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1. Introduction

Agreeing and disagreeing is a central part of people’s everyday lives. (Dis)agreement plays an important role in the construction of identity. Through the expression of agreement and disagreement we position ourselves towards certain persons and viewpoints. Next to its relevance in ordinary life, it also has a valuable part in certain institutional settings. The institutional context under investigation in this paper, belongs under the heading of talk show discourse. Talk show discourse covers a range of different televised shows, differentiated by its topics, participants, goals, turn design and degree of argumentation and disagreement. The focus of this research is on the genre of the panel debate or panel interview. This genre is characterized by a high degree of disagreement and argumentation and therefore provides an interesting ground for this study. Another substantial part of this research (and of interaction in general) is the use of questions. Questions are omnipresent in human communication and play a substantial role in most institutional settings. This is no different for the subtypes of talk show discourse. Basically all talk shows resolve around the act of questioning and answering, but paradoxically it is also a means to distinguish between different subtypes; the precise act of questioning and answering is different for informal chat shows featuring celebrities, news interviews and panel debates (Lauerbach 2007: 1392-1393). That questions have such a defining function in the context, makes it even more interesting for examination. However, in this paper not only the host’s use of questions will be looked at, but also the ways in which the interviewees use questions in the construction of their argumentation.

Even though the topic of questions has been studied quite frequently with respect to different institutional settings such as law courts, hospitals and police institutions, the application to talk show discourse is still a hot research topic. This can be attributed to the fact that the amount of talk shows on contemporary television keeps increasing. Ilie argues that talk television is growing rapidly and as a result the genre is becoming more diversified (Ilie 2001: 216). Because talk show are so popular and keep evolving, the field remains an interesting topic for research. Also the combination with disagreement sheds a new light onto the subject matter. In this paper, all these elements are brought together resulting in an investigation of how questions function in construing disagreement on the Belgian talk show ‘De zevende dag’.

For the exploration of the use of questions in the construction of disagreement in panel debates on ‘De zevende dag’, 14 episodes of the show, dating from 19 October to 8
February, have been recorded. 66 extracts were transcribed and analysed, all involving disagreement sequences which include questions. After the discussion of the state of the art, the methodology will be illustrated, followed by the results and a thorough data analysis. In order to provide a satisfactory answer to the research question, first a general analysis according to question type was conducted, followed by a more detailed, qualitative study of the findings.
2. Disagreement

The first chapter of this paper concerns an introduction to the topic of disagreement. As will be explained later on in this section, disagreement is part of our everyday lives; everybody uses (dis)agreement on a daily basis. In this chapter, I will discuss the notion of disagreement as an interactional accomplishment and make reference to politeness theory, face(work) and framing. These paragraphs stress the importance of disagreement in our everyday interactions. After looking at these notions, I will include some new insights and focus on different markers of disagreement. Not only verbal indicators will be listed, but also nonverbal and prosodic features of the expression of (dis)agreement. Lastly, I will end this first theoretical chapter with a discussion of some of the basic disagreement sequences and I will look at their structure.

2.1 Disagreement as an interactional accomplishment

Sifianou (2012: 1554) defines disagreement as “the expression of a view that differs from that expressed by another speaker”. According to this definition disagreement is an utterance; it is reactive and requires a prior utterance from another conversational partner (Rees-Miller 2000: 1088). Clayman (2002) argues that disagreement in its most elementary form consists of an oppositional transaction between two primary interactants. However, this basic format can be elaborated when a third party is added to the interaction. This third participant can choose to align with one of the disputants or choose to remain neutral (Clayman 2002: 1385). The choice between alignment and neutralism in multiperson interaction will prove to be relevant for the topic of this research and will be discussed in more detail further on in the paper when specific reference is made to the talk show discourse.

An important framework concerning the topic of disagreement is that of Conversation Analysis (CA). Their concept of adjacency pairs, which consist of preferred and dispreferred seconds is often related to the issue of disagreement. Kotthoff (1993: 193) quotes Atkinson & Heritage in expressing a definition of the concept of preference in CA terms, namely:

*The term ‘preference’ refers to a range of phenomena associated with the fact that choices among non-equivalent courses of action are routinely implemented in ways that reflect an institutional ranking of alternatives. Despite its connotations, the term is not intended to reference personal, subjective, or psychological desires of dispositions.*
The quote explains that in reacting to a previous utterance, you have a choice between different alternatives. It emphasizes that there is a hierarchy in terms of preference between the options. In traditional terms, there is a correlation between preferred seconds and agreement and between dispreferred turns and disagreement. Ogden (2006: 1756) shows how both instances are realized in interaction. With regard to the turn design of preferred turns of agreement, Ogden (2006) argues that the gap between first and second turn is minimized, the agreement takes up the whole turn, it is explicit and indexed soon. Dispreferred turns of disagreement show a different structure: they are delayed (no immediately forthcoming talk, repair initiation, expression of words like well and uh) and the disagreement is frequently implicit (Ogden 2006: 1756).

This last characteristic of dispreferred seconds leads us to the differentiation between directness and indirectness (or explicitness and implicitness). Disagreement can be expressed directly or indirectly (Bousmalis et al. 2009: 2). Direct agreement is easily detected as the person disagreeing starts his/her utterance with the statement that he/she does not agree or disagrees (e.g. I don’t agree with what you just said). When a speaker does not explicitly state his or her disagreement, but expresses an oppositional opinion to the one that was expressed by another participant earlier in the conversation, this is indirect disagreement (Bousmalis 2009: 2). These notions of direct and indirect disagreement will be elaborated on in the more detailed discussion of the data from the political debate talk show ‘De zevende dag’.

2.2 Politeness, face & framing
The notion of disagreement is often discussed in relation to politeness theory and facework. Sifianou (2012: 1554) states that in the first politeness theories (e.g. Levinson & Brown), disagreement is regarded as impoliteness, which implicates that the speech act should be avoided in the interest of preserving the interlocutor’s face. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory of politeness is most widely known and applied, but the theory is also most widely critiqued (Arundale 2006: 193). One of these critiques involves the complaint that the authors handle face as if it was an individual phenomenon. Arundale (2006: 193) argues for a revised communication framework for research on face, facework and politeness. He stresses that face is a relational and interactional concept; a person’s identity is interactionally achieved in relationships with others.
Facework is closely related to the interactional construction of identity. Face can be defined as “the negotiated public image mutually granted to each other by participants in a communicative event” (Scollon et al. 2012: 47). Jones (2012: 20) highlights several aspects of this definition, namely it is public, negotiated and mutually granted. The author says that face is a public image rather than ‘one’s true self’. This means that this image is not the same in every interaction. The fact that a person’s face is negotiated and mutually granted, again stresses the interactional aspect of the concept (Jones 2012: 20). Important notions within the face-framework are the pairs involvement strategies - independence strategies and positive face - negative face. Basically, involvement strategies are used to establish or maintain closeness with the people we are interacting, while independence strategies refer to methods we use to establish or maintain distance. In table 1 different usages of both strategies are listed. The concepts positive and negative face respectively refer to the need to be liked by others and the need to be respected, in that our freedom is not imposed on or inferred with (Jones 2012: 20). These notions will be relevant for the discussion of the data later on in the paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVolVEMENT STRATEGIES</th>
<th>INDepEnDENCE STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using first names or nicknames</td>
<td>Using titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing interest</td>
<td>Apologizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiming a common point of view</td>
<td>Admitting differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making assumptions</td>
<td>Not making assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using informal language</td>
<td>Using formal language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being direct</td>
<td>Being indirect and hedging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being optimistic</td>
<td>Being pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being voluble</td>
<td>Being taciturn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about ‘us’</td>
<td>Talking about things other than ‘us’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Face strategies (Jones 2012: 21)

Framing theory is another relevant notion with regard to this research. Bednarek (2005: 685) defines frame as a mental phenomenon, as a knowledge structure. She stresses that this knowledge is acquired through socialization; it is constructed out of experience. The fact that these knowledge structures are acquired depending on experience, implicates that frames are both diachronically and culturally dependent (Bednarek 2005: 690). Furthermore, frames
appear to be conventionalized and capture the prototypical features of a situation (Bednarek 2005: 690). In different contexts, people will have expectations about what will be said and how this ought to be interpreted; Jones (2012: 21) calls these sets of expectations frames. As will be clear from the discussion of the corpus, disagreement in political debate talk shows such as ‘De zevende dag’ is very common, this can be attributed to the frame.

Some caution on the application of these notions is desired, as politeness, face and framing strategies can be used in a manipulative way. Therefore context is essential and decisive in determining the exact strategies used. In relation to political discourse (see 4.3) some manipulative instances of speech will be touched upon.

2.3 New insights

In their paper ‘Theorizing disagreement’, Angouri and Locher (2012) discuss some observations in an attempt to systematically approach the understanding of the topic. The authors give following overview:

a) Expressing disagreement is an everyday phenomenon
b) In some settings disagreement is the expected speech act
c) Disagreement cannot be seen as inherently negative
d) The different ways in which disagreement is expressed is meaningful

(Angouri & Locher 2012: 1551)

The first point that the authors cite, stresses that we all use disagreement in our daily lives because it is related to issues of identity construction in general (Angouri & Locher 2012: 1549). By agreeing or disagreeing with a certain point of view of a specific person in conversation you show what kind of person you are and what kind of relationship you want to establish or maintain with your conversational partner. We do not construct these identities all by ourselves; it is negotiated with the people with whom we are interacting (Jones 2012: 18). As mentioned earlier, this negotiation takes place through face strategies and framing strategies. Sifianou (2012: 1556) states that disagreement seems to be an essential ingredient in many daily setting. Examples such as talk over coffee after a movie and pub interaction about football games are given as illustration.

Secondly, points b), c) and d) are closely related and for this reason they can be discussed together. Angouri & Locher (2012) highlight that in certain contexts disagreement can be expected by the participants and that it thus can be a preferred turn in terms of the CA framework. The authors give the example of decision making and problem solving talk.
(Angouri & Locher 2012: 1551). Similarly, Kangasharju’s research (2002) on oppositional alliances in committee meetings, shows us that the use of non-delayed and non-mitigated disagreeing turns can be regarded as preferred actions in this specific context (Kangasharju 2002: 1452). This demonstrates both statement b) and c), namely, disagreement is not inherently negative and it is possible that it even is the expected turn design. The authors also emphasize that disagreement can be expressed in a whole range of different ways and that this choice is meaningful. Point d) is also related to face strategies and politeness: when somebody expresses disagreement they can choose face-aggravating, face-maintaining or face-enhancing strategies. How you express disagreement will have an impact on the interaction and how the oppositional turn is understood (Angouri & Lochner 2012: 1551).

2.4 Disagreement markers

It is possible to identify specific characteristics of the interactional display of disagreement. Disagreement can be marked in a couple of different ways. The speech act can be signalled by verbal, nonverbal audio-visual and prosodic cues. In following paragraphs each kind of marker is discussed in more detail.

2.4.1 Verbal markers of disagreement

The most obvious marker of disagreement concerns the verbal features. As mentioned before, disagreement can occur in different formats. The idea that disagreement is by definition a dispreferred second, does no longer apply. In her work on multimodal (im)politeness, Stadler (2006: 89-101) distinguishes between pre-disagreement, core-disagreement and post-disagreement strategies. These categories are pretty straightforward (see schematic rendition below), but the fact that the author identifies pre- and post-disagreement strategies, again proves the importance of politeness and facework in the expression of disagreement. The fact that a speaker uses these extra strategies, indicates that there is still some truth in the traditional division between preferred and dispreferred turns. According to the maxims of Grice (1975), a dispreferred turn requires more work. This idea is reflected in the division made by Stadler (2006).

Stadler (2006: 89-90) argues that pre-disagreement strategies can occur through the introduction of the disagreement. This can be explicit, e.g. through the use of ‘but’ or more implicit, e.g. by using ‘well’. Another pre-disagreement design, is the use of initial agreement, for example the ‘yes – but’ strategy. Furthermore, a pre-disagreement justification can occur or a forewarn by means of turn-gaining devices (e.g. ‘wait a minute’) or attention seeking (e.g.
Core-disagreement strategies contain the actual disagreeing message. As explained earlier in this paper, disagreement can be explicit or implicit. Stadler (2006: 92) also distinguishes hints, this basically is a disagreeing turn that is so implicit, that it may not necessarily be recognizable as disagreeing. A last core-disagreement strategy concerns qualified disagreement, and this can practically be rephrased as partial agreement. Stadler (2006: 93) gives the following example: A: It was a golden age? B: It was in a way. Now moving on to post-disagreement strategies, where the author identifies concession and post-disagreement justification. However, it is important to point out that Stadler (2006: 93) emphasizes that post-disagreement strategies are far less common than the other two categories.

Schematic rendition of disagreement strategies:

- **Pre-disagreement strategies**
  - Disagreement introduction
    - Explicit
    - Implicit
  - Initial agreement
  - Pre-disagreement justification
  - Forewarn
- **Core-disagreement strategies**
  - Explicit
  - Implicit
  - Hint
  - Qualified agreement
- **Post-disagreement strategies**
  - Concession
  - Post-disagreement justification

Within the actual disagreement (core-disagreement), a speaker may apply a whole range of different devices, which are used to either soften or strengthen the disagreeing turn. Stadler (2006: 96-101) gives an overview of different verbal markers used for mitigation and strengthening (see table 2). What is striking, is that some verbal cues occur on both sides of the table. Tag questions, address forms and modal verbs can be used both as a softening and as a strengthening device. Concerning the tag questions, there is a division to be made between facilitative and softening tags on the one side and challenging tags on the other. For this distinction, Stadler refers to the categories of Holmes (1995). Stadler (2006: 96) states that facilitative and softening tags are respectively positive and negative politeness devices.
Challenging tags on the other hand, are confrontational in nature (Stadler 2006: 99). It could be argued that for the use of tag questions, the semantics and context are decisive factors to whether it is used for mitigation or strengthening. This is also the case for address forms. Although they are generally seen as a politeness marker (e.g. ‘sir’ or addressing people by their first names), in a certain confrontational contexts, address forms have the opposite effect. Furthermore, while modal verbs ‘could’ and ‘would’ can be seen a softening devices, ‘must’, ‘need to’, ‘can’t’ or ‘have to’ on the other hand serve as means of strengthening the utterance. Other linguistic markers can more clearly be subdivided. Stadler (2006: 96) argues that impersonalization (e.g. ‘one’, ‘people’, use of the passive) is a way of avoiding direct attack, therefore it functions as a downgrader. Other downgraders such as politeness markers, hesitation markers, hedges and verbosity have been introduced already in the paragraph on politeness, face and framing and in relation to the notion of (dis)preferred turns. The author states that gambits (e.g. ‘you know’, ‘I mean’) are signals that the speaker feels uncomfortable about what he/she is about to say and that they are often found in connection with disagreements as a form of softening strategy (Stadler 2006: 97). Stadler refers to disarmers as “a form of anticipation of a possible offence”. She asserts that it is often related to initial agreement (e.g. ‘yes-but’ strategy). Moving on to the other strengthening devices, it can be observed that some are just the counterparts of markers of the softening category. For example personalization, boosters and minimal verbosity. That swear words are a means of strengthening disagreement is pretty straightforward. For the purpose of this research most interesting upgrading strategies are the aggressive interrogative and the repetition. These mechanisms will be applied to the discussion of the corpus retrieved from ‘De zevende dag’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Softening devices</th>
<th>Strengthening devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag question</td>
<td>Tag question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonalization</td>
<td>Personalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness marker</td>
<td>Swear word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation marker/pause</td>
<td>Aggressive interrogative/exclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address form</td>
<td>Address form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge</td>
<td>Booster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gambit | Repetition
---|---
Modal verb | Modal verb
Disarmer | Minimal verbosity
Verbosity |

Table 2. Softening and strengthening devices (Stadler 2006: 96-101)

2.4.2 Nonverbal audio-visual cues of (dis)agreement (Bousmalis et al. 2009:1-9)
Disagreement can be expressed verbally, but often a multimodal analysis can provide deeper insight into the topic. Bousmalis et al. (2009) provide an overview of nonverbal audio-visual cues and tools which can be used to detect agreement and disagreement. Their work aims at facilitating computer interpretation of natural language. The authors of the article stress that the nonverbal cues that occur during the verbal expression of (dis)agreement play a crucial role in their interpretation (Bousmalis et al. 2009: 1). For the purpose of this study of political debate talk show discourse, it is relevant to look both at the cues of disagreement and those of agreement. Other research (Kangasharju 2002) has shown that in multiperson interaction, it is possible for the participants to form alliances. As this behaviour is also expected to be a substantial feature of the debate panel interviews, the cues of agreement can be integrated into the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE</th>
<th>KIND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head nod</td>
<td>Head gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener smile/lip corner pull</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyebrow raise</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideways leaning</td>
<td>Body posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughter</td>
<td>Audio-visual cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimicry</td>
<td>Second-order vocal and/or gestural cue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Cues of Agreement (Bousmalis et al. 2009: 3)

In table 3, Bousmalis et al. (2009: 2) list possible cues of agreement. They observe that head nods and listener smiles are very clear indicators of agreement. However, both these cues of agreement can also have a different meaning. According to the authors, nods, shakes and smiles can also serve as backchannel signals. This mean that they may relate to the participants’ feelings regarding the nature and progress of the conversation itself (Bousmalis...
The authors refer to Brunner (1979), who states that a backchannel operates at three levels of meaning. The level of involvement, of understanding and that of actual response. It is in this last level, that for example disagreement can be expressed. As human communication is a complex phenomenon, it is important to keep in mind that most of the time several different cues will be used and that only within this combination they can be understood as hints of agreement or disagreement (Bousmalis et al. 2009:2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE</th>
<th>KIND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head shake</td>
<td>Head gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head roll</td>
<td>Head gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden ‘cut off’ (of eye contact)</td>
<td>Head gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye roll</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironic smile/smirking</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowered eyebrow/frowning</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lip bite</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lip pucker</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly parted lips</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth movement(preparing for speech)</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nose flare</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tong show</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suddenly narrowed eyes</td>
<td>Facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm folding</td>
<td>Body posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head/chin support on hand</td>
<td>Body/head posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large body shift</td>
<td>Body action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg clamp (crossed leg)</td>
<td>Body posture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighing</td>
<td>Auditory cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throat clearing</td>
<td>Auditory cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays</td>
<td>Second-order auditory cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance length</td>
<td>Second-order auditory cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruption</td>
<td>Second-order auditory cue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clenched fist</td>
<td>Hand action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forefinger raise</td>
<td>Hand action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forefinger wag</td>
<td>Hand action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand chop</td>
<td>Hand action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Cues of Disagreement (Bousmalis et al. 2009: 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gesture</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand wag</td>
<td>Hand action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand cross</td>
<td>Hand action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck clamp</td>
<td>Hand/head action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-manipulation</td>
<td>Hand/facial action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head scratch</td>
<td>Head/hand action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaze aversion</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disagreement cues listed by Bousmalis et al. (2009: 4) in table 4, are a much larger group. The authors state that head shakes are the most commonly used disagreement cue. Again, it should be noted that also this cue is used to indicate a backchannel signal. As both the most common agreement cues, and most common disagreement cue is conveyed using backchannel signals, Bousmalis et al. (2009: 3) conclude that most of the implicit nonverbal cues of (dis)agreement are of this kind. Nonverbal audio-visual markers of disagreement are not the main focus of this study, so no extensive discussion will be put forward here. Nevertheless the cues listed in table 4 will be taken into account and applied when necessary when we arrive at the analysis of the data recorded from the Belgian debate talk show ‘De zevende dag’.

2.4.3 Prosodic features of (dis)agreement

Prosody has been described as the music of speech; intonation, loudness, rhythm, tempo and pauses are all important features (Skidmore & Murakami 2010: 69). Stadler (2006: 52) argues that it is necessary to include prosodic features in a pragmatic research, because speech and prosodic effects are inseparable. The author explains some of the functions of prosodic cues. The first function relates to the semantic content of an utterance. Stadler states that prosodic cues indicate how what is said, is meant and that the markers can stress the importance of the information content of an utterance (Stadler 2006: 53-54). Not only are prosodic cues relevant to the semantic content of an utterance, but also to the organization of interaction, as prosodic elements help maintain thematic cohesion in a conversation (Stadler 2006: 55). A third function concerns the expression of emotion. Stadler (2006: 55) argues that prosody provides vital information about the emotional state of the speaker. Lastly, the author mentions that prosodic cues can also serve as contextualization cues; they have the potential to turn a statement into an ironic or sarcastic remark (Stadler 2006: 56-57).
Now moving on to the relevance of prosody to both disagreement and politeness. Stadler (2006: 63) argues that prosodic cues can signal the type of speech act through the clustering of certain prosodic signalling cues. She states that rhythm, intonation and emphasis can all be indicators of disagreement and provides a short explanation (Stadler 2006: 63). In ordinary conversation (= non-argumentative) disagreement is signaled by rhythmic delay. In argumentative contexts on the other hand, disagreement should be rhythmically integrated and immediate, to avoid losing face. Secondly, Stadler (2006: 64) refers to Brazil (1997), who says that sentence-final intonation can mark disagreement. The author observes that a falling tone at the end of a sentence, signals that the speaker is certain of his/her statement, and leaves no room for negotiation. Next, strong emphasis is often related to the issue of emotional involvement; it is perceived as energetic and angry and for this reason relevant to both the topic of disagreement and that of politeness (Stadler 2006: 64). Stadler also refers to another crucial element of disagreement, namely the high frequency of turn-competitive and turn-interruptive sequences. Both these sequences are also prosodically marked through rapid speech rate, high vocal amplitude and heightened pitch (Stadler 2006: 65).

Another relevant work concerns ‘Phonetics and social action in agreements and disagreements’ by Richard Ogden (Ogden 2006: 1752-1775). The author analyses how phonetic resources are used in expressing agreement and disagreement in assessment sequences. Ogden (2006: 1755) distinguishes along a continuum between ‘strong agreement’ and ‘strong disagreement’, with intermediate notions of ‘same assessment’ and ‘downgraded assessment’. He relates these agreement types to different linguistic forms (see table 5 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>LINGUISTIC FORM</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong agreement</td>
<td>Upgraded assessment term modifier</td>
<td>Hot (\rightarrow) boiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not bad (\rightarrow) not bad at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same assessment</td>
<td>Repeat of assessment term</td>
<td>Nice (\rightarrow) nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial repeat but no assessment turn</td>
<td>That’s nice (\rightarrow) yes it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgraded assessment</td>
<td>Scaled-down or weakened assessment</td>
<td>Really nice (\rightarrow) nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong disagreement</td>
<td>Antonym opposite polarity</td>
<td>Boring (\rightarrow) really good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Ogden’s research show that the phonetic exponents of strong agreement and disagreement in the second turn, display the same structure of ‘upgrading’ (Ogden 2006: 1759-1765). Those phonetic features include an expanded pitch span over the whole turn, more dynamic pitch contours on accented items, a pitch higher in the speaker’s rage than in T1, slower tempo and a closer, tenser articulation (cf. ‘hyper-speech’) (Ogden 2006: 1762). Agreements that preface disagreement on the other hand, demonstrate phonetic details which are consistent with ‘downgrading’. Ogden interprets this as “an orientation to the phonetic design of the turn which conveys token agreement while simultaneously projecting impending disagreement” (Ogden 2006: 1767-1768). As was also the case for the nonverbal audio-visual cues, prosodic features of disagreement will be kept in mind and mentioned when necessary in the data analysis of this research.

