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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

**Argument:** The use of a statement in a logical process of argumentation to support or refute another statement whose validity is questionable or contentious.

**Communicative Purpose:** The function(s) of various phases of a genre.

**Conversational Analysis:** An approach to the study of social interaction, embracing both verbal and non-verbal contact situations of everyday life.

**Discourse Community:** A local and temporary constraining system, defined by a body of texts or more generally practices that are unified by a common focus. In this study, argumentative talk shows are a discourse community.

**Genre:** A class of communicative events that shares modes and purposes. It has a common structure of functional units that are repeated from text to text.

**Genre Analysis:** The study of how language is used and organized within particular settings to achieve communicative goals. In this study, the term refers to an analysis of how argumentative radio and TV talk shows are organized, and the features of language that participants use to achieve the communicative goals of the argumentative talk shows.
**Generic Features:** The linguistic features that characterize a genre. In this study, aspects of argument such as action-opposition arguments and question types are generic features.

**Panelists:** These are the invited guests who discuss the topics in the Talk shows.

**Talk show Host:** A journalist who conducts the talk show.

**Turn:** An uninterrupted utterance produced by a single speaker.

**Turn Taking:** A type of organization in conversation where participants speak one at a time alternating turns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Caller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conversational Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAK</td>
<td>Communication Authority of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Critical Discourse Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Commission on the Implementation of the Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORD</td>
<td>Coalition of Reform and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>English for Specific Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDA</td>
<td>Federation of Women Lawyers in Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Frequency modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGP</td>
<td>Inspector General of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMRD</td>
<td>Introduction, Methods, References, Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPG</td>
<td>Inter Party Parliamentary Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Initiation Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANU</td>
<td>Kenya African National Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTN</td>
<td>Kenya Television Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUFA</td>
<td>Kenyatta University Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBC</td>
<td>London Broadcasting Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAs</td>
<td>Members of County Assemblies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACADA</td>
<td>National Authority for Campaign Against Alcohol and Drug Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODM</td>
<td>Orange Democratic Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>First Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Second Panelist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>Possible Completion Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Primary Sampling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Short Message Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Programme for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>Turn Construction Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>Transitional Relevance Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNA</td>
<td>The National Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URP</td>
<td>United Republican Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USUs</td>
<td>Ultimate Sampling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

[ ]  –  Simultaneous speech

( )  –  Transcription doubt

(()  –  Descriptions of non-lexical vocalizations or speaker activities

{(( ))}  –  Overlay on non-verbal phenomenon on speech

…  –  ellipsis

:::  –  Prolongation / stretched sound

_  –  Intentional ellipsis of proper nouns so as to ensure anonymity

-  –  Interruption or self correction

=  Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs- one at the end of a line and
one at the start of the next line or one shortly thereafter. They are used to
indicate two things:

i)  If the two lines are connected by the equal signs by the same speaker,
thен there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause,
which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of
overlapping talk.
  e.g. P1: The truth of the matter is=
      H: [keep it brief please]
      P1: =[ there are challenges ]within jubilee

ii) If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers,
then the second followed the first with no discernible silence between
them, or was latched to it.
ABSTRACT

This study involved a genre analysis of sampled radio and TV argumentative talk shows in Kenya. The research objectives were: to describe the generic structure of the talk shows; to explore the particular aspects that characterize argument on the talk shows; to investigated the question typology that sets apart this talk show genre, and finally to establish the communicative purposes of the discrete phase of the talk shows in light of the the generic features established. The study used a descriptive research design whereby purposive sampling was used to identify the talk shows that contained the relevant issues. A multistage sampling procedure was used to arrive at a sample size of 7 hours, 30 minutes of conversational data that was subjected to analysis. Data was collected through tape recording of the talk shows. The data was transcribed using standard orthography to allow for identification of the required language features. The aspects of argument and the question types were coded and analyzed using SPSS version 17 to generate tables on the frequencies of their occurrence. This facilitated comparison and discussion of the emerging patterns of the features across the sampled talk shows. Data analysis was guided by two theories: The first was Genre Analysis that views a genre as a class of communicative events with a common structure, content and shared communicative functions. The second was Conversation Analysis used to analyze sequential as well as overall organization of the talk shows. From the analysis, it was established that the sampled argumentative radio and TV talk shows constitute a genre for exhibiting a common structure; recurring aspects of argument, common question types and shared communicative goal. This study was motivated by the fact that argumentative talk shows have provided an arena in which journalists solicit statements of public policy, hold politicians accountable for their actions, all under the immediate scrutiny of the citizenry. The findings may therefore provide useful insights to the producers and hosts of these programmes on the various features of language that may be used in conducting more engaging programmes; thus, informing the public more.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter provides an introduction to the study. It begins by giving the background to the study, followed by the statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions and research assumptions. Further, the rationale of the study and scope and delimits are provided.

1.1 Background to the Study

The word ‘genre’ comes from a Latin word, through French for kind or ‘class’. Conventional definitions of genres tend to be based on the notion that they constitute particular conventions of content, form or structure and style which are shared by the texts which are regarded as belonging to a particular genre. The principal criterion feature that turns a collection of communicative events into a genre is some shared set of communicative purposes (Swales, 1990). This is in line with Martin’s (1992, 2001) assertion that genres are staged, goal oriented social processes. Social in that we participate in genre with other people; goal oriented because we use genres to get things done, and staged as it usually takes us a few steps to reach our goals.

Scholars (Hansen, 1988; Swales, 1988; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987) began to use genre analysis as a research and pedagogical tool in the 1980s, notably, in the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) approaches. For ESP scholars, focus has been on actual, community identified genres used within those disciplinary settings. These are genres such as research articles, literature reviews,
conference abstracts, research presentations, grant proposals, legislative
documents and so on. Systemic Functional Linguistics genre approaches
locate genre at the level of context and culture. Genres are recognized as a
system for accomplishing social purposes by verbal means. This recognition
leads to an analysis of discourse structure.

In relation to structure, genres have beginnings, middles and endings of
various kinds and are complete structured texts based on genre membership
(Swales, 1990). Other scholars state that every genre or discourse type has its
own discourse structure and content that defines it, and it aims at revealing
templates or scripts in the organization of the discourse (Hassan, 1978; Martin,
1985; Ventola, 1994). As far as genre structure is concerned, Martin (2001) on
his part argues that a genre’s interest is more in the rhetorical organization of
the text than its logic. This motivates the investigation of the organizational
structure of the talk shows genre which was of concern in this study.

Generally, significant studies on genre analysis have been carried out with a
view to establishing the underlying rhetorical organization of texts in the
contexts in which they occur. Some of these are studies on research articles
(Swales, 1990; Hunston, 1993a; Hyland, 1998; Maroko, 1999, 2008), and
others on grant proposals (Myers, 1990; Connor & Mauranen, 1999). This
study falls in the area of genre analysis but in spoken media discourse on radio
and TV setting.
Genre in media refers to a kind of media content such as news, classified advertising, game shows, weather forecasts, talk shows, among others (Bell, 1991). Argument is a verbal activity that sets apart some radio and TV talk shows. The shows are by nature argument saturated; disagreement and discussion are the staples of talk show diet (Hutchby, 2001; Myers, 2001). The verbal activity is specific on the production of argument in support of a standpoint. In the talk shows sampled in this study, there is interactive negotiation between the panelists, audience and the host in the process of constructing the argument.

Traditional rhetoric distinguishes between four kinds of discourse: exposition, argument, description and narration. These four forms, which relate to primary purposes, are often referred to as different genres (Fairclough, 1995:88). All arguments as classes of discourse have structure, which can be either deliberately designed or may be discovered through analysis. Van Djik (1985) in the analysis of argument says that an argument is the use of a statement in a logical process of argumentation to support or weaken another statement whose validity is questionable. The purpose of argumentation is to logically convince the reader to take a specific course of action or writer’s point of view (Comrie, 1984). However, there are contexts in which it is the third party rather than the addressee, who speakers may aim to convince by their argument. This happens for example in the legal context, non-mediated public debates, and parliamentary debates, controversies in written and spoken media.
where evaluative language is largely employed. This study looked at talk that is argumentative in the radio and TV settings.

The talk shows, in Hutchby’s (1996) and Myers’ (2001) view, presents a genre in which topics are made into issues through the development of opposing stances, controversy and dramatization of conflict. In a similar direction, Coulter (1990) notes that arguing is an activity type that is intentionally built around assertion/counter pairs or more broadly action/ opposition sequences. In some contexts the action does not even have to be a verbal one. For example, in the analysis of children’s arguments, Maynard (1985) found out that just about anything which gives rise to an opposition by another party to talk can count as an ‘arguable’ action utterance.

The study of media language and discourse has gained interest and focus among scholars in linguistics, and a range of media genres have been researched for instance in the ‘Critical Linguistics’ framework (Fowler, 1990; Kress & Hodge, 1979; Cook, 1992; Talbot, 1992). However, most work in media discourse has been the ‘factual’ genres, and particularly news (Greatbach, 1998, Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Montogmerry, 2007). Most of the studies have been carried out in on data from the USA and United Kingdom where most of the contributors are based. Other studies are by Hamo (2010) and Hungbo (2011) on talk shows broadcast in Israeli and South Africa respectively. The current study focused on talk shows broadcast in selected
radio and TV stations in Kenya drawing from Conversational Analysis and Genre Analysis frameworks.

In the Kenyan context, media research has been carried out in print discourse in an attempt to investigate the rhetorical structure of newspaper discourse (Mbugua, 1997; Nyongesa, 2005; Magena, 2011). On the radio scene some researchers have looked at the underlying structure of various programmes (Karanja, 1993; Kiai, 1996; Mwai, 2008). Talk shows on radio and TV which form the focus of this study are characterized by conversation that is initiated by a programme host and usually involves listeners who telephone or tweet, to participate in the discussion about topics in politics, sports or current affairs.

Different sections of the talk shows perform different functions and thus require different linguistic resources to realize these functions. In the introduction, the host presents the topic, introduces the panelists, welcomes the wider audience and provides the necessary background information to facilitate understanding of the situation which has produced the problem. The body develops as speakers weigh the contribution of co-participants agreeing or disagreeing as the case may be. This is characterized by a variety of question types that have different forms and functions. The questions realize most of the aspects of argumentative talk shows such as action-opposition sequences, shifts in footing, validity challenges, reformulations, interruptions, overlaps, among others. Still, vocabulary, sentence structures, and lexical choices vary as the text unfolds (Hutchby, 1996). The conclusion is usually a
mini summary as the host strengthens the discussion by recapitulating the main points, using repetition, expressing gratitude and a farewell. This study adopted a linguistic view of genre analysis by first describing the structure of the talk shows with particular focus on the linguistic components that characterize each phase, accounting for their communicative purposes in the construction of the texts towards the practical accomplishment of their goals.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

With the proliferation of media houses in Kenya, talk shows have become a major arena for the discussion of public opinion on a range of issues, from personal dilemmas, family relationships to broader social, political problems and concerns, both on radio and television. The talk shows are aired at any time of the day in many stations. Given their interactive nature, they present a distinct forum that helps “reconnect” media and citizens for constructing and rallying public opinion on issues affecting them. Hence, they are a popular means of shaping public opinion and are establishing themselves as a genre that remains little understood. Therefore, it is important to accord this genre the scholarly focus it previously lacked by investigating how talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya are structured, exploring the aspects of argument and the question types that characterize the argumentative talk shows, and examining how, as a consequence of this, the framework of interaction within talk shows functions to achieve communicative functions of the talk show genre.
1.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Describe the generic structure of sampled radio and TV argumentative talk shows in Kenya.
2. Explore the particular aspects of argument that participants use in the discrete parts of sampled radio and TV argumentative talk shows in Kenya.
3. Investigate the questions typology that sets apart the argumentative talk shows genre from other types of talk.
4. Establish the communicative purposes of the discrete parts of the argumentative talk shows based on the generic features identified.

1.4 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions.

1. What is the generic structure of sampled radio and TV argumentative talk shows in Kenya?
2. Which particular aspects of argument do participants use in the discrete parts of the sampled argumentative radio and TV talk shows in Kenya?
3. What questions typology sets apart the argumentative talk show genre from other types of talk?
4. What communicative purposes do the discrete parts of the talk shows achieve based on the generic features identified?
1.5 Research Assumptions

The study was based on the following assumptions:

1. TV and radio argumentative talk shows in Kenya constitute a genre given that they have an identifiable structure.
2. Discrete parts of argumentative TV and radio talk shows employ particular aspects of argument in varied ways.
3. A particular questions typology sets apart argumentative talk show genre from other types of talk.
4. Based on the generic features identified, the discrete phases of talk shows achieve varied communicative goals.

1.6 Significance and Rationale of the Study

Texts that aim to persuade or argue against a view are important in various social contexts. According to Hutchby (2006) news programmes, and documentaries have tended to diminish the access of lay people to the media. Instead, they have given, for example, politicians and other elite groups, priority to state their views and opinions. However, he also notes that talk shows are a clear exception to this tendency as they allow for audience participation in the discussion of domestic, social, political matters that directly affect them. A comprehensive study of how talk in these programmes is constructed is therefore necessary as it adds to the overall understanding of how media influences public opinion. The study may also illuminate an understanding of how participants use linguistic resources to develop
arguments on radio and TV. The findings of the study could offer insights that apply to arguments in other contexts as well.

The broadcast media offers opportunities to analyze arrays of spoken genres, such as interviews, commercial advertisements, and various kinds of monologues. For the most part, such analysis has been conducted using the methods of Conversational Analysis, which set out to describe how conversations are structured; for example, in their openings, closings and turn takings. Much of this research has focused on radio and TV interviews, particularly because of their sociopolitical emphasis. The current study on argumentative talk shows not only adopted CA but had an abiding interest in establishing the generic similarities and/or differences between the sampled talkshows. This study, therefore, fused Conversational Analysis with Genre Analysis approach. The fusion of approaches reflected in this study is a promising indicator of the way forward for media discourse studies. The study will therefore, give a practical demonstration of some of the ways in which the two approaches can be applied in analyzing media texts or texts.

The motivation to study media discourse stems from the fact that media has long been a focus amongst those working with language and communication, as well as others working within the broader field of media studies (Bell, 1998). Bell (1991) gives four reasons for this: one, the media is a rich source of readily available data for research and teaching; two, media usage influences and represents people’s use and attitudes towards language in a
speech community; three, media can tell us a great deal about social meanings and stereotypes projected through language and communication, and finally (and relatedly), the media reflect and influence the formation and expression of culture, politics and social life. All these are issues that were evident in the talk shows sampled for this study. The findings of this study could shed light on how the argumentative talk shows should be conducted to inform the public more. The results could also have implications in terms of training of the media personnel on how to conduct broadcast talk.

Various studies have been conducted on written texts (Swales, 1990, 2004; Connor & Mauranen, 1999; Maroko, 1999, 2008; Magena, 2011). However, little research has been conducted on spoken media discourse and in particular from a distinctive perspective of the genre analysis. Therefore, a comprehensive account of language such as the one proposed by the two theories may prove particularly valuable to the study of the linguistic resources that characterize the talk shows under study. Further, owing to the limited studies on spoken genre, and argumentative discourse in particular, the findings of this study could create ground from which future studies could emerge.

The linguistic choices made in any act of communication have effects on the whole process. This study focused on the linguistic resources that participants employ in the construction of argument in the programmes. It is expected, therefore, that the findings of this study could shed genre knowledge that
orientates readers/listeners towards appropriate expectations about a text which are useful in making sense of it.

1.7 Scope and Delimits of the Study

Radio and TV stations in Kenya conduct live interviews, live discussion shows, debates, and live talk shows as forms of broadcast talk. Some of these talk shows are argumentative in nature; others are not. The focus of this study was on argumentative talk shows. Hugbo (2011) notes that most audience cite moments of controversy on important national matters as push factors. Still, the deliberate format of the argumentative talk shows may have a significant impact on audience’ willingness to express conflicting opinions in a hostile environment or a willingness to listen to opposing views. As they become popular, their impact will also persist.

Empirical studies indicate that TV stations and radio stations are considered to be the most important sources of information to the general public (Hayden, Drobot, Radil, Benight, Gruntfest & Bames, 2007; Tai & Sun, 2007). On the Kenyan scene, radio leads in overall media consumption followed by the mobile phone, TV, and the internet respectively Communication Authority of Kenya [CAK], 2017). As such, this provided a rich source of data on argumentative talk shows which constitutes the focus of this study.

The present study focused on four talk shows that are presented in English language. It is a fact that English occupies an overwhelmingly predominant
role in the international world of scholarship and research (Jernud & Balduf, 1987) so the findings may have a wider reach. Additionally, English being one of the national languages in Kenya would address a varied audience. Accordingly, the study data comprised of programmes broadcast in English. These were *Opinion Court* on Citizen TV, *Checkpoint* on KTN, *Spotlight* on Hope FM, and *The Nation’s Talking Point* on Nation FM. It was expected that the sample would yield data required for a genre analysis of argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya.

In genre studies if something has a certain rhetorical organization, certain features and communicative functions, it is likely that the others will be repetitive (Bhatia, 2003). Previous works on genre analysis have also demonstrated that large samples are unnecessary (Dudley-Evans, 1986; Hopkins, 1985). This is because texts in the same discourse community are guided by a common model and are expected to have similar linguistic identifying units so a bigger number does not bring any differences (Romaine, 1982; Swales, 1990). Furthermore, larger samples are likely to bring about data handling problems.

Communication in the argumentative talk shows included both verbal and non-verbal aspects used in talk (e.g. intonation, stress, volume, tone, laughter) which may also be involved in signaling of ideological positions. The current study however, dealt primarily with verbal data as the focus of the study clearly remained on examining in detail instances of linguistic behavior deemed to be
argumentative. This was identified in the utterances made by the participants in the construction of talk.

1.8 Summary of the Chapter

This chapter has presented a background to the study. It has also presented the statement of the problem, the research objectives, research questions and assumptions. The chapter also presented the justification as well as its scope and delimits. The next chapter presents the literature review and the theoretical framework that guided the study.
2.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of related literature that lays the foundation for the current study, as well as the theoretical framework for the study.

2.1 Literature Review

This section presents literature related to the problem under investigation. It begins by presenting the concept of genre in a number of fields, approaching argument, aspects of argumentative talk shows, question types in argumentative talk shows, studies in genre analysis and media discourse studies.

2.1 The Notion of Genre

Genre refers to a class of communication that shares modes and sets of communicative purposes. It is a system comprising configurations of field, mode and tenor selections which unfold in recurring stages of discourse (Swales, 1990). There are various properties that identify the extent to which an exemplar is prototypical of a particular genre. However, Swales (1990) notes that exemplars of genres vary in their prototypically, meaning that, a text’s genre membership is defined by rather a long spectrum of family resemblance. An initial way of tackling the issue of genre is to examine what scholars have actually said about genres in a number of fields.
2.1.1 Genre in Folklore Studies

In folklore studies, to begin with, it is maintained that the adequacy of generic descriptions depends entirely on the theoretical view they are designed to satisfy. Therefore, (Ben-Amos, 1976) considers genre as a classificatory category; for example, a story can be classified as a myth, legend or tale where the classificatory work considers genres as ‘ideal types’ rather than as actual entities. Actual texts will deviate from the ideal in various kinds of ways. Another approach sees genres as forms, one taking these forms as permanent. Thus, legends and proverbs have maintained a fixed form over recorded history, which withstands social variations and technological developments. They, thus, have kinds of cognitive deep structure preserved by relations among the discoursal components of the texts themselves.

What changes is the role of texts in society. For example, proverbs no longer play as central a role in popular education as they once used to. For Malinowski (1960) for example, folklore genres contribute to the maintenance and survival of social groups because their purpose of serving social and spiritual needs; a legend provides an account of actual events, while a myth is sacred. The folklorists recognize that folk narratives have permanence of form; they are produced by individuals, during social interactions, and are informed by surrounding cultural traditions. Genre is seen valuably fundamental to the realization of goals, and thus, act as a determinant of linguistic choices. This view of the folklorists is an important contribution to the present study that has as one of its key interests, language choice towards
construction and realization of the goals of argumentative talk shows in radio and on TV.

2.1.2 Genre in Rhetoric

In rhetorical inquiry and criticism, a discourse is classified according to which component in the communication process receives the primary focus. If the focus or aim is on the sender, the discourse will be expressive; if on the receiver, it will be persuasive; if on the linguistic form or code, it will be literary; and if the aim is to present the realities of the world, it will be referential. Thus, discourses are classified on the communicative purpose or aim they serve. Rhetorical scholars like Campbell and Jamieson (1978), have tended to take context more into account to give genre a more central place. Taking an inductive and/or historical orientation, they stress the recurrence of similar forms in genre creation.

A genre is a group of acts unified by a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members. These forms, in isolation, appear in other discourses. What is distinctive about the acts in a genre is a recurrence of the forms together in constellation (Campbell & Jamieson, 1978:20). This kind of genre analysis suggests comparing rhetorical similarities and differences as a potential method of establishing the genre membership or otherwise of a particular text. This is the approach that was taken in the current study to compare the similarities and/or differences in the structure and the aspects of the talk shows sampled.
2.1.3 Genre in Linguistics

Linguists have been more partial in the attention they have given to the term genre. Halliday, (1978) and Martin (1985), just like those interested in genre as rhetoric, also seem to recognize that genres comprise a system for accomplishing social purposes by verbal means. For Hymes, (1974), genres often coincide with speech events restricted to activities, or aspects of activities that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech (1974). Staying with the folklorists view, linguists too pay interest in the communicative purpose in genre identification. For example, Miller (1984) in support of the concept of purpose argues that ‘a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centered not in substance or form of discourse but in the action it is used to accomplish’ (Miller 1984, cited in Freedman & Medway 1994:24). Linguistic contributions to the evolving study of genre lie in the emphasis given to: genre as types of goal-oriented communicative events; genres as having schematic structures; and genres as dissociated from registers or styles.

The genre analysts among folklorists, rhetoricians, thus, make a substantial contribution to the evolving concept of genre suitable for the purposes of this study. In classifying genres, the emphasis placed on form, context, aim of communicative event, and the mechanism for reaching communicative goals are valuable to the current study. These are the four parameters that were used in establishing argumentative talk show genre. The talk shows under study are designed to accomplish a particular goal: inform, educate as well as shape
public opinion, so they may require a process that unfolds through different stages each of which is characterized by different linguistic resources.

2.2 Radio and Television Talk shows

There are numerous forms of broadcast talk presented both in radio and on television with audiences-whether the co-present bodies of which a studio audience is comprised, or the altogether amorphous distributed population making up the ‘absent’ audience of viewers and listeners. Audience participation debates, news interviews, phone-ins, talk shows and the like are examples of broadcast genres (Hutchby, 2006).

A talk show, which evolved from conversations with a personality to the discussion about social issues, is a particular instance of broadcast discourse which is envisaged both as a media product and as an ongoing talk-oriented process (Ilie, 1999). The interaction is task related in the sense that the talk is principally designed to discuss personal opinions about public issues. As Myers (2001) observes, talk shows present a genre in which topics are elaborated on to make them something participants and audiences can talk about. These talk shows are generally characterized by a high level of opinion giving and argument. The programmes are live broadcasts with the panelists usually experts in the area of the issue under examination, while the audience in the talk shows is profoundly active as they participate in the discussions via telephone calls, SMS or tweets from the private domain of their homes. Hence, to keep with Greatbatch (1998), the wider audiences are not exactly
constructed as eavesdroppers listening in on a private conversation. The goal of this broadcast genre is threefold: entertainment, information and public service (Hutchby, 1996, 2006).

As an arena that mediates between society and the state, talk shows offer an opportunity to the lay public to try to influence political, economic and social decisions with their opinions. These issues are discussed under the management of a host. The talk shows adopt the classic debate format in the sense that a social or political problem is discussed by two parties who argue each supporting one side of the matter and trying to convince of the correctness of the side they support with their arguments. The host controls the controversial form of talk by keeping order and selecting speakers in such a way that disagreement is sought (e.g. by demanding answers to refutations); in other words, provoking confrontation, eliciting divergent views, but preventing the talk from developing into a quarrel as the degree of emotional intensity increases. Once an opinion is presented, the host immediately selects a representative of the opposing view as the next speaker. The argument/talk thus is maintained during the give-and–take of the confronting parties. The choice of the panel is determined by the topic under discussion. This seems to be guided by the principle that a discourse community has a threshold level of members with a suitable degree of relevant content and discoursal expertise (Swales, 1990).
The communicative event is expected to have an organizational structure. Structure of broadcasting refers to the means used to bring about the objectives of the TV and radio genres. It has an introduction that foregrounds the subject/problem or topic. It presents the expectations of the programme as it relates to the contributions of the panelists and the wider audience. Moreover, the topics are presented as given themes in public domain, and the fact that something is recognizably in the public domain is a significant way in which it can be construed as an issue. The host conducts the introduction in his/her turn that is constructed as an announcement, self identification by the panelists in organizational turns. They give their names, titles and areas of expertise (Hutchby, 1996). This is primarily meant to address the wider audience. In an extended turn, the host then gives a background to the issue at hand and invites the participation of the panelists and the wider audience.

What follows the opening sequence is an exchange of speaking turns in which the host and the panelists discuss or, much more frequently, dispute the issue in question. The argument is developed through a sequence of turns, mostly distributed by the talk show host. Speakers, in their turns, comment on the argument previously pointed out by the previous speaker(s). Just like the opening, the closing of the programme is usually initiated by the host. He may do a recap of the issues raised as no new subject is introduced at this stage. With specific reference to four talk shows: Spotlight on Hope FM, Nation’s Talking Point on Nation FM, Opinion Court on Citizen TV and Checkpoint on KTN, this study undertook an analysis of structure, linguistic
features and communicative functions of the argumentative talk show genre which is regarded as host-controlled, participant-shaped and audience evaluated speech event (Ilie, 1999).

2.3 Approaching Argument

The study of argument, or rhetoric, dates back to classical Greece and was revitalized in Europe with the work of Toulmin (1958) and Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1971). This approach was concerned with how arguments are designed to persuade. Indeed Van Eemeren (2010) views argumentation as a social, intellectual verbal activity serving to justify or refute an opinion, and consisting of a constellation of statements and directed towards obtaining the appropriation of an audience. But this classical approach treats argument as a function of reason, as the way in which arguments are made by single speakers, as essentially an intellectual activity. In contrast, the approach this study took sees argument as an interactional process between many parties.

This view is informed by the work of (Hutchby, 1996) whose studies of arguments as dispute sequences have stressed the crucial role of adversative activities such as agreement, disagreement, challenge, contradiction, negations and other forms of opposition. The current study focused as part of its interest on aspects that are characteristic of argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations. These aspects are discussed in the section that follows.
According to Schegloff (2007), talk-in-interaction is composed of various practices by which participants construct an interaction. Interactional episodes in different speech exchange systems are the products of different practices and accordingly have different features. These practices also referred to as organizational issues need to be managed in order for orderly, understandable and effective interaction to get done. These are ‘genre issues’, whose solutions are managed by what is called ‘generic organizations. Various interactional properties, features or aspects characterize argumentative talk as an oral disagreement involving different points of view.

2.4 Aspects of Argument in Argumentative Talk shows
The current study adopted the classification by Hutchby (1996) who observes that an argument can be viewed as constructed on various interactional properties. The first are the Action – Opposition Sequences. Arguments can be viewed as constructed by means of basic Action-Opposition Sequence, which can be chained by a given opposition move being treated as the Action move for the next sequence (Hutchby, 1996). On this note, Maynard (1985) notes that any interactional move can, in principle, be opposed; it can be treated as an arguable action and hence as the basis for starting an argument. Opposition is the key feature of argument; thus, an argument can proceeds by means of opposition moves themselves being treated as arguable actions in further Action – Opposition sequences. This is not to say that arguments always take the form of chained “paired–action sequences” as in many kinds of interviews; the oppositional moves depend on the recipient electing to treat the prior turn
as arguable (Frankel, 1990; Greatbatch, 1998).

Schriffin (1987) distinguishes between “rhetorical” and “oppositional” argument by stating that in rhetorical arguments, a speaker presents an intact monologue supporting a disputable position. Oppositional arguments, on the other hand, are produced in some interactional context whereby two or more speakers openly engage in disputing over a position across a series of turns. In the oppositional arguments, speakers’ positions are contested and opposing positions are taken up and argued for. This is the kind of argument that this study focused on. The argumentative talk shows under study were conducted by more than two speakers, and mediated by a talk show host. Approaching arguments as action-opposition sequences in this sense allowed us to investigate participants’ use of locally emergent features of the talk in constructing their argument.

*Shifts in footing* is another aspect of argument in which hosts are able to disclaim sole authorship for a position by attributing it to a third party (Clayman, 1992; Hutchby, 1996). When used by news interviewers, this strategy enables their producers to maintain a stance of official neutrality on an issue, while at the same time articulating a position that contrasts with that of the interviewee. Depending on the type of third party evoked—a knowledgeable authority or the general public—there may be further implications for the credibility of the viewpoint being expressed or the legitimacy of the questioning being pursued by the host. The results are
neutralism, credibility and legitimacy (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Hosts on talk shows sampled certainly did orient to a constraint for neutrality on their part. But while the footing shift device may not be functioning to protect anyone’s neutrality in some instances, its use still serves to moderate opposition in the sense that the host establishes a distance between himself/herself and the counter position they are articulating. The use of this strategy arises from the professional norms that constraint broadcast journalism that interviewers should avoid the assertion of opinions on their own behalf, and should refrain from direct or overt affiliation with (or disaffiliation from) the expressed statements of the interviewees.

Validity challenges are a class of utterances which oppose a claim on the grounds of its relevance to the matter in question. These aspects may take the form of utterances like ‘so?’ ‘What’s that got to do with it?’ which oppose a claim on the grounds of its relevance to the matter in question. Goodwin (1990), studying children’s argument has termed these utterances as ‘disclaimers.’ A disclaimer is an action that denies the relevance of a prior action without disagreeing with it. Frequently, turns containing the challenge have distinctive prefaces. Thus, terms such as ‘so,’ ‘I know’ ‘How’ can be used to begin turns containing reasons why a current speaker considers prior speaker’s talk to be of no consequence (Goodwin, 1990 cited in Hutchby, 1996). After the challenge, speakers themselves then go on to provide grounds for the relevance of the challenged claim. The challenge of the relevance of a preceding turn is normally in oppositional sense. The validity challenges
function to pursue credibility and legitimacy of claims made by the participants as in response to the challenge. The participants to whom the challenge is directed are often required to provide facts.

Additionally, turning a claim against itself is another significant generic argumentative device that enables participants in the talk show to project doubt about the general validity of the claims and assertions made by demonstrating faultiness in their details. By use of this device, the host or a panelist is able to engage in argument by turning a participant’s claim against themselves. This device takes the form of a contrast nature in the general linguistic form; “You say (X), but what about (Y)?” where (X) represents the attributed claim and (Y) the competing version (Atkinson, 1984a; Mulky, 1986; Drew, 1990). This device is particularly effective in argumentative environments precisely because its first component directly allocates responsibility to a recipient for the claim that its second component shows to be at fault (Hutchby, 1996, 2001). The source of the challenged position provides information for supporting their position and justifying their claim.

Another aspect of argumentative talkshows is interruption/intervening in ongoing talk. One of the rules governing conversation is that one party talks at a time (Sacks, 1974). Although participants orient themselves to this rule, very often two or more participants speak at the same time. In such a situation, some action is initiated by a participant before a new question has emerged on the interactional “floor.” According to Schegloff (2007), a common form of
departure emerges in a discussion that involves multiple participants where a currently unaddressed speaker seeks to comment on some aspect of talk in-progress in breach of the turn taking provision that interviewees’ turns should properly be produced as responses to interviewers’ questions. Simultaneous talk may be the result of misprojection of the end of the current speaker’s turn. Very often though, simultaneous talk is the result of intentional, abrupt cutting-in while the current speaker has not yet reached what might be considered the proximity of the end of his/her turn. Interruptions may occur if the second speaker, having evidence that the current speaker had no intention of relinquishing the floor, starts speaking at what could not be a completion point; Transition Relevance Place (TRP).

Tannen (1994) found out that simultaneous speech can be cooperative overlapping, that is, supportive rather than obstructive when simultaneous talk showed understanding, participation and solidarity. Hutchby (1992) treats interruption as an interactional phenomenon that allows the discrimination of particular uses depending on the organizational constraints of the setting in which the phenomenon occurs. In talk show programmes, the questioning role is the prerogative of the talk show host (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Tolson, 2006; Hutchby 2006). However, a departure may occur in cases where a panelist takes up the questioning role and therefore initiates a Q-A sequence addressed to a fellow panelist.
The turn taking system for conversation is described in terms of a turn constructional component, a turn-allocational component and a set of rules. The completion of one turn component constitutes a point at which speakers may, but need not, change turn; this point is known as Transition-Relevance Place (TRP) (Schegloff, 2007). Though the turn taking system appears to provide a means to precise timing of speaker transfer, sometimes the end of turn units are misprojected, and consequently two or more participants speak at the same time. Their turns are said to overlap. Thus, overlaps characterize argument in talk shows. Another possible source of overlap is competition by self–selecting speakers for a next turn. In case of misprojection, the potential speaker tends to let the current speaker finish his/her turn. In case of competition for a next turn, the easiest way to resolve the overlap is for one willing speaker to drop out. Overlap, overlapping talk speech therefore refers to talk taking place at the same time by two or more interlocutors.

Although speakers tend to avoid talking simultaneously with their interlocutors, overlapping is not rare and it comes into being at places where speaker change occurs. These are Transition Relevance Places (TRPs) (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). There are two types of overlaps: competitive and non-competitive overlaps. Competitive overlaps are produced in overlap with the current speaker’s unfinished turn. They are a result of an attempt by a non-selected speaker to take the floor prematurely. On the other hand, non-competitive overlaps refer to overlapping whose purpose is to not to complete for speakership with the current speaker. The current study described the two
types of overlaps as an argumentative and interactional phenomenon. In particular, it looked at how the overlaps started, how they were resolved and what happened after they were resolved.

Another feature of radio and TV argumentative talk show is the use of reformulations. On several occasions during talk, a formulation offered by one person is re-formulated by the other. In argumentative the talk shows, the hosts can clarify, refocus or underline prior talk, as well as to cooperate or challenge the panelist’s statements. They also attempt to establish control over the agenda by selectively “reformulating” the gist or upshot of the participant’s remarks. Heritage (1985) notes that in institutional settings (e.g courtrooms, classrooms, news interviews etc.), reformulating is most commonly undertaken by questioners to strategically direct the talk. The participants can also make use of question reformulations to avoid some aspect of an interviewee’s question. Before providing an answer, they can paraphrase the question that was asked. After reformulating, interviewees continue talking, and as such subsequent talk builds on the reformulation rather than the original question (Heritage, 2004; Clayman, 2010).

**2.5 Question Types in Argumentative Talk shows**

The talk show is first and foremost, a course of interaction to which participants contribute on a turn by turn basis, for the most part by asking and answering questions (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). The contributions are understood in terms of their thematic content and also by how they bear on the
unfolding interactional ‘game’ being played by the participants (Tolson, 2006). According to Martinez (2002), each question has a retrospective import, that is, some questions accept and build upon a speaker’s previous remarks in a way that that moves the discussion along, while other questions subject prior remarks to challenge. Each question also has a prospective import, that is, some questions are relatively open-ended and allow the participants maximum leeway to respond, whereas others narrow the parameters of an acceptable response and exert pressure on the interviewee to respond in a particular way. Correspondingly, the sense and import of a speakers’s response depends in part on how it deals with the agenda established in the question- whether it is dutifully answering, or resistant in some way, or downright evasive.

2.5.1 Classification of Questions

Question-answer exchanges are common examples of the basic unit of sequence interaction referred to as adjacency pairs (Sacks, 1972b; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; Schegloff, 2007). An adjacency pair consists of two utterances made by different people in a fixed sequence such as one asking a question and the other one responding to it (Danet, 1980). In general, by asking a question, the speaker positions him or herself as lacking certain knowledge. This is referred to as ‘K-’ position. Simultaneously, it implies that the addressee is knowledgeable, which is referred to as a ‘K+’ position. Questioning, therefore, brings into play an epistemic gradient between interlocutors, which then makes a response to the question relevant. The
speaker then having received and accepted the answer, moves from a ‘K-’ position to a ‘K+’ position, which he/she should indicate with an acknowledging response (Jagitani, 2013). In the talk shows under study, hosts elicit information on behalf of the wider audience; hence, the wider audience may be treated as the addressee lacking certain knowledge or information.

Questions have been classified differently: on their formal or structural properties, as well as on their functions; hence, different typologies exist. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Startvik (1985) classify questions into three major types on the basis of their form. The first type is the *Wh-questions* that invite a reply from an open range options. They are often marked by the presence of an interrogative word, hence their name. The interrogative words, (what, which, when, why, how) specify the element the answer is to be oriented to. For example, in the question ‘why is the government against dialogue?’ The word ‘why’ expects a response relating to reason rather than to say manner or place.

Second, are the *Yes/ No questions* which expect an answer that confirms or negates what the questioner asks. The Yes/No questions provided by Quirk et al. (1985) are further divided into sub classes. The first sub class involves *inversion of the subject* and the operator as in the example below:

Does he go to school? {Yes (He does)  
No  (He doesn’t)  

The subject ‘he’ in the example above is inverted and the auxiliary ‘do’ is
added to function as an operator. Inverting the subject and the operator gives rise to the characteristic syntactic form of Yes/No questions in English.

The second sub class of Yes/No questions are the *statement-form questions*. They are marked with a rising intonation to declarative statements. So the subject-operator inversion does not always take place. These types of questions are posed in anticipation of confirmation. For example:

Jane is a first year student?

Yes {she is)

No {she isn’t}

This question is marked in the sense that the speaker poses the question in anticipation of a confirmation (Strivers, 2010).

The third subclass is the *tag questions* (you go to school, don’t you?/ You don’t go to school, do you?). The tag question is appended to a statement. The Yes/No questions have a different orientation that gives rise to negative Yes/No questions (Quirk et al, 1985; de Ruiter, 2012). The negative questions are framed in a way that shows bias of expectation to a given response. Consider following contrast:

Are you taking exams?

Aren’t you taking exams?
The first question is neutral with regard to speaker expectations, but the negative question signals that he or she is hoping for a positive answer but not really expecting one. For this reason, negative questions may be conducive, that is, they may indicate that the speaker is predisposed to the kind of answer he wished (Quirk et al, 1985). Respondents then can either comply with or resist these constraints.

According to Raymond (2003) and Strivers (2011), where Yes/No responses occur, such responses are called *type-conforming*, since they are predominantly produced as answers to polar questions. Generally, the type conforming Yes-No responses can stand alone or they can occur in turn-initial position with further components added, for example; ‘Yes we can dialogue.’ Departures from such responses are done for certain interactional purposes and have different sequential consequences. On the other hand, *non-conforming* responses to a polar question occur when a respondent provides an explanation instead of responding with a Yes/No answer. Heritage (2002) study of news interviews records that interviewers’ negative questions are posed “under the auspices of an ideology of ‘neutrality’” (p.1430), but in reality allow for the interviewer to project an expected answer.

Under the third broad category are *alternative questions/choice questions* that expect as the reply one of the options contained in the question itself.
In a study of broadcast talk, Clayman and Heritage (2002) have added to the classification of questions as they occur in news interviews as follows: One is *prefaced question design* in which the question contains one or more statements prior to the question proper. The prefatory statements establish a context and background that gives meaning and point to the subsequent question which otherwise might seem to come “out of the blue” (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

Two, are *questions and “preference”* in which questions are designed to exert pressure on a respondent through its facilitation of one response over the other. This question design is largely associated with “Yes/No” questions which “prefer” particular responses (Pomerantz 1984a; Sacks 1987; Schegloff 1988/1989; Heritage 1998). For example, questions that are framed using negative interrogative; for example, ‘won’t you…?, isn’t this…?’ are routinely treated as embodying a very strong preference for a “yes” answer. So, questions can be shaped to prefer particular responses through the interrogative design of the question itself, or through prefatory statements or by a combination of the two.

*Accusatory questions* are the third type of questions. They may be used to question past activities of the panelists and they are virtually specialized for the delivery of accusations. These questions are often followed by statements that consolidate the interviewer’s accusatory role with hostile remarks. These questions normally take the form why did you Y’. However, they can also take
a more damaging form: ‘How can/could you Y’ (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). The current study, examined the questions that the hosts engaged the participants in, and how these questions, together with the other aspects of argumentative talk shows discussed earlier, were used to achieve the communicative purposes of the argumentative talk show genre.

Another classification of questions is by Gruber (2001) and Ilie (1999). They investigated how sequencing of an interaction is affected by questions. They classified questions into two broad categories: standard and non standard questions. Standard questions elicit an answer or require or expect information. Non-standard questions on the other hand do not exhibit primarily answer-eliciting or information-eliciting response. They elicit several other types of responses, such as answers of confirmation, permission-granting, suggestion, acceptance, etc., or no response at all (but rather a meaningful gesture).

Building upon Gruber, 2001; Ilie 1999, Clayman and Hertitage 2002, Schirm 2008 came up with another classification of questions that characterize talk shows taking note of the fact that the talk shows are goal oriented and aim at fulfilling information. She noted that the framing of questions is central to the talk show structure. In addition, the institutional roles assigned to speakers, the interactional roles they assume themselves in relation to other participants, as well as the reactions of the wider audience are important factors to be taken into account when classifying questions in talk shows.
Picking up from this classification, Schirm (2008) proposed a more elaborate system of categorization of questions based on four parameters: role, competency, standardness and sequential place. Regarding role, a question in talk shows can be asked by either the moderator or the guest; a question is the result of competency if it is within the role of the person asking it, while it is not if it does not fit this role. A question is standard if it is asked because of a gap in the knowledge of the person asking it and if this person expects an overt verbal answer. Otherwise it is non standard. Sequential place refers to the place of the question within the turn sequence it occurs in. Three broad categories of questions emerge from this classification as presented in the next few paragraphs.

The first broad category is dispute directing questions that shape and direct the course of a dispute. Under this broad class are first, the dispute starting questions which are asked by the talk show host after introducing the panelists. The second sub class is clashing questions that are typically generated by the host and directed at another panelist to elicit opposing views from the panelists and to clash them with each other to ground the dispute. The topic changing questions are the third type of questions in this category. While the topics of discussion in the talk shows are usually rigid, there are few instances when the participants drift away from the main agenda.
The second broad category is **argumentative questions** whose role is to maintain the dispute. Just like the topic changing questions, these questions can be generated by the talk show host or the panelists. The following are the sub classes: **negative debating questions** that display an expectation about the type of answer that would be correct or preferable. These questions are negatively formulated for example, ‘Aren’t you…?’ ‘Isn’t it true that…’ hence, they embody a strong preference for an affirmative answer. They are often treated as expressing an opinion rather than merely asking a question (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Clayman, 2010). The second sub-class is the **attacking echo questions** that repeat a prior utterance partly or fully to question its validity.

The **attack-back questions** on the other hand are questions that constitute the third sub class of questions under argumentative questions. These questions category also challenge a previous utterance. However, unlike the attacking echo questions, they make no direct reference to the issue raised earlier. These two sub classes; attacking echo and attack-back are sometimes referred to as supplementary questions as they are produced in third turns (Greatbatch, 1986). These questions display three basic properties: they are located after an answer to a prior question; they are addressed to the author of the prior answer; and they are built on to the preceding answer either by continuing the topical line or by taking up a specific aspect of the answer in question. The last sub-class is **rhetorical questions** which do not elicit any response, but are used to prompt argumentative talk and influence opinion (Gruber, 2001). The
questions can be asked by either the talk show host or the panelists, and can occur anywhere in the turn sequences.

The last broad category is **clarifying questions** which are generated by the talk show host to elicit missing information. Under this category are four sub classes: First are **classic clarifying questions** that are used to pursue absolute fact in an attempt to elicit the truth value of the content presented (Schirm, 2008). The second sub class is **opinion eliciting questions** that enquire about the opinion or the view of the panelists. They take the form ‘what is your opinion of that….’ What do you think about ….’ The third sub-class is **examination questions** whose function is to map up whether the interlocutor has a gap in their knowledge with regard to the issue in question. The question can be asked by either the host or the panelists.

The last sub-class of questions under the clarifying questions is the **permission eliciting questions** that the interlocutors use to make a plea, to add something, to make some corrections or to enter the dispute. The participants, aware of the constraints of the speaking roles in broadcast talk would want to avoid some unpreferred acts such as cutting in on an ongoing turn. Hence, they result to such questions (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

Schirm (2008) classifies questions based not only on their formal characteristics but on their role in verbal conflict in argumentative talk shows. For this purpose, this classification was adopted to account the functions of
questions in the talk shows in the present study. These questions contributed to
the achievement of the goals of the talk shows under study- to inform, educate
and shape public opinion.

2.6 Studies in Genre Analysis

The genre based approach applied here owes a substantial debt to previous
work in various fields mainly from written research genres. Such studies
distinguish various genres by spelling out compositional characteristics that
describe different categories of texts within their respective settings (Swales,

Swales (1990) studied the introductions of the scientific journal articles. He
developed a concept of genre as a communicative activity guided by
purpose(s) and, which occurs within a discourse community. He notes that an
Introduction, Methods, Results and Discussion (IMRD) section characterize
scientifc writing. Swales (1990) observes that such schematic structure serves
the communicative purpose which is agreeable to experts in the scientifc
field. Hence, it was of interest to establish if the talk shows under study have
an identifable structure that facilitates the achievement of their
communicative goals.

Drawing on the findings of Swales (1990), Hafner (2010) focused on the
description of of a barrister’s opinion as a legal genre. Thus, he analyzed the
genre in terms of its intertextual and interdiscursive writing context, generic
move structure, and lexico-grammatical textualization. His findings were that in order to construct a barrister’s opinion; novice lawyers must not only master the conventional structure and legal language, but also develop an understanding of these shared institutional values and beliefs in order to produce convincing arguments. These findings provided useful insights to current study on spoken arguments that also focused on the structure of argumentative talk shows, and language use that are constrained by the communicative goals as well as by some institutional norms in the production of the talk. However, tape recorded data was used in the current study, unlike the questionnaires used in Hafner’s work.

Another study by Gibbons (2003) looks at legal genres involved in the court system, and observes that each genre has particular characteristics that enable it to perform its role. For instance, a trial is organized into a predictable sequence of stages, so it is a macro-genre. Within a trial, examination-in-chief or a judge’s summing up will also reveal distinct stages. Finally, the conclusion of examination-in-chief may consist of a staged reconstruction of the evidence, for confirmation by the witness. While the current study also focuses on the linguistic aspects that characterize each stage of the talk shows, the current study departs from that of Gibbons in the sense that it is based on radio and television context. However, the various phases of the argumentative talk shows, that is the introduction, body and closing could be considered as sub-genres that make up a macro genre; the overall talk show.
Locally, Maroko (1999) looks at Rhetorical Structure in M.A research proposals of Kenyatta University in the light of Kenyatta University Faculty of Arts (KUFA) model. His study, in particular focuses on the linguistic signaling devices characterize the statement of the problem, the citations and how these features enhance the rhetorical structure of the research proposals. In a similar study, Maroko (2008) investigates the generic characteristics of M.A and M.Sc theses in Kenyan universities. This study investigates generic features (moves, tense, writer stance, hedging and citation) that emerge in the M.A and M.Sc theses are used in a bid to meet the communicative purposes in two discourse communities. His study further explains the rationale behind the structure and language use in the said theses. Though based on written texts, these studies are anchored on Swales (1990, 2004) Genre Theory. Therefore, they provided insight into the application of the theory in data analysis for the current study.

Magen (2011) on the other hand, looked at the print media’s use of language to cover post-election violence by describing the linguistic features of headlines used by Daily Nation and The Standard newspapers. While focusing on the similarities and differences in the news text, his study further discusses the discourse functions of the linguistic features in the light of Genre Theory, Systemic Functional Linguistics and the Appraisal Framework. Magen’s study draws data from the print media while our study focuses on electronic media. Nevertheless, his study informs the proposed study on the use of Genre Analysis in data analysis and presentation.
In a study on the form and content of the press release Lassen (2006) seeks to establish if it may be seen as a genre. Focusing on a corpus of press release on a specific biotechnological issue, he analyzed the staging terms in terms of content as well as logico-semantic relations between the stages, patterns of stage combinations and their linguistic realizations with the aim of identifying variation in rhetorical objective. His argument is that the press release may be recognized as a genre on the basis of repeated textual patterns which amounts to form. On the basis of this he suggested that the press release is a highly conventionalized and indeed a static genre, though there would seem to be crucial variation in terms of rhetorical objectives according to the context in which the press release are issued. The current study also sought to delineate the argumentative talk shows based on a common form/structure, aspects of argument, question types as well as shared communicative functions.

Although using different texts in different contexts, the above studies on genre analysis, address features of genre similar to the proposed study namely, identifiable structure, particular choice of content and style and communicative purposes. They undoubtedly provided useful insights into the analysis of the character that is typical of the argumentative talk show genre on radio and TV in Kenya.

2.7 Media Discourse Studies

The study of media discourse has proven to be a particularly fruitful area of investigation. This is in both print and electronic media which is evident in the
growth of linguistic research on this area in the West, Africa and Kenya in particular.

While focusing on aspects confrontational talk drawn from London’s LBC radio station, Hutchby (1996) takes a Conversational Analysis approach to examine verbal confrontation as it occurs in a single context: talk shows that are broadcast in England. His study aims at describing the underlying social organization conceived as an institutionalized substratum of rules, procedures and conventions. Hutchby demonstrates that arguments are interactional accomplishments, and they require the active participation of all the communicators. Hutchby provided this study with the aspects that characterize argumentative talk. His study was limited to talk shows on radio while this study focused on talk shows on radio and TV in the local scene.

Clayman and Heritage, (2002), Montogmery, (2007) studied the structure and fundamental practices through which the modern news interview is conducted under CA. Drawing on news programme on both UK and USA based TV stations, they focused on such practices are turn taking, question design and the management of answers. Taken together, these practices were reported to comprise the building blocks on which the news interview interaction is constructed. Likewise, the current study applied CA to describe the overall organization of the talk shows on both TV and radio stations in Kenya. Clayman and Heritage findings on the question design were particularly helpful as they set the ground on which the investigation of the question
typology that characterizes argumentative talk shows partially emerged. The two studies also guided this study on the use of the transcription symbols under Conversational Analysis.

Hungbo (2011) studied how discourses in the public domain on radio talk shows in South Africa constitute useful political messages aimed at constructing identities for the mobilization of citizens towards specific objectives. Drawing on the tenets of Critical Discourse Analysis, (Fairclough, 1992; Reisgl & Wodak, 2009) his study shows the significance of people’s contributions on issues dealing with the politics beyond ‘mere talk’. The current study focuses on argumentative talk shows on radio and TV that also aim at shaping public opinion on various issues, majority being political issues that touch on the citizens. However, the current study differs from his in the theoretical framework as it was based on Genre Analysis and Conversational Analysis.

Some researchers have investigated the structure and content of newspaper language. For instance, Nyongesa (2005) investigated the rhetorical structure in editorials as argumentation on Kenyan newspaper discourse, based on Rhetorical Structure Theory. His study sought to establish if editorials adhere to the generic constraints of argumentation in terms of structure and content. The findings of this study showed that the editorials adhere to the classical structure of argumentation i.e. summary of events, evidence/support (evaluation) and conclusion (the pragmatic coda). The current study seeks to
find out the generic structure and linguistic features of argument on radio and TV talk shows based mainly on the Genre Theory.

From the literature above, it can be observed that this is not the first time that both print and audio media discourse has been subjected to analysis. The studies reviewed have taken a discourse analysis approach focusing mainly on the structure of these texts. However, what emerges is less attention has been paid to the ways in which the communicative activity in the said contexts is practically accomplished. Additionally, the texts do not address the concept of communicative purpose that indeed determines structure and choice of language in the contexts in which they occur. It is these latter interests that represented the principal concerns of this study. The aim was to demonstrate the general value of a genre-based approach to the study of broadcast talk.

