

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. The Present Study and Its Scope**

The television plays a vital role in our life. It does not only pursue the aim of entertaining but also educating people through some socio-cultural programs. Of these programs, news interviews have a significant place because they enable people to catch up on the agenda. Therefore, they are watched by a large number of audiences. Moreover, due to their format regulating conversation in them, news interviews take many conversationalists' attention. Especially, various British and American news interviews have been analyzed to understand this framework better and to put forward the special interaction system they have (Greatbach, 1992; Clayman, 1992 and 2002; Clayman and Heritage, 2002). As for Turkish news interviews, it appears that there are not much research done about it (see Yemenici, 2001). For this reason, Turkish news interviews have been chosen as the research area for this study.

News interviews present a different interaction system in comparison to mundane conversation. This system assigns particular roles to the participants such as either asking questions or responding to them. News interviews do not only differ from ordinary conversation in terms of their unique turn-taking system but also their preference for expressing opposition. In ordinary conversation, stating opposition is a dispreferred act (Pomerantz, 1984 and Sacks, 1987, cited in Kakava, 2002). However, in news interviews, there is an interviewer and at least two interviewees who have opposite ideas on the topic at hand. The interviewer asks questions which invite disagreement between interviewees, and the interviewees disclose their ideas by giving answers to these questions. For this reason, unlike in mundane conversation, expressing opposition that is, disagreement appears as a preferred act in news interviews. In this study, the back bone of news interviews that is, expressing disagreement will be investigated around these questions:

- 1- What are disagreement types used in Turkish news interviews?
- 2- To what extent does the context affect the number of oppositions and types of disagreements?

The research questions show that this study will focus on the discourse in Turkish news interviews as well as their conversational system. Therefore, it can be said that the study makes use of both Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA).

Moreover, in news interviews, participants are supposed to cooperate while disagreeing with each other. They are also expected to be polite while expressing opposing ideas. The study investigates these aspects by drawing upon Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle (CP), Leech's (1983) Politeness Maxims, Goffman's (1967) Face Concept, and Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory. The study provides a literature review for these concepts and explains how they work in news interviews by giving examples. In brief, politeness phenomenon is always considered in each phase of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a survey of previous studies carried out in this area. In addition, information about the institutional character of news interviews is given. Under this heading, lexical choice in news interviews, the roles of interviewers and interviewees and the neutrality term are mentioned. Finally, the organization of disagreement and politeness in news interviews are explained.

In Chapter 3, the methodology of data collection and data processing is explained. In this section, information about news interviews that have been analyzed in this study is also given.

In Chapter 4, an in-depth empirical analysis of disagreement types is done. Illustrative data fragments are given to make the analysis more clear. Besides, expressing disagreement in the data is examined from the point of view of politeness phenomenon.

Finally, in Chapter 5, the main findings of the study are summarized and discussed around the research questions. In addition, suggestions for further research will be given.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Introduction

As a member of society and as being a social character, we need to be aware of the changes and developments, in other words, news around us. The television is only one of and maybe the most prominent means enabling us to get to know the news. The news on TV is presented to us in different formats. Sometimes it is narrated by a spokesperson, mostly a journalist, sometimes they take the form of press conference, sometimes a talk show and sometimes a panel interview.

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 1) get our attention to news interview in their book *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air* and state that news interview is now a common form in which broadcast news is packaged for public consumption. In addition, they see the news interview as an alternative to the traditional narrative or story form of news presentation (*ibid*).

News interviews are getting more and more popular day by day. In USA, they were rare in the 1950s and 1960s. After 1980s, with Ted Koppel's slogan, who was presenting Nightline program at that time, "Bringing people together who are worlds apart", this kind of programs began to appear on TV more often (Clayman, 2002 and Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 299). This is the same in Turkey, too. Especially after 1980s and 1990s, news interviews started to take more place on TV. Now each channel has at least one news interview program on at least one day of the week. To illustrate, "9th Senfoni" on TRT1, "Teke Tek" and "Siyaset Meydanı" on ATV, "32. Gün" on Kanal D, "Cevizkabuğu" and "Alternatif" on Flash TV, "Sözün Özü" and "İskele Sancak" on Kanal 7 and "Manşet" on CNN Türk are some of these programs.

This increase in the number and popularity of news interviews in media has aroused much interest among conversational analysts. Many analysts have primarily focused on the interactional organization, mainly turn-taking system in news interviews (Clayman, 1988 and 1992; Greatbach, 1988, 1992 and 1998; Heritage, 1985; Schegloff, 1989, cited in Fetzer, forthcoming) while some of them have analyzed institutional character neutrality (Clayman, 1988, 1992; Greatbach, 1998, cited in Fetzer,

forthcoming, and Clayman and Heritage, 2002:150-188). Apart from these, Clayman (2001, cited in Leon, 2004) has studied answers whereas Heritage (2002, cited in Leon, 2004) has studied negative interrogatives. Moreover, there are many present studies in that area. Leon (2004) studies the semantic structure of question-answer pairs in French news interview, Weizman (forthcoming) focuses on roles and identities in news interviews in Israeli context, Fetzer (forthcoming) mentions media references in news interviews, Atifi and Marcoccia (forthcoming) deal with the connection between television talks, genre and politics in their studies and Johansson (forthcoming) displays how objects of discourse are co-constructed in the political broadcast interview. In Turkey, news interview analysis is a bare area. There is not much research done related to this field. A well-known study is the one carried out by Yemenici (2001) "Analysis of the Use of Politeness Maxims in Interruptions in Turkish Political Debates".

This chapter investigates the format of news interviews as an institutionalized talk dwelling on the institutional character of news interviewers (henceforth, IRs) and news interviewees (henceforth, IEs), and discusses the organization of disagreement and politeness in news interviews.

## **2.2. The Institutional Character of News Interviews**

Greatbach (1992) states that there are a number of studies dealing with the institutional settings and describe them as "in which the participants use a turn-taking system that restricts the incumbents of particular social roles to either asking and responding to questions" (268). He gives "courtroom examination", "formal classroom lessons" and "news interviews" as examples (*ibid*). Drew and Heritage (1992: 3) oppose the idea of setting. According to them, "the institutionality of an interaction is not determined by its setting" because institutional talk, that is "work related interaction", may also occur at a private home (*ibid*), for example, during a visit of a doctor to a patient at home. Therefore, they urge that it is the participants' professional and institutional identities, which make an interaction institutional (*ibid*: 4). For this reason, Schegloff (1992: 110) prefers to use "context" instead of "setting". With the context he means "a part of social structure" (*ibid*). For him, it is the "courtroomness" of courtrooms which organizes the talk distribution among the participants in a court.

That is why the potential next speakers are not the members of audience but the judge, the attorneys or the witness (*ibid*: 112-113). In sum, in an institutional setting, interaction is carried out through a rigid turn-taking organization (Greatbach, 1992: 268; Schegloff, 1992: 112; Yemenici, 2001: 309; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 13).

Besides these, Drew and Heritage (1992: 21) put forward some features of institutional talk in order to distinguish it from mundane conversation and draw the boundaries for that talk. According to them, first of all, institutional talk is goal-oriented. These goals are restricted by relative conventional form (*ibid*). Johansson (forthcoming) calls the goal as function and delineates the function of news interview as “producing a discussion for the third party, the addressee, the TV audience”. Secondly, institutional interaction may include special and particular constraints on the participants. These are powerful and in some situations legally enforceable constraints (like in courtrooms) (*ibid*: 23-27). It is these constraints which allocate the counsels, teachers, and IRs the duty of asking questions whereas allocating witness, pupils and IEs the duty of responding to the questions (Greatbach, 1992:268; Clayman and Heritage, 2002:13). Thirdly, institutional talk may have its own inferential framework (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 22). For instance, withholding expressions of agreement or affiliation or stating straightforward disagreement may be interpreted as disaffiliative in mundane conversation, but they are not interpreted as impolite in institutionalized settings such as courts, clinics and news interviews (*ibid*: 24).

In order to have a better understanding of the institutional character of news interviews, first one has to know what a news interview is. Drew and Heritage (1992) describe news interview as “interview involving two or more persons holding opposing positions about some issues” (56). A similar definition comes from Clayman (2002). According to him, they are programs involving usually two interviewees who present opposing ideologies and interests.

Blum- Kulka et al (2002) call these programs “political talk shows” and portray them as follows:

The definition of the environment of the political talk show as a context of dispute emerges from its institutional as well as discursive design: institutionally it brings together, for any topical sequence, a group of politicians,

and sometimes experts, representing different sides of the issues on the agenda (1570).

In short, news interviews include an IR, usually a journalist, and at least two IEs having opposite ideas. The IR asks the questions and IEs, mostly politicians or experts in one area, discuss their opinions in lively programs in front of an audience in the studio or in front of TV. Therefore, Clayman and Heritage (2002: 12) define news interview as “a vehicle” for communicating to a mass audience as well as a form of interpersonal communication between IR and IE. Here the role of audience comes forward. In news interview, the audiences are not “eavesdroppers” as in some broadcast interviews or discussions. They are the primary addressees of IEs’ statements (Greatbach, 1992:269; Yemenici, 2001: 309; Johansson, forthcoming).

To conclude, news interviews are different from the talks at home, on the street or at a café between friends. This difference comes from its form and structure (Drew and Heritage, 1992:25). Unlike a casual conversation, in news interviews, participants do not have equal rights to talk. Interaction in institutional settings is asymmetrical (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 47; Weizman, forthcoming; Johansson, forthcoming). It is ruled by a turn-taking system (Greatbach, 1992: 269; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 22; Leon, 2004; Johansson, forthcoming) which determines who speaks, when speaks, etc. News interview will be examined, depending on the studies (Greatbach, 1992; Drew and Heritage, 1992; Yemenici, 2001; Clayman and Heritage, 2002), under three major dimensions of institutional character that is seen in news interviews: lexical choice, turn-taking system and neutrality.

### **2.2.1. Lexical choice**

As Drew and Heritage (1992) state, lexical choice is a “significant way through which speakers evoke and orient to the institutional context of their talk” (29). Hence, it can be said that it is the context which specifies the type of language and the words used while talking. For example, the talks of a doctor to a patient or a lawyer to a judge are different from the talk between friends. While the former ones may include some technical vocabularies, the latter one includes more lay vocabularies. Drew and Heritage (1992) give an example from Heritage and Sefi’s health visitor corpus. The

talk occurs during the first visit of a health visitor to the home of a two-week-old infant in Britain and the extract includes many technical jargons:

- (1) [HV: 3A1:2] \*
- 1 M: And I was able to push her ou:t on my ow::n, =  
 2 HV: =Goo:d.  
 3 M: → And um (0.6) I didn't have an *episiotomy* so:,  
 4 (0.3)  
 5 HV: O::h s[u:per.  
 6 M: [I had a (0.3) tiny little tea:r it wasn't a  
 7 → *perineal* one (0.2) it was a (sort of )=  
 8 HV: =Mm  
 9 M: And um (1.5) but otherwise everything was fi:ne (.) and  
 10 → the *epidural* made it lovely at thee:nd because I was  
 11 able to pu:sh still .hhh but I had no pai:n and it was  
 12 (.) super, it was lo:vely,  
 (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 29).

Like in this example, news interviews also have their own lexical choice. Maybe it will be true to call it as media language. This is clear in Fetzer's (forthcoming) article which is about media references in political interviews. She states that communicative intentions are realized through particular surface structures and "it is the linguistic surfaces which the hearer is confronted with and from which he/she infers the speaker's communicative intention" (Fetzer, forthcoming). Fetzer (*ibid*) claims that "media frame references" are higher in opening sections since they interactionally organize the communicative genre (Clayman, 1991; Fetzer, 2000, 2002b, cited in Fetzer, forthcoming):

- (2) On the Record (20.05.90)  
 IR Good afternoon and *welcome to on the record*. In *today's program* mad cow Disease and *the Minister of Agriculture, John Gummer*, argues his case that Your beef is safe in his hands. Then Labor's answer to the poll tax. What is it? Would you like it? *On The Record* puts the roof tax to the test. Put bluntly, you have something of a credibility problem.  
 (Fetzer, forthcoming)

In the extract above, the IR uses media frame references such as "welcome to on the record" or "today's program" which describe the conversational format. Moreover, the IR mentions the professional status of IE in order to introduce him to the audience. These utterances are peculiar to news interviews.

---

\* See page 35 for transcription conventions

In the closing sections, IRs also announce the program is approaching to its end, for example by saying “one final question” or “let me put this final thought to you” (Fetzer, forthcoming). These are all uncommon in mundane conversation. In addition, the IR thanks to the IEs at the end of the program for participating:

(3) On The Record (13.05.90)

IR *Mister Lamont, thank you for being so straight with us.*

(4) On The Record (20.05.90)

IR *We look forward to seeing how you decide to make it better.  
Jack Cunningham, thank you.  
(Fetzer, forthcoming)*

A similar example can be given from Yemenici’s data:

(5) KANAL D

IR *Teşekkür ediyorum sayın Okuyan teşekkür ediyorum sağolun Sayın Okuyan  
teşekkür ediyorum sağolun.  
(Yemenici, 2001: 326)*

Drew and Heritage (1992: 30) urge that many speakers choose “descriptive terms” in accordance with their roles within an institutional setting. For example, Sacks (1992 [fall 1967]: lecture 11, cited in Drew and Heritage, 1992:30) observes that when persons are speaking as a member of an organization, they call themselves as “we” instead of “I”. In the example below- the IE, FG, is talking on behalf of his party.

(6) [Nightline 10/6/86:CT5]

1 FG: → ... *We don’t like hh (.) uh (.) having::*  
2 → *arguments made which we feel are .hh uh (.)*  
3 *not only not (0.9) contributing to:: (0.3)*  
4 *positive and effective arms control, .hhh*  
5 → *uh but we of course don’t like having people*  
6 → *(0.3) e- misrepresenting: our view of what*  
7 *would constitute (.) effective arms control.*

(Clayman, 1992:188).

Besides, in news interviews, IEs select to use third person singular while referring to a co- IE:

(7) [WAO: 15.2.79]

1 PJ: → I disagree with *Sam Brittan* on a- in a  
2 most (.9 fundamental way about this, (.)  
3 → because (0.2) it may well be so. = *he*  
4 → would arg- *Sam Brittan* would argue from a  
5 monetarist point of vie:w. = But what *Mister*  
6 *Healey* does about the money supply over the  
7 next few months .hhh will... (continues)

(Greatbcah, 1992: 283)

The IE, PJ, uses third person singular (lines 1,3,4) though he is referring to co-IE in front of him. This is because, as a rule in news interviews, IEs direct their responses to IRs, the “default addressee” (Greatbach, 1992:284). All these show that news interviews have their own lexis. This is a character of institutional settings.

### 2.2.2. Turn-taking system in news interview

Turn-taking procedures in the news interview setting display significant differences when compared to those in mundane conversation (Greatbach, 1992: 269; Drew and Heritage, 1992: 25; Yemenici, 2001: 308). This difference comes from the underlying methods of handling turns at talk (Greatbach, 1992: 269; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 13) and the institutional identities of IRs and IEs (Greatbach, 1992: 269). Atifi and Marcoccia (forthcoming) explain this clearly. They state that news interview program should be analyzed as a “subject of negotiations between participants” as well as a “communication cannot settled by external parameters”. This means that it is specific to interactional strategies that construct the ongoing communicative activity in a news interview (*ibid*). While applying their strategies, the participants, the IRs and the IEs, pursue different roles due to the expectations of the discourse pattern (Heritage, 1985, 1998; Heritage and Greatbach, 1991; Greatbach, 1988; Drew and Sorjonen, 1997, cited in Weizman, forthcoming). Weizman (forthcoming) divides these roles into two: social (institutional) roles and interactional roles. Social roles refer to the speakers’ status and activities such as being a politician, a physician, a friend, a colleague, a journalist, etc. (*ibid*). As a rule, these roles are set in the opening of an interview by the IR. The extract below shows this obviously:

(8) New Evening 8.12.91

IR: Now to our Jerusalem studio former *Israeli Ambassador* to the US  
Moshe Arad good evening to you.

(9) New Evening 12.12.91

IR: With us today is *Ha’aretz Journalist*, Natan, Dunevitch, who has  
been writing uh about music, for many years. Good evening to you.

(10) New Evening 9.12.91

IR: Well our last guest is Jacqueline Elharar, uh *mother to eighteen children*,  
she even won an award for that especially since she raised them in  
the menacing shadow of an unfriendly border, in Kiryat uh Shmona,  
good evening to you Jacqueline.

(Weizman, forthcoming)

In the examples above, IEs are introduced with their social roles as politician (8), journalist (9) and a mother who raised eighteen children (10).

On the other hand, interactional roles are related to speakers' rights and obligations within the interaction (Weizman, forthcoming). As stated before, there is an asymmetrical interaction between the participants due to the unequal distribution of interactional roles (*ibid*) "in terms of types of turns, length, turn allocation and the use of address terms" (Heritage, 1985, 1998; Heritage and Greatbach, 1991; Greatbach, 1988; Owsley and Scotton Myers, 1984; Winter, 1993; Drew and Sorjonen, 1997, cited in Weizman, forthcoming). Therefore, IRs establish a role of "report elicitors" for they ask questions whereas IEs "report producers" for they answer IRs' questions (Greatbach, 1992: 269; Yemenici, 2001:309). In other words, it can be said that news interviews are governed by a "turn-taking system" which requires IRs manage, open and close turns (Heritage and Greatbach, 1991:97-98, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 309). The following quotation explains clearly this characteristic of news interview:

The news interview is, first and foremost, a *course of interaction* to which the participants contribute on a turn-by- turn basis, for most part by asking and answering questions (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 13).

On the contrary, in everyday conversation, there is not such a communicative contract that determines "the standard of shape" or "order of phases" (Drew and Heritage, 1992:43); who will speak first and next, how long the participants will speak. As Clayman and Heritage (2002: 21) put it, these are worked out "turn by turn", "moment by moment".

Johansson (forthcoming) expresses that the news interview displays its own type of social relation based on three poles: the IR, the IE and the addressee, the public. According to him, there is an interpersonal relation between the IR and the IE, and their relationship as a whole with the audience. Furthermore, there are relations between the IEs and the public separately (Johansson, forthcoming). Within these poles, the role of audience is different from the others. Although they are the primary addresses of both IRs and IEs, most of the time they do not take active part. For this reason, the turn-

taking system in news interview will be discussed from the points of the roles of IRs and IEs.

### **2.2.2.1. The role of the interviewer in the turn-taking system of news interviews**

The IRs confine themselves to asking questions and keep their “report elicitors” role (Greatbach, 1992: 269, Yemenici, 2001: 309). While doing this, they carry out the basic purpose of news interview which is eliciting information or opinion from “newsmakers, experts or others” to the broadcast audience (Greatbach, 1992: 269). IRs refrain from expressing their own opinions (Greatbach, 1992: 270) and making assessments (Pomerantz, 1984: 57, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 309).

Clayman (2002) also emphasizes the same idea:

Interviewers generally restrict themselves to asking questions, avoid making unvarnished assertions except as prefaces to questions or as attributed to third parties, avoid various responsive actions indicating approval or disapproval with what the interviewee has said.

In all these ways, the IRs try to maintain their neutrality.

The IRs ask questions to “invite interplay between panelists” (Clayman, 2002, Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 327). Yet, as Clayman (2002) states, the questions of this kind appear in a variety of forms. Some of them include simple address terms with a rising intonation (e.g. Senator Dole?). Some of them invite IEs to respond (e.g. How do you respond to the Ambassador’s point?) while some of them invite IEs to agree or disagree (e.g. Do you accept that?). Finally, some of the questions solicit disagreement in particular (e.g. You don’t agree with the Senator, do you?).

