

The Closing of Illegal Interventions: A Conversation Analysis Study

Mohammad Ibrahim Alqatawna¹

¹ King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Mohammad Ibrahim Alqatawna, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: m.alqatawna@gmail.com

Received: February 13, 2024

Accepted: May 23, 2024

Online Published: July 10, 2024

doi:10.5430/wjel.v14n6p139

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n6p139>

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to examine the termination of illegal interventions using conversation analysis (CA henceforth). The findings indicate that the closure of interactions occurs unilaterally without negotiation by the participants, leading to an absence of interaction termination. The chairperson of the parliament consistently initiates the closure by utilizing various elements within the closing implicative environment, such as announcing the closure, expressing appreciation, issuing demands to comply with internal regulations of the parliament, and warning of potential suspension of parliamentary sessions. The participation framework plays a significant role in the process of closing illegal interventions. The rights and roles of participants differ significantly from ordinary conversations. This discrepancy has a notable impact on the manner in which closings are conducted, particularly when the CP is involved. As a result, the closing of interactions in this study is characterized as unilateral and brief due to the influence of the participation framework.

Keywords: conversation analysis, discourse analysis, closings, institutional interactions

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the closing of illegal interventions in the Jordanian parliament. In the first section of the paper, I review the existing literature on closings and how they are designed; I explain the actions and sequences that occur within the closing: termination, pre-closings and closing implicative actions. In the second section, I show how the interactions in my corpus are closed. The data analysis section informs us that in ordinary conversations termination is negotiated by the participants. In my data, the interactions are brought to a close in a unilateral fashion. Participants do not exchange farewell tokens due to the fact that these are illegal interventions which are committed by UPs. In contrast to informal conversations (Schegloff, 2007), pre-closing sequences are rarely used by Arabic speakers in the Jordanian parliament. Closings are generally initiated by the parliament's chairperson who brings about the closing by using one or more of a range of kinds of actions. The analysis of the data informs us that interactions are brought to closure using closing implicative actions. These are; instructing others as a means of closing the illegal interventions, acknowledgements, arrangements, announcing closure, appreciations, demands to obey the internal regulations of the parliament, and warning to suspend the session of the parliament. In the following section, I provide an overview of termination, for which I draw on Schegloff & Sacks (1973), Button (1987) and Liddicoat (2007).

2. Conversation Analysis and Participation Framework

The primary goal of conversation analysis is to examine how talk is produced and interpreted in interaction, with a focus on the participants themselves actively shaping and adhering to an organized structure (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Additionally, it seeks to uncover the underlying organization of talk from the participants' perspective, emphasizing their understanding of "what is going on" (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 14-15). In other words, the participants themselves orient themselves towards the orderly nature of interaction, and their orientations form the foundation of shared understanding and the smooth flow of conversation. Conversation analysis is built upon three main principles: first, that talk-in-interaction is systematically organized and exhibits inherent orderliness; second, that the analysis of talk-in-interaction should be based on naturally occurring data; and third, that the production of talk-in-interaction follows a methodical approach (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 23).

Conversation analysis research has always had a broader scope beyond ordinary conversations. It has evolved in relation to diverse collections of data and, as a result, the term "talk-in-interaction" is commonly employed to describe the focus of CA research, instead of simply referring to it as "conversation" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 4). In the context of the current study, the significance of institutional talk lies in the involvement of individuals who assume distinct roles, each with varying rights, including the ability to contribute to the ongoing interaction.

This study utilizes Goffman's (1981) framework of the participation framework, which is supplemented by the concepts of activity type (Levinson, 1988) and participation framework patterns (O'Driscoll, 2018), specifically in the context of parliamentary interactions. Within this study, the specific roles within the institutional context have an impact on participants' rights to speak and how they may violate rules to gain a speaking role. The CP always holds a ratified participant status due to their institutional privileges. The CS can be a Member of Parliament (of the lower house), a minister, or the Prime Minister, and their ratified participant status depends on the CP's selection for participation in parliamentary debates. Other participants and audience members, such as prime ministers, ministers, and MPs. Hence, these permissible

contributions and the rights and obligations of participants are considered crucial aspects of participation in parliamentary interactions.

3. The Closing in Ordinary Conversation

Closing a conversation can be a sensitive interactional issue. At some point, participants not only need to disengage from the talk but also from the turn-taking system (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Liddicoat, 2007). Participants produce closure of relevant actions to propose and bring about the closing of the conversation. However, closings in this study are different because it is not achieved through mutual collaboration. Instead, the interaction is brought to a close in a unilateral fashion.

Participants do not close a conversation simply by leaving each other or suddenly stopping talking. Instead, they bring a conversation to closure, and there are some procedures for doing this, as illustrated in the following subsections.

3.1 The Terminal Pair

In all languages, participants terminate conversations in a recurrent way, by exchanging farewell tokens such as bye-bye and the like. The closings of a conversation do not occur spontaneously or effortlessly, instead, they happen through interactional achievement and negotiation (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). This means that when a conversation closes, participants have collaborated to produce a closure. Participants close a conversation through ‘negotiating’ (Button, 1990, p. 131) in the closing phases of the interaction. Participants in a conversation may initiate closing, which means that there is no relevant future talk for this current conversation and that the conversation may now be completed and can move to close (Liddicoat, 2007 p. 264). Schegloff & Sacks explain:

It should be clearly understood that the ‘closing problem’ we are discussing is proposed as a problem for conversationalists; we are not interested in it as a problem for analysts except in so far, and in the ways, it is a problem for participants. by problem ... we mean that closings are to be seen as achievements, as solutions to certain problems of conversational organisation.

(Schegloff & Sacks, 1973 p. 290).