2.5 Disagreement sequences

As previously mentioned in this chapter, disagreement is not an isolated phenomenon. It is an utterance and its disagreeing nature is created interactionally. Looking at the notion from this perspective, it is clear that for the aim of this study, it will be necessary to look at disagreement sequences. There has already been some research on the topic and I will discuss two interesting approaches. For the discussion of the data retrieved from ‘De zevende dag’, I will rely on these frameworks.

First of all, I will discuss the terminology used by Helga Kotthoff in her article on disagreement and concession in disputes. The author stresses the importance of context in determining whether a sequence can be regarded as a preferred or dispreferred turn (Kotthoff 1993: 193). The data used for Kotthoff’s study are taken from transcripts of eight German and eight Anglo-American dyadic discussions between students and lecturers, taped at the University of Konstanz (Kotthoff 1993; 196). Below an overview of the different kinds of disagreement sequences is given.

- Dispreferred disagreement
- Preferred dissent

Table 5. Relation between agreement type and linguistic form (Ogden 2006: 1755)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Type</th>
<th>Linguistic Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I certainly don't like Nathan</td>
<td>oh I like Nathan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction of reluctance markers

Aggravated dissent

Agreement in disputes

- Upgraded agreement as a presequence to further dissent
- Partial agreement
- Concessions

(Kotthoff 1993: 193-216)

The first type of disagreement sequence is the one which is discussed most frequently in the traditional CA framework, i.e. dispreferred disagreement. Sifianou (2012) states that disagreement has mostly been seen as a confrontational turn which should be mitigated or avoided (Sifianou 2012: 1554). When a disagreeing turn is dispreferred, this is reflected in its linguistic realization. The turns are often prefaced, weakened and delayed (Kotthoff 1993: 194). Kotthoff (1993) discusses some tactics to downgrade disagreement, namely laughter particles, pauses, downgrading evaluation, the ‘yes-but’ strategy and typical words like ‘yeah’, ‘well’, ‘anyway’ (Kotthoff 1993: 196-199). The softening devices put forward by Stadler (2006: 96-98) and discussed in the section on verbal markers of disagreement, are other examples reflecting dispreferred disagreement.

Secondly, some formal characteristics of preferred disagreement are discussed in more detail, namely reduction of reluctance markers and aggravated dissent. The first characteristic of preferred dissent refers to the structure of the turn. As mentioned before, according to the traditional perspective, turns indicating disagreement show the format of dispreference. However, the author noticed that not all disagreeing turns follow this format. These turns do not use any of the softening devices mentioned above but still convey disagreement (Kotthoff 1993: 199). Once a preference for disagreement is established between interactants, the possibility of aggravated dissent arises. Kotthoff argues that aggravation can be signaled by fewer reluctance markers, an increase of focusing strategies and repeated tries to deny the relevance of the interlocutors’ utterance for the discussed issue (Kotthoff 1993: 200). The author asserts that the orientation towards dissent can be noticed by looking at aggravating devices such as the use of words like ‘really’, ‘most of all’, sometimes in combination with prosodic focusing. Reluctance markers are reduced and topics are no longer cooperatively negotiated, instead the participants try to dominate topic development by downgrading the relevance of the other’s turn (Kotthoff 1993: 200-201). Furthermore, Kotthoff stresses the importance of cohesion in contexts where disagreement
is preferred. Repetition plays an important role in this. In general it can be observed that once it is no longer preferred to agree, it seems to be very important to contradict quickly and in a coherent manner (Kotthoff 1993: 203).

A last type of disagreement sequence discussed in Kotthoff’s article, is agreement in disputes. Within this type there are some subdivisions possible, the first of which is ‘upgraded agreement as a presequence to further dissent’ (Kotthoff 1993: 203). For this category, the author refers to instances where utterances such as ‘wonderful!’ or ‘you are absolutely right!’ are produced, where it is clear from the context that these turns have an ironic meaning. Kotthoff mentions that in the context of a dispute, the more upgraded a yes is, the stronger it is interpreted as a pre-step towards opposition (Kotthoff 1993: 204). A second subtype is ‘partial agreement’. Kotthoff argues that within an argument sequence, there is a hierarchy. The main topic of the debate is approached through the expression of presupposed points, which make up minor issues. Partial agreement is basically agreeing on a minor issue, as a presequence to the disagreement on the major issue (Kotthoff 1993: 205). However, according to Kotthoff (1993: 208) partial agreement can also be used to make room for the expression of concession, which is yet another subdivision made in the model. The author mentions that concession can potentially be face threatening as it may imply that an interactant is not able to defend his/her position in an argument (Kotthoff 1993: 209). Also the difference between partial agreement and concession is explained; concession terminates a conflict, whereas partial agreement is only a preliminary to further disagreement. This distinction is sometimes difficult to manage for non-native speakers of a language, whose sudden concession can be felt to be inappropriate and irritating (Kotthoff 1993: 211).

Moving on to the next approach to disagreement sequences, I will briefly discuss the description used by Peter Muntigl and William Turnbull in their article on the conversational structure and facework in arguing (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998: 225-256). The authors define an arguing exchange as “speaker A in turn 1 (T1) makes a claim that is disputed by speaker B in the second turn (T2), following which speaker A in turn three (T3) disagrees with speaker B’s T2 claim by either supporting the original T1 claim or directly contesting the T2 disagreement” (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998: 227). They distinguish between T2 and T3 disagreement and also mention the relevance of the orientation of the disagreement in T3. An overview of the model is given below.
Muntigl & Turnbull (1998: 229) identified four types of disagreement in their corpus, namely, irrelevancy claims, challenges, contradictions and counterclaims. The first type consists of irrelevance claims. The authors define this subtype as the assertion that a previous claim made by a participant is not relevant to the present discussion. According to Muntigl and Turnbull (1998: 229), it are “meta-dispute-acts that comment on the conversational interaction”. The second type of disagreement are challenges. Here the authors define a challenge as the questioning of an addressee’s prior claim and demanding that the addressee provides evidence for his/her claim, while suggesting that he/she cannot do so. Thirdly, contradictions are characterized as the utterance of the negated proposition expressed by the previous claim (also called denials). The last type of disagreement concerns counterclaims. This type is designated as the proposal of an alternative claim that does not directly contradict nor challenge the other’s claim. Counterclaims tend to be mitigated and preceded by prefaces and pauses (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998: 231). The authors also noticed a small percentage of act combinations, with the most frequent being a contradiction followed by a counterclaim (Muntigl & Turnbull: 1998: 236).
3. Questions

Blas Arroyo (2013: 187-213) states that questions are omnipresent in verbal communication. It comes as no surprise that the topic has been studied quite frequently, with syntactic, prosodic, semantic, pragmatic, conversational and rhetoric aspects examined over the last decades (Blas Arroyo 2013: 187). In this chapter, I will start by providing a definition of the term ‘questions’. Next, the distribution of questions within the mechanisms of turn design will be examined. Furthermore, some prosodic elements such as intonation will be mentioned, followed with a discussion of the contextual features of questions in institutionalized discourse. Lastly, I will introduce different syntactic types of questions and elaborate on some of their semantic functions.

3.1 Defining questions

Blas Arroyo says that despite the progress made in the study of questions, there is still some disagreement about the way they should be defined or analysed (Blas Arroyo 2013: 190). Stivers & Enfield outline a coding scheme that was developed and used in the 10-language comparative project on question-response sequences in ordinary conversation, carried out from 2007 in the Multimodal Interaction Project at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (Stivers & Enfield 2010: 2620-2626). The authors provide their inclusion criteria in order for a question-response sequence to be coded:

- A formal question (lexico-morpho-syntactic or prosodic interrogative marking)
- A function question (seek to elicit information, confirmation or agreement whether or not they made use of an interrogative sentence type)
  - News marks (‘really?’, ‘yeah?’, ‘is it?’) were coded as functional questions because they are often treated as seeking confirmation

(Stivers & Enfield 2010: 2621)

According to this model, questions seeking acknowledgement were not coded as questions, because they don’t seek confirmation or affirmation. Also questions offered in reported speech and requests for immediate physical action were excluded (Stivers & Enfield 2010: 2621). For the purpose of this research, we are going to adopt this definition of questions. The functional description given in this chapter, will provide a more elaborate discussion of the semantics of questions.
3.2 Turn design and distribution

Within the CA framework, many interactional sequences are organized according to the basic notion of the adjacency pair, which consists of a first and second turn. According to Koshik (2002: 1853), questions are first pair parts as they make a certain type of response relevant, namely an answer to the question. When an answer is the preferred response, this indicates that it is also possible for an interlocutor to provide an alternative response, i.e. a dispreferred response. Koshik (2002: 1853) states that these different responses contain different alignments toward the project undertaken in the first part of the adjacency pair. Some scholars use a different terminology and use the terms type conforming responses opposed to nonconforming responses (Emmertsen 2007: 579). As mentioned earlier in the paper, dispreferred responses are often disagreeing turns, although disagreement can also be the preferred action within certain contexts. The contextual aspects are discussed later on in this chapter in more detail, when questions in an institutional setting are discussed.

The preference design discussed above, is often associated with the notions of constraint and presupposition. Emmertsen (2007: 580) argues that by limiting the range of preferred answers, the person asking the question can constrain the other interlocutor to answer questions that he/she may have reasons not to want to answer. These notions are often discussed in relation to yes-no questions. These questions narrow the scope of formally satisfactory answers (according to preference design) to ‘yes’ or ‘no’ (Emmertsen 2007: 580). Emmertsen (2007: 580) states that yes-no questions exert a lot of pressure for a particular answer, and this makes them a useful tool for presuppositions. Bolden (2009) argues that questions express presuppositions about different aspects of the addressee’s life, circumstances, beliefs and knowledge (Bolden 2009: 122). The use of presuppositions in questions will be relevant for this research when reference is made to the political debate talk show ‘De zevende dag’, as the topic is often associated with journalistic means of interviewing. The issue explained here refers to constraints because of preference structure, but there are also constraints imposed on interactants because of contextual aspects. This latter concern, will be explained later on in this chapter.

Now I am going to discuss the position of the questions in the turn, namely the distribution. I am going to base this discussion on the terminology used by José Luis Blas Arroyo in his discussion of constraint factors in the formulation of questions in conflictual discourse (Blas Arroyo 2013: 195-201). The author distinguishes between initial contexts, end contexts, intermediate contexts and simultaneous speech contexts (Blas Arroyo 2013: 195-
First of all, initial contexts concerns questions that appear at the beginning of turns. The author creates another division between questions located among the first of the speaker’s utterances after regaining the turn, and those that are posed in a somewhat more advanced position (which he also calls delayed initial contexts). In Blas Arroyo’s analysis of Spanish face-to-face election debates, these only occur in 16.9% of the cases, and their most prominent function was reintroducing an unanswered question which was posed earlier. The second distribution category of questions concerns the end context. According to Blas Arroyo (2013: 196) the end contexts are another prominent position in the turn because of the interactional constraints it imposes on the other interactant. These occur in 28% of the corpus’ questions. Thirdly, the intermediate context consists of utterances produced in the middle of a turn. These questions are not answered by a next speaker, but by the person asking the question himself, they can be seen as rhetorical questions. Blas Arroyo notices that the majority of the questions (43.2%) in the debate occur in intermediate positions in the turn. Lastly, Blas Arroyo (2013: 197) distinguishes the simultaneous speech context, which conveys instances where one participant interrupts the other, in order to ask a question (12.1%).

3.3 Prosodic aspects: intonation

As was also the case with the notion of disagreement, for the discussion of questions it is useful to include prosodic aspects in the analysis. The term prosody captures features such as emphasis, loudness, rhythm and intonation. Emphasis and loudness are expected to be relevant in the discussion of the data from ‘De zevende dag’, but mostly because of their disagreeing nature. With respect to questions, intonation is likely to be the most relevant prosodic feature. Hedberg and Sosa (2002: 1) examined the prosody of questions in natural discourse. They focused on yes-no questions and wh-questions because these occurred the most frequently in their data. The authors observe that the elements marking the sentence as a question (wh-word in wh-word questions and the fronted auxiliary in yes-no questions) correlate with a specific pitch accent (L+H*). However, an interesting remark must be added: the fronted auxiliaries of negative yes-no questions were stressed in most of the observed cases, but in positive yes-no questions the fronted auxiliary was frequently deaccented (Hedberg & Sosa 2002: 2-3). The authors suggest that negative yes-no questions are marked with a specific pitch because of the implication that the answer will be yes, this in contrast with positive yes-no questions which are neutral regarding the answer (Hedberg & Sosa 2002: 3). This illustrates the additional meaning prosody can attribute to verbal speech. Hedberg &
Sosa (2002: 3) also tested the assumption that yes-no questions are pronounced with a rising intonation at the end and that Q-word questions are pronounced with a falling intonation. The researchers found evidence for the second hypothesis but not for the first. Lastly, another element where prosody conveys meaningful information concerns the information structure, i.e. topic-focus articulation (Hedberg & Sosa 2002: 3).

3.4 Contextual aspects: institutional discourse

When studying different aspects of language it is always necessary to incorporate context. In relation to the topic of questions, I already hinted at some relevant elements to consider such as a potential different preference design or the contextual constraints imposed on interactants. Recent years has shown a growing interest in studying questions in institutional contexts such as law courts, hospitals, police institutions, different media genres and political discourse (Blas Arroyo 2013: 187-188). Heritage (1998: 106) provides us with a definition that includes three basic characteristics of institutional talk:

1. Specific goal orientations tied to institutional identities
2. Special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions
3. Association with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional context

(Heritage 1997: 106)

Although some scholars emphasize that the boundaries between ordinary and institutional discourse are just arbitrary, Heritage stresses that nevertheless the distinction is useful and empirically sound (Heritage 1997: 108). He distinguishes some different dimensions of distinctiveness in institutional talk such as turn taking, overall structural organization, sequence organization, turn design and lexical choice (Heritage 1997: 115-137). These different aspects will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter on the genre of talk show discourse.

3.5 Syntax: different types of questions

Stivers (2010: 2773) puts forward a basic distinction between polar questions, Q-word questions and alternative questions. Polar questions are basically yes-no questions, a term referring to the prototypical way these questions are answered. Stivers (2010: 2773) makes another subdivision between interrogative, tag and declarative questions. Firstly, interrogative polar questions are formed by subject-auxiliary inversion, e.g. do you like her? (Stivers 2010: 2773). Secondly, tag questions are defined by Kimps et al. (2014: 64) as
“consisting of an anchor followed by an interrogative tag with the finite and subject of the tag typically agreeing with those of the anchor”. Kimps et al. (2010: 64) state that speakers have the possibility to add many tags of many kinds to their utterances in order to form tag questions. They can add variable and non-variable, clausal and monomorphemic tags. The last subtype consists of declarative questions, these lack the subject-auxiliary inversion and often portray a different intonation pattern (Stivers 2010: 2773).

Furthermore, another relevant concept in relation to polar questions, is that of conduciveness. Conduciveness is related to the issue of preference in the CA framework (Koshik 2002: 1852). Sacks (1987: 57) suggested that “if a question is built in such a way as to exhibit a preference as between ‘yes’ or ‘no’, then the answerers will tend to pick that choice”. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 808) conducive questions indicate that the speaker is biased towards the kind of answer he wants or expects. Stivers (2010: 2773) argues that tag questions are characterized by maximum conduciveness, which indicates that they coerce particular answers in line with the question and this in greater extent than the other question types. This characteristic of questioning is often studied in relation to power and control. Blas Arroyo (2013:188) refers to political discourse when he says that questions can play a coercive role; they are powerful tools for exercising control. Koshik (2002: 1851-1877) discusses a special type of polarity question, i.e. reversed polarity questions. The author suggests that conducive yes-no questions are often treated by recipients as conveying an assertion of the opposite polarity to that of the grammatical from of the question (Koshik 2002: 1851). Other authors have also looked at special types of polar questions in relation to conduciveness, namely Heritage and his study of negative interrogatives (Heritage 2002: 1427-1446). He defines negative interrogatives as questions beginning with ‘isn’t it’, ‘don’t you’, ‘shouldn’t you’ etc. and considers such questions as limiting cases of questioning (Heritage 2002: 1427). The author suggests that negative interrogatives are even more conducive than tag questions because the negative interrogative frame is placed at the beginning of the turn. This makes the utterance more assertive and less questioning according to the Heritage (Heritage 2002: 1440-1441).

In addition, I am going to present some numbers relating to the distribution of the three subtypes of polar questions put forward by Stivers. The author (Stivers 2010: 2773) refers to Quirk et al. (1985), who argues that interrogative questions are the most common and most neutral type. However, Stivers’ (2010: 2773) own findings show a different distribution. In her analysis of the questions-response system in American English
conversation, she found that the declarative subtype was used in 63% of the total number of polar questions occurring in her corpus. Interrogative formatted polar questions accounted for 31%, and tag questions were relatively rare in her study, as they occupy only 6% of the total (Stivers 2010: 2773).

Moving on to the next main type of questions, namely Q-word questions or wh-questions. Blas Arroyo (2013: 193) defines these questions as headed by an interrogative pronoun or adverb, such as ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘when’, ‘why’ and ‘how’. In Stivers’ corpus of American English conversation, Q-word questions accounted for a little more than a quarter of the total. She observed some non-prototypical instances where the turn begins with a Q-word question and is followed by a polar question or when the Q-word questions were prefaced by ‘and’, ‘but’ or ‘so’ (Stivers: 2010: 2775). Regarding distribution Stivers (2010: 2775) discovered that ‘what’ questions were the most used (38%), followed by ‘how’ questions (23%). The last main category of questions concerns the alternative questions or disjunctives. Blas Arroyo gives a definition of disjunctives as questions which call for a decision to be made between two or more alternatives (Blas Arroyo 2013: 193). The distribution of Stivers’ research shows that alternative question convey only 3% of the total amount of question asked in her corpus (Stivers 2010: 2773).

3.6 **Semantics: functions / social actions carried out**

Regarding a functional description, questions are often defined with respect to response elicitation. Such a classification based on response elicitation is carried out by Ilie (1999: 975-999), who states that in their most basic form, (standard) questions are answer-eliciting or information-eliciting (Ilie 1999: 977). These categories are often used as synonyms from each other, while they do not always portray the same event. Ilie stresses that apart from information, questions can elicit several other types of responses, such as confirmation, permission, suggestion and acceptance (Ilie 1999: 977). Other authors, such as Stivers (2010: 2776) also observe that requesting information is the most common type of social action implemented by questions: 43% of a total of 328 questions in the researcher’s corpus are of this type, and also confirmation requests are good for 21% of all questions (Stivers 2010: 2776). Now that a proper definition of standard questions is portrayed, we can move on to what Ilie (1999: 975-999) calls non-standard questions. Still working in terms of response eliciting design, these alternatives are characterized as action-eliciting and mental response eliciting (Ilie 1999: 981). The first non-standard type concerns instances where the speaker requires
the performance of an action by the addressee, the latter refers to speakers requesting a silent acknowledgement with his/her message (Ilie 1999: 981). However, Ilie (1999: 975-999) remains silent about a crucial group of questions, i.e. those initiating other repair (Stivers 2010: 2776). According to Stivers’ (2010: 2776) corpus these questions occur rather frequently; with 31% they are the second largest function depicted in the data.

Another functional criterion to describe question is according to their argumentative nature or orientation (Ilie 1999: 975-999). It is widely acknowledged that certain questions convey the expression of the speaker’s epistemic stance, e.g. yes-no questions which communicate reversed polarity assertions (Koshik 2002: 1854-1870) and tag questions (Kimps et al. 2014: 64). Recognizing this statement, it is clear that if questions may contain an epistemic stance, they can be used in an argumentative way. Ilie (1999: 975) distinguishes between argument eliciting questions which are interlocutor-oriented, argument prefacing questions which are both interlocutor and audience-oriented, and lastly argumentative questions which are oriented to the message and the audience. These categories will be relevant with regard to the corpus of the political debate talk show ‘De zevende dag’. Both in relation to the argumentative nature of some questions and with the data of this research, challenges and opposing questions provide an interesting category. Emmertsen (2007) observed that in recent years, British broadcast panel interviews have taken a more confrontational form with interviewers challenging the interviewees with hostile question content (Emmertsen 2007: 570-591). Also Gruber (2001) did some interesting research of questions and strategic orientation in verbal conflict sequences, where he focussed on opposing questions (Gruber 2001: 1815-1857). The author distinguished different types of opposing questions, the categories are summed up below.

- Explicit opposing questions
- Rhetorical opposing questions
- Implicit opposing questions
- Distorting opposing questions
- Enticing questions

(Gruber 2001: 1829-1849)

I will expand on these question types in particular, as they will be applied to the data of this research. Gruber (2001: 1829) defines opposing questions in relation to disagreement. Disagreement conveyed in the second turn can also be represented by a question. This type
of question puts an interactional and topical constraint on the answerer: the question expresses an oppositional stance towards the former speaker and forces the other speaker to react (Gruber 2001: 1829). In the previous chapter on disagreement, it was already mentioned that disagreement is not always marked or dispreferred. In contexts where the traditional notions still apply, explicit opposing questions are likely to be used (Gruber 2001: 1829). However, within the same setting the dynamics can change. Gruber (2001: 1833) argues that once a conflict sequence is established and agreement is no longer the preferred or unmarked strategy, explicit announcement of disagreement is no longer necessary. This is where rhetorical opposing questions can be used. The author characterizes these as ‘an oppositional question format that enables a questioner to provide the answer him/herself’ (Gruber 2001: 1833). Ilie (1999: 985) also highlights the argumentative nature of rhetorical questions: they are not a request for information but rather “a personal judgement put forward in a challenging way”. Another important kind of opposing questions are the implicit opposing questions. According to Gruber (2001: 1835) this type has the possibility to provide an opponent with unfavourable interpretations of his/her point of view, and because of this they force their interlocutor to make his/her opinion explicit. Concerning politeness strategies, implicit opposing questions are a useful tool because they do not explicitly reject the other’s view. This makes them only slightly face-threatening (Gruber 2001: 1838). Closely related to implicit opposing questions, are distorting opposing questions. Gruber states that these questions do not only project a next move by the opponent, but also confronts them with a distorted (or even false) representation of their own point of view (Gruber 200: 1843). For the analysis of the data from ‘De zevende dag’ this might be a relevant concept as the type of question is frequently used when an overhearing audience is present (Gruber 2001: 1843). The last kind distinguished by Gruber (2001: 1829-1843) are enticing questions. These differ from the others in that they do not occur in second position. The author characterizes them as operating on a global level of interaction; “they are used to provoke an opponent to produce a turn that facilitates a counter move by the current speaker” (Gruber 2001: 1844). With respect to the data analysis of the transcripts of ‘De zevende dag’, this last category of enticing questions will be excluded.