At that point, a different characteristic of news interviews comes forward. As a general principle, in ordinary conversations agreement is preferred rather than disagreement. Disagreement is accepted as dispreferred (Pomerantz, 1984 cited in Clayman and Heritage, 2002:303; Sacks, 1973, cited in Leon, 2004). However, in panel interviews disagreement is not a disaffiliative action for panelists are there to disagree (Clayman and Heritage, 2002:303; Leon, 2004). In other words, since the context of argumentation is established in news interviews, agreement is no longer preferred. On

the contrary, contradicting quickly that is, expressing disagreement becomes important (Kotthoff, 1993).

#### **2.2.2.2. The role of the interviewees in the turn-taking system of news interview**

In news interviews, the IEs' role is to answer the questions directed by IRs. Therefore, they are expected to "limit themselves to responses to IR questions" (Greatbach, 1992: 277). Within this constraint, IEs wait for a question from IRs to state their opinions, agreements and disagreements (Cayman and Heritage, 2002: 309). Before asking their questions, IRs employ "an initial prefatory statement" (Heritage and Greatbach, 1991: 99, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 309). These are statements which provide "contextual information and lay the groundwork for the question" (Yemenici, 2001:309). Yet, the IEs do not perceive this information as "transition relevance places where they get the floor" to speak. Instead, they hold back until the IR asks his question (Greathbach, 1988: 410, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 310). Furthermore, IEs do not use back channels such as "mm- hmm, uh- huh" while the IR is talking since they may be perceived as claims for a turn. On the contrary, back channels are generally used in casual conversation, but they do not mean that the speaker wants to get the floor (Yemenici, 2001:310).

On the other hand, while expressing their ideas, IEs address a third party, the IR (Greatbach, 1992: 277) although they are agreeing or disagreeing with a co- IE. This is because "the news interview turn-taking provisions" do not allow parties, the IEs, to respond to one another (Greatbach, 1992:279-280; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 310). However, there may occur departures from the turn-taking provisions. Sometimes IEs do not withhold their statements until the IR addresses a question. They may prefer to initiate their turns before a question has been asked to them (Greatbach, 1988: 418, cited in Yemenici 310; Greatbach, 1992: 282) or the IEs may initiate their turns by interrupting a co- IE (Greatbach, 1992:283) without waiting for him/her to complete his/her statement. That kind of talk is perceived as more direct and rude. Therefore, Greatbach (1988:419, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 311) urges that the IEs may ask for permission when they are going to speak out of turn. Besides, departures from the standard news interview format do not lead in " a complete breakdown of turn-type pre-

allocation” (Greatbach, 1998: 421, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 311) since sooner or later IRs return to the normal framework, for example, by asking their previously intended question or by reminding the IEs the rules of news interview form (Yemenici, 2001:311).

### **2.2.3. Neutrality**

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 151) describe news interviews as “spontaneous and unpredictable events”. They are commonly “broadcast live without the benefit of editorial review” (Clayman, 1992: 163; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 151). As being the authority in news interviews who opens, manages and closes turns, the IR is expected to display a neutral stance (Gretbach, 1992: 270; Clayman, 1992: 163; Yemenici, 2001: 311) by treating the participants in a balanced way (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 322) and by maintaining his/her objectivity through withholding his/her personal opinions, assessments and challenges (Clayman, 1992: 163, 2002; Greatbach, 1992: 268-269; Yemenici, 2001: 311).

The IRs have to keep their neutrality since they pursue the role of report elicitor “who elicits information on behalf of an overhearing news audience” (Yemenici, 2001: 311) not the role of report receiver (Greatbach, 1992: 270). In that sense, the turn-taking system in news interviews helps to maintain the neutrality since it constructs a framework in which IR questions and IEs response to those questions (Greatbach, 1992: 271). Yet, this form of turn-type pre-allocation does not mean that IRs cannot produce assertions, assessments and strongly evaluative statements (Clayman, 1992: 168). It is seen that IRs usually deliver such statements as “an initial prefatory statements” before asking a question (Heritage and Greatbach, 1991: 99, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 309). However, while doing this, IRs shift “footings” (Clayman, 1992: 165). Goffman (1967) uses the concept of footing to explore the nature of involvement and participation in social interaction. According to him, there are different forms and degrees of participation in an interaction. The speakers employ particular “production formats” which load different roles to them such as “animator, author, principal of what is said” (Goffman, 1981, cited in Clayman, 1992: 168).

In news interviews, IRs carry out the role of “animator” in order to “place some degree of distance between themselves and their overtly opinionated remarks” (Clayman, 1992: 168). The most direct way of doing this is speaking on behalf of a third party (Clayman, 1992: 168; Yemenici, 2001: 311; Clayman, and Heritage, 2002: 152). The extract below exemplifies this case clearly:

- (11) [Nightline 6/6/85: 19-20]  
 1 JS: ...And if you look et- simply thuh record in  
 2 thuh low level waste field over thuh last  
 3 fifteen thuh twenty years... thuh record is  
 4 not very good (0.3) an' it doesn't give one  
 5 a cause for optimism.=  
 6 IR: → =You heard what *Doctor Yalow* said earlier in  
 7 → this broadcast *she*'ll have an opportunity to  
 8 → express her own opinions again but *she* seems  
 9 to feel that it is an Eminently soluble problem,  
 10 and that ultimately that radioactive material  
 11 can be reduced, to manageable quantities,  
 12 put it thuh bottom of a salt mine.  
 13 JS: Thuh p\_ thuh point that she was making earlier  
 14 about (.) reprocessing of: thuh fuel rods goes  
 15 right to thuh heart (.) of thuh way a lotta  
 16 people look at this particular issue...  
 (Clayman, 1992: 168; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 152).

In this example, the IR declares that nuclear waste can be managed (lines 9-12); but before asserting the statement, he ascribes it to another co-IE, Dr. Yalow (line 6-8). By means of this, the IRs indicate that “the view points they report originated elsewhere” (Clayman, 1992: 173).

Clayman and Heritage (2002: 153) state that the cited third party needs not to be a specific individual (as in Doctor Yalow). It can be a group of persons such as “Democrats” (in extract 12), a generic or anonymous collectivity such as “people” (in extract 13) or the third party may not be named as in passive voice use (extract 14) (ibid).

- (12) US PBS NewsHour: 22 July 1985: South Africa  
 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... (continues)

- (13) UK BBC Radio Today: June 1993: Bosnian Camps  
 1 IR: → .hhh *People* have used the phrase concentration  
 2 camps: and the Bosnians themselves have used  
 3 that phrase. Do you believe there's any  
 4 justification for that at all?
- (14) UK BBCTV Newsnight: June 1989: Thatcher  
 1 IR: → .hhh *It's been widely reported* that these  
 2 matters' e:are are an:d particularly have put  
 3 .hhh heavy strins on th- your relationship with the  
 4 Foreign Secretary and indeed with the  
 5 Chan:cellor. How would you defi::ne that  
 6 Relationship ( ).  
 (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 153).

It is urged that 85 percent of the time the IRs restrict themselves to asking questions and more than a third of remaining turns, the IRs attribute their statements to a third party while expressing views points (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 154).

Footing shift is an important device which enables IRs to perform their tasks while maintaining a neutral stance. As put forward before, news interview format is different from mundane conversation. As a general principle, expressions of agreement are favored over disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984, cited in Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 303; Sacks, 1973, cited in Leon, 2004). However, news interviews are different. Participants in an interview are there to discuss their ideas; to disagree (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 303) and it is IR's role to generate disagreement between IEs still keeping a neutral posture (Clayman, 1992: 176-177). For this, IR paraphrases previous remarks of one participant and addresses it to a co-participant to get a constructing answer (Clayman, 1992: 176; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 3003). Hence, IRs can generate and maintain a debate without entering it as a participant (Clayman, 1992: 177). Apart from this, footing shift helps the IR defend himself against any critics (Clayman, 1992: 178). The IR presents himself as a "tribune of the people" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 171). That means the IR hides behind the professional journalistic identity who speaks on behalf of the people (Clayman, 1992: 180; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 171).

On the other hand, IR cannot achieve the preservation of the neutrality alone. It requires a collaborative effort on the part of IE as well (Clayman, 1988:480, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 311; Clayman, 1992:180). Normally IEs refute or counter the

animated statements or assessments by IR. While doing this, IEs may cite the same third party whose opinions have been animated by IR (Clayman, 1992: 180-181; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 162) as in the example below:

- (15) US ABC Nightline: 22 July 1985: South Africa  
 1 IR: Reverand Boesak lemme a- pick up a point uh  
 2 the Ambassador made.  
 3 What- what assurances can you give u:s .hh  
 4 that (.9 talks between moderates in that  
 5 country will take pla:ce when it see:ms that  
 6 any black leader who is willing duh talk to  
 7 thuh government is branded  
 8 as the Ambassador said a collaborator  
 9 and is then punished.=  
 10 AB: → =Eh theh- thuh- *thuh Ambassador* has it wrong.  
 10 It's not thuh people who want to talk with  
 11 thuh government that are branded collaborators  
 12 it is: those people .hh who are give powers  
 13 by thuh government that they use in an  
 14 oppressive fashion .hh within thuh township  
 15 that are branded collaborators....  
 (Clayman, 1992: 181; Clayman and Heriatge, 2002: 162).

Other than this, IE may not name a third party in order to preserve the neutrality. He or she may simply refute the disputed viewpoint “without attributing it to anyone in particular (Clayman, 1992: 182; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 163) or the IE may present an opposite idea “without referring to the prior viewpoint” asserted by the IR (Clayman, 1992: 184; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 165).

The institutional character of news interview requires IRs to show a neutral posture. For this reason, they avoid making explicit personal assessments and statements; they shift footings. IEs also collaborate with the IR to keep that neutrality on. They follow a similar way as IRs do.

### 2.3. The Organization of Disagreement in News Interviews

Clayman (2002) depicts disagreement as “an activity framework and an environment for language use” consisting of oppositional negotiation between two participants. Edstrom (2004) agrees with Clayman’s definition. According to her, disagreement is “communication of an opinion or belief contrary to the view expressed by another speaker” and people may express their disagreement via “depending one’s opinion, attacking another’s position or quietly withholding approval”. Kakava (2002)

uses the term “opposition” to explain both verbal and non-verbal oppositional stances from mild disagreements to aggravated ones. Although it is claimed by many linguists such as Pomerantz (1984), Leech (1983) and Sacks (1973) that disagreement is dispreferred and one needs to “minimize disagreement between self and other” in terms of politeness (Goodwin et al., 2002; Kakava, 2002), anthropologists such as White and Watson-Gegeo (1990:3, cited in Goodwin et al., 2002) argue that “interpersonal conflict, disagreements, and moral dilemmas are at the heart of social life”. This idea is also reinforced by many sociolinguists and linguistic anthropologists who have carried out studies on different ethnic groups (Goodwin et al., 2002). For example, Schiffrin (1984), and Tannen and Kakava (1992), find disagreement as a “form of sociability” (Goodwin et al., 2002). Furthermore, Goodwin et al. (2002) asserts that there are arenas like debates and games in which disagreement is expected. Bilmes (1988), Kotthoff (1993), Blum- Kulka et al. (2002) and Kakava (2002) summarize that preference of disagreement is under the effect of culture and context. This means that in some cultures disagreement can be considered as a dispreferred action such as in Western discourse (eg. Brown and Levinson, 1987; Goffman, 1967; Leech, 1983; Pomerantz, 1975, cited in Kakava, 2002) while in other cultures, like Greek, it can be accepted as a form of sociability (Kakava, 2002; Kotthoff, 1993). Besides, in ordinary conversation marking disagreement is dispreferred but in some settings such as focus groups disagreement is “allowable and encouraged” (Myers, 1998). In such contexts where contentious discussion takes place, agreement rather than disagreement is “marked for reluctance” (Bilmes, 1988).

News interview falls into this category in which disagreement is allowed. As noted before, there are two opposing sides in news interviews who are there to discuss their ideas. For this reason, disagreement is inevitable. An investigation done by Leon (2004) indicates that disagreeing answers are much more frequent than agreeing answers (104 against 32) in news interviews. The disagreements in news interviews can be produced “in accordance with turn-taking provisions” and “via departures from the turn-taking provisions” (Greatbach, 1992. 277).

### 2.3.1. Disagreements produced in accordance with the news interview turn-taking provisions

In news interviews, turn-taking system specifies the framework and most of the talk, so the disagreement, occurs within this frame (Greatbach, 1992: 277). IEs restrict themselves to responses to IRs' questions. Therefore, IEs do not produce their disagreement in adjacent turns as in mundane conversation, but produce their disagreements as answers to IRs' questions (Greatbach, 1992: 277). That is, the IE waits for the IR to ask a question which requires him/her to agree or disagree with the idea previously stated by the co- IE. This can be seen in the example below:

- (16) [ WAO: 17.1.80]
- 1 IR: But how does the government (.) curb  
 2 inflation which was a central .hhhh (.)  
 3 plank in its election policy: . =
- 4 PH: =It certainly wa:s and it will be:: a:nd  
 5 what is more the government is determined to  
 6 keep down the increase in the supply of  
 7 money which is the: ma:in determining factor  
 8 which er- concerns prices,  
 9 [that's wha- ]
- 10 IR: → [Mister Radi] ce what' s your answer to  
 11 that.
- 12 GR: → Well of course I don't agree with that.=bu-  
 13 er- as the: the: inflation rate has  
 14 increased by seven per cent since the  
 15 general election.=and .hh much of this in  
 16 fact about five per cent of this is  
 17 directly, hh attributable to what the  
 18 government has done.= The fact that they  
 19 increased....
- (Greatbach, 1992: 278)

Although IEs wait for the IR to ask a question in order to declare his/her disagreement (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 309), this disagreement is not delayed or mitigated, as is the case in ordinary talk (Greatbach, 1992: 279; Yemenici, 2001: 314; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 311). They are not preceded by pauses, repairs or reformulations and the disagreeing particles are not deleted. Instead, they occur right away in the turn (Leon, 2004). Yet, by addressing their talk to a third party, IEs' disagreements are automatically mitigated (Greatbach, 1992: 279; Clayman and Heritage, 2002:310).

### 2.3.2. Disagreements produced via departures from the news interview turn taking provisions

Sometimes IEs depart from the standard question-answer format of news interviews to display their disagreements with a co-IE. Greatbach (1992: 280-283) mentions four main positions in which IEs may do this:

#### 2.3.2.1. Following their responses to IRs' question

If the IR asks a question which does not invite an IE to disagree with a co-IE, the IE may prefer to answer IR's question first and then state his/her disagreement with the co-IE's previous claim (Greatbach, 1992: 280).

- (16) [WAO: 24.1.81] (Simplified)
- 1 IR: Would you want Lord Chalfont would you like  
2 to see .hhh bases built up to to defend  
3 from the arc of the crisis as it were.=
- 4 LC: = Not formal bases in the old sense of Aden  
5 or Singapore: in in the days of the British  
6 presence east of Suez, what I would like to  
7 see: is a strong military and naval maritime  
8 presence by the West in that are,  
9 [.hhhh e:r in- in- in- co-]
- 10 IR: [Which would involve bases wouldn't it]
- 11 LC: Well it wouldn't necessarily require  
12 [a- a ( ) ( ) or] Persian kind of=  
13 IR: [In ( ) or Persia ]  
14 LC: =base. But it requires arrangements with  
15 ( ) perhaps in ( ) .hhh with the:  
16 Kenyans in Mombassa, perhaps with the  
17 → Somalies, .hhh but I want to make a point  
18 about what Peter said. Hhh a- And that is  
19 that surely the the invasion of (.)  
20 Afghanistan has made the whole difference= It  
21 is true as he says that since nineteen  
22 seventy- eight ....(continues)
- (Greatbach, 1992: 280-281)

First, the IE, LC, answers the IR's question (line 14-16) and then returns to what co-IE, Peter, has said. He states that he wants to give answer to Peter (line 17) and asserts his disagreement.

### 2.3.2.2. Prior to their responses to IRs' questions

Unlike the first position, IEs may express disagreement first and then answer IR's question (Greatbach, 1992: 281).

- (17) [AP:22.1.80] (Simplified)
- 1 IR: So in fact the clause has now got  
2 [ two wo:rds ]
- 3 JK: [Now says seri] ous. Y[ es.]
- 4 IR: [s e] rious and  
5 substant[ ial ]
- 6 JK: [Yes] That's right.
- 7 IR: Oonagh what implications from your point of  
8 view=  
9 OM: =mhm=  
10 IR: =does that make,  
11 OM: → I'd like to make my own position clear first  
12 of all. I support the sixty-seven Act. hhhh  
13 and abortion to be allowed on those  
14 particular grounds. .h I don't believe that  
15 we have abortion on request, = still less do  
16 we have abortion on demand..... (continues)
- (Greatbach, 1992: 281-282)

### 2.3.2.3. Following a co- IE's turn

Normally, IEs uphold their agreement or disagreement with a co- IE until the IR addressees a question. However, sometimes they may initiate disagreement without waiting for IR's question (Greatbach, 1992: 282; Yemenici, 2001: 315).

- (18) [WAO: 15.2.79]
- 1 SB: ...and far less on incomes policy hh then  
2 he claims to be:.=
- 3 IR: Do you think the implications of this  
4 document are a (.) tough budget.
- 5 SB Hhh We:ll hh again it is important how  
6 it's presented. I disagree with the idea  
7 hhhh that you have to punish workers for  
8 wage claims.  
. .  
. .  
. . ((13 lines omitted))  
. .
- 22 The most important thing hhh is that Mister  
23 Healey h should stick to his gu:ns.=
- 24 PJ: = [You s] ee  
25 IR: → = [Wel I-]  
26 (.)

27 PJ: → I disagree with- with Sam Brittan on a- in a  
 28 Most (.) fundamental way about this (.)  
 29 because (0.2) it may well be so.=I mean he  
 30 would arg, Sam Brittan would argue from a  
 31 monetarist point of vie:w.=But WHAT Mister  
 32 Healey does about the money supply over the  
 33 next few months hhh will ... (continues)  
 (Greatbach, 1992: 282-283)

As it is seen, the IE states his/her disagreement before the IR asks his question. At a possible completion of co-IE's talk, the IE launches his/her disagreement (line 27)

#### 2.3.2.4. In the middle of co- IE turns

IEs may also express disagreements interruptively, in the middle of a co-IE's turn (Greatbach, 1992: 283).

(18) [LRC: 20.10.80] (Simplified)  
 1 DW: ...the government advertising campaign is .h  
 2 highly irresponsible. .h It's being given  
 3 [u n d e r hug] e ..... (continues)  
 4 TD: [Utter rubbish]  
 (Greatbach, 1992: 283).

Without waiting for the co- IE complete his/her statement, the IE states his/her own ideas (line 4). Usually that kind of talk is more direct and "has negative connotations implying violation of another's right to speak" (Yemenici, 2001: 313). Greatbach (1992) supports this idea, too. He explains that "sequential positioning" that means waiting for IR's question or not and "turn design" that means whether the disagreement is addressed to a third party or directly to the co- IE upgrade the disagreement (Greatbach, 1992: 285-286). On the other hand, Clayman and Heritage (2002: 313) describes this upgrading as escalation from disagreement to confrontation.

#### 2.3.3. Exits from disagreement

As for the exit from disagreements, it is seen that they are not resolved by IEs themselves, but by an IR (Greatbach, 1992: 287-288; Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 320). The IR either shifts topic to another issue or produces a next question on the same topic discussed (Greatbach, 1992: 289). The IR's words in the extract below show this

clearly. In order to end the disagreement between two parties, he brings another issue up (lines 5-6).