2.8 Theoretical Framework

This section deals with the theoretical basis for the study. It describes the two theories used in identifying the aspects of talk that the study focused on. The theories are: Genre Analysis and Conversational Analysis. Conversational Analysis seeks to account for the sequence and overall organization of conversation while Genre-based approach incorporates an analysis of the rhetorical structure, linguistic patterns and communicative purposes. Thus, an eclectic theoretical framework was necessary to address the concerns of the current study.
2.8.1 Genre Theory

The Genre Theory was developed by the Sydney School of theorists as a reaction to Halliday’s (1978) Systemic Functional Linguistics which emphasized on the expressionist (creative) process approach in Australian elementary schools. In North America, the intellectual starting point of the Genre Theory was started as New Rhetoric, as articulated by Miller (1984), and Bakhtin (1984). Practically, it was rooted in concerns with writing in the disciplines and workplace. In recent years, Genre Theory has become multi-faceted too, often prompting varied perspectives on analyzing a genre (Bhatia, 2004). It is a theory that looks at how language is used within a discourse community (Swales, 1990).

The first focus of the Genre Theory is the structure of a text. In relation to structure, genres have beginnings, middles and endings of various kinds, and are complete structured texts based on genre membership (Swales 1990). Other scholars (Hassan, 1978; Martin, 1985; Ventola, 1994; Van Dijk, 1985; Martin, 2001) state that every genre or discourse type has its own discourse structure and content that defines it. It aims at revealing templates or scripts in the organization of the discourse. For Halliday and Hassan, the organizational structure is defined in terms of obligatory elements in a specific order (Halliday & Hassan, 1985). Thus, a genre has a constituency structure in which each constituent plays a functional role in the whole, and has specific functional meaning relations to other constituents in its own level.
The second focus of Genre Theory is the content or language choice that characterizes a particular discourse type constrained by the communicative goal. A genre based approach; therefore, concerns itself with the analysis of language use in routine settings. It has been viewed as a staged, goal-oriented, social process, and as a ‘socio-psychological category defined by a structural arrangement of textual features’ (Martin, 1992; Swales, 1990). However, most approaches to genre analysis identify two areas of knowledge that provide clues to text genres: knowledge of formal schema (i.e the rhetorical structure of a text type) and content schema (‘what content is appropriate to a particular purpose in a particular time’), (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995:13).

Additionally, the compositional and stylistic features of a genre may vary since they are determined by the communicative objectives of the speaker (Feng, 2013).

Finally, Genre Theory focuses on shared communicative purpose of texts. This has been nominated as the privileged property of a genre as genres are communicative vehicles for the achievement of goal. Communicative events pertaining to the same genre are recognized primarily by a set of shared communicative purposes that the participants aim to fulfill.

According to Swales (1990):

A genre comprises of a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. The purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constraints choice of content and style… [...] In addition to purpose, exemplars of
a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience (p.58).

Thus, genres occur within a functional setting (Swales, 1986). Secondly, communicative events pertaining to the same genre are recognized primarily by a set of shared communicative purposes that the participants aim to fulfill. Genre membership is determined by the achievement of specific communicative goals. Thirdly, these goals shape the internal structure of the genre and constrain the choice of content and style. Bhatia (1993) argues that it is predictable that a major change in communicative purpose is likely to render a different genre, with sub-genres being distinguished on the basis of minor goal modifications.

It is this three-parameter notion of Genre Theory, based primarily on Swales (1990) definition that was adopted for this study. Accordingly, the three concepts of structure, content and communicative goals guided the study in investigating the organizational structure of argumentative talk shows to establish how the talk unfolds through discrete stages these are: the opening, body and closing. The prototypical talk show involves a distinctive constellation of participants, subject matter, and interactional form. The host is known as a professional journalist and the panelists have some connection to recent news or events, either as primary actors (For example, as government officials, church or political leaders).
2.8.2 Conversational Analysis

CA is an approach to discourse analysis derived from Ethnomethodology, an area within Sociology initiated by Harold Garfinkel. The theory has its origins in the work of Harold Garfinkel (1967) and Ervin Goffman (1955). By analyzing detailed transcripts of authentic ordinary speech events, CA seeks to identify the systematic recurrence of patterns (turns, pairs of turns, exchanges) in an attempt to discover the methods by which individuals make sense of social order. CA has concern on the following: turn taking organization, adjacency pair and preference organization, sequence organization and overall organization of interaction.

Regarding turn taking, all interactions involve participants switching roles in the process known as turn taking (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). For Schegloff (2007), one of the most fundamental organizations of practice for talk-in-interaction is the organization of turn-taking. Participants should be able to show that what they are saying or doing is responsive to what another has said and done. Thus, utterances are context based; that is, they are contextually located both in social relations and with reference to other utterances. A speaker’s utterance is context shaped, for it is by reference to prior utterances that it can be understood; and context renewing, for it provides the context for a next utterance (Heritage, 1984). Thus, the context of a next utterance is constantly renewed with every current utterance. Context is primarily saying and doing. In taking turns, one party needs to talk after the other, and it turns out, they have to talk singly - that is, one at a time. It is the
organization practices of turn taking that is relied upon by parties in talk-in-
interaction to achieve these outcomes routinely.

The building blocks out of which turns are fashioned are called turn
construction units (TCUs). For English and many other languages, the basic
shapes that TCUs take are sentences (or clauses more generally), phrases, and
lexical items. A speaker beginning to talk produces a TCU, which may realize
one or more actions. As the speaker approaches the Possible Completion Point
(PCP) of a TCU, in a turn, transition to a next speaker may become relevant at
a point known as Transition Relevance Place (TRP). A party to an interaction
comes to be in the position to take a turn by a prior speaker selecting them as
next speakers by addressing, shifting gaze at them, or by a speaker self
selecting themselves (Schegloff, 2007).

The next concern of CA is the unit of the adjacency pair (AP) or “nextness”
and preference organization as a resource for talk-in-interaction. In its
minimal, basic unexpanded form, an adjacency pair is characterized by certain
features. It is composed of two turns, by different speakers, adjacently placed.
These two turns are relatively ordered; that is, they are differentiated into “first
pair parts” (FPPs, or Fs for short) and “second pair parts” (SPPs or Ss for
short). First pair parts are utterance types such as question, request, offer,
invitation, types which initiate some exchange. Second pair parts are utterance
types such as answer, grant, reject, accept, decline, agree/disagree,
acknowledge, types which are responsive to the action of a prior turn.
The APs are pair–type related; that is, not every second pair part can properly follow any first pair part. For instance, a question should receive an answer, and an invitation an acceptance as the preferred second pair parts; while failure to produce an answer, or decline to an invitation is dispreferred. The adjacency pairs and turn taking operate across two neighbouring turns and give talk in interaction its sequential organization.

Overall structural organization is another concern of CA. It is a type of sequential organization of speech events by reference to their shape viz. their openings, main bodies and closings. Some types of actions/utterances are positioned early in a conversation (e.g., greetings) and others late in conversations (e.g., arrangement making, farewells). A standard practice of the opening section is a reciprocal exchange of greetings, mutual identification and recognition. The main body of an interaction is then structured around the topic; in the chain-like series of turns as participants collaboratively develop the coherent content of the topic.

Closing is the last stage of an interaction and the readiness to close or terminate is announced via a pre-closing sequence sometime before the actual closing. Typically, in the closing, exchanges of farewell take place (Sacks et al, 1974; Shegloff, 2007).

Whereas sacks CA focused mainly on ‘ordinary, plain talk’ as it occurred in various everyday settings, later it would be used to study the structure of talk.
produced in a large variety of different institutional settings, in which the participants are more goal oriented and institutional restrictions on the interaction are in force. Such settings include courts (Atkinson & Drew, 1979; Maynard, 1984; Drew, 1985; Atkinson, 1992; Kiguru, 2014), and broadcasting, (Heritage, 1985; Greatbach, 1998, Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hutchby, 1992, 2006).

Radio and television talk shows, which were the focus of this study are “basically task-related and fall within the definition of institutionalized talk. Accordingly, Conversational Analysis was used to describe the overall structure of the talk shows. This structure was achieved through the sequential organization of question answer sequences, as well as through the use of the following aspects of argument: action-opposition sequences, shifts in footing, turning a claim against itself, validity challenges, overlaps, reformulations and interruptions.

2.9 Summary of Chapter

This chapter has presented a review of the literature that is related to the interest of the present study. It has also presented the theoretical framework that guided the analysis of study data. The chapter that follows presents the research methodology adopted for the current study.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodological procedures used in the study. Specifically, it provides details on the research design, sampling techniques and sample size, data collection procedures, data analysis and presentation. It ends with the ethical and confidentiality considerations made for the study.

3.1 Research Design

The current study sought to describe the structure of argumentative talk shows on radio and Television in Kenya. In addition, the study investigated aspects of argument as well as the questions typology that characterizes these talk shows. Further, it discussed the communicative purposes of each phase of the talk shows. These are issues best studied within the framework of a descriptive design using qualitative methods. Accordingly, the descriptive design provided a framework for detailed analyses of texts in order to determine the reason for the generic features and communicative functions correlations in the programmes under study. Further, the design was adopted to focus on the frequencies of occurrence of aspects of argument and question types in the talk shows. This was necessary in order to establish the general tendencies of the features’ occurrence in the programmes. This is because if certain elements occurred frequently, then they would be deemed typical features of the argumentative talk show genre (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990).
3.2 Study Population

The study analyzed argumentative talk shows on selected radio and TV stations in Kenya. Accordingly, all radio stations and TV stations in Kenya, and all argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya constituted the population of interest to the study.

The Media Council of Kenya indicates that the media landscape in Kenya has changed beyond recognition over time. Radio in particular has expanded from 10 in 1999, to 66 in 2017. TV stations have increased from to 18 to 166 over the same period. A report by the Communication Authority of Kenya [CAK], (2017) also shows that, radio is the most popular and accessible medium, and that 95% of all Kenyans regularly listen to the radio.

The decision to compare radio and TV argumentative talk shows was based on the premise that identifying similarities and differences in the application of features of argumentative talk shows from different channels would be a sure way of establishing as a genre. This decision was influenced by Coates (1996) observation that in studies interested in similarities and differences of features in the population, focus on different groups provides firmer grounds for making conclusions than if the data was from one group.

3.3 Sampling Design

This study used non probability sampling design (also referred to as deliberate, purposive or judgment sampling) that involves deliberate selection of
particular units of the universe for constituting a sample that will be typical or representative of the whole (Kothari, 2004). Accordingly, judgment sampling technique was used to deliberately select the argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya. It was expected that this sample would yield results that would be typical or representative of all argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya. Part of the interest in this study was on the questions typology and the aspects of argument that characterize the talk shows sampled. This required the judgment of the researcher in identifying these particular aspects, which probability/random sampling of the programmes could not handle. Random sampling would perhaps result to samples that did not display these features, which would inhibit the comparison of the occurrence of the features across the programmes in establishing a genre.

3.3.1 Sampling Procedure

This study used multi stage sampling procedure where the sampling is carried out in stages using smaller and smaller sampling units at each stage (Kothari, 2004). In the first stage, the sampling frame consists of large aggregate of units. This unit is referred to as the Primary Sampling Unit (PSU). From the PSU, the second stage involves sub sampling into the first sub units, second or third sub units to the final sub sampling that arrives at the Ultimate Sampling Units (USUs) (Field, 2005). Accordingly, in the first stage, all TV and radio stations were sampled, and they constituted the Primary Sampling Unit. From this unit, the first sub-unit, that is, all talk shows on radio and TV stations in
Kenya were sampled. Further, the third sub-unit, that is, the Ultimate Sampling Unit was sampled and constituted the argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya: *Opinion Court* on Citizen TV, *Checkpoint* on KTN, *Spotlight* on Hope FM and *Nation’s Talking Point* on Nation FM. The choice of the programme to analyze was guided by the researcher’s judgment of the recordings that best displayed the features of interest for the study. The recordings constituted the linguistic data that was analyzed to describe the following features of the sampled talk shows: the generic structure, aspects of arguments, question types and the communicative purposes of each of the phases identified.

### 3.3.2 Sample Size

The study sample size comprised a grand total of seven hours and thirty minutes (450 minutes) of audio-taped radio and TV programmes. The amount of time devoted to commercial breaks is excluded from this size. Two broadcasts of each talk show from the four stations were recorded that added up to eight broadcasts of all the talk shows. The distribution of time per programme was follows: *Opinion Court* on Citizen TV runs for 45 minutes, so the data from Opinion court was 90 minutes; *Checkpoint* runs for 60 minutes yielding a total of 120 minutes, while *The Nation’s Talking Point* and *Spotlight* take 80 minutes and 40 minutes respectively. This means 160 minutes and 80 minutes for each were recorded. In total 450 minutes of conversational data was subjected to analysis. It is important to note that the difference in duration among the talk shows on radio and TV did not seem to
be an impediment for establishing similarities or differences since they still generated the categories of interest to the current study.

The justification for the sample size is that linguistic studies do not require large samples as small samples are able to provide data that is representative of the wider reality (Mestherie, Swan, Deumart & Leap, 2000; Cheshire, 1982; Trudgill, 1974). Secondly, it is argued that a large corpus of texts does not necessarily represent a genre better than a small one, particularly if it is used to study high frequency items (Hyland, 2005). Further, the complexity of some frameworks or approaches to media discourses can be daunting for students and even specialists (Hyland, 2005). Hyland, therefore, advises that few texts with more detailed and specific analyses on the text samples would suffice. Thus, a sample of seven hours and thirty minutes was adequate to allow for the study of the research questions without bringing about redundancy in data (Rubin, 1987; Milroy & Gordon, 2003). An attempt to sample more talk shows from other stations would have increased the volume of the data without adding new categories for analysis.

3.4 Data Collection Methods and Instruments

For this study, the researcher used recording as the main method to collect data. A digital audio recorder was used to capture the interactional episodes in the TV and radio programmes. This was the primary linguistic data of the study. Digital audio recording was a suitable method as it was capable of capturing all aspects of conversational data that allowed for the analysis of the
objectives of the study (Hutchby, 1996). In addition, digital recordings could be uploaded onto a computer for storage, and this allowed for repeated replay of the recordings to facilitate the transcription of the data.

3.4.1 Data Collection Procedures

The data for this study was collected in the months of August to October 2014. During this period, the programmes sampled for this study were presented weekly, on different days and at different times. Hence, Opinion Court on Citizen TV was recorded on Thursdays from 9.50 p.m -10.50 p.m; Checkpoint on KTN on Sundays from 9.40 - 11.00 p.m; The Nation’s Talking Point on Nation FM on Monday and Wednesday from 730.a.m - 9.00 a.m; while The Spotlight on Hope FM was recorded on Fridays from 6.00 -7.00 p.m.

3.4.2 Data Analysis Procedures

Media content is not independent of its expression, and we can only have a clear understanding of the nature of media content such as talk shows by close analysis of the media texts (Hutchby, 2006). Such an analysis illuminates how the talk shows are constructed and the functions they serve. During the data collection period, the digital audio recordings were uploaded to a computer so that the verbal interactions could be transcribed. The transcriptions provided a permanent record of data that was subjected to analysis. Transcription of each of the talk shows recorded was done using standard orthography, rather than a phonetic transcription, to allow for coding of aspects of argumentative talk
shows as well as question types. The researcher would play back the recorder to accurately capture the utterances.

The mode of transcription combines English orthography with notational conventions that follow the model developed by Jefferson (1974). The CA model captures the verbal and prosodic details of speech, such as inbreaths, cut-offs, simultaneous speech and pauses. Some of these conventions were included in transcripts insofar as they became analytically relevant. The transcribed data was carefully studied to identify the discrete phases that constitute the overall structure of the argumentative talk shows. This addressed the concern of the first objective of the study. Further, the aspects of argument and the question types that characterize the argumentative talk shows were identified, classified and coded accordingly. This was the data needed for the second objective and third objectives respectively. The fourth objective on the communicative functions of the discrete parts was discussed alongside the first three objectives.

The codes were analyzed using the Statistical Programme for Social Sciences SPSS version 17 to generate frequencies of occurrence of these generic features in the talk shows. This allowed for exemplification and detailed discussion of the emerging patterns. Repeated occurrence of a feature in the data showed that the feature was typical of the talk shows under study (Swales, 1990, 2004). This also enabled a qualitative and quantitative analysis of generic features of the talk shows and the communicative function of each
of the phases that constituted their overall structure. The analysis was guided by two theories: Conversational Analysis that was used to account for the sequence organization of the talk, while Genre Analysis guided in accounting for common structure, aspects of argument, question types and shared communicative function.

3.4.3 Data Presentation

The qualitative data in this study was on the structure of the sampled talk shows; the aspects of argument identified and question types. Actual examples were therefore drawn from the transcribed data and presented to illustrate each of these features. Each of the examples given was labeled for easy identification. The labeling included the chapter in which it is presented, the name of the TV or radio station sampled, the name of the programme and the topic of discussion. For example, Example 1 KTN1 Topic: Tides of Terror means the example was the first in the document, and it was drawn from the first broadcast of the sampled programme on KTN and the topic of discussion for the particular show was Tides of Terror.

The quantitative data on the frequency and percentages of the aspects of arguments and question types were presented in bar graphs that captured and displayed the emerging patterns in the different talk shows. Tables that displayed the actual figures of frequencies of these features were also generated and presented. This facilitated comparison across the talk shows upon which conclusions on the recurrence of the features were made. A
detailed discussion was done to establish how all these features characterize
the talk show genre.

3.4.4 Ethical and Confidentiality Considerations
In line with the ethical requirements, a research permit (c.f. Appendix 9) was
obtained from the National Commission for Research Technology and
Innovation (NACOSTI). The researcher used the permit to visit the media
houses concerned. In the media houses the researcher explained that the data
was required for academic purposes; and not an attempt to rate the
performance of the hosts, the panelists and or the stations they represent. It
was on the basis of this that verbal permission was given to record and analyze
the programmes. In disseminating research results, two ethical issues were put
in mind: confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher kept private and
confidential any information relating to the panelists’ names and addresses.
Regarding anonymity, initials, rather than names, were used to refer to the
hosts, members of the wider audience and the panelists.

3.5 Summary of Chapter
This chapter has focused on the research methodology adopted in the present
study. It has presented the research design, the sampling procedures used, the
sample size and the study population, the data collection procedures adopted,
methods of data analysis, and presentation and ethical and confidentiality
considerations made for the study. The chapter that follows presents the
analysis of data under the first objective of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE STRUCTURE OF RADIO AND TV ARGUMENTATIVE TALK SHOWS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of the structure of argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations. This is in line with the first objective of the study which sought to describe the generic structure of argumentative the talk shows. This was done by examining how the talk show hosts and the panelists oriented to their respective roles in the construction of each of the phases towards the achievement of the overall goal of the talk shows. Thus, the description of structure was be accompanied by a discussion of the communicative function of each of the phases as per the fourth objective. Guided by CA, three fundamental assumptions were adapted to: interaction is structurally organized; contributions to interaction are contextually oriented; and these two properties inhere in the details of interaction so that no order of detail can be dismissed, a priori, as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant. Before moving on with the presentation of the data, an overview of the structure of the talk shows is provided.

4.1 An Overview of Talk show Structure

The talk show is a genre of broadcast talk that can be set apart from news interviews, debates, commercial advertisements and other programmes (Hutchy, 2006). It can be established by a distinctive mode of analysis appropriate to its distinctive structure. Previous studies indicate that talk
shows are constructed in three stages: the opening that sets the talk off the ground, the body where the discussion proper takes place as the host engages the panelists through question and answer sequences in an attempt to develop the topic; and finally the closing phase that brings the talk to a close (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Martinez, 2000; Tolson, 2006). Each of these stages is realized through different elements and /or practices. The focus on each phase is inspired by Iedema’s (2003) claim that to be able to classify a communicative event as belonging to a specific genre, it is necessary to pay attention to the objectives of each individual stage, and how these objectives are realized. Regarding structure, Ogutu (1996) has observed that for a text to be well structured, it needs to have cohesive features showing coherence of the message being conveyed.

Analyses of the structural organization helped determine if the talk shows under study constituted a genre, as “properties such as form, structure and audience expectations operate to identify the extent to which an exemplar is prototypical of a particular genre” (Swales, 1990, p.52). Bahktin (1984) also proposes that the study of genres should focus on the thematic content, compositional structure and style of utterances within a specific sphere of communication. By describing the internal structure and the communicative functions of each of the phases of the sampled talk shows, the study sought to establish if they share a similar structure.
The analysis presents an example from each station in so far as the various phases were realized through different features. Where the phases were characterized by the similar features, two examples will be presented, one from radio and the other from TV. The examples were alternately drawn from appendices 1-8 which present full transcriptions of all the sampled talk shows.

In the presentation of data extracts, the feature(s) of interest in each of the examples is presented in italics, for example: Welcome to Opinion Court, indicates the host’s invitation of the wider audience to join in the programme; while Arabic numerals paired with the letters of the alphabet are used to mark moves and turns. For example, T1, T2 show the first and second move respectively in a sequence of turns. For easy identification, the numbering of the examples shows the chapter, the appendices from which it is extracted and the specific programme it is obtained from. For instance, Example 1.4 KTN 2 indicates the first example in the thesis, 4, represents the chapter while 2 represents the second recording of the argumentative talk show on KTN.

### 4.2 Structural Features of Argumentative Talk shows

The subsequent sections present the the phases of the talk shows structure. Openings are presented under section 4.2.1; the body section 4.2.2, preface to the final thanks, section 4.2.3 while the terminations are presented in section 4.2.4.
4.2.1 Talk shows Openings

This is the initial stage at which the talk shows open up to the public. Martinez (2000) has rightly observed that of the overall structure of speech encounters, openings constitute the first distinguishable section or transaction. The opening constitutes the prior initial steps to reach the heart of any conversation. This, therefore, means individuals do not find themselves suddenly talking about a topic without having previously engaged themselves in some activities specifically oriented at negotiating the entry into that spoken interaction.

At first glance, it might seem that nothing very interesting or significant takes place within the opening phase of talk shows. However, the openings are governed by a robust and highly distinctive set of social conventions. These conventions are best understood as adaptations to the specialized task of interviewing and the institutional environment in which the discourse takes place (Clayman, 1991). Three tasks are accomplished in the opening segment. First, the opening begins with an announcement of the topic, which is also termed as the headline. Second, background information about the topic is given, and third is the introduction of the panelists which leads in to the interview proper (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Montogmery, 2007). The opening phases of the sampled talk shows will be examined to establish if they demonstrate some, all of these or some other structural norms enacted by the ‘host’ category as identified in these earlier works. What follows are examples of the opening segments that show how the argumentative talk shows open.
Example 1.4 KTN 1  Topic: Tides of Terror

T1 M: Welcome, thanks for staying with us. You are watching our special coverage Tides of Terror now on Checkpoint.

2. We want to analyze the radicalization of youths in this country; take a look at the security forces and the effort of stemming terror in this country; and you are free to reach us on twitter; we are using the # tag tonight ‘tides of terror’.

3. You can also send your messages to the number 22115.

4. Let me introduce my panel tonight. On my extreme left we have A who is a former security analyst who has worked in the country for over 30 years and he will be bringing his expertise. Right next we have S who has a great history of Somalis in Kenya and who has also authored a book which details the Wagalla Massacre. There after we have J who spearheads the ‘Nyumba kumi initiative’ and he will take a look at how this can be used in the fight against terror. Then we have M, the police spokesman.

5. Thank you all for joining us this evening.

6. Let’s start by understanding how we got to this point. We are talking about radicalization, a very new term in the Kenyan history. This did not just start yesterday.

7. Let’s us start with you A, can you just explain how we got to this point.

Example 1.4 KTN 1 above shows that openings normally consist of an extended monologue by the host. In this segment, the host starts by welcoming the wider audience and thanking them for staying on the programme at line 1 welcome, thanks for staying with us. This phrasing reflects the fact that the programme comes soon after the 9 p.m news and the host had anchored the news. She then presents the topic to be discussed in a single phrase Tides of Terror still in line 1, and mentions the programme they are on, that is, Checkpoint. Next, she expounds the topic in line 2 and points out the precise issues to be addressed in the programme; We want to analyze the radicalization of youths in this country, take a look at the security forces and the effort of stemming terror in this country.
This headline is designed in such a way as to capture the audience’s attention to the discussion to follow. This is evident as the host then, invites the wider audience to take part in the show in the statement, you are free to reach us on twitter, r we are using the hash tag tonight #tides of terror. Send your messages to the number 22115 in lines 2 and 3. The panelists are formally introduced to the audience in line 4 where the host says: Let me introduce my panel tonight. Such introductions are designed to indicate how each panelist is qualified to comment on the present topic and in what capacity he or she will be speaking for the purposes of the discussion at hand. For example, we have A, who is a former security analyst who has worked in the country for over 30 years and he will be bringing his expertise... The introduction of the panel in this example is more complex, and is presented in an appositive structure in which more description of the panelist is given after a mention of his name ‘S’, as shown in the statement Right next we have S who has a great history of Somalis in Kenya and who has also authored a book which details the Wagalla Massacre.

The need to supplement the panelist’s full name with additional information arises from the different levels of shared knowledge among the audience (Martinez, 2000; Montgomery, 2007). The host then thanks the panelists for coming in the statement Thank you all for joining us this evening. In the last line in the opening segment, the host directs the first question to one of the panelists to give his position on the topic. Let’s us start with you A, can you just explain how we got to this point. The first panelist to be invited to
Contribute is a security analyst who is presented as having worked in the country for 30 years hence his stand towards the topic may be useful in opening up the talk on the insecurity in the country. The first question at the end of this segment is an indicator of the generic boundary between the opening phase and the body of the text. It is after this question that the discussion on the topic starts.

As much as the opening segments occupy a fixed position, it was observed in this study that some rarely arrive without some prior notice. The host announces that the talk show will be taking place before the news bulletin begins as observed in the example that follows:

**Example 2.4 Citizen TV1**

**Topic: Jubilee Wrangles**

H T1: And ah welcome back to the programme and, we want to welcome your views on Opinion Court.

2. You could text us at 22422 or you could tweet us hash tag citizen Kenya, #citizen tv, __, and we would like to hear your feedback.

3. Lemmie introduce my panel in the studio tonight. On my immediate right is Dr. C. He is an ODM member of parliament and definitely in the CORD Coalition. Then in the middle we have Prof. E. our resident political analyst and seated across me is Senator K. Gentlemen welcome.

4. I want to start with you Prof. to set the stage for us.

5. We have seen a lot of bickering and wrangling perhaps in the past two weeks in the Jubilee coalition and it was thought that this coalition may not last because many thought really what brought it together at the time of election was that there was the unhappy marriage with the ICC that forced the two principals to work together.

6. Now with the wrangles that are emerging a year down the line. What do you make of it?

The host begins by welcoming the audience back to the programme and invites the audience to participate in the talk (line 1). Just like in Example 1.4
KTN 1, the host, too, mentions the programme at turn 1, and _ah welcome back to the programme_ and, _we want to welcome your views on Opinion Court_. This is a natural consequence of the fact that the programme comes soon after 9 p.m news, and she usually informs the audience the show will be on air even before the news. Example 2.4 Citizen TV 1 comprises of the following: invitation of the audience to join in the show and a mention of the programme. The use of the conjunction ‘and’ at the beginning of the turn indicates continuation.

At turn 2, the host provides the audience with the contact to reach the show on, _you could text us at 22422 or you could tweet us hash tag citizen Kenya, #citizentv, #___. _An introduction of the panelists by name and also an identifier- a specification of the grounds on which they speak for purposes of the interview at hand; Lemmie introduce my panel in the studio tonight._ She introduces them thus, _Dr. C. he is an ODM member of parliament and definitely in the CORD coalition. Then in the middle we have Prof. E. our resident political analyst and seated across me is Senator K (line 1)._ This introduction includes their party affiliations, which establishes the relevance of their contribution for the interview at hand. She then welcomes them to the show in the statement _gentlemen welcome._

Identification of this type also grants a specific kind of communicative entitlement (Myers, 2001). Being politicians representing the parties under question, their contributions are elicited on the grounds that they, by
implication, share responsibility for the party, and are accountable to the public on whose behalf they hold office. At line 4 that follows, the host draws the attention of one of the panelists in the statement *I want to start with you Prof. to set the stage for us.* However, she does not follow that up with a question; instead she provides some background to the topic in the segment that follows. This segment also details relevant background information to the problem in line 4, *We have seen a lot of bickering and wrangling perhaps in the past two weeks in the Jubilee Coalition and it was thought that this coalition may not last because many thought.* Through background information, the subject is cast as a controversial and hence, a debatable issue. It depicts a recent a clash between the two parties TNA and URP, which form the Jubilee Coalition, and the different opinions of some part of the public regarding this clash.

Following this background, the host directs a question to one panelist in line 5-6 that acts as a lead-in to the discussion proper (Clayman, 2002). *Now with the wrangles that are emerging a year down the line. What do you make of it?* This question is directed to the person’s beliefs and thoughts and it is probably meant to elicit his perspectives on the issue at hand (Montgomery, 2007). It also marks the boundary between the opening segment and the body. The discussion then picks up on the ongoing clash of perspectives.

In other programmes, it can be observed that when the topic is treated as a matter of controversy, the opening may also include some mention of where a
particular panelist stands on the issue. Example 3.4 Nation FM 1 below is a case in point. The topic is on the establishment of County Development Boards, which governors were opposed to. Hence, one of the panelists is a Governor, and indeed the Chair of The Council of Governors. The second panelist is a Senator who is in support of the said boards. The combination of these two panelists who hold opposing views already constructs the topic as a controversial issue.

Example 3.4 Nation FM 1  Topic: County Development Boards

T1H:  A. A. with you. We have a very interesting morning on The State of the Nation and a very good morning to you.

2. Now, in 2013, we were seeking to amend the County Government Act that was introduced in the Senate. The Bill brought by Senator ___ sought to establish County Development Boards to the county government to consult with the national government. The Bill proposed that a 14 members’ board would consist of Senators, elected MPs and the County Governors, Deputy Governors, County Speakers and leaders of majority and minority parties in the Assembly. …The Bill states the Senators would be the chairperson and the women representatives vice chair and the governors will be the secretary, which the Governors seem opposed to. According to Senator ___, Section 91 of the County Government Act gives impetus to counties to establish structures aimed at encouraging citizens’ participation on development agenda. These governors have failed to make use of this platform, and it is from this same law that he found it necessary to craft the legislation to enhance and streamline county function….

3. We are having a conversation about this, this morning. And joining us we do have governor I, from B County and Senator K M, from E M County and myself.

4. I want to start with you senator. Senator M. Why was it necessary to set up this board?

The opening in the Example 3.4 Nation FM 1 starts with a lengthy utterance by the talk show host. It can be observed that the components of the opening segment discussed in the examples Example 1.4 KTN 1 and Example 2.4 Citizen TV1, are not exhaustive; greetings by the host and a mention of their name also pertain to the spectrum. As presented in this example, the host
begins by introducing herself, A.A with you. This element is not present in the other opening segments discussed above. She then mentions the name of the show as *The State of the Nation* and greets the audience *a very good morning to you* in line 1. This is followed by an extended spate of background to the issues at hand in line 2. *Now, in 2013, we were seeking to amend the County Government Act that was introduced in the Senate*....The background is formulated to portray some unresolved disagreement over devolution issues. She points out that the governors were opposed to the establishment of the boards.

In order to cast light on this issue, the host introduces the panelists, *and joining us we do have Governor I from B County and Senator K from EM County and myself.* Once again, the panelists are introduced by name, their official positions, which are topically relevant credentials that provide for their communicative entitlement in this particular subject (Montgomery, 2007). The Governor I is the Chair of the Council of Governors and the Senator K is a member of the Senate Committee on Justice and Legal Issues. These details are designed to provide the audience with a general “frame” in terms of which the subsequent components of the talk can be understood. Such “frames” play a considerable part in predefining the roles, interests, and competencies of the participants (Heritage, Clayman & Zimmerman, 1988; Clayman & Heritage, 2002).
Notably, an invitation to the wider audience to participate is missing. However, it is provided later as the host provides the contacts to the audience just before a break (c.f Appendix 7). At the end of this segment the host turns to one of the panelists to direct the first question to him, *I want to start with you senator, senator M. Why was it necessary to set up this board?* This first question aligns him as a privileged speaker in Martinez (2000) terminology, by virtue of the direct knowledge of the topic acquired from his being a senator, and from his particititating in the creation of the Boards.

Following the analyses of the opening segment, a number of observations can be made. The opening segments are organizationally similar in a number of aspects, and the rules that govern the structural organization of this phase are the same for all the programmes recorded. First, they are realized unilaterally by the talk show hosts, and that the opening spate of talk is explicitly addressed to non-participating third party, the media audience. This can be observed in the statement *Thank you all for joining us this evening. Also, and joining us we do have....* This indicates that the media audience is part of the show. This audience directedness is also apparent in the fact that descriptive items are selectively elaborated in a way that enables audience members to grasp their topical relevance (Sacks & Schegloff, 1979). For example, the panelists are described for example as Chair of the Council of Governors, Senator for E.M., Police Spokesman among others.
The additional information supplementing the panelists’ full name is in tandem with Martinez (2003) observation that the amount of shared knowledge among the audience varies, hence, the sole use of one of the introductory items may be insufficient to guarantee a full identification of the personality. As a result, this may present an adequate apprehension of the connection between the panelist and the topic at hand. The introduction of the panelists is governed by two principles: The first is the *principle of recipient design* that determines the extent of elaborateness of a panelists introduction; if the degree of familiarity that the intended audience is assumed to have vis-à-vis the panelists’ official position is considered high, then the amount of information selected is just the necessary to make the relation of the panelist to the topic at hand sufficiently transparent (Clayman, 1992). For example, in Example 3.4 Nation FM 1, very little description is done of the panelists, just simple apposition…as Governor *I from B County…, K M…Senator E M.*

The second selection principle constraining the panelists’ introduction is the *topical relevance principle* which holds that that in principle, any description may be extended indefinitely (Schegloff, 1992). When that relation is not considered graspable then elaborate descriptions may arise as in the Example 1.4 KTN 1. *Right next we have S who has a great history of Somalis in Kenya and who has also authored a book which details the Wagalla massacre.* However, descriptions are limited only to those components that are relevant to the forthcoming topic.
A second significant feature of the talk shows is the way in which they are characterized by clear differentiation or pre-allocation of roles. At the opening segment, the hosts do the introduction from an institutionally defined position. They set the agenda, the terms and the topic of discourse. The panelists normally remain silent during the introductions, and indeed throughout the entire opening discourse, a practice also true to news interviews (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). As already mentioned, absent from the opening segment is greeting-greeting sequence or an exchange of hellos as would be the case in casual conversations (Schegloff, 1972). This is a natural consequence of the fact that the panelists normally get to interact before the programme is opened to the audience.

Structurally, all openings examined are commonly set apart from the rest of the talk, and have a recognizable structure with common features typical of this stage of talk show, with little room for variation. However, underlying the small differences, a formal sequential organization remains. Constant across the programmes examined, and across a wide range of topics and hosts, the opening segment typically comprised of elements reported by Clayman and Heritage (2002) and Montogmery (2007). These are: greetings to the wider audience and an invitation to join in the programme, introduction of the panelists, the topic/headlines and background information. These are the routine opening components to stay with Martinez (2000) term. Some of these elements were core or obligatory. These were: invitation to join in the talk show, mention of the topic, and an introduction of the panelists. However,
greetings by the host, mention of the hosts’ name and background to the topic were optional.

Unique to radio talk shows under study, the opening segment displayed another component: a mention of the talk show host’s name as seen in Example 3.4 Nation FM 1, A A with you. However, in the TV argumentative talk shows, the host’s name was omitted. The talk show hosts usually presented the news bulletins just before the programmes, hence another introduction was unnecessary. At any rate, at the end of the completion of the opening segment comes the first question that takes the structure in *we start with you*....This question marked the generic boundary between the opening phase and the body of the talk shows.

In all these opening segments, there was no fixed order in which the components occur; their presence was enough. This finding departs from an observation that the elements in the opening segment in news interview follow a particular order: mentioning the topic/ headline, detailing the background information, introducing the guests (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). In Example 1.4 KTN 1 for example, the host begins by inviting the audience to the show, followed by a mention of the topic, the programme, and panelists and then thanks the audience for joining in the programme. In Example 3.4 Nation FM 1 on the other hand, the host starts off by a mention of her name, followed by an introduction of the programme, greetings to the audience, background information, while the introduction of the panelists comes last. Another unique
feature is that the panelists do not exchange greetings in the opening segment. This is accounted for by the fact that the panelists usually arrive before the onset of the programme hence they will have exchanged the greetings. The opening presented to the wider audience would therefore be considered pseudo-opening.

With regard to their role in the overall talk, it can be argued that the distinctive features of talk shows openings are thus not mere happenstance; they reflect the special circumstances under which talk shows are conducted. Correspondingly, these features are rich in implications for the interaction to follow; the shape of the opening segment provides in part for qualities of formality and impersonality that are attributes of talk shows. From the very outset it comes across to the audience as something other than a private conversation among friends - it appears as a “strictly business” encounter that has been planned in advance and is now being orchestrated on behalf of the wider audience. The opening phase has a form, shared components that characterize them, and shared communicative goal particular to this segment. Against this background, and inspired by Swales (1990), it can be concluded that the opening segment is a sub genre of the overall genre which is the argumentative talk show on radio and TV in Kenya.

The transition between the opening phase and the body is commonly marked by the hosts shifting gear, so to speak, and directs the first question, which
opens up the talk, in a direct address to one of the panelists. The section that follows therefore, examines this second phase of the talk shows; the body.

**4.2.2 The Body**

The talk show interview is first and foremost, a course of interaction to which participants contribute on a turn by turn basis, for the most part, by asking and answering questions (Martinez, 2000). The contributions are understood in terms of their thematic content and also in terms of how they bear on the unfolding interactional ‘game’ being played by the participants. After the initial opening phase, the discussion moves on to the second phase which begins and progresses as the host engages the panelists in the aspects of argument, and Question–Answer sequences that advance the topic.

Throughout the data, this was characterized by an exchange of speaking turns in which the host framed questions in disputable ways, and the panelists discussed or, much more frequently, disputed the issue in question. The body consisted of lengthy stretches of talk involving many and varied interactional sequences. To give the talk show its argumentative character, the hosts frequently alternated their selection of the panel members by selecting a representative of the opposing view as the next speaker.

It was observed that certain programmes devoted part of the broadcasting time to audience participation. Therefore, in this phase, the members of the wider audience were given an opportunity to participate by questioning the panelists
or making any other contribution on the topic. Consequently, their participation role was acknowledged in the opening phase, mostly in such components as *You could text us at 22422 or you could tweet us hash tag citizen Kenya, #citizen tv.#___*, and we would like to hear your feedback. (c.f example 2.4 Citizen TV1).

In the body, also, there were breaks at some predetermined and timed intervals to allow for advertisements, announcements and music. The hosts usually informed the wider audience that they were taking a break. Re-introductions of the programme, the topic and the panelists may occur prior to a commercial break; a technique that served to induce viewers or listeners not to tune to other channels (Martinez, 2003; Montogmery, 2007). The end of this phase was marked by indicators of advance time warnings. For the purpose of describing this phase, consider the examples that follow:

**Example 4.4 KTN 1**  
**Topic: Tides of Terror**

1 H …This did not just start yesterday. *Let us start with you__*. Can you just explain how we got to this point?

2 P1:  
*Radicalization actually has a long history in Kenya*. In fact radicalization leads to violence when genuine grievances advanced are ignored by the authority, for example land issues, racial discrimination……. *And when genuine means fail, there is only one way of dealing with it, people turn to violence.*

3 H:  
The effect starts to show much later…… and the anger is deep seated among us, among some people who may feel marginalized for a long time… *S?*

4 P2:  
I look at the Somali factor, in Kenya what is happening in Mombasa, and the problem of marginalization started in 1963 and *we have the news to show the same in 1989, 1978 news looking at Somalis as parasites, look at other news, Kenya government has marginalized the Somali for 50 years....... Now Kenya is facing three things: the Somali factor, Islamic extremism that we have talked about and the change in technology… So what we are facing is really bigger than it has been presented. Putting 6000 people in a camp is not a solution, its creating more terrorists =
Alright, alright

= more terrorists every night

We shall get to the government and K, having been in the government and for the years S has been detailing, what do you think the government has been doing towards contributing to radicalization?

In Example 4.4 KTN 1 on the topic *Tides of Terror*, the host at turn 1 starts off the discussion by posing a question to the first panelists to explain how terror attacks got into the the country; *Let us start with you*. Can you just explain how we got to this point? At turn 2, P2 gives his explanation as … when genuine means fail, there is only one way of dealing with it, people turn to violence… At turn 3, 5 and 7 engages two of the panelists to give their views regarding the radicalization of Muslim youths, something claimed to have contributed to the current insecurity in the country. Their contributions on the said topic open up and advance the topic at turns 2, 4 and 6. The host builds her turns in form of questions. Prominent among these are declaratives that refer to what Labov and Fanshel (1977:100) term ‘B-events,’ events about which the recipient of the statement has unique or privileged knowledge. This is observed as the host turns to the first panelist, P1 referred to as A who is a former security analyst who has worked in the country for over 30 years to bring his expertise on the matter. He takes turn 2 to do the same. She then turns to P2 referred to as S who has a great history of Somalis in Kenya to comment on the same. The panelists’ credentials are captured in the opening segment (cf. Example 1.4 KTN 1). They are therefore better placed to shed light on the problem of terrorism in the country. Example 5.4 Citizen TV 2 that follows further illustrates this practice.
Example 5.4 Citizen TV 2  Topic: Politics Post SabaSaba

T1: H  I want to start with you Prof__. Did sabasaba live up to your expectations? Did CORD deliver what you think they had set out to?

P1: Yes and no. And ah in the point of yes, they re-emphasized the point that there are problems in this country that require urgent attention. Some were outlined in their programme, and in that, they still delivered because the message continues reaching the people that there is a problem and we all can probably collectively get a solution. But on the other side, my expectations were that in terms of doing business, political business, I expected a different approach in doing it. I didn’t expect the ‘mapambano’ team coming because I think the nation is tired about this ‘mapambano’ story. Fellows who have not been very creative in their politics and offering new solutions. People who have a past that shows that if they, they are given some goodies perhaps they will keep quiet. So…. A few fellows were smart like eh ____ who is a new fellow on the platform but the old group that were part of CORD and especially ODM, I think I didn’t see anything new. I would still imagine the same 2007 story, 2013 story….. so=

T3: H: Mmh

P3: =So in terms of innovativeness, in terms of changing our politics, I saw the same old story so I was very very disappointed.

H: O, some have called it an anti-climax. A tsunami was promised and it was sunny blue skies. Is it yet to come?

P3: You know ah ah A, before you determine whether sabasaba was a success or not, you must ask yourself several questions. Who was giving the yardstick to measure its success? But again, the most important thing, thing……

H: Mmh

The discussion from which the above excerpt was taken centered on the SabaSaba rally that had been held by the opposition CORD. The host at turn 1 set out to find out if it was successful or not, and seeks the position of the first participant P1, a political analyst by the question, I want to start with you Prof__. Did sabasaba live up to your expectations? Did CORD deliver what you think they had set out to? At turn 2 he points out two different views ‘yes’ and ‘no’. And ah in the point of yes, they re-emphasized the point that there are problems in this country that require urgent attention. And at turn 4, he says that the rally was a disappointment, but on the other side, my expectations were that in terms of doing business, political business, I expected a different
approach in doing it. I didn’t expect the ‘mapambano’ team coming because I think the nation is tired about this ‘mapambano’ story’. This position is considered as arguable, thus; the host shifts to another participant P2, a member of CORD to get his view of the rally.

In a B-event kind of questions that include hypothetical or future oriented statements about what future move CORD plans to take, the host asks the panelist whether the ‘tsunami’ that the coalition had promised is yet to come, 

*O, some have called it an anti-climax. A tsunami was promised and it was sunny blue skies. Is it yet to come?* (Turn 5). The panelist challenges the claim by P1 that SabaSaba was a flop when he asks; *who was giving the yardstick to measure its success?* (6). It is worth noting that the host’s questions normally take a prefaced form which involves additional statements that lead to the question itself. For instance, at turn 5, the host first makes a brief comment that SabaSaba was an anti climax then asks if the expected outcome was still to come. Examining these prefaced questions gives a better sense of the special nature of turn - taking rules for talk shows under Conversational Analysis. They also show the ways in which turn- taking rules give the talk show its distinctive shape (Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

The panelists collaborate with the host’s effort to arrive at a question; so they withhold any response until a recognizable question has been produced. By doing so, the panelists embody the expectation that the host’s turn should properly consist of a question (Clayman, 1988; Schegloff, 1988/89). They,
thus orient to, and collaborate in producing the character of the interactions in which they are engaged. The panelists’ rights to a turn come when the host has come up with a question and their talk emerges as an answer to a question which maintains the talk show framework. This can also be seen in the example below.

**Example 6.4 Nation FM 2  Topic: SabaSaba**

T1H:  What was ah the 1990 sabasaba movement about? I start with you M.

2P1:  It was for increasing democratic space in the country. Remember we were ah by law a one party state. KANU was ‘mama na baba’ (mother and father). So anybody not subscribing to KANU had no platform for expressing themselves. And there was a lot of violation of human rights and bad governance. So we were fighting to increase democratic space, improve human rights and governance.

3H:  Rev., we believe you were a big part of this movement, and we know you were beaten to a point of death. What was the movement for? Thank you for being part of this movement all of you. What was this movement for?

4P2:  It was ah about recruiting people to this movement and the first person I went to was _____ =

5P1:  That’s true

6P2:  The reason is we wanted to transform this country from one party to multipartism and we wanted to change the political dispensation. As a market, it was very competitive….

7H:  Mmh

9H:  Mmh….. It is interesting that the church was part of spearheading this process. We do not see that these days. We see a lot of church leaders not really standing for what we see as right. And ah these days……

At turn 1, the host provides some background to the topic after which she directs the first question, *what was ah the 1990 sabasaba movement about? I start with you M.* to the first panelist, a former Minister for Justice and a lawyer by profession, to give her view on what sabasaba was all about. She takes up turn 2 and gives an elaborate explanation on the same that *it was for increasing democratic space in the country*. The subsequent questions at turn
3 further elicit more information on sabasaba from P2, Rev, we believe you were a big part of this movement, and we know you were beaten to a point of death. What was the movement for? At turn 4 and 6, he explains that the reason is we wanted to transform this country from one party to multipartism and we wanted to change the political dispensation…these are responses that advance the topic. The host makes acknowledgements of their contribution at turns 5and 7 by use of tokens like ‘mhm’ and a short statement ‘that’s true.’

Another substantial illustration of the same structure comes from Spotlight on Hope FM in which a subject on a proposed Marriage Bill is being discussed.

**Example 7.4 Hope FM 1 Topic: The Marriage Bill**

T1H: …So lemmie start with you mheshimiwa C. Tyranny of numbers is what women legislators are calling this Bill and that this Bill being passed was a disgrace to the women and discrimination against them?

2P1:  Eeh thank you P. Now, there is no tyranny of numbers.

3H:  Mmh

4P1:  In fact when we convened, it was almost an even number. The parliament is not supporting polygamy. In this country polygamy has been legalized by the courts. You will find in many cases customary marriages are like any other. Like Christian marriages, Islamic marriages, they are the same. This law is out to give customary marriage status like any other.

5H:  Okey.

6H:  Aah now, let us come to you mheshimiwa. How did this Bill pass now that we have eeh more female representation in the house? Fourty seven women representing the counties, and many saying before, the numbers were lower and this is the function of the county women reps to sort of champion the rights of women. How was this able to pass at a time like this?

7 P2:  ... about ten women were out there. We had another conference in Geneva and they feel the timing was not in good faith. I can tell you for sure we were about 50-50 and we were discussing the Bill. But when we were just about to vote, some men legislatures sent SMS and we saw several men come in, who were not in this Bill debate. So they just came in to vote…
In Example 7.4 Hope FM1, the host begins by directing the first question to a Member of Parliament and the Chair of Justice and Legal Affairs Committee in parliament to shed light on the seemingly controversial Bill. The Bill had been dubbed ‘tyranny of numbers.’ The first question by the host forms the basis for starting the argumentative talk that follows. At turn 1, the host asks so lemmie start with you mheshimiwa C. Tyranny of numbers is what women legislators are calling this Bill.... At turn 2, P1 refutes this allegation in the statement Eeh thank you P. Now, there is no tyranny of numbers. And in the other turns 2 and 4, P2 justifies his claim by indicating that there were equal numbers of men and women legislators when the Bill was being discussed.

After engaging the first panelist in a series of questions, the host then turns to the second panelist, a female legislator and poses a challenge on why the Bill could pass, yet there were more women in the house then than there were in the previous parliament, Aah now,let us come to you mheshimiwa. How did this Bill pass now that we have eeh more female representation in the house....? (Turn 6). In the subsequent turn, she claims that some men legislators sneaked into the house and voted just after the discussion of the Bill. Some women legislators were away on a conference when it happened; thus, the women lost as captured in the statement …about ten women were out there. We had another conference in Geneva and they feel the timing was not in good faith... (Turn 7). The discourse unfolds as the various panelists give their views on subject; The Marriage Bill.
So far, the argument is that the talk show host also controls the length, shape and even the style of the encounter. Within the sequential context of the body are commercial breaks that are typically formatted into a pre-face ‘coming up after the break…’ ‘next in our programme…’ ‘don’t go away…’ followed by the identification of the panelists. The re-introductions are brief as compared to the introductions occurring in the opening phase. This is attributed to time constraints since they are uttered when time is due for advertisements or when the programme has gone on for some time. The examples below illustrate thus.

Example 8.4 Nation FM 2  Topic : SabaSaba

H:  Now, I know many want to ah just check on what you have just said. Let us take a short break. Remember our telephone lines are open ah 0719073963. What is SabaSaba movement all about? We have sabasaba...Are we ready for another SabaSaba? We have got to discuss this. In our studio today we have Rev. T. N, Hon M. K and K.O a journalist. We gonna continue this conversation shortly.

Break

H:  This is 96.3 Nation FM. You are on The State of the Nation. In the show we are talking about Sabasaba. What the movement was really about? What was the spark that lit the fire? What was the main thing that made Sabasaba?

The extract in Example 8.4 Nation FM 2 comes just before the break. The host provides the telephone lines through which the wider audience can call: our telephone lines are open ah 0719073963. Unlike in the other programmes, this information on the contact lines was not been presented at the opening segment. The host then introduces the specific content issues to be discussed after the break, in form of a question Are we ready for another sabasaba? She then re-introduces the panelists we have Rev. T. N, Hon M.K., and K. O, a journalist. It can be noted that even after the break, the host not only repeats the content to be discussed, but also mentions the name of the programme and the station in the statement, This is 96.3 Nation FM. You are on The State of
the Nation... Such re-introductions serve to encourage the audience to remain tuned in to the programme, and also to inform the audience who may have tuned in late, what the programme is on, and the progress so far (Tolson, 2006; Montogmerry, 2007).

There are formulaic utterances that mark transitions from the first segment of the body to the break such as; *we must take a break, when we come back.* Other formulaic utterances mark a return from the break; for example, *welcome back...* This is illustrated in the example below taken from *Opinion Court* on Citizen TV.

**Example 9.4 Citizen TV 1  Topic: Jubilee Wrangles**

H: *Gentlemen.... We must take a break. When we come back we will be discussing CORD’s planned rallies*

Break

H: *Welcome back. Thanks for staying with us on Opinion Court. Just before we wind up we must discuss the rallies that ah the CORD has been having before the major one and especially the one for welcoming ___ from his trips to the States, but first we start by listening to what M. N. thinks is the real reason behind CORD’s re-invigoration.*

At this juncture, the host announces that its time to take a break from the talk, by directly addressing the panel, *Gentlemen.... We must take a break.* Additionally, she mentions the content the show will address after the break, that is, *CORD’s planned rallies.* After the break, the host welcomes back the panel as well as the wider audience and thanks the wider audience for staying on the programme, *Opinion Court.* She then gives the direction the talk will take by indicating that they will first listen to a video clip on an interview with a political analyst. The subsequent talk builds on the reactions by the panel on the said political analyst’s opinion.
The analysis of the body of the talk shows displayed their institutionalized character that is driven by certain established goals, patterns of action, roles and norms. The participants’ actions are organized and coordinated in relation to a specialized and distinctive turn-taking system based on question-answer. What they can do is tied to this system. The talkshow hosts take the questioning role, while the panelists answer or at least respond to the questions. This is in line with Ekstrom (2007) observation that the institutional interaction is comprised of already established and restricted discursive roles according to which the participants are expected to behave. So, that the right to ask questions is reserved for the host (Hutchby, 2006). The participants display an orientation to institutional setting by selectively engaging in certain activities and refraining from others. However, there were instances when panelists broke the expectation that they should refrain from asking questions. These instances will be addressed in chapter 6 on questions typology.