In addition, I am going to refer to a last type of argumentatively used question; echo questions or repeat prefacing questions. These two are not completely synonymously, but still closely related. Echo questions (Ilie1999: 980) echo (part of) a previous utterance in order to elicit a repetition or a clarification. However, these questions may also convey an attitude
of surprise and disbelief. Repeat prefacing question on the other hand are defined as the ‘turn-initial repeat of (part of) a question (or another first pair part) deployed as a preface to the required response’ (Bolden 2009: 123). One of the standard functions of these questions is that they can indicate information retrieval problems, but it is also a means of resisting goal or agendas in conversation (Bolden 2009: 121-143).

Furthermore, another important semantic function occupied by questions is organization. In the previous parts, turn design has already been mentioned a couple times. It is regarded as a crucial component of the organization of talk. A primary way in which a speaker comes to take the turn in a conversation, is when he/she is selected to do so. One of these methods of selecting a next speaker is asking a question or addressing your interlocutor by name in the course of asking the question, often accompanied by gaze (Stivers 2010: 2777). Stivers’ research on distribution of these questions in American English conversation, showed that in multi-person interaction 93% of questions selected a next speaker (Stivers: 2010: 2777). Next, another organizational aspect of questions is focus shifting (Gruber 2001: 1826). Gruber (2001) displays that these questions can also be used in a strategic way. He defines the format as “one speaker chooses an element of the previous turn, which was originally not in topical focus, and makes it the topic of the following stretch of talk” (Gruber 2001: 1826). The author argues that this is a strategy to prompt the addressee to bring the focus shift about (Gruber 2001: 1826). Closely connected to focus shifting questions are expository questions. Ilie (1999: 980) characterized expository questions as introductory utterances. The author argues that these are less challenging compared to the questions put forward in the previous paragraph (concerning argumentative nature of orientation), but they are still used in a strategic way to “address the audience and foreshadow information” (Ilie 1999: 980).
4. Talk show discourse

On contemporary television, talk shows cannot be ignored. Ilie argues that talk television is growing rapidly and is becoming more diversified (Ilie 2001: 216). With the popularity of the genre, a diversion between different subtypes has emerged. In this chapter on talk show discourse, I am going to argue in favour of talk show discourse as a continuum. In accordance with criteria such as participant framework, themes, argumentation and disagreement, turn taking design and goals, different types can be detected. These subtypes share some characteristics, but also diverge on important issues. All types of talk show discourse are concerned with questioning and answering, but at the same time this aspect conveys the most differences as the exact practice of questioning and answering is different. In this part, I am going to discuss the talk/chat show, the news interview and the panel debate interview. After giving a brief overview of these formats, a little follows on media discourse and political discourse. As the focus of this research is the panel debate, this chapter ends with a discussion of the general structure of the pattern.

4.1 Continuum of different types

The title of this chapter might be somewhat misleading, as there is no one ‘talk show discourse’. Ilie clarifies that the genre does not represent a homogeneous discourse type (Ilie 2001: 216). It is important to keep in mind that talk show discourse is an umbrella term for a range of different types of media interactions (Ilie 2001: 210). Lauerbach & Aijmer (2007: 1336) state that the talk show genre is a fluid one. It is possible to distinguish the different genres along a continuum. This continuum is based on criteria referring to participants, themes, argumentation and disagreement, turn taking design and goals. For the purpose of this research, three formats of talk show discourse will be explained briefly. I am going to discuss the talk or chat show, the panel debate and the news interview. The panel debate will be the focus of this study, the genre shares both features with talk/chat shows and news interviews. Lauerbach (2007: 1392-1393) sums up some similarities and differences between the different genres:

Shared characteristics:

- All three genres involve interactions or speech acts concerned with questioning and answering
- The genres portray the same role distribution: all include the interviewer as a representative of the media organization and an interviewee. The politicians are
representatives of their parties, experts are representatives of their profession and celebrities are representatives of their roles as stars

- The different types all contain the same role specific distribution between interviewer and interviewees: i.e. the interviewer is asking the questions and the interviewees are answering them
- The patterns are all performed for a third party, namely an overhearing audience (studio audience and the audience watching the TV at home)
- Interviewers are in control of the dialogue in every format

Main difference:

- The precise practice of questioning and answering is distinct in the different genres

(Lauerbach 2007: 1392-1393)

The purpose of this research is to look at the question-answer design of the Belgian Sunday morning talk show ‘De zevende dag’. As the main difference along the continuum concerns the exact procedure of questioning and answering, a discussion of the chat show, news interview and panel interview will be significant for the analysis of the corpus of this study later on in the paper.

4.1.1 Criteria

To distinguish different patterns along the continuum of talk show discourse, there are some criteria to be taken into consideration. I am going to briefly discuss five criteria: participation framework, themes, turn taking, argumentation and disagreement and goals.

4.1.1.1 Participation framework

The participation framework of the different types of talk show discourse, displays some differences according to the prototypical guests invited. Also the number of participants involved on the show, diverges along the continuum. A sufficient criterion concerns the presence of an interviewer or host, at least one interviewee and an audience. In certain talk shows, there are multiple interviewers present. The interviewers take turns in generating the questioning. More often than multiple interviewers, there can be several interviewees participating in the same interview.

1 Lauerbach (2007: 1988-1419) makes no reference to talk shows where lay people are invited to discuss their experiences.
Talk shows in general involve a layered audience: the studio audience and the audience at home watching the TV-show. The audience is a crucial component of the participation framework, they are the target at whom the persuasion or message is directed. This applies to both the media event itself (the producers of the show want a lot of watchers) as to the interviewees (they want to reach as many people as possible through the medium). That the audience is an important aspect of the format is clear, but the degree of participation by the audience varies across the different televised TV-shows. Sometimes the audience is allowed to ask questions and actively participate, this concerns both the studio audience as the audience at home. In some formats the people watching can call into the show and also actively participate. In other varieties of the genre, the audience plays a more passive role as bystander at home, at whom the interaction is oriented.

4.1.1.2 Themes

Televised talk show discourse, can be differentiated according to the themes discussed on the show. However, this criterion is closely interwoven with the prototypical guests invited. Some talk shows, will discuss more informal topics, while others will explore more formal subject matter. Also the degree of controversy will vary over the continuum of genres.

4.1.1.3 Turn taking

Most scholars define talk show discourse as a form of institutional discourse (or at least as a hybrid genre: semi-institutional discourse (Ilie 2001: 209-254)). Institutional discourse sometimes portrays very specific and systematic transformations in conversational turn taking procedures (Heritage 1997: 115). One of the shared characteristics given by Lauerbach (2007: 1393), is the fact that in all the genres, the interviewer is in control of the dialogue. Heritage (1997: 116) talks about turn-type preallocation when discussing several institutional settings (including news interviews). He states that the most pervasive form of turn-type preallocation involves the restriction of one party to answering questions. This restriction of rights, permits the institutional representative (here: the interviewer or host) to maintain control over the overall structure of the interaction (Heritage 1997: 116). In addition, Heritage mentions that also the interviewer experiences a restriction on the types of turns that he/she may perform: they are obliged to use turns that question. The author asserts that this keeps them from expressing overtly evaluative responses for example (Heritage 1997: 116). These restrictions in terms of turn design, make topic management largely restricted to the interviewer. The occupation with questioning and answering, is shared by all the different
types of talk show discourse. The precise practice however, is different. Specific turn taking systems, will have a major part in distinguishing between the formats. Ilie (1999) argues that while the turn taking system in interviews follows a pre-established order, this is not always the case with talk shows (Ilie 1999: 976).

4.1.1.4 Argumentation and disagreement

Lauerbach & Aijmer (2007: 1336) question if argumentation is a constitutive feature of all variants of talk shows. What is certain, is that the various formats display a different degree of argumentation. The notion of argumentation is closely related to disagreement. Aspects such as (dis)alignment and neutralism are crucial in the discussion of the several talk show interactions.

4.1.1.5 Goals

Lauerbach (2007: 1393) argues that the fact that the question-answer sequence is embedded in the context of a media institution, reinforces the social constraint of the activity. The overall purpose of the media event and the goals of the participants play a critical role in distinguishing along the continuum of different genres.

4.1.2 Talk/chat show

With reference to the participation framework, we can distinguish between different prototypical guests for each show. Even within the category of the talk or chat show, a division can be made between talk shows featuring lay persons and those involving celebrities. This variant of talk show, is usually perceived as the least formal format. Here the typical interviewee is a celebrity or an ordinary person narrating their experiences. The number of participants involved, may differ within this group. Sometimes only one person or celebrity is interviewed and sometimes various people or celebrities are interviewed at the same time. A layered audience is a central feature of talk shows within this category, but they may display a difference in participation. Sometimes members of the audience are allowed to ask questions themselves, or questions posted on social media are read aloud for example.

Secondly, the themes discussed in the talk/chat typically are more informal. The celebrity talk shows, primarily belong to the comic feel-good genre (Lauerbach 2007: 1388). Talk show involving ordinary people, often concern everyday topics but here the degree of controversy also plays a role. People featuring on the show, tell about mundane problems a lot of people are confronted with, but sometimes more serious matters are called attention to.
Next, the turn design in corresponding talk shows is characterized as being the least restricted among the different variants. Ilie (1999) argues that although talk shows are rule-governed and topic centred to a certain extent (i.e. displays of institutional discourse), the interaction also displays typical features of conversational discourse. One of these typical features listed by the author, concerns question asking initiated by show guests (Ilie 1999: 976). Both in lay person and celebrity talk shows, it is possible for the guest to ask a question to the host.

The fourth criterion discussed above, is argumentation and disagreement. Here it is necessary to clearly differentiate between the talk show featuring celebrities and those inviting ordinary people. Celebrity talk shows in general, do not convey an argumentative nature. Disagreement is very rare, and this in mainly because of the comic feel-good character of these shows; they score high on the entertaining function. While talk shows featuring lay persons are also meant to be entertaining and appealing to a large audience, these shows are often associated with a more argumentative characterization, often including some aspect of debate. In discussing the ‘Oprah Winfrey Show’, Ilie (1999: 983) argues that unlike news interviewers, it is not rare for show hosts to agree or disagree with the statement of an interlocutor, when developing their own arguments.

Lastly, the main goal of interviewers in talk shows is entertaining the audience (Lauerbach 2007: 1393). In the celebrity talk shows, they do this by allowing the celebrities to ‘do stardom’ by telling interesting stories about their profession or personal life. The goal of the celebrity interviewee is achieving good publicity (Lauerbach 2007: 1391). In the talk shows featuring ordinary people, identification and familiarity with the topic also play an important role in the goal-orientation of the media institution. The main goal of the interviewees, is to be heard; they want to tell their story.

4.1.3 News interview

The news interview often concerns politicians, and for this reason it is sometimes called the political news interview (e.g. Lauerbach 2007: 1393). Other prototypical interviewees, are experts with regard to the topic discussed. In terms of number of participants, we can provide a clear answer. A news interview consist only of two active participants; the interviewer and the interviewee. However, one should bear in mind that there is always an overhearing audience (watching TV), for whom the interaction in constituted in the first place. Another distinct feature of the news interview, is that the audience does not play an active
participation-role in the interaction. One of the design features of news interviews, is that it is meant for reception by absent audiences.

The themes discussed in news interviews are more formal than those of the talk/chat show. This is due to the fact that the news interview is information oriented, while the talk show is both information and entertainment oriented (Ilie 2001: 217). Politicians or experts are interviewed in the light of a specific current newsworthy event. With respect to turn taking design, the news interview is the most restrictive genre. This means that it is also the pattern which shows most features of institutional discourse. The question-answer design is prescribed and controlled: the interviewer asks the questions and the interviewee answers them. The interviewer has to incorporate aspects of opposing viewpoints, but at the same time he/she has to maintain an objective and neutral stance.

The criterion of argumentation and disagreement is somewhat more complicated regarding the news interview. As already mentioned in the previous paragraph on turn taking, the interviewer has to be objective and neutral, but he/she also has to ask challenging questions. The interviewer is a neutral representative of a media institution, but also has to include opposing views into the questioning. Those two exercises are more or less contradictory.

Lauerbach (2007: 1393) defines the goals of the interviewer and interviewee in the news interview as follows: the interviewer wants to provide an up-to-date and appealing perspective on the concerning events and on their main protagonists, while the interviewee (here primarily a politician) – in exchange for information and opinion – wants to realize good publicity.

4.1.4 Panel debate interview
Politicians and experts are popular participants of the panel debate. Guillot (2008: 180) asserts that the panel discussion is a vehicle for people of influence to promote their views to the wider community. Looking at the medium from this perspective, it comes as no surprise that politicians are commonly featured in television panel interviews. The presence of multiple interviewees is a standard feature of the format. Again, there is a layered audience: an audience present in the studio and an audience watching the show. The active participation of the audience is rather limited.

Themes discussed on the panel interview, are more or less the same as those raised in the news interview. The guests are invited to state their opinion about a current socially
relevant issue. Here again the topics are more formal than those of the talk/chat show, but still appealing enough to a broad audience.

In terms of turn taking design, the panel debate interview provides a system where the interviewer does no longer need to incorporate oppositional stances into his/her questions (cf. the news interview), and thus can remain neutral and take on the role as mediator (Emmertsen 2007: 571). However, not all scholars agree on this last advantage of panel interviews. Clayman (2002: 1388) claims that the problem of neutralism only re-emerges in a different form. He argues that preferential treatment of one of the panellist is easier to detect through the format.

Next, argumentation and disagreement play a crucial role in the format of the panel debate. Clayman (2002: 1386) defines panel news interviews as consisting of multiple interviewees who represent opposing positions. Emmertsen (2007: 571) gives a similar description, but also stresses that the participants are invited to debate their differences. The format has become a lot more popular over the last years. This is due to the possibility it creates for liveliness and dramatic conflict (Clayman 2002: 1387). This paper has already discussed some aspects of disagreement, and here the link with the talk show genre becomes clear. Researchers agree that panel discussions necessarily involve disagreement (Guillot 2008: 183). Guillot (2008: 183) states that another advantage of the system is that it makes room for the emergence of overt disagreement. This statement is in accordance with the new insights on disagreement, i.e. disagreement may be expected and display characteristics of the preferred design format (Angouri & Lochner 2012: 1551).

The goals of the different participants in the panel debate interview are quite similar to those of the news interview. This is mainly because of the great similarity in participants, i.e. primarily politicians and experts. Also the fact the panel interview originates in the news interview and can be seen as an evolution of the format, creates striking parallels. The main goal of the interviewer is again to give an interesting viewpoint on current events and their actors. The public receives information, while the politician – and the expert to a lesser extent – achieves publicity.

4.2 Media discourse

The influence and cultural power of the mass media continues to grow. Whether we like it or not, we all consume various media; either by choice or unconsciously (Tolson 1996: ix). Tolson (1996: ix-xii) argues that the media structure our experience through the consumption of media texts. This means that text and discourse play a central role in the media. We are
confronted with media discourse when we watch television, listen to the radio and read the newspaper, but also through advertising and publicity. The focus of this study will only be on televised talk shows. According to Luginbühl (2007: 1371), TV formats often present information in a dramatized, personalised and polarised way. This practice is regularly referred to as ‘infotainment’ (Luginbühl 2007: 1371). Argument and narrative are two ways to structure the media act (Tolson 1996: 28-43). When considering the participation framework it is important to keep in mind that media discourse is always directed at an overhearing audience. Fetzer & Weizman (2006: 147) define media discourse as a dual endeavour because it consists of two different frame oriented interactions. The first-frame interactions concern the media co-participants, the second-frame co-participants relate to the ratified generic audience.

4.3 Political discourse
Talk and discourse are not only closely interwoven with the media, it also plays a central role in doing politics. Fetzer & Weizman (2006: 143) assert that politics and language are very closely related. The authors quote Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 3) who argue that ‘political activity does not exist without the use of language (...) the doing of politics is predominantly constituted in language.’ In recent years, politics has undergone some changes and has become more and more interrelated with the media. Fetzer & Weizman (2006: 146) notice this change and argue that a conversationalization of political discourse took place. They claim that as political discourse was primary monologue-oriented in the fifties, sixties, seventies and eighties, it is now no longer appropriate in western culture (Fetzer & Weizman 2006: 146).

As already briefly touched upon, the main aim of the politicians in TV discussions or talk shows is to promote their own opinions, their party and their personas (Luginbühl 2007: 1376). Luginbühl claims that the public statements made by politicians are always information and propaganda at the same time; the discussion is an instrument for persuasion (Luginbühl 2007: 1376). The author discusses political discourse with respect to conversational violence. He observes some forms and functions of conversational violence used by the politicians in the Swiss political TV debate show ‘Arena’. His first observation is that politicians allege that their opponent in the debate is incompetent. Luginbühl (2007: 1378-1379) states that the realisation of this technique takes place in various ways like asking a question (e.g. do you know the budget?), give advice (e.g. please actually read the convention once) and by speculating (e.g. you don’t read the newspapers, I suppose). The
researcher calls this ‘staging cooperative behaviour’, because the politicians misuse patterns of cooperative interaction, in order to make their opponent look bad (Luginbühl 2007: 1379).

Secondly, Luginbühl distinguishes instances where politicians allege their opponent of insincerity, by accusing them of spreading false information, lying or holding back important information (Luginbühl 2007: 1379). Interestingly the author notices a difference in replying to this allegation between politicians and other participants. While others counter the claim explicitly (e.g. This is a lie!), the politicians, react indirectly by formulating generic needs, make statements concerning the standard of knowledge of an opponent or by naming unfulfilled conditions about the honesty of the opponent (Luginbühl 2007: 1379). This could indicate that these strategies of conversational violence are predicted and part of the specific frame of this kind of talk show in particular. Lastly, next to ‘staged cooperative behaviour’, Luginbühl (2007: 1380) discovers some instances of ‘staged confrontation’. Here the conversational behaviour of the opponent is used as a strategy to discredit this person by accusing him/her of interrupting (e.g. Please let me finish my statement, I let you finish) (Luginbühl 2007: 1380). The author calls this instances of staged confrontation because the accusation is not always justified (Luginbühl 2007: 1380).

Politicians in talk shows are assigned the status of expert, they act out of their political profession and ideology. However, it is important to keep in mind that this expert status interacts with other features of identity, such as social class, gender and culture (Fetzer & Weizman 2006: 149).

4.4 Structure of the panel debate interview

In his work on conversation analysis and institutional talk, Heritage (1998: 119-120) argues that most kinds of interaction have typical overall structural features such as openings, closings and slots for topics. However, while in ordinary conversation these notions are rather free and fluid – depending on the preferences of the concerning participants – some institutional genres have a rather specific overall structure (Heritage 1997: 119-120). For the panel news interview, Clayman (2002: 1385-1401) distinguishes some structural elements: the introductions, the first round of questioning, inviting interplay between panellists and the closing. Clayman discussed these structural features in order to question the neutral status of the interviewer in a particular interview of the Sunday morning public affairs program ‘Face the Nation’, conducted in 1985 by Lesley Stahl (Clayman 2002: 1389).
4.4.1 The introductions

At the start of the TV show, the host gives a short introduction of all the participants invited. The interviewer makes reference to their profession, mentions relevant credentials and institutional affiliations (Clayman 2002: 1389). Clayman (2002: 1389) argues that already in this stage of the interview, a preference can be detected. Through holding back some of the participants credentials for example or overstating the importance of another.

4.4.2 The first round of questioning

After introducing all the members of the panel, the host starts the question-answer process. In general, the interviewer starts the debate by letting each panel member answer a question. Although this can be seen as an institutional mechanism for maintaining a neutral stance, Clayman (2002: 1390) observes that sometimes a pattern of favouritism can be recognized in this first round of questioning. The consequences of using negative interrogatives has already been mentioned in this paper, when discussing questions: these type of questions are highly assertive and prefer a ‘yes’ answer. Clayman (2002: 1391) stresses that recipients regularly treat negative interrogatives as if they were asserting a position rather than asking a question. Also the use of acknowledgement tokens towards a participant may threaten the host’s neutral position (Clayman 2002: 1391).

4.4.3 Inviting interplay between panellists

The third structural feature of the panel debate distinguished by Clayman (2002: 1385-1401) is the inviting of interplay between the panellist. This is a crucial component of the format, because it enables lively debate and minimizes the chance that the host loses his/her neutral position as mediator as he/she become a less central player in the interaction. In this stage, questions again play an essential role. Through the use of inviting-interplay questions, disagreement is constructed between the panellists (as they are chosen because of their opposing viewpoints concerning a particular issue).

4.4.4 The closing

At the end of the debate, the host closes the interaction. This confirms the institutional nature of such discussion talk shows. Here again Clayman (2002: 1398-1399) observes a departing from objectivity. Which participant is given the last word can be regarded meaningful in some instances. The author also mentions that the restricted nature of the last question asked can display aspects of favouritism. Accompanied by nonverbal cues such as a
broad smile or shaking the head, the host can lean towards a specific answer, and because of this reveal his or her evaluative stance (Clayman 2002: 1399).
5. **Methodology**

In following section, I will elaborate on the methodology used for this study. First I will elaborate on the process of getting to the specific research question of this paper, i.e. the analysis of questions in disagreement sequences in an institutional setting such as a televised panel debate. Secondly, I will discuss the compiled corpus where the investigation is based upon. Next, I will give a brief explanation of the analytic approach used. This perspective consists of both elements of Pragmatics and Conversation Analysis. Lastly, I will end this section with a more thorough exposition of the conducted analysis of the data.

The initial aim of this research was to explore the use of questions in an institutional setting. The institutional context chosen, was televised talk show discourse. More specific, the show used for analysis is the Belgian Sunday morning debate talk show ‘De zevende dag’. As mentioned earlier in this paper, talk show discourse is very broad and ranges along a continuum. The data from ‘De zevende dag’ consists of both news interviews and panel debates. The choice was made to focus on the latter. Panel interviews are by definition multiperson interactions where a lot of disagreement is constructed. This provided an interesting matrix for the study of disagreement sequences and how questions are used in shaping disagreement.