- (19) [WW: 6.6.79] (Simplified)
- 1 IR: I shall restrain myself er from  
 2 saying anything about your view of  
 3 Birmingham. .hhhn All right (.) we've got a  
 4 straight disagreement between you on the  
 5 → industrial thing. H *Let me bring something*  
 6 *else up.* (.) For both of you. Hhhh What  
 7 about the civil service? HhhAll these  
 8 permanent secretaries,= you know they are not  
 9 great believers in radical changes and sharp  
 10 departures. And they do seem to have a great  
 11 impact on ministers= As Willie Amrstrong  
 12 said. Hhh Doesn't that worry you Mister  
 13 Cosgrave?  
 14 PC: I th:nk hhh that is an area which in many  
 15 respects is far more important than any  
 16 opposition she may meet from the trade  
 17 unions.... (continues)
- (Greatbach, 1992: 288-289)

All these show that news interview is different from other institutional and everyday talks. This difference comes from its unique format which includes special lexical choice, turn design, neutrality, and organization of disagreements. Yet, due to this format, news interviews can be judged as being impolite talks. In the next part, news interviews will be discussed in terms of politeness strategies.

#### 2.4. Politeness in News Interviews

It has been explicitly noted in previous parts that news interviews differ from casual conversations in terms of their institutional character, that is mainly asymmetric turn taking system, and preference for disagreement. In this part, politeness phenomenon in news interviews will be questioned. While doing this, interviews will be analyzed from the point of view of Grice's Cooperative Principle (henceforth CP), Leech's Politeness Principle (henceforth, PP) and maxims, and Brown and Levinson's (henceforth, B&L) Politeness Theory and face-threatening-acts (henceforth, FTAs).

### 2.4.1 Cooperative Principle

Human communication basically involves two aspects: a speaker and an addressee, and these always have to take each other into consideration and “keep constant track of the other during a conversation” (Östman, 1981: 4). In other words, participants are expected to cooperate with each other in order to have healthy conversation.

While communicating, more is conveyed than is said. For this reason, according to Yule (1996: 36) there must be some basic principles in operation to be able to understand the implied meaning. Thus, the term CP comes forward. Grice (1975) defines CP as follows:

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (cited in Thomas, 1995: 61-62)

Grice (1975) elaborates his CP under “four sup-principles called maxims” (cited in Yule, 1996: 37). These maxims are:

- 1- Quantity
  - a) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)
  - b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
- 2- Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true
  - a) Do not say what you believe to be false
  - b) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence
- 3- Relation: Be relevant
- 4- Manner
  - a) Avoid obscurity of expression
  - b) Avoid ambiguity
  - c) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
  - d) Be orderly

(cited in Yule, 1996:37; and in Thomas, 1995: 63-64)

These maxims present us a reference point on the basis of which we interact with others and interpret what others say. When we look at news interviews from this perspective, we expect IRs and IEs to co-operate with each other and follow these maxims. Yet, as Wardhaugh (1986: 281) states, these principle and maxims characterize ideal exchanges. This means these maxims are not observed in every conversation. Yule’s (1996: 36) example explains this clearly. He mentions a scenario

in which a woman sitting on a bench in the park and a dog lying in front of the bench on the ground. A man comes along and asks the woman whether her dog bites. The woman's answer is "no". Then the man approaches the dog and strokes it. Yet, the dog bites. The man gets angry and says, "you said your dog doesn't bite". The woman answers, "he doesn't" and explains that it isn't her dog. The problem in that situation is that the woman has given less information than expected. In fact, this often occurs in everyday conversation.

Violation of these maxims is also apparent in news interviews. For instance, when IEs do not want to answer a question, they may try to go through it by giving irrelevant or unclear answers. The extract below exemplifies it clearly:

- (20) SHOW TV  
 1 IR İyi akşamlar tanıyor musunuz Abdülkadir Bey bu Hüseyin  
 2 Baybaşın'ı?  
 3 AA Efendim ben önce Diyarbakırlı'yım, Diyarbakır  
 4 milletvekiliyim, ve=  
 5 IR [evet  
 6 AA = Hüseyin Baybaşın de Diyarbakır'lı, Lice'li . Bunu gösteren =  
 7 IR [evet.Tanıyor musunuz=  
 8 kendisini  
 9 AA = fotoğraf ee bir Diyarbakır gecesinde çekilmiş olan bir  
 10 fotoğraf ....  
 (Yemenici, 2001:319).

As it is seen, the IE, AA, avoids giving the required answer because saying the truth will be a threat to his political status. Therefore, he tries to go with irrelevant answers, but the IR asks his question again to get the answer.

Due to these deviations from the conversational maxims, Grice's CP has been criticized by many linguists. B&L (1987: 5, cited in Karatepe, 1998: 18) urge that Gricean maxims do not describe actual patterns of social behavior. Östman (1981) asserts "no ordinary conversation will turn out to be cooperative if the speakers follow the conversational maxims" (37) and he suggests an alternative perspective: constructive view. Grice himself also points out that speakers do not always follow maxims (Thomas: 1995: 64). They may "flout", "violate", or "opt out" of one or two of the maxims (Thomas, 1995: 64; Wardhaugh, 1986: 282). Eggins and Slade (1997: 43) argue that it is difficult to apply Grice's theory to the analysis of natural data. They state that the maxims and the CP do not work in real interaction as it has been put

forward by Grice's theory. That means encounters in a conversation do not always cooperate. Eggins and Slade (1997: 43) maintain that in some situations disagreement makes the conversations go on as it does in news interviews (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 300).

On the contrary, Wardhaugh (1986) declares that interaction is not an "unprincipled" process (283). According to him, "Grice's maxims provide the necessary interpretive framework within which to establish the relevance of utterances to each other" (*ibid*: 283). For this reason, Wardhaugh (1986: 284) suggests that conversation is a cooperative activity in the Gricean sense because speakers and listeners share a common idea about what is happening. The institutional character, neutrality in news interviews, can be given as an example for this. Throughout the news interviews IRs are expected to keep their neutrality. For this, they pursue the role of animator and speak on behalf of a third party rather than express his/her own views. Although, IEs are aware of these, they collaborate with the IR and "cite the same third party as responsible for the previously expressed view" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 162).

In addition, Wardhaugh (1986:288) states that conversation is also a cooperative activity in the sense that it involves two or more parties, each of whom must be allowed to participate. Yet, there must be principles of turn-taking in order to govern who gets to speak first, etc (*ibid*). This is also clear in news interviews. In news interviews, IRs ask the questions and IEs answer them. Furthermore, IEs withhold their speech until IRs properly complete their questions and IRs do not use any responsive actions during IEs talk (Heritage and Greatbach, 1991: 99-100, cited in Yemenici, 2001:310). This shows that IRs cooperate with IEs by not interfering with their talk.

In conclusion, looking at IRs and IEs' roles in the process of realizing a news interview from Grice's (1975) CP will build the present study. Both parties are supposed to follow a fixed format. In order to do this, they need to cooperate. In this sense, violation of maxims may be perceived as a threat to the institutional format..

#### 2.4.2. Leech's Politeness Principle and Politeness Maxims

Leech (1980 [1977], cited in Thomas, 1995: 157) focuses on politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon and interprets it as a strategy or strategies used by a speaker to develop or maintain harmonious relations with others. Yet, one has to know Speech Act Theory so as to understand politeness better. Therefore, initially “speech act” term will be discussed in this part.

Speech act is a “functional unit” in communication (Cohen, 1996: 384). For Blum-Kulka et al. (1989: 2) it is the minimal unit of human communication. Yule (1996: 47) describes speech acts as “actions performed via utterances”. Yet, there may be differences between the utterances and actions. Therefore, Austin (1962, cited in Thomas, 1996: 49; Yule, 1996:48; Cohen, 1996: 384) mentions three kinds of meanings a speech act has. They are “locution (the actual words uttered)”, “illocution (the force or intention behind the word” and “perlocution (the effect of the illocution of the hearer)” (*ibid*). For Searle (1969, cited in Cohen, 1996: 384; Thomas, 1995: 93) also speech acts have “prepositional content (what is said)” and “illocutionary force (what is meant)”. These meanings are also defined as culture and context bound that is, an appropriate speech act in a culture or situation may not be appropriate in another culture or situation (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989: 24). Therefore, use of appropriate speech act requires sociocultural and sociolinguistic knowledge (Cohen, 1996: 388).

Thomas (1996: 157) urges that some speech acts seem inherently impolite. She gives an example of asking someone to stop picking his/her nose. According to her, there is no polite way of asking this in any language (*ibid*). On the other hand, a speech act which is accepted as impolite may perfectly sound polite in a situation (*ibid*: 156). Thomas (*ibid*) gives the example below:

- (21) A married couple are trying to decide on a restaurant. The husband says:  
“You choose” (156)

In the example, the least polite speech act the imperative is seen perfectly polite. Therefore, Thomas (1995: 157) underlines that it is not only the linguistic form that makes a speech act polite or impolite but also the context of utterance and the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. This explanation throws light to a study of the oppositions in news interviews. In casual conversations, disagreement is

regarded as an impolite, a dispreferred speech act (Mey, 1994). However, in news interviews since the aim is to discuss ideas, disagreement is not that much impolite. In contrast, it is IRs' role to initiate and maintain opposite ideas between IEs (Clayman and Heritage, 2002: 300-303). Leech's (1983a: 107-108, cited in Thomas, 1995: 156) definition of speech acts also supports this idea: speech act is "costly to the speaker" or "beneficial to the hearer". In fact, this definition explains Leech's politeness theory obviously:

Minimize (all things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs; Maximize (all things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs (Thomas, 1995: 159).

According to Leech (1983, cited in Yemenici, 2001) "there are some illocutions which are inherently polite and some illocutions which are inherently impolite" (316). Therefore, Leech (*ibid*) distinguishes between two types of politeness. One of them is "positive politeness" which maximizes the politeness of polite behaviors and the other is "negative politeness" which minimizes the impoliteness of impolite illocutions. Butler (1996: 316) criticizes Leech's assumption and states that Leech restricted himself to the study of "general pragmatics". According to Butler (*ibid*), Leech only focused on inherent politeness of particular forms. He excluded relative politeness in particular types of context and gave no account to the relation between politeness and personal tenor. For this reason, Leech's PP could not explain why in certain situations a form with high inherent politeness might be too polite even interpreting as ironic or impolite (Butler, 1996: 172).

Leech (1983, cited in Thomas, 1995: 160 and Yemenici, 2001: 316) offers six maxims in order to "explain the relationship between the sense and force in human communication". They are Tact maxim, Generosity maxim, Approbation maxim, Modesty maxim, Agreement maxim and Sympathy maxim (*ibid*). The Tact maxim minimizes cost to other and maximizes benefit to other; the Generosity maxim minimizes benefit to self and maximizes cost to self; the Approbation maxim minimizes dispraise of other and maximizes praise of other; the modesty maxim minimizes praise of self and maximizes dispraise of self; the Agreement maxim minimizes the disagreement and maximizes the agreement between self and other; the Sympathy maxim (The Pollyanna maxim in Thomas, 1995 166) minimizes antipathy

and maximizes sympathy between self and other (Leech, 1983, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 316-317; Thomas, 1995: 160-166). Leech's politeness maxims observe an ideal human communication. They try to create an atmosphere of solidarity, express approval and agreement and they offer "reassurance and encouragement" (Yemenici, 2001: 335). Yet, this is not the case all the time. To illustrate, in news interviews these maxims are violated not because the participants are impolite but because of the format. In news interviews, there are two opposite sides. They have to defend their ideas until the end of the program. While doing this, they cannot praise the other side and dispraise themselves. Thus, they violate Approbation maxim and Modesty maxim. Furthermore, during the debate, IEs utter words which can pose a threat to the other side but a benefit to themselves or IRs may ask questions which maximizes cost to the IE. That is, the Tact maxim and Generosity maxim are violated. Finally, since the parties are there to discuss their ideas, the Agreement maxim is also violated. IRs do this via asking questions which interplay disagreement between the IEs and by IEs via presenting opposite ideas to the co- IE. Yemenici (2001) supports all these in her analysis of politeness maxims in Turkish TV debates and gives many examples:

(22) KANAL D

1	YO	Şimdi tabi önce Sayın Perinçek'in deminki açıklamasını
2		kısa bi u cevap vermek istiyorum. ....Doğu Perinçek
3	→	<i>beni mazur görsün ama yani Mesut Yılmaz'a suikastını</i>
4		<i>ben önledim şeyi biraz fazla iddialı bir söz olarak</i>
5		geldi, ıı pek
6	DP	[peki evet olabilir tabii yani o insanlar açıklayacak Yaşar
7		Bey yani o bu v v görevi almış bu görevi almış bu görevi=
8	YO	[tabi hayır yani şey olarak söylüyorum hayır ben ben
9		bişey söylemiyorum teşekkür ettim,
10	DP	=ver bu normal bunda bi ütünlük yok ya size de birisi
11		gelse Doğu Perinçek'e suikast yapmak için bana
12		görev verdiler dese, siz bunu önlediğiniz zaman
14		diil mi?

(Yemenici, 2001: 328)

In the extract above, the IE, YO, downgrades DP's explanation by expressing doubt about it (lines 3-4). Thus, he violates the Generosity maxim because he maximizes benefit to self. On the other hand, by downgrading DP's words, YO invites a disagreement covertly. In that sense, he violates the Agreement maxim.

Yemenici (2001:335) states that there is a correlation between the level of impoliteness and the number and kind of maxims being violated. In other words, the more maxims are violated, the higher the level of impoliteness is.

In Turkey, there is a rating struggle between TV channels and even between the news programs. Therefore, IRs try to turn their programs into heated debates to capture a large number of audience and increase their ratings. As a result, news interviews may contain expressions and interpretations which can be referred to as impolite and rude due to the breach of some or all maxims of politeness with the aim of saving faces (Yemenici, 2001: 335), but on the other hand threatening other's faces.

#### **2.4.3 Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory and Face-Threatening Acts**

As it has been said previously, participants in a conversation, that is IR and IEs in a news interview, may violate politeness maxims in order to save their faces. At that point, face work comes forward which is a basic notion in B&L's politeness theory (Meier, 1995; Ji, 200; Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998; Bou-Franch and Graces-Conejos, 2003; Fukado and Asato, 2004; Kasper, 1990; Snow et al., 1990; Pizziconi, 2003; Miller, 2000; Thomas, 1995: 168; Yemenici, 2001: 317). The concept of "face" was first proposed by Goffman in 1967 (Thomas, 1995: 168; Heisler et al., 2003) and he defined "face" as:

... the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contract. Face is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes- albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself (Goffman, 1967:5)

For Goffman "face" is much more than verbal behavior (1967:7) and within politeness theory it is best understood as "every individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image" which can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others (Thomas, 1995: 169). Therefore, one shares responsibility for the maintenance of one another's face (Shiffrin, 1996: 311). Bargiela-Chiappini (2003) looks for new insights for old concepts in her article and criticizes Goffman's ideal social actor who is based on "a Western model of interactant, almost obsessively concerned with his

own self-image and self preservation” (*ibid*). In addition, Chinese linguist Mao (1994, cited in Ji, 2000) and Japanese linguists Matsumoto (1988) and Ide (1989, cited in Pizziconi, 2003; and Fukada and Asato, 2004) criticize B&L’s Politeness Theory for their interpretation of the concept of face.

Heisler et al. (2003) urge that speakers are aware that what they state has the potential to reflect negatively or positively “on their self-presentation- or face- as well as on the face of those with whom they interact”. These words explain why “face” concept is significant in politeness and a basic notion in B&L’s politeness theory.

According to B&L (1987, cited in Lidia, 2004: 15), face is a human desire that influences human interaction. The face has two aspects: positive face and negative face (Thomas, 1995: 169; Yule, 1996: 60; Meier, 1995; Muntigl and Turnbull; 1998; Pizziconi, 2003; Bou-Franch, Garce-Conejos, 2003 and Lidia, 2004:15). Positive face displays the desire to be liked, approved, appreciated, understood and respected by others whereas negative face displays the desire not to be impeded or put upon to be able to act freely (*ibid*). Thus people communicate in order to “save” face by using strategies that address either positive or negative face (Lidia, 2004:15). However, there are many communicative acts which are likely to threaten or damage another person’s face. These acts that can cause “loss” of face are called face threatening acts (FTAs). A great number of speech acts are possible FTAs. For instance, orders, requests, suggestions and reminders are threats to hearer’s negative face while criticism, disagreement and expressions of violent emotion are threats to hearer’s positive face (*ibid*). There are also speech acts which can potentially pose as a threat to the speaker’s face such as thanking, offering excuses, accepting thanks and apologies (*ibid*). However, the weight of a FTA is not stable; it changes depending on three factors: the social distance (D) between the speaker and the hearer, the power (P) relation between the participants, and the rank of imposition (R) (Lidia, 2004: 15; Thomas, 1995: 169; Bou-Franch and Garces-Conejos, 2000; Meier, 1995 and Snow et al., 1990). In other words, these are factors assesses the force of a speech act and determine whether it is polite or not.

News interviews are full of FTAs. The most prominent of them is disagreement. According to Rees-Miller (2000), Kaufman (2002), Muntingl and

Turnbull (1998) and Georgakopoulou (2001), disagreements are threats to positive face because they express disapproval of another person, and threaten the desire to be liked and appreciated by others. On the other hand, Culpeper et al. (2003) proposes an impoliteness theory and according to his theory, disagreement is a positive impoliteness. This is because it damages the addressee's positive face wants. Yet, Georgakopoulou (2001) emphasizes the importance of context and states that in contexts which present a specialized turn-taking system as in news interviews it is normal to see such FTAs. Accordingly, the news interview's question-answer format includes many FTAs (Jucker, 1986, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 317). According to Jucker (*ibid*), there are twelve ways for IRs to threaten IEs' faces during an interview. Yemenici (2001) counts some of them as follows:

The IRs may ask the IEs to confirm their opinions with the presupposition that they demeaning; to accept discrepancy between their opinions and actions and between their opinions and reality; to take responsibility for the action they performed with the proposition that is demeaning; to justify the action they are believed to be responsible for; to state that the other party's face is demeaning and to accept that their own face is demeaning (Jucker, 1986:77, cited in Yemenici, 2001: 317).

Due to the format of the news interviews IRs ask questions. It is their role. Yet, each question is a potential threat to IEs' negative face since they are attacks to their independence.

Considering all these, politeness from B&L's point of view can be conceptualized as strategic conflict avoidance which tries to counter balance the disruptive effect of a FTA through a series of redressive actions (Kasper, 1990). This leads to a correlation between politeness and FTAs. Ervin-Trip et al. (1990) propose this correlation as follows: politeness increases as threats to face increases. This means more FTAs require more politeness strategies to handle them. For this reason, B&L identify some strategies in order to minimize the degree of a FTA (see Thomas, 1995: 169-175, Bou-Franch and Garces-Conejos, 2003). The speaker chooses among the strategies considering three factors explained before: D, P, and R. For example more direct disagreement strategies are used when there is less social distance between the speaker and the hearer, when the speaker has greater power than the addressee and

when the rank of imposition is less (Rees-Miller, 2000). When the social distance factor is considered, it is expected to see less number of occasions of direct disagreements in news interviews. Yet, this is not the case. Disagreement is explained straightforwardly in news interviews (Greatbach, 1992: 279). However, it is still possible to minimize the severity of disagreement by using some strategies. Rees-Miller (2000) suggests some of them as follows: expressing partial agreement, making positive comment and humor, and using first person pronouns (we/us).

