

Mediation Discourse in Moroccan Television: A Conversation Analytic Study of Interactional Practices in “*The Mediator*” TV Show

Ilham Malki¹

¹ Assistant Professor, English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Hassan II University, Casablanca, Morocco

Correspondence: Ilham MALKI, Assistant Professor, English Department, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Hassan II University, Casablanca, Morocco.

Received: October 27, 2025

Accepted: December 22, 2025

Available online: February 12, 2026

doi:10.11114/ijsss.v14i1.8479

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v14i1.8479>

Abstract

This study investigates the interactional framework of mediation discourse in the Moroccan television program “The Mediator”. Drawing upon Conversation Analysis (CA) (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974), and Goffman’s (1981) concept of participation framework, the study examines how mechanisms of institutional discourse, more precisely the turn-taking system, participation statuses, and hybrid interactional framework, operate to handle interpersonal disputes. By conducting an in-depth analysis of selected episodes, the study probes into how the principal mediator, disputants, and co-mediators jointly reframe conflict narratives, oscillate between institutional and conversational speech exchange systems, and negotiate their positions within a media-regulated context. The findings of the study reveal how institutional discourse practices such as pre-allocated turns, structurally determined participation framework, and regulated dyadic interaction are strategically implemented to minimise discordance and uphold normative protocols of mediation and conflict resolution processes. The present study contributes to a comprehensive understanding of how the interactional framework of mediation functions as a discursive mechanism to mitigate confrontation and reframe contentious issues. It further addresses a critical gap in the literature by examining mediation and conflict resolution discourse within Arab and North African contexts, regions that have received limited attention in media and discourse research.

Keywords: Conflict, mediation, discourse, institutional discourse, interaction, participation framework

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview of “The Mediator” as a Televised Conflict Resolution Platform

“The Mediator” is a Moroccan televised show that handles real-life interpersonal conflicts and assists disputants to negotiate their interests and positions effectively through broadcast mediation. The show is modeled around a lead mediator, Nassima El Hor, and co-mediators, acting as field-specific experts, who invite disputants to a studio setting, listen to their concerns, and interpose to direct the dispute towards constructive management. As a hybrid show that merges legal, therapeutic, and entertainment genres, “The Mediator” exemplifies a wider trend in contemporary media that blurs the boundaries between reality and performance. Such hybrid formats lay the groundwork for in-depth analysis of institutional discourse, particularly how conflict arises, is escalated, and de-escalated in mediated contexts.

1.2 Research Problem

Despite the program’s considerable popularity among Moroccan audiences and normative objectives of fostering social harmony and reconciliation, little academic interest has been directed to the discursive and interactional strategies that define the dynamics of mediation and conflict resolution. Much of the existing studies overlook the discursive tactics, leaving a considerable gap in academic understanding of how mediated conflict talk is discursively and interactionally handled in televised contexts (Hutchby, 2006; Thornborrow, 2010).

Within the context of televised media talk, whereby mediation shows are no exception, interaction is far from neutral; rather, it functions within a thoroughly institutionalised and media-regulated discourse framework (Fairclough, 1995; Tolson, 2006; Hutchby, 2006). It is shaped by production routines (behind-the-scenes-procedures), interactional norms, and performance expectations that determine who speaks and when, how participants are positioned, and how moral

and emotional authority is discursively established. The interaction in such shows is thereby both dialogic and performative, combining aspects of legal inquiry, therapeutic counselling, and entertainment (Loxley, 2006; Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Livingstone & Lunt, 1994).

A further focus of this study is the discursive role of the third party in "The Mediator" TV show, whose institutional power is enacted through the strategic use of discursive and conversational strategies including turn allocation, question design, summarization, and reframing (Goffman, 1981; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Mediators in these settings consistently alternate between roles such as facilitator, counsellor, and moral judge, and these roles are enacted and negotiated through their talk.

Irrespective of the fundamental role of discursive mechanisms in managing interpersonal conflicts, few studies have adopted conversation analysis in the investigation of media-based mediation in Arabic-speaking or North African contexts (Malki, 2018). Therefore, the current study seeks to examine the talk format, turn-taking system (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974), and participation framework (Goffman, 1981). By exploring these discourse mechanisms, this research provides insightful understanding of how the interactional framework of *"The Mediator" TV show* leads to the effective management of interpersonal disagreements. In more depth, this research is steered by the following questions:

1. How is the talk format of "The Mediator" TV show systematically organised to promote mediated interaction among disputants, the lead mediator, and co-mediators?
2. What discourse aspects define the speech exchange system in "The Mediator" TV show?
3. What discourse patterns are integrated within the hybrid interactional framework of mediation hearings in "The Mediator" TV show?

By drawing upon conversation analysis of Arabic-language televised mediation, the current research contributes to institutional discourse studies by offering empirical insights into an underexamined North African media discourse field.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1 Conversation as a Basis for Social Interaction

Ordinary talk serves as the fundamental model upon which distinct types of institutional discourse is compared and explored. The foundational work of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) on the systematics of conversation has demonstrated that ordinary conversation is regulated by a set of interactional conventions that are situationally negotiated in real-time. These conventions structure the organization of turn-taking, the sequencing of repair, and the management of conversational topics. In everyday interaction, speakers self-select or are selected by the current speaker to contribute to the flow of conversation, thereby minimizing silence and overlapping talk (Sacks et al., 1974; Levinson, 1983). Turns are flexibly managed and interactants often co-construct meaning through adjacency pairs, repair sequences, and topic shifts. Although such interactional norms make ordinary talk appear inherent, they are grounded in systematic patterns that sustain coherence and order.

Furthermore, in ordinary conversation, roles are not pre-determined, and interactants are expected to maintain equitable engagement in the progression of talk. Everyday talk is also shaped by relational goals, such as building rapport, expressing emotions, and maintaining social bonds (Tannen, 1984). The dynamic patterns of everyday conversation are further guided by Grice's (1975) cooperative principle, which posits that interlocutors tend to provide informative, truthful, relevant, and clear information to ensure mutual understanding. These maxims of conversation lay the groundwork for investigating how more patterned types of conversational behaviours deviate from these norms in institutional contexts like mediation.

Equally important, everyday conversation is fundamentally shaped by the prerequisite of managing face which designates the social value individuals identify themselves with (Goffman, 1967). Within social interactions, participants tend to prioritize the relational outcomes of their utterances instead of orienting themselves towards the content of talk. To that end, interlocutors invoke a set of politeness strategies to manage face-threatening acts and sustain social cohesion. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory posits that the tendency towards the adoption of either positive face strategies (strategies that promote connection and a sense of belonging to a social group) or negative face strategies (strategies that uphold individuals' autonomy and freedom of action), is conditioned by the situational setting of the interaction and the social proximity between participants. Notably, politeness strategies are not only micro-level conventions; rather, they are imbricated in the structure of interaction to minimize confrontation and sustain empathy, rapport, and social harmony. This implies that face management needs to be acknowledged as a pertinent interactional concern that regulates the construction of turn units, how oppositions are articulated, and how interactional cooperation is attained.

2.2 Institutional Discourse and Its Distinctiveness

Institutional discourse is inherently regulated by interactional constraints, more precisely, pre-defined goals, restricted turn-taking systems, institution-specific speech acts, and role asymmetry (Hutchby, 2006). These distinctive features shape how participants are introduced, how narrative rights are distributed among interlocutors, and how speaking turns are systemised. Mediation, in particular, is typically a highly governed interactional context where the third party strives to manage communication effectively.

Moore (2014) defines mediation as “a conflict resolution process in which a mutually acceptable third party, who has no authority to make binding decisions for disputants, intervenes in a conflict or dispute to assist involved parties to improve their relationships, enhance communication, and use effective problem-solving and negotiation procedures to reach voluntary and mutually acceptable understandings or agreements on contested issues” (p.8). Unlike arbitration, mediation is structured around communication, with the third party managing the interaction instead of enforcing unilateral decisions. In this context, the mediator's role is fundamentally interactional, fostering effective dialogue, managing interactional power imbalances, and handling participants' positions.

Within a pragmatic-interactional framework, mediation is best conceived as a genre of institutional talk (Heritage, & Clayman, (2010); Roberts et al., (2004); Drew, & Heritage, (1992)), whereby participants adhere to discursive and interactional conventions. In contrast to ordinary conversation that is spontaneous and guided by cooperative turn-taking systems, adjacency pairs, and topic negotiation (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974), institutional discourse swerves from those typical attributes of everyday interaction and sustains an interactional framework where speaking turns are pre-allocated and topic shifts are controlled. This is consistent with discourse research that underlines how institutional roles are discursively established and maintained through nuanced interactional patterns (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 2008; Greatbatch & Dingwall, 1990).

2.3 Participation Framework

Within any mundane or institutional interaction, participants involved in an interactional activity seek to find a space within a conversation. Such forms of involvement in the midst of talk refer to the notion of 'the participation framework' (Goffman, 1981). Goffman (1981) argues, "When a word is spoken, all those who happen to be in a perceptual range of the event will have some sort of participation status relative to it. The codification of these various positions and the normative specification of appropriate conduct within each provide an essential background for interaction analysis" (p.3). Participation framework is a structured scheme that analyzes the manifold roles participants play in an interactional event. For example, if we consider a group of five people involved in an interaction in a family dinner, there will be two ranges of participants who occasionally undertake the role of addresser or, the 'main speaker' and who are the main addressees of each other's talk. The other three individuals in the group are assumed to be acknowledged participants in the interaction but are 'non-addressed' participants or bystanders' (Goffman, 1981). The clusters of utterances the main speaker produces, then, are not directed towards them. At the level of talk production, Goffman (1981) postulates that utterances could be "authored" by the speaker, or "animated" on behalf of another. Speakers can alter their relationship to the conversational actions they are introducing through the use of 'footing shifts' mechanism.

2.4 Dispute Talk

Within the realm of discourse studies, dispute discourse has evolved as a core focus in Conversation Analysis (CA) because it provides a unique interactional context through which researchers can explore the interactional mechanics implemented by opposing parties to articulate disagreement, negotiate adversarial positions, and maintain the sequential organization of conflictual discourse. Far from being conceptualised as a verbal argument where speakers develop confrontational attitudes and negotiate power relations, dispute discourse emerges as a set of conversational behaviours that escalate disagreement into sustained confrontation delineated by emotional intensity, disruptions to the flow of conversation, including competitive overlaps and interruptions, and face-threatening acts (Van Meurs, & Spencer-Oatey, 2010; Grimshaw, 1990).

Significantly, conflict discourse is identified by subtle communicative attributes that distinguish it from collaborative genres of talk. As has been asserted by Angouri (2012), conflict discourse is framed in terms of remarkable organizational features, namely oppositional adjacency pairs (e.g., accusation-denial, arguments-counterargument), face-threatening acts, and competitive turn-taking behaviours. Of particular attention is the fact that these features are tightly interrelated with the social roles conflict serves in human interaction, which most often incorporate maintaining power, resisting control, and expressing hostility. Conflict discourse, therefore serves both interactional and ideological objectives. Not only does it impede rapport and social harmony but indexes status hierarchies, power imbalance, and competitive accounts.

Furthermore, dispute discourse often embodies meta-pragmatic comments (Silverstein, 1993) by which interlocutors

orient towards the disputing nature of interaction, framing the discourse as argumentative through conversational strategies such as paralinguistic cues, framing devices, and disagreement constructs. In this context, conflict discourse marks itself as an interactional system with its distinctive conversational patterns, expectations, and communicative objectives.

2.5 Mediation: An Institutional Practice

Mediation has carved out a niche in institutional discourse on account of its bidimensional orientation towards managing conflicts and establishing mutual understanding between disputing parties. The institutional identity of mediation as a practice is embedded in a structured turn-taking system, pre-defined roles, and goal-based outcomes, which separate it from other genres of ordinary talk (Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Drew & Heritage, 1992). As a third-party intervention, it seeks facilitating dialogue between disputants with the aid of impartial mediators (/and or co-mediators) whose role is to lead the interaction towards a settlement while adhering to principles of due process and maintaining disputants' autonomy (Moore, 2014).

As opposed to adjudication contexts, mediation operates on the basis of the voluntary participation of disputants rather than imposition. Although the mediation process is not formalized, it adheres to a set of rules to ensure the effective management of interaction and therefore the timely resolution of conflicts. These rules include confidentiality, neutrality, self-determination, and fairness (Menkel-Meadow et al., (2018); Boule, (2005); Bush & Folger, (2005)). However, it remains essential to acknowledge that mediation involves asymmetrical participation work whereby mediators and co-mediators withhold management authority to establish relational symmetry (Greatbatch & Dingwall, (1990); Cobb, (1993)).

Equally significant, mediation is more commonly acknowledged as a discursive practice within which language is deemed a pertinent instrument for transformation rather than a mere medium of communication (Winslade & Monk, 2000). By reframing narrative accounts (Cobb, 1993; Winslade & Monk, 2000), recontextualizing conflictual events (Gumperz, 1982), adopting impartial and mediated lexis (Winslade & Monk's, 2000), and encouraging repositioning and identity renegotiation (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999), third parties discursively transform confrontational talk into collaborative dialogue.

2.6 Gaps in the Literature

While numerous studies have explored institutional discourse and mediation in community and adjudication settings, (Chi, (2024); Malki, (2018); Roberts, (2008); Cobb, (1993); Merry & Milner (1993); Greatbatch & Dingwall, (1990); Menkel-Meadow, (1984); Abel, (1982); Mnookin & Kornhauser, (1979)), they have primarily concentrated on the role of third party neutrality, power imbalances, and procedural principles. It is evident that these studies have enriched the current understanding of how mediation eases tensions through fostering disputants' autonomy, enhancing mediators' neutrality, and promoting active listening. However, they have only partially examined how the interactional organization of mediation operates to handle conflicts constructively within media-controlled environments.

Even fewer studies have investigated how mediation performs in media settings, whereby the interaction is structured by the critical need to project neutrality, audience engagement, and reinforcement of procedural legitimacy (Tolson, 2006; Fairclough, 1995; Goffman, 1959). In such contexts, the management of disputes is cognisant on how the process of mediation is interactionally carried out based on the turn-taking system, participants' alignment, neutrality aspects, and face-management work. However, research that relates interactional patterns to conflict mitigation in broadcast mediation remains limited. Therefore, this research seeks to address this gap by examining how the interactional framework in "The Mediator" TV show functions to mitigate confrontational exchanges, foster rapport, and direct adversaries towards resolution.

Furthermore, a substantial body of current research on media-mediated conflict resolution has predominantly revolved around Anglophone and European settings, with limited scholarly attention on Arab and North African contexts (Malki, 2018). This limited scholarly engagement has hindered a comprehensive understanding of how discourse contributes to de-escalating confrontation, sustaining disputants' alignment, and ultimately terminating disagreements in broadcast Arab mediation. By addressing this scholarly void, the current research explores how talk is sequentially enacted and strategically managed in "The Mediator" TV show, with prime focus on how discursive behaviours and conversational patterns mitigate adversarial interaction in a media-regulated setting.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design and Analytical Procedure

The present study adopts a qualitative research design grounded in the principles of Conversation Analysis (CA). The selection of CA is motivated by its rigorous methodological orientation to investigate naturally occurring talk-in-interaction and its analytical potential to systematically probe the sequential organization of speech and social

behaviours grounded within it (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, (1974); Hutchby & Wooffitt, (2008); Hutchby & Wooffitt, (2006)). The analytic lens is directed towards investigating a set of episodes of the Moroccan TV show “The Mediator” hosted by Nassima El Hor. The TV show is intended to resolve interpersonal conflicts through mediation.

