

# Heckling in Parliamentary Interactions

Mohammad I. Alqatawna

English Language Centre, Preparatory Year Deanship, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

**Abstract**—This paper aims to describe and discuss the phenomenon of gaining illegal speakership in the Jordanian parliament with reference to the application of conversation analysis (CA), the participation framework, the notion of activity type, the notion of participation framework patterns, and the forms of embodiment and social organisation. The use of these strands enabled a fine-grained analysis of the ways in which hecklers enter the interaction, what they do with the floor and how other participants respond to these incursions. This study also shows how allotting certain roles in institutional contexts impacts people's rights to speak and how they can disobey the rules to become speaking participants.

**Index Terms**—heckling, CA, institutional interactions, participation framework, parliamentary interaction

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, many video recordings of members of parliament (MPs) have gone viral on social networking sites. Some MPs interrupt each other in the parliament for various reasons. Although heckling in the Jordanian parliament is a prohibited behaviour, participants insist on making a contribution to an interaction.

Most data consist of contexts where the participants are ratified, for instance, informal interaction, meetings, news interviews and classrooms. The participation framework in these settings is rather different from the current study. In these settings, participants are ratified to speak, i.e. take part in an interaction without the need of finding a way to gain the floor of the interaction. However, the data of this study is unusual, because the heckler is not meant to be a ratified participant in the interaction. Theories of interaction and their findings are essentially based on ratified participation where they can join, leave or re-join in an interaction without restrictions. The data of this study allows an investigation of how participants get to the floor (under circumstances where they are not meant to have it), how they work to keep the floor and how ratified participants work to regain the floor or allow the heckler to become a ratified participant (even though it is against the rules).

## II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is a constitutional monarchy. The constitution of Jordan was established in 1952 and the country's system is a hereditary parliamentary monarchy (Petrov, 2010). According to the constitution of Jordan, the powers of the country are divided into three: executive, legislative and judicial authorities (Nasrawin, 2012). The executive authority is comprised of the prime minister, appointed by the king and 20 to 28 ministers chosen by the prime minister. The legislative authority consists of two houses: the lower house is made up of 130 members elected directly by the people and include fifteen secured seats (quota) for women, fifteen seats for the semi-desert (Badia) region, nine seats for Christians and three seats for Chechens and Circassian (Atiyat, 2017). Whereas the upper house (the senate) consists of 65 members appointed by the king (IUP, 2016).

### *Physical Circumstances of the Parliament*

The physical design of the parliament is a round shape, where all MPs can face the stage of the parliament. MPs do not have their own individual seats. This means that they sit wherever they can in the parliament. Each desk in the parliament is equipped with a microphone and a screen where the MP can log in whenever a parliament session begins. MPs give their speeches from their desks without the need to stand up (Article 104<sup>1</sup>). However, there are some cases in which they can deliver speeches from the podium if the chairperson (CP) approves (Article 104<sup>2</sup>). When the CP assigns a current speaker to give a speech, he/she allocates a specific time to him/her. The current speaker (CS) must deliver his/her speech during the allocated time, otherwise the CP can shut down the microphone and assign a new speaker. MPs typically address their speeches to the CP, looking directly at him (Article 105)<sup>3</sup>.

## III. HECKLING

Heckling can be defined as 'to interrupt a public speech or performance with loud, unfriendly statements or questions' (Cambridge online dictionary, 2016). It may take place in various settings, including political speeches,

<sup>1</sup> Article 104 of the internal regulations of the parliament.

<sup>2</sup> Article 104 of the internal regulations of the parliament.

<sup>3</sup> Article 105 of the internal regulations of the parliament.

public talks, sports events, stand-up comedy and parliament. Within these settings, heckling can vary in nature, as the speaker, physical space and size of the audience can shape the heckling performance.

Heckling has been defined by various scholars in different settings. For example, Sloan, Love, and Ostrom (1974, p. 519) write that heckling 'is used to refer to a variety of hostile actions, including attempts to prevent the speaker from completing his talk, distracting the audience from attending to the speaker's message, disrupting the speaker's poise and disorganising his presentation, and making it difficult for the audience to hear clearly.'

In conversation analysis, McIlvenny (1996b, p. 21) defines a heckle as 'a public utterance usually directed at a ratified speaker – often in response to a particular assertion, utterance, statement or speech'. The above definitions also offer valuable insights into the definitions of heckling. However, the most useful definition among them is that of McIlvenny, which offers a thorough definition of heckling in terms of the participation framework of recipients, such as the heckler who is unrated and the CS/speaker who is ratified to speak.

#### IV. PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORK

This section discusses the participation framework, which is an important concept in relation to heckling because it outlines the status of the participants engaged in an interaction. In heckling, participants self-select themselves to speak and often disrupt a speaker during talk. Self-selection as the speaker may be seen as inappropriate by others, especially the CS, who holds the speakership.

Prominent scholars in linguistics, specifically, linguistic anthropologists, have provided a useful structure for the understanding of participation. The notion of participation has been used by such scholars in order to analyse the forms of social organisation of vocal and non-vocal interactions (Goffman, 1981; Levinson, 1979).

Goffman (1981) makes a distinction between what he calls the production format, i.e. the speaker and the participation network or participation framework (the hearer). These concepts will be discussed in the following sections.

##### A. *Speaker/Production Format*

The concept of the 'speaker' (Goffman, 1981) or 'the production format' is defined in three ways: the animator, author and principal of an utterance.

The demonstration of the speaker is illustrated by the following.

Production format (speaker), which includes three categories (Goffman, 1981, p. 226):

- Animator 'the sounding box' (p. 226).
- Author 'the agent who scripts the lines' (p. 226).
- Principal 'the party to whose position the words attest' (p. 226).

##### B. *Listeners/Recipients*

Goffman uses three labels interchangeably for the reception end: listeners, hearers or recipients. Goffman (1981) makes a distinction between what he calls 'ratified and non-ratified' participants (p. 226). The term 'ratified participants' refers to the participants in the interaction who are 'official hearers' of the speech (Goffman, 1981, p. 133). Ratified participants are divided into two groups: addressed recipients, which refers to 'the one to whom the speaker addresses his visual attention and to whom, incidentally, he expects to turn over his speaking role' (Goffman 1981, p. 133); and unaddressed recipients, which refers to 'the rest of the official hearers who may or may not be listening' (p. 133).