Yemenici (2001:335) states news interviews in Turkey present a competitive nature displaying both positive and negative politeness. Yet, when the participants begin to attack one another's face in order to save their own, news interviews become conflictive. This situation leads to an impolite and rude interaction.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Data Collection

The data were collected by recording news interviews on Turkish TV channels: “Flash TV” and “Kanal 7”. A TV card loaded on a computer was used for recording and the whole programs were kept at its hard disk for the transcription. The news interviews were also recorded on CDs in the video format for any risk of losing the data. The corpus included approximately seven hours of recording, amounting to 61.500 words and 1984 turns.

The news interviews analyzed in present study were “Ceviz Kabuğu”, “Alternatif” and “Sözün Özü”. So as to understand the data better, each news interviews was described in detail below:

#### *“Ceviz Kabuğu”*

It was broadcast on 16th July 2005 on Flash TV after the terrorist attack in London. There were one interviewer and six interviewees. Two of them were at the studio and four of them participated in the program by telephone for some time. Thus, they were not permanent speakers. The topic was “universal terrorism” and the interviewees discussed it for about 217 minutes. This program provided more than 30.000 words of the corpus and 1073 turns.

When compared to the other programs, “Ceviz Kabuğu” showed some differences. First of all, in this program the interviewer acted like an interviewee by not withdrawing his disagreements. Secondly, due to the discussion topic, most of the time the interviewees were on the same side, supporting similar ideas. Yet, they were either against the practices carried out or general beliefs. As a result, the variety of disagreements amongst the interviewees was limited in comparison to that of other two programs in the corpus.

*“Alternatif”*

It was broadcast on 31st July 2005 on Flash TV. There were one interviewer and three interviewees one of whom participated in the program through telephone from the beginning to the end. The topic was Vahdettin, one of the Sultans of the Ottoman Empire. The parties argued over whether Vahdettin was a traitor or a patriot. Of three news interviews, this was the most heated debate. Although it was the shortest interview (88 minutes; 13.974 words and 551 turns), it included a large portion of disagreements.

This news interview was also different from the others owing to interviewer’s incapability of managing the discussion. Throughout the program, one of the interviewees appeared to be the dominant one and to violate other interviewees’ rights to speak. For this reason, interviewees often stated their oppositions to the format of the program and the interviewer’s apparently inefficient management skills.

*“Sözün Özü”*

This news interview was on Kanal 7 and was broadcast on 14th December 2005. This program involved one interviewer and four interviewees. Two of the interviewees were at the studio while the other two participated in the debate via cable connection. The discussion topic was “micro” and “macro” identities in Turkey. It lasted for approximately 122 minutes and comprised of over 17.000 words (360 turns).

In comparison to others “Sözün Özü” was the news interview which was closer to the format presented in the literature review. It supplied many examples of disagreements.

### **3.2. Data Processing**

First, written transcriptions of recordings were produced in order to represent the data for the analysis. Yet, as Psathas and Anderson (1990, cited in Yılmaz, 1998) point out that there cannot be an accurate and a neutral presentation of a conversation. In other words, it is almost impossible to give the reader a full sense of the actual context.

In this study, a simplified version of the Jefferson's Transcription System (1974, cited in Yılmaz, 1998) was used. The conventions used to transcribe the data were the followings:

//	: indicates the start of an overlapping speech
=	: indicates no pause between speakers' turns or words uttered by the same speaker
(.)	: indicates noticeable pauses
(.2)	: indicates timed pauses
:	: indicates stretching sounds
-	: indicates a sharp cut off
(h)	: indicates laughter
.hh	: indicates in-breath
hh	: indicates out-breath
°...°	: indicates quiet speech
((...))	: indicates words impossible to write phonetically (e.g. sobbing)
Underlining	: indicates vocal emphasis
Capitals	: indicate louder speeches
(incomp)	: indicates incomprehensible speeches
(.....)	: indicates unclear talk
....	: indicates that there preceding or following utterances
→	: indicates a particular word or a sentence

In the transcription, "IR" was used to represent the interviewer and the first letters of their names and surnames were used to represent the interviewees (e.g. KM represents Kadir Mısıroğlu).

Secondly, oppositions done in the data were identified and counted for each news interview. Thirdly, within these oppositions, disagreements were picked out and they were analyzed for creating categories. This means that disagreement categories used in the analysis were not determined beforehand. The data shaped it. After deciding on categories, each disagreement was examined in-depth in order to detect their types. In the analysis, politeness phenomenon was taken into consideration, too. Finally, the

total number of disagreements that occurred in each category defined was calculated for every one of the programs.

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS

#### 4.1. Introduction

Kakava (2002) describes opposition as “both verbal and non-verbal oppositional stance issued to an antecedent verbal or non-verbal” (1538). She states that opposition can take different forms. Some oppositions may be mild disagreements, some of them may be aggravated ones and some oppositions can be seen through silences (*ibid*). For some linguists such as Pomerantz (1984) and Sacks (1987; cited in Kakava, 2002; Leon, 2004) opposition is a dispreferred act since it attacks to addressee’s face while for some others like Schiffrin (1984), Katriel (1986, cited in Kakava, 2002) and Katthoff (1993) however stating opposition is a means of socialization. In other words, it is a preferred act.

One of the contexts in which opposition is employed very often is the news interview. Due to its format, in news interviews opposition is not a dispreferred action because participants are there to discuss their opposite ideas. Therefore, news interviews are full of oppositions done by both IRs and IEs.

According to the data analysis of the present study IRs mostly oppose IEs:

- 1- to maintain the format (especially when the IEs talk at the same time),
- 2- to change the speaker,
- 3- to return to main topic (when talk out of discussion topic occurs)
- 4- to do correction
- 5- to disagree with the IEs. In fact IRs’ disagreement to IEs’ statements and opinions is against the format because they are expected to keep a neutral stance.

On the other hand, the data shows that IEs oppose a co-IE mostly:

- 1- to get the floor or not to leave the floor,
- 2- to do correction and
- 3- to disagree.

The table below shows the number of oppositions occurred in the data collected.

Table 1: Number of Oppositions in News Interviews

<b>Name of the Program</b>	<b>The Number of Oppositions</b>	<b>The number of Disagreements</b>
Ceviz Kabuđu	322	251
Alternatif	290	207
Sözün Özü	211	171
Total	823	629

Out of 823 oppositions, disagreements take the largest portion. In “Ceviz Kabuđu” 251 (78 %) oppositions are disagreements. In “Alternatif” 207 (71 %) oppositions are disagreements and in “Sözün Özü” disagreements are 171 (81%). In total, 629 (76.4 %) oppositions have been done to express disagreement. These results show that like in Kakava’s (2002) work done on everyday speech; disagreements in news interviews serve as a “ritualized form of opposition”. For this reason, disagreements will be at the center of this analysis and they will be examined in order to give answers to these questions:

- 1- What are disagreement types used in news interviews?
- 2- To what extent does context affect the number of oppositions and type of disagreement choice by speakers?

#### **4.2. Types of Disagreement**

As noted before, stating opposition to others is at the heart of social life. Therefore, it has taken many linguists’ attention. For instance, Goodwin et al. (2002) examined disputes in children games, Myers (1998) in focus groups, Kangasharju (2002) in committee meetings, Greatbach (1992) in news interviews and a great deal of studies have dwelled on the opposition in everyday conversation (Kakava, 2002; Rees-Miller, 2000; Muntigl and Turnbull; 1998 and Georgakapoulou, 2001). All these studies have analyzed disagreement from a different perspective in order to understand its form and function better.

In this analysis, disagreements will be classified and examined according to their structural characteristics and pragmatic functions as in Muntigl and Turnbull’s

work (1998). For this reason, their classification system will be employed in the analysis of the data. Yet, there are differences. Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) examined mundane conversation at exchange structure level which they have called “arguing exchange”. In this structure, speaker A in turn 1 (T1) makes a claim that is disputed by speaker B in T2, and then speaker A in T3 disagrees with speaker B’s T2 claim by either supporting the original T1 claim or directly contesting the T2 disagreement. This structure is not so obvious in news interviews because speakers’ talk is up to a turn allocation system. That is, IEs do not talk whenever they want; they wait for a question from the IR to express their ideas. As a result, opposition may not occur just after a co-IE’s claim and they may wait for the end of a long turn of a co-IE or more than one co-IE. Therefore, the opposition in this study will not be examined at exchange structure level since it is possible for a speaker to state a disagreement after many turns against a view already expressed by a co-IE. Moreover, there may appear more than one disagreement in a turn. For this reason, a topic-based approach will be used. Disagreements related to a single topic will be counted as one occurrence of disagreement. When the topic changes, the disagreement in this topic will be treated as another occurrence of disagreement. Considering all these, disagreements in news interviews will be analyzed under five main categories; namely irrelevancy claims, challenges, contradictions, counterclaims and act combinations.

#### **4.2.1. Irrelevancy Claim (IRC)**

Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) describe IRCs as “meta-dispute-acts” that comment on the conversational interaction”. In this analysis, any utterance which asserts that the previous claim is not relevant to the discussion at hand, will be put under the category of IRC. IRCs vary widely in form. Some of them are explicitly stated through using oppositional markers and some of them are more indirect and done through hinting.

Consider the following example of IRC in (1):

(1) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	IR		//evet Yavuz Bey devam edin
2	YE		işte dediğim gibi sayın Mısıroğlu ne diyosa doğrudur
3			başkalarının //söylediği de yanlıştır böyle böyle görüş=
4	IR		//evet (.) Erdoğan Bey sanıyorum bu noktada
5			söyliyecek
6	YE		=olmaz böyle düşünce olmaz böyle tartışmada aslında
7			olmaz şimdi bir Atatürk niye Cumhuriyeti kurdu neden
8			milleti e: kul iken millet yaptı Türkleri (.2) neden işte bize
9			bu hakkı tanıdığını ve ülkemizi işgalden kurtardı (.2)
10			diyemiyenler Vahdettin'in kahramanlığına ulu hakanlığına
11			işte sarılıyorlar //o yolla işte dolaylı olarak bunu =
12	KM	→	// hiç alakası yok
13	YE		= milletin kafasına sokmaya çalışıyorlar (.) bunlar
14			işte yeni Osmanlıcı um e: zihniyeti zihniyetinin eseri

YE and KM are arguing about Sultan Vahdettin, whether he is a traitor or a patriot. KM claims that Vahdettin is a patriot and YE is against this idea. He states that those who do not approve Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his revolutions such as founding a republic, in other words those who are still in pursue of a regime based on religious principles want to assign the Sultan a status of hero. KM disagrees with these claims and says “hiç alakası yok”. KM emphasizes the irrelevancy of the claim in his reply by using “hiç” and “yok” oppositional markers. These markers make the disagreement statement explicit. In addition, KM does not cooperate with the co-IE, YE because he expresses his disagreement during YE’s turn as a backchannel. This is an attack to the co-IE’s right. Yet, KM does not get the turn with that interruption. Therefore, the effect of backchannel is not that much high.

(2) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG		//hayır (.2) şu var bakın benim için şu var (.) siz başka
2			bi şey söylediniz (.) benim (.) kimsenin kendini (.) e: başka
3			kimlikle (.) tanımlamasına hiçbir itirazım yok dedim bunu
4			özellikle vurguluyorum (.) dileyen kendini ben Kürdüm desin
5			(.) e: Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı olarak resmi işlemlerini
6			yapsın böyle de tanımlamasın isteyen Türkiyeliyim desin her
7			ne derse desin (.) ama (.) e: bu ulus kendi kimliğini (.) o
8			insanları mutlu edecem anlayışıyla (.) kendi kendini niçin
9			inkar etsin kendi kendini (.) //niçin yok varsaysın
10	GG		//e ben de bunu anlamıyorum
11			zaten nasıl inkar etmiş olur ben Türk Türk olarak kalıcım (.)
12			o da Kürt olarak kalıcak ve biz Türkiyelilik //kimliğinde=
13	UG		//e ben bakın

14 GG → =birleşicez bunun benim (.) Türklüğümü //inkar etmemle (.)  
15 → *ne ilgisi var*

In this example UG and GG are talking about the terms “micro identity” which refers to each nationality living within the borders of a country and “macro identity” which refers to a general nationality label of the country comprising all sub identities. UG is against the term micro identity because he thinks that this is a demand from Turks to deny their identities. According to GG, this idea is not valid so she asks “ne ilgisi var” in order to express her disagreement. She emphasizes the irrelevancy of the idea by asking a question. Here the word “ilgi” is important because it displays that the claim is not relevant. Moreover, when the extract is analyzed, it is seen that GG starts her turn without waiting the end of UG’s turn. This overlapping decreases the level of politeness.

Some of the IRCs may not include oppositional markers or they may not be in the form of interrogative. They may be simple utterances having an exclamation meaning:

### (3) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1 IR =ama bakın //sizin bu söylediğinize karşı şunu =  
2 ÜÖ //bakın bunlar neden  
3 IR = söylüyorlar ben hemen söyleyeyim de (.) bu kimliğini  
4 ön plana çıkararak (.) e: değil (.) bu kimliğini gizliyerek  
5 ÜÖ ha//yır  
6 IR //ancak belirli makamlara gelebiliyor=  
7 ÜÖ =şimdi bakın bu kimliğini gizliyerek değil Türkiye  
8 Cumhuriyeti kimliğiyle gelirsiniz zaten belirli makamlara  
9 IR ama //yani ben  
10 ÜÖ //yani TC vatandaşı olmadan bi yere gelmezsiniz (.)  
11 mesela (.) e: (.) Ergenekon’dan buraya bir Türk gelse (.) çıkıp  
12 (.) eğer (.) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı değilse  
13 //hiç bi şey olamaz di: mi (.) mesele o zaman (.) ırk=  
14 IR → //o başka  
15 ÜÖ =bazlı mesele değil bir

In this example, IR and ÜÖ are arguing about the rights that Kurdish and Turkish people have. ÜÖ claims that it is not something to do with being Kurd or Turk but it is about something to be a citizen of this country and gives the example of a Turk coming from Ergenekon. IR disagrees with ÜÖ’s example and with the word “başka”, he means that what has been said is not relevant to the topic being discussed. As a

result, it can be said that IR states his disagreement through an IRC. This IRC is also stated in the middle of a co-IE's turn as a backchannel.

Some IRCs can be done more indirectly as in (4).

(4)ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	YE	.... di//ğer bir konuy ise e: e: (.) Őu Atatürk yıldırım=
2	KM	//canın saęolsun
3	YE	=orduları komutanı iken (.3) Adana'da o sırada e
4		İskenderun İngilizler tarafından işgal edilmeye haz
5		hazırlanıyo İngilizler (.2) //İskenderu'nu işgal=
6	KM	//(incomprehensible)
7	YE	=etmeye çalışıyolar onun için hazırlık //yapmaya=
8	KM	→ //nası profesörsün be
9	YE	= yapıyorlar ve (.2) Atatürk (.2) de kendi birliklerine
10		İngilizler Őehre girdięi takdirde yani oraları işgal etmeye
11		kalkıŐtıęı takdirde karŐılık verilmesini (.) emrediyor ....

In this extract, with disagreement expression “nası profesörsün be” KM implies that YE's claims are irrational. In other words he makes an IRC to express his disagreement. This disagreement also occurs as a backchannel. However, this IRC is more aggravating than others because as Rees-Miller (2000) states, disagreements become more severe when they threaten the personal or professional identity.

#### 4.2.2. Challenge (CH)

According to Labov and Fanshel (1979, cited in Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998) and Krainer (1988, cited in Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998), challenge is “any negative thought, attitude or action that a speaker attributes to an addressee”. In this paper, challenge is treated as a certain type of disagreement through which a speaker expresses his/her disagreement in an indirect way. In challenge, a speaker implies his/her disbelief to the claim uttered by the other party by questioning its validity and demanding more evidence. Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) state that CHs are usually in the interrogative form as in the examples below:

(5) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	GG	=kimlięini le e: (.) Kürt kimlięini benimsemesinden ve
2		onlarla Türkiyelilik kavramında birleŐmekten (.) hiç
3		bir mahsur görmem bu beni ne mutsuz eder ne bi
4		//Őey eder

5 UG //bakın e:  
 6 ÜÖ siz buluşabilirsiniz (.) //bunda bi sakınca yok  
 7 UG //ben de size şunu söylüyorum  
 8 //büyük çoğunluk olarak  
 9 GG → //hayır yani bunda altmış milyonun mutsuzluğuna sebep  
 10 olacak *ne var bunda* onu soruyorum

(6) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1 EG şimdi bizimkiler tabi bu kadar yani (.) bunlara ben  
 2 tabi çok kaba konuşurum da (.) a.zım bozuldu tabi ben  
 3 eskiden (.) çok efendi bi çocukmuşum (.) a:zım bozuldu  
 4 nedense bilmiyorum (.) şimdi bu kadar (.) bu kadar da  
 5 yağcılık olmaz (.) şimdi biz biliyoruz bir yetkili giderken  
 6 soruyor (.) bizim kestaneci arkadaşlar dinliyorlar giderken  
 7 diyor ki (.) saygı duruşu saatini toplantıya ayarlayın  
 8 ha diyor (.) önemli bir yetkili (.) değerli değil önemli  
 9 IR tersini demek istediniz herhalde (.) saygı duruşunu  
 10 toplantıya değil de toplantıyı saygı duruşuna  
 11 //bütün dünya aynı saatte olduğu için  
 12 EG //yani saygı duruşu saatini öyle ayarlayın ki toplantı  
 13 saatine gelsin (.) kamaralar orda bi bizde aya: (.) aya:  
 14 → kalkalım (.) şimdi *ne demek lazım buna*

In (5), again the topic is sub identities in Turkey. ÜÖ urges that accepting sub identities make Turkish people unhappy. GG expresses her disagreement by asking a question “altmış milyonun mutsuzluğuna sebep olacak ne var bunda”. This question is a rhetorical one which does not look for an answer. It shows that GG does not share ÜÖ’s ideas.

In (6), EG and IR are talking about people who paid their respects with one minute silence following the explosions in London. One of the authorities in Turkey wants to make the meeting at the time of one-minute silence to be video recorded. EG criticizes this and asks “ne demek lazım buna”. The form of both oppositions in (5) and (6) are the same. They both have been asked through wh- questions. Yet, the disagreement in (6) is somewhat different in comparison to (5). In (5), GG’s disagreement is to the co-IE’s idea. However, in (6), EG’s disagreement is to the situation. He evaluates something done by an authority figure and states his disagreement to his behavior. Both disagreements have been uttered without waiting for the end of co-IE’s turn. Yet, (6) is less face threatening than (5) because the IE, EG

has given a short pause and used a preface marker “şimdi” before stating his disagreement. These have mitigating effects on disagreements.