Notwithstanding the fact that the interactions occur in a broadcast context, the examined conflictual events are real-life disputes involving non-professional participants. While systematic constraints in media production might affect the turn-allocation system and sequencing, the interactional behavioural patterns investigated remain grounded in naturally occurring mediation talk rather than pre-scripted or rehearsed performances

This study seeks to explore how the mediation process is interactionally carried out in broadcast discourse and how participants, be they the mediator, co-mediators, or disputants, orient to a broad cluster of interactional and relational dimensions, namely procedural legitimacy, impartiality, mutual understanding and rapport-building. A key premise underpinning this research is that speech within this media context is informed by institutional objectives and restrictions that dictate what the involved parties can communicate, how they communicate it, and when to communicate it (Heritage & Clayman, (2010); Drew & Heritage, (1992)).

While Conversation Analysis constitutes the primary analytic framework, the study borrows conceptual and theoretical insights from Erving Goffman’s (1981) participation framework. This approach remains pertinent to provide a better understanding of how the mediator in “The Mediator” TV show interactionally assists disputants to voice out their concerns and reach joint outcomes.

3.2 Data Collection and Analytical Procedure

The data of the current study consists of a set of selected broadcast episodes from /ʔəl xajt ləbjəD/: الخيط الأبيض “The Mediator” talk show. To preserve the institutional identity of “The Mediator” TV show, classical Arabic is mainly implemented in formal sections, more specifically the host opening statements, summaries of narrative accounts, and closing statements. This linguistic choice upholds the program’s formality, the hosts’ authority, and standardization. However, in phases of direct communication with disputants, Moroccan Arabic (Darija) is more often used. This strategic linguistic shift serves different interactional functions, such as achieving emotional proximity, establishing rapport with disputants, and reducing social distance especially in moments of emotional charge. Furthermore, the transition between Classical Arabic and Moroccan Arabic allows a shift in footing (Goffmann, 1981) enabling the mediator to switch fluidly from an institutional role to an interpersonal role, and vice versa. It is also consistent with Heritage and Clayman’s (2010) perspective about institutional talk as being both goal-oriented and context-sensitive, where linguistic choices are grounded in the interactional requirements.

The corpus consists of 20 excerpts derived from different episodes broadcast between 2010 and 2016. These excerpts were selected purposively based on the involvement of disputants’ interactional exchanges, the occurrence of discursive conflictual exchanges, and the present of interactional sequences that include turn-taking practices, interruptions, overlaps and other discourse aspects that hold analytic relevance for Conversation Analysis.

Each excerpt was manually transcribed using both phonetic transcription and Jeffersonian conventions (Jefferson, 2024) with the main objective of identifying the acoustic details and the minute sequential and interactional features critical to Conversation Analysis. As the program incorporates Classical and Moroccan Arabic, translating the selected excerpts into English is mandatory to achieve ethical and methodological clarity, ensuring that the data can be accessible and interpreted intelligibly by an international academic audience. More importantly, careful consideration was taken to preserve pragmatic and cultural aspects in translation, especially when idiomatic expressions or culturally embedded interactional practices were identified. To adhere to established ethical standards, this study preserves the anonymity of all the involved disputants through identifying them with their initials and relies entirely on publicly accessible broadcast recordings.

The analytical process followed a systematic procedure drawn from the Conversation Analysis tradition. Initially, the researcher engaged in repeated viewing sessions of the episodes to enhance familiarity with the interactional dynamics of the mediation process in “The Mediator” TV show. Next, the target sequences were selected and analysed inductively, focusing on interactional phenomena that bring conflicts into termination. Each sequence was then examined through detailed turn-by-turn analysis, focusing on how participants express their concerns and negotiate their positions. Finally, findings were discussed while contextualizing them within broader discursive themes.

4. Results

The present section presents descriptive findings drawing on the examined interactional practices, whereas their interpretation is handled in (Section 5).

4.1 Principal Mediator's Opening Statement

The analysis of the mediator's opening statement in "The Mediator" TV show, reveals that the mediator, N.H., who acts as the principal mediator, always adopts a monologic style to deliver the program's opening statement. The lead mediator consistently commences with a standardized statement to open the mediation hearings of the program. This recurring opening statement of "The Mediator" TV show delivered in Classical Arabic serves as a framing strategy that reinforces the institutional identity of the program. At this one-sided monologue style, disputants and co-mediators do not typically intervene; rather, they tend to opt for a receptive stance and delayed engagement. Essentially, the adoption of a monologic style in the introductory phase incontrovertibly sets the stage for a mediation process whereby the principal mediator reflects her complete control of the process.

The formulaic opening of "The Mediator" TV show initiates with greetings and welcome moves directed for the mass viewers. This is immediately followed by the listing of the main objectives for which the show has been televised. Viewers who have been unable to watch the broadcast episode are invited to watch a recorded stream made available on the 2M website. This is illustrated in the table below:

Table 1. Principal Mediator's Opening Statement (2MTV, May 2, 2016)

Excerpt: 1

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
Principal Mediator: ʔassalamu ʕalajkum warahmatu llahi taʕala: wabaraka:tuh wamərhaban bikum muʔahidi:na ʕabra qanatajna Duzəm ʔalʔarDija walfaDa:ʔija ʔila liqa:ʔina ʔalʔinsanij ʔalijtimaʕijji lhiwarijji ttaDamunij ttaSaluhij walladi jarbiTuna bikum bilxajT ləbjəD Dahirata kulla jawm ʔahad maʕa htisa:b lʔiʕada:t wakada:lika hada ləbarna:maʔ lladi taʔidu:na tasʔila:tihi lkamila lihada lmawsim ttalfazij ʕala xa:riTati ləbaramiʔ ʕala mawqi ʕ Duzəm ppəwaʔ ʔem ʔa ʔaj ʔal mawqi ʕrrasmij Duzəm	Principal Mediator: Peace be unto you and so may the mercy of Allah and His blessings and welcome our viewers via our terrestrial and satellite 2M channel to our human, social, conversational, solidary, reconciliatory meeting, and which connects us through "The Mediator" TV show every Sunday afternoon added to the reruns as well as this program, which you find its full recordings for this television season on the map of programs on the official website of 2M: 2M.ma

Presented in a conversational style, the mediator shifts to delivering a prepared scripted speech that provides a brief introduction to the nature and basic causes of the target conflict based on the involved parties' preliminary statements. The mediator's version of the target conflict is substantiated by two reportage segments in which disputants' first stories are solicited. The reportage is strategically implemented to convey the patterns of neutrality and credibility of the TV show. It is to be noted that the complainant's first story is delivered in the first reportage segment, while the second reportage is devoted to the respondent's first story. This aligns with the institutional traditions of complaint handling in mediation contexts (see the Table below):

Table 2. The Reportage Introductory Statements

(2MTV, May 2, 2016)

	Arabic Transcription	English Translation
The Complainant's story	Principal Mediator: ʔasbabu ʔidan watada ʕja:tu lxila:f bajna zzawʔajən kama jarwiha zzawju lmuttasil mina lbajDaʔ	Principal Mediator: So, here are the causes and consequences of the conflict between the couple as narrated by the calling husband from Casablanca.
The Respondent's Story	Principal Mediator: sma ʕna raʔjək wmawqifk (.) lʔan nsəm ʕi raʔj wəməwqif mratək F lli walda mʕa:k ʔ:uʔ dləwliɖat daʔiman mina DDari ləbajDaʔ	Principal Mediator: We listened to your opinion and attitude (.) Now, let us listen to the opinion and attitude of F, with whom you have two kids and always from Casablanca.

As the first reportage ends, the mediator, N.H., introduces the co-mediators, the lawyer, M.A., and the psychologist, F, L. As exemplified below, both co-mediators are identified based on their epistemic status (Heritage, 2012) to establish the reliability and institutional authority of the show. This is elucidated in the table below:

Table 3. The Identification Move of the Co-mediators in "The Mediator" TV Show (2MTV, May 2, 2016)

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
Principal Mediator: liniqafi lmawDu:ʔ wakal ʕada ʔalʔustad M.A duktur filhuqu:q ʔustad baħiθ muħami wamuhallil qanu:ni (.) ʔalʔustad F.L. ʔixtiSasija fi ʕilmi nnaʔs walʕila:ʔ nnaʔsi wafa ʕila ʔamawija	Principal Mediator: To discuss the topic and as usual Professor, M.A, Doctor in law, research professor, lawyer, and legal analyst (.) Professor, F.L, a psychologist, psychotherapist, and actor Association

Clearly, the team approach "The Mediator" TV program adopts does not only reflect the credibility and reliability of the resolution efforts but it also highlights the synergistic aspect of the TV show. The integration of co-mediators' endeavours from two pertinent backgrounds, such as those of psychology and law, is exceedingly helpful in coping effectively with interpersonal disputes. Immediately after the introductory statement of the mediation hearing, the second manifesto, complainant's opening statement, is established.

4.2 Soliciting Disputants' Opening Statements in "The Mediator" TV Show

A deep examination of an array of episodes of the target mediation program of this study reveals "The Mediator"'s unique protocol for deciding which disputant is to introduce their opening statement first. In "The Mediator" TV show, the complainant is typically selected to proceed first as they are the initiating party to the process of conflict resolution. The choice of the first storyteller, then, does not appear random in the target TV show; it adheres to procedural fairness norms in mediation and dispute resolution practices. By upholding the procedural ethics of mediation, the mediator does not make herself vulnerable to preconceptions of partiality and bias.

On one hand, the process of soliciting the first disputant's statement in "The Mediator" TV show, conventionally initiates with a few conversational turns through which the mediator discloses further personal information about the disputant. However, in some episodes, in which the participants have earlier expressed their concerns about self-identity disclosing or face showing, the mediator evokes first a commitment statement regarding their preference before proceeding with the first disputant's personal information utterances. An illustrative instance is provided from a mediation hearing (November 2, 2014) that tackles a conflict between a married couple, N and M, who have been married for thirteen years. The wife expresses that the conflict with her husband arises from his frequent desertion and the sense of irresponsibility he has developed since the birth of the second child. The husband, on the other hand, asserts that he has deserted the family not because he has another woman, as his wife claims, but because his wife has been making life so intolerable for him. Here is an exchange between the lead mediator and the complainant, N:

Excerpt 2. Mediation hearing: 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
1-M: wfəDəlti sajjidati: ʔnnək Dəhri bʔism mustaça:r xtariti N kif kajsəmmiwk lʔira:n wgultili hada ʔism likajnadiwək bih lʔaʔila fima qabl tumma xtariti təDahri wtkllmi bwaʔəh ʔajr məkfuf wəhna kanhtarmu xtijarək 2-N: barakəlla:hu fik 3-M: N taqdiran fəqumrək səb ʔa wəʔfiri:n sana liʔanna lwalid ma qmāl lhalal lmadanija ʔilla muʔaxxaran = 4-N: = n ʔam= 5-M: = kan qumrək taqriban ʔila h̄səbna ʔla h̄sab sinn lli ʔTitina rbə ʔTa:f ʔaw x̄məsTa:f lsana məlli ʔəfti M = 6-N: = tamaman = 7-M: = w̄məlli t̄zəwwəʔti:h ha:d Duruf fa:f ʔəfti had lʔinsa:n w̄t̄zəwwəʔti:h w̄ʔəfti m̄ça:h hadi tləTTa:f lsana b̄yina nəʔarfu:ha	1-M: And you preferred to appear with a pseudo name. You chose, N, as you are named by the neighbours. You have also told me that the family used to call you with that name. Then, you chose to have a face covered, and we respect your choice. 2-N: God bless you 3-M: N, approximately, you are 27 years old because you father has recently issued a family book. = 4-N: = yes= 5-M: = you were, based on the age you have provided, 14 or 15 years old when you met M= 6-N: = exactly= 7-M: = and when you got married to him, these circumstances under which you knew, married, and lived with this person for 13 years, we want to know about.

After producing a set of conversational actions (**T 3** and **T5**) that further identify the first disputant, N, the mediator allows her to tell her story: **T7:** = w̄məlli t̄zəwwəʔti:h ha:d Duruf fa:f ʔəfti had lʔinsa:n w̄t̄zəwwəʔti:h w̄ʔəfti m̄ça:h hadi tləTTa:f lsana b̄yina nəʔarfu:ha ", "= and when you got married to him, these circumstances under which you met, married, and lived with this person for 13 years, we want to know about."

Having been allowed to tell her story, the complainant immediately proceeds directly to develop her opening statement. Interestingly, within the mediation framework of "The Mediator" TV show, the first disputants lean on narrative constructs to formulate their opening statements. Facilitated by the mediator's questioning strategy, the first disputant, as is illustrated in the forthcoming extract, successfully establishes a systematic and coherent recitation of events through which she manifests how she and her husband end up in conflicting relationship.

Excerpt 3. Mediation hearing: 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
8-N: kan məzjan faf ʔaftu = 9-M: =ja ʔni fʔajji Duruf kənti xəddama DDar wəla ʔnuʔ= 10-N: =lla kənt xəddama kandir lxubz = 16-N: = ʔafni ʔənd ʔi nas wəfdak nnas h̄dər fijja wana maʔTitu:f lʔism d̄jali ləh̄qiqi ʔh ʔh ʔismi mabyi:tʃ nə ʔTihalu gutlu ʔana smiti mina = 17-M: = n ʔam = 18-N: = baʔ manə ʔTihf lʔism d̄jali mabyitʃ nət̄zəwwəʔ [dik sa ʔa] 19-M: [baqa syira] = 20-N: = wah naD huwa dar d̄fə ʔəndi bənt xaltu ʔat ʔəndi (.) bənt xaltu gatli ʔat̄zəwʔi hada hada gutəla ʔawəddi bimən gatli wəld xalti (.) 21-M: gultili ʔa xtəb ʔat lwalida ʔaw xutu-	8-N: He was nice with me= 9-M: =What job did you have? Housemaid or what? = 10-N: =No, I used to make bread= . . 16-N: = he met me with some people whom he talked to them about me' I did not give him my real name uh uh I did not want to give it to him. I told him my name was Mina= 17-M: =yes= 18-N: = in order not to give him my real name. I did not want to get marry [at that time] 19-M: [you were young]= 20-N: =yes. Then, he sent me his cousin (.) she told me you would marry this this. I told her who? She said my cousin (.) 21-M: You told me he proposed to you. His mother came and so his sibling- 22-N: -his mother, siblings, and his father all came to my house=

