeats done by lawyers with *their* witnesses (as in Excerpt 33) while DOIRs resemble repeats by lawyers with uncooperative witness (as in Excerpt 34).

Another finding of mine is that there is variation in the responses to those repeats. In the case of AOIRs, IEFs may respond with a confirmation minus an identical repeat. Occasionally, IEFs respond with "of course" which allows them to confirm a prior point but also to question the alternative as a response (in the IR's question/repeat). IEFs in this case do not take the opportunity to highlight controversial points by repeating. IEFs may orient to the IR's repeat as disaffiliative but the IR does not issue any follow up questions or disagreements. Instead, the IEFs are allowed to further support their previous points. As for DOIRs, a DOIR sequence ends with the IR's producing a disagreement.

In addition to DOIRs, this study found that the IR disagrees with his IEDs by using disrespectful language. Previous research on "The Opposite Direction" found that the IEs use rude and derogatory language with one another. My findings show that the IR also uses similar language with his IEDs. Such statements are usually said in Arabic dialect.

My dissertation also found that the IR uses ‘did you know’ questions with his IEDs. The IR’s use of this particular strategy was more common when the topics discuss the civil war in Syria. The dissertation found that that question did not expect a response from the IEDs. In fact, it was used only after a series of unanswered questions, when the IR did not get the answer he was going for. These questions allow the IR to move from a “unknowing” K- to a “knowing” K+ stance. They convey hostile presuppositions with which the IEDs could neither agree nor disagree. In fact, this study showed that they were used to block the IEDs’ agenda.

One goal of this dissertation was to present and analyze previously undescribed adversarial strategies that the IR uses with his IEs. In addition, this dissertation uncovered affiliative strategies that have not yet been studied in existing Western or Arabic literature. These strategies were used by the IR with his IEs to allow them to further their agenda and, in some cases, to change the direction of their agenda to further the IR’s agenda.

The dissertation also found that, when the IR used disrespectful language to disagree with the IEDs, he usually also code switched from Standard to Dialect Arabic. Prior research on *The Opposite Direction* found that the guests use rude and disrespectful language with each other. My findings contribute to that literature by showing that a) the IR used disrespectful language with his IEDs, and b) he most often made those disrespectful remarks in an Arabic dialect. My findings suggest that, unlike what has been argued in the Arabic diglossia literature, code switching from Standard Arabic to a dialect does not merely occur when speakers are illiterate, informal, or are less serious in their talk. Quite the opposite. My research suggests that switching to a dialect may be part and parcel of the disagreement making process. But firmer claims for the connection between disagreement and code-switching to dialect are beyond the scope of this dissertation and need to be supported by future research.

One of the main conclusions that this dissertation makes is that, despite his motto “I do not take any sides” and his claim that he seeks “to give everyone a voice”, Alkassim, the IR of “*The Opposite Direction*” does clearly take sides. His guests are not allowed equal opportunities for the floor. The IR uses a specific set of practices with each IE, allowing some of them to further their agenda while blocking

the agenda of the others. The IR systematically uses the affiliative practices with his IEFs and the disaffiliative practices with his IEDs. At times, the IR shifts what seems to be the agenda of his favored IEs towards his own agenda, as it was the case in pseudo candidate understandings, candidate responses, and candidate completions.

Another finding of this dissertation is that the IR used the second and third disaffiliative strategies more often when the topic of discussion was the Syrian civil war, especially in its first few years of life. This possibly has to do with the IR being Syrian. Those two practices were common in the thirteen episodes I transcribed from 2013-2016 which mainly focused on Syria, the revolution in its early phase, and the presence of terrorist groups. The IR used less disrespectful language and almost no “did you know” questions with his IEDs in the seven episodes I studied from 2017-2018 where other geopolitical issues were discussed.

My findings suggest possible avenues for future research. First, it would be useful to make a comparison with other broadcast news interviews in Arabic, and with other hosts on Aljazeera and other channels. As it was mentioned, this study does not intend to generalize findings on “The Opposite Direction” to other shows in Arabic or on Aljazeera.

As for the implications of this dissertation, the findings discussed here have implications that are multidisciplinary for Conversation Analysis, Arabic linguistics, cross cultural studies, Middle Eastern studies and Arabic media studies. As for CA, the findings here add to the growing body of literature on institutional talk and broadcast news interviews in particular. Many of the existing studies on broadcast news interviews analyze, describe and compare various ways through which the IRs exert pressure on their IEs. The findings here add three more undescribed practices through which the IR can disaffiliate with his IEDs. The findings also add to studies on affiliation in institutional talk in general and broadcast news interviews in particular. As for Arabic linguistics, this study bridges a gap in and contributes to research on repair and non-repair practices in spoken Arabic. The findings also add to the literature of Arabic diglossia by showing that switching to a spoken variety in institutional talk does not entail switching to less serious topics. And finally, this study adds to studies on media with particular emphasis

on Arabic media. Its findings show that Faisal Alkasim and his show “The Opposite Direction” use different questioning strategies with their IEs that further certain agendas that may incite violence (throwing acid on those who do not share the same ideologies as the IR and the IEF, for instance) in the Middle East. The findings here, however, do not claim to apply to all programs on Aljazeera. They are very specific to “The Opposite Direction” and its host, Faisal Alkasim.