The following example illustrates the termination of a sequence in ordinary conversation:

Example 1

1. Emma: So we’ll do it at 7.30
2. Sue: it’ll be fun
3. Emma: alright
4. Sue: Okay
5. Emma: bye=
6. Sue: bye,;

(Liddicoat, 2007, p. 255)

In the above example, Sue and Emma terminate the sequence by exchanging the farewell tokens "bye/bye." We can observe that the FPP of the closing is marked in line 5, and in return, the second component of the adjacency pair is achieved in line 6. Consequently, we can observe that both participants have mutually agreed to bring the conversation to closure, as Emma initiated the FPP and Sue agreed to end the conversation. A second observation is that both participants have discussed the topic of the talk and that no further conversation exchange is due (Liddicoat, 2007).

However, termination-relevant actions may not lead to conversation closure. Firstly, it is necessary for participants to launch an interactive environment i.e. negotiation of closing, so that closing relevant actions may be oriented to as such and lead to closure. Secondly, conversationalists may introduce further matters to extend the conversation (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). Thus, in order to close a conversation, "participants must collaboratively work to suspend the transition relevance of possible turn completion such that stopping talking and/or leaving is understood as ending the occasion and thus not in violation of interactional norms" (Robinson, 2013, p. 277). Thus, closing sequences are made up of more than just the terminal pair as participants negotiate closure over several turns. Prior to the terminal pair, a pre-closing may be used to propose closure. This may then be followed by the terminal pair or by the continuation of the conversation.

3.2 Pre-closing

Pre-closings can be launched with a token such as “well” or “okay” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) which, if matched by a similar token can end with the terminal exchange. However, Liddicoat argues that “not all instances of “Okay” are heard as pre-closings and whether such a turn will be treated by a speaker as proposing or not depends on its placement in the talk in progress” (2007, p. 257). In other words, this means that some participants may not treat short tokens such as “Okay” as indications of a “passing turn” (Lerner, 2003) of talk. Further, Liddicoat claims that “pre-closing provides a space in which new mentionables may be inserted, they do not therefore always lead to closing and are never more than possible pre-closing” (2007, p. 257).

Thus, pre-closings are adjacency pairs: the first pair part of pre-closing calls for a similar second pair part.

1. pre-closing FPP
2. Pre-closing FPP



To illustrate the pre-closing, let us consider example 2 which is drawn from a telephone conversation.

Example 2 (Button, 1987: 101-2)

1. Pam: hh Oh [well than:ks [anyway]
 2. Vicky: [I:'m so so [rry Pa:] m
 3. (.)
 4. Pam: Okay,=
 5. Vicky: =Okay,=
 6. Pam: =Bye:=
 7. Vicky: =Bye.
- end call -----

In line 4, Pam initiates the closing by producing the token 'Okay', which marks the FPP of the pre-closing sequence. In response to that, Vicky produces the SPP of the adjacency pair by producing the token 'Okay' in line 5.

In sum, Liddicoat (2007) argues that conversational closing is twofold. Firstly, it involves determining whether all points in the conversation have been introduced. Secondly, it involves an agreement to terminate the conversation and cease the turn-taking. Participants may also move to closure using other ways instead of using pre-closing components. In the next section, I review the literature on other closing implicative actions that participants may employ to bring conversations to closure.

4. The Closing Implicative Environment

As I have indicated above, participants may produce tokens such as "Okay" or "yeah" before terminating a conversation. However, such tokens may not always lead to closing (Liddicoat, 2007) because pre-closings are located at the analysable end of the topic (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Liddicoat, 2007). In this regard, it is possible to observe that during the course of closing, other materials (in addition to, or instead of) closing components may be introduced. These materials are referred to as the 'closing implicative environment' (Button, 1987). The term closing implicative environment refers to a "set of actions after which closing may be a relevant next activity and after which closure is a common activity but it does not imply that closure will necessarily happen after such action" (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 259). Button (1987) identified 'sequence types' that could lengthen the interactional closedown, or even end it. Button identified seven types which are used to move out of closure: references to arrangements, back-references, topic initial elicitors, in-conversation objects, 'solicitudes', reason-for-calls, and appreciation (p. 104). Liddicoat (2007) points out that these are closing implicative actions.

4.1 Announcing Closure

In ordinary conversations, conversationalists may move a conversation to closure by announcing it. The announcement of closure can be broadcast in different ways based on the needs of conversationalists. Liddicoat (2007) argues that "such announcements of closure usually invoke some external circumstances which warrant ending the current conversation, with a greater or lesser degree of specificity" (p. 259). In other words, if one of the participants in a conversation announces closure, the other participant may be influenced by such an announcement, and this may result in the termination of the closing sequence. In Example 3, Mandy announces the closure of the conversation and gives a reason for ending the call.

Example 3 [MK 2:11] (Cited in Liddicoat, 2007, p. 259)

1. Mandy: look Karen I gotta go now Tom's jus' got home
2. Karen: Okay [love
3. Mandy: [Okay
4. Karen: B-bye=
5. Mandy: =By::e

In line 1, Mandy announces the closure of the conversation using "I gotta go now." Accordingly, Karen acknowledges the announcement through "Okay love." The announcement of closure is not instantly followed by the terminal exchange, but rather a pre-closing sequence where passing turns are exchanged before the conversation is closed. Thus, the announcement does not indicate the immediate closure of the conversation but rather functions as a suggestion for closure as the next activity (Liddicoat, 2007). Moreover, Mary offers a warrant for the announcement of closure; that is "Tom's just got home." By this, we can observe that the announcement of closure is produced based on the needs of the person who announced the closure. Alternatively, conversationalists may also announce closure by referring to the addressee's needs. This is illustrated in Example 4. The speaker (Hope) invokes the recipient's needs from earlier in the talk.