<p>22-N: -zat lwalida zaw xutu za lwalid zaw kullfi çandi =</p> <p>23-M: =dörtu l çars</p> <p>24-N: dərna l çars =</p> <p>25-M: =w çəfti m çə darhum gəlti jhal [lmudda]↑</p> <p>26-M: [ʔh ʔh] ngullək rəb çnin ngullək tətsnin =</p> <p>27-M: = çəfti mça walidi:h =</p> <p>28-N: =mça walidi:h [maçmmərhum xəssru lija jihazə]</p> <p>.</p> <p>37-M: =çad bda Sda:ç binatkum=</p> <p>38-N: = ja çni M kan kajhəzər (.) kan kajəmfi</p> <p>39-M: rəzlək mən nha:r təwwəzti:h katçarfi:h fin xəddam↑ ʔaʃ kajdir↑</p> <p>40-N: ʔana galli kanxdəm fəlqahwa</p> <p>41-M: hədʃi kullu lli hkiti whəd Səda:ç binatkum whəd lʔaxd wərrad whəd mad wəzazər whəd sijnəd lli kulla nha:r xarəz çla həd qawlək maki çammərʃ DDar (.) çla:f ↑</p> <p>42-N: yir çla tSawər wənnəmra tilifu:n wəkajsmah fijja wjəmfi</p> <p>43-M: hədʃi [llikajən] ↑</p> <p>44-N: [nnəmra tilifu:n] wəkajsmah fijja wjəmfi makajxdəmʃ dija çajfi:n mkərfsi:n çajja mkərfsa mkərfsa mkərfsa kangulha wən çawəha</p>	<p>23-M: =You had a wedding party</p> <p>24-N: We had the wedding party=</p> <p>25-M: = and you lived with his family. For how long did you say?</p> <p>26-M: [Uh uh four or three years=</p> <p>27-M: = you lived with his parents=</p> <p>28-N: = I lived with his parents. They never did me wrong [act]</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>37-M: =then conflict raised=</p> <p>38-N: = I mean M started leaving us (.)</p> <p>39-M: Since the day you got married to this person, do you know what job he has been doing?</p> <p>40-N: He told me he is a waiter</p> <p>41-M: All what you have narrated: the acrimonious dispute, the ebb and flow of your relationship, and the husband who, based on your sayings, frequently deserts the house (.) Why?</p> <p>42-N: Only because of the photos and phone numbers of ladies and he deserts me</p> <p>43-M: That'[s all?]</p> <p>44-N: [Phone numbers] and he deserts me. He does not financially care about me. We live under tough circumstances. I live under tough circumstances. I live under tough circumstances. I live under tough circumstances. I say it and confirm it</p>
--	---

The first disputant initiates her story with a confirmation move, **T8**, through which she asserts that her husband was nice to her: "kan məzjan faʃ çəftu =", " He was nice with me=". After a brief discussion, the complainant shifts, in **T16**, **T18**, **T20**, **T22**, **T24**, **T26**, and **T28**, to list the circumstances under which she met and married her husband. It is until **T38**, **T42**, and **T44** that the first disputant announces the underlying causes of the discordance with her husband, namely desertion, disloyalty, and financial irresponsibility. While she has been telling her story, the complainant has never identified herself as a wrongdoer or at least acknowledged a partial contribution. Conversational actions, such as "I had a part in this", "I also contributed to this", or "I also acted wrongly," remain undetected in the above exchange. Rather, the complaint utilizes her opening statement to present her stance positively, more specifically, through deprecating the opponent, in **T42** and **T44**, for his inadequate conduct.

Before switching to the second disputant, the lead mediator, in "The Mediator" TV show, ensures that she closes the complainant opening statement. To this end, she typically asks a question about what they want to achieve through "The Mediator" TV show, or inquires after, though it is less frequent, the real incentive of the opponent's act. The following are some conversational instances, that have been drawn from different episodes of "The Mediator" TV show, and that the lead mediator, N.H., utilizes to close the first disputant's statement:

Table 4. Conversational Moves for Closing the First Opening Statements

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>N: nti Talba lhiwar lju:m fəlxajT ləbjəD ʔa:f byiti↑</p> <p>M: ʔa:f byiti lju:m↑</p> <p>M:wənta zai lu:m lxiJT ləbjəD baf tgu:l ʔafnu↑</p> <p>M: hədʃi kullu lli hkiti whəd Səda:ç binatkum whəd lʔaxd wərrad whəd mad wəzazər whəd sijnəd lli kulla nha:r xarəz çla həd qawlək maki çammərʃ DDar (.) çla:f↑</p>	<p>N: Today, in "The Mediator", you are asking for a dialogue. What do you want?</p> <p>M: What do you want today?</p> <p>M: Today, you are in "The Mediator" TV show to say what?</p> <p>M: All what you have narrated: the acrimonious dispute, the ebb and flow of your relationship, and the husband who, based on your sayings, frequently deserts the house (.) Why?</p>

As the complainants provide responsive utterances to the closing elicits of their statements, the mediator shifts to open the respondents' statements. First, she emphasizes that what has been laid out on the table, heretofore, represents only the complainant's version of the story (see Table 2). Second, she prompts the audience to listen to the respondent's narrative account which is also broadcast through a reportage.

Similar to the process of soliciting the first disputant's statement, the mediator generates informing initiating moves that bear further personal details about the respondent. She subsequently allows the respondents to start telling their stories most often through producing a question-answer adjacency pair. Below are the most conventional questions the mediator uses to lead the respondents to tell their stories:

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>M: smə çti ləʔaqwa:l djal mratak nta ʔa:f katgu:l↑</p> <p>M: smə çti zawzək wəʔahl djal ʔa:f kajgulu nti</p>	<p>M: You have been listening to your wife's sayings. What do you have to say?</p> <p>M: You have been listening to your husband' and in-laws' sayings. What do</p>

ʔa:ʃtatguli↑	you have to say?
--------------	------------------

The analysis of the above examples reveals that the mediator's most common initiating moves of soliciting the respondent's story incorporate two important verbs, namely, listen and say. The implementation of these verbs serves dual- purpose. First, it reflects the non-argumentative character of the story-solicitation process marked by the absence of immediate counter-accusations or counter-argument exchanges during the complainant's storytelling. Second, it manifests the pre-eminent format that mediation affords for the involved parties to provide their respective stances on the target issues. Each party has the right to communicate their attitudes and emotions, and tell their stories without any interruption from the opposing party. Nonetheless, reconstructing well-founded stories within mediation does not rely only on the speaker's ability to articulate their concerns but also on the respondent's willingness to genuinely listen and reduce immediate rebuttals.

However, the process of soliciting the respondent's story is not always initiated by the mediator; some respondents in "The Mediator" TV show, engage in telling their stories without being explicitly invited by the mediator. The following is an excerpt from the discourse of the lead mediator and respondent, the husband:

Excerpt 4. Mediation Hearing: (2014, Nov 2)

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
120-M: hada zzawʒ M mən mawali:d zuʒ səbʕa ʔaləf wtəs ʕəmja wəwahəd ʔutmani:n jaʕni fəqumrək lju:m tlati:n sana= 121-H: =n ʕam= 122-M: =mən mawali:d qasbət ta:dla= 123-H: =ʔajjih	120-M: He is the husband, M, born on Jul 2, 1981. This means, you are 30 years old. = 121-H: =Yes= 122-M: =You were born in Kasbet Tadla= 123-H: =Yes
124-H: ʕəjəʃi:n fwəsT mənha xuja naD xuja ləkbiʕ fətmənja wtəsʕi:n binatna rəb ʕʃhu:r lli binatna dar lʕərs xuja dwwəzt rəb ʕʃhu:r ʔana ddit had səjjda hadi = 125-M: =hadi hijja Duru:f lli byina nə ʕarfu ʔa M hijja hka:t lina klaməha walakin maqtana ʕna:ʃ [ja ʕni] = 126-H: = [ja ʕni] = 127-M: =nta kənti syir whija kanət syira = 128-H: = ja ʕni = 129-M: =ʃhal kanət f qumrək dək saʕaʃ 130-H: dək saʕa:t kanət f qumri tmənTa:ʃ rsana qəl rəb ʕʃhu:r (.) nəDt ʔana kənt bayi nəddi wahd lbənt qbəl mənha walid- 131-M: - gəltili nta byitiha walakin walidik mabyawhaf= 132-H: =walidija mabyawha:ʃ	124-H: We were having daily disputes. (A reference to the disputes he has had with his father) My elder brother got married in 1998. Four months later, I married this lady= 125-M: = These are the circumstances we want to know about, M. She told us her story, but we are not convinced= 126-H: = meaning= 127-M: =you were young, she was young as well= 128-H: =meaning= 129-M: =How old were you at that time 130-H: At that time, I was 17years and 9 months (.) I wanted to marry another girl but my paren- 131-M: - You told me that you wanted her but your parents did not= 132-H: = my parents did not accept her

Following the same protocol of soliciting the complainant's story, the mediator works to open the respondent's story through constructing informing utterances that convey personal information about the respondent. (T120 up to T122) As he elaborates more on the mediator's informing moves, the respondent, husband, switches to tell his story in T124. Having realized that the respondent is about to initiate his story, the mediator releases T125 which marks an official invitation for him to tell his story. Once the respondent's story is solicited, the mediator evokes T127, T129, and T131 to facilitate its production.

Unlike the complainant's story that operates to provide a coherent narrative of how the target conflict spurs, the respondent's story serves various potential functions. These functions are examined within the following exchange.

Excerpt 5. Mediation Hearing: 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
133-H: = ... hijja galət fəl kla:m djalha lwalid xdəm ʕijja ʕamajən (.) ʔana mənha:r faʃ dəxxəltha lDar nəhar faʃ dərt liha lkuzina djalha buhədhə wəsbabha Tabsil djal lhu:t (.) zəbt lhu:t mən bərra mfa:t Tajjəbu fəl kuzina maxəllawha:ʃ tTajjəb mʃit jəddi:t dək lhu:t rmitu ʕa bərra dəxxəltha ldaxəl həzzi:t buTa djali bdi:t ʔana bəhSira dəlmika (.) ʔana məlli tatgulli hijja drari hadu hijja lixədma:t ʕlihum wəkəbrathum ʔana hijati fin mfa:t↑ 134-M: ʔah hada huwa suʔa:l 135-H: [hijati ʔana fin mfa:t]↑ 142-H: ləkla:m lligalət ʔila ka:n fəhijati ʃi mərə xra taldaba ja ʕni faʃ ʕra:t ʕijja mən DDa:r =	133-H: ...She said my father had been a breadwinner for my family for two years. (.) The first day she entered my house, she got her own kitchen. This happened because of a plate of fish. One day, I brought fish; she wanted to cook it in my family's kitchen but she was not allowed. I threw the fish and got her a small cylinder. The plastic mat was the only furniture I had. When she says that she has been the only provider for my kids, what have I been doing throughout my life then? 134-M: Yes, that is the question 135-H: [What have I been doing throughout my life?] 142-H: Concerning what she said about having another woman, if there is another woman in my life it is only after she has kicked me out of the house =

While telling his story, the responding husband, H, does not recount or delve into the details of the narratives provided by the complainant. Instead, he formulates his opening statement as a challenging response to the complainant's statement (Cobb and Rifkin, 1991). The respondent produces three rebuttal moves to his wife's claims in his opening statement. First, in **T133**, he implicitly denies the claim that his father took charge of his small family by narrating an incident regarding his refusal to allow his wife to utilize his father's kitchen. He then consolidates his claim through producing a rhetorical question towards the end of **T133** which seeks to increase the mediator and audience's attitudinal resistance towards his wife's accusatory move. Subsequently, while confirming the allegation of being involved with another woman, he justifies it as being a consequence of domestic exclusion (**T142**)".

Furthermore, the husband constructs his response to disclose some information that his wife has left unsaid. The following excerpt demonstrates how the respondent develops his opening statement to challenge the favourable position the first disputant has strived to achieve through her opening statement.

Excerpt 6. Mediation Hearing: 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>136-H: bya:t tərəf rəzəlha fi: kajyi:b matxəssarlu:f matçajrni:f bəlkəma baf stərtha t çəjəmi biha ?h ?h ?al?uxt nasima 137-M: katgulli:k kla:m xajb↑ 138-H: ja çni ?h ?h llimajətsawwərç (.) Dərbatni bəzənwija hahija çandi hna təqdr tʃufuħa fərippurTa:z Dərbatni bəzənwija hahija mazala fijja wəddəçwa djala kifmagalət hijja rah çand ddarak=</p> <p>150-H: = walakin maʃi ɖa Syər maʃi ɖa Syər ɖa fisa:b (.) təxsar lhədra lli xəssratli zarfa:tni fəalbi (.) [mankdəb çli:k] 151-M: [ha:] nta daxəl nta wjaha fəçalaqa djal DDəD- 152-H: - hadik hijja ssəbab djali djal lmaʃakil djali lli kajəwaçqı fəDDar djali (.) whija təxsar lhədra (.) (inaudible speech) 153-M: -ləklam lxajəb 154-H: hadak huwwa hadak huwwa fima tʃəkkərtha kanmrəD</p> <p>180-M: ?aʃnu lli xajəb fha:d ləmrə↑= 181-H: =?ah = 182-M: =?aʃnu lli xajəb↑- 183-H: - lšanha (.) lšanha huwa lli xayəb ?ana daba fialijan ɖa:f kanhrəb mənha tʃla:f ↑ mən lšanha llsa:n djalha maʃi huwa hadak kəlmə zu:z katəhdr yir bəlkəlam lxajəb (.)</p>	<p>136-H: If she wants to know where her husband disappears, she should not hurt him from what I protected her uh uh sister Nassima 137-M: does she insult you? 138-H: I mean uh uh you cannot imagine. She stabbed me with a knife. Here it is. You can also see it in the reportage. She stabbed me with a knife. I still have the mark and the legal procedures, as she said, are still undertaken by the Gendarmerie forces. =</p> <p>150-H: But, not because of being young. Not because of being young. It was because (.) she had hurt me (.) [to be honest with you.] 151-M: [Oh] So you are engaged with her in adversarial relationship- 152-H: -That was the reason of my wrongdoings (.) the hurting words (.) (inaudible speech) 153-M: -harsh words 154-H: That is it. That is it. Whenever I remember that I get disturbed</p> <p>180-M: What is wrong about this lady? = 181-H: =Uh= 182-M: =What is that wrong?- 183-H: -her sharp tongue (.) her sharp tongue is the wrong thing about her. Currently, I'm leave her only because of her sharp tongue. She cannot control her sharp tongue (.)</p>

In **T136**, the husband reveals the morally problematic part of his wife's character, namely her sharp tongue. This announcement is confirmed in his subsequent turns, more specifically, in **T150**, **T152**, and **T183**. The respondent then goes on, in **T138**, to declare further information that has remained unrevealed during the first-position arguer's opening statement, more precisely an incident that involves physical aggression against him. While she has been framing her opening statement, the wife has never gone through the above-mentioned details, which she might consider as face-threatening acts (FTA's). Evidently, the second position storyteller's response has not been framed to reconstruct new narrative accounts of how the conflict has broken out; instead it has been composed mainly to raise doubts against the reliability of his wife's claims by unravelling information that remain unstated in the narrative of the first-position arguer. Once the second parties conclude their opening statement, the mediator proceeds to open the third statement of the co-mediators: the lawyer and psychologist.

4.3 Co-Mediators' Statement

An examination of various episodes of "The Mediator" TV show demonstrates that the transition process into the co-mediators' statements is typically set out as the lead mediator produces one of the following announcing moves:

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>1-M: ?idan yaɖi nənaqfu: mça lʔasatida wəjku: xayr ?inʃa:ʔalla:h 2-M: nəthawəru: mça lʔasatida wəjku:n xajr 3-M: sməçna raʔjək nəmʃi:w nʃufu: ʔasatida wəjku: xayr</p>	<p>1-M: So, let us discuss with professors. Everything will be all right, God willing. 2-M: We talk to professors and everything will be all right. 3-M: We have been listening to your views. Let us now turn to professors and everything will be all right.</p>

The co-mediators' intervention, in "The Mediator" TV show, is situationally pre-established. It is only after the lead mediator solicits the various frames the both disputants formulate about their conflict that the co-mediators, namely the lawyer and psychologist, are invited to provide their initial interpretation of the target conflict. To explore the talk format of the co-mediators' statements, in "The Mediator" TV show, a conversational exchange is provided.