The analysis reported here further indicates that the domain of the talk show discourse has its own intrinsic organizational integrity (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). At one corner of it, the talk show opening has organizational properties that demonstrably influence the content of the talk/discussion. Within the basic tasks of CA, the participants in the talk shows construct their conduct over the course of talk-turn by responsive turn. Consequently, they progressively and collaboratively realize the occasion of their talk. Once the talk show host determines that the topic has been addressed adequately, and the time allocated is running out, they move the talk to the next phase; the
closing. This phase is discussed in detail in the next section.

4.2.3 Talk shows Closings

Closings are the third and last phase of the programmes under study. Like openings, closings are an integral part of the structure of spoken interaction in general, and have been described as “events-in-the-conversation” (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973:238). Analysis of broadcast talk closing has been conducted on the genre of news interview that found out that the news interview closings are routinely managed unilaterally by the interviewees. It is their decision when to decline eliciting a further response, thus bring the interaction to a close (Greatbatch, 1998; Clayman, 2010; Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

The talk show closings, like openings, adhere to conventions which are strikingly different from their counterparts in ordinary conversation in which any party may initiate the closing (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). These differences are bound up with various institutional circumstances and contingencies. One paramount contingency is the need to end the encounter at or near a pre-specified point in time. This time frame must be realized in practice, and the host is interactionally positioned to manage the closing process. As the one who asks questions, the host is in the interactional driver’s seat, launching all sequences of action including those that bring about closing (Hutchby, 1992, 1996; Clayman & Heritage 2002; Martinez, 2003).
This section, therefore, examines the structure of talk show closings in which the talk progressively embodies the activity that constitutes the phase. It establishes the point at which the closings begin, and the features of the distinctive nature of the closing phase of the argumentative talk shows. Further, the analysis attempts to demonstrate that the specific goal or set of goals determine the structure, style and content of the closing segment, in an attempt to elucidate the genre–specific imprints that are manifested in the closing of the talk shows.

Closings do not occur abruptly. The closing phase might be said to begin well in advance; hence, talk show hosts may prepare for termination just before launching into the final thanks (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). They engage in a pre-closing sequence that may take various forms as discussed in section 4.2.3.1 that follows.

### 4.2.3.1 Prefaces to the Final Thanks

This is a pre-closing phase in which the host prepares for termination or closing, before launching into the final thanks or goodbye. One way of doing this is to announce that the termination is necessary prior to thanking the panelists (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). Such announcements generally have an imperative character, and at least imply that time has run out. This procedure clearly establishes the relevance of termination, but it does little to wind down the discussion in progress. In a similar vein, the host comments on what has been said over the course of the discussion. In effect, the host withdraws from
a turn-by-turn engagement with the panelists to comment on the discussion in its entirety.

The significance of this move is that it effectively caps off the discussion and provides the relevance of closing (Martinez, 2003; Clayman, 2010). A less elaborate type of preface involves use of discourse markers such as “well”, “okey”, or “all right”. Martinez (2000, 2003) refers to this as the pre-terminal phase and indicates that this is the slot where “unmentioned mentionables” can be fitted in (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973: 246). The prefaces lead to a termination or the close of the show. The examples that follow illustrate this phenomenon.

Example 10.4 KTN 2  Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums

1H:  *I need to rush you because of time*

2 P2:  No problem, so, so we need a Bill that will provide us with a legal framework that will enable us to move on to emergencies……

3 H:  *Very quickly, the issue that is for Jubilee only, laptops. When will those standard one children get laptops….*

4 H:  *Senator, senator, lets wind up on this, senator A just give us the way forward and what we are likely to see from the national dialogue you are talking about and what is the way forward for the country about the opposition keeping the state in check and ensuring that the citizens get their fair share of the national cake…very briefly.*

5 P1:  … Must understand that the role of the opposition is …… it is to keep the government in check but not the responsibility of the opposition to make them perform their duties.

In Example 10.4 KTN 2, the host indicates the need to rush because of time; *I need to rush you because of time* (turn 1). At turn 2, the panelist P2 recognizes this and just talks of a need for a legal framework to address emergencies. At turn 3, the host indicates that time is running out and refers to the issue of the laptops and national dialogue discussed earlier in order to summarize the
discussion. She uses the structure *Very quickly, the issue that is for Jubilee only, laptops*. The host is clearly targeting their cumulative remarks over the course of the discourse from one panelist, a senator representing government, and requests him to give the way forward on the issue of the laptops promised to pupils in primary schools by the Jubilee government.

In this pre-closing phase, certain questions come as “last questions” by virtue of their content. For example, in line 4, the host requires P1 to give his position regarding future prospects of holding a national dialogue, *Senator, senator, lets wind up on this, just give us the way forward and what we are likely to see from the national dialogue you are talking about* (turn 4). Such questions have an air of finality about them. Consequently, after the final response at turn 5, the host moves to the final closing phase of the show. A similar orientation can be observed in the example below taken from *Opinion Court* on Citizen TV.

**Example 11.4 Citizen TV 2  Topic: Politics Post Sabasaba**

1. T1,H: Welcome back. Thanks for staying with us on Opinion Court.

   2: *Just before we wind up we must discuss the rallies that ah CORD has been having...*

   3 H: Alright! Interesting... *a final question to you Prof tonight. ...And there are many issues that CORD are raising and every Kenyan regardless of which side of political divide they fall are concerned about security, we are all concerned about the cost of living etc. in what constructive way can both sides of divide discuss these matters.*

This pre-closing comes after a commercial break as the host is seen to welcome the wider audience back to the programme ‘Welcome back. Thanks for staying with us on opinion court’ (turn 1). She then signals that the discussion is coming to a close at turn 2 by using the structure *Just before we*
wind up... after which she poses what she refer to as a ‘final question’ to the one panelist P1. She uses the discourse marker ‘alright’ and then refers to the panelist by his title; a final question to you Prof. tonight.... in what constructive way can both sides of divide discuss these matters. This demonstrates an explicit fashion in expressing the “lastness” in the design of the question.

In the extract below taken from Talking Point on Nation FM, the pre closing consists of an exchange between a caller, the host and a panelist.

**Example 12.4 Nation FM 1  Topic: County Development Boards**

1H: *Very quickly we are running out of time. ___ if you could give your comments.*

2 C: Aah all I can say there are egos of Kenyan politicians. I cannot really get what they are saying. It got nothing to do with development, nothing to do with the people. And that is why many people did not vote for this constitution because it was going to create demi-gods and…

3 H: *Sorry ___ I’m gonna stop you right there because we are running out of time, but thanks a lot for calling…*

4 H: *Thank you… governor. Senator, your parting shot.*

The host at turn 1indicates that time is running out of time and gives the caller a chance to make his contribution; *Very quickly we are running out of time. ___ if you could give your comments.* The caller, appearing to extend his call is cut off by the host who at turn 3 *Sorry ___ I’m gonna stop you right there because we are running out of time, but thanks a lot for calling’* then invites the last panelst to quickly give his parting shot.
Advance time warnings of this sort may be done more than once especially when the host realizes the panelists may make lengthy contributions regardless of prompts that time is running out. Example 13.4 Hope FM 1 below illustrates thus.

**Example 13.4 Hope FM 1  Topic: The Marriage Bill**

1 T1H: And that’s the correct example ever. *As we conclude, mheshimiwa* W. We all remember Hon ___ and the passing of Sexual Offences Bill. It was looked at as a thing for women although it was a thing for protecting the children…..

2 P1: Lemmie lemmie react to that..

3 H: Yes...*As we conclude mheshimiwa.*

In the example above, the host uses the structure *as we conclude* and names the panelist that he wants to take the next turn (turn 1). At turn 2, P1 makes a request to react to the host’s remarks at turn 1 about the Sexual Offences Bill that had been passed some time by parliament. The host grants the panelist a chance and still makes use of the acknowledgement ‘yes’ and repeats that the programme is coming to a close in the statement *Yes...As we conclude mheshimiwa* (turn 3).

Advance time warnings function to enable the panelists to design their responses from the outset with the temporal situation in mind, and are clearly issued to encourage them to limit their responses (Tolson, 2001, 2006). The panelists, with very minimal deviations, displayed this effort. Accordingly, they made their responses brief, thus, presenting themselves as “hurrying” and dutifully responding to the hosts’ time warning.
This practice as observed in this study data enabled the host to end the show within the time limits. However, these advance time warnings did not constitute the closing of the talk shows proper. Having issued them, and the panelists having adhered to them, the hosts then launched into the closing proper in the termination phase. This last section of the closing phase is presented in the section that follows.

4.2.3.2 Termination

No interaction is over until the participants recognize it as such, and display that recognition to one another (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). The talk show hosts, unlike the panelists, are able to select a point in the course of the programme at which they can end the discussion. This is a juncture that provides the host with an argumentative opportunity that is not open to the panelists. Subsequently, closings in the talk shows were usually launched by the hosts and usually involved thanking the panelists for their participation. It was also common for the host to state the panelist’s full name and title, in the course of expressing gratitude. This was presumably done for the purposes of the audience who may have tuned in late or forgotten who was speaking, and would benefit from reiterated identificatory information (Martinez, 2003; Clayman, 2010). It was done by overtly announcing that the show had come to an end, and/or announcing that the elicitation from each of the panelist would be the last.
Example 14.4 Citizen TV 1 Topic: Jubilee Wrangles

T₁H:  Alright gentlemen, I must appreciate what you have said but you have unfortunately left my final guest very little time. So please make your final comments.

₂P₂:  Yah my final comment is that this is the right opportunity for Kenyans to correct the wrongs that were created by the previous regime…… so it is an issue that…. That ah..

₃P₁:  Tell us….. tell us =

₄H:  We are out of time….. Well… Prof

₅P₁:  =Let him…. Let him….

₆H:  I am gonna, I am gonna have to move away from you all, but I must say thank you for joining us on opinion court.

In example 14.4 Citizen TV1, there is an exchange of turns between the host and the panelists towards the closing. The host first appreciates the contribution by the panelists but indicates that they have ran out of time and so, she invites final comments. At turn 2, P2 takes the floor and seems to orient to this time warning as he starts off his turn by indicating that he will make his final comments in Yah my final comment is that… However, he appears to prolong his turn yet the host appears to have completely ran out of time. The host just cuts the panelists off after giving them a warning unfortunately you have left my final guest very little time. So please make your final comments... At turn 3, P1 attempts to make a contribution also and therefore interrupts P2 before he completes his turn resulting in an overlap. In the turn 4 that follows the host steps in and still gives time warning prompts in the statement, We are out of time...Well Prof.

Upon realizing that they are completely out of time and none of the panelists seems willing to make their final comment, the host abruptly cuts off all the
panelists and brings the show to a close, *I’m gonna have to move away from you all, but I must say thank you for joining us on opinion court.*

This is seen as a battle to achieve closure. The host does not mention the names of the panelists, but still thanks the audience for watching the programme. She closes off any access to the argumentative arena while retaining full access to the arena herself. It can be observed that the host had twice invoked the time constraint at turns 1 and 4 which the panelists did not seem to adhere to. This practice disrupted the orderly “winding down” of the discussion the host otherwise had strived to achieve.

While such a practice was observed in the study data, according to Montogmerry (2007), such an occurrence is unusual in talk shows and in news interview. However, it would be unmarked in the context of ordinary conversation, where time constraints are less rigid and where any conversationalist can launch the closing process (Shegloff, 2007). From this observation, it can therefore be argued that the argumentative talk shows studied displayed features of ordinary conversation; hence, giving them a dual nature. An observation also shared by Ilie (1999) and Shirm (2008).

The next example illustrates how closing was achieved on KTN.

**Example 15.4 KTN 2  Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross- Talk Ultimatums**

H:  *Alright and that’s where we leave our discussion tonight. Keep your comments coming in as we continue with our discussion on Checkpoint on the state of the nation, which way forward after 51 years of self-rule. I will be sampling your comments.*
In Example 15.4 KTN 2, the host clearly indicates that the discussion has ended in the statement *Alright and that’s where we leave our discussion tonight*. She then moves on to remind the wider audience to keep their comments coming; mentions the name of the talkshow; *Keep your comments coming in as we continue with our discussion on Checkpoint...* and also makes reference to the topic under discussion *on the state of the nation, which way forward after 51 years of self-rule*. Finally, she thanks the panelists and announces that it is time for KTN prime news; *taking a short break. KTN Prime live news coming in shortly*. This is clearly operating in the following example taken from *Talking Point* on Nation FM.

**Example 16.4 Nation FM 1 Topic: County Government Boards**

H: *Thanks so much to our guests this morning. Governor R. and Senator K. That’s all we had for you this morning.*

*We look forward to your tweets this morning. It’s 9 o’clock.*

The host thanks the panelists and once again mentions their names; *Thanks so much to our guests this morning. Governor R. and Senator K.*, then indicates that there is nothing more left to be discussed as put in the statement; *That’s all we had for you this morning*. Further, she welcomes contributions from the wider audience and finally mentions the time; *we look forward to your tweets this morning. It’s 9 o’clock.*
In a different move, the host’s final turn may consist of a summary of the discussion, and pointing out that there will be another edition of the programme in the week to follow. This practice was common on Hope FM.

**Example 17.4 Hope FM 1 Topic: The Marriage Bill**

**H:** Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen for staying with us tonight.

**T2:** It is definitely a discussion we cannot conclude in one sitting but we thank you all for making time and having a live show discussion around this important issue that touches on the family. *And as J., a family lawyer says, it is even important that we are having a discussion like this.* Many times we talk about politics but a family is a fundamental basis of society so this is an important discussion. We continue to see what will happen on the floor of the house on Tuesday.

**T3:** *Till we meet again next week for another episode of Spotlight, it is a good night for now. Thank you. Good evening and God bless.*

In Example 17.4 Hope FM 1, the host thanks the panelists for taking part in the show; *Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen for staying with us tonight.* Further, she makes a brief summary of the discourse ended, at the lengthy turn 2. The host also comments on the information given by the panelists in, *And as J., a family lawyer says, it is even important that we are having a discussion like this*…The host’s reformulation, by offering a version of the argument, sets up a cooperative environment in which the discussion can be ended. Finally, at turn 3, she mentions that there will be another edition of the programme which she hopes the audience will join in; *till we meet again next week for another episode of Spotlight*

From the analysis of the talk show closing carried out above, it can be argued that the talk show closings are organized into two sequentially related components: the pre-closing, also referred to ‘preface to the final closing,’ and
the termination. The pre closing comes first and prepares the participants and the wider audience for the final closing.

Looking first at the sequential dimension, it can be observed that the sequential environments in which these endings are established exhibit patterned features which consist some or all of the following components: advance time warning, summary of the discussion ended, expression of gratitude to the panelists, which takes the general form of Thank you, [Name]’, an address to the audience and a final goodbye to the panelists and to the audience.

The particular closing structure of this institutionally situated talk on radio and TV, as well as its content and style is genre-specific and it is shaped by the specific goal pursued in each speech event, and by the relationship between the parties in the encounter. As in ordinary conversations, the closing task in the talk shows studied can be identified as an integral part of the organized machinery of the entire communicative encounter; the talk shows cannot be complete without a structured closing segment (Shegloff, 1973, 2007). The closing in talk shows generally compares with that in news interviews where typically, the talk is ended unilaterally by the host (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Montogmerry, 2007).

However, it differs from the news interview in that in some instances, and at the discretion of the interviewer, the news interview closing may comprise of
an exchange of farewell between the interviewer and the interviewee in the statements ‘thank you for being with us’ from the interviewer, and ‘thank you, it was my pleasure’, from the interviewee (Clayman & Heritage, 2002, p.82). From the discussion presented in this chapter, the generic structure of argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations can be summarized diagrammatically as presented in Figure 1 that follows.
Figure 1: Generic Structure of Argumentative Talk Shows
Figure 1 presents the structure that is common to the talk shows sampled. The paragraphs that follow present the findings of the generic structure of the talk shows, making close reference to the existing literature to show how this the findings on structure agrees with, or departs from the the findings reported in other studies.

Following the analysis of the different phases of the talk shows, some observations can be made and compared with other findings from existing literature with reference to Conversationa Analysis and Genre Analysis. First, as presented in Figure 1, the argumentative talk shows have a basic overall structure sequentially organized as a sequence of three phase activity pattern. The first phase is the formulaic opening which is conducted exclusively by the talk show host. It comprises of various elements in no fixed order: invitation of the panelists and the wider audience to join in the show, introduction of the topic, and background to the topic, provision of contact lines and twitter handles, name of the show among others. With regard to some of the elements that characterize the the opening in the talk shows, the findings compare with news interview opening (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). However, the lack of a fixed order in their occurrence departs from that reported by Clayman and Heritage.

After the opening phase, the host engages the panelists in the discussion on the topic which tends to be a relatively long phase. This is the second phase that would be considered as the discussion proper. It is generally build by the
Question-Answer (Q-A) sequences. It is in this phase that the wider audiences are given a chance to participate by sending SMS, tweets or by calling in. The hosts restrict themselves to questioning, while the panelists are fundamentally constrained to answering the hosts’ questions, or at least responding to them. This constraint shapes the form taken by the participants’ talk and the order in which they talk to the following pattern: Question–Answer, Question–Answer (Q-A, Q-A). This form of turn-taking involves “turn-type pre-allocation” (Sacks et al.; 1974; Schegloff, 2007), in which the activities of asking and answering (or responding to) questions are pre-allocated to the roles of host and panelists.

With minor exceptions, this pre-allocated pattern holds in this study data regardless of the number of participants in the encounter. The structure of the talk shows sampled distinctively shapes the opportunities the participants have to achieve their ends, and adhering to them, creates a highly recognizable interactional format. Analysts who have studied broadcast talk tend to share this view (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hutchby, 2006; Montogmery, 2007).

Within the body of the talk shows are commercial breaks that make room for commercial advertisements. The hosts usually inform the wider audience that they are taking a break but they will be back shortly. After the break, the host welcomes the wider audience back to the programme, re-introduces the panelists and sometimes the topic of the day (c.f Figure 1). This is necessary to ensure that the wider audience stay on the programme. The re-introduction also
provides the necessary information that some members of the wider audience may have missed during the opening segment. This is due to the fact that these programmes are presented for the sake of the wider audience (Hutchby, 1992; Tolson, 2006; Montogmerry, 2007).

When the hosts judge that this phase is complete and the topic is adequately presented, or the time allocated for the show is running out, they begin the third phase which is the closing phase that brings the programme to an end. However, the closing phase has a pre-closing phase that ushers in the final closing through a number of strategies, among them, advance time warning. Because opening and closing practices are very distinctive, they combine to mark the interaction at its boundaries as something other than casual conversation, but a distinctive genre of media discourse.

There are two significant dimensions to the act of talk show closing: one which might be called topical and the other temporal. From the perspective of timing, closing provides a discursive solution to a technical problem: for the programme must close exactly at a predetermined moment in order to implement the onward movement of the broadcasting schedule (Hutchby, 2006). From the perspective of topicality, the discussion is always about something, some content which is almost always treated as finite in a definitive way. In the production of a closing, the talk has completed itself; everything of interest has been exhausted, at least for the purposes of this
programme at this point in time, whatever other topical pressures might be in
play.

From a Conversational Analysis perspective, it can be argued that the
organization of the sequences in the different phases of the talkshows is the
central form of organization that give shape and coherence to the series of
turns of which the talk shows are composed. This sequence organization gives
the argumentative talk shows a stable overall structure.

Owing to the common overall structure of the talk shows presented in this
chapter, and due to the fact that the different phases are staged to achieve
certain communicative goals, it can be argued that argumentative talk shows
on radio and TV stations in Kenya constitute a genre  (Swales, 1990; Bhatia,
1993; Halliday & Martin, 1993; Eggins, 1994).

4.2.4 Summary of Chapter
This chapter has presented an analysis of the structural organization of
argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya in the study
sample under the first objective of our study. The chapter has described the
distinct phases of the talk shows and shown how each stage in the genre
contributes a part of the overall structure, and the role each plays towards the
overall achievement of the goal of the talk shows. The next chapter presents
the analysis of the aspects of argument that characterize argumentative talk
shows.
CHAPTER FIVE: ASPECTS OF ARGUMENT IN RADIO AND TV
ARGUMENTATIVE TALK SHOWS

5.0 Introduction
In the previous chapter on the structure of argumentative talk shows, it was observed that talk shows have an organizational structure with identifiable beginnings and endings. Within those brackets, particular aspects of argument are used as participants express their opinions on the subject. Accordingly, focus on these aspects, along with their functions is the principal preoccupation in this chapter. In doing so, analysis in this chapter will address the second objective on the aspects of argument of argumentative radio and TV talk shows, as well as the fourth objective on communicative functions of the aspects in the phase in which they occur, that is, the body of the talk shows.

5.1 An overview of Aspects of Argument
At the heart of any talk in interaction are specialized activities or participation structures engaged in by participants in the setting in which they occur (Hutchby, 1996). Hutchby further observes that such talk may involve arguments which are interactional accomplishments that require active participation of all communicators. As such, arguments are achieved through particular interactional properties or aspects available to the participants. In light of the above, the particular argumentative aspects that participants use to configure what we hear as argumentative talk shows were examined.
Analysis in this chapter follows a Conversational Analytic framework (cf. 2.8.2) by examining how turns are constructed, what they do in relation to each other, and how they form sequences in interaction. Media formats are to a specific degree constituted by what Schegloff (1992, 2007) describes as “speech exchange systems” and “sequence organizations,” that function as resources for distinctive activities. This analysis further establishes and accounts for the recurrence of the aspects of argument across all the talk shows sampled guided by Genre Analysis framework.

The analysis in this chapter adopted a classification of interactional properties of argument advanced by Hutchby (1996). These are: action-opposition sequences, shifts in footing, validity challenge, turning a claim against itself, interruptions, overlaps and reformulations. Both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the aspects of argument was also carried out. Quantitative analysis presents separately tables and bar charts that show the frequency of occurrence of each of the features in each of the radio and TV stations. This was in an attempt to display the emerging patterns of the generic features that facilitated a comparison of the argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya in the light of the frequency of occurrence of these aspects. In qualitative analysis, examples from transcripts in which the aspects of argument occurred were presented.
5.2 Presentation of Data on Aspects of Argument in Sampled Radio and TV Argumentative Talk shows

The section that follows presents the frequencies of the various aspects of argument identified in section 5.1 above as they occurred in the four stations sampled: KTN, Citizen TV, Hope FM and Nation FM.

![Figure 2: Aspects of Argument in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows](image)

Figure 2 displays a contrast of the aspects of argument as they occurred in various degrees in talk shows in the four stations sampled, while the Table 1 below presents data on the frequency of occurrence of these aspects.
Table 1: Aspects of Argument in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen TV</th>
<th>KTN TV</th>
<th>Hope FM</th>
<th>Nation FM</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action-Opposition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifts in Footing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity Challenges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning a Claim against Itself</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlaps</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 1, the aspects of argument on Citizen TV yielded a cumulative of 50 aspects. Out of these, the action-opposition sequences were the majority at 14 (28%). These were followed by overlaps that constituted 10 (20%) of the occurrences, and the interruptions followed closely at 8 (16%). The three aspects constituted over two thirds of the total frequency. This was so because any time an overlap occurred as the panelists competed for turns to speak, the host would frequently interrupt to restore order to the turn taking format. The fourth in the frequency were the validity challenges at 6 (12%). They were followed closely by shifts in footing and turning a claim against itself at 5 (10%) and 4 (8%) respectively. Reformulations constituted the lowest occurrences on Citizen TV, at 3 (6%).
Turning to KTN TV, an almost similar pattern in the distribution of the aspects of argument was observed. The frequency of occurrence of all the argumentative aspects was 47. Out of these, action-opposition frequencies registered the highest frequency of 13 (27.7%). The other aspects recorded occurrences less than 10 as interruptions had 9 occurrences (19.1%) and validity challenges followed closely with 7 (14.9%). Shifts in footing and overlaps had a tie of 6 (12.8%) in occurrence each. Reformulations and turning a claim against itself too had a tie with a frequency of 3 (6.4%) each.

Occurrence of the aspects drawn from the radio stations was as follows. On Hope FM, action-opposition sequences constituted 6 (27.3%) out of the 22 frequency counts identified in the data. Shifts in footing came second with a frequency of 4 (18.2%). Interestingly, there was a tie among three of the aspects, these were validity challenges, interruptions and overlaps with 3 (13.6%) counts each. Following this were reformulations that constituted 2 (9.1%) while turning claim against itself had the lowest frequency of 1 (4.5%). The low occurrence of the aspects on Hope FM could be attributed to the length of the programme that ran for 40 minutes which was shorter than all the other programmes recorded.

On Nation FM, a total of 46 aspects were identified from the data. Just like in the previous data drawn from Citizen TV and KTN, action-opposition sequences had the highest frequency counts of 11 (23.9%). Interruptions came a close second at 10 (21.7%). These two aspects constituted more than half the
total frequency. The other five aspects had a frequency count of less than ten with overlaps recording a frequency count of 8 (17.4%). A tie was recorded between shifts in footing and validity challenges that had 5 (10.9%) each. Reformulations followed closely at 4 (8.7%) while turning a claim against itself constituted 3 (6.5%) of the total frequency.

The next few paragraphs explain the patterns of aspects observed in the data. From the data presented above, one can argue that the talk shows are designed to largely present a standpoint for or against a given proposition. The talk shows are also task related in the sense that the talk is principally designed to discuss personal opinions about public issues. As Hutchby (1992, 1996) has observed, arguing is the central speech activity in this kind of talk; hence, opinion on the matter under discussion is bound to differ. Again, most of the topics discussed were argumentative in nature. In such cases, speakers openly engage in disputing over a position across a series of turns. This explains the high frequency of action opposition sequences across the talkshows sampled.

The prominent occurrence of this aspect was further attributed to the choice of the topic and the panelists. The panelists, mostly political figures representing both sides of the political divide, that is, the government and the opposition, dominated most of the panels especially on Nation FM, Citizen and KTN. The panelists appeared committed to presenting entirely competing versions of the issue under discussion. The high frequency of action-opposition sequences further confirms Hutchby’s (1996) argument that a basic action-opposition
sequence is at the root of the different forms of argument found in institutionalized disputes. It was however observed that on the radio stations, even when the topics were argumentative, the panelists employed more discussion than argument, hence the lower frequency of use of action-opposition frequencies on radio. This observation was made on Hope FM.

Regarding the use of shifts in footing, a view in the literature reviewed indicated the encounter in these shows is staged for the benefit of the general public, who is absent and is constructed as a mass audience. Hence hosts would frequently use structures like ‘many people think….’ ‘most Kenyans feel….’ This explains the frequency on the use of the aspect shifts in footing in this study data. Again in Clayman’s (2010) observation, such shifts in footing are frequently used to enable their producers to maintain a stance of official neutrality on an issue.

The panelists, on the other hand, showed a tendency to use overlaps and interruption to a much larger extent, especially in the heat of an argument and when the host indicated that they were running out of time in the pre-closing phase. This phase has been described as highly a combative environment where talk can degenerate into a confrontation (Hutchby, 1991, 1996). Politicians and other public figures are accountable to the general public, and demand for accountability is the ultimate goal of such communicative events as talk shows and interviews (Martinez, 2000). With this general goal in mind, and acting on behalf of the public, the talk show host attempted to hold the
panelists accountable of every claim they made. So, validity challenges as well as turning a claim against itself were significantly used by the host to critique, accuse or express doubt on a claim advanced by a speaker. This is because the panelists who, influenced by their professionalism and affiliation to the topic, have an obligation for accountability. This ensures that truth is the centerpiece of the interaction. The hosts did not appear to reformulate the topics much and the occurrence of the feature reformulations was rather low in all the four programmes sampled. This could be attributed to the fact that topics on talk show are fixed and participants rarely deviate from the relatively fixed agenda (Tolson, 2006).

Having presented the percentages of occurrence of the aspects of argument in the talk shows, section 5.3 that follows exemplifies the use of the various aspects as they featured in the transcribed data. The main interest is to show how sequential patterns in talk practically accomplish the communicative activity of arguing in the radio and TV contexts.

5.3 Aspects of Argument in Radio and TV Talk shows

The section that follows presents a discussion of the aspects of argument as they occurred in the sampled talk shows in the following order: action-opposition sequences, shifts in footing, validity challenge, turning a claim against itself, interruptions, overlaps and finally reformulations.
5.3.1 Action – Opposition Sequences

Hutchby (1996) observes that approaching argument through the Action-Opposition model places the analytic focus squarely on the sequential organization of talk-in-interaction as the framework within which participants manage conflict talk. This category includes strategies of expressions either ‘for’ or ‘against’ the issue under discussion. The strategies encompass whether panelists use direct or indirect strategies of expressing agreement or disagreement to the topic under discussion. Maynard (1985), working from a conversational-analytic perspective, conceives arguments as essentially sequential phenomena, occurring in locally managed action-opposition sequences. The examples that follow present these sequences as they occurred in the study.

Example 18.5 KTN 2  Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums

1 H  … Prof A, I want to give you a chance and I want you to respond to that….What exactly does national dialogue mean? What will be the terms for that?

2P1: Well I am glad that it is in the media so that it is not misunderstood. But you know we have some very urgent issues that are of national importance. The issue of security is not an issue we can only leave to the government. It is a national issue requiring the participation of everybody. The issue of tribalism, the nation is more divided than ever before….

3H: So the national dialogue will be to what end?

4P1: That’s what I’m trying to tell you. The dialogue will try to come up with a joint programme to deal with these issues which we will all adopt… We gave not more than two months because these are very urgent issues.

5H: Alright, and we shall come back to eh that deadline that has been given by CORD that is by July 7th. Senator K why is Jubilee against the idea of national dialogue? Is it the idea that Jubilee has the solution to all problems to get any ideas from the others in the country?

6P2: Thank you. The said dialogue, everybody who has spoken from the President to myself today in ____ and many other leaders including ____in __, we have said one, we have been encouraging dialogue …. We have one of the most expensive constitution in the world. So the idea of a dialogue is not a new thing. What is new to us are ultimatums, threats and incitement of
Example 18.5 KTN 2 is on the national dialogue that members of the opposition, CORD wanted to have with the Jubilee government. The panelists here, who represent the government and the opposition, are drawn into overt disagreements with one another over the same. At turn 1 and 3, the host seeks to find out from P1, a senator from the opposition, what the terms for the national dialogue will be by asking what will be the terms for that? This forms the action for the next actions at turns 2 and 4, where the panelist P1 from the opposition points out to the urgent issues that the opposition wants addressed, such as security and tribalism and indicates that these are issues that can’t wait, thus the issuance of a deadline by the opposition.

The host, at turn 5, seeks to get the position of the government from P2; a senator representing government, by the question: Why is Jubilee against national dialogue…? This forms the basis for the next utterance where he consents that the government is ready for dialogue but he opposes the idea of the ultimatums given by the opposition CORD, and accuses them of incitement. It can therefore be observed that the positions by both the opposition and the government on the national dialogue are similar in the sense that both sides claim to be willing to engage in dialogue. This evident in the statement by the senator representing the government, who says, we have said one, we have been encouraging dialogue …. (Turn 6). However, the differences are foregrounded in the sense that the government is opposed to
the ultimatums being issued by the opposition when the senator says, *what is new to us are ultimatums, threats and incitement of the public*.... The action move by P1 therefore, is continuously opposed by P2, consequently building up a dispute. A similar occurrence of action–opposition sequence can be observed in the example that follows.

**Example 19.5 Nation FM1   Topic: County Development Boards**

1M: Let’s talk about eh fact that the CIC eh the Commission on the Implementation of the Constitution has come out saying that this is unconstitutional. *These new amendments as you are calling them you know are basically unconstitutional.*

2P1: *Unconstitutional is not declared by the CIC …. Lemmie…*

3H: There are various issues

4P1: Lemmie lemmie ..... My memory is very clear. When the CIC, when the Council of Governors appeared, FIDA, when the Law Society of Kenya appeared before our Committee of Legal Affairs which I sit, *the only challenge the governors had, they said we don’t want the senators to chair because we are the big men. And lemmie tell you, the only problem governors have with the County Development Board, and you can read in any newspaper is who chairs?*

5H: Is this the main issue governor?

6P2: *No it is not the only issue.*

7P1: It is the main issue ....

The exchange above demonstrates action and opposition on the issue of the county development boards that the senators want constituted which the governors are against. The argument as directed by the host is between a senator and a governor, who are members of the Jubilee coalition. At turn 1 in an action move *These new amendments, as you are calling them, you know, are basically unconstitutional*, the host indicates that the CIC has declared the setting up of the County Development Boards as unconstitutional and
therefore, the senators should drop the bid to have them. At turn 2 the first panelist P1 opposes this view and points out the CIC does not determine if a process is constitutional or not in the statement *unconstitutional is not declared by the CIC*...At turn 3, the host further seeks to find out if there are other issues in a statement, *there are other issues*. This forms the action upon which P1 further advances his disagreement at turn 4 that the Governors are opposed to the establishment of the Boards because the Senators will be chair, but not the governors themselves. At turn 5, the host then turns to the P2, the Governor to find out if indeed they are opposed to the boards because they will not chair them. At turn 6 the Governor directly disagrees and says *no it is not the main issue*...The Senator still disagrees and holds on to the claim that that is the main contention....the ‘big man’ syndrome. The example that follows illustrates this phenomenon as it occurred on Hope FM.

**Example 20.5 Hope FM 1  Topic: The Marriage Bill**

1 H:  Mheshimiwa… Le’ts have J. before we come to you.

2 P3:  *Aah what I’m saying is this Bill is not about marrying many wives. It is about many other things because even when it comes to polygamy, women have options. You can marry through civil which is very cheap and it is monogamous. There is no way you can turn it into polygamous. But we are Africans, we have African values…*

3 P2:  *Now*

4 H:  *Yes mheshimiwa*

5 P2:  *I do not want my colleague to lose a point and I can see he is missing the point. This Bill has over 90 articles and most of the articles are very good. The only articles, 3 or 4 that we want put in place so that our work as legislators is to move a Bill that will work for the whole of Kenya not just for a group. We need to defend women by looking at the culture which the chair keeps identifying with. In fact traditionally, it is the wives who went for another wife for the husband. So what we are saying … if it is polygamy then let’s have a system.*

6 P1:  *You know there is a misunderstanding here...*
The discussion in Example 20.5 Hope FM 1 is among three participants: P3 who is a family lawyer, P2, a legislator and a women representative, and P1 a member of parliament and the chair of the Committee of Justice and Legal Affairs in parliament. They are discussing the controversial Marriage Bill, a matter that has been raised by the host at turn 1. There appears to be a perception that the Bill encourages polygamy. Consequently, the host in an action move at turn 1 asks P3 a family lawyer to clarify the matter, which she does at turn 2 in another action move, this Bill is not about marrying many wives... because there are other types of marriages women can get into, but it is about many other things. However, still at turn 5, P2 indicates that We need to defend women by looking at the culture which the chair keeps identifying with ... The women representative indirectly disagrees and expresses the view that the Bill is oppressive to women, and calls for a system that protects women because she is of the view that there are some cultural practices that oppress women, that the Bill does not seem to address.

This opposition forms the action for the next opposition move by P1 at turn 6 and indirectly disagrees with P1’s view. He puts it as you know there is a misunderstanding here.... An action that P2 overtly disagrees with by ‘no, no, no’ but P1 goes ahead to further explain that the Bill does not encourage polygamy and that there are other types of marriages Customary Law is not for
polygamy… (Turn 8). At turn 9, P2 is seen to hold onto her claim by dismissing any misunderstanding between the panelists over the issue of the Marriage Bill.

The analysis of action-opposition shows that by the extensive use of this aspect, participants are able to highlight and preserve the argumentative nature of interaction in the talk shows. Participants constantly engage in reactions for and/or against propositions. This analysis confirms Mohd Nor+ (2014) findings that topic opinion discussions include strategies of expressing either ‘for’ or ‘against’ the issue under discussion. These strategies encompass whether interlocutors use direct or indirect strategies of expressing agreement or disagreement to the issue under discussion.

Further, this analysis shows that disagreement may be exhibited by formulating events in an action-reaction sequence where parties’ moves and counter-moves index their divergent views (Mynard, 1985). Regardless of the subject, the disputes in the study data almost always followed the same basic pattern, which can be described as follows: Three speakers, A, B and C produced the following pattern during a dispute. The talk show host injected a dispute at a speaking Turn 1 (T1) which B responded to at Turn 2 (T2). In turn, speaker C responded to the statement by B at Turn 3 (T3), by either supporting the statement or openly discussing why they do not agree with B. This means that the second turn did not always contain a disagreement. This finding therefore departs from the argument that disputes usually follow sequences of
two turns, containing two adjacency pairs (T1 and T2, as well as T2 and T3), with the second turn in each pair containing the disagreement (Muntgl & Turnbull, 1998). It is also important to point out that action-opposition turns were not always adjacently positioned because each speaker’s opportunity to put forward a case was sometimes followed by an intervening question from the talk show host.

In spite of their high occurrence in the study data (cf Table 2), the use of action-opposition sequences did not exhaust the resources which parties to the interaction could draw on in the construction of radio and TV argumentative talk shows. In the next section therefore, focus is on another aspect of argument in which the host or the panelists used; shift footing.

5.3.2 Shifts in Footing

According to Goffman (1981), the notion of footing refers to the different ways in which a speaker can claim (or disclaim) personal responsibility for the words he or she is uttering. The “footing” shift technique is mainly used by hosts to modify the way in which disagreement is couched. The hosts are able to disclaim sole authorship for a position by attributing it to a third party, in this way, the host presents him or herself as the proxy for the views of an absent third party (Clayman, 2010). They use structures such as “some people claim….” Clayman sees many of these resources as an expression of “practices aligning with the public” (2002, p.200). The questions can, for example, be framed with references non-specific voices using structures such
as ‘many are wondering’, ‘many may ask…’, ‘what do you say to those who feel that….’ This is derived from first, the fact that it is the members of the wider audience for whose benefit the talk is ultimately produced. Second, the hosts must manage this task while meeting the constraint that they retain a broadly balanced, impartial, or neutral stance towards the statements and opinions presented by the panelists (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hutchby, 1996; 2006). The examples that follow present this aspect as it occurred in the study data.

**Example 21.5 KTN 1 Topic: Tides of Terror**

T1 H: M., *many may ask why this is happening… now you are in Eastleigh. Right? Why was this not being done in a systematic way and even what the Deputy President said “tutamwaga polisi…… “*

2 H: And….. got through our borders, got to Daadab refugees camp and got to the city. *Many would say you are putting the cart before the horse because….*

In Example 21.5 KTN 1 above, the topic was on the terrorist attacks in the country and the operation by the police in Eastleigh Estate in Nairobi to flush out alleged terrorists. This operation had received divided opinion with regard to the manner in which it was being conducted. The host uses the structure *many may ask…. (Turn 1) and many would say…. (Turn 2)*, to present herself as the voice of the Kenyan public who may be questioning the manner in which the police are carrying out the operations. Clayman (1992; 2010) looked at this concept as “third party attribution” which may be expressed in structures such as “comment by”, or “observance by”. Example 22.5 Citizen TV 1 below is a case in point. Here it can be observed that this aspect was used by the host and a panelist.
At turn 1, the host seeks information from a member of parliament P3 about the perceived warm relationship between URP, one of the parties that constitute the Jubilee coalition and ODM, a party in the opposition. Again, just as in the previous excerpt, at turn 1, she uses the structure ...and there are those who may observe or opine that there is still very warm relationship between URP and ODM because of the previous relationship between ___and ___.; again attributing the claim that there is still a warm relationship between URP and ODM....to a third party. The panelist P3 in response to this uses the phrase many pessimists thought the relationship between the Kalenjins and the Kikuyus would not work. Also, in by eh looking at eh what ___. has just mentioned...So that is not a personal opinion but that of another third party, ___. Unlike in the previous examples where it is the hosts who have been using this strategy, here we find a panelist, a political analyst using it. Gofman (1981) has referred to this as a maneuver to a shift in the speaker’s interactional “footing.”

In the example below drawn from Nation FM, the shift in footing is realized by the host but in different wording.
Example 23.5 Nation FM 2   Topic: Sabasaba

1P2: They are not representing the people now, they are representing the national government on the grassroot.

2H: I just, I just need to understand something. *I need to clarify something simple for the people...*

3 P1: Mmh

4 H: When we were electing governors and the senators, one of the roles of the senate...

In Example 23.5 Nation FM 2 the debate revolves around the roles of Senators and Governors. The host requests for clarification first, for her own understanding, *I just, I just need to understand something*, and second, for the sake of the people in the statement, *I need to clarify something simple for the people* at turn 2. This follows a prior turn 1 where P2, a Governor alleges that the Senators, rather than representing the people, they are representing the National Government.

On Hope FM, this phenomenon was observed but it was realized in a different structure from those in the previous examples. Take a look at the example that follows.

Example 24.5 Hope FM 2   Topic: Illicit Brews

T1H: You gave the impression that you had the ability to deal with illicit brews. *How do you respond to the Kenyans* who say M is the man who brought the law.

2 P1 In October I appeared before the committee in parliament to discuss all that and the memo said we must test all alcohol in the Republic of Kenya because I can see a problem coming.

3 H: Since you took office, what can NACADA boast of in having curbed alcoholism in the country in terms of numbers? *A lot of people out there may feel really very little is being done...*
The discussion from which the excerpt above is drawn centres on the spread of illicit brews in most parts of the country. The host takes the chair of NACADA to task, to explain why that is the case. In the first turn 1, the host uses shifts in footing in the structure *how do you respond to the Kenyans who say M is the man who brought the law*. He responds to this question at turn 2 he responds to this citing a memo that requires all alcohol in Kenya to be tested. At turn 3 that follows, the host still seeks to find out what the chair has achieved since he took office. In response, the panelist uses the statement; *A lot of people out there may feel really very little is being done...* This footing indicates that the panelist is not attributing the feeling of dissatisfaction to anyone in particular, but to ‘a lot of people out there.’

It can therefore be observed that the hosts of the talk shows are supposed to hold back explicit personal opinions and comments to maintain a formally neutral stance while interacting with their panelists (Hutchby, 1996, 2006; Clayman, 2002). However, the host not only needs to maintain a neutral stance, but also needs to create an engaging interview. They achieve the neutral stance by various techniques as illustrated in the excerpts. So “the host appears to work to place some degree of distance between themselves and their more overtly opinionated remarks” (Clayman & Heitage 2002, p. 152). It was also noted from the study data that the panelists may also attribute their remarks to another third party as seen in Example 24.5 Hope FM 2.
The next section evaluates the use of validity challenges as another aspect of argumentative talk shows.

### 5.3.3 Validity Challenges

Validity challenges are a class of utterances which oppose a claim on the grounds of its relevance to the matter in question. Hutchby (1996) in a study of talk radio calls has observed that a caller may set up an agenda for discussion. However, that agenda is not something that the caller necessarily maintains subsequent control of. A speaker is required to take the floor again and expand on or account for the challenged claim. The host in a talk show may also use validity challenges to strategically control over the field of relevancies locally at work within a dispute. Clayman (1992) has observed that the moderator’s right to ask questions and the relevance of such questions are undisputed.

On a similar ground, Clayman and Heritage (2002) observation on news interview is that, an interview is not designed to be simply a platform for the interviewees’ preferred spin on events, but rather a context in which their judgments, opinions and actions are tested in the process of interrogation. In conducting the argumentative talk shows, hosts responded to panelists’ views by first listening to them, then taking issue with the views to establish the rational grounds of their stances on the issue in question.
In this study data, turns containing the challenge are marked by terms such as ‘so,’ ‘I know’ ‘How’. Such prefaces begin turns containing reasons why a current speaker considers prior speaker’s talk to be of no consequence (Goodwin, 1990, cited in Hutchby, 1996). The examples that follow illustrate this phenomenon.

**Example 25.5 KTN 2 Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums**

T1H: You talked a while ago about Jubilee taking over the problems of the previous government. However, does it mean the rise in insecurity, terrorism cases, the promise that was made by the Jubilee government itself, laptops, does the rise in the cost of living we are seeing now.... historical? Case in point. Look at the comments/ remarks that have been made by the Inspector General on matters like tinted windows... It looks like it’s a government that is at odds with itself and not in control and perhaps that what CORD might be enquiring.

2P2 Three things: one, the insecurity problems. The Jubilee government has employed last year alone 10,000 new police officers...

3H: How? But we still see attacks?

4 P2: Just a moment, Just a moment … vehicles we fuel and from 1st July every police officer will have a life insurance but that has not been done as we thought. Equipment, but there are other structural issues amid police reforms and that’s why we are saying this dialogue that CORD is talking about is a dialogue that could help us to do the structural and legal issues and I could have expected especially instead of doing a rally…

5 H: Right, what would you want?

6P2: We would want legislation. I would be happy to see a Bill on national security sponsored by the leaders of minority in the Senate or in the National Assembly. I would be the first to support him.

In Example 25.5 KTN 2, the topic of discussion is the security situation in the country and the host asks a police spokesman, P2 why there is a rise in insecurity and why the government does not seem to deliver on the promises made to Kenyans prior to elections (turn 1). You talked a while ago about Jubilee taking over the problems of the previous government. However, does it mean the rise in insecurity, terrorism cases, the promise that was made by the
Jubilee Government itself, laptops, does the rise in the cost of living we are seeing now.... historical? A turn 2, the panelist provides information that the government is doing something by having employed 10,000 police officers in only one year. However, the host undermines the rational grounds for the claim by showing that hiring is not sufficient as seen in a prefaced turn 3 how? but we still have more attacks...?

Typically, the police officer seeks to still justify the effort the government has put in. He defends the position taken earlier then goes on to supplement it with factual details of the vehicles we fuel and from 1st July every police officer will have a life insurance... that supplies further relevance and weight to the question that precedes it, that is, ‘what the government is doing about curbing insecurity?’ The panelist then challenges the idea of the opposition holding a rally to address insecurity. At this point the host asks him what he could have wanted done instead of a rally in the words what would you want? (turn 5). The panelist responds by saying he would expect a Bill on national security from the opposition.

The feature is further exemplified in the excerpt below taken from Nation FM.

**Example 26.5 Nation FM 1 Topic: County Development Boards**

T1P2: I want to tell you that the report from the Controller of Budget has clearly shown that counties have spent more money on development than the National Government. …The Auditor General has been revealing that they lose about 300 million in the National Government. So what are we really talking about?

2 H: So what’s government position?

3 P2: We do not want to continue with that culture of the National Government, we want to ensure our funds go to the needs of the people. And we would want county by county to be checked whether development is reported to those areas.
4 H:  *But who is supposed to check that because you cannot monitor yourselves?*

5 P2:  The County Assemblies

6 H:  *No no no. Your assemblies comprise of MCAs. MCAs in some counties have said we do not want these people. They feel you are coming to position to spend money. Who is supposed to vet this money spending?*

7 P2:  Lemmie tell you, lemmie tell you. The procedure of spending money in the counties is ah first of all you got a plan for it, you got a budget for it and you got an expenditure program.

The topic of discussion in Example 26.5 Nation FM 1 is on the establishment of County Development Boards that the Governors are opposed to. P2, a Governor at turn 1 claims that these Boards are unnecessary since the counties are already spending more money on development than the National Government. So at turn 2, the host asks a question that seeks to find out what the government’s is take on the same, in *so what’s government position?* Again, just like in Example 25.5 KTN 2, it can be noted that the turn containing the challenge is prefaced by the term ‘so’. At turn 3, the P2 says ‘we would want county by county to be checked on whether development is reported to those areas’ a proposition that the host challenges at turn 4, *But who is supposed to check that because you cannot monitor yourselves?* So the host’s response is seen to register a difference of view about the idea of oversight.

When at turn 5 the P2 indicates that the MCAs should do the vetting, the host disputes this at turn 6 in the utterance *No no no. Your assemblies comprise of MCAs. MCAs in some counties have said we do not want these people...* So the MCAs would not be ideal to oversight the governors. Indeed the question that the host asks at turn 6 is built around propositions that are considered
disputable. She cites that the MCAs in the County Assemblies have rejected the Governors claiming that they are rising to positions to spend money. P2 justifies the spending by saying that it is guided by some budget and procedure.

The analysis of the validity challenge device presents a highly recursive two-part linguistic device used by the hosts to express a skeptical stance vis-à-vis the panelists’ remarks. This device has an argumentative aspect built into it as the opposition expressed in the challenge is a crucial feature of arguments (Hutchby, 1996). The use of the validity challenge serves to elicit credible and legitimate information from the panelists. The next section, presents the fourth aspect of argument identified in the data; turning a claim against itself.

5.3.4 Turning a Claim against Itself

Talk show hosts may undermine an argument without necessarily dealing with its actual truth or falsity (Hutchby, 1996). On the same point, both Pomerantz (1988, 1989) and Drew (1990) have noted that the significant point about contrasts in disputatious talk is not whether or not the two versions are respectively true or false, but rather that the juxtaposition itself has the effect of encouraging a recipient or audience to ‘judge’ that one of the versions is wrong. Turning a claim against itself is a device that takes the form of a contrast nature in the general linguistic form: “You say (X), but what about (Y)? Where (X) represents the attributed claim or position, while (Y) points to the component that finds fault, and/or puts forward the competing version
Thus, it presents an exchange of directly addressed positions and counterpositions. In a similar way, hosts in radio and TV talk shows can exploit the same properties to project doubt about the general validity of the claims and assertions made by demonstrating faultiness in their details (Hutchby, 1996). The examples that follow show how this aspect was used in the talk shows.

**Example 27.5 KTN2 Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums**

T1H: Alright, and we need to get to some of the promises that the Jubilee Government gave and we realize in the beginning you did say that it is very clear that the Jubilee Government is up for dialogue. However yesterday at Uhuru Park right after the statement that was made by the___ the Deputy President was on record saying there will be no dialogue….. and today we see the President saying there will be dialogue but with certain limitations…Senator K….

2 P2: We are entitled to put the record correct, the same way CORD is entitled to clarify what they meant. Our understanding and I listened very well and watched the statements mainly by the ___ and the former ___ especially the former ___ said eh, we cannot have a government which does not represent everyone in Kenya, so we have to sit down and all of us then have everyone on board and… With the grand coalition and…

3 H: And … and …. I will take you back to my question which was about the Deputy President ___ saying no dialogue…

4 P2: …but I… I want to clarify …What we got from CORD yesterday is like they want us to sit down, create an imaginary crisis, and start now forming some grand coalition government like what we had with ___; full of quarrels, trouble and competition.

5 H: Senator A, where do you think this idea of perhaps reviving the coalition government came from? Could it be perhaps from ___ statement that a government cannot be formed by 60% the people coming from outside of and that if there will be no dialogue before sabasaba wataenda nyumbani (they will go home). Do you think that’s the place where it could be coming from?

6 P1: You know…Of course I can understand Jubilee’s worry about the government of national unity because there are only quarrelling about what there is. I mean there is nothing to be shared, the meat is small. But we do not want to have a government of national unity or grand coalition…..

In the example above one of the panelists P2, a Senator in the Jubilee Coalition had earlier mentioned that the coalition is ready for dialogue but the
host points out a difference in the Deputy President’s position over the same. Hence, the host turns P2’s claim against itself in the words in the beginning you did say that it is very clear that the Jubilee government is up for dialogue... this is the attributed position. The host then presents the competing claim in the words however yesterday at Uhuru Park right after the statement that was made by the __, the Deputy President was on record saying there will be no dialogue, and today we see the President saying there will be dialogue but with certain limitations... So the host here seeks to establish what the actual position of the Jubilee government is.