As part of the research, I have recorded a corpus with episodes of the Belgian TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’. The corpus consists of recordings of 14 episodes of the show, dating from 19 October 2014 to 8 February 2015. This amounts to 14 hours and 20 minutes of video recorded data. From these 14 hours and 20 minutes, 66 extracts were selected and transcribed. These extracts, varying in length and complexity, all involve disagreement sequences which include questions. The transcription of the excerpts makes a written corpus of approximately 29000 words. In the data analysis the extracts are numbered according to their position in the corpus. The talk show ‘De zevende dag’ is a Sunday morning talk show where a variety of topics are dealt with. These topics include politics, news issues, social affairs, sports, culture and music. The show airs every Sunday morning at 11 a.m. on the channel één and is presented by two hosts who each take different interviews or debates: Tim Pauwels and Ihsane Chioua Lekhli. Besides being aired on television, the show is also free available online for five weeks.

---

The analytic approach used for this study is based on both Pragmatics and Conversation Analysis. Pragmatics was introduced in linguistics in the 1980’s and is standardly defined as meaning in use, meaning in context or the study of human interaction (Thomas 2013: 1-2). Bardovi-Harlig (2010: 219) asserts that pragmatics “bridges the gap between the system side of language and the use side, and relates them to each other at the same time”. The approach deals with speech acts, indirectness, theories of politeness and the construction of meaning. As the focus of this research is disagreement in talk, pragmatics provide an interesting model. In the previous theoretical chapters aspects such as indirectness and politeness theory are introduced. Another useful approach where this research is based upon, is Conversation Analysis (CA). The tradition of Conversation Analysis (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson) has provided a model for the regulation of turn-taking in spoken conversation. The selected extracts are disagreement sequences consisting of multiple turns. In the analysis of the data, typical CA concepts such as adjacency pairs and preference design are important in relation to the question component of this study.

The first step in the analysis of the disagreement sequences, was the classification according to question type. In the second theoretical chapter on questions, different syntactic types and semantic functions are listed. For this classification, a division is made between questions used by interviewees and those posed by the hosts. As all the excerpts involved instances of some kind of disagreement, and also because of the debate context, the questions are classified according to their argumentativeness. A clear characterization of the applied categories follows in the next chapter where the results are put forward. After the study of the distribution of the different types of questions in the disagreement sequences studied from the ‘De zevende dag’, a qualitative study could be conducted where the questions are analysed within their interactional context. In the further analysis the concepts introduced in the three first theoretical chapters are applied. From the first chapter on disagreement, issues such as politeness, face and framing are related to the excerpts. Also the different markers of disagreement (verbal, audio-visual and prosodic) are tested on the corpus. Lastly two perspectives on disagreement sequences are practiced to the data. These frameworks are from Kotthof (1993: 193-216) and Muntigl and Turnbull (1998: 225-256). The second theoretical chapter is about questions in general. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the questions were grouped according to notions explained in this chapter. The second step is a more detailed analysis of the concerning questions. The last theoretical chapter regards a discussion of talk show discourse. For the analysis, the paragraphs on media
and political discourse proved most important, as well as the structural elements of the panel debate interview.
6. Results

In this section the results of the research will be presented. As mentioned before in the methodology section, I looked at the use of questions in disagreement sequences in panel debates on the Belgian TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’. The first step in the analysis, was the classification according to question type, this for both the interviewees’ and the hosts’ use of questions in the disagreement sequences. The tables below shows the distribution according to question type. First I will provide a clear characterization of the applied categories. Concerning the interviewees, the main distinction was made between challenging questions and other less argumentative questions. The first category involves what Ilie (1999: 986) calls ‘argumentative questions’ these questions are message and audience oriented. Ilie states that the argumentative function lies in the involvement of the speaker by advancing, supporting, negotiating or refuting his/her own arguments (Ilie 1999: 986). Within this first category, some special instances can be distinguished; namely rhetorical opposing questions, implicit opposing questions, distorting opposing questions and explicit opposing questions. These subtypes have been adopted from Gruber (2001: 1815-1857). The second category consists of other argumentative questions: expository and echo questions. Expository questions are characterized by Ilie (1999: 980) as less challenging and often occurring in initial position. The author argues that they are used to focus on a controversial issue and/or problematize it (Ilie 1999: 980). Within the class of echo questions, the degree of argumentativeness varies. Ilie (1999: 980) asserts that the less repetition-eliciting the echo question is, the more argumentatively it tends to function. It could be argued that some of these instances can be incorporated in the first category of challenging questions. However, the examples from the data from ‘De zevende dag’, do not score high on the scale of argumentativeness. The question types observed from the two hosts vary from neutral in terms of argumentativeness to highly challenging. There are requests for clarification, which are fairly neutral. Another expected type are the argument-eliciting questions. Ilie (1999: 986) calls these questions interlocutor oriented and states that they often occur in the host’s questions. The author explains that argument-eliciting questions do not necessarily involve the speaker’s personal commitment to a particular viewpoint (Ilie 1999: 986). Within this group, some response invitations are included. Some of the more clearly argumentative questions are challenging questions and conducive polar questions. Argument eliciting questions are often also polar questions; here conducive polar questions are the ones that convey a strong presupposition and argumentative nature (instead of an argument-eliciting function (cf. Ilie 1999)).
As expected, the interviewees use questions mainly in an argumentative way. In the previous paragraph, the categories of question types are elaborated on. The data portrays 68 examples of challenging questions used by panel members. This means that the majority of the questions used by interviewees are message and audience oriented in that the speakers advance, support, negotiate or refute their own arguments (Ilie 1999: 986). Within this category, a large group of rhetorical opposing questions can be distinguished (49 of 68 instances). The frequency of rhetorical opposing questions can be explained in relation to political persuasion. The questions are a means to stress the difference in opinion and often serve to highlight the results of measures taken by the opponent, which are portrayed as negative evolutions. The extract was also checked for implicit, explicit and distorting opposing questions. Five examples of implicit opposing questions were to be found, and only one of each for the distorting and explicit opposing questions. The limited use of implicit opposing questions was somewhat surprising. Such questions are only mildly face-threatening but still allow the speaker to discredit the opponent (however in an implicit way). Because of the link with political discourse, more frequent use was expected. The lack of distorting opposing questions can be attributed to its potential face-threatening nature, while the rare example of an explicit opposing question can be explained with reference to the debate frame: once a disagreement frame is established, it is no longer necessary to be explicit. The twelve remaining cases within the class of challenging questions are those which could not be categorised under a special sort of opposing questions but however clearly portray an argumentative function. Next, a distinction was made between the challenging questions – with a clear argumentative function – and other argumentative questions. I made this division because the questions categorized under the latter heading are clearly less argumentative in the data. 25 samples of these other argumentative questions could be distinguished, from which 19 were expository questions and six echo questions.

For the distribution table concerning the hosts, it is important to stress that only disagreement sequences were studied. The distribution is not representative for the use of the hosts’ questions on the talk show in general. The table shows that within the disagreement sequences, the host uses 17 questions asking for clarification. These questions are mainly information-eliciting instead of argumentative in nature. The largest group of questions asked by the host in the excerpts are argument-eliciting questions (56 examples). These questions are interlocutor oriented and do not necessarily involve the speaker's personal commitment to a particular viewpoint (Ilie 1999: 986). Within this group, six
response invitations are included. The question types listed until now are not surprising, as they are fairly neutral or only mildly argumentative, maintaining the host’s neutral position as a mediator. However, there are also some cases with a clearer argumentative function: challenging questions and conducive polar questions. Challenging questions are pretty straightforwardly defined as conveying a challenge in the form of a questions. Conducive polar questions however, need a clear characterization as the other type of questions can also be yes-no questions, but are not categorized under this heading. For the purpose of this research, conducive polar questions are the ones that include a strong presupposition and argumentative nature (instead of for example an argument-eliciting function or a mere asking for clarification) (cf. Ilie 1999). The challenging questions posed by the hosts function to provoke lively debate and are a means for the host to express his own viewpoint or evaluate arguments of the interviewees. Nevertheless, these questions come with a risk of losing neutrality. Quoting other voices is a way to resolve this risk. However, these instances are rare in the data. This can be explained with reference to the genre of the panel interview: the interviewees are supposed to provide input. Moreover, the use of conducive polar questions is characteristic for the hosts’ use of questions. In the analysed disagreement sequences, the interviewees do not use this type of question. It is a way for the host to limit the interviewee in answering, and thus allows the host to structure the debate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging questions</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical opposing questions</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit opposing questions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distorting opposing questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit opposing questions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other argumentative questions</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository questions</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo questions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Distribution according to question type: interviewees
The next step in the analysis, was a more thorough investigation of the selected excerpts. Here again a distinction was made between interviewees and the hosts. First I am going to discuss the results concerning the interviewees. Next to the distribution results of the classification into question types (a more detailed analysis follows in the data analysis section), some other observations could be made. The panel members featuring on the show, are very often politicians. One of the main findings was that the guests make frequent use of metacommunicative acts related to political discourse and conversational violence. Luginbühl (2007: 1380) calls this instances of staged confrontation. It is a method to discredit the opponent as a rude, impolite conversational partner. Another interesting result also related to political discourse, is the presence of direct rejections of presuppositions conveyed in challenging questions. The data show a rather unexpected result. As mentioned in the paragraph on political discourse, similar political TV debate shows, demonstrate that politicians react indirectly by formulating generic needs, make statements concerning the standard of knowledge of an opponent or by naming unfulfilled conditions about the honesty of the opponent, rather than countering such a claim explicitly (Luginbühl 2007: 1379). This observation implies that the frame of ‘De zevende dag’ is less confrontational than that of the Swiss TV show ‘Arena’. Furthermore, the data shows that politicians and experts diverge in the conservation of the institutional turn taking dynamics. While both use questions in an argumentative way, the politicians move on to a dyadic interaction where the host’s role as mediator is backgrounded, as the experts preserve the triadic dynamic where the host keeps his/her central position in the interaction. This departure is an indication of aggravated dissent. Aggravated dissent is completely acceptable for politicians, while experts are more sensitive to politeness mechanisms. A last observation for the interviewees, is the fact that also interrupting with a question is a means to express aggravated dissent. Moving on to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS TYPE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TIMES USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument-eliciting</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response invitation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging questions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducive polar questions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Distribution according to question type: hosts
host, the presence of argumentative questions such as challenging questions or conducive polar questions is analysed in more detail as this could be seen as an anomaly to his/her neutral position as mediator. Lastly, it could be observed that the host repeats his/her question several times, pushing for a satisfactory answer. On the surface, this seems a normal action for a show host, but in the disagreement sequences analysed, it shows that there is an argumentative function to this. It can be seen as a way for the host to express disagreement. Repeating a question functions as a way to counter, express an irrelevancy claim or depict the interviewee as an incompetent conversational partner.
7. Data Analysis

The main focus of this study concerns the use of questions in disagreement sequences on the TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’. In the following section the results of the research will be analysed. This chapter will be divided in two parts. First of all, I will discuss some of the findings concerning the interviewees. The guests use rhetorical opposing questions most frequently. Implicit opposing questions are used less frequently than expected, while distorting and explicit opposing questions are rare. Other interesting findings concern expressions of metacommunication (staged confrontation), direct rejections of presuppositions, a departure from institutional turn taking regulations and interrupting with a question. Secondly, several instances of questions used by the host will be elaborated on. In the TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’, the hosts mainly use argument-eliciting questions, followed by requests for clarification. More surprisingly, the hosts also use challenging questions in order to evoke lively debate or express an evaluation, sometimes doing so by quoting or referring to other voices. They also pose conducive polar questions in order to limit the interviewee in answering and the hosts regularly repeat the same question when interviewees fail to provide a conforming or satisfactory answer. This latter observation can also be regarded as a means for the host to express disagreement.

7.1 Interviewees

In following part, some of the interviewees’ use of questions in disagreement sequences on ‘De zevende dag’ will be analysed in more detail. The transcribed disagreement sequences, feature mostly politicians. This explains why a lot of the questions posed in the disagreement sequences are used as a means of political persuasion. In this section, some of the findings put forward in the result section will be thoroughly analysed.

7.1.1 Rhetorical opposing questions

One of the most striking findings of this study was the distribution of rhetorical opposing questions in disagreement sequences on ‘De zevende dag’. As already mentioned in the results, rhetorical opposing questions are found in more than half of the extracts. A similar distribution is found in Blas Arroyo’s research on questions in Spanish face-to-face election debates. The author notices that the majority of the questions (43,2%) occur in intermediate positions in the turn. Rhetorical opposing questions are a popular way for politicians to
express conflicting views and establish a disagreement format. More specifically, the politicians often use rhetorical opposing questions to focus on the results of measures taken by the opponent, and portray the outcome as a negative evolution. Below, some extracts involving rhetorical opposing questions used by politicians will be analysed.

**Extract 21:**

30/11 – Hoe moeten we de begroting saneren en toch banen creëren?

*Topic: How can we remediate the budget deficit and still create new jobs?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Host:</th>
<th>Van Biesen:</th>
<th>Calvo:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>ja meneer Van Biesen (.) we hebben eigenlijk aan- of we hadden eigenlijk aan Europa beloofd (0.3) dat we (.) in 2016 (.) al een evenwicht zouden hebben (1.6) we veranderen dat (.) dan kunnen ze nie enthousiast zijn natuurlijk eh?</td>
<td>wel erh daarin hebt ge gelijk natuurlijk (.) wij hadden ook liever het traject gevormd zoals vroeger was voorzien (.) 2016 (.) het gaat moeilijker (.) op dit ogenblik (.) het erh het is heel moeilijker om op dit ogenblik dieper te saneren dan dat we reeds doen (.) we doen een enorme inspanning om (.) met andere woorden voor de eerste keer echt diep te saneren (.) om zo de uitgaven onder controle te krijgen (.) en eindelijk niet onze toevlucht te hoeven zoeken &lt;zoals toen in het verleden naar nieuwe belastingen&gt; we saneren nu eindelijk (.) de Europese commissie (.) en alle instellingen geven ons daar ook goede punten voor (0.3) wij erh dalen het structureel tekort daalt fundamenteel en momenteel (.) met andere woorden we zitten daar eigenlijk wel op het goede spoor (.) dus we moeten daar niet zo bevreesd zijn (.) erh erhm (.) maar we kunnen natuurlijk niet erh sneller gaan (.) en als je een tekort hebt (.) betekent dat dat de schuld ook blijft ↑stijgen</td>
<td>ja der is inderdaad- we hebben een boeiende week achter de rug in erh in het parlement (.) er zijn behoorlijk wat opmerkingen geweest erh om het begrotingswerk zowel van het Rekenhof als van de</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Europese Commissie (0.6) wat eigenlijk mij nog veel meer boeit (.) is
erh (0.5) ja je hebt de deliberatie op begrotingsniveau maar wat is
het maatschappelijk (.) resultaat? Wat is het resultaat van het
maatschappelijk examen van deze begroting? En dan is men
gebijsd (.) deze begroting (.) van 2015 (0.4) ja vraagt eigenlijk (.)
onevenredig (0.3) onrechtvaardig veel inspanningen van mensen die
werken (.) en dat is een vaststelling die die [je alleen maar kan maken
als je-

Government: [unintelligible speech]

Calvo: neenee [ma das een vaststelling die ik kan maken] als je kijkt naar
naar de-

Government: [unintelligible speech]

Host: is dat een vaststelling?

Van Biesen: dat is helemaal niet juist (.) wat wij juist proberen te doen is
doormiddel van te saneren (0.3) er niet voor te zorgen dat er extra
belastingen weer bijkomen (0.3) en daardoor dat er voldoende (.) dat
op termijn eh (0.7) ik zeg u dat (0.3) in alle objectiviteit is dit eigenlijk
de meest sociaal [rechtvaardige begroting (.) erh en-

Host and opposition: ((laughing))

Host: u lijkt me daaraan te twijfelen mevrouw Temmerman

Van Biesen: en het is misschien de minst socialistisch begroting die we voorstellen
(.) maar de meest sociaal [rechtvaardige begroting]

Host: [mevrouw Temmerman]

Temmerman: meneer Van Biesen (.) allee (0.3) er is ↑één zaak waar we het
allemaal over eens zijn eh? De lasten op de lonen die zijn te hoog

Van Biesen: dat hebben we-

Temmerman: en jullie hebben allemaal gezegd (.) dat het niet de ↑londen zijn (0.3)
die te hoog zijn (0.4) maar de lasten op die lonen (0.3) die lasten
doen we naar beneden-

Van Biesen: die doen we naar beneden (.) [doen we]

Temmerman: [en hoe] hoe doet u nu in deze
begroting de lasten naar beneden? Door een indexsprong (.) met andere woorden door de ↑lonen te verlagen-

Van Biesen: onder[andere]

Temmerman: ↑iets iets wat u nooit zou doen (0.3) waardoor de koopkracht sowieso vermindert (.) en ↑daar zit die onrechtvaardigheid (0.3) laat ons die loonlasten verlagen (0.4) door de vermogen op- door de winsten op de vermo[gens te gaan verhogen-]

Host: ↑ja (0.5) meneer Terwingen?

In this extract the panel is discussing the budget deficit of the Belgian government. The excerpt starts with the host stating that Europe cannot be satisfied as the Belgian government had to adjust her promise of reaching a balance in 2016. Van Biesen partly agrees with the host, but defends his government by mentioning that it is impossible to go any faster but that they are heading in the right direction (partial agreement). The host gives the turn to Calvo who is part of the opposition. In line 21, the politician expresses agreement with the host in that there has been some criticism from the European Commission. From line 24 onwards the disagreement sequence starts. Calvo uses a rhetorical opposing question to switch from the budget deficit to an accusation of a deficit at a social level. By using an rhetorical opposing question, he expresses the argument that if an assessment was to be made of the government’s work, they would fail the test. He continues his reasoning by stating that the current government asks disproportionate much effort from the working people. At this point (line 30) Calvo is interrupted by the members of the government who are all talking at the same time, which makes their speech unintelligible. However, it is clear that they do not agree with Calvo’s statement. Calvo continues that this is simply an observation, implying that it is a fact. At turn 36, the host rephrases Calvo’s statement and asks the other panel members if this is a fact. Van Biesen very directly disagrees with the sentence dat is helemaal niet juist (that is not true at all), followed by a counterclaim. Van Biesen states that this is in fact the most socially fair government. However, the counterclaim is not very effective as this statement is received with mocking laughter from both the host as the opposition. In line 43 the host gives the turn to Temmerman (a member of the opposition). Temmerman uses an independence naming strategy; she politely addresses him as meneer Van Biesen (mister Van Biesen), using an address form is also a verbal marker of disagreement (i.e. strengthening device). This is followed by the expression of allee (come on) indicating how ridiculous
previous statement was. Temmerman argues that there is one thing where they all agree on: labour burden is too high. The politician states that everyone agreed that it are not the wages itself that are too high, but the burden on those wages. From line 54 onwards, Temmerman also uses a rhetorical opposing question to make her point. She poses a rhetorical question to stress the injustice and absurdity of the measures taken. The politician accuses the government of lying to the people. She states that they do exactly what they said they would never do.

**Extract 27:**

**30/11 – Hoe moeten we de begroting saneren en toch banen creëren?**

*Topic: How can we remediate the budget deficit and still create new jobs?*

01 Demir: het klopt *niet* eh (. ) wat mevrouw Temmerman zegt (. ) ze zegt ja der
02 Host: ja als je minder geld hebt (. ) ga je minder gebruiken-
03 Demir: *nee* (. ) ma wa ma wa mijn (. ) men vergeet (. ) men *vergeet* wel (. )
04 Host: dawé met de *maatregelen* dat we nemen (. ) dawé ook *banen* gaan
05 Demir: creëren eh (. ) *zestigduizend* jobs (. ) das wel zestigduizend
06 ↑gezinnen die een ↑inkomen hebben (. ) da is ↑pure koopkracht
07 (0.3) [da is zestigduizend-
08 Temmerman: [de indexesprong is wel in maart eh] mevrouw Demir (. ) is wel
09 in maart eh (. ) das nie in 2019 eh (. ) da is nu in maart]
10 Demir: [mevrouw Temmerman (. ) zestigduizend werkgevers die- ik heb u
11 ook laten uitspreken] [mevrouw Temmerman (. ) ik wil ook even]
12 Temmerman: *nee* (0.4) [gebt mij nie laten uitspreken]
13 Demir: da zijn ook zestigduizend werkgevers die *ook* gaan bijdragen aan de
14 sociale zekerheid (0.6) en (0.4) ik wil ook even zeggen dat (0.5) een
15 *beetje* bescheidenheid langs socialistische kant (. ) da mag ook wel eh
16 → (. ) *want* wat (. ) *wat* is na vijfentwintig jaar (. ) het resultaat eh? (0.6)
17 de werkloosheid is gigantisch groot (0.3) vooral in *Brussel* en
18 *Wallonië* (0.4) de armoede *stijgt* (0.4)-
19 Host: *oké*
Demir: [er is een basisinkomen en dat is na vijventwintig jaar-

Temmerman: [unintelligible speech]

Host: [nemen we wel de] juiste maatregelen? (.) kan een vraag zijn (.)

↑waarom richten we ons niet specifiek op die laagste [inkomens?

Demir: [maar dat doen we] ma ma dat doen we-

Host: neenee de indexsprong is voor iedereen

Demir: maar op ↑Vlaams niveau (0.4) <want daar wou ik op komen> want op Vlaams niveau (.) we vergeten dat doelgroepen beleid [dat dat op]

Calvo: [daar wil ik nog op terugkomen (making gesture at host]

Demir: dat op ↑Vlaams niveau <want na de zesde staatshervorming is dat naar Vlaanderen gegaan> en Vlaanderen ↑doet da ook eh (.) heel doelgericht zet men in op die laagste loonklasse-

Host: meneer Calvo

Demir: en dat ↑vergeet [de oppositie vaak]

Host: [meneer Calvo]

→ Calvo: wat heeft de Vlaamse regering gedaan? Dat is twee maal honderdvijventwintig miljoen euro lastenverlaging voor ↑doelgroepen <gepland in het commitiviteitspact> opgeschoven (.) uitgesteld (.) geannuleerd-

Temmerman: ja (0.4) [ja mevrouw Demir]

Calvo: [heel belangrijk-

Demir: uitgesteld

Calvo: heel belangrijke vaststelling (.) dus loon- afgesproken afgesproken loonlastenverlaging zowel op federaal niveau als op Vlaams niveau die zijn doorgeschoven (0.4) een tweede element (0.3) de indexsprong u kan- u kan dat- u kan zich daar vrolijk over maken (.)