Non-ratified participants refer to those participants whose social place in talking is not ratified, such as listeners. Non-ratified participants are comprised of two categories: overhearers or bystanders, (non-official) 'inadvertent', non-official listeners (p. 132), 'cavesdroppers' (non-official) and 'non-official' followers of talk (p. 132).

There is an analytic perspective that can be used alongside Goffman's participation framework to examine participants' interpretive procedures; it focuses on the 'activity type'. Levinson defines activity types in this way:

I take the notion of an activity type to refer to a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded events with constraints on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable contributions. Paradigm examples would be teaching, a job interview, a jural interrogation, a football game, a task in a workshop, a dinner party, and so on. (Levinson, 1979, p. 69).

Here, it is observed that the activity type focuses on the ways in which the 'structural properties of an activity constrain (especially the function of) the verbal contributions that can be made towards it' (Levinson, 1979, p. 71).

The notion of participation patterns that are sustained across an activity type is also used alongside the activity types of Levinson (1979). Participants, i.e. speakers and hearers, exchange roles in the momentum of interactions. This means that ratified participants who are unaddressed may possibly become addressed by the speaker at a moment in the interaction (O'Driscoll, 2018). By combining the dynamic considerations with the concept of frame, it becomes noticeable 'that certain kinds of encounters dictate, or at least predispose towards, certain patterns of participation framework throughout their course, including particular roles, rights and obligations allocated to particular participants' (O'Driscoll, 2018, p. 46).

This study follows Goffman's (1981) categories of the participation framework. With reference to parliamentary

interaction, Goffman's account of participation framework is used alongside the notion of activity type (Levinson, 1979) and the notion of participation framework patterns (O'Driscoll, 2018). In this study, particular roles in this institutional context have an influence on participants' rights to speak and how they can violate the rules to gain speakership. The CP is always a ratified participant because of his institutional privileges. The CS can be an MP (of lower house), a minister, or the prime minister. The CS is a ratified participant if the CP selects him/her to participate in parliamentary debate. Other participants, such as the prime minister, ministers, MPs and audience members in the gallery are unrated to participate. Thus, these allowable contributions, rights and obligations of participants are seen as an important aspect of participation in parliamentary interactions.

The reason behind favouring Goffman's typology instead of other scholars, e.g. Levinson, is that Goffman's typology is more influential. Although Levinson's decompositions of speaker and hearer categories are seen as an improvement of Goffman's categories, they have received some criticism. Some scholars have criticised Levinson for decomposing the speaker and hearer categories, e.g. Irvine (1996), where she points out that it shifted the analysis back to the beginning. Others have argued that such practice "would lead to countless proliferation of labels" (O'Driscoll & Holt, 2021, p. 21).

## V. METHODOLOGY

The analysis of the data is based on 41 heckling interactions that occurred at the Jordanian parliament. The participants of the study are adult males and females. The data of the current study was collected using the YouTube public site and the designated setting of the data is the Jordanian parliament. All of the YouTube data have been transcribed according to the standards of CA conventions (Jefferson, 2004). The transcription of the study occurred in three steps. First, the data was transliterated from the Arabic language into English. Second, the data was transcribed by me instead of hiring someone to do it. This enabled me to live, experience and handle the data properly instead of relying on hiring a transcriber. Third, the translation of the Arabic language was included in the transcription (Clift & Helani, 2010). In terms of translation, the original language was presented, then again with a morpheme-by-morpheme 'gloss', and then a translation into the language of the publication immediately below it, line by line.

CA research has never been restricted to ordinary conversations; rather, it 'developed in relation to a wide range of data corpora' and 'the term "talk-in-interaction" has come to be generally used, in preference to conversation, to refer to the object of CA research' (Heritage & Drew, 1992, p. 4). The relevance of institutional talk to the current study is that institutional talk involves people who play different roles, and those roles have different rights (including being able to contribute to an interaction). The analysis of the data is mainly qualitative. Nevertheless, I used a quantitative component in order to count the frequencies of recurrent actions. With the assistance of the recordings and the transcript, CA was chosen as the method because it aims to examine how participants cooperatively launch turns of talk and their consequences, i.e. how they orient themselves to them (Clayman & Gill, 2004). Conversation analysis is ideally significant because it looks at the sequence of talk and turn (ten Have, 2007) whilst pragmatics does not. Further, Clayman and Gill (2004) point out that 'analysis is thus a type of mapping exercise, albeit one that maps not only interactional patterns but also the underlying methods and procedures through which participants produce them and render them intelligible' (p. 595). In order to perform such analysis, it is necessary to consider that 'participants in conversations are seen as mutually orienting to, and collaborating in order to achieve, orderly and meaningful communication' (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 1). In other words, the focus should be on what participants are doing and how they are doing it in the conversation, rather than why are they doing it.

## VI. GAINING SPEAKERSHIP

This section looks at how unrated participants UPs attain speakership when committing an 'illegal intervention' (Shaw, 2000). The importance of gaining the speakership enables us to see exactly what MPs do at the point when they are not allowed to enter an interaction, i.e. to speak or participate in the parliament's debate. Therefore, they use some strategies or techniques as an attempt to gain the speakership.

In ordinary conversations, conversationalists take turns to bid for the floor, with one speaker's turn following the previous one without any perceptible gap and without any overlap (This model is sometimes referred to as the 'no gap, no overlap' model – see Sacks et al., 1974.) Sacks et al. (1974) argue that a speaker who launches a turn has primary rights to the floor, and the transfer of speakership becomes a salient possibility only at certain specifiable occasions. In this study, however, heckles may occur in response to an assertion or procedure in the parliament, or could even be produced *not* in response to an assertion in the parliament, such as complaining about something beyond the parliamentary business. In many instances, heckles occur near transition relevance place (TRP). Nevertheless, heckles can also be launched in gaps and pauses in the CS's talk. In order to see the exact timing of heckles, see Example (1). The UP illegally intervenes in the CS's speech, complaining about establishing new legislation in the parliament.