REFERENCES

- Alfahad, Abdulrahman. (2013). A Conversation Analysis of Aggressiveness and Deference in Arabic News Interviews. Unpublished thesis. University of Leeds.
- _____. (2015). Saudi broadcast interviews: Moving towards aggressiveness. *Discourse and Communications*, 1-20.
- Alghathani, S. and Roever, C. (2015). The Development of Requests by L2 Learners of Modern Standard Arabic: A Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(4), 570-583.
- Aljazeera's Mission Statement. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.aljazeera.net/portal/pages/%d8%b4%d8%a8%d9%83%d8%a9-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%ac%d8%b2%d9%8a%d8%b1%d8%a9-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%a5%d8%b9%d9%84%d8%a7%d9%85%d9%8a%d8%a9-%d8%a7%d9%84%d8%b1%d8%a4%d9%8a%d8%a9-%d9%88%d8%a7%d9%84%d9%85%d9%87%d9%85%d8%a9>
- Al-Harabsheh, A.M.A. (2015). A Conversation Analysis of self-initiated repair structures in Jordanian Spoken Arabic. *Discourse Studies*, 17(4)
- Alkasim, Faisal. (1999). "Crossfire: the Arab version." *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 4(3), 93-7.
- _____. (2005). The Opposite Direction: A Program which Changed the Face of Arab Television. In "The Al Jazeera Phenomenon: Critical perspectives on New Arab Media" Mohamed Zayani (eds). pp. 93-105.
- Al Raya. (2002, December 31). Faisal Al Kasim voted best media man for the sixth consecutive year, pp. 14.
- Al-Rojaie, Yousef. (2003). A discourse analysis of interruption, moderator role, and address terms in Arabic and American panel news interviews. Unpublished thesis. Oklahoma State University.
- Alshathry, Talal. (2015). A comparative framing analysis of ISIL in the online coverage of CNN and Al-Jazeera. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Iowa State University.

- Awwad, Julian. (2005). *Al-Jazeera's Discourse of 'Arabness': An Examination of the Discursive Construction of Identity in Talk Show Programming*. Unpublished Thesis.
- Ayish, Muhammad I. (2005). Media Brinkmanship in the Arab World: Al Jazeera's The Opposite Direction as a Fighting Arena. In "The Al Jazeera Phenomenon: Critical perspectives on New Arab Media" Mohamed Zayani (eds). pp. 106-126
- Bassiouney, R. (2006). *Functions of Code Switching in Egypt: Evidence from Monologues*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- _____. (2009). *Arabic Sociolinguistics: Topics in Diglossia, Gender, Identity, and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Benjamins, Trevor. (2012). When Problems Pass Us By: Using "You Mean" to Help Locate the Source of Trouble. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), pp. 82-109.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, pp. 131-146.
- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), pp. 196-213
- Boussofara-Omar, N. (1999). *Arabic diglossic switching: an application of Myers-Scotton's MLF model*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Texas, Austin.
- Boussofara-Omar, N. (2003). Revisiting Arabic Diglossic Switching in Light of the MLF and its Sub-Models: The 4-M Model and the Abstract Level Model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 6(1), 33-46.
- Bouchara, A. (2015). The role of religion in shaping politeness in Moroccan Arabic: The case of the speech act of greeting and its place in intercultural understanding and misunderstanding. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 11(1), 71-98
- Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying Neutrality in Television News Interviews, *Social Problems* 35(4): 474-92.