CH may also be done with a yes/no question:

(7) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	ÜÖ	e: şimdi karşımızdaki sorun (.) bir etnik (.) sorun bir
2		etnik çatışma değil çünkü sosyoloji (.) kitaplarına baktığımız
3		zaman (.) tanımlar çok net ortada (.) peki sorunu nasıl gördü
4		bazı (.) e: Türk aydınları mesela sayın Göktürk de onlardan bi
5		tanesi (.) bir demokrasi ve insan hakları sorunu olarak gördü
6		(.) bu iyi niyetli bi yaklaşımdı ve (.) daha fazla demokrasiyle
7		(.) üniter devlet (.) yapısı içersinde (.) bu sorunun (.)
8		aşılacağını Türk halkına anlattılar (.) e: bi noktaya gelindi
0		.
		.
		.
		.
21		aydınlarımızın bu çıkış noktası yanlıştı (.) çünkü onlar
22		demokrasi ve insan hakları sorunu diye meseleye yaklaşırken
23		(.) Türkiye’deki Kürtçü partilerden bir tanesinin liderinin (.)
24		Avrupa (.)e: birliği üyesi ülkelerin liderlerine yazdığı
25		mektupta şunu görüyoruz yirmi dokuz (.) on bir iki bin dört
26		tarihli mektup (.) Kürt sorunu bir demokrasi ve insan hakları
27		sorunsalı değil (.) siyasal temsil ve (.) siyasal otoriteyi
28		paylaşma sorunudur (.)2) bu (.) devletin yeniden kurulmasıdır
29	GG	→ <i>siyasal temsille demokrasi ayrı şeyler midir=</i>
30	ÜÖ	=hayır efendim bakın=
31	GG	→ <i>bi parçası değil midir</i>

In this extract, ÜÖ and GG are arguing over Kurdish problem. ÜÖ claims that Kurdish problem is not related to democracy and human rights; it is related to political representation. GG disagrees with this by asking yes/no questions. These questions emphasize that democracy and political representation are related issues. GG does not hesitate to express her disagreement; even her second CH rushes after ÜÖ not allowing him to complete his assertion. These all make her disagreement an aggravated one.

CHs do not have to be in the form of interrogative. They may be statements which imply disagreement in a challenging way. The extract below is an example for this:

(8) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	IR	.... Mustafa Kemal’in Samsun’a gittiğine dair
2		fermanın içeriğini okudu
3	EA	evet //yani Osmanlıca’yı

4	IR	//bu belgeye // katılıyo musunuz
5	EA	// Osmanlıca'yı sadeleştirecek olursa
6		orda hükümetin kararını uygulamaktan (.) asayışı temin
7		etmekten (.) mülküne dikkat edin (.) vatana değil <u>mülküne</u>
8		çünkü maalesef padişahlık rejimi yani Cumhuriyetle def
9		ettiğimiz padişahlık //rejimi mülktür
10	KM	//o o günün üslubudur=
11	EA	= <u>hayır</u> (.2) üslup //değildir bu bir realitedir (.) mülk=
12	KM	//padişahın mülküdür
13	EA	= ile vatan arasında ise niteliksel fark //vardır ve=
14	KM	//vay (incomp)
15	EA	= insanoğlunun (.) dünya çapında (.) mülkten vatana geçmesi
16		kuldan (.) yurttaşa geçmesi bir devrimdir=
17	KM	=o kul da teba manasındadır (.) kelimelerin böyle
18	EA	yurttaş teba manasında değildir=yurttaş (.) hak
19		//ve özgürlükleri olandır
20	KM	→ // tarih deyimlerine bakın bakalım

EA and KM are arguing about some historical terms, “mülk”, “kul” and “teba”. EA describes the people in the Ottoman State as slaves of the Sultan and claims that because of Atatürk, they become citizens of a democratic country. KM disagrees with this idea and states that the term “kul” (slave) has the same meaning with “teba” (subject). When EA disagrees with him, he says “tarih deyimlerine bakın bakalım”. This is a challenging statement evaluating the validity of EA’s idea. In this sentence the word “bakalım” shows KM’s self-confidence and forces EA to overview his claim. In this way, this CH maximizes benefit to KM and cost to co-IE. This means it violates Leech’s (1983) the Tact and the Generosity Maxims besides the Agreement Maxim. Moreover, this disagreement is directly addressed to co-IE and questions his competency in one area. For all these reasons, it is an aggravated form of disagreement with high face threatening effect.

In short, CH as a type of disagreement can be done in different ways. In this study, all kinds of challenging statements and questions have been analyzed under this title.

#### 4.2.3. Contradiction (CT)

In CT, a speaker utters a proposition in his/her claim and the addressee contradicts by uttering the negated form of the proposition. In Muntigl and Turnbull’s words, “if A utters P, then B utters –P” (1998). Therefore, CTs often occur with

negative particles such as “no” or “not” (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998). This is the same in Turkish news interviews. When an IE wants to contradict a co-IE, they use some oppositional markers.

(9) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	IR		hocam buyurun //lütfen
2	YE		//şimdi şunu söylemek peki meseleye
3			bi de şu açıdan bir de bakalım (.) sözü edilen yıllarda (.2) iki
4			taraf var (.) biliyorsunuz (.) biri ülkeyi işgal edenler ve
5			Mısıroğluna göre tabi işbirliği yapmayanlar (.) ama bana
6			göre İngilizlerle işbirliği yapan Osmanlı hükümeti (.) bu
7			bir taraf (.) diğeri ise işgalciler ve işbirlikçilerine karşı
8			bir bağımsızlık savaşı veren Atatürk ve arkadaşları (.) bu
9			durumda <u>siz</u> (.) Vahdettin hain değil dersiniz (.) bu söz
10			Atatürk haindir anlamına gelir
11	KM		hep sığındığınızı //budur
12	YE		//çünkü (.) //çünkü
13	KM	→	//bu o demek <i>değildir</i> (.)
14			batıl maküsün aleyh olmaz (.) mantığa davet ediyorum
15			//seni
16	YE		//sayın //sayın Önkibar e: sayın sayın Mısıroğlunu ben=
17	KM	→	//falan haindir demek ona hain diyen haindir
18			demek <i>değildir</i>
19	YE		=o beni //mantığa davet //ediyo ben onu kibarlığa davet
20			ediyorum

YE and KM are arguing about Vahdettin. YE states that there were two opposite sides: one was the Ottoman Government which cooperated with the British Government and the other was Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and his supporters who fought against occupation in the country to gain freedom. Depending on this, YE claims that saying Sultan Vahdettin is not a traitor means that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk is a traitor. KM contradicts YE by uttering a negated form of the proposition YE uttered before. In order to display his contradiction, KM uses the oppositional marker “değil” here. Stating disagreement interruptively also reinforces the aggravation of disagreement.

Another oppositional marker used to state disagreement is “hayır”. Hacıeminoğlu (1992) define “hayır” as a refusal and denial marker (cited in Cin, 2000:39). Moreover, Cin (2000:42) also emphasizes the negative meaning of “hayır”.

(10) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	IR		= ama mesela siz Kürt (.) dili konuşmalarına veya
2			Kürtçe //eğitim yapılmasına (.) yani kültürel dediniz için
3			sormak istiyorum yani tam

4	ÜÖ		//müsaade ederseniz anla- ha müsaade ederseniz
5			sonra a (.) a (.) a (.) hep hepsi evet bunların hepsine (.)
6			değince:m ama (.) öncelikle neyin olmadı olmayacağını ortaya
7			koymamız lazım (.) yani sorunun ne olduğunu teşhis etmemiz
8			gerekiyo ki tedaviyi önerebilelim (.) bir Türkiyede etnik bi
9			sorun var mı (.) hayır (.) Türkiyede hiçbir zaman etnik bi
10			sorun olmadı (.) yani (.) Türk Kürt arasında bir çatışma
11			olmadı (.) bir (.) Kürt Kürt olduğu için (.) bir işe
12			girememelik konumunda olmadı Kürt olduğu için bir okulda
13			okuyamazlık konumunda olamadı (.) Kürt Kürt olduğu
14			için (.) bilinçli bir şekilde (.) belirli bir yerlerde yükselmekten
15			(.) belirli (.) semtlerde oturmaktan veya dairelerde
16			oturmaktan alıkonulmadı =
17	IR		=ama bakın //sizin bu söylediğinize karşı şunu =
18	ÜÖ		//bakın bunlar neden
19	IR		= söylüyorlar ben hemen söylüyeyim de (.) bu kimliğini
20			ön plana çıkararak (.) e: değil (.) bu kimliğini gizliyerek
21	ÜÖ	→	hallıyr
22	IR		//ancak belirli makamlara gelebiliyor=
23	ÜÖ		=şimdi bakın bu kimliğini gizliyerek değil Türkiye
24			Cumhuriyeti kimliğiyle gelirsiniz zaten belirli makamlara

IR and ÜÖ are arguing over the rights of Kurdish people. IR presents a claim which states that the Kurds have to hide their identity in order to come to important positions. ÜÖ contradicts this with an oppositional marker “hayır”. This CT is a strong one because there is not a pause, a preface marker or a signal of hesitation to mitigate it. Furthermore, the CT is stated while IR is talking.

A similar marker to “hayır” is “yok”. Cin points out the similar meanings of “hayır” and “yok” and states that in most situations they can be used interchangeably or together (2000:48). In the data, two different uses of “yok” occur. One is at the beginning with a similar meaning to “hayır” and the other is at the end. (11) and (12) are examples of these.

(11) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	EA		.... en nihayetinde İngiliz gemisiyle kaçmıştır (.) eğer
2			programı bitireceksek niçin bu tartışma Türkiyede son
3			dönemde fazla güncelleşti meselesine girmek istiyorum=
4	IR		niçin (.) //bir cümleyle ama
5	EA		//niçin (.) şu çok önemli (.) Amerikanın bütün
6			dünyayı denetleme altına aldığı (.) bütün karşıt rejimleri
7			işgal ettiği ve işbirlikçiliğin artık meşrulaştırılmaya
8			çalışıldığı bir dünyada yaşıyoruz (.2) işbirlikçiliğin (.)
9			bütün kamusal değerlerin yok pahasına satılmasının (.) ve

10 Amerikancılığın bu kadar pirim yaptığı bir ortamda  
 11 tarihten (.) arka plan oluşturmak lazım //ve Vahdettin (.)=  
 12 IR → //yok ya Türkiyede  
 13 EA =ve Vahdettin //işbirlikçiliğın (.)iş (.) iş  
 14 IR //halkın yüzde doksanına yakını  
 15 Amerikaya karşı yani bu biraz şey

(12) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1 NA şimdi batının İslam dü coğrafyasına yönelik yaklaşım  
 2 tarzının temelinde (.) Hıristiyan dünyasının yüzyıllarca  
 3 boyunca İslama (.) İslamiyete (.) İslam peygamberine  
 4 ve Orta doğu coğrafyasına yaklaşım tarzı yatıyor  
 .  
 .  
 .  
 12 Amerikan bakanı John (Ashword) İslam dininde Tanrı  
 13 sizden (.) kendi çocuğunuzu kurban etmenizi ister (.)  
 14 Hıristiyanlıkta ise Tanrı kendi oğlunu (.) sizin canınızı  
 15 kurtarmak için gönderir (.) sözüyle birlikte (.) eğitim  
 16 bakanı diyo ki işte bu nedenle en büyük kitle imha  
 17 silahı olan İslamdan kurtulmalıyız //çağrısı yapıyor  
 18 IR //yani o (.) hangi  
 19 adalet bakanı dediniz  
 20 NA jo- jo- John (askoft)??  
 21 IR //ne zaman  
 22 EG //(aşkoft)??  
 23 NA (aşkoft) bin dokuz yüz doksan dokuz  
 24 IR yani // bin dokuz yüz doksan dokuzda halt etmiş bi kere=  
 25 NA //yani iki (.) on bir eylül  
 26 IR =İslamiyette kendi çocuğunuzu kurban edin diye bi şey  
 27 → yok ki

In (11), IR disagrees with EA's claims about why discussion of Vahdettin has recently been on the agenda of the media. In order to contradict EA, IR uses "yok" in the same meaning of "hayır" (no). The use "ya" after oppositional marker is important. It is a marker which is mostly used between people who have close relationships such as friends. For this reason it functions as a mitigating device showing intimacy. Besides, expressing disagreement in a backchannel is also noteworthy.

In (12), NA reports the claim put forward by the American Minister of Justice about Islam. IR refutes these claims and says that there is not such a belief in Islam. The suffix "ki" aggravates disagreement by implying invalidity of the claim. In that sense, this CT closes to IRC.

On the other hand, the example below presents varying forms of contradiction:

(13) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	EA		düşük padişah Vahdettin bir süre Maltadan Sanremoya
2			giderek orda orta büyüklükte bir villaya yerleşti (.)
3			Rumboltun yaptığı son görüşmeden sonra İngiliz
4			elçisi (.) Sultanın paralarıyla öteki değerlerinin
5			dışarıya göndermesine aracılık ettikleri yani İngiliz
6			istihbaratı içerden Vahdettine bir para akışı da
7			sağlamışlar ama bunun //ötesinde
8	KM	→	//yalan
9	EA		bunun ötesinde e: (.) e: gizli belgelerin gizli belge//lerde
10			genel olarak
11	IR		//bu
12			yaşam tarzı pek
13	KM	→	hayır //yalan
14	IR		//pek //bu yaşam tarzı öyle pek (kitabınızdaki) yaşam=
15	EA		//ve son olarak (.) böylece
16	IR		=tarzı değil
17	KM	→	hayır //öyle değil

KM and YE are arguing about Sultan Vahdettin's wealth. EA expresses that the Sultan and his family lived in good conditions because the British Government financed them. KM contradicts this claim in three different turns and in three different forms. First he states that it is a lie (yalan). Then he expresses his disagreement by using "hayır"(no) an oppositional marker. Here the word "yalan" (lie) is as important as "hayır". It is an aggravated form of contradiction because it threatens addressee's positive face and accuses him of telling a lie. KM goes on disagreeing in the third turn and uses both of the oppositional markers "hayır" and "değil" together. Yet, when compared to other two contradictions, this disagreement turns out to be a soft one in spite of the use of two oppositional markers. This may be because the word "öyle" mitigates the contradiction and gives the signal that an explanation will come to justify the claims.

(14) shows that some words like "yalan" (lie) can also be used to state CT. Another word displaying opposition is "yanlış" (false).

(14) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	EA		e: aktardığı tablo bize (.) Vahdettinin aslında hiçte
2			az bi parayla gitmediğinin çok açık bir göstergesi (.) nefis e:
3			Maltadan vesayreden dolaşmalarının sonucunda e: nihayet
4			Sanremoya gidiyor (.) nefis bir saray yavrusu olan villanın
5			kırk odası var (.) on beş dönüm genişliğinde portakal limon

6		ve e: bahçesi olan beyaz renkli mükellef bir kasır (.) e:
7		Göztepe orda yaşamış ta Vahdettinin öldüğü güne kadar orda
8		yaşamış
9	KM	ama ne kadar (.2) iki sene yaşıyamadı yirmi dörtte çıktı
10		yirmi altıda //vefat etti
11	EA	//izin verin izin verin //baş haremi ikinci=
12	KM	//iki sene
13	EA	= haremi üçüncü haremi arkasından işte hemşiresi ikinci
14		hazinedarı e: vesayre vesayre bir dizi insan sayıyor ve
15		bunların gerçek anlamda lüks içinde yaşadıklarını hatta söz
16		konusu şahsiyetlerin (.) Osmanlı sarayında Yıldızda yaşadık
17		//ları dönemde bile almadıkları kadar fazla para=
18	KM →	//tam yanlış
19	EA	=kullandıklarını (.) söz konusu e: yerde içkilerin su gibi
20		içildiğini e: çıplak kadın resimlerinin olduğunu (.) kuşkusuz
21		bunlar 1 asla bir eleştirel anlamda söylemiyorum

In the extract above, KM and EA are arguing over the conditions Vahdettin lived after he left Turkey. EA claims that he lived comfortable life. KM contradicts this with the word “yanlış” (false). Here, the speaker also uses the marker “tam” (completely) which upgrades disagreement and increases its severity. Moreover, disagreement is stated in a backchannel. In sum, it can be said that some words like “yalan” (lie) and “yanlış” (false) can work as oppositional markers and their strengths can be reinforced by some other words.

Example (13) also shows that more than one oppositional marker can be used at one time. Yet, the force of the contradiction strengthened not only on the oppositional markers used but also becomes on words which go with these markers. To illustrate, the word “öyle” mitigates the contradiction as in the example above, but the words “elbette” and “mümkün” aggravate disagreement as in the example below.

(15) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	EA	ama şu anda //mevcut şu andaki mevcut durum hoş bi
2		durum değil
3	IR	//ama tamam siz de girin ya yapmayın
4		tamam cevap verin lütfen evet İstanbul'un yarısını satın
5		alıcak kadar bi parayı verdiği doğru mu Erdoğan Bey
6	EA →	<i>elbette</i> doğru <i>değil</i> doğru olması da <i>mümkün</i> //değil

Idiosyncratic uses of markers are also seen in the data. Particularly, KM in “Alternatif” often uses Ottoman Turkish Language. As a result, his oppositions are

supported with some idiosyncratic occurrences of markers, such as “haşa ve kella”. This marker has not been used by any other IEs in any programs.

(16) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	EA	aynı saray içinde İtal İtalyan görevliler de	
2		çalıştırılmaktadır (.) aynı Vahdettin'in birazdan eğer vakit	
3		olursa gerek olursa okuycam Fransız Cumhurbaşkanı'na	
4		(.) İngiliz Kralı'na nasıl yalvaran mektuplar // yazdığını	
5		da onları biliyoruz	
6	IR		//son bölüm
7		toparlayalım son //bölüm evet	
8	KM	→	//HAşa ve kella

KM uses the oppositional expression “haşa ve kella” here to display his contradiction to EA for his claims that Vahdettin lived in wealth in San Remo. “haşa” is likely to be the most severe oppositional marker because it does not only deny a claim and shows impossibility of accepting it but also stresses inappropriateness of the claim in terms of beliefs and worth.

In extract (17), UG and IR are talking about government's attempts to restrict areas where alcohol consumption is allowed. IR claims that it is not a new law but interpreted by the media in this way. UG contradicts IR's explanations and implies his disapproval of the government's act.

(17) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG	....içki meselesine gelince (.) buradaki sorun (.) yerel	
2		yönetimler eliyle (.) çok hukuklu bir yapıya dönüşülmüş	
3		olmasıdır (.) farklı uygulamalar vardır (.) ve bu farklılığın	
4		temelinde (.) e: dinin bir toplumsal yaşam biçimine	
5		dönüştürme eğilimleri vardır (.) bu münferit bazı yerlerde	
6		olsa da (.) sizin e: söylediğiniz gibi (.) bu adımın atılmış	
7		olması laiklikle hiçbir biçimde (.) bağdaşamaz (.) bunun	
8		ötesinde (.) devletin <u>en</u> tepe noktasındaki kişinin (.)	
9		Türkiye'de toplumsal düzenin (.) daha İslamiyle bir yapıyla	
10		değiştirilmesinin zamanının geldiği (.) bunun gerektiğini	
11		söylemesi laikliğe karşı (.) e: çok sempatik (.) bir ifade çok	
12		sempatik bir kararlılık (.) anlamına (.) gelmez=	
13	IR	=şimdi onu //sayın müsteşar izah etmişti	
14	UG	//yani (.) devletin en tepe noktasından böyle	
15		→ bi söylem ifade edilemez	
16	IR	e: sayın Uluç Gürkan onu sayın müsteşar izah etmişti	

Here a different form of opposition is used. It is the negative morpheme “-mez” added to the end of the verb. In Turkish, these negative morphemes “-me, -ma” and “-mez, -maz” make negative sentences and show denial as in “katılmıyorum” (I disagree/ I don’t agree), “düşünmüyorum” (I don’t think) or olmaz (not possible), etc.. In this CT, UG’s use of modal “-ebilmek” (can) in the passive form also strengthens his disagreement. This use implies the falsity of producing such an utterance and the impossibility of agreeing with it.

In addition, contradicting ideas can also be expressed without using oppositional markers.