→ [meneer Peeters heeft dat deze week ook gedaan (.) en wat is]

Demir: [ik maak mij daar helemaal niet vrolijk over]

Calvo: het resultaat? (0.5) voor een gemiddelde werknemer
tweehonderdtachtig euro koopkrachtverlies per jaar (0.3) voor een tweeverdienersgezin (0.4) zevenhonderdzestig euro
koopkrachtverlies (0.4) dat is-

Excerpt 27 is derived from the same episode as excerpt 21. This stretch of speech starts with Demir overtly disagreeing. She explicitly states het klopt niet wat mevrouw Temmerman zegt (what Mrs. Temmerman says is incorrect). Demir uses an address form, which can be both an indication of strengthened and softened disagreement. In line 3, we see the host taking on the viewpoint of Temmerman and in this way disagreeing with Demir. Demir answers from line 4 onwards, with a contraction or denial nee (no), followed by a counterclaim which stresses the positive measurements the government does take. Demir’s turn can be seen as an act combination in T2 disagreement (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998: 225-256). However, Temmerman interrupts Demir with an irrelevancy claim. She implies that those measures are irrelevant for the people now, as the wages will decrease in March this year, those extra created jobs will only be workable from 2019 onwards. This extract can be seen as an example of preferred dissent (Kotthoff 1993:193-216). Once the frame of preference for disagreement is established, the possibility of aggravated dissent arises. This is the case in extract 27, where there is a reduction of reluctance markers and a lot of overlapping speech. The politicians also directly address each other in what Emmertsen would call ‘unmitigated IE-IE disagreement’. From 11 to 13 we see both politicians arguing about letting each other finish the turn. This phenomenon will be discussed in more detail later on in the paper (see 7.1.5). Demir’s turn beginning in line 14 conveys a rhetorical opposing question. The politician starts by continuing her reasoning but then after a short hesitation, she states that some modesty from the opposition is in place. In line 17 she asks about the outcome of 25 years of socialist government. Demir answers this question herself by saying that unemployment has never been higher and that poverty rises in Wallonia. At this point in the interaction, the disagreement is even more aggravated and that is why the host tries to interfere (turn 20, 23, 27). In line 38, Calvo gets the turn and he also uses a rhetorical opposing question. The politician asks what this government did do, and the answer is that they delayed or even cancelled 125 million euro decrease of labour burden. After some interruption from Demir and Temmerman who are still arguing, Calvo continues his argument with yet another rhetorical opposing question in line 49 and further. He also asks about the outcome of current policy, and that is that people will lose a lot of money.
7.1.2 Implicit opposing questions

While rhetorical opposing questions are the largest group by far in the corpus constructed from episodes of ‘De zevende dag’, there are only 5 examples of implicit opposing questions posed by interviewees to be found. Implicit opposing questions are interesting, because they are said to be only slightly face threatening yet at the same time have the possibility to provide an opponent with unfavourable interpretations of his/her point of view, and therefore they force their interlocutor to make his/her opinion explicit (Gruber 2001: 1835-1838). The limited use of this kind of question was unexpected, as they are method to discredit the opponent with only a slight chance of losing face. In this section some examples are given.

Extract 1:

26/10 – Spoorboden moeten voorzichtig omspringen met stakingsrecht

Topic: Railway unions should handle their right to strike more cautiously

01 Demir: Om nu terug te komen op die wilde stakingen (.) Ik denk dat niemand aan deze
tafel het recht op staken betwist (.) ik ook niet (.) dat is een recht, die
vakbonden hebben (.) maar men moet goed nadenken wanneer gaat men dat
recht gebruiken (0.4) en ik denk dat we dat moeten gebruiken als ul-tie-me
middel [als sociaal overleg niet] meer
06 Hedebouw: [unintelligible speech]
07 Demir: gaat (.) en in een normaal sociaal overleg gaat men praten, komt men aan
tafel, komt men discussiëren-
09 Hedebouw: maar u [wilt niet discussiëren met de vakbonden
10 Demir: [maar jawel]
11 Hedebouw: [u wilt niet praten (.) erhm u u u-
12 Demir: maar jawel, wij hebben meermaals de vakbonden uitgenodigd-
13 Hedebouw: ja uitgenodigd [om te zeggen zo en zo gaan we het doen]
14 Demir: [nee nee nee] (.) het brugpensioen bijvoorbeeld [daar-
15 Hedebouw: [kan ik-
Demir: [da hebben we besproken]

Hedebouw: [mevrouw Demir <kan dat de discussie zijn?>]

Demir: [en er is een kleine-

Hedebouw: [Oké ik zal gewoon de vraag stellen(.) kunt u hier zeggen dat een open
discussie terug open is om de beslissing van tot 67 jaar te werken? (1.0) Kunt
u hier zeggen dat er onderhandelingsmanoeuvre is voor de vakbonden? (1.0)
een antwoord alsjeblieft-

Demir: erhm heel duidelijk(.) tis misschien nie in u communistisch model(.) maar in
ons model, democratisch model is het zo dat mensen kiezen(.) mensen kiezen
en [er is nu een-

Hedebouw: [wie heeft er gestemd[voor-

Host: (gesturing at Hedebouw) [wacht even rustig

Demir: op 25 mei hebben de mensen gekozen(.) en er is op dit moment een
democratische meerderheid (2.0) en we zullen me- langer moeten werken
(1.0) kijk of dat da nu plezant is of- ik vind dat ook niet zo plezant-

Hedebouw: wie heeft er in Vlaanderen gestemd om [tot 67 jaar te werken?

Demir: [maar de kosten, de kosten, de kosten

[van de vergrijzing] die gaan we moeten opvangen en

Hedebouw: [mevrouw Demir]

Demir: en daarom hebben we een regering[nodig die-

Hedebouw: [mevrouw Demir(.) kunt u antwoorden

Host: op de vraag?

Hedebouw: danku mevrouw Demir(.) ik wil even terug naar die wilde stakingen

The exchange in extract 1 occurs during a rather heated conflict sequence with a lot of
countering, contradictions and overlapping speech. At line 20 Hedebouw expresses an
implicit opposing question, through which he asks Demir if she is able to tell him and the
audience that the decision to raise the retirement age is still up for debate. One of the main characteristics of implicit opposing questions is that they confront the opponent with unfavourable interpretations of their points of view and that they oblige the opponent to make his/her position towards these interpretations explicit. In this exchange, Hedebouw makes explicit that he is inviting an answer. In line 20 he explicitly mentions that he is about to ask a question, the expression of kunt u hier zeggen dat ... twice, and at the end of his turn he even explicitly asks for an answer (an answer please). When Demir answers rather evasively that the people have voted for this government, implying that they also voted for these measures, Hedebouw again uses a question to construct his disagreement. He interrupts his opponent by asking a challenging question (see 7.1.8): who voted to work till the age of 67? (line 27, 32), through which he implies that no one has. The question sequence used by Hedebouw is an implicit way of discrediting the opponent. The politician implies that Demir is incompetent in her profession because she sends the audience misleading messages and because her party lied to people or at least promised them a different government.

Extract 10:

9/11 – Stakingen

Topic: Strikes

01 Timmermans: wij hebben in dit land alles verhoogd wat maar kon (0.3) ik heb al een paar keer gezegd (.) en das denk ik niet ver van de waarheid (.) alles in dit land is belast behalve het in- en uitademen van lucht-

02 Host: zal ik u iets noemen wat niet belast is? Meneer Coucke die krijgt 1.2 miljard omdat hij zijn bedrijf verkocht heeft <we moeten die man koesteren (.) die maakt jobs> oké (0.3) maar hij krijgt 1.2 miljard (.) moet daarvan niets aan de gemeenschap geven

03 ➔ Timmermans: wel (1.2) meneer Pauwels (.) zou u (points at host) 25 jaar geleden uit het niets honderdvijftigduizend Belgische frank gaan lenen? 25 jaar het risico genomen hebben om alle eh lasten te doorstaan ondertussen jobs gecreëerd zodat hij 40% van die toegevoegde waarde afgestaan hebben aan de schatkist waarmee de sociale
zekerheid gefinancierd wordt. En nu zegt hij, nu ga ik nog keer
investeren in bedrijven, ik heb heel graag dat hij dat doet (1.0) dat
gaat ons land erbovenop helpen (0.7) dus laat ons daar niet van één
voorbeeld (0.3) dat te stigmatiseren [want ik denk eerlijkgezegd- ik
denk eerlijkgezegd- ik denk-]

Host: [nee maar andere landen hebben een meerwaarde belasting op aandelen] (gesturing at Leemans in
order to give him the turn)

Timmermans: ja ma andere landen hebben ook geen andere- andere vormen van
fiscaliteit eh (2.0) neem eens de landen waar er een
meerwaardebelasting is (0.4) ik zei het daarjuist (…)

The next example is rather surprisingly a disagreement sequence between the host and an interviewee who is not a politician. Timmermans is the director of the alliance of Belgian companies (VBO). In line 4, the host expresses a relatively hostile and challenging counter to Timmermans’ statement that in Belgium people pay taxes on everything except breathing air. The host interrupts the panel member with a question, he asks if he should name something where no taxes are paid on, referring to the recent businessman Marc Coucke who sold his company for a great amount of money without giving anything to the community. Timmermans reacts irritated and addresses the host directly (naming him and pointing at him), asking if he would have taken the risk Marc Coucke took 25 years ago. However, although the interviewee starts his turn clearly as an implicit opposing question, he softens the direct disagreement with the host by continuing the argument himself instead of pushing for an answer from the host. Aggravated dissent between the host and an interviewee is not what the TV format is aiming for. The host is allowed to ask challenging questions and statements countering the interviewees, but an interviewee asking an opposing question to the host can be seen as a reversal of the institutional rules of the format. It is possible that Timmermans became aware of this and altered his move.
19/10 – De indexspring: wat we de mensen vragen, geven we later terug

Topic: ‘Index jump’: the contributions we now ask from the people, will be given back in the future

01 Verherstraeten: de lastenverlaging zal hoe dan ook al tot meer jobs aanleiding geven
02 (.) al was het maar in de non-profit (0.5) want twintig procent van de loonlastenverlaging gaat naar de socio-profit en dat zal direct jobs worden (0.4) in een ander gedeelte vragen we- we vragen inderdaad inspanningen van iedereen (0.3) en we vragen ook inspanningen <en da geven we ook toe> aan de werknemers maar we vragen ook inspanningen (.) van de werkgevers en daarom willen we da toekomstplan met de sociale partners-
08 Host: Hoe doet u dat precies?
09 Verherstraeten: wel (.) ik verwacht (.) ik verwacht geen resultatsverbintenissen maar ik verwacht wel een inspanningsverbintenis (.) ook van de werkgevers dat de vrijgekomen middelen (0.4) dankzij de lastenverlagingen dat ze die investeren (.) investeren in duurzaamheid investeren in innovatie en investeren in jobs jobs en nog eens jobs
15 Calvo: Meneer Pauwels, ik heb een- ik heb e een voorstel <en ik denk> de kans dawe der vandaag gaan uit geraken is redelijk is redelijk klein denk ik eh (0.3) erhm maar der is een der is het fiscale status quo van van deze regering-
19 Verherstraeten: er is geen status quo
20 Calvo: en een beperkte lineaire lastenverlaging (0.4) laten we nu laten we nu der zijn heel veel der zijn heel veel (.) slimme neutrale mensen,
22 federaal planbureau en de hoge raad voor financiën (0.5) laten we hen
nu eens de oefening maken (.) u regeerakkoord (.) versus een gerichte
lastenverlaging en een lastenverschuiving richting de grootste
vermogens (0.5) als uit die oefening zou blijken meneer
Verherstraeten dat het federaal planbureau en de hoge raad voor
financiën zegt dat het tweede scenario meer jobs oplevert bent u dan
bereid om in het kader van uw toekomstplan te zeggen awel we gaan
toch die gerichte [belastingverlaging opleggen, we gaan toch die
belastingverlaging doen?

Verherstraeten: [unintelligible speech]

Host: meneer Dewael (louder) meneer Dewael

Calvo: Bent u bereid die oefening te maken?

Host: meneer Calvo (1.0) meneer Dewael (2.0) meneer Verherstraete? (0.5)

meneer Dewael heeft het woord

Calvo: ik wil alle oefeningen bekijken, maar ik stel u de vraag als u die lineaire
lastenverlaging als te beperkt omschrijft (.) en u spreekt over een taks
shift (0.3) hoeveel miljard gaat u denkt u partij denkt groen te halen
uit een vermogens of een vermogenswinst belasting om dat allemaal
te financieren? In u verkiezingsprogramma was dat meer dan 8
milieu- miljard euro (0.6)

Calvo: (signalling at host he wants the turn)

Dewael: Bent u bereid om eens duidelijk te maken aan de publieke opinie-
Host: u stelt een vraag terug maar bent u bereid om financieel om het
planbureau dat te laten narekenen-

Dewael: maar het planbureau doet dat constant

(all speaker's talking at the same time)
Excerpt 4 portrays a stretch of speech where two examples of an implicit opposing question are used, by two different interviewees. The extract starts with a member of the government (Verherstraeten) explaining the measures they have taken. From line 15 onwards, Calvo enters the conversation and addresses the host in a direct manner, stating that he has a proposal. He juxtaposes the measures taken by the current government to an alternative. From line 25 onwards, Calvo no longer addresses the host but he directly addresses Verherstraeten. In the preceding speech Calvo proposed to let experts weigh both options and now he asks the other politician if he is willing to adjust the measures if the experts would conclude that the alternative creates more jobs. At this point, there is some overlapping speech between Verherstraeten and Calvo. The host intervenes and lets Dewael speak, although Calvo directly addressed Verherstraeten. Calvo reiterates the same question, but now directed at the Dewael (are you willing to let experts do the test?). From line 36 onwards, Dewael very shortly answers the question (I am willing to do every test), and then expresses a counterclaim introduced by maar (but) followed by an implicit opposing question. Dewael asks how many billion euro Calvo and his party think they will get out of their tax on wealth. At this point Dewael continues his reasoning (which makes it also a rhetorical questions), using the same linguistic form bent u bereid om ... (are you willing to ...), to counter his opponent. The host observes the conversational behaviour of Dewael, and intervenes. He states that Dewael asks a question back, but has not really provided a satisfactory answer to the question directed at him. Dewael interrupts the host with an irrelevancy claim, stating that such tests are constantly conducted. Through the expression of the irrelevancy claim the politician portrays his opponent as a manipulative conversational interactant.

7.1.3 Distorting opposing questions

In the data collected from the TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’, only one instance of a distorting opposing question was to be found. This finding was rather unexpected as the panel interviews feature a lot of politicians who overtly express disagreement as part of the preferred frame. The lack of distorting opposing questions can be explained by its face-threatening nature. It is also an indication that the frame of ‘De zevende dag’ is not very confrontational. Disagreement is expected to some degree, but compared to other political debate TV-shows (e.g. ‘Arena’), the behaviour is less aggressive. Below, the only disagreement sequence featuring a distorting opposing question is illustrated.
De indexsprong: wat we de mensen vragen, geven we later terug

**Topic: ‘Index jump’: the contributions we now ask from the people, will be given back in the future**

Calvo: daar zijn we het dan over eens, dus laten we met die bril naar de regerakkoord kijken, dan stel ik eerst en vooral vast dat erhm de indexsprong aan de gemiddelde werknemer meer kost dan de lastenverlagingen die men krijgt 276 euro jaar na jaar, das nie een jaar das voor het leven, kost de indexsprong in het beste geval 250 terug, maar er is veel meer dan de indexsprong der is besparingen op deeltijds werken, pensioenbonus, mensen die langer werken die pensioenbonus sneuvelt er is tijdscredit dat sneuvelt en ga zo maar door dus ik vraag mij meer en meer af meneer Verherstraeten, meneer Dewael meneer Vuye? Wa hebben jullie nu eigenlijk tegen werkende mensen? Wa hebben jullie tegen mensen die zich in het zweet werken om dit land beter te maken? Als je de optelsom maakt van dit regerakkoord laat ik even het Vlaamse regerakkoord nog buiten beschouwing dan stel je vast dat gewone mensen, mensen die werken, da zijn achter het leeuwendeel van die inspanning moeten dragen en dat is onevenwichtig, dat is onrechtvaardig Host: meneer Vuye dat klopt dus helemaal niet, wij zetten net in op de werkende mensen en die indexsprong is eigenlijk een soort van investering in de toekomst en wat is een beetje makkelijk om te zeggen kijk door die in door die indexsprong gaat u inkomen er tijdelijk op achteruit, ja dat is inderdaad zo, maar de bedoeling is wel om 80 duizend [jobs te creëren, om 80 duizend jobs te creëren]

Calvo: [unintelligible speech]
In this excerpt Calvo addresses all the members on the other side of the panel by name, and asks them why they dislike the regular working people. He even strengthens his question by repeating it in an upgraded way: he asks why they dislike the people who work really hard, in order to make this country better. The distorting opposing question is used to strengthen the argument that the current government is taking unreasonable measurements which have big implications for the regular working people. However, the presupposition conveyed in the question is in fact distorting, as it implies that the government dislikes the working people and for that reason takes the measurements under discussion. Rather surprisingly, after the accusation nobody reacts directly. The hosts regulates the turn taking and gives the word to Vuye through a response invitation. In line 17 the Vuye explicitly and directly rejects Calvo’s statement. He denies the statement and expresses a counterclaim: the regular working people are their priority. Vuye also accuses Calvo of arousing a false image. He does so through the expression of a partial agreement: he indicates that indeed the wages will decrease a little, but that they do so in order to create eighty thousand new jobs.

7.1.4 Explicit opposing questions

In the 66 selected disagreement excerpts featuring questions, only one instance of an explicit opposing question was found. This can be explained by the fact that once a disagreement frame is established (as is the case in panel debates), it is no longer necessary to be explicit. Another explanation is the fact that the explicit expression of disagreement is often conveyed in different forms than an interrogative. In this section, the one instance of an explicit opposing question is illustrated.

Extract 38:

14/12 – Naast de vakbond, de werkbond: zinvol of niet?

*Topic: Besides labour unions, work unions: useful or not?*

01 → Schelfhout: met de werkbond pleiten wij voor onder andere minimale dienstverlening
02 (0.7) eh da wil zeggen da da bedrijven of bijvoorbeeld bus erh (.)
03 busmaatschappijen ook de NMBS erh (0.3) een stuk minimale dienstverlening
04 voorziet (0.4) ik neem aan dat u daar tegen bent?
05 D’Haese: ik ben **absoluut** voor een minimale dienstverlening (0.5) van miljonairs (0.3)
06 van multinationals die op dit moment geen belasting betaling (.) van Luxleaks
07 (.) mensen die terug hun fortuinen gaan parkeren (.) **waar** blijft die hun
08 minimale dienstverlening? Waar blijft die hun return on society? (0.4) da
09 vraag ik mij af (.) en das waar vandaag die staking over gaat-
10 Schelfhout: das-
11 D’Haese: **nee ma**
12 Schelfhout: [das u goed recht om da te vinden (0.4) ma nie om andere mensen te gaan]
13 D’Haese: [unintelligible speech]
14 Host: oké ik ga meneer Schelfhout even laten uitspreken en dan-
15 Schelfhout: dat is u goed recht om een politieke mening te hebben (.) dat is België (0.3)
16 da daar- daar dient democratie voor (.) daar dient zelfs politiek voor <u bent
17 daar ook in actief-

In this extract two young politicians are debating the topic of striking. Recently, there had been a lot of strikes in Belgium, and not everyone is pleased with this kind of protest. Schelfhout wants to start a work union, in order to guarantee the right to work. He advocates minimum services for companies as NMBS and De Lijn (transport companies), to make it possible for people who do want to work, to get to their workplace. In line 4, Schelfhout explicitly asks his opponent if he disagrees with such a regulation (I suppose you are against that?). d’ Haese answers rather cynical, that he totally favours minimum services. After a short break (0.5 sec.) he pronounces that he is in favour of minimum services for multinationals who do not pay their taxes (reference to Lux leaks). From line 7 to 9, d’ Haese poses a rhetorical opposing question: he asks what has happened to those multinationals’ return on society. The young politician stresses that this is the purpose of those strikes, namely equivalent contributions of all categories of income.

7.1.5 Metacommuniative acts of staged confrontation

In 4.3, a short discussion of political discourse is conducted. In the data from ‘De zevende dag’, Luginbühl’s acts of staged confrontation proved particularly relevant. Instances of staged
confrontation are rather frequent in the analysed data. In following part, I will discuss some specific examples of staged confrontation between interviewees. Staged confrontation is basically using the conversational behaviour of the opponent as a means to discredit this person; it is a method to depict the adversary as a rude, impolite interlocutor.

**Extract 19:**

23/11 – Moet het leger te veel besparen?

*Topic: Does the government save too much on military issues?*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Host:</td>
<td>het ziekenhuis van Neder-Over-Heembeek (.) het militair ziekenhuis (.) blijft dat open?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Grosemans:</td>
<td>ja ik wil geen voorafnames doen natuurlijk op het strategisch plan (.) maar ik vind wel dat het debat daarrond mag gevoerd worden (.) das een heel sterk militair ziekenhuis echt een heel sterk (.) state of the art (.) maar moet defensie da allemaal doen? Net hetzelfde als bijvoorbeeld een buitenlandse reis (.) allee een werkbezoek [van de minister erh]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Host:</td>
<td>dingen meneer Van Mechelen?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grosemans:</td>
<td>komt altijd op conto van (.) defensie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Van Mechelen:</td>
<td>nee (0.4) zoals ik daarnet zei (.) het is een uniek moment -het is inderdaad een schakelmoment- om te kiezen wat soort troepen hebben we nodig? Ik heb daarjuist gezegd we hebben op dit ogenblik een leger dat in 2015 nog ongeveer 30 duizend [manschappen zal hebben-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19 | Van Mechelen: | nee (.) ik denk dat als je het aantal manschappen (0.5) nog steeds
Van der Maelen: wel (0.3) erhm ik heb het daarnet gezegd (.) tis het moment van de waarheid (.) als u doet wat (0.4) erhm collega Grosemans zegt erh en u houdt de vier componenten en je maakt daar een minilegertje van → (0.4) wat is de uitkomst daarvan? Van-

Grosemans: Maar dat is geen minilegertje eh → Van der Maelen: erhm excuseer eh? (0.5) dan heb je een investeringsprogramma voor de volgende tien jaar van tien miljard (1.7) daarin zit vijf zes miljard van de F16 (.) daarin zit één miljard van de A400M da-

Host: da zijn de transportvliegtuigen eh?

Van der Maelen: als je nog een beter bewijs wil (.) van het feit (.) dat erh de luchtmacht (0.3) de grote brokken al binnen heeft en-

Grosemans: jama die beslissing (.) die beslissing (.) [die beslissing is wel genomen door erh-

Host: [even het woord aan meneer Penris] Penris: als ik even mag collega’s (.) want het debat is natuurlijk beperkt in de tijd (0.5) ma we hebben van de week mevrouw u als voorzitter (.) toch ook met ons mee het engagement genomen (0.4) dat we die
denk oefening wel eens willen maken (...)