## Example (1) 12

1. CS: ?rai;s ?lexwa ?zzumula (2.0) ?na men ?ham mutat? mutat?labat bina?  
Chairperson brother colleagues for importance requirements  
establishing  
**chairman brothers and colleagues (2.0) the most requirements for requirements for establishing**
2. CS: ?ddawala ?lʕasriya (.) huwa ?lʕmal bi?hkam ?ddustu:r watʕdi:l aḥkamihi  
State modern is working rules institution and its  
amendments  
**modern state is by applying what the constitution stipulates and its amendments**
3. CS: letuwakib ?ttat?awr( ) filʕa::lam amutaɣyr bistimrar  
Keep up with development in world changing constantly  
**To constantly keep up with the development of changing world**
4. CS: [ watula?im masʕlhat ?lbilad walʕeba:d]  
Appropriate benefit of country and people  
**[To cope up with the benefit of the country and its people]**
5. UP:→ [saʕadet ?lna?b (|.)saʕadet ?lna?b]  
excellency MP excellency MP  
**[ your excellency (.) your excellency ) ]**

At the beginning of the interaction, the ratified participant holds the floor to give his speech with regard to applying the constitution and its amendments to keep up with the changing world and to cope up with the benefit of the country (see lines 1-4). Line 5 overlaps with line 4, where the UP begins to talk near TRP. This means that, before the ratified participant completed the turn constructional unit (TCU), the UP began to summon an MP. On the other hand, UPs may also begin speaking by choosing a gap or pause of the CS's speech. That is, while a CS is holding a turn, his/her speech may have gaps or silence. Thus, a UP is likely to seize the opportunity to begin to talk in the gaps or pauses in the talk. In order to see how this occurs, see Example (2). The UP begins the heckle in the gap/pause in the CS's speech.

## Example (2) 21

1. CS: kama: (.) waʕadat?lhokoma (.) ma taza:l moltazima ʕnda wʕdeha (.)  
As promised the government still committed to its promise  
**As the government had promised and still it is committed to its promises**
2. CS: la yomkin ?n tarfʕ (.) ?sʕar ?lkahruba:ʔ (.) ?la (.) bilʕwda ?la majls  
?nawab  
Not possible to increase rates of electricity except in consultation to  
MPs  
**rates of electricity (.) (energy) will not be increased (.) only (.) in consultation with MPs**
3. CS: bidʕabt? kama ?ltazamna (2.0)  
Exactly as we have pledged  
**Exactly as we have pledged (2.0)**

In lines 1 and 2, the prime minister (CS) discusses the idea of increasing the electricity rates only in consultation with the members of the parliament. In line 3, the CS then continues to make his point, followed by a short silence at the end of the turn.

Having considered at what point UPs begin talking, I now move on to explore what they do in their turns. Most commonly, in my corpus, MPs who are unratified to participate attempt to gain the speakership using the following: summons, announcements and launching straight into the reason for heckles.

A. *Summons*

A summons is a derivation of the pre-sequence, which is not designed in reference to the prior interaction but is used to introduce any sort of talk (Liddicoat, 2007). The summons and answer sequence is a kind of pre-sequence that is designed to draw the attention of recipients (Liddicoat, 2007). Schegloff (2007) writes that 'there is one type of pre-sequence which is not directed to any sequence type in particular, but rather is aimed at a feature generically relevant to the efficacy of talk-in-interaction – the attention, or mobilised reciprocity, of an interlocutor' (p. 48). In face-to-face interaction, the first pair part (FPP) of a summons sequence can take a number of different forms, such as 'excuse me', or an address term, or even a non-verbal form such as touching an addressee. On the other hand, the second pair part (SPP) of the summons pair can be short verbal tokens such as yes/yeah or can be eye contact. In the following section, I will examine how hecklers attempt to gain access to the floor using address terms as summons, as well as the response of the recipient.

In this section, I examine summons produced by MPs who are unratified to participate and the response of the recipients, i.e. the CS or the CP. Out of 41 cases, five examples were found that represent address terms in the form of summons. At the first turn, MPs who are unratified to speak launch a summons, followed immediately by a telling. In Example (3), the CP informs MPs with regard to consulting them after having completed with the speakers. The UP aims to bid for the floor of the interaction approximately just before the CP selects a speaker to talk. The CP informs MPs that all of the speakers have delivered their speeches and will now move to the next phase of consulting MPs. Based on this, an unratified MP intervenes to tell the CP that there is a proposal to be discussed.

Example (3) 43

1. CP: la bƿawrko hassa bƿd ma txlsʿu: ( ) l?nu: ?nhyna ( ) ?lmotaħdiθi:n  
Not consult you now after you finish ( ) because we finished the  
speaker  
**No I will consult you now after you finish because we ceased the speakers**
2. CP: wetgulu ?ktafyna(.)bkalam maktu:b hata ?tʿrħ ma ladykom min moqtraħa:t  
You say enough talk written so I propose what you have PRT proposals  
**then you say we had enough in a written form so I give you a proposals**
3. UP sƿadat ?ra?i:s fi moq [ tarah  
**your excellency there is a proposal**
4. CP: [ said  
[ Mr

In line 3, the UP summons the CP through an address term, ‘your excellency’, in order to enter the interaction. Through this turn, the UP first draws the attention of the CP using an address term followed immediately by a reason for the heckle. When the UP provides the reason for the heckle, the CP thus has an idea of what the UP will talk about. In ordinary conversations, the summons and answer sequence occurs in two pairs; the FPP and the SPP (Liddicoat, 2007; Schegloff, 2007). The speaker produces a summons, such as ‘Ahmad’, and the other speaker acknowledges the summons through a token such as ‘yeah’ or possibly a redirection of eye contact. In this study, a summons is similar to ordinary conversation but has distinctive features. First, a summons is produced by MPs via an address term such as ‘your excellency’. The UP does not usually wait for a verbal acknowledgment from the recipient because the summons occurs in a face-to-face interaction; thus, the recipient usually exhibits an acknowledgement through a redirection of his/her face posture (Goodwin, 1986), though this is rarely spotted. Following the summons, unratified MPs tend to rush into launching the reason for the heckle, which pertains to ‘*there is a proposal*’. I believe that the unratified MP produced two TCUs in succession, i.e. the summons and the reason for the heckle, in order to minimise the gap between them. If the unratified MP produced the summons in a separate turn, the CP might not have reacted to such a summons without a reason for the heckle. Line 4 overlaps with line 3, where the CP proceeds in assigning a new speaker in the parliament by producing the token ‘Mr’, followed by the name of the selected speaker (see line 5). Through this, the CP does not orient to the heckler despite the fact that he offered a reason for the heckle. Thus, the CP ignored the heckler and continued to the next speaker in the parliament.