Example 4 (Clay I 5) (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 261)

1. Mary: and he's going to come by himself I think
2. Hope: → Okay well I better let y' go now
3. Mary: Alright
4. Hope: Okay
5. Mary: Bye Hope
6. Hope: Bye

In line 2, Hope announces the closure using "I better let y' go now." Mary produces an acknowledgement of the closure through 'Alright'. Here, we observe that the formulation of the announcement is produced in an explicit way of the external need of her recipient to terminate the conversation. In other words, Hope's turn is not designed for the sake of her needs; but for the necessity to consider the needs of the addressee.

In sum, the typical way for announcing the closure of conversations is when one of the participants explicitly talks about the closure as a relevant activity i.e. "I have to go now" or "I must get home" which is also referred to as the internal needs of the person who initiates the announcement. Alternatively, participants may also announce the closure of conversations for the sake of the external needs of recipients i.e. "I should let you go." Moreover, participants may also make use of materials or objects as a warrant for closing such as dog barking, having dinner, fixing the car and the like.

4.2 Appreciations

As far as announcing closure is concerned, appreciation is also another form of closing implicative action (Button, 1987). Liddicoat (2007) argues that when appreciation occurs at the end of a conversation, it suggests that a conversation has arrived at a conclusion. In Example 5, Lucia and Fatima are the participants, and they are having a phone conversation.

Example 5 [Phone 2:9] (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 264)

1. Lucia: Okay I'll talk to yuh later
2. Fatima: Yeah thanks for calling
3. Lucia: Okay
4. Fatima: Okay
5. Lucia: Bye
6. Fatima: Bye

In line 2, Fatima produces a confirmation "Yeah" followed by an appreciation for making the call "thanks for calling." Lucia acknowledges the appreciation by producing a confirmation "Okay." When participants formulate an appreciation, this suggests that the conversation has been accomplished. In other words, it entails that there is no more relevant talk due to the current conversation and that participants can now move to the termination of the conversation (Liddicoat, 2007).

In news interviews, appreciation is the traditional method employed by the interviewer to close an interview (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). To illustrate this, let us examine Example 6. The participants in the conversation are the interviewer (IR) and the interviewee (IE). The IR prepares some moves, which are called a preface to final thanks.

Example 6, US ABC Nightline: 22 July 1985: South Africa

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| IR: Charles Gibson | IE1: Rev. Allan Boeask | IE2: Ambassador Herbert Beukes |
| 1. IR: | I am afraid we could go on forever. I am afraid | |
| 2. | that we have to stop at some point, and it's | |
| 3. | gonna have to be this point. Reverend Boeask and | |
| 4. → | Ambassador Beukes, thank you both ever so much | |
| 5. | for joining us. | |

(Cited in Clayman & Heritage, 2002, p. 77)

In line 4, the IR produces an appreciation of both interviewees through "thank you both" There are two observations that help explain why the appreciation is oriented to as termination relevant. Firstly, the appreciation occurs at the end of the interaction, which informs us that there are no terminal exchanges, as in face-to-face interaction, in news interviews. Secondly, appreciation is not usually produced without a preface to it (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). In other words, the IR prepares or winds down before he formulates an appreciation at which point the IR produces a couple of moves (see lines 1, 2, & 3). Moreover, the response to appreciation appears to be optional, as the IE has not reacted to the IR's appreciation.

In summary, appreciation is a very common strategy used by participants to move a conversation to closure. In addition, appreciation is

used as a signal that there are no further topics to be discussed in the conversation and that participants can now move to terminate the conversation. In ordinary conversations such as phone calls, the response to appreciation, is typically through acknowledging the thanks through tokens such as "Okay", whereas in other settings, such as news interviews, the response would either be exchanging the same appreciation term "thanks/thanks, or it could be an optional response; that is no verbal response to appreciation.

4.3 Arrangements

Arrangements are also considered closing implicative. Button (1987, p 143) claims, "Arrangements have been seen to be closing implicative but not terminal elective. That is, they move out of closing but this movement is minimal and provides for the termination of closing following a minimal return to the arrangement." In Example 7, Julie and Helen are coordinating to bring the conversation to closure by referring to the future arrangement:

Example 7 [JH:5:09-22] (cited in Liddicoat, 2007, p262)

1. Julie: .hh Yeah hh. (.) b'd I really won' know much
2. more ' n that until Kris gives me a call tuh
3. say wha' she' s gonna do.
4. (0.2)
5. Julie: Then I'll know more about it.
6. (0.2)
7. Helen: Yeah
8. (0.2)
9. Helen: → So lemme know w' ts happenin when yih know.
10. Julie: → Yeah okay I'll call yuh then.
11. Helen: Okay:
12. Julie: Okay
13. Helen: By [bye
14. Julie: [bye : :

In line 9, Helen enters into closing by producing "So lemme know w' ts happenin when yih know." Helen makes a future arrangement in line 10, and Julie accepts Helen's arrangement "Yeah okay I'll call yuh then." The future arrangement sequence offers a connection between the current conversation and a future conversation. Moreover, they orient to the prospective of conversational closing of social relationships (Liddicoat, 2007).

In sum, the sequence of arrangement is a closing implicative action which is typically composed of two turns. The first turn consists of the arrangement i.e. "I will see you in a month", whilst the second turn consists of an acknowledgement such as "okay/yeah." The arrangement sequences are typically formulated in order to link the current conversation with a future conversation. This is because participants may have not completed a debated topic, and they propose and confirm the arrangement in the current conversation in order to bring the conversation to closure.