From line 22 onwards, Van der Maelen starts expressing his disagreement with the arguments of Grosemans. He argues that with such measurements, Belgium will end up with a miniature army. In line 25 Van der Maelen starts posing a rhetorical question, asking about
the outcome of such an army, but he is interrupted by Grosemans contradiction; she denies the idea of a miniature army. Van der Maelen reacts rather angry to this interruption with the statement *excuseer eh?* (excuse me?). Luginbühl (2007: 1380) calls these acts of metacommunication instances of ‘staged confrontation’. The conversational behaviour of an opponent is used as a strategy to discredit this person by accusing him/her of interrupting (Luginbühl 2007: 1380).

**Extract 23:**

**30/11 – Hoe moeten we de begroting saneren en toch banen creëren?**

*Topic: How can we remediate the budget deficit and still create new jobs?*

01 Calvo: ik verwelkom voortschrijdend inzicht (...) het inzicht [van meneer Terwingen maar-

02 Terwingen: dat is geen voortschrijdend inzicht maar (...) u heeft de gewoonte om mensen [woorden in de mond te leggen (unintelligible speech)]

03 Calvo: [ik heb u ook laten uitspreken (0.3) nee ma kheb u ook- kheb u ook- kheb u ook-

04 Host: oké (0.3) meneer Calvo

05 Terwingen: [ja meneer Pauwels (...) ik moet ook de kans krijgen om te reageren (unintelligible speech)]

06 Calvo: [kheb u ook (...) ja ik krijg hier blijkbaar de kans nie- blijkbaar-]

07 Terwingen: neenee u houdt het debat [(unintelligible speech)]

08 Calvo: [meneer Terwingen (0.5) rustig rustig]

09 Host: maar zeg es (0.4) u hebt een compleet idee (...) het is goed [dat u dat zegt]

10 Calvo: [ja ik ben]

11 Host: maar zeg es (0.4) u hebt een compleet idee (...) het is goed [dat u dat]

12 Calvo: blij dat het sociale karakter van de CD&V (...) dat er- er is gevoeligheid rond (...) das positief (0.5) maar kijk naar die begroting 2015 (0.4) 2015
het jaar van de indexsprong (.) 2015 het jaar van de loonblokkering voor 100% van onze werknemers (0.6) 2015 het jaar van 1,4 miljard euro besparing op de sociale zekerheid (0.5) is een beugeling- als je dan kijkt naar de eerlijke bedracht van de grootste vermogens dan blijft die dit jaar (0.3) het komende jaar (0.3) beperkt tot tachtig miljoen euro beurstaks (0.4) dus wa zeg ik? Het maatschappelijk examen (.) een dikke buis (.) een onevenwicht een onrechtvaardige inspanning van [van de gewone mens-]

Host: [meneer Van Biesen]

In following extract we see even more metacommunicative acts. In line 3 Terwingen directly rejects the presupposition of Calvo’s statement (turn 1-2) and adds a further comment: he accuses Calvo of putting words into people’s mouths. At this point there is some overlapping speech because Terwingen interrupted Calvo’s reasoning. In turn 5 and 6, Calvo also uses the strategy of staged confrontation. He mentions that he let Mr. Terwingen finish, and repeats this statement until the host eventually has to interfere. The host gives the turn to Mr. Calvo, but Terwingen addresses the host by name and comments that he should also get a chance to react. Terwingen’s statement can both be seen as an expression of disagreement towards the host, or as an apology for his conversational behaviour also directed at the host. The comment also implies a sense of injustice, the host lets Calvo get away with strategic acts of conversational violence, and does not give Terwingen the chance to properly react to these misrepresentations. At line 10, Calvo also mentions (simultaneously to Terwingen’s comment on the host conversational behaviour) that apparently he does not get the chance to finish his argument, followed by a comment directed at Terwingen. Calvo states that the topic appears to be a sensitive point for Terwingen’s party CD&V. Terwingen again immediately reacts with a contradiction, to which Calvo again replies with a comment on the conversational behaviour of his opponent. The politician tells his opponent to remain calm, implying that he is not keeping his calm right now. After this aggravated disagreement sequence, the host again selects Calvo as the next speaker. In his next turn, Calvo continues his reasoning and the disagreement frame as he expresses dissent with a rhetorical question (already analysed before: 7.1.1).
Extract 59:
01/02 – Sociaal overleg vakbonden en regering

Topic: Social dialogue between the unions and government

01 Host: ik wil nu even van meneer Leemans horen (.) stel dat dat er komt (.) wat
02 meer belasting op speculatie van aandelen (.) bent u dan tevreden?
03 Leemans: nee das nie genoeg (0.4) want daar kan je nooit genoeg mee vangen (0.3) de-
04 de premier zelf heeft gezegd (.) het moet een substantiële (.) en een
05 structurele verschuiving zijn (.) en-
06 Host: hoeveel moet het zijn?
07 Leemans: (0.9) hoeveel moet het zijn?
08 Host: hoeveel miljoen wil u ervan hebben?
09 Leemans: ik hoor die regering zeggen dat men richting 3.5 miljard wil gaan (0.3) dat 
10 zegt die regering (0.4) en dat is inderdaad een substantiële beweging (.) maar 
11 erh ja het is aan die regering om daar de keuzes in te maken en wellicht zal 
12 het niet alleen een taks shift zijn maar een taks mix zijn (.) want met één 
13 maatregel ga je dat nooit vangen 
14 Host: ja minister-
15 De Leeuw: mag ik er toch nog eens aan herinneren dat het hier gaat om een regering 
16 (0.3) die eerst elf miljard afneemt van de mensen (0.5) [die ons nu-]
17 Timmermans: [nie van de mensen
18 allemaal alleen]
19 De Leeuw: ja ma alstublieft (0.4) der is die kaaim- die kaaimantaks-
20 Timmermans: ma daar- focus daar niet op (.) ik moet hier niet het hele beleid [verdedigen]
21 De Leeuw: [ma] wilt u 
22 mij nu ook eens laten uitspreken? Want u bent aan slechte gewoontes bezig 
23 (0.4) ik heb u laten uitspreken telkens (.) plus (...)

73
Next extract (extract 59) is again a clear example of staged confrontation on ‘De zevende dag’. From line 15 onwards De Leeuw stresses the differences in opinion between the panel members. He asks the host: may I remind you once more that the government first takes eleven billion euro from the people? This challenging turn invites reaction from the opponent who refines the statement: not only from the people. After some arguing between the two interviewees, De Leeuw comments on Timmermans conversational behaviour in line 21. He asks if his opponent will let him finish and accuses him of making a habit of it. In addition De Leeuw also mentions that he himself let Timmermans finish his reasoning.

In general it can be observed, that these acts of metacommunication add to the confrontation and disagreeing nature of the interaction and that the politicians on ‘De zevende dag’ use it as a strategy to focus on their divergent opinions. Above that, it is also used as a means to accuse the other of not being able to debate in a proper way. It is a method to discredit the opponent as a rude, impolite conversational partner.

7.1.6 Direct rejection of presuppositions conveyed in challenging questions

Another striking finding of this study, is that politicians do in fact react to challenging questions with a direct rejection of the presupposition it holds. Other research has shown that there is a difference in response to false allegations conveyed in questions between politicians and other participants. In his data from the Swiss political TV debate show ‘Arena’, Luginbühl notices that while others counter such a claim explicitly (e.g. This is a lie!), the politicians, react indirectly by formulating generic needs, make statements concerning the standard of knowledge of an opponent or by naming unfulfilled conditions about the honesty of the opponent (Luginbühl 2007: 1379). The data of this study show a different result. In the panel debates on the Belgian TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’, politicians do directly reject the presupposition with an explicit counter. In section 7.1.3 the lack of distorting opposing questions was partially attributed to the less confrontational frame of the talk show (compared to for example ‘Arena’). The direct rejection of presuppositions conveyed in challenging questions by both experts and politicians, is another indication of this observation. Strategies of conversational violence and manipulative of language is not that big a part of the frame; disagreement is preferred but the informative character of the show still prevails over the entertainment element. In this part some disagreement sequences where politicians reject presuppositions put forward in challenging questions are analysed in more detail.
**Extract 2:**

26/10 – Spoorbonden moeten voorzichtig omspringen met stakingsrecht

*Topic: Railway unions should handle their right to strike more cautiously*

01  Calvo:  daar zijn we het dan over eens, dus laten we met die bril naar da
02  regeerakkoord kijken (.) dan stel ik eerst en vooral vast (0.5) dat erhm de
03  indexsprong aan de gemiddelde werknemer meer kost (.) dan de
04  lastenverlagingen die men krijgt 276 euro jaar na jaar, das nie een jaar (.) das
05  voor het leven (.) kost de indexsprong (0.3) men krijgt in het beste geval 250
06  terug, maar er is veel meer dan de indexsprong (.) der is besparingen op
07  deeltijds werken, pensioenbonus, mensen die langer ↑werken (.) die
08  pensioenbonus sneuvelt (.) er is tijdskrediet dat sneuvelt en ga zo maar door
09  dus ik vraag mij meer en meer af meneer Verherstraeten, meneer Dewael
10  meneer Vuye? Wa hebben jullie nu eigenlijk tegen werkende mensen? Wa
11  hebben jullie tegen mensen die zich in het zweet werken om dit land beter te
12  maken? Als je de optelsom maakt van dit regeerakkoord (.) laat ik even het
13  Vlaamse regeerakkoord nog buiten beschouwing (.) dan stel je vast dat
14  gewone mensen, mensen die werken, da zij inderdaad het leeuwendeeel van
15  die inspanning moeten dragen en dat is onevenwichtig, dat is onrechtvaardig
16  Host:  meneer Vuye
17  ➔ Vuye:  dat klopt dus helemaal niet, wij zetten net in op de werkende mensen en die
18  indexsprong is eigenlijk een soort van investering in de toekomst (.) en wat is
19  een beetje makkelijk om te zeggen kijk door die in door die indexsprong gaat
20  u inkomen er tijdelijk op achteruit, ja dat is inderdaad zo, maar de bedoeling
21  is wel om 80 duizend [jobs te creëren, om 80 duizend jobs te creëren]
22  Calvo:  [unintelligible speech]
23  Host:  Even uitleggen (louder) even uitleggen
To illustrate this phenomenon, extract 2 will be recapitulated. The excerpt is already discussed in relation to the distorting opposing question posed by Calvo from line 9 to 12. The reaction of Calvo’s opponent, is a direct counter and rejection of the presupposition in the distorting opposing question. Vuye explicitly asserts: this is not true at all.

Extract 19 (short version)

23/11 – Moet het leger te veel besparen?

**Topic:** Does the government save too much on military issues?

01 Van Mechelen: *nee (.) ik denk dat als je het aantal manschappen (0.5) nog steeds
02 kunt *reduceren* en ervoor maken da je een snel modern en flexibel
03 leger hebt (0.4)
04 Van der Maelen: *wel (0.3) erhm ik heb het daarnet gezegd (.) tis het moment van de
05 waarheid (.) als u doet wat (0.4) erhm collega Grosemans zegt erhm en u
06 houdt de vier componenten en je maakt daar een minilegertje van
07 (0.4) wat is de uitkomst daarvan? Van-
08 → Grosemans: Maar dat is geen minilegertje eh
09 Van der Maelen: *erhm excuseer eh? (0.5) dan heb je een investeringsprogramma voor
10 de volgende tien jaar van tien miljard (1.7) daarin zit vijf zes miljard
11 van de F16 (.) daarin zit één miljard van de A400M da-

In extract 19, we observe a similar explicit and direct rejection of a presupposition. In Van der Maelen’s turn starting at line 4, the politician starts a rhetorical question but is interrupted by his opponent. In the rhetorical question Van der Maelen mentions Grosemans name directly, and states that if the government was to follow her vision on the army and thus make it a miniature one, the outcome will be an investment program of ten years and ten billion euros. The politician’s rhetorical question conveys the presupposition that Grosemans wants to make a miniature army out of the Belgian military force. Grosemans counters this assumption directly and interrupts Van der Maelen’s reasoning.
Extract 24:

30/11 – Hoe moeten we de begroting saneren en toch banen creëren?

*Topic: How can we remediate the budget deficit and still create new jobs?*

01 Calvo: En dan moet er toch maar eens duidelijkheid zijn over (.) meneer Terwingen
02 u kan niet met de voeten van de mensen blijven spelen (0.6) meneer [Van
03 Biesen-]
04 Opposition: [unintelligible speech]
05 Host: [rustig rustig]
06 Calvo: meneer Van Biesen- meneer Van Biesen [heeft deze week-]
07 → Demir: [wie speelt hier met de voeten] van
08 de mensen meneer Calvo?
09 Calvo: excuseer (1.1) meneer Van Biesen heeft deze week (.) heel duidelijk gezegd
10 (.) die vermogenswinstbelasting (0.3) een eerlijke bijdrage van de grootse
11 vermogens (.) vanzelfsprekend komt die er nie (0.4) dat betekent meneer
12 Terwingen (.) u staat voor de keuze (.) meneer Van Rompuy heeft daarvoor
13 gepleit (.) meneer Beke heeft daarvoor gepleit (.) meneer Peeters heeft
14 daarvoor gepleit (.) en tegelijkertijd zegt meneer Van Biesen die komt er niet
15 (.) der is een ↑maatschappelijke meerderheid voor de
16 vermogenswinstbelasting (.) der is een parlementaire meerderheid voor een
17 vermogenswinstbelasting (.) wat zal het zijn? Wat zal het zijn?

In extract 24, rather than a direct rejection of the assumption made by an opponent, we see a more typical way for politicians to react to presuppositions put forward by the opposition. Calvo accuses Terwingen of fooling the voters. To this statement there is a lot of reaction from the other participants, resulting in mostly unintelligible and overlapping speech. However, in line 7 Demir reacts to this assumption with a challenging question: she asks who is fooling the voters. This challenging question can be seen to convey a reversal: it is an
accusation of Calvo fooling the audience because he provides false information on the debate show.

7.1.7 Departure from institutional turn taking dynamics: politicians vs. experts

One of the findings of this study was that aggravated disagreement sequences in political discourse are often characterized by a change in dynamics. It could be said that the institutional turn taking dynamics are changed when aggravated disagreement is constructed and questions do play an important role in this. Both politicians and experts use questions as a rhetorical device, but the dynamic of the interaction and the presence of the host as mediator plays a crucial role in the evolution of the disagreement sequences. Politicians use questions as a means to discredit the opponent, the role of the host as mediator is backgrounded as the politicians directly address each other (the question is posed directly at the opponent and the opponent immediately reacts without waiting for host mediation). The experts also use questions as a way to construct disagreement, but they do not move away from the institutional format where the host asks the questions and they react. It could be said that the politicians depart more easily from the normal institutional turn regulation while the experts maintain the regular organization of a televised panel interview. I will illustrate this phenomenon by two contrasting pairs of interaction between politicians and experts.

Extract 1: politicians

26/10 – Spoorbonden moeten voorzichtiger omspringen met stakingsrecht

*Topic: Railway unions should handle their right to strike more cautiously*

01 Demir: Om nu terug te komen op die wilde stakingen (.) Ik denk dat niemand aan deze
02 tafel het recht op staken betwist (.) ik ook niet (.) dat is een recht, die
03 vakbonden hebben (.) maar men moet goed *nadenken* wanneer gaat men dat
04 recht *gebruiken* (0.4) en ik denk dat we dat moeten gebruiken als *ul-tie-me*
05 *middel* [als sociaal overleg niet] meer
06 Hedebov: [unintelligible speech]
07 Demir: gaat (.) en in een normaal sociaal overleg gaat men praten, komt men aan
08 tafel, komt men discussiëren-
Hedebouw: maar u [wilt niet discussiëren met de vakbonden]

Demir: [maar jawel]

Hedebouw: [u wilt niet praten (.) erhm u u-

Demir: maar jawel, wij hebben meermaals de vakbonden uitgenodigd-

Hedebouw: ja uitgenodigd [om te zeggen zo en zo gaan we het doen]

Demir: [nee nee nee (.) het brugpensioen bijvoorbeeld [daar-

Hedebouw: [kan ik-

Demir: [da hebben we besproken]

Hedebouw: [mevrouw Demir <kan dat de discussie zijn?>]

Demir: [en er is een kleine-

Hedebouw: [Oké ik zal gewoon de vraag stellen (.) kunt u hier zeggen dat een open
discussie terug open is om de beslissing van tot 67 jaar te werken? (1.0) Kunt
u hier zeggen dat er onderhandelingsmaneuver is voor de vakbonden? (1.0)
een antwoord alsjeblieft-

Demir: erhm heel duidelijk (.) tis misschien nie in u communistisch model (.) maar in
ons model, democratisch model is het zo dat mensen kiezen (.) mensen kiezen
en [er is nu een-

Hedebouw: [wie heeft er gestemd [voor-

Host: (gesturing at Hedebouw) [wacht even rustig

Demir: op 25 mei hebben de mensen gekozen (.) en er is op dit moment een
democratische meerderheid (2.0) en we zullen me- langer moeten werken
(1.0) kijk of dat da nu plezant is of- ik vind dat ook niet zo plezant-

Hedebouw: wie heeft er in Vlaanderen gestemd om [tot 67 jaar te werken?

Demir: [maar de kosten, de kosten, de kosten

[van de vergrijzing] die gaan we moeten opvangen en

Hedebouw: [mevrouw Demir]
This is an example of an excerpt where two politicians directly address each other in a disagreement sequence; there is little interference from the host (only at line 28 he regulates the turn design, allowing Demir to finish). Hedebouw clearly uses questions as a way of expressing his disagreement with his opponent (indicated with \rightarrow). From line 10 onwards, the participants engage in overt disagreement with a lot of counterclaims (starting with maar, English but: 10, 11, 13) and contradictions/denials (12, 15). There is also a lot of overlapping speech and interruptions. A disagreement frame is established and now Hedebouw tries to make a first point: there is no room for negotiation between the government and the unions. Hedebouw does this by asking an implicit opposing question (line 20): he asks if his opponent can guarantee that there is room for negotiation, while he clearly indicates that she cannot. Luginbühl (2007: 1378) argues that this is a technique politicians use to allege that their opponent is incompetent. The author calls this ‘staging cooperative behaviour’, because the politicians use patterns of cooperative interaction in order to make their opponent look bad (see 7.1.5). The turn from line 20 to 23, is clearly an example of this pattern. Hedebouw even ends his turn by adding that he wants an answer, followed by politeness marker alsjeblieft (please). The turn does not have the desired effect, as Demir makes reference to the communist model (Hedebouw is part of the pvda; a more radical socialist party) opposed to the democratic one, where the people choose. Hedebouw opts for an argumentative question (starting in line 27, recapitulated in line 32) which he uses in the same way as the first time. The politician asks who has voted to work till the age of 67, with the implied answer that nobody has. Here again the concept of ‘staging cooperative behaviour’ is appropriate. Hedebouw uses naming strategies; he is always addressing the opponent and again pushes for her to provide an answer to his question.

Extract 5 & 6: experts

9/11 – Moet de strijd tegen cannabis met andere middelen gevoerd worden?

Topic: Should we fight the use of cannabis in a different way?
Host: oké ik ga eerst eens horen bij u meneer Nysmans wat vindt u van dit voorstel?

Nysmans: Dat ze het beperkt toelaten?

Host: uhu

Nysmans: het het het kern van de zaak is ik denk dat het heel belangrijk is om blijven grenzen te stellen (0.8) eh

Host: uhu

Nysmans: grenzen te stellen aan het gedrag ook en daar dan ook te duidelijk in te zijn, een van de de de de zaken die ik erhm toch ook wel (.) even wou bevragen ook ook aan erhm Brice de Ruyver dat is (.) in zijn artikel boek ook wat ik trouwens een zeer mooie titel vind eh op zoek naar een evenwichtig beleid ook een evenwichtig cannabisbeleid het (.) werk ook vind ik als idee een zeer goed erhm gebeuren (0.8)

Host: uhum

→ Nysmans: maar de vraag is zo erh tegelijkertijd (0.4) blijft iedereen ervan overtuigd dat we moeten cannabis ontraden omwille van heel veel erhm problemen maar erh maar ook wat is de boodschap die binnenkomt bij de mensen bij jongeren? Ge moet het eh we moeten het ontraden want het is gevaarlijk maar tegelijkertijd gaat men het toelaten (0.4) en gaat men het reguleren en controleren van allee dat zijn toch zaken waar dat jonge mensen zeker de meest kwetsbare (.) toch wel verdomd zeggen van wat is da hier nu in dit land?

Host: uhu (.) meneer de Ruyver dat is een duidelijk tegenargument eh het beperkt toelaten-

De Ruyver: nee ik vind dat niet ik beschouw dat niet als een tegenargument dat erh zijn pleidooi voor een consistente boodschap die deel ik volledig (0.4) dat is zo (.) wij moeten ontraden laat dit duidelijk zijn (.) in ons voorstel <en trouwens ook in een eerder voorstel van collega Decorte> is er geen sprake dat voor minderjarigen (0.8) er op dat punt enige concessie wordt gedaan (.) dus laat
dit duidelijk zijn ten aanzien van minderjarigen is de boodschap zeer
eenduidig (sighs) wat wel een gegeven is (0.5) en u weet dat ook (.) of wij da
nu graag hebben of niet maar er is nu eenmaal cannabis gebruik (0.4) en het
is nu eenmaal de belangrijkste illegale drug (sighs) die we kennen in Europa
zeer zeker (0.4) dus gaat sowieso een aantal mensen gaan sowieso opzoek daar
naartoe (0.4) dan kun je op een bepaald moment de vraag stellen wie die
allemaal naar de illegale markt drijft om zich te bevoorraden of kiezen we de
weg van de minste schade die erin bestaat dat 1 men weliswaar inderdaad
onder strikte controle de kans krijgt om zijn eigen gebruik te voorzien (1.0)
en daartoe ook beperkt of 2 eh dat men dat zoals in die cannabis social clubs
waar toch (0.8) op bepaalde plaatsen zeer goeie ervaringen zijn (.) de
spelregels zeer strak naleeft <op andere minder> maar je hebt er 700 in
Spanje (...)

Extract 6:

→ Nymsans: Gaan we hier dan binnen 3 jaar discussiëren over het controleren en reguleren
van andere producten? Want dat is dan de volgende stap (.) waarom zouden
we het bij de ene doen en niet bij de andere?