The Senator, at turn 2 attempts to clarify that point ‘Our understanding and I listened very well and watched the statements mainly by the __ and the former VP, especially the former VP ___ said eh, we cannot have a government which does not represent everyone in Kenya, so we have to sit down and all of us then have everyone on board…’ However, the host finds P2’s response unsatisfactory and takes him back to her earlier point on the Deputy President saying there will be no dialogue; I will take you back to my question which was about the Deputy President _saying no dialogue... (turn 3). At turn 4, the Senator tries to explain that the CORD Coalition is trying to create an imaginary crisis so as to be included in the government in order to form a coalition government. At turn 5 however, the host seeks to get P1’s a Senator in the CORD coalition to respond to the alleged interest in a coalition government in the question, Senator A, where do you think this idea of perhaps reviving the coalition government came from? This would be perhaps
in further pursuit for validity since the senator represents the CORD coalition. As expected, the senator refutes this allegation at turn 6 by saying that *I mean there is nothing to be shared, the meat is small. But we do not want to have a government of national unity or grand coalition...* It is observed that, using this tool, the host routinely pursues a satisfactory response from the panelists drawn from both sides of the political divide. She either repeats the utterances containing the challenge or rephrases them.

On Nation FM, this phenomenon was notable. It is worth noting though that in the example below, the challenge comes from a member of the wider audience.

**Example 28.5 Nation FM Topic: County Development Boards**

1 C: My question is directed to the Governor. You’ve complained a lot about the Senators’ wanting to establish a County’s Management Boards. *Yes, you say they have a role in county governance, but you do not want them to play the role the way they want to. What is your counter proposal?*

2 P2: Our counter proposal is the provision by Section 91 which is in place up to now because we do not recognize what ___ is trying to buddy around. We’ve also proceeded to court over the same. The provision of Section 91 is very clear that the Governor may call for a forum in which all the representative both national and local will participate through the public participation process. This is not in the process of them micro managing counties.

In Example 28.5 Nation FM 1, the discussion is on the establishment of County Development Boards that the Governors are opposed to yet, they still expect the Senators to take part in county governance. A caller raises concern on how the Governors expect the senators to execute their role by using the structure *Yes, you say they have a role in county governance*, which constitutes the attributed claim, after which he presents the counter claim *but you do not want them to play the role the way they want to*. The caller then
goes on to ask the Governor what their alternative is in the words, *what is your counter proposal?*

This is a ‘you say X but what about Y’ structure that is meant to challenge the governors to state their actual position as going by his statement, it is not clear how the senators are expected to perform their roles. The governor responds to this question at turn 2 by citing ‘the provision of Section 91 is very clear that the governor may call for a forum in which all the representatives both national and local will participate through the public participation process.’ This would therefore mean that the said boards are not necessary as there is a provision for the senators to participate through the public participation process.

It can be argued from this analysis that this device of turning a claim against itself was routinely used to pursue controversy in the panelists’ contributions in the show. ‘Pursuit of controversy’ to stay with Hutchby (1996) term, is the practice by which the talk show hosts attended to the panelists’ talk as potentially arguable. So, this device was used as a resource for building opposition for which the panelists were expected to react to, either by clarifying a claim, justifying or providing facts. The analysis of this feature in the data confirms Hutchby’s (1996) observations that this structure enables the host to find fault in a panelist’s talk in an especially argumentative and confrontational way.
The section that follows focuses on the aspect of interruption as it emerged from the argumentative talk shows.

5.3.5 Use of Interruptions/Intervening in Ongoing Talk

Interruption is a recurring feature of oral interaction, and may acquire different functions in conversational and institutional dialogue. A speaker may interrupt his/ her interlocutor in order to convey objection to, but sometimes also to acknowledge or support the later’s statement (Ilie, 1994, 1995). On radio and TV talkshows, hosts are in a position to use interruption to exercise power within the interaction by constraining the participation options open to callers and participants at certain moments (Hutchby, 1996). Interruptions from the panelists occur when a participant initiates some action before a new question has emerged on to the interactional “floor.” A common occurrence is noted when a currently unaddressed speaker seeks to comment on some aspect of the talk in progress-in breach of the turn taking provision that the next speaker’s turns should properly be produced as responses to the host’s questions.

Interruption in the study data was an argumentative strategy through the use of which, hosts and panelists, in different ways, pursued their respective lines in arguments and defended their occupancy of the floor. Often times, interruptions were observed when the discussions were coming to a close. So, the host sometimes interrupted the show panelists due to time and/ or agenda constraints.
The next section explores how talk show hosts and panelists used the strategy of interruption to highlight the combative, aggressive and confrontational character of the talk shows.

Example 29.5 Citizen TV2  Topic: Politics Post Sabasaba

T1 P2: Jubilee, Jubilee in their wisdom have refused to join the Kenyans. Now Kenyans have decided to continue with dialogue on their own. That’s why….

2P1:  Now

3H:  *Just hold on that Prof. He has brought in a very interesting point.* I want to bring in an exclusive commentary from M. N. You say you have succeeded in getting the masses to support the issue….

4P2:  We have … We have

5H:  *Hold on… hold on please. Please S …let’s get what M. N. has to say about mass support and Sabasaba.*

M.N : Sabasaba was not about ___ and his brigade. Sabasaba was about masses as it should and ah if you looked at the groups that came out, they did not look convinced about it. And I think it is an indication that ah probably ___ has his course and it’s probably he has ran out of ideas and it’s unfortunate. And I am greatly saddened by that myself because I think he is a great revolutionary but probably he is… he did not have a plan….

6P2:  Now, lemmie

8H:  I know you are eager to respond but lemmie put the question to you O. Because now that you are an ODM Member of Parliament. Conspicuously, a lot of young tucks of ODM if you want, abandoned this rally. What happened?

9P3:  Let me

9H:  S I know you are willing to speak out but just hold your peace for a bit. They did abandon n the rally. Is that the case mheshimiwa? We have the footage……

10P2:  To address what M.N. was talking about. He is expressing his own opinion

11H:  Yes

12P2:  Which is of course prejudiced and his ideology which we don’t want to get into right now. But then the point is that eh over the time, CORD has demonstrated that with the people and the people have demonstrated everywhere that the issues that CORD is raising are real….

In Example 29.5 Citizen TV2, the talk is moving towards a contrast in opinion as to whether the saberSaba rally was successful or not. A claim initiated by P1
at turn 1 that the Jubilee government has refused to join Kenyans in national dialogue brings a series of varied reactions. At turn 2, P1, a political analyst jumps in to comment on the same in the words now… However, the host at turn 3 requests him to hold on so as to get comments from M. N., a political analyst, in the statement, Hold on… hold on please. Please S …let's get what M. N has to say about mass support and sabasaba.

Notably in Example 29.5 Citizen TV2, at turn 4, P3, a Senator from Jubilee attacks the host’s turn in progress in the words we have… but the hosts still holds the floor and tells him to hold on. After the commentary, P3, an unselected speaker takes the next turn to make a comment. However, the host takes her interactional and institutional right to control the participation. She, thus, gives the next turn 10 to P2, an MP from CORD to make his comment on M. N’s observation. He takes the right to continue and at turns 10 and 12 he dismisses M. N’s opinion as prejudiced. It is observed that he continues with his turn in progress without further contest save for the host’s ‘yes’ acknowledgement at turn 10. “Normality” is thus restored. This excerpt demonstrates a relationship between interruption and confrontation as explored by Schefloff (1988-1999). The panelists use interruption to compete for the floor, while the host uses interruption for participation control. A similar case was recorded on Nation FM.

Example 30.5 Nation FM 1 Topic: County Development Boards

T1 H: So if you two cannot work together, we are the ones suffering because they were not voted in Nairobi. They were voted by the same people who voted for you whoever they are.
2 P2: But down there, the Bills that concern ordinary operations of the counties are actually passed by the County Assemblies and the senators ah can only participate through the process of Section 91 of the County Governments Act…

3 P1: Can I ….. can I ….

4 P2: These Senators can only participate through the provision provided by eh Section 91 of the County Government Act.

5 P1: Can ..... can I come to that ..... can I ....

6 P2: Strictly Section 91 of County Government Act.

7 P1: Can I come to that A. First of all, let’s eh, let’s do some small civic education. First, the County Government Act we are talking about is the amendment. The one that used to be there is gone. So let’s not talk about things that are already gone. The role of parliament was to pass laws and we have already passed and it is not about another law unless someone is coming with some amendment.

The contest in the example above is between P1 and P2 a Senator and a Governor respectively. It is on the establishment of County Development Boards that are hoped to enable Senators to participate in county development. At turn 1 the host points out to the conflict between the two offices and says that the voter is suffering as a result. At turn 2, P2 explains that the Bills that concern ordinary operations of the counties are actually passed by the County Assemblies and the senators can only participate through the process in Section 91 of the County Governments Act, therefore; no need for the boards. Before he can complete his turn, P1 intervenes in the ongoing turn in the plea can I…. can I…, but the P2 still completes his statement at turn 4, and still reiterates that the Senators can only operate according to the said Act. At turn 5, P1 makes another attempt in form of a plea can I...can I… but P2 still makes his statement to the end of the turn. Notably, it is only when he appears to have completed making his point and gives up the floor that P1 succeeds in taking up the floor at turn 7. He addresses the host by name to make his plea at the next turn. Perhaps to acknowledge the interactional authority vested in the
host. P1 then continues with his turn uninterrupted: *can I come to that A. First of all, let’s eh, let’s do some small civic education: first, the County Government Act we are talking about is the amendment…* (turn 7)

At other times, the host interrupts the panelists in a particular sequential location referred to as “post-continuation” (Jefferson, 1986). This is where a panelist comes to the recognizable completion of a sentence. However, before its completion, the host starts to speak. According to Jefferson (1986), this is a systematic place for overlapping talk to occur. This scenario was observed on Nation FM as presented in the example that follows.

**Example 31.5 Nation FM 2**

**Topic: SabaSaba**

T1P2: Sabasaba is a media term. It was not called Sabasaba, it was said that on 7th of July, we will meet at Kamukunji. I hired a vehicle to take ___ to Kamukunji. I think I paid 20 cents. We were trying to dismantle a one party state, the…..

2 H: *Yes, the Lancaster Constitution.*

3 P2: Yes. But ___ patted himself on the back and said Kenya wants only one party. But finally he agreed. When one party state was dismantled, we did not rest because we still wanted to dismantle *the the* =

4 H: *The Constitution*

5 P2: *The one party constitution.* That is why we have a 2nd Sabasaba in 1997.

In example 31.5 Nation FM 2, P2 is shedding some light on the concept Sababsaba as directed by the host. He explains that it is a media term (turn1). As he continues towards his turn completion point, he appears to be looking for an appropriate word at *the*... to complete his turn. It is at this point that the host comes in and provides the post continuation *the Lancaster Constitution*.

A similar case is observed at turn 3 as P2 continues to explain the concept of Sabasaba. Again towards the end of the turn …we still wanted to dismantle *the*.
The host once again jumps in and provides the completion of the constitution. The P2 repeats this completion in his next turn and continues with his turn to the end. The host completed the turn when the current speaker hesitated as he had difficulties in finding the appropriate word to complete his turn. This interruption is therefore collaborative. The next example from Hope FM illustrates this aspect further.

Example 32.5 Hope FM 2 Topic: Illicit Brews

T1 P2: Do we even know how much of this is out there. Has NACADA for example said this is the sample, this is the bottle so that when we see it we know it. This is the kind of brew that is killing people….

2H: Let him respond to that.

3P1: Tomorrow all the illicit killer brews will be displayed at NACADA=

4P2: Okey…that’s very okey…

5P1: =at NACADA board room, we have a conference. The board is meeting out there…

6H: Mmh

7P1: And like you can see most of these people are in the hiding. Most of this alcohol was actually carried in jerry cans. It was not labeled. So for you to display empty jerry cans it was very difficult to identify the brew.

In Example 32.5 Hope FM 2, P2 seeks to find out how much of these brews are out in the public at turn 1. Do we even know how much of this is out there? Has NACADA for example said this is the sample… As the panelist develops his turn further; the host intervenes at turn 2, to give P1 the right to take the floor. She uses the words let him respond to that. P2, therefore, recognizes this interruption and yields the floor to P1. At turn 3, P1 explains that all killer brews will be displayed at NACADA. P2 is seen to align himself with P1’s statement in the statement okey, that’s very okey… P1 then continues to complete his earlier statement at turn 3 by saying there will be a conference at
NACADA board room. The host gives an acknowledgement ‘mhm’ at turn 6 and the P1 takes the next turn 7 in which he continues with his explanation uninterrupted. In these last two examples 31.5 Nation FM 2 and 32.5 Hope FM 2, interruptions can be viewed as a communicative deed rather than merely a type of speech overlap of interactional environments. Jefferson (1986) focuses on such post-continuation interruptions that package affiliative responses to something that was just said.

Analysis of interruptions shows that they were often used by the hosts to control the contributions of the panelists (Example 32.5 Hope FM 2). Other times, panelists interrupted an ongoing turn to make a contribution even before the host assigned them turns to speak (Example 30.5 Nation FM 1). The interruptions observed in this data confirm that they usually appear when participants in an interaction are in a difficult discursive position (Hutchby, 1991, 1996). Also, towards the close of the talk show, panelists normally engage in a heated debate as they attempt to make some final important points. In form of an interruption, the host normally comes in with simply an invitation/a plea to wind up/to give final comments. This demonstrates one person’s power to take the floor and force the other to stop what they are doing (Ekstrom, 2007). The section that follows presents overlaps as they occurred in the study data.
5.3.6 Overlapping Talk

One basic type of social coordination achieved by conversation participants is the moment-by-moment allocation of speaking turns (Lerner, 1989). Fundamental to this accomplishment is the practice of beginning a speaking turn at a place where the current turn might come to completion. This practice does not preclude participants from starting to speak elsewhere in the course of another speaker’s. This causes overlapping talk to occur. Speaking turns that begin elsewhere, however, may be met with procedures to enforce the practice of starting at possible completion places. To account for the practice of speakers beginning to speak at possible completion places, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) have identified the “Turn Constructional Unit” as a component of the turn taking system for conversation.

The examples that follow illustrate instances of overlapping talk, and how they were resolved in the study data. Overlaps are marked in square [ ] brackets.

**Example 33.5 KTN 1 Topic: Tides of Terror**

1 P2: The nyumba kumi was imported from a neighbouring country called Tanzania

2P3: Not necessarily

3P2: Actually it is [ actually it is….]

4P3: [I must, I must ] the whole world knows

5 P2: It is, it is true

6P3: The world knows…..

7 H: We are closing our discussion

In Example 33.5 KTN 1, the subject on “nyumba kumi” as a security measure comes up. The second panelist, P2, makes a claim that the idea was imported
from Tanzania (turn 1). However, P3, the proponent of the “nyumba kumi” initiative contradicts him and as much as P2 still holds the same opinion at turn 3, P3 is still eager to contradict him at turn 4, determined to defend his position that “nyumba kumi” was an original idea thereby resulting in an overlap. The result is that turn transition from P3 to P4 is conflictual. The turn taking system is completely abandoned. However, the host interrupts an ongoing turn 6 by P3 by informing the panelists that they are closing the discussion (turn 7).

The Example 34.5 Citizen TV2 further illustrates this phenomenon.

Example 34.5 Citizen TV2  Topic: Politics Post Sabasaba

T₁ P₃: CORD is a total failure as an opposition in this country. When Kenyans went to the ballot, they elected a government, and at the time, they elected an opposition. The government was elected legitimately.

T₂ P₂: The government was not elected legitimately

T₃ H: But for the purpose of our argument, let us hold it as such.

T₄ P₃: Yes…

T₅ P₂: [I don’t believe it…]

T₆ P₃: [You don’t have to]…. you don’t have to believe it.

T₇ H: Can you continue please…

T₈ P₃: It is ruling. I would expect an opposition that would oppose on issues, an opposition that would tell us look, this is what we would want, not ultimatums. CORD lacks these things; one, originality; two, substance and three, substance.

Example 34.5 Citizen TV 2 presents an argument between a member of the Jubilee Coalition (P3) and another from the opposition (P2). At turn 1, P3 refers to the opposition as a failure and states that the government was elected legitimately, a statement that P2 refutes at turn 2 by saying the government
was not elected legitimate. This triggers a heated debated as the two panelists attempt to defend their position. At turn 3, the host comes in and upholds P3’s turn for the sake of the argument. In support of that position, P3, at turn 4 says yes to support his earlier claim, but this overlaps with P2’s utterance at turn 5, who still says *I don’t believe the government was elected legitimately.* The P2 is not willing to drop out of his turn space and thus still holds his position at turn 6, in the words *you don’t have to*… again resulting to simultaneous speech with P2. The panelists are seen to address one another, in a series of overlap and in sustained disagreement.

The overlapping sequence is only resolved when the host interrupts and assigns the next speaking turn to P3 by actually addressing him by name in the statement *can you continue please S.* P3, therefore, continues with his turn 7 uninterrupted and succeeds in maintaining the argumentative initiative he had gained at turn 4 just prior to the interruption by P2 at turn 5. In this extract instances of sequentially incursive utterances representing interactionally hostile actions are observed (lines 4, 5, 6). One way that these interruptions are used is as part of each speaker’s attempt either to gain, or keep hold of, the argumentative initiative (Hutchby, 1993; Clayman & Heritage, 2002).

Example 35.5 Nation FM 1 further illustrates this phenomenon. The panelists are arguing about the County Development Boards that Senators want established, but the Governors opposed to the move.
Example 35.5 Nation FM 1 Topic: County Development Boards

T1 P1: You see they have this misguided mentality that if another person, even a villager would chair a meeting and the Governor sits, they would be less powerful. You do not need to go everywhere to show you are a big man with cars, and sirens with whatever…

The Constitution [wants a servant….]

2 H: [Please we have 2 minutes.]

3 P1: [Lemme finish]. Two he has this misconception that Article 6 says that Counties are distinct. Distinct but independent.

4 H: Yes

5 P1: And the only constitutional institution that has a role in that in the national and county is the senate. That is why we sit at the national level with functions on the county governments. So, we are as I said earlier, we are the constitutional umbilical cord between the county and the national government. That is why the senator was to chair this forum at the county level.

6 H: Ahaaaa …

7 P2: [But you are looking for money]

8 P1: [Hold on … hold on, lemmie ] finish my thought. You can always have your chance. The point is this, it says, the others have money, the MPs have CDF, the women reps have county funds, Governors have county funds….

In Example 35.5 Nation FM1, the first participant P1, a senator is trying to explain why the senators should chair the County Development Boards at turn 1. His turn is prolonged and since the programme is coming to a close, the host interrupts him before he gets to his turn completion. At turn two therefore, the host’s time prompt, please we have 2 minutes overlaps with P1’s last statement wants a servant. At turn 3, P1 still begs to continue with his explanation by let me finish…. and at turn 5, he continues to explain the role of the senate as the main link to the national government. At turn 7, P2 jumps in and accuses the senator by but you are looking for money. P1 is not ready to relinquish the floor and so goes on to explain that all other offices are
allocated some money to run. Therefore P2’s words ‘but you want money’ occurs across the talk of P1 and thus overlaps with P1’s plea to continue in the words *hold on, hold on lemmie finish my thought*.... It is worth noting at this turn 8, P1 fights off the overlapping talk from P2 by explicitly appealing to the rules of talk. This is significant because in all the other examples overlap is resolved by the host.

Another example 36.5 presents this phenomenon as observed on Hope FM.

**Example 36.5 Hope FM**

**Topic: The Marriage Bill**

1H: Alright and let’s get it from the Chair. How applicable would those clauses be, for example, a promise to marry? What constitutes a promise in the legal setting? A couple of coffee dates? How applicable are those clauses like I don’t see a woman being asked I want to get a second wife and she’s oh! Fantastic. You know!

2 P4: Now, the issue of consent happens at a point you are signing on the dotted line as to whether you want a monogamous or a polygamous union. What this Bill intended however is that you will be informed that your husband is taking a 2nd, 3rd or 4th wife and that is of course reasonable. [It is reasonable that you know ]

3 P1: [Lemmie lemmi say this..]

4 H: So it is just information?

5 P4: [It is information]

6 P1: [Now lemmie lemmie..]

7 H: Okey finish.

8 P1: Aah..I am not saying that I support polygamy but polygamy exists in this country. There is no culture that I know in this country where a man will go and seek approval. It has never happened. Lemmi give a live example. Last year ___ married his 15th wife…

Two instances of overlap are observed in Example 36.5 Hope FM1. The panelists are discussing the issue of consent by a first wife to her husband on taking another wife. So at turn 1, the host seeks to find out what constitutes a
promise to marry. At turn 2, P4 explains that it is only reasonable to have the first wife informed but before he gets to the end of his turn construction unit, P1 comes in with a plea *lemmie say this*... which overlaps with the last part of P1’s words *it is reasonable you know*. The current speaker P1 is seen to stop mid word at the onset of talk by another speaker P4. The host at turn 4 seeks to find out if the consent is just for purposes of information, a confirmation that P4 at turn 5 makes. However, P1 is still keen on continuing with a statement that she did not complete at 3 and she still begs to finish. Her appeal in form of *lemmie finish...* again overlaps with P4’s words ‘it is just information.’ The simultaneous claims for turn occupancy have entailed simultaneous speech by two participants. At turn 7, the host gives P1 the right to take up the floor in the words ‘okey finish,’ and the simultaneous speech is thus resolved as P1 takes up and continues with turn 8 uninterrupted.

In the study data, overlaps occurred when panelists discarded the regulations of interaction and started engaging in hostile talk. They, therefore; momentarily abandoned the organizational structure (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1991). This transformation consists of two parts: the institutionalized turn taking system breaks down and competitive overlap occurs (Schegloff, 1988/89). Due to time constraints, most overlaps occurred towards the close of the discussion as panelists competed for the floor to make their ‘unmentioned mentionables. Most of the overlaps were resolved by the host; however, there were instances when the panelists explicitly appealed to the rules of talk to make a contribution; thus, resolving the overlap (Example 35.5 Nation FM1).
As stated by Hutchby (1996), the occurrence of overlapping talk was a powerful argumentative device and indeed would turn the talk confrontational or combative.

This verbal resource just like interruptions have their home in ordinary conversation where the organizational mechanisms are seen as general (Sacks, 1974). The occurrence of overlaps in the data further confirmed that they are powerful generic argumentative devices of broadcast talk (Hutchby, 1996). Hutchby refers to overlaps, interruptions, validity challenges and turning a claim against itself discussed so far and packages them as classically argumentative actions. Their use in argumentative sequences may be bound up with the accomplishment of an argument. The next section presents reformulations as another aspect of argumentative talk shows.

5.3.7 Reformulations

According to Heritage and Watson (1979), reformulations are utterances produced as responsive actions that make the original version of the statements relevant. Most research in CA focus on the functional aspects of reformulations as used by institutional agents as a means to transform laypersons accounts according to institutional relevancies, such as arriving at a diagnosis, facilitating agreements in meetings, or committing interviews to more newsworthy claims (Drew, 2003; Hutchby, 2006; Antaki, 2008).
Other reformulations display understanding of what has gone before in a conversation (Hauser, 2011). On radio and TV talk shows, the host can clarify, refocus or underline prior talk, as well as challenge a panelist’s statements (Hutchby, 1992, 1996). The hosts also attempt to establish control over the agenda by selectively “reformulating” the gist or upshot of the panelist’s remarks. After reformulating, panelists continue talking, and as such subsequent talk builds on the reformulation rather than the original question (Heritage, 2004; Clayman, 2010). In the talk shows under study, the host took steps to heighten the clash between panelists. The primary way of doing this involved paraphrasing remarks expressed previously by one panelist and deploying them to counter the remarks of another. This phenomenon was observed in the data as illustrated in the examples that follow.

Example 37.5 KTN1 Topic: Tides of Terror

T1 P2: I am ,I am a muslim,I am a citizen I have rights. You cannot come to my house and tell me that you are protecting me. Aren’t you are making me suffer? ___you are not protecting me.

2 P4: But it is not that this thing has been haphazardly …

3 H: Gentlemen, though…… I think we need to clarify what part in the Law gives you the justification to conduct the operations that you are conducting.

4 P4: I may not be able to give ….

5 H: Or should it be that these are extra ordinary times and therefore the Law should not be applied. Are you saying that?

6 P4: We are saying so many lives are at risk and we must bring sanity back…… they need to know that the government can protect them but they need to know that they do not have time and place to cause insecurity.

In Example 37.5 KTN 1, P2 raises concern over the manner in which the security officers are conducting operation in the Eastleigh Estate in Nairobi in an attempt to flush out alleged terrorists.He claims that they are harassing the
residents (Turn1). However, P2 a police spokesperson in defense counters this claim and says the exercise is being done in an orderly manner as he had earlier stated that there are Laws to be observed (Turn 2). The host takes issue with P 2’s claim to establish which part of the law gives them the justification to conduct the search in such a manner; ‘I think we need to clarify what part in the law gives you the justification to conduct the operations that you are conducting’ (Turn 3).

But in what works as a “co-operative” formulation (Heritage, 1985) the host offers the P2 a version of her position in asking if these are extra ordinary times and therefore the law should not be applied, or should it be that these are extra ordinary times and therefore the law should not be applied?. Are you saying that? (Turn 5). Though not directly assenting to this position in the next turn, P2 insists that while the government has a duty to protect its citizens, they too should be careful not to cause insecurity (T6).

The next example from Citizen further illustrates this feature.

Example 38.5 Citizen TV1   Topic: Jubilee Wrangles

T1 P2…We are entitled to put the record correct. The same way CORD is entitled to clarify what they meant. Our understanding and I listened very well and watched the statements mainly by the former Prime Minister and the former VP, especially the former VP ___ said eh, we cannot have a government which does not represent everyone in Kenya, so we have to sit down and all of us then have everyone on board and___With the grand coalition and___

2 H:  Jubilee is talking of the revolution and the significance you put towards Sabasaba. Everyone is wondering what happens if this dialogue doesn’t take place by Sabasaba. What’s the new strategy that we hope to see from CORD. Will you take reigns of the government by illegitimate means?
3 P1: You know Y., it’s important to say the truth. The government has said they want dialogue, isn’t it? So if they want dialogue, saying that we want dialogue within two months=

4 P2: We have been doing it.

5 P1: = Should not be a problem. Sabasaba should not scare them. Apparently they are very scared of the power of the people. It is the power of the people that brought it.

Example 38.5 Citizen TV1 illustrates an instance where P1, a Senator from the Jubilee Coalition claims that the opposition intends to be included in forming a coalition government. At turn 1, he claims that ‘we cannot have a government which does not represent everyone in Kenya, so we have to sit down and all of us then have everyone on board and...’. In turn 2 that follows, the host responds to this claim by referring to an earlier topic on the emphasis that was put on the sabaSaba rally to force the government to address matters that the opposition considered urgent. Since the Senator had ruled out the possibility of a coalition government, the host asks, Jubilee is talking of the revolution and the significance you put towards sabasaba. Everyone is wondering what happens if this dialogue does not take place by sabasaba. Will you take reigns of the government by illegitimate means?

This paraphrase heightens the clash between panelists as in the turns that follow, the two politicians engage in conflicting views. A turn 3, P1, a senator from the opposition says the government has said they want dialogue, isn’t it? So if they want dialogue, saying that we want dialogue within two months...

Before he finishes his turn, P2, a senator from the government interrupts by saying they have been holding dialogue anyway (turn 4). At turn 5, P1
continues with his earlier statement and insists that the government is scared of sabaSaba in the words, *SabaSaba should not scare them. Apparently they are very scared of the power of the people.* Therefore, the reformulation here functions to link back to some prior version of things talked about; an observation also made by Antaki (2008).

Besides linking back to some prior version of things talked about, reformulations may also serve to direct talk to some new agenda in the discourse. This is illustrated in the example that follows from Hope FM.

**Example 39.5 Hope FM 1  Topic: The Marriage Bill**

T1H: As we conclude, mheshimiwa W. We all remember Hon ___ and the passing of Sexual Offences Bill. It was looked at as a thing for women although it was a thing for protecting the children. There were 9 female members of parliament at that time out of 222 members. We now have 47 County Women Representatives alone, not to count the others for other posts, 67 in total. *We saw in the case of___,* there was a lot of lobbying done. She found a lot of support from men because as J has said, this was not men versus women… But she was able to get the support of the entire house something we didn’t see the women do. *Aaam has the role of women been diminished despite the numbers?* They could not have cut short that trip to come back to discuss something so fundamental to the family?

2 P2: It was in order because the trip was not for leisure; it was for official duties designed for that particular time. So if we failed to go out of the 47 countries, then Kenya misses. But I would like to say that all along the Legal and Justice Committee being the main stake holders in this, they lobbied specifically to woo the committee and…

3 H: But…but…

4 P2: Unlike ___ time, the committee is now mandated to bring in stakeholders…the bishops, priests but in the committee you find specific 7 or so men who have specific agenda.

The discussion presented in Example 39.5 Hope FM 1 is on the Marriage Bill that had been passed earlier by parliament. P2, a women representative had earlier in the programme indicated that the men legislators did not support the women and therefore passed the Bill out of ill will. The programme is coming
to a close but the host refers to P2’s earlier claim. She refers to ___’s Sexual Offence Bill that had been passed in parliament yet there were very fewer women legislators then. The Bill also got the support of the male legislators. So the host reworks the claim by the women representative through a reformulation *Aaam has the role of women been diminished despite the numbers?*

This question receives varied reactions, first by P2, at turn 4 who asserts that ‘unlike ___’s time, the committee is now mandated to bring in stakeholders…the bishops, priests but in the committee you find specific 7 or so men who have specific agenda. It can be observed that while each reformulation preserves parts of the issue addressed before, that is, the failure by men legislators to support the Bill, it adds new aspects to the matter by adding that the Committee on Legal and Justice issues should now include bishops and priests.

Analysis of aspects of argument on radio and TV talk shows in Kenya presents a number of findings. First, the argumentative talk shows exhibited specific aspects with regard to the discursive organization of talk, the sequence of adjacency pairs and turns. The aspects discussed are action opposition sequences that featured prominently in the study data, shifts in footing, validity challenges, turning a claim against itself, interruptions, overlaps and reformulations. The aspects did not occur in isolation but frequently in a relationship one with the other. The routineness, created, repeated and
sustained by the talk show host, brings stability and familiarity to this mediated form of communication. Informed by previous genre analysts (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Devvit, 2004; Maroko, 1999; 2008) the argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya can therefore be recognized as a genre because exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarities in terms of purpose, structure, style, content and intended audience.

Second, regarding sequence and overall organization of talk under CA, the argumentative talk show is an emergent product of how the participants choose to deal with each other then and there, moment by moment, move by move. The speaking turns were mostly distributed by the talk show hosts, while the panelists responded to the issues raised, and/or addressed to them. It is this orientation to each others move, in the aspects studied that further advanced the topic and created what came out as argumentative talk.

5.4 Summary of Chapter

At this point in this study, aspects of argument in argumentative talk shows have been analyzed, and tables and bar graph displaying the frequency of occurrence of the aspects studied have also been presented. The argumentative talk is achieved as the participants orient to each other’s turn moment by moment. The aspects discussed are mainly achieved through question answer sequences. Accordingly, the chapter that follows focuses on questions typology in the argumentative talk shows.
CHAPTER SIX: QUESTIONS TYPOLOGY IN RADIO AND TV
ARGUMENTATIVE TALK SHOWS

6.0 Introduction

So far, this study has established the argumentative talk show genre based on common structure, shared aspects of argument, and common communicative goals. Question-answer sequences are the building blocks of the interactional order. Indeed, the aspects discussed in the previous chapter are realized through these sequences and the talk unfolds through the joint participation of co-participants in the talk as they engage in the practice of asking and answering questions. This chapter, therefore, seeks to investigate the questions typology that set the argumentative talk shows apart from other forms of broadcast talk under the third objective. The communicative functions of the questions identified will be discussed thereby addressing objective four.

6.1 Classification of Questions

Questions have been systematically studied since antiquity, and different classifications have emerged. According to traditional views, questions are aimed at finding out information. That is, when we talk about a question, we think of a formula which is syntactically an interrogative sentence and is aimed at eliciting an answer (Jagitani, 2013). Interrogative sentences are also studied on the basis of their semantic structure (Keifer, 1983), according to which we can differentiate between Yes/No questions, Wh-questions, choice questions, and open questions. These questions differ from each other with regard to their possible answer sets.
Question-answer sequences have been examined through Conversational Analysis and Discourse Analysis in several contexts such as casual conversation (Jefferson, 1973; Edmonson, 1981; Tannen, 1994), courtroom interaction (Atikinson & Drew, 1979; Ilie, 1994, 1995; Kiguru, 2014), and news interviews (Greatbach, 1998; Heritage & Roth, 1995; Clayman & Heritage, 2002). In these discourses, different participants’ roles exist with regard to the question-answer sequences, and different question types have been explored in these interactions from a discourse analysis perspective.

Questions that occur in talk shows can be described using four parameters as advanced by Ilie (1994, 1999) and Schirm (2008). These are: the role of the participant posing the question, competency of the participant asking the question, the standardness and the sequential place of the question itself. As far as the role of the person asking the question, questions in talk shows can be asked by either the host or a panelist. Sequential place refers to the place of the question within the turn sequence it occurs in. A question is the result of competency if it is within the role of the person asking it, while it is not if it does not fit this role. A question is standard if it is asked because of a gap in the knowledge of the person asking it, and if this person expects an overt verbal answer; otherwise, it is non standard. The strength of this taxonomy is that it recognizes the differences between the two participants in the moderated talk shows, the characteristics of these roles, and the communicative functions of the question type in the conversation. In the radio and TV talk shows under study, three participant roles exist: the talk show
hosts, the panelists and the wider audience. The identification of the
participant roles is crucial for the work that questions do, the nature of talk
that is built through them, and the programme identity that is sustained by
these means (Tolson, 2006).

Regarding the study of arguments, Walton (1988) holds that no theory of
argument could be adequate without dealing with the role that questions play
in arguments. In the current study on argumentative talk shows on radio and
TV, the question–answer sequences were therefore evaluated in terms of their
argumentative orientation. After all, as Ilie (1999) demonstrated, the main goal
of the interaction in talk shows is to discuss issues of controversy, by
advancing arguments meant to reinforce one’s standpoint and/or reject the
‘opponents’ arguments. Accordingly, this study sought to describe the
question types that characterize talk shows, and the language use associated
with them. Further, the study took interest in finding out if the questions recur
across the four talk shows sampled in an attempt to delineate the generic
features of talk shows.

6.2 Questions: Interplay between Form and Function

Questions can be defined formally (by syntactic, semantic or intonational
criteria or combinations of all) or one can define them functionally (in
pragmatic, speech act sense), by identifying what they accomplish in
interaction. The traditional function of questions is “to seek information on a
specific point” (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Startvik, 1985). However, there
are questions that do not seek information and there are statements that do (de Ruiter, 2012). For example, there are formal statements like ‘You are married’ which request information and formal questions like ‘Are you kidding?’ that do not. Hence it is questionable to call all utterances ‘questions’ in the interrogative mood of asking something.

Similarly, Strivers (2011) has noted that there are several ways (syntactically, lexically, intonationally and by content) to indicate that an utterance a question. Pragmatic functions of questions can also be identified, by identifying what they accomplish in interaction. However, it is difficult to clearly map their syntactic form to their pragmatic function. It therefore follows that in order to be sure of what counts as a question and what its pragmatic functions are, all available information needs to be taken into account. It is this view of questions that this study adopted so that assigning the question type was dependent on their form (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Startvik, 1985), content as well as their communicative function in their context of use (Schirm, 2008). This dimension was partly justified by Couper-Kuhlen (2012) argument that the type of question used in broadcast talk depends on the local interaction and the nature of the communicative activity.

Examples illustrating first, each type of questions and second, their communicative functions in the interaction, that is, a focus on how the questions are designed and what they are doing interactionally, when a speaker utters them are provided. This study focused on the talk shows as a genre, and
communicative functions is one criterion in genre identification (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 2002). In order to categorize questions occurring in talk shows, four main criteria were used as put forward by Ilie (1994, 1999) and Schirm (2008). These are: Role, Competency, Standardness and sequential place as summarized in Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Question Types on The Basis of Role, Competency, Standardness and sequential place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class/Question Type</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Standardness</th>
<th>Sequential place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. dispute directing questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Dispute starting</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not standard</td>
<td>T1 (at start of a sequence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Clashing questions</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not standard</td>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Topic changing</td>
<td>Host/guest</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Standard/not standard</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Argumentative questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Negative debating question</td>
<td>Host/guest</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Non standard</td>
<td>T1, T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Attacking echo</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not standard</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Attack-back</td>
<td>Host/guest</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not standard</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Rhetorical questions</td>
<td>Host/guest</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not standard</td>
<td>Anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Clarifying questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Classic clarifying</td>
<td>Host/guest</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Opinion eliciting</td>
<td>Host</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Examination</td>
<td>Host/guest</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Permission eliciting</td>
<td>Host/Guest</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Pre-T1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The symbols and terms in this table require some explanation. The plus (+) indicates competency, that is, it is within the role of the participant asking it.
Minus (-) indicates lack of competency, that is, it is not within the role of the participant asking. For example, in opinion eliciting questions, Host (+) means that the question is the result of competency because it is within the role of the host to ask it. On the other hand, in topic changing question, Guest (-) means that the question is a result of lack of competency because the person asking it, in this case the guest does not fit the role of asking this type of questions.

On standardness, a question is standard if it is asked because of a gap in the knowledge of the person asking it, and if the person expects an overt verbal answer. For example, *when does the government plan to provide laptops to primary school children?* The host would expect a panelist who represents the government to provide an answer to the question.

Turn 1 (T1) shows a question occurs within the first turn of a question-answer sequence; Turn 2 (T2) indicates a question occurs at turn two of the sequence, while Pre-turn shows the question occurring before the sequence begins. For example:

T1 M: *I want to start with you Prof...... did Saba Saba live up to your expectations? Did CORD deliver what you think they had set out to?*

T2 P1: Yes and no. and ah in the point of yes, they re-emphasized the point that there are problems in this country that require urgent attention.

Hence, the dispute starting question at turn 1 (T1) above occurs at the first turn of the Question-Answer sequence. The response by P1 occurs at turn 2 (T2).
The section that follows presents frequencies of occurrence of the question types in the talk shows sampled.

### 6.3 Presentation of Question Types

This section presents figures and tables that show the patterning and frequency of occurrence of the question types in the four talk shows sampled.

**Figure 3: Dispute Directing Questions in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows**

The Figure 2 above displays the occurrence of the dispute directing questions under three sub classes: Dispute Starting Questions, Clashing Questions and Topic Changing Questions as they occurred in the talk shows sampled.
A total of 44 dispute directing questions occurred in all the talk shows sampled. The analysis of the frequency of occurrence of the dispute directing questions indicates that the clashing questions registered the highest frequency in all the stations sampled. They were 8 (53.3%) on Citizen TV, 7 (70%) on KTN, 6 (60%) on Hope FM, and 5 (55.6%) on Nation FM. These made up a total of 26 (59.1%) which constituted more than half of the total number of the dispute directing questions analyzed. Dispute starting questions came second. A total number of 12 questions were identified with a frequency of (27.3%). Citizen TV had a count of 4 (26.7%), KTN 2 (20%), Nation FM and Hope FM had a tie of 3 counts each though the frequency varied. The frequency was 33.3% and 30.0% for Nation and Hope FM respectively.

Topic changing questions came at a distant third across all the stations. A total of 6 questions with a frequency of 13.6 % were counted. Citizen TV recorded the highest count of 3 (20.0%) of the total. It is interesting to note that 1 topic
changing question was recorded in all the other three stations KTN, Hope FM
and Nation FM, though at varying frequencies, 10%, 10% and 11% for KTN,
Hope FM, and Nation FM respectively.

The dispute starting questions normally set up the agenda of the day, and the
subsequent talk developed as panelists argued for or against the issue. Thus,
they were fewer than the clashing questions as the host did not keep bringing
up a new dispute. The topic developed as the panelists responded in support or
opposition of the issue raised. The host used the clashing questions more often
from the two conflicting sides of the debate. Objectivity is an umbrella
concept that encompasses a range of journalistic values, including factual
accuracy, balance between opposing views, and neutrality in presentation
(Clayman & Heritage, 2002). So, in argumentative talk shows the host is
expected to uphold diverse and often conflicting aspects of objectivity
simultaneously. Hosts were usually in control of the topic and the subsequent
contributions in the discourse. They also ensured that the panelists did not
stray from the main agenda. However, as discussed in this section, the topic in
the talk shows may change from time to time though in a very subtle way.
This could account for the low number of topic changing questions.

Figure 4 and Table 4 present the patterning of the second broad category of
questions; Argumentative Questions.
Figure 4: Argumentative Questions in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows

Figure 4 shows the subclasses of the Argumentative Questions in the sampled talk shows while Table 4 presents data on the frequency of occurrence of the question types for comparison.

Table 4: Argumentative Questions in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen TV</th>
<th>KTN TV</th>
<th>Hope FM</th>
<th>Nation FM</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Debating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacking Echo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack back</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second class of questions that characterize argumentative talk shows are the argumentative questions. A total number of 69 questions were counted.
from the corpus of this study. Out of the 69, rhetorical questions had the highest count of 28 (40.6%), followed closely by the attacking echo questions that recorded a total of 23 (33.3%). Attack back questions came a distance third recording a count of 12 (17.4%), while the negative debating questions came last at 6 (8.7%). Negative debating questions were missing on Nation FM, thus the low total frequency. The rhetorical questions were more because they confer a higher argumentative value on the question, which normally exhibit a strong argumentative force because they imply the speaker’s firm commitment to their implied answer (Ilie, 1999).

The attacking echo questions were mainly used by the hosts to aggressively challenge the stance of the panelists in order to elicit credible and valid information from them, and also make them accountable for the information they gave. This way of ensuring accountability in the talk exemplifies a claim that “the interactional accountability of answering questions is the fundamental basis for the public accountability of public figures” (Clayman cited in Montogmery, 2007, p.211).

Attack back questions were asked by the panelists, whose institutional role limits them to answering questions rather than asking them. Due to this institutional constraint, the occurrence of these questions was likely to be lower in comparison with the others. This is so because when asked a question, interviewees always try to respond in some way, and most often attempt to look as if they are answering the question (Clayman, 2002).
There are real boundaries to the topics set by questions, and the panelists, in their response usually oriented to the hosts’ question’s topical boundaries. This could account for the low number of topic changing questions since the panelists rarely departed from answering questions, but when they did, the host would bring them back to their role by insisting on them to supply an answer to the questions posed.

Negative debating questions occurred in very low frequencies. These questions are coercive and normally tend to embody preference for a particular response (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Kiguru, 2014). The host, therefore, sparingly used them since preference of a particular response could threaten the ideal of neutrality of the host if he/she was seen to be promoting his or her own biases on the topic, or biases of the organization owners or sponsors. The negative questions are a relatively extreme form of question design that is used sparingly in the talk shows because they can involve a real erosion of the neutralism that the hosts claim. Nonetheless, they were a part of an array of question design practices with which hosts could display strong expectations in favour of a particular answer.

Figure 5 that follows captures the trends of occurrence of the clarifying questions under the different sub classes: classic clarifying, opinion eliciting, examination and permission eliciting questions.
Figure 5: Clarifying Questions in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows

Table 5 below presents the frequency counts of the four sub classes of clarifying question in each of the four stations.

**Table 5: Clarifying Questions in Sampled TV and Radio Talk shows**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizen TV</th>
<th>KTN TV</th>
<th>Hope FM</th>
<th>Nation FM</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic Clarifying</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Eliciting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission Eliciting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last type of the questions studied in this study data were the clarifying questions under which there were four sub categories that occurred in varying frequencies. A total of 94 questions (the highest count among the three broad categories) were identified. Out of these, classic clarifying questions recorded the highest count of 38 (40.4%), followed closely by opinion eliciting questions with a frequency count of 31 (33.0%). Permission eliciting questions came third with 19 (20.25 %). With examination questions missing on Nation FM, the examination questions registered a much lower count of 6 (6.4%).

From the analysis, it can be observed that the opinion eliciting category was the main source of interactional order. The host strived to get the opinions of all the panelists present with the motivation to sustain an objective talk. One would therefore expect that the opinion eliciting questions would be more. However, this was not the case, as the hosts not only elicited opinions on the issue(s) under discussion, but in most cases, they also challenged the panelists to give credible facts to support their opinion, and or to clarify some facts. This could, therefore, explain the high number of classic clarifying questions in the corpus of this study.

The high number of permission eliciting questions recorded came in form of a request or plea to make a contribution. The panelists were conscious of the fact that speaking roles are pre allocated and they had to stick to this institutional role. The panelists invited were experts and knowledgeable in their respective fields so these credentials gave them authority to make
contributions. It was probably expected that they had the information anyway; hence, the hosts used them in a very limited range of interactional environments. This could explain the very low occurrence of this type of questions.

The next Section 6.4.0 illustrates the question types identified in the previous section. For every question type, examples from two stations are presented, but in situations where there are significant differences, an example from each station is provided. The discussion focused on both the form and the function of the questions. The question(s) of interest are put in italics font.

6.4 Dispute Directing Questions

Specific to argumentative discourse, all questions to some extent shape and direct the course of a dispute, since all questions determine the answers that can be given in response to them (Ilie, 1999). However, dispute directing questions are specific questions whose institutional function is to direct a dispute or an argument. In broadcast talk shows, the role of the host is to initiate the conversation and to elicit opposing views of the panelists as well as to monitor that the dispute does not run too heated (Ilie, 1999; Schirm, 2008). In accordance with the role of directing, the host’s dispute directing questions which enjoy competency include: dispute starting questions, clashing questions, and topic changing questions. These questions are illustrated in the sections that follow.
6.4.1 Dispute Starting Questions

These are questions that were typically generated by the host after introducing the topic and the panelists in the opening segment. Typically they occurred at the beginning of a turn sequence. The following are examples of dispute directing questions from some of the programmes recorded.

Example 40.6 KTN 2 Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums

T1H: Members of CORD are saying they have been misinterpreted … Prof A., I want to give you a chance and I want you to respond to that…. What exactly does national dialogue means? What will be the terms for that?

2P1: Well I am glad that it is in the media so that it is not misunderstood. But you know we have some very urgent issues that are of national importance. The issue of security is not an issue we can only leave to the government. It is a national issue requiring the participation of everybody….

In Example 40.6 KTN 2, the topic of discussion is on the national dialogue that the opposition CORD was trying to push for. However, the government was allegedly opposed to the idea of holding the dialogue. The host, in the background in the opening segment, had provided contentious statements of opinion by government and the opposition (cf.4.2.1). She pointed out that the opposition members claimed to have been misinterpreted. This contrast of opinion already presented the topic as arguable. The host, therefore, directs the first question to one of the panelists, P1, a Senator from CORD to kick off the argument, Prof A I want to give you a chance and I want you to respond to that…. What exactly does national dialogue means? What will be the terms for that? This is a WH- question marked by the presence of the interrogative word ‘what’, and it places no restrictions on P1 on the expected response (Quirk et. al, 1985).
At turn 2, the panelist responds by supporting the need for national dialogue to address issues that are of national importance, that could not be left to the government, *But you know we have some very urgent issues that are of national importance. The issue of security is not an issue we can only leave to the government...* It is expected, as presented in the next section, the host will direct the next question to another panelist to elicit a different view on the topic. That is how the issue to be discussed in the programme started and developed. In the next example taken from Citizen TV, a similar phenomenon is presented. However, the dispute starting question is put in two sets.

**Example 41.6 Citizen TV 2  Topic: Politics Post Sabasaba**

T1H: Tonight we are discussing ‘Politics Post Sabasaba’ and what does it mean for Jubilee and for CORD. We are going to dedicate the first part our discussion to CORD. *I want to start with you Prof…… did saba saba live up to your expectations? Did CORD deliver what you think they had set out to?*

2 P1: Yes and no. and ah in the point of yes, they re-emphasized the point that there are problems in this country that require urgent attention….. But on the other side, my expectations were that in terms of doing business, political business, I expected a different approach in doing it. I didn’t expect the ‘mapambano’ team coming because I think the nation is tired about this ‘mapambano’ story. Fellows who have not been very creative in their politics and offering new solutions.

In Example 41.6 Citizen TV 2, the topic is on the Sabasaba rally that had been held by the members of the opposition CORD. The host, in the opening segment introduces the topic ‘Politics Post Sabasaba’ after which she poses a question targeted to one of the panelists on the topic to be discussed. The question is structured in a set of two consecutive questions ....... *did saba saba live up to your expectations? Did CORD deliver what you think they had set out to?* The host casts this question in a Yes/No format knowing that one side of the political divide would wish to emphasize on the Yes and the other on the No. In his response at turn 2, P1, a political analyst says that the rally
managed to raise issues of concern to the public, but they failed to deliver any creative solutions to the issues. The two questions take a Yes/No form. Inverting the subject ‘sabasaba’ and ‘CORD’ and the operator ‘did’ gives rise to the characteristic syntactic form of Yes/No questions in English (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012). As expected, these questions receive a Yes/No response as produced by P1 at turn 2 in the statement, *yes and no. And ah in the point of yes, they re-emphasized the point that there are problems in this country that require urgent attention…. But on the other side…. The position on the topic taken at an early stage in the programme is expected to be developed in the subsequent talk.

In the previous Example 40.6 KTN 2 and Example 41.6 Citizen TV 2, the dispute directing questions are in the interrogative mood and were used to ask for information. However, there are statement–form questions (statement syntax accompanied by rising intonation), that also seek information. The Example 42.6 Hope FM 1 that follows illustrates such.

**Example 42.6 Hope FM 1**

**Topic: The Marriage Bill**

T1H: Today we are discussing the Marriage Bill passed in parliament last week and is waiting the President’s accent. It is something that generates a heated discussion and it is one that we are going to be talking about for some time….

   So lemmie start with you mheshimiwa __ Tyranny of numbers is what women legislators are calling this Bill and that this Bill being passed was a disgrace to the women and discrimination against them?

2 P1: Eeh thank you __. Now, there is no tyranny of numbers.

3H: Mmh

4 P1: In fact when we convened, it was almost an even number. The parliament is not supporting polygamy.
The host introduces the topic ‘The Marriage Bill.’ She further points out that the Bill is something that had generated a heated discussion in parliament. At this point in the discussion therefore, she has already presented the topic as disputatious. In her turn 2 that follows, she still indicates that the Bill is contentious in that the women legislators had referred to the Bill as ‘tyranny of numbers’ and a disgrace to women. The question, *Tyranny of numbers is what women legislators are calling this Bill and that this Bill being passed was a disgrace to the women and discrimination against them?* is directed to the first panelist, a male legislator. This is a statement form of question marked simply with a rising intonation on the last two words. It conveys a certain presupposition, that is, the Bill is about tyranny of numbers and that it is discriminative against women.

At turn 2, P1 responds to the question by refuting the proposition of the declarative question that the passing of the Bill was about tyranny of numbers. He continues to explain at turn 4, that when legislators convened in parliament, they were an even number and that the parliament is not supporting polygamy. It is indeed this opinion that generates further talk as, after the response to the first question, the host then directs the second question to another panelist to seek his/ her different view. This is by use of the second type of question under the category; the clashing questions.
6.4.2 Clashing Questions

Besides starting off the argument in the talk shows, the dispute directing questions and the responses they receive create a link with the clashing questions. These are questions used to elicit opposing views of the panelists. These questions normally occurred following an elaborate utterance by the host, and were typically directed at another panelist. That is, typically, the main function of the clashing question was to change the speaker and to assist in developing the conflict (Schirm, 2008). The host can initiate disagreements on a preceding utterance soon after the first dispute starting question. This early disagreement among the panelists set the stage for the argumentative talk that ensued. These questions advanced the already established argument by changing speakers. Typically clashing questions occurred in the second turn.

The examples that follow present this phenomenon.

Example 43.6 KTN 2  Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums

T1H: Alright, and we shall come back to you. Eeh that deadline that has been given by CORD that is by July 7th…. 

Senator K why is Jubilee against the idea of national dialogue?Is it the idea that Jubilee has the solution to all problems to get any ideas from the others in the country?