5. Review of Related Literature

The closings of conversations have been well explored in several studies, namely telephone conversations (Okamoto, 1990; Auer, 1990; Takami, 2002; Selting, 2007; Harren, & Raitaniemi, 2008; Raitaniemi, 2008;), doctor-patient interactions (White et al, 1997; ten Have, 1989; Robinson's research, 2001; West, 2006, White, 2012; Park, 2013), talk shows (Mart ínez, 2003); news interviews (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

In telephone conversations, Harren, & Raitaniemi (2008) suggest that when ending phone conversations in German, there are typically two negotiation sequences involved. In the first sequence, participants engage in a discussion to determine if they are ready to conclude the conversation. We observed that apart from commonly used words like "gut" (meaning 'good'), phrases such as "dann sehen wir uns morgen" (meaning 'then we'll see each other tomorrow') are often employed in this initial negotiation. In the second sequence, participants negotiate the timing of their terminal greetings, such as saying "tschüss" (meaning 'bye'). This negotiation process frequently involves producing a series of utterances, like "okay – bis dann – tschüss" (meaning 'okay – till then – bye'), often overlapping with the partner's speech Harren, & Raitaniemi (2008). In another study, Okamoto (1990) found out that Japanese telephone conversations typically consist of two closing phases: pre-closing and leave-taking. In contrast, English telephone conversations involve three distinct stages of closing: pre-closing, leave-taking, and terminal exchanges. As a result, the researcher concluded that Japanese do not commonly utilize phrases like "sayonara" or "goodbye" in the same way that English speakers use "goodbye" during the terminal exchange phase.

In news interviews, Clayman & Heritage (2002) found out news interview closings can be achieved through a prearranged schedule using the following: earlier efforts at winding down, preface to final thanks, winding down, and terminating. Unlike casual conversations, news

interviews are tightly structured and constrained by the time limits of broadcasting schedules. As a result, interviewers play a crucial role in managing the closing process, including initiating all sequences of action that lead to the conclusion of the interview (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Similarly, Martínez (2003) analysed how talk show interviews are brought to an end. The closing process of televised talk shows is analysed and compared with Clayman's (1989) characterization of news interview closings. The study concludes that closings in both genres share features relating to the structural organization and the participants' behaviour which can be accounted for in terms of the institutional context in which the speech events take place (Martínez, 2003).

In doctor-patient interaction, there are four different types of possible pre-closing that have been identified in medical interactions. These are arrangement-making, final-concern sequences, pre-closing announcements and passing a turn (Robinson, 2001, West, 2006, White, 2012; Park, 2013). In another study, Ten Have (1989) noted that the closing sequence begins with the pre-closing phase, which includes the final concern question such as "anything else?" Robinson's (2001) research showed that the closure phase is characterized by the use of "goodbye" type phrases, such as "goodbye," "see you later," "good day," and so on.

This study aims to analyse how illegal interventions in the Jordanian parliament are brought to closure. It is pertinent to note that the participants' rights and roles in this study are distinct and differ from ordinary conversation, which significantly influences the way closings are conducted. The closing of the interactions is more unilateral and brief due to the restrictive nature of the participation framework, resulting in a distinctive closing format.

6. Methodology

The analysis of the data in this study focuses on 41 instances of heckling that took place within the Jordanian parliament. The participants involved in the study are adult males and females. The data was collected from the publicly available videos on YouTube, specifically from recordings of the Jordanian parliament sessions. All of the data was transcribed following the conventions of conversation analysis (CA) as outlined by Jefferson (2004).

The transcription process in this study involved three steps. Firstly, the Arabic language data was transliterated into English. Secondly, I personally conducted the transcription instead of outsourcing it to someone else. This allowed me to have firsthand experience with and better handle the data, rather than relying on a transcriber. Thirdly, the transcription included the translation of the Arabic language (Clift & Helani, 2010, Alqatawna, 2022). Regarding the translation, the original Arabic language was presented, followed by a morpheme-by-morpheme 'gloss', and finally, a line-by-line translation into the language used in the publication.

6.1 Analysis

The chosen method for analysis in this study was conversation analysis, which involves examining recordings and written documents to explore how participants initiate their speech turns and the resulting outcomes. Specifically, it looks at how they position themselves in relation to these turns (Clayman & Gill, 2004). The study also utilized the "noticing method" (Clayman & Gill, 2004, p. 597) to carefully observe and identify recurring actions performed by the participants. This approach allowed us to gain insights into how these actions are constructed, where they are placed in sequence, how other participants respond to them, and the outcomes that follow. Additionally, we incorporated a technique called "deviant cases analysis" (ten Have, 2007) which involves using "analytic induction" to draw general conclusions from negative findings. Thus, distinguishing between recurring and deviant cases relies, at least partially, on observing patterns of regularity (Pallotti, 2007, p. 59).

7. Results and Discussion

7.1 Closing Illegal Interventions

The closing of illegal interventions in the Jordanian parliament shares some similarities with closings in ordinary conversations; however, it is worth noting that there are some differences. These differences distinguish the closing of illegal interventions from casual conversations. It is significant to know about the design of closings in ordinary conversation as well as news interviews because they inform us that closings are negotiated over several turns. In other words, participants collaborate with each other in order to close the interaction. However, closings in this study are different in the sense that participants do not collaborate with each other, and that closings are brought about by a single speaker i.e. the CP in a single turn. This section aims to shed light on the analysis of closing illegal interventions led by the CP. The closing of illegal interventions section is divided into three sub-sections, these are; termination of illegal interventions, the closing of implicative actions for public audience members, and the closing of implicative actions for unratified members of the parliament.