In a similar example, the UP supports a public audience member in the gallery through urging MPs to listen to his issue. This public audience member attended the gallery to complain to MPs about the death of his 15-year-old son. Therefore, the unratified MP addresses the MPs in order to ask them to listen to him. The UP bids for the floor using a summons as an address term, followed by a reason for the heckle, as in Example (4).

Example (4) 51

1. CS: sƿadt arai:s (1.0)  
your excellency  
**your excellency (1.0)**
2. UP: ya jamaƿa fo ?lxasxa ( )  
PRT guys what privatization ( )  
**Ya guys what privatisation ( )**
3. CS: [ ħaθra:t ?lnwab ?lmoħtarami:n]  
PRT MPs respected  
**[ respected MPs**
4. UP [ haθo:l ?hl Mƿan ya jamaƿa]  
These PRT Ma’an PRT guys  
**[these are the people of Ma’an guys] |**

In line 1, the CS begins the interaction by addressing the CP, using ‘your excellency,’ In line 2, the UP produces a summons as an address term ‘*Ya guys*’, followed by criticising an MP for talking about privatisation using ‘*what privatisation*’. The CS, however, shows no response to the UP and proceeds to address MPs, as seen in line 3. Line 4 overlaps with line 3, where the UP takes another turn to offer background information about the public audience member, using ‘*these are the people of Ma’an guys*’ in order to create audience alignment. In the same turn, the UP

immediately produces a strong statement using, *'it's unfair to talk about privatisation now this father [this this] murdered son'*. Through this turn, we can observe that the UP is not only offering background details about the public audience, but also criticising MPs for debating the privatisation topic and ignoring the public audience member's issue. In other words, the UP urges MPs to postpone talking about privatisation and pay attention to the public audience in the gallery. This shows that the UP gives the public audience member's issue more attention than debating the privatisation topic in the parliament.

Summonses not only occur at the beginning of a turn, but also occur after the UP produces an action, e.g. a complaint or request. Summonses–answer sequences are, however, not simply specialised for openings (Liddicoat, 2007). They can also be found within ongoing talk, where the availability of an intended recipient may be problematic or may be claimed by a speaker to be problematic (Liddicoat, 2007). In order to see how this occurs, see Example (5). The prime minister (CS) gives a speech about increasing the energy rates for electricity, and further claims that this will occur only in debate with MPs. This led the UP to bid for the floor using a heckle and a reason for the heckle followed by an address term.

#### Example (5) 21

1. CS: kama: (.) waʃadatʔlhokoma (.) ma taza:l moltazima ʃnda wʃdeha (.)  
As promised the government still committed to its promise  
**As the government had promised and still it is committed to its promises**
2. CS: la yomkin ʔn tarfʃ (.) ʔsʃar ʔlkahruba:ʔ (.) ʔla (.) bilʃwda ʔla majls  
ʔnawab  
Not possible to increase rates of electricity except in consultation to  
MPs  
**rates of electricity (energy) will not be increased only in consultation with MPs**
3. CS: bidʃabtʔ kama ʔltazamna (2.0)  
Exactly as we have pledged  
**Exactly as we have pledged (1.0)**
4. UP: <dawer ʃbadi:l thani> daw [ lat ʔrraʔi:s ] yeir rafʃ ʔlʔsʃa:r  
Look on alternative other state President instead increasing rates  
**look for an alternative your Excellency instead of increasing the rates**

The CS begins the interaction by making a statement that the government will not increase the energy rates only in consultation with MPs, as seen in lines 1-3. In line 4, the UP disrupts the CS's speech at a TRP and approximately during the produced silence by the CS (see line 3), and by producing three TCUs. First, he produces advice, using *'look for an alternative'*. Next, he immediately rushes to launch an address term using *'your excellency'*. Then, the UP continues, using *'instead of increasing the rates'*. Here, it is clear that the UP objects to the CS's statement with regard to increasing the energy rates. Through this turn, we can see that the UP bids for the floor not only by making an illegal intervention but also by producing a form of advice followed by the address term. Also, it is observed that address terms do not always occur at the beginning of the turn; it is readily observed that the address term *'your excellency'* occurs in the middle of the turn. Terasaki (2004) argues that address terms are formed at the beginning to establish reciprocity, that is, to indicate reciprocity before continuing. On the other hand, post-positioned address terms can be composed *'to establish reciprocity'* during talking (Terasaki, 2004, p. 189). The UP produces the post-positioned address term during the speech, which indicates that he treats himself as part of the ongoing talk. In other words, MPs summon the recipient and then proceed with the speech, as seen in Example (3) and Example (4). But in Example (5) the UP shifted the address term during the speech.

The response to a summons can take different forms, such as ignoring the UP, treating the illegal intervention as inappropriately timed or displaying non-verbal disaffiliation. Such responses are enough to indicate that heckles may be seen as inappropriate by the CP. In Example (3), the CP launches into talking (line 4) through *'Mr'*, which overlaps with line 3. At first glance, it may appear that the CP is addressing the UP, but after a close analysis it appears that the CP ignores the UP's interjection (Bilmes, 1997) and proceeds in selecting a new speaker (Terasaki, 2004) to talk (see line 5). In Example (4), the CP's turn is delayed (see line 7). Here, the CP treats the UP's intervention as inappropriate by producing the term *'excuse me'*. In the same turn, the CP immediately provides a justification to the UP with regard to the issue of the murdered son in the city of Ma'an, using *'we have listened to the Ma'an report'*. This shows that MPs already know about the issue of the murdered child. In Example (5), the CS's responses to the UP are not always recorded by the person operating the camera, including the non-verbal behaviour after the UP makes an illegal intervention. The CS produces the non-verbal behaviour, that is, the CS ceases speech, looks at the UP and simultaneously moves the fingers on his left hand. This kind of reaction is closely associated with disaffiliation (Edelmann, 1987), whereby recipients treat illegal intervention as inappropriate. For example, the following figure illustrates the response of the prime minister (CS) to that of the heckler.