Extract 5 is an example where three experts are invited to discuss a proposal to legalise and
regulate the use of cannabis. Because of the nature of the panel debate interview, some of the
participants hold opposing viewpoints which leads to the expression of disagreement
sequences. Again questions are used as a technique to construct disagreement, but in
comparison to extract 1, there are some differences. Nymsans in this extract uses a rhetorical
opposing question. In the turn starting at line 13, ending in line 19, the speaker expresses two
rhetorical questions. He questions the message legalising and regulating the use of cannabis
will send to the youth and in the second instance he speaks from the perspective of one of
these young people wondering what is going on in this country. As the normal use of
rhetorical questions prescribes, the speaker does not want an answer to these questions. He
uses them to assert his view that the youth needs an unambiguous and clear message. At a later stage of the discussion, the same speaker again uses the same technique: he questions whether they will come up with the same idea of legalising and regulating other drugs in a couple of years, because why would you regulate one kind of drug and not the other? With this rhetorical question the speaker wants to highlight the possibly dangerous reasoning such an arrangement may give rise to. Thus, the speakers in extract 1 and 5 both use questions to express their opposing views, but the expert here uses it in default way, while the politician uses it as a technique of conversational violence (‘staged cooperative behaviour’). Another striking difference, is the presence of the host. In this excerpt, the host has a much more central role as mediator. He very clearly is in control of turn taking. After the rhetorical opposing questions asked by speaker 1, there is only reaction after the host’s intervention. The host uses the argument expressed by Nysmans, to move the discussion onwards. However, De Ruyver contradicts him and even produces an irrelevancy claim: he states that he does not agree, he does not perceive the argument just given as a counterargument, he even asserts that he shares the same opinion, i.e. there needs to be a simple, unequivocal message. One of the main differences seems to be the turn dynamics. Because of the host’s mediation, the interaction becomes triadic instead of dyadic in the first extract. Even though the participants use the same disagreement markers, the presence of the host avoids aggravated disagreement. Another noticeable difference, is the lack of interruptions and overlapping speech. There is only one interruption in this excerpt and it is the host who is interrupted, rather than one of the interviewees.

Extract 15: politicians

16/11: De Lijn wordt duurder

Topic: Transport company De Lijn will become more expensive

01 Vandenbroecke: das een retorisch trucje dat men natuurlijk altijd bovenhaalt eh (.) het
02 is maar zoveel cent per week of zoveel euro’s per maand (0.3) het zijn
03 inderdaad allemaal kleine (.) en fair-lijkende bedragen (.) ma voor de
04 gezinnen in Vlaanderen is het de zoveelste factuur die u weer
05 opstuurt (0.3) kinderopvang wordt duurder (.) [onderwijs wordt
06 duurder (.) zorg wordt duurder (.) water wordt duurder]
To give a second example of the difference in dynamic between disagreement sequences where politicians are arguing and discussions between experts on 'De zevende dag', I will compare excerpt 15 and 16. Extract 15 concerns a disagreement sequence between four politicians. In this example the host is present, but he mainly tries to keep the discussion
intelligible for the audience in the studio and the audience watching at home. The interviewees do not wait to react until the host asks a question. The extract starts with Vandenbroecke (part of the opposition) expressing disagreement; he accuses the government of using rhetorical tricks because they convert the extra contributions into small measurements (e.g. the use of wordings as 1€ per month or a couple of cents per week instead of naming the entire sum). The politician also stresses that it is yet another extra contribution, a lot of things are getting more expensive this year. As this is still the beginning of the arguing sequence, in turn 7, a member of the government asks for the turn rather than reacting immediately. At this point there is some overlapping speech and the real disagreement frame gets established. From line 16 onwards De Ridder (member of the government) takes the turn. She does so by posing a rhetorical opposing question; she asks about the alternative. De Ridder answers the question herself by stating that what the previous socialist governments tried, did not work out. The politician implies that Vandenbroecke’s accusation of the government’s incapability is not justified. The use of a rhetorical question in a disagreement sequence can be seen as means for politicians to discredit the opponent. When we compare this to extract 1, we see that yet again when the disagreement gets more clear and direct, the dynamic of the interaction changes. The host’s role as mediator is backgrounded in similar stretches of talk between politicians on ‘De zevende dag’.

**Extract 16: experts**

23/11 – Moet er meer vrijheid komen rond nalatenschap?

**Topic: Should there be more freedom concerning inheritance?**

01 Nofl: ja het boewoord is altijd Napoleon natuurlijk (0.4) oké het-

02 Host: ja die wet is al heel oud uit die tijd

03 Nofl: ja en eigenlijk is het omgekeerd (.) het is niet Napoleon (.) tis de Franse

04 revolutie die dat ing- die dat ingevoerd heeft (0.4) en het <ik spreek uit> ik

05 ben een beetje bang voor dit debat (1.0) omdat erhm (0.3) het probleem zit

06 ergens elders vind ik (0.3) ten eerste vind ik dat erhm heel dat debat om voor

07 meer keuzemogelijkheid meer vrijheid (.) <vrijheid blijheid voor de ouders>

08 (0.9) is eigenlijk erh (.) het Trojaanse paard noem ik dat (0.3) voor een (.)
meer voor meer paternalisme (0.8) autoritair denken vanuit ouders naar kinderen toe (1.2) en ik denk nie dat da een goede erh weg is (.) ik denk dat wij in tegendeel moeten denken aan meer overleg (.) meer bruggen tussen families (0.4) en de erfenis kan net een brug zijn (0.4) maar natuurlijk ik weet ook wel dat samengestelde gezinnen dat dat dat dat een puzzel wordt (.) ma die puzzel wordt steeds ingewikkelder (0.5) en hoe ver zullen we in die onderhandelings situatie gaan?- ik wil u toch wel opmerken (.) kheb vanmorgen (.) een retweet gedaan van een tweet van erh advocate Malfait (.) van net een jaar en een dag geleden (0.6) en het tweede Trojaanse paard is natuurlijk het- eens we het beginnen schuiven <aan die percent aan die percentages> dat we naar de nuloptie gaan en dat- minister Malfait zegt heel duidelijk (.) ja maar wij onze bedoeling is die nuloptie (.) totale vrijheid (.) we moeten nul voorbehouden (0.4) en totale vrijheid voor de ouders (.) en dan zeg ik dat is een discours dat voor mij ligt (0.3) dat dateert van 1873 (0.5) en das de pater familias (0.3) als de goddelijke heerser (.) voor voor de familie (0.6) die gezegend is met een soort goddelijk gezag <zo wordt het hier zo onder ook uitgelegd> en ik ben tegen dat autoritair [denken-]

[ja oké] (0.3) hoever mag het opschuiven? Moet er een verplicht deel zijn voor de kinderen? Bijvoorbeeld 50% naar de kinderen (.) 50% vrij? Ongeacht het aantal kinderen?

ja das een maatschappelijk debat dat je moet voeren maar erh laat ons eens een concreet voorbeeld nemen eh (0.5) een geval dat ik bijvoorbeeld nog vorige week heb meegemaakt en dat iedereen notaris (.) wel eens meemaakt (.) dat is je hebt een hersamengesteld gezin eh? Je hebt twee partners eh? En elk van de partners heeft twee kinderen (0.5) oké (.) zij doen het goed samen (.) erh en zij denken ook wat moet er met ons gebeuren (.) bij overlijden?
daarvoor gaan ze naar de notaris en ze zeggen ze notaris (0.8) wij beschouwen dat allemaal als onze kinderen (0.3) en wij willen ieder een gelijk deel geven (...) das een logische vraag (...) eh? Daar moet de notaris teleurstellen en moet hij zeggen ja maar da kunnen we nie doen want je hebt nu eenmaal de reserve (...) en de reserve laat je niet toe om dat mooi te verdelen over die vier kinderen (...) dus das eigenlijk een voorbeeld om te zeggen (0.3) geef misschien iets meer souplesse (...) aan de bestaande regels <want de bestaande regels (...) hebben ongetwijfeld ook hun hun functie eh> je mag niet naar Amerikaanse toestanden verglijden ((Nolf nods agreeingly)) eh? Waar dat je de volledige vrijheid hebt- er is bijna geen enkel land in Europa dat dat heeft (...) de meeste landen kennen op de een of de andere manier wel de reserve (0.4) maar je zou mensen wat meer helpen als je de regels wat soepeler maakt (...) zodanig dat de notaris overeenkomsten kan ↑makken (0.3) conform de ↑wil van die mensen [en die wil] (...) heeft nie altijd te maken met paternalisme (...) die wil is gewoon uit het leven gegrepen

Host: [ja] iets meer souplesse (...) bijvoorbeeld die 50:50 Nolf: met alle respect (...) voor de positieve keuze van een aantal ouders die daarmee samenhangt (1.2) ma-

Host: maar u ziet vooral de nadelen?

Nolf: ik zie vooral het ↑gevaar (...) ik werd een paar maand geleden (0.3) op het voetpad staande gehouden door iemand die zegt kent u mij nog? (...) das altijd een beetje voorzichtig zijn ofdata nog een leuke herinnering is en de man legt mij uit dat ik hem veroordeeld heb (0.4) voor onderhoudsgeld (0.4) voor een dochter die (...) hij al (0.3) tien vijftien jaar niet meer zag nu zat ze aan de universiteit (0.5) en dan zegt hij ja kijk es vrederechter (...) ik begrijp het (...) gebt het mij uiteindelijk uitgelegd (0.3) ik aanvaard het en ik zal het betalen
(0.4) maar ze zal niets zien van m’n erfenis (.) 
(1.1) en ↑daar ligt het gevaar dus van het discours (.) van als we beginnen sleutelen (0.4) aan iets
waarvan je kan zeggen (.) het is praktisch evengoed of net minder goed of net niet aangepast (.) dat is een onderhandelingssituatie zoals in een begroting 
(0.4) en ik heb het niet voor het recht als een mathematische formule
Host: het kan een chantage middel worden eh? Meer vrijheid betekent je kan kiezen tussen je kinderen je favoriet meer geven (.) of ze zelfs helemaal uit
die erfenis houden
Van Opstal: ja ongetwijfeld maar laat ons dan nog eens ook weer naar de praktijk kijken

Following excerpt, by contrast, features two experts or professionals. Just like in the first comparison, here the host plays a much more crucial role as mediator and the interaction is much more polite as there are no interruptions or stretches of overlapping speech between the interviewees (only the host interrupts to ask/give clarification or to organize the debate). From line 10 onwards Nolf expresses his opinion against more freedom about legacy. He states that the change would imply a return to more authority for parents and that he does not think this would be a positive evolution. In line 14-15 Nolf uses a rhetorical opposing question to cast doubt upon the room for negotiation, he asks what the extent of that shift will be. After the expression of the rhetorical opposing question, Nolf continues his argumentation. He argues that total freedom of choice concerning inheritance is a dated phenomenon, going back to 1873. In line 25 he explicitly states – with emphasis – that he is against such a regulation. As was also the case in the previous excerpt featuring experts (excerpt 5 & 6), the host recapitulates the argument expressed by the rhetorical opposing question, and poses it as a regular information-eliciting question. In contrast to the political interaction, the opponent does not directly react after the argumentation. The host remains a central participant in the debate; the host asks questions and the interviewees react to these questions. Looking at the answer provided by Van Opstal and the disagreement sequence following, it is clear that the disagreement is less aggravated and direct than in the excerpts featuring politicians. Van Opstal replies that the extent of the shift is something to be debated within society and he moves on with an anecdote of his professional career where parents ask him for more flexible regulation and he cannot help them because of the strict laws. He
argues in favour of more flexible regulations and also states that he does not think total freedom of inheritance is an option. With this argumentation Van Opstal basically implies that Nolf’s concerns are irrelevant (irrelevancy claim) as nobody is demanding total freedom. Even though Van Opstal does express an irrelevancy claim, it is very much indirect and softened. Van Opstal replies with a long stretch of talk, and only near the end it becomes clear that the interviewee is saying that his opponent's argument is irrelevant. After the expression of the main argument, the host again recapitulates the argument so that the opponent can react. Nolf reacts with a counterclaim also realized as an anecdote. From line 66 to 68 the host again rephrases Nolf's argument as a question towards Van Opstal: a more flexible regulation could possibly be a means of blackmail. The disagreement sequence continues in the same way for a while, but the disagreement never gets aggravated.

7.1.8 Interrupting with a question

Apart from the change in dynamics put forward in 7.1.7, another means for politicians to express aggravated dissent is through interrupting the opponent with a question. In previous paragraphs some typical questions in disagreement sequences have been touched upon. However, when argumentative questions are posed as an interruption, it adds to the disagreeing and confrontational nature of the interaction.

**Extract 65:**

**08/02 – Hoe creëren we nog meer jobs?**

*Topic: How should we create more jobs?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Host:</th>
<th>Demir:</th>
<th>De Coninck:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>mevrouw Demir?</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Demir:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>De Coninck:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Demir:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>De Coninck:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Demir:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>De Coninck:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Demir:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>De Coninck:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>De Coninck:</td>
<td>ja ik er ben er ook geen voorstander van (.) omdat da weer de zoveelste techniek is (0.3) want het doet mij denken aan Rosetta-plan</td>
<td>nee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nee (0.4) das nie waar

nee (0.4) das nie waar
Demir: ja [ma wa] doen wij nu op Vlaams niveau mevrouw de Coninck?

De Coninck: [nee]

Demir: wij hebben een systeem- in België had ge vijvetig verschillende soorten RSZ-kortingen

De Coninck: ja

Demir: ↑alle doelgroepen- jawel alle doelgroepen hadden korting (.) en wat doen we nu op Vlaams niveau? We gaan het beperken tot [drie heel] doelgerichte kortingen

De Coninck: [nee u hebt het-

Demir: kortingen [de laaggeschoolden (.) mensen met een handicap] en de vijvenvijftigplussers

De Coninck: [nee u hebt het uitgebreid tot mindergeschoolden]

Demir: en [↑federaal (0.3) en]

De Coninck: [en tot tweeduizend euro]

Demir: <het klinkt misschien afgezaagd- ma ↑federaal (0.3) moeten we echt wel die lasten op arbeid [gaan verlagen]

De Coninck: [das waar] (.) en de regering Di Rupo heeft dat ook beslist ja (0.4) en dat is nu uitgesteld (.) want normaal ging dat dit jaar uitgevoerd worden en ’t is uitgesteld (.) en [de indexsprong is er ook nie (.) het moet nu uitgevoerd worden]

Demir: [en hoeveel jobs heeft erh de regering Di Rupo daarmee gecreëerd?]

Host: ma we gaan niet gaan- ik ben echt op zoek naar constructieve voorstellen

In this extract four politicians are debating about which possible measurements could be taken in order to create more jobs. The interaction is characterized by a lot of aggravated IE-IE disagreement. The excerpt starts with the host expressing a response invitation towards Demir, to which she replies by asserting that she is not an advocate of De Coninck’s proposal.
Hereafter, from line 5 onwards Demir starts an argumentation in favour of her own suggestion. De Coninck on her turn criticizes this proposal and she interrupts her opponent a couple times. In line 10 De Coninck expresses an explicit contradiction. However, the politician does not directly reject the proposal put forward by her opponent, but she denies the fact that this is what the current Flemish government is doing right now. The contradiction in line 10, could be seen as an accusation of lying. In line 11, Demir starts posing a rhetorical question but she is interrupted a couple of times by De Coninck who is still accusing Demir of providing false information. The arguing continues until Demir brings up the need to decrease the burden on labour. In line 26 De Coninck interrupts and pronounces her agreement. However, partial agreement (agreeing on a minor issue, as a presequence to the disagreement on the major issue (Kotthoff 1993: 205)), does not end a conflict, rather it is a preliminary to further disagreement. De Coninck agrees with Demir’s statement and then she attributes it to the previous government (where her party was a major part of). The counterclaim goes even further, as she indicates that those measurements taken by the previous government, are now been postponed. Basically, De Coninck wants to discredit her opponent by portraying her as taking credit for projects that are not hers. In line 30, Demir interrupts De Coninck with a challenging question asking how many jobs the previous government developed, implying that their policy was not efficient. The interruption with a challenging question, can be seen as a characteristic of aggravated dissent. The host also recognizes it as such, as he intervenes by stating that he wants constructive proposals and does not want a heated debate. This might seem surprising, as other research indicates that TV talk shows featuring debates often like to elicit heated and aggravated disagreement. However, in this exact episode the host wants to create an open discussion, focusing on possible resolutions. In general the politicians respect the purpose of this debate, except for De Coninck who expresses most dissent towards the others and for this reason also provokes most disagreeing turns from her opponents.

**Extract 53:**

18/01 – De vakbonden hebben niet goed gelezen wat er allemaal op het menu staat

*Topic: The unions did not read the policy properly*

01 Dewael: wat u goed moet weten eh? Gratis geven meneer Calvo (.) dat bestaat nie

02 (0.3) je kan niet blijven wijsmaken aan de mensen (.) want u bent
bijvoorbeeld ook tegen de pensioenmaatregelen (0.3) dat we in een land
leven (.) waar dat mensen eigenlijk altijd maar <gelukkig maar> gezond ouder
worden (.) maar door minder ↑te werken (.) meer kunnen blijven verdienen
(0.5) ja dat land dat bestaat niet eh (.) wat deze regering doet dat is eigenlijk
hetzelfde doen als in de ons omringende landen gebeurd (.) en ofwel blijven
wij een sociaal paradijs (0.3) erbij beloven (.) maar dan komt u terecht op
een economisch kerkhof

Calvo: ja maar het is net omdat wij een economische heropleving heel erg genegen
zijn (.) dat wij zeggen van kijk die indexsprong (.) die de loonlasten op korte
termijn nie verlaagd (.) de koopkracht van mensen aantast (.) doe da nie (0.3)
[geef da sociaal overleg- geef dat sociaal overleg]

→ Dewael: [wat dan wel? (.) wat dan wel? (.) wat dan wel?]

Calvo: geef dat sociale overleg echt zuurstof

In extract 53, another instance of interruption with a question can be observed. The excerpt starts with disagreement. Dewael asserts that Calvo cannot keep fooling the voters: nothing is for free. Dewael accuses Calvo of miscommunication and making false promises. He continues his reasoning as he argues that if the Belgian government keeps promising a social paradise, they will end up on an economic graveyard. In line 10 Calvo answers using a pre-disagreement strategy, i.e. the ‘yes-but’ strategy (ja maar...). He pronounces that exactly because he and his party want an economic recovery, they are against the actions taken by the current government. The politician explicitly warns his opponent: doe dat niet (do not do this). At line 14, we arrive at the interruption through asking a challenging question. Dewael is not pleased with the impression Calvo is sending the audience. Dewael asks multiple times: wat dan wel? (then what?). The question implies that it is easy for the opposition to bash the proposal of the government, but that they in fact do not provide any useful alternatives.

Extract 37:

14/12 – Naast de vakbond, de werkbond: zinvol of niet?

Topic: Besides labour unions, work unions: useful or not?
Schelfhout: de economische schade die dat tewerk brengt (.) van mensen die op dat moment nie kunnen werken (.) bedrijven die platliggen eh (.) da gaat over honderden miljoenen euro’s eh (.) met die honderden miljoenen euro’s (0.3) [ga je heel wat werkzoekenden tewerkstellen (.) en dat is erg (.) dat is erh]

D’Haese: [kben heel blij dat u dat zegt (.) want de schade- de schade-] de schade tijdens een staking dat is natuurlijk de waarde die we op andere- alle andere dagen wordt gecreëerd (.) door de werkende mensen (.) dus heel leuk om te zeggen da we eindelijk keer een ander verhaal horen dan dat het de ondernemers zijn die de welvaart creëren [het zijn de werkende mensen die dat creëren (0.4) en dat wordt] [en en (0.5) weet je wat er nog erger is?]

D’Haese: heel duidelijk op zo’n stakingsdag (0.4) en daar wordt men natuurlijk nerveus van (.) das logisch

Schelfhout: manee (0.4) weet je wat er eigenlijk nog erger is? (0.4) en dat is ook belangrijk (0.6) de staking (0.3) dat gaat over politieke eisen ten opzichte van de regering (.) da gaat niet over de mensen die willen werken (0.5) dus moet je ook de mensen die willen werken [niet gaan treffen (0.3) dat is belangrijk]

D’Haese: [het gaat over de zeshonderdduizend mensen] die geen job kunnen vinden (.) over de mensen die zullen worden ontslagen bij de lijn (.) bij de NMBS (.) dankzij het beleid van uw ministers (0.3) dus ik nodig u uit om morgen mee aan het piket the komen staan

Furthermore, following extract also provides an example of an aggravated disagreement sequence where the use of questions plays an important role. The excerpt starts when Schelfhout expresses his opinion about the economic losses a strike induces. In the turn starting at line 5, d’Haese demonstrates an instance of agreement in disputes. Kotthoff (1993:
calls this phenomenon ‘upgraded agreement as a presequence to further dissent’. The politician asserts that he is very pleased that his opponent made a point about the economic losses of a strike. However, d’Haese reverses the argument and uses it in his advantage. He argues that a strike rises awareness to the fact that without the regular working people, the economy is lost; it is a different story than the one which glorifies the entrepreneurs from bringing welfare to the country. At this point the disagreement sequence gets aggravated, and at line 11 Schelfhout interrupts his opponent and starts posing a challenging question, more specifically a rhetorical opposing question. At line 14 Schelfhout continues, he asks: do you know what is even worse? He answers this question himself, by stating that the real issue is that regular working people are affected for political demands towards the government. D’Haese again interrupts his opponent with an irrelevancy claim. He asserts that the real issue are the six thousand people who cannot find a job because of the actions taken by the government.

7.2 Host

In the following section, some of the hosts’ ways of asking questions in disagreement sequences on the TV talk show ‘De zevende dag’ will be discussed. Apart from the expected neutral or mildly argumentative questions such as requests for clarification and argument-eliciting questions, the hosts also use challenging and conducive polar questions in the analysed disagreement sequences. On the latter instances, a more detailed analysis will be conducted. In addition, the results show that the repetition of a question can also be a medium to express disagreement. Hosts use this technique in order to counter an interviewee, state an irrelevancy claim or depict the interviewee as an incompetent actor in the debate. On this specific use of questions, the data analysis will provide a better insight.

7.2.1 Challenging questions

First of all, the host asks challenging questions in order to elicit lively debate and evaluate the argumentations put forward in the debate. However, by doing so he/she risks losing the neutral stance which is expected from a show host. The hosts must be aware of this, as they sometimes rely on the typical news interview-strategy of quoting other voices. Nevertheless, this is not often the case because the entire point of the panel interview is that the interviewees (who are chosen because of their different opinions on a certain topic) provide the input.
7.2.1.1 Provoking lively debate

The main purpose of these challenging questions is the elicitation of lively debate. This finding is not new, as it has been observed in several other studies (Emmertsen 2007: 570-591). In the chapter on talk show discourse, a short overview of the structure of the panel debate interview was given. One of the main structural characteristics is the inviting of interplay between the panellists by the host. Clayman (2002: 1385-1401) argues that this is a crucial component of the format because it enables lively debate and minimizes the chance that the host loses his/her neutral position as mediator as he/she becomes a less central player in the interaction. However, paradoxically exactly because these inviting-interplay questions take such a challenging form, the host also risks losing his neutral position and possibly even becomes a participant in a disagreement sequence.