- _____. (1992). Footing in the Achievement of Neutrality: The Case of News Interview Discourse, in P. Drew and J. Heritage (eds) *Talk at Work*, pp. 163—98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2001). Answers and Evasions. *Language in Society*, 30, 403-42.
- _____. (2002). Disagreements and Third Parties: Dilemmas of Neutralism in Panel News Interviews, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34: 1385-401 .
- _____. (2016). Political Positioning Sequences: The nexus of politicians, issue positions, and the sociopolitical landscape.
- Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. (2002) *The News Interview*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- Drew, Paul. (1992). Contested Evidence in Courtroom Cross-examination: The Case of Trial For Rape. In P. drew & J, Heritage, *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1997). “Open” class repair initiators in response to sequential sources of troubles in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 28(1). 69–101
- Eid, M. (1982). The non-randomness of diglossic variation in Arabic. *Glossa: An International Journal of Linguistics* 16, 54-84.
- Eid, M. (1988). Principles for code-switching between Standard and Egyptian Arabic. *Al Arabiyya* 21, 51-79.
- Eid, M. (2007). Arabic on the Media: Hybridity and Styles. In H. Motzki and E. Ditters (eds.), *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics* (403-434). Leiden & Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.
- El-Nawawy, Mohammed and Adel Iskandar. (2002). *Al-Jazeera: The Story of the Network That Is Rattling Governments and Redefining Modern Journalism*. New York: Westview Press.
- Fisk, R. (2017). If you're wondering why Saudi Arabia and Israel have united against Al-Jazeera, here's the answer. *The Independent*. Retrieved on September 4th, 2017 from <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/al-jazeera-saudi-arabia-israel-policy-terrorism-isis-iran-prince-mohamed-netanyahu-a7885851.html>.

- Ferguson, C. (1959). "Diglossia". *Word*, 15 (3): 325-40.
- Ferguson, c. (1966). "Diglossia Revisited." *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 10(2), 14-34.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Golato, A. Betz, E., Taleghani-Nikazm, C., Drake, V. (forthcoming). Repeated Assessments in German.
- Golato, A. & Golato, P. (2015). Reference Repair in German and French. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 87, 218-237.
- Greatbatch, D. (1988). A Turn-taking System for British News Interviews. *Language in Society*, 17: 401-30.
- Greatbatch, D. (1992). On the management of disagreement between news interviewees. In Drew, P. and John Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings* (268-301). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimshaw, A. (1982). A cross-status dispute in ongoing talk: Conflicting views of history. *Text*, 2, pp. 323-58
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Haeri, N. (1996). *The Sociolinguistic Market of Cairo*. Kegan Paul International: New York.
- Haeri, N. (2003). *Sacred Languages Ordinary People: Dilemmas of Culture and Politics in Egypt*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Harkov, L. (2017). Netanyahu threatens to shut Al Jazeera Jerusalem office. *JPost*. Retrieved on Sept 1, 2017 from <http://www.jpost.com/Israel-News/Netanyahu-threatens-to-shut-Al-Jazeera-Jerusalem-office-500886>
- Hawi, Z. (2015). فيصل القاسم يحاول لملمة أخطاءه وحقده العنصري والتحريض الطائفي لبرنامج الاتجاه المعاكس. Retrieved on 10/01/2018 from <http://www.souriyati.com/2015/05/08/7368.html>
- Holes, C. (1993). The use of variation: A study of political speeches of Gamal Abd Al-Nasir. *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics*, V, 13-45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Holes, C. (2004). *Modern Arabic: structures, functions, and varieties*. Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press.
- Hayano, Kaoru. (2013). Question Design in Conversation. In *Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. pp. 395-414
- Heritage, John. (1985). Analyzing News Interviews: Aspects of the Production of Talk for an "Overhearing" Audience', in T. van Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol.3, Discourse and Dialogue*, pp. 95—119. London: Academic Press.
- _____. (2002) "The Limits of Questioning: Negative Interrogatives and Hostile Question Content", *Journal of Pragmatics* 34: 1427-46.
- _____. (2003) "Designing Questions and Setting Agenda in the News Interview", in P. Glenn, C. LeBaron and J. Mandelbaum (eds) *Studies in Language and Social Interaction: In Honor of Robert Hopper*, pp. 57—90. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- _____. (2012). Epistemics in Action: Action Formation and Territories of Knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45:1-29.
- Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. (1991) "On the Institutional Character of Institutional Talk: The Case of News Interviews", in D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds) *Talk and Social Structure*, pp. 93—137. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heritage, J. and Roth, A. (1995) Grammar and Institution: Questions and Questioning in the Broadcast News Interview, *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 28(1): 1-60.
- Hutchby, Ian. (2006). *Media Talk. Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. Glasgow: Open University Press. Pp. xiii, 185.
- Issa, Saddam. (2010). The persuasive strategies used in "Alitijah Al-mu;akis" TV program. Unpublished thesis. University of Wisconsin.
- Kendrick, Kobin. (2015). Other-initiated repair in English. *Open Linguistics* 1, 164–190
- Kitzinger, C. (2012). Repair. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis* (pp. 229-256). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- Lerner , G. H. (1996b). On the ‘ semi - permeable ’ character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker . In E. Ochs , E. A. Schegloff & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238 – 276). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .
- Maheux-Pelletier, G and Golato, A., (2008). Repair in Membership Categorization in French. *Language and Society*, 37, 689-712.
- Migdadi, F. Badarneh, M. and Abu Abbas, K. (2013). Conflict talk and argumentative strategies in highly adversarial talk show: the case of Al-Jazeera’s the opposite direction. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 9(1): 93–121.
- Miles, H. (2006). *Al-Jazeera: The Inside Story of the Arab News Channel That is Challenging the West*. Grove Press: New York.
- Mufwene, S. (2001). *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1980). Telling My Side: “Limited Access’ as a “Fishing” Device. *Sociological Inquiry*, 50 (3-4), 186-198.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In Atkinson, J.M. and J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1988). Offering a candidate answer: An information seeking strategy. *Communication Monographs*, 55 (4), 360 – 373 .
- Raymond, G. (2003). Grammar and Social Organization: Yes/No Interrogatives and the Structure of Responding. *American Sociological Review*, 68(6), 939-967.
- Robertson Rieschild, V. (n.d.). Emphatic Repetition in Spoken Arabic. Retrieved on May 20, 2017 from <https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitstream/2123/274/1/ALS-20060903-VM.pdf>
- Sayahi, L. (2014). *Diglossia and Language Contact: Language Variation and Change in North Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selting, Margret. 1996. "Prosody as an Activity-Type Distinctive Signaling Cue in Conversation. The Case of So-Called 'Astonished Questions' in Repair-Initiation." In *Prosody in Conversation. Interactional Studies*, ed. by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting, pp. 231-270. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2006). Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language, and the arena in which culture is enacted. In Enfield, N. & Levinson, S. (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality*. London: Berg, pp. 70–96