The examined exchange deals with a conflict situation that involves a father, H, and his son, Y, who is intentionally denied the issuance of his identity documents. The father, on the other hand, claims that his son owes him MAD 50000.00 in interest calculated on MAD 4000.00 loan previously provided to support the son's business venture. The father announces bluntly that he will not proceed with the administrative procedures for the son's identity documents unless the interest is repaid. The following exchange illustrates the format of co-mediators' interventions in "The Mediator" TV show:

Excerpt 7. Mediation Hearing: 2015, July 19

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>1-M: l?usta:d M, A n?lafDu bi?anna lju:m tk?all?mna qa mahuwa ma:ddi: kt?r matk?all?mna qa mahuwa ?insa:ni ?aw ma?nawi wka?annana fha:d l?alaqa makantk?allmu:f ?aw makanfiawaru:f ?ab f?alaqatu: m?a w?ladu ?aw mra:tu wal?aksu safi:fi</p> <p>2-L: bismi llahi rrafima:ni rrafi:m jaqu:lu: lla:hu subfianahu wata?ala "ja:ajjuha lladi:na ?a:manu: ?inna min ?azwa:zikum wa ?awla:dikum ?aduwwan lakum fah?adu:hum wa?in ta?fu: wataSfahu: watayfuru: fa?inna lla:ha yafu:run rafi:m ?innama: ?amwa:lukum wa ?wladukum fitnah walla:hu ?indahu ?azrun ?aDi:m" hiya lfitna mutabadala bin l?ab w?l?ibn bima?na hunaka ?uqu:q mutabadala wkimag?alna sa:biqan ?annahu za:?a razulun jaf?aki: ?ila ?umar bnulxaTTa:b ?an ?uqu:qi waladihi lah fah?aka lahu ja?ni ?an mafakilihi bajnahuma: faqa:la lahu laqad qaqaqtahu qabla ?an ja quqak bima?na ?anna ?indama lajuhsinu l?abu bibnihi wahuwa Sayi:r (.) fana:zilatu lyawm ssi H ja?ni mas?z?alf lw?eld djalul ja?ni kama jazib ja?ni lmisTara kan? qb?l ?alfaj?nuzu?-</p> <p>3-M: -tata l?wli:n=</p> <p>4-L: =qb?l qanu:n lfiala lmadaniya ?alfaj?nuzu? ka:n qanu:n ?al?f wt?s ?omja wxamsi:n w?kan? lmisTara muttaba?a w?ila fa:t l?azal ja?ni mumkin lluzu: ? ?ila lmafikama w?l?idla: ? b?lwa?a?:q qabla dalika x?SSu js?wwi lwaD?ja djalul binu wbi:n zzw?za djalul ja?ni tubu:t zzw?zija ha:d l?umu:r kull?ha makan?f ssi H jazhaluha: tama:man ?illa f?sanawa:t m?n ba?d=</p> <p>5-M: =na ?am</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>7-L: w?lla daba ssi H l?ab kajbr?z waf?ad TTuyja:n djalul ?la:f ↑ li?nnahu kajgu:l hada w?ldi ?ana ndi:r fi:h kima byi:t walakin nta f?ratt? fi:h flqawani:n lwa:ziba w?alitan bdiiti tu?di:h f?l?amal djalul tatzi w?atfahj?f? ?li:h wkaDr?b w?lla ?aj?f fwaf?ad rru? ? z?dtti ?akk?ti ?nna:k fr?mti:h wz?ti daba katf?rmmu tam?n ssakina w?TTuma?nina wmabyiti:f txalli:h j?i:f qa xaTru li?annahu lxaTa? huwa f?l?aSl walakin manbqawf n?bki:w ?la l?aTla:l kix?Sna lfulu:l hada howa l?iTa:r l?a:m ?amma l?ita:r lxa:S xaSna lhawijja wkan?erfu ?annahu lajaSihhu taqa:Di ja?ni f?lmisTara lmadaniya ?illa man lahu SSifa w?lmaslafia wal?ahlia daba ssi Y ?andu waf?ad l?ahlia ?andu rru?d lqanu:ni maj?mk?nf j?tsnna bbah ?awla mmu tem?i ts?z?lu x?SSu huwa jqu:m bha:d lmasa?:i:l hadi biTalabihi huwa w?j?rfa?l?amr lmafikama walakin bina: ?an ?la wata: ?iq lix?Sha tku:n bin jadaj?h</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>9-L: kan xaSha tku:n ?alaqa ?abawija Safi:fia lajafu:buha ?unf la jafu:buha Tuyja:n li?nnahu ?a ssi H nta ?and?k waf?ad TTuyja:n S?i:b kat?byi t?qm? ? kat?byi lkala:m djal?k huwa</p>	<p>1-M: Prof. M.A, we notice that today the discussion has focused more on financial concerns rather than humanistic or spiritual concerns as if we are not dealing with a relationship between a father, his children, and his wife, and vice versa.</p> <p>2-L: In the name of God, the most compassionate, the most merciful. The God Almighty says, [Ch: 64, Vs 14-15] "Believers, even among your spouses and your children you have some enemies — beware of them — but if you overlook their offences, forgive them, pardon them, then God is all forgiving, all merciful. Your wealth and your children are only a test for you. There is great reward with God. (Abdel Haleem, 2004, pp. 377) There is mutual strife between the father and son. In other words, there is mutual disobedience. As previously stated, a man once came to Umar ibn Al-Khattaab complaining of his son's disobedience to him. As he told him about the problems he had with his son, Umar ibn Al-Khattaab said, "you have failed in your duty to him before he has failed in his duty to you." This refers to the rights a child has over his father. (.) As far as today's problem is concerned, Mr. H has not registered his son in the family record book. The legal code was established before 2002-</p> <p>3-M: -The first three sons=</p> <p>4-L: = Before the 2002's code of civil status, there had been the code of 1950. The law had been enforced. If the deadline has elapsed, it is possible to initiate a case and provide the required documents. However, the husband has first to settle the issue of recognition of marriage with his wife. Not all these matters have been dealt with. Mr. H, has recently been aware of them. =</p> <p>5-M: =yes</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>7-L: Now, Mr. H is acting tyrannically. Why? Because of the father's authority, he has over his son. But, you have failed in your duties toward him. Thirdly, you have caused him troubles in his workplace. You verbally blast and attack him. The son lives in maelstrom of panic. You have confirmed that you denied him his rights and now again you deny him serenity and tranquility. You are reluctant to let him enjoy a peaceful life. He (the father) is the wrongdoer, but let us not cry over the past. We need solutions. This is the overall context. As far as the specific context is concerned, we need to settle the identity issue. Litigation is only valid for those who have the legal status, interest, and capacity. Mr. Y has the capacity; he is mature. He should not rely on his parents to settle the issue of his identity. Instead, he should proceed for a litigation process, but based on documents that should be available for him.</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>9-L: It should have been a strong, firm, unaggressive, and democratic parental relationship. Mr. H, you do have an absolute tyrannical character: you are oppressive and intolerant. You are acting wrongly, and you need to be told so. When a person acts</p>

llikajon wənta ʔannaka muxTiʔ ra:h xa:S lʔinsa:n jgullik ʔannak xTaʔti wderti ʔalʔaqal xTaʔti nnas kaj ʔorfu ʔannək xTaʔti nnas kajbərdu wkajfiawəl jəSlaʔ wəjzib lih hada:k ləwəld ʔawla ləmrə lixTaʔ mʔahum wkajfiawəl ykəffər ʔa sajjilʔa:t djalə bwafəd TTariqa litəhfəd lih ma:ʔ lwaʒh djalə wətxalli:h huwa kaʔab walakin bəl ʔamal nSajəb lwlidati ləwriqa:t ʔazi ʔwəldi hadak nta ddir li:h lə ʔə ʔəl mayadi:f nzidu lju:m makanʔarfu:f ydda təbqa ʔaj wəʔku:n fina ʔajəbqa ʔaj walakin ʔinda rabbikum taxtaSimu:n hada mən ziha tanijan lʔa:n daba kajna furSa ma ʔəmmrhum huma tkəllimu mʔa:k fwaʔəd nniqa:f lli huwa bfi:l luma xərzu dəkʔi lli ʔəndhum nta mataxudha:f ʔannahu rah lʔaʔda:ʔ djalək hadu wʔənnahum ʔəSdu bi:k ssu:ʔ fi ta huma mən ʔaʔhum jgu:lu hadʔi liʔənnak Dləmtihum wbtali fina kangulu lssi Y xarəzti walakin matənsa:f biʔannahu ʔəndək lʔab djalək huwa fu:q kulʔi ʔab biʔami:ʔ lʔafiwa:l

10- M: ʔustada F wa:f ha:d lʔada:ʔ wha:d lʔaTiʔa lilʔsaf lli kantəkalimu ʔliha lju:m mabin ssi H w wəldu Y hiya nita:j Siraʔa:t ma:ddija mafiDa ʔawla ʔandha tari:x nafiʔ

11- P: hiya fi ʔan ʔila ʔənwəna ʔTina ʔənwəna lha:d lʔalaqa hiya fi ʔan ʔalaqa ʔadaʔija bkul ma ʔna lkalima liʔnna ʔawwalan hiya ʔalaqa ʔajər na:Diʔa ʔalaqa fiha tawaSul ʔada:ʔi ʔila tkəlləmma ʔa lʔalaqa ʔajər nna:Diʔa makanlahiDu:ʔi hna ʔanna lʔab kajəl ʔəb ddawr kaʔab ba:ʔ təfimi wəldək waxxa ʔandu tlati:n sana tari:x lʔalaqa djalək bəlwəld djalək huwa ʔnna wəldək məlli kam Syi:r maqdarʔi jəzʔzəl ʔanna lʔab ʔa:m dəddawr djalə jnuwa ddawr djalək hiya təfimi:h tʔəbb ʔu mən nafiʔat lʔaTifa tənəmmilu jʔaxSija djalə jfiəs wəjʔər wəjʔəkkər ʔnna lʔab djalə qwi fida:h ʔna makanDunʔ ʔnnahu lʔa ha:d lʔaʔja:ʔ hadi bqadr malqaha: fəʔʔari ʔ ʔidan fəʔfiwa:r djalum məlli kuntu kathəwru mʔa bəʔDijatkum ka:n tahdi:d ʔah wtarabbuS bəlʔaxar wəwəʔi:d tumma kajən lilʔsaf whada huwa lli xati:r katlahDu makajənf ʔi hadak ttaʔaTuf bajnatkum rah hada huwa llikajawwəf hna ʔətti hadak lmadda lli kathədr ʔiha djal ləflus rah ʔir wafəd lʔamil ʔa jfəzʔar likum lʔaʔi:qa djal lʔalaqa lli kat ʔjhuha

P: Y fina makanxtaruʔi lʔaba:ʔ djalna walakin kanxtaru ttariqa ba:ʔ nə ʔəmlu mʔa:hum ʔəndək lʔurrija təxta: r Tariqa ʔila ləʔəti ləkla:m lli wəzʔaht lʔab djalək ʔajər naDiʔ jəl ʔəb dawr lʔab DDuru:f ʔsa:t ʔli:h makajənf fi ta llikləm mʔa:h wəgallu ha:d lʔaʔja:ʔ nta kadalik DDuru:f ʔsa:t ʔli:k wktaʔəti bəzza:f djal lʔaʔja:ʔ w ʔəlmataək Su ʔabat lʔiʔa:t wəʔlaqa:t lʔiʔtima:ʔija ʔidan lju:m fəkkar wgu:l ʔajnu nəqdar nqaddəm lʔab baʔ ʔarbu lilək wətku:n nta huwa Silat lwaSl wəʔfaSil mabajn ha:d lmaʔkil kulha lli dazət

wrongly, he should get calm and communicate with the son or wife he has been wrongful to. The wrongdoer has to fix his mistakes in a manner that saves his face and reinforce his role as a father through accomplishing his duties: getting the identity documents for his children. You bring him to his senses. Let us not make it worse. We are not sure whether we are alive tomorrow. But, [Ch: 39, V: 31] "you will dispute with one another in the presence of your Lord." (Abdel Haleem, 2004, pp. 297) Secondly, there is a chance; your sons have never been engaged in candid communication with you. Look at the positive side of their act; do not consider them as enemies who want to do you harm. They have the right to have their sayings also because you have been unfair to them. We also say to Mr. Y, you disclose your concerns, but do not forget that your father is above all else.

10- M: Prof. F is this ruptured relationship, between Mr. H and Y, we are unfortunately dealing with, today, a result of purely financial issues, or does it have psychological accounts?

11- P: If we entitle this relationship, it is certainly a hostile relationship. It is an immature relationship that builds on hostile communication. This relationship is immature because the father does not accomplish his role as a father who protects his son even he is 30 years old. During his childhood, your son could not realize that you performed your role as a father. The role you should have performed was, to protect him, offer him affection, develop his personality, feel, and believe that you are protective. I do not think that you offered him all those needs while he has found them in the street. The communication you had together is marked by threat uh stalk, menace, and unfortunately, the most dangerous things is that your relationship lacks empathy. The financial issue you have raised is only a push factor that reveals the real face of your relationship.

P: Y, we do not choose our fathers, but we do choose the manner we treat them. You are free to do so. Your father has been stricken by hard circumstances that he has been unable to perform his role as a father properly. Similarly, you have been stricken by tough circumstances that you realize how life and social relationships are hard. Therefore, try to think how you can get your father close to you and terminate these problems

Before yielding the floor, the lead mediator lays the groundwork for the first co-mediator's statement, namely the lawyer, with a summary move of the general outlook of the conflict: **T1**. A predominant feature that identifies the statement of the lawyer, in "The Mediator" TV show, is the religious introduction that sets out the general context of the conflict on the table before tackling the issue from a legal prospect. In **T2**, the lawyer initiates his statement with 2 Quranic verses, 14 and 15, from Surah Al-Taghabun, No. 64, translated into English: on mutual neglect (Abdel Haleem, 2004, pp: 376), to attribute the primary cause of the conflict between the father, H, and his son, Y, to the tempting power of money.

Throughout his conversational actions, the lawyer attempts to reformulate the target dispute in terms of morality. In so doing, he makes a further religious reference to the Sunnah that alludes to the father's neglect of obligations towards his children: **T2**. The morality discourse of the lawyer culminates in **T7** and **T9** through which the lawyer holds the father accountable for different transgressions: excluding his son from the official family, exercising tyrannical control, obstructing his work life, and exerting verbal and physical abuse towards his son. The lawyer's morality discourse encourages the parties to reframe their conflict on a moral basis on the grounds of the intimate relationship that binds the discordant individuals: the father-son relationship. It is a discourse that highlights the obligations fathers have to accomplish for their children among which the lawyer refers to identity obligations and ensuring a tranquilized and peaceful atmosphere: **T9**. Though it is heavily built on judgmental and evaluative moves, the morality discourse of the lawyer, more precisely in **T7** and **T9**, serves characteristically to rectify the father's misconduct and urge him to behave differently: (**T9**)

Along with the morality discourse, the lawyer drives the legal discourse twice within his statement. Having examined the legal discursive actions the lawyer has articulated in **T4** and **T7**, it can be drawn out that they serve to convey further authority than that of moral discourse he utilizes at the beginning of his statement or even later in his statement. Settling identity issues for one's children is not only a moral matter but also a legal right that children have over their parents and that Mr. H fails fulfill: **T2**. In this regard, the lawyer refers to Articles 1950 and 2002 of the civil status code. Furthermore, the legal discourse has been evoked, once again in **T7**, to provide legal guidance to the son and encourage him to initiate the procedures of settling the identity issue.