Figure 1. The CS's Facial Expression After being Heckled.

In summary, this section has examined the first turn of an interjection by a UP involving a summons. Unratified MPs seek to gain the speakership through producing summons, e.g. 'your excellency' and informal summon terms, such as 'PRT guys', immediately followed by a speech. This makes them different from summonses that occur in ordinary conversations, which are typically composed of two turns, and participants use names such as 'Sarah', polite terms such as 'excuse me' (Liddicoat, 2007) and responses such as 'yeah'. Not only do summonses occur at the beginning of the turn but they may occur after a speech. The above analysis informs us that summonses are a commonly used technique on the part of MPs when they bid for the floor. However, the responses of recipients do not indicate that they are welcome to gain speakership. We have seen that the CP may react to the illegal intervention by ignoring the UP, by treating it as inappropriately timed or by displaying non-verbal disaffiliation as a response.

#### B. Announcements

According to Schegloff (2007), an announcement is 'a telling package in a single, grammatically simple, turn-constructional unit' (p. 42). In the following subsections, I shall begin by examining announcements at the first turn. UPs, such as MPs, tend to gain access to the floor of the interaction simply by launching announcements. Announcements are a common way for MPs to gain the speakership. More specifically, announcements are preliminary to the main action that will be produced later on in the interaction, and they occur in the form of a headline. In order to illustrate this, see Example (6). The unratified MP attempts to enter the interaction by launching into an announcement to support an audience member in the gallery.

##### Example (6) 51

1. CS: sʕadt arai:s (1.0)  
your excellency  
**your excellency (1.0)**
2. UP: ya jamaʕa fo ʔlxasxa ( )  
PRT guys what privatization ( )  
**Ya guys what privatization ( )**
3. CS: [ haʕra:t ʔlnwab ʔlmohtarami:n]  
PRT MPs respected  
**[ respected MPs**
4. UP [ haʕo:l ʔhl Mʕan ya jamaʕa]  
These PRT Ma'an PRT guys  
**[these are the people of Ma'an guys]**
5. UP: hram thku bilxs'xs'a ʔlʔa:n haʕ ʔb[ haʕ ʔbu haʕ ] ʔbnu qutil  
unfair talk on privatization now this father this PRT this son nurered  
**it's unfair to talk about privatization now this father [ this abu this] murdered son**
6. MPV: [yʕni Mʕa:n ( )]  
PRT Ma'an ( )  
**[ yʕni Mʕa:n ( )]**
7. CP: [ lw samhti ya: Hind lw samhti (.) istamʕna ʔla qarar Mʕa:n]  
excuse me PRT NAME excuse me we listened to decision of Ma'an  
**[excuse me ya Hind excuse me (.) we have listened to the Ma'an report]**

As we can see at the beginning of the extract, the CS begins the interaction by addressing the CP using an institutional address term: 'your excellency' (line 1). The UP immediately makes an interjection, first by addressing MPs and then by criticising them for debating the topic of privatisation (line 2). In line 3, the CS continues to address MPs, using the address term 'respected MPs'. Line 4 overlaps with line 3, where the UP produces an announcement

that is straight and simple (Liddicoat, 2007). This announcement provides general background about an audience member in the gallery through offering a piece of information, using 'these are the people of Ma'an guys' (line 4). The UP continues (line 5) to develop the announcement using 'it is unfair to talk about the privatisation now', followed by warranting the announcement with 'this is his father his son has been murdered'. Through this, the UP attempts to gain access to the floor by offering some general information about the audience member's issue and hoping that the CP will offer her an invitation to become a ratified participant to elaborate on the murdered son of the audience member. It is pertinent to note that the UP seeks to gain the 'alignment' (Stivers, 2008, p. 32) of the MPs through offering background information about the audience member to parliament. In other words, the background information 'his son has been murdered' clearly shows that he seeks the sympathy of MPs in order to support his assertions about the audience member. Furthermore, an announcement may also be associated with the notion of epistemics, where the UP refers to an issue that may have been debated in the parliament in advance. The response of the CP to the illegal intervention is observed at line 7, where the CP summons the UP using 'excuse me' followed by a speech in which he explains the situation to the UP (line 7). Such responses occur with only limited frequency because the CP of the parliament does not always make such a clarification of any issue that a UP brings up. The response of the CP at line 7 is more than enough evidence to show that it has indeed been debated in the parliament, through 'we have listened to Ma'an's report'. Here, we can see that the CP mentions the name of the city, 'Ma'an' (at line 7), which corresponds to the announcement produced by the UP at line 4.

For a similar case to an announcement, see Example (7). The member of parliament (UP) disrupts the CS's (prime minister's) speech to argue about the procedures of the parliament as managed by the CP. Thus, he criticises the CP for randomly selecting participants to speak.