2P2: Thank you Y., the said dialogue everybody who has spoken from the President to myself today in ___ and many other leaders including ___in ____, we have said… one, we have been encouraging dialogue and some of the issues that CORD is saying we believe there are other issues including the issue of the wage bill under the new constitution which is too heavy on the people of Kenya. We have one of the most expensive constitutions in the world. So the the idea off a dialogue is not a new thing. What is new to us are ultimatums, threats and incitement of the public in the face of young men in the stadia, to excite them and cheat them…

In an earlier Example 40.6 KTN 2, the host had introduced the issue under discussion, that is, the national dialogue that members of the opposition were pushing for at a rally. In the first dispute directing question, the host had asked
one of the panelists P1, a senator from CORD what the national dialogue meant and what would be the terms for the said dialogue. In his response, P1 said that the national dialogue was necessary so as to address the various issues like insecurity, which requires the participation of everybody. In Example 43.6 KTN 2 above, therefore, in an attempt to elicit a different view on this, the host poses the next question to the next panelist, a senator from Jubilee to comment on the view that the government is opposed to the dialogue; Senator K why is Jubilee against the idea of national dialogue? This is a WH-question that requires the senator to give reasons as to why the government is not keen on holding the national dialogue.

In the same turn 1, the host uses another question that would be considered restrictive is it the idea that Jubilee has the solution to all problems to get any ideas from the others in the country? This is a focused Yes/No question in which a proposition may be thought to be true in general, but some uncertain elements in the proposition are queried in a focused way (Givon, 1993). Thus, the host is questioning the perception that the Jubilee government holds the solution to all the problems in the country. The probable response to such a focused question would be ‘yes it is’ or ‘No it is not.’ Therefore, in this example the host makes use of a WH-question and a Yes/No question to bring in conflicting arguments.

Accordingly, the senator in his response asserts his disagreement at turn 2, and says the government is not against the dialogue, what they are against are the
ultimatums given by the opposition. This is in the statement …*we have been encouraging dialogue..... What is new to us are ultimatums, threats and incitement of the public in the face of young men in the stadia, to excite them and cheat them*... A contrast between P1 and P2 responses which is generated by the clashing question posed by the host is observed. The host is meant to cross-examine the politician in as much as his party is responsible for the position on the national dialogue. Disagreement is normally a response to a previous clashing question, as the next panelist takes a negative orientation to the propositional content of a previous speaker’s utterance. Through the clashing question, the host obtains more information regarding national dialogue which is a matter of controversy that takes up the rest of the talk.

In some instances, a response to a clashing question not only contains a disagreement, but also a request for clarification of the preceding turn. This is clear in Example 44.6 Nation FM that follows.

**Example 44.6 Nation FM 1**  
**Topic: County Development Boards**

1H: Mmmh. I better ask the Governor. What’s the issue? *What’s the issue in setting up this particular Board?*

2P1: Lemie lemmie ….. My memory is very clear. When the CIC, when the council of Governors appeared, FIDA, when Law Society of Kenya appeared before our Committee of Legal Affairs which I sit, the only challenge the Governors had, they said we don’t want the senators to chair because we are the big men. And lemmie tell you, the only problem governors have with the county development board, and you can read in any newspaper is who chairs?

3H: *Is this the main issue Governor?*

4P2: No it is not the only issue.

5P2: We are not okey ….. lemmie tell you first of all, this particular Board there are several questions on it. Rather than constitutional ones, why would you create a board and allocate yourselves chair? Here is the problem.
Why would you give yourself the power? Unless you are a dictator?

The topic in Example 44.6 Nation FM 1 is on the establishment of County Development Boards proposed by one Senator, to which Governors are opposed. P1, Senator points out that the Governors are opposed to it because the senators are supposed to chair the boards. At turn 1, the host poses a question to the Governor to find out what the real issue about the boards is. *What’s the issue in setting up this particular board?* However, the next turn 2, is taken up by the senator, P1 who still insists that *the only problem Governors have with the County Development Board, and you can read in any newspaper is who chairs?* At this point, the host seeks to get the view from the Governor P2 by asking the question *is this the main issue governor?*

At turn 4, the governor directly disagrees in the words ‘no it is not the main issue.’ At turn 5, he resumes with an assertion that is deemed accusatory. He advances his own view by challenging the allocation of the senators as chair of the boards, and also clarifies that while the senators are seeking participation in the county governance, they never attend some of the meetings they are expected to. This another instance just like in Example 43.6 KTN2 where the host uses a Wh- question *what’s the issue in setting up this board?* This is probably because this is an issue that requires more probing to elicit more information. *Is this the main issue Governor...?* This question is neutral with regard to the host’s expectation as the governor could respond with a ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ answer. He actually provides a ‘No’ answer.
In the cases observed above, panelists cast themselves in opposition to a point of view arising from the clashing question posed by the host. Each panelist tries to endorse their view in the ensuing argument. Schirm (2008) argues that this conflict of opinion advances the argument as domains of consensus and controversy are established and maintained in the unfolding discourse.

### 6.4.3 Topic Changing Questions

These types of dispute directing questions either introduce an entirely new topic, or single out a point mentioned earlier and raise a question about it. The topic changing questions always open a new turn sequence. In the corpus of this study, these questions were used by the talk show host as illustrated below:

**Example 45.6 KTN 2 Topic: Jubilee and Cord Cross-Talk Ultimatums**

**T1H:** Senator, Senator let’s talk about the challenges that the Jubilee government has faced over the last one year and as we conclude, how you are going to sort that out. There are a lot of Kenyans who are unsafe today…. Going to the market, being in a matatu, being in a shopping mall, no matter where they are…… there is a real threat of insecurity we have seen a rising since Jubilee won power, something we have not seen in the previous regime Tell us what challenges you are facing and how you are planning to tackle them so that one year from now we will have a different discussion.

**2P2:** Thank you. The issue of insecurity is very worrying. We do not want to pretend that it doesn’t worry us…One area that must improve is the security sector especially with the regard to the effort that our men and women in uniform make toward national emergency and terrorists attacks.…

Example 45.6 KTN 2 is drawn from a discussion on the topic on Jubilee and CORD Cross - Talk Ultimatums. The talk had earlier progressed as panelists from both sides, the government and the opposition, disputed the need for the national dialogue. Towards the end of the programme as marked by the words ‘as we conclude’ the host brings in a new though closely related topic on the
challenges the Jubilee government has faced since they took power. *Tell us what challenges you are facing and how you are planning to tackle them so that one year from now we will have a different discussion.* Here, the host uses two successive questions in the same utterance.

The question *what challenges has the Jubilee government faced…?* requires of P2 to provide information on the specific challenges the Jubilee government is facing, while the next question *how are you planning to tackle them….?* demands an explanation on the strategies the government will use to address the challenges. Note that the host poses the question at the beginning of her turn and repeats it at the end of the turn, probably to control the nature of contribution from the panelist. The panelist sticks to the topic by saying that the police needs to improve on their response towards emergencies and terrorist attacks. The topic changing question creates a link between what had been discussed before, that is, the national dialogue and what comes next in the show; the challenges being faced by the Jubilee government. The example that follows from Hope FM is another case in point.

**Example 46.6 Hope FM 1**  **Topic: The Marriage Bill**

T 1H: As we conclude, msheshimiwa W. We all remember Hon ___ and the passing of Sexual Offences Bill. It was looked at as a thing for women although it was a thing for protecting the children. There were 9 female members of parliament at that time out of 222 members. We now have 47 county women representatives alone, not to count the others for other posts, 67 in total. We saw in the case of ____, there was a lot of lobbying done. She found a lot of support from men because as J has said, this was not men versus women. But she was able to get the support of the entire house something we didn’t see the women do.

This Bill was published last year in July. It was in the public domain......*aam has the role of women been diminished despite the numbers? They could not*
have cut short that trip to come back to discuss something so fundamental to the family?

3 P2: It was in order because the trip was not for leisure; it was for official duties designed for that particular time. So if we failed to go out of the 47 countries, then Kenya misses. But I would like to say that along the Legal and Justice Committee being the main stakeholders in this, they lobbied specifically to woo the committee and…

4H: But…but…

5P: Unlike __’s time, the committee is now mandated to bring in stakeholders…the bishops, priests but in the committee you find specific 7 or so men who have specific agenda.

In Example 46.6 Hope FM1 the topic is on ‘The Marriage Bill’ that had been passed in parliament and one that had elicited a heated debate among female and male legislators. In the earlier part of the show, the panelists had been discussing the Marriage Bill. However, in this example the host brings in the issue of the Sex Offences Bill by Hon__ that got support from both female and male legislators. She poses two successive questions. The first question is aam has the role of women been diminished despite the numbers? The second, they could not have cut short that trip to come back to discuss something so fundamental to the family? The first question is a Yes/No question that the host probably uses to get the panelist admit that the role of the women has diminished after all the facts regarding their increased number in parliament have been supplied. The increase was due to the creation of women representative posts in the forty seven counties.

The second question is in the form of a negative declarative that serves to challenge the women legislators for making a trip out of the country when a Bill that greatly touches on family was being discussed. This question also brings back the topic of the day ‘The Marriage Bill.’ It can be observed that
the topic drift is only brief and it serves to contrast the support for the Sex Offences Bill and the lack of it for the Marriage Bill. This is evident in the next response by P2 at turn 5 unlike__ time, the committee is now mandated to bring in stakeholders...the bishops, priests but in the committee you find specific 7 or so men who have specific agenda.

Analysis of the topic changing questions in the corpus of this study demonstrates that the topic in the talk shows is not as rigid as expected in some institutionalized discourse, such as courtroom and news interview discourse (Drew, 1990; Kiguru, 2014; Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Montogmerry, 2007). The argumentative talk shows exhibited some features of ordinary conversation where topics emerged freely though in a limited manner and a panelist could initiate a new turn sequence. The section that follows, presents the second broad category of questions: the argumentative questions.

6.5 Argumentative Questions

This category questions the standpoint of the other participants and expresses opposition to their statement, thus maintaining the argument (Schirm, 2008). In the study data, four different kinds of argumentative questions were identified: Negative debating questions, attacking echo questions, attack back and rhetorical questions.
6.5.1 Negative Debating Questions

These types of questions are structurally interrogative questions with a negative particle. They can be interpreted as either statements or possible standpoints. Dispute participants do not regard negative questions as questions asking for clarification but, instead, as expressions of possible standpoints or of criticisms of a third party (Heritage, 2002). The questions may take both contracted and uncontracted forms for instance, ‘couldn’t it be/ could it not be,’ ‘can’t we/ can we not’ aren’t we/ are we not…” These questions are routinely treated as embodying a very strong preference for a given answer.

Accordingly, a response to it is either agreement or disagreement. For this reason, negatively formulated questions may be conducive. Heritage (2002) looks at the negative questions as Yes/No questions whose function depends on the context and the speaker’s intention. For this reason, Raymond (2003) called questions “a form of social action” (p.1427). In this study data these questions appeared in the contracted form, they achieved various functions, and were asked by either the host or the panelists. The questions could occur in the middle of a turn sequence as shown the examples below:

Example 47.6 KTN 1  Topic: Tides of Terror

T1 P2:  Section 24 …eh a right or fundamental freedom in the Bill of Rights shall not be limited except by law. Which law? That is the question…..because in this case you are searching people’s houses.

2 P4:  but in the interest of security because……

3  P2:  I am , I am a muslim, I am a citizen , I have rights. You cannot come to my house and tell me that you are protecting me. Aren’t you making me suffer? you are not protecting me .
In Example 47.6 KTN 1, the talk is about the terror attacks being experienced in the country and as a result, the police have embarked on a search of alleged terrorists in Eastleigh, Nairobi. This operation had received criticism across the political and religious divides. P2, a Muslim at turn 1 is criticizing the operation and points that it is not provided by any law. At turn 4, P4 a police officer claims that the operation is in the interest of security. P2 disputes and criticizes the move and insists that is not any protective measure; it is causing suffering to the residents aren’t you making me suffer (Turn 3). The question which is addressed to P4 who is a police spokesperson does not solicit any given response.

Thus, structurally, this is a negative Yes/No question that serves as a rhetorical question. If anything, the speaker reiterates his earlier standpoint in the statement that follows, ‘you are not protecting me.’ In statement form it would be formatted as ‘you are making me suffer’. This question is asked by the panelist, not by the host as in the other questions discussed earlier under this sub category. A similar case is observed in the example below.

Example 48.6 Citizen TV1 Topic: Jubilee Wrangles

T1,P3: And URP must be able to understand that the President has all powers as put in the constitution… It is really time that the URP expectations were that ___ and when I talk of URP, it is actually Kalenjin land. If you look at the Kalenjins, all of them actually are in URP, including ___=

T2,P2: Don’t we have people in KANU?

T3,P3: =and their expectations are, they think, they should share power halfway with TNA. But this is not happening….
The topic of discussion in Example 48.6 Citizen TV1 above is on the wrangles in the Jubilee coalition over the sharing of powers between the two parties that make up the Jubilee coalition; TNA and URP. P3, a member of the opposition at turn 1 points out that the URP, which produced the Deputy President, should understand that the President, who is a member of TNA has all the powers under the Constitution. He adds that URP is synonymous to Kalenjin land; alleging that all Kalenjins are members of URP. However, in a negative debating question, *don’t we have people in KANU?* P2 interrupts and dismisses this claim. If anything, it is a fact that there are some Kalenjins who are indeed members of KANU. P2, therefore, uses the question to counter and challenge P3’s stated position that all Kalenjins are members of URP. This is another example of a negatively formulated question that functions as a rhetorical question. P3 does not provide an answer as to whether or not there are some Kalenjins in KANU as signaled by the form of the question. Instead, at turn 3, P3 continues to complete his statement which was interrupted turn 3 turn by stating that URP members think they can share power halfway with TNA. In the example that follows, a slight difference is noted in the sense that it is asked by the talk show host.

**Example 49.6 Hope FM 1  Topic: Marriage Bill**

T1: You say you are against polygamy...all well and good but some of the people you are representing are not Christians.

2P2: But I want to protect that woman who will be subjected to customary law as she will not have money for a church wedding. She will get knowledge to go to the registrar and we even know some parts of our country like Marsabit need information.

3H: *But but can’t that be sorted out after the Bill is passed?... And we shall have something like civic education exercise?*
T4 P4: I want to jump in. Very sorry mheshimiwa.

T 5H: Alright J.

T6P4: Very important. We have said the customary marriage will be celebrated in accordance to the customs of the people. If consent is required, or information is required, that will be done because a witness will say this marriage has been done according to the customs of these people. So this doesn’t kill it because we will put you to task on whether all the steps were taken according to the customary law.

A difference is noted in Example 49.6 Hope FM 1. The negative debating question is followed by another question that is in form of a statement. At turn 1, the host challenges, P2, a county women representative who is against polygamy, that not all people she represents are monogamous. At turn 2, she claims that she is protecting some woman who may not have information regarding the Matrimonial Bill. It is at this point then that the host poses a negative debating question *But but can’t that be sorted out after the Bill is passed?* This a negatively formulated question that the host uses to challenge P2s argument why she was opposed to the Bill. The host follows up this negatively formulated question with another question in form of a statement, *and we shall have something like civic education exercise?* This question probably expects P2 to confirm or clarify this assertion. It is also provocative in nature and forces the speaker to whom it is addressed to develop her argument. What follows at turn 4 is a plea by P4, a family lawyer to react to the question. She clarifies that the Marriage Bill does not kill the customary marriage.

The negative debating questions identified in the corpus of this study were packaged as rhetorical questions that sought to enhance the argument in the
confrontative sequences in which they occurred. For instance, the question *don’t we have people in KANU?* (Example 48.6 Citizen TV1) is more of a challenge or a dispute to the previous utterance that all Kalenjins are in URP. The challenges advanced by the negative interrogatives were unanswerable in the examples given. The findings, therefore, agree with the claim that negative debating questions fall in the same class as rhetorical questions Koshik (2002).

### 6.5.2 Attacking Echo Questions

The second member of the argumentative category of questions is one which repeats fully or partly an utterance that occurred earlier in the conversation. This repetition is also augmented with arguments expressing opposition, thus, questioning the truth value of the original statement (Schirm, 2008). These questions express a speaker’s surprise at a previous utterance and cast the previous statement in a negative light. They draw on resources from a previous answer to provide for their relevance and credibility (Clayman & Heritage, 2002). These questions were used by the hosts to undermine the validity of an earlier claim by a panelist. The following examples illustrate this phenomenon:

**Example 50.6 KTN 2**  
**Topic:** Jubilee and CORD Cross Talk Altimutums

T,H:  
*CORD talked about security. Is security a problem in this country?*

2P:  
It is but when O is saying the success of the rally was to remind Kenyans about the problem they are facing….

3H:  
Mmh

4P:  
You don’t have to remind any Kenyan. We are facing serious challenges as a country. There are problems, we know it. *But what are your solutions? Have you ever heard any one alternative policy that CORD in the past through their Shadow Cabinet Minister in different dockets? What’s CORD’s plan on security?* We have plans and implementing them. It is
taking time yes, there are challenges we admit. We would want to see what alternative they have. But in due time, and as soon as it is possible, most of the things will be sorted out.

Earlier in the talk, on the discussion on Jubilee and CORD cross talk ultimatums, a panelist from the CORD had pointed out issues that they had sought to address in the national dialogue, insecurity being one of them (c.f Example 40.6 KTN 2). In Example 50.6 KTN 2 above, the host repeats the issue of insecurity in the statement CORD talked about security. She, on the basis of this poses the next question to a senator from Jubilee Coalition, Is security a problem in this country? So, the first statement echoes an earlier statement which is then followed up by the question that seeks to get the view of the senator on the matter. This is a Yes/No question with a subject-operator inversion and it enjoys competency as it is posed by the talk show host.

Accordingly, the question receives a conforming response in which the senator, P2 admits that there are many challenges the country is facing as put in the statement we are facing serious challenges as a country... The panelist then challenges the opposition to come up with strategies to address the problems in the questions, but what are your solutions? Have you ever heard any one alternative policy that CORD in the past through their Shadow Cabinet Minister in different dockets? What’s CORD’s plan on security? (turn 4). He responds to the attack by presenting the government’s position that as soon as it is possible, most of the things will be sorted out. The attacking echo question is seen to also generate and advance an argument.
Let us now see how attacking echo questions occurred on Hope FM.

**Example 51.6 Hope FM1 Topic: Marriage Bill**

1. H: *So you are against polygamy entirely?*

2. P2: Definitely I am because I am a Christian. However, I am not arguing as a Christian, but as a leader.

3. P4: *Mheshimiwa here has said she does not support polygamy at a personal level. How do you legislate against polygamy? If you legislate against that, you legislate against the people you represent.*

4. H: Mheshimiwa… Let’s have J before we come to you.

5. P3: Aah what I’m saying is this Bill is not about marrying many wives. It is about many other things because even when it comes to polygamy, women have options. You can marry through civil which is very cheap and it is monogamous. There is no way you can turn it into polygamous…

The Marriage Bill being discussed in Example 51.6 Hope FM 1 had received mixed reactions from male and female legislators. At turn 1, the host asks P2, a women representative if she is against polygamy; *so you are against polygamy entirely?* This question is formulated as a ‘so’ prefaced statement-form question. By using this question, the host expects P2 to affirm either if she is against polygamy. The panelist in a conforming response confirms she is against polygamy because she is a Christian. At turn 3, a male legislator puts her to task in form of an attacking echo question *Mheshimiwa here has said she does not support polygamy at a personal level. How do you legislate against polygamy? If you legislate against that, you legislate against the people you represent.* He, therefore, repeats the utterance that she is opposed to polygamy, then challenges her stand by saying that she then legislates against the people she represents since they could be polygamous.
This response prompts the host to direct a question to P3, a family lawyer, to comment on that claim. It is important to note that the host does not give the next turn to the panelist whose stand had been challenged. Probably, he intended to get an expert view from the lawyer. Indeed, at turn 5, P3 clarifies that the Bill is not about marrying many wives. The attacking echo questions used in this example are, therefore, used to clarify issues surrounding the said Bill, reinforce facts as well as build on the ongoing argument.

One observation made from the analysis of attacking echo questions is that a panelist can present an opinion, which the host may challenge. After that point the organization of the talk situates them in a defensive position vis-à-vis the host. The attacking echo questions in this data may stand as accusatory questions in that once posed, they prompt the panelists to defend themselves or subsequently clarify the issue under attack (clayman & Heritage, 2002).

In other instances, panelists or hosts may make a response to a previous utterance by simply presenting a contrasting argument without referring to the previous viewpoint. This occurs in the use of attack-back questions discussed in the next section. This is the third member under the argumentative class of questions.

**6.5.3 Attack Back Questions**

Unlike attacking echo questions, attack back questions make no direct reference to the previous view in the course of attacking it; but they formulate
another question instead of providing an answer. This means that in certain circumstances, the question-answer adjacency pair as a basic unit of social interaction may not hold true. Typically, the attack-back questions always immediately follow a previous question (Ilie, 2001). Schirm, 2008 observed that the authority of the talk show host is not absolute; the talk show guests themselves may also initiate a turn without necessarily being prompted. Thus, these questions were typically posed by panelists when they addressed each other directly without turn allocation by the host. Consider Example 52.6 Citizen TV 1 that follows.

**Example 52.6 Citizen TV 1**

**Topic:** Jubilee Wrangles

*T1,H:* Please keep it brief prof. Why these wrangles or conflicts?

*2P1:* Yes. I will keep it brief. I want to give free advice to my friend Senator M…. those who do not respect history will never respect the present or the future and you are one of them in your coalition. If you look at the history of this country from 1963 to now. Look at the script by Machiavelli, those who help you to power must be done away with. Look at Jaramogi and Jomo Kenyatta, what he said that Kenyatta should rule, but what about the quarrel between Jaramogi Oginga and Tom Mboya and what it did to the people. Then you come to Daniel Arap Moi and the vice president Kibaki, vice president eh Karanja. What happened? They start to to have conflicts. He did away with them. And he did away with them because of causes related to power. Kibaki and Raila Odinga. They agreed they would share government and finally you saw Kibaki say where did I talk about this? I am the President.

*3H:* [ Now ]

*4P3:* [How can ] you prove that you are an exception?

*5P1:* You cannot, you cannot argue from the past. We must show the facts and….address the present…. 

In the scenario presented in Example 52.6 Citizen TV1, the host at turn 1 nominates P1, a political analyst to explain why there is conflict in the Jubilee Coalition, *please keep it brief prof. Why these wrangle or conflicts?* This is a Wh- question that demands that P1 provides reasons for the wrangles in the
Jubilee coalition. It invites a narrative response with little degree of restriction as observed at turn 2, as the political analyst gives an elaborate background on previous squabbles between political leaders. He enumerates a list of previous political leaders who rose to power and then did away with those who had helped them get to those positions. These, he argues, relate well to the rift in Jubilee Coalition.

The political analyst cites conflict between the first President Jomo Kenyatta and the then Jaramogi, who helped him ascend to power. Then Mwai Kibaki and Raila Odinga’s agreement to share power which was never honoured; Look at the script by Machiavelli, those who help you to power must be done away with. Look at Jaramogi and Jomo Kenyatta, what he said that Kenyatta should rule... He, therefore, connects these past experiences with the current coalition between URP and TNA whereby power should be shared equally, but this has not been the case. His argument makes reference to Machiavelli’s Principle that states that those who help you to rise to power should be done away with in order to remain in power.

At turn 2, the host attempts to come in probably to direct the next question to another panelist. She uses the discourse marker ‘now’ to indicate intention to take over the floor. However, before she could go on, P3, a panelist from the CORD coalition asks the Wh-question how can you prove you are an exception? This question is directed to a senator from the Jubilee coalition. This question casts doubt on the willingness of the President, who is a member
of TNA to share power equally with URP, the other party in the Jubilee Coalition. This question, therefore, occurs as P3 addresses another panelist, P2 directly without turn allocation by the host. A turn 5, the co-panelist, in response to the question dismisses P1 allegation by stating that you cannot, you cannot argue from the past, we must show the facts and...and address the present.... Here, a departure in the Q-A roles is is manifested in that P3, other than waiting for the host to allocate the next turn, he initiates a question – answer sequence himself addressed to a co-panelist.

Example 53.6 below drawn from Nation FM 1 illustrates a question –answer sequence initiated by a panelist.

**Example 53.6 Nation FM1**  
**Topic: County Development Boards**

1H: Oversight is good eh but I think Senator .... Your last point please.

2P1: This is my last point. We have talked about returning money. That is the counties returned the money

3P2: To where?

4P1: For re-budgeting at the county level

5P2: Is that money still in the county?

6P1: It will be budgeted in the next financial year

7P2: Which financial year?

8P1: This financial year

9 H: Oversight is good, Senator, oversight is good. A lot of people tend to ask the question, is the senate overstepping their mandate given that the county governments are the basic mirror image of the national governments?

The discussion from which the example is drawn is on the establishment of County Development Boards that seek to enhance public participation in county governance. At this point in the show, the host seeks to get the last
comments on the said boards from the two panelists. At turn 1, she allocates the next turn to P1, a Senator, who at turn 2 claims that most counties have returned their money to treasury. In the turn that follows, the P2, without waiting to be allocated the next turn attacks the P1 with the question *to where?* P1, at turn 4 says it has been returned for re budgeting at the county level. This forms the basis for the next Yes/No question still from the panelist: *Is that money still in the county?* At turn 6, P1 explains that it will be budgeted for in the next financial year. Note the next question *which financial year?* is also asked by a panelist (turn 7).

This is a Wh-question that places greater demand on the P1 to give specific time when the money claimed to have been returned will be allocated. The host seems to have given the floor to the two panelists to engage in the question-answer exchange. However, the host does not allow this departure to continue for long; she, therefore, resumes her questioning role at turn 8 and directs a question to the senator, P1 on whether the senate is overstepping its mandate; *Is the senate overstepping their mandate given that the county governments are the basic mirror image of the national governments?*

Clayman and Heritage (2002) note that the attack-back question is a form of breach of turn taking norm, where a currently unaddressed interviewee seeks to comment on some aspect of talk in progress. The norm is that panelists’ turns should properly be produced as responses to hosts’ questions. In such a context, the host engages in a non questioning behavior that potentially
diverges from the normative Q-A framework, and they risk losing control over the topical agenda of the talk. However, this sequence does not go for long as the host soon returns to the safety of the questioner’s role. A normal course of question - answer is thus restored.

This practice is a violation of institutional norms of turn taking expected of institutional discourse such as broadcast talk (Clayman & Heritage, 2002), but is a feature of ordinary conversation (Shegloff, 2007). This gives the talk shows under study a dual nature; an observation that confirms that although the framing of questions is institutionally rule-governed, the talk show interaction also displays distinctive features of conversational discourse, such as spontaneous role switching and question –asking initiated by the talk show panelists (Ilie, 1999).

The last category of questions under the argumentative questions is rhetorical questions.

6.5.4 Rhetorical Questions

These are questions to which the person asking it does not expect an immediate answer, but uses it as a means of creating effect (Ilie, 1999; Gruber, 2001). In this study data, the rhetorical questions occurred most often in the hosts’ and the panelists’ argumentative monologue as illustrated below:

Example 54.6 Citizen TV 2 Topic: Politics Post SabaSaba

T,P₁: Just a little response to what mheshimiwa is saying, these issues have been acknowledged they are very important issues, but A, if you look at these
issues, look at the messages… issues of corruption, some of these messengers have been in position in government where they could have sorted out issues of corruption in their own dockets. In the land, in medical services, what have they done?

H: You are referring to Prof __

P1: Yes, yes, because Prof ___ was in medical services at one time, through his declaration nurses were sacked. How do you create jobs by sacking nurses? It’s probably they have forgotten that… Secondly, they have people in immigration. ___ was in immigration. How much did he work? Tangible evidence that he did something to change the level of corruption in immigration? So, I could go on and go on. So the message they are putting forth is correct. But what most Kenyans are not comfortable about is the messengers…..

P1, a political analyst presents his reservations about the members of CORD calling for a rally to discuss the challenges like security and corruption in the country. At turn 1, he points out to the host that some of the politicians in the opposition were in the previous government but they did not delivered much. In the utterance, in the land, in medical services, what have they done? The question what have they done? Which is a Wh- question comes out as rhetorical as the host to whom it is directed does not give a response; instead she asks him if he is referring to __, at turn 2, in a statement form question. You are referring to __? At turn 3, P1 indeed confirms so in the statement that begins ‘Yes, yes, because ___ was in medical services at one time; through his declaration nurses were sacked.’ This response creates a link between the question and the rhetorical questions that follow. How much did he work? This is another Wh-question followed by a statement- form question; tangible evidence that he did something to change the level of corruption in immigration? Through these rhetorical questions, P1 appears to convey a strong personal commitment that these members of the opposition have no
ground to actually condemn the current incompetence in government. Another illustration of the use of rhetorical questions follows below.

Example 55.6 Nation FM 2 Topic: SabaSaba

P1: The parties went to Ufungamano. I did not go to Ufungamano but my then leader __, __ went to Ufungamano. And those of us who were in parliament, when we saw that the country was reaching a boiling point, got together as Inter-Party Parliamentary Group-IPPG. We sat and asked ourselves, what is our role as elected leaders? what can we do to save our country? We got together and started discussing one, having a law that would enable us to review the constitution. Number 2, having minimum reforms. The IPPG package because 1997 was an election year and we did not want to go into elections with the draconian laws that were there…

In Example 55.6 Nation FM 2 the discussion is on Sabasaba and an issue on constitutional reforms that would do away with the then draconian laws comes up. P1, a former Minister for Justice presents some matters that were of interest in form of rhetorical questions. Thus, we sat and asked ourselves, what is our role as elected leaders? what can we do to save our country? P1 expresses a strong commitment that elected leaders have a duty to protect their country from draconian rules. These questions are interrogative in structure but have a force of a strong assertion (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1990). The rhetorical questions acquired an institutional function of controlling and/or evaluating the ongoing talk (Ilie, 1998).

In all the examples above, it can be noted that neither the hosts nor the panelists attempted to answer the rhetorical questions. This provides further evidence that these questions are meant to prompt an argumentative discussion (Ilie, 1999). The rhetorical questions observed in the corpus of this study were used argumentatively and normally appeared to present an opinion. This
agrees with Ilie observation that “rhetorical questions shape arguments and influence public opinion” (Ilie, 1999:980). Their strength is reinforced by the fact that they are message – oriented, audience – oriented and interlocutor-oriented at the same time. The next section presents the last broad category of questions: clarifying questions.

6.6 Clarifying Questions

These are standard questions that elicit missing information. They fall in three types as illustrated in four sub-sections: Classic clarifying questions, opinion eliciting questions, examination questions and permission eliciting questions.

6.6.1 Classic Clarifying Questions

These types of clarifying questions aim to elicit information in pursuit for credibility. They do not start or contain an opinion and usually occur in the first turn of a secondary sequence adjacency pair. The questions are directed at absolute fact with the forms ‘why so…’ ‘who is…?’ These questions were usually asked by the talk show host thus have competencies. They are also standard in that the host pursued the panelist to whom they were directed to provide some missing facts. They mostly occurred during highly probing and adversarial lines of questioning. The examples that follow illustrate these questions as they featured in the study data.

Example 56.6  KTN 1  Topic: Tides of Terror

T1 H: Okey A, while we are still talking about the police, let’s talk about how much we are investing in the police service and whether they are equipped enough for these times of terror....
2 P1: Yeah I think, the Kenya police service act has never been enacted. We went into the election in 2013 without a unified police force.... so there was the Operation Linda Nchi in which was about 400-450 officer have been killed by the Al Shabaab....

3 H: 450 police officers killed in the line of duty since the Operation Linda Nchi took off. So M, you are the police spokesman. One of the efforts in terms of security is?

4 P1: Thank you very much... since the IGP came into office he has made a strong urge that there is order in the police service. One, through ensuring there is....

5 H: Such as?

6P1: Equipment... motor vehicle to enable us the officers to survey the border in a way that they are able identify any elements coming, but also the number because on its own it will not be enough....

7H: So...so?

8 P1: So we are working on the number and you have seen the effort of the government to increase the number of the officers. We are also working on the mobility....

The host seeks to find out what measures the government is taking to curb terror in the country. In turn 1 therefore, she asks the police spokesman to comment on that. In the statement let’s talk about how much we are investing in the police service and whether they are equipped enough....’ This question in statement form comprises a requisition with an embedded wh- word ‘how.’ In turn 2, the P1, a police spokesman points out that 450 officers have been killed. This response forms the basis for the next question by the host at turn 3, who still seeks to find out credible facts on what the government is doing in a ‘so’ prefaced statement- form question so one of the effort in terms of security is? In turn 4, the host probes further, and directs the next question to P1 to clarify on what order the IGP had brought to the police service, in the question such as? It therefore seems that her questions are conditioned by pursuit of
tangible facts. This demand for credibility is further pursued at line 7 through the use of non-sentence question so...so?

At turn 6 and 8, P1 in his response talks of the motor vehicles that have been increased to enable the security officers survey the boarders, equipment... motor vehicle to enable us the officers to survey the border....He also says that the government has increased the number of police officers.... you have seen the effort of the government to increase the number of the officers ... (turn 8) P1, a police spokesman has therefore enhanced the credibility of the message he is conveying by providing facts that consolidate his responses. The effort to accentuate P1’s authoritativeness is perhaps most apparent when the host refers to him by the title ‘police spokesman’ which forms the basis of that knowledge.

The police spokesman is influenced by his professional position, and consequently his obligation for accountability to make truth the centre piece of his response and that of the encounter at large; a view shared by Martinez (2002).

In the next example, the host makes explicit the need for clarity.

**Example 57. 6 Citizen TV 1  Topic: Jubilee Wrangles**

T,H: Alright. For purposes of clarity. The issue of ___

P: The issue of ___ coming in. One thing I want to say is when you read the constitution, it is very clear that you can only bring the issue of impeachment when there is serious violation of the constitution. My friend eh ___ has given eh.... We have not seen what ___ has done wrong. If it is
the issue of transferring Rugut, he is a public servant and he can be transferred like any other person. So to me, the issue of ___ coming for impeachment it does not hold water at all.

In Example 57.6 Citizen TV1, the host seeks clarification from P3, a Senator on the issue of the impeachment of ___, a former Cabinet Secretary. The impeachment had been a subject of debate. It is obvious that the question is meant to clarify the terms for impeachment as the host uses the statement for purposes of clarity...this preface is followed by a statement-form question, the issue of ___. P3 explains that one is only impeached if he or she has seriously violated the constitution and therefore, an act like transferring a civil servant is far from such violation. Thus, the person under discussion should not be a candidate for impeachment.

The next Example 58.6 Nation FM 1 also demonstrates a pursuit for clarity on the motivation behind the ‘SabaSaba’ movement.

Example 58.6 Nation FM 1   Topic: SabaSaba

T1H: And, and what was it you wanted in that democratic space. Let’s clarify. We keep talking about the 2nd liberation. What was the 2nd liberation about?

2P1: The most important thing is that we wanted Section 2A of the Constitution which had outlawed any other political party except KANU =

3H: Mmh

4P1: =To be reviewed

5H: Mmh

6P1: So that people with dissenting views could register political parties. We also wanted respect for human rights; we wanted the rule of law because there was the rule of the jungle. Anything that KANU bigwigs desired became law.
At turn 1 the host seeks to find out what was the second liberation that the “Sabasaba” movement fought for. Note also this search for clarification is marked by the use of the statement ‘let’s clarify’ which is then followed by the clarifying question. The question which is formulated as a Wh- interrogative *what was the 2nd liberation about?* is directed to a P1, a former Minister for Justice who also championed for the liberation as an official of the Law Society of Kenya. At turns 2 and 4, she indicates that *we wanted Section 2A of the Constitution which had outlawed any other political party except KANU to be reviewed.* At turn 6 she further adds that *we also wanted respect for human rights, we wanted the rule of law because there was the rule of the jungle. Anything that KANU bigwigs desired became law...*

A similar orientation is observed in Example 59.6 Hope FM 1 that follows. Notable, in this example is the choice of panelist to address the matter. The question is directed to P4, who is a lawyer; thus, her response constitutes a move in developing authoritativeness and credibility (Martinez, 2000).

**Example 59.6 Hope FM1**  **Topic: The Marriage Bill**

T1H: Alright....and let’s get from the chair. How applicable would those clauses be? for example, a promise to marry. What constitutes a promise in the legal setting? A couple of coffee dates? How applicable are those clauses?

2 P4: Lemmie go straight to the issue of polygamy and the issue of consent. Like my friend, the Hon member has said, we have marriages that are polygamous or potentially polygamous and others are not. It is hoped that Kenyans will be able to be in a place where they can stand and choose whether they want to be in a monogamous or polygamous union....

3H: Okey

4 P4: Now, the issue of consent happens at a point you are signing on the dotted line as to whether you want a monogamous or a polygamous union. That’s where consent comes in. What this Bill intended however is that you will be
informed that your husband is taking a 2nd, 3rd or 4th wife and that is of course reasonable.

The questions at turn 1 are directed to the chair of the Parliamentary Committee of Justice and Legal Affairs, and let's get from the chair. How applicable would those clauses be? for example, a promise to marry. What constitutes a promise in the legal setting? These two questions are formulated as Wh-questions that seem to demand for precision with reference to the applicability of the said clauses in the Marriage Bill. The host seems to be seeking clarification on this matter that appears unclear. This could be affirmed by the statement- form question that follows a couple of coffee dates? How applicable are those clauses? The chair clarifies what constitutes consent in the statement ‘Now, the issue of consent happens at a point you are signing on the dotted line as to whether you want a monogamous or a polygamous union…’

It is worth noting that the host does not leave the floor open to any panelist to respond to the classic clarifying questions; rather, she selects a panelist based on their credentials as presented in the opening segment (c.f 4.2.0). This sequentially obligates a response from the selected speaker which is connected to the preceding challenge. Reynolds (2011) identifies a similar practice and looks at it as a display of relative difference in knowledge, which treats the selected speaker as having the primary rights to the answer. These kinds of questions could be described as recipient- focused (Schegloff, 2007).
The next section presents opinion eliciting questions, another sub class of clarifying questions.

### 6.6.2 Opinion Eliciting Questions

This type of questions enquires directly about the interlocutor’s opinion, rather than an absolute fact, in connection with some concrete event. That is, they are interested in the interlocutor’s attitude, regardless of the truth value of the content (Schirm, 2008). In the talk shows under study, the topics were usually argumentative and it was expected that panelists would hold different opinions on the matter under discussion. Therefore, this makes the occupancy of this category predictable. The questions took the forms, ‘what is your opinion on….’, ‘what’s your take… ‘What are your thoughts on….’ In responding to the questions, panelists prefaced their responses with structures like ‘I think…’ ‘For me….’ The hosts first set the context of the question and then topicalized the matter to which the panelists would respond as shown in the examples in this section.

**Example 60.6 KTN 1 Topic: Tides of Terror**

T1M:  I would like to talk about aah… we see an attack in Likoni, we see a grenade blow up in Eastleigh…… we see ahah some explosives assembled in Pangani, then we have the police who start vetting thousands of people in the country. Can we talk about probably as we come to the close of our discussion about making this more sustainable, about how we can win this fight, about it being more of intelligence gathering….. let’s talk about the long time solutions because to some extent and while many Kenyans appreciate what is happening it sometimes appears like a knee jerk reaction.

2 P4:  *I think* the biggest problem we are having right now is for the people to try and agree that we cannot just fight terrorism or insecurity generally using the security agency. It is an undertaking where everybody needs to be involved…. Unfortunately even as the government brings initiative, community policing there are people who are some people who are comfortable with how things are and they are now taking advantage of the previous problems …. 
3H: So in your view, what is your solution now? What will make Kenyans feel safer because it can now happen when you are in a matatu, it can happen in the bus stop.

4P4: These things are normally stored where people are, they are normally transported among people. The public needs to trust us, give us information....

In Example 60.6 KTN 1, the host seeks to establish from the police spokesman (P4) what the government’s solution to the terror attacks is. At turn 1, she sets the background to the issue by highlighting the various attacks, for example, the Likoni attack and the explosives at Pangani. The host does not seek the opinion in form of a question but a statement that indeed requires the opinion of P4 in the statement let’s talk about the long time solutions because to some extent and while many Kenyans appreciate what is happening...... it sometimes appears like a knee jerk reaction. At turn 2, P4 gives his opinion that the fight against terrorism should be a collective responsibility. Note here the use of the words ‘I think’ as a marker of his personal opinion I think the biggest problem we are having right now is for the people to try and agree that we cannot just fight terrorism or insecurity generally using the security agency... So by responding to the host statement, P4 presuppose his interpretation of the host’s proposition as a question.

This is a clear indication that form cannot be a sole indicator of a question since questions do not necessarily need to be produced in interrogative form (Jagitani, 2013). At turn 3 that follows, the hosts asks for his view on the solution so in your view, what is your solution now? Again, the host is trying to elicit his thoughts on topic by using the structure ...in your view which is
followed up by the Wh-question, *what is your solution now?* In turn 4, the panelist says that the public needs to work with the security agents, a statement that reiterates his earlier position, ‘the public needs to trust us, give us information.’

Another case is presented in Example 61.6 Hope FM 1 that follows where the host seeks the opinion of P4, a family lawyer on an issue concerning the Marriage Bill.

**Example 61.6 Hope FM 1 Topic: Marriage Bill**

1H: J, let’s look at it. We have been trying to consolidate all the seven laws that govern marriage in this country. *What’s your thought on it including the clause that says the man needs to ask for permission from his first wife to get another wife.*

2P4: A lot of debate has been going on. It is important to say beyond the debate we are going to see what is in the best interest of Kenyans. We also need to look at what opportunities were women MPs denied…It is not the debating of the Bill. It is not the passage of the Bill that is the issue with women. It is the fact that some clauses were removed from that Bill. One of the clauses being the breach of the promise to marry, that you cannot get damage…

3H: Mmh

4P4: So the women did not support the removal of these clauses and as Kenyans we need to think whether the removal of these clauses kills the Bill. *For me that is critical.*

5H: Alright…

In Example 61.6 Hope FM 1, at turn 1, the host seeks to find out from P4, a family lawyer what her thoughts are on the issue of a man seeking permission from his first wife to take a second wife, as stipulated in the Marriage Bill. The request for her opinion in a Wh-question is marked thus, *what’s your thought on it including the clause that says the man needs to ask for permission from his first wife to get another wife?* At turn 2, the lawyer not
only answers the question but goes further to explain why the women legislators had issues with the Bill, one of them being the removal of the clause on the breach of the promise to marry. In turn 4, she explains that the women did not support the removal of these clauses which she considers critical in her view. Note how she presents her view in the statement *for me that is critical*. Probably, this shows that the panelist is aware that not everyone may hold the same view as she does. However, she not only presents an opinion but also provide a valid and experiential connection to the topic by mention of other clauses that have not been captured in the question by the host. Note the choice of the panelist; J a family lawyer, to address the matter. Her response thus constitutes a move in a developing authoritativeness and credibility (Thornborrow, 2001b).

In some other cases, the host elicited opinions from different panelists on a matter of opinion or controversy drawn from an interview with a political analyst. In such cases, the panelists either displayed an opinion in support or non support of the issues raised. The host had to take a neutral position on their views as expected of her professional conduct (Clayman, 2010), but equally she had to debate with the panelists on the issues raised.

The example below drawn from Citizen TV presents an elaborate illustration of this. The host first presents a video clip on an interview she had earlier conducted with a political analyst. She then invites the panelists to share their thoughts on the political analyst’s opinion.
Example 62.6 Citizen TV 1  Topic: Jubilee Wrangles

T1H: Gentlemen, I want to bring another view because part of the woes as you have seen within Jubilee Coalition have also been occasioned by the ___ who wants to impeach ___. Let’s listen to the views of M.N.... And what he has to say about that and if it could catapult into something even bigger.

M.N: If this game is escalated to a point where the President is impeached, and by the way, that is something we must anticipate especially with this impeachment talk. If he is impeached, the beneficiary of the impeachment will be ___.

H: On what grounds? On what possible grounds would one use to bring up a bid to impeach the president?

N: You do not need to have any grounds. It can just be you do not like the shape of his head. If we have numbers, we will impeach him and eh..... look at it if you have the URP members saying that ah we are not with ___ because ___ seems to be with ___. Then you have the CORD members. If you put the two together, then you will have a President with crises within parliament. But the beneficiary of this ultimately will have to be ___ because if you impeach ___, ___ becomes President for the remainder of the term and he can appoint anyone to be his Deputy President. And he can even appoint ___ to become the Deputy President.

2P1: Now

3H: Hold on Prof. I want to come to you C. on this because he has mentioned your coalition leader ___. And there are those who may observe or opine that there is still a very warm relationship between URP and ODM because of the previous relationship between ___ and ___. Does that theory that you have just heard resonate with you?

4P3: I think A, one thing you need to know is that eh in politics, we do not have permanent enemies and ah permanent friends. So in terms of strategic partnerships in politics is allowed. The same way Senator M. had mentioned about the relationship between the Kikuyus and the Kalenjins. Many pessimists thought it would not work. But eh looking at eh what M has just mentioned, I don’t think ODM has plans of mending woes with URP and TNA. CORD, we are very keen, we want Kenyans to give a report card... Indeed the coalition has really failed as far as insecurity is concerned. ....

5H: I will come, we will come to details of what is going on and the rallies. Please hold on to that. Lemmie get the views of the rest of the panel very quickly...... on M’s views.

6P1: M. N. he is preparing the President to see the beneficiary of his problems. And that is how ___ will destroy him. In fact, what M N has done is what I have exactly said. He is telling the President, you know the danger for you....... If they impeach you ___ is the beneficiary so watch out on ___

7P2: A, what M. N. is saying at least I know M he is my friend. What he is saying is what vultures and brokers in town are doing. Because in all honesty, is what we call political vultures are doing because they want a political rift between ___ and ___.

In the long excerpt, presented in Example 62.6 Citizen TV1, the host presents the views of M. N. who is of the opinion that an attempt to impeach cabinet secretary __ is a larger scheme to impeach the President. At turn 1, the host therefore seeks to get the views of the panel on this matter. The first turn 3 is allocated to P3, an MP from the CORD, to give his view as put in the statement …and there are those who may observe or opine that there are still very warm relationship between URP and ODM because of the previous relationship between __ and __. This statement precedes the Yes/No question Does that theory that you have just heard resonate with you? In his response, P3 first generally admits that in politics there are no permanent enemies but he later refutes the allegation that ODM has any plans of mending with URP and TNA.

Note how he begins his turn by ‘A, I think….’ I don’t think ODM has plans of mending woes with URP and TNA. CORD, we are very keen, we want Kenyans to give a report card... thus, sharing his thoughts which are totally in contrast with M__’s view. At turn 5, the host then allocates the subsequent turns to the rest of the panel to share their views also. Note the statement ‘Please hold on to that’. Lemmie get the views of the rest of the panel very quickly on M’s views. At turn 6, P1, a political analyst shares his views that are rather contentious that if the President is impeached, the Deputy President will be the beneficiary. This is in the statement M N, he is preparing the President to see the beneficiary of his problems. And that is how __ will destroy him.
The last different view is held by P2, a Senator from the Jubilee Coalition who opines that the purported impeachment is meant to cause a rift between the President and his Deputy. In a rather scathing remark he refers to those plotting the impeachment as ‘political vultures’ (turn 7). M’s view on this highly divisive issue has strong judgmental overtones, thus sparks varied opinion from the panelists.

The observation made from the examples presented in this category is that the host introduces a balance of perspectives from the panelists while maintaining a neutralistic posture on matters of opinion and controversy. Such matters could in principle be quite damaging to neutralism (Hutchby, 2006). The remarks from the panelists come across as distinctly contentious or objectionable in character. In exercising some degree of control over the issue, the host selectively invites a panelist to respond to the issue raised. In responding to the questions, the panelists authenticate their talk with experiential background and knowledge to show the relevance of their contributions to the topics under discussion. They seek to justify their statements or actions in the sense that they hold institutional positions and by their status the “public figures are treated as ‘having some locus’ on the matter at hand” (Montgomery 2007, p.148). For example, P3 is a senator in ODM thus his response to M’s claim I don’t think ODM has plans of mending woes with URP and TNA, is likely to hold because he represents the party and has knowledge on what the party believes in.
In section 6.6.3 that follows, focus shifts on the third type of questions under the category of clarifying questions: Examination Questions.

### 6.6.3 Examination Questions

Examination questions seek to find out if the person at whom the question is directed has certain information or not. They mostly take the form ‘are you aware…?’, ‘do you know….?’ , ‘Are you complacent with…?’ It was noted that this kind of question was asked by the host, and it was directed to a particular panelist whom the host considered could be the custodian of the information elicited going by the credentials spelt out in the opening segment (c.f 4.2.0). Consider the examples in this section that illustrate this phenomenon.

**Example 63.6 Hope FM 2**  
**Topic: Illicit Brews**

1. **T1: H:** As far as the illicit alcohol that is now in the question. *Do you still know how much is still in circulation?*

2. **P1:** We have done what no one is talking about: the mitigation. Take for instance yesterday they are moving from house to house to try to find out anything…anything that resembles the product that we are chasing. It is happening in Embu and other places. The public health and our team are out. We have also tonight launched our call free number that is 192 for anybody with information.

3. **3P2:** *Do you and do we even know how much of this is out there? Has NACADA for example said this is the sample, this is the bottle so that when we see it we know it. This is the kind of brew that is killing people?*

4. **H:** Let him respond to that.

5. **5P1:** Tomorrow all the illicit killer brews will be displayed at NACADA=

6. **6P2:** Okey…that’s very okey…

7. **7P1:** =at NACADA board room, we have a conference.
The discussion in Example 63.6 Hope FM 2 is on the illicit brews that had claimed many lives in some parts of the country. At turn 1 the host poses a Yes/No question question *do you still know how much is still in circulation?* to P2, the chair NACADA to find out if he is aware of the illicit brews that are still in circulation. At turn 2, the chair explains that they have taken mitigation measures. Again in turn 2, a co-panelist P2 challenges the chair if he and the public have information on the sample of the illicit brews that are out there. In another Yes/No question *Do you and do we even know how much of this is out there? Has NACADA for example said this is the sample, this is the bottle?* At turn 5 that ends at turn 7, he says that that all illicit killer brews will be displayed at NACADA board room. At turn 6, the host acknowledges this response in the words *okey, that’s very okey.* It is expected that the information that the NACADA chair gives is credible. It is also noticeable that the role of questioner is not fixed on the host. Here, a panelist P2 also poses a question to a co-panelist P1. A similar case is observed in the example that follows.

**Example 64.6 Citizen TV 1  Topic: Jubilee Wrangles**

**M.N:** The insecurity galore being blown up, they want to blow up until we have a situation where we say we have no confidence in this government to be able to deliver.... Do you remember 43% of polls of 2013 did not go to the current government? which means they could begin to have an avalanche, this could lead to an African spring. A spring that could flow into Uganda, that could go into Rwanda, go into South.

**T1H:** *Let me start with you Dr. C. He is alleging that the new push, the rallies CORD is holding and telling the public, voice your grievances against the government is a larger scheme to form an African spring? Are you complacent?*

**2P3:** I think eh first and foremost we need to understand where M.N. is coming from. In terms of research, you look at the person in terms of truthfulness. This is a gentleman who came up with the issue of tyranny of numbers. *So whatever opinion that he comes up with, the aspect of objectivity is not...*
there. M. N. is subjective. He knows where his bread and butter comes from. So to me I am not going to agree with what he is saying...We are just holding rallies, and we are here to welcome our CORD leader, ___

The discussion in this excerpt sparks out of a video clip on an interview conducted by the host on a political analyst M. N. The issue under discussion is the rallies that CORD had held to welcome their leader. The political analyst alleges that the holding of the rallies is a wider scheme to form an African spring that will begin right here in Kenya and spread into other African countries. The host, therefore, seeks to establish from P3, a Member of Parliament from the CORD if indeed, this is the case. After reformulating the context for the question in the statement let me start with you Dr. C. He is alleging that the new push, the rallies CORD is holding and telling the public, voice your grievances against the government is a larger scheme to form an African spring, the host then poses the examination question Are you complacent? Probably, the host expects the panelist to verify the information delivered by the political analyst.