Equally important, a psychological statement articulated by the second co-mediator, Prof. F., supports the lawyer's statement. Unlike the lawyer, M, who has been more concerned with coping with the conflict in moral and legal terms, the psychologist embarks on a therapeutic discourse to enhance the constructive management of the conflict. The psychologist's statement, conveyed in **T11**, does not only focus on the content of the messages communicated by either the father or the son, but it highlights how that content is conveyed and talked about as well. The psychological contribution is established when the psychologist reorients the focus of the conflict from monetary claims to unfulfilled emotional and psychological needs, announcing that these underlying issues rather than monetary disputes are the fundamental cause of the tension. One of the significant aspects that distinguishes the psychologist's discourse is the fact that it withholds judgment moves against the father, while still portraying him as lacking maturity and a sense of responsibility

To sum up, the role of the co-mediators, in "The Mediator" TV show, is highly instrumental as they take part in steering a major part of the mediation process. Their management sequences of acts seek to provide religious, legal orientation and underline any psychological needs and incentives of the dispute. Whether it is reflective or evaluative, the co-mediators' interventions, in "The Mediator" TV show, are contributory to developing effective communication and hence leading the antagonists towards problem-solving negotiation.

4.4 The Speech Exchange System of "The Mediator" TV Show

Sacks et al., (1974) distinguish speech exchange systems as a specific interactional apparatus determined on the grounds of the turn-taking procedures and participants' engagement framework (Goffman 1981) implemented.

4.4.1. Turn- Taking System

Sacks et al., (1974) recognize the turn-taking system as a set of rigorous patterns and procedures interactants employ to exchange turns. While examining the talk format of "The Mediator" TV Show, a set of turn-taking mechanisms that vary from those of mundane conversation have been detected. The lead mediator, N, speaks first. She opens the mediation session, provides the initial versions of the disputing parties' stories, and then evokes the complainant's story. As has been previously discussed, the order of storytelling is not randomly established; it is pre-fixed based on disputants' proactive involvement in the mediation process. Therefore, the complaining parties are to proceed first to introduce their opening statements, while the respondents wait until the mediator closes the complainants' stories to report their narrative accounts. Most frequently, conflicting participants do not engage in reporting their stories unless the leading mediator invites them. By so doing, they reflect their tendency toward the mediator's control of managing the interactional process.

To explore the turn-taking organization of "The Mediator" TV Show, the following exchange is provided:

Excerpt 8. Mediation hearing: 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
9-M: =ja ɣni fʔajji Duruf kənti xəddama DDar wəla ʃnuʔ=	9-M: =What job did you have? Housemaid or what? =
10-N: =lla kənt xəddama kandir lʔubz =	10-N: =No, I used to make bread=
11-M: =ʔah =	11-M: = yes=
12-N: = kandir ləħərʃa wəlməmmən =	12-N: I used to make Harsha (Moroccan pan-fried bread made from semolina) and Msemmen (crispy flatbread)=
13-M: = n ɣəm =	13-M: =Yes=
14-N: = wəʃ fħəmti wəllaʔ =	14-N: = do you understand or no?=
15-M: =n ɣəm =	15-M: =yes=
16-N: = ɣafni ɣənd ʃi na:s wəfdak nna:s hədər fijja wana maɕTitu:ʃ lʔism dʒali ləħqiqi ʔh ʔh ʔismi mabyi:tʃ nə ɕTihalu gutlu ʔana smiti mina =	16-N: = he met me with some people whom he talked to them about me I did not give him my real name uh uh I did not want to give it to him. I told him my name was Mina=
17-M: = n ɣəm =	17-M: =yes=
18-N: = baʃ manə ɕTihʃ lʔism dʒali mabyitʃ nətzəwwəz [dik sa ɣə]	18-N: = in order not to give him my real name. I did not want to get marry [at that time]
19-M: [baqa syira] =	19-M: [you were young]=
20-N: = wah naD huwa dar dʔə ɕ ɕəndi bənt xaltu ʒat ɕəndi	20-N: =yes. Then, he sent me his cousin (.) she told me you would

(.) bənt xaltu gatli yatəwəzi hada hada gutəlha ?awəddi bimən gatli wəld xalti (.)	marry this this. I told her who? She said my cousin (.)
21-M: gultili 3a xtəb 3at lwalida 3aw xutu-	21-M: You told me he proposed to you. His mother came and so his sibling-

The above exchange reveals that the order of speaking is pre-specified in mediation hearings. The complainant, N, does not self-select to produce her utterances; rather, she waits until she is invited by the mediator's solicit, (**T9**). The complainant continues developing her utterances until **T21** when the mediator initiates further declarative or interrogative conversational actions as is shown in **T21**. The complainant employs the current-speaker self-selection mechanism to carry on talking after the mediator's move. For example:

Excerpt 9. Mediation hearing: 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
21-M: gultili 3a xtəb 3at lwalida 3aw xutu-	21-M: You told me he proposed to you. His mother came and so his sibling-
22-N: -3at lwalida 3aw xutu 3a lwalid 3aw kullfi ɣandi =	22-N: -his mother, siblings, and his father all came to my house=
23-M: =dərtu l ɣərs	23-M: =You had a wedding party
24-N: dərna l ɣərs =	24-N: We had the wedding party=
25-M: =w ɣəfti m ɣa darhum ɣəlti ʃhal [lmudda]↑	25-M: = and you lived with his family. For how long?
26-N: [ʔh ʔh] ngullək rəb ɣnin ngullək tətsnin =	26-N: [Uh uh four or three years=

Whilst the complainant produces her opening statement, her utterances are directed towards the mediator. The latter produces continuers and minimal responses in **T11**, **13**, **15**, **17**, thereby confines herself to a reciprocity role. The respondent, on the other hand, remains silent. No instances of interruptions or overlapping speech from the respondent husband are observed in the above speech sequence. Therefore, the husband displays his orientation to the turn-taking system of mediation.

In establishing her institutional position in the mediation hearing, the mediator restricts herself to constructing turns that are distinguishable as questions or participatory moves in the storytelling process. The forthcoming excerpt exhibits how through a series of question-answer sequences that the opening statement of the complainant is elicited progressively.

Excerpt 10. Mediation hearing, 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
35-M: = wəɣla:ʃ hta xɾətu↑ wɣəlti wnti həbla (.) [bəlwljəd]	35-M: And why did you leave your in-laws' house? and you said you were pregnant (.) with [your son]
36-N: [ttani B]=	36-N: [the second B]=
37-M: =ɣad bda Sda:ɣ binatkum↑ =	37-M: =then conflict raised ?=
38-N: = ja ɣni M kan kajhəzər (.) kan kajəmfi	38-N: = I mean M started leaving us (.)
39-M: rəzlək mən nha:r tɾəwwəzti:h katɣarfi:h fin xəddam↑ ʔaf kajdir↑	39-M: Since the day you got married to this person, do you know what job he has been doing?
40-N: ʔana galli kanxdəm fəɣəhwa	40-N: He told me he is a waiter
41-M: hədʃi kullu lli hkiti whəd Səda:ɣ binatkum whəd lʔaxd wərrad whəd mad wɣazər whəd sijəd lli kulla nha:r xarəz ɣla həd qawlək maki ɣəmmərʃ DDar (.) ɣla:ʃ↑	41-M: All what you have narrated: the acrimonious dispute, the ebb and flow of your relationship, and the husband who, based on your sayings, frequently deserts the house (.) Why?
42-N: ɣir ɣa tSawər wənnəmra tilifu:n wəkajsmah fijja wjəmfi	42-N: Only because of the photos and phone numbers of ladies and he deserts me
43-M: hədʃi [llikajən↑]	43-M: That[s all?]
44-N: [nnəmra tilifu:n] wəkajsmah fijja wjəmfi makajxdəmʃ ɣijja ɣajfi:n mkərfsi:n ɣajfa mkərfsa mkərfsa mkərfsa kangulha wən ɣawəha	44-N: [Phone numbers] and he deserts me. He does not financially care about me. We live under tough circumstances. I live under tough circumstances. I live under tough circumstances. I live under tough circumstances. I say it and confirm it

After the mediator closes the complainant's story, she elicits the respondent's story. In the same manner, the mediator facilitates the production of the respondent's story through sequences of question-answer turns produced respectively by the mediator and respondent, as is displayed in the excerpt below:

Excerpt 11. The Respondent's Statement: Mediation Hearing, 2014, Nov 2

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
135-M: hijja bya:t tɾəf rəzəlha fi: kajyi:b	135-M: She wants to know where her husband disappears
136-H: bya:t tɾəf rəzəlha fi:n kajyi:b matxəssarlu:ʃ matɣajrmi:ʃ bəlkəlmə baʃ stərtha t ɣəjəni biha ʔh ʔh ʔalʔuxt Nasima	136-H: If she wants to know where her husband disappears, she should not hurt him from what I protected her uh uh sister Nassima
137-M: katgulli:k kla:m xajb↑	137-M: does she insult you?
138-H: ja ɣni ʔh ʔh llimajətsawwərʃ (.)Dərbatni bəzənwija hahija ɣandi hna təqdar tʃufuħa fərippurTa:3 Dərbatni bəzənwija hahija mazala fijja wədda ɣwa djala kifmagalət hijja rah ɣand	138-H: I mean uh uh you cannot imagine. She stabbed me with a knife. Here it is. You can also see it in the reportage. She stabbed me with a knife. I still have the mark and the legal procedures,

ddarak= 139-M: =ssi M= 140-H: = n ɣam = 141-M: =nta sma ɕi mratak ʔa:f katgu:l fərippurTa:ʒ (.) mratak katgul katəhʒərha Tu:l lwaqt nta rəʒəl ɣajr masʔu:l wmakathəlla lafiha lafəwladha makatsrəfʃ tumma katta:hmək bəlxijana katgul ʔannaha katəlqa ɕandək ʔarqa:m hawatif whija mətʔakda biʔanna fəhjatək nsa xrin (.) nta ʔafnu raddək ɕa ha:d ləklam lli galət mratak↑	as she said, are still undertaken by the Gendarmerie forces. = 139-M: = Mr. M= 140-H: = Yes= 141-M: = You have been listening to your wife's in the reportage (.) your wife says: you desert her all the time, you are irresponsible, you don't care about her or your children, and then she accuses you of cheating on her. She says she finds phone numbers and she is certain that there are other women in your life (.) What is your reaction about what she said?
---	--

As the above exchange displays, the respondent husband's responses are addressed to the mediator. The husband does not deploy current-speaker-selects- next, namely the wife, to speak, nor does the wife self-select to counter-argue her husband's accusations. Notwithstanding the strong face-threatening acts the husband expresses against his wife, in **T136**, **T138**, the wife remains silent. The mediator, N, again works through questioning moves to reinforce her institutional role in the mediation process: **T137** and **T141**.

In contrast to the disputing parties who do not interrupt each other during the production of their stories, the mediator can produce interrupting moves as one of the parties tells his/her story. For example:

Excerpt 12. The Respondent Husband's Story: Mediation Hearing (Nov 2, 2014)

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
145-M: =dək sa ɕa nta mʒəwwəʒ ↑= 146-H: = kənt mʒəwwəʒ w - 147-M: -ha:- 148-H: - walakin maʃi- 149-M: -kəti Syi:r ʔayDan ʃha:l tmənTa:f lɕam↑ tsəɕTa:f lɕam↑= 150-H: = walakin maʃi ɕa Syər maʃi ɕa Syər ɕa fisa:b (.) təxsar lhədra lli xəssratli ʒarha:tni fəqalbi (.) [mankdəbʃ ɕli:k] 151-M: [ha:] nta daxəl nta wjaha fəɕalaqa djal DDəD- 152-H: - hadik hijja ssəbab djali djal lmaʃakil djali lli kajəwaqʊ fəDDar djali (.) whija təxsar lhədra (.) (inaudible speech)- 153-M: -ləklam lɕajəb 154-H: hadak huwwa hadak huwwa fima tfəkkərtha kanmrəD . 155-H: = Drəbtha bəlbūTa sbabəha dək ləlma Drəbtha bəlbūTa ʃhi:f tanijan fimma ʒaw ɕəndi xxutha maʃi jgəlsu fəlməθal simana Djafət nbi təltijja:m ʔana ɕaTihum lfurrija djalhum kima galət ʃʃari ɕa tatgul lik makajəxdəmf ɕina- 156-M: - lla bəllati nʒəqfu: ɕla had nnuqTa (.) ʔila kanət mratak katgu:l nta katxwi DDarbəʃhar wəʃfəhrajən wəbkəθar ʔafnu ʒaydarək ʔila ʒaw nsabək ʔaw ʒat fimatak wglu: [mɕakum]↑	145-M: = were you married at that time? = 146-H: =Yes, I was and- 147-H: -Oh- 148-H: -But It was not- 149-M: -You were also young. How old were you? 18 or 19 years old? = 150-H: But, not because of being young. Not because of being young. It was because (.) she had hurt me (.) [To be honest with you.] 151-M: [Oh] So you are engaged with her in adversarial relationship- 152-H: -That was the reason of my wrongdoings (.) the hurting words (.) (inaudible speech)- 153-M: -harsh words 154-H: That is it. That is it. Whenever I remember that I get disturbed . 155-H: =Yes, it is. I hit her with a gas cylinder because she insulted me. Secondly, whenever her family members come to our house they do not stay for three day as it is morally encouraged by the Islamic teachings. She says he does not afford us- 156-M: -No, let us stop at this point (.) what does disturb you about having accommodated you in-laws if your wife says that you desert the house for a month, two months, and even more?

While the husband has the floor to tell his story, the mediator intervenes in the complainant's ongoing speech and evokes various interrupting moves, more specifically, in **T147**, **T149**, **T153**, and **T156**. These interruption turns carry out various functions. In **T147**: "-ha:-", "- oh -" the mediator interrupts the husband's ongoing talk to signal a "change of state" (Heritage, 1984). By using 'Oh receipt', the mediator expresses empathy with the wife as a result of the speaker's unpleasant previous utterance. The use of 'oh receipt' does not only signal a cognitive change of state, but it also entails a tacit judgment toward the husband's misconduct: cheating on his wife. To soften the undesirable impact her utterance might generate on her neutrality stance, the mediator introduces a further interrupting move in **T149** that casts blame on his immaturity. Such an interrupting move holds interpersonal considerations for restoring the respondent's face.

A further interruption action occurs in **T153** where the mediator breaks in to confirm the reception of the respondent's utterance. Finally, the mediator evokes another interrupting conversational instance in **T156** to refocus the topic and get more clarifications. Notably, after each interrupting move the mediator generates, the interrupted speaker self-selects to carry on developing his opening statement (**T148**, **T150**, and **T154**).

As has been previously explored, the participants' orientation to the mediation turn-taking system is manifested in the silence practices they place in the course of the opening statements flow. The silent attitude the opposing parties adopt during the production of their stories does not indicate lack of verbal response; rather, it indicates that the conflicting parties act in accordance with instructions likely given by the mediator to remain silent as the disputants reconstruct their stories.