Example (7) 49

1. CP: tfdal dawl ?ra?i:s  
Go ahead your excellency  
**go ahead (speak) your excellency**
2. CS: saydi ?r[ ?i:s ]  
your excellency  
**your exc[ellency]**
3. UP [ ( ) ] ((CS looks at H))
4. UP ( [ ] )
5. CS: [ saydi ?rr?i:s (1.0) ?waln  
Your excellency (1.0) first of all  
**[Your excellency (1.0) first of all**
6. UP [ rawah ?stna: lewyf bt?arid?  
PRT wait why refute?  
**[rawah wait why do you refute?**
7. MP: xals<sup>c</sup> ya nidal  
That's enough NAME  
**That's enough Nedal**
8. UP ?y<sup>f</sup> ?tas<sup>c</sup>wi:t [ ( )  
what's voting [ ( )  
**what is the voting for? [ ( )**
9. CP: [fi ra?i:s wozora  
PRT Prime Minister  
**fi the Prime Minister**

In line 5, the CS begins his speech by addressing the CP using the address term ‘your excellency’, followed by a listing connector, ‘first of all’. The latter expression overlaps with the UP’s disruption, where he forms the question ‘why do you refute?’ at line 6. By doing so, the UP aims to prevent the CS from speaking and, therefore, projects that he wishes to raise something through ‘why do you refute?’ This kind of speech equates to making an announcement. Consequently, the CS ceases his speech and gives the floor to the UP. In line 8, the UP continues to interrogate with ‘what is the voting’, which is a preliminary to the complaint about the parliament’s procedures. The announcement functions as a pre-sequence, as is clearly observed in line 6, where the UP questions the CS for speaking. However, this question is not used to gain an answer; rather, it functions as a pre-sequence before the UP develops the complaint structure. The response of the CP can be observed at line 9 in overlap with line 8. Through this, the CP produces some sort of speech with ‘the prime minister is—’. Here, the CP informs the UP that the floor is being occupied by the CS by producing an incomplete TCU of ‘fi the prime minister is’, which lacks the token ‘talking’. Here, the CP treats the illegal intervention by the UP as ‘inappropriately timed’ (McIlvenny, 1996a).

In Example (8), the UP raises the issue of the city of Ma'an; she makes an announcement that the government supports the people of Ma'an and thus it has become a rebel city. In other words, the UP blames the government for supporting the city of Ma'an and, as a consequence, the city of Ma'an protests against the government, i.e. the



government faces problems when taking control of the city in terms of protesting and security.

Example (8) 40

1. CP: saʃadat ?zoml? ?nawab ?l?karim ?rjo ?ljlus bi ?makinkom  
dear colleagues MPs noble please sit at your seats  
**dear colleagues and noble MPs please take your seats**
2. CP: hta tabd? [ ?ljalsa  
to begin the session  
**to begin the [ session**
3. UP: [ ( ) bigoly bigoly ?l?min wel?man ?hm min ( )  
Tell me tell me security and safety is important than  
**[ ( )they tell me that security and safety is important than( )**

Line 3 overlaps with line 2, where the UP produces an announcement through ‘they tell me that security and safety is more important than ( )’. Through this announcement, the heckler offers general headlines or an outline of what is to follow. Nevertheless, it is rather difficult to comprehend what is specifically being talked about because she is referring to an issue that may have been unknown not only to some MPs but also to us as watchers and listeners. Here, the announcement in this example functions as a pre-sequence that is preliminary to an action that will occur later in the conversation. The pre-sequence in this above example is very similar to pre-sequences in ordinary conversations, as there is evidence that the UP has not explicitly stated what she is trying to convey. Develotte and Rechniewski (2001) argue that news ‘headlines are signposts showing the route to take through complex materials. They encapsulate not only the content but the orientation, the perspective that the reader should bring to their understanding of articles’ (pp. 2–3). This is very similar to announcements that are produced by MPs who are not ratified to speak. MPs rely on opening an illegal interaction through making such immediate announcements. These announcements offer a general idea about what the MP will talk about. As for the response to the first turn of an illegal interaction, the CP simply launches a summons to all MPs, possibly to draw the attention of the UP, but this does not necessarily mean that the CP will produce an action after the summons. This is because it is very common in my corpus to find that the CP produces a summons to the UP alone, not only to notify him/her that the interjection is inappropriately timed but also to force the UP to withdraw from the interaction. The response of the recipient in the first turn of the analysed examples above is a summons followed by an explanation of the issue that the UP has announced, as seen in Example (6). In Example (7), the CP treats the illegal intervention by the UP as inappropriately timed through ‘the prime minister—’. In Example (8), the CP uses a summons to draw the UP’s attention, but it does not necessarily mean that he will launch a speech. In other words, the CP simply produces a summons to draw attention so that the addressee will not proceed in bidding for the floor. The summarised responses are enough to indicate that announcements may not enable UPs to gain the speakership with the approval of the CP. However, UPs launch such announcements in the first turn immediately, without producing a summons. This informs us that producing an announcement falls under the umbrella of launching straight into the reason for the heckle.

In summary, announcements are used as a way to gain speakership in parliamentary interaction. One of these ways is to offer a headline of the issue before the UP gets to the heart of the matter, e.g. complaining about a procedure or against a statement. In other words, producing a headline is similar to offering background information, which may be associated with the concept of epistemics (Heritage, 2012), and information that may be known to the CP and members of the parliament. Therefore, the UP supports MPs with background information. In addition, some announcements also function as pre-sequences, which are used by participants to offer a preface before the interaction develops. Launching an announcement does not necessarily mean that it will enable the UP to gain the speakership with the approval of the CP.

### C. Launching Straight Into the Reason for a Heckle

MPs who are unratiſed to speak launch straight into heckles in response to an assertion or statement in the parliament. According to McIlvenny (1996a, p. 37) hecklers often ‘launch a heckle boldly as a short direct question, denial, or abusive utterance. In relation to prior talk, a heckle is often precisely formed, syntactically or semantically, to draw upon just prior talk’. In this section, MPs who are unratiſed to participate may launch straight into the reason for their heckles at the first turn. Launching into the reason for heckles occurs in response to prior speech in the parliament, and they are short and straightforward. This also means that UPs do not employ any preliminary sequences, such as summons, before launching into the reason for their heckles. The following section shows how public audience members launch straight into the reason for heckles.

This section aims to show how MPs who are unratiſed to speak launch straight into the reason for heckles. In 9 of the 41 instances of my corpus, MPs who are unratiſed to speak launch straight into the reason for heckles in response to prior speeches. These intrusions are very similar to *topic development* as a target of heckles, as mentioned by McIlvenny (1996a). MPs who are unratiſed to participate often produce such heckles with regard to the CS’s speech, i.e. asking a question or giving advice. In Example (9), the unratiſed MP launches straight into the reason for a heckle by producing a question related to the CS’s speech.