In his response, P3 builds a rebuttal and says that M. is subjective in his opinion. He makes reference to M’s notion of tyranny of numbers that appeared to favour the current government in the last general election, so the panelist feels that M’s view is meant to please the government. He puts this in the statement M. N. is subjective. He knows where his bread and butter comes from. So to I am not going to agree with what he is saying. The next section focuses on the last type of clarifying questions; the permission eliciting questions.
6.6.4 Permission Eliciting Questions

These questions do not elicit any information but “ask for permission” to add or to comment or clarify on a comment made earlier in the show. Clayman and Heritage (2002) reckon that their use demonstrates a common and relatively benign form of departure that emerges in multi-interviewees where a currently unaddressed interviewee seeks to comment on some aspect of the talk in progress. This practice results in breach of turn taking provision that interviewees’ turn should properly be produced as responses to interviewer questions. These questions were mostly used by the panelists, though on some occasions, the hosts would use them. With the permission granted, the interlocutors moved on with their utterance. In the corpus of this study, requests were made in the format of a positive interrogative through the construction ‘can I….’ Examples that follow illustrate this occurrence.

Example 65.6 KTN 2 Topic: Jubilee and CORD Cross-Talk Ultimatums

T1H: Yes I would like you to address the challenges as we close our discussion…

2P1: Can I, can I make a few corrections?

3H: Alright.

4P1: You know quite a number of projects Jubilee say they are implementing, were initiated during the previous government. The thing is government projects will take time to come to fruition. Fortunately, they have borne fruits in their government….. and they should not tell the people that they are Jubilee projects. No, they were there during the Grand Coalition government…….

5H: Yes

6P1: They are part of vision 2030….
In Example 65.6 KTN 2, the programme is coming to a close as indicated in the host’s statement at turn 1, *as we close our discussion.* The host directs at turn 1 that the panelist should address the challenges the Jubilee administration is facing. But at turn 2, P1, a Senator from the opposition seeks permission to make a few corrections, put in the positive interrogative, *Can I, can I make a few corrections?* The host grants him permission at turn 3, in the word *Alright.* With the permission granted, P1 states that *you know quite a number of projects Jubilee say there are implementing, were initiated during the previous government....* He differs with the previous statement earlier in the show on the achievements the Jubilee government claims to have made. He firmly states, *fortunately, they have borne fruits in their government.....* The host acknowledges that with the marker ‘yes’ at turn 5. At turn 6, P1 continues with the turn he had discontinued at turn 4 when the host cuts in. He states that the projects are part of vision 2030. Hence, the activity initiated with the request at turn 2 by P1 is completed.

In some other instances, the host did not always give permission to contribute after a request had been made. This forestalled the production of a comment until a time when a panelist was done making his/her contribution on an issue.

The following Example 66.6 Nation FM 1 is a case in point.

**Example 66.6 Nation FM 1 Topic: County Development Boards**

T1P2: But down there, the Bills that concern ordinary operations of the counties are actually passed by the County Assemblies and the senators ah can only participate through the process of Section 91 of the County Governments Act.

2P1: *Can I ... can I?*
The Senators can only participate that through the provision provided by Section 91 of the County Government Act

Can ..... can I come to that ..... can I ....?  

Strictly Section 91 of County Government Act

Can I come to that A. First of all, let’s eh, let’s do some small civic education: first, the County Government Act we are talking about is the amendment. The one that used to be there is gone. So let’s not talk about things that are already gone.

At turn 1, P2 a Governor explains how some Bills in the counties are passed, and that the Senators can only participate through the process of Section 91 of the County Government Act. Before he completes his turn, P1, a Senator, cuts in to request for permission to speak in can I.... This attempt is unsuccessful as the host does not grant him permission, so P2 continues with his statement at turn 3. At turn 4, P1 makes another unsuccessful request for permission still in the positive interrogative Can .... can I come to that ..... can I ....? So P2 still continues to emphasize his earlier point on the Act that allows the participation of Senators in county governance. After this, now P1 takes the next turn 6 to make the comments he had attempted to in his earlier turns. He still begins this turn with a request for permission in the words Can I come to that A... P1 proceeds to make his contribution without waiting for the host to respond to his request.

This practice was also noted in the attack-back questions where panelists made non-elicited comments in the unfolding talk. The requests made in the permission eliciting questions could in principle consist of an adjacency pair with the first pair part comprising of a request, and the second pair part
compliance or rejection (Schegloff, 2007). This principle applies in Example 65.6 KTN 2 where the P1 request at turn 2 receives acceptance ‘alright’ at turn 3. However, Example 66.6 Nation FM 1 presents a different case altogether. The pleas at turns 2 and 4 do not receive any acceptance, so P1 makes a final plea at turn 6 and continues to make his contribution without any response to his request from the host. This confirms the argument that the use of the modal verb ‘can I’ licenses the possibility that the host may turn down the request (Couper-Khulen, 2012).

So far the questions typology that characterizes argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya has been investigated. Based on form and function, the questions identified can be summarized diagrammatically in Figure 6 as follows:
Figure 6: Diagramatic Presentation of Questions Based on Form and Function

Figure 6 presents the questions typology that characterizes argumentative talk shows based on form and function. The next couple of paragraphs discuss the findings putting them into perspective with regard to previous works on questions. Regarding form, some questions were formally distinct; the Wh-
Questions, Yes/No Questions and Rhetorical Questions. Other types borne out of the data were the statement-form questions marked by a rising intonation. As observed in Figure 6, the form of the questions did not clearly mark their pragmatic function. For example a Wh- question could be used to seek clarification or could also serve a rhetorical question. A Yes/ No question could also be used to seek permission, to attack-back a previous claim or to seek clarification on a proposition put forth by a panelist. This confirms that while form and function of questions are intertwined, one form of question can serve several different functions in the interaction (Couper-Kuhlen, 2012).

Of significance is that in the sequential organization of the practice of questioning and answering, speaker selection was crucial in developing the argument; the host was seen to direct some particular questions to a particular panelist. This happened when information to be elicited belonged to the recipient’s territory of knowledge. Consequently, the selection of the speaker sequentially obligated a response, and the response enhanced the credibility of the information passed to the wider audience. It can be observed under CA that the talk show hosts and the panelists orient to one another’s action as they engage in question-answer sequences in the interactional ordering of the talk, with the talk show host having a dominating role over the turns. The question–answer sequence largely displayed a Q-A, Q-A answer format whereby a question was followed by an answer.
Notable though were Q-A-A, where an elicitation from the host in form of a question was followed by two responses from the panelists. Q-Q-A sequences featured in this study data as a question from the host would be followed by another question from a panelist normally addressed to a co-panelist. The co-panelist would then provide a response as was noted in the attack-back questions. This displayed a violation of the turn taking system unexpected of institutional discourse (Clayman & Heritage, 2002, Tolson, 2006).

Additionally, a high number of the hosts’ questions did not only consist of a questioning component. Unlike ordinary conversation, where a speaker is initially entitled to only one turn- constructional unit, the talk show host can produce multi-units (Greatbatch, 1998; Heritage & Roth, 1995). These generally consist of “prefatory” statements which serve to set the background context that helps establish the relevance of the subsequent question and provides the necessary references. The panelists seen to recognize this introductory statement as such; they withheld any responses until the host launches the question. They therefore display an orientation to the institutional character of the pre-allocated turn types; a genre specific orientation.

Though speaking turns in the talk shows are pre allocated, there were few recorded instances of switch of roles. The panelists could switch roles to initiate a question-answer sequence addressed to a co-panelist; hence, demonstrating a clear violation of turn taking conventions. This occurrence was particularly noted in the use of attack-back type of questions. Accordingly,
the argumentative talk shows studied have a dual nature in that they displayed features of both ordinary conversations and institutional discourse (Ilie, 1999; Schirm, 2008).

Notable also was that examination questions and negative debating questions were conspicuously missing in *Nations Talking Point* on Nation FM. These questions have a strong preference for a particular response (de Ruiter, 2013). However, as a journalistic norm, talk show hosts are expected to remain neutral in the kind of response they elicit (Clayman, 2010; Clayman & Heritage, 2002). This could therefore explain the low occurrence and lack of the said questions on Nation FM. All the other question types identified featured in all the four talk shows sampled though in varying frequencies. This patterned recurrence of questions justifies the conclusion that the argumentative talk shows are a genre of broadcast talk.

### 6.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has investigated the question typology that characterizes argumentative talk shows. Further, it has attempted to account for the frequency of occurrence of the different question types. The overall observation is that the question design is a signature feature and may be termed as the dominant style of conducting the argumentative talk shows studied. The next and last chapter presents the summary of the findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER SEVEN: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.0 Introduction

This study undertook a genre analysis of argumentative talk shows of sampled radio and TV stations in Kenya. The study was based on the assumption that the argumentative talk shows constitute a genre owing to their common structure, shared content and style, and communicative goals. It was guided by four objectives which were to: describe the generic structure of sampled radio and TV argumentative talk shows in Kenya; determine particular aspects of argument that participants use in conducting the argumentative talk show; investigate the questions typology that sets apart the argumentative talk show genre from other types of talk and establish the communicative purposes of the discrete parts of the argumentative talk shows based on the generic features identified.

The Genre Analysis theory was used to delineate the talk show genre on the basis of shared generic features as stated in the objectives. Conversational Analysis framework was used to deduce an ‘event structure’ as well as the fundamental interactional practices through which the argumentative talk shows were conducted. The identification, description and analysis of these generic features were based on transcriptions of audio recordings of the following argumentative TV and radio talk shows: Nation’s Talking Point, Nation FM; Spotlight, Hope FM; Opinion Court, Citizen TV, and Checkpoint,
KTN. The findings of the analyses for each objective are presented in the sections that follow.

7.1 Summary of Findings

This section presents a summary of the findings of each of the objectives of the study as follows:

7.1.1 The Structure of Radio and TV Argumentative Talk Shows

The sampled talk shows comprised of three interrelated phases: the opening, body and closing. The analysis showed that the opening is unilaterally conducted by the talk show host and generally comprise the following components: mention of the programme, the name of the talk show host, introduction of the topic and the background to the problem, acknowledgement of the panelists and their credentials, invitation of the wider audience to join in the programme. It was observed that some of these components were obligatory, while others were optional. Obligatory ones included: a mention of the programme, introduction of the topic, introduction of the panelists, invitation of the wider audience, while the optional ones included: a mention of the host’s name, time for the talk show and background to the topic. However, in some programmes for example the Opinion Court, the background was supplemented by a taped video clip on events that warranted the topic.
Introductory descriptions were chosen with an eye toward their relevance to the present agenda, and they were audience directed in a way that enabled the audience to grasp their topical relevance. The panelists were introduced by stating their names followed by an elaboration of their credentials that qualified their selection into the panel. This was followed by an elaboration of the background to the problem or by playing a video clip of the events leading to the problem under discussion. The generic imprints of the opening segment were a natural consequence of the strongly institutionalized nature of the talk show genre, which has constraints that the participants had to attend to. Such constraints are that the opening segment must be unilaterally conducted by the host and the panelists must remain silent until a time when the host launches the first question addressed to one of the panelists at the end of the phase. The information goal and the opinion shaping goal of the genre were evident in the details on the topic and choice of the panelists.

From the analysis of the opening segment, it was established that the components in this segment did not follow a fixed order; their presence was just enough and the opening segment still achieved its communicative function of getting the programmes off the ground. This finding differs from reported by Clayman and Heritage (2002) in a study of news interview that reports that the elements in the opening segment follow a particular order.

After the opening sequence, came the discussion proper that constituted the body. This phase displayed a shift in the structure, as it was organized in
sequences as the host engaged the panelists in question-answer exchanges that embodied different question types as well as different aspects of argument that are characteristic of argumentative talk show genre. The body, thus, realized different communicative goals from the opening. In this phase, the wider audiences were given a chance to participate by sending SMS, tweets or by calling in. The hosts restricted themselves to questioning, while the panelists were fundamentally constrained to answering the hosts’ questions, or at least responding to them. This constraint shaped the form taken by the following pattern: Question–Answer, Question–Answer (Q-A, Q-A). This form of turn-taking involves “turn-type pre-allocation” (Sacks et al.; 1974; Schegloff, 2007), in which the activities of asking and answering (or responding to) questions are pre-allocated to the roles of host and panelists.

With minor exceptions, this pre-allocated pattern held in this study data regardless of the number of participants in the encounter. The structure of the talk shows sampled distinctively shaped the opportunities the participants had to achieve their ends, and adhering to them, created a highly recognizable interactional format. Analysts who have studied broadcast talk tend to share this view (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hutchby, 2006; Montogmery, 2007).

Within the body of the talk shows were commercial breaks that made room for commercial advertisements. The hosts usually informed the wider audience that they were taking a break. After the break, the host welcomed the wider audience back to the programme, re-introduced the panelists and sometimes
the topic of the day (c.f Figure 1). This was necessary to ensure that the wider audience stayed on the programme. The re-introduction also provided the necessary information that some members of the wider audience may have missed during the opening segment. This was due to the fact that these programmes are presented for the sake of the wider audience (Hutchby, 1992; Tolson, 2006; Montogmerry, 2007).

Finally, after the topic had been sufficiently addressed within the time allocated, the talk show host launched the closing. The core elements of the closing were: expressions of gratitude by ‘thank you’ that may be followed by a mention of the panelists’ names, and farewell. Other optional elements included an invitation to join in a future broadcast of the talk. This was observed on Spotlight on Hope FM only, and a mention of time which was noted on Nation’s Talking Point on Nation FM and Checkpoint on KTN. It was established that time was a defining characteristic of the nature of talk shows, and a major compulsion in the procedure of conducting the talk. Additionally, time had an influence on the structure of the talk show discourse.

Thus, the final termination was preceded by a pre closing phase that gave advance time warning to the panelists. This terminal segment was cooperative whereby the panelist remained silent after making their last remarks and allowed the hosts to unilaterally close the show (c.f Example 17.4 Hope FM1). It was also be confrontational as panelist sometimes defied the time prompts by the host and competed for the floor to make their final comments. This usually
resulted in overlaps that were resolved by the host by abruptly ending the show. A case in point was on *Opinion Court* on Citizen TV (c.f. Example 14.4 Citizen TV1).

The organizational structure of the talk shows enabled us to witness ‘at the surface’ the broad framework of the talk shows. Within the opening and closing brackets, the participants engaged in practices that were meant to advance the topic/argument.

### 7.1.2 Aspects of Argument in Radio and TV Argumentative Talk Shows

The second objective sought to ‘unpack’ some of the practices through which the talk unfolded. Focus was paid on the particular aspects that gave the talk its argumentative nature. A quantitative analysis of the frequency of occurrence of the aspects across all the talk shows was carried out. This was in an attempt to establish the generic similarities and/or differences of the talk shows. Over the course of the analysis of the aspects of argument, the communicative role of the various aspects emerged. The aspects of argument were: action opposition sequences, shifts in footing, validity challenges, turning a claim against itself interruptions, overlaps and reformulations. The frequencies of occurrence of these aspects are presented in Table 1.

A total of 160 counts of aspects of argument were identified. Out of these, action-opposition sequences registered the highest count of 44 (26.7). This is so because the talk unfolded mainly as the hosts engaged in eliciting opposing
views on the topics from the panelists. The panelists too appeared committed to be presenting entirely competing versions of the issue under discussion to maintain or influence more followers to their side.

Overlaps and interruptions recorded 29 (17.6%) and 23 (13.9%) counts respectively. Argumentative talk shows are notorious for generating a high degree of confrontational talk among the participants for the most part of the encounter. The motivation for these overlaps and interruptions in the course of confrontation stems from the consistent wish for each side to appear to win an argument in order to look more attractive to the mixed audience (the viewers and listeners). The choice of the topics and the selection of panelists displayed controversy; the panelists were mostly political figures representing both sides of the political divide, that is, the government and the opposition thus conflictive exchanges were frequent.

The use of validity challenges recorded a count of 21 (12.7%). Related to their role was the aspect ‘turning a claim against itself’ that yielded 11 (6.7%) tokens. When the panelists provided a response to an elicitation by the host, the hosts on some occasions did probe the panelists’ statements or arguments, either through requiring further details or an account of some of his/her response. The hosts also countered the panelists’ statements, either through questions which casted doubt on their assertions, through challenges. This explains the occurrence of these two aspects in the study data.
Some of the turns produced by the talk show hosts were attributed to third parties under the aspect ‘shifts in footing.’ Hosts often did so through remarks that might be regarded as particularly opinionated or controversial. To avoid appearing to make opinionated remarks, the hosts used this resource extensively in order to distance themselves from such, and to maintain a neutral stance as a journalistic norm. Hence, a count of 20 (12.1%) occurrences was noted in the data. The talk show hosts are expected play their moderating role effectively to give the talk shows the objectivity they deserve.

Topics in institutionalized discourses such as classroom, news interviews and talk shows are fixed and participants rarely deviate from the relatively fixed agenda. This explains the low frequency count of 17 (10.3%) of the feature ‘reformulations’. The hosts were seen to reformulate the topics in order to briefly shift the focus of the talk. In heated debates, such as those witnessed in the argumentative talk shows studied, shifting the focus was a good strategy to allow opposing panelists to gain their composure and to avoid turning the show into a shouting match.

The aspects discussed above can be treated as the distinct features of the social construction of argumentative talk shows in radio and TV settings where arguments routinely take place. The talk unfolded as panelists reacted to opposing views/alternative views on the topic as solicited by the talk show host. All the aspects of argument: action-opposition sequences, shifts in footing, validity challenges, turning a claim against itself, reformulations,
overlaps and interruptions featured in all the talk shows sampled though in varying degrees. It is against this background that argumentative talk shows on radio and TV stations in Kenya qualify to constitute a genre.

### 7.1.3 Typology of Questions in Radio and TV Argumentative Talk Shows

Argumentative talk shows are constructed through the question answer/response sequences. Four parameters were used to analyze the questions: competency, standardness, role and sequential place. As far as the role of the person asking the question, questions in argumentative talk shows can be asked by either the host or a panelist. Sequential place refers to the place of the question within the turn sequence it occurs in. A question is the result of competency if it is within the role of the person asking it, while it is not if it does not fit this role. On the other hand, a question is standard if it is asked because of a gap in the knowledge of the person asking it, and if this person expects an overt verbal answer; otherwise, it is non standard.

Further the questions were described based first on their form (Yes/No questions, statement form questions, Wh- questions). Second, questions were classified based on their functions under three three broad categories. The first broad category was dispute directing questions under which three sub classes were identified: dispute starting, clashing and topic changing questions. In the second broad category were the argumentative questions with negative debating questions, attacking echo questions, attack-back and rhetorical questions as the subclasses. The third broad category was the classifying
questions with classic classifying questions, opinion eliciting questions, examination and permission eliciting questions as sub classes.

A statistical analysis of the frequency of occurrence of each of the questions across the talk shows (cf.Table 3, Table 4, Table 5) was done. A total of 207 questions were identified. The arguments in the talk shows studied were initiated through some category of questions immediately after the opening segment; the dispute directing questions. This first broad category had a frequency of 44 counts out of which the dispute starting questions, clashing questions and topic changing questions recorded 12 (27.3%), 26 (59.1%) and 6 (13.6%) counts respectively. Once the talk show hosts started off the arguments, the talk developed as they engaged the panelists in opposing or clashing views throughout the talk show. Hence, more clashing questions were bound to occur. Instances of topic shift were rare as the participants appeared committed to the goal of the discourse. Thus, low counts of topic changing questions were evident in the data.

In the second broad category were argumentative questions that recorded a count 69 of the 207 questions identified. Under this broad category, rhetorical questions registered the highest count of 28 (40.6%) followed by attacking echo questions at 23 (33.3%), attack-back at 12 (17.4%) while negative debating questions had 6 (8.7%) tokens. The rhetorical questions were used argumentatively and mainly presented the speakers’ opinion. Probing a panelist’s statements or arguments, either through requiring further details or
an account of some of his/her response was a common practice used by the talk show hosts. This was done through questions which casted doubt on the panelists’ assertions or through challenges. Thus the attacking echo questions and attack-back questions occurred in the study data.

Negative debating questions embody a strong preference for an affirmative answer hence they are often treated as expressing an opinion rather than merely asking a question. As indicated in the literature review on shifts in footing, (cf. section 5.3.1) journalists are expected to be neutral in their questioning of public figures. They, therefore, used the negative debating questions quite sparingly. This could explain the low occurrence of this type of questions in the corpus of this study.

The third broad category constituting clarifying questions were the most prominent with a count of 94. These questions had two subclasses that carried the main agenda of the talk shows. One was the opinion eliciting questions that had a frequency count of 31 (33.0%) and classic clarifying questions that yielded 38 (40.4%) counts. One explanation for this would be that while the talk shows developed as the panelists gave their opinions on the matter at hand, the hosts always demanded for facts and explanation of the opinions in pursuit for credibility. This was achieved mainly through the use of classic clarifying questions (cf. section 6.4.0) Permission eliciting questions also contributed to the high occurrence with a count of 19 (20.4%). These
questions were used by a currently un-addressed speaker to seek permission to a turn, while the hosts used them to control participation.

All these questions occurred in varying degrees though some were found to be absent in some stations. For instance, negative debating questions (c.f. Table 4) and examination questions (c.f. Table 5) were missing on Nation’s Talking Point on Nation FM. This absence did not however dethrone the talk shows from genre membership.

Literature on broadcast talk and other institutionalized discourses indicate that the question answer sequences orient to pre-allocation of roles in these contexts. However, it turned out that this turn-taking system, is not a law of nature, and it can be departed from and returned to. In this connection, the panelists would ask questions directed to a co-panelist thus, deviating from their pre-established fixed role (cf sections 4.2.2, 6.3.2). Nevertheless, after some transgressions, the interaction was generally reoriented by the talk show host to follow generic conventions, so that, to certain degree, the talk shows did not always display an orientation towards ordinary conversation. Topic changing questions brought off the informal nature of the talk shows to the fore.

7.2 Conclusions

At the heart of this study has been a complex web of relationships between structure, content and communicative purposes that delineate the Kenyan radio
and TV argumentative talk show genre. Regarding structure, it was established that argumentative talk shows have an identifiable structure that is routinely organized into three phases: opening, body and closing that exhibit obligatory and optional elements that perform different communicative functions specific to this genre. Differences in the elements chosen, and the order in which they were presented, demonstrated attendance to different styles by different journalists. Underlying the small differences in the elements that made up the different phases of the talk shows, the talk shows studied displayed a stable organization structure. This stability in the structure of argumentative talk shows leads to the conclusion that they constitute a genre of broadcast talk.

The investigation of questions typology exhibited institutionalized constraints of turn order and turn type. As expected in institutionalized discourse, there were discernible systematic turn-taking procedures in these talk shows with the speaking turns being pre-allocated by the host. Although that was the case, few instances of departure from the expected turn taking system were observed where a panelist could initiate a question-answer sequence directed to a co-panelist: a practice common in ordinary conversation. Turn order could also be violated by interruptions. This shows that the boundaries between this institutionalized talk and ordinary conversation are permeable. This leads to the conclusion that the argumentative talk shows under study have a semi-institutional nature.
Commitment to communicative purpose in establishing a genre was another focus of this study. The basic function is to communicate information or opinion from public figures, experts or other persons on a range of issues, for the benefit of the wider audience. The study confirmed that the communicative goal determined what the talk was about, that is, the content, and how it started and ended. The communicative goal was achieved through the features of language used in the discrete phases of the talk shows. The study concluded that the information goal of the talk shows strongly determine the degree of formality of the speech event, as well as the interpersonal relation between the participants.

Demand for accountability to the public is another of the goals of the encounter (Clayman, 2010). As such, the talk show hosts strived to engage the panelists who happen to be public figures in probing questions and validity challenge. The panelists were consequently made to explain their actions/claims to the public. It is with this general goal in mind, and acting on behalf of the public that the host attempted to unmask the truth about policies and political dilemmas in which the politicians and the party they represents were involved.

The conclusions drawn from the analysis of sampled argumentative talk shows on their repeated overall structure, recurrence of aspects of argument, common question types and shared communicative purposes warrant their belonging to a stable broadcast genre.
7.3 Recommendations

The findings of this study open up some issues about the nature of argumentative talk shows on Radio and TV stations in Kenya. Mention will be made on two of these issues. One is on the fundamental question of how the talk shows routinely accomplish to achieve their goal. The panelists often collaborate in the interactional production of the talk by restricting their behavior to answering or responding to questions posed by the hosts. However, there were recorded cases of departures from this norm when the struggle for the argumentative floor became too fierce. Subsequently, the talk went beyond its boundaries and became something else; a confrontation, the hosts attempts to restore order notwithstanding. This would be a challenge to the achievement of the goal of the talk shows. Consequently, media colleges need to focus on how confrontational talk should be best handled when training journalists who host talk shows and other forms of broadcast talk that has the potential to generate into a combative talk.

Another observation was that neutralism as a key journalistic norm is not always easy to maintain. Some hosts were seen more willing than others to present opinionated views hence challenging the boundaries of neutralism. An understanding of how neutralism is maintained could be emphasized in the training of talk show hosts and presenters of other forms of broadcast talk that demand the same neutrality. This would project the talk show, the host as well as the broadcasting organization as objective and in positive light.
7.4 Limitations of the Study

Transcription of data presented a challenge during the process of data analysis. Transcription was an intensive and tedious process; it could take up to six hours to transcribe a single hour conversational data. This is so because transcription required several playbacks of the recorder to accurately capture the utterances. Any attempt to speed up the process would have compromised the transcript quality. The researcher would therefore put on hold the transcription for several weeks until she could find enough time for the same. This slowed down the study and it indeed took longer to complete than the researcher had earlier envisaged.

7.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The research reported here opens up a number of avenues for future research. First, over the course of discussion of the nature of the argumentative talk shows, some points of convergence and divergence with other types of talk; for instance, ordinary conversation and news interview have been highlighted. It is with this in mind that we wish to suggest a comparative account that would open up more linkages which may not have been subjected to scrutiny. Such a study could take interest in paralinguistic elements such as intonation, pause, stress and other non verbal cues. These could increase insights and understanding of the discourse beyond words.

Second, dimensions to text or discourse analysis include first, micro levels (e.g. vocabulary and syntax) and macro levels of text structure, as well as
interpersonal elements in a text. The second dimension is analysis of discourse practices. This looks at how a text is constructed and interpreted, and also how it is distributed. The third dimension is analysis of social practices, focusing in particular on the relation of discourse to power and ideology. This study focused on the macro level: the structure of the text, with very little attention paid on the vocabulary and syntax. Future researchers could take an analysis of language structures using the tools of Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis to analyze the transitivity of sentences and use of passives and nominalizations.

The understanding which audiences bring to broadcast media, their evaluative reactions to discourse styles, their preferences for other variables, the situations in which they receive media texts would be crucial to an approach to media discourse. In addition, as radio and TV programming is becoming more interactive, it would be interesting to conduct a survey on the wider audience to explore the role of contributions through viewers’ call-in sessions and comments in social media platforms such as twitter in shaping the argumentative talk show genre. Such a study analysis would provide a basis for exploring the responses of the audience to the media texts to establish if they meet the intended goals-to influence opinion. This is a concern that was not pursued in this study.

The conclusions that have been drawn here were based on the examination of argumentative talkshows conducted in English. It would be necessary to
analyze talk shows conducted in vernacular stations, which are on the rise in the media industry in Kenya, in order to verify if the conduct observed and the features of language identified are specific to talk shows conducted in English only.
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TOPIC: TIDES OF TERROR

T1 H: Welcome, thanks for staying with us, you are watching our special coverage ‘Tides of Terror’ now on Checkpoint. We want to analyze the radicalization of youths in this country, check a look at the security forces and the effort of stemming terror in this country and you are free to reach us on twitter, we are using the hash tag tonight tides of terror. You can also send your messages to the number 22115. Let me introduce my panel tonight. On my extreme left we have A who is a former security analyst who has worked in the country for over 30 years and he will be bringing his expertise. Right next we have S who has a great history of Somalis in Kenya and who has also authored a book ‘Blood in the runway’ Which details the Wagalla Massacre, there after we have K who spearheads the ‘Nyumba kumi initiative’ and he will take a look at how this can be used to in the fight against terror. Then we have M, the police spokesman. Thank you all for joining us this evening.

Let’s start by understanding how we got to this point. We talking about radicalization, a very new term in the Kenyan ……… This did not just start yesterday. Let’s us start with you A, can you just explain how we got to this point.

2 P1: Radicalization actually has a long history in Kenya. In fact radicalization leads to violence when genuine grievances are ignored by the authority, for example land, racial discrimination…….. And when genuine means fails, there is only one way of dealing with it, people turn to violence. If you look at some part of South Africa, racial discrimination led to violence in the nation.

3 H: The effect starts to show much later and the anger is deep seated among us among some people who feel marginalized for a long time……

4 P2: I look at the Somali factor, in Kenya what is happening in Mombasa, and the problem of marginalization started in 1963 and we have news to show the same in1989, 1978 news looking at Somali as parasites, look at other news, Kenya government has marginalized the Somali for 50 years. Now Kenya is facing three things: the Somali factor, Islamic extremism that we have talked about and the change in technology. The media…… so put those three together and you have a time bomb. So what we are facing is really bigger than it has been presented……. putting 6000 people in a camp is not a solution, its creating more terrorists.

5 H: Alright, alright

6 P2: More terrorists every night

7 H: We shall get to the government and K, having been in the government….. and for the years S has been detailing, what do you think the government has been doing towards contributing to radicalization
Actually, the matter is more complex than it has been detailing. go to the time of independence, go to the time of referendum, when the maasai were being left in Tanzania, Uganda and others are in Somalia…… the world……. Kenya becoming the low pressure belt, look at the whole process setting the whole country……. do not look at it from a narrow point of view.

When you are in government were you looking at it from a wider point of view

The... that used to be there even throughout the provincial committee of ethnic kind of balance. Say like Murang’a when I look back for sure, I can tell you that the country continues growing, but have some upheavals. For example, the suffering of some people, the disagreement that are there….. we are asking, why are you killing people who are worshipping, why are you killing our leaders? We look at devolving security to the lowest level.

And nyumba kumi is one of those means?

Yes

We will get to that in a moment but let us now bring it to the police and try it the present day…… there is what is happening in Eastleigh and there have been complains about bribery taking place, and complains that we hear from people like S on what is being conducted.

Thank you eh…… I don’t think the government is entirely at fault here because when such an operation is conducted, it is normally conducted in utmost good faith. I don’t think the government could be any happier to vilify its own citizens or… but there are issues here of security at hand. So who are we after? And how do we get to them? So what is happening here is that if you have been screened, people have been screened but we have to appreciate since the operation started people who have been accounted for they have been set free. We have been receiving complains that eh eh people have been illegally held……. and people have been asked for money to be set free…. But Kenyans, either from Somali origin or other ethnic group Kikuyus, Luos, Kamba, have been arrested …… and have been picked from that place ….. they have been verified to be of Somali origin…. And they are underage, these people are being verified through their parents….. they say whether I am Kenyan, I am in school, My parents are so and so……. so they come out eventually.

M, many ask why this is happening. Now you are in Eastleigh... Right? with several barricades right within Eastleigh itself. Why was this not being done in a systematic way and even what the Deputy President said “tutamwaga polisi “

Previously, we must also understand that Kenya is a country with laws, it has a constitution that gives freedom of movement…… it.....

A lot of refugee are here right?

Eeh we are a situation where we label Kenya a terror zone. We need a situation where..... but now, security has been provided on a daily basis, in order of say priority in order of necessity. Because we don’t want to scare everybody else.
19 H: Ok, ok. my question though is, how did all these people who if you claim were not meant to be there in the first place?

20 P4: Yes…

21 H: And and got through our borders, got to Daadab refugees camp and got to the city. Many would say you are putting the cart before the horse because……

22 P4: You see Y., some people are taking advantage of the goodness of Kenya because I witnessed……

23 H: The goodness or bribery? Because they obviously willing to get here on a clean course…..

24 P4: I think, eh this is the first instance, if it’s the goodness of Kenyans, because the bribery process if it is there, and if it is investigated, if there are officers who are engaging in this, these officers are in big big big trouble. We want to use the facts……. Now the issue of people coming into Eastleigh, into Mombasa, into Nairobi, they are supposed to be in refugee camps, they are supposed to be in Kenya but with documents, either travelling visas……. This now is something we are working on because we know Kenya is a country that does not operate without rules.

25 H: Really it is.

26 P4: Yes

27 P2: What we are convinced is If you are in court for for…..

28 H: 24 hours

29 P2: 24 hours, what happens if it is 4 days…… it takes a lot of people

30 H: And that is an interesting question. Let’s see, we have so many people who have been arrested.

31 P2: Yes . that’s….

32 H: Why…..

33 P4: I think we didn’t have 6000 people there not even a 1000 people…. I told you I was there personally these people are less than 500…… ha……ha

34 H: Not Kasarani…..

35 P4: It is It is…..

36 H: But in addition to people who are in Kasarani, we hear, there are 400 people who have been taken to Kasarani today. Following the Likoni…. You recall, more than a 100 youths were arrested.

37 P4: Yes
49 of them were charged with loitering which then means you do not have information that they were arrested?

When an arrest is made, there has to be justification. An officer will have a big problem trying to prove his case in court and nobody will be taken to court if the officer has no credible case against this person…. remember we have cases collapsing in court because officers…..

If you insist on cases collapsing in court, eeh you cannot talk of warrants because these are provisions for their privacy. If somebody goes to court in the current regime and say that…… was scared did you find a gun and you even didn’t find a grenade and you searched that house without a search warrant, the judge will throw it away.

Now, now

What what context of law are you using in your operation in Eastleigh?

Unless you are saying there is an article that says here that a constitution can be suspended if there is an emergency. That means that everyone’s right can be suspended.

This is a security operation that we must all appreciate that.

I agree…… that, that the constitution that has a section 24 which also states that we have limitations in how we conduct ourselves

Section 24?

Let’s take a look at that section 24

Section 24 ……eh a right or fundamental freedom in the Bill of Rights shall not be limited except by law. Which law? That is the question because in this case you are searching people’s houses.

But in the interest of security because……

I am ,I am a muslim,I am a citizen I have rights. You cannot come to my house and tell me that you are protecting me…..aren’t you are making me suffer? You are not protecting me .

Now that…..are you happy that the police are able to take the evil from the people

If if you take this person to a court of law and you are told you cannot take this person any further because you have not investigated him…

Then you will have the same individuals come back on the streets

Yes, the same crooks out there……

But it is not that because this thing has been haphazardly
I am actually on the front line of ….I live in Eastleigh

Okey….okey

Have you been arrested or stopped?

I have been several times, but because I can speak several languages ……

Several languages, is it the language or…..

Gentlemen, though I think we need to clarify what part in the law gives you the justification to conduct the operations that you are conducting

I may not be able to give…..

Or should it be that these are extra ordinary times and therefore the law should not be applied. Are you saying that?

We are saying so many lives are at risk and we must bring sanity back. They need to know that the government can protect them but they need to know that do not have time and place to cause insecurity

We support……

Aha

We support the police but we don’t want to live in a country that has become……

………..

Okey, alright we will get to K., I will get to you in a moment. A while we are still talking about the police, let’s talk about how much we are investing in the police service and whether they are equipped enough for these times of terror.

Yeah I think, the Kenya Police Service Act has never been enacted. We went into the election in 2013 without a unified police force. There was the operation linda nchi which was in place but 400-450 officer have been killed by the Al shabab

450 police officer killed in the line duty since the operation Linda took off.

Yes

That a big number that should get us acting

We are focusing on what is going on in Eastleigh

Mmh

Last week, a vehicle that was discovered with explosives having been driven from Mandera by some Al shabaab all the way to Mombasa. We are still holding people in Kasarani….
Yes, because since that time, since we went into Somalia, there have been attacks, 25 of those the Al shabab have claimed responsibility and you know…….

This is the problem, as you said it …but the Kenya police and immigration office. There are 200 kilometers into Kenya so they do not care who comes. If you get to that point you can cross the Tana river and come to Nairobi whenever you want. The border Tana river bridge is not……. Are we looking at Kenya which is divided into two halves, one have nobody cares about in terms of security Mandera, Garissa nobody is caring. But you are trying to protect…….

Borders.

Borders…… Security…..

Border in Tana River which is one checkpoint. We have chechpoints literally in all strategic points but again the porosity of the border so we have got so many unauthorized and illegal…….

So one of the effort in terms of security is…….

Thank you very much. Since the IGP came into office he has made a strong case to ensure that there is order in the police service. One, through ensuring there is……

Such as?

Equipment. Motor vehicle to enable us the officers to survey the border in a way that they are able identify any elements coming but also the number because on its own will not be enough…….

So …so

So we are working on the number and you have seen the effort of the government to increase the number of the officers. We are also working on the mobility.

Let’s…… let’s have some specifics

What specifics?

Because when you look at Mandera point one…….

Border point 1

Border point 1, how many police officers do we have there?

We may not give numbers out rightly, but eh it is suffice to say have officers who are right now able to contain the situation with limited resources

They are able to do that?

Let me respond to that
I was in Garissa

Yes

And it was fantastic to hear that Garissa.....the people were telling us this is what happened. Every time there is a bomb, we have told the police no no. We as leaders will now take it up. We want to introduce ‘Jua Jirani Yako’ initiative.......you are in a meeting......know the person on your left, know the person on your right, know the one infront, know the other one all the motorcycles, have your name written......

Alright, let us talk about the effectiveness of ‘nyumba kumi’ so far

Yes

How effective?

Devolve, devolve so that everybody.....

You are saying nyumba kumi

Yes

Nyumba kumi will work in Eastleigh where all these things that you are claiming to be happening. This operation may not have been necessitated if people felt that they could trust the police

What I’m saying is......

Let me.....

Okey finish.....

Give the people opportunity so that everybody becomes sensitive to what they be, sensitive to what they hear and then within the capacity of the citizens we ensure, they are empowered. We tell the police officer also you have got to be trusted.

I would like to ask for some timelines and may be S you can tell us....... Timelines, you are saying it’s just starting.

I would say that the number 6000 is on the social media, it’s on facebook, it’s everywhere and nobody has come out to say they are 500, I am only hearing it from you. How many of them speak Somali? You are going to raid homes of a certain ethnic community that speaks a specific language to communicate amongst themselves.

Allow me...... allow me to say this, if they speak as you are claiming who speaks the Somali language..... but we also have people who speak Kiswahili and English.

Kiswahili

No problem...... What?
But the people we are looking at should be able to speak Swahili which is the national language.

How many if you go deep in Nyanya I have been there, those people do not speak Swahili…

At all?

At all

I have been there, those people use Kiswahili even in church 99% of Kenyans speaks Swahili

I think that is that is the most outrageous eh eh thing that…….

I think…..

With respect….. no one seems no one appears to object the assertion that we have failed to enforce the police force…. The reality of the matter is that

I would like to talk about ……. Whether all this looks like a quick fix. we see an attack in Likoni, we see a grenade blow up in Eastleigh…… we see aah some explosives assembled in Pangani, we see…… then we have the police who start vetting thousands of people in the country. Can we talk about…… probably as we come to the close of our discussion about making this more sustainable, about how we can win this fight, about it being more of intelligence gathering….. let’s talk about the long time solutions because to some extent and while many Kenyans appreciate what is happening it sometimes appears like a knee jerk reaction.

Y., I think the biggest problem we are having right now is for the people to try and agree that we can fight terrorism or insecurity generally using the security agency. It is an undertaking where everybody needs to be involved. Unfortunately even as the government brings initiative, community policing there are people who are saying simply because there are some people who are comfortable with how things are and they are now taking advantage of the previous problems ….

So in your view, what is your solution now? What will make Kenya feel safer because it can now happen when you are in a matatu, it can happen in the bus stop?

These things are normally stored where people are, they are normally transported among people. The public needs to trust us, give us information. Don’t wait….

And you give them a reason to trust you?

They can trust us because now, they are dealing with a police entity which has changed. Nobody would be incompetent.

Okey, do you also have intelligence gathering, you know as opposed to asking the resident to come to you and to tell you ‘we know what is happening here…..’

Yes that’s why we are having some of these people getting interdicted.
Is there a shoot to kill order now that the commander of Mombasa has said it? Is there a shoot to kill order?

Eeh, the police do not have a shoot to kill order. We are advised to use the arms in extreme dire situations, and not to kill, to immobilize……

So there is no shoot to kill order?

There is no shoot to kill order.

K

The solution is to get every citizen, every leader get involved in securing the areas they are living in. We need to change the mindset within our police officers. The syllabus got to be revisited so that it comes to their service. The citizens must be helped…… and the definition of the police service is that proactive system which happened even before colonialism. Where there is order for social economic growth

Please give us the status update, Nyumba kumi and when a Kenyan can start to feel its effect.

Let's look at it this way…… the visit that we had with the intelligence committee and the security all of them we finished last Thursday in Garissa. We are standardizing the way they form those clusters. Take it from me. Let those committees take their traditionally set systems, there are others which have been set, what we don’t want are the vigilantes and now each cluster and their leaders…

So when is this going to happen? Is it already happening?

Yes, it is already happening

But there are people who might say ‘ we are not feeling the nyumba kumi.’

Where you are staying…… We have a gated community, we have a neighborhood association and we are bringing it closer that they are able to help the law enforcement agencies and the citizen to come closer.

Alright

Because if you listen to him talking, you can tell he is not happy because he doesn’t think that the leaders in Eastleigh have been consulted adequately as soon as……

Okey

As soon as this operation takes off, we take it that people in these committees will…… So that we keep off those operations. Tell Garissa to give you examples of what they have done.

Okey

Ask, ask…… he will tell you.
151 H: Alright, okey…..

152 P2: The nyumba kumi was imported from a neighbouring country called Tanzania

153 P3: Not necessarily

154 P2: Actually it is, actually it is….

155 P3: I must, I must…… the whole world knows

156 P2: It is, it is……

157 P3: The world knows

158 H: We are closing our discussion

159 P3: Don’t allow, don’t allow

160 H: Okey

161 P3: Tanzania……

162 P2: It is the idea

163 H: Bwana K let us have S finish…

164 P2: We don’t have to borrow from Tanzania. What we need to borrow is that. When Boston marathon happened, did the Americans go…and nothing like 6000 people in jail. You are bringing two issues that are not related. Hinduism and terrorism are not related.

165 H: So you do not see any relationship to

166 P2: There is no relationship. There are refugees who are terrorists, there are refugees who are not terrorists, So we are bringing in two issues that are not related together. So we should say what we are doing now, we are killing a mosquito with a hammer.


168 P4: Lemmie

169 H: Oh, you wanted to interject? Very quickly, we are running out of time.

170 P4: I think we are getting the sentiments, but we are pursuing people in and these are people who are not where they are supposed to be…

171 H: Okey

172 P4: Another day the Kenyans will thank us for that.

173 H: Alright… A
174 P1: In fact there is a situation that has led to a situation of military command to fight terrorism, has led to killing of policemen at westgate … the thing is, we are ignoring the fact that we are not implementing any security legislation…

175 H: This is one of the issues you are going to address? Exactly the legislation on security

176 P4: Yes

177 H: You are not concerned that if is not being……

178 P2: This idea…… Like the shoot to kill order. This is 1988 when the president then, M gave a shoot to kill order for poachers we are still losing elephants and

179 H: Rhinos

180 P2: Rhinos shoot to kill order has not been effective

181 H: Alright, alright. I think your parting shot

183 P3: My parting shot is very simple

184 H: Okey in a minute

185 P3: My parting shot is simple. In an international TV, let’s avoid being insensitive to the victims. Either of terror or even losing our police officers, because we…the constitution doesn’t have the duties and the responsibilities of citizens.

186 H: So you are taking us back to the citizens and…

187 P3: Let’s take it back to the citizens

188 H: Okey

189 P3: So that they participate effectively so that we avoid these what we are calling major lapses in the systems.

190 H: I think we leave it at that. Gentlemen we thank you very much for joining us on our discussion tonight, our special coverage ‘Tides of Terror’. I just want to read you one tweet from…… You say ‘so ironic that the war against Al shabab is successful in Somalia and failing in Kenya…….’ keep your views coming and remember that hash tag is at tide of terror.
TOPIC: JUBILEE AND CORD CROSS-TALK ULTIMATUMS

T1H: Thanks for staying with us. You are on Checkpoint. The number to use is 22155 and twitter is hash tag Checkpoint. We are analyzing the state of the nations’ 51 years of madaraka and today we are discussing quite a bit and we hope to get as much as we can. My guests tonight Prof. A and K K. Thanks for both making time to be with us. Now that ‘baba’ is here, ‘baba’ is back, the issue of national dialogue. Members of CORD are saying this has been misinterpreted. Prof A. I want to give you a chance and I want you to respond to that…. What exactly does national dialogue means? What will be the terms for that?

2P1: Well I am glad that it is in the media so that it is not misunderstood. But you know we have some very urgent issues that are of national importance…… The issue of security is not an issue we can only leave to the government. It is a national issue requiring the participation of everybody. Particularly the many parties in the nation, the issue of tribalism, the nation is more divided than ever before. And the issue of the cost of living, I mean we cannot postpone these issues.

3H: So the national dialogue will be to what end?

4P1: That’s what I’m trying to tell you. The dialogue will try to come up with a joint programme to deal with these issues which we will all adopt. I think for no reason we have been talking on cross purposes. We gave not more than two months because these are very urgent issues.

5H: Alright, and we shall come back to ……eh… that deadline that has been given by CORD that is by July 7th.

6H: Senator K why is Jubilee against the idea of national dialogue? Is it the idea that Jubilee has the solution to all problems to get any ideas from the others in the country?

7P2: Thank you ….. the said dialogue everybody who has spoken from the President… to myself today in Tharaka Nithi and many other leaders including A in Dhujis, we have said one, we have been encouraging dialogue and some of the issues that CORD is saying we believe there are other issues including the issue of the wage bill under the new constitution which is too heavy on the people of Kenya. We have one of the most expensive constitutions in the world. So the idea of dialogue is not a new thing. What is new to us are ultimatums, threats and incitement of the public in the face of young men in the stadia, to excite them and cheat them that somebody somewhere has taken away what really belongs to them, and pretending like the country is celebrating one year of independence, yet we are celebrating 51 years of independence. In other words what the Jubilee government is trying to resolve are problems that have been created over the last 50 years by people like Prof A N. and others who have been government ministers for decades.

8H: Alright, and we need to get to some of the promises that the Jubilee government gave and we realize in the beginning you did say that it is very clear that the Jubilee
government is up for dialogue, however yesterday at Uhuru Park right after the statement that was made by the former Prime minister __ the Deputy President was on record saying there will be no dialogue….. and today we see the president saying there will be dialogue but with certain limitations Senator K.

9P2: …..We are entitled to put the record correct. The same way CORD is entitled to clarify what they meant. Our understanding and I listened very well and watched the statements mainly by the former Prime minister and the former VP, especially the former VP __ said eh, we cannot have a government which does not represent everyone in Kenya, so we have to sit down and all of us then has everyone on board and…… With the grand coalition and…..

10H: And …. and …. I will take you back to my question which was about the Deputy President --- saying no dialogue.

11P2: But I…. I in my statement today clarifying on after the statement made by__ and__ but after yesterday what we got from CORD yesterday is like they want us to sit down, create an imaginary crisis, and start now forming some grand coalition government like what we had with Kibaki full of quarrels, trouble and competition.

12H: Senator A, where do you think this idea of perhaps reviving the coalition government came from. Could it be perhaps from ___ statement that a government cannot be formed by 60% the people coming from outside of and that if there will be no dialogue before sabasaba wataenda nyumbani. Do you think that’s the pace where that could be coming from?

13P1: You know, I have always said I have always said it’s not good really to try and see simple solutions to complex problems like my friend is trying to do. Of course I can understand Jubilee’s worry about the government of national unity because there are only quarrelling about what there is…. I mean there is… to be shared, the meat is small…… But we do not want to have a government of national unity or grand coalition…… No no no we don’t…… I wouldn’t want to be in that government…. I mean, there is so much crises that anybody in CORD would want to be there. I don’t think so. But what we mean is…… when you think about government of Kenyans, and Ruto himself today said the government should be for all Kenyans…. We examine government as a whole. Not just cabinet, go down to the parastatals, to the civil service, to ministries and so on. It is a shame when

14H: Okey

15P2: Just a small comment

16H: Okey.

17P2: __ excepts the private secretaries who had to apply by the Public Service Commission and shortlisted for that matter…..

18H: Okey.

19P2: Aaaah….. __ has not appointed over 200 parastatal as we speak some because of the legal reasons and some because of the reforms on structure……
20H: So is it’s an imaginary crisis

21P2: It is imaginary. The standards that the President is supposed to meet a certain threshold when appointing are there. And the people who feel that threshold has not been met they can go to court so let us not create an imaginary mentality that somehow there have been some jobs given to some people and other left out, That’s not true.

22H: You talked a while ago about Jubilee taking over the problems of the previous government. However does it mean the rise in insecurity, terrorism cases, the promise that was made by the Jubilee government itself, laptops, does the rose in the cost of living we are seeing are by the previous government? Case in point. Look at the comments/ remarks that have been made by the Inspector General on matters like tinted windows… It looks like it’s a government that is at odds with itself and not in control and perhaps that what CORD might be requiring.

23P2: …… Three things one, the insecurity problems. The Jubilee government has employed last year alone 10’000 new police officers

24H: How? But we still see attacks?

25P2: Just a moment, Just a moment vehicles we fuel and from 1st July every police officer will have a life insurance but that has not been done as we thought. Equipment but there are other structural issues amid police reforms and that’s why we are saying this dialogue that CORD is talking about is dialogue that could help us to do the structural and legal issues and I could have expected especially instead of doing a rally..

26H: Right what would you want?

27P2: We would want legislation. I would be happy to see a theme on national security sponsored by the leaders of minority in the Senate or in the National Assembly. I would be the first to support him.

28H: Though we talk about the reforms in the police sector.

29P2: Yes.

30H: There is still a great deal of insecurity; there are still a number of attacks in the country. Over the last year many Kenyans have lost their lives not to mention Westgate. Take a look at Wajir and Mandera attacks going on as we speak. The reforms that you are talking about perhaps have not been felt by Kenyans.

31P2: Even though we had Sabaot defense forces in 2005, we have had Kikambala, the 1998 bomb blast. I think it’s good to put things in context Y., by saying in a nutshell whatever ___ has done in the last one year is not enough to resolve all the crises. I want to mention something very quickly that its very important to be sober. Don’t use the 1980 tactic of inciting people and exciting poor youths in the rallies because the window now is open. Even if Jubilee was not interested in carrying out dialogue.

32H: Ehe
33P2: The window is there. But…

34H: But I want Prof comment on that.

35P2: I want to say if I tabled the report of the President on national security last year which he tabled in both houses and I know paragraph 44 of the report says what he wants to do. Now he wants to restructure the security sector especially the National Intelligence Sector.

36H: Aha…

37P2: I thought they should have picked up from there and given us ideas on how that can be done.

38H: They are…. Jubilee is saying the revolution and the significance you put towards sabababa. Everyone is wondering what happens if this dialogue doesn’t take place by sabababa. What is the new strategy that we hope to see from CORD. Will you take reigns of the government by illegitimate means?

39P1: You know Y., it’s important to say the truth. The government has said they want dialogue, isn’t it? So if they want dialogue, saying that we want dialogue within two months…

40P2: We have been doing it.

41P1: Should not be a problem. Sabababa should not scare them. Apparently they are very scared of the power of the people. It is the power of the people that brought it.

42H: That you do not want dialogue?

43P1: No, the point is some questions are rhetorical. They are rhetorical in that old parties… they want dialogue. All we said we want dialogue by this date because the government has been saying they want dialogue without any structure of dialogue put down.

44H: Okey.

45P1: And it is important when we say, when you make a statement, you give a person a certain framework in institutional management, time framework is important.

46H: So

47P1: Why is time framework frightening them? Secondly, it is very unfortunate that my dear friend Senator K. is speaking very disparagingly about the youth, very about the people. These are Kenyans with their rights under the constitution to assemble and to speak. That’s their constitutional right. Even if they exercise that right, with their leaders, and you sit here and talk disparagingly about them. That tells a lot about you regime.

48H: Alright…. Senator your role and the role of the opposition in terms of keeping the government in check. The opposition has not had a very good run lately and we shall
get specifically to ODM having failed in the election and now having ODM talking about disbanding the IEBC. We don’t seem to have a lot of alternative solutions. Is what a lot of Kenyans are saying

49P1: Really interesting

50H: How would you deal with Anglo leasing for example?

51P1: Very interesting. You know we have all the lies that Jubilee tell. A very detailed document which I would want to hand over to my friend because you are the people who think we don’t have alternatives. Yet when you do things like these are you send to them…… You don’t read………… and my friend say we only analyse the President and we don’t have alternatives.