A further manifestation of the adversaries' orientation to the mediation turn-taking model, in "The Mediator" TV show, is embedded in the permission-request actions the non-storytelling participants make during an opponent's turn-at-talk. This is exemplified in the forthcoming excerpt:

Excerpt 13. Mediation Hearing, Nov 2, 2014

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>202-N: ... ?ana makajhənʃ fijja ləhiana:n makajhənʃ fijja kajəlqani kanəʒən kangu:l ?ah rasi kajəhraqni ?awla Dahri kajəhraqni ?awla jəddi kajəhəru:ni majqəddərʃ jguliija Safi matəʒni:ʃ ?awla matxədmī:ʃ ?awla kajdi:r lmanTa ʕla rasu wəjən ʕas (inaudible speech)-</p> <p>203-H: -mumkin mumkin ?aʔustada wəhəd suʔa:l=↑</p> <p>204-M: =[?ah]=</p> <p>205-N: =[wa:h] sʔalni=</p> <p>206-H: =ʃha:l mən mərɾa wəSlatni ʕand dɾarak ʕa ʃsəb had lɾədma hadiʃ səwliha</p> <p>207-N: lla lla ʕummri</p>	<p>202-N: ...he is not affectionate towards me. He is not affectionate towards me. If I am kneading the bread dough and complaining of headache, backache, or armache he does not ask me to stop kneading, working, or. He covers himself with a blanket and sleep (inaudible speech)-</p> <p>203-H: -Is it possible, Professor, is it possible to ask a question=?</p> <p>204-M: = [yes]=</p> <p>205-N: =[Yes] ask me=</p> <p>206-H: =how many times she has filed a complaint against me at the gendarmerie because of this work? Ask her.</p> <p>207-N: No, no never=</p>

As the complainant develops her statement, the respondent husband interrupts the speaking turn of his wife with a permission request to ask a question in **T203**. The husband conducts his request utterance to ask a question to the mediator rather than to the opponent, and awaits until a favourable reply is provided by the mediator in **T204** to posit his question, in **T 206**, thereby the husband aligns himself with the speech exchange system of mediation.

Although rare in these data, such obtrusion into a conflicting disputant's turn is not regarded as a violation of the mediation speech exchange system for two main reasons. First, such moves are directed to the mediator rather than to the opponent, which minimizes the possibility of adjacently placed confrontational pairs. Second, the husband's move is formulated as an information-seek question that allows the mediator and audience to get more information about an uncovered side of the conflict. Not only does the permission request to speak illustrate the husband's orientation to the mediation speech exchange system, but also it illustrates the mediator's power over the autonomy of the disputants' speakership as well.

4.4.2 Participation Framework in "The Mediator" TV Show

Drawing on Goffman's notion of the 'participation framework', the analysis below reveals how participants' roles and statuses are discursively negotiated in "The Mediator" hearings, more precisely through the allocation of reciprocity and addressivity roles across mediators and conflicting parties.

Excerpt 14. Mediation Hearing, 2016, May 29th

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>109-M: jak (.) wa:ʃ naʕta:bru biʔanna ha:d ləmra hijja lli bəʕda:t mənnek wla nta lli bəʕətti mənha wla ntuma mabdəltu fta məʒhu:d wəbəʕəttu bzu:ʒʃ=</p> <p>110-A: =lla hijja llibəʕda:t mənni liʔanna bəzza:f djal ləfiwa:j3 lli fiha huma lli -</p> <p>111-M: -ʔafnahuma [ləfiwa:j3]</p> <p>112-A: [bəzza:f]=</p> <p>113-M: =lli mən xila:lhuma biʔanna hijja bya:t tbaʕəd mənnek (.) ʕəʃrəni:n hadi:=</p> <p>114-A: =katəsməfi frasha matat -</p> <p>115-M: -təsməfi frasha=</p> <p>116-A: =matatəhtəmʃ brasha=</p> <p>117-M: =matatəhtəmʃ brasha ?ahhah wa:ʃ taniʃ</p> <p>118-A: wəbəzza:f djal ləfiwa:j3 mən DDa:r ʕawtani hadu:k lmasaʔil djal DDa:r kanəlqaha mərəwna makaj ʕəbni:ʃ lha:l xaSni nədxul IDDa:r nəlqa rraha djali</p>	<p>109-M: Alright (.) do we consider that this woman drifted apart from you or you drifted apart from her or you both did not make an effort and you withdrew?=-</p> <p>110-A: =No, she drifted apart from me because she did many things that-</p> <p>111-M: -what are these [things?]</p> <p>112-A: [many]=</p> <p>113-M: =through which you realized that she wanted to separate from you (.) for 10 years</p> <p>114-A: = she does not take care of herself she does not-</p> <p>115-M: -She does not take care of herself=</p> <p>116-A: = she neglects herself=</p> <p>117-M: =She neglects herself. Ok, what else?</p> <p>118-A: And many other things related to the house. The house is in mess. I do not like that. I have to feel comfortable in my house.</p>

The above interactive exchange is drawn out from the discourse of the principal mediator and the husband, A, who wants to repudiate his wife on account of his claims of disloyalty. The exchange initiates with the mediator's eliciting move in **T109** to identify how the disputants have entered a broken relationship. In reply to the mediator's question, the husband addresses his statement, in **T110**, to the mediator rather than to the complainant who has been alluded to in the third person 'she'.

As the husband develops his opening statement, he maintains addressing his utterances to the mediator. By referring to the complaining wife in the third person, 'she' in **T114** and 'herself' in **T116**, the husband clearly restrains the wife's participation status to the non-addressed or 'bystander' whose access to the encounter is unratified. By way of explanation, the wife is allowed to perceive the speech of the ratified participants, namely the husband and mediator; however, she is not permitted to self-select and speak. As a result, the disputants' participation roles and statuses in "The Mediator" hearings are pre-determined.

In addition to the use of third-person, recipient-oriented speech actions, produced mainly by the mediator, provide further indication that the contestant's discourse is addressed to the mediator. Repetitive responses in **T115** and **T117** are produced by the mediator in the immediately next turn that incorporates the repetend. The production of these repeated moves serves to mark the receipt of new information, and accordingly, reflect that the mediator, N, and not the complainant, is the primary recipient of the utterance.

When the mediator carries out individual exchanges with conflicting parties, she conventionally refers to the counterparty in the third person as well. In the following segment the mediator speaks with a mother, M.A., who engages in a conflictual relationship with her daughter, W. The primary reason for the conflict lies upon coercing the daughter into returning to the marital house. After surviving a suicide attempt, the daughter exhibits hostile behavioural attitudes towards her mother. In pursuit of reconciliation, the mother reaches out to "The Mediator" TV show to seek to mend the relational bonds with her daughter.

Excerpt 15. Mediation Hearing, 2016, May 15th

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
147-M: =wmaytwaqfi:f mça ha:d lbənt ra:h məftaja:k ki:fma dfaçtiha nħa:r ləwwəl waqəfi lju:m=	147-M: Won't you help her? She needs you. As you involved her in the beginning, help her today=
148-M.A: =ʔah watana ra:h waqfa waqfa zənbħa tana ʔila fəthħa twazzaç tanbki dħiħa tatbqa təkki tanbki m çaha fəthħa tatgullija tzajjərat dħija kurfi tanu:D ndi:r zzi:t wtanəbqa nədħan liħa kurfħa wtanəbqa nəbki wənədhən liħa kurfħa wənəbqa nəd ç m çaha=	148-M.A: Uh, I am by her side. If she is in pain I cry. If she cries, I also cry. If she has pain in her womb, I bring oil, give her a massage, and cry. I give her a massage and cry, I keep praying for her
149-M : =bəntək=	149-M: = she is your daughter=
150-M. A : = wənəbqa nəd ç m çaha=	150-M. A: =I keep praying for her=
151-M: =ra:h bəntək=	151-M: = she is your daughter=.

In the above exchange, the mediator refers to the respondent in the third subject 'she' or the object pronoun 'her.' The mediator in **T147**, **T149**, and **T151** represents and speaks for the daughter, W, because her participation status as a non-addressed participant does not provide W with the right to address her mother, M.A, directly. Similarly, the mother's responses are headed to the mediator not to the daughter.

However, some respondents may deviate from the participation framework of mediation. Although they are very rare in the data of the current study, such deviations are not left untreated by the mediator. The following excerpt incorporates an exchange between the mediator, M, and a divorced couple. The ex-wife, F, seeks the intervention of "The Mediator" TV show to urge her ex-husband, H, to establish a close relationship with his 18-year old son.

Excerpt 16. Mediation Hearing, 2015, June 14th

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
207-F: -ra:h çajb (.) məlli həzzi:tu wddi:tu çandək ʔafnu byiti [mənni↑]	207-F: -it is disgraceful (.) I brought him and came to your house. What else do you want from [me?]
208-H: [nti kdəbti] whadi whadi whadi	208-H: You lied and this and this and this
209-M: fa:f kdəbt↑	209-M: what I lied about?
210-H: kdəbti fbəzza:f dəlfħwajz=	210-H: you lied about many things=
211-F: =lla makdəbtj=	211-F: = No, I did not lie=
212-M: =bfħala:f↑	212-M: = Can you give examples?
213-H: = kədba:t bfħa:l gatli:k kajzi jlu:f lija lfħwajz whadi whadi whija mfa:t rasha maTrədħa fta wafəd mən dda:r=	213-H: she lied when she said that I had thrown her clothes out of the house etc. etc. She willingly left the house no one has fired her out of the house=
214-F: ʔajjih=	214-F: yes, you did=
215-M: =bəlla:ti çafa:k=	215-M: wait please=
216-F: =waxxa	216-F: = Ok
217-M: kədba:t galət lina ləfti li:ħa lfħwajz wgəlti li:ħa siri çand mmuk fa:f kədba:t tani↑	217-M: she lied when she told us that you had thrown her clothes away and told her to go back to her mother's house. What else she lied about?
218-H: wkədba:t çla hada djal l l gatlək makatmfj:f rasha katəmfj rasha hiħa makanTrədħa mawalu=	218-H: she lied about that t t she did not leave by her own willingness. She used to leave the house. I did never fire her=

In **T 207**, the ex-wife produces an interrupting move to explain that she has never deprived her ex-husband of seeing his son and that she has already visited his house accompanied by her son to facilitate contact. In response, the ex-husband

launches a second pair-part **T 208** that incorporates an accusatory move, which is reiterated in **T 210**. The husband's threatening-face act impels the wife to introduce a denial component in **T211**. Lest they should engage in incipient argument after the adjacent accusation-denial moves the ex-spouses develop, the mediator intervenes in **T 212** to ask for more clarification.

Not only does the mediator's intervention serve to get more clarification about pertinent issues, but it re-establishes the participation framework of mediation as well; and hence, initiates withdrawal from confrontation. As the ex-husband addresses the mediator in **T 213** and illustrates how his wife, who has been referred to as 'she', lied about being fired from the marital house, the complainant, F, withdraws from the non-addressed status by addressing the respondent directly in **T214** and engenders a dispreferred denial move: "=ʔajjih= ", "=yes, you did". The mediator immediately cuts off in **T 215**: "=bəlla:ti ʕafa:k= ", " =wait please=" to sanction the ex-wife for departing from the participation framework of mediation. The ex-wife, on the other hand, adheres to the mediator's instruction in **T 216**: "=waxxa", "=Ok." Subsequently, the mediator launches a question-elicitation move, in **T217**, that is prefaced with a repeated statement of the ex-husband's previous utterance. Remarkably, the mediator refers to the wife in the third person, and hence, frames her participation status as a non-ratified participant. In his response, **T218**, the ex-husband addresses his statement to the mediator, and in the same manner he refers to the complainant as 'she'. As a result, the participation framework of mediation is re-established, and control over the process is restored. Notably, then, within the participation framework of "The Mediator" TV show, issues of disagreement are commonly addressed through mediated means rather than through a direct interaction between the involved parties in a given conflict.

To sum up, the turn-taking system and participation framework of the mediation vary from those of ordinary speech. They are managed in a manner that facilitates the hearing sessions and ensures a collaborative communication between the participants. The conflicting parties routinely wait until they are solicited by the mediator to speak rather than self-select and address the opposing party directly. As the disputants produce their opening statements, they are allowed to construct extended turns to recount their narratives in turn, disclose their concerns, and respond to any inquiries. In so doing, disputants establish and uphold a speech exchange system that minimizes direct confrontational talk and facilitates the process of conflict resolution.

4.4.3 The Hybrid Interactional Framework of Mediation Hearings in "The Mediator" TV Show

The pre-allocated turn-taking system and participation framework that have been previously examined are not conventional peculiarities of mediation process in "the Mediator" TV show. Direct interaction between participants, including oppositional interaction, is a prevalent pattern in "The Mediator" TV show. However, a direct interaction between the adversaries in the mediation hearing is not randomly constructed; rather it is managed in a manner that precludes heated confrontation between disputants.

This study has borrowed the term 'hybrid' (Garcia, 2019) to refer to those sessions of mediation whereby contestants shove off the speech exchange system of mediation and launch into an encounter that integrates aspects from the conversational speech exchange system. Before delving deeply into examining the hybrid interactional framework of "The Mediator" TV show, it should be noted that the institutional role of the mediator is firmly manifested within the double-barreled speech exchange system. Disputants are not allowed to engage into direct communication unless the mediator evokes conversational moves that grant explicit permission. Some conversational moves are illustrated below:

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
-M: ha M ʕadda:mək	-M: Here is M in front of you
-M: lju:m nta lli Taləb lfiwa:r hahija F mratak qudda:mək	-M: today, you request dialogue. Here is F your wife in front of you.
-M: lju:m mməmtək qudda:mək ʔa:f kat ʕa:təb ʕli:ha liʔanna ʔaraDək ʔa:f tatgu:l huwa (.) tSaləh m ʕa mməmtək wətrəʕu ki:f kəntu	-M: Today, your mother is in front of you. What do you blame her for? Because as you say you seek reconciliation with her and regain the relationship you had with her before.
-M: hahija F lju:m məftaʔa:k nta tgulli:ha ha:d ləkla:m wətnaqəfha hadʕi ʕla:f ziti lju:m	-M: here is F. she needs you to talk and discuss with her because this is why you are here today.
-M: tkəlmi m ʕa bəntək	-M: talk to your daughter

As a matter of fact, the production of such permission moves does enable the disputants to handle direct communication; however, such authorization is subtly conditional on yielding effective dialogue and facilitating the process of conflict resolution. This is clearly implied through the following utterances the mediator incorporates in the permission move: "Taləb lfiwa:r", " you request dialogue"; "tSaləh m ʕa mməmtək wətrəʕu ki:f kəntu", " you seek reconciliation with your mother and regain the relationship you had with her before"; "məftaʔa:k nta tgulli:ha ha:d ləkla:m wətnaqəfha hadʕi ʕla:f ziti lju:m", " she needs you to talk and discuss with her because this is why you are here today".

Disputants, in "The Mediator" TV show, are allowed to hold direct conversation with each other only after the co-mediators provide their statements. To investigate the hybrid interactional format of mediation, some excerpts from different mediation hearings are examined.