## Example (9) 38

1. CS: ?bd?(.) bi mʕlu:ma natija ?lʔtsalat mʕ ?ljehat ?rasmiya ?lʕraqiya  
begin with information result contact with bodies official Iraqi  
**I begin (.) with a piece of information in to contact with Iraqi authorities**
2. CS: waxasatn wazi:r ?lxarijiya (.) kalmni ʕlhatif (.) qabil saʕa taqribn  
specially minister foreign spoke me phone ago hour  
approximately  
**specially the foreign minister (.) he talked to me over the phone (.) approximately an hour ago**
3. CS: (.) waqadm ?ʕtiðar(.)  
offered apology  
**(.) and he apologised (.)**
4. UP: mi:n ho =  
Who he  
**who is he=**
5. CS: = ?lhoqoma ?lʕraqiya  
government Iraqi  
**the Iraqi's government**
6. CS: ((looks to his colleague 'interior minister'))
7. UP: [ booo ] ((expression of disagreement))
8. CS: [ wazi:r ?lxarijiya ?lʕraqi  
minister foreign Iraqi  
**[The Iraqi foreign minister**

In line 3, the CS reports that the Iraqi minister of the interior offered his apologies. In line 4, the UP produces a question: 'who is he'. Through this, the UP addresses the CS, whereby he seizes the short silence and forms the question to gain information regarding the name of the one who apologised to the minister of the interior. The predominant observation here is that the UP produces the question immediately, while the CS is still in the middle of a TCU. This shows that the UP interjects before the CS completes his turn. This kind of heckle is short and straightforward and, thus, it informs us that UPs do not always use a summons before they get to the heart of a matter. Therefore, this is called launching straight into the reason for a heckle. In line 6, the CS notices that something has gone wrong, and thus he changes his facial posture and looks at the colleague next to him (the minister of the interior). Through the non-verbal signs in the video recording, it is observed that the MP (minister of the interior) whispers to the CS that he had been asked about the name of the person who offered his apologies for the incident. Accordingly, the CS produces an answer to the question, which was delayed until he acknowledged the question (line 8). The answer to the question is observed when the CS utters 'the Iraqi minister of foreign affairs'. The question sequence consists of the question 'who is he' and the answer to it is 'the Iraqi foreign minister'; these form the FPP and the SPP of the sequence, respectively. Commonly, CSs do not respond to other MPs who are not ratified to speak, because they consider it not only a breach of the internal regulations of the parliament but also an immoral way of causing a disruption to the flow of the speech. Unusually, the CP's response to the incident is delayed, as the CP has not intervened to manage the situation at the appropriate time. This also means that he may have given the opportunity for the CS to sort out the issue through responding to the UP.

Similarly, in other instances, MPs who are not ratified to speak also launch straight into heckles. To illustrate this, see Example (10), where the prime minister gives a speech regarding the increasing energy tariffs. The UP cuts off the prime minister's speech before he completes his turn and asks him to look for an alternative instead of increasing the electricity rates.

## Example (10) 21

1. CS: kama: (.) waʕadat?lhokoma (.) ma taza:l moltazima ʕnda wʕdeha (.)  
As promised the government still committed to its promise  
**As the government had promised and still it is committed to its promises**
2. CS: la yomkin ?n tarfʕ (.) ?sʕar ?lkahruba:ʔ (.) ?la (.) bilʕwda ?la majls  
?nawab  
Not possible to increase rates of electricity except in consultation to  
MPs  
**rates of electricity (energy) will not be increased only in consultation with MPs**
3. CS: bidʕabtʔ kama ?ltazamna (1.0)  
Exactly as we have pledged  
**Exactly as we have pledged (1.0)**
4. UP: <dawer ʕbadi:l thani> daw [ lat ?rraʔi:s ] yeir rafʕ ?lʔsʕa:r  
Look on alternative other state President instead increasing rates  
**look for an alternative your Excellency instead of increasing the rates**
5. CS: [ waaa ]  
and  
[and ]

At the beginning of the interaction, the CS embarks on the speech through proposing that the government will not pursue increasing the rates of the electricity except in consultation with MPs (lines 1-3). This triggers a response from an MP to comment on this. In line 4, the UP seizes the opportunity and interjects during the short silence (see line 3) to produce three TCUs. The UP gives advice (Hutchby, 2006; Heritage & Sefi, 1992) using ‘seek for an alternative’, followed by an address term in the form of ‘your excellency’, followed by ‘instead of increasing the rates’, in turn. The design of the advice occurs in response to what the CS has been talking about; that is, increasing the electricity rates. Furthermore, it occurs in an imperative form through the token ‘seek’. Imperatives are said to be dedicated to actions such as ordering and commanding (Aikhenvald, 2010).

In Example (11), the heckler launches straight into the reason for the heckle using a question to gain information.

## Example (11) 54

1. CS: ?ʕlnat ?lharaka ?lislama fi ?rbid (.) watansi:qyt iħrak ?bnaʔ ?ʕmal (.)  
ʕn  
announced party islamic in CITY cooperation party northern people party  
**The Islamic party of Irbid announced in cooperation with northern publics' party**
2. CS: xru:j bimasi:ra lilmuṭʔalba bi esʕla7a:t siyasiya  
Emergence a march to demand for reforms political  
**to organise a march to demand for political reforms**
3. CS: wamuħarabt ?lfasad (.)=  
and anti-corruption  
**and anti-corruption**
4. UP: = muʕ muħim ya mʕali:k mi:n ?li ?ʕln ?lmuħimʔ ( ) ((CS looks at H))  
not important your excellency who PRT announce important  
**=it is not important your Excellency the important matter is who/what has been announced ↑**
5. Aud: ( )
6. CS: saiydi: lw samħt txlini ?kmil  
PRT if you excuse me let me finish  
**excuse me allow me to finish**
7. CP: → [ ((rings the bell)) ]
8. CS: [ xalini ?kmil lw] samħt ((in sharp tone))  
**let me finish please**

In line 4, the UP heckles the CS during a short silence (line 3) using, ‘it is not important your Excellency the important matter is who/what has been announced’ (line 4). Here, the UP conjoins a negative assessment with a question to gain information from the CS with regard to ‘who has been announced’. In line 6 the CS produces the phrase ‘excuse me allow me to finish’ in order to disengage the heckler from intruding on his speech. Through this turn, it is evident that the CS treats the heckle as inappropriate and that the UP is not ratified to make a contribution in the interaction.