In ordinary conversation, termination is produced through mutual collaboration and negotiation between participants (Button, 1990). Participants produce termination of relevant actions to propose and bring about the closing of the conversation. However, the termination of illegal interventions for UPs is different because it is not achieved through mutual collaboration. Recurrently the CP ends the interaction without securing the collaboration of the UP. Since the context of the study deals with an institutional setting, where the internal regulation of the parliament stipulates that UPs in the gallery should not interfere with the parliamentary business; the situation is very different from ordinary interaction. It is pertinent to note that CPs of the parliament possess institutional powers which enable them to prevent illegal interventions either in the gallery or during another MP's speech. The majority of the analysed cases reveal that it is the CP(s) who initiate the closing of the interactions, and this is because it is their responsibility to close illegal interventions launched by UPs. The CP usually attempts to manage the closure of an unsanctioned interaction in order to keep the session progressing smoothly.

In sum, participants do not negotiate the closing nor do they exchange farewell tokens such as bye/bye or its equivalents. However, illegal

interventions are brought to closure through the closing implicative actions. It is worth mentioning that in ordinary conversation, speakers usually share control of the talk. However, in this study, the CP's responsibility is to end intrusions by the UP. That is, the CP has the authority and obligations to close an interaction, whilst other speakers do not have this. In the following section, I will closely analyse how the CP uses such strategies to bring the interaction of illegal interventions to closure.

7.2 The Closing Implicative Environment

This section presents the closing actions which are used by the CP to close illegal interventions for Members of Parliament. The data analysis informs us that the CP routinely uses the following strategies to bring the interaction to closure: announcing closure, appreciation, demands to obey the rules, and warnings to suspend the session of the parliament.

7.2.1 Announcing closure

Announcing closure is one of the ways one of the participants may move a conversation to closure (Liddicoat, 2007). In this study, the CP always launches the announcement of the closure of an interaction. A predominant action which allows the CP to announce the closure as the next activity is when UPs disrupt a speaker during a speech. Thus, it becomes necessary to announce the closure in order to keep the orderliness of the parliament session progressing. Alternatively, the CP may also dismiss Members of Parliament who violate the internal regulations, especially when the UP (such as a Member of Parliament) insists on disrupting a CS's speech or affecting the progress of parliamentary sessions, however, this kind of occasion has not been witnessed in the data. In 4 of the 41 instances, the CP announces the closure of the interaction. For the first example of announcing closure, see Example (8).

Example 8

1. CP: [ya Yahya] (.) ya Yahya
PRT NAME (.) PRT NAME
[ya Yahya] (.) ya Yahya
2. UP: [?nawab lazim yekhafu:k min ?lqaʕa ha ði=
MPs must dismiss from the this hall
The MPs must dismiss you out of this hall [parliament]
3. CP: →= xalas yahya xalas inhi (.) ?llah yerða ?leek (.)
Enough Yahya enough end it God's mercy on you
[That's] enough Yahya put an end to this (.) gods mercy on you (.)
4. CP: yahya m?leish
Yahya please
Yahya please
5. CP: tfedal dawalt ?ra?i:s (2.0) tfedal dawalt ?ra?i:s
you may state President you may state President
you may speak your excellency (2.0) you may speak your excellency

In line 3, the CP announces the closure of the interaction using "that's enough Yahya end it (.) god's mercy on you." Here we can observe that the announcement of closure occurs in an imperative form, as the CP demands the UP to cease talking using "end it"; this indicates that the CP talks explicitly about the closing. When the CP utters an explicit announcement of closure, it does not mean that a UP will definitely withdraw from the interaction. The analysis of the data has shown that UP participants (particularly Members of Parliament) do not easily withdraw from interaction if they have not made their point or have not been successful in fulfilling their demands.

For a different case, the CP moves the interaction by informing the UP that his point is acknowledged. In order to illustrate this, see example (9).

Example 9

1. CP: <xalas^s xalas^s xalas^s>
enough enough enough
<enough enough enough>
2. UP: haða qanu:n muwa:zna ?na tʔalbt mink noqtʔit niðam
this law arbitrage I demand from you system point
this is an arbitrage law I demanded from you a system point
3. UP: bagolak ma fi nesʕab=

- say no there quorum
I'm telling you there is no quorum=
4. CP:→ = xalas^s hkeit ?li findk
 enough you said PRT have
= enough you made ?li your point
5. UP: Sid ya sidi Sid =
 count PRT PRT count
count ya sidi count =
6. CP: = xalas^s hkeit ?li findk
 enough you said what PRT have
= enough you made your point
7. UP: Sid ya sidi Sid
 count PRTsir

In line 4, the CP announces the closing of the interaction using “*enough you have made your point.*” By this, the CP inexplicitly suggests that the UP has delivered his point and no further talk is due. In other words, the CP produces an announcement which is very similar to the closing implicative environment (Liddicoat, 2007) to withdraw him from the interaction. Moreover, when the CP produces this, it invokes an indeterminate external condition that has an impact on the speaker’s ability to proceed in the current conversation (Button, 1990; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). A typical and obvious way to close an interaction is done explicitly; that is, talking about the closure “*Please end it.*” This announcement of closure is noticeable because the initiator of closing talks clearly about the closing. However, most closures appear not to include such announcements, instead, they are done through a closing implicative environment but without talking explicitly about the closure as a relevant activity (Liddicoat, 2007, p. 261). In Example (8), we have seen that the CP does not explicitly move to the closure by asking the UP to withdraw from the interaction, instead, he does it by talking inexplicitly about closure as a relevant activity, that is “you made your point.”

In sum, the announcement of closure consists of a single turn of talk, which is initiated by the CP as an ultimate need. The announcement of closure is produced either explicitly or inexplicitly. The former occurs when one of the participants talks clearly about closure as a relevant activity using an imperative character such as “*end it*”, whilst the latter occurs when one of the participants talks inexplicitly about closure such as “*you made your point.*” The participants of the interaction do not negotiate the closing of the sequence, instead, the addressees of the announcement withdraw from the interaction.