(18) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	IR	arayabilir mi peki (.) Türkiye’de yabancı birisi sizi
2	EG	e: Türk (.) şeyin içinde ara (.) böyle bi şey olabilir mi
3		(.) mümkün değil ki
4	NA	→ <i>mümkün</i>

IR asks the IEs, EG and NA if it is possible that foreign securities can search a Turk at a Turkish airport. EG directly disagrees with the question and states that it is not possible. Yet, a positive contradiction comes from NA to EG’s claim. NA explicitly says it is possible (*mümkün*). As it is seen, there is no negative marker used here to make a contradiction. NA answers EG’s negative proposition with a positive one. Since this CT has no oppositional markers and involves some humor in it, it is the least face threatening one.

So far, the examples given for CT were direct disagreements. However, CT can also be done in an indirect way. The data includes two kinds of CT for this category. One is done through stating a positive word with a negative connotation.

(19) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	IR	peki onlar öyle anlıyorlar zaten yardım ettikleri
2		için (.) silah verdikleri için (.) siyasal ve ekonomik
3		destek verdikleri için böyle yapmış olabilirler (.)
4		kendimize dönelim (.) Türkiye’ye bakın (.) Leyla
5		Zana ve arkadaşları (.) bölücü terör örgütüne yani PKKya
6		üye olmak (.) ve devletin bölünmez bütünlüğünü bozmak
7		suçundan mahkum olmuşlardı
8	İA	e biz bunlara maaş ödüyoruz
9	IR	VIPden geçiriyosunuz
10	İA	evet
11	EG	→ <i>maaşallah</i>

12 IR emekli maaşı veriyosunuz ....

In the extract, the discussion topic is the rights given to the members of PKK like Leyla Zana. This argument is different from others because in this discussion IR and IEs are on the same side. They all oppose to the current situation. They are only evaluating the situation and commenting on it. In a way, they are expressing their disagreement to the general practice in Turkey. EG's way of stating his contradiction is interesting because he uses the word "maaşallah" which is generally used in Turkish to approve someone's act. Yet, in this example "maaşallah" has a negative meaning. It hints disapproval of the practice in Turkey in a sarcastic manner.

Expressing disbelief is also observed as one of the ways of indirect disagreement in the data.

(20) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	IR	Samsuna gidişi e: sorguluyalım isterseniz
2	YE	hay //hay
3	IR	//Mustafa Kemal'in //Bandırma vapuruyla Samsun'a
4		gidişte
5	YE	//hay hay (.) Samsun'a gidiş
6		Atatürk'ün Samsun'a gidişinin nedeni (.) Doğu Karadeniz'de
7		(.) çıkan olaylarla ilgili o meseleyi görmek anlamak
8		ve çözmek içindir (.) yoksa //alsana şu kadar para (.) git=
9	KM	//niye kendisine (maraşalin)
10		tanı selayetine koyuyorlar
11	YE	= Anadolu'ya geç (.) Kurtuluş savaşı'nı //başlat gibi=
12	KM →	//Karadenizmiş
13	YE	=buna e: inan ki herkes güler yani

YE urges that Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was not sent to Anatolia by Vahdettin to start the Turkish War of Liberty. He claims that he was sent there to solve the problems in the Black Sea Region. KM disagrees with this claim first by a CH (niye kendisine maraşalin tanı selayetine koyuyorlar) and in the next turn he shows his contradiction by saying "Karadenizmiş". In this word, "-miş" implies disbelief and questions the accuracy of YE's assertion. Since, KM does this in an ironic manner, it is a threat to YE's face.

To sum up, CT is done in different ways either in a direct or indirect way. Of all the types, using oppositional markers is the frequent one.

#### 4.2.4. Counterclaim (CC)

Another way of expressing disagreement is CC. CCs propose an alternative claim that does not directly contradict (as in CT) nor challenge others' claim(s). Yet, they allow further negotiation of the claim uttered by the opposite party (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998). Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) separate CCs from other types of disagreement for according to them, only CCs are preceded by "pauses, prefaces and mitigating devices" (*ibid.*). For this reason, they describe CCs as the least face aggravating disagreement type (*ibid.*). However, this is not always the case in our data. When CCs are examined, it is seen that a great deal of them are produced without a pause and even without waiting for the end co-IE's speech.

##### (21) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	EA	aslında (.) e: bence de olay (.) belgeleri incelediğimizde çok
2		açık (.) şimdi e: İngilizlere; Osmanlı Devleti'ni kontrol altına
3		almış vaziyetler (.) Vahdettin ve Vahdettin'in atadığı başta
4		Damat Ferit olmak üzere (.) İngilizlerle mümkün olabilen <u>en</u>
5		iyi uyumu sağlamaya (.) ve İngilizlere yamanarak İngilizlerle
6		işbirliği içinde kendi //tahtını (.) <u>kendi</u> tahtını
7	KM →	//Mustafa Kemal'e zaman
8		kazandırmak ihtiyaçları var

In (21), KM and EA are arguing about Sultan Vahdettin. EA claims that the Sultan cooperated with the British Government. KM disagrees with this claim with a CC. He explains the reason for Vahdettin's behavior in his CC. Although KM's statement is not an aggravated one, it still seems impolite. There are two reasons for this: First of all, KM does not wait for EA to finish his statement. He interrupts and gets the floor to state his disagreement. For this reason, it is more face threatening. Secondly, with this disagreement, KM aims to maximize benefit to himself, so he violates the Generosity Maxim in addition to the Agreement Maxim (Leech, 1983).

##### (22) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG	efendim Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığı bir hukuki
2		tanımdır (.) bir ulusal kimlik değildir
3	IR	anladım sayın Atilla //Yay-
4	UG	//dünyada ulusu olmyan ulustan
5		soyutlanmış sadece vatandaşlıkla bir hukuki tanımla ifade
6		edilen (.) bir ülke yoktur böyle //bi şey yoktur=
7	GG →	//Amerikan
8		vatandaşlığı
9	UG	=bunu nerden keşfediyoruz yeniden

In (22), there is another kind of CC. To UG's claims about citizenship, GG states her disagreement by giving an example. This example shows that GG refuses to cooperate with UG's claims. Besides, via this example, GG maximizes cost to co-IE and benefit to herself. This means she breaches the Tact and the Generosity Maxims (Leech, 1983). Her CC also starts in the middle of UG's turn as in (21). For all these reasons, GG's disagreement as a counterclaim is a face threatening act in itself.

In the data collected, most of CCs appear as declaratives, and a great number of them are preceded with the oppositional marker, "ama" (but). As Schiffrin (1987: 152-53) states "but" marks that the stated unit is a contrast to the one stated previously.

(23) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG	e: sayın Ilıcak teşekkür ediyorum (.) e: her konuyu (.)
2		Atatürk'e bakarak çözelim (.) e: (.) diye bi nostalgik (.)
3		söylemde bulunduğumu sanmıyorum (.) ama (.) Türkiye
4		Cumhuriyeti (.) vatandaşlığının (.) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti
5		devletinin (.) getirdiği ulusal kimliğin ne anlama geldiğini (.)
6		e: bu anlamın etnik bir nitelik içermediğini (.) bunu
7		anlatmaya çalıştım //bu sözcükle (.) Atatürk
8		orada (.) Atatürk orada
9	GG →	//ama (.) Atatürk'ün atfettiği
10		anlam o olabilir (.) ama bakın (.) Atatürk onu o o anlamda
11		kullanmış olabilir öyle bir mana atfetmiş olabilir ama (.)
12		muhattap olan kesim (.) böyle bir mana atfetmiyorsa bunun
13		tersi bir mana atfediyorsa (.) yine o kavram o sorunu
14		çözmüyo demektir

UG gives Atatürk's definition of Turkish nationality as a reference, but GG disagrees with a CC starting with "ama". Here "ama" signals that a disagreement is coming in an explanation form. This CC also occurs interruptively. Yet, GG gives a short pause (.) after "ama", in other words before the main opposing idea. This pause mitigates disagreement. Moreover, GG states her disagreement in "if clause type" which appears to be an attempt to mitigate the disagreeing statement.

(24) is another example for "ama". This time CC is mitigated by showing partial agreement. GG disputes IR's idea about government's practice on alcohol prohibition. She states partial agreement before expressing disagreement. This use makes it less face threatening.

## (24) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	IR	.... yani bunu biraz da bizim medyamız (.) bu demin
2		söylediğim hassasiyetleri de kullanarak (.) böyle
3		yansıtabiliyo ve kamuoyundan birazcık (.) yanlış algılama
4		da ortaya //çıkabiliyo
5	GG →	//olabilir abartılmış olabilir <i>ama</i> yani siz de biz de
6		bili ben de biliyoruz ki (.) zaten belediyeye ait iş yerleri
7		belediyeye ait //yerlerde (.) tesislerdeki yasakta doğru=
8	IR	//tesisler de daha doğrusu
9	GG	=bi //şey değil (.) dolayısıyla bu da bi hassasiyeti=
10	IR	//doğru değil tabi
11	GG	=gösteriyö (.) bu hassasiyet karşısında biz de (.) e: (.)
12		karşı mücadele veriyoruz yeri geldiğinde yani mesela bu
13		belediyelerdeki yasağın da kalmasını istiyoruz ....

Yet, after “ama” does not always come a CC, sometimes a CT may follow “ama” as in “ama doğru di:il”. Considering this, in this study the usage of “ama” which occurs alone has been treated as a CT.

In the data, there are some other markers used frequently before stating CC. They are: “bakın” or “bakınız” and “şimdi”.

## (25) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG	siz bu söyleminiz (.)2 bir (.) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti
2		yurttaş olarak (.) benim elimden (.) ben Türk ulusunun bir
3		ferdiyim (.) deme hakkını (.) başkası kendini (.) benim hiçbir
4		itirazım olmadığı biçimde (.) e: Kürt olarak ifade etsin diye
5		nasıl alırsınız (.) bunu nasıl savunabilirsiniz=
6	GG	=siz gene ben //Türküm diyceksiniz
7	UG	//bunu hangi insan hakları anlayışı hangi
8		demokrasi (.) anlayışı içine e: //sığdırabilirsiniz
9	GG →	//efendim (.) <i>bakın</i> bu sizin
10		Türklüğü//nüzü elinden almıyor

In (25), UG and GG are arguing over sub identity term in Turkey. UG accuses GG of forcing Turkish people to deny their identities to satisfy other ethnic groups. GG disputes this idea with a counterclaim (CC) starting with “bakın”. Like “ama”, “bakın” signals that an opposing idea is coming. Yet, the strength of “bakın” is less than “ama” since it does not directly oppose to the claim uttered previously, but it aims to get opposite party’s attention to the counterclaim. In this sense, it functions as a preface mitigating disagreement. Therefore, it is more polite. The word “efendim” also

increases the politeness of this disagreement. It indicates deference; therefore, it can be regarded as an attempt to save the co-IE's face.

(26) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	ÜÖ	işte (.) bu çerçevede meseleye baktığımız zaman bir (.)
2		Türkiyede etnik bir sorunla karşı karşıya değiliz (.) iki
3		Türkiye sağlayabileceği demokrasiyi (.) asgari olarak
4		sağlamıştır (.) bundan sonra kimse Türkiyeye (.) içeriğinin
5		ne olduğu belli olmıyan (.) siyasal reformlara devam edelim
6		demesin çünkü bundan sonra siyasal reformlara devam
7		edelim demek (.) milli devleti ortadan kaldıralım //demek
8	IR	//şimdi ben
9		hemen e: sayın e: Göktürke dönmek itiyorum (.) daha fazla
10		demokrasi (.) ülkemizi bö(.) bölünmüşlüğe mi götürür yoksa
11		daha mı az demokrasi (.) faydalıdır
12	GG →	<i>şimdi</i> (.) bi kere etnik bi sorundur ama onun üzerinde
13		durmycam etnik sorun oluşu (.) e: o bölgeyi gidin insanlarla
14		konusun (.) nasıl bir etnik sorun yaşadıkları yani Kürt
15		oldukları için (.) o bölgede on yıllardır devam eden
16		olağanüstü halde neler çektikleri için (.) e: ((clearing her
17		throat)) e: (direkt) çektiklerini anlatacaklardır ama burada
18		bunun tartışmasının bi //faydası yok

In (26), the discussion topic is the ethnic problem in Turkey. ÜÖ asserts that there is not an ethnic problem in Turkey. GG disagrees with this claim with a CC preceded by “şimdi”. In this example, “şimdi” presents a comparison between “my view” and “another’s view” as Schiffrin (1987: 236) states and works as preface marker like “bakın”. Moreover, after “şimdi” there is a pause. All these seem to be attempts to make this CC less aggravating. However, still we cannot say this disagreement is not face threatening. This is because of the violation of the Generosity Maxim (Leech, 1983). After expressing her CC, GG goes on her turn with some supporting assertions. Through these assertions, GG maximizes benefit to herself.

Moreover, it is possible to use “şimdi” and “bakın” together. (27) is an argument among IR, NA and EG. NA and EG urge that Kenan Evren led Turgut Özal to the president position. IR is against this and makes a counterclaim (CC) with “şimdi”. Again “şimdi” marks a comparison between different ideas here. NA answers IR's CC with another CC. In his CC, NA uses both of the markers “şimdi” and “bakın” together. This kind of use aims to take attention to one's CC. NA appears to focus the topic which seems to have been digress to other issues however still related to Özal.

## (27) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	IR		//yani o dönemi bilmiyorlar beş yaşında olanlar otuz
2			yaşında yani büyük bir gençlik var şu anda o dönemi
3			yaşamamışlar kitaplardan şu anda sizin anlattıklarınızdan
4			okuduklarından dinlediklerinden öğreniyorlar doğruyu
5			doğruları anlatmamız gerekir şimdi Özal geldi ama o
6			dönemleri hepimizin yaşı müsait hatırlamamız //için
7	NA		//hayır
8			ekonomik ayağı açısından //Turgut Özal boyutunu ele
9			almak lazım
10	IR	→	//şimdi askeri idare Turgut
11			Özalı getirmeye çalışmadı ki getirmemeye çalıştı Turgut
12			Özal geldi di: mi // MDP diye bir parti vardı
13	EG		//ama o zaman hatırlıyo musunuz
14			//sayın hocam o zaman bi tartışma vardı
15	NA	→	//şimdi bakın yirmi dört Ocak kararlarının gerçek
16			mimarı yirmi dört Ocak kararları başbakan müsteşarı
17			olarak devlet planlama müsteşarı olarak Turgut Özal
18			tarafından //hazırlanmıştı

In short, there is not a particular way of expressing CC in the data. It may appear in different forms with or without oppositional markers. In this analysis, every utterance including an opposite idea to the claim (as stated previously) has been counted as a CC.

#### 4.2.5. Act Combination

This type of disagreement refers to using more than one disagreement type among IRC (Irrelevancy Claim), CH (Challenge), CT (Contradiction) and CC (Counterclaim). According to Muntigl and Turnbull's findings a small percentage of disagreements were act combinations. However, in the present study, Act Combinations have a large portion in disagreement types. It is possible that disagreements appear to occur more frequently in news interviews in comparison to everyday conversation. Although, Muntigl and Turnbull mention only one type of combination; namely CT + CC, it is possible to identify different combinations in our data such as CT + CC; CC + CT; CC + CH. In addition, more than two acts combinations like CT + CC + CT or CC + CH + CT are also observed.

In this part, examples for different act combinations will be given and analyzed. While doing this, act combinations will be examined under two categories: two acts combination and more than two acts combination.

#### 4.2.5.1. Two Acts Combination

One of the most significant Act Combination is Countradiction and Counterclaim (CT + CC).

(28) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	EG	on iki Eylül'den evvel görev yapılmadığı için
2		ihtilal yapılmıştır (.) yani //güvenlik birimleri=
3	İA	//o (.) o (.) o
4	EG	=görev yapamamıştır
5	İA	→ o düşüncenize ben <i>katılmıyorum</i> (.) <u>Bakın onu da</u>
6		<u>size şöyle ifade edeyim</u> (.) on iki Eylül öncesinde silah
7		kullanma yetkilerini biliyorsunuz (.) ne yapıyo (.)
8		kanun namına dur (.) //durmadı havaya ateş et (.) yere=
9	İR	//sıkı yönetim vardı
10	İA	=ateş et (.) yoksa bacağında vur

In this example, first İA disputes EG's claim with a CT formed by a negative morpheme “-me” (*katılmıyorum*) (in italics), and then he expresses why he does not agree with him by a CC (underlined). In his CC, İA uses the marker “bakın”. As it is seen, this disagreement is expressed without any interruption. This shows that İA cooperates with EG by waiting for him to end his turn. This cooperation decreases the aggravation level of disagreement when compared to others which are stated interruptively. Yet, İA does not hesitate to declare his contradiction. Besides, he directly addresses it to the co-IE, EG. In this way, he upgrades his disagreement because IEs are expected to address their disagreements to a third party, the IR. For this reason, İA's disagreement is a face threatening one.

A different act combination is Counterclaim and Contradiction (CC + CT). In this type, initially the speaker makes his counterclaim and then states his contradiction. A good example of this is below:

(29) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG	bakın Fransa'da Korsikalılara (.3) e: (.2) tat onları tatmin
2		etmek için Fransızlara Fransızlıklarından vazgeçmelerini
3		söyleyebilir misiniz
4		(.3)

5	IR	um sayın Uluç-
6	UG	yani böyle //bi şey düşünebilir mi dünyanın hangi =
7	IR	//°siz°
8	UG	=ülkesinde düşünülebilir=
9	IR	=sayın Uluç Gürkan (.) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığı
10		bağlamında bir (.) üst kimliğe (.) karşı mısınız
11		(.2)
12	UG	→ <i>efendim Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığı bir hukuki</i>
13		<i>tanımdır (.) <u>bir ulusal kimlik değildir</u></i>

IR asks UG whether he accepts Turkish Republic citizenship as a national identity or not. UG disagrees with the term in the question and states that citizenship is a constitutional term. This is his CC (in italics). Then, UG expresses his CT (underlined). He states that it is not a national identity. While doing his contradiction, UG uses an oppositional marker “değil”. In this example, the address term “efendim” is also important. It displays deference and indicates that UG addresses his disagreement to IR not to co- IE who has asserted this claim. Furthermore, UG states his disagreement after IR’s question. All these show that UG acts in accordance with the framework of news interview. For these reasons, UG’s disagreement is not that much face threatening.

The data displays combinations of Countercalim (CC) and Challenge (CH). A CH can be done before or after a CC. Yet, combination of Contradiction (CT) and Challenge (CH) is not so frequent.

(30) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	KM	yüzlerce delili olan adam (.) öyle bir delil ileri sürer ki
2		yüzden seçer en vurucusunu (.) tabiyat kanunu gibi itiraz
3		edilmez bir şey söyler (.) mağlup bir devletin padişahı ne
4		diyecek (.) hafifletmekten başka (.) ama: //bunların=
5	YE	→ <i>//Atatürk mağlup</i>
6		<i>devletin subayı değil miydi <u>o kabul etmedi ve savaştı</u></i>
7	KM	=hepsinin arkasında müsaade buyurun anladık (.) anladık
8		sizin ne söylediğinizi

In (30), KM tries to justify Vahdettin for accepting the Treaty of Sevr. He says he did not have any other choice. YE disputes his claim by a CH (in italics) followed by a CC (underlined). YE expresses his disagreement in the middle of KM’s turn. This increases its severity.

## (31) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG		efendim Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığı bir hukuki
2			tanımdır (.) bir ulusal kimlik değildir
3	IR		anladım sayın Atilla //Yay-
4	UG	→	//dünyada ulusu olmıyan ulustan
5			soyutlanmış sadece vatandaşlıkla bir hukuki tanımla ifade
6			edilen (.) bir ülke yoktur böyle //bi şey yoktur=
7	GG		//Amerikan
8			vatandaşlığı
9	UG		= <u>bunu nerden keşfediyoruz yeniden</u>

In (31), UG expresses his disagreement to the idea of accepting Turkish Republic citizenship as a national identity. He starts his disagreement with a CC. Then he challenges the co-IE by asking a question. With this question, UG implies that the co-IE has not got enough information on this matter because she is trying to discover something which does not exist. This is a face threatening type of disagreement since it attacks to co-IE's competency. Moreover, while disputing, UG interrupts IR who is trying to give the turn to another IE. This interruption also upgrades disagreement and decreases politeness level.