MPs who are unratiſed to speak launch straight into the reasons for their heckles by producing various actions, such as questions and giving advice. The remarkable feature of launching straight into the reasons for heckles is that UPs get to the heart of the matter without needing to produce prior actions, such as a summons or pre-sequence. CSs who hold

the floor of the interaction do not always react to MPs who are unratiſed to speak when their speech is disrupted.

## VII. CONCLUSION

This paper looks at the first turn of speech in terms of how participants aim to enter an interaction when they are not ratiſed to speak. The findings of this study have shown that the UPs commonly launch into heckles using a number of strategies. These are: summons, announcements and launching straight into the reason for heckles. Moreover, this study has shown that MPs launch heckles while the CS is speaking, e.g. in overlap or when the CS pauses temporarily; this finding supports McIlvenny's (1996a) timing and sequence of heckles.

Much of the research on institutional interactions occurs when participants follow the rules of institutional interaction. However, institutional interactions, such as in this study, are informed by disobeying the rules. That is, UPs do not follow the rules of the parliament as well as the CP's directives or demands. The data analysis has shown how UPs violate the rules of parliament, and what happens when UPs break the rules. This study also shows how allotting certain roles in institutional contexts impacts people's rights to speak and how they can disobey the rules to become speaking participants.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to extend his sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Faisal University for supporting this study.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2010). *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [2] Atiyat, F. (2017). Jordanian women participation in the parliamentary elections of 2016: field study in Albalqa governorate. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 7(3), 109-122. Retrieved May 18, 2018, from [https://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_7\\_No\\_3\\_March\\_2017/13.pdf](https://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_7_No_3_March_2017/13.pdf)
- [3] Bilmes, J. (1997). Being interrupted. *Language in Society*, 26(4), 507-531. Retrieved June 7, 2018, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4168801>
- [4] Cambridge Dictionary. (2020). *Meaning of heckle in English*. Retrieved June 15, 2020, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/heckle>
- [5] Clayman, S. E., & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In M. A. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis*. (pp. 589-606). London, England: Sage.
- [6] Clift, R., & Helani, F. (2010). Inshallah: Religious invocations in Arabic topic transition. *Language in Society*, 39(3), 357-382. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000199>
- [7] Develotte, C., & Rech-Niewski, E. (2001). Discourse analysis of newspaper headlines: A methodological framework for research into national representations. *Web Journal of French Media Studies*, 4(1), 1-12. Retrieved July 2, 2020, from <http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01510703>
- [8] Edelmann, R. J. (1987). *The Psychology of Embarrassment*. Chichester: Wiley.
- [9] Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [10] Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684>
- [11] Heritage, J. & Sefi, S. (1992). Dilemmas of advice: Aspects of the delivery and reception of advice in interactions between health visitors and first time mothers. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. (pp. 359-417). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Heritage, J. & Drew, P. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. (pp. 359-417). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- [14] Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices, and applications*. Malden, Mass: Polity Press.
- [15] Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). (2016). *Jordan: Majlis Al-Nuwaab (house of representatives)*. Retrieved July 3, 2020, from <http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/reports/2163.htm>
- [16] Irvine, J. T. (1996) Shadow conversations: The indeterminacy of participant roles. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban. (Eds.), *Natural Histories of Discourse*. (pp. 131-159). University of Chicago Press.
- [17] Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, (pp.13-34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Retrieved July 8, 2020, from <http://tinyurl.com/y4h9k72d>
- [18] Levinson, S. C. (1979). Activity types and language. *Linguistics*, 17, 365-399. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1979.17.5-6.365>
- [19] Levinson, S. C. (1988) Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.), *Erving Goffman. Exploring the Interaction Order*. (pp. 161-227). Cambridge: Polity
- [20] Liddicoat, A. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.
- [21] McIlvenny, P. (1996a). Heckling in Hyde Park: Verbal audience participation in popular public discourse. *Language in Society*, 25(1), 27-60. Retrieved July 9, 2020, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4168672>
- [22] McIlvenny, P. (1996b). Popular Public Discourse at Speakers' Corner: Negotiating Cultural Identities in Interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 7(1), 7-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926596007001002>
- [23] Nasrawin, L. K. (2012). The constitutionality of the Jordanian law of election to the house of deputies of 2010, *Arab Law Quarterly*, 26(2), 211-225. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157302512X628341>
- [24] O'Driscoll, J. (2018). Dances with footings: a Goffmanian perspective on the Soto case. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 14(1),

- 39-62. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2017-0038>
- [25] O'Driscoll, J., & Holt, E. (2021). Participation and Footing. In M. Haugh, D. Z. Kádár, M. Terkourafi (Eds). *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociopragmatics*. (pp. 1-26). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [26] Petrov, M. A. (2010). *Jordan: Background and issues*. New York: Nova. Retrieved July 9, 2020, from <http://tinyurl.com/yyznox8u>
- [27] Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735. Retrieved March 2, 2020, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/412243>
- [28] Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I (Vol. 1)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved June 5, 2020, from <http://tinyurl.com/y64a7mcb>
- [29] Shaw, S. (2000). Language, gender and floor apportionment in political debates. *Discourse & Society*, 11(3), 401-418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926500011003006>
- [30] Sloan, L., Love, R., & Ostrom, T. (1974). Political heckling: Who really loses?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30(4), 518-525. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037023>
- [31] Stivers, T. (2008). Stance, alignment, and affiliation during storytelling: When nodding is a token of affiliation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(1), 31-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810701691123>
- [32] ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). London: SAGE.
- [33] Terasaki, A. (2004). Pre-announcement sequences in conversation. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation*. (pp. 171-223). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Company. Retrieved July 10, 2020, from <http://tinyurl.com/y4h9k72d>

**Mohammad Alqatawna**, Ph.D. is a senior lecturer at the Preparatory Year Deanship, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. His research interests include discourse analysis, conversation analysis, pragmatics, and English teaching.