7.2.2 Appreciation

Appreciations, thanking and offering gratitude are actions which participants use to close a conversation (Liddicoat, 2007). An important question is raised; how is appreciation used in an institutional setting such as the Jordanian Parliament? As I have indicated, the literature informs us that the design of appreciation is designed in an implicit way which participants use in order to move a conversation to an end. The typical way of terminating the interaction occurs when the CP initiates the closing by thanking the UP for his/her participation. In ordinary conversations, appreciations are usually acknowledged through exchanging tokens such as “thank you.” However, in the context of this study, a response to “thank you” appears to be optional (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). In other words, the UP does not exchange thank you with the CP. The analysis of the data reveals that appreciations are found, but in a limited frequency (out of the 41, I found 5 instances), and this is due to the fact the UPs illegally intervene. Thus, it may be a reason why the CP does not offer appreciation for their inappropriate attitude.

What follows are three examples of appreciation where the CP aims at terminating the interaction. Firstly, in example 10, some Members of Parliament gather in the parliament gallery as a way of protesting against the government. One of them disrupts the CS speech through “THEY SOLD IT” in a loud voice (see line 2). The CP intervenes to manage the situation.

Example 10

1. UP: ((stood up and approaches the end edge of the balcony))
2. UP: [?lmalakya] bafoha ma ðal ?ji bilmalakia=
 The Royalty] sold not left in the royalty
[The Royal Jordanian] has been sold nothing is left in the RJ
3. CP:→ = tab fokran ilko ?rjo ?n nahtarem [?ljalsa]
 PRT thank you kindly we should respect the session

PRT thank you kindly we should respect [the session]

4. UP [ma tha] eshi bilmalakia klo ba3ooha=
the not left thing in the royalty is everything is sold
[nothing is] left in the (royal Jordanian) they have sold it

5. CP: xo ðlak ʕadeh=
PRT PRT
((expression used to express disaffiliation))

In line 3, the CP produces an appreciation to Members of Parliament who protest in the gallery using “*thank you all*” followed by a demand to obey the rules using “*we should respect the session.*” Here, it is clearly observed that appreciation occurs at the beginning of the turn. When the CP uses the strategy of appreciation, this means that he does not seek to continue the talk with the UP. In addition, we can see that the CP uses the latter expression by addressing the talk in a plural form “all” instead of addressing the UP to respect the session, despite that it is only one Member of Parliament who disrupts the CS.

For a deviant case, see Example (11). The UP criticises the Prime Minister and the minister of interior for talking whilst a Member of Parliament gives a speech. The CP intervenes to manage the situation by demanding the UP respect the internal regulations.

Example 11

1. CP: [lw samht]
excuse me
[excuse me]
2. CP: Abo Abo Haditha=
PRT PRT NAME
Abo Abo Haidtha=
3. UP: =moʃ ʕeeb ?lhaki hað
no shame this talk
=Isn't it a shame to say this
4. UP: [()]
5. CP: [lw samht lw samht
excuse me me
[excuse me excuse me
6. UP: ([])
- 7.→CP: [ʔrjo ?bu hadi:Øa] ?nak tihtarim ?neðam ?ddaxli tislm
[Please NAME] you (singular) respect the internal regulations thanks
[please Abu Haditha] respect the internal regulations thanks
8. UP: ((sits down))
9. AUD: ()
10. CP: ?oskot ya Mhmd ?nta
shut up NAME you
shut up Mohammad
11. MP: ()
12. CP: kamil ya Naif kamil ya Naif
Continue PRT NAME continue PRT NAME
Continue ya Naif continue ya Naif

In line 7, the CP produces two TCUs. Firstly, the CP launches a demand to obey the rules of the internal regulations, followed by an appreciation token thanks.” In contrast to example (10), the appreciation is positioned at the end of the turn. The CP aims to close the interaction using an appreciation token “*thanks.*” Through the appreciation token, the CP shows that there is no more talk will be produced and that appreciation is the last topic.

In sum, appreciations are always launched by the CP in order to terminate the interaction. Although appreciations are used as a means of

moving a conversation to closure in casual conversations, in this study they are used to terminate an interaction. The typical way to use appreciation is by saying it on its own in a single turn, as in example (10). Other forms of appreciation can be produced within the talk, either pre-positioned appreciation as in example (11).

7.2.3 Demands to Obey the Rules

Demands are used as an interesting strategy to terminate an interaction by telling the Members of Parliament of the internal regulation. The design of demands to obey the rules of the internal regulations obligates UPs not only to limit their participation but also to withdraw from interaction. In 5 of the 41 instances, the CP launches in demanding the UPs to obey the rules of the internal regulations. First, see Example 12).

Example 12

1. CP: ()
2. UP: fi moqtarah qodim
there proposal submitted
a proposal has been submitted
3. Aud: ()
4. CP:→ lw samhtu (.) ?rju ?nkom tahtaremo ?neð'am ?ddaxili= ((sharp tone))
excuse me (plural) (.) Please you respect the internal regulations
Excuse me please I hope that you respect the internal regulations =
5. UP: =sʕadat ?ra?is fi moqtarah ()=
Your excellency their proposal
= Your Excellency there is a proposal
6. CP: =nʕam fi ʕedet moqtarahat saʕrahha bitasʕwi:t ((in sharp tone)) (1.0)
Yes there are some proposal that will give through voting
= Yes there are some proposals I will give to you through voting

In line 4, the CP produces the expression “*excuse me*”, followed by a demand to obey the rules of the internal regulations “*Please I hope that you (plural) respect the internal regulations.*” Demanding Members of Parliament to follow the internal regulations is an implicit way of closing. Members of Parliament should be aware that disciplinary actions will take place if they do not apply the regulations. In other words, if a Member of Parliament seeks to disrupt a speaker while talking, the CP may take actions, such as dissolving the session for ten minutes, or even it could reach to dismiss a Member of Parliament of the parliament of that day's sitting. However, using such actions depends on various circumstances such as the CP's point of view and the internal regulations procedures for dissolving a parliament session etc. A predominance feature has been noticed where the CP produces the demand in a sharp tone, which projects disaffiliation to the UP's illegal intervention, as well as to other members who may plan to illegally intervene.