## 4.2.5.2. More than Two Acts Combination

In news interviews, the turns may be long due to the format. For this reason, IEs may prefer to use more than two acts combined while disagreeing. Although there is not a strict form of this type of disagreement, it is seen that a CC is used in all act combinations and in most of them it goes with a CT. CHs or IRCs may follow, precede or may be used between them.

## (32) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	YE	→	<i>işte dediğim gibi sayın Mısıroğlu ne diyosa doğrudur</i>
2			<i>başkalarının //söylediği de yanlıştır böyle böyle görüş=</i>
3	IR		//evet (.) Erdoğan Bey sanıyorum bu noktada
4			söyliycek
5	YE		= <i>olmaz böyle düşünce olmaz böyle tartışma da aslında</i>
6			<i>olmaz <u>şimdi bir Atatürk niye Cumhuriyeti kurdu neden</u></i>
7			<i><u>milleti e: kul iken millet yaptı Türkleri (.2) neden işte bize</u></i>
8			<i><u>bu hakkı tanıdığını ve ülkemizi işgalden kurtardı (.2)</u></i>
9			<i><u>diyemiyenler Vahdettin'in kahramanlığına ulu hakanlığına</u></i>
10			<i><u>işte sarılıyorlar //o yolla işte dolaylı olarak=</u></i>
11	KM		//hiç alakası yok
12	YE		= <u>bunu milletin kafasına sokmaya çalışıyorlar (.) bunlar</u>

13		<u>işte yeni Osmanlıcı</u> //um e: zihniyeti zihniyetinin eseri
14	KM	// Ecevit de mi Osmanlıcı
15	YE	// <u>hilafet yanlılarının e: söylemleridir bunlar</u> (.) <b>bunların</b>
16		<b>gerçekle tarihi gerçekle hiçbir ilgisi yoktur yani</b>
17	KM	→ //matbuatta bu kadar Sultan Vahidettin hain değildir
18		diyenler var <u>bunlar da mı Osmanlıyı istediği için</u> (.) <b>insaf</b>
19		<b>be</b> (.2) sizin gibi düşünmeyenler hemen Cumhuriyet
20		düşmanı
21	IR	evet (.)Erdoğan Bey

The extract above is about an argument over Vahdettin and presents examples for two different kinds of act combinations. One of them is done by YE and the other is done by KM. YE is against KM who claims that Vahdettin is not a traitor. He starts his disagreement with a CT (in italics). Here CT is not only against KM's claims but also his attitude since throughout the program KM has often interrupted co-IEs' turns in an aggressive manner. In this respect, he violates the Cooperative Principle as described by Grice (1975). YE continues his disagreement with a CC (underlined) in which he tries to explain why KM and people like him support Vahdettin. In his CC, YE also implies his disapproval. Finally, YE states that none of KM's claims are related to historical facts. Thus, he ends his turn with an IRC (in bold). This IRC attacks to co-IE's rationality. For this reason, it is a threat to co-IE's positive face which desires to be appreciated. Besides, through his disagreement, YE not only violates the Agreement Maxim but also violates the Approbation Maxim (by maximizing dispraise of co-IE) and the Tact Maxim (by maximizing cost to other) (Leech, 1983). Therefore, his disagreement is an aggravating one. KM's reply to YE's claims can be an example for CC + CH + CT combination. KM makes a CC (in italics) and then asks a rhetorical question (underlined). With the word "insaf be", he displays his CT (in bold). Since he expresses his disagreement by interrupting YE, it is not a polite one.

In addition, it is possible to use the same type of disagreement twice or more in an act combination as in the extract below.

(33) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	IR	sayın Uluç Gürkan bi şey söylemek istiyorum yani
2		//şimdi e: burada (.) bu millete yani (.) e: (.)her kimse=
3	UG	//buyurun efendim
4	IR	=Türk milleti değil demiyo bakın yanlış anlaşılmasın
5		sayın (.) e: geçmişte Atatürk de bir Mayıs bin dokuz yüz
6		yirmide aynen şöyle demişti meclisi alinizi teşkil eden zevat

- 7 yalnız Türk değildir yalnız Çerkez değildir yalnız Kürt  
8 değildir yalnız Laz değildir (.) fakat hepsinden mürekkep (.)  
9 ana asrı İslamiyedir samimi bir mecmuadır dolayısıyla (.)  
10 yani biz Türk olabiliriz Kürt olabiliriz Laz olabiliriz derken  
11 (.) Türk aynı zamanda bir alt kimlik de olabilir (.) hepimizi  
12 birleştiren milletin adı da aynı zamanda tabi ki Türk  
13 milletidir yani burdan yola çıkarak yani (.) sayın Tayip  
14 Erdoğan (.) Türk de oluruz Laz da olabiliriz Çerkez de (.)  
15 olabiliriz demesini bir bölücü unsur değil bir birleştirici unsur  
16 olarak da görmek mümkün nitekim yıllar önce (.) Atatürk de  
17 bu sözleri sarfetmiş ben müsaade ederseniz e: (.)siz //eğer  
18 UG //e: bi şey  
19 söyleyebilir //miyim sayın Ilıcak yalnız (.) Atatürk bin=  
20 IR //evet tabi buyurun  
21 UG → = dokuz yüz yirmi bir yılında Kurtuluş savaşı  
22 koşullarında (.) savaş koşullarında bu sözü söylemiştir (.)  
23 Cumhuriyetin kurulduğu anda bu um cumhuriyetin (.) ulusal  
24 kimliğini biraz önce söylediğim biçimde (.) Türkiye  
25 Cumhuriyetini kuran Türkiye halkına (.) yani bin dokuz yüz  
26 yirmi birde ifade ettiği biçimiyle (.) Türkü Kürdü e Lazı her  
27 neyse (.) kaldı ki bugün itibarıyla e: kendisi için bi kimlik  
28 arayışında olmıyan (.) Çerkezdi Lazdı gibi (.) ayrımları tahrik  
29 etmek onları (.) ayrı bi kimlik olarak kendilerini ifade etmeye  
30 tahrik ve teşvik etmekte (.) çok anlamlı değil (.) *bütün bu*  
31 *unsurları bir araya getiren Türkiye cum- e: Türkiye halkına*  
32 *Türk ulusu denir tanımını ortaya koymuştur*

UG is aganist AKP Government's division of ethnic groups living in Turkey as micro and macro identities. He perceives it as a threat to the unity of Turkish Republic. IR states that the president may have not used micro and macro identity terms in that sense and gives examples from Atatürk's speeches. Yet, this is not convincing for UG because he expresses his disagreement in the next turn starting with a CC (in italics). He urges that Atatürk used these terms during the Liberation War in order to unite the ethnic groups living Anatolia by then. Afterwards, UG makes a CT (underlined) including oppositional marker "değil". At the end of his turn, UG repeats his CC (in italics). It is worth noting that UG asks for permission from IR to speak. This has a mitigating effect on UG's disagreement.

There also examples for more than three acts combination, but they are limited (in total five of act combinations). For this reason, they will not be examined here.

### 4.3. Results

Three news interviews have been analyzed in this study: “Ceviz Kabuğu”, “Alternatif” and “Sözün Özü”. As noted in Table 1, 823 oppositions done by both IRs and IEs have been found in the data. Out of 823 oppositions, 629 of them have been done to disagree and 194 of them have been done for different purposes such as to get the floor, to do a correction, to maintain the format, to return the main topic, etc.. Table 2 shows the distribution of oppositions in news interviews. Oppositions other than disagreement have not been categorized since it is not the subject of this study.

Table 2 Distribution of Oppositions

Name of the Program	Number of Disagreements	Oppositions categorized other than Disagreement	Total number of Oppositions
Ceviz Kabuğu	251	71	322
Alternatif	207	83	290
Sözün Özü	171	40	211
Total	629	194	823

Out of 629 disagreements, 124 (20 %) of them have been expressed by IRs and 505 (80 %) of them have been expressed by IEs. Table 3 displays the distribution of disagreements done by IRs and IEs in each program.

Table 3 Distribution of Disagreements by IRs and IEs

Name of the Program	Disagreements done by IR	Disagreements done by IE
Ceviz Kabuğu	88	163
Alternatif	11	196
Sözün Özü	25	146
Total	124	505

As a general rule, IRs are expected to keep a neutral stance during discussion. Their role is asking questions to IEs and challenging argument between them. Yet,

Table 3 indicates that IRs have violated the format by stating their disagreements. Especially in “Ceviz Kabuğu”, IR expressed his disagreements in many occasions. Yet, when the whole data is examined, it is understood that most of IR’s disagreements was not to an IE, but to the events/situations/general belief discussed in the program. In fact, this is the case in Ceviz Kabuğu. In this news interview, the topic was “universal terrorism” so the IEs were mostly on the same side but they were against some practices both in Turkey and Europe.

As for the statistics of disagreement types used in news interviews, Table 4 summarizes it briefly:

Table 4 Distribution of Disagreement Types

Name of the Program	IRC	CH	CT	CC	Act Combination
Ceviz Kabuğu	2	31	56	88	73
Alternatif	10	19	45	84	49
Sözün Özü	1	10	30	58	73
Total	13	60	131	230	195

The most frequent disagreement type used is CC (230 out of 629; 36.56 %) both in total and in each news interviews. Act combination follows CC (195 out of 629; 31 %). This type of disagreement is also analyzed in detail in Table 5. Then comes CT (131 out of 629; 21 %) and CH (60 out of 629; 9.53 %). A small percentage belongs to IRC (13 of 629; 2%).

Table 5 Distribution of Act Combinations

Name of the Program	Two Acts Combined	More than two Acts Combined
Ceviz Kabuğu	70	3
Alternatif	37	12
Sözün Özü	60	13
Total	167	28

In Acts Combination, 167 (85.6 %) of them are two acts combination and in two acts combination, CT + CC has the largest portion (104 of 167; 62 %). In “Ceviz Kabuđu” there are 44 (63 %) CT + CC combination. In “Alternatif” this number is 19 (51 %) and in “Sözün Özü” 41 (68 %) act combinations are CT + CC. In other words, more than half of two acts combination is a CT followed by a CC.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

#### 5.1. Discussion of the Main Findings and Conclusion

The present study has investigated the act of disagreement in Turkish news interviews to provide answers to these questions: how is disagreement expressed in news interviews (what are their types?) and to what extent does the context affect the number and type of disagreements? Besides, the factors that affect the politeness degree of disagreements have been examined. In this part, main findings of the data analysis will be summarized and discussed in the light of research questions (stated above) and areas which need further research will be identified.

In mundane conversation, disagreements are treated as dispreferred acts because they are inherently face threatening and they can damage the solidarity. However, as presented in Chapter 2, news interviews are called institutional talk and they have their own framework. In this framework, disagreements are not observed as dispreferred acts. Preference for disagreement is clearly seen in IR's questions which challenge disagreements between IEs and in IE's expressions of disagreement which are stated without any hesitation. This is also true for our study. The data collected has displayed that disagreements occur in news interviews more frequently than agreements. Moreover, IRs invite arguments between IEs (e.g. Kadir Beyi dinlediniz, nerelerde itiraz ediyosunuz?, Katılıyo musunuz Emin Beyin bu tanımına?, etc.) and IEs mostly state their disagreements directly without any pauses or prefaces (e.g. hayır yalan, kesinlikle düşünmüyorum, etc.). All these have proved that disagreement is the main speech act which makes the conversation in news interviews go on. For this reason, it can be said that disagreements are preferred acts in Turkish news interviews.

Stating disagreement is an important part of news interview conversation. Yet, disagreements can be expressed in different ways. Sometimes they are stated directly and sometimes indirectly. Sometimes IEs disagree by asking a question and sometimes they dispute with a counterclaim. All these ways present different structural characteristics and pragmatic functions. Following Turnbull and Muntigl (1998), disagreements in this study have been classified under five main types: IRC

(Irrelevancy Claim), CH (Challenge), CT (Contradiction), CC (Counterclaim) and Act Combinations.

IRCs assert that the previous claim uttered by one party is not relevant to the topic being discussed. The data has showed that there is not a particular way of expressing IRC. Some of them are explicitly stated as in “hiç alakası yok” or “ne ilgisi var” and some of them are more implicit done through hinting (e.g. nasıl profesörsün be). The analysis has indicated that IRCs are not common in the data. Only 2% (13) of disagreements are IRCs.

CHs are indirect way of expressing disagreement. The data analysis has demonstrated that about 90% of CHs are in the interrogative form. IEs (or sometimes IRs) question the validity or accuracy of co-IEs’ claims and require more evidence via CHs. In short, it can be said that CHs display disbelief to the claim uttered by a co-IE. In the data, 60 out of 629 disagreements (9.53%) are CHs. This shows that CHs like IRCs are not commonly used in news interviews.

In the data, CTs unlike CHs, are observed as the most direct way of disagreeing. They express denial of a claim uttered by a co-IE. The study has displayed that there are numerous ways of stating CT. One and the most frequent one is using oppositional markers such as “hayır”, “yok”, “değil”, “yalan” and “yanlış” or morphemes such as “-me, -ma” and “-mez, -maz” (as in “olmaz”, “katılmıyorum”, etc). Another way of stating CT is answering a negative claim with a positive one. This is called positive CT. Moreover, the data has showed that CT can be done indirectly through using a positive word with a negative connotation or through stating disbelief. When compared to IRCs and CHs, it is seen that CTs are used ten times more than IRCs and twice more than CHs (131 in total; 21%).

CCs do not directly contradict or challenge an IE’s claim. They mark disagreement by proposing alternative claims to co-IE’s claims or explaining reasons why he/she does not agree with these claims. The data analysis has found that CCs usually appear as declarative sentences and most of the time they are preceded by the oppositional marker “ama”. Other markers which go with CCs are “bakın” and “şimdi”. These markers not only signal counterclaim but also work as prefaces mitigating disagreement. In the data, the largest portion belongs to CCs (230 of 629; 36.56%).

The news interviews analyzed in this study have also demonstrated that more than one disagreement type can co-occur. To illustrate, first they use a CT and then a CC, or first they express a CC and then a CH. The data has showed that different types of combinations are possible, but CC and CT combinations are more frequent. Moreover, more than two types can be combined to express disagreement to an issue. This kind usually appears in long turns in the data. Act Combinations have also a large portion in news interviews: 195 out of 629 disagreements (31%) have been expressed through them.

The data has also proved that these types not only have different structures and functions but also different values in terms of politeness. As noted before, disagreements are inherently face-threatening. Yet, as many other conversational acts, they have mitigated and aggravated forms and one which determine the degree of aggravation is the types of disagreement. When their contents and positions in the data are concerned, the ranking of disagreement types from the highest to the lowest face aggravation comes out like this: Irrelevancy Claim (IRC), Challenge (CH), Contradiction (CT), and Counterclaim (CC).

IRC is the least polite way of expressing disagreement because it directly opposes the rationality of what a co-IE has just said. In this way, it limits any further discussion. Next comes CH. CH is also aggravated form of disagreement because it hints the inefficiency of the co-IE and implicates that he/she cannot back up his/her claim. In that sense, it criticizes the competency of the co-IE. CT is also a severe type of disagreement for it explicitly denies the co-IE's claim. Yet, since it does not directly criticize the co-IE's rationality or competency, it is not as aggravated as IRC or CH. At the end of the continuum is CC. Since it proposes alternative claim(s) or reason(s) for disagreement, CC is the most polite way of disagreeing. Furthermore, rather than closing negotiation down as it happens in IRC or CH, it opens up the topic of discussion. The place of act combination in the continuum seems rather problematic. They include more than one type of disagreement and the severity of disagreement changes according to the types which have been used in the combination. For instance, the analysis has showed that a combination of CT and CC (CT + CC or CC + CT) stands between CT and CC since CC mitigates the aggravation of CT to some degree.

On the other hand, CH + CC is more severe than CT + CC and CH + CT is more severe than CH + CC.

The data has showed that in addition to the type, the position where a disagreement is expressed may have a significant implication. Disagreements become more face threatening and less polite when they are uttered interruptively in the middle of a co-IE's turn. This is also against the framework of news interviews in which IEs are expected to wait for a question from IR to express their disagreement. It has also been seen that some of disagreements are expressed as back channels in the study. Expressing disagreement via backchannels seems to have a forcing effect because they are attacks on speaker's right of talking. Yet, since the IEs or IR cannot get the turn through these expressions, they are not as aggravated as overlaps or interruptions. In addition, to whom they are addressed can influence the degree of severity. According to the provisions of news interviews, disagreements are addressed to a third party, the IR. If they are stated to a co-IE directly, they become more aggravated and impolite. In sum, the study has indicated that departures from the framework make disagreements more face threatening because each departure refers to a break in the cooperation (provided by news interview format) between IR and IEs.

In the study, the degree of politeness expressed in disagreements is also looked at from Leech's (1983) the Politeness Maxims. News interviews violate the Agreement Maxim in nature by maximizing disagreement use. Yet, the data has displayed that other maxims can be violated while expressing disagreement. In that way, the study has shown that a mitigated type of disagreement, for example a CC, can become more impolite. In other words, there is a correlation between the degree of impoliteness and the number of maxims violated. Breach of more number of maxims makes a disagreement more face threatening.

Apart from these, the data has provided evidence that it is possible to upgrade or downgrade disagreements by using some downtoners or intensifiers. Downtoner markers such as "öyle" (as in "öyle değil") or "pek" (as in "pek doğru bulmuyorum") mitigate disagreement whereas intensifiers such as "mümkün" (as in "mümkün değil") or "kesinlikle" (as in "kesinlikle katılmıyorum") strengthen disagreement. Besides, the data analysis has showed that expressing partial agreement, using prefaces or giving a

short pause before asserting disagreement softens its severity and increases politeness because they indicate reluctance for stating disagreement. Furthermore, attributive disagreements that is, disagreements which directly attack a co-IE's professional identity, thoughts or beliefs are among the most aggravated disagreements.

Another finding of the present study is this: the more severe a disagreement stated by an IE is (size of imposition), the more severe retaliation it gets. This means, in order to maintain his/her face, the IE disputes a co-IE's aggravating disagreement with a more aggravating one.

So far, disagreement types and their degree of politeness have been discussed. Thus, the first research question of the study has been answered. As for the second research question, "to what extent does context affect the number and type of disagreement in news interviews?", the data has shown that the context has an effect but not adequate to explain the number and type of disagreements. As stated in Chapter 3, Methodology Part, the discussion topic of "Ceviz Kabuđu" is universal terrorism, the topic of "Alternatif" is whether Vahdettin is a traitor or not, and lastly the topic of "Sözün Özü" is micro and macro identities in Turkey. Of all, "Ceviz Kabuđu" presents a social topic on which people share common ideas; everybody is against terrorism. This affects the number and type of disagreements. When compared to the other two programs, it is seen that "Ceviz Kabuđu" has less number of disagreements although it is the longest program (217 minutes). Moreover, the majority of the disagreements used in this news interview fall into CC category which is the least face threatening one. As a result, it can be said that context affects the occurrence of disagreement in news interviews. Nevertheless, the analysis has shown that context is not a sufficient factor on its own to explain disagreement use in these programs. "Alternatif" and "Sözün Özü" confirm this. The topics of both programs are political and sensitive issues which have always led to heated debates between parties. Yet, when the number of disagreements is compared, it is observed that "Alternatif" includes more number of disagreements than "Sözün Özü" though it is shorter. Additionally, it comprises more severe disagreements such as IRC, CH, and CT. This shows that there are other factors affecting the number and type of disagreements. The data has indicated that another significant factor is the characteristics (styles) of the participants and their political

stance. Since one of the IEs (KM) has an aggravating nature and the IR is inefficient in managing the program in “Alternatif”, there occurs high number and more aggravated disagreements in it.