**Extract 56:**

01/02 – Sociaal overleg vakbonden en regering

*Topic: Social dialogue between the unions and government*

1. → Host: meneer de Leeuw (.) dit is een land van consensus (0.3) we gaan aan een tafel zitten en we komen eruit (0.6) en u wil niet?
2. De Leeuw: erh dit was onmogelijk voor ons (.) omdat erh door de indexsprong gaan de mensen (.) echt te veel geld verliezen (.) inkomen verliezen erhm en hun lonen gaan achteruit gaan in feite (0.3) dit is eigenlijk 2.6 miljard die men aan de bedrijven overlaat zonder veel tegenprestatie-
3. Host: ma meneer de Leeuw (0.4) der zijn in dit land verkiezingen geweest (.) en de meeste mensen die hebben partijen gesteund die (.) die indexsprong <de lonen even bevriezen> ja die dat ↑nodig vinden
4. De Leeuw: ja wel vandaag is de wet van ’96 nog altijd van toepassing (.) die is nog niet gewijzigd (.) het is duidelijk dat wij op basis van dat loonrapport (.) dat wij een alternatief hadden (.) dat het indexmechanisme gelet op de lage inflatie
5. (.) kon behouden blijven (.) en dat er toch nog een kleine marge mogelijk was
een marge die erh absoluut niet groter ging zijn erh dan wat nu op tafel ligt-

Host: ja maar oké (?) die regering vindt iets anders (?) en ze heeft wel haar best gedaan (?) er zijn overgangsmaatregelen bij de pensioenen (?) er kunnen toch kleine loonsverhogen komen (?) de werkloosheidsuitkeringen en andere uitkeringen gaan toch een beetje omhoog (?), men heeft u toch iets proberen gunnen?

De Leeuw: maar maar hoe- wat eerst verloren gaat is enorm eh (?) op een loopbaan (?) van een starter is dat twintigduizend ↑ euro (?) we hebben dat altijd [tezamen gezegd]

Host: [over een hele] carrière

De Leeuw: ja maar ook vandaag op korte termijn gaat men daar 2.6 miljard verliezen (?) zonder enige tegenprestatie

In extract 56 below, an example of such an interaction is given. In line 1-2 the host, poses a challenging question at an interviewee. The host states that Belgium is a country of consensus; the people get together and talk it through until there is a resolution. After a short pause, the host poses a question: en u wil niet?, implying that De Leeuw does not want to negotiate with the government and is not helping the discussion forward in any way. It could be argued that the interviewee is rather startled, because there are a lot of hesitation tokens in his response (e.g. erh). In his next move, the host again is rather hostile towards the panel member. He interrupts De Leeuw with a counterclaim, starting with disagreement marker maar informal for maar (but) and an address form, which can both be seen as a strengthening device or a softening cue in the expression of dissent. After another short pause, the host continues by stating that the current government has been chosen by the people, that the majority of the voters supported political parties who were in favour of the ‘index jump’. De Leeuw replies to this challenging statement, by referring to their alternative. However, the host rejects this as a valuable argument with the pre-disagreement strategy of initial agreement (yes-but strategy). After the initial agreement, the host lists some transitional measures taken by the government, ending his reasoning with yet another challenging
question in line 19-20: *men heeft u toch iets proberen te gunnen?* (they did try to accommodate to your remarks?). In a way the host is accusing De Leeuw of being unreasonable. The interviewee is again noticeably surprised by the challenging question. He tries to defend himself, but does so rather weakly as he is not able to directly produce his counterclaim (he repeats the linguistic marker of a counterclaim (*maar*) and makes a false start in providing his next argument). Another indication that his defence is not very effective, is the fact that he is again interrupted by the host who refines his counterargument. The host blames De Leeuw for overstating the relevance of an argument, nuancing that the amount specified relates to a whole career.

7.2.1.2 Quoting other voices

As has been illustrated in the example above, the hosts’ use of challenging questions functions to elicit lively debate but can sometimes result in a disagreement sequence between host and interviewee (thus the host loses his neutral position as mediator). However, the host must be aware of this possibility, as he often quotes other voices when he poses such a challenging question. This is a common strategy for news interviews, because this way the host can provide an opposing viewpoint without losing his neutrality. By attributing the challenging content of the question to a third party, the host avoids the risk of being involved in a dispute with a member of the panel.

**Extract 7:**

9/11 – Stakingen

*Topic: Strikes*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>→ Host:</td>
<td>meneer Leemans, ja meneer Peeters heeft het hier in de studio nog maar eens gezegd (1.0) overleggen dat doeje niet op straat eh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Leemans:</td>
<td>nee actie voeren doeje op straat eh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Host:</td>
<td>ja maar het maakt het overleg wel moeilijker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In excerpt 7, we see an example of the host confronting one of the interviewees with a challenging question. However, the difference with the previous example is that here the host attributes the statement to a third party who does not partake in the panel debate but has been interviewed earlier on in the TV show. It should be mentioned that this example of attribution to a third party, is not representative for the use of challenging questions by the
host on ‘De zevende dag’. It seems that the context of the TV talk show, allows the host to disagree with his or her interviewees to a certain extent.

7.2.2 **Conducive polar questions**

Another practice of questions posed by the host in disagreement sequences are polar questions. This kind of question is constraining by nature (i.e. yes or no answer is preferred or expected) and was expected to play a key role in the data from the political debate talk show ‘De zevende dag’ as it is a powerful tool for exercising control (cf. political discourse). Also the notion of presupposition is involved here. Interestingly, conducive polar questions are a typical feature of the questioning of the host while it is rare in disagreement between panel members. This type of question is also a possible channel for the expression of disagreement by the host. It is basically an instrument to put the interviewee at whom the question is directed in a difficult position. Often these conducive polar questions need to be nuanced or denied. However, a direct negation of a presupposition asserted by the host can be somewhat harsh. This often results in what Emmertsen calls a dilemma-question (Emmertsen 2007: 580). Because of the constraining and controlling nature of conducive polar questions, these interrogatives are highly argumentative in nature.

**Extract 8:**

**9/11 – Stakingen**

**Topic: Strikes**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>→ Host:</td>
<td>U moet hier begrip voor hebben meneer Timmermans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Timmermans:</td>
<td>wel ik denk dat daar begrip voor moet zijn inderdaad (.) maar er moet ook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>begrip zijn voor evenveel mensen die ook ↑anders gereageerd hebben (.) wij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>hebben (.) vorige donderdag een actie gelanceerd ‘Ik werk vandaag’ (0.3) wel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>ik moet zeggen dat is een onverhoopt succes geweest (.) ik zou zeggen er zijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>bijna evenveel mensen die via de sociale media (0.3) ook betoogd hebben (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>tegen de betoging die aan de gang was (0.6) dit gezegd zijnde denk ik dat we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>moeten een stap verder kijken (0.5) erh en men zou erh inderdaad- actie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>voeren en staken tegelijkertijd met overleg gaat niet samen (0.7) het is het een</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>of het ander (0.8) maar ik denk dat uiteindelijk (.) finaal (.) overleg altijd meer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extract 8 portrays an instance where the host asks a polar question conveying a presupposition. The host projects the notion begrif on the interviewee (you have to be sympathetic towards this?) and limits him in answering the question. From the context panel debate it is clear that Timmermans is not an advocate of the current strikes. However, the question posed in this fragment portrays the interviewee as sympathetic towards them. An explicit negation of the thesis would be a rather harsh statement, but a yes answer would imply concession and this can possibly be face-threatening in contexts such as this. Concession could be seen as a defeat; the opponent is no longer able to defend himself. A more suitable answer is partial agreement followed by a counterclaim, and this is exactly what Timmermans opts for. Emmertsen (2007: 580) calls this phenomenon a dilemma-question to the interviewee.

**Extract 13:**

16/11 – Belasting op vermogen

*Topic: Wealth tax*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Crombez</td>
<td>en waarom zegt men nu (0.3) diezelfde mensen niet van kijk of data nu de rijkste families zijn De Spoelberch (.) de Mevius of de grootste bedrijven (0.3) waarom steekt men da nie meteen in onderzoek? [unintelligible speech-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Host:</td>
<td>[Zegt u dan] we moeten daarmee stoppen (0.3) [met die rulings?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Crombez</td>
<td>[ma tuurlijk moeten we] ma we moeten ni stoppen met &lt;die rulings op zich zijn nie het probleem eh&gt; want die rulings moeten nie gaan over minder belastingen maar over rechtzekerheid (0.3) rulings moeten dienen om (.) op voorhand aan mensen te kunnen zeggen (.) dit is wat daje zou willen doen economisch is de ficus akkoord of nie? (0.5) en ni over minder belastingen- [maar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Host:</td>
<td>[maar het] komt erop neer dat ze lager tarief krijgen?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crombez: maar dat is (.) en dat is opmerkelijk nu (.) de BBI (0.4) <deel van financiën>
doen een onderzoek naar de rulingcommissie deel van financiën (.) eh? Dus
de (0.3) tis al goed dat de BBI da doet (.) maar het punt is men zei das ↑wettelijk
wat dat die grote bedrijven en die die erhm (.) particulieren doen (0.4) ik ben
het daar zelfs nie mee eens (0.5) ↑da moet onderzocht worden of da wettelijk
is-
Host: vraag het aan de expert (addresses Maus) is dat wettelijk? (1.0)
Maus: ahum (0.4) wel ik denk dat erhm er bedrijven die op dat niveau opereren er
wel voor zouden zorgen da alles binnen het wettelijk kader (.) passeert maar
we hebben nu eigenlijk de discussie <enfin de filosofie> dat alles wat
wettelijk is per definitie ook ethisch zou zijn (.) daar heb ik toch mijn ↑vragen
over (.) bovendien erhm ja erhm en dat is voor België ook het geval (.) heel
wat van de erhm fiscale uitzonderingsregimes zijn er precies gekomen na
lobby↑werk of zelfs na ↑dictaat van van erhm van multinationals (.) dus dan
wordt het natuurlijk makkelijk om te zeggen dat men binnen het wettelijk
kader opereert en dat alles perfect oké is

The excerpt above illustrates two instances of conducive polar questions used by the host (line 4-5 & 12). The quotation starts with an argumentative question from Crombez. According to Ilie’s paradigm, argumentative questions are oriented to the message and the audience (Ilie 1999: 975). Crombez wonders why they do not immediately investigate possible abuse concerning taxes whether or not it is conducted by influential families or companies. The host interrupts the panel member by asking for clarification in the form of a polar question. The question in line 4 and 5 functions as a means to force Crombez to make his opinion explicit. The host’s question is answered with a contradiction and an irrelevancy claim. The host puts words into Crombez’s mouth by asking if (and assuming that) he thinks Belgium should stop taxation agreements to which the interviewee replies that there is no need to stop the practice of rulings as their function is not to lower the taxes. In line 12, the host yet again interrupts the politician with another polar question. On the surface the host
asks a straightforward information-eliciting question, but there is some argumentative nature to it. The host asks (and also states in a way) if in practice, taxation agreement does not equal a lowering of the taxes. Interestingly, none of these yes-no questions are answered with a type-conforming question. In both his replies, Crombez starts with the expression of the linguistic marker maar or ma (but), clearly countering the message the host is hinting at. This can be related to the study of Koshik (2002: 1855), who asserts that interviewees hear some polar questions as assertions which display the stance of the interviewer.

7.2.3 Repeating of questions

Analysing disagreement sequences featuring questions in the data retrieved from ‘De zevende dag’, it could be observed that the host often repeats the same question as a way to counter an argument or portray it as irrelevant. When an interviewee gives a non-type-conforming and thus unsatisfactory answer, the host often repeats the question. On the surface these repeats are in concordance with the host’s function as debate mediator, but sometimes they can also convey an argumentative load and can be seen as a way to discredit one of the interviewees. By repeating the question, the host often counters a statement and portrays it as irrelevant. Sometimes the repetition of a question can also be seen as a means to depict the interviewee as an incompetent conversational partner in the debate.

Extract 19:

23/11 – Moet het leger te veel besparen?

**Topic: Does the government save too much on military issues?**

01 → Host: mevrouw Grosemans ik zou heel graag van u nu horen (.) wat moet
02 Grosemans: het leger (.) dan niet meer doen?
03 Grosemans: wel ik vind aan de componenten mogen we niet meer raken (.) dus
04 we hebben een landcomponent lucht marine (.) de medische
05 component (0.3) en we hebben die vier componenten nodig (.) ik zou
06 zelfs een vijfde component willen toevoegen eh (.) cyber en
07 inlichtingen (.) is ook verwaarloosd-
08 Opposition: (unintelligible speech)
09 → Host: jama wat niet meer?
Grosemans: dus die componenten moeten we behouden <sommigen willen componenten afschaffen> dus toch vind ik het belangrijk dawé niet aan die structuren (.) erh mogen komen (.) en dan vind ik dawé moeten kijken (0.5) wat zijn precies de competenties en wa zijn de capaciteiten die enkel en alleen defensie kan en mag?

Host: uhu

Grosemans: en da zijn eigenlijk de kerntaken-

Host: wees eens concreet

Grosemans: een privéfirma (.) die mag bijvoorbeeld nie met een tank rondrijden <kzeg maar iets>

In the extract above, the host clearly invites Grosemans to make her opinion explicit: he asks what the military forces should refrain from doing in the light of the savings the government wants to push through. The interviewee replies that they need to preserve the army’s four components and maybe even add a fifth one. At this point, Grosemans is interrupted by the members of the opposition who are complaining in unintelligible speech. Also the host challenges the politician’s statement by asking her what they should not keep instead of adding new things. In her reasoning from line 10 onwards, Grosemans uses an expository question in line 13 and 14, asking about the skills and capacities which can only be conducted by national defence. In line 17, we see the host again inviting the interviewee to be more concrete. This excerpt can be seen as an example where the host is depicting the interviewee as an incompetent interlocutor on the debate.

Extract 36:
14/12 – Moeten er Europese fiscale afspraken komen tussen lidstaten?

Topic: Do we need tax treaties between European member states?

Host: nu de ↑vraag van mevrouw Almaci was (0.6) gaan we het ook proactief doen? Gaan we nie wachten tot een land het ons vraagt (.) ma vanaf het moment da we zeggen (.) we gaan ervan uit dat dit in Frankrijk wordt belast (.) gaan we dan Frankrijk vanzelf op de hoogte
brengen? Da kunnen we ↑zelf doen (.) daar moeten we niet voor
wachten op Europa eh?

Loones: ↑natuurlijk en da moeten we ook doen-
Host: ja ik verneem dat het tot nu toe niet gedaan werd?
Almaci: [manee da werd nie gedaan]
Loones: [wat mij vooral] verbaast is-
Van Der Maelen: en meneer Van Overtveldt kondigt aan dat hij het niet gaat doen
Host: pardon
Loones: wat mij vooral verbaast is er wordt telkens gevraagd naar nieuwe
maatregelen (.) bijkomende stappen (.) extra Europa (0.4) wat ik
alleen vaststel is dat Europa ons heel veel middelen geeft (.) dat wij al
heel veel middelen hebben (.) en dan denk ik aan (0.6) alles wat
bestaat rond staatssteun eh (0.3) daar is een administratie-
⇒ Host: u wijkt een beetje af [de vraag was] (0.3) België proactief-
Almaci: [ja absoluut]
Loones: ja ma ik heb geantwoord (.) ja we gaan dat doen
⇒ Host: we gaan dat doen?
Loones: we hebben zeker [al plannen wat dat-]
Van Der Maelen: [unintelligible speech]

In excerpt 36, the interaction starts with the host taking up an argument made by Almaci and
rephrasing it as a question. Instances like these display the importance of questions in
moving the discussion forward. When the panel members do not use questions themselves,
the host uses their arguments and rephrases them as questions. It is a way for the host to
develop the debate further, and establish a desired level of disagreement between the
interviewees. The host asks if Belgium shall proactively take steps in consulting other
member states. In his reply, Loones articulates his initial agreement through the expression
of natuurlijk (of course) and starts the expression of an irrelevancy claim, indicating that this
is something they already are obliged to do, but the politician is interrupted by the host. The host challenges the irrelevancy claim put forward, and states that he understands that it has not been carried out until now. Almaci intervenes and mentions that this indeed was not the case, accusing her opponent of lying and misleading the audience. In line 11, another panel member backs up Almaci’s statement, by arguing that the minister in control of the issue, has announced that he will not proactively consult other countries. Loones takes the turn again, and expresses his astonishment towards questions about which new measures will be taken as he notices that Europe already hands them pretty good resource to handle the issue. At line 18, the host again interrupts him, asserting that the politician is deviating from the topic and he reiterates his question posed at the beginning of the excerpt. When Loones again replies that they will proactively consult other member states, the host yet again repeats the same question asking for clarification. Loones states that they are already planning certain steps, the members of the opposition start complaining, resulting in overlapping speech and aggravated dissent. Basically, Loones gives an unexpected answer and is accused of lying. That is also the reason why the host keeps hammering on the question and forcing the politician to make his opinion explicit. The other panel members react quite heavily to Loones’ statements because they argue that the minister arranging the issue – who is also a party member of Loones – just clearly said that they were not going to proactively consult other countries, while Loones is now claiming the exact opposite. In this extract the repeating of the question by the host, is a means to counter the interviewee without losing his role as mediator as he still keeps to his main task of asking questions.

Extract 62:

08/02 – Hoe creëren we nog meer jobs?

Topic: How should we create more jobs?

01 → Host: mevrouw Demir (0.3) om te beginnen (.) we moeten eigenlijk (0.3) Europese doelstellingen halen (0.4) een tewerkstellingsgraad van 73% (.) als we nu (.)

02 Demir: erhm (.) erhm t is in ieder geval als we de studies bekijken (.) erhm dat het duidelijk is dat we vooruit gaan eh (.) met werkgelegenheid dus wat doet erh-

03 → Host: halen we die Europese doelstellingen of niet?

04 Demir: erhm (.) erhm ja wat da we doen is jobs creëren (.) dus wat deze regering doet
is bijvoorbeeld heel belangrijk (.) structureel (.) das die loonlasten verlaging (.) van ongeveer 1 miljoen euro- erh 1 miljard euro excuseer (0.3) en twee <ook heel belangrijk (.) vrijdag beslist> erh door deze meerderheid is die honderdzeventwintig miljoen euro voor de laagste lonen (0.3) en waarom is dat heel belangrijk voor die laagste lonen? Om het [verschil] te maken Host: [ja] Demir: tussen een uitkering en een [de laagste lonen-] ➔ Host: [de vraag was] halen we de Europese doelstelling (0.4) en het antwoord is (.) nee eh Demir: maar wat da we wel- jama nee (0.3) ik vind het toch heel belangrijk (.) wat da we halen (.) en da zegt zowel (.) de nationale bank en het planbureau is dat er jobs bijkomen

In the last excerpt concerning this phenomenon, the panel is discussing possible actions in order to create more job opportunities. The exchange starts when the host asks Demir about the objectives of Europe, and if Belgium realized the target of an employment rate of 73%. Demir responds rather hesitant and states that nevertheless research shows that they are making progress on the issue. The politician is interrupted by the host who repeats his question. Again Demir answers hesitantly and changes the subject by focussing on aspects where the government is making progress. In the turn from line 15 to 16, the host yet again echoes his question, and he provides the answer himself, stating that Belgium does not realize the European targets concerning employment. The politician replies quite annoyed through a counterclaim in which she states that it is important to stress that extra job opportunity has been established. The conversational behaviour of the host is actually very bold here. He both challenges the government Demir is a member of and the politician’s own behaviour on the show.
8. Conclusion

The main aim of this paper was to explore how questions function in the construction of disagreement on the talk show ‘De zevende dag’. The principal result was the confirmation that both hosts and interviewees use questions in their construal of disagreement. The interviewees, who are mainly politicians, use questions almost exclusively in an argumentative way. Here the division was made between clearly argumentative questions and others who are mildly argumentative. As disagreement is a defining element of the genre of the panel debate, it was somewhat expected that the guests participating on the show would express opposite opinions through the use of questions. However, also the hosts make use of argumentative questions. Regarding the interviewees, the most significant observations were the fact that they used rhetorical opposing questions most frequently and that a lot metacommunicative acts of staged confrontation were present. These observations could both be explained with reference to political discourse. Rhetorical opposing questions are used as a means of political persuasion, highlighting a difference in opinion and depicting results of actions taken by the opponent as negative evolutions. Metacommunicative acts of staged confrontation on the other hand, use the adversary’s own conversational behaviour against him/her by portraying this person as an impolite interactant. Less expected findings were the rather limited use of implicit, distorting and explicit opposing questions plus the fact the politicians did reject presuppositions conveyed in challenging questions in a direct way. Distorting opposing questions were only very scarcely used because of their potential face-threatening nature, while explicit opposing questions were no longer necessary once a disagreement frame was established. For the rather limited use of implicit opposing questions, no real explanation could be found. The unexpected overt rejection of presuppositions conveyed in challenging questions, could be attributed to the less confrontational frame wherein ‘The zevende dag’ acts. Furthermore, it was discovered that aggravated dissent was established through the departure from institutional turn-taking dynamics and through the use of questions in interrupting turns. Concerning the hosts’ use of questions in disagreement sequences on ‘De zevende dag’, it can be said that in most of the cases the hosts maintain their neutral position as mediator. The hosts’ most common used type of question in disagreement sequences were argument-eliciting questions, followed by requests for clarification. However, two other instances could be observed: challenging questions and conducive polar questions. The hosts’ challenging questions principally serve
as a way to elicit lively debate. However, sometimes it can be used to express an opinion or evaluation of an argument. Conducive polar questions are useful to the host because they limit the interviewee in answering. A more surprising finding was that also the repetition of a question when an interviewee did not provide an satisfactory answer can be used as a way of disagreeing. The results set forth were tested by means of a qualitative analysis of the data. The analysis provides a thorough discussion of some concrete disagreement sequences where questions were used.

This research contributes to the knowledge of how language is used in panel debates. It demonstrates how questions can be used as a conversational strategy in institutional settings such as talk shows and portrays that questions play an important role in the construction of disagreement. Basically, the analysis adds to a more thorough understanding of human interaction. However, it should be noted that this study is highly dependent on the collected data and the people involved in the interactions: further research in the same vein can confirm or contradict the results of this study. An examination of the same show could help in establishing a more complete account of language in ‘De zevende dag’. Also a comparative study could be conducted, where other debate shows are set side by side. Another direction for further research is an examination which focusses more on nonverbal and prosodic aspects of disagreement. Because this is a relatively small scale study, nonverbal and prosodic aspects were kept in mind in the analysis, but inevitably remained more on the background. A full multimodal investigation of the same setting (and partly based on this research) could provide even more interesting results.
Appendix

(0.5) The number in brackets indicates a time gap in tenths of a second

(.) A dot enclosed in a bracket indicates a pause in the talk of less than two-tenths of a second

[] Square brackets between adjacent lines of concurrent speech indicate the onset and end of a stretch of overlapping talk

↑↓ Pointed arrows indicate a marked falling or rising intonational shift

Under Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis

- A dash indicates the sharp cut-off of the prior word or sound
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