For a second example of demands to obey the rules of regulations, see Example). The CP manages an illegal intervention where a Member of Parliament (UP) sits in the parliament's gallery in company with other Members of Parliament. It is uncommon for Members of Parliament to sit in the gallery, but this is an exceptional case, where these members protest against the government.

Example 13

1. UP: ((stood up and approaches to the end edge of the balcony))
2. UP: [ʔlmalakya] baʕoha ma ʕal ?ʕi bilmalakia=
[The Royalty] sold not left in the royalty
[The Royal Jordanian] has been sold nothing is left in the RJ
3. CP:→ = tab ʕokran ilko ?rjo ?n nahtarem [ʔljalsa]
PRT thank to you kindly we should respect the session
PRT thank you kindly we should respect [the session]
4. UP [ma thal] eshi bilmalakia klo baʕooha=
not left thing in the royalty everything is sold
[nothing is] left in the (royal Jordanian) they have sold it
5. CP: xo ʕlak ʕadeh=
PRT PRT
((expression used to express disaffiliation))

In line 3, the CP produces two TCUs of closing. The first one is an appreciation to Members of Parliament who are seated in the gallery through “*thank to you.*” Here the CP offers appreciation not only to the UP who have illegally intervened in the CS, but also to all Members of Parliament who are seated in the gallery. The second TCU comprises a demand to obey the regulations using “*kindly we should respect the session.*” Demands to obey the rules of the internal regulations is a powerful strategy to close the interaction because such a demand affects the opponent and they will orient to the CP.

In sum, demands to obey the rules of the internal regulations consist of a single turn, which is initiated by the CP as the closing of the interaction. The CP demands UPs obey the internal rules of the parliament. The typical design of demand occurs in an imperative character using “*please respect the internal regulations.*” It appears that demands are an effective device for closing illegal interventions, as UPs withdraw from interactions.

7.2.4 Warnings to Suspend the Session of the Parliament

The CP may exercise control over Members of Parliament who are unratiated to speak in terms of warning them before suspending the parliament session. In 5 of the 41 instances, the CP warns Members of Parliament to suspend the parliament session. Before the CP announces the closure of the interaction by suspending the parliament session, he often makes a preface to it. In order to illustrate this, see Example 14).

Example 14

18. CP: iða bidku ti7tarmu majlis ?lnawab yuftrað ?n tahtarimo ?lri?asa wa
If want you respect parliament MPs presumed to respect the chairship and
If you respect the parliament of MPs presumably you should respect the chairship and
19. tahtarimu ?niðam ?daxili
respect the regulations internal
respect the internal regulations
20. CP:→ ?na mohtar ella raf? ?ljlsa ?lla () ?raf? ?ljlsa
I obliged to adjourn the session to I adjourn the session
I obliged to adjourn the session to I adjourn the session
21. MPs: lyf tirfa? ?ljalsa
why adjourn the session
why did you adjourn the session

In line 20, the CP warns Members of Parliament that the session will be suspended using “*I obliged to adjourn the session to.*” This warning shows that the closing is imminent. In the same turn, the CP continues to launch an announcement of closing the parliament session using “*I adjourn the session.*” Through this turn, it is observed that the CP makes an explicit announcement of closing the interaction based on his needs. The announcement of closure occurs because the CP is not successful in bringing the interaction to an end. Also, the UP is not collaborative with the CP in closing the interaction. This announcement shows that there will be no talk from the CP’s side in the parliament.

Similarly, in Example 15, the CP initiates the closing of the interaction by warning Members of Parliament in the gallery that the session of the parliament will be suspended for ten minutes.

Example 15

10. CP: (2.0) tfdal (.) ?smholi (1.0)
You may allow me
(2.0) please (.) allow me (1.0)
11. Aud: () ((inaudible voices from the gallery))
12. CP: ya ?xwan (.) ya ?xwan ?li bilfurfa (.) ya axwan ?li bilfurfa (.) ya
PRT brothers (.) PRT brothers PRT the gallery (.) PRT in the gallery (.) PRT
ya brothers (.) ya brothers in gallery (.) ya brothers ?li in the gallery (.)ya
13. CP:→ ?xwan ?li bilfurfa(.) ?na s?ðt’ar (.) ?na saðt’ar ?rf? ?ljalsa w?xli ?l
PRT PRT in gallery I obliged I obliged to suspend session and evacuate the
?xwan ?li in the gallery (.) I’m obliged (.) I’m obliged to suspend the session and evacuate the
14. CP: → ?ljfurfa (.) saðt’r ?n ?rf? ?ljalsa (.) w?xli ?ljfurfa i ða lazam (.) ?rf?
gallery obliged to suspend the session and evacuate the galley if must
the gallery (.) I’m obliged to suspend the session (.) and evacuate the gallery if necessary I suspend the session

15. CP:→ ?ljalsa lemudat ʕshr daqaʔq ?rfʕ ?ljalsa
the session for ten minutes suspend the session
the session for ten minutes I shall suspend the session
16. Aud: (()) bravo bravo
(()) **well done well done**

In line 13, the CP warns Members of Parliament who reside in the gallery using “*I’m obliged (.) I’m obliged to suspend the session.*” Here, it is observed that the CP shows that the closing of the parliament session is forthcoming if they do not stop from making disruptions of the session. Again in line 14, the CP warns them again but this time he adds “*and evacuate the gallery if necessary.*” This shows if members in the gallery were not cooperative with the CP, the closing of the parliament session would be imminent. In lines 14 and 15, the CP announces the closure of the interaction using “the session for ten minutes suspend the session I suspend the session.” Example (14) and Example (15) are very similar in terms of their design. For example, the occurrence of the warning occurs approximately before the CP makes the announcement. In other words, the CP issues the preface of the announcement and then immediately rushes into announcing the closure.