Finally, a whole analysis of Turkish news interviews has indicated that they do not follow the provisions of news interview format proposed in the “Literature Review” in Chapter 2. The IEs usually do not wait for a question from IR to state their ideas. They mostly express their disagreements as soon as co-IE finishes his/her turn or interruptively in the middle of it. In addition, IEs generally address their disagreement statements to co-IE directly instead of to the third party, the IR. This is also against the format of news interviews. IRs also violate the rules. They are expected to keep a neutral stance and play the role of “animator” by shifting footing. Yet, in the data, it is seen that they take part in news interviews as if they were a co-IE. For all these reasons, it can be suggested that Turkish news interviews depart from Western news interviews framework and present a different style which is more competitive and so more aggressive and less polite. Yemenici (2001: 335) also reported similar findings. She compared Turkish news interviews with Greek ones and stated that due to their competitive nature, Turkish news interviews are more impolite.

The study has also indicated that expressing disagreement is at the heart of news interviews. Yet, the analysis has only focused on disagreements at word/sentence level. This is a limitation. In expression of disagreements, as in other acts, intonation and body language also play important roles. These areas can be suggested for further research. Moreover, a comparison of disagreements in news interviews with those in mundane conversations and those in other institutional settings in Turkey such as courtrooms will help us to understand their forms and level of politeness better. Besides, the corpus includes three news interviews. Therefore, it must be noted that the results may change when a larger corpus is used. For instance, it is likely that topic specific and idiosyncratic disagreements will be used less.

In conclusion, this thesis has examined three Turkish news interviews and provided an empirical analysis of naturally occurring expressions of disagreement in these programs. It has showed that there are different ways of expressing disagreement and each way presents a different level of politeness depending on disagreement types

used, where they are stated and whom they are addressed to, politeness maxims violated, use of downtoners or intensifiers and size of imposition. Apart from these, the study has demonstrated that disagreement use is under the effect of the context that is, the discussion topic and the characteristics of participants.

## REFERENCES

- Atifi, H. and Marcoccia, M. (forthcoming). Television Genre as an Object of Negotiation: A Semio-pragmatic Analysis of French Political “Television Forum”. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and Politeness: New (insights) for Old (concepts). *Journal of Pragmatics*. 35: 1453-1469.
- Bilmes, J. (1988). The Concept of Preference in Conversation Analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 17: 161-181
- Blum- Kulka, S., House, J., and Kasper, G. (1989). “Investigating Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: An Introductory Overview”. In *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Blum- Kulka, S., House, J., and Kasper, G. (eds.) 1- 34. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex
- Blum- Kulka, S., Blondheim, M. and Hacoheh, G. (2002). Traditions of Dispute: Negotiations of Talmudic Texts to the Arena of Political Discourse in the Media: *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34: 1569- 1594.
- Bou- Franch, P. and Garces-Conejos, P. (2003). Teaching Linguistic Politeness: A Methodological Proposal. *IRAL*. 41: 1-22.
- Butler, C.S. (1996). “On the Concept of an Interpersonal Metafunction in English”. In *Meaning and Form: Systemic Functional Interpretation*. Berry, C.S., Butler, C. S., Fawcett, R., and Huang, G. (eds.). 151-181. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Cin, A. (2000). Hayır Kelimesi ve Türkçede Kullanılışı Üzerine. *Türk Dili Dergisi*. 583: 39- 49.
- Cohen, A. D. (1996). “Speech Acts”. In *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. McKay, S. L. and Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). 383- 420. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S. (1992). “Footing in the Achievement of Neutrality: the Case of News Interview Discourse”. In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (eds.). 163- 198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clayman, S. (2002). Disagreements and Third Parties: Dilemmas of Neutralism in Panel News Interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34: 1385- 1401.
- Clayman, S and Heritage, J. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., and Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness Revisited: With Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 35:1545-1579.
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992). "Analyzing Talk at Work". In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (eds.). 3- 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edstrom, A. (2004). Venezuelans in Conversation: Reconsidering the Influence of Culture. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 36: 1499- 1518.
- Eggs, S & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Ervin-Tripp, S., Guo, J., and Lampert, M. (1990). Politeness and Persuasion in Children's Control Acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14: 307-331.
- Fetzer, A. (forthcoming). "Minister, we will see how the public judges you." Media References in Political Interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Fukada, A. and Asato, N. (2004). Universal Politeness Theory: Application to the Use of Japanese Honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 36: 1991-2002.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2001). Arguing about the Future: On Indirect Disagreements in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 33: 1881- 1900.
- Greathbach, D. (1992). "On the Management of Disagreement between News Interviewees". In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (eds.). 268- 301. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodwin, M. H., Goodwin, C. and Yaeger-Dror, M. (2002). Multi-modality in Girls' Disputes. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34: 1621- 1649.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interactional Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour* .USA: Penguin Press.
- Heisler, T., Vincent, D., and Bergeron, A. (2003). Evaluative Metadiscursive Comments and Face-work in Conversational Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 35: 1613-1631.
- Johansson, M. (forthcoming). Constructing Objects of Discourse in the Broadcast Political Interview. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Ji, S.(2000). Discussion Note. "Face"and Polite Verbal Behaviors in Chinese Culture. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 32: 1059-1062.
- Kakava, C. (2002). Opposition in Modern Greek Discourse: Cultural and Contextual Constraints. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34: 1537- 1568.

- Kangasharju, H. (2002). Alignment in Disagreement: Forming Oppositional Alliances in Committee Meetings. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34: 1447- 1471.
- Karatepe, Ç. (1998). Teaching Pragmalinguistics in Teacher Training Programmes. Unpublished PhD. Thesis. University of Liverpool. Liverpool, UK.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14: 193-218.
- Kaufman, A. (2002). Negation and Prosody in British English: A Study Based on the London-Lund Corpus. *Journal of Pragmatics*.34: 1473-1494.
- Kotthoff, H. (1993). Disagreement and Concession in Disputes: On the Context Sensitivity of Preference Structures. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 22: 193-216.
- Leon, J. (2004). Preference and “bias” in the Format of French News Interviews: the Semantic Analysis of Question-Answer Pairs in Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 36: 1885- 1920.
- Lidia, T. (2004). *Gender, Language and Culture: A Study of Japanese Television Interview Discourse*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Meier, A.J.(1995). Passages of Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 24: 382-392.
- Muntigl, P. and Turnbull, W. (1998). Conversational Structure and Facework in Arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 29: 225-256.
- Mey, J.L. (1994). *Pragmatics: an Introduction*.Oxford: Blackwell.
- Myers, G. (1998). Displaying Opinions: Topics and Disagreement in Focus Groups. *Language and Society*. 27: 85-111.
- Östman, J-O. (1981). *You Know: A discourse Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examining Politeness, Face and the Japanese Language. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 35: 1471-1506
- Rees- Miller, J. (2000). Power, Severity, and Context in Disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 32: 1087-1111.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992).“On Talk and Its Institutional Occasions”. In *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (eds.). 268- 301. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1996). "Interactional Sociolinguistics". In *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. McKay, S. L. and Hornberger, N. H. (Eds.). 307-328. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, C.E., Perlmann, R.Y., Gleason, J.B., and Hooshyar, N. (1990). Developmental Perspectives on Politeness: Sources of Children's Knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14: 289-305.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman Press.

Yemenici, A. (2001). "Analysis of the Use of Politeness Maxims in Interruptions in Turkish Political Debates". In *Linguistic Politeness across Boundaries. The case of Greek and Turkish*. Bayraktaroğlu, A. (eds.). 307- 339. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yılmaz, E. (1998). Turkish Discourse Particles: a Pragmatic Analysis of "şey", "yani" and "işte". Unpublished PhD. Thesis. University of Essex. Colchester, UK.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Weizman, E. (forthcoming). Roles and Identities in News Interviews: The Israeli Context. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

## APPENDIX

## A- Irrelevancy Claims (IRCs)

## (1) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	IR	sayın Ercan siz //Mustafa Kemalın Vahdettin tarafından=
2	YE	//şim e: sayın Önkibar ben
3	IR	=gönderildiğini kabul ediyo musunuz Samsuna
4	YE	ben bütün konuşmaları Kadir Mıroğlunun başta olmak
5		üzere (.) saygıyla sonuna kadar dinledim (.) araya
6		girmedim saldırganlık yapmadım=eğer e: doğru bir
7		bilimsel //bir tartışma yapacaksa sayın Mıroğlu
8	KM →	//ciddi bi şey söyle
9	IR	buyurun hocam

## (2) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	NA	....on iki eylül yönetimi askeri yönetimi Türkiyenin iç
2		(.2) yönetimini zaptrapt altına alırken ekonomiden
3		sorumlu başbakan yardımcılığına Turgut Özal ve ekibini
4		getirdi şimdi bu nokta çok önemli yani
5		Bülent Ulusu ile aralarındaki yönetim farklılığı olabilir
6		ama on iki eylül yönetiminin ekonomi ile sorumlu ekibi
7		Turgut Özal ve ekibiydi Kaya Erdem vesayreden
8		//meydana gelen yapıydı
9	IR	//demek ki memnun olmamışlar ki daha sonra parti
10		kurduğu zaman bin dokuz yüz seksen üçte e. Bu adamı
11		seçmeyin noktasına geldi demek ki birlikte çalıştıkları
12		zamanlardan memnun kalma //mışlar di: mi neyse peki
13		siz kendi fikri bütünlüğünüzü tamamlayın
14	NA →	//ama o ayrı bi konu biz
15		sadece (incomprehensible) biz ona yani on iki ey on iki
16		eylülün on iki eylülün Türk siyasi hayatında ....

## B- Challenges (CHs)

### (3) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	YE		evet (.3) şimdi servetini götürmedi diyosunuz (.) bundan
2			kimse emin olamaz ne kadar ne götürdü (.) kızı bir şey
3			söylüyor (.) baş yanındakiler e: farklı bi şeyler söylüyor
4	KM		biz burda //Mustafa Kemali konuşmuyoruz
5	YE		//ancak şu bi gerçek ki gerçekten hayat ın son
6			um son yıllarında son yılında yahutta e: çok fazla maddi
7			durumu iyi değildi (.) ben o biliniyor ve söyleniyor ve
8			buna da bildiğim kadarıyla itiraz eden de yok
9	IR		//evet
10	KM	→	//o zaman vasiyatnamesini açıklayın (.) vasiyatnamesini
11			açıklayın

### (4) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	IR		//namussuzu hırsızlık yapanı onu bunu yapanı hukuken
2			cezasını verecek ayrı bi şey yoksa
3	EG		//öldürcek diye bi şey yok da bu bu açıklama bu açıklama
4			(.2) bu açıklama yapılmıştır Nurullah hocam bilir (.) bu
5			açıklama yapılmıştır.
6	IR		peki hemen // (incomprehensible)
7	EG		// olgunlaşmasını bekliyoduk diyo
8	IR		o söze itiraz yok çünkü o söz kayıtlara girmiş gerçekten
9			//söylenmiş bi söz
10	EG	→	//tamam ne demek olgunlaşmasını bekliyoduk yani
11			gençler ölürken neyi bekliyorsunuz
12	IR		evet buyurun sayın Aydın

### C- Contradictions (CTs)

#### (5) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

1	IR		ama ben o tarihlerde (.2) gazeteciliğe yeni başlamıştım
2			ekonomi muhabirliği yapıyordum zaten siyasi haberler
3			yasaklanmıştı on //iki Eylül'den sonra ee Bülent Ulusu=
4	NA		//evet
5	IR		=ile de yaptığım birkaç tane röportaj vardı (.) daha sonra
6			Turgut Özalla birbirlerine girdiler amiyane //deyimle
7	NA		//onu
8	IR		Turgutun hatırı için zam yaptık sözü bana ödül aldırın
9			bir haberdir (.) yani birbirlerine girdiler
10	NA		ama //başbakan yardımcılığına onu getirdiler Turgut
11			Özal'ı getirdiler
12	IR	→	//Turgut Özalla anladım ama çok uyum içinde bir ekip
13			<i>değildi</i> şimdi böyle anlattığınız zaman benim <i>itirazlarım</i>
14			<i>olacak</i> çünkü bizzat yaşadığım dönemler haber haberci
15			olarak yaşadığım dönemler e: bu <i>bağlantıyı</i> ben kafamda
16			<i>kuramıyorum</i> //katılmıyorum yani genel teori olabilir =
17	NA		//peki ama şöyle ifade edebiliriz
18	IR		=şemsiye olarak da bazı yerler <i>tutmuyor</i>

#### (6) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	ÜÖ		daha ademi merkezîyetçi bir zemine (.) oturtulması
2			yaklaşımı (.2) yine (.) bu anayasa yaklaşımı yeni anayasa
3			yaklaşımıyla e birlikte ele alınması gereken (.) ve (.) halen
4			(.) yürüyen bir süreç olan üniter devleti ademi
5			merkezîyetçi bir yapıya doğru kaydırmaya çalışan (.) e:
6			AKP nin hazırladığı (.) kamu reformu (.2) yasaları ki
7			bunlar bir diziden ibaret (.) ve (.) tabi bu çerçevede Avrupa
8			Birliğinin (.) AKPnin (.) etnik merkezli tercihe dayanan (.)
9			politikaları =
10	IR		=ne gibi mesela
11	ÜÖ		onların da detaylarına //gircem ama hemen kısa kısa
12			vereyim
13	IR		//hayır hayır fazla detay değil kıs
14	ÜÖ		kısa kısa //mesela
15	IR		//yani Türkiyeli (.) veya Türkiye Cumhuriyeti
16			vatan //daşlığı (.) o mu
17	ÜÖ	→	//hayır (.) hayır onun ötesinde hayır
18	IR		nedir

## D- Counterclaims (CCs)

### (7) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

- 1 KM yüzlerce delili olan adam (.) öyle bir delil ileri sürer ki  
 2 yüzden seçer en vurucusunu (.) tabiyat kanunu gibi  
 3 itiraz edilmez bir şey söyler (.) mağlup bir devletin  
 4 padişahı ne diyecek (.) hafifletmekten başka (.) ama:  
 5 //bunların hepsinin arkasında müsaade buyurun anladık (.)  
 6 anladık sizin ne söylediğinizi  
 7 YE //Atatürk mağlup devletin subayı değil miydi o kabul  
 8 etmedi ve savaştı  
 9 IR tek tek konuşalım efendim //evet  
 10 KM → //anladık (.) hafifletilmesini  
 11 istemiş (.) *tabi böyle oyalıyacak (.) bilmediğiniz bir*  
 12 *gerçek (.) Mustafa Kemalle anlaşmış (.) onu Anadoluya*  
 13 *göndermiş (.) işte genel kurmayın vesika istiyorsun (.)*  
 14 *yüz elli sayı devam etmiş olan harp tarihi vesikaları*  
 15 *dergisi (.) şu birinci cilt yirmi sekiz tane vesika ihtiva*  
 16 *ediyor*  
 17 IR ne var //efendim içinde

### (8) CEVİZ KABUĞU FLASH TV

- 1 EG .... şimdi onun için diyorum ben (.) kim olursa olsun  
 2 bi Mustafa Kemalci bürokrat olur (.) bi nası diyorum  
 3 ya: bi savcı vardır (.) bi Cumhuriyet savcısı vardır (.)  
 4 bi asker vardır bir Mustafa Kemal'in askeri vardır (.)  
 5 bi bürokrat vardır bi Mustafa Kemal'in bürokratu vardır  
 6 (.) yani bu anlamda söylüyorum (.) kim ne alınıyorsa  
 7 alınsın yani onlara bakmam ben şimdi öyle (.) öyle  
 8 adamlar var ki ders anlatırken (.) asker ders anlatırken  
 9 Amerikasız olmaz diyor (.) adama sonra sorarlar (.) bi  
 10 öğrenci çıkıp bana soruyor harp okulundan (.) eğer  
 11 bu Amerikasız=  
 12 IR = harp okulunda ders mi veriyorsunuz  
 13 EG yok ben (.) kapıdan geçmek bana yasak  
 14 IR ((laughing))  
 15 EG şimdi bir öğrenci diyor ki (.) yani birkaç tane öğrenci  
 16 diyorlar ki eğer bu Amerikasız olmuyorsa (.) Avrupasız  
 17 olmuyorsa (.) o zaman biz yedi yüz elli bin kişilik ordu  
 18 niye duruyoruz (.) onlar yani bu işleri organize ediyorsa  
 19 o zaman biz niye varız (.) şimdi bu genç subaylar böyle  
 20 soruyorlar (.) e hakları var  
 21 IR → *ama Genel Kurmay Başkanımız daha önce açıklamıştı*  
 21 *bu konularda genç subay yaş (.) yaşlı subay diye olmaz*  
 22 *(.) Türk subayı tek vücuttur demişti*

## E- Act Combinations

### (9) ALTERNATİF FLASH TV

1	YE	=şimdi şeyhülislam zaman kazanmak için um Atatürk
2		hakkında Mustafa Kemal hakkında fetva yazmış (.) ve
3		buna karşılık da Rıfat Börekçi Ankaradan (.) e: karşı
4		fetvayı yayınladı (.) peki İstanbul hükümeti bu kadar iyi
5		niyetliydi de neden Rıfat Börekçiyi görevinden azletti (.) o
6		da mı zaman kazanmak içindi yani e: bunlar söy//lenenler=
7	KM →	//Rıfat
8		<i>Börekçinin vazifeden alındığı sözü doğru değil <u>oraya</u></i>
9		<i><u>hükmü geçmez İstanbul hükümetinin</u></i>
10	YE	= o saman kağıt yok defter sayfaları (.)biraz bunlar arka
11		tarafını görmeyen meselenin //arkasına bakmayan=
12	KM	//evet
13	YE	=tek yönüyle gören insanların görüşü bu ....

### (10) SÖZÜN ÖZÜ KANAL 7

1	UG	.... dileyen kişi kendini Kürt olarak tanımlayabilir (.3) e:
2		kendini e: üst kimlik olarakta Türkiye Cumhuriyeti
3		vatandaşlığıyla ifade edebilir (.) buna hiç kimsenin itirazı
4		yok (.2) ama (.)sırf başkalarını (.2) bu toplumda bu ulusun
5		içinde (.) küçük küçük parçaları (.2) memnun edicez onları
6		tatmin edicez diye (.) bir koskoca ulus (.2) kendini niçin
7		inkar edecek (.) //dünyanın hangi ülkesinde böyle bi şey =
8	IR	//şimdi
9	UG	=istenebilir
10	IR	ben şunu sor-
11	UG →	<i>bakın Fransada Porsikalılara (.3) e: (.2) <u>tat onları tatmin</u></i>
12		<i><u>etmek için Fransızlara Fransızlıklarından vazgeçmelerini</u></i>
13		<i><u>söyleyebilir misiniz</u></i>
14		(.3)
15	IR	um sayın Uluç-
16	UG	yani böyle //bi şey düşünebilir mi dünyanın hangi =
17	IR	//°siz°
18	UG	=ülkesinde düşünülebilir=
19	IR	=sayın Uluç Gürkan (.) Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşlığı
20		bağlamında bir (.) üst kimliğe (.) karşı mısınız