Schegloff, E. (2007a). *Sequence Organization in Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2007b). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 462-482.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., and Harvey S. (1977). The Preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, (53) 2, 361-382.

Shalash, D. (2009). A Conversation Analysis study of Alignment and Disalignment in Political News interviews. Unpublished thesis. University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign.

Soliman (2008). The changing role of Arabic in religious discourse: A sociolinguistic study of Egyptian Arabic. Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Stivers, T. and M. Hayashi. (2010). Transformative answers: One way to resist a questions constraints. *Language in Society*, 39(1), 1-25.

Stivers, Tanya. 2005. "Modified Repeats: One Method for Asserting Primary Rights from Second Position." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 38 (2), 131-158.

Steensig, J. and Drew, P. (2008). Introduction: questioning and affiliation/ disaffiliation in interaction. *Discourse Studies*, 10 (1): 5–15

Robinson, and Kevoe-Feldman, H. (2010). Using Full Repeats to Initiate Repair on Others' Questions. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(3), 232-259

"The Kurds' Story". Retrieved on July 12th, 2017 from

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/saddam/kurds/>

Vesely, M. (2002, July/August). Al-Jazeera kicks up a sandstorm. *The Middle East*, 325, 10-11.

Versteegh, K. (1997). *The Arabic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilkinson, S. and Kitzinger, C. (2006). Surprise as an interactional achievement: Reaction Tokens in Conversation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 69, 150-182.

Wu, Ruy-Juan Regina. 2006. "Initiating Repair and Beyond: The Use of Two Repeat-Formatted Repair Initiations in Mandarin Conversation." *Discourse Processes* 41 (1): 67-109.

Zimmerman, D. (1992). The Interactional Organization of Calls for Emergency Assistance. In P. Drew & J. Heritage, *Talk at Work*, pp. 418-169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A: CONVERSATION ANALYSIS TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

The following is a list of the transcription conventions based on Gail Jefferson's notation in Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

- [] Overlapping utterances
- = Latching: when there is no interval between adjacent utterances
- (0.2) Timed silence within or between utterances in tenths of a second
- An abrupt cutoff of a word or sound
- : Extension of the sound
- . Falling intonation, e.g. final intonation.
- , Continuing intonation
- ? Rising intonation
- _ Stressed syllable
- ° Quieter than surrounding talk
- CAP Louder than surrounding talk
- ↑↓ Marked change in pitch: upward or downward.
- (h) Aspirations
- (.h) Inhalations
- < > Utterance is delivered at slower pace than surrounding talk
- > < Utterance is delivered at quicker pace than surrounding talk.
- () Unclear hearing
- (()) Comments, details of the scene

APPENDIX B: EXPLANATION OF FOUR LINE TRANSCRIPTION

I present 4 lines of transcript:

1st line is the Arabic, with switches to Dialect Arabic in italics

2nd line is the Romanized Arabic transcription

3rd line is the morpheme by morpheme translation of lines 1-2

4th line is the free English translation

Switches to local Arabic are done in *italics* in the final three lines.