52P2: There are no alternatives

53P1: No no no…it’s unfortunate that Jubilee has an all know attitude

54P2: That’s not true, that’s not true

55P1: They know everything. That’s a dismissive attitude. It’s very interesting he says he can read this document and he knows nothing about it. It’s very interesting.

56P2: You know, You see… Y.,you know…

57P1: It’s very interesting

58P2: Y., Two things, one, there are no alternatives here and I have said again and I want to repeat. CORD has no number in the Senate and in the National Assembly. If they seriously wanted to use those numbers to move this country to the next level, they can do a tremendous job…

59P1: But we are doing it.

60P2: I have not seen a single Bill…

61P1: There are three Bills.

62P2: Sponsored by the leader of minority because those are private member bills……..

63P1: Those those …those

64P2: Private member bills……. but have not seen a party position where you say this is what CORD will discuss and give solutions on this and this problem.

65P2: I want to say look for instance.

66P1: I will say it

67P2: My brother here whom I respect a lot is accusing us of knowing it all and being arrogant. We are not arrogant.
68P1: You are very arrogant

69P2: We are very humble because the fact……

70P1: In fact the last two days, If you were listening to what you people were saying……

71P2: The fact, the fact

72P1: I was surprised at what you were saying that this was a presidential material. You know……

73P2: That’s a topic for another day. Let me finish. You know the problem with CORD is what I would call the Pharisee syndrome. The holier than thou deceptive syndrome.

74H: Some… say……

75P2: If you are here talking about insecurity and the lapses we have seen on our borders and the scams we have seen in our immigration and passport control processes.

76H: Right

77P2: You would want to ask yourself who has been the minister for immigration for the last so many years…CORD!

78H: ‘Okey but let us

79P2: CORD today because they were defeated in an election…… they want to show the public

80H: Allow me to interject. We may not really talk about the past. Jubilee right now, is it in the way?

81P2: Sure

82H: From the issues that are in play in Kenya today

83P2: We do not want people to mislead Kenyans

84H: I agree with you even though the government originated from the previous regime, you are the ones who are in power today.

85P2: And the system……last month we broke ground for the forensic lab. So we are working on these things.

86H: Right

87P2: The speed could have been better and this spirit that is coming now although incidentally because CORD realized that people are not interested in this coalition thing, so they switch and started talking about discussing……

88H: Alright, alright
89P2: So we want to welcome CORD together with all other stakeholder to come so that they can help us to speed up.

90H: I would like us to shift gears for this conversation because you have just talked about the things…

91P2: The challenges

92H: Yes I would like you to address the challenges as we close our discussion

93P1: Can I, can I make a few corrections?

94H: Alright.

95P1: You know quite a number of projects Jubilee say there are implementing, were initiated during the previous government. The thing is government projects will take time to come to fruition. Fortunately, they have borne fruits in their government….. and they should not tell the people that are the Jubilee projects. No, they were there during the grand coalition government……..

96H: Yes

97P1: They are part of vision 2030, they are unfortunately

98H: So this is the same way, they are……

99P2: You know…They have…

100H: Senator, senator let’s talk about the challenges that the Jubilee government has faced over the last one year and as we conclude, how you are going to sort that out. There are a lot of Kenyans who are unsafe today, going to the market, being in a matatu, being in a shopping mall, no matter where they are, there is a real threat of insecurity. We have seen a rising since Jubilee won power, something we have not seen in the previous regime….. what are you telling Kenyans. Tell us the challenges you are facing and how you are planning to tackle them so that one year from now we will have a different discussion.

101P2: Thank you. The issue of insecurity is very worrying. We do not want to pretend that it doesn’t worry us to see Kenyans leaving in fears and they need to venture out and enjoy their lives and enterprise. One area that must improve is the security sector especially with the regard to the effort that our men and women in uniform make toward national emergency and terrorists attacks because like what we saw in Westgate.

103H: Yes

104P2: It’s very embarrassing to say the least and in four days, a bunch of four terrorists took hostage of the whole country and the problem was because

105H: Yes
106P2: because of lack of coordination and that is a legal problem because the KDF act, if you read it together with the police act, it does not provide a situation where the military, the police and the paramilitary can work together in an operation.

107H: Mmh

108P2: In a synthesized manner

109H: I need to rush you because of time

110P2: No problem, so, so… we need a bill that will provide us with a legal framework that will enable us to move on to emergencies……

111H: Very quickly, the issue that is for Jubilee only, laptops. When will those standard one children get laptops….

112P2: As soon as eh eh the battles and the court cases before the contractors

113H: Do you think that is the reason Jubilee has not met the promise?

114P2: Of course, of course

115H: Right

116P2: It’s not our making. The matter is in the court of law, we wait for the court of law

117P1: I think, I think…

118H: Prof

119P1: Lawyers have a very important ways of outsourcing their problems. Courts exists to solve social problems

120H: Alright

121P1: In this case madam, it is out of corruption…corrupt deals in acquiring laptops, that is why the matter is in court

122P2: I am not aware, I am not aware

123P1: Of course you are not aware

124P2: What I’m aware of…

125P1: Of course

126H: Senator, senator, lets wind up on this, senator A just give us the way forward and what we are likely to see from the national dialogue you are talking about and what the way forward for the country about the opposition keeping the state in check and ensuring that the citizens get their fair share of……
127P1: … Must understand that the role of the opposition is to keep the government in check but not the responsibility of the opposition to make them perform their duties. The government must rise up to the occasion and not wait for the opposition to remind it what it should do but if Kenyans feel that the government is not doing their duties, and feel it’s the duty of the opposition to remind it well……… But the government has the duty to follow the constitution and the rule of law. If they do not this they have no business being in government

128H: Alright and that’s where we leave our discussion tonight. Keep your comments coming in as we continue with our discussion on Checkpoint on the state of the nation, which way forward after 51 years of self-rule. I will be sampling your comments. We thank you senator A and senator K, taking a short break. KTN Prime live news coming in shortly.
APPENDIX 3: CITIZEN TV1-OPINION COURT

TOPIC: JUBILEE WRANGLES

T1H: And ah welcome back to the programme. We want to welcome your news on ‘Opinion Court’. You could text us at 22422 or you could tweet us hash tag citizen Kenya, #citizen TV, #__ and we would like to hear your feedbacks. Lemmie introduce my panel in the studio tonight. On my immediate right is Dr. C. He is an ODM member of parliament and definitely in the CORD coalition. Then in the middle we have Prof. E. K. our resident political analyst and seated across me is Senator K. M. gentlemen welcome. I want to start with you Prof. to set the stage for us. We have seen a lot of bickering and wrangling perhaps in the past two weeks in the Jubilee Coalition and it was thought that this coalition may not last because many thought really what brought it together at the time of election was that there was the unhappy marriage with the ICC that forced the two principals to work together. Now with the wrangles that are emerging a year down the line. What do you make of it?

T2P1: It’s it’s totally no surprise, this marriage was not meant to last. Political practice across the world demonstrated that. In fact if you look at the traditions in the past, in Europe, you will see that most people pursue their politics based on the lines advised by Nicole Machiavelli. Those who helped you to come to power must be destroyed for you to stay. So people who make political coalitions without that awareness have themselves to to to blame. So in my opinion the bickering and the cracks you are watching and witnessing is actually going to climax upto the final party because they are going to be in the same party where one person says they are superior or they are sharing presidency and power is not shared. So in this case the preparation is on the way, finally the coalition will break and the deputy president unfortunately will be the sufferer if the coalition breaks because the script is written.

T3H: I want eh, Senator__ I want you to respond to what you have heard and what you expect since you are a leader from the region. Tell us what you believe the wrangling is about from the region.

T4P2: Well, first of all, the Prof. is completely wrong because aah this script that he is talking about was written and says that……. A leader from a Kalenjin and Kikuyu will never come together. They lied to ___ that 20% of the votes in the Rift valley will go to him. If it is true what the professor is saying, then his hypothesis that the reason for the wrangles is President ___, on the contrary, wrangles are within URP itself. It’s not between URP and TNA. And we must appreciate that the........... triggered in the last 10 years in this country was ah crying for nusu mkate, consultation and that kind of thing. So the script for the 10 years, Kenyans are surprised that we have a president and a deputy that are working so close, joking in public, working together….. and unfortunately, for a few of our leaders ..... from where I come from, they thought that when we said 50-50, 50 were Kalenjins and 50 Kikuyus......

T5P1: Of course it was

T6P2: So the what there is
T_H: What was 50-50?

T_0P_1: Of course it was between URP and TNA

T_0P_2: It was Kalenjin and Kikuyu. Unfortunately, what is coming out from those who have been agitating for that claiming we have been short changed are trying to say that Kalenjins have been short changed. And ah that’s an unfortunate script because that script and that is why you see the Deputy President saying today….

T_10H: Mmh

T_11P_2: We have come from there…. that is script the one that is basically forgetting that we have a responsibility for national reconciliation. Part of R____’s story is the context of this debate.

T_12H: And eh……

T_13P_2: ____ is not a member of URP. He is a civil servant. And Kenyans who question the manner in which he was transferred…

T_14H: Mmh

T_15P_2: Must, must question from the perspective of how did this civil servant being treated just in the same way. You must ensure that as a leader you must, you must look at civil servants, not from the perspective of URP or TNA but a public servant who must be treated fairly. Two, you cannot transfer…… argument that if ____ probably made a mistake, if she made a mistake, or if the President made a mistake, then Kikuyus made a mistake. That, that dictation, that script was already done in 2008 and we went into elections.

T_16P_1: Just listen, I want

T_17H: Just go on

T_18P_2: If there is a mistake by a person from western you say he is…

T_19P_1: I want, I want….

T_20P_2: You say he is civil servant. Not that he is from Ford Kenya, or from CORD

T_21H: Now, lemmie bring is C to the conversation

T_22P_3: Thank you very much A.. I think the honeymoon in Jubilee is over. And whatever we are seeing, we are yet to see more

T_23H: There is… in the

T_23P_3: Absolutely and whatever mheshimiwa Senator M is trying to put across I don’t think it holds water. These people had an MOU before they came to elections. And the element of 50-50 it is there between URP and TNA. But I want to remind eh senator that this is not a coalition of half mkate at that time…
T₃⁰P₁: Yah

T₃₀P₂: Eeh President ____and eh and eh Prime minister ____ had shared powers. But in this case His Excellency ____ is the President.

T₃₀H: Mmmh

T₃₀P₃: And URP must be able to understand that the President has all powers as put in the constitution. And what is happening currently and you have seen ____ coming on board. It is really time that the URP expectations was that....... and when I talk of URP, it is actually Kalenjin land. If you look at the Kalenjins, all of them actually are in URP, including ____

T₃₀P₂: We have people in KANU

T₃₀P₃: And their expectations are, they think, they should share power halfway with TNA. But this is not happening. We are yet to see more. ____now is celebrated. Last weekend the Deputy President had to go all over Rift valley to put off the fire that ____ has put on board. My friend____...

T₃₀P₂: But..... but....

T₃₀P₃: Is among the legislators who are being accused of being sycophant and probably being with the Deputy President anyhowly without addressing him objectively..... and ... and...

T₃₀P₂: I want to I want to

T₃₀H: Please...please...

T₃₀P₃: There are examples I want to give....

T₃₀H: I understand and you will finish in just a while

T₃₀P₃: Can I finish please

T₃₀H: Alright

T₃₀P₃: The issue of ____coming in. one thing I want to say is, when you read the constitution, it is very clear that you can only bring the issue of impeachment when there is serious violation of the constitution. My friend eh ____ has given eh..._. We have not seen what ____ has done wrong. If it is the issue of transferring ____, he is a public servant and he can be transferred like any other person. So to me, the issue of ____ coming for impeachment it does not hold water at all.

T₃₀H: Alright... but I want to make an apology and a correction on your coming from Ford Kenya so my apologies for that. M. please respond.

T₄₁P₂: Ah... As a matter of fact, this script... There is a fact we are running away from. The script says if a Kikuyu is appointed, there must be a Kalenjin being appointed. The script is saying that if a Kikuyu minister or the president makes a mistake, you must
circulate evidence to accuse Kikuyus. The script ah is what Kenyans are running away from. The truth here is and that is what eh Madela said, when he came out of prison every black South African was baying for the blood of the whites and what Madela did was to stand and say, yes, the people want violence, but I am a leader and you must listen to me. …

T_{42}H: I want to get your views so far and then we shall get the views of _____

T_{43}P_1: Please please….

T_{44}H: Please keep it brief……

T_{45}P_1: Yes. I will keep it brief. I want to give free advice to my friend Senator M.... those who do not respect history will never respect the present and the future and you are one of them in your coalition. If you look at the history of this country from 1963 to now. Look at my script by Machiavelli, those who help you to power must be done away with. Look at Jaramogi and Jomo Kenyatta, what he said that Kenyatta should rule, then the quarrel between the Kalenjins and Kalenjins in URP, but what about the quarrel between Jaramogi Odinda and Tom Mboya and what it did to the people. Then you come to Daniel Arap Moi and the vice president Kibaki, vice president eh Karanja. What happened? They start to to differ. what happened? He did away with them. And he did away them because of causes related to power. Kibaki and Raila Odinga. They agreed they would share government and finally you saw Kibaki say where did I we talk about this? I am the President.

T_{46}H: Now

T_{47}P_1: How can you prove that you are an exception?

T_{48}P_2: I….. I

T_{49}P_1: You cannot, you cannot argue from the …… We must show the facts and….. and…

T_{50}H: Can, can you share your views……

T_{51}P_2: I”m I”m saying, because corruption was there we must put in, because ethinicity was there we must………..

T_{52}P_1: I want to I want to tell you we must……

T_{53}H: Gentlemen, we must, I want to bring another view because part of the woes as you have seen within Jubilee coalition have also been occasioned by the M.P L. who want to impeach ___. Let’s listen to the views of M. N…. And what he has to say about that and if it could catapult into something even bigger.

M. N: If this game is escalated to a point where the President is impeached, and by the way, that is something we must anticipate especially with this impeachment talk. If he is impeached, the beneficially of the impeachment will be ___.

T_{54}H: On what grounds? On what possible grounds would one use to bring up a bid to impeach the President?
M. N: You do not need to have any grounds. It can just be you do not like the shape of his head. And eh recently you do not like the way he walks. If we have numbers, we will impeach him and eh….. look at it if you have the URP members saying that ah we are not with __, because __ seems to be with ___ then you have the CORD members. If you put the two together, then you will have a president with crisis within parliament. But the beneficially of this ultimately will have to be Ruto. So in my view whichever way we look at it, targeting ___ is targeting __ and the beneficially of this. If we read the constitution strictly, will have to be one ___ because if you impeach___, ____ becomes president for the remainder of the term and he can appoint anyone to be his deputy. And he can even appoint ____ to become the Deputy President. And they put a new coalition for the election yet to come.

T55P1: Now……..  

T56H: Hold on Prof. I want to come to you C on this because he has mentioned your coalition leader ___. And there are those who opine that there is still very warm relationship between URP and ODM because of the previous relationship between __ and___. Does that theory that you have just heard resonate with you?

T57P1: I think A__, one thing you need to know is that eh in politics, we do not have permanent enemies and ah permanent friends. So in terms of strategic partnerships in politics is allowed. The same way Senator M. had mentioned about the relationship between the Kikuyus and the Kalenjins. Many pessimists thought it would not work. But eh looking at eh what ____ has just mentioned, the issue of I don’t think ODM has plans of mending woes with URP and TNA. CORD, we are very keen, we want Kenyans to give a report card. Whatever mistakes they made, 2017 is not far. Because, because, the report card of Jubilee is here. We have just seen in Kuria, the issue of insecurity, cattle rustling is there. Indeed the coalition has really gfailed as far as insecurity is concerned. The aspect of corruption has really gone up. The issue of umeployment, the issue of ethinicity. When you look at 70% of the cabinet, is actually between the Kikuyus and the Kalengins. So the issue here why CORD are assembling, they are meeting, they are telling Kenyans, look at the government you elected…

T58H: I will come, we will come to details of what is going on and the rallies. Please hold on to that. Lemmie get the views of the rest of the panel very quickly…… on M’s views.

T59P1: M, he is preparing the President to see the beneficiary of his problems. And that is how___ will destroy him. In fact, what M__ N__ has done is what I have exactly said. He is telling the President, you know the danger for you……. If they impeach you ___ is the beneficiary so watch out on __ And that’s exactly the political script and what we are talking about . M. has used a more, a more complicated language, a little reserved but he could have spoken it openly. What he is saying is check on __ because he is the beneficiary of your problems.

T60P2: A., what M. N. is saying at least I know M. he is my friend. What he is saying is what vultures and brokers in town are doing. Because in all honesty, is what we call
political vultures are doing because they want a political rift between __ and __ so can I confess something?

T₆₃H: Please

T₆₃P₂: The President has once told me eh some of those people just like N. is saying have come to bring gossips to him and when he does his investigation he realizes they wanted a contract here, they wanted a deal here….., so he is not saying things that are hypothetical. He is saying things that are happening. Everyday people walking into Deputy President’s office to tell him the President is a bad man, run away…

T₆₃H: Gentlemen…. We must take a break. When we come back we will be discussing CORD’ planned rallies

BREAK

T₆₄H: Welcome back. Thanks for staying with us on opinion court. Just before we wind up we must discuss the rallies that ah the CORD has been having before the major one and especially the one for welcoming ___ from his trips to the state but first we start by listening to what ___ thinks is the real reason behind CORD’s re-invigoration.

M: They could be working on the African spring. Not fighting the East. CORD has told us they want elections probably before the term of Jubilee expires. Probably they know something that we do not know.

H: And what would that African spring in your opinion look like?

Mi: The insecurity galore……. Being blown up, they want to blow up until we have a situation where we say we have no confidence in this government to be able to deliver. We have that well photographed. Do you remember 43% of polls of 2013 did not vote for the current government. Which means they if you begin to have an avalanche, this could lead to a spring……. A spring that could flow into Uganda, that could go into Rwanda, go into South Sudan and the west has been very good in choreographing such springs. This is the beginning here in Kenya with the current rate of terrorism.

H: Let me start with you Dr. C. He is alleging that the now push, the rallies CORD is holding and telling the public, voice your grievances against the government is a larger scheme to form and African spring? Are you complacent?

T₆₆P₃: I think eh first and foremost we need to understand where M. N. is coming from. In terms of research, you look at the person in terms of truthfulness. This is a gentleman who came up with the issue of tyranny of numbers. So whatever opinion that he comes up with, the aspect of objectivity is not there. M. N. is subjective. He knows where his bread and butter comes from. So I am not going to agree with what he is saying. But whatever is happening eh, A., I don’t think there is any problem for the CORD coalition to assemble to demonstrate what is outlined in article 37 of the constitution. We are justified to hold rallies, and we are here to welcome our CORD leader, ___.

T₆₆H: `And ah, and ah
T_{67}P_{3}: Because many allegations have been there, the issue of terrorism. We don’t want this to be a conspiracy, we go to the rallies and there is a bomb or something. Because we are really watching. The element of terrorism should not be used as an excuse. You realize the Jubilee side had talked of coming up with a rally, which was a fallacy, it was a lie! This was to bring in a confusion so that they ban the rallies which is against the constitution.

T_{68}H: Alright

T_{69}P_{3}: So what we want to tell the Kenyans is that they should turn out in large numbers.

T_{70}H: Alright. wind up

T_{71}P_{3}: And it is going to be peaceful

T_{72}H: Let’s see what M has to say to say to that and please include what you heard from M. N.

T_{73}P_{2}: Ah, ah…… I think what M. is saying… I think is the extreme end. But my point is…. Ah, this homecoming thing in Kenya shows the level of idleness of the opposition. I mean __ goes to America to go and study for a month, you do a homecoming, next time he goes to China for two weeks, you do another homecoming, he goes to the UK……. it is a complete show of idleness and have said so many times.

T_{74}P_{3}: A., A., I think…..

T_{75}P_{2}: I have, I have said……

T_{76}H: Please, please

T_{77}P_{2}: This homecoming has become as, as ah part of the culture of the republic. And I have really seen grownup people without any substance here…. Assemble to meet somebody who has been in a private tour to the US. But the point is……

T_{78}H: For whatever reason……

T_{79}P_{2}: Lemmie come, lemmie come to the ……

T_{80}H: Okey

T_{81}P_{2}: To the issue of the rallies

T_{82}H: Yes

T_{83}P_{2}: The opposition, especially in parliament where my colleague is eh a leader of the coalition in the opposition. In parliament, there is only majority and minority. Ah, when you are the majority or minority, there is a lot of work to be done in doing bills……

T_{84}H: Mmh
In questioning cabinet secretary, questioning the executive in the implementation of the constitution, on the implementation of the Jubilee policy…. there is a lot of work to be done. CORD has 24 governors out of the 47 which is slightly higher by one than the Jubilee….. they should be busy working with these governors on issues…… but now to hold a rally? … I think and I have said….. CORD needs to appreciate one thing.

You can be in opposition but don’t loose your patriotism. You must understand the times. You cannot just tell people we are we are facing insecurity and you are calling for rallies. It should be time to say which rules we need to amend, how we assist the cabinet secretaries in charge of security because you must demonstrate patriotism, but they can have as many rallies as they are because I have seen it is a demonstration of high, high level of idleness.

Alright! Interesting…… a final question to you Prof tonight. And there are many issues that CORD are raising and every Kenyan regardless of which side of political divide they fall are concerned about security, we are all concerned about the cost of living etc. in what constructive way can both side of divide discuss these matters.

Exactly, that is the big question. And we must be concerned, I think we might reach a point where we shall have an Arab spring. And if the people we are going to see on Saturday and the type of ___ and the type of ___ then, then, they cannot bring order in this country. And this is the height of hypocrisy even……. But what, what I want to say is this. This is the reason why we are having this kind of scenario, the person who must have woken up CORD is Jubilee….

Thank you for that. Let’s take in your views. Thanks for sending them out, we will be reading them soon

The coalition was based on a common denominator, ICC, with the cases falling apart they no longer share anything in common

The day we will be run by opinion rather than our ethnic lines we will go far

I think the Jubilee government should be given enough time to lead the country in the best way possible

__ is a genius. The spring theory to me is very true

CORD have wrangles too, its only because they are not in government that it does not show especially ___ and ___.

Thank you for your views there. we are bound by time. Keep sending them, we will read them. And to my guests Dr. C, Prof. K. and Senator K. M. Thank you all and thank you for watching Citizen. God bless you and have a wonderful, wonderful night.
APPENDIX 4: CITIZEN TV2: OPINION COURT

TOPIC: POLITICS POST SABA-SABA

T1H: Thank for staying with us. It’s time for Opinion Court. We welcome your views on our discussion. Please use the following lines to get in touch with us, 22422. You could send your text message. You can tweet us #citizentv Kenya, #citizentv news or # and respective facebook pages. Please use the #opinion court to be able to track your conversation and track your views. Tonight we are discussing ‘Politics Post Saba Saba’ and what does it mean for Jubilee and for CORD. We are going to dedicate the first part our discussion to CORD. I want to start with you Prof……. did Saba Saba leave up to your expectations? Did CORD deliver what you think they had set out to?

T1P1: Yes and no. and ah in the point of yes, they re-emphasized the point that there are problems in this country that require urgent attention. Some were outlined in their programme, and in that, they still delivered because the message continues reaching the people that there is a problem and we all can probably collectively get a solution. But on the other side, my expectations were that in terms of doing business, political business, I expected a different approach in doing it. I didn’t expect the ‘mapambano’ team coming because I think the nation is tired about this ‘mapambano’ story. Fellows who have not been very creative in their politics and offering new solutions. People who have a past that shows that if they, they are given some goodies perhaps they will keep quiet. Soo…. A few fellows were smart like eh __ who is a new fellow on the platform but the old group that were part of CORD and especially ODM, I think I didn’t see anything new. I would still imagine the same 2007 story, 2013 story….. so

T1H: Mmh

T1P1: So in terms of innovativeness, in terms of changing our politics, I saw the same old story so I was very very disappointed.

T1H: O, same have called it an anti-climax. A tsunami was promised and it was sunny blue skies. Is it yet to come?

T1P2: You know ah ah A__ before you determine whether Sabasaba was a success or not, you must ask yourself several questions. Who was giving the yardstick to measure its success? But again, the most important thing, thing……

T1H: Mmh

T1P2: Is to look at Sabasaba and its aftermath in the context of history…

T1H: Mmh

T1P2: Yah, you must look at it from a historical perspective why Sabasaba came and what is its impact……. I would like to remind you and everyone else that eh, this country has achieved the gain the floor of democratic reform, human rights, over a period of time, for a long of time indeed.
T₁₁H: Mmh

T₁₃P₂: If you recall, the 1990 Sabasaba. It was the first sabasaba. It was all about fighting for the introduction of multipartism which was achieved. Then after the introduction of multipartism, there came the issue of constitutional and legal reforms of which would not have been achieved therefore the clamor for legal and constitutional reforms got underway…

T₁₃H: It is a long process you are going through

T₁₄P₂: Yah…. Now the point here is. What this sabasaba was all about

T₁₃H: Which one?

T₁₆P₂: Ah the latest sabasaba was all about the protection of the democratic gains which have been achieved over the years. The sweat and suffering of Kenyans. And more importantly to check on the current regime, the Jubilee regime to blow up the gains that have been achieved over a long period of time.

T₁₇H: And in your opinion it was successful? In what ways? Perhaps raising public awareness on the same?

T₁₉P₂: It was and it succeeded in refocusing the attention of the people

T₁₉H: Mmh

T₂₀P₂: To the current issue that bedevil the country, issues which we have said should be tackled through honest structured dialogue which the Jubilee regime have refused

T₂₁P₁: But…. But…. 

T₂₂H: Right

T₂₃P₁: Just a little response to what mheshimiwa is saying, these issues have been acknowledged they are very important issues, but A., if you look at these issues, look at the messages…… issues of corruption, some of these messengers have been in position in government where they could have sorted out issues of corruption in their own dockets. In the land, in medical services…… what have they done……..

T₂₃H: You are referring to Prof.___

T₂₅P₁: Yes I am giving specific examples……

T₂₆H: Lets, lets seek to hear…..

T₂₇P₁: Yes, yes, because Prof.___ was in medical services at one time, through his declaration nurses were sacked. How do you create jobs by sacking nurses? Its probably they have forgotten that……….. Secondly, they have people in immigration. ___ was in immigration. How much did he work, tangible evidence that he did something to change the level of corruption in immigration. So, I could go on and go
on. So the message they are putting forth is correct. But what most Kenyans are not comfortable about is….. the messengers…..

T₃₉H: Mmh

T₃₉P₁: Some some of the messengers give the impression that and probably if you gave them the responsibility to look after us, they would probably not do the things they are talking about.

T₃₉H: Mmh

T₃₉P₁: So these are the frustrations that I myself as a Kenyan I am going through when I look at the people who are passing the message

T₃₉H: Lemmie get to S. What do you think of the message the Prof has passed? I didn’t want to introduce the Jubilee this early in the conversation but nevertheless. The theory is, the Jubilee is sitting somewhere smug, right? Saying there was no tsunami and as a result it is going to be business as usual, while the fact is there were, as Prof is saying, real issues that were raised and that there has been inaction and even if there has been action, perhaps we have not seen the change that Kenyans envisaged when your team was elected to power.

T₃₉P₃: A. you know if your opponent is talking about your mistakes, it is rude to interrupt them. And CORD is a total failure as an opposition in this country. When Kenyans went to the ballot, they elected a government, and at the time, they elected an opposition. The government was elected legitimately

T₃₉P₂: The government was not elected legitimately

T₃₉H: But for the purpose of our argument, lets us hold it as such

T₃₉P₃: Yes…..

T₃₉P₂: I don’t believe it…

T₃₉P₃: You don’t have to. You don’t have to…..

T₃₉H: Can you continue please…. 

T₃₉P₃: It is ruling. I would expect an opposition that would oppose on issues, an opposition that would tell us look, this is what we would want, not ultimatums. CORD lacks these things; one, originality; two, substance and three, substance

T₄₁H: Let’s talk about substance

T₄₂P₃: Yes

T₄₃H: CORD talked about security. Is security a problem in this country?

T₄₄P₃: It is but when O is saying the success of the rally was to remind Kenyans about the problem they are facing
T₄₅H: Mmh

T₄₆P₃: You don’t have to remind any Kenyan. We are facing serious challenges as a country. There are problems, we know it. But what are your solutions? Have you ever heard any one policy alternative that CORD in the past through their……. Shadow cabinet minister in different dockets. What’s CORD’s plan on security? We have plans and implementing them. It is taking time yes, there are challenges we admit. We would want to see what alternative they have. But in due time, and as soon as it is possible, most of the things will be sorted out. When CORD was busy politicking and actually hurting our economy, you saw the president, he went eh to the land registry to sort out ---’s mess, he went to the airports authority to sort issues which by extension would have been sorted out by____. We have issues of insecurity, he was minister for security when he brought a lot of……….. so we are working. We are doing what most Kenyans expect us to do as government.

T₄₇P₁: But, but

T₄₈H: We are…

T₄₉P₃: Let me speak on that point of originality, credibility and substance……...

T₅₀P₂: No, no….

T₅₁P₃: The people who have been in government are these principals of CORD

T₅₂H: Let’s give mheshimiwa a chance.

T₅₃P₃: So the CORD principals…

T₅₄H: Am sure you are satisfied

T₅₅P₃: I am actually concerned.

T₅₆H: Please go ahead….

T₅₇P₂: Unlike my friend S. who trivializes very serious issues, CORD did not go to Uhuru Park to remind Kenyans of the problems they are facing. Kenyans are very aware of their problems because they feel them

T₅₈P₃: So….. so what solutions do you have to offer?

T₅₉P₂: What Kenyans have done in the past few weeks is to engage in robust conversation among themselves. And this is the conversation to which we are inviting the Jubilee government so that we can have constructive dialogue and look towards how we can chat the way forward and move as a country

T₆₀P₃: Which is okey

T₆₁P₂: Jubilee, Jubilee in their wisdom have refused to join the Kenyans. Now Kenyans have decided to continue with dialogue on their own. That’s why…
Now

Just hold on that Prof. He has brought in a very interesting point. I want to bring in an exclusive commentary from M. N. You say you have succeeded in getting the masses to support…. about the issue……

We have … We have

Hold on…… hold on please. Please S. …S. is saying you……. lets get what M. N. has to say about mass support and sabasaba

Sabasaba was not about___ and his brigade. Sabasaba was about masses as it should and ah if you looked at the groups that came out, they did not look convinced about it. And I think it is an indication that ah probably ___ probably he has ran out of ideas and its unfortunate. And I am greatly saddened by that myself because I think he is a great revolutionary but probably he is, he did not have a plan……

Now…. Lemmie

I know you are eager to respond but lemmie put the question to you O. Because now that you are an ODM member of parliament. Conspicuously a lot of young tucks of ODM if you want abandoned this rally. What happened?

Let……

S. I know you are willing to speak out but just hold your peace for a bit.

They did abandon the rally. Is that the case mheshimiwa? We have the footage……

Don’t think so…..

We have the footage lemmie make my point. Would you agree that perhaps there is the leadership of ODM going on and they are not now able to hold on the mantle…. Quote and quote is…… of those who showed up…… who have a legitimate concerns you that there is a problem with security and appointments. Tell us about that.

First of all…..Ann

Mmh

To address what M. N. was talking about. He is expressing his own opinion

Yes

Which is of course prejudiced and his ideology which we don’t want to get into right now. But then the point is that eh over the time, CORD has demonstrated that with the people and the people have demonstrated everywhere that the issues that CORD is raising are real. You will reckon that A.. If you were of age…

Right
T_{78}P_2: In 1990 when Jaramogi Oginga Odinga led the clamour for multipartism, he was in his late 70’s. It is easy to attempt to re write history……

T_{79}P_1: Are you campaigning for……

T_{80}P_2: But the truth is……

T_{81}P_1: You can…. You can…. 

T_{82}H: Professor please, let him finish

T_{83}P_2: The facts are in the public domain. So the point is what is critical is to focus on the message

T_{83}H: Mmh

T_{84}P_2: The message…… Not the person propagating the message.

T_{85}H: Could… Could the messager have cost you the message? Is that…. Is that possibly the problem?

T_{86}P_2: Well, we have our own way, as CORD, we have a game plan, we have strategies to achieve what majority of Kenyans desire for themselves. We must break the yoke of dictatorship which is creeping back.

T_{87}H: Prof

T_{88}P_1: I have three things to say which summarizes CORD: intolerance, they always think they are right and when you purpose something they do not think they like them….. so it’s not about somebody coming to power when he is 70 or something, but it is also about looking at yourself and see if you can be an alternative government……

T_{89}P_2: Yes

T_{90}P_1: So there are people in CORD that have lost direction. In fact I do not usually buy M. N. but today I will cite him. The other ting is as you become intolerant like this….. you see is happening to our nation. On one hand you say you are right, but even when men in black come to disrupt your elections and you do not hold your elections you still think you are working with all Kenyans. This is short sightedness. But for you, my friend S., when you go back, tell Jubilee, they should stop lavishing in this arrogance about numbers. Part of the reason why CORD has set a very unique civilian coo is because they do not want us to go to the Constitution because they have lost interest. Because you guys, when you got power, you do not practice power with humility. A good government and a civilized government should practice power with humility, and so that you listen to the people you defeated and the points they raise. The points that……

T_{92}P_3: That’s not right……
T93P1: The points that CORD are raising are genuine points you should engage them through the institutions in the constitution, but when you close doors, these guys are staging a coo.

T93P3: At the beginning of this show and even now, I have acknowledged that we have a challenge.

T95P1: Tyranny of numbers, talk about tyranny of numbers which is always being cited.

T96P3: Tyranny of....

T97P1: When somebody says, lets go to parliament and sort this out. This is what they say ‘wata do’. This attitude

T98P3: No no no

TH: Lemie lemie… Prof let him respond.

T100P3: Parliament is an institution in the constitution. It is not us who decided to have numbers, it is the Kenyans who voted in majority of Jubilee in the National Assembly and majority of Senators. Parliament is the place where we reason out. There are Bills that have been proposed by CORD members for example by___ on VAT …… he has put two Bills which have passed but the point is I am trying to make is which now you are veering off….Raila Odinga is an indelible part of our history. He has played a serious role in this country and we respect him for that. But the key point here is he is part of history, he is not part of the future. Unless CORD rebrands…. And he has used words, in fact I am shocked because he has used words like strategy, rebranding, those are foreign words in CORD. Because there …..

T101P2: You cannot expect S....

T102P3: Because there is no strategy.....

TH: S...

T104P3: Number I just because we did not go to Uhuru Park..... we could have…… and duplicated the number…… as government, we did not. Now look at the people he says demonstrated support. Why don’t they demonstrated support for CORD during election?

T105P2: But...

T106P3: Three by elections, in three by elections, CORD has lost severely. CORD is losing a sitting member in Bomachoge and in two weeks we are seeing…… Two days after

T107P2: Please…. Lemmie....

T108P3: The people are not with CORD. The people want delivery.....

TH: S…… S just hold on. O, I really must give you a chance to start
T 110 P 2: Yes…. A. I must put the record straight. On the point that CORD is plotting a civilian coo. Its nothing, indeed, could be further from truth. As Jubilee government behave the way they are. No revolution is ever planned…. okey?

T 111 H: Are you planning for one?

T 112 P 2: We are not planning for one because the conditions that are necessary for a revolution are…. Are being created by the government itself. But then that is not the point…

T 113 H: Mmh

T 114 P 2: This parliament, which is of course led by Jubilee has had a record of enacting legislations with a view to subverting some part of the constitution, and I can cite the media law. Look at the police service Act, look at the NGOs which of course presented by us

T 115 H: Alright

T 116 P 2: And you can go on and on and so … the Jubilee has been trying to amend the constitution through the back door. This tyranny… and that’s why we are saying parliament is something that needs to be…………………

T 117 H: The Honorable MP has brought in a very interesting issue of amending the constitution and I want to have an analysis from……

T 118 P 3: May I say something….

T 119 H: You will have a chance to respond. We want to bring an analysis from M. N. on the same and focus on Jubilee after Sabasaba. Is there an opportunity for them and what do they have to do with the constitution

M: …and if there is anything that came out of this sabasaba thing, there is no resolution that makes sense. There may be need to have a referendum regarding this Constitution…. In my thinking, this is the calamity that people should capitalize on. One of the things people need to do is to support the referendum

T 120 H: And what do you think would happen if the referendum does not win

M: It does not matter if the referendum is won. It may be about the shape of ___’s head. They might say the head was round, now it has become oval and we want to have a President with a shape of the head which is consistent. It can be as fickle as that when it comes to ___because ___ is using the referendum purely to galvanise his support and to prepare himself for election….

T 121 H: Alright, I come to you gentlemen and I come to you fot your final comments because we are out of time and please do touch on what M. N. has said. The constitution and may be for both sides of the divide. The contention of being a village document. Is this the opportunity to correct? S. your views.
T_{122}P_{3}: Of course…. The question of bringing everything to parliament. If they feel parliament is not the right platform to address these issues…. Resign, just resign. The call for a referendum in a political rally, I think they came up with it out of…… there is no plan. If you ask them what are the referendum questions, they cannot tell you. What are the questions?

T_{123}P_{2}: Now the…. The fact that

T_{124}H: Now probably Honorable can respond to that…..

T_{125}P_{3}: Tell us the questions…

T_{126}P_{2}: Now the constitution……

T_{127}P_{3}: Where are the questions. What questions do you want answered?

T_{128}P_{2}: I will….. I would disclose…..

T_{129}H: Lemmie….. lemmie repeat……

T_{130}P_{3}: Do we need to go to the referendum……?

T_{131}P_{2}: We have had pertinent issues. In fact I am surprised…..

T_{132}P_{3}: …I have to read this….. Kenyans want very many things. Kenyans want development, Kenyans want food on the table, Kenyans want cohesion and unity. Kenyan do not want to be in a perpetual election cycle. Now CORD says we disband the IEBC, we go for a referendum on the disbandment. Then they say they want a referendum conducted by the United Nations….. because……

T_{133}P_{2}: Yes yes

T_{134}P_{3}: Because….. where… where are the funds to run an election?…. in the world

T_{135}H: Gentlemen, gentlemen

T_{136}P_{3}: You know they lack faith in the institutions that have been created by the constitution. Institutions that were created when ___ was the Prime Minister. If you, if you fail in a game like what is happening in world cup, you do not change the referee, change the strikers.

T_{137}H: Alright, alright, your final comments prof.

T_{138}P_{1}: My final comments is that people are… it confirms what we have said. That the whole referendum story, the IEBC…. If you are going to change the IEBC, without following the laid down procedure in the constitution, you are staging a civilian coup outside the constitution. So… so lets get this right. So I think eh….. I think the frustration that CORD is having is because the Jubilee is not applying its power with humility. But finally, what I would like to say with regard to M. N.. M. N. did not support the constitution. And he did not support the constitution, he is encouraging our president to…… The constitution. If that is the case then we…… the referendum
Alright gentlemen, I must appreciate what you have said but you have unfortunately left my final guest very little time. So please make your final comments.

Yah my final comments is that this is the right opportunity for Kenyans to correct the wrongs that were created by the previous regime…… so it is an issue that…. That ah

Tell us….. tell us

We are out of time….. Well… Prof

Let him…. Let him

I am gonna, I am gonna have to move away from you all, but I must say thank you for joining us on opinion court.
TOPIC: THE MARRIAGE BILL

T1H: Welcome to Spotlight. Today we are discussing the Marriage Bill passed in parliament last week and is waiting the President’s accent. It is something that generates a heated discussion and it is definitely one that we are going to be talking about for some time. Your views…should the President accent to the Bill and in turn turning it into Law? Send us your views on SMS line 2933

Yea, that was quite a debate last week. Today we want to put this to perspective so lemmie introduce you to my panel. In our studio tonight we have Pastor A, next is Hon C the women Rep.N. County. Thank you for joining us. Next we have J, a family lawyer and S the chair Justice and Legal Affairs Committee in parliament. So lemmie start with you mheshimiwa . Tyranny of numbers is what women legislators are calling this Bill and that this Bill being passed was a disgrace to the women and discrimination against them?

2P1: Eeh thank you P. Now, there is no tyranny of numbers.

3H: Mmh

4P1: In fact when we convened, it was almost an even number. The parliament is not supporting polygamy. In this country polygamy has been legalized by the courts. You will find in many cases customary marriages are like any other. Like Christian marriages, Islamic marriages, they are the same. This law is out to give customary marriage status like any other.

5H: Okey.

6P1: As you know the parliament passed aah Matrimonial and Properties Bill last year. This particular Act confers some rights to the first and second wife. And that is specifically in Section 8 of Matrimonial Properties Act. Aah the Marriage Bill is just in support of Matrimonial and Properties Bill.

7H: Okey. What are the legal terms…What are the nitty gritties of the Bill for anyone out there who may think it’s about polygamy?

8P1: Let us put this into perspective. The current Marriage Bill as it is recognizes 4 types of marriages. First marriage is the Christian marriage that is for persons who profess the Christian religion. Second we have the civil marriage. And eh the Christian marriage is monogamous. It cannot be coverted once you enter it…..

9H: Mmh

10P1: …you cannot be polygamous. Then we have the civil marriage that is also monogamous. It cannot be converted to become polygamous

11H: Polygamous…Okey.

12P1: Then the third is customary marriage. If you get married under Customary Law as it is in the Act, the marriage is always monogamous, polygamous or potentially polygamous. The 4th one we have the Islamic marriage. It is potentially polygamous. The final one is the Hindu marriage which is purely monogamous.

12H: And you do all that appertains to that.
Aah now, let us come to you mheshimiwa. How did this Bill pass now that we have eeh more female representation in the house. 47 women representing the counties, and many saying before, the numbers were lower and this is the function of the county women reps to sort of champion the rights of women. How was this able to pass at a time like this?

First I like the way the chairman of the legal and justice committee is explaining it so nicely, and I wish that is the scenario.

I want to say the Bill is not meant for the 47 women representatives or the women in parliament because we are all representatives of the people be it men or women. It is upon parliament to give what is good to Kenyans.

So for men legislatures is what you are giving to the right thing for the women of Kenya? For instance, the most controversial clause about women to be informed in case a 2nd or a 3rd wife is coming…..

But then …but then as you say the law is there for everyone but you are there to specifically champion the rights of women….

Yes and we hold. We hold that dearly and one woman legislature said this Bill is for women because in such scenarios women suffer most. However, the timing of the Bill is not in good faith.

How so?

For instance, we had a conference in New York…

…for 10 days and about ten women were out there. We had another conference in Geneva and they feel the timing was not in good faith. I can tell you for sure we were about 50-50 and we were discussing the Bill. But when we were just about to vote, some men legislatures sent SMS and we saw several men come in, who were not in this Bill debate. So they just came in to vote.

Could the same thing have been done on the part of women?

No…they could not do SMS when they were in New York you know.

They could have possibly written. Just asking.

My point is this. It is important for legislatures to discuss a Bill in totality when you are in the house. We women protested and walked out because these men are just out there to vote as men versus women which should not be the case. Otherwise how do you take tea outside and then when we are just about to say ay or nay you see 20 men coming in. You should be there to listen and you should not enter a debate with a set mind that is how I shall vote.

But Hon J. did you go there with an open mind?
Yes. I went there with an open mind. I had read the Bill well. And let’s not close our eyes to the realities. The thing is, we are making laws for the whole country.

We are not making laws for MPs or for people who live in urban centers. Mombasa, Nairobi, wherever…

Alright ladies and gentlemen we take a break now. We will be back on Spotlight.

I come Back to you Hon J for your response on this law being created for some urban elite woman. Do you think that is what the women are trying to do? Creating laws for some up town, urban women elites?

This is the scenario I found in parliament. Where I come from and the people I represent 80% of the marriages there are polygamous even as we speak. So, so there is no way a Bill is being discussed in parliament and I want to turn the marriages there into monogamous in one day. That can’t happen.

This might be thinking when I say 80% of the people I represent are polygamous, I might be talking about the Islamic faith. In fact the people I represent are 99% eeh …

She might be thinking when I say 80% of the people I represent are polygamous, I might be talking about the Islamic faith. In fact the people I represent are 99% eeh …

Christians

Christians and they practice customary marriages. Customary marriages are potentially monogamous. That is why the chapter on customary law was being discussed and I had to put my foot down to ensure that they get what they wanted.

J, let’s look at it. We have been trying to consolidate all the seven laws that govern marriage in this country. What’s your thought on it including the clause that says the man needs to ask for permission from his first wife to get another wife.

A lot of debate has been going on. It is important to say beyond the debate we are going to see what is in the best interest of Kenyans. We also need to look at what opportunity were women MPs denied. It is not the passage of the Bill that is the issue with women. It is the fact that some clauses were removed from that Bill. One of the clauses being the breach of the promise to marry, that you cannot get damage…there other one being to inform as mheshimiwa has said the existing spouse that you want to marry again. So the women did not support the removal of these clauses and as Kenyans we need to think whether the removal of these clauses kills the Bill. For me that is critical.

Alright….and let’s get from the chair. How applicable would those clauses be, for example, a promise to marry. What constitutes a promise in the legal setting? A couple of coffee dates? How applicable are those clauses…like I don’t see a woman being asked I want to get a second wife and she’s oh! Fantastic..you know!
Lemmie go straight to the issue of polygamy and the issue of consent. Like my friend, the hon member has said, we have marriages that are polygamous or potentially polygamous and others are not. It is hoped that Kenyans will be able to be in a place where they can stand and choose whether they want to be in a monogamous or polygamous union.

Now, the issue of consent happens at a point you are signing on the dotted line as to whether you want a monogamous or a polygamous union. That’s where consent comes in. What this Bill intended however is that you will be informed that your husband is taking a 2nd, 3rd or 4th wife and that is of course reasonable. It is reasonable that you know.

Yes. Let us give mheshimiwa a chance to respond.

You see I want members to take seriously is this Bill contradicts the matrimonial property Bill. How? In the case where a woman is not informed that another woman is coming and that woman has stayed with the man for 10 years, the matrimonial Bill says that in the case the 2nd wife comes, the property will be shared to you from that point...

So you are against polygamy entirely?

Definitely I am. Because I am a christian. And pastor here will support that from a biblical perspective. However, I am not arguing as a Christian, but as a leader.

You say you are against polygamy...all well and good but some of the people you are representing are not Christians necessarily or monogamous.

You see I have neighbors who even have three wives and they live very well. So we really cannot go to personal choices of life. But I want to protect that woman who will be subjected to customary law as she will not have money for a church wedding. She will get knowledge to go to the registrar and we even know some parts of our country like Marsabit need information.

But but can’t that be sorted out after the Bill is passed... And we shall have something like civic education exercise?

I want to jump in. Very sorry mheshimiwa.

Alright J.

Very important. We have said the customary marriage will be celebrated in accordance to the customs of the people. If consent is required, or information is required, that will be done because a witness will say this marriage has been done according to the customs of these people. So this doesn’t kill it because we will put you to task on whether all the steps were taken according to the customary law.

Customary law.

But lemmie say something that is surprising me in the media. It is like we are saying these gentlemen imported polygamy into the Bill in the house and I think we need to backtrack and see the beginning of it. It began in 1902 when the Marriage Act came into force.
Yes.

And we were told the way into marriage is the monogamous way and you know what has happened…polygamous unions have continued to compete side by side. Even the cases we have continued to find in courts, issues of polygamy come out. The point then was it was necessary to recognize what happens out there. The Bill is not about women; it is about Kenyans. Mheshimiwa here has said she does not support polygamy at a personal level. How do you legislate against polygamy, If you legislate against that, you legislate against the people you represent.

Mheshimiwa… Let’s have J before we come to you.

Aah what I’m saying is this Bill is not about marrying many wives. It is about many other things because even when it comes to polygamy, women have options. You can marry through civil which is very cheap and it is monogamous. There is no way you can turn it into polygamous. But we are Africans; we have African values.

Now..

Yes mheshimiwa

I do not want my colleague to lose a point and I can see he is missing the point. This Bill has over 90 articles and most of the articles are very good. The only articles, 3 or 4 that we want put in place so that our work as legislators is to move a Bill that will work for the whole of Kenya not just for a group. We need to defend women by looking at the culture which the chair keeps identifying with.

You know there is a misunderstanding here…

No…No….

Customary Law is not for polygamy. Again there are various other types of marriages that one can engage in. so… so..

it is just a perception that the customary law seems to lead to polygamy?

No this Bill just seeks to recognize marriages that are polygamous. Now where I come from, I am a Kalenjin, and I think even Kikuyu wives are informed. There are places where they were never informed.

Okey okey very quickly… I want us to address and I know we have very little time left. I know it is not all about polygamy. There is another one enforcing conjugal rights because when you go to court because you are not getting conjugal rights. Your insight on this because it is my word against his… J..

So there are some of those pieces that hang there but I am not sure they have been made. That the fact that they are women rep, where were they, what is the issue?. I would like to say this is a family Bill. Very important. It is a Bill where we ought to see the support of men and women equally participate in. But more importantly, a woman rights are never guaranteed until family rights are guaranteed because you must remember where the woman is coming from. She is coming from a family of origin where she was born or the family of choice where she has joined. And I tell you what? Until that area is sorted out, a woman is not sorted. It is the same case for a man.

And that’s the correct example ever. As we conclude, mheshimiwa W. We all remember Hon.___ and the passing of Sexual Offences Bill. It was looked at as a
thing for women although it was a thing for protecting the children. There were 9 female members of parliament at that time out of 222 members. We now have 47 county women representatives alone, not to count the others for other posts, 67 in total. We saw in the case of there was a lot of lobbying done. She found a lot of support from men because as J has said, this was not men versus women. But she was able to get the support of the entire house something we didn’t see the women do.

This Bill was published last year in July. It was in the public domain….aaam has the role of women been diminished despite the numbers? They could not have cut short that trip to come back to discuss something so fundamental to the family?

73P2: It was in order because the trip was not for leisure; it was for official duties designed for that particular time. So if we failed to go out of the 47 countries, then Kenya misses. But I would like to say that all along the Legal and Justice Committee being the main stake holders in this, they lobbied specifically to woo the committee and…

74H: But…but…

75P2: …unlike ___ ’s time, the committee is now mandated to bring in stake holders…the bishops, priests but in the committee you find specific 7 or so men who have specific agenda.

76P1: Lemmie lemmie react to that..

77H: As we conclude msheshimiwa.

78P1: I want to tell you we are very pro- women. I am married to a woman and I have two daughters. So when somebody claims we are fighting women, that is not true. We want a law that is universal. We are not legislating against one section of that Bill or women.

79H: I would like to give the two of you 30 seconds . Very strictly, 30 seconds. J..

80P4: Aah I think the Bill has been successful. The fact that is has found its way to the house is a great success of the time.

. 81H: Alright.. Alright.. msheshimiwa J.

82P3: The things that have been put in this Bill are enormous. And I would request the president to accent to the Bill as fast as possible. If it is to be returned I can assure you the issue of requesting for permission in a polygamous marriage will not change.

83 H: Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen for staying with us tonight. It is definitely a discussion we cannot conclude in one sitting but we thank you all for making time and having a live show discussion around this important issue that touches on the family. And as J., a family lawyer says, it is even important that we are having a discussion like this. Many times we talk about politics but a family is a fundamental basis of society so this is an important discussion. We continue to see what will happen on the floor of the house on Tuesday. That will form our debate in our next episode of Spotlight. Thank you. Good evening and God bless.

This is Hope FM where you listen and live.
APPENDIX 6: HOPE FM2-SPOTLIGHT

TOPIC: ILLICIT BREWS

T1H: Welcome to the show. In studio tonight we have Dr. O. Next we have M. the NACADA chairman, thanks for coming. In the middle M. and of course K.. Member of Parliament Hon. I. Thank you all gentlemen for coming.

When we come back we look at this social ill and try to find out what the government is doing about it. You can reach us on SMS line 2933, please finteract with us as you share your views. This is Hope FM where you listen and live.

BREAK

T2 H: Welcome back. This is Spotlight. The recent deaths of Kenyans especially the youth in some parts of the country have raised concern across the church, government and the society at large. I want to start with you aah M. because a lot of feedback I must say says you should be held personally responsible for the illicit brews.