Excerpt: 17. Mediation Hearing, 2015, June 14th

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
203-F: çla:f ?a M katgu:l ha:d lhædra ?u ?u gædda:m wældæk(.) wa:f ha:d hadra kajna beSa:fi↑ walnafriD matalan kajna(.)	203-F: Why do you say this M? uh uh in front of your son (.) Is this true? Let us suppose that it is true (.)
204-H: ?ə ?ə=	204-H: uh uh=
205-F: =ra:h fiʃu:ma wçajb ba:f tgu:lha gædda:m wældæk (0.2) ra:h çajb=	205-F: =it is shameful and disgraceful to say that in front of your son (0.2) it is shameful=
206-H: = wajji:h mætta:fəq mça:k maxaSni:f ngu:la gædda:mu (.) walakin ntij-	206-H: = yes, I agree with you. I shouldn't have said that in front of him (.) but you-
207-F: -ra:h çajb (.) mælli hæzzi:tu wddi:tu çandæk ?afnu byiti [mænni↑]	207-F: -it is disgraceful (.) I brought him and came to your house. What else do u want from [me?]
208-H: [nti kdəbti] whadi whadi whadi	208-H: [You lied] and this and this and this
209-M: fa:f kdəbt↑	209-M: what I lied about?
210-H: kdəbti fbəzza:f dəlfwajz=	210-H: you lied about many things=
211-F: =lla makdəbtj=	211-F: = No, I did not lie=
212-M: =bħala:fj↑=	212-M: = Can you give examples? =
213-H: = kədba:t bħa:l gatli:k kajzi jlu:f lija lfiwajz whadi whadi whija mja:t rrasha maTrədha fita wafəd mən dda:r=	213-H: =she lied when she said that I threw her clothes out of the house etc. etc. She willingly left the house no one has fired her out of the house=
214-F: =?ajjih=	214-F: =yes, you did=

Once disputants are permitted to undertake direct communication, they alternate between the speech exchange system of mediation and the mundane conversational speech exchange format. In **T203**, F engages in a direct interaction with her ex-husband through a question-answer adjacency pair. The ex-husband responds, in **T 204**, with hesitation minimal moves, and immediately, F introduces a latching move, **T205**, through which she blames him for his wrong act in front of their son. The ex-husband, on the other hand, responds with an agreement move in **T206**. The interaction continues in **T207** as the ex-wife evokes an interrupting move to reaffirm a part of her previous statement and to address another question. The ex-husband replies with an accusation move in **T208** prompting the ex-wife to press for specifics (**T209**): “fa:f kdəbt↑”, “What I lied about↑”. This query is left unanswered by the ex-husband who, in **T210**, opts for launching a turn constructional unit that deliberately avoids precision “kdəbti fbəzza:f dəlfwajz =.” The reiteration of the ex-husband's accusatory move, in **T 210**, triggers the wife to launch a denial turn in **T211**: “=lla makdəbtj=”, “=No, I did not lie=.”

Having examined the above exchange, the researcher identifies different patterns that reflect the conversational character of the examined discourse. The ex-married couple communicate directly with each other throughout question-answer exchanges. The ex-spouses do not require the mediator's permission to be selected to speak; instead, they embark on patterns of conversational turn-taking system (Sacks et al., 1974) to select themselves and each other to speak throughout various turns. Although the ex-spouses engage in accusation and denial interactional exchange, more specifically from **T203** to **T211**, instances of intense argument or mediator engagement have not been identified. Argumentation between the ex-couple has not been intensified because the act-denial moves are not followed by immediate counter-accusation moves.

Nevertheless, the interactive exchange in the above excerpt exhibits significant aspects that differ from the ordinary speech exchange system. The mediator does not totally discard herself from the interchange. She is still committed to the interactive process as she works to facilitate the communication between the disputants. On account of the husband's reproduction of accusation moves, the mediator intervenes, in **T 212**, to urge the ex-husband to provide clarification “=bħala:fj↑=”, “= Can you give examples?=”. In response, the husband addresses his reply, **T 213**, to the mediator instead of his ex-wife referring to her in the third person “= kədba:t bħa:l gatli:k kajzi jlu:f lija lfiwajz whadi whadi whija mja:t rrasha maTrədha fita wafəd mən dda:r=”, “= she lied when she said that I had thrown her clothes out of the house etc. etc. She willingly left the house no one has fired her out of the house=”. In **T214**, F immediately produces a latching move to confirm her claim: “=?ajjih=”, “=yes=” which has been sanctioned by the mediator in **T 215-M**: “=bəlla:ti çafa:k=”, “=wait, please.”

Following the mediator's sanctioning move, the interactional framework of the hearing switches from direct conversation between the opposing disputants to the conventional interaction of mediation. The ex-spouses cease to address each other directly. This is illustrated in the next excerpt:

Excerpt: 18. Mediation Hearing, 2015, June 14

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
215-M: =bəlla:ti çafa:k=	215-M: =wait please=

<p>216-F: =waxxa 217-M: kədba:t galət lina ləfti li:ha lfiwajz wəlti li:ha siri çand mmuk fa:f kədba:t tani ↑ 218-H: wkədba:t çla hada djal l l gatlək makatmfı:f rasha katəmfi rasha hijə makanTrədha mawalu= 219-M: =gatlək kat ka ja qıi katəmfi wənta makatbəçha: f= 220-H: =kanəmfı kanxru:z məlxədma makalqaha:f fədda:r= 221-M: =wa:f nfəfhmu mən klamək ?nnahu nta gərha:tək jəmkən galət li:k fi fiwajz ma çbu:k f= 222-H: =lla ma fi [galət fi fiwajz ma çbu:ni:f] 223-M: [ziti lfarafha↑] mfi:ti lfarafha ?a M= 224-H: =had fi çla:f kədba:t ↑= 225-M: = ?um wəldək= 226-M: =kədba:t wfa= 227-F: -mankdəbf çli:k= 228-H: =məlli kan çajjəT çliha kadəwwəz lija laxur fətilifu:n= 229-F: =lla lla fu:f had fi kul fi- 230-M: - Sfi:fi ?ənnə:k məlli çajjəT li:k ra:h maçajjəT li:k fi fita bayı jətkəlləm mça:k bSiftək ?um wəldu= 231-F: =had fi kul fi- 232-H: -katgullija ?ila ziti lddə:r yajqətlu:k</p>	<p>216-F: = Ok 217-M: she lied when she told us that you had thrown her clothes away and told her to go back to her mother's house. What else she lied about? 218-H: she lied about that t t she willingly left the house. She used to leave the house. I did never fire her= 219-M: =she said she le she le she left and you never went after her= 220-H: =I went after her. After leaving work, I went to the house but she was not there 221-M: =Do we consider that because she verbally hurt you= 222-H: = No, it is not because that [she said harsh things]= 223-M: = you targeted her honour, M? = 224-H: =because she lies= 225-M: =she is the mother of your son= 226-M: =she lied and whe- 227-F: -I do not lie to you= 228-H: =when I called her, she passed the phone to the guy= 229-F: = No, no, look, all these things- 230-M: - Is it true that when he called you when he called you he wanted to talk to you as a mother of his son= 231-F: =all these things- 232-H: -she tells me if you come to my house they will kill you=</p>
---	--

The above extract clearly displays a functional engagement of the mediator in the interaction. After restoring the interactional mediation framework, the mediator produces **T217** to refocus the topic of the interaction through repetition and questioning moves. The ex-husband responds with a move, in **T218**, that provides restated reply of his previous statement. The active role the mediator plays, in the above extract, continues from **T219** to **T225** as she engages in direct dyadic interaction with the ex-husband by restating the ex-wife's statements as in **T219**, or suggesting a motive behind his accusation moves as in **T221**, **T223**.

The reproduction of allegation moves, by the ex-husband in **T224** and **T 226**, propels the ex-wife to self-select and interrupt the ongoing speech of the husband by producing an act-denial move in **T227** "-mankdəbf çli:k=", "-I do not lie to you=". In so doing, the wife grabs the floor and re-alter the mediation interactional format to a more conversational interaction through addressing the ex-husband directly and referring to him using the second-person pronoun 'you'. This departure, however, does not invoke any sanction from the mediator, which may be regarded as a tacit shift to the ordinary conversation speech exchange system.

Excerpt 19 reveals a clear pattern in which the ex-husband despite being directly addressed in **T227** and **T229**, he maintains directing his comments to the mediator rather than engaging his wife directly as illustrated in **T228** and **T232**. It is only when the ex-wife challenges what she considers a groundless claim, in **T 233** and **T235** that the husband engages in a direct interaction with F, which extends across various turns (**T235** to **T240**).

Excerpt 19. Mediation Hearing, 2015, June 14

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
<p>227-F: -mankdəbf çli:k= 228-H: =məlli kan çajjəT çliha kadəwwəz lija laxur fətilifu:n= 229-F: =lla lla fu:f had fi kul fi- 230-M: - Sfi:fi ?ənnə:k məlli çajjəT li:k ra:h maçajjəT li:k fi fita bayı jətkəlləm mça:k bSiftək ?um wəldu= 231-F: =had fi kul fi- 232-H: -katgullija ?ila ziti lddə:r yajqətlu:k= 233-F: =Kuka:n had fi bSSafi(.) 234-H: ?ahhah= 235-F: = yajku:n çandək ddali:l= 236-H: =ddali:l ?ajmən dali:l= 237-F: = yajju:n çandək ddali:l= 238-H: =?a:fmən dali:l wana lqi:tu↑ 239-F: wa:f ziti wa:f ziti lha:d dda:r wlqiti fi fiad↑ 240-H: ?ah= 241-H: =kajən fji:x kajən ləmqaddəm ?ana ma fi çajfa fbi: ?a bbu fidi 242-M: lju:ma ?abənt nna:s ?a:f byiti↑ ?a:f byiti↑</p>	<p>227-F: -I do not lie to you= 228-H: =when I called her, she passed the phone to that person= (A reference to her boy friend) 229-F: = No, no look, all these things- 230-M: - Is it true that when he called you when he called you he wanted to talk to you as a mother of his son= 231-F: =all these things- 232-H: -she tells me if you come to my house they will kill you= 233-F: if this were true (.0) 234-H: Ok= 235-F: = you would have an evidence= 236-H: An evidence! What evidence! = 237-F: you would have an evidence= 238-H: =what evidence, have I found it? 239-F: have you ever come to the house and found someone? = 240-H: yes= 241-F: there are authority auxiliaries. I do not live in an isolated area 242-M: Now, what do you want? What do you want?</p>

The mediator reappears in **T 242** to take a more critical role and asks the ex-wife, "lju:ma ?abənt nna:s ?a:f byiti↑ ?a:f byiti↑", "Now, what do you want? What do you want?" The mediator's question serves to facilitate the interaction, keep it

limited to the mediation objective; and accordingly, lead it towards the resolution process.

As the ex-wife responds to the mediator's elicitation move (**T 242**), in excerpt 20, the ex-husband does not wait to be solicited by the mediator; instead, he selects himself as the next speaker and reacts to the ex-wife's proposal in **T 246**: "wəldi nçajjəT çli:h wəjzi çandi wənhdər mça:-", "I will call my son and ask him to visit me. I will talk to hi-".

Excerpt 20. Mediation Hearing, 2015, June 14

Arabic Transcription	English Translation
242-M: lju:ma ʔabənt nna:s ʔa:f byiti↑ ʔa:f byiti↑	242-M: Now, what do you want? What do you want?
243-F: ʔana lli byi:t huwa-	243-F: what I want is-
244-M: -mən baɣl masma ɣa lʔsatida	244-M: - and after we have listened to the specialists
245-F: lli byi:t ʔana huwa jəthawər m ɣa wəldu wəjgləs m ɣa wəldu wəjzi çandu wəjɣufu:	245-F: what I want from him is to communicate with his son, spend time with his son, and visit him frequently
246-H: wəldi nçajjəT çli:h wəjzi çandi wənhdər mça:-	246-H: I will call my son and ask him to visit me. I will talk to hi-
247-F: -lla fu:f fu:f çandək çandək çandək nta ki:f magalu lʔsatida=	247-F: -No, look, look you have you have you have as the specialists said=
248-H: = ʔah=	248-H: =yes=
249-F: =çandək lhaq ʔila ʔana mnəɣək mən wəldək kajən lməxzən zi:b lija ɣalmqaddəm ha:d səjda ra:h zi:t byi:t nfu:f wəldi çandək lha-	249-F: =you have the right if I forbid you from seeing your son, there is an authority. Send me an authority auxiliary: I want to see my son but this woman. You have the rig-
250-M: -lla kajmfi jəslək lmisTara lqanu:nija=	250-M: No he has to proceed through legal proceedings=
251-H: =mənç:atu çlija Syi:r	251-H: = she stopped me from seeing him when he was a child
252-M: nta ʔasi:di nta ʔassi M liʔanna lafeDna biʔanna fiṭa llaḥza llikətti katəhdər bi:ha fdək lmaka:n maʔi hiya fa:f gləsna wəsmə ɣa lʔasa:tiða wa:f nəçta:bru biʔannaka ndəmti ɣa fiḥa:za gəlti:ha ↑	252-M: You, Sir. You Mr. M because we have noticed that the tone of you voice you used in that place has changed after we communicated and listened to the specialists. Can we consider that you regretted having said something?
253-H: ɣa fiṣa:b dək dərri: gəlti:h dək lhədra wSafi	253-H: I regretted having talked about her in that manner in front of the son
254-M: ʔa:f byiti: lju:m	254-M: what do you want today?
255-H: ddəri wəldi ɣandi:r li:h lfiana:n	255-H: I will offer my son the affection

The ex-spouses resume engaging in dyadic exchange up to **T250** whereby the mediator produces a repair move of the wife's statement (**T249**), **T250**: "- lla kajmfi jəslək lmisTara lqanu:nija= ", " No he has to proceed through legal proceedings=". This intervention re-establishes the speech exchange system of mediation. At this moment, the disputants discontinue their direct interaction, and the ex-husband directs his attention to the mediator explaining in **T250** that he had been denied visiting his son when he was a child. The facilitative approach of the mediator is identified in **T252** and **T254** through the question-answer exchange she engages in with the responding disputant. The conflict appears to reach resolution as the ex-husband re-admits his misconduct of accusing his wife of disloyalty in front of their son (**T253**) and expresses a commitment to establish a good relationship with his son (**T255**).

To conclude, at the joint mediation phase, in "The Mediator" TV show, disputants are allowed to engage in extended sequences of adjacent exchanges, which are recognized by self-selection patterns to get the floor to speak directly to the opponent. However, this does not designate a total relinquishment of the mediation speech system. The various forms of the mediator's patterns of involvement in this stage of joint mediation, asking questions, refocusing the discussion, restating the disputants' concerns, and engaging in direct exchanges with the disputants, do not only facilitate the process of resolution, but also give rise to an interactive framework that is close to but certainly not a mundane conversational interaction.

5. Discussion

The results of the current study highlight the fundamental role the principal mediator plays in organizing the interactional process during mediation sessions. The mediator's approach to opening the sessions, in "The Mediator" TV Show, draws a positive impact on the interactional framework of mediation and its virtuosity in promoting better communication and negotiating discordances productively.

Following a consistent model of mediation session opening, the mediator opens the mediation story with a brief introduction of the nature and subtle causes that have spurred the conflict. The mediator's prefatory statement is supported with a reportage in which the complainants report their initial story. The principal mediator, in "The Mediator" TV show, requests a second story from each contestant alternately. While disputants construct their narrative accounts, the principal mediator typically responds through producing question-answer sequences, minimal responses, repetitions, etc. Such types of interventions serve to facilitate the production of disputants' stories and empower disputants who lack effective skills to present well-constructed narrative accounts.