In sum, warning a Member of Parliament who is unratiſed to speak is always initiated by the CP in order to announce the closure of the interaction. The warning occurs before the parliament session is suspended by the CP; this shows that the closing of the interaction is imminent.

8. Conclusion

In this paper, I aimed to look at the closings of illegal interventions, in particular by the CP. The findings show that interactions are brought to a closure in a unilateral fashion. Participants do not negotiate the closing of illegal interventions and thus there is no termination of an interaction. The most remarkable finding is that the CP always initiates the closing of an interaction using the closing implicative environment: announcing the closure, appreciation, demands to obey the internal regulations of the parliament, and warning to suspend the session of the parliament. The participation framework is significant in closing illegal interventions. In ordinary conversation, participants usually have equal status and equal rights to the floor, especially when closing the interaction. Consequently, this results in extended sequences of closure where participants collaborate and negotiate the closing. In this study, however, the rights and the roles of participants are very different (from each other and from ordinary talk). This has a significant impact on the way closings are done, especially with the CP doing closings. Therefore, closing interactions in this study are unilateral and brief because of the effect of the participation framework.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research, Vice Presidency for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabi KFU241060.

Authors contributions

Dr. Mohammad Alqatawna was responsible for study design and revision. He was responsible for data collection and analysis. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia KFU241060.

Competing interests

The author declares that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal’s policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

References

- Alqatawna, M. I. (2022). Heckling in Parliamentary Interactions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(9), 1770-1782. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1209.09>
- Auer, P. (1990). Rhythm in telephone closings. *Human Studies*, 13, 361-392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00193570>
- Button, G. (1987). Moving out of closings. In G. Button & J. R. Lee. (Eds.). *Talk and social organisation*. (pp. 101-151). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800418226-007>
- Button, G. (1990). On varieties of closing. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interaction Competence* (pp. 93-148). Washington: University Press of America.
- Clayman, S. E. (1989). The Production of Punctuality: Social Interaction, Temporal Organization, and Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(3), 659-691. <https://doi.org/10.1086/229329>
- Clayman, S., & Gill, V. (2004). Conversation analysis. In M. A. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of data analysis*. (pp. 589-606). London, England: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608184.n26>
- Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613623>
- Clift, R., & Helani, F. (2010). Inshallah: Religious invocations in Arabic topic transition. *Language in Society*, 39(3), 357-382. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000199>
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at Work. Interaction in Institutional Settings* (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Harren, I., & Raitaniemi, M. (2008). The sequential structure of closings in private German phone calls. *Gesprächsforschung online*, 9, 198-223.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices, and applications*. Malden, Mass: Polity Press.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, (pp.13-34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting the next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, 32(2), 177-201. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450332202X>
- Levinson, S. C. (1988) Putting linguistics on a proper footing: explorations in Goffman's concepts of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wootton (Eds.). *Erving Goffman. Exploring the Interaction Order*. (pp. 161-227). Cambridge: Polity.
- Liddicoat, A. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Mart ínez, E. R. (2003). Accomplishing Closings in Talk Show Interviews: A Comparison with News Interviews. *Discourse Studies*, 5(3), 283-302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456030053001>
- O'Driscoll, J. (2018). Dances with footings: a Goffmanian perspective on the Soto case. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 14(1), 39-62. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2017-0038>
- Pallotti, G. (2007). Conversation Analysis: Methodology, machinery and application to specific settings. In H. Bowles & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *Conversation Analysis and Language for Specific Purposes*. (pp. 37-68). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Park, Y. (2013). Negotiating last-minute concerns in closing Korean medical encounters: The use of gaze, body and talk. *Social Science & Medicine*, 97, 176-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.08.027>
- Robinson, J. D. (2001). Asymmetry in action: Sequential resources in the negotiation of a prescription request. *Text & Talk*, 21(1-2), 19-54. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.21.1-2.19>
- Robinson, J. D. (2013). Overall Structural Organization. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers. (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis*. (pp. 257-280). Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118325001.ch13>
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis I* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791208>
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289>
- Selting, M., (2007): Beendigung(en) als interaktive Leistung. In: Hausendorf, Heiko (Hg.): *Sprache als Prozess*. Tübingen: Narr, 307-338.

- Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed). London: SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208895>
- Ten Have, P. (1989). *The consultation as a genre*. Text and talk as social practice.115-35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111684369>
- West, C. (2006). Coordinating closings in primary care visits: producing continuity of care. *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*, 20, 379. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172.015>
- White, J. C., Rosson, C., Christensen, J., Hart, R., & Levinson, W. (1997). Wrapping things up: a qualitative analysis of the closing moments of the medical visit. *Patient education and counselling*, 30(2), 155-165. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991\(96\)00962-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991(96)00962-7)
- White, S. J. (2012). Closing surgeon-patient consultations. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 4(1), 58-79. <https://doi.org/10.1163/187731012X632063>