T3 H: You gave the impression that you had the ability to deal with illicit brews. How do you respond to the Kenyans who say M is the man who brought the law. Why should this happen under his watch?

T4P1: Aah I compare myself to the big jet when it touches the runway, the screech. When I landed in NACADA, that’s what I felt. I was not welcome. Not a single thing that I proposed was implemented.

T5H: Mhm.

6P1: It was very hostile. Very very hostile.

7 P2 don’t want to go through it for purposes of ethics and decorum. But I can tell you the first memo that I did was in October and I appeared before the committee in parliament to discuss all that.

And the memo said we must test all alcohol in the Republic of Kenya because I can see a problem coming. I followed that and then said we must profile all the outlets and the manufacturers and we must register all alcoholic drinks.

I congratulate the government tonight because eeh the government and the cabinet secretary Olelenku have said exactly that. So the CEO is supposed to follow the instructions from the board to the letter. But he wasted all his time doing unnecessary memos, letters all over the world, carrying out seminars forgetting that we have a timeline. After that, the president has visited the area.

You have seen it discussed in parliament because it is a well thought of policy. But then we did memos against each other, accusations counter accusations.

8M: Lemmie ask you even as we proceed with the show…

9P1: Yes

10H: Since you took office, what can NACADA boast of in having curbed alcoholism in the country in terms of numbers? A lot of people out there may feel really very little
is being done. Going by the rise in the cases reported...fatalities, people going blind.

11P1: We have a policy that we now have every manufacturer screened. We are coming up with a policy that we shall have all alcoholic drinks registered so you can go have your drinks without thinking you might die. We have also been able to win public support in terms of...alcohol is no longer fashionable. In fact you look odd putting about 30 bottles of beer on the table. That’s a campaign we’ve been able to do. We’ve also been able to define clearly what alcohol is, and that methanol is not alcohol for purposes of consumption.

12H: As far as the illicit alcohol that is now in the question. Do you still know how much is still in circulation?

13P1: We have done what no one is talking about; the mitigation. Take for instance Nakuru. From yesterday they are moving from house to house to try to find out anything...anything that resembles the product that we are chasing. It is happening in Embu and other places. The public health and our team are out. We have also tonight launched our call free number that is 192 for anybody with information.

14P2: The issue here is...

15H: Mmh

16P2: Do you and and do we even know how much of this is out there. Has NACADA for example said this is the sample, this is the bottle so that when we see it we know it. This is the kind of brew that is killing people.

17H: Let him respond to that.

18P1: Tomorrow all the illicit killer brews will be displayed at NACADA...

19P2: Okey...that’s very okey...

20P1 ...at NACADA board room, we have a conference. The board is meeting out there...

21H: Mmh

22P1: And like you can see most of these people are in the hiding. Most of this alcohol was actually carried in jerry cans. It was not labeled. So for you to display empty jerry cans it was very difficult to identify the brew. But if you display the smell, other parameters and the possible sources like we are trying to do and the public will be aware. I want aah to thank the people of Narok. Somebody came with a probox and was selling and the people said we have a warning here. We are likely to buy bad alcohol that is in circulation. Why don’t you taste it first yourself. The guy took in a hurry and unfortunately we lost him.

23H: Okey. Lemmie bring in the other panelists. K lemmie start with you because you represent a part of the country where alcohol abuse is prominent. One, has the current government done enough to curb alcohol abuse and two, what do you think is the heart of the problem especially why are young people in alcoholism so much?

24P2: Aah lemmie begin with if the government is doing enough. What the government has done is enough talking but in terms of actions it has not done enough at all. Allow me to take you back to a situation either early this year or last year where the president I think gave the county commissioners a 100 days ultimatum to deal with the problem
of alcohol abuse and drug abuse in their respective counties. For a county to mourn 20 lives that have been lost to alcohol it means the government is not doing enough. And the challenge is the government aaah….

25H: To do what exactly?

26P2: Basically what they’ve done today and I must congratulate the government but I beg they should go beyond that.

27H: What should they do?

28P2: The county commissioners tasked by the president to make sure that there is no alcohol and drug abuse in their own county. I want to ask the cabinet secretary Olelenku to further and fire the sub-county commissioners and the OCPDs because they are the ones who have failed in their duties, but the buck should really stop with the county commissioner’s office.

Two, there is what our youths do: over indulgence in alcohol. I saw it in today’s paper that it is really a problem that is more prevalent in Kenya than anywhere else.

29H: Mmh. It just happens that this particular incidence largely happens in Central Kenya.

But I must also be quick to tell you that there are a lot of frustrations with our young people in Central Kenya and that could be one of the reasons why we have our young people slipping into alcoholism.

30H: M. Is NACADA a waste of public funds?

31P4: I think it is. When I first heard this, the first question I wondered really why is Mututho still in office? I…I was expecting that he would be here.

32H: Well you can ask him.

33P4: I was expecting he would be here as the former chairman of NACADA.

34H: Yah….

35P4: M___ brought the loss…that part of it got us here. Part of it is he criminalized fairly good quality alcohol which is for common mwananchi.busaa, changaa. Then he came up with these weird rules that require packaging.

So now in fact people who manufacture changaa take methanol, get them from companies that make detergents and everything and package them as proper alcohol and people take them in faith that this one is better than changaa. …So for how long have you been in office?

36P1: Half a year.

37P4: Half a year and you have been fighting with your CEO…complaining to us that..but you are the boss. You are the chairman of the board!

Why is it that you are waiting for the cabinet secretary to interdict the CEO? So far..why didn’t you interdict him the first instance it happened?

38H: Mr M. are you toothless at NACADA?
39P1: No we are not toothless.

40H: But there are issues between you and the CEO which as the chair you should have addressed.

41P1: We are. we have but we are civilized. We are not the kind of men who will hold each other at the neck and shout …

42 P2 First I want to correct my friend whom I respect.

You have not read Mututho law. In fact the second paragraph allows you to... we legalized the traditional brews. Two, we take cognizance that African brews are not illicit.

The illicit element of it comes because you are not presenting it for testing. Have a simplified regulatory mechanism to allow it put in the market without endangering the consumer. That is what Mututho Law is all about.

43P2: And now you want the old man brewing changaa in my village have it registered? That will be expensive!

44P1: You know you are dealing with people who are not sober and you really have to be sober yourself.

45P3: There was a question that was raised earlier if NACADA is a waste of public funds.

Lemmie say NACADA collects money from bar owners and those in alcohol business. The problem is not even within NACADA itself but it is in the structure of the Act that established NACADA. 50% of this goes to the same…

46P1: District

47P3: …to the same district or sub-counties. These are the sub county commissioners that are being fired by ____ for what we call advocacy.

That money I can tell you it happens in my constituency where there is a DC.

I have never seen any advocacy but as a leader I have taken a step and there is Bill that will be coming in parliament.

48H: Mhm

47P3: Bill amending the ACT to ensure that part of that money actually goes into establishing rehabilitation centers which will help in educating people. Which will mean advocacy. Because alcoholism, we do not first recognize it as a disease and yet for resources into it…

48H: Sure.

49P3: …many of our young people will continue to die. The youngest I have heard died is a 17 year old form 3 student to an average of 35-37 year olds. Believe you me these are people who are very frustrated because they don’t have jobs.

50H: I agree with you and it is good to hear there will be some sort of approach by the house to deal with this matter.
Can I say something?

Okey very quick final comment.

I think the issue you are raising ..there is some area we need to hand on…

Mhm…Dr..last comment…

…because we keep asking what the government is doing. You see this country must have some morality. This person who is selling things that will kill people. Is he a Kenyan?

This idea..this idea government do this government do that. I’m sure we shall have this debate next year again. So I have a feeling we need to find out the root cause of the issue. It’s not about the government and the laws. It is about our morals, our culture as a people. Can we go back and find out where the problem started.

Some..some information. Methanol doesn’t kill instantly. So I think part of what NACADA should do is to teach people how to react when they suspect they have methanol poisoning.

Mhm

If you took a glass or two of changaa after methanol poisoning you not likely to suffer death..consequences.

And that’s what .. that’s where NACADA falls. Part of the money that you have is also supposed to teach the barmaid, everybody and Kenyans like you that if you take changaa in some places, you leave

You leave…

You cannot die from some chemical reactions.

That’s good information.

Gentlemen I must give special thanks of course to the NACADA chair for joining us. Dr J., legislators for staying with us. We have a role to play in raising up a responsible youth. The law makers, the church, and all got a huge huge task. That’s all we had for you on Spotlight tonight.Good evening and blessed night.
TOPIC: COUNTY DEVELOPMENT BOARDS

T1H: A. A. with you on ‘The state of the Nation’. We have a very interesting morning on the state of the Nation and a very good morning to you. Now, in 2013, we were seeking to amend the County Government Act that was introduced in the Senate. The bill brought by Senator__sought to establish County Development Boards to the county government to consult with the national government. The bill proposed that 14 members board would consist of Senators, elected MPs and the county governors, deputy governors, county speakers and leaders of majority and minority parties in the assembly. The board would be responsible for the harmonization of county development plans and projects. The members would consider and adopt annual county budgets before they table them in the county governments for approval. The Bill states the Senators would be the chairperson and the women representatives vice chair and the governors will be the secretary. According to Senator __, Section 91 of the county government Act gives impetus to counties to establish structures aimed at encouraging citizens’ participation on development agenda. These governors have failed to make use of this platform….. it is from this same law that he found it necessary to craft the legislation to enhance and streamline county function. We are having a conversation about this morning. And joining us we do have Governor R from B county and Senator M. from E. county and myself.

2H: I want to start with you senator, senator M. Why was it necessary to set up this board?

3P1: Eh (cough) first of all I want to start by ah the requirement for consultation corporation is a constitutional requirement under Article 6: 2 that says that there will be consultation between the both levels of governments. The only constitutional body of intergovernmental relations is the senate which is the umbilical cord between the national and the county government. The desire to have eh the board, was necessitated by the experiences of devolution in the past one year, where ah we found that sometimes some leaders who are organizing protest against the county governments. Some county governments where locking out certain participants from county issues. So we thought that we needed to take advantage of everybody’s’ knowledge synergize the direction that the county was going and harmonize development because I have attended several functions across the country where you find that would the CDF is funding is not harmonized with what the county government is funding, what the dons are doing and so forth. But even most importantly, the constitution requires that ah you have participation and the senator is actually the protector of the counties in the county government and cannot do this when there is no forum of getting information on what you want to do or defend eh eh. You know sometimes you need to protect the people against the governor, or protect the people against the MCAs, and you cannot do that if you cannot understand what they are doing.

4H: Mmmh. I better ask the governor: What’s the issue? What’s the issue in setting up this particular board?

5P2: Thank you. First of all, I will start with the real issues, not the preliminaries. One is very clear in the County Governments Act and I would like to pick from there. Under Section 91, that the senators and the MPs may participate through the public participation process and there is a clear provision for the counties to set up such an arrangement for that particular consultative process. The point that we are at departure on is the senators would only like us to discuss the budget from the
counties, and they are actually whatever senator K is saying is not true. For instance
they have not brought up the issue of the CDF. Now have you brought…..

6P1: And the how….. ah

7P2: And all the other development aspects and let all the leaders come in, and let us all
debate. But you cannot bring in, you cannot just come in to discuss county issues.
Secondly, the constitution provides clear functions for the senate. It is representation,
it is legislation, it is eh those other kitty. It has got nothing to do with executive work.
What they are purporting to do with the county budgets and such like things are
actually executive functions, they are not legislatative. First of all, it is there we
would like to establish ah a some kind of ah a linkage between the counties and the
senate. We would like to create that ah that nexus and theirs would be to participate
and even understand issues and be able to….. and as w are saying, the senate is a
representation of what people would like passed at the senate. But as of now, senator
K and company are busy selling ideas straight from Nairobi and ah trying to push it
down the throats of citizens out there……

8H: But eh ……

9P2: They are are not representing the people now, they representing the national
government on the grassroot…. 

10H: I just, I just need to understand something. I need to clarify something simple for the
people

11P1: Mmh

12H: When we were electing governors and the senators, one of the roles of the senate

13P1: Mmh

14H: We were told the role of the senator and that is where the confusion is coming in for
me is to debate and approve county debate, and approve County Bills. Correct?

15P1: Yes

16H: The role of the senators?

17P1: Yes bills concerning counties

18H: Bills concerning counties and represent the interests of the counties at national level

19P1: Yes

20H: Determine allocation of national revenues to the counties

21P1: Yes

22H: And debate impeachment of the president or Vice President, Right?

23P1: Yes

24H: And support governors if there is impeachment within counties that would affect the
people.
25P2: Yes
26H: That’s why those cases of those governors have been taken to the senate. Correct?
27P2: Yes
28H: How, and just for clarity. How do you then ..... approve those bills representing counties, without being involved, or without understanding, given that eh you can not tell me senator M or these county reps are debating things in Nairobi when technically, they are all every single ah ah every single .....  
29P1: discussion about it........
30H: Discussion about it is from their own region. Aren’t they coming back? So if you two can not work together, we are the ones suffering because they were not voted in Nairobi. They were voted by the same people who voted for you whoever they are.
31P2: Lemmie tell you ...... whoever the governor is. There are debates on the bills…
32H: Okey
33P2: …affecting counties.
34H: Yes
35P2: At the national level, for instance if there is a Bill on forests and may be there are certain aspects of it or for example on allocation of revenue, or division of revenue
36H: Mmh
37P2: Those are matters that the senate definitely does appear
38H: Okey
39P2: But down there, the Bills that concern ordinary operations of the counties are actually passed by the county assemblies and the senators ah can only participate through the process of Section 91 of the County Governments Act
40P1: Can I …… can I ....
41P2: The senators can only participate that through the provision provided by eh Section 91 of the county government Act
42P1: Can …. can I come to that …. can I ....
43P2: Strictly Section 91 of county government Act
44P1: Can I come to that A., First of all, lets eh, lets do some small civic education: first, the County Government Act we are talking about is the amendment. He one that used to be there is gone. So lets not talk about things that are already gone. The role of parliament was o pass laws and we have already passed and law is not about another law unless someone is coming with some amendment. So the only Section 91 we are talking about is the one, it is called Sang’s Act. There is also a misconception that CDF is not part of the discussion, that uwezo fund is not part of the discussion. That’s far from the truth. If you read the Act, section 1,2, it says provide a forum for the county level consultation coordination between the national government and the
county governments on matters of development and projects in accordance to Section 62 of the constitution. CDF is part of national fund, uwezo is part of national fund. Most importantly, if you read 2, it says ah, consider and give input into county development plans before they are tabled in the county assembly, and that consider and give input to the county annual budget, and then consider and advise on any issues of concern that may arise within the county, any issue that may …

45H: But at the end of the day aren’t we getting the issues of concern from the governors because they are the ones running the show?

46P1: Not the governors alone. Not the governors alone.

47P2: And the county assemblies

48P1: The … the CDF for example, in Elgeyo Marakwet CDF is 400 million in this financial year. 400 million a year in the four constituencies. We want to know and the development fund for the county. You cannot tell me we ignore this 400 million. It doesn’t become part and parcel of our discussion in the county governments. That is why we needed a situation where the governors knows what CDF is doing.

49H: You know you know looking for … it’s a forum where leaders are able to go through peer review and harmonization. Two …. Very quickly I want, I want to get to development

50P1: Now, now….

51H: Lets talk about eh fact that the CIC eh the commission on the implementation of the constitution has come out saying that this is unconstitutional. These new amendments as you are calling them you know are basically unconstitutional?

52P1: Unconstitutional is not declared by the CIC …. Lemmie…

53H: There are various issues

54P1: Lemie lemmie …. My memory is very clear. When the CIC, when the council of governors appeared, FIDA, when Law Society of Kenya appeared before our Committee of Legal Affairs which I sit, the only challenge the governors had, they said we don’t want the senators to chair because we are the big men. And lemmie tell you, the only problem governors have with the county development board, and you can read in any newspaper is who chairs? And and … the reason why, and the reason why

55H: Is this the main issue governor?

56P2: No it is not the only issue.

57P1: It is the main issue …. 

58H: Coming from the perspective of Kenyans, because I am sorry if there is a county government which I understand should already been doing what we are setting up these counties to do what they are supposed to do …. Why are we duplicating roles? We have been fighting for less duplication of roles.

59P1: Yes
When it comes to devolution. But you are okey with duplication of roles but you are okey with …

We are not okey ….. lemmie tell you first of all, this particular board there are several questions on it.rather than constitutional ones, why would you create a board and allocate yourselves chair? Here is the problem

Mnh

If in deed you are honest …. We will get there

Why would you give yourself the power? Unless you are a dictator? What would you do if you had clear laid, you would suggest the formation of that board and let the participants elect their chair. Secondly, why would you cut on members of the County Assemblies when they are actually the representatives at the local level. Two, these same senators never attend any of the development meetings at the lower level even when they are supposed to

That is …. that is exactly the reason.

So you have a problem with the board itself. Do you have the problem with the board?

Yes, the question of the board and the question of the function. Because the functions actually duplicates and eh creates a parallel super imposing on top of the functions of the county

Is this a consensus among all governors?

Two, the other issue is that senate is part of parliament. Parliament is a national institution. Article 6,2 talks about the distinctiveness of the county and the national governments

Why do you always talk about …. Secondly, they talk about the process of consultation, cooperation between the two levels of government. Each level should respect the institutional integrity of the other level of government, and assist one another in the Implementation of ah various functions assigned

Can can I can I just say something there

Let him finish, let him finish

Why would the national government agency like senate. Because senate is the parliament

It is lie … is an organ of the national government. The senators are supposed to be in that parliament to represent counties and the county governments

I want to establish something. I want to hear what is you counter proposal as governors. What is the ideal thing that you want to see that a) allows the senators to continue with their roles, allows them to continue with this harmonization because if you are talking about a situation where you are saying, yes they are national
government but they also hold money that is used in your own county. Let hear what …

78P1: Can I can I first correct that

79P2: Okey

80P1: Can I correct something

81H: I want to put this on pause now. When we come back I would like Lorna’s question to be answered. And just to remind you we are having a conversation between senator M and the governor I who is also the chairman of the council of governors and we are just trying to understand what are these wrangles between the governors and the senators? What are they all about? Call us on 0719038963. What is your take as Kenyans they are supposed to serve? These are some of the conversations you are waking up to this morning

BREAK

82H: In studio with us on Nation’s Talking Point we got governor I. R who is the chairman if the council of governors and senator K and we are still talking the various wrangles between the senators and governors. You can call us on 0719038963. We are five minutes to the top of the hour. __I want to pick up from your question

83C: My question is directed o the governor. You’ve complained a lot about the senators’ wanting to establish a county’s management boards. What we are hearing and what you have clarified this morning. Yes, you say they have a role in county governance, but you do not want them to play the role the way they want to. What is your counter proposal?

84P2: Our counter proposal is the provision by section 91 which is in place upto now because we do not recognize what K is trying to buddy around. We’ve also proceeded to court over the same. The provision of section 91 is very clear that the governor may call for ah a forum in which all the representative both national and local will participate through the public participation process. This is not in the process of them micro managing counties

85H: Why do you think, why do you think you are being micro managed when you have said there is the role of the national government and the county government

86P2: Mine mine yes the national government has its functions cut out in the constitution and it implements the same. But now it can’t come down to the counties and start micro managing the counties. For me, the ambassadors, the senators, every weekend K is moving all over the place, actually eh harassing the counties and spreading the message from the national government.

87H: Senator, senator, senator

88P2: Lemmie now come to the point

89H: Okey

90P1: Lemmie make this clear

91H: Okey senator ….. 3 minutes go ahead
First of all, the law is not meant to be recognized. It is meant to be obeyed. K is talking about recognizing the law. The problem A and L is that the first orientation that governors got in Naivasha was that someone is still in the days when they are powerful. He gave the flats, gave them the idea that they would around the counties and …… it is very clear in our minds, if governors want to a big man, they look for another constitution. Chapter 6 of the constitution says that all of us are servants

Even MCAs deserve respect. The mentality that you are a big man, you have this convoluted idea that …..

Can I now …… we are the chair

Let him finish … let him finish … we have 2 minutes

You see they have these misguided mentality that if another person, even a villager would chair a meeting and the governor sits, they would be less powerful. You do not need to go everywhere to show you are a big man with cars, and sirens with whatever. The constitution wants a servant

Lemmie finish. Two he has this misconception that article 6 says that county are distinct. Distinct but independent

And the only constitutional institution that has a role in that in the national and county is the senate. That is why we sit at the national level with functions on the county governments. So we are as I said earlier, we are the constitutional umbilical cord between the county and the national government. That is why the senator was to chair this forum at the county level. And I must confess this is a forum of consultation cooperation. And the senator is the only duly elected leader who does not manage money. And that is why the forum gives the senator

We are the only ones ……

But you are looking for money

Hold on … hold on, lemmie finish my thought. You can always have your chance. The point is this, it says, the others have money, the MPs have CDF, the women have county funds, governors have county funds. We are the only persons who can bring these minds together, to negotiate and agree which development should be prioritized

Now lets talk about …..

We are the only ones ……

Senator, senator. We assume, wait, we gonna talk about development issues. You seem to argue about where the money is meant to go

Yes

Development issues. That what we talk about in the next hour on Nation’s Talking Point. We need to clarify what is going on …..
BREAK

110H: You are on Nation’s Talking Point. Governor R, Senator K. of E. and myself. We are talking about the wrangles between the governors and the senators and we do have a caller on the line. Hello, good morning K..

111C: Good morning A

112H: Yes, Good morning Sir, go ahead

113C: I am listening to the two debaters and am looking to the point where they disagree and I cannot. I think the disagreement is just perceived between themselves. Ah… the issue of the county government development board, somehow I find is a consolidative body that brings everybody into forum to discuss about the issues concerning the county because I believe if we sit down and discuss how to develop our county, we know what to prioritize, the roads, since we know all the concerns, we bring even the villagers. I believe we are going to agree. I do not want to break the spirit of the senators, which appear to want to dominate the governors. And we see how they speak about the governors. I do not think they are supposed to speak about the governors like that. They are supposed to support the governors in whatever they are doing in the counties. So there must be a spirit that will make this people work together, unite them

114H: Mmh

115C: I do not also understand the relationship between the national and the county governments. The other day I heard the President say ‘watu wanaitisha pesa na hawajatumbia ile ingine wako nayo wamefanyia nini? Do we support or do we not support devolution?

116H: Thank you very much eh K. we’ve got to cut for short because we are running out of time. He has brought in some very interesting points and the president did make that statement sometime before and lemmie pass this on to you ….. governor. But eh so far our counties have received millions of money ….. but why would you be opposed to setting up of these county boards yet it is clear that expenditure have not been done appropriately. In some cases we find cash being returned to the exchequer or not being fully utilized. Why would county governments then decline this kind of help eh ….. in form of a board?

117P2: Thank you very much madam. First of all I want to associate with the views of the caller K, it is very clear that these two levels of governments are supposed to work in a consultative mode. Now, when the national government and the senate and others peddle around propaganda like for example we have returned cash to the exchequer, which is a big lie. We have not returned money. Our money is still in the county governments’ accounts. What normally happens and it is the procedure in government is that on 30th June, the monies you had in various accounts comes back on one account so that as you spend on the 1st of July, it is on the basis of a new budget in a new financial year. It is not that the money has been returned to the national government as it is being propagated around. Remember we started getting development monies in November, the procedure of going through expenditure is abit lengthy. Secondly, you need to bear in mind that these are county governments that are coming into place for the first time. So we need certain capacity to be put into place and we needed certain procedures. All these money is committed and is going to fund these projects. But the shocking thing is that now we are in August and the national government and the senate have not passed the prerequisite laws to allow funds to flow down. Now, they start siphoning what the president had said. We do not account to the president. We account to the accounting institutions. The Auditor
General checks and I want to tell you that the report from the controller of budget has clearly shown that counties have spent more money on development than the national government. The Auditor General has been revealing that they lose about 300 million in the national government. So what are we really talking about?

118H: So what’s government position?

119P2: We do not want to continue with that culture of the national government, we want to ensure our funds goes to the needs of the people. And we would want county by county to be checked whether development is reported to those areas.

120H: But who is supposed to check that because you cannot monitor yourselves?

121P2: The county assemblies

122H: No no no. your assemblies comprise of MCAs. MCAs in some county have said we do not want these people. They feel you are coming to position to spend money. Who is supposed to vet this money spending?

123P2: Lemmie tell you, lemme tell you. The procedure of spending money in the counties is ah first of all you got a plan for it, you got a budget for it and you got an expenditure program.

124H: What …. What about prioritizing these to ensure it is the right thing you are spending on

125P2: There is a public participation all the way from sub location to location in which communities identify their priorities, and it comes up all the way and we develop something called CIDP- County Development Plan and in this CIDP the residents participate and it is also approved by the county assembly.

126H: But that are very ideal, very ideal situation …

127P2: Lemmie tell you ……

128H: What exactly happens in situation where that is not effectively done?

129P2: It is not the ideal situation. It is a must …… it is a law. You do not spend county fund other than through the CIDP. The Controller of budget will not release money for that job if it came out of the blues. She releases money every day by the way. And you explain how …..

130P1: Can I ….. can I come in now

131H: Please do.

132P1: First of all K said very good thing but there is only one problem …… ah the big man’s mentality, where he said the governor should be questioned publicly. First of all …..

133P2: We should not be quarreling

134P1: Ah ah, if you see the constitution, Article 96, one of the role of the senate is to oversee counties. Oversight eh necessitate that questions must be asked. The biggest challenge we have had ever the last one year is accountability, over the last three months corruption in the county s massive. We had to look at the Auditor General’s
report. We have a number of governors who have been summoned to answer some questions including governor R. he faced the county accounts committee to answer questions some of which became very difficult for him. We saw him on TV saying he will not come back again. Lemmie tell you A, the senate was naturally going to be the enemy of the counties when we asked questions on accountability. When we are allocating the money, we are friends. During division of revenue bill, we are friends, during the allocation of revenue bill we are friends. Doing part of legislation including when I chair the committee that transferred all the functions of the counties, we are friends. But the moment, the moment I ask questions on accountability that’s where the problem comes in so we cannot say, let us stop asking questions of accountability so that we look good with the governors. It is the responsibility that people gave us so that …. Any time we ask governors questions, they tell us the national government is stealing money but eh CDF has not been accounted for. If you read the newspaper today, they have ran into the argument that can you audit CDF first

135P2: Ah ah

136P1: We knew very well ……

137P2: That’s propaganda

138P1: No no no it is in the newspaper. Its your governors A

139H: Its in the newspaper today. It says the governors have questioned auditor general ___to audit detailing how members of the national assembly have spent cash in their constituency

140P1: Lemmie, lemmie make my point.

141P2: But eh ….

142P1: The reason is this, the reason we went for the devolution is because we knew centralism and the centre is rotten. We wanted to start afresh using devolved governors so that more development can reach the people. So you can’t tell us that oh if you make a mistake, even national government has …. 

143H: Oversight is good eh but I think senator …. Your last point please.

144P1: Lemmie finish, lemmie finish

145H: Why aah

146P1: This is my last point. We have talked about returning money. That is a fact! Most of the counties returned the money

147P2: To where?

148P1: For re budgeting at the county level

149P2: Yes

150P1: That return of[ money is inability……] 

151P2: [No no no, you know…]
Lemmie finish, lemmie finish

Is that money still in the county?

It will be budgeted in the next financial year

Which financial year?

This financial year

So they will have their money! Why misinterpret …..

The point is this, anything that went to my county for usage in 2013/2014, it had to be returned again to the county assembly

No, the money arrived in November

Foe budgetary afresh

Oversight is good, senator, oversight is good. A lot of people tend to ask the question, is the senate overstepping their mandate given that the county government and we are … that the county governments are the basic mirror image of the national governments.

Correct

We do not see the national government having anything like development boards. Why is the need for county government to have these things

Thank you vey much

Is it because senators are looking for relevance?

Excellent

Mmekosa kazi ya kufanya?

That’s an excellent question. First of all, the only entity that is able to cross guard the national and the county government is the senate

Now where is the point?

Wait, two, two, you cant tell me A, that the county governments are like national government and are governors like president Uhuru!

But they are, they are

No no they cannot be

That is what you do not want to hear

National government, it is a mirror with different words, different words

No no no way. It is not true, we are are one united nation with a devolution that is focused on development
Which is very true
The problem with you say the reason why governors... want to go for a referendum, they want to be commander in chief of some armed forces in the counties
Kwenda uko!
No no no. it’s a fact. They have the wrong notion that they are the presidents .....
We want roads, we want security
But eh forget, forget
They have the wrong notion. But eh, am sorry ... lets just answer the question. My only thing is this, governors, you get this money from somebody, correct? You are not generally, you are county is not generating this money
You will give me time to answer
Yes, I will. We are talking about county allocation. Meaning national government is allocating you these funds
Lemmie tell you, the constitution has indicated the taxes that are collected nationally, including VAT, income and what not
Mmh
And it indicates the procedures of allocating that revenue. And I want to tell you that Kenya is one Sovereign indivisible nation
Yes
Whose sovereignty exercised at two levels: at national level and at the county level. If it was not meant that that exercise of sovereignty would be there, it would not be in the constitution
But it is not sovereignty of governors
Lemmie tell you, the sovereignty, there will also be ...
I must understand. Can you tell me
Lemmie tell you, lemmie tell you. This sovereignty is exercised at two levels and it clearly indicates who exercises it
Mmh
The executive at the national level and parliament. At the county level it is the county government. And the county assemblies. Lemmie also tell you, the people of Kenya may exercise that sovereignty directly and that is why we are talking about them at some stage
Do you actually think

The people of Kenya are not governors

Very quickly we are running out of time. ___ if you could give your comments.

Caller 2: Aah all I can there are egos of Kenyan politicians. I cannot really get what they are saying. It got nothing to do with development, nothing to do with the people. And that is why many people did not vote for this constitution because it was going to create demi-gods and…

Sorry ___ am gonna stop you right there because we are running out of time, but thanks a lot for calling. Now he says its an ego contest and that’s what most Kenyans keep saying. I want to pick on the part that talks about the things that Kenyans are going through and what your role in this and what’s being done…Quickly…governor R., your parting shot..

My parting shot is…I want to ask Kenyans to support devolution, and I want to ask Kenyans to watch out against possible retrogressions and the forces that want to reverse the gains by Kenyans. Participate in development discussions in your counties. And in spite of the apparent threats, we as county governments are determined to see devolution works.

Thank you… governor. Senator, your parting shot..

Eeh..first, I want to reiterate that devolution was meant to provide development. For the last one year, governors have focused on big names syndrome, issues to do with flags, sirens , egos etc. My request thou is accountability, governors to focus on accountability. Corruption is the greatest threat to devolution and I want to give my parting shot by using the biblical parable of the talents Jesus gave to three people. One was given 5, the other 3, and the other 2. The one given 5 multiplied 2, the one given 2 multiplied by 2, but the one given 1 hid it on the ground and said I knew you were a bad master. But when the talents were being given out, he didn’t say you are a bad master. He received it gladly. I want to tell our governors you have been given talents, whether 1, 2 or 5. Multiply …don’t focus on it. When we insist on accountability, you say senate is a bad master.

Thanks so much to our guests this morning, Governor R. and senator K. That’s all we had for you this morning. We look forward to your tweets this morning. It is 9 o’clock.
TOPIC: SABASABA

T1H: Good morning on the ‘State of the Nation’. I am A. A.. We need to have a sabasaba conversation. With me in studio we have Rev. N, who is retired from the Presbyterian Church, M.K, who is the leader of N. K and K., a journalist, who was eh who was quite pivotal at that particular point in time. Welcome to the show. What was ah the 1990 sabasaba movement about? I start with you M.

2P1: It was for increasing democratic space in the country. Remember we were ah by law a one party state. KANU was mama na baba. So anybody not subscribing to KANU had the platform for expressing themselves. You could not hold rallies, you could not even register another political party. And there were a lot of violation of human rights and bad governance. So we were fighting to increase democratic space, improve human rights and governance.

3H: Rev, we believe you were a big part of this movement, and we know you were beaten to a point of death. What was the movement for? Thank you for being part of this movement all of you. What was this movement for?

4P2: It was ah about recruiting people to this movement and the first person I went to was ___

5P1: That’s true

6P2: Then we recruited others and we formed what we call Forum for……… Then we divided work. Go this side… go this side. So we went to Garissa, we recruited all these people. Then we called ourselves Moral Alliance for Peace. The reason is we wanted to transform this country from one party to multipartyism and we wanted to change the political dispensation. As a market, it was very competitive. And in the whole case as she has said, it was a one party matter. A group of people would come together and decide the destiny of everybody in Kenya.

7H: Mmh

8P2: So we wanted to transform this country to accommodate everybody. And also to be open to everybody. ‘Mabadiliko’.

9H: Mmh….. It is interesting that the church was part of spearheading this process. We do not see that these days. We see a lot of church leaders not really standing for what we see as right. And ah these days……

10P2: You see it is change of ideology. The church was not……

11H: Mmh

12P2: Conscious of the acquisition of power and resources like today. Many pastors would be engaged in getting wealth, material wealth. May be the space we created, we created….. quickly for some people to …… Transformation is a continuous process.
Democratization is also a continuous process and if we started capitalizing on it to get rich, to get power, then one thing we were going to jeopardize the process because there is nothing as dangerous as trying to capture power without an agenda. An ideological or moral agenda or value agenda. We wanted people to be free, people to be relational...

Absolutely

You know when you just want power and no the vision, not to improve the lives of the people…. Then you are going to use other people as means to an end.

Lemme bring in K. O into this. K., that time you were writing about this…. What do you remember most about the media and the space and where we are….. and what you felt about sabasaba movement then?

Ah it was really so much about the media. It was everybody. It was about KANU regime that instead of expanding the democratic space, instead of allowing debate, instead of allowing self expression, it was an exclusive clique wanting to speak for the rest of the country. This is what it was about. And eh media at that time, just like the religious leaders, just like the lawyers, had been through a period of humiliation, a period of dehumanization, we resolved, it was time to speak out. Just like the rest of the society felt it was time to say enough is enough.

And sabasaba which everyone is talking about now was saying listen, we have had enough of KANU’s constitutional monopoly of power. We have had enough of exclusion from ah decision making process and policy making process. We want to participate in making decisions about our country.

Now, I know many want to ah just cheek on what you have just said. Let us take a short break. Remember our telephone lines are open ah 0719073963. What is sabasaba movement all about. We have got to discuss this. In our studio today we have Rev. N., M.K. and K. O. a journalist. We gonna continue this conversation shortly.

This is 96.3 Nation FM. You are on the ‘State of the Nation’. In the show we are talking about sabasaba. What the movement really about. What was the spark that lit the fire? What was the main thing that made sabasaba, became sabasaba in 1990. What wad it up to….

I believe it was in 1988. In 1988 we had a general election and it was a mlolongo election

Mmh
You had to queue behind your candidate or behind the poster of your candidate. Kenyans agreed to do that. The election was rigged on an industrial scale. What resulted was the Kenya’s 6th parliament was a house of phychophants. Issues of the day were not being discussed in parliament. Under one party rule KANU had constitutional monopoly of power. It was worse. Debate was taken out of parliament and into the streets. Section 2A which allowed KANU to monopolize power allowed KANU to rig the elections in such an industrial scale, for me it was a trigger.

Now, when ___ says that elections were rigged on an industrial scale, I want Kenyans who were not there that time, or who were not conscious that time to know what that means.

Remember that time people were queuing behind their candidate and they would be counted. It was not secret ballot. The most surprising thing is that throughout the country it was the shortest queue that won. That means it was open rigging without a care what people think. There was an outcry in the whole country and people were feeling really oppressed. It was that little window that you have to elect a person of your choice to go at least and make some feeble noise in parliament. There was no room for that. And surprising thing that time is that even without sitting together to discuss, Kenyans would still, Kenyans who were bold enough to speak amidst a culture of fear which had engulfed the country. There were few religious leaders like the Rev. Dr. ___, the late Bishop__, the late Bishop the late Archbishop

And, and what was it you wanted in that democratic space. Let’s clarify that because we keep talking about the 2nd liberation. What was the 2nd liberation about?

The most important thing is that we wanted section 2A of the constitution which had outlawed any other political party except KANU

To be reviewed

So that people with dissenting views could register political parties. We also wanted respect for human rights, we wanted the rule of law because there was the rule of the jungle. Anything that KANU bigwigs desired become law.

So we wanted the rule of law restored, respect for human rights and we wanted to be able to enjoy our freedom of expression and association. That’s really what sabasaba was about. And at that time I want Kenyans to know that the security of tenure for the judges, for the Attorney General had already been removed. So you can imagine a prosecution office which takes dictation from the executive. You can imagine courts that can take orders from the executive…
38P1: We had to bring these forces together to coalesce into a movement

39H: I want to bring in Rev. N. When you look at the situation then, and wanting to recruit these people, what was your hope for this country then?

40P2: Lemmie keep you in perspective. When I declared on October 5th in 1987, let’s dismantle, I used the word dismantle of course and it was allowed in KBC. Let’s dismantle the one party state, let’s dismantle the Lancaster constitution because it was imposed on us by the British rule and it won’t transform Kenya.

41H: Mhm

42P2: A fiction of a one party legacy. In my sermon, I was trying to call for an end to the cold war. We were now bringing a new democratic order. The issue was not simply ___

43H: Mhm

44P2: It was not simply Kenya. It was the ideology of the market at that time. My ideology that time was that eh we need to transform Kenya and make people human because we were completely completely dehumanized. ___called Cardinal ___...

45H: Mhm

46P2: To be found with a copy of my sermon was a crime for lawyers. But the good person I remember, I still remember__. I was recruiting people to come and help me to issue a statement and go to Nyayo house. We were the first to go to Nyayo house

47H: Nyayo or Chester house?

48P2: Chester house. __ and ah who else…. We were the first people to go to Chester house for a press conference to announce that we have formed a party called Mobile Alliance for Peace to lead Kenya to multi party. And we recruited kina Matiba and they came and declared that there is sabasaba.

49H: Yes

50P2: Sabasaba is a media term. It was not called sabasaba, it was said that on 7th of July, we will meet at Kamukunji. I hired a vehicle to take Shikuku to Kamukunji. I think I paid 20 cents. We were trying to dismantle a one party state, the Lancaster constitution

51H: Yes

52P2: But __ parted himself on the back and said Kenya wants only one party. But finally he agreed. When one party state was dismantled, we did not rest because we still wanted to dismantle the the

53H: The constitution

54P2: The one party constitution. That is why we have a 2nd sabasaba in 1997
Yes

In which I was killed at All Saints Cathedral

You…… you were beaten so hard

Yes because, because you could not have done any with an emperor

And ah K I want you to please be emphatic and clarify to those of us who were not there it did not happen in one day

You

In which I was killed at All Saints Cathedral

Yes because, because you could not have done any with an emperor

And ah K I want you to please be emphatic and clarify to those of us who were not there it did not happen in one day

Yah

Sabasaba did not happen in 1990 on the 7th of July. What did happen after that day? We lost lots of lives of people. What happened after that because we are talking about 1997 so we are talking about some years after. So lets talk about the gains that were there. So lets talk about the second one

When Rev. N. and M. K. mention Section 2A of the constitution, it stated this: ‘There shall be only one political party in Kenya’, The Kenya African National Union (KANU). Now what was section 2A? it was brought into the constitution in 1982. We had been a defacto one party state until 1982 when we became a one party state by law

Okey

Now section 2A became the main call. Lets do away with section 2A

Mmh

Section 2A became the call to mobilize Kenyans and for Kenyans to understand what it is

Mmh

It was broken down, simplified for them in 1990 as the Rev. N. mentions, president __ says aah we are going to have a commission. Let us find out what is going on. So we have a KANU commission led by the late Prof. __. And it goes round the country and it finds out that Kenyans want one party, KANU to proceed…. And…. And… that is in 1990. In 1991 December, KANU meets in Kasarani and declares……

Publicly declares……

Yes, publicly declares we are doing away with section 2A. And we rush to celebrate because our running call has been achieved. So we became multi party state but with a constitution that is fundamentally single party

…Party
Now, I think it is worth mentioning that the calls were for the reviewing of section 2A. And I must say that Rev. N. was far ahead of us in terms of thinking because in his sermon, he could see what we needed was a overhaul of the constitution.

But for us, the immediate was section 2A. In your subconscious you may think yes you need to do more but you are focusing on only one thing.

It was a mammoth test….

Yes. So later we were to call for an overhaul of the constitution much later. After the reveal os section 2A.

Okey

And after Sabasaba because of the brutalities and the deaths that were done to the people by the police, this angered the people and they made people more conscious about their rights.

Mmh

It served to galvanize the country together. The clergy continued to agitate the few who were bold enough to speak, like the Rev. N. and to take the consequences. The Law Society of Kenya we continued, the media continued to support us and in all this came a few media houses because there was only KBC at that time for the TV.

Then enter KTN.

…. enter KTN…. You know

Then CNN. It was like allowing another party in Kenya because they used to report us.

Yes

So unofficial opposition activity because the church, the Law Society, other voices, that was like the opposition in Kenya.

Absolutely

We were now being reported, and on a daily basis and the media now was putting us on headlines and prominent places. But you know not everybody will access a copy of electronic media. They were no FM stations. It was not like today.

So our alliance with the media was really critical to raise awareness in the country. The government was detaining people on charges that they want to overthrow the government mainly aimed at making people even fear them more.
91H: Right

92P1: So many things are happening in between. And the reveal of Section 2A is not out of President Moi’s goodness. It is out of his political acumen. Seeing that I am in a crumbling house, and I have got to do this. And for one thing you must credit President Moi, he knew when time is ripe to do something before the flood……

93H: Alright, I want to bring K. to respond to this because we need to ……. To the news. We are taking your phone calls 0719……. Lets hear what sabasaba means to you, what is the true story? We are getting it right on ‘The Nation’s Talking Point’. In the studio with us is Rev. N, M. K., K. O.. Conversation continues after the break.

BREAK

94H: 96.3 FM. You are on Nation FM and this is Nation’s Talking Point. We went to the streets and asked you what sabasaba means to you. The leader called on all of you to participate and the government telling you to stay home. Lets hear what you have to say

A1: We have to fight for our rights
A2: Wananchi wanafaa kutetewa
A3: Sabasaba sijui itanisaindia nini. Itaniletea chakula mezani. Nitaenda kazini kama kawaida

95H: As you can hear, a lot of people do not know what sabasaba is. We need to understand what it is. Right now the nation is crying for a national dialogue. In 1990 after sabasaba day we had so many people killed. Did we see anytime the President speak M. and say okey, how we can talk in 1991. And why did we have another 1997 situation if the President did say okey we can ……. And decide on this one party situation?

96P3: I think, as I said, we changed the constitution removing Section 2A, then so we became a multi party state, but with a single party constitution. So, the struggle began for the review of the Constitution. And so___agreed to change section 2A but said no to a new constitution. It was back to the trenches. I remember the NEC- National Convention Executive Committee of David Lamba, Kibutha Kibwana, and I think Rev. Njoya mobilizing again for a new constitution. And that’s why in 1997, we have sabasaba again. And I remember Kibutha Kibwana saying if sabasaba does not work, we have none none that means we will be demonstrating again, mobilizing affair on 8th of August, tisa tisa kumi

97H: Kumi

98P3: The struggle did not end there. The struggle continued

99H: continued
1997 was for the overhaul of the constitution. Finally the message that the Rev N. was preaching at the pulpit was preaching for the dismantling of the constitution.

Had become obvious to everybody. And those that were discussing the Lancaster constitution like the late___ and many others were all saying yes, this is the time to do it. And ah when it appeared that ah because there were running battles in the streets between the pro-democracy forces, mainly the civil society, the church, the church was the largest group, religious groups because even the muslims constituted the Ufungamano group. And I was then in parliament, a member of opposition to the Democratic Party.

The parties went to Ufungamano. I did not go to Ufungamano but my then leader __, ___ went to Ufungamano. And those of us who were in parliament, when we saw that the country was reaching a boiling point, got together as Interparty Parliamentary Group- IPPG. We sat and asked ourselves, ‘what is our role as elected leaders?’ what can we do to save our country. We got together and started discussing one, having a law that would enable us to review the constitution. Number 2, having minimum reforms. The IPPG package because 1997 was an election year and we did not want to go into elections with the draconian laws that were there.

Our meetings as opposition political parties were being disrupted, but we needed a breathing space to be able to conduct good elections. In the IPPG, we went and reviewed some of the oppressive laws, the chief’s authority act. They were using the chiefs to arrest people. Even people coming to dinner in your home, that you are having an illegal meeting. And the country is multi party. So we changed a few things, and we even amended the constitution to include a clause that both men and women will have gender parity in nominated seats. So that the 12 nominated seats could be shared equally by men and women.

We removed discrimination on the basis of sex to allow women to participate not only in politics but also in society without discrimination. We removed the law that allowed the state to discriminate media. They always went for ‘The Finance’ which was a very bold magazine. ‘Finance by ____, and they would dismantle the machines that used to print it, which were owned by a private firm. Instead of going for __ if they think his magazine has breached the law, they would go for the private operator who whose offence is to agree to print. So we reviewed a lot of laws.

At that time, the Ufungamano especially the civil societies saw as traitors for talking to KANU. But we were mainly doing what we needed to do in parliament. And it is that expanded democratic space in 1997 that allowed the opposition finally in 2002 to overthrow democratically.
The KANU regime. One other important thing. Remember there was KBC and KTN. There still were not many media houses. The Royal Media was licensed just before the 2002 elections. There was still monopoly we changed The Kenya Broadcasting Corporation Act and we said they have to give equal airtime to political parties during the elections because only KANU was getting.

Airtime

Now you brought it up to speed. 1990 was to get the clause 2A to be reviewed and to get the single party out. Then we have 1997 where we are talking about constitutional change and that’s why we saw riots, we saw opposition. That’s when they almost killed Rev. N. and all of us remember that image of him being beaten thoroughly by the police. First forward, the IPPG came into place, negotiations have taken place. 2002, KANU is finally out of power and lets fast forward to 2014

We are all talking if fighting for rights, fighting for democratic space and allowing different voices to come into space. Do you believe and I want to speak their opinion. Do you believe the expanded space that was being fought for is there? In terms of expression, in terms of being able to work out something, in terms of constitution. Let’s start with you K.

I believe the democratic space was expanded and it is still being expanded

Mmh

Ah, in 1990 of course 1991, we do away in Kasarani with 2A. I remember Mr. ___saying lets not go into an election in 1992 without changing the constitution. It did not happen, that struggle continued. We have a new constitution, so democratic space is still being expanded. In media, how many media houses did we have in 1997, 3. How many do we have now? How many Kenyans would have stood at the corner of Jeva Jee Gardens and say this is ‘Bunge la Wananchi’?

Wananchi?

What was Nyayo house about? Torture. Is it there any more? The democratic space has expanded. In 2002 elections are held. In 2003 President ___ takes over and the government never tired of reminding us to criticize the government because the president is a believer of democracy. We have come a long way

Alright, I wanna take a quick break here and when we come back, M. and Rev N.’s opinion. Do we have the fruits of 2nd liberation? Is there what we fought for? Are we reaping those fruits now? We gonna take a quick break and when we get back we receive more of your phone calls, o7………… lets figure out and understand what sabasaba
BREAK

124H: We are talking about sabasaba. With me, Rev. N., M.K and K. O. Three individuals who were there at the time. The fruits of what the liberation was about. Are we seeing those freedoms?

125P2: I think we should not doubt that we have adequate structures and institutions better than in any other country in the world

126H: Mmh

127P2: What we do not have are human beings to rule the structures because the old morale is no more. What we are calling sabasaba today is illusions. We have democracy, a change of philosophy which was not there during one party state

128H: Mmh

129P2: But when we look at our attitude towards materialism, ethnicity, we are still thinking in terms of ethnicity. We still think it is more important what you have than what you are. The institutions to take us where we want are there but we do not have people who think differently. What are we calling democracy is not democracy. Look at the men in black. You see whom I like very much and whom I voted for is still having kina __. __

130H: M., M. I want to bring you in and is there need for another sabasaba?

131P1: I want to begin by saying we got of what we fought for. But, we do not have a culture of being in the rule of law, a culture of constitutionalism. So for the government, when CORD says they want to have a rally, the first knee jerk reaction is you cannot have the rally. It is until when CORD insisted that I heard the deputy president say that they can have the rally, and there will be security. The same happened with the Eldoret rally. If we were following the law, there is nowhere the government would say or the Inspector General of Police would be saying this is not time for a rally. What barometer does he have to know the right time for politics? We are still trying to crawl back on the freedoms of expression. Has the opposition or those of us who are not in government have an opportunity to ventilate?

132H: Mmh

133P1: Yes, we must use the institutions that we have. One of them is parliament. But I, I want to emphatically say political parties too are institutions. So, when as leader of CORD says lets have dialogue, the president and his government should not be saying lets go through parliament. Political parties are institutions recognized by the constitution.

134H: Mmh

135P1: So the government is behaving like CORD’s call for dialogue is not important. What I am saying is that I have reservations about the way government is doing things. But I also have equal reservations with the way CORD is doing some of those things. Should you, in a political rally, simply because you are annoyed with the
government, with its appointment of many people from one ethnic group. Should you now call that a crime by the entire ethnic community

136H: Mmh

137P1: There could be many people appointed from the president’s community or from the deputy president’s community. Is that a community issue? The hungry Kikuyu, the hungry Kalenjin is just the same as the hungry Luo and a hungry any other person from another community. So when you ethicize it and say that this is a government of two communities.

138H: Mmh

139P1: what are you doing to a person who does not have time to serve through what you say

140H: Yes

141P1: I have reservations, but the government have a greater duty to ensure the democratic space expanded by our constitution and our laws is actually enjoyed to the fullest. That there is respect for human rights, yes, we have ots of issues we could discuss, but I want to say political parties are set by the constitution and they must be recognized. And is there need for sabasaba?

142H: Mmh

143P1: May be not in the way that there was. But if there is need for CORD to have a rally and call it sabasaba, let them have it. ….. and let it be within the law. But let also ask the government to be a listening government. Listen even to the weakest of your citizens. That is why you were elected. And let our elected leaders articulate the people’s issues so that the people do not feel locked out and look for avenues other than the institutions that are set out for them

144H: Alright. And I want to give all of you one minute parting shot. We are running out of time. We gonna read your twitter messages shortly. We are talking about sabasaba. What is sabasaba really about? I want to start with you. Parting shot K.

145P3: My parting shot is…. The best exemplification of sabasaba in 1990 and even sabasaba 2014 is the constitution. The best exemplification of sabasaba in 1990 and 2014 is the constitution that was promulgated in 2010. Now what do we need to do? We need to safeguard, we need to protect the constitution. I am glad that M. K. has pointed out that we have a culture where we do not want to live by the law. The law must be enforced and it is the only way it is going to be respected.

146H: Thank you K.. M., your parting shot

147P1: I will say, let the government concentrate on governing and doing all the things that the people need them to do……. Attending to security. Let them avoid the knee jerk reactions when the CORD or any other person say they want to do what they are legitimately entitled to do. Whether it is to hold a rally, call it sabasaba. Let the government facilitate within the law. But let us also as Kenyans obey the law. And
let the political parties and political leaders nurture a culture of respecting the law, of democracy, of regard for one another. We are telling the government yes, stand for our right but we must stand for each other’s rights. We need a new conversation in Kenya. That we can oppose each other but we are still one country

148H: Thank you M., Rev. N.

149P2: I am very happy about what M. and K. are telling us. We are all Kenyans. If somebody says eh this is a government of the Kikuyus and Kalenjins…. the person I voted for, none won and some people voted for M. So to classify me when it comes to partisanship, you are wasting your time. Let’s classify people according to their ideas and their ideologies

150H: Exactly

151P2: The other thing I want to tell Kenyans is that if by sabasaba they want regime change, they want power sharing, they want civil war, they will get all of them. But the question is, do they want all of them? If __ wants power sharing with __, that’s possible, if we want civil war, we will get it. We have it in Rwanda. These things are there in the whole world. Kenya is not except from South Sudan or from Somalia. But I urge Kenyans to have leaders who at the moment respect the rule of law. Kenyans choose the Godly way, which is the peaceful way

152H: To our news panel thank you so much. M. K., Rev. T. N., K. O., thank you so much
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