A remarkable result to emerge from the analysis of the data is the fact that conflicting parties conventionally do not interrupt each other while presenting their stories; and when they talk, they direct their utterances to the mediator.

Similarly, responding participants in the mediation sessions wait until they are invited by the mediator to introduce their opening statements. This interactional framework has a positive impact on the mediation process because it precludes adjacently placed accusatory moves, which are likely to heighten conflict, and minimize confrontational talk. This result is consistent with previous findings of Garcia (2019); Greatbatch & Dingwall (1997) with regard to the basic role mediation interactional organization plays in precluding argumentative talk.

While the speech exchange system of ordinary conversation does not involve restrictions on the speakership patterns (Sacks, et al, 1974), the findings of this study demonstrate that the speech exchange system of mediation exhibits three key distinctive features. First, the turn-taking system of mediation is most often pre-allocated in nature. This confirms previous findings of Heritage & Clayman (2010) which highlight the pre-allocation mode of institutional interactions, among which they refer to mediation interaction. Furthermore, the speaking structure in the mediation process is meticulously established. The principal mediator opens the session, sets the introductory stage, and then introduces soliciting move of the complainant's story. This denotes, henceforth, that the framework of providing narrative accounts is also predetermined; it is the complainants who are typically solicited first to proceed to tell their stories.

Second, as has been examined, conflicting parties do not self-select to produce their opening statements; rather they wait until they are requested by the mediator to initiate their accounts. Instances of ordinary conversational talk are not identified during the opening statements phase in this data. Alternatively stated, disputants do not interrupt each other or engage in adjacently positioned interaction; and, this reflects their orientation towards the turn-taking system of mediation. Disputants, who exhibit a high level of orientation towards the mediated speech exchange system, tend to introduce permission-seeking moves to ask a question or elaborate on a given statement; and once they are allowed, they tend to do it in a mediated manner as well. It is to be noted that these interactional practices are allowed only after the both disputants' stories are elicited. Interestingly, the mediator, in "The Mediator" TV show, is not concerned with these speaking restrictions. Within sequences of question-answer turns, she may interrupt and overlap the disputants' flow of talk to attain the purposes of the progression of the session.

The third feature that distinguishes the interactional exchange of mediation is the restricted participation framework. Following the notion of 'participation framework' (Goffman, 1981), the results of the data analysis exhibit that reciprocity role in mediation hearings is also restricted. While constructing their narratives or responding to the mediator's soliciting moves, disputants, in "The Mediator" TV show, direct their segments of talk to the mediator rather than to the co-contestants. Two basic attributes that reflect the pre-established character of the participation framework of mediation are identified in the data. First, disputants and the mediator's identification of opponents through the use of the third person: "he" or "she" which restrains the opponents' status to the 'non-ratified' addressers or 'bystanders'. Second, the production of recipient speech units by the mediator, embedded in repetitive conversational actions, implies that the mediator and not the opponent is the main receiver of the articulated utterances. Controversial issues, then, within the participation framework of mediation, are handled through mediated means rather than direct interaction between the involved parties.

However, not all disputants, in "The Mediator" TV show, orient toward the pre-determined participation model of mediation. Although it is infrequent in this data, some disputants attempt to adopt the participation framework of ordinary conversation by self-selecting and addressing the co-disputants directly rather than remaining silent. Once such situations emerge, the mediator launches sanction moves, such as "please wait" to inhibit incipient oppositional talk and reconstruct the participation framework of mediation.

Although the third party maintains an institutionally ratified stance of neutrality, the analysis indicates that neutrality is interactionally established through selective interventions, turn management practices, and moral framing, rather than through non-involvement patterns.

A conspicuous observation to emerge from the analysis of the data is the hybrid interactional format mediation hearings adopt during the negotiation stage. After soliciting the two stories, disputants typically engage in direct interaction, which may incorporate exemplars of oppositional talk. However, this does not denote that direct interaction between disputants, in "The Mediator" TV show, is not systematically handled. Disputants do interact directly with each other only after being granted the mediator's permission. Furthermore, under the hybrid interactional format of mediation, the mediator does not discard herself from the interactional process. She is there to issue interventions whenever they are required. As a result, interactional activities whereby disputants alternate between the speech exchange system of mediation and the mundane conversational speech exchange format are frequently identified in mediation hearings of "The Mediator" TV show. This finding correlates favourably with the findings of Greatbatch and Dingwall (1997) who posit, "Mediation cannot be defined in terms of a single system of turn-taking" (pp. 166). Features of the hybrid interactional format of mediation are illustrated in the following table:

Table 5. The Hybrid Interactional Framework "The Mediator" TV Show

The Hybrid Interactional Format of Mediation	
Speech Exchange System of Mediation	Mundane Conversational Speech Exchange
1-Frequent interventions by the mediator [through clarification seeking moves, or the production of sanction moves in case of departures. 2-Re-addressing utterances to the mediator. 3- Redirecting the topic.	1-Direct communication through question-answer sequences. 2- Self-selection mechanism to respond to accusation (interruption, overlaps). 3-Accusation-denial interaction.

Indeed, the interactional framework of mediation, in "The Mediator" TV show, includes some generic components that discern the speech exchange system of mundane talk; however, it exhibits typical peculiarities, such as pre-allocated turn-taking system, a pre-established participation framework, and the absence of adjacent sequences. By means of these features, the principal mediator, in "The Mediator", manages to shape an interactional surrounding whereby disagreements are tackled without escalated oppositional speech behaviours.

The results of this research carry significant theoretical and practical implications for the analysis of mediation interaction and the practice of broadcast conflict resolution. Theoretically, the study expands scholarly understanding of institutional discourse through demonstrating how Arabic-speaking broadcast mediation programs operate within a highly systemised yet flexible interactional framework combining a pre-allocated turn-taking system with institutionally regulated contexts for direct disputants' engagement.

From a practical perspective, the study provides practical guidance for media practitioners, mediators and family coaches who endeavour to develop protocols and frameworks that enhance effective communication while mitigating conflict escalation. The results highlight the significance of third-party strategic interventions, regulated participation frameworks, and organised sequencing in fostering impartial and constructive exchanges between adversaries. Such discourse patterns may serve as a framework for further media-based mediation programs functioning within diverse cultural spaces.

Ultimately, the findings yield implications for future research by conducting comparative studies between Arabic-speaking and Non-Arabic media mediation. Prospective research can investigate whether variations in mediator style, linguistics choices, and cultural norms affect the interactional organization of televised mediation, thereby advancing global understanding of mediation and conflict resolution discourse.

6. Conclusion

Conflict discourse in mundane conversation is marked by a participant-regulated turn-taking system and a participation framework that permit disputants to respond in adjacent turns. This implies that accusations and blame can be squarely assigned with denials articulated immediately. Therefore, the interactional organisation conducive to heightened conflict is expected to evolve. On the other hand, the interactional framework of mediation, in "The Mediator" TV show, restricts the integration of conversational strategies embedded in conflict discourse. While helping disputants manage their conflicting issues, the mediator strives to entrench institutional discourse norms within the interaction process, mainly: non-sequential accusation-denials turns. The delayed occurrence of denial responses de-escalates conflict through avoiding scenarios where conflict discourse devices might be implemented. Furthermore, selective engagement with accusations by disputants allows for the curtailment of accusatory instances and thereby lays the ground for a resolution.

The findings of this study foreground the key role of the mediator in organising and maintaining the interactional framework of broadcast mediation. While the TV show embodies one-on-one communication between adversaries, this interaction is established within a thoroughly normative scenario identified by the mediator's interventions, giving permissions, and topic management. The hybrid interactional framework that develops, more precisely in joint mediation, reveals a combination of conversational and institutional attributes, generating a distinctive approach to broadcast conflict and mediation talk. It is critical to note that the hybrid format in "The Mediator" TV show does not replicate informal communication; rather, it incorporates components of mundane conversation within a highly regulated institutional environment whereby utterances are tightly shaped by legal, moral, and therapeutic registers. In this context, third-party conflict resolution manifests to be not only a communicative task but also a dramaturgical process that seeks to resolve conflicts and uphold social and cultural norms. By addressing the dearth of research on Arabic-speaking media mediation, this study initiates novel lines of inquiry into how discourse reshapes social reconciliation within specific cultural media contexts.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable

Authors' contributions

The author, Dr. Ilham Malki, was solely responsible for the study design, data collection, analysis, and manuscript

preparation. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding

Competing interests

The authors declare 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

Not applicable.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Redfame Publishing.

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 ethical considerations.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

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

- Abdel Haleem, M. A. (2004). *The Qur'an: A new translation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Abel, R. (1982). *The politics of informal justice: The American experience* (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Angouri, J. (2012). Managing disagreement in talk: Conflict talk and argumentation in real-life interactions. *Discourse & Communication*, 6(2), 199-222.
- Boulle, L. (2005). *Mediation: Principles, process, practice* (2nd ed.). Sydney, Australia: LexisNexis Butterworths.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813085>
- Bush, R. A. B., & Folger, J. P. (2005). *The promise of mediation: The transformative approach to conflict* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chi, X. (2024). Dispute resolution in legal mediation with quantitative argumentation. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA241252>
- Clayman, S. E., & Heritage, J. (2002). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613623>
- Cobb, S. (1993). Empowerment and mediation: A narrative perspective. *Negotiation Journal*, 9(3), 245-259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1571-9979.1993.tb00694.x>
- Cobb, S., & Rifkin, J. (1991). Practice and paradox: Deconstructing neutrality in mediation. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 16(1), 35-62. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.1991.tb00283.x>
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Garcia, A. (2019). *How mediation works: Resolving conflict through talk*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University

- Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139162548>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Greatbatch, D., & Dingwall, R. (1990). Interpreter-mediated mediation. *The Sociological Review*, 38(3), 361-392.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, *Speech acts*, pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003
- Grimshaw, A. D. (1990). *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611834>
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511665868.020>
- Heritage, J. (2012). Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 45(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2012.646684>
- Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. E. (2010). *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318135>
- Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: 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. 13-31). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313>
- Livingstone, S., & Lunt, P. (1994). *Talk on television: Audience participation and public debate*. London, England: Routledge.
- Loxley, J. (2006). *Performativity*. London, England: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203391280>
- Malki, I. (2018). Conflict resolution strategies in media discourse: The case study of *The Mediator*. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(5), 24-35. <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v6i5.3107>
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (1984). Toward another view of legal negotiation: The structure of problem solving. *UCLA Law Review*, 31(4), 754-842.
- Menkel-Meadow, C., Love, L. P., & Schneider, A. K. (2018). *Dispute resolution: Beyond the adversarial model* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Aspen Publishers.
- Merry, S. E., & Milner, N. (1993). *The possibility of popular justice: A case study of American community mediation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.13313>
- Mnookin, R. H., & Kornhauser, L. (1979). Bargaining in the shadow of the law: The case of divorce. *The Yale Law Journal*, 88(5), 950-997. <https://doi.org/10.2307/795824>
- Moore, C. W. (2014). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Roberts, C., Sarangi, S., Southerton, J., & Plester, B. (2004). Presentation of self and the co-construction of roles in interview talk. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, work and institutional order* (pp. 29-50). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, M. (2008). *Mediation in family disputes: Principles of practice* (3rd ed.). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010>

- Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. A. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics* (pp. 33-58). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621031.004>
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Thornborrow, J. (2010). *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. London, England: Routledge.
- Tolson, A. (2006). *Media talk: Spoken discourse on TV and radio*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748626311>
- Van Langenhove, L., & Harré R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp. 14-31). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Van Meurs, N., & Spencer-Oatey, H. (2010). Multidisciplinary perspectives on intercultural conflict: The “Bermuda Triangle” of conflict, culture, and communication. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.), *APA handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 59-78). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1chs0s5.8>
- Winslade, J., & Monk, G. (2000). *Narrative mediation: A new approach to conflict resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

Jeffersonian Transcription Convention System

This appendix provides Jeffersonian transcription convention system needed to represent basic transcription of the disputants' speech.

Convention	Symbols	Function
[text]	Brackets	Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.
=	Equal Sign	Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single utterance.
(# of seconds)	Timed Pause	A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.
(.)	Micropause	A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.
. or down arrow	Period or Down Arrow	Indicates falling pitch or intonation.
? or up arrow	Question Mark or Up Arrow	Indicates rising pitch or intonation.
,	Comma	Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.
//	Double slash	Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.
>text<	Greater than/Less than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker.
<text>	Less than/Greater than symbols	Indicates that the enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker.
°	Degree symbol	Indicates whisper, reduced volume, or quiet speech.
ALL CAPS	Capitalized text	Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.
underline	Underlined text	Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech.
:::	Colon(s)	Indicates prolongation of a sound.
(hhh)		Audible exhalation
•or (.hhh)	High Dot	Audible inhalation
(text)	Parentheses	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.
<i>italic text</i> ^[+]	Double Parentheses	Annotation of non-verbal activity.
~word~	Tilde sign	Indicates shaky voice (as in crying)

APPENDIX B

International Phonetic Alphabet

Arabic script	Phonetic Symbols	Distinctives	Examples	English Translation
ء	ʔ	the pause in <i>uh-oh!</i> ; Glottal stop	ʔinsa:n lʔamal	Human The hope
ب	B	voiced labial stop	Lbab	The door
ت	T	voiceless alveolar stop	Tlata	Three
ط	T	emphatic 't'	Tlɒb	Beg
ث	θ	voiceless dental fricative	maθal	Example (CA)
د	D	voiced alveolar stop	dima	Always
ظ	Dd	emphatic 'D'	Ddar	The house
ك	K	voiceless velar stop	Kla:m	Speech

*ك	G	voiced velar stop	Gulli	Tell me
ق	Q	uvular stop	Rqi:q	Slim
ر	R	alveolar trill	Lbra	Needle\ injection
رَ	Rr	emphatic 'r'	rru: h	Spirit
س	S	voiceless alveolar fricative	salam	Hi\ peace
ص	S	emphatic 's'	SSalat	The prayer
ش	f	voiceless pal- alv. Fricative	ʃhar	A month
ف	F	voiceless labial fricative	fi:n	Where
ز	Z	voiced alveolar fricative	Zwin	Nice
ج	ʒ	voiced post “ “	ʒwa:b	The answer
ح	h	voiceless pharyngeal fricative	hlu	Sweet
خ	X	voiceless uvular fricative	xdəm	Work
ع	Ç	voiced pharyngeal fricative	ɖaɸ	Why
غ	ɣ	voiced uvular fricative	ɣali	Expensive
ل	L	alveolar lateral	lwaqt	The time
م	M	labial nasal	məzja:n	Good
ن	N	alveolar nasal	nu:D	Get up
ه	H	voiced glottal fricative	Hada	This
و	W	labiovelar glide	waqila	Perhaps
پ	p	P	Pwarru	Leek
ي	J	palatal glide	jəmkən	Perhaps
و	Double consonants	Geminates	hətta	Until

1. Vowels

Arabic and English Script	Phonetic Sounds	Gloss	English Approximate
إ ----- i	High front vowel	ʔila	If
أ ----- ə	Central vowel	məlli	When
أ ----- a	Low back vowel	Mra	A woman
أ ----- u	High back vowel	kul	Eat (imperative)
: + صانت	Long vowels	Su